The Catholic Historical Review

VOL. LXXXIX JANUARY, 2003 No. 1

MARGERY KEMPE: AN EXEMPLAR OF LATE MEDIEVAL ENGLISH PIETY

BY

RAYMOND A. POWELL*

When the only complete manuscript of *The Book of Margery Kempe* came to light in the 1930's, it brought both joy and disappointment to students of the religion of late medieval England. On the one hand, *The Book* opens up medieval daily religious practice to modern scholars in a way few other sources do. On the other hand, the mystic experience of the author herself proved to be disappointing. Scholars had anticipated another Julian of Norwich; what they got was Margery Kempe. Kempe's description of her religious experience is not just cast into shadow by her fellow-countrywoman's *Shewings*; her story has struck modern readers as both bizarre and naive.[1]

The reluctance of many modern scholars to take Kempe seriously has been reinforced by her description of the reception her piety received at the hands of her contemporaries. Apparently the English of the fifteenth century were not impressed by Kempe either. According to her own account, she was accused of Lollardy on numerous occasions, constantly rejected by fellow pilgrims, resented and mistrusted by many of the clerics with whom she came into contact, and accused of hypocrisy and hidden vice by her fellow townspeople in Lynne.

*Mr. Powell is a graduate student in European and American Religious History at the University of Virginia. He would like to express his appreciation to Dr. Augustine Thompson for his assistance with this article.

[1]For a treatment of *The Book*'s negative reception, see Maureen Fries, "Margery Kempe," in *An Introduction to the Medieval Mystics of Europe*, ed. Paul Szarmach (Albany, 1984), pp. 227–229; for an example of one of those personally disappointed by *The Book*, see David Knowles, *The English Mystical Tradition* (New York, 1961), p. 139.

More recent scholars who do not want to dismiss Kempe so easily have attempted to rehabilitate her by claiming her as a feminist heroine. According to one proponent of this theory, *The Book* is "a valuable and fascinating testimony into the history of women's liberation," and of "a woman's quest for identity and independence."[2] Religion here is recognized as a subterfuge for Kempe's self-actualization: "Fortuitous for the history of feminism, the cloak of holiness allowed her to move in a niche sanctioned by contemporary society."[3] Though other authors are more restrained, many agree that the true merit of Kempe's *Book* has been hidden because of an insistence on evaluating it, and her, by patriarchal standards. "The fitting of her *Book* into a Procrustean bed has confused and negated the values she represents."[4] The recognition of Kempe as a proto-feminist underlies a variety of positive evaluations of *The Book*. One theory portrays Kempe as an unrecognized literary genius, of the caliber of Geoffrey Chaucer or William Faulkner, whose brilliant writing and scathing social analysis have been overlooked because she was female. The alleged oddities of Kempe's text disappear when the reader recognizes Kempe's "need for strategies to conceal and disguise [her] strongly original and, in some cases, destabilizing insights into the systems of theological or communal ordering."[5] According to another interpretation, Kempe is a "revolutionary," a woman ahead of her time, some of whose themes and ideas "are flourishing in the . . . radical . . . expressiveness of modern Protestantism."[6]

Modern interpretations, both negative and positive, share the characteristic of ignoring Kempe's context. Those who reject the *Book* do so because it does not fit the twentieth-century standard of medieval mysticism created by scholars from the works of Teresa of Avila or John of the Cross. Those who admire Kempe do so by an anachronistic (and often unconvincing) discovery of feminist virtues in her story. In either instance, modern scholars do Margery Kempe a disservice by ignoring the context in which she wrote. An ahistorical twentieth- or twenty-first-century reading may indeed leave the impression of an hysteric, a feminist heroine, or a brilliant social commentator. In fact, Kempe was neither a visionary in the tradition of the Spanish mystics nor a preco-

[2]Verena Neuburger, *Margery Kempe: A Study in Early English Feminism* (New York, 1994), pp. 56, 101.

[3]*Ibid.*, p. 112.

[4]Fries, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

[5]Lynne Staley, *Margery Kempe's Dissenting Fictions* (University Park, Pennsylvania, 1994), p. 3.

[6]Elizabeth Psakis Armstrong, "'Understanding by Feeling' in Margery Kempe's *Book*," in *Margery Kempe, A Book of Essays*, ed. Sandra J. McEntire (New York, 1992), p. 18.

cious champion of female equality. Instead she was a late medieval English Christian. Her piety was the piety of the devout in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century England, especially East Anglia. Her mystic experience was based on the devotional practices enjoined on the English faithful by numerous religious works. Virtually every element of her religious life has its counterpart, and more often than not its precedent, in the experience of other medieval Christians. The strong personality which shines through in the pages of her *Book* may give the impression that Margery Kempe was a religious individualist. She was not. She was not idiosyncratic or eccentric. In a very profound sense she was strictly conventional. *The Book* seems unusual only when divorced from its context; against the backdrop of popular piety in late medieval England Kempe fits perfectly. In fact, so many of the religious trends in the England of her day find an expression in her religiosity that she may well be considered an exemplar of late medieval English piety.

This article will attempt to demonstrate how Kempe's religious life is a reflection of mainstream medieval English piety. Through the use of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century English devotional works as well as other sources, Kempe's beliefs and practices will be placed in the context of fourteenth/fifteenth-century religious life. This context will be contrasted with interpretations of Kempe advanced by various modern scholars. Kempe's piety will also be examined in light of continental Catholicism at the same time period, especially with trends in women's devotion. The article, having defended the thesis of Kempe's conventionality, will then consider the difficulty posed to such an interpretation by the opposition Kempe's religiosity aroused in her own day. The article will conclude with an examination of Kempe's goals in writing *The Book*.

The sources for this study are literary ones. According to Kempe's own testimony, the Bible and biblical commentaries were read aloud to her, along with "St. Bride's Book, Hilton's Book," *Stimulus Amoris*, and *Incendium Amoris*.[7] Margery Kempe's faith was also shaped by numerous other sources, including the sermons she so fervently desired to hear, the pastoral counseling of her many confessors, and the godly conversations she enjoyed so much.[8] A number of scholars have recognized

[7]Margery Kempe, *The Book of Margery Kempe* (New York, 1985), p. 182.

[8]For the influence of preaching, note that Louise Collis argues in her *Memoirs of a Medieval Woman* (New York, 1964) that sermons were the dominant influence on Kempe's literary style (pp. 256–257).

[9]B. A. Windeatt identifies references to the Wakefield Mystery Play of Scourging and the York Crucifixion Play in Kempe's writings (*The Book*, p. 326, chap. 80, n. 4, 5); Neuburger claims to recognize traces of "Noah and his Wife" from the York play cycle (*op. cit.*, p. 62).

the influence of several identifiable religious dramas on her prose.[9] Above all, the rituals of Catholic worship, especially the liturgy of the Mass, formed the foundation on which her religiosity was based. By focusing on literary sources no claim is being made that they were the only, or even the most important, influences on the development of Margery Kempe's religious practices. Instead, the congruence of themes and ideas in Kempe's *Book* and other books of her time is meant to illustrate the ways in which Kempe's faith conformed to the religious norms and expectations of her society.

Any serious study of Margery Kempe requires an examination of two major influences on the spirituality of late medieval England. The first influence is that of imaginative and affective piety stemming from the devotional tradition of the *Meditaciones vite Christi*, a work attributed in the Middle Ages to St. Bonaventure, but actually the product of an obscure Franciscan, Johannes de Caulibus. As the title implies, this spiritual work revolves around the concept of devout meditation on the life, and especially the suffering and death, of Jesus Christ. Through detailed and serious reflection on the events of Jesus' life, the soul of the devout person is made aware of the great love displayed by God in redemption, and is drawn to respond to that love. The significant aspect of this form of spirituality was the encouragement to draw on the resources of the imagination to facilitate devotional practice.

The *Meditaciones*, passing under Bonaventure's name, certainly circulated in England in its original Latin form, where it had tremendous influence in shaping the pious practices of devout lay people as well as Religious. There were also a large number of English religious works drawing on the pseudo-Bonaventuran devotional tradition by Kempe's day. The best known and most influential was *The Mirrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christ*, a loose translation of the *Meditaciones* made about 1410 by Nicholas Love, prior of the Carthusian House at Mont Grace.[10] The same style of affective meditation based on the life of Christ circulated widely in England in another volume incorrectly attributed to Bonaventure, of which the English translation, *The Prickynge of Love*, was dubiously credited to Walter Hilton.[11] So ubiquitous was its influence that it is impossible to pinpoint by which avenue the *Meditaciones*' distinctive form of imaginative devotion came to be introduced to Margery Kempe. It may be significant that both the actual and

[10]Love's *Mirrour* was "probably the most popular vernacular book in the fifteenth century." Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars* (New Haven, 1992), p. 235.

[11]The attribution to Hilton is discussed in the preface to *The Prickynge of Love*, ed. Harold Kane (Salzburg, 1983), I, xxii–xxiv.

the purported author of the *Meditaciones* were Franciscans, since Kempe would be closely associated with a number of Franciscans, both in England and abroad. Yet however it came to be, there is no question that Kempe, like so many other English Christians in the late Middle Ages, was a disciple of the *Meditaciones*' tradition.

Even without determining which of the many possible sources lay behind Kempe's own practice of imaginative devotion, it is possible to recognize the influence of the system on *The Book*. Any of the works in the tradition of the *Meditaciones* can appropriately serve as a guide to the devotional life of late medieval Catholic piety in England, the piety which nurtured Margery Kempe. For the purposes of this article, the chief guide will be Nicholas Love's *Mirrour*, both because of its great popularity and widespread circulation, and because it is contemporary with Kempe's own religious experience. While a number of the characteristic themes of the *Meditaciones*-style piety will be discussed in greater detail below in conjunction with the experiences of Margery Kempe, it will be worthwhile to consider a few of the most important themes in this tradition, themes which will be particularly important in coming to an understanding of Margery Kempe's faith.

The whole basis of *Meditaciones*-style devotion is the assumption that those who engage in it are familiar with the general narratives of the Gospels, especially the details of the birth and death of Christ. Kempe's facility for quoting Scripture and the biblical allusions that are scattered through *The Book* are reflections of the wide circulation of biblical material in popular religious culture. While *The Mirrour* does present the stories of Christ's life for affective reflection, it presupposes the basic familiarity of its audience with them. Whether learned through liturgy, sermons, plays, church art, devotional tracts, or Scripture itself, the stories of the Bible, especially the stories of Jesus' life, had to be well known in order for people to engage in meditation on them.

A second important aspect of the *Meditaciones* is the degree of theological sophistication passed along through its medium, a reflection of the general level of theological teaching available to interested laity in the Middle Ages. Fifteenth-century English audiences were especially familiar with Catholic doctrines challenged by Lollardy. It is "because of lewd Lollards who falsely meddle against the faith," for instance, that Love interrupts his narrative about the Last Supper to reflect on the theological significance of the Eucharist.[12] With the Church making a concerted effort

[12]Love, *The Mirrour of the Blessed Lyf of Jesu Christi* (Salzburg, 1989), p. 208. (For the sake of clarity all quotations from Love are rendered in modern English.)

to present orthodox doctrine to good Catholics, Margery Kempe's ability to defend herself against charges of Lollardy in episcopal courts need not appear unusual, and does not even require that a theologically more sophisticated scribe take a hand at polishing those portions of her prose.

Another important aspect of the *Meditaciones* tradition was that it placed the focal point of devotion on the humanity, especially the suffering humanity, of Jesus Christ. Practitioners of this pattern of devotion were encouraged to think of Jesus' humanity, not his impassible divinity. "You who wish, through fervent inward affection, to have sorrowful compassion for the painful suffering of Jesus must mentally lay aside the might of his Godhead for the gentle weakness of his humanity. . . . You shall imagine and inwardly think of him in his passion as a fair young man."[13] This because, according to St. Bernard, the "contemplation of the humanity of Christ is more helpful and beneficial than the contemplation of the Godhead" for "simple souls." Thus these simple souls are to "have in mind the image of Christ's incarnation, passion, and resurrection."[14] Another author in the same tradition wrote, "It behoveth [a man] to set thereto all the sharpness of his mind with open eyes of [the] heart . . . and making himself present in all that befell in the Passion and Crucifixion, effectively, busily, thoughtfully and perseveringly, and passing over nought lightly or with tedious heaviness, but with all the heart and with ghostly gladness."[15]

Finally, and most important for understanding some of the most criticized aspects of Kempe's visions, is that the *Meditaciones* tradition encouraged the use of imagination in devotional practices. It was appropriate to imaginatively supply those details the Gospels did not reveal. Scripture itself had been written so that the story of Christ could stir people to everlasting life, and "for this purpose, along with Scripture were written various books by devout men and women . . . among which are devout meditations on Christ's life, which are more detailed in certain places than the four Gospels."[16] Indeed, since as St. John had said, not all that Jesus said and did was recorded in the Gospels, "in order to stir devotion we imagine and think of the words and deeds of Jesus and others which are not included in the Bible, as long as they do not contradict the faith."[17] The whole practice of meditation was an

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 216.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 8–9.

[15] Duffy, *op. cit.*, p. 235, quoted from *Yorkshire Writers*, ed. C. Horstman (New York, 1895), I, 198.

[16] Love, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

imaginative recreation of the Gospel stories, in which the devout person was urged "with all your might and attention in this way to make your soul present to the things written, said, or done here to our Lord Jesus."[18] The goal, then, was for the one meditating to insert himself or herself into the story, as a witness or even a character, and to follow the action. When describing the Nativity, Love urges the reader to "take heed and think as though you were present in the room of Our Lady"[19]

Some of this imaginative devotion was intended to instruct; the practice of supplying missing details, or creating whole stories, was used by religious writers largely to make theological points. Nicholas Love portrays the archangel Michael in the Garden of Gesthemane with Jesus, telling him of how the angels begged God to spare the Son, while the *Meditations of the Life and Passion of Christ* has Mary capturing a unicorn.[20] In each case the works drew on familiar images instead of resorting entirely to imagination, and both stories were added for didactic purposes. But such Gospel supplements also served to heighten the emotional impact of the images on the heart, and it was for this reason that the practice was enjoined upon pious laypeople as an aid to further devotion.

The second major influence on English lay piety in Kempe's day which must be considered in any study of Margery Kempe is the writing of the English mystic and hermit Richard Rolle. Rolle was a figure of considerable influence in late medieval England, venerated as a saint and remembered as the author of a number of extremely popular religious works. As with the *Meditaciones*, Rolle's influence on Kempe will be discussed in greater detail below, but it will be worthwhile to consider a few of Rolle's major contributions to English religious practice.

One of the marked tendencies of Richard Rolle's spirituality was an experience of God's presence received through the physical senses. His most distinctive image of the sensual reception of God is that of a heart warmed by the fire of devotion. "I cannot tell you how surprised I was the first time I felt my heart began to warm," he writes in the opening lines of the prologue to his *Incendium Amoris*, a work to which Margery Kempe refers on several occasions. "It was real warmth too, not imaginary, and it felt as if it were actually on fire. I was astonished at the way the heat surged up, and how this new sensation brought great and

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 222–223; *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ, from British Museum Addit. MS. 11307*, ed. Charlotte D'Evelyln (London, 1921), p. 2.

unexpected comfort. I had to keep feeling my breast to make sure there was no physical reason for it! But . . . I realized that it came entirely from within . . . this fire of love . . . was the gift of my Maker."[21] The burning heart became the central theme and organizing principle for Rolle. It was also a mark of genuine spirituality. No one who had not "experience[d] in his heart the genuine fire of the love of God" could claim to be a contemplative.[22]

Rolle physically experienced God's presence in other ways besides the burning of his heart. Closely allied with the sensation of heat was the reception of a heavenly melody. "Music, divine and delectable, comes to rejoice" the spirit set on God.[23] The contemplative, "straining with every nerve to burn with the fire of the Holy Spirit . . . will burn vigorously in his love for God . . . [and] through contemplation . . . is lifted up to celestial joy and song and sound."[24] And in addition to heat and sound, tears also are physical responses to God's presence.

Rolle combined his physical response to God's presence with a lighthearted sense of joy that came in contemplation. "Sweet charity, you are so obviously the dearest of all that is sweet! You take hold of our minds by your love. . . . You came to me . . . and every secret corner of my heart has been filled with the lovely sound of your joy, and made abundant with fervent, spiritual happiness."[25] After heat and melody, sweetness is the phrase most commonly associated with the devout life.

Rolle combined his idea of the sweet nature of experiencing God with more conventional marriage-mysticism. The language of romance and of the Song of Songs served to furnish images of human love for God; Rolle writes of "swoon[ing] with unspeakable delight," when he "feel[s] the embrace and caress of [his] sweetheart."[26] The strong images of God/Christ as lover allow Rolle to present a contrast between carnal love and spiritual love. While admitting marriage is good, *The Fire of Love* leaves the impression that marital sexuality invariably leads to sin and to distance from God.[27] The God who is both lover and spouse is jealous of rivals.[28] Only the individual who has renounced

[21]Richard Rolle, *The Fire of Love*, trans. Clifton Wolters (New York: Penguin Books, 1972), p. 45.
[22]*Ibid.*, pp. 51–52.
[23]*Ibid.*, p. 76.
[24]*Ibid.*, p. 85.
[25]*Ibid.*, p. 97.
[26]*Ibid.*, p. 123.
[27]*Ibid.*, pp. 117–119.
[28]From MS. Arundel 507, in *Yorkshire Writers*, pp. 147–148.

earthly love can know the Heavenly Lover. As might be expected from a hermit, chastity is closely tied to the experience of God.

Rolle and the practices of the *Meditaciones* could be easily combined. In fact, a division between the two traditions is artificial. Rolle himself wrote an influential English-language *Meditations on the Passion*, and included similar material in works such as *Ego Dormio*.[29] Other versions of the *Meditaciones* circulated under Rolle's name.[30] One work (besides the *Book*) in which the influence of both can be discerned is the anonymous *Meditations on the Life and Passion of Jesus Christ*. This brief poetic adaptation of pseudo-Bonaventure incorporates quotations from Rolle in its text. On the other hand, *The Mirrour* contains themes normally associated with Rolle, as when it tells the story of a man meditating on the Eucharist. This individual "suddenly felt spread throughout his own body a joy and delight which pass all understanding . . . and through this joy and delight his whole body was enflamed with so delightful and joyful a heat that he physically felt as if his body were melting for joy like wax before a burning fire."[31] Within the wider context of the Western Christian tradition, Rolle and the *Meditaciones* would set their stamp on late medieval English religious life, and it is with relationship to one, or the other, or both, that much of Margery Kempe's 'unique' religious experience must be understood.

No part of Margery Kempe's narrative has done more to discredit her as a mystic with modern people than the visions she records. The most notorious involves her service as maid and attendant to first St. Anne, then St. Mary. In her vision (or visions, for it is unclear if this was a single extended vision or a series following in sequence) she begins by serving the pregnant Anne, then raises Mary from infancy. At one point in the narrative "the creature" (as Kempe refers to herself) tells the young Virgin, "You shall be the Mother of God." The child responds that she wishes she were worthy to serve that person. As the vision proceeds Kempe serves as Mary's maid, and finally as nurse to the infant Jesus, though interestingly Mary is absent from Kempe when the Annunciation occurs. Kempe's role as nanny continues during the visit of the Magi and the flight to Egypt.[32] A later vision places Kempe at the tomb just after Jesus has been buried. When Mary swoons, Kempe fixes

[29]Richard Rolle, *Ego Dormio,* in *English Writings of Richard Rolle*, ed. Emily Allen (Oxford, 1931), p. 67.

[30]E.g., *Yorkshire Writers*, pp. 158, 198.

[31]Love, *op. cit.*, pp. 208–209.

[32]Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 52–54.

her "a good hot drink of gruel and spiced wine."[33] The banality of such spiritual communication (especially when compared with the depth of Julian of Norwich's visions) has left Kempe's modern reputation quite low. The best that one sympathetic observer was able to do was to claim that the envisioned acts of service must have been inspired by the [assumed] death of her children, and that her visions were "compensating for her real life deprivation."[34]

But neither interpretation does justice to Margery Kempe, or to the context of her religious experience. The visions that seem so shallow as remarkable revelations are in fact a record of Kempe engaging in *Meditaciones*-style devotional practice, inserting herself as a character into the story, the better to feel, to experience, and to be affected by, the events of Christ's life. And the image of service which has been such a stumbling block for modern scholars proves to be a medieval commonplace. *The Mirrour*, imaginatively recreating the childhood of the Virgin, records the fervent prayers of Mary asking God for the favor that she herself might be permitted to attend and serve the Maiden chosen to bear the Messiah.[35] When Kempe imagined herself serving Mary, she was merely recreating the behavior of the Mother of God modeled in popular piety. Popular piety also advised, "If you will use your powers, you too will know how to obey, serve, console, and comfort [Our Lady], so that she may eat a little. . . ."[36] When Kempe offered Mary a drink she was simply following instructions.

Yes, Kempe was using her imagination. The common form of devotion she practiced demanded it. But her real problem was not too much imagination, but too little. As one of the leading authorities on late medieval English religion writes, Kempe's visions "seem in places to be little more than literal-minded paraphrases of the relevant sections of *Meditationes Vitae Christi* or of Richard Rolle's almost equally influential *Meditations on the Passion*."[37] The heavenly visions which occupy so prominent a place in *The Book* are not the delusions of an hysterical female, but the simple fruit of rather commonplace spiritual disciplines taught by numerous authorities in late medieval England.

If Kempe's visionary mysticism had not been troubling enough for modern readers, her sensual mysticism has done nothing to increase

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 236.
[34] Neuburger, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
[35] Love, *op. cit.*, p. 21.
[36] Kempe, *The Book*, p. 326, chap. 81, n. 1, quoted from *Meditationes Vitae Christi*.
[37] Duffy, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

the favor in which she has been regarded in recent times. Yet oddly enough, none of Kempe's practices are unique, either among other medieval women mystics or within the context of medieval English religion. Kempe's heart glows and burns with the fire of God's love. She describes "a flame of fire of love—marvelously hot and delectable and very comforting, never diminishing but ever increasing; for though the weather was never so cold she felt the heat burning in her breast and at her heart, as veritably as a man would feel the material fire if he put his hand or his finger to it."[38] One puzzled writer can only imagine it to be a cozy image for a housewife.[39] Yet who can fail to hear the direct echoes of Richard Rolle? In the same way Kempe describes God's presence as resulting in sounds and a sense of sweetness.

> One night, as this creature lay in bed with her husband, she heard a melodious sound so sweet and delectable that she thought she had been in paradise. And immediately she jumped out of bed and said, . . . 'It is full merry in heaven'. This melody was so sweet that it surpassed all the melody that might be heard in this world, without any comparison, and it caused this creature when she afterwards heard any mirth or melody to shed very plentiful and abundant tears of high devotion, with great sobbings and sighings for the bliss of heaven. . . . And ever after her being drawn to God in this way, she kept in mind the joy and melody that there was in heaven, so much so that she could not very well restrain herself from speaking of it. For when she was in company with any people she would often say, 'It is full merry in heaven!'[40]

Once again it is a disciple of Richard Rolle and not a weak-minded hysteric who envisioned the reception of God in this way, and moreover a disciple planted firmly in the mainstream of English piety. The association of music with God's presence had a particularly distinguished tradition. One medieval English devotional guide approvingly quotes Robert Grosseteste to the effect that worldly music provides a foretaste of the joys of God's kingdom.[41] The association of sweetness with an encounter with God is also common in medieval piety. Like Rolle, Kempe luxuriates in the simple sense of joy in God's presence. Heaven is "full

[38]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 125.

[39]"It is tempting to envisage Margery Kempe busy cooking and burning her finger on a hot pot. Cold weather probably was a worry for the lady of the house, so the idea of any constant fire burning wherever must have been associated with contentment." Neuburger, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

[40]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 46.

[41]Robert of Brunne, *Robert of Brunne's "Handlyng Sinne,"* ed. Frederick Furnivall (London, 1901), p. 158. Of course, the association of spirituality and music in Western Christianity dates back to the Early Church.

merry." Such language is also reminiscent of Julian of Norwich, who speaks so glowingly of God's homely love.

This homely love for God is expressed in some of the most notorious passages in *The Book.* At one point on her travels Kempe wears a wedding ring engraved with the words "Jesus is my love." The temporary loss of the ring throws her into despair.[42] Apparently the relationship represented by the ring only applied to Jesus' humanity, because later Kempe describes her marriage to the Godhead, a wedding witnessed by the Mother of God and all the saints.[43] Finally, she tells us the words of Jesus addressed to her as his spouse.

> 'It is appropriate for the wife to be on homely terms with her husband. Be he ever so great a lord and she ever so poor a woman, when he weds her, yet they must lie together and rest together in joy and peace. Just so must it be between you and me, for I take no heed of what you have been but what you would be. . . . Therefore I must be intimate with you, and lie in your bed with you. Daughter. you greatly desire to see me, and you may boldly, when you are in bed, take me to you as your wedded husband, as your dear darling, and as your sweet son, for I want to be loved as a son should be loved by the mother, and I want you to love me, daughter, as a good wife ought to love her husband. Therefore you can boldly take me in the arms of your soul and kiss my mouth, my head, and my feet as sweetly as you want. . . .'[44]

Apparently even some familiar with medieval bridal mysticism have found such passages to be too much. Yet once again, Kempe is merely expressing in her own words common ideas and themes of the religious culture of her day. Rolle, as noted above, could speak of "swooning" at the "embrace and caress" of his "sweetheart." *The Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ* also draws on images of home and marriage to speak about a relationship with God. The anonymous poet describes how, "I may make him a dwelling in my heart at his liking. There he shall be fed with love, a clean soul shall be his bed. . . . There shall be embracing and kissing for great love of that comely King." The poet then provides descriptive details of a home being readied for a newly married couple, followed by common images of daily married life and love to describe the relationship between the soul and Jesus.[45]

One of the byproducts of affective meditation and the emphasis on the humanity of Jesus (exemplified in England in the cult of the Holy Name

[42]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 114.

[43]*Ibid.*, pp. 122–124.

[44]*Ibid.*, pp. 126–127.

[45]*Meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ*, pp. 43–44. All quotations from this source have been rendered in modern English.

of Jesus) was a sense of Jesus' accessibility best expressed through the language of kinship.[46] Thus for Kempe, Jesus is not only at times husband, but also father, brother, and son. And such expressions fall well within the bounds of mainstream English piety.

In fact, Kempe's whole attitude toward God is typical of her religious culture. Despite a few references to the Trinity (she was a member of the Trinity Guild in Lynne), Kempe's piety was focused on the humanity of Christ. The prospect of marrying the Godhead frightens her because "she was very much afraid of the Godhead; and she had no knowledge of the conversation of the Godhead; for all her love and affection were fixed on the manhood of Christ, and of that she did have knowledge and would not be parted with that for anything."[47] In this, as in so much else, Kempe was mirroring the values taught in common devotional practice. Her "handsome" male picture of Jesus, and her tears at the sight of a child or images of motherhood, are the natural by-product of *Meditaciones*-inspired religion which depended on the accessibility of the human figures in the stories of the Gospels. This human focus culminated in England in devotion to the Holy Name of Jesus, a movement which will be discussed in more detail below.

The tradition of the *Meditaciones* is also related to another practice of Margery Kempe with which modern commentators have found fault—pilgrimages. Incredibly, even Kempe's pilgrimages have been cited as examples of ways in which she stood out from her contemporaries. One twentieth-century author suggests, "Margery's constant journeying, whether on pilgrimage or more minor errand, must have struck . . . many . . . as incompatible with her claims to sanctity."[48] Another modern writer suspects that, as usual, ostensibly religious action was merely a cloak. Apparently "her wish to travel was only a physical expression of an inner desire . . . [to find] fulfillment outside her prescribed sphere."[49] With far more insight W. A. Pantin, many years before, recognized Kempe's commitment to pilgrimages as typical of fourteenth-century English religion, where contrary to Lollard assertions, externals such as images and relics were "not a hindrance but a direct help to a more spiritual devotion."[50]

[46]Duffy, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[47]Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 122–123.

[48]Fries, *op. cit.*, p. 230.

[49]Neuburger, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

[50]W. A. Pantin, *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1955), p. 259.

The essentially religious nature of Kempe's pilgrimages can be glimpsed in part from her intense desire to garnish every available indulgence along the route, a desire which remained undimmed even when God assured her such an activity was not necessary in her case.[51] But more importantly, the role of pilgrimages in Kempe's piety can be seen in their effect on her spiritual life. It was in Jerusalem, following friars through the stations of the cross, that the full enormity of the suffering of Christ came home to Margery Kempe. At the foot of Mt. Calvary she rolled on the ground, "and cried with a loud voice as if her heart would have burst, for in the city of her soul she saw how truly and freshly our Lord was crucified. . . . And she had such great compassion and such great pain to see our Lord's pain, that she could not keep herself from crying and roaring though she should have died for it." It was the first time, she records, she had ever cried out during contemplation, but from that time on images of crucifixes, wounds, or the beating of a child or animal, would bring back the emotion and the cries.[52] The sights of the Holy City provided the material she needed for even more vivid imaginative recreations of the events of the life of Christ.

Pilgrimage may have served another purpose for Kempe, or at least another purpose in terms of Kempe's narrative. Her visit to Hayles in 1417 followed not long after the arch-Lollard Sir John Oldcastle had singled the shrine out for specific scorn. In those troubled times, a visit to Hayles was a public assertion of orthodoxy.[53]

The fact that pilgrimage was a normal part of medieval religious life is so obvious it need not be demonstrated here. But aside from noting the connection of pilgrimage with the devotional habits of the *Meditaciones,* it is worthwhile to consider that even within the context of pilgrimage, Kempe was typical. She visited all the obvious holy sites: Jerusalem, Rome, Canterbury, and Compostela. She also visited the Bridgettine Abbey at Syon, the favorite nonlocal religious house of East Anglia, to judge by the number of bequests left to it, and a central focal-point of East Anglian piety.[54] Even her choice of the types of shrines she visited was in keeping with current trends in pilgrimage.[55]

[51]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 108.

[52]*Ibid.*, p. 104.

[53]Clarissa W. Atkinson, *Mystic and Pilgrim* (Ithaca, New York, 1983), p. 12.

[54]Gail McMurray Gibson, *The Theater of Devotion* (Chicago, 1989), pp. 20–21, 97–98.

[55]In a study of English pilgrimage, *Miracles and Pilgrims* (Totowa, New Jersey, 1977), Ronald Finucane notes a shift in interest from shrines connected with healing miracles to shrines associated with Christocentric/Mariocentric devotion. Though with exceptions such as Canterbury, Kempe's pilgrimages largely conform to this pattern.

Another of Kempe's habits which has struck modern scholars as strangely significant was Kempe's inveterate custom of rebuking evil-livers. Those who would cast Kempe as a feminist before feminism are especially taken with her practice of confronting priests with their sins. But even this ostensibly unladylike habit fell within the realm of acceptable medieval behavior, and has links with important English devotional practices. That a medieval woman could rebuke a sinful priest was accepted even by a misogynist like Richard Rolle. In his *Fire of Love* he recalls three instance where women quite rightly pointed out his failings to him.[56] One of the by-products of the rising involvement of lay people in religious life was the emergence of a "lay apostolate" which chastised and encouraged their fellow Christians.[57]

In Kempe's case, her involvement in public chastisement was usually limited to rebuking oath-swearers. This indicates a close relationship to the popular English cult of the Holy Name of Jesus, a cult championed by Richard Rolle. In English devotional practice, veneration of the Holy Name of Jesus was a way of connecting with Jesus' humanity, a central concern in medieval English religious life. Devotion to the Holy Name focused on "the sweetness, gentleness, and accessibility of the human Saviour."[58] Because of the centrality of Jesus' name to this popular movement, swearing was particularly offensive. To swear oaths is to "dismember Jesus," and those who swear "scorn Jesus; and upbraid his pain."[59] Concern about swearing and a willingness to rebuke sinful priests do not set Margery Kempe apart from her culture.[60]

But of all Kempe's alleged foibles, nothing has provided so much fodder for modern speculation as her concern about chastity, an interest which merits a detailed examination. The fact that Kempe's initial mystical experience was connected with an episode of *post-partum* depression (from one of her fourteen pregnancies), some evidence that Kempe was less than fond of her husband, and especially the statement that her

[56]Rolle, *Fire of Love*, p. 81.

[57]Pantin, *op. cit.*, p. 260.

[58]Duffy, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

[59]Robert of Brunne, *op. cit.*, p. 25. All quotations from this source have been rendered in modern English.

[60]Those who emphasize the significance of Kempe's willingness to confront clerical vice often point to her story of the unworthy monk told in the presence of the archbishop of York, citing both the bravado of a woman telling stories critical of priests and the importance of her use of a parable in the first place. In fact, stories were common didactic devices in the Middle Ages, especially in sermons, and stories about irreligious clerics abounded. *The Handlyng of Sinne*, for instance, which illustrates every vice with at least one tale, tells of "the backbiting English monk" (Robert of Brunne, *op. cit.*, p. 158).

personal convictions about chastity made the thought of sexual relations with her husband disgusting to her, have all led to the feminist interpretation that Kempe's religious quest for chastity was in reality a way of breaking the bonds of an unwelcome marriage and avoiding further, unwanted pregnancies.[61] It may well be that these played a part in shaping Kempe's intense interest in chastity as a form of religious expression; yet even the evidence of *The Book* itself is far more ambiguous than the bald summary outline above might indicate. While some passages point to a woman unhappily married (and so presumably eager to escape the necessity of sexual relations with a despised spouse) other passages indicate a far better relationship with her husband. Evidence of Kempe's own sexuality militates even more strongly against the too-easy view that Kempe was a woman eager to trade away sex for the opportunity to separate from an unloved partner. By her own admission Kempe was subject to sexual temptation. There was a memorable Evensong service where she consented to commit adultery, then was rebuffed, connected with several years of temptation with lecherous thoughts.[62] Most significant of all is Kempe's reflection on her married life as she tended her now senile husband during his last days. It seemed to Kempe that the degrading and burdensome task of caring for an incontinent and senile adult was a penance for the pleasure she had once taken during marital relationships from the same body she must now tend in illness.[63] It is not entirely obvious that Kempe chose chastity because she did not like sleeping with her husband.

Based on the ambiguous evidence, an equally compelling explanation is that Kempe shared the religious sensibilities of her age, and found chastity appealing for the same reasons as the men (such as Richard Rolle) who promoted it. *The Fire of Love* uses both lust and sex as general evidences of reprobation; even within marriage sex serves to separate the individual from God. Carnal lust prevents a knowledge of Christ, and ultimately excludes from Paradise.[64] Rolle strongly connects the sensual experience of God's presence with the complete rejection of carnal sweetness.[65] The great value placed by society on chastity/virginity can best be seen in another of Love's supplements to the Gospel. At the Annunciation Mary greets the angelic prophecy not just with the biblical question of how she, a virgin, can become a mother,

[61]Neuburger, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
[62]Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 49–50.
[63]*Ibid.*, p. 221.
[64]Rolle, *The Fire of Love*, pp. 49–50, 57–58, 130.
[65]*Ibid.*, pp. 125–126.

but with the news that she has taken a vow of perpetual chastity. Only when she has been assured that God's will could be carried out even through birth without challenge to her virgin-status, does Mary agree to let it be done as the angel had said.[66]

Kempe's interest in chastity was part of a greater movement toward a more spiritual life, and was intimately connected with fasting. Lust and gluttony were seen as closely related, and the fact that the start of Kempe's desire for chastity coincides with efforts at fasting and wearing a hair-shirt indicates a strong religious motivation.[67] Rolle had offered fasting as the most helpful way to curb bodily desires.[68] The coincidence of fasting and a desire for chastity in as obvious a disciple of Richard Rolle as Kempe was certainly suggests that there was more to Kempe's surrender of sex than a desire to escape from marriage.[69]

The religious culture of Kempe's day valued chastity. While other explanations are possible, it is equally possible to understand Kempe's interest in chastity in light of her culture's religious values. Her adamant statements about longing for chastity may seem an indictment of her husband. But there are dangers in taking all of Kempe at face value. Kempe's goals in writing will be discussed below, but it is clear that one motivation was to present the sanctity of her life. The memorable declaration that she would rather see her husband dead than sleep with him again can be understood in light of her desire to present herself as a model of spirituality.[70]

This article has concentrated on demonstrating how Margery Kempe was a typical product of late medieval English religious life. Kempe has also been located solidly within the tradition of continental female mystics.[71] Carolyn Bynum places Kempe into a number of categories of behavior supposedly representative of 'female' piety. While Kempe does not fit exactly the model of 'normal' female practice presented by Bynum, nevertheless, like many medieval women mystics, Kempe fasted,

[66]Love, *op. cit.*, pp. 29–31.

[67]Walter Hilton, in *The Ladder of Perfection* (Baltimore, 1957), connects gluttony and lust (p. 89).

[68]Rolle, *The Fire of Love*, p. 78.

[69]There was even a local model for chaste marriage in the East Anglian saint Aethelthryth (Atkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 68).

[70]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 58; Rolle wrote that spiritual perfection causes an individual to lose interest in carnal desires (*The Fire of Love*, p. 113).

[71]Dhira B. Mahoney, "Margery Kempe's Tears and the Power Over Language," in *Margery Kempe, A Book of Essays*, pp. 40–41.

cried, focused on the humanity of Christ, lived chastely in the world, and had visions of Jesus in the Eucharist.[72] Since the majority of behaviors Kempe shares with continental religious women were also modeled by both men and women in England, it may be unnecessary to cross the Channel to find patterns to relate to Kempe's religious practices. Of greater significance is that, in addition to general similarities, there are some striking parallels between Kempe and several specific religious women of the Middle Ages. Marie d'Oignies was certainly known to Kempe—it was the record of her example that convinced Kempe's amanuensis that Kempe's tears were of God. Even more significant is the fact that Marie and her husband (who coincidently bore the name John, as did Kempe's spouse) took vows to live chastely in marriage, and that Marie afterwards adopted white garments to symbolize her commitment to chastity.[73] Another woman who may have served as a model for Kempe was Angela of Foligno. Kempe's account of her visit to Assisi, where a vision in the Church left her crying and sobbing, and to where she returned on Lammas Day, almost exactly parallels the previous experience of Angela.[74] If it is true that Kempe was a product of the religious culture of her own nation, it is also true that her religious life was in continuity with continental religious women.

The central thesis of this article has been that Margery Kempe was not religiously abnormal in the context of fifteenth-century England, but was an exemplar of many of the most common devotional practices of her day. Despite having demonstrated a high degree of continuity between Kempe's religiosity and the 'normal' Catholicism of devout medieval English people, one major objection to the thesis remains to be considered. If she were so normal, why did she encounter so much opposition from her own contemporaries, people who presumably had a much clearer sense of what was and was not appropriate behavior for Christians of Kempe's day than does any modern scholar?

There are very few records of Kempe's life outside of her own work, but one is very suggestive. About the same time that Kempe was detailing her rejection by society in *The Book* she was admitted to Lynne's

[72]Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, 1987) and "Women's Stories, Women's Symbols: A Critique of Victor Turner's Theory of Liminality," in *Readings in Ritual Studies*, ed. R. Grimes (New Jersey, 1996).

[73]Atkinson, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[74]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 115, p. 314, chap. 31, n. 6.

most prestigious religious confraternity, the Trinity guild.[75] As she makes clear in her writings, she came from a prominent family. Both her father and brother served as city mayor several times. Aside from mentioning her father's quality Kempe largely ignores her own social prominence, but it is hinted at in passing on several occasions. Once she is haled before an episcopal court in part because it was alleged that while visiting the countess of Westmoreland Kempe encouraged the countess' daughter, Lady Greystoke, to divorce her husband.[76] How the supposedly despised and friendless Kempe came to have such a close relationship with the half-sister of Henry IV and the aunt of England's then reigning monarch is not stated. On another occasion a threatening demand to appear before a bishop turned out to be an invitation to dinner by an old acquaintance of her father.[77] She certainly never had any difficulty getting access to bishops or archbishops whenever she needed an audience. The little evidence available suggests Kempe was not as unpopular as she would have her readers believe.

Kempe's motivation for writing has been touched on briefly, and will be discussed in more detail below, but the present writer believes that Kempe was interested in promoting her own cult through *The Book.* It is in this context that the repeated episodes of Kempe's rejection by her neighbors takes on new meaning. Kempe's claim to sanctity depended in part on the suffering she experienced as a result of scorn and rejection at the hands of her neighbors. Persecution was her "purgatory."[78] The scorn of others could be taken as a sign of God's approbation.[79] Kempe needed persecution to justify her assumed future status as a saint.[80]

[75]The significance of Kempe's admission in light of her claims of rejection was pointed out by Gibson (*op. cit.*, p. 47).

[76]Kempe, *The Book*, p. 172.

[77]*Ibid.*, pp. 146–147.

[78]*Ibid.*, p. 87.

[79]Rolle, *Fire of Love*, pp. 56, 92.

[80] Poverty plays a similar role in Kempe's narrative. Despite Kempe's business failures and the impression that her husband was never the success her father had been, it is clear Kempe came from a well-to-do family. There is no evidence of a lack of resources for travel or leisure. Kempe clearly must make an effort to demonstrate the poverty appropriate to a saint. Kempe was able to give evidence of poverty on her travels, where circumstances frequently conspired to leave her penniless, most memorably when she gave away the resources she had borrowed from a companion (Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 128–129). The episode is highly reminiscent of a story in *The Mirrour*, in which Mary charitably gives away all the gifts of the Magi, and is subsequently unable to afford the price of the mandatory Temple offering (Love, *op. cit.*, p. 58). The record of Kempe's own experience was meant to associate her with Mary's sanctity.

The role persecution plays in Kempe's narrative is underlined by one of the major influences on Kempe not yet considered in this article: the Bible. There is no question Kempe was familiar with the stories of the Bible. She meditated on them, and she quoted them before an episcopal court. But Kempe also used the stories, and the language, of the Bible to advance her own claim to sanctity. Repeatedly the stories she tells of her own trials and tribulations are close echoes of biblical accounts of the persecutions undergone by the Apostles and by Christ. Much has been made of Kempe's insistence on using parables before a court. As mentioned above, the use of didactic stories would have come naturally to a devout medieval English person. But perhaps even more its inclusion in the narrative was meant to remind readers of the One who taught in parables. Certainly, other passages about judicial hearings strongly suggest that Kempe is presenting herself as being in continuity with those who suffered unjust trials in the New Testament.[81] If Kempe's stories of persecution were meant to give seal to her aspirations to saintly honor, the language in which she couched these stories, language so strongly reminiscent of the New Testament, was meant to strengthen her case.

The balance of Kempe's account indicates that she was rejected by her contemporaries not because they found her odd, but because they found her annoying. Someone who talked only about religion, who constantly rebuked her companions for swearing, and who regularly created disturbances in church by her wailing, was considered no better company in the fifteenth century than in the twenty-first. But as annoying as Kempe may have been, her off-putting behavior was recognized as a mark of sanctity.[82] No one wanted her at a party or seated nearby in church, but Kempe noted people were quick enough to call on her when prayers were needed.

The second major challenge to the thesis of Kempe's conventionality is offered by the continual difficulties Kempe had with religious and secular authorities with respect to possible Lollard tendencies. Yet her difficulties are easily explained by the times in which she lived. During

[81]Kempe speaks, for instance, of being given the grace to answer clerics, and later portrays educated people being amazed at the wisdom taught her by the Holy Ghost (Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 51, 174), all highly reminiscent of a number of biblical stories (e.g., Matt. 10:19–20; Acts 4:13).

[82]And thus by implication conformed to society's standards of sanctity. That most of her actions had symbolic significance to her contemporaries is evidenced by the repeated charges of hypocrisy leveled against Kempe—everyone knew her actions betokened holiness; the question was whether Kempe was herself actually a holy person.

the course of the fourteenth century Lollardy had been sheltered by a number of powerful and important individuals. This state of affairs came to an end shortly before the first events narrated in Kempe's *Book*, when Henry V agreed to an increasingly active suppression of Lollardy, which eventually sparked the rebellion of Sir John Oldcastle (Lord Cobham). Though the crown was never seriously threatened, those hostile to Lollardy benefited from the opportunity to weaken the movement by emphasizing the dangers presented by the heretics, exaggerating their threat to the state, and associating the movement with treason. This threat to the state took on important dimensions since England was at war with France during this same period, and since during some of the events recorded in *The Book* Sir John Oldcastle was still at large. In this context repeated ecclesiastical and judicial concern about Lollardy are put in perspective. Significantly, Kempe's most serious brush with the law did not involve questions about the orthodoxy of her beliefs, but the charge that "she was Cobham's daughter, and was sent to carry letters about the country."[83] Considering the environment of anti-Lollard hysteria and concerns about national security, Kempe's experience with various courts was no more unusual that her religious practices.[84]

A critical question in assessing and interpreting Margery Kempe's writing is why she wrote her *Book* in the first place. W. A. Pantin, in his still valuable 1955 survey of the Church in fourteenth-century England, describes the fourteenth century as the "age of the devout layman." Two figures are chosen as typical of fourteenth-century English piety: Margery Kempe and Henry Grosmont, first duke of Lancaster.[85] Though not mentioned by Pantin, one of the traits which links the two is lay-authorship of a religious work. Grosmont, one of the military and administrative mainstays of Edward III's government and a patron to Chaucer, left behind a religious meditation, *Le Livre de Seyntz Medicines,* written in Norman-French.[86] Yet if Grosmont is paired with Kempe as an example of fourteenth-century lay piety, his authorship has also earned him a place on a list of prominent fourteenth- and fifteenth-century

[83]Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 170–171.

[84]Some scholars have investigated similarities between Lollard doctrine and Kempe's thought. Such similarity is purely coincidental. Her attachment to sermons, her knowledge of Scripture, and her willingness to upbraid sinful priests are no evidence of Lollard tendencies. Militating against putative Lollard influence are Kempe's love of pilgrimages, her devotion to the Eucharist, her worship of saints and relics, and her respect for clerical authority.

[85]Pantin, *op. cit.*, pp. 1–2.

[86]*Dictionary of National Biography* (London, 1968), XI, 552–557.

noblemen known to have been writers.[87] In England in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries more and more individuals, neither priests nor "professional" authors, were putting thoughts on parchment. As the author of such an early example of an English-language autobiography Kempe is interesting, but as a late-medieval writer she is not unique.

But the burgeoning number of authors in England is not enough to explain Kempe's motivation for writing her own work. That motivation, as suggested above, was auto-hagiography. *The Book* contains ample evidence that Kempe believed she would one day be venerated as a saint. God promised Kempe a martyr's reward in heaven, and assured her that in heaven her every request would be granted.[88] She was told that St. Bridget had never had a revelation to equal hers, and that she was "a pillar of Holy Church."[89] Her *Book* tells of miracles, prophecies, interaction with God and all the saints, and evidences of holiness. Kempe's writings include all the necessary ingredients to inspire future Christians and to assure the recognition of her own sanctity. She recorded the ways in which her lifestyle corresponded to standard expectations of saintly living, including fasting, chastity, humility, poverty, service, and pilgrimage. She recorded miracles and prophecies connected with herself, her experiences of God's presence, and most of all her conversations with God. She was careful to remind her readers of the approbation she had received from ecclesiastical authorities and to present credentials for complete orthodoxy while still giving evidence of suffering and persecution for the sake of her faith. *The Book* was written to promote the cult of St. Margery of Lynne.

Kempe had associations with saints who lived in her own time. One of Kempe's confessors had served as confessor to St. John of Bridlington, to whose shrine Kempe made a pilgrimage.[90] In Rome Kempe had visited the room where Bridget of Sweden had died and had also met with Bridget's former maid.[91] With saints so accessible it was plausible for Kempe to believe she belonged in their company, and she wrote to make that very point.

Kempe wrote of her religious experience in an attempt to ensure the spread of her reputation for sanctity. How ironic that modern readers

[87]K.B. McFarlane, *The Nobility of Later Medieval England* (Oxford, 1973), pp. 46, 241–242.

[88]Kempe, *The Book*, pp. 65–66, 88.

[89]*Ibid.*, p. 65.

[90]*Ibid.*, pp. 164, p. 320, chap. 52, n. 2. According to the note, St. John, like Kempe, had the gift of tears.

[91]*Ibid.*, pp. 131–132.

have either largely discounted her religious experience as mediocre, or have ignored it in an attempt to find an "historical Margery" tailored to suit the tastes and interests of modern (often feminist) scholarship. Yet religion is what *The Book* is about, the religion of late medieval England as it was appropriated by middle-class lay people. It is only against the backdrop of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century England that Kempe can be understood, and it is of such piety that Kempe is a model.

PEIRESC AND CENSORSHIP: THE INQUISITION AND THE NEW SCIENCE, 1610–1637

BY

JANE T. TOLBERT*

Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637) worked to transform ideas about natural philosophy by communicating information, patronizing research, and demonstrating the utility of scientific investigations. Although he did not achieve the status of contemporaries like Galileo and Kepler, he made significant contributions. He stressed practical applications of telescopic observations, developed a research program, and used persuasive strategies to ensure compliance for astronomical work. He did not want these efforts, some of which held implications for the traditional world view, to be obstructed by the Roman Catholic Church, and he actively involved the Church in projects requiring telescopic observations at the time of Galileo's sentencing. Peiresc fully understood the need to insulate research from the external controls of the Church and state. At the same time he needed the authority and patronage of these groups to carry out many of his investigations.[1]

Purpose

Recent studies[2] have suggested that the contributions of Peiresc as an innovator and organizer of science were embellished by his contemporaries and later historians. But even though Peiresc did not publish any

*Dr. Tolbert is an assistant professor of communication in the Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne.

[1]For related articles, see those by Armand Beaulieu, "Les réactions des savants français du début du xvii siècle devant l'héliocentrisme de Galilée," *Convegno internazionale di studi galileiani* (Florence, 1984), pp. 373–382; John L. Russell, S.J., "Catholic Astronomers and the Copernican System after the Condemnation of Galileo," *Annals of Science*, 46 (1980), 365–386; Lisa T. Sarasohn, "French Reaction to the Condemnation of Galileo, 1632–1642," *Catholic Historical Review*, 74 (1988), 34–54.

[2]Gregory Matthew Adkins, "Excavating the 'Shipwreck of Antiquity': Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the Scholarly Tradition in France from the Seventeenth through Nineteenth Centuries" (Thesis, University of Florida, May, 1997). See also Robert A. Hatch,

scientific works and his investigations often lacked synthesis,[3] he left a "legacy" of correspondence, an estimated 10,000 letters, of which half are extant.[4] Approximately 3,200 of these exchanges have been published,[5] most of which were sent to Paris and Rome, where correspondents likely had ties with the crown and the Church.[6] These individuals kept Peiresc informed of policy and official views toward the New Science of observation and inquiry, and they often helped organize observation stations for work on longitude.[7] Peiresc's central position in correspondence networks enabled him to manage a vast information retrieval system.

Past research has focused on Peiresc's role in astronomical investigations[8] and his ability to patronize scholarship[9] and procure information and artifacts.[10] The purpose of this study is to examine Peiresc's role in transforming ideas and attitudes about the new astronomy in the context of censorship and the Inquisition. More specifically I will document

---

"Peiresc as Correspondent: The Republic of Letters & the 'Geography of Ideas,'" *Science Unbound*, ed. Brian Dolan (Umeå, 1998), pp. 19–21.

[3]Yvette Conry, "Peiresc et l'ordre des 'portraits,'" *Peiresc ou la passion de connaître*, ed. Anne Reinbold (Paris, 1990), pp. 124–127.

[4]See Hatch, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 31–33, 36 n. 1. The publication of a working calendar of the Peiresc correspondence by Hatch is forthcoming.

[5]Bernard Rochot (ed.), *Pierre Gassendi: Lettres familières à François Luillier pendant l'hiver 1632–1633* (hereafter cited as *GL*) (Paris, 1944); Philippe Tamizey de Larroque (ed.), *Les Correspondants de Peiresc: Lettres inédites, publiées, et annotées* (hereafter cited as *PC*) (2 vols.; Paris, 1879–1897; repr., Geneva, 1972); Philippe Tamizey de Larroque (ed.), *Lettres de Peiresc* (hereafter cited as *PL*) (7 vols.; Paris, 1888–1898); Paul Tannery, Cornelis de Waard, and Armand Beaulieu (eds.), *Correspondance du P. Mersenne* (hereafter cited as *MC*) (16 vols.; Paris, 1932–1986); Apollinaire de Valence, *Correspondance de Peiresc avec plusieurs missionnaires et religieux de l'ordre des capucins, 1631–1637* (hereafter cited as *PV*) (Paris, 1891); Phillip Wolfe (ed.), *Peiresc: Lettres à Naudé* (hereafter cited as *PN*) (Seattle, 1983).

[6]Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[7]For articles on correspondence networks, see Paul Dibon, "Communication in the Respublica literaria of the 17th Century," *Res Publica Litterarum: Studies in the Classical Tradition*, 2 (1978), 46; *idem*, "Les échanges épistolaires dans l'Europe savante du xvii[e] siècle," *Revue de synthèse*, *III*, 81–82 (1976), 44.

[8]Seymour Chapin, "The Astronomical Activities of Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc," *Isis,* 48 (1957), 13–29; Pierre Costabel, "Peiresc et Wendelin: Les Satellites de Jupiter de Galilée à Newton," in *Peiresc ou la passion de connaître*, ed. Anne Reinbold (Paris, 1990), pp. 91–110. Jean Bernhardt, "Les activitiés scientifiques de Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc (1580–1637)," *Nouvelles de la république des lettres*, 2 (1981), 165–184.

[9]Lisa T. Sarasohn, "Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc and the Patronage of the New Science in the Seventeenth Century," *Isis*, 84 (1993), 70–90.

[10]Sydney H. Aufrère, *La Momie et la tempête: Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc et la curiosité égyptienne en Provence au début du xvii siècle* (Avignon, 1990).

his development and extension of communication networks to obtain specific astronomical information, his use of persuasive techniques to legitimize telescopic observations to various publics, and his strategies to ensure the involvement of the Catholic Church in these endeavors.

Context

Prior to the publication of Copernicus' book *On Revolutions of Heavenly Orbs* in 1543, the texts of the scriptures, Aristotle, Plato, and Ptolemy provided the foundations for the conception of a finite and geocentric world. When Copernicus' lengthy text was circulated in clerical, literary, and university circles, it posed little threat to the traditional world view. The disclaimer in *ad lectorem* implied that Copernicus described a hypothetical system rather than a true system.[11] Things changed, however, with the publication of *The Sidereal Messenger* (1610), in which Galileo detailed his telescopic observations of the pitted lunar surface, the moons of Jupiter, and the stars of the Milky Way.[12] These observations were met with skepticism by some members of the emerging scientific community. Telescopes were rare and difficult to use; there was no optical theory to explain the operation, and lenses were thought to distort, not enhance the senses.[13] While astronomers like Kepler accepted Galileo's observations on the basis of his reputation, some Jesuit astronomers still attempted to reconcile data with church dogma.[14] In Rome Cardinal Robert Bellarmine asked Jesuit mathematicians to determine if these discoveries were "apparent and not real."[15] Until empirical proof could be furnished, the Church maintained that the Copernican world view should be classified as a hypothetical system.[16]

[11]Owen Gingerich, "The Censorship of Copernicus' De Revolutionibus," *Annali dell'istituto e museo di storia della scienza di Firenze*, 4 (1981), 46–47. See also Robert S. Westman, "The Copernicans and the Churches," *God and Nature*, eds. David C. Lindberg and Ronald L. Numbers (Berkeley, 1986), pp. 77–83.

[12]Albert Van Helden, "The Telescope in the Seventeenth Century," *Isis*, 64 (1974), 51 n. 75.

[13]Paul K. Feyerabend, "Problems in Empiricism, Part II," in *The Nature and Function of Scientific Theories: Essays in Contemporary Science and Philosophy*, ed. Robert G. Colodny (Pittsburgh, 1970), pp. 321–322.

[14]Johannes Kepler, *Kepler's Conversation with Galileo's Sidereal Messenger*, trans. with intro., concl., and notes by Edward Rosen (New York, 1965), pp. 12–13.

[15]Albert Van Helden, Conclusion, in Galileo Galilei, *The Sidereal Messenger*, trans. with intro., concl. and notes by Albert Van Helden (Chicago, 1989), p. 110.

[16]Galileo Galilei, *Discoveries and Opinions of Galileo*, trans., ed., and notes by Stillman Drake (Garden City, New Jersey, 1957), p. 203.

The Injunction of 1616 stated the Church's prohibition of teaching and support of the Copernican opinion in universities and Jesuit schools, and it placed Copernicus' book and a related text on the Index of Prohibited Books pending changes.[17] In 1633 Galileo was sentenced by the Inquisition, and his *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, in which he claimed to prove the Earth's mobility, was condemned.

Peiresc as Organizer and Communicator

Peiresc strengthened his ties to the French crown and the Roman Catholic Church in 1618 when he received the Abbacy of Guîtres in the diocese of Bordeaux *in commendam*. This conferral by the French king was recognized by Pope Paul V on January 5, 1619.[18] He was also in Paris at the time of the disgrace of Du Vair and experienced first hand the intrigues and duplicity of members of the royal entourage.[19] He returned to Aix in 1623. His responsibilities in the Parlement, which included presiding over civil and criminal cases and overseeing trade, public welfare, and civil defense, provided time for scholarly pursuits.[20] His positions as magistrate and clergyman ensured some protection from censors; his house in the South of France distanced him from the royal court. Peiresc once wrote that he felt it more prudent to be a "spectator rather than an actor" in politics.[21]

Within six months of the publication of *The Sidereal Messenger*, Peiresc began observing with a telescope in November, 1610. However, unlike Galileo, he did not present evidence that would refute the traditional world view. Instead he explored practical applications of these early discoveries, believing that the configuration of the satellites of Jupiter, as seen from different points on the globe, could provide a method of determining the difference in terrestrial longitude.

[17]Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, future Pope Urban VIII, disapproved of the Injunction. See Stillman Drake, Preface, in Galileo Galilei, *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems,* trans. and notes by Stillman Drake (Berkeley, 1967), p. xxiii.

[18]Michel Feuillas, "Le catholicisme de Peiresc," in *Peiresc ou la passion*, ed. Reinbold, p. 66.

[19]See Jules-Marie Priou, "Magistrate et citoyen français," and Jean Clément, "Peiresc et le monastère de Guîtres," in *Les fioretti du quadricentenaire de Fabri de Peiresc*, ed. Jacques Ferrier (Avignon, 1988).

[20]André Bailly, *Défricheurs d'inconnu: Peiresc, Tournefort, Adanson, Saporta* (Aix-en-Provence, 1992), pp. 13–14.

[21]Peiresc to Bouchard, July 14, 1632, *PL*, IV, 74.

Peiresc established contact with more than 500 individuals scattered throughout Europe and the Levant to obtain information, generally seeking correspondents based on their geographical location and competence.[22] During his university studies in Italy (1599–1601), he established ties with major intellectual and ecclesiastical circles, and he sought tutoring under Galileo. He became the heir to the correspondence networks of the well-known humanist Giovanni Pinelli.[23] Before returning to France to assume his uncle's position in the Parlement of Aix-en-Provence in 1607, Peiresc traveled extensively in Europe, meeting scholars and visiting cabinets of curiosities, collections that were precursors to modern museums. A later stay in Paris when he served most of the time as secretary to Guillaume du Vair, the Keeper of the Seals from 1616 to 1621, introduced him to prestigious European groups, notably the circle of humanists and librarians Pierre and Jacques Dupuy, with whom he maintained a regular correspondence throughout his life. These Parisian and Roman contacts would be invaluable in extending communication networks and setting up observation stations for later work on longitude. This central role as intermediary in correspondence networks enabled him to send and receive news of scientific endeavors when the Church and state used censorship and the Inquisition to control publications. Generally letters traced a circuitous route between sender and receiver, passing first through intermediaries, who shared and copied their contents before sending these letters to their destinations. The complexity of these exchanges is shown below:

> I opened a letter that Mr. Diodati [Paris] sent you, which included one that Mr. Schickard [Tübingen] wrote to Bernegger [printer in Strasbourg], asking him to send you his observations of the eclipse. I showed it to Gaultier [Aix or Belgentier] and asked Garrat [Agarrat, Peiresc's secretary] to have him [Gaultier] compare it with your observation. I used the same channel to send a second letter from Galileo, the original of which I had sent to Diodati and the copy of another letter from Galileo that Rossi [Galileo's relative in Lyons] sent.[24]

The excerpt reveals how information traveled over a wide geographical area. Each of these individuals mentioned by Peiresc in turn forwarded copies in entirety or relevant portions to interested correspondents. Some letters were also read aloud at scholarly gatherings.

[22]Harcourt Brown, *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth Century France* (New York, 1934), p. 5. René Pintard, *Le Libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du xviie siècle* (Paris, 1943; repr. Geneva, 1983), p. 88.

[23]Peiresc to Clusius, January 18, 1602, *PL*, VII, 941.

[24]Peiresc to Gassendi, April 19, 1635, *PL*, IV, 477.

Some correspondents such as the Swiss-born Protestant Elie Diodati or the Italian Paolo Gualdo relayed letters to Galileo. The Dupuys maintained ties to royal circles and European scholars. The priest Marin Mersenne, also in Paris, provided links to numerous correspondents, many of whom held high positions in the Church and crown. Peiresc's need for observational data for work on longitude forced him to seek correspondents spread over a large geographical area, extending from Europe to the Levant. His letters are filled with requests, asking that a telescope be given an able priest[25] and that observations of a lunar eclipse be made from the pyramids.[26]

Although maintaining contact with large circles of correspondents was time-consuming, Peiresc's friends portrayed him as jealously guarding this role, which enabled him to control information flow.[27] As an intermediary in these networks, he had the authority to forward, adapt, or withhold information.[28] Peiresc and his colleagues developed strategies to send information and evade censorship from clerical authorities. These strategies included self-censorship and the use of a powerful intermediary in main routes. He withheld news of Galileo's sentencing by the Inquisition and modified passages in Gassendi's letter to Galileo, who was under house arrest, to avoid problems with intercepted mail.[29] He also sent mail in care of powerful friends as a strategy to evade Inquisitors. Hence, he told Pierre Dupuy to address a packet to "Cardinal Barberini, and I will try to enclose something for him. Otherwise there will be difficulties in obtaining it from the Inquisition."[30]

Letters provide insight into the progress of scientific investigation, from inception to implementation. Peiresc and members of the scientific community eagerly awaited the publication of the *Dialogue*.[31] Letters also reveal shared assumptions and the shaping of scientific claims. In one letter, the cleric Pierre Gassendi described his vision of the sun as a "great furnace" at the center of the world, "making continual eruptions or smoke."[32] Although many priests might publish in support of

[25]Peiresc to Magy, [n.d.] 1633, *PV*, p. 6.

[26]Peiresc to Agathange de Vendôme, May 28, 1635, *PV*, p. 141.

[27]Gassendi to Luillier, November 9, 1632; December 4, 1632, *GL*, p. 19; December 29, 1632, *GL*, p. 47.

[28]See Peiresc to P. Dupuy, May 21, 1633, *PL*, II, 527; Peiresc to Luillier, January 8, 1633, *GL,* p. 57.

[29]Peiresc to Gassendi, February 1, 1634, *PL*, IV, 428–429.

[30]Peiresc to P. Dupuy, August 8, 1633, *PL*, II, 575–576.

[31]Pierre Gassendi, *Peiresc, 1580–1637: Vie de l'illustre Nicolas-Claude Fabri de Peiresc, Conseiller au parlement d'Aix*, trans. Roger Lassalle (Paris, 1992).

[32]Gassendi to Peiresc, February 26, 1632, *PL*, IV, 259.

the traditional world view, in private they did not reject the Copernican propositions. "They were pressured and forced to write in favor of the common assumptions of Aristotle; even Father [Christoph] Scheiner only upheld [these suppositions] from duty and obedience," Peiresc wrote.[33]

These exchanges demonstrate Peiresc's ability as moderator in disputes and his belief that the advance of knowledge could take place only through reasonable discussion, not conflict or censorship. He maintained that individuals had a duty to God to be tolerant of other beliefs.[34] He criticized published attacks on Galileo such as that orchestrated by the Jesuit Scheiner. When Mersenne planned to publish a discussion questioning the results of Galileo's experiments, Peiresc asked him to phrase his commentaries as "modest propositions" rather than as refutations and maintained the need for "deference" toward established astronomers such as Galileo.[35] By promoting an atmosphere of tolerance in these networks, Peiresc provided a forum for discussion.

Although he had ties with the crown through patronage, Peiresc solicited the help of the Catholic Church for work on longitude. Peiresc favored collaboration with the Church because of the skills offered by the priests and the desire to maintain a safe distance from the crown. At the time he organized observation stations to test his method of longitude, the French professor of mathematics Jean-Baptiste Morin, an Aristotelian and astrologer, unsuccessfully presented his lunar-distance method for determining longitude before a board of astronomers appointed by Cardinal Richelieu.[36] Missionary priests skilled in mathematics and astronomy would provide the needed quality observations. The participation of clergy might seem paradoxical in the light of the Galileo affair, but the controversy following the publication of the *Dialogue* could be attributed to Galileo's claim to prove the Earth's mobility and his caricature of the pope as the Aristotelian simpleton in this book. While dialogues offered a rhetorical strategy by which to communicate views with relative impunity, the casting of Simplicio as the spokesman for the Church made Galileo's position clear.[37]

Although the condemnation of the Copernican system had not been promulgated in France, the sentence did impose what has been termed

[33]Peiresc to Gassendi, September 6, 1633, *PL*, IV, 354.

[34]Peiresc to Holstenius, [June, 1637], *PL*, V, 486.

[35]Peiresc to Mersenne, December 2, 1635, *MC*, V, 520.

[36]See Mersenne to Peiresc, May 14, 1634, *MC*, IV, 135; Derek Howse, *Greenwich Time and the Discovery of the Longitude* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 6–8, 14.

[37]See Mersenne to Rivet, February 8, 1634, *MC*, IV, 37–38.

a "moral obligation" to uphold the church decision.[38] Peiresc sought ways to legitimize astronomical observations at the time of Galileo's sentencing by adapting arguments to specific audiences. He maintained that new evidence could change perceptions of the world. At the same time he insisted on the need to verify data and to make firsthand observations.[39] Unlike some contemporaries who copied data from existing astronomical tables, Peiresc stressed the need for repeated observations and standardized materials and methods.[40] He complained of the past when proof consisted only of simple conjecture[41] and criticized those individuals who "want to remain in ignorance, avoiding knowledge of causes or at least effect in experience."[42] Unlike Galileo, who challenged church authority, insisting on the primacy of observational data over the Scriptures, Peiresc wrote that new evidence should be presented cautiously and over time and that a change in perceptions would follow.[43] He and many of his contemporaries believed the Copernican propositions would eventually be accepted just as the Antipodes had been recognized centuries earlier.

Peiresc used various appeals in letters to missionary priests. He emphasized the practical aspects of telescopic observations not only in determining longitude but in reforming the church calendar. Precise tables of planetary movements would enable the dating of religious holidays years in advance. Easter, for example, falls on the first Sunday following the full moon after the vernal equinox. By marking the image of the sun along a meridian, or a north-south line, astronomers could determine the daily position of the sun and the precise number of days between equinoxes.[44] In other words, Peiresc stressed applications relevant to the Church and did not generally engage in discussions of the implications of observations taking place at that time. He also assured priests of their contribution to public service, writing that observations would "not be injurious to your pious and charitable conquest of souls. On the contrary, this could serve one day to attract others to follow your example."[45] Not only did cardinals Bagni and Barberini endorse the project for practical reasons, but an ordered world was also proof of a divine creator. "The Book of Nature is the book of books, and nothing is

[38]Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 367.
[39]Peiresc to Arcos, January 25, 1634, *PL*, VII, 123.
[40]Peiresc to Gassendi, November 13, 1633, *PL*, IV, 559.
[41]*Ibid.*, p. 383.
[42]Peiresc to Césaire de Rosgoff, May 6, 1636, *PV*, p. 232.
[43]Peiresc to Holstenius, July 2, 1636, *PL*, V, 443.
[44]See J. L. Heilbron, "The Sun in the Church," *Sciences*, 39 (1999), 29–35.
[45]Peiresc to Colombin de Nantes, August 1, 1634, *PV*, p. 82.

so conclusive as observations of things . . . [where] the greatness of God appears even greater," Peiresc wrote.[46] Hence, by legitimizing telescopic observations in terms of practicality, historical knowledge, church endorsement, and the Book of Nature rather than seeking to disprove the traditional world view, Peiresc hoped to secure the assistance of missionary priests.

In letters to other correspondents, Peiresc justified the importance of astronomy in historical research. Celestial observations could be compared to those made 2,000 years earlier by the Greek navigator Pytheas. Furthermore, careful observations could provide a more accurate determination of latitude and a method of calculating terrestrial longitude of sites from antiquity and early Christianity.

The participation of priests offered some standardization in terms of training and the proximity of their missions to historic sites. The Church, of course, had the authority to command these observations to be made and had the power to give or withhold reward.

Peiresc's Use of Patronage

Peiresc has been described as using gifts to "flatter, bribe, or coerce . . . ; kindness, persuasion, ruse . . . threats, supplications . . . to achieve his goals."[47] In exchange for gifts, financial security, and protection, correspondents were obliged to provide the information Peiresc requested. As a patron, he not only provided funding and protection but served as a broker in positioning clients in strategic locations—geographically to provide observations and politically to improve his own ties to powerful circles. Jean-Jacques Bouchard, who served as secretary of Latin letters to Barberini, estimated that Peiresc dedicated approximately 12 percent of his income to scholars in Rome alone.[48] His connections to influential circles enabled him to serve as an interface between the private sector of correspondence networks and the public of the Church and state.

By arranging political and ecclesiastical appointments, Peiresc strengthened his own connections as shown in the following exam-

[46]Peiresc to Celestin, April 29, 1633, *PL*, VII, p. 856.

[47]Sydney Aufrère and Marie-Pierre Foissy-Aufrère (eds.), *Egypte et Provence* (Avignon, 1985), p. 182.

[48]Jean-Jacques Bouchard, *Eloge de Peiresc*, December 21, 1637, eds. and trans. Roger Lassalle and Jean-Pierre Blanchi (Mane, France, 1997), p. 33.

ples. He promised the priest Gilles de Loches to bring his scholarly translations to prominence and arrange a position with Barberini. Working as a broker, Peiresc forwarded rare books from De Loches to the cardinal to initiate arrangements, but the explanatory letter that was to accompany this packet was misplaced.[49] Peiresc negotiated positions in Rome for the librarian and geographer Lucas Holstenius and Bouchard, but he was less successful in attempts to obtain a position for the librarian Gabriel Naudé. Recipients of these appointments helped organize observations of the lunar eclipse of August 28, 1635, which enabled Peiresc and his colleagues to determine the difference in longitude of numerous European cities and to discover an error of approximately 1,000 kilometers in maps of the eastern Mediterranean Sea.[50] The promise and acceptance of patronage did not ensure that observations would be made or data provided. Peiresc used various persuasive strategies to procure the needed information. He began by reassuring participants of the need for data even if errors occurred, and when that failed, he reminded them of the telescopes, books, and artifacts he sent, implying there were no free gifts, and he did not hesitate to call upon their superiors.[51]

Peiresc as Advocate

The repercussions of the Galileo affair were felt in the private arena. In June, 1633, Peiresc wrote Holstenius in Rome that everyone found Galileo's questioning by the Inquisition "unusual" since censors had approved the manuscript for publication.[52] René Descartes would later write that he could not "imagine that he [Galileo], being an Italian and even in the pope's favor, could be accused for wanting to establish the movement of the Earth."[53] Peiresc learned of Galileo's sentencing by the Inquisition (June 22, 1633) only in mid-July in letters from Scheiner—letters that he was to forward to Gassendi in Digne and the Jesuit Athanasius Kircher in Avignon.[54] He wrote Gassendi on August 12,

[49]Peiresc to Gilles de Loches, July 23, 1635, *PV*, p. 148.

[50]Guillaume Bigourdan, *Histoire de l'astronomie et l'observation et des observatoires en France* (Paris, 1918), p. 37.

[51]Peiresc to Michelange de Nantes, August 21, 1636, *PV*, p. 257; Peiresc to Agathange de Vendôme, September 5, 1635, *PV*, p. 167; Peiresc to Bonaventure de Lude, August 22, 1636, *PV*, pp. 258–259.

[52]Peiresc to Holstenius, June 2, 1633, *PL*, V, 406–407.

[53]Descartes to Mersenne, November 28, 1633, *MC*, III, 558.

[54]Beaulieu, *op. cit.*, p. 374.

1633, saying, "You will be pleased to see the esteem he [Scheiner] holds for you but mortified to learn what he has said of poor Galileo . . . which should not be divulged . . . as it has been kept secret in Rome."[55] In correspondence to the Dupuys, he mentioned the sentencing in passing, downplaying the fact that "poor Galileo had to declare solemnly that he did not support the opinion that the Earth moved, yet in his dialogue he used strong reasons to support it."[56] Peiresc tried to minimize the news, fearing it would lead to a controversy between the Church and science and ultimately bring more restrictions on scientific investigations. He stressed in letters that the Church often attempted to reconcile positions "carefully and over time rather than carrying things to the extreme and possibly involving too many men who looked for obvious contradictions . . . so many other affairs of great consequence would have amounted to little if one had not proceeded with such vehemence."[57] He upheld the authority of the Church and its doctrines and did not want a full-blown confrontation that would lead to the condemnation of the Copernican propositions in France. Despite an attempt by the scientific community to maintain the secrecy of the sentence, the journalist Théophraste Renaudot held a public conference in Paris on the mobility of the Earth in October, 1633, four months after the sentencing, and the following January he printed a retraction for this conference in his paper *Relations*, in which he described the Copernican propositions and Galileo's sentencing.[58]

Inquisitors throughout Europe (including France) sent news of the condemnation of the Copernican System to clerics, many of whom taught mathematics and astronomy.[59] However, the sentence and condemnation from Rome were not promulgated in France and hence not recognized by the French Catholic Church. But still scholars remained uncertain as to the status of the Roman decree and whether they could publish freely on the Copernican System in France.[60]

Following the sentencing Peiresc renewed contact with Galileo, generally sending letters through Roberto Galileo in Lyons or Bouchard in Rome. On January 16, 1634, he asked for a telescope in a letter to

[55]Peiresc to Gassendi, August 12, 1633, *PL*, IV, 342.

[56]Peiresc to P. Dupuy, August 16, 1633, *PL*, II, 582.

[57]Peiresc to P. Dupuy, February 6, 1634, *PL*, III, 28.

[58]Théophraste Renaudot, *Relations*, January 5, 1634, pp. 530–532.

[59]See Robert S. Westman, "The Reception of Galileo's *Dialogue*: A Partial World Census of Extant Copies," *Novità celesti e crisi del sapere*, ed. P. Galluzzi (Florence, 1984), pp. 330–331.

[60]Descartes to Mersenne, early February, 1634, *MC*, IV, 27.

Galileo.[61] Galileo sent lenses along with an unusual request to Diodati in a letter of July 25, 1634. Diodati then conveyed the contents of this letter and lenses to Gassendi in the fall of 1634:[62] "If Mr. Peiresc, with the contacts he has with Cardinal Barberini, would intercede to obtain . . . his [Galileo's] freedom to go to Florence . . . it would be a memorable act."[63] This request, which originated with Galileo, indicated the importance of Peiresc's ties to Rome. Since meeting Barberini at the turn of the century, Peiresc cultivated this friendship with gifts of rare manuscripts, exotic plants, a cameo, and even a gazelle.[64] The cardinal reciprocated by sending plants and artifacts, appointing Peiresc's protégés to patronage positions, and endorsing the work on longitude. But this request for clemency was decidedly different as it could set a precedent for ecclesiastical policy. Peiresc made a personal appeal to Barberini on December 5, 1634, for a mitigated sentence, asking the cardinal to convey this request to his uncle, the pope.[65] Peiresc had reason to hope for success in this endeavor. Barberini remained a participant in scientific activities and had received books on the Copernican System.[66]

"Forgive my boldness and give me reason to maintain the confidence I have always had in your kindness to see you undertake several steps to ensure the consolation of an aging man," Peiresc began. He pointed out that Galileo had recanted and that the imprisonment would "stain" the papacy. In his response, Barberini thanked him for the gifts but only addressed the Galileo affair in passing. "I will not fail to convey your letter about Mr. Galileo to His Holiness." But Barberini made no offer to intervene.[67] Peiresc wrote again on January 31, 1635, stressing that Galileo's punishment would be compared to the "persecution" of Socrates and that he had recanted.[68] Often a recantation served to absolve an individual of the crime of heresy.[69] But Peiresc was unsuccessful in his appeal. In this case, friendship and personal loyalty could not bring change in

[61]Stillman Drake, "A Long-Lost Letter of Galileo to Peiresc on a Magnetic Clock," *A Letter from Galileo*, eds. Bern Dibner and Stillman Drake (Norwalk, Connecticut, 1967), p. 45.

[62]This is described in a letter from Peiresc. Peiresc to J. Dupuy, December 5, 1634, *PL*, III, 236.

[63]Diodati to Gassendi, [n.d.] in Guglielmo Libri-Carucci, "Life of Galileo . . . Vie de Galilée," *Journal des savants* (April, 1841), p. 216.

[64]Peiresc to P. Dupuy, April 20, 1625, *PL*, I, 59.

[65]Peiresc to Barberini, December 5, 1634, in Libri-Carucci, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

[66]Peiresc to Holstenius, October 22, 1632, *PL*, V, 393.

[67]Barberini to Peiresc, January 2, 1635, in Libri-Carucci, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

[68]Peiresc to Barberini, January 31, 1635, *ibid.*, pp. 221–222.

[69]Raymond A. Mentzer, Jr., "Heresy Proceedings in Languedoc, 1500–1560," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 74 (1984), 9.

public affairs. Peiresc's letters do reveal his familiarity with the papal entourage and his use of emotional and rational appeals. Peiresc argued for humanitarian reasons (e.g., an aging man), fulfillment of ecclesiastical conditions (e.g., recantation), and for posterity (e.g., comparison to the persecution of Socrates).

Learning of Peiresc's letter from his relative in Lyons, Galileo described it as an "undertaking where so many others who recognize my innocence have remained silent."[70] Although Peiresc made no more direct appeals to Barberini on this matter, he persisted in his efforts to obtain evidence in support of Galileo's theory of the tides, which according to arguments in the *Dialogue* demonstrated the Earth's mobility. But evidence refuted Galileo's theory.[71]

In August, 1634, Peiresc sent a gazelle, which he received from a correspondent in Tunisia, to Barberini. Although his letters do not explicitly state the purpose of sending this gift to Barberini (except Peiresc did mention he did not have the status to keep such a prestigious gift himself), the timing was propitious—just prior to his attempted negotiations for clemency.[72] About the same time Peiresc also helped Diodati arrange for the publication in Germany of a Latin translation of the *Dialogue* and of a Copernican treatise, both of which had been condemned by the Church. Copies of the book arrived in Paris in July, 1635.[73] This translation enabled members of the scientific community who read only Latin to access Galileo's thoughts and opinions.

The End of an Era

Peiresc expanded his investigations in astronomy after 1633, seeking to perfect observational procedure and eliminate errors. With the help of Gassendi and Gaultier, he established a training program in astronomy to provide hands-on experience. Many priests stopped by his home in Aix to receive instruction before traveling to missions in the Levant.[74] He also initiated a project in selenography, or moon mapping,

[70]Galileo to Peiresc, February 22, 1635, in *Galilée: Dialogues et lettres choisies*, ed. Paul-Henri Michel (Paris, 1966), p. 422.

[71]For an example of Peiresc's seeking information on the tides, see Peiresc to Colombin de Nantes, August 1, 1634, *PV*, p. 82; for other efforts, see Drake, "Long-Lost Letter," p. 48.

[72]Peiresc to Aycard, July 26, 1634, *PL*, VII, 326; Peiresc to Arcos, December 18, 1634, *PL*, VII, 144.

[73]See Gassendi to Peiresc, February 11, 1634, *PL*, IV, 458; Mersenne to Peiresc, July 1, 1635, *PC*, II, 550.

[74]Agathange de Vendôme to Pierre de Guingamp et Agathange de Morlaix, April 22, 1636, *PV*, p. 227.

which would enable more precise viewing of the passage of the Earth's shadow over the lunar surface. And he arranged observations of the solstice for work on latitude and the church calendar by constructing a meridian line in a church in Marseilles.

Peiresc's death and the absence of a patron and successor brought a halt to the activities of what would become known as the Provençal School of astronomy. Many participants dispersed; some like Gassendi went to Paris. Although Peiresc left no heir to assume the duties he carried out during his lifetime, he influenced many contemporaries by establishing a protocol for investigations and carrying out astronomy at the time of Galileo's sentencing.

Conclusion

Peiresc was committed to the New Science and influential in transforming prevailing attitudes about astronomy because he had access to communication networks, used persuasive arguments to legitimize observations, and involved the Church in these undertakings.

With presses controlled by censors, Peiresc developed and expanded correspondence networks for the exchange of scientific information. He also controlled the flow of information. He hesitated to convey news of Galileo's sentencing for fear it would lead the French church to ratify the Roman condemnation and implement more restraint on scientific investigations. Furthermore, he believed that attitudes toward the Copernican System would change with new evidence. Hence, he recognized that control of news in private circles could have implications for public policy. By cautiously advancing new propositions, he decreased the likelihood of controversy and further restrictions on scientific activities.

While Galileo publicized his so-called proof of the Earth's mobility, Peiresc cautiously advanced his research program and gained the needed assistance of the Church. Galileo did not consider the traditional authorities sacrosanct and promoted the primacy of physical evidence. Peiresc, however, maintained the sanctity of church authority and at the same time sought to establish the authority of the individual observer by establishing criteria for acceptable observational evidence. Recognizing that many priests upheld traditional views out of an obligation to the Church, he adapted arguments to legitimize astronomy, portraying it in terms acceptable to the Church (e.g., church calendar reform, a method of longitude, and the Book of Nature). He also used

the promise of reward to induce correspondents to comply, while making it clear that in accepting a gift, they had the obligation to comply.

He used his connections to powerful ecclesiastical circles to promote scientific activities when the Church used censorship and the Inquisition to revive its waning authority. His appeal to Barberini in behalf of Galileo indicated his willingness to support the advance of knowledge, challenge a church decision, and make demands on friendship. This appeal, as well as his work promoting the publication of the Latin translation of the *Dialogue*, could have jeopardized his favored status with Barberini.

Peiresc avoided a direct confrontation with the Church in matters of doctrine while advancing the New Science. He tried to separate religion from science and avoid confrontation. He included the Church in scientific activities, fully understanding that he needed the endorsement of cardinals to implement his program of research.

LEO XIII, LOISY, AND THE "BROAD SCHOOL": AN EARLY ROUND OF THE MODERNIST CRISIS

BY

HARVEY HILL*

Many Catholics at the beginning of the twentieth century feared that their Church was becoming increasingly anachronistic, and they therefore sought to update its teachings. Alfred Loisy (1857–1940) was one of the most important people engaged in this task. As the first step in his program of modernization, Loisy tried to bracket theological considerations and to claim an independence from the supervision of the hierarchy, at least in his activity as an historian of religion. When his specific historical conclusions challenged contemporary church teaching, however, the hierarchy re-asserted its authority, eventually condemning his efforts, as well as the efforts of many others, as "modernism" and excommunicating the most prominent modernists, including Loisy. For his part, Loisy welcomed his excommunication in 1908 and renounced any remaining allegiance to an institution that he had come to consider hopelessly outdated. These events constituted the "modernist crisis."[1]

Although Pope Pius X condemned specific modernist propositions and then what he took to be the modernist philosophical system,[2] the issue in the crisis was not only particular historical or philosophical claims that the Vatican found objectionable. At stake in modernism were different ways of construing the relationship between modern academic work, the theological tradition of the Church, and ecclesiastical authority. Modernists like Loisy celebrated human autonomy, particu-

*Dr. Hill is an associate professor of religion at Berry College. He would like to thank the Reverend C.J. T. Talar for his many helpful comments on this article.

[1]Loisy offered his perspectives on the crisis and his role in it in his autobiographical *Choses passées* (Paris, 1913) and *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps* (3 vols.; Paris, 1930–1931). Recent histories include Marvin O'Connell, *Critics on Trial: An Introduction to the Catholic Modernist Crisis* (Washington, D.C., 1994), and Pierre Colin, *L'audace et le soupçon: La crise moderniste dans le catholicisme français (1893–1914)* (Paris, 1997).

[2]Pius' most important condemnations came in *Lamentabili sane exitu* (July 4, 1907) and *Pascendi dominici gregis* (September 8, 1907).

larly intellectual autonomy or academic freedom. In Loisy's view, the value of academic freedom significantly qualified the authority of the Church over scholarship. The Vatican, on the other hand, insisted on the vital role of the Church in maintaining orthodox teaching, including in institutions of higher learning.

Concerns about the fundamental question of Church authority appear in the modernist and anti-modernist writings from the beginning of the twentieth century, but they are obscured to a certain extent by divisive political events as well as by the fact and extent of the papal condemnations. These concerns appear more clearly in an earlier conflict, which already contained all of the major elements of the modernist crisis except the final dramatic dénouement. In January, 1893, Maurice d'Hulst (1841–1896), the rector of the Institut catholique de Paris, published an article on "la question biblique" in which he explained how one might combine commitment to the tradition of the Church and the independent historical criticism of the Bible.[3] Loisy, then a promising young biblical critic at the Institut, publicly distanced himself from d'Hulst's most radical claims, but advanced controversial claims of his own about the value of scholarly analysis independent of ecclesiastical oversight.[4] Pope Leo XIII responded with the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, condemning the positions set forth by both d'Hulst and Loisy on the independent historical analysis of the Bible and instead emphasizing the role of theology in biblical interpretation. The issue uniting these three in "conversation" was the relationship between doctrinal or theological claims and critical historical work, an issue that took on a particular urgency given the rapid development of the historical study of religion in the nineteenth century. But the importance of this issue transcended purely theological or historical considerations because it had such significant implications for how one conceived of and exercised authority in the Church more broadly at a time when church authority was hotly contested.[5] For all three figures, then, the question standing behind their writings on biblical interpretation concerned the proper relation of ecclesiastical authority to intellectual autonomy, especially for scholars of religion.

[3]d'Hulst, "La question biblique," *Le Correspondant*, n.s. 134 (1893), 201–251.

[4]Loisy, "La question biblique et l'inspiration des Écritures," reprinted in Loisy, *Études bibliques*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1903), pp. 139–169.

[5]During the course of the nineteenth century, the Holy See lost control of the Papal States and became increasingly isolated diplomatically. In this context, challenges to the spiritual authority of the Church could easily appear linked to anticlerical attacks in the political realm.

1. Answering "La question biblique"

The nineteenth century was not good for Catholic education in France, particularly at the highest levels. At the beginning of the century, Napoleon brought together educational institutions of every level to form the new Imperial University, under the direct supervision of the state. According to the original decree organizing the Imperial University in 1808, no independent Catholic universities could exist.[6] Catholics were not allowed to found their own institutions of higher learning until 1875, when five Catholic universities quickly opened (by 1878), including one in Paris. The rapid establishment of these universities worried anticlerical politicians, however, and soon elicited a reaction. Catholic schools, so went the anticlerical criticism, focused more on indoctrinating their students than in offering a modern education.[7] By 1880 anticlerical legislators had enough votes to pass a new law forbidding Catholic schools to call themselves universities and increasing the amount of state supervision over them. The renamed "Instituts catholiques" survived, but they went through a protracted financial crisis and could not effectively compete with the state schools for many years.[8]

Named rector of the Institut catholique de Paris in 1880, the year that Parliament curtailed its rights, Mgr. d'Hulst experienced the conflicting imperatives placed on all Catholic educators.[9] On the one hand, he wanted to defend his school against the anticlerical accusation that the Church did not offer an adequate education as a result of its dogmatic

[6]The decree did leave bishops control over their diocesan seminaries and took "the precepts of the Catholic religion" as one of the principles of instruction.

[7]See, for example, Paul Bert, *Discours parlementaires* (Paris, 1882), p. 153, and Jules Ferry, *Discours et opinions de Jules Ferry*, ed. Paul Robiquet (3 vols.; Paris, 1895), III, 198.

[8]See Alfred Baudrillart, *L'Institut catholique* (Paris, 1920), p. 20, and *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, 2nd ed. (2 vols.; Paris, 1912–1914), I, 385–396. Loisy agreed that the Instituts catholiques remained weak and ineffective at least until the mid-1890's. See "Essais d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse," Vols. 3–5 of the Papiers Loisy, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Department of Manuscripts, NAF 15636-15638, V, 1051–1055/358–362. This was an unpublished work completed in the late 1890's. Loisy partly quoted it in *Mémoires*, I, 475. For concurring opinions from non-Catholics, see Émile Beaussire, "Les questions d'enseignement secondaire sous la Troisième République," *Revue des deux mondes*, 51 (1882), 866; Louis Liard, *L'enseignement supérieur en France, 1789–1893* (Paris, 1894), pp. 331–332. See also George Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities* (Princeton, 1983), p. 121; Joseph Moody, *French Education since Napoleon* (Syracuse, New York, 1978), pp. 91–92.

[9]See Baudrillart, *L'Institut catholique*, pp. 21, 24–25, and *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 412–444, 504–528; Francesco Beretta, *Monseigneur d'Hulst et la science chrétienne* (Paris, 1996), pp. 68–99.

commitments. Given the recent action of the French Parliament, this defense was an institutional necessity. On the other hand, he wanted to preserve the Catholic identity of the school by affirming these dogmatic commitments, and he depended on the financial support of the French hierarchy, who insisted that the school be orthodox. In the eyes of many, these imperatives were mutually incompatible. How could one simultaneously defer to the authority of the hierarchy and engage in truly independent critical work? To show that these imperatives did not, in fact, conflict, d'Hulst sought to promote Catholic scholarship that was both orthodox (i.e., faithful to the authoritative teachings of the Church) and academically respectable (i.e., truly independent). He called this scholarship "Christian science."

As one strategy for promoting Christian science that was both orthodox and academically respectable, d'Hulst took the lead in establishing the "International Scientific Congresses of Catholics."[10] In 1885 a regional conference of French clergy decided to organize a larger gathering of Catholic scholars from around Europe.[11] Important members of the French hierarchy, such as Mgr Charles Freppel, promptly expressed concern that such a gathering would give scholars too much independence from ecclesiastical control.[12] Given this opposition, François Cardinal Richard, the archbishop of Paris, suggested that d'Hulst submit the plan to Pope Leo XIII. D'Hulst did, and Leo approved it in 1887 on the condition that participants avoid controversial theological questions.[13] D'Hulst agreed to this stipulation, and the first Congress took place in Paris the next year. Three years later, the Institut catholique de Paris officially hosted the second Congress. Thereafter the Congresses were to meet every three years at various locations around Europe.

Participants at the Congresses tried to meet both of the dual imperatives placed on Catholic educators, to balance modern academic work with a commitment to the theological tradition of the Church. As d'Hulst had said in his memoir to the Pope, some Catholics criticized Catholic scholars for conceding too much to secular science. At the

[10]See Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 91–94; Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 529–561.

[11]D'Hulst described the initial program in a circular letter dated February 1, 1886, in Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 267–272.

[12]See Freppel to Richard, August 22, 1886, *ibid.*, pp. 281–284.

[13]d'Hulst to Leo, January 24, 1887, *ibid.*, pp. 301–311; Leo to d'Hulst, May 20, 1887, *ibid.*, pp. 317–320. See also Albert Houtin, *La question biblique chez les catholiques de France au XIX^e siécle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1902), pp. 126–130; Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 528–545, especially 535–537; Maurice Clément, *Vie du Cardinal Richard* (Paris, 1924), p. 230.

same time, some non-Catholics argued that "science in the Church is not sincere because it submits its conclusions in advance to an extrinsic authority."[14] D'Hulst's plenary speech at the third Congress in Brussels in 1894 described the same problem as well as his proposed solution.[15] Catholics, he said, needed to find a middle way between the Charybdis of heterodox recklessness and the Scylla of uncritical traditionalism. "Minimists" reduced orthodoxy too much, leaving scholars a great deal of freedom but threatening the doctrinal integrity of the Church. They were a problem, but d'Hulst devoted more time to "maximists" who defined orthodoxy so broadly as to rule out any autonomy for Catholic intellectuals. For example, "maximists" argued that the foundation of French dioceses by the apostles was an essential teaching of the faith. D'Hulst countered that not every pious legend was part of the authoritative tradition derived from the apostles and preserved in the Church. Historians could debate the facts of the foundation of French dioceses, and the question could ultimately be decided only "by the proceedings of historical science."[16] D'Hulst and the participants in the Congresses tried to maintain a middle ground between the maximists and the minimists, to pursue academic research that did not challenge essential Catholic doctrine but that was truly independent and scholarly in its treatment of those questions it did address.

The Catholic Congresses illustrate the basic tension of the later modernist crisis: balancing truly independent scholarship with a commitment to the theological tradition and teaching authority of the Church. Ecclesiastical authority in the person of Leo approved of independent scholarship, but only so long as scholars did not touch on questions of theology. D'Hulst tried to respect Leo's strictures by distinguishing between matters of doctrine and matters of, for example, history. Scholars could then be free in their historical analyses and still be loyal to the doctrinal authority of the Church. But this distinction between doctrine and history was not always clear. What about historical conclusions with direct relevance for theology? In fact, the participants in the Congresses were unable to maintain this distinction to the satisfaction of the hierarchy. Deemed reckless, the section on biblical interpretation

[14]d'Hulst to Leo, January 24, 1887, in Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 303–304.

[15]d'Hulst, "Introduction historique," quoted in Brigitte Waché, *Monseigneur Louis Duchesne (1843–1922): Historien de l'Église, Directeur de l'École Française de Rome* (Rome, 1992), pp. 321–323.

[16]Albert Houtin would later survey the debate over the apostolicity question in his *La controverse de l'apostolicité des Églises de France au XIX^e siècle* (Laval, 1901), which was placed on the Index in December, 1903.

was discontinued after 1897, and the Congresses as a whole followed suit in 1900.[17] Thus ended one of d'Hulst's efforts to promote Christian science that was academically respectable and theologically orthodox.

D'Hulst experienced the same tension at the Institut catholique itself. His Institut had a reputation as the center for a small group of historians who were trying to introduce modern historical methods into the Church. Some influential Catholics publicly questioned the orthodoxy of these historians. For example, Henri Icard (1805–1893), the superior general of the Society of Saint Sulpice, had forbidden students at his seminaries from taking courses from Louis Duchesne (1843–1922), the leader of this group, in 1882 or from Alfred Loisy, a historical critic of the Bible, a decade later.[18]

D'Hulst responded to such doctrinal scruples with two articles that defended the combination of independent scholarship and Catholic commitment at the Institut. In the first, published in October, 1892, he provocatively suggested that Ernest Renan, a former student of Icard's at the Sulpician seminary in Paris and a famous apostate, might not have left the Church if he had received the kind of modern historical training offered at the Institut.[19] The problem was not modern historical methods themselves so much as the failure to harness them to Catholic truth. Following the success of his piece on Renan, d'Hulst more directly defended the orthodoxy of the Institut's biblical courses in January, 1893, with an article entitled "La question biblique."[20] Here, too, he hoped to describe the line between those who stifled the intellectual life of the Church in the name of orthodoxy and those who abandoned the essentials of the faith. In a letter to Loisy, he called his new article "a political act destined to win us, little by little, first tolerance, then liberty."[21] By describing the full spectrum of orthodox opinion on the doctrine of inspiration, he would show the freedom available to loyal Catholic critics like his young professor of exegesis.

[17]See Houtin, *La question biblique,* p. 261; Loisy, *Mémoires*, I, 481.

[18]See Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 458–480; Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 89–90. On Duchesne's various troubles at the Institut, see Waché, *op. cit.*, pp. 163–245. Loisy described the opposition he encountered from Icard in *Mémoires*, I, 114–115, 216.

[19]d'Hulst, "M. Renan," *Le Correspondant*, n.s. 134 (1893), 202. See also Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, II, 132–138, especially pp. 136–137. For Loisy's comments, see *Mémoires*, I, 232–233.

[20]Beretta describes the background and context of this article in *Monseigneur d'Hulst*, pp. 99–115. See also d'Hulst's own notes on the topic *ibid.*, pp. 375–382.

[21]d'Hulst to Loisy, January 20, 1893, *ibid.*, p. 387, and in Loisy, *Choses passées*, pp. 125–126, and *Mémoires*, I, 235–236. See also Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 480–481.

In his article on the biblical question, d'Hulst began by identifying the basic issue. As a way of attacking the inspiration of Scripture, he noted, rationalist critics like Renan identified apparent errors in the Bible. Even without accepting the more extreme claims of the rationalists, many Catholics of good will no longer found the traditional insistence on biblical inerrancy persuasive. For these troubled souls d'Hulst sought a compromise position between overly critical rationalism and uncritical traditionalism.[22] But, as rationalists and traditionalists agreed, granting any validity to rationalist criticism meant admitting the existence of scientific and, even worse, historical errors in the Bible.[23] How could Catholic critics reconcile this admission of biblical error with the declaration of the Councils of Trent and the Vatican affirming that God was the author of Scripture? This was the biblical question as d'Hulst understood it.

D'Hulst identified three orthodox answers. Conservatives denied the existence of errors in the Bible and continued to proclaim that God wrote it. D'Hulst did not flatly reject this opinion, but he noted that it failed to resolve the dilemma, and then he left it.[24] He devoted considerably more space to the "broad school," the most important and controversial of the three options. Its advocates met rationalist critics on their own ground, acknowledging the fact of biblical errors and forming their hypotheses accordingly. Scientific and historical errors need not contradict biblical inspiration, argued these scholars, if one confined inspiration (or at least the inspiration that guaranteed inerrancy) to matters of faith and morals, which the Bible taught accurately despite its incidental errors.[25] Although they would naturally defer to Catholic teachings on faith and morals, scholars in the broad school could freely investigate any other issue. Without adopting this position as his own, d'Hulst went to some lengths to defend its orthodoxy, distinguishing it from rationalism and arguing that it was consistent with the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican.[26] Finally, d'Hulst briefly signaled an intermedi-

[22]d'Hulst, "La question biblique," pp. 201–203. See also Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, II, 145–146.

[23]*Ibid.*, pp. 210–219. See also Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, II, 149–150.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 220. See also Houtin, *La question biblique*, pp. 156–158.

[25]Beretta notes that d'Hulst did not deny that the historical claims of the Bible were inspired, only that they were inspired so as to guarantee their historical accuracy (*op. cit.*, p. 117).

[26]d'Hulst, "La question biblique," pp. 220–232. D'Hulst strongly insisted that he merely reported positions advocated by others. He adopted a similar strategy with regard to the biblical sections of the Catholic Congresses (see Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 540–541). Despite his pose as a simple reporter, d'Hulst himself belonged to the broad school (Beretta,

ate position that accepted the principles of the broad school but applied them more cautiously.[27] D'Hulst concluded his article by asserting the compatibility of historical criticism with Catholic belief and the apologetical value of combating anticlerical adversaries with their own weapons.[28] As a whole, then, the article argued that biblical critics were free to discern historical errors in Scripture so long as they espoused Catholic faith and morals as defined by the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

D'Hulst's defense of the broad school thus followed the basic lines of his address to the Catholic Congress on how best to balance independent scholarship and a commitment to the authoritative teachings of the Church. Here, too, he advocated narrowing the definition of essential teachings, deferring to ecclesiastical authority in matters involving these essential teachings, and leaving scholars free to investigate non-essentials without oversight from the Church. The key was distinguishing essential from non-essential teachings. Then, he could argue, scholarship and the teaching authority of the Church would not conflict because they would not meet.[29] In this way, d'Hulst sought to protect the academic freedom of scholars without challenging ecclesiastical authority or the theological tradition.

To d'Hulst's chagrin, his article, rather than winning liberty for Catholic scholars, unleashed a storm of protest that had the opposite effect. Conservative theologians like Joseph Brucker and Paulin Moniquet attacked the broad school, forcing d'Hulst to go to Rome in April, 1893, in an only partially successful effort to avoid condemnation.[30] The Vatican did not censure him personally, but the Pope responded to d'Hulst's article with an encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893), which condemned the broad school. D'Hulst, Duchesne, and the

---

op. cit., pp. 118–119; James Tunstead Burtchaell, *Catholic Theories of Inspiration Since 1810* [Cambridge, 1969], p. 221).

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 240.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 242, 251.

[29] This "negative" agreement between science, including history, and Church teaching directly challenged the dominant "concordism" of the day which tried to reconcile the latest findings of science with the Catholic tradition in ways that sometimes did violence to both (Beretta, *op. cit.*, p. 90). For several examples of "concordism," see Houtin, *La question biblique*, pp. 186–205, on the interpretation of the flood story.

[30] See *ibid.*, p. 119; Houtin, *La question biblique*, pp. 158–159; Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, II, 157–171. Brucker and Moniquet subsequently reissued their responses as chapters of larger works. See Brucker, *Questions actuelles d'Écriture sainte* (Paris, 1895); Moniquet, *Le rationalisme dans la foi: Controverse* (Paris, 1894). Beretta includes several letters from d'Hulst about his experiences in Rome and about his response more generally to the reactions elicited by his article in *op. citato*, pp. 393f. See particularly d'Hulst to Brucker, May 12, 1893, pp. 404–407.

remaining professors of the Institut catholique sent to the Vatican a joint adhesion to the encyclical. D'Hulst added a personal submission in which he retracted the offensive portions of his article.[31] Although he continued to promote Catholic scholarship for the rest of his life, henceforth he avoided controversial questions about the Bible.

2. Loisy and the "Broad School"

The fallout from d'Hulst's article did not end with him, however. The controversy stirred by the article swept over Loisy as well. Although the article did not mention Loisy by name, most people assumed that he belonged to the broad school.[32] Sacrificing Loisy to protect the orthodox reputation of his Institut, d'Hulst confined the now controversial exegete to the teaching of Semitic languages in May, 1893, even before the promulgation of *Providentissimus Deus*. Loisy accepted his demotion, but on November 10, 1893, he published a final lecture (first delivered the preceding June) on biblical criticism distancing himself from the broad school.

The basic argument of Loisy's article distinguishing himself from the broad school was simple: one should approach the biblical question from the standpoint of history rather than of theology. Because d'Hulst focused on the doctrine of inspiration, Loisy noted, he discussed the apparent errors in Scripture as a *theological* issue. And, as d'Hulst discovered in the wake of his article, "if one poses the biblical question and discusses it only on the terrain of theology, it is a difficult and irritating problem to which one offers solutions only partially true." But, Loisy continued, this question "is also and first a question of *history* and of historical criticism."[33]

As a historian, Loisy argued that the Bible aided in reconstructing the beliefs of particular ancient cultures, but that it also clearly reflected

[31]D'Hulst to Leo, December 22, 1893, in Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 421–422. See also *ibid.*, pp. 121–122, and Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 489–491; II, 174.

[32]See Baudrillart, *Vie de Mgr d'Hulst*, I, 481–482; II, 157–170; Loisy, *Choses passées*, pp. 130–132, and *Mémoires*, I, 239–243; Albert Houtin, *La vie d'Alfred Loisy*, in Émile Poulat (ed.), *Alfred Loisy: Sa Vie—Son Oeuvre* (Paris, 1960), pp. 60–69; Marie-Joseph Lagrange, *M. Loisy et le modernisme* (Juvisy, 1932), pp. 53, 78–79.

[33]Loisy, "La question biblique," pp. 145–146, my emphasis. For comments on this article, see Dietmar Bader, *Der Weg Loisys zur Erforschung der Christlichen Wahrheit* (Freiburg, 1974), pp. 44–59; Burtchaell, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–225; Christoph Théobald, "L'entrée de l'histoire dans l'univers religieux et théologique au moment de la 'crise moderniste,'" in Charles Kannengiesser (ed.), *La crise contemporaine* (Paris, 1973), pp. 21–24.

their limitations. To emphasize the point, he listed several well-established historical findings, all calculated to disturb conservative readers. Moses did not write the Pentateuch. The first chapters of Genesis did not record actual history. The different parts of the different books of the Old Testament did not all have the same historical value. Doctrines changed and developed even within the Bible itself. And the Bible contained the erroneous scientific beliefs of the ancient world.[34] The original lecture, which Loisy toned down for publication, expressed his point even more strongly. "The condemnation of Galileo," it said, "has delivered a mortal blow to the theory of the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures, since Galileo was right and since the Bible, in the name of which Galileo was condemned, with good logic, was wrong."[35] Galileo showed that the sun did not revolve around the earth, while the Bible testified to the Israelite belief that it did. The Bible, Loisy concluded, might be a generally accurate historical witness to past beliefs, but the beliefs to which it bore witness were not themselves necessarily true.

Did Loisy's admission that historians could discern apparent errors in the Bible undermine its theological value? Loisy answered no, and he ended the article with a theological discussion of the "relative inerrancy" of Scripture.[36] The Bible, he said, had communicated its message in the relative forms most appropriate for its original audience. Even the theological assertions of the biblical authors were bound to their cultural and historical contexts. However, the very "imperfections" of the Bible (as seen from a later time) had played an essential role in communicating its religious message. In a rare concession, Loisy added, "This purely relative truth carries no prejudice to the absolute value of the principles which are the base of biblical teaching."[37] The errors and historical limitations of the Bible only concerned the relative expressions of its religious truth, not the absolute principles that these expressions were intended to convey.

Loisy attributed to the magisterium the task of eliciting the theological or religious (as distinguished from historical) truth of Scripture. He suggested that the Bible was a "repository for religious and moral teaching," but that even its properly religious teachings remained true only "on the condition of being interpreted" so as to speak to modern

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 148–149.

[35] Loisy, Lecture, 1893, quoted in *Mémoires*, I, 252. The manuscript of the original lecture is in volume nine of the Papiers Loisy in the Bibliothèque nationale.

[36] Loisy, "La question biblique," pp. 156–167. "Relative inerrancy" is Burtchaell's term (*op. cit.*, p. 222).

[37] *Ibid.*, pp. 162–163.

people in modern language. Theology had to progress; biblical theology had to be translated into modern terms in order to be true relative to the modern period. As a Catholic making the standard Catholic argument against Protestants, Loisy concluded, "the Bible is true but the Church is infallible."[38] He might have added that, in this religious realm, the infallible Church was fully authoritative.

Contrasting Loisy with d'Hulst's broad school illustrates his quite different proposal for reconciling independent scholarship and the authoritative teachings of the Church.[39] The broad school affirmed biblical inerrancy in matters of faith and morals while acknowledging scientific and historical errors in Scripture. From Loisy's perspective, this position inappropriately combined theological and historical judgments. Affirming biblical inerrancy in matters of faith and morals made past expressions of religious truth normative for contemporary religious life. It thus stifled the natural development of properly religious teachings. On the other hand, acknowledging scientific or historical errors in Scripture judged the biblical authors by the standards of modern scholarship. Both claims violated the integrity of religious and scientific truth relative to a particular historical moment. Combining these claims confused the analysis of the past (an historical question) with the religious interpretation of the past in contemporary terms (a theological question).

By distinguishing historical from theological *approaches* to the same material rather than non-essential from essential teachings, Loisy could be both more radical and more traditional than the broad school. More radical historically, he recognized that all expressions of religious truth, including Catholic doctrine, changed with changes in scientific knowledge and human culture.[40] Even the most venerable teaching on faith or morals could only articulate religious truth in relative terms subject to the ebb and flow of history. More traditional theologically, however (at least in rhetoric), Loisy did not limit inspiration or biblical truth to questions of faith and morals. He could thus profess the truth of the Catholic tradition and the (relative) inerrancy of Scripture as a whole, while still accepting the most radical conclusions of contemporary historical criticism.

[38]*Ibid.*, pp. 165, 167. See also *ibid.*, p. 161.

[39]For a similar treatment, see William Wernz, "The 'Modernist' Writings of Alfred Loisy: An Analysis" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1971), pp. 14–16.

[40]Loisy, Lecture, 1893, quoted in *Mémoires*, I, 252. Loisy insisted that these changes constituted the true challenge of the biblical question to traditional orthodoxy (*Choses passées*, pp. 128–129, and *Mémoires*, I, 237).

Although Loisy could sound orthodox when he spoke theologically, his distinction between historical and theological approaches to the same biblical material had radical implications, particularly for the nature and exercise of ecclesiastical authority.[41] No longer should one assume that the authoritative pronouncements of the Church were absolute—like the Bible, they, too, were relative to a particular time and place and would change as necessary. Theologically, one might claim that the modern Church preserved the spirit of its earlier teachings, but historians could see the dramatic changes in the Catholic tradition across the centuries and had to account for them.[42] Once again, the contrast with the broad school is illuminating. D'Hulst's broad school could still presume that the role of the magisterium was to define and preserve church teachings. Once the Church had defined a dogma, scholars would respect it, and it would presumably remain unchanged. By contrast, Loisy wanted the magisterium itself to acknowledge and participate in the flux of history. It should not attempt to preserve the letter of the dogmatic tradition so much as to govern the constant effort to reformulate it in new terms. Even in its dogmatic definitions, then, the Church did not transcend history, but rather participated within it. As a result, the Church did not have any authority over those who studied history, including the history of religion, at least in their office as historians.[43]

[41]Such efforts to use orthodox terminology to convey potentially radical ideas was characteristic of Loisy. See, for example, Wernz's discussion of Loisy's "Firmin" articles in "The 'Modernist' Writings of Alfred Loisy." Several other commentators have also discussed the subtlety of Loisy's language and the dangers of taking his words too literally. See, for example, Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford, 1980), pp. 55–58; Émile Poulat, *Histoire, dogme et critique dans la crise moderniste* (Paris, 1962), pp. 90–92; Stephen Sykes, *The Identity of Christianity* (London, 1984), pp. 137–138; C. J. T. Talar, "A Reading of the Gospel (and the Church) According to Alfred Loisy," *Thought*, 67 (1992), 302–316.

[42]Over the next decade, Loisy refined the developmental view that he first presented here. It stood at the heart of his later "modernist" writings, the "Firmin" articles, *L'Evagile et l'Église*, and *Autour d'un petit livre*. It was also an important point of contention with his Neo-Scholastic and Neo-Thomist opponents. Many scholars have examined this conflict. The three that have focused the most strongly on the contrast between Loisy's developmental view and the dominant position in the Church are T. Howland Sanks, *Authority in the Church: A Study of Changing Paradigms* (Missoula, Montana, 1974); C. J. T. Talar, *Metaphor and Modernist: The Polarization of Alfred Loisy and His Neo-Thomist Critics* (Lanham, Maryland, 1987); and Daly, *op. cit.*

[43]In *The Historian and the Believer: The Morality of Historical Knowledge and Christian Belief* (Urbana, Illinois, 1966), Van Harvey makes a similar point about the challenge that the canons of modern historical scholarship pose to traditional claims of religious authority. See especially pp. 102–126.

The relevant members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy received Loisy's proposals no differently than they had received d'Hulst's article on the broad school. Loisy's article scandalized the bishop protectors of the Institut catholique, who insisted that d'Hulst ask for his resignation. Loisy duly resigned just as Leo promulgated *Providentissimus Deus*. Like d'Hulst's, Loisy's effort to limit the control of the Church over modern scholarship foundered when it confronted the practical realities of ecclesiastical authority.

3. The Church Speaks

Loisy could not successfully establish a modern, orthodox, Catholic scholarship in part because his efforts ran counter to the most powerful intellectual current in the Church at that time: Neo-Thomism. During the second half of the nineteenth century, several ecclesiastical leaders promoted Neo-Thomism as the best Christian philosophy.[44] Following the ascension of Leo XIII to the papal throne in 1878, the Neo-Thomist revival effectively became official Church policy. Shortly after his election, Leo issued an encyclical entitled *Aeterni Patris* (August 4, 1879) that instructed Catholics to return to the thought of Thomas himself, as distinguished from its rigid codification in the Neo-Scholastic manuals in use in Catholic seminaries around the world.[45] To facilitate the study of Thomas's thought, Leo then commissioned the publication of a new edition of Thomas's writings, complete with two classic commentaries. Leo's support for Thomism initially encountered passive resistance from many local clergy, but it eventually exercised a decisive influence on Catholic intellectual life, including at the Institut catholique de Paris.[46]

[44]See Leonard Boyle, "A Remembrance of Pope Leo XIII," in Victor Brezik (ed.), *One Hundred Years of Thomism* (Houston, 1981); Gerald McCool, *The Neo-Thomists* (Milwaukee, 1994), pp. 25–40, and *From Unity to Pluralism* (New York, 1989), pp. 12–32; Nicholas Lobkowicz, "Whatever Happened to Thomism?" *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 69 (1995), 403–406; Pierre Thibault, *Savoir et pouvoir: Philosophie thomiste et politique cléricale au XIX^e siècle* (Quebec, 1972), pp. 41–72. McCool particularly stresses the influence of Matteo Liberatore and Joseph Kleutgen on the developing Neo-Thomist revival.

[45]On the encyclical, see McCool, *Nineteenth Century Scholasticism* (New York, 1989), pp. 228–236, and *From Unity to Pluralism*, pp. 5–15; and Thibault, *op. cit.*, pp. 141–149. Leo himself discussed the place of Thomism in Catholic education and made explicit reference to *Aeterni Patris* in *Depuis le jour*, in Claudia Carlen (ed.), *Papal Encyclicals* (5 vols.; Wilmington, North Carolina, 1981), II, 458.

[46]Even before the promulgation of *Aeterni Patris*, d'Hulst was an active advocate of a return to "Christian philosophy" based on Aristotle. D'Hulst continued to support Thomism

What distinguished Neo-Thomism from other, less satisfactory philosophical schools? Unlike modern philosophies, argued its proponents, it described the relationship between faith and reason in a way that did violence to neither. Within its own sphere, taught Thomas, reason was fully autonomous and trustworthy. For the highest truths of faith, reason depended on revelation, but here, too, reason and faith were perfectly concordant. What was true of reason and revelation was true of intellectual life as a whole. All academic disciplines had a limited autonomy, but had to respect the theological tradition and authority of the Church. For example, regarding philosophy Leo noted that "in the case of such doctrines as the human intelligence may perceive, it is equally just that philosophy should make use of its own method, principles, and arguments—not indeed," he hastened to add, "in such fashion as to seem rashly to withdraw from the divine authority." Rather, philosophers should presume the truth of supernatural revelation "with a full and humble faith." Leo continued:

> Since it is established that those things which became known by revelation have the force of certain truth, and that those things which war against faith war equally against right reason, the Catholic philosopher will know that he violates at once faith and the laws of reason if he accepts any conclusion which he understands to be opposed to revealed doctrine. . . . Those, therefore, who to the study of philosophy unite obedience to Christian faith are philosophers indeed.[47]

In those philosophical questions that had implications for theology, philosophers had to answer to ecclesiastical pronouncements about the faith.

History interested Leo less than philosophy, but he insisted that historians, too, should defer to Catholic theology and Church authority. "History," he explained, "contains a body of dogmatic facts which none may call into question." As long as historians recognized the proper limits to their craft, however, "the history of the Church constitutes by itself a magnificent and conclusive demonstration of the truth and

---

after 1878 and, in 1885, formed the Société Saint-Thomas-d'Aquin at the Institut catholique (Thibault, *op. cit.*, p. 158; Beretta, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–97). However, Beretta makes the point that d'Hulst's form of Thomism was more "progressive" than that of most Thomists in that d'Hulst wanted to repeat not Thomas' particular claims so much as his effort to integrate new knowledge into Christian theology. As such, his Thomism had more in common with Loisy's view on the role and function of theology than with the views of some of the more conservative Thomists.

[47]Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals*, II, 20–21. On this argument of the encyclical, see also McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, pp. 5–11.

divinity of Christianity."[48] Careful historical analyses grounded in Catholic theology could show, among other things, that God ruled all "to the glory of his Church" and that Rome "was forever to be the dwelling place and throne of the successors of the blessed Peter, who from this city, as from a center, should govern the entire Christian society, independent of all other powers."[49] Such historical scholarship clearly discredited the recent Italian encroachments on the temporal power of the Holy See. This example illustrates the purpose of history as Leo and Neo-Thomists more generally understood it. Catholic historians were to dedicate their researches to buttressing the Church's teaching and authority against those disposed to challenge them. Leo thus positioned philosophy and history as ancillary disciplines and stressed their role in defending Catholic theology and the Church.[50]

Given this commitment to Neo-Thomism and the integration of academic disciplines under the authority of the Church, Leo and his advisers could only see the different efforts of d'Hulst and Loisy to limit the authority of the Church over some forms of scholarship as an attack on the Church and the truth that it guarded.[51] To address this attack, Leo released *Providentissimus Deus* (November 18, 1893) re-asserting the place of Neo-Thomist theology and church authority in the interpretation of Scripture.[52] The encyclical explicitly condemned "those who, in order to rid themselves of . . . difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond." It was wrong, Leo said, "to narrow inspiration to certain parts only of Holy Scripture or to admit that the sacred writer has erred."[53] That is, the encyclical condemned the broad school, although without mentioning it or d'Hulst by name. Leo also condemned "free science" and "higher criticism" (a version of which Loisy advocated) for ignoring the authoritative teaching of the Church.[54]

[48]Leo XIII, *Depuis le jour*, p. 459.

[49]Leo XIII, "Letter on Historical Studies," in Colman J. Barry (ed.), *Readings in Church History*, Vol. 3 (Westminster, Maryland, 1965), p. 92.

[50]During the Modernist crisis the influential Neo-Thomist theologian Louis Billot would develop this position at great length in his attack on Loisy entitled *De Immutabilitate Traditionis*.

[51]Sanks and Talar have drawn on Thomas Kuhn's theory of paradigm shifts to describe the "incommensurability" separating partisans of the dominant theology from innovators like d'Hulst and Loisy. See *Authority in the Church* and *Metaphor and Modernist*, especially pp. 26–34.

[52]Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*, in Carlen, *Papal Encyclicals*, II, 333.

[53]*Ibid.*, p. 335.

[54]*Ibid.*, pp. 329, 334.

To correct those who tried to limit the inspiration of the Bible or ignored the authoritative teachings of the Church, Leo offered several specific prescriptions for the study of Scripture. After adequate theological preparation, he said, exegetes should begin their investigations with passages interpreted by the biblical authors themselves or by the Church. Next, exegetes should use the analogy of faith to discern the meaning of more obscure passages. Finally, they should consult the early Church Fathers and later Catholic scholars. Leo allowed the reading of non-Catholic scholars, but he did not encourage it because of the inevitable taint of corrupt doctrines.[55] Biblical interpretation, in Leo's view, was clearly not independent of Church teaching or authority.

Disciplines other than theology could aid in biblical interpretation so long as their contribution reinforced orthodox teaching. Leo used the physical sciences to illustrate the supporting role that various academic disciplines could play. True science, he said, did not conflict with Catholic doctrine. On the contrary, an accurate knowledge of nature testified to the glory of God and aided in the refutation of anti-Christian propaganda. Catholic exegetes could usually resolve apparent conflicts between the findings of modern science and the biblical reports by recalling that the biblical authors, "or, to speak more accurately, the Holy Ghost," did not intend to teach "the secrets of nature." At the same time, Catholic interpreters should prefer biblical teaching in those places where (erroneous) scientific findings did indeed contradict it.[56] The same was true for history. Catholics needed to know "the modern methods of attack," so that they could "repulse hostile assaults" on the trustworthiness of Scripture and its testimony to the authority of the Church. Leo therefore recommended the study of biblical languages and "the art of criticism."[57] But, of course, critical conclusions had to conform to church teaching. They could confirm Catholic doctrine, but not challenge it.

4. Loisy's Answer to Leo

Predictably, reactions to the encyclical varied widely.[58] Most prominent biblical critics in Catholic France (including d'Hulst, Loisy, and the faculty of the Institut catholique de Paris as a whole) sent Leo their ad-

[55] *Ibid.*, pp. 331–333.
[56] *Ibid.*, pp. 334–335.
[57] *Ibid.*, p. 333.
[58] For a survey of reactions, see Houtin, *La question biblique*, pp. 173–185.

herence to the teachings of the encyclical. But even this apparent unity concealed quite different interpretations of what those teachings were. Did *Providentissimus* condemn all independent historical criticism of the Bible? Or did it condemn only the abuse of historical criticism? Different critics answered these questions in different ways. For his part, Loisy's answer to these questions depended on the context. Privately he acknowledged that Leo encouraged a theological exegesis wholly foreign to the kind of independent biblical criticism he practiced. Loisy tried to console himself that the encyclical concentrated its attack on the broad school rather than on "true historical criticism" (meaning his own method), of which it displayed no understanding. Given the encyclical's general tenor, however, he admitted that the Pope's ignorance of criticism was insufficient grounds on which to base the rights of historical scholarship in the Church.[59]

Publicly, however, Loisy interpreted the encyclical as consistent with his views on the independent historical criticism of Scripture. When he reissued his controversial article on the biblical question distancing himself from the broad school in 1901, he added notes aimed at reconciling his position with *Providentissimus Deus*. The encyclical, Loisy asserted in these notes, simply restated the traditional theological position more clearly. By remaining silent on true historical criticism, it left historians free.[60] In fact, Leo's encyclical actually encouraged the legitimate use of textual criticism.[61] Loisy sought to extend this encouragement to historical analysis more broadly, and he even went so far as to suggest that the encyclical warned contemporary commentators against seeking absolute truths in the Bible on matters only tangentially related to its religious purposes. The encyclical thus allowed Loisy's notion of historically relative truth, at least implicitly.[62] Loisy therefore claimed the freedom to reject "the theory of absolute inerrancy" and to stress the merely "relative truth" of the Bible's form "although it might be absolutely true in its substance."[63] Given this interpretation of the encyclical, Loisy's notes suggested, Catholic critics had no reason to regret Leo's pronouncement.

[59]Loisy to Baron Friedrich von Hügel, December 6, 1893, quoted in *Mémoires*, I, 297.

[60]Loisy, *Études bibliques*, p. 139 n. 2. Loisy later regretted these notes. See Loisy to von Hügel, January 3, 1903, quoted in *Mémoires*, II, 182–183.

[61]*Ibid.*, p. 155 n. 1.

[62]*Ibid.*, p. 159 n. 1.

[63]*Ibid.*, p. 157 n. 1. Loisy's practice of responding only to the most extreme formulation of the opposing position ("the theory of absolute inerrancy") was typical of his polemical practice more generally. See O'Connell, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

Loisy also sent directly to Leo an adherence to the teachings of the encyclical, and he enclosed a memoir interpreting it in light of the distinction he always drew between the theological interpretation of the Bible under the authority of the Church and the independent historical interpretation of the Bible by scholars. The encyclical, Loisy claimed, governed theological exegesis, to which it gave a "powerful impulsion" through its "intelligent return to the doctrine of Saint Thomas Aquinas." But it also implicitly acknowledged the independence of historical science. It allowed historians to "regard the Bible not simply as the eternal rule of faith, but as an historical document attesting to the state of revealed doctrine in a particular epoch, presenting it in particular historical conditions and in writings of a particular date and character."[64] Of course, critics would only address secondary questions which the tradition left open. And they would never reach well-established conclusions that contradicted the Catholic faith.[65] But, curious about the state of revealed doctrine at a particular historical moment, they studied the Bible with questions in mind different from those raised by theologians or by the magisterium. In admittedly subtle ways, Loisy suggested, the encyclical encouraged historians to ask these questions for themselves.

Leo rejected these efforts to interpret the encyclical as leaving Catholic biblical critics free from ecclesiastical authority, however. Responding to Loisy's memoir by way of Cardinal Rampolla, Leo thanked Loisy for his humble submission and suggested that he apply his talents to a field other than biblical criticism.[66] To Loisy's dismay, subsequent papal pronouncements continued to assert the value of ecclesiastical oversight for biblical scholarship. First, in 1897, Leo promulgated a new Constitution of the Index of Forbidden Books in order "to protect civil society from erroneous beliefs and corrupt morals, the twin causes of the decline of States, which commonly owes its origin and its progress to bad books."[67] Second, on September 8, 1899, Leo released *Depuis le*

[64]Loisy, "Mémoire," pp. 191–192, 197–198. The original manuscript of the memoir that Loisy enclosed with his adhesion is in volume ten of the Papiers Loisy at the Bibliothèque nationale. Loisy never published it, but Dietmar Bader includes it as an appendix to his *Der Weg Loisys*, pp. 191–198. My references are to Bader's pagination.

[65]*Ibid.*, pp. 195, 197. We may disregard these concessions as an (unsuccessful) effort to make his free interpretation of the encyclical more palatable to Leo. Note, however, how similar they sound to d'Hulst's broad school.

[66]Rampolla to Loisy, December 31, 1893, quoted in Loisy, *Mémoires*, I, 317, and *Choses passées*, p. 155.

[67]Leo XIII, *Officiorum ac munerum*, in John Wynne (ed.), *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, 3rd ed. (New York, 1903), p. 409. Loisy called Leo's act the disciplinary part of *Providentissimus Deus* (*Mémoires*, I, 429, and *Choses passées*, p. 185). For Loisy's response, see "Essais," V, 724–728/31–35.

jour, an encyclical in French addressed to the French clergy on the subject of pastoral formation. It condemned Catholic scholars who recklessly adopted historical methods of biblical criticism and went on to insist, in the strongest terms, on the importance of hierarchical obedience for all priests.[68] Finally, in 1902, Leo established a commission of scholars to serve as the official voice of the Church on all biblical questions.[69] The initial composition of the commission gave critics some room to hope that it would protect them from judgments of the Holy Office such as the requirement that critics accept the authenticity of 1 John 5:7–8, the passage on the "heavenly witnesses" (a decision confirmed by Leo in 1897).[70] Baron von Hügel, one of Loisy's closest allies, called the appointments "truly good," and even Loisy was guardedly optimistic. Within a few months, the addition of twenty-eight conservative consulters dashed these hopes.[71] During Loisy's lifetime, the Pontifical Biblical Commission consistently acted as a restraining force on independent critics themselves, not on their censors.

Loisy responded to these developments with a bitter pseudonymous article lamenting the state of biblical criticism in the Church and reassessing the teachings of *Providentissimus Deus*.[72] Many Catholics (including, he might have added, his own public writings) had interpreted *Providentissimus Deus* as condemning only the reckless application of higher criticism, not the very principle of the historical interpretation of the Bible independent of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In fact, Loisy now said, the natural sense of the encyclical clearly ruled out the purely historical investigation of Scripture. Attributing his own historical opinions to "certain Catholic exegetes," Loisy admitted that such views were "entirely foreign to the encyclical and the preoccupations which dic-

[68]Leo XIII, *Depuis le jour*, pp. 459–461, partly quoted in Loisy, *Choses passées*, p. 391. As his note on this excerpt shows, Loisy interpreted this encyclical as a personal blow aimed at himself.

[69]Leo XIII, *Vigilantiae*, in Wynne, *The Great Encyclical Letters*. See also Lawrence Barmann, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Modernist Crisis in England* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 88–93; John McGrath, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Debate on Historical Christianity* (San Francisco, 1993), pp. 36–38.

[70]See Houtin, *La question biblique*, pp. 224–241, for a description of the controversy that preceded this decision. For Loisy's reaction to this decision, see *Mémoires*, I, 435–438.

[71]For Loisy's initial reaction, see Loisy, *Mémoires*, II, 85–87; Loisy to Paul Desjardins, January 10, 1902, quoted *ibid.*, II, 89–90; Loisy to von Hügel, November 10, 1902, quoted *ibid.*, II, 155. For Loisy's subsequent reaction, see Loisy to von Hügel, February 5, 1903, quoted *ibid.*, II, 216.

[72]For what follows, see [Loisy], "La lettre de Léon XIII au clergé de France et les études d'Écriture sainte," *Revue du Clergé Français* (June 1, 1900), pp. 9–15.

tated it." With the growth of critical awareness among Catholics, the papal ignorance of biblical science had turned into outright hostility. Leo's recent pronouncements left no room for independent history, but rather reduced it to a subordinate branch of theology. And subordinating history to theology meant subordinating it to the ultimate theological tribunal, the Holy Office. Loisy rejected this effort to integrate history and theology under the supervision of the Church and continued to insist on distinguishing history from theology in order to free scholars from ecclesiastical authority.

Conclusion

Already the basic issues of the "modernist crisis" had emerged. Loisy wanted an independent and critical analysis of biblical literature using the methods of scientific history, while Leo stressed a theological interpretation of Sacred Scripture. This disagreement would re-emerge during the modernist crisis, when some of Loisy's specific historical claims seemed to certain members of the hierarchy to be heterodox or worse. However, underlying the disagreement between Loisy and Leo, and between both and d'Hulst, on historical or theological interpretations of the Bible was the question of the authority of the Church. To what degree did the Church have authority over Catholic scholars? How should one conceive of that authority? How should the Church exercise it?

Although d'Hulst and Loisy did not finally resolve the issues they addressed, they honestly faced the emergence of the modern academic study of religion, as well as other modern intellectual challenges, and asked important questions about how it related to the tradition and authority of the Church. And, at this point, the Holy See did not simply terminate the conversation. Leo spoke authoritatively, and his pronouncements became increasingly hostile to the position advocated by Loisy, but he did not anathematize those like Loisy who disagreed. On his side, Loisy resented the papal pronouncements, but he did not openly defy them nor did he renounce his allegiance to the Church. If the issues raised by modernism already appeared in the 1890's, it was not yet a "crisis."

The modernist "crisis" began, in an important sense, only with the series of papal pronouncements on modernism starting in 1907, when Pius X defined "modernism" as a heresy and vigorously attacked it in an effort to root it out of the Church.[73] Pius condemned modernism, ex-

[73]See Colin, *op. cit.*, pp. 239–269.

communicated leading modernists, imposed an anti-modernist oath on all candidates for major orders, and established "Councils of Vigilance" to continue the war against modernism. Pius's attack succeeded in driving modernists out of the Church, but at great cost. The anti-modernist measures made meaningful reflection on the relationship between some modern academic work on religion and the tradition and authority of the Church dangerous for Catholic scholars, exercising a chilling effect on the intellectual life of the Church particularly in the area of biblical criticism. Until the promulgation of *Divino afflante spiritu* by Pius XII in 1943 gave Catholic biblical critics more freedom, Catholic critics could not seriously consider certain kinds of historical questions about the Bible, thus ceding leadership in biblical studies to non-Catholics.[74] More generally, Pius's strong exercise of authority to condemn certain forms of intellectual inquiry left unresolved the question of how best to combine ecclesiastical authority and academic freedom, a question that continues to challenge the Catholic Church to this day.

[74]See Burtchaell, *op. cit.*, pp. 234, 238–239.

CATHOLIC GREENWICH VILLAGE: ETHNIC GEOGRAPHY AND RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN NEW YORK CITY, 1880–1930

BY

THOMAS J. SHELLEY*

Introduction

Greenwich Village is a neighborhood of diagonal streets and narrow alleys on the lower West Side of Manhattan. Tourists find it an unexpected contrast to Manhattan's rigid grid of north-south avenues and cross-town streets. The area is so different from the rest of the city that even seasoned New Yorkers will admit that a walk through Greenwich Village can be a disorienting experience. Until the morning of September 11, 2001, confused visitors would often look up at the twin towers of the World Trade Center to regain a sense of direction. The population of the Village has long been as distinctive as its topography. Until late in the nineteenth century Greenwich Village remained the stoutly nativist "American Ward" in a city teeming with immigrants. In the early twentieth century it became world-famous as the Bohemia of America. More recently it has been the home of a thriving gay community.[1]

For a period of about fifty years, from 1880 to 1930, Greenwich Village was also a vibrant Catholic neighborhood. There were a dozen churches and chapels with their attendant institutions located either in the Village proper or immediately adjacent to it caring for at least seven different ethnic groups. In many respects Catholic Greenwich Village was a microcosm of the big-city American Catholicism of that era. For that reason it is a researcher's delight today. The compact area and well-

*Monsignor Shelley, a priest of the Archdiocese of New York, is professor of historical theology in Fordham University.

[1]The boundaries of Greenwich Village are 14th Street on the north, 4th Avenue and the Bowery on the east, Houston Street on the south, and the Hudson River on the west. In 1990 the population was 100,000. Kenneth T. Jackson (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of the City of New York* (New York and New Haven, 1995), p. 506.

defined character of Greenwich Village in those years make it possible for the historian to trace the complicated interplay among the different Catholic ethnic groups that lived there, and between each of them and the local Irish-American ecclesiastical power structure. Such an analysis yields some fascinating insights into the grassroots strengths and weaknesses of the largest Catholic archdiocese in the United States at a time when ethnic, urban-centered Catholicism was reaching the apogee of its influence in America.

Greenwich Village was once a real village, a northern suburb of New York City to which the residents of the city fled during periodic outbreaks of cholera. As early as 1822, however, an English visitor noted that, "though once a separate town, [it] now forms part of the city." Nonetheless, for many years thereafter Greenwich Village still preserved its distinctive identity. Amid the tenement districts of lower Manhattan it remained a middle-class enclave with a predominantly native-born white Protestant population. As late as 1893 a rather dyspeptic observer commented favorably on the "humanity of a better sort" who inhabited Greenwich Village in contrast to the inhabitants of the lower East Side of Manhattan, "where even the bad smells have foreign names."[2]

By that date, however, Greenwich Village was already in the process of a major social transformation as the influx of Irish and Italian immigrants from adjacent neighborhoods accelerated the flight of middle-class Protestant residents. In 1902 a prominent social worker stated without hesitation that most of the people were now Catholic. The anonymous writer of the WPA's *New York City Guide* commented condescendingly that by 1910 "the American Ward had become Ward 9, a foreign ward . . . its people faithful followers of the Roman Catholic Church and of Tammany." By the 1920's Greenwich Village was overwhelmingly Catholic and remained such until the deterioration of the neighborhood, and then its subsequent gentrification initiated still another social transformation that sent many middle-class Catholic families scurrying to the outer boroughs of the city.[3]

[2]Newnham Blaine, *An Excursion through the United States and Canada during the Year 1822–1823. By an English Gentleman* (London, 1824), cited in Phelps Stokes, *The Iconography of Manhattan Island* (New York, 1926), V, 1624. Thomas A. Janvier, "Greenwich Village," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine,* 87 (August, 1893), 356–357.

[3]Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, *Neighborhood: My Story of Greenwich House* (New York, 1938), p. 107. *New York City Guide* (New York, 1956), p. 128. Caroline F. Ware, *Greenwich Village, 1920–1930* (Berkeley, California, 1994), p. 292; Ware's book was originally published in 1935.

The Irish Village

Fully half of the twelve Catholic churches in and around Greenwich Village had predominantly Irish congregations. Far and away the most important of them was St. Joseph's Church, located at the corner of 6th Avenue and Washington Place in the heart of Greenwich Village. Founded in 1829, St. Joseph's was the Mother Church of the Catholics in Greenwich Village and the fifth oldest parish in the whole archdiocese. The modest Greek Revival parish church, dedicated in 1834, antedates the Gothic revival in America and has a good claim to be considered the oldest unaltered Catholic church building in New York City.[4] The original boundaries of the parish included the whole West Side of Manhattan from Canal Street to 34th Street. Between 1847 and 1887, however, the growth of the Catholic population led to the establishment of five other predominantly Irish parishes in the area. By 1900 they surrounded St. Joseph's Church like outposts on all four sides. Each had its own distinctive character.

The first of the new parishes was St. Alphonsus, which was founded as a German national parish in 1847 and entrusted to the Redemptorist Fathers, who had a plentiful supply of multilingual, European-born priests. Located on Thompson Street, about a mile south of St. Joseph's Church, St. Alphonsus quickly attracted Irish Catholics who lived in the southern part of Greenwich Village. The Irish presence was evident when Confirmation was first administered in the new parish in 1854. Of the 160 candidates, 35 were German, 48 were Irish, 76 were listed as "other."[5] The Irish soon outnumbered the Germans at St. Alphonsus Church, much to the distress of the German parishioners who resisted the introduction of English-language services. The original plans for a new and larger church in 1870 envisioned both an upstairs church and a downstairs church. The proposal was dropped after vehement protests of German parishioners who suspected that they would be relegated to the basement church. "We will not go downstairs and have the Irish over our heads," they fumed. However, by the turn of the last century, ethnic friction had faded. In 1905 John Talbot Smith, a New York diocesan priest and historian, cited the harmony among the Germans, Irish, and American-born parishioners as a model for all American Catholic

[4]"New York's Oldest Catholic Church Structure," *Historical Records and Studies*, 35 (1946), 18–45.

[5]Francis X. Murphy, C.Ss.R., *The Centennial History of St. Alphonsus Parish* (New York, 1947), p. 14. Father Murphy is better known today for his "Letters from Vatican City" written under the alias of Xavier Rynne during the Second Vatical Council.

parishes. Of course his comment may simply reflect the fact that the Irish had won control of the parish.[6]

No pastor likes to preside over the diminution of his parish, but Father Michael McCarron, the stern Ulster-born pastor of St. Joseph's Church from 1845 to 1857, may have welcomed the establishment of St. Alphonsus Church on his southern border. The neighborhood where St. Alphonsus was located contained a red-light district with more than one hundred brothels, 198 liquor stores, and a densely populated area of run-down tenements that a housing inspector described as "universally unclean and offensive." The Redemptorists boasted that they were available for confessions in seven languages at any hour of the day. In such an environment their services may often have been needed. In contrast to the presence of St. Alphonsus on the southern border of his parish, however, Father McCarron could not have been pleased with the next two parishes established on the fringes of his parochial domain in the early 1850's, St. Ann's and St. Francis Xavier's. Both would have been classified as *bon ton* parishes in the clerical argot of the day.[7]

St. Ann's Church was founded in 1852 on the eastern border of St. Joseph's parish. Eventually located on East 12th Street between 3rd and 4th Avenues, it became the most fashionable Catholic church in the city in the late nineteenth century. The first two pastors, John Murray Forbes and Thomas Preston, were both former Episcopal clergymen. Forbes returned to the Episcopal Church, but Preston served as chancellor and then as vicar general of the archdiocese under three archbishops as well as pastor of St. Ann's until his death in 1891.[8]

The fine choir at St. Ann's Church and Monsignor Preston's reputation as a preacher assured the success of the parish. Before the High Mass on some Sundays the carriages of wealthy Catholics lined East

[6]Jay P. Dolan, *The Immigrant Church: New York's Irish and German Catholics, 1815–1865* (Baltimore, 1975), p. 96. John Talbot Smith, *The Catholic Church in New York* (New York and Boston, 1905), I, 201.

[7]*Report of the Council of Hygiene of the Citizens' Association of New York upon the Sanitary Condition of the City* (New York, 1865), pp. 67–68. *New York Freeman's Journal and Catholic Register*, September 3, 1870.

[8]For the origins of St. Ann's Church, see the model parish history written by Henry J. Browne, *St. Ann's on East Twelfth Street, New York City, 1852–1952* (New York, 1952), pp. 2–16. On Forbes and Preston, see Kent Wilson, "The Oxford Movement in New York" (M.A. thesis, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York, 1990). For Preston's role as the enforcer of orthodoxy in the Archdiocese of New York, see Anthony D. Andreassi, "'The Cunning Leader of a Dangerous Clique?' The Burtsell Affair and Archbishop Michael Corrigan," *Catholic Historical Review*, 86 (October, 2000), 620–639.

12th Street from 5th Avenue to 3rd Avenue. In spite of St. Ann's toney reputation, however, when Preston died in 1891, he left a staggering debt of $93,000. It was little consolation to Preston's successors that parishioners fondly remembered him as a priest who never asked for money. In 1895 the pastor, Father William O'Neill, told Archbishop Michael Corrigan that the number of parishioners had been declining for years and that the parish was "practically bankrupt." In 1901, unable to reverse the decline, O'Neill asked for a change of assignment.[9]

While the fortunes of St. Ann's ebbed, those of St. Francis Xavier soared. Established in 1850 on West 16th Street, in what had been the northern quadrant of St. Joseph's parish, St. Francis Xavier was the first permanent Jesuit parish in the Archdiocese of New York. The original church was replaced after 1878 with a large Baroque church designed in the European Jesuit style by Patrick Keely, the well-known Irish-American church architect. Around the corner from the church on 6th Avenue, the new department stores with their elegant cast iron façades were creating the trendiest shopping district in the city. The side streets were lined with new three-story brownstone houses that were home to many of New York's burgeoning middle class. When the Jesuits held a fund-raising parish fair in November, 1880, the sponsors included some of the most prominent Catholic laity in the city, among them Thomas H. O'Connor, John Hassard, Morgan J. O'Brien, Mrs. Eugene Kelly, and Mrs. Thomas F. Meagher.[10]

Even in the early days of St. Francis Xavier parish, Archbishop John Hughes received complaints from neighboring pastors that the Jesuits were stealing their parishioners because of their reputation as skilled confessors. Hughes's bizarre solution was to restrict the Jesuits to hearing men's confessions in the confessionals of the church, which, the local Jesuit superior said, "are always besieged by women." For the next forty years or more, the pastors of St. Joseph's Church would keep up a constant barrage of complaints to the diocesan authorities about the number of their parishioners who regularly attended Sunday Mass at the Jesuit church.[11]

[9]O'Neill to Corrigan, December 30, 1895; Corrigan to O'Neill, April 23, 1901, Archives of the Archdiocese of New York (hereafter AANY), St. Ann's Parish File.

[10]*The Journal of the Fair to Aid in the Completion of the New St. Francis Xavier Church*, November 13, 1880, n.p.

[11]Francis X. Curran, S.J., "Archbishop Hughes and the Jesuits: An Anatomy of Their Quarrels," in Thomas Hennessy, S.J. (ed.), *Fordham: The Early Years* (n.p., 1998), p. 189. This article was originally published as "Archbishop Hughes and the Jesuits," *Woodstock Letters*, 97 (Winter, 1968), 5–56.

From the vantage point of the pastors of St. Joseph's, the least offensive of the new parishes was St. Bernard's, which was established in 1868. Located on West 14th Street near 9th Avenue in the far northwestern corner of the parish, St. Bernard's Church literally faced north across 14th Street to its assigned portion of the vineyard, the rapidly developing Chelsea area of Manhattan. If only because of distance, St. Bernard's was not a major competitor for St. Joseph's parishioners. It was quite otherwise with the last of the five new parishes that surrounded St. Joseph's parish, St. Veronica's on Christopher Street.

When Father John Salter, the pastor of St. Joseph's Church from 1882 to 1892, first heard in 1886 that the archdiocese intended to establish still another parish, he immediately complained to Archbishop Corrigan. "This parish is now surrounded by churches, each one drawing a large percentage of communicants from us," he told the archbishop. When Salter discovered that the projected new parish was to comprise thirty square blocks that would be subtracted from the western part of his own parish, he did all in his power to prevent it. "There is not now a sufficient population between St. Joseph's and the river to support another church, much less a school," he informed Archbishop Corrigan.

Corrigan sent his vicar general, Monsignor John Murphy Farley, to mollify the irate Salter. One rainy evening in November, 1886, Farley and Salter tramped through the dark streets of the West Village in the rain, as Salter made his case that there were only a couple of hundred Catholic families in the whole area and that very few of them lived near the waterfront. Farley was not convinced. (He had earlier calculated that there were in fact 17,000 Catholics in St. Joseph's parish.) Feigning shock at Salter's revelation of so few Catholics near the Hudson River, Farley announced that the obvious solution was to give the new parish an even larger portion of St. Joseph's territory. At this point in the conversation, Salter did an abrupt about-face and conceded that perhaps there were more Catholics near the waterfront than he had calculated. "I allowed myself to be convinced of this," Farley told Corrigan with a chuckle, and he left Salter with the latter begging him not to change the original boundaries of the new parish.[12]

Salter may have exaggerated the paucity of Catholics in the area of St. Veronica's parish, but there was no doubt about their poverty. For the first three years the parishioners worshiped in a former warehouse and

[12]Salter to Corrigan, September 22, November 20, 1886; Farley to Corrigan, December 1, 1886, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

stable that was leased for $2,000 per year. In March, 1890, they laid the cornerstone of the present church on Christopher Street and shortly thereafter began to celebrate Sunday Mass in the basement. It took another thirteen years to complete the upper church, which was finally dedicated on June 7, 1903, by Farley, who had succeeded Corrigan as the archbishop of New York the previous year. The journal that was published for the dedication of the church is a good indication of the character of the neighborhood. In addition to the usual full-page advertisements from funeral directors ("undertakers" as they were then called), there were numerous advertisements for stables, horse dealers, truckers and forwarders, scrap metal dealers, and even a dog and horse hospital, all located within the confines of the parish and owned mostly by proprietors with Irish names. These advertisers represented the more prosperous residents; the bulk of St. Veronica's parishioners were employed in even more humble occupations, many of them as longshoremen and teamsters. The fact that it took thirteen years to complete the upper church was a fair indication of the poverty of that part of Greenwich Village. In fact, almost half the money for the church came from two exceptionally successful parish fairs, one in 1890 and the other in 1902.[13]

"Most Prosperous Irish Parish"

Although St. Joseph's Church was reduced to more modest boundaries after 1887, it was arguably the most influential religious institution in Greenwich Village during the half-century between 1880 and 1930. Caroline Ware, in her classic study of Greenwich Village after World War I, noted that, by 1930, after a long process of erosion, the fifteen Protestant churches in and around Greenwich Village could claim the allegiance of no more than five percent of the population. The Village had become overwhelmingly Catholic. Although Ware never identified St. Joseph's Church by name ("Most Prosperous Irish Parish" was her charming and transparent circumlocution), she also called attention to the unique status of this particular church in Greenwich Village. "In this [Catholic] community one parish had always stood markedly above the others," she explained. "[I]t had the dignity of age on its side." She also noticed perceptively that in 1892 the new pastor was designated a "per-

[13] *Church of St. Veronica* (New York, 1903), not paginated.

manent rector," a prestigious honor reserved for only the pastors of the most important parishes in the archdiocese.[14]

Even after the loss of a substantial portion of the West Village to St. Veronica's parish in 1887, St. Joseph's remained a large parish. It extended from 14th Street in the north to Houston Street in the south, and from Hudson Street in the west to University Place and South 5th Avenue in the east, an area of eighty-one square blocks with a Catholic population of perhaps 10,000. In 1895–1896 the pastor reported an income of $27,773.60, almost half of which came from pew rent and seat rent, two sources of revenue that indicated a relatively stable, if not exactly an affluent congregation. Another $6,873.48 was derived from the Sunday collection, and the remaining income came from special collections and donations. Unlike St. Veronica's, St. Joseph's did not have to resort to a parish fair to raise money until it embarked on construction of a new parochial school building. However, when there was a special collection for new pews in 1889, only thirty-eight of the 720 contributors donated more than $5.00, an indication of the working-class character of the parish.[15]

However menial their occupations, the parishioners of St. Joseph's Church regarded themselves as the social superiors of their poorer cousins in St. Veronica's parish. In 1908 the principal of St. Veronica's School reported that the fathers of half of her students were unemployed.[16] Poverty, however, was a relative term among the Irish in Greenwich Village. While it was true that the housing stock tended to deteriorate the farther west one went from 6th Avenue toward the Hudson River, there was a general deterioration in living accommodations throughout much of Greenwich Village in the 1890's. Many private homes were converted into lodging houses or subdivided into workers' flats. For the first time, too, tenement houses were built in considerable numbers in this once solidly middle-class neighborhood. By 1903 there were 2,283 such buildings with 51,777 residents. They were typically

[14]Ware, *op. cit.*, pp. 292–294, 309–310. Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, the director of Greenwich House, the most important local settlement house, estimated that Greenwich Village was eighty percent Catholic in the 1930's. Writing in 1938, she added, "The Roman Catholic Church in our neighborhood is the most influential of all forces." Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, pp. 117, 172.

[15]Financial Report of St. Joseph's Church, January 1, 1895, to January 1, 1896: A Special Collection, October 20, 1889, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

[16]Mary Simkhovitch, Report of the Director, January 21, 1908, Greenwich House Papers, Tamiment Institute Library, New York University (hereafter GHP).

six-story structures only twenty-five feet wide with the most minimal sanitary facilities. The construction of New York's first two elevated railways through Greenwich Village also contributed to the decline in real estate values. For over sixty years the trains of the Sixth Avenue "El" rattled past the front of St. Joseph's Church, blighting the street below and drowning out all but the most powerful preachers in the pulpit.[17]

After the turn of the century the Protestant churches in Greenwich Village curtailed their activities as their congregations dwindled and moved away to greener pastures. By contrast St. Joseph's Church offered its parishioners a full array of sacramental, educational, and social services every day of the week. On Sunday there was Mass every hour on the hour from 6:00 A.M. until 11:00 A.M., including a children's Mass at 9:00 A.M. and a sung High Mass with sermon at 11:00 A.M. Many of the more devout parishioners returned to church on Sunday evenings at 7:30 P.M. for vespers, a sermon, and Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, a popular Eucharistic service. Every weekday there were four regularly scheduled Masses between 6:30 A.M. and 9:00 A.M., with a High Mass at 9:00 A.M. on the First Friday of each month, a day when Catholics were encouraged to receive Holy Communion.

Frequent confession was also an integral part of contemporary Catholic piety. Confessions were heard after every weekday Mass, and on Saturdays all five priests remained in the confessionals from 4:00 P.M. until late in the evening with a brief break for supper. The same was true on the eve of Holydays of Obligation and before the First Friday of the month. Many Catholics would never have dared to receive Holy Communion without first going to confession, although there was no church law that obliged them to do so. In striking contrast to the meticulous attention given to confession, however, baptism and marriage were treated in almost nonchalant fashion. There was no pre-baptismal catechesis or even an interview with the parents. Godparents were simply advised to present the child for baptism on any Sunday afternoon from 4:00 to 5:00 P.M., or on Sunday or Thursday evenings from 7:00 to

[17]A housing survey published in 1903 noted that "in former years [Greenwich Village] was not distinctly a tenement house district. It has, however, recently become so and this tendency is fast increasing." Lawrence Veiller, "A Statistical Study of New York's Tenement Houses," in Robert W. DeForest and Lawrence Veiller, *The Tenement House Problem* (New York, 1903), I, 201. Nevertheless, living conditions in Greenwich Village were still considerably better than on the Lower East Side. In the Ninth Ward, which included most of Greenwich Village, the population density in 1890 was 169.0 people per acre; in the Tenth Ward, the so-called Jewish Quarter, the population density rose to 523.6 people per acre. *Report of the New York State Legislative Assembly Tenement House Committee* (Albany, 1895), p. 273.

9:00 P.M. It was presumed that any parent requesting baptism would raise the child as a Catholic. In the case of weddings, which were usually celebrated in the morning at Mass time with a minimum of formality, there was a three-week waiting period, but only to allow sufficient time for the readings of the "banns" (the names of the couple) at Mass on three successive Sundays. There was no spiritual preparation for the sacrament other than an exhortation to the bride and groom to receive Holy Communion on their wedding day.

The visitation of the sick was a major pastoral responsibility since many terminally ill people avoided hospitals and died at home. At St. Joseph's the parishioners were urged to inform the rectory by 10:00 A.M. if they wished a priest to visit them at home. Office hours at the rectory lasted only from 8:00 A.M. until 10:00 A.M., and again from 6:00 P.M. until 9:00 P.M., leaving the priest "on duty" free to make house calls during the middle of the day. Parish missions—the Catholic equivalent of a Protestant revival service—were also an integral part of the parish life of that era. A large urban parish like St. Joseph's might sponsor a parish mission every year, especially during the penitential season of Lent. In 1897 three diocesan priests and the well-known Paulist preacher, Father Walter Elliott, conducted a mission in St. Joseph's Church that lasted four weeks. As was customary, each week was set aside for a specific group of parishioners. The first week was reserved for married women because they were the ones who were most likely to attend in large numbers and set the tone for the subsequent three weeks. The technique worked well at St. Joseph's Church, where almost 1,700 women filled the church to capacity twice a day, at both the morning Mass and the evening sermon, and they flocked to the confessionals throughout the day.[18]

One way of strengthening the bonds between the parish and the parishioners was through a network of sodalities, confraternities, and parish societies each of which was designed for different purposes and for different age groups. Every organization had its own elected officers and a priest moderator, held regularly scheduled meetings, and performed specific functions, many of which would be described today as lay ministries. One of the smallest but most valuable organizations in St. Joseph's Church was the local chapter of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, which was the principal means of bringing material assistance to the needy of the parish. Unlike some of the bigger parish societies, the St.

[18]Rules and Regulations of St. Joseph's Church, 1896, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File. New York *Catholic News*, December 5, 1897.

Vincent de Paul Society was a highly structured, no-nonsense organization. The members (all men) met each Sunday after the 11:00 A.M. Mass with the pastor to consider requests for financial assistance. In 1895 they distributed $501.17 to poor parishioners in their homes.

The two largest parish societies were the Holy Name Society for the men and the Rosary Society for the women, each of which held monthly meetings. For the younger parishioners there were the Sodality of the Children of Mary and the Sodality of the Holy Angels. The main cultural and social organization was St. Joseph's Lyceum, which sponsored lectures and excursion trips, while the League of the Sacred Heart served a more devotional purpose. There was a parish library, but it does not appear to have been well patronized since it was open only two evenings a week. A Sunday school was operated by the Sisters of Charity and the Christian Brothers, but the clergy and many parents regarded it as a poor substitute for enrollment of children in the parochial school.[19]

St. Joseph's School was the pride of the parish. In 1893 the building was almost forty years old, but the diocesan inspector of schools reported that the classrooms were well ventilated and lighted, and that the academic standards were excellent. In 1895 there were 715 students in the school, which had a teaching staff of nine Sisters of Charity, seven Christian Brothers, and one lay teacher. Total expenses for that school year were $7,978.45, which meant that the per capita cost of educating the children came to $11.16. However, the location of the school was inconvenient because it was one-quarter mile from the church. In 1897 it was replaced with a new five-story limestone and brick school adjacent to the church. Within seven years enrollment almost doubled from 800 to 1,500 children.[20]

The priest who built the new school, and who served as pastor of St. Joseph's Church from 1892 until his death in 1906 was Father Denis Paul O'Flynn. Irish-born and educated in Paris and Louvain, O'Flynn typified the strengths and weaknesses of many Catholic pastors in New York City. He was a conscientious and well-respected figure whose funeral was attended by over 2,000 people, but he played no role in the affairs of the larger community in which he lived even though he was the leader of the biggest congregation in Greenwich Village. He left po-

[19]Rules and Regulations of St. Joseph's Church, 1896, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

[20]M. J. Considine, Report of the Parish School Inspector, July 10, 1893, AANY, G-83; Financial Report of St. Joseph's Church, January 1, 1895, to January 1, 1896; O'Flynn to Farley, December 6, 1904, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

litical matters safely in the hands of the three local Democratic clubs, all of whom courted his tacit approval, while he concentrated on his pastoral ministry, assisted by four fulltime curates. Even this pastoral ministry was conceived exclusively in terms of service to his fellow Irish-Americans. In 1896, at the time that O'Flynn was contemplating the construction of his new school, he hesitated to proceed with the plans, he told Archbishop Corrigan, because "the Jews, the Italians and others are encroaching on us." As a result, he said that he wondered how Catholic the neighborhood would be in a few years. What he really meant, of course, was how Irish the neighborhood would be.[21]

Such a narrow-minded attitude dismayed at least one other Irish-American cleric, Father Salter's old nemesis, John Farley, the vicar general. In June, 1898, at the monthly meeting of the diocesan consultors (the archbishop's advisory council), Farley mentioned that there were now probably 300,000 Italians in New York City. He emphasized the "need to impose upon rectors their duties to *all* the souls in their parish," and he complained in particular that "some seem to feel that they are not responsible for the Italians."[22] Evidently Father O'Flynn was not the only pastor in New York who equated being Catholic with being Irish. At his funeral, with unconscious irony, O'Flynn's eulogist predicted that his memory would remain "green" among his parishioners. One reason that O'Flynn could regard St. Joseph's as an exclusively Irish parish with a good conscience was his conviction that, at least in Greenwich Village, "the Italians and others" were well provided with Catholic churches of their own in the immediate vicinity.

The African-American Village

Of all the "other Catholics" who lived in Greenwich Village, the ones who might have felt least welcome in St. Joseph's Church were the African Americans, since there was a long history of antipathy between the Irish and blacks in New York City. However, one of the few friends that the blacks had in the Catholic community was Father Thomas Farrell, pastor of St. Joseph's Church from 1857 to 1880. Before the Civil War, he had been that rarest of rare birds, an ardent Irish-American abolitionist. In his will Farrell left $5,000 in Alabama state bonds for the establishment of a black Catholic church in New York City. Knowing Cardinal John McCloskey's lack of enthusiasm for such a project, Farrell shrewdly added a codicil to his will that, if the money were not used for

[21]O'Flynn to Corrigan, October 6, 1896, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

[22]Minutes of the Meetings of the Archdiocesan Consultors, June 3, 1898, AANY.

that purpose within three years, it should be given to the Colored Orphan Asylum, which was not a Catholic institution. McCloskey waited the full three years, swallowed hard, and agreed to the founding of such a parish.[23]

However, even Farrell's generosity might not have sufficed to sway McCloskey without the added intervention of two of Farrell's closest young disciples, Fathers Edward McGlynn and Richard Burtsell. McGlynn warned McCloskey of the scandal that would ensue among African Americans if he failed to take advantage of Farrell's benefaction. Burtsell went further. Hearing that a Protestant church on Bleecker Street was for sale, he asked for an interview with McCloskey. He could not get to see the cardinal, but he outlined his proposal to Father John Farley, who was then McCloskey's secretary. "I explained," Burtsell confided to his diary, "that I was willing to undertake the experimental scheme of a colored church on my own responsibility." As a sweetener, he added, "If the scheme was a success, I would be glad to turn it over to the ecclesiastical authorities. If it turned out a failure, the loss would be upon me." Two days later Cardinal McCloskey accepted Burtsell's proposal.[24]

Burtsell then used his own money for a mortgage to purchase the former Third Universalist Church for the price of $40,000. He renamed it the Church of St. Benedict the Moor. It was not only the first black Catholic church in New York City, but also the first black Catholic church north of the Mason-Dixon line. The blessing of the church on November 18, 1883, was such an unusual event that it attracted a large number of curious bystanders who blocked traffic in front of the church. The church itself was so crowded that, in a nice reversal of roles, most whites were excluded and admission was limited to blacks.[25]

The reason for choosing Bleecker Street for the site of the church was that the surrounding area of the South Village contained the high-

[23]Burtsell, Diary, July 23, 1880, AANY.

[24]McGlynn to McCloskey, July 18, 1883, AANY; Burtsell, Diary, September 5, 7, 1883, AANY. McGlynn and Burtsell were both members of the Accademia, a group of liberal-minded New York priests who met regularly at St. Joseph's rectory under Farrell's auspices. On the Accademia, see Robert Emmett Curran, "'Prelude to Americanism': The New York Accademia and Clerical Radicalism in the Late Nineteenth Century," *Church History*, 47 (1978), 48–65. On Farrell himself, see Thomas J. Shelley, "'A Good Man but Crazy on Some Points': Father Thomas Farrell and Liberal Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century New York," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 97 (2002), 110–132.

[25]*New York Times*, November 19, 1883.

est concentration of African Americans in New York City. In fact, it was popularly known as "The Plantation" or "Little Africa." On Sunday the congregation at St. Benedict the Moor included not only black Catholics from Greenwich Village and the rest of Manhattan, but also others from as far away as Brooklyn, Queens, and New Jersey. By January, 1885, there were 510 registered parishioners and seventy-six children in the Sunday school. It may be surmised that most of the parishioners were working people, but at least two members of the congregation, Washington Parker and Robert N. Wood, were prominent figures in local politics and were instrumental in the organization of the four Colored Catholic Congresses that were held between 1887 and 1891. Still another parishioner, Dr. John E. W. Thompson, served as the U.S. minister to Haiti from 1885 to 1891 and sent a gift of $50.00 to the church from Haiti in 1886. Not all of the worshipers were black. Father Salter, the prickly pastor of St. Joseph's, who was ever suspicious of other pastors poaching on his turf, complained that many of his parishioners regularly went to Mass there. His complaint about white people attending Mass there was confirmed by the pastor of St. Benedict's, which means that it was one of the few integrated churches of any denomination in New York City.[26]

Although Burtsell was the founder of St. Benedict the Moor, he remained pastor of his own Church of the Epiphany. The first pastor of St. Benedict's was Burtsell's former curate, Father John E. Burke, who was to spend the rest of his forty-seven years in ministry to African Americans. One of Burke's most impressive accomplishments was the establishment of St. Benedict's Home, an orphan asylum for black Catholic children who could not gain admission to Catholic institutions. Originally located on MacDougal Street, in 1890 the home was moved to Rye, New York. The following year it had an enrollment of 125 children, who were cared for by eleven Dominican sisters. Finances were a constant worry for Burke, especially after the opening of St. Benedict's Home. In 1892 he explained to Archbishop Corrigan why neither he nor his parishioners had made any contribution to the building of the new diocesan seminary. "I have done nothing personally," he said, "because I have no money." "Connected with my mission," he added, "the calls for help are surprisingly constant and quickly drain my purse." As for raising money from his parishioners, he said, "I have done nothing

[26]Financial Report of the Church of St. Benedict the Moor, 1885; Salter to Corrigan, November 26, 1886, AANY, St. Benedict the Moor Parish File. Father John E. Burke, the first pastor of St. Benedict the Moor Church, confirmed that white people often attended Mass in his church. Burke to Corrigan, June 12, 1892, AANY, C-29.

through others because the 'others' are colored people scattered over the city who are unable to assist."[27]

In the 1890's the center of New York's black population shifted farther north to the area of the West Side known as the Tenderloin. Father Burke decided that the church should follow its people. Accordingly he purchased a former Protestant church on West 53rd Street and made it the new home of St. Benedict the Moor. The last service in the old church was a baptism on May 1, 1898, bringing to an end one chapter of Catholic life in Greenwich Village. However, the church on Bleecker Street was not vacant long, for it was quickly taken over by Italian Catholics who were seeking a place to worship. By 1930 all that remained of "Little Africa" in Greenwich Village were two dilapidated tenement houses on West 3rd Street in the shadow of the Sixth Avenue "El."[28]

The Italian Village

Between 1880 and 1910 the number of Italians in New York City increased from 12,223 to 554,449.[29] Not since the days of the Great Famine in Ireland had so many Catholic immigrants from one country descended upon New York City in such a short period of time. Not all of them remained in the Archdiocese of New York; many settled across the East River in the Diocese of Brooklyn or in New Jersey. However, Bishop Farley's estimate of 300,000 Italians in the archdiocese by 1898 seems reasonable. This massive influx of Italian immigrants was the single biggest pastoral challenge faced by the Archdiocese of New York during the administrations of Archbishops Michael Corrigan (1885–1902) and John Cardinal Farley (1902–1918).[30]

By 1900 there were at least three "Little Italies" in Manhattan. The largest was in Lower Manhattan in the formerly Irish Sixth Ward. The second, made famous by Robert Orsi's *The Madonna of 115th Street*,

[27]Jack M. Arlotta, "Before Harlem: Black Catholics in the Archdiocese of New York and the Church of St. Benedict the Moor," *Dunwoodie Review*, 16 (1992–1993), 85–90. Burke to Corrigan, June 12, 1892, AANY, C-29. On the history of St. Benedict the Moor Church, see also George Coll, *A Pioneer Church* (Elizabeth, New Jersey, 1993).

[28]Ware, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

[29]Mary Elizabeth Brown, "Italian Immigrants and the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of New York, 1880–1950" (Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1967), p. 66.

[30]On Corrigan and the Italian immigration, see Stephen M. DiGiovanni, *Archbishop Corrigan and the Italian Immigrants* (Huntington, Indiana, 1994). On Farley and the Italian immigrants, see Mary Elizabeth Brown, *Churches, Communities and Children: Italian Immigrants in the Archdiocese of New York, 1880–1945* (New York, 1995).

was uptown in East Harlem. The third and oldest "Little Italy" was located in the South Village between Washington Square Park and Houston Street. It was smaller in both area and population than the two other "Little Italies," but the number of Italians continued to increase.[31] By 1930 at the latest, they constituted more than half the population of Greenwich Village. Greenwich Village was also the site of the oldest permanent Italian national parish in New York City, St. Anthony of Padua, which dates from 1866, when Franciscan friars from upstate New York responded to Archbishop McCloskey's plea to minister to the Italian immigrants in New York City. The parishioners were from northern Italy and had no tradition of an annual *festa.* It was first introduced in St. Anthony's Church in the 1950's by an enterprising pastor as a means of raising money from gullible tourists.[32]

From 1866 until 1883 the Franciscans were the only religious community in New York caring for the Italians. However, they did not limit their ministry to the Italians. Like the German Redemptorists at St. Alphonsus twenty years earlier, the Franciscans discovered that the Irish were more generous contributors than their own countrymen. Predictably the reaction among the Italians at St. Anthony's was the same as it had been among the Germans at St. Alphonsus. They promptly complained that they were being neglected in favor of the Irish.

The outstanding figure among the early pastors of St. Anthony's was Father Anacletus DeAngelis. In 1888 he replaced the original church, yet another former Protestant church on Sullivan Street, with the present large Romanesque church on Houston Street. Father Anacletus' luck was legendary. The property on Houston Street that he wanted for the site of his new church was to be sold at auction on January 31, 1882. That day a sudden blizzard left New York City paralyzed with snowdrifts. Father Anacletus was the sole bidder to appear at the auction. He

[31]In 1915 the Reverend A. Ray Petty, the newly appointed minister of the Judson Memorial Church on Washington Square Park, was shocked at the poverty and overcrowding in Italian Greenwich Village. "When I first went south of the Square," he said publicly, "and saw these people in their filth with their undernourished babies in their dirty halls and unhealthy environment, I said to my wife: 'These people are not human. They are rats. No human beings would live like these.'" A. Ray Petty, Address at the Meeting of the Washington Square Association, January 11, 1921, *Washington Square Association Yearbook* (1921), p. 24. Such condescension helps to explain why Protestant proselytism among Italian immigrants in New York produced few results.

[32]Ware, *op. cit.*, pp. 127, 152–153. *St. Anthony of Padua Church, New York City* (South Hackensack, New Jersey, 1967), not paginated.

got the property at the price he wanted. Despite such feats, Father John Farley, who knew the diocese as well as anyone, was not pleased with the friars' work. He warned Archbishop Corrigan in 1883: "Something more must be done for these poor unfortunate people; the children are being swallowed up everyday by heretics—and the Franciscans are utterly inefficient."[33]

Archbishop Corrigan's solution was to appeal to other religious communities to send Italian-speaking priests to New York. Among those who responded to his request was the Pious Society of St. Charles, better known as the Scalabrinians, who by 1891 had opened three churches in New York, one of them in Greenwich Village. Their church in the Village had a modest beginning in a private house. The founder of the parish was an Italian Scalabrinian, Father Pietro Bandini, who came to New York in 1891 to serve as the director of the Italian St. Raphael Society, an emigrant aid society. Father Bandini, who ministered every day to the Italian immigrants first at Castle Garden and then on Ellis Island, established the headquarters of the St. Raphael Society in this private house at 113 Waverly Place, a stone's throw from St. Joseph's Church. Bandini used the house to provide temporary lodging for women and children, and he opened a labor bureau for the men. He also fitted out a room on the first floor as a chapel, which he dedicated to Our Lady of Pompei. He celebrated the first Mass there on May 8, 1892. The church would move twice in the next six years, first to a former Protestant church on Sullivan Street, and then to the former Church of St. Benedict the Moor, until it found a permanent home in 1928 in the magnificent building that was erected at the corner of Bleecker and Carmine Streets.[34]

By the early twentieth century, therefore, the Italians of Greenwich Village could boast of two flourishing parishes. In 1903 St. Anthony's claimed to have 8,000 parishioners and a parochial school with 887 children and fifteen sisters. There were seven priests assigned to the church, which was not an excessive number in view of the fact that, during the previous year, there had been 999 baptisms and 258 weddings, and some of the priests celebrated Mass in other parishes on Sun-

[33]*St. Anthony of Padua Church*. Farley to Corrigan, November 1, 1883, AANY, C-2, cited in DiGiovanni, *op. cit.*, pp. 114–115. Farley's letter is no longer available in the archives of the Archdiocese of New York.

[34]Mary Elizabeth Brown, *From Italian Villages to Greenwich Village: Our Lady of Pompei. 1892–1992* (New York, 1992), pp. 15–16.

days. Our Lady of Pompei had an even larger number of parishioners, 8,500. There was no parochial school until 1930, but there were 777 children in the Sunday school. Since there were only seven teachers, one wonders what kind of religious instruction the children received. The Scalabrinians had three priests assigned to the parish. They must have been kept busy with the 547 baptisms and 196 weddings that were recorded in 1902.[35]

There are indications that the close proximity of these two Italian churches in Greenwich Village created a certain friction between them, and that the Scalabrinians were more popular than the Franciscans. When both churches were assigned the same evening for their Lenten devotions in 1899, Father Anacletus asked the Chancery Office to change the date assigned to St. Anthony's so that his parish would not have to compete with Our Lady of Pompei. Father Thomas Lynch, the pastor of Transfiguration Church, claimed that his Italian parishioners disliked the Franciscans and stayed away in droves when they conducted a mission in his parish. An attempt to organize the St. Vincent de Paul Society in St. Anthony's Church fizzled because the men failed to respond. As late as 1898 Archbishop Corrigan was still expressing unhappiness with the work of the friars at St. Anthony's. The fact that, within ten years of its founding, the Church of Our Lady of Pompei had more parishioners than the much older Church of St. Anthony may well indicate that, like Archbishop Corrigan, the Italians in Greenwich Village preferred the Scalabrinians to the Franciscans.[36]

Back in the 1880's, before the founding of Our Lady of Pompei, several of the Irish parishes in Greenwich Village made efforts to reach out to the Italians. In 1889 Archbishop Corrigan published a list of Italian-speaking priests who were available throughout the archdiocese. In Greenwich Village they included Father John Milo of St. Veronica's, Father T. F. McManus of St. Bernard's, and Father John Burke of St. Benedict the Moor. St. Joseph's Church, with its staff of five priests, is notable by its absence from the list. Neither Father Salter nor Father O'Flynn took

[35]Thomas F. Meehan, "Evangelizing the Italians," *The Messenger*, 39 (1903), 16–17. Meehan obtained these statistics from Archbishop Farley's secretary, Father Patrick J. Hayes, who had access to the annual *cura animarum* reports submitted to the Chancery Office by every pastor.

[36]Anacletus to Rev. Dr. Father, January 12, 1899; Anacletus to Corrigan, January 14, 1898, AANY, G-23; Lynch, "Some Facts Concerning the Italian Congregation of the Church of the Transfiguration," n.d., AANY, G-33.

any initiative to provide pastoral care for the many Italian immigrants living within the parish boundaries. On the contrary, both expressed fears that the two Italian parishes might siphon off some of their parishioners. In 1886 Salter complained angrily that many of the Irish-American longshoremen had abandoned his parish for St. Anthony's.[37]

Father Bandini tried to forestall similar complaints from Father O'Flynn before he started his little chapel on Waverly Place in 1892. As he later explained to the diocesan authorities, "I did all what [*sic*] human prudence could suggest to me." He called upon O'Flynn to assure him that his little chapel would not be in competition with St. Joseph's Church. The response that he got from O'Flynn was a tirade against the Jesuits at St. Francis Xavier for stealing his parishioners, a long-standing grievance with pastors of St. Joseph's. Bandini promised that this would not happen at his "microscopical church." He even posted a sign on the door that admission was restricted to Italians. It was all in vain. Within three months O'Flynn reported Bandini to the Chancery Office for stealing his parishioners. When Bandini denied the accusation, Father McLaughlin, one of O'Flynn's curates, practically called him a liar.[38]

In 1896 Archbishop Corrigan came under considerable pressure from certain unidentified priests to close Our Lady of Pompei Church. Happily, he resisted the pressure and the parish survived under Bandini's successor, Father Francesco Zaboglio, due largely to two Irish-American New Yorkers who showed a more enlightened attitude to the Italians than Father O'Flynn. One was Miss Anne Leary, a wealthy heiress who became a generous benefactor. The other was the ubiquitous John Farley, now auxiliary bishop as well as vicar general. He advised Archbishop Corrigan that the priests who were criticizing Our Lady of Pompei Church were "neither capable nor interested in the work there." He expressed confidence in Father Zaboglio as a pious and honest man and sent him a check for $750 to supplement the money that he had received from Miss Leary. He warned Corrigan that it would be a mistake to close even one Italian parish at a time when "we must provide churches for these Italians who are pouring in at an unusually rapid rate now."[39] The church stayed open.

[37]Michele Agostino Corrigan, "Ai Cattolici Italiani Dimoranti in Questa Diocesi," January 15, 1889, AANY; Salter to Corrigan, November 20, 1886, AANY, St. Joseph's Parish File.

[38]Bandini to Rev. Dear Father, August 11, 1892; McLaughlin to Rev. Dear Sir, August 22, 1892, AANY, G-77.

[39]Farley to Corrigan, April 25, May 28, 1896, AANY, G-15.

The Other Village Catholics

While the Irish and Italians formed the great bulk of the Catholic population in Greenwich Village, there were also smaller numbers of French, Spanish, and Lithuanian Catholics. The French community was the oldest of three, concentrated in the blocks south of Washington Square adjacent to "Little Africa." The area was famous for its French restaurants and was commonly known as the French Quarter. French-speaking Catholics had been part of New York's Catholic community since the early nineteenth century. By 1841 they were sufficiently numerous to establish their own national parish, St. Vincent de Paul, which was entrusted to a small French religious community, the Fathers of Mercy. Originally located on Canal Street near Broadway, St. Vincent de Paul Church was relocated several miles farther north to West 23rd Street in 1857. By the 1880's the parish was in chronic financial difficulties, partly because the Fathers of Mercy had lost contact with the French-speaking community who lived farther downtown. To rectify this situation, with the encouragement of Archbishop Corrigan, in 1888 they opened Our Lady of Mercy School and a day nursery (they called it a "crèche") on Washington Square South, a location that was within the boundaries of St. Joseph's parish. The Marianite Sisters of the Holy Cross took charge of the school. They charged no tuition, ran bilingual classes, and attracted not only French children, but also Alsatians, French-Canadians, Belgians, and Swiss. In the early 1890's the enrollment averaged around 300 children.[40]

At the same time, the Fathers of Mercy also opened a small chapel in Our Lady of Mercy School, a step which could hardly have gone unnoticed by the ever vigilant Father Salter. However, neither he nor Father O'Flynn seems to have raised any protest, perhaps because the Fathers of Mercy had the support of Archbishop Corrigan and because they limited their apostolate to a French-speaking congregation. The benefactors of our Lady of Mercy Chapel and School included the cream of New York's French Catholic community, wealthy families such as the Bouviers, Couderts, Hoguets, Binsses, and Delmonicos, as well as Archbishop Corrigan himself, who contributed $100. Our Lady of Mercy Chapel and School continued to exist until 1947, by which time the French Quarter of Greenwich Village was only a memory. In that year

[40]H. L. Hoguet and Rev. G. Septier to Preston, March 8, 1888; Preston to Septier, June 16, 1888, typed copy; Memorandum Concerning the Church of St. Vincent de Paul, May 1, 1894, AANY, St. Vincent de Paul Parish File.

both the chapel and the school were closed. Shortly thereafter the buildings were razed and replaced with a Catholic Center for the students at nearby New York University.[41]

By the turn of the last century a small colony of Spanish Catholics had established themselves in the northwest corner of Greenwich Village, in the area near the Hudson River south of 14th Street. It was minuscule in comparison with the Irish and Italian communities and proved to be ephemeral. By 1930 it had virtually disappeared. In 1902, however, the Spanish presence in Greenwich Village was sufficiently strong to lead to the establishment of still another national parish, Our Lady of Guadalupe. The Spanish population that it served was made up mostly of immigrants from Galicia, who worked as seamen, longshoremen, or laborers. As was the case with the Italians, the women were more faithful church-goers than the men. Even more than the Italians, the Spanish formed a tightly knit community with its own grocery stores, barber shops, and taverns. When the women traveled the five or six blocks from their homes to the stores on 14th Street, they regarded it as a major adventure.

Archbishop Corrigan established Our Lady of Guadalupe Church as the national parish for all Spanish-speaking Catholics in New York City and confided it to the Augustinians of the Assumption, a small French religious community. Although French in origin, the Assumptionists included a number of Spanish-speaking members. They also had a surplus of priests available because they had just been expelled from France due to their notorious role in the Dreyfus Affair. (Their Paris daily, *La Croix*, was rabidly anti-Semitic.) From the beginning, however, the Assumptionists were unhappy with the small size of the church, which was little bigger than a convent chapel. In 1903 they told the new archbishop, John Farley, that they could only hope to attract Spanish Catholics if they had a "*vrai temple*" (real church) that would appeal to Spanish pride. They seemed to expect the archdiocese to provide it for them.[42]

Archbishop Farley did not provide the *vrai temple* that the Assumptionists desired, but he did give them some unsolicited paternal advice based on his own long experience in dealing with both the diocesan

[41]Financial Statement, Church of St. Vincent-de-Paul, New York, for the Year 1888; Edward Gaffney to James Francis McIntyre, January 22, 1947, AANY, St. Vincent de Paul Parish File.

[42]Thomas Darbois to Farley, April 26, 1903; Paul Journet to Hayes, February 23, 1927, AANY, Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish File.

clergy and various ethnic groups in the archdiocese. He predicted that the Irish would be more generous to them than the Spanish. However, he warned them not to entice the Irish to Our Lady of Guadalupe Church, but to let them come of their own accord so that neighboring pastors could not accuse the Assumptionists of stealing their parishioners. It proved to be wise advice. The Assumptionists soon discovered that the Irish came unsolicited to Mass at Our Lady of Guadalupe Church and contributed more to the upkeep of the church than the Spanish for whom it had been founded. As Farley anticipated, however, this development did not escape the notice of at least one neighboring pastor, Father Clark, the pastor of the Church of St. Francis Xavier on West 16th Street, who complained that the Assumptionists were stealing his parishioners. He voiced his complaints in almost exactly the same language that the pastors of St. Joseph's Church had been using about the pastors of St. Francis Xavier Church for many years.[43]

The last of the dozen Catholic churches in or near Greenwich Village was the Lithuanian church of Our Lady of Vilna on Broome Street. As far back as 1881 Lithuanian Catholics who were worshiping in the Polish Church of St. Stanislaus on East 9th Street had asked Cardinal McCloskey for permission to start their own parish. However, the archdiocesan authorities rejected this and several other requests (including one proposal to buy a former school on Leroy Street) for fear that such a project would not be financially feasible. Finally, in 1909, Archbishop Farley gave permission to start the first and only Lithuanian national parish in the Archdiocese of New York.[44]

The founding pastor was Father Joseph Shestokas, a Lithuanian-born priest who served as pastor until 1939. Back in 1910, when Greenwich House organized a cooking class for Lithuanian girls, the director noted that Father Shestokas "is much pleased to think that anyone is interested in his people."[45] Although Our Lady of Vilna Church was located well south of Greenwich Village, some of the parishioners lived within the boundaries of the Village and others came from as far away as the Bronx. Our Lady of Vilna served a much smaller population than any of the Irish or Italian parishes and never became an integral part of the Catholic life of the Village. By the early 1930's average Mass attendance

[43]Zachary Saint-Martin to John J. Dunn, February 28, 1926, AANY, Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish File.

[44]Petition to His Eminence Cardinal Archbishop McCloskey, July 29, 1881; Joseph Shestokas to Farley, n.d., AANY, Our Lady of Vilna Parish File; Minutes of the Meetings of the Archdiocesan Consultors, June 1, 1910.

[45]Mary Simkhovitch, Report of the Director, November 16, 1910, GHP.

on Sunday totaled only about 300, of whom only twenty were non-Lithuanians.[46]

Catholic Greenwich Village in an Irish-American Church

By 1900, if not earlier, the population of Greenwich Village became predominantly Catholic. It was hardly a homogeneous religious community, however, for ethnic divisions ran as deep as the common religious bonds. The one exception to the ethnic divisions was the relationship between the two oldest Catholic ethnic groups in the Village, the Irish and the Germans. The old animosities that had marked their relationship at St. Alphonsus Church in the mid-nineteenth century were now largely forgotten, and the Germans, few though they were, were the only ethnic group that felt comfortable in the heavily Irish atmosphere of St. Joseph's Church. Since the Irish vastly outnumbered the Germans by 1900, however, it might be more accurate to say that they simply absorbed the remnants of the once flourishing but now thoroughly assimilated German Catholic community.

The smaller Catholic ethnic groups, the French, Spanish, Lithuanian, and African-Americans (who themselves constituted a multi-ethnic community) remained largely isolated from the rest of the civic and religious community in Greenwich Village. They also tended to draw worshipers from outside the Village to a greater extent than the other churches, since (with the exception of the French) each of their churches was the single national parish in New York City for its respective ethnic group. The African-Americans were pretty well gone from Greenwich Village by 1900 as was their Church of St. Benedict the Moor. After World War I the French and Spanish enclaves also disappeared, although the Church of Our Lady of Guadalupe found a new *raison d'être* as the religious center for the increasing number of Portuguese, Puerto Rican, and Cuban immigrants who were spreading through New York City.[47]

The most important factor in shaping the character of the Catholic community in Greenwich Village between 1880 and 1930 was the rela-

[46]Cura Animarum Report, 1933, AANY, Our Lady of Vila Parish File; Ware, *op. cit.*, pp. 128, 318.

[47]The pastor of Our Lady of Guadalupe told the auxiliary bishop John J. Dunne in 1926: "Our parish being a Spanish-American parish, comprises all the faithful coming from these parts of America and [the] Ancient World where the Spanish tongue is in common use." Zachary Saint-Martin to Dunn, February 28, 1926, AANY, Our Lady of Guadalupe Parish File.

tionship between the two largest Catholic ethnic groups, the Irish and the Italians. They still lived in separate worlds at the turn of the century. Cultural differences were often exacerbated by economic competition for the same jobs, especially on the docks. They only began to intermingle ("integrate" would be too strong a word) after World War I, when members from both groups climbed up the economic ladder and moved into some of the better housing on the same streets.[48]

In view of the centralized structure of the Catholic Church, the role of the clergy was bound to be crucial in giving direction to the Catholic community and especially in facilitating the accommodation between the Irish and the Italians. Unfortunately, St. Joseph's Church, which might have been expected to take the lead in this process as the oldest, largest, and wealthiest Catholic church in Greenwich Village, provided no leadership at all. After the death of Father Thomas Farrell in 1880, the pastors who succeeded him retreated from his involvement in the affairs of the larger community and displayed a narrow concern about protecting the interests of their own parish from other ethnic groups, especially the Italians. In the case of Father John Salter, he even opposed the creation of an additional parish in Greenwich Village that was designed to provide better pastoral care for the Irish.[49]

On the other hand, some Irish-American clerics showed admirable concern for the plight of their Italian co-religionists. Father John Burke did extraordinary work, not only as the first pastor of St. Benedict the Moor Church and the founder of St. Benedict's Home, but also by making himself available to the Italians. The pastor of St. Veronica's added an Italian priest to his staff, and the Italian-speaking pastor of St. Bernard's Church volunteered to assist in the ministry to the Italians. On the diocesan level, both Archbishop Corrigan and Cardinal Farley have been rightly praised by historians for their efforts on behalf of the Italians.

What also emerges from a study of the Catholic Church in Greenwich Village is the positive role played by John Farley for a quarter-century before he became the Archbishop of New York, first as secretary to Cardinal McCloskey and then as vicar general under Archbishop Corrigan. He played a minor but crucial role in the founding of the first black

[48]Ware, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

[49]Even Archbishop Corrigan seems to have found Salter something of a crank. When Salter resigned as pastor of St. Joseph's in 1892, Bishop Charles McDonnell of Brooklyn, Corrigan's former secretary, said: "This must be a relief to you." McDonnell to Corrigan, November 6, 1892, AANY, C-33.

Catholic church in New York, called attention to the inadequacies of the Franciscans at St. Anthony's in the 1880's, saved Our Lady of Pompei from suppression in the 1890's, and was a consistent advocate of an expanded apostolate to the Italians at the meetings of the archdiocesan consultors throughout this period.[50]

Finally, one should not overlook the role of the Irish-American laity. Whatever their economic rivalry with the Italians and their social antipathy to them, they showed a willingness to worship with them in their churches. Not only did the Irish frequent their churches, and the churches of most of the other Catholic ethnic groups (the Germans, blacks, Spanish, and French), but in so doing, they provided them with indispensable financial assistance that was not forthcoming from their own communities. Professor Lawrence McCaffrey once wrote that only the Irish could have provided the leadership for the multi-ethnic community that constituted the Catholic Church in the United States.[51] Whether or not his thesis is true of the Catholic Church throughout the United States, it was certainly true of the Catholic Church in Greenwich Village during the half-century that it was a Catholic Village.

[50]In 1910 the pastor of St. Anthony's Church, Father Ludovico Foppiano, asked for an exemption from the diocesan assessment because of the heavy debt that he had incurred in building a new parochial school. Farley readily granted his request. Minutes of the Meetings of the Archdiocesan Consultors, March 30, 1910, AANY.

[51]Lawrence J. McCaffrey, *The Irish Diaspora in America* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1976), p. 9.

BOOK REVIEWS

General

Storia della Chiesa di Bologna. Edited by Paolo Prodi and Lorenzo Paolini. 2 vols. (Bologna: Istituto per la Storia della Chiesa di Bologna, and Bergamo: Edizioni Bolis. 1997. Pp. xv, 402 and 670.)

These two handsome volumes make a splendid contribution to the history of the Church in Italy. In a series of carefully researched and beautifully illustrated essays, twenty-five local experts trace the history of the Bolognese diocese from the early fourth-century Bolognese protomartyrs, Vitale and Agricola, down to the early 1960's. As Paolo Prodi writes in his "Introduction": the substantial novelty of the project lies not so much in the particular research methods, or the discoveries presented in these volumes, as in their ambition to cover the entire history of the Bolognese church in a way that includes substantial treatments of the questions of administration, pastoral care, parish life, and devotional practices that have attracted much recent attention by historians of the Italian Church, but which are usually neglected in the one-bishop-after-another diocesan histories with which Italy abounds.

The first volume gives a basic chronological narrative of the Bolognese church parceled into four essays. Amedeo Benati offers a clear discussion of the evidence concerning the late Roman and early and high medieval periods. His treatments of the boundaries of the diocese and of the local impact of the investiture controversy—Canossa was quite close by—are especially interesting. Augusto Vasina offers a good treatment of ecclesiastical foundations, with particularly thorough discussion of the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth centuries. Umberto Mazzone develops much rich material, previously little-explored, on the period from the Council of Trent to the early nineteenth century. Giuseppe Battelli is excellent on the Risorgimento and Fascism, although in the post-World War II period he says not nearly enough on the relations between the local church and the Communist Party, which dominated communal administration beginning in the 1950's.

In the second volume, "Saints and Devotions" in the Middle Ages and the modern period (sixteenth century to the present) are treated in essays by Paolo Golinelli and Gabriella Zarri, respectively; and for "Liturgical Life" a similar division of labor is observed by Giampaolo Ropa and Enzo Lodi. Essays on "Charity, Welfare, and Social Commitment" by Mario Fanti, Giampaolo Venturi, and Alessan-

dro Albertazzi are especially rich on the Catholic Reformation and the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One imagines that Fanti's treatment of the late medieval and early modern periods would have been more detailed had he been able to consult Nicholas Terpstra's book on Bolognese confraternities, which appeared in English only two years before these volumes were published. Educational issues are treated in an interesting essay on relations between the University and the local church by Carlo Dolcini, and by Gian Paolo Brizzi, who discusses schooling in the modern period. Religious architecture, painting, sculpture, and music are adequately surveyed in essays by Anna Maria Matteucci, Fabrizio Lollini, Donatella Biagi Maino, and Piero Mioli. Religious orders are discussed by Paola Foschi and Alfeo Giacomelli. A final section treats pastoral life, preaching, and religious dissent in essays by Giandomenico Gordini, Samuele Giombi, Maurizio Tagliaferri, and Guido Dall'Olio.

In the first volume, especially, it is surprising that the period from the 1470's down to Council of Trent receives somewhat short shrift. One suspects that Vasina and Mazzone, who already had large and important topics to explore, shied away from each other's turf. In particular, it would be nice to be told more about the policies of the later Bentivoglio, for which there are plentiful sources. The Bentivoglio response to the territorial ambitions of the Borgia papacy merits closer treatment, as do their quarrels with Bishop Giuliano della Rovere—quarrels that certainly contributed to the latter's decision to march on the city after he became Julius II. Similarly, the complexities, and the theoretical and ideological implications of civil administration by the Church in the period after the expulsion of the Bentivoglio are not explored. The writers are also largely silent on the post-Vatican Council II period: possibly they thought it polite or prudent not to say much about the living and the recently dead.

Bologna has a longstanding and richly deserved historical reputation, originating in the Middle Ages, as a center of anticlericalism. Heartfelt criticism and anger toward the Church found expression in popular protests, scathing satirical verse, and, in more recent years, votes for Communists. The reader of these two volumes will find little discussion or explanation of these phenomena. (Dall'Olio's essay on "Dissent" is little more than an afterthought.) But that, in a way, is really the point these volumes are trying to make. Notwithstanding centuries of much-publicized turmoil involving the Church, genuine religious feeling has remained an enduring presence in Bolognese society. To attempt to capture this sentiment, and to document its role over so many centuries, is an ambitious and necessarily difficult enterprise. That the editors and contributors have succeeded as well as they have in these two volumes is cause for congratulations.

WILLIAM J. CONNELL

Seton Hall University and Institute for Advanced Study

Ancient and Medieval

After Augustine: The Meditative Reader and the Text. By Brian Stock. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 2001. Pp. viii, 132. $32.00.)

Despite its diminutive size, this recent volume by Professor Brian Stock exhibits enormous learning in its efforts to uncover the patterns of relations between reading, writing, and the search for self-understanding during the Middle Ages. As the title suggests, the book presents a number of studies of what medieval readers made of Augustine's presentation of reading and writing as ways of achieving self-understanding. Though, as Stock points out, medieval authors may have gone considerably beyond Augustine in their hermeneutics and the extent to which they perceived literary activities as ends in themselves, their indebtedness to the Bishop of Hippo's ideas is always the starting point for understanding their contributions.

In the first chapter, Stock outlines Augustine's own ideas and practices regarding reading and writing in search of self-knowledge. What is distinctive about Augustine and what sets him apart from many of his late ancient contemporaries and near-contemporaries is his conviction that we can come to understand ourselves best through the narratives, always incomplete, of our own lives and the lives of others. To be sure, this orientation toward narrative was derived from the practice of reading and reflecting upon biblical narratives, but Augustine's incorporation of the narrative approach within the Neoplatonic theme of rising from the sensible realm to the supersensible realm inspired many of the approaches to reading and writing throughout the Middle Ages.

In the second, third, and fourth chapters, Stock makes a number of acute observations regarding the different forms and approaches found within medieval literature. In these chapters, he traces out why ancient philosophical dialogues and treatises gave way, in the course of the Middle Ages, to literature as the preferred vehicle for exploring ethical positions and counterpositions. The main cause for the shift in both literary form and the mode of questioning is to be found in the influence of Augustine's *Confessiones* and its stories, including Augustine's own story, of moral reform and spiritual renewal. Connected with this encouragement to medieval readers to engage in self-discovery through narrating lives are two other ideas: the notion that the self is never fully revealed through language and the idea of elevating the emotions so as to have them function as markers of spiritual progress. In the fourth chapter, moreover, Stock compares Augustine to both earlier authors and later ones. Like Seneca, Augustine values writing and reading as ways of spiritual advancement, but unlike Abelard he does not think of the employment of linguistic signs as ways of achieving privileged insights into the intentions of our moral actions.

In chapters five and six, Stock turns his attention to the later Middle Ages in the form of studies of Francesco Petrarch's *Secretum* and St. Thomas More's *Utopia*. In the case of Petrarch, Stock claims, we find the notion of achieving self-

understanding through reading, which has now become nearly an end in itself. More's *Utopia* takes the notion of achieving spiritual insight through reading a step further toward a secular use, when he portrays ideal citizens as readers of books befitting them for effective participation in the utopian government.

In the final chapter, Stock turns to the forms of reading and reflection that medieval readers used. Distinguishing between *lectio divina* and *lectio spiritualis*, Stock argues that, while the former is text-based and returns to the biblical text after allowing for meditation as an exercise consequent upon oral reading, the latter type of reading is not so directly text-based; instead, it encourages its practitioners to use their own imaginary representations to guide self-examination and to induce emotions that aid in one's spiritual ascent.

Overall, this book is a profound study of the ways in which Augustine's philosophy of language and forms of literary expression influenced a wide variety of authors, from Hugh of St. Victor to Montaigne, in their construction, use, and interpretations of texts. Stock's book should be purchased by every library attempting to keep up on its secondary sources in medieval literature and medieval philosophy, while it should be a welcome addition to a growing number of recent studies in English of the influence of Augustine on Western culture.

TIMOTHY B. NOONE

The Catholic University of America

Church Law and Church Order in Rome and Byzantium: A Comparative Study. By Clarence Gallagher, S.J. [Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Monographs, Volume 8.] (Brookfield, Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company. 2002. Pp. xi, 279. $79.95.)

Scholars have seldom been courageous (or some might say foolhardy) enough to embark upon a comparison between the canon law of the Eastern and Western Churches in the Middle Ages. The obstacles to such an enterprise are fearsome. The sources, to begin with, are not easy to find. They are, moreover, written in a daunting battery of languages: Latin, Byzantine Greek, old Slavonic, and Syriac. Even more discouraging are their contents. These include conciliar and synodal canons, many of them from obscure, little-known assemblies, plus papal decretals, passages from church fathers, edicts and decrees of Byzantine emperors, and the directives of local bishops, both east and west, as well as records of local customs and practices.

Few scholars have been as well equipped to attempt this task as Father Gallagher, a former dean of the Faculty of Canon Law at the Gregorian University who subsequently served as rector of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, and church historians have every reason to thank him for taking it on. Gallagher has carried through this formidable undertaking with impressive clarity and grace. He was able to do so because he was wise enough to impose strict, yet sensible,

limitations upon its scope. He chose to examine just eight writers and their works, three from the Latin tradition and five by Eastern writers.

He begins the book with an examination of a pair of sixth-century writers, Dionysius Exiguus, the compiler of a famous collection of canonical texts known as the *Dionysiana*, which exercised a continuing influence on all subsequent canonical collections in the West. He then examines the work of Dionysius' Eastern counterpart, John Scholastikos, Patriarch of Constantinople, who produced a substantial collection of Byzantine canon law, the *Nomokanon in Fourteen Titles*, which he later revised and enlarged as the *Synagoge in Fifty Titles*. Gallagher next treats two sets of ninth-century writers, the anonymous compilers of the *Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals* in the West, and the Eastern missionary, St. Methodios, who was responsible for no less than three canonical collections in Old Slavonic, the *Synagoge in Fifty Titles*, the *Law for Judging the People*, and the so-called *Anonymous Homily*. The twelfth century is represented by Gratian's *Decretum* in the West, and Balsamon's *Commentary* on the *Nomokanon*. Finally, from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries, Gallagher selected two Eastern canonists for examination. The first was Bar Hebraeus, a prelate of the Syrian Orthodox (or Jacobite) church and author of a Syriac *Nomokanon* or *Book of Directives*. The second in this pair was Ebedjesus, a bishop of the East Syrian Church, who produced two canonical works, *A Collection of the Synodical Canons* and the *Regulation of Ecclesiastical Judgments and Laws*, both in Syriac.

For each of these sets of writers Gallagher provides an account of the contents of their works, together with an analysis of the similarities and differences between the Eastern and Western authors on three key issues: church governance, the discipline of the clergy, and marriage and divorce. In this way he presents not only a comprehensible overview of the development of the law in the Eastern and Western churches, but also furnishes concrete examples in the ways they differed in their treatments of these crucial topics.

Gallagher's book will be indispensable to historians of canon law and enormously useful to anyone concerned with relationships between the Eastern and Western churches, not only in the medieval period, but even down to the present.

JAMES A BRUNDAGE

University of Kansas

A Descriptive Catalogue of the Medieval Manuscripts in Worcester Cathedral Library. Edited by R. M. Thomson with a Contribution on the Bindings by Michael Gullick. (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer; Rochester, New York: Boydell & Brewer, Inc. 2001. Pp. xlviii, 256; 50 plates. $170.00.)

It is still not widely known that the cathedral church at Worcester houses one of the best-preserved book-collections to have survived from medieval Eng-

land. There are few churches, colleges, or schools of medieval origin whose early libraries are more complete—amongst the cathedrals, only Durham has more pre-Reformation books—and none which displays the same remarkable degree of continuity, retaining books or fragments of books dating from the eighth to the sixteenth centuries in the same room (above the south aisle of the nave) which has stood for over six hundred years. The majority of the medieval books now in the collection were those copied, compiled, or otherwise acquired by the monks of the Benedictine priory that served the cathedral until 1540. But there is also an important group of manuscripts that came to the collection from other medieval institutions nearby, notably the Cistercian abbey at Bordesley and the mendicant convents at Chester, Hereford, Shrewsbury, and Worcester. The collection as a whole cannot be distinguished for the antiquity, beauty, or rarity of its books. But it does reveal the whole variety of texts—homilies and meditations, academic textbooks, Latin literature, preaching aids and sermons—which shaped the intellectual culture of religious communities across the Middle Ages.

The wealth of the Worcester library has long been obscured by the inadequate and incompetent early catalogue produced by two canons of the cathedral in 1906. For this new catalogue, which follows his previous work on the Hereford and Lincoln manuscripts, R. M. Thomson has begun again from scratch, taking from his predecessors only the old shelf-mark system which classified the codices according to size, F (Folio) and Q (Quarto). Thomson's descriptions are exemplary, giving thorough but concise summaries of the physical structure and textual contents of each codex, together with details, where applicable, of the decorative and scribal work involved in their compilation. He pays particular attention to the medieval and later history of the books, and in many cases provides important new insights into their institutional or personal provenance. In a brief introduction, Thomson traces the origins and expansion of the collection, and drawing on the evidence of Worcester manuscripts held elsewhere as well as at the cathedral, he also examines the role of the monastic community in the production of books. A short essay by Michael Gullick serves to underline the importance of the bindings, of which almost half are medieval, including one pre-Conquest example (Q.5), ten locally made in a Romanesque style, and several identified as the work of Worcester monks.

There are more Anglo-Saxon books surviving from Worcester than from England's other Benedictine houses, although many of them are now in other libraries. There are six Latin books still at the cathedral including copies of Eusebius, Gregory, and Smaragdus and a selection of unusual and early grammatical treatises (in MS Q.5). Also in this group is the eleventh-century sacramentary (MS F.173) that was made for Winchester Old Minster and several fragments of lost books, including leaves from a seventh-century copy of Jerome's commentary on Matthew, and those thought to be from the great bible given to Worcester by Offa of Mercia in c. 780.

The post-Conquest manuscripts fall into three broad groupings. The earliest and most coherent is a group of twelfth-century books that bear witness to a vi-

brant period of copying at Worcester that probably reached its zenith between c.1100 and c.1135. These are manuscripts of quality, displaying the common features of script and decoration characteristic of a 'house' style. The early- and mid-thirteenth-century books form a smaller and more diffuse group. Amongst them are the codices copied and annotated by the unnamed monk of the 'tremulous' hand, and several pieces of particular importance to musicologists; the Worcester Antiphoner (F 160), an extremely rare example of its genre, and the so-called "Worcester fragments," *membra disiecta* containing the earliest known examples of English polyphony, now collected together as MS Add. 68.

The largest and arguably the most important group of manuscripts, however, are those associated with the studies of the Worcester monks at Oxford from the end of the thirteenth century down to the dissolution. There are more than thirty books now in the collection that were evidently bought, copied, or used at the university at some point during the later Middle Ages. From the turn of the thirteenth century onwards, all Benedictine houses in England were required by statute to send a proportion of their most able men to pursue a course of academic study at a *studium generale*. The Worcester monks were in the vanguard of this development and in the course of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries they emerged as a dominant presence at Oxford. This great academic enterprise of the late medieval Benedictines has only recently begun to attract the attention of historians, and there remains much to be investigated about their role at the universities, the true extent of their intellectual activities, and the impact of the graduate monks on the traditional culture of the cloister. It is likely that much of the raw material for such a study is to be found in the Worcester books described here.

The presence of these books might suggest that the priory was swamped by the academic preoccupations of a clique of graduates, but as Thomson highlights, there are also a number of important later fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts that are redolent of wider influences. Perhaps most significant are the several books acquired before the end of the Middle Ages from local mendicant communities. These include four very large anthologies of sermons (F.10, F.126, Q.11, and Q.63) much used by the monastic community in its later years.

Thomson's catalogue is a fine and very valuable achievement. The only possible criticism can be that his account of the Worcester books goes so far beyond the cathedral manuscripts that it is something of a pity that the many extant manuscript fragments, and those in exile elsewhere, are not also fully described. But at a time when the listings of other manuscript collections are being completed or revised, Thomson's work will serve as the very best of exemplars. It must also be hoped that it will give further encouragement to the current generation of scholars to uncover more of riches of English monastic culture that have lain un-remarked at Worcester for so long.

JAMES G. CLARK

University of Bristol

Guerre sainte, jihad, croisade: Violence et religion dans le christianisme et l'islam. By Jean Flori. (Paris: Éditions du Seuil. 2002. Pp. 342. Paperback.)

In this timely and useful survey, Professor Flori offers a comparative study of the character and development of the idea of holy war in Christianity and Islam from the foundation of these religions. In their earliest days, they provide a study in contrasts; by the late eleventh century and with the First Crusade, the two religions reached similar stages in the sacralization of warfare. This assimilation, substantial but not complete, forms the conclusion of this study, though Flori rightly hints at its current relevance: his final observation is that we have perhaps not yet ceased to pay the price of the fateful and harmful convergence of ideas of holy war and jihad. This book is not only for medievalists but also for those who would understand in depth the world in which we now live.

Flori tellingly sets out the contrast between the attitudes of the founders of the two religions to the use of violence with Jesus entirely rejecting and Mohammed necessarily accepting it; this was a consequence of the insistence of Jesus that his kingdom was not of this world, while Mohammed was at once head of religion, of state, and of war in a society strictly ruled by religious laws. Flori well explains the ambiguities and complexities of the notion of jihad in the Koran and in Islamic tradition, but he powerfully argues that in its essential aspects, including the concept of martyrdom and its rewards, it was present from the beginning. The ninth century saw its full elaboration, although it might still mean different things to different people in changing circumstances. By contrast, the changes and developments in Christian attitudes to violence were gradual and slow; only with the eleventh-century reform papacy, with its claims to spiritual and temporal authority, was there such an effective complex of leadership as Mohammed had evidenced and which could bring to a head such a thoroughgoing sacralization of violence as had always been possible in Islam.

Unsurprisingly, therefore, Flori devotes about twice as many pages to the Christian development as to the Islamic. In both, he shows what evidence historians are currently mainly using and what interpretations they are placing on it, frequently adding insights of his own. Almost always he carries conviction, though more might, perhaps, be said about Augustine and the use of coercion within Christendom against the Donatists and his anti-Marcionite recognition of the Old Testament God of battles. A valuable feature of the book is the appendix of thirty-one documents in French translation, some of them unfamiliar or not easily accessible, such as the appeal of the Muslim rulers of al-Andalus in c. 1085 to the Almoravid ruler of the Maghreb to wage holy war in Spain, and the remarkable address on the jihad with which the Damascus preacher as-Sulami in 1105 responded to the success of the First Crusade.

H. E. J. COWDREY

St Edmund Hall, Oxford

God's Scribe: The Historiographical Art of Galbert of Bruges. By Jeff Rider. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 2001. Pp. viii, 360. $59.95.)

Jeff Rider is perhaps the ideal reader and interpreter of Galbert of Bruges's intriguing account of the murder in the castral church of Bruges of Charles the Good, Count of Flanders, since Rider earlier published a new translation of the Latin text which is the subject of this present book. He here demonstrates the sort of mastery of the text in all its details that is the rich reward for his work of translation.

Charles the Good was assassinated in 1127 by a clique of Flemish nobles at whose center lay the Erembalds, men whom the Count had cited to his court to defend their "liberty," acting on the rumor that their aristocratic status was a fiction and their true descent not noble at all, but instead servile. Had they been determined to be of servile status, the Count was legally entitled to degrade them of their nobility and offices and retract their privileges, a process of recuperating rights over serfs that Charles the Good was pursuing throughout the lands under his control. The Erembald clan, however, resisted the Count's claims, with all the ensuing disastrous results: for Charles, his assassins, and ultimately the citizens of Flanders in general and Bruges in particular, since the murder of the Count was followed by political upheaval, killing and counterkilling leading to the death of the traitors, and civil war occasioned by two subsequent changes of regime, culminating finally in the election of Thierry of Alsace as the new count in 1128. As a secular cleric and minor official in the Flemish comital administration, Galbert was ideally situated to record these happenings and did so for the benefit, Rider argues, of his fellow citizens of Bruges. Unfortunately, his *De Multro, traditione, et occisione gloriosi Karoli comitis Flandriarum*, which reports the full course of these events, remained unknown in the Middle Ages and seems to have been discovered only in the fifteenth century, when a French translation was made. The only other extant account of the events reported by Galbert is that of Walter of Thérouanne's, whose contemporary *Vita Karoli comitis* lacks the vitality and detail of Galbert's far superior effort. Although contemporaries neglected it, modern scholars have persistently prized Galbert's text as a unique, virtually journalistic report not only of the murder of the Count, but also as the first "secular" testimony to a "feudal crisis" over status and lordship, to which it is the earliest medieval chronicle to bear witness. It is precisely this approach to Galbert that Rider's book sets out to dispute, with great precision in his marshaling of evidence and argumentation, hence persuasiveness.

Through a minute analysis of the process of Galbert's writing, from journalistic "notes" made on wax tablets during the period when the signal events occurred which derived either from his own eyewitness or from oral testimony of contemporaries; to the initial transfer of this material in written form on parchment; and then through a complex process of revision, Rider shows that the core of Galbert's work, as well as the core of his historiographical conceptions,

was a theologically informed understanding of historical events, which form a *Passio Karoli* at the heart of his text. Thus rather than the first "journalistic" report to survive from the Middle Ages, the *De multro* looks like a rather traditional Augustinian text that seeks to demonstrate the overarching operation of God's justice hidden beneath the manifest activities of man, a view of history enlivened by the rhetorical skill and learning that—contrary to prevailing scholarly opinion—Rider is also able to demonstrate as central components of Galbert's "historiographical art." No mere "reporter" or "journalist," Galbert functions, in this view, as "God's scribe," a historiographically sophisticated and skilled writer whose formal treatment of historical events so perfectly matched and articulated his underlying theology that Rider, with perhaps a tad of exaggeration, feels safe in comparing his "art" to that of Dante. Although I am persuaded by Rider's reading of Galbert and his assignment of the text to a well-known tradition of theologically-informed historiography, it is with some regret that I acknowledge the rightness of his interpretation, removing from us that rare, "secular" view that Galbert once represented.

GABRIELLE M. SPIEGEL

The Johns Hopkins University

Monastic Spaces and Their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries. By Megan Cassidy-Welch. (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols Publishers. 2001. Pp. xv, 293. €50.00.)

This provocative book explores the monastic culture of seven thirteenth-century Yorkshire Cistercian abbeys—Fountains, Rievaulx, Sawley, Kirkstall, Jervaulx, Roche, and Byland through the concept of space, with space understood in two senses; on the one hand, the visible, physical space, and, on the other hand, abstract or imagined space, such as heaven, purgatory, and hell. The work rests on careful study of the archaeological remains of these abbeys, on an analysis of relevant contemporary monastic texts, on an exceptional control of the vast secondary literature, and on the application of the ideas of theorists, such as Michel Foucault.

Dr. Cassidy-Welch focuses on the abbey church as the center of monastic psalmody and devotion; the cloister (usually) on the south side of the church as both the scene of communal rites, such as shaving, and rituals such as processions, and as the vision of paradise; the infirmary, as the place for bloodletting and of rest for the sick; and on the cemetery and all that relates to rituals surrounding death and burial. The *conversi* or lay brothers receive some consideration, though the reasons for their dissatisfaction, revolts, and violence do not get the attention that they deserve, given the brothers' importance for Cistercian economic culture. There is no mention of the monastic refectory, dormitory, or bathing places, though those parts of the compound obviously held significance for the physical, spiritual, and psychological health of the brethren.

The Chapter House has traditionally been understood as the place for the daily community meeting, or chapter, the place for the conduct of *negotia*, the business of the house, such as the lease, purchase, or sale of property; discussions about renovations or expansion of buildings; about the admission of novices to profession; the election of officials; about preparations for abbatial visitations and the implementation of visitorial recommendations. The *negotia* rests on St. Benedict's advice that "when anything important is to be done in the monastery, the abbot shall call the whole community together, explain what the business is, and after hearing the advice of the brethren, let him ponder it . . ." (*Rule*, chapter 3). Cassidy-Welch, however, sees the chapter house as the place for confession and correction, the scene of the disciplining of the monks, the space where "institutional solidarity," to use anachronistically Foucault's phrase, was enforced. She draws no distinction between infractions of the *Rule*, the customs of the Order, and practices of the house on the one hand, and, on the other hand, sins against God which are properly between the monk and his abbot or confessor, not the concern of the Chapter of Faults. She portrays a routine atmosphere of public accusations, confessions, and harsh physical floggings. While the *Rule of Benedict* allows corporal punishment (chapters 23 and 28), it repeatedly stresses kindness in correction, urging the abbot to "use argument, appeal, reproof," "to vary (correction) with circumstance and the individual," to remember "to adapt himself to each one's character and intelligence" (Chapter 2). Monks in no age can be forced into a rigid mold, certainly not by beatings; nor is an atmosphere of accusations and whippings conducive to the charity and spiritual freedom that the monastic life seeks to promote. Much of the material on the Chapter House rests on the *Ecclesiastica Officia*, a Cistercian legislative book of usages. Tryng to reconstruct social practice from a book of laws is like describing twenty-first-century American political culture on the basis of the Constitution of 1787.

The prose is lucid, generally free of jargon. The utility of the many illustrations would have been enhanced by explanatory captions.

BENNETT HILL, O.S.B.

Georgetown University

The Concept of Woman, Volume Two: *The Early Humanist Reformation, 1250–1500*. By Sister Prudence Allen, R.S.M. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 2002. Pp. xxiv, 1161. $70.00 paperback.)

This comprehensive volume comes as close to being an exhaustive treatment of what philosophers and theologians in the High Middle Ages of Christian Europe had to say about women as we are ever likely to get. It includes a useful discussion of the Aristotelian background so important to philosophical thought in this period, as well as substantial treatments of the thought of Robert

Grosseteste, Albert the Great, Roger Bacon, Thomas Aquinas, Meister Eckhart, Giles of Rome, Duns Scotus, William of Ockham, Nicholas of Cusa, Marsilio Ficino, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, and many less well known philosophers and theologians. It also includes helpful accounts of the views on gender identity of prominent women thinkers of this period, such as Bridget of Sweden, Julian of Norwich, Catherine of Siena, and Margery Kempe. It includes a chapter on the "Philosophical Content in Early Satires about Woman" and a chapter on important literary figures of this period, such as Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio, and what they had to say about women.

The author sees the Aristotelian tradition as promoting the idea of "gender polarity," where the feminine pole is characterized negatively as deficiency and failure to come up to the male standard. Thus women are thought of by Aristotle and his followers as imperfect, deformed, or failed men; they are considered to have a deliberative faculty that is, as Aristotle puts it in *Politics* A13, "without authority," and to be incapable of any real self-control. Sister Prudence also shows how these and other denigrations of women are either exaggerated or inverted by the satirists of the period.

One of many fascinating topics Sister Prudence treats in this unbelievably rich review of conceptions of gender identity is the way Marsilio Ficino's fresh translation of the Platonic dialogues in the late fifteenth century made the idea in Plato's *Republic* that "there are no philosophically significant differences between women and men in an ideal society" (pp. 862–863) generally available to educated readers of the time. Apparently, reading Plato was both cause and effect of a more open and enlightened exchange between men and women on issues of gender identity. Yet in this same period women were burned to death as witches, and the gender-polarity theory was even incorporated into a published manual on witchcraft.

Sister Prudence's unparalleled work gives deserved attention to the unique contributions three "women humanists" made to the philosophy of gender. Thus Christine de Pizan (1363–1431) maintained that gender-polarity arguments of the Aristotelians are inconsistent with the existence of a perfect Divine Creator. Isotta Nogarola (1418–1466) tried to show by *reductio ad absurdum* that gender-polarity arguments are outright incoherent. And Laura Cereta (1469–1499) tried to establish that the gender-complementarity theses she argued for support the claim that "women should steal time and sequester space from domestic service for the study of humanist texts, science, and art" (p. 1088).

This volume is an invaluable guide to all the philosophical and theological thinking on gender difference in Christian Europe from 1250 to 1500. But one of its very special contributions to the thoughtful consideration of its topic is to give full attention to what women authors of the period had to say about womanhood and to illuminate their role as living counter-examples to Aristotle's dismissive treatment of women as failed men. "By example as well as by philo-

sophical arguments," Sister Prudence writes, "women authors demonstrated that the gender polarity premises of women's weak intellect, disordered will, and natural subservience to men were false" (p. 1065).

GARETH B. MATTHEWS

University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Kirche und Macht im römischen Trecento: Die Colonna und ihre Klientel auf dem kurialen Pfründenmarkt (1278–1378). By Andreas Rehberg. [Bibliothek des deutschen historischen Instituts in Rom, Band 88.] (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1999. Pp. x, 658. 192 DM.)

Andreas Rehberg's study of the Colonna examines how three Colonna cardinals—Jacopo (1278–1318), Pietro (1288–1326), and Giovanni (1327–1348)—used their access to papal benefices to build a client network and to establish their family's position as one of the two most powerful baronial families in fourteenth-century Rome. This innovative study of the Colonna stands at the intersection of three historiographic themes, making this a useful book for scholars in several fields. First, as Rehberg acknowledges, this study of the Colonna finds inspiration in Wolfgang Reinhard's work on cathedral chapters in the Holy Roman Empire. Recognizing that ecclesiastical wealth formed the basis for relations between church and ruling class, Reinhard used chapter records as a way to reconstruct urban patron networks. In similar fashion, Rehberg reconstructs Colonna client networks by sifting through papal registers to identify those persons who obtained benefices through the assistance of Colonna cardinals. Second, Rehberg provides a prosopographical and structural analysis of the Colonna cardinal households, thus building on earlier groundbreaking studies of thirteenth-century cardinal households by Agostino Paravacini Bagliani and others. Finally, this study contributes to recent work on Roman baronial families and the transformation of fourteenth-century Roman politics and society by scholars such as Sandro Carocci. The result is a rich study that provides the reader with a tremendously helpful and detailed description of the institutional and social mechanisms—from the intricacies of the papal bureaucracy to the composition of a cardinal's household—that allowed the Colonna cardinals to transform their privileged access to benefices into the far-reaching network of clients that formed the basis of Colonna political power.

Papal provisions, or the grant of ecclesiastical benefices by the papacy, constitute the center around which practically everything in this study revolves. By the early fourteenth century the papacy had aggressively asserted its claim to collation rights—the right to appoint candidates to vacant ecclesiastical positions—over certain classes of benefices throughout Europe. During this same period, chancery officials began to record these provisions systematically in papal registers. Rehberg has worked through these registers and other sources to construct prosopographies of three groups that received benefices with the help of Colonna cardinals: clerics from the Colonna family, Colonna-cardinal fa-

miliars, and Colonna clients. A summary of this careful prosopographical work is included in several appendices, along with numerous tables and graphs that organize and quantify the results of Rehberg's prosopographical database. This is a methodologically innovative approach. Lacking many of the sources that have proven so helpful for reconstructing patron networks in other Italian cities, such as judicial records and city-council minutes recording mass exiles of aristocratic families and their dependents, Rehberg has demonstrated that in certain cases an examination of provisions in papal registers can go a long way toward compensating for such deficiencies.

The main body of the work is divided into three parts. Part One examines the structure and history of the Colonna family. This section establishes the framework for the entire study by tying the family's fluctuating fortunes to their access to papal provisions. Jacopo and Pietro benefited from the goodwill of Pope Nicholas IV (1288–1292) toward the Colonna. Pietro, whom Nicholas IV elevated to the cardinalate, held over 400 benefices. In 1297 the family's fortune plummeted when Boniface VIII declared a crusade against the Colonna, confiscated some of their most important properties, and deposed Jacopo and Pietro. In 1305 Pope Clement V restored Jacopo and Pietro to the cardinalate. The benefices placed at the disposal of Jacopo, Pietro, and Giovanni greatly facilitated the arduous process of rebuilding the family's wealth and power between 1305 and 1347. By mid-century the family's fortunes plummeted once again. After Giovanni fell victim to the plague, it would be thirty years before another Colonna became cardinal. Compounding the difficulties, the political tide began to turn against Roman baronial families in the 1340's, beginning with the revolution of Cola di Rienzo and culminating with the anti-magnate legislation of the 1360's.

The second and third sections of the book examine the structure and development of the Colonna-cardinal households and the broader Colonna client networks within the narrative framework of the first section, leaving no doubt that the family's political power rested heavily upon the ability of Colonna cardinals to function as brokers in what Rehberg refers to as the "benefice market." In certain respects, this conclusion comes as no surprise. Sandro Carocci and others have already recognized that political power among Roman baronial families rested heavily on access to ecclesiastical wealth. What makes Rehberg's study so useful is that it lays bare the mechanisms that allowed the most powerful Roman families, like the Colonna and Orsini, to translate access to ecclesiastical wealth into patronage—the sine qua non of aristocratic political power in the Middle Ages.

David Foote

Mississippi State University

The Abbot and the Rule. Religious Life at St Albans, 1290–1349. By Michelle Still. [Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West] (Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate. 2002. Pp. ix, 329. £45; $79.95.)

From the historian's viewpoint the sources for the history of St Albans abbey lie more in its chronicles than in its archives. St Albans outshone all other English Benedictine houses in the production of a great series of chronicles. The work of Roger of Wendover, Matthew Paris, and Thomas Walsingham is not matched elsewhere. The extensive archival series of registers, rolls, and charters, covering all aspects of the life of the community and of the abbot, do not survive for St Albans as they do, for example, at Durham and Westminster. St Albans boasts some very fine registers and cartularies but very few charters, papal letters, and virtually no court and account rolls. The chroniclers, however, were acutely aware of the importance of texts and frequently included privileges and statutes in their documentation.

Michelle Still's work is a study of religious life at St Albans based on what now constitutes the second volume of the *Gesta Abbatum*, attributed in its final composition to Thomas Walsingham. The manuscript of the *Gesta* was edited by H. T. Riley in three volumes in the Rolls Series in 1867–69. Volume 2, the heart of Still's book, covers the period from the accession of Abbot John of Berkhamsted in 1290 to that of Abbot Thomas de la Mare in 1349. None of the abbots during these years was a nonentity. Hugh of Eversden, John de Maryns, Richard of Wallingford, and Michael of Mentmore were educators, reformers, and legislators. Outstanding amongst them in intellectual contribution was the polymath Richard of Wallingford, the inventor of the great clock, which he considered more important than the repair of the crumbling building.

Some corrections of detail must be made. Firstly, Abbot John de Maryns died on the 7th of the kalends of March (or the vigil of St. Matthias' day), 1308 (see *Gesta* ii 108 and 113) but this of course is February 23, 1309 New Style. Hugh of Eversden's succession is also therefore in 1309, not 1308. Secondly, the list of the Priors of St Albans' cells is not accurate. There are notable omissions, e.g., for Tynemouth and Wallingford, and at least two 'ghosts'; Stephen de Wittenham was never prior of Belvoir, nor John Langley prior of Hertford. This reviewer would also query the purpose of some of the maps—particularly those showing the location of St Albans and the dependencies. The OS maps of Monastic Britain are far superior. Also the map on p. 263 duplicates that on p. 128, with the one small difference that Ridge is marked on p. 128, and the key on the same page should show the liberty shaded. There are, too, some areas of the bibliography and the index (e.g., St Albans under A) that should have been tidied up in the transition between thesis and book. Chapters 1 and 2 are indulgent in providing background, but the two chapters on education and the provision of charity do add to our knowledge of the community and its activities in the half-century before the Black Death.

JANE SAYERS

University College London

Women in a Medieval Heretical Sect: Agnes and Huguette the Waldensians. By Shulamith Shahar. Translated by Yael Lotan. (Rochester, New York: The Boydell Press. 2001. Pp. xix, 184. $60.00.)

On Tuesday, May 1, 1320, Raymond de la Côte and Agnes Franco were, after nine months of interrogation and imprisonment by the bishop-inquisitor of Pamiers, Jacques Fournier, burnt as heretical Waldensians. Sixteen months later on Thursday, August 2, 1321, Huguette de la Côte and her husband, Jean of Vienne, were, after two years of questioning and confinement by the same inquisition, also burnt as Waldensian heretics. The testimonies of these four Waldensians, these Poor of Lyon, survive with 110 other confessions from Jacques Fournier's inquisition into heretical depravity in some small Pyrenean villages (most famously Montaillou) in MS lat. 4030 in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Jean Duvernoy edited this manuscript in three volumes in 1965 (with corrections in 1972). Shulamith Shahar, using Duvernoy's edition, translates (in an appendix) and discusses (in six chapters) the testimonies of Agnes Franco and Huguette de la Côte.

These two women were believers in the Poor of Lyon and not Waldensian Sisters themselves, although Huguette de la Côte was, rather intriguingly, labelled a "perfect of the heretics" in the heading of her interrogation. They both came from modest backgrounds: Agnes Franco was a poor elderly widow (of around 60) who had been Raymond de la Côte's wet-nurse; while Huguette de la Côte was a young woman (of around 30) whose father was a baker and whose husband, Jean of Vienne, was a carpenter. Agnes Franco became a believer through the influence of Raymond de la Côte, who was a Waldensian Brother and a deacon of the sect, but she never seems to have developed a deep understanding of the beliefs and habits of the Poor of Lyon, except their prohibition on taking oaths. Huguette de la Côte came to believe in the Poor of Lyon because of the Waldensian Brother Gerard of Arles and was quite passionate and thoughtful about why she "wished to live and die in the faith" of the heretics. Both women, on occasion, also went and prayed in Catholic churches and saw no contradiction in blending their heretical ideas with more orthodox ones. All that is known about Agnes Franco and Huguette de la Côte comes from what they confessed to Jacques Fournier's inquisition into heretical depravity.

Shahar opens with a summary of the history of the Poor of Lyon from the original preaching of Vaudès of Lyon in the late twelfth century to the surviving Waldensians becoming Protestants in the sixteenth. Her observations about inquisitorial questioning, scribal transcription, and translation of testimonies, as well as the dangers and delights of inquisition registers for modern scholars, is subtle and useful. What she has to say about the lack of a "feminine voice" as opposed to a "Waldensian voice" in the confessions of Agnes Franco and Huguette de la Côte is interesting if not completely convincing. Crucially, and somewhat ironically, Shahar's discussion is weakest when she actually focuses upon women and heresy in medieval society. A curiously meandering narrative about Jungian archetypes, feminine elements in culture, and women as an internal

"other," leaves the reader less than prepared for the translated testimonies of Agnes Franco and Huguette de la Côte. Despite the occasionally hazy quality of Shahar's analysis, where historical specificity succumbs to a kind of ahistorical generalization, she nevertheless provides a concise introduction to, and a very good translation of, two fascinating medieval women.

MARK GREGORY PEGG

Washington University

Le diable chez l'évêque: Chasse aux sorciers dans le diocèse de Lausanne (vers 1460). Edited by Georg Modestin. [Cahiers Lausannois d'Histoire Médiévale, 25.] (Lausanne: Université de Lausanne, Faculté des Lettres, Section d'histoire, 1995.)

The early witch trials in western Switzerland are among the most interesting and important of all witch trials, and thanks to a team of scholars at the University of Lausanne we now have editions, meticulous examinations, and translations into French of the most revealing trial records: those in manuscript Ac 29 in the Archives Cantonales Vaudoises. The present volume, edited by Georg Modestin, contains the records for four individuals, two men and two women, tried between 1458 and 1464. It closes the gap left by previous volumes in the series, which presented materials from as early as 1448 and as late as 1498. Modestin's work follows the same high standards seen already in the previous editions.

Of the cases given in this volume, that of Perrissone Gappit (1464) is especially important because it contains the testimony of three witnesses, thus allowing the voices of the accusers to rise above those of the inquisitors. Perrissone's stepson testified that she was a "heretic" (which is to say, a witch) and that she had been the cause of an illness of his. Then her husband told with bitter tears how she had been the cause of his difficulty in speaking. A neighbor woman said Perrissone had successfully cursed her and members of her family, and after the witness gave birth Perrissone had tried more than once to snatch her newborn baby away from her.

The trial of Guillaume Girod is of interest in part because it shows with clarity how the authorities posed as friends of the accused: the procurator of the bishop of Lausanne spoke to Guillaume in the manner of a counsellor, reminding him how he had gone to him at the castle of Lucens and admonished him charitably to confess his guilt and return to the bosom of the Church—and now, in the castle of Ouchy, the accused had reaffirmed his willingness to make a spontaneous confession, which he then made. Pierre dou Chanoz was considerably less compliant: he needed to be raised from the ground on an instrument of torture more than once before making what the record calls a "spontaneous" confession. At one point, when he had confessed his guilt and was asked if he had anything further to tell, he asked for time to consider. (The reader may be reminded of the trial for Satanic ritual abuse in Washington state, analyzed in detail by Lawrence Wright, in which time to consider meant time

for the accused father to develop false memories roughly parallel to those of the accusing daughters.) Even after one series of confessions, Pierre retracted his testimony, swearing "by Jesus who was sold for thirty pence" that he had told not a word of truth in his previous statements.

In his introduction Modestin raises the question how we should understand the testimony: whether we should follow Norman Cohn in seeing the record as essentially a monologue on the part of the inquisitor (with words placed in the mouths of the accused by the tribunal) or Carlo Ginzburg in reading the text as a collaboration and a kind of dialogue between the judges and the accused. The key difference between the evidence Ginzburg has chiefly in mind and the present cases is that here "torture is omnipresent," and thus the confessions spring mainly from the inquisitors' imaginations. But who in particular was responsible for this series of trials? Modestin plausibly assigns the initiative to the bishop of Lausanne, George de Saluces, who had acquired experience in witch-hunting when he was still bishop of Aosta, and who had been bishop of Lausanne in 1448 when there was an earlier wave of prosecution in his diocese. Modestin reminds us that the bishop was temporal as well as spiritual lord of the territories where this new series of trials occurred.

RICHARD KIECKHEFER

Northwestern University

Early Modern European

Church, Censorship and Culture in Early Modern Italy. Edited by Gigliola Fragnito; translated by Adrian Belton. [Cambridge Studies in Italian History and Culture.] (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2001. Pp. x, 264. $59.95.)

The most important result of the official opening of the Archive of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (ACDF) in January, 1998, was the discovery that the records of the Congregation of the Index are extraordinarily rich. Scholars are now able to follow the deliberations of censors, cardinals, popes, and others, as they debated which authors and books should be prohibited or expurgated, and whether the rules were implemented. This volume of studies by nine well-known Italian historians concentrates on the period 1550–1610, the crucial years in which the indexes of 1559, 1564, and 1596, and the single Roman *Index expurgatorius* of 1602, were drafted, and conflicts resolved. The use of the chronologically meaningless "early modern" in the title does not reflect the book's content.

Gigliola Fragnito begins with an excellent study of decision-making in the Congregation of the Index, especially the failed attempt to decentralize expurgation. At the time of the Clementine Index of 1596 the Congregation wanted local bishops to assume authority in censorship matters, including expurgation. It directed bishops to create and to preside over local committees, which

would supervise censorship and expurgate according to the rules. Decentralization did not work for several reasons. Many small dioceses lacked the expertise or even the ecclesiastical structure to expurgate. When they did, the quality of expurgation was uneven. Some laymen pressed into service hesitated to "mutilate" books. University scholars were reluctant to participate. No pay was offered for a time-consuming task. Delays in getting answers from the Congregation in Rome on some questions slowed work. Most important, there was the feeling that expurgators were laboring on texts that would never be reprinted because the market for them had waned, or they would be banned anyway. Eventually the Congregation in Rome took over and issued a single *Index expurgatorius* in 1602 for about fifty authors, the only expurgation index produced in Italy. Fragnito tells the story well. Along the way, she questions some long-held assumptions about the deleterious impact of censorship on Italian culture. For example, she notes that the evidence suggests that "the expulsion of Erasmus from Italian culture was less radical and less rapid than is usually believed" (p. 30).

Several articles assess the impact on different genres. Ugo Baldini surveys the condemnation of books on astrology. While astrological books were first condemned in 1559, and denounced again by Sixtus V in 1586, little was done because of their popularity. But eventually the Church's prohibitions, even when not enforced, helped bring about the decline of astrology in the seventeenth century. The prohibitions helped separate astrology from the legitimate science of astronomy. As Baldini cautiously notes, this might be a case in which censorship supported a useful scientific purpose. Claudio Donati describes the censorship of books on dueling. The Council of Trent banned duels. But the Tridentine Index did not ban books about duels, because books telling a gentleman what he must do, and not do, when his honor was impugned were needed. The Clementine Index of 1596 banned books on dueling, but permitted them in expurgated form if they would prove useful in settling controversies and fostering peace. But no expurgation was done. Inquisitors permitted lay persons to hold books on duels, and they continued to circulate.

Rodolfo Savelli studies the attempts to ban or expurgate law books written by Protestants or containing objectionable material. As might be expected, the censors did not like legal treatises promoting conciliarism, or some parts of Roman law dealing with marriage. The censors concentrated on French and German jurists who had written after the appearance of Luther and Calvin. The Congregation of the Index was more permissive about Protestant jurists, the Congregation of the Holy Office sterner. Not a great deal of expurgation was accomplished. In one of the best articles, Fausto Parente studies the fate of the *Talmud*. After destruction of many copies of the *Talmud* at mid-century, the Congregation of the Index decided that Jews might be entrusted with expurgating the *Talmud*. They prepared an expurgated version by 1578, which was not accepted. Then the Congregation of the Index ordered the preparation of an expurgated version, which was ready by 1588. But the Congregation of the Holy office wanted condemnation, and prevailed. An expurgated *Talmud* never appeared. Parente tells

a fascinating story of moderates and hardliners, of popes sympathetic toward the Jews cowed by the Congregation of the Holy Office, and much else.

Edoardo Barbieri studies censorship of vernacular religious literature without using ACDF documents. He notes that inquisitors were concerned about the superstitious and ambiguous material found in some popular works of medieval spirituality. But he seems unaware that many of these titles were read in vernacular schools at the end of the sixteenth century and beyond. Ugo Rozzo presents a rapid list of secular vernacular literary titles (works of Giovanni Boccaccio, Baldesar Castiglione, etc.) that were expurgated or banned. He notes that changes were introduced from edition to edition, a form of undeclared expurgation, but seems unaware that this was a common phenomenon before the Counter-Reformation. Sixteenth-century editors and publishers lacked the respect for the author's words now taken for granted. Rozzo also repeats the traditional Italian scholarly view about a "monstrous" attempt to rewrite Italian culture, and he opines that the effects on Italian cultural, political, and religious history were "even more disruptive than we realize." Luigi Balsamo tells the story of Antonio Possevino's *Apparatus sacer* (1603), a bio-bibliographical dictionary of orthodox authors, written as an alternative to Conrad Gesner's *Bibliotheca universalis* (1545).

Some of the articles offer excellent new material and are well organized; others throw the information on the page. Quotations from Italian and Latin are almost always translated, but without the original in the notes. It would often be useful to have the original words. Although some authors offer precise references to printed sources, several do not. Nevertheless, all the articles list a wealth of printed primary and secondary sources. And all except Barbieri and Rozzo have used the ACDF documents well. The English translation of the articles should have been cleansed of such confusing phrases as "nobiliary ideology," "heterodoxes," and "theorization by jurists."

The most important message of this volume is that a change in the historiography of Counter-Reformation censorship may be under way. Censorship certainly had considerable impact on Italy, but Italian scholars have painted the picture in a monochromatic deep black. For more than 150 years they have unanimously agreed that church censorship was extraordinarily harsh, that the censors spoke in a single severe voice, that the Counter-Reformation shut Italy off from the culture of the rest of Europe, and that censorship's effects on Italian culture linger to this day. This position owes much to *Risorgimento* and leftist anticlerical ideology. Non-Italian scholars who did not join the consensus were and are ignored. It is very encouraging that some excellent Italian scholars are offering "a less ideologically biased assessment of the effects of ecclesiastical censorship," in the words of Fragnito (p. 14).

PAUL F. GRENDLER

University of Toronto (Emeritus)

Building Codes: The Aesthetics of Calvinism in Early Modern Europe. By Catharine Randall. (Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press. 1999. Pp. xii, 288. $36.50.)

Randall's monograph examines the work of Calvinist architects in France from the outbreak of the French Wars of Religion in 1562 to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, a period in which space was a highly emotive and contested issue between the Catholics and the Huguenots. She argues that in the face of persecution, "these Calvinist creators devised strategies to subvert from within: to inscribe, via representational reconfiguration and code their distrust of the hierarchy on the very buildings commissioned to attest to Catholic authority." Furthermore, "a Protestant aesthetics of subversion, possessing its own idiom, voice, strategies, and conceptual responses to specific historical moments of oppression, existed from the mid-sixteenth through the early seventeenth century." Randall dedicates chapters of her book to exploring this in the writings and work of leading architects of the period: Bernard Palissy, Philibert de l'Orme, and a group defined as "second generation Calvinist architects" which includes figures such as Jacques Boyceau, Jacques Androuet du Cerceau, and Salomon de Brosse. It is argued that they subverted the Catholic iconography through means such as the use of code, creating hidden spaces for dissent, trompe l'oeil, "eccentric or fantastical deviations," etc. It was an architectural style that drew upon the Scriptures and was informed by the work of Jean Calvin. In the second chapter, Calvin is seen as providing a prototype for Calvinist architects. His writings employ "para-architectural terminology," and his exploration of the relationship between the visible and invisible churches led him to consider the concept of space. Randall even argues that the *Institutes*, "written from Calvin's location in self-imposed exile" in Strasbourg, provide Calvin's blueprint as to how the city-space of Geneva should be reconfigured. While it is true that the 1539 edition of the *Institutes* expanded on the original text, the basic structure of the *Institutes* as a guide for those deprived of spiritual sustenance in France had already been established in the first edition of 1536, before Calvin ever arrived in Geneva.

While there is certainly no doubt about the Calvinist beliefs of du Cerceau or de Brosse, the inclusion of a substantial chapter on Philibert de l'Orme does raise questions. It is in de l'Orme's writings and work that his Calvinism is evident according to Randall, but it is encoded and camouflaged so that it is only apparent to those readers familiar with Calvinist exegesis and the vernacular scriptures. It is this code and hidden meaning that Randall attempts to reveal through deconstructing his texts and "reading Philibert's allegories allegorically." And yet Randall herself comments that "Philibert has never been identified explicitly as a Calvinist, and while some aspects of his life suggest that he remained nominally a Roman Catholic until the end of his days." Much of the evidence would seem to be circumstantial, and there are problems in equating the terms 'evangelical' with 'crypto-' or 'proto-' Calvinist. Belief in the importance of Scripture was shared by various evangelicals and was not the sole preserve of

the Calvinists; it was also a concern of earlier Catholic reformers, such as Lefèvre d'Etaples and Guillaume Briçonnet.

This well-illustrated book does serve to demonstrate, particularly in the chapter on "second generation Calvinist architects," the artistic and cultural importance of the contribution made by Huguenots in France during the early seventeenth century. Their work for Catholic patrons could, as Randall argues, illustrate the "Calvinist strategies of subversion." But, it also demonstrates the religious pluralism of the age.

ANDREW SPICER

University of Exeter

Monumenta Proximi-Orientis, V: *Egypte (1591–1699)*. By Charles Libois, S.J. [Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu, Vol. 152; Monumenta Missionum Societatis Iesu, Vol. LXV.] (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu. 2002. Pp. lxii, 593. Paperback.)

This book, in keeping with the plan of the collection "Monumenta Historica Societatis Iesu," publishes archival documents concerning the Jesuits who set foot in Egypt in the seventeenth century.

Except for Father Marciano Manieri, a Neapolitan, who devoted himself to ransoming captives, the documents as a whole concern the efforts of Jesuits to enter Ethiopia setting out from Cairo. It was, therefore, not Egypt that interested them but rather "Abyssinia" to the point that their first residence was called "Residence of the Missionary Fathers for Ethiopia."

The mission of Ethiopia, begun in the sixteenth century, at the outset had as the center of interest only the chaplaincy of the Portuguese who had established themselves in Tigré on the shore of the Red Sea. Subsequently it developed into attempts to lead the Church of Ethiopia back into the bosom of the Church of Rome. The Jesuits who then tried to reach Ethiopia were Portuguese, and for the most part they set out from Goa to try to reach Eritrea by way of Mocha. Because of the almost insurmountable difficulties of these journeyings the Jesuits, taking advantage of the good relations existing between France and the Sublime Porte during the reign of Louis XIV, tried with the help of the French consuls in Cairo to make contact with Ethiopia through the north, the valley of the Nile.

Three expeditions mark off the century.

The first, in 1627, was an abortive attempt; the four Jesuits who began the journey did not get beyond Guirga, approximately 500 kilometers south of Cairo. Denounced as spies by a Maltese, a slave merchant, the four Jesuits were arrested by the police, brought back to Cairo with a heavy escort, and thrown into a dungeon. They were not set free until the French consul, Gabriel Fernoux, paid a large ransom, which the Society of Jesus afterwards had to repay.

A second attempt was made in 1698. A French physician, Charles Poncet, before going to Abyssinia, agreed to take Father Charles de Brédevent along as a factotum. They departed from Boulac, the port of Cairo, on July 10, 1698, but Father Brévedent, who had already been stricken with dysentery even before his departure, succumbed to the fatigue of the journey and died at Barko, a half-day's journey from the capital of Abyssinia, on July 9, 1699, one year after their departure. Charles Poncet for his part seems to have reached the court of the King of Kings at Congar and even to have returned to Egypt.

A third attempt took place in 1700 with the journey of Fathers Louis Grenier and Antoine Paulet, who set out in search of Father Brédevent, of whom they had had no news. They went as far as Congar, but they were quickly expelled from there. Father Grenier died at Silica near Congar on September 25, 1701, and Father Paulet at Senaar on March 3, 1702. The documents of this third expedition will be published in the next volume.

The first residence of the Jesuits was not established in Cairo until 1697, by Father Verzeau, who was at that time superior of the Jesuit missions for the Levant, but the first superior of the residence, Father Marquart, died of cholera a week after his arrival in Cairo.

This foundation gave rise to a whole series of disputes between the Franciscans of the Custody of the Holy Land and the Jesuits—disputes which were the subject of a great number of documents. The Custody claimed to have been established in Egypt since the time of St. Louis. They were chaplains and the ordinary pastors of the foreigners at Alexandria, Damietta, and Cairo, and they feared that the Jesuits desired to steal their titles of pastor, especially with regard to the foreigners of French nationality. It is a fact that the Jesuits at this time were strongly supported by M. Maillet, who was the French consul in Cairo.

In all these cases expeditions and installation in a residence concerned only a very small number of Jesuits. Only twelve passed through or sojourned in Egypt during the century, and never more than four at a time.

The editing of the 193 documents contained in this volume follows the norms of the "Monumenta Historica." Each one is carefully described in its material form, briefly summarized, and then published in its original language—seventeenth-century French or Italian, or Latin. Many texts repeat extracts of old editions in order to fill in their gaps. Such editions are C. Boccari, *Rerum aethiopicarum Scriptores occidentales*, published in fifteen volumes at Rome between 1903 and 1917; H. Omont, *Missions archéologiques françaises in Orient aux XVII^e^ et XVIII^e^ siècles* (Paris, 1902); and A. Rabbath, S.J., *Documents inédits pour servir à l'Histoire du Christianisme en Orient*, Vol. I (Paris, 1905) and Vol. II (Paris, 1910). Father Libois offers a very good introduction, briefly summarizing the origins of the Jesuit missions in Ethiopia and extending over the period covered by the published documents. There is a bibliography at the beginning of the volume, and biographies of the Jesuits who went to Egypt and an analytical or subject index complete the book.

The next volume, which is in preparation, will be devoted to the eighteenth century up to the suppression of the Society of Jesus in 1773 and to the death of the last Jesuit still in Egypt at that time, Father Louis Grimod, who died in 1788.

JACQUES MASSON, S.J.

Collège de la Sainte Famille au Caire

The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800. By David A. Bell. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 2001. Pp. xv, 304, $45.00.)

In 1792 Jean-Paul Rabaut de Saint-Étienne declared to the National Convention, "We must make of the French a new people" by following the example of "priests, who, with their catechisms, . . . ceremonies, sermons . . . [and] missions, . . . infallibly led men to the goal they designated" (pp. 2, 3). Rabaut's directive provides David Bell's starting point in his masterful analysis of nationalism in eighteenth-century France. Although nation-building was, he argues, a project with "a dynamic that was primarily . . . religious" (p. 199), it was not simply a substitute religion. It arose in eighteenth-century France deeply influenced by the Church's approach to inculcating beliefs, but it depended on a significant change in those beliefs.

Nationalists had only one possible model for their political project, that which the Church had used in Catholic-Reformation evangelization campaigns. The precedent became apparent during the Seven Years' War, when the government sponsored a propaganda campaign fashioned on the literature that demonized Protestants during the sixteenth-century Wars of Religion. However, the English were not denounced as heretics. Rather they were barbarians, beyond the pale of European civilization as defined by the French concepts of sociability and politeness.

Republican nationalists criticized this notion of civilization by associating it with a morally corrupt aristocracy and with women, who exercised too much influence in polite society. "National virility" was "impaired" (p. 150); national character needed to be reformed. To do so, nationalists disseminated a patriotic pedagogy based on a cult of great French men, whose lives made them secular saints celebrated for their service to the nation. The revolutionaries were firmly convinced that France's national character was corrupt, and they, particularly the Jacobins from 1792 to 1794, undertook an ambitious campaign to reshape it. Bell focuses on one aspect of this well-known campaign—the attempt to make French the language of all citizens. Linguistic diversity seemed a barrier to the regeneration of the nation. Here the irony of revolutionaries adopting church practices is most apparent. Catholic reformers had learned local languages to further evangelization. Revolutionaries now turned against priests and patois. But the regeneration they sought was, itself, a term laden with religious echoes of the miraculous.

Does the religious heritage of nationalism mean that it was merely an alternate belief system substituting for religion, which modernity had left behind? Not so, according to Bell. Nationalism arose in eighteenth-century France because of changing beliefs about God's relationship to the world. In the years around 1700, the French began to think of the world as disenchanted; God was absent from it. They no longer perceived a necessary link between the earthly and divine orders. To fill the gap, they turned to certain "foundational concepts," particularly the nation and the patrie, which allowed them to conceive of an autonomous space within which human will could construct political legitimacy without reference to God, religion, or, for republicans, the king. A new moral or sacred community could be constructed around the nation and patrie. Bell's sweeping characterization of this change in sensibilities may be true only of a small segment of the population, but it offers a more sophisticated understanding of how nationalism was constructed than that which sees it as merely supplanting religion. Still the contrary view dogs his language, which sometimes suggests that nationalism was a substitute religion. Sacrality was transferred from the Church and its beliefs to the nation and patrie, which inspired "forms of adoration akin to religious devotion" (p. 52). Nor is it certain that modern nationalism necessarily depended on a notion of God's absence. Nineteenth-century nationalists devoted to the shrine at Lourdes did not see their world as disenchanted, and, as Bell admits, nationalism has often flourished where "religious observance has remained most intense" (p. 23). But as he shows well, eighteenth-century French nation builders did not share those sentiments. They used the Church's methods, but their goal was a nation of free and equal citizens bound together by a feeling that did not depend on God.

KEITH P. LURIA

North Carolina State University

Late Modern European

Religion and Public Doctrine in Modern England. Volume III: *Accommodations*. By Maurice Cowling. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2001. Pp. xxiv, 766. $100.00.)

For scholars and intellectuals who take religion seriously, perhaps the most important topic in the history of modern western civilization has been the decline in the status and influence of religious thought—that is, the process of secularization that has de-Christianized public thought and culture over the last 200 years. If that is the case, Maurice Cowling has written a masterpiece not to be ignored by the religious-minded. The broad theme of his three-volume work, twenty years in the making, is "to show that secularization, and de-Christianization, are intellectual and religious rather than mechanical, inevitable, or sociological processes; to describe the lines of argument by which they have established their hold on the English public mind; and to establish that they have often arrived so innocently and surreptitiously that their coming has passed unnoticed"

(p. x). Unfortunately, the confusing organization and idiosyncratic judgments of this massive work often detract from the wisdom of Cowling's central assertions.

Cowling offers a brief summary of his earlier work in the preface to Volume III. The first volume, published in 1980, he describes as an intellectual autobiography that reviews the ideas of the thinkers who most influenced him in his formative years, including Eliot, Waugh, Churchill, Toynbee, Collingwood, and Oakeshott. The second volume, published in 1985, describes the conflict between orthodox religious thinkers and modern secularists over the past 200 years, focusing on the works of Christian thinkers like Newman, Gladstone, Keble, Pusey, Manning, Chesterton, and Belloc and secular critics like Spencer, Tyndall, Wells, and Shaw.

These early volumes, Cowling acknowledges, offered a simplistic view of the intellectual process of secularization, following the normal textbook approach of highlighting conflicts between starkly contrasting rivals. Volume III proposes a more subtle approach, distinguishing among three varieties of modern thinkers—latitudinarians who sought to accommodate religious thought to modern trends, orthodox Christians who tried to uphold traditional religious ideas, and post-Christian thinkers who professed the irrelevance of religious thought entirely. The vast majority of figures reviewed in Volume III are of the latitudinarian variety (hence the title of the book). Indeed, Cowling's main argument centers on the problems of this group, who turn out to be wolves in sheep's clothing in the Christian camp.

Cowling's central argument—that the modern mind cannot escape from religion, that "Christianity's retreat has not entailed the retreat of religion," and that "religion will still be found in the crevices of thought wherever investigation looks for it" (p. xvi)—is pursued in seemingly exhaustive fashion as he summarizes the thought of well over 100 prominent English intellectuals in the three volumes. Prominent subthemes in the work include an assertion that latitudinarians contributed as much as secularists to the decline of Christian influence on public life and an overriding criticism of the moral confusion of contemporary English culture.

Cowling recognizes that his arguments and methods will be considered outdated by modern sociologists and structuralists. He defends his essential conservatism, reflected in his uncompromising emphasis on individuals and his acceptance of the vitality of ideas, and reiterates his notion of the fundamental task of the historian as interpreter and cultural critic. Cowling is at his most poetic when describing the essential tragedy of his theme and his defense of orthodox Christian thought. Orthodoxy does not represent an archaic surrender to barbarism but recognition of the demands of "dignified public behavior" and "social respectability." More importantly, orthodoxy constantly "requires a silent effort of the will, and acceptance of mysteries (or presuppositions) which, though they do not have to be explained, do have to be related to conduct, belief and understanding" (p. 699).

However much traditionalists may admire Cowling's stout defense of the relevance and influence of religious thought, his work remains problematic. The very breadth of the survey can be overwhelming. Cowling's utter English bias, allowing little interaction with other British (much less Continental) influences, robs the story of its appropriate context and broader relevance. His refusal to survey his subjects chronologically—"one may properly speak of the historic English mind taking shape in the blur and fog of an undiscriminating contemporaneity"—makes herculean demands on the critical reader. Cowling's juxtaposition of often contradictory and unrelated figures and themes detracts from the coherence of the work. In one chapter, for instance, he shifts from a review of the religious sensibilities of Dickens, Tennyson, and Browning to a discussion of Pater and Wilde's "deconstruction of respectability." The unrelenting pessimism of Cowling's theme leads to some perplexing characterizations, as in his criticism of the religious writings of C.S. Lewis for their "certain evangelical narrowness."

Cowling may have been better served to offer his thoughts as a reflective and insightful personal essay on the role of religious thought in public culture, with appropriate allusions and citations. By couching his thoughts in the form of an encyclopedic summary of modern English thinkers he runs the risk of losing even the sympathetic reader and diluting the effectiveness and coherence of his central argument.

RICHARD J. JANET

Rockhurst University
Kansas City, Missouri

John Lingard and the Pursuit of Historical Truth. By Edwin Jones. (Brighton: Sussex Academic Press. Distributed in the U.S. by ISBS, Portland, Ore. 2001. Pp. xxv, 308. $69.95.)

Lord Macaulay did not like the *History of England* written by John Lingard in the 1820's. He complained that Lingard's "great fundamental rule of judging seems to be that the popular opinion cannot possibly be correct." It would be fairer to say that Lingard's fundamental rule of judging was that evidence matters more than public opinion. And the evidence of history, as he so often found and documented, ran against public opinion in England.

John Lingard was a Roman Catholic priest who taught philosophy at the seminary of Ushaw near Durham, then moved to the remote parish of Hornby near Lancaster—and here he wrote a revolutionary new version of England's history. With these eight volumes he may not have changed public opinion of historical facts, but he certainly changed the way history was written in England. Especially after the appearance of his volumes on the English Reformation (Vol. 4 in 1820 on Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary Tudor; and Vol. 5 in 1823 on Elizabeth), historians scrambled to defend the good name of their Protestant forebears and the Anglican Church. Robert Southey, Henry Hallam, Thomas Carlyle,

James Anthony Froude, and Lord Macaulay all wrote histories of England in the following years in defense of opinions cherished since the reign of Good Queen Bess, whom Lingard thought not so good after all. But they had to do so on Lingard's terms. No longer was it sufficient to write history as David Hume did, starting from his philosophic prejudices and making the facts fit; from Lingard on, historians needed to amass more and better documents.

Edwin Jones, the author of this interesting study of Lingard's historical method, attempts to do two things in this book. First, he examines Lingard's methodology, by taking us into what he (Jones) calls the "historian's workshop." Since Lingard never revealed his method, much of it has to be gleaned from private letters and Lingard's lengthy footnotes. Jones finds that, in almost every area of research, Lingard was far ahead of his time. Modern revisionists are only now catching up and arriving at conclusions Lingard espoused almost two hundred years ago. Jones shows how Lingard used public records and private sources, tested the "source of the sources," prioritized the authority of sources, and applied forensic rules of source criticism—all long before anyone else except perhaps the Bollandists and Maurists, from whom Lingard clearly learned. G. P. Gooch, in his monumental *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913), maintained that Froude was the first Englishman to use the Simancas Archives in Spain, and Macaulay claimed to be the first to see the Barillon papers in France and was praised by the *Times* for his thoroughness. In fact, Lingard saw the latter long before Macaulay and had access to Simancas through an agent before Froude.

Secondly, Jones contends that Lingard's methodology resulted in historical judgments which have stood the test of time. All of the above-named authors, as well as the esteemed twentieth-century historian George Trevelyan, who tried to perpetuate the "great Myth" of the English nation, have been proven substantially wrong in their judgments. Only Lingard stands out as an accurate assessor of England's past. Edwin Jones points out, "I know of no serious matter in which a later court of appeal, in terms of modern scholarship, has overturned a historical judgement or major historical interpretation made by Lingard nearly two centuries ago; and I know of no other English historian of whom this can be said" (p. 170).

The author includes several test cases—William Wallace, Mary Stuart's Casket Letters, Edmund Campion's Trial among them—and could have included many more, where Lingard's conclusions have stood the test of time. What is clear from this book is that what Lingard produced was far superior to what anyone else in England had produced to date. Jones contends in Bellocian style that Lingard's "achievement makes him worthy of the name of the greatest English historian of the second millennium—the greatest, in fact, since Bede" (p. 122).

What is not clear from this book is that Lingard had his faults. John Kenyon, in his *History Men* (1983), accuses Lingard of pandering to Protestants, then altering his work in subsequent volumes, once he had gained a hearing. While

Kenyon totally misreads Lingard, Edwin Jones could have spent some time answering the charge, since it is recent and weighty. While he compares Lingard's first and later editions, which vary greatly (and instructively), he does so only to highlight Lingard's superior methodology and not to answer Kenyon's peevish assessment.

More substantially, Lingard was a diocesan priest and shared the secular's tendency to blame current civil disabilities (Catholics were still not free to vote or hold office) on the irresponsible behavior of religious orders and especially Jesuits. He did not like religious orders and never would, and urged Cardinal Wiseman not to look too closely at the state of the monasteries at the time of the Reformation, because they were indefensible. Lingard had not applied his critical apparatus to Cromwell's Comperta, which both Aidan Gasquet and David Knowles would later do, and mistakenly accepted them at face value.

Lingard could also be prejudiced against certain characters of the Reformation, such as Anne Boleyn. He thought that Anne Boleyn must have done *something* to provoke the charge of adultery, and thus bring about her execution. While Lingard admitted that he could not support his argument with documentation, he claimed that Henry VIII "must have been impelled by some more powerful motive to exercise against her such . . . superfluous rigour" (Lingard, *History*, IV, pp. 245–246). There are other explanations. Anne was executed in 1536, at a time when opposition to Henry VIII was systematically and ruthlessly being rooted out. The Observant Friars were hanged in their habits, against all precedent, in 1535, and More and Fisher were executed as well. Yet Lingard does not suggest that they must have done something far beyond that of which they were accused, even though the statutes which they violated (in the case of More and Fisher) did not call for the death penalty. And if the eighty-year-old Abbot of Glastonbury, who had backed Henry at every opportunity, could be dragged through the streets and hanged, drawn, and quartered, then Anne Boleyn could conceivably have been treated unfairly.

Despite these oversights, and a quirky use of italics which is confusing and unhelpful, Edwin Jones has produced a very good book, and has re-introduced one of Catholicism's greatest historians to the English-speaking world. He concludes with a touching epilogue on a visit to Lingard's parish of Hornby. As Lord Acton said of Lingard's *History*, it "has been of more use to us [Catholics] than any thing that has since been written. All educated men were obliged to use it . . . it is to this day a tower of strength to us." All educated historians would do well to read this book.

JOHN VIDMAR, O.P.

St. Stephen's Priory
Dover, Massachusetts

The Politics of Modernism: Alfred Loisy and the Scientific Study of Religion. By Harvey Hill. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 2002. Pp. ix, 227. $54.95.)

One is unlikely to find in any language a clearer, better written introduction to the neuralgic career of Alfred Loisy than Harvey Hill's. In addition to its clarity, what sets it apart from the many studies of Loisy is its well-argued conception of the historical integrity of Loisy's mature modernist works as growing out of ideas he formulated in the 1870's and 1880's to which other scholars have paid scant attention. To argue this point, Hill interprets Loisy's published works within the context of his unpublished, autobiographical writings, thus conveying an authoritative, virtually first-person reading of the complex contours of Loisy's life.

Out of an artful rehearsal of the conflicts with church authorities over Loisy's historical criticism of Scripture and tradition with implications for doctrine, what emerges is a clarification of the role of Loisy's political interests—thus the book's title. Hill perceptively argues that Loisy's odyssey originated not within a nascent modernist movement, but within the context of France's Church-State conflict. This conflict contributed to Loisy's crisis of faith in the 1880's, out of which he conceived an agenda for church reform in the 1890's, the prosecution of which led to his condemnation and departure from the Church in the 1900's. Hill argues that just as Loisy, out of sympathy for "the values of enlightened and anticlerical France" (p. 11) (autonomous authority), supported the separation of Church and State, so he logically supported the separation of the scientific study of religion from theology. The Church's legitimate role in religion, Loisy argued, was to teach its adherents to be morally autonomous—a role far from the magisterium's current conception. Loisy and the magisterium were on a collision course.

Far from taking sides in the conflict between Loisy and the church authorities, Hill maintains aesthetic distance. Loisy wanted to make room in the Church for scientific history and so prove Renan wrong that it could not be done. From a laudably objective, historical vantage point, Hill takes the reader stepwise through Loisy's strategy, clarifying the influences of key figures such as Renan, Duchesne, d'Hulst, A. Sabatier, and von Hügel, as well as of various political figures and ideas, showing that the conflict with church authorities occurred as the result of two diametrically opposed ideologies. Although Loisy argued that scholarly investigations must be historically objective, Hill shows that, in fact, Loisy was blind to the nonobjectivity of the modern ideology within which and out of which he operated. Nor did Loisy fully appreciate the Vatican's stake in promoting Thomism as the instrument of instruction on the proper relationship between revelation (faith) and reason and therefore between Church and State: Thomism was to be the papal strategy to secure political influence. In the antagonistic Church-State climate of fin-de-siècle France, it was virtually impossible that Loisy could realize his aim of serving the Church with a historical method free from the pressures of doctrine. The then-irreconcilable differences

between Loisy's modern ideology and the Church's authoritarian ideology was unfortunate for both parties.

DAVID G. SCHULTENOVER, S.J.

Marquette University

The Defamation of Pius XII. By Ralph McInerny. (South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine's Press. 2001. Pp. xii, 211. $19.00.)

The past few years have seen book after book critical of Pope Pius XII, and behind almost every one of them was a larger attack on the papacy and the Catholic Church. The culmination is Daniel Goldhagen's hate-filled *A Moral Reckoning: The Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and Its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*. Fortunately, there are also occasional books that offer more insight than hate. *The Defamation of Pius XII* is a fine contribution from Ralph McInerny, professor of philosophy and head of the Jacques Maritain Center at the University of Notre Dame.

McInerny offers a vigorous "defense" (though neither he nor I like that word in this context) of Pius XII as a holy and courageous leader who was responsible, directly and indirectly, for saving 860,000 Jews from the Holocaust. He goes on to note that the evidence for this truth is massive, the testimonies are many, and the facts are incontestable.

For McInerny, then, the question is not whether Pius XII acted heroically during World War II. That is certain. The question becomes: Why is this good man being defamed? Who are the people devoted to besmirching Pius XII's reputation, and what are they really after?

McInerny makes abundantly clear that the real subject of attack is the Catholic Church and her unchanging moral doctrine, especially on all matters sexual. The animus of the (mostly Catholic) authors is directed as much against Paul VI and John Paul II as it is against Pius XII. McInerny calls these writers: "Catholic anti-Catholics" because they call themselves Catholic despite their denial of central dogmas of the faith. On this list, McInerny would place former seminarians John Cornwell and Gary Wills, Father John F. Morley, and former priest James Carroll.

McInerny is dismayed that some Jewish writers have also joined in the defamation. Analyzing this, he advanced a position that virtually all other supporters of Pius XII have avoided. He raises questions about what certain Jewish leaders, particularly Zionists, did or did not do to help save other Jews during the war. In fact, McInerny concludes that Jewish leadership today is not in a moral position to criticize the much bolder and more effective actions of Pius XII and the Catholic Church.

McInerny lays out his case clearly and convincingly, as his well-written book moves, year by year, through World War II. While he did not do new archival

work, he refers to newspaper accounts of the time and stresses the importance of listening to the contemporaneous voices—many of them from within the Jewish community—that praised Pius XII during and after the war. He shows that no other person or group accomplished anything close to what Pope Pius XII and his nuncios did during the war.

I was not certain about McInery's observations regarding the defamation campaign until I read Goldhagen's *Moral Reckoning*, but that convinced me. The attacks against Pius cannot be explained by new evidence or honest variations in historical accounts. There is something else at work here, and it is very troubling. It is, in fact, nothing short of a campaign to defame the papacy and to portray the Church of Christ as the enemy of mankind. Read McInerny's book.

RONALD J. RYCHLAK

University of Mississippi

Consensus and Controversy: Defending Pope Pius XII. By Margherita Marchione. (Mahwah, New Jersey: The Paulist Press. 2002. Pp. x, 389. $24.95 paperback.)

Although Sister Margherita Marchione first won scholarly recognition in the United States by publishing studies on Philip Mazzei (1730–1816), the Florentine friend of Thomas Jefferson, she has been devoting these last five years to the laudable work of defending the reputation of Pope Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli). Since 1997, for example, this member of the Sisters Filippini and professor emerita in Italian Studies at Fairleigh Dickinson University has published a half-dozen works on the pope in order to counterbalance the criticism of such recent opponents as James Carroll, Richard Chesnoff, John Cornwell, Michael Phayer, Gary Wills, Robert Wistrich, and Susan Zuccotti with the arguments of testimonies from Christian as well as Jewish eyewitnesses. "My books," she writes (p. 14), "will help enlighten all who seek the truth."

In her attempt to provide the general reader with the basic sources which refute the arguments of the pope's critics, Sister Margherita shows that there is a basic consensus on the pope in this controversy which she presents by dividing her study into eight parts. Having introduced her readers to the problem and the life of the pope in the first part of her study, she proceeds to expose the truth about Pius XII and the Holocaust in the second part, falling back on the sources which underscore the evidence in his career on how he helped the Jews during the Holocaust. The third part focuses on how the media, including *The New York Times*, in addition to Vatican Radio and *L'Osservatore Romano*, provide documentary evidence in favor of the record of Pius and the Catholic Church during those dark days of World War II. In part four, the author introduces her readers to the arguments of recent authors who have been responsible for refueling the controversy which Rolf Hochhuth ignited back in 1963. While part five brings

the book to its conclusion in defending the pope, the last three parts are concerned with the appendices, notes, and the index of her study.

Certainly, Sister Margherita leaves no stone unturned in marshaling her evidence. While her study reminds one of *Pius XII and the Holocaust* (2002) by José Sánchez, it is a more passionate exposition which might leave even a reader who is sympathetic with her position wondering if, objectively, she has not overplayed her hand. Although those interested in the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments set forth by the pope's critics can find a more detailed analysis of them in the work by Sánchez, they will find superior documentation for the refutation of those same arguments in this work by Sister Margherita. Thus, these studies complement one another in trying to have their readers understand the controversy.

Lastly, to her credit, Sister Margherita is not unlike Hilaire Belloc, who, if this reviewer is not mistaken, when faced with the twisted history of Catholicism in England, as narrated by Protestant historians, saw how necessary it was to bend the warped board of history back in the opposite direction so that the truth might emerge. Sister Margherita's analysis of the controversy does reminds one of Belloc's approach since the history of the Catholic Church during the time of Pius XII and the Holocaust has been grossly distorted by the warped allegations of his critics. Understandably, this has led her to underscore the truth of what really happened by providing solid documentation to counteract the twisting of the objective evidence so characteristic of those recent studies which have disguised themselves as historical scholarship but which are really a form of ideological polemics.

VINCENT A. LAPOMARDA, S.J.

College of the Holy Cross

American

Making Heretics: Militant Protestantism and Free Grace in Massachusetts, 1636–1641. By Michael P. Winship. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 2002. Pp. xvii, 322. $29.95.)

Controversies about the nature of grace and the constraints, if any, on where and how it might flow figured importantly in the Protestant Reformation. In England and America, where Puritans carried forward the Reformers' belief in the priesthood of all believers, and in the personal receipt of grace as the only means of salvation, these controversies centered on debates about the Holy Spirit and whether its empowerment of individual conscience might transcend clerical or even biblical authority. The ostensible target of Puritan resistance to human efforts to control the pathways of divine grace was, of course, the Roman Church and its priests and sacraments. But as Michael Winship shows, Pu-

ritans in early-seventeenth-century New England directed the real fire of their animosity against one another.

Professor Winship provides a fresh account of the famous battle between the conservative and moderate leaders of the first generation of New England Puritans—Thomas Shepard, Thomas Hooker, and John Winthrop—on one hand, and more radical proponents of free grace—John Cotton, Henry Vane, and Anne Hutchinson—on the other. This book goes beyond previous histories of the controversy in its thoroughness in tracing the escalating religious tension that almost broke up the Puritan settlement in Boston, and in its identification of crucial turning points where people might have behaved differently, and history might have taken a different course. In this highly readable book, Winship reconstructs events and motivations to the best of his considerable abilities, not oblivious to his own interpretive hand, but not invested in one theology or ideology either.

The upshot of the story is that the proponents of free grace developed in symbiotic relationship with the militant defenders of social order and religious self-discipline. Shepard's growing concern about the pretentious, self-aggrandizing, and self-deluding aspects of Cotton's theology helped create a situation in which more mystical, intuitive types, like Cotton and Hutchinson, felt compelled to defend themselves. Shepard's increasingly venomous conservatism drove Hutchinson further toward radicalism, and her growing radicalism, in turn, pulled the relatively moderate Winthrop into the fray as her chief legal opponent. Winthrop's lead role in Hutchinson's banishment generated widespread resentment in Boston, which led to his unseating as Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and to the election of the religious radical, Henry Vane. Although short-lived, Vane's governorship had the further unsettling effect of calling unfavorable attention in England, where Vane was prominent and well regarded, to intolerance and confusion in Boston.

In the most skillful way, Winship shows that advocates of free grace and proponents of religious intolerance were not simply adversaries, but also creatures of each other's imaginations. The implications of this conclusion are far-reaching. One need only think about the antagonism today between seekers and fundamentalists to appreciate the ongoing relevance of Winship's discoveries about the ways in which a tiny Puritan community in seventeenth-century New England established patterns of religious and cultural interaction that still persist in the United States today.

AMANDA PORTERFIELD

University of Wyoming

Guadalupe: Our Lady of New Mexico. By Jacqueline Orsini Dunnington. (Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press. 1999. Pp. xviii, 189. 15 color, 32 b&w photographs. $45.00 hardback; $24.95 paperback.)

Miracles are said to occur at the beginning of new evangelization in condescension to the immaturity of the unconverted and the newly converted. Therefore heavenly pronouncements, visions, locutions, speaking in tongues, ecstasies, healings, and other such miracles are something of an insult to well-informed cradle Catholics and cradle Christians. God's grace in word and sacrament ought to be enough. But it isn't.

The Guadalupe apparition is, in its strange way, a permanent miracle, as has been thought of the mandylion of Abgar of Edessa, Veronica's veil, and the shroud of Turin. The Guadalupe tilma is far more likely than the others to withstand continued testing as scientific method develops. The Shroud of Turin failed the carbon-dating test several years ago, though as a matter of fact Herbert Thurston's article "Shroud" in the old *Catholic Encyclopedia* told the Church in the 1910's all we need to know.

Even if it were not a miracle, the Guadalupe tilma has certainly been for the people of New Spain (including the U.S. Southwest) a providential legacy. If it is "of God," we can be bold enough to recognize in the calm, serious maiden the feminine face of the divine. After serving in her first century or so as a "mother of miracles," La Criolla (the American-born woman of old-world ancestry [p. xiii]) has come to be an abiding symbol of hope for the marginalized, the oppressed, and the suffering.

Jacqueline Orsini Dunnington is certainly both scholarly in her argumentation and prudent in her judgments, but it is at the same time quite plain that her book is as much an act of devotion as an act of scholarship. She gathers and evaluates all information and misinformation as accurately as possible. She has good instincts about debated issues (that is to say, she almost always agrees with *me*); I especially commend her description of the infra-red analysis performed by the Franciscan Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate and written up by Philip Serna Callahan. This study showed that all of the gold, all of the black, the swag of drapery across the Virgin's feet, the moon, and the angel (not to mention the crown and roses that were painted out a century ago) were all added about 1600. The bottom-line result is that the indigenista interpretation of the image as popularly received is false; the image has now stopped talking second-rate sociology and simply says, "Here I am for you."

The down side: I found the index scanty and the bibliography lacking in the newer and better parallels—Matt Pearce's *New Mexico Place Names* but not Bob Julyan's *Place Names of New Mexico*, Manuel Espinosa's books on Diego de Vargas but not those by John Kessell *et al*. And I make my usual plea to regional publishers to do their readers a big favor by providing more editorial help to their authors; I found a few parts of the book unnecessarily difficult to read. But the up side is the real story: this book is as good a book as there is on Guadalupe—especially so for readers who prefer a New Mexican point of view.

THOMAS J. STEELE, S.J.

Regis University, Denver
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

Between Church and State: Religion and Public Education in a Multicultural America. By James A. Fraser. (New York: St. Martin's Press. 1999. Pp. x, 278. $24.95 clothbound; $14.95 paperback.)

The interrelationship among church, state, and school in the United States has been quite complicated, and any book on the subject is apt to be equally so. When the author is not only a historian but a professor of education and a Congregationalist pastor, such a work becomes even more complex.

James Fraser is all of these. Relying heavily and selectively on secondary sources, Fraser the historian traces the history of religion and education from colonial times, when official Anglicanism and Puritanism prevailed. Fraser argues that religious freedom came to the new nation not by any grand philosophical design, but by a simple process of elimination: once established churches began to lose their exalted status, they sought to prevent others from supplanting them. Horace Mann's eastern "common schools," in which students listened to readings from the King James Bible "without note or comment" (p. 26), and Lyman and Catherine Beecher's midwestern public schools, in which *McGuffey's Reader* served as the "textbook for the common creed" (p. 40), were agencies of "lowest-common-denominator" (p. 6) Protestantism, the *de facto* established religion of the nineteenth century. Those who were not fully Protestant—African Americans, Native Americans, Catholics, atheists, and even Lutherans, Baptists, Presbyterians, and Methodists—were thus not fully "American."

Education, which propagated this exclusionary gospel, also challenged it, as slaves broke the law to read and write, Catholics left the public schools to build their own, and Indians endured the indignities of forced assimilation. The Republican attempt to prohibit public aid to parochial schools through the Blaine Amendment of 1876, the fundamentalist assault on the teaching of evolution in the Scopes trial of 1925, and the Protestant resistance to Catholic presidential candidates in 1928 and 1960 aimed to protect the gospel from further attacks. The Religious Right's campaigns to restore creationism in the 1980's and 1990's sought to recover the gospel from its adversaries.

Fraser the professor of education advocates a new era in the history of church, state, and school, one which rejects not only the minimalist Protestantism of the nineteenth century but also the nihilist secularism of the late twentieth century. "The central question of this book," Fraser writes, is "how should a diverse and democratic society deal with questions of religion in the public schools?" (p. 4). He answers that while public schools must not *promote* religion, they should *confront* it—in history, literature, science, and even religious-studies classes. "For all the confusion sown by the Supreme Court's divided and seemingly contradictory opinions," Fraser concludes, "the Court has been clear and consistent in ruling that the study of religion is acceptable in the public schools" (p. 229). To avoid the excesses of the past, Fraser contends, such a study should reflect and respect the deep racial and religious diversity of the students.

Fraser the pastor is virtually absent from this book. Far from betraying religious bias, Fraser's analysis is a bit harsh on his fellow Protestants who, he concedes at the end of the book, "believe many different things and disagree passionately with each other" (p. 232). After all, the "Protestant hegemony" (p. 175) over American schools, according to Fraser, consisted of little more than Bible reading and hymn singing, and it was in almost constant decline throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Fraser stumbles when advocacy intrudes upon history. He gently chides a president he likes, John Kennedy, for "uncharacteristic" (p. 144) rigidity on federal aid to nonpublic schools (actually, Kennedy unsuccessfully compromised on this issue in 1961). He irreverently notes that a president he does not like, Ronald Reagan, "often . . . made up the facts . . . to suit his argument" (p. 178), only to confuse his own facts. According to Fraser, Reagan's school prayer constitutional amendment "never got out of committee" (p. 179); actually, it received (less than two-thirds) majority support on the Senate floor in 1984. His otherwise excellent chapter on the Christian Coalition, which chronicles its "grassroots" success against the liberal Americans United for Separation of Church and State and People for the American Way, omits perhaps the Religious Right's strongest opponents at the local level, the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers, whose pro-evolution, anti-school prayer, and anti-voucher agenda Fraser shares. Those who agree with the author are "thoughtful scholars" (p. 209); those who agree most of the time are "usually thoughtful" (p. 236); and those who disagree most of the time are "conservative" (p. 209).

Despite these flaws, Fraser has written a highly accessible piece of history. He has eloquently advocated a larger, if limited, role for religion in American public schools. And, if he has not eliminated the confusion between religion and public education in the United States, he has gone a long way toward explaining it.

LAWRENCE J. MCANDREWS

St. Norbert College
De Pere, Wisconsin

No Cross, No Crown: Black Nuns in Nineteenth-Century New Orleans. By Sister Mary Bernard Deggs. Edited by Virginia Meacham Gould and Charles E. Nolan. (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. 2001. Pp. xxxvii, 226. $44.95.)

The editors, Virginia Gould and Charles Nolan, have entitled this journal most aptly *No Cross, No Crown*, because the author's conviction that earthly suffering dutifully embraced yields spiritual rewards and graces resonates throughout her work. Sister Mary Bernard Deggs's journal chronicles the nineteenth-century experiences of the Sisters of the Holy Family, the second Roman Catholic sis-

terhood of African descent in the United States. The paucity of historical records documenting the sisterhood's tortuous evolution from a religious confraternity in 1842 to a community of women religious, whose Rule and habit the Catholic Church formally approved in the 1880's, underscores the historical significance of Deggs's journal, begun in 1894. Deggs's insights about communal spirituality and devotional piety, her revealing accounts of personality conflicts and communal tensions, her explicit and candid comments about color caste and class status, and her reflections on the sisterhood's ministry more than compensate for her lack of literary skills. The journal consists of five parts, covering the administrations of co-founders Mothers Henriette Delille and Juliette Gaudin, Mother Josephine Charles, Mother Marie Magdalene Alpaugh, Mother Marie Cecilia Capla, and Mother Mary Austin Jones.

Gould and Nolan introduce each part with chronologies and commentaries. A few of their editorial emphases raise concerns. Gould and Nolan contradict their own evidence of the "attitudes of race, status, and condition represented in this journal and elsewhere in the archives of the Sisters of the Holy Family . . ." (p. 7), by arguing unconvincingly that from their inception the sisters identified racially with the black slave and free people they evangelized. The editors bolster this contention by asserting, "In one of the most telling actions, the sisters soon after the conclusion of the Civil War eliminated the rule that only women from previously free and elite families were eligible to enter" (p. 6). Adjustment to the reality of the postwar abolition of slavery more plausibly explained this policy change than the sisters' putative rejection of racist social proscriptions. Furthermore, the editors' reference to Sister Borgia Hart's account of the first rift in the sisterhood precipitated by conflict over color and caste, self-characterizations like "young quadroon and octoroon ladies" (p. 10), slave ownership, and explicitly stated preferences for and admiration of light skin color indicate that the nineteenth-century sisters considered the black population, "our people," primarily as the recipients of their ministry.

The editors state, "That a small band of Afro-Creole women founded a religious community in the antebellum South was remarkable" (p. ix). They reiterate, "Conventions of class, race, gender, and condition held implications for free women of color in New Orleans as they did nowhere else in the deep South. It was only there, in the 1840s and 1850s, when the slave-based social system was at its most restrictive, that a band of women of African descent could turn their spiritual energy and hope into the reality of an officially recognized religious community, committed to serving the religious and social needs of their people" (p. xx). Such assertions completely ignore the existence of the first black Catholic sisterhood, the Oblate Sisters of Providence, in Baltimore from 1828. Comparing aspects of the experiences of these two antebellum southern black Catholic sisterhoods—such as respective community attitudes about color and caste, respective acceptance by the institutional church and secular society, and respective responses to clerical requests for domestic service—would have proven instructive.

Nevertheless, Gould's and Nolan's efforts to surmount the considerable obstacles they encountered in editing Deggs's journal prove well expended; for as they correctly assert, "the complexity of this document, the way in which it intertwines issues of race, class, and gender against the backdrop of economic, political, and social change, should make it a godsend to scholars in many fields" (p. xvii).

DIANE BATTS MORROW

The University of Georgia

Catholic Women's Colleges in America. Edited by Tracy Schier and Cynthia Russett. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 2002. Pp. ix, 439. $45.00.)

The stated aim of this collection of essays is to open up what has been "a closed book"—the history of Catholic colleges founded by women religious. The editors make no claim that it is definitive, but it is a significant landmark which should serve to stimulate scholarly interest in a topic that has been grievously neglected. The scope of the activity alone warrants investigation. Leaving aside junior colleges and those founded strictly for sister-students (over a hundred of which existed at one time or another), the number of four-year colleges founded by Catholic women religious increased from ten in 1918 to 142 in 1968. Today only about twenty still restrict their enrollment to women, but some ninety others have become coeducational institutions, not a few of which are now universities.

The origins of the volume at hand go back to a November, 1994, conference held at the offices of the Lilly Endowment, which has supported the project from the beginning. All the contributors are experienced educators; twelve of the fourteen are women, two of whom have served as presidents of Catholic women's colleges. As is usually the case in such collections, the chapters vary in approach and execution, and readers will differ in how they evaluate the results. Chapters by Thomas M. Landy, Mary J. Oates, David R. Contosta, and Melanie M. Morey struck me as particularly meaty and rewarding.

Though Landy is a sociologist rather than a historian, his chapter comes closest to providing an overall picture of how Catholic colleges for women evolved over time. He accomplishes this by careful examination of statistics derived from the biennial reports of the U.S. Commissioner of Education and the *College Blue Book* series. His data trace exponential growth of institutions until 1968. The sharp decline that followed was partially offset by the shift to coeducation and by expanded curricular offerings that attracted so many non-traditional students that overall enrollments grew significantly. In speculating on what caused the mushrooming of institutions in the first two-thirds of the twentieth century, Landy stresses the point that many different communities of nuns, most of

which were already involved in education and were also attracting new vocations in record numbers, decided independently to open their own colleges. The obverse of this "supply side" explanation of growth would also apply to the very different situation that prevailed after 1968.

Oates's chapter, "Sisterhoods and Catholic Higher Education, 1890–1960," offers no overall scheme of historical development or periodization. It is, however, so densely packed with empirical information under topical headings ("Founding Colleges," "Developing Curricula," etc.) that it constitutes the best historical account of Catholic women's colleges available for the period covered. In keeping with her background as an economist, Oates's treatment of the financing of women's colleges is particularly rewarding. Among other valuable points she makes, Oates provides solid evidence for the belief that the Catholic women's colleges were effective recruiting agencies for sisterhoods—during their heyday of expansion, about ten percent of their graduates entered the convent.

Contosta treats student life at three of Philadelphia's Catholic women's colleges—Immaculata, Rosemont, and Chestnut Hill—from their foundation in the 1920's until the early 1970's. Rosemont, the only one not to grow from a preexisting academy, had the wealthiest constituency, benefited from the special affection of Cardinal Dougherty, and was Fulton J. Sheen's "favorite college." Chestnut Hill's student body was less upscale than Rosemont's; a bit more so than Immaculata's. Not coincidentally, Immaculata offered the widest range of vocationally oriented subjects, while Rosemont was the most ardently devoted to liberal education as an end in itself. In addition to these revealing sidelights on social class and its relation to curricula, Contosta covers the full spectrum of campus life: religious climate, disciplinary rules and regulations, extracurricular activities, and, most interestingly, the impact of "the Sixties" on student attitudes and conduct. One might wish he had pursued these themes closer to the present, but what he has given us is first rate.

Morey's analysis of "the present relationship of religious congregations of women to the colleges they founded" is comprehensive, penetrating, and sobering. It is also the only chapter in the book that confronts directly, and in a sustained way, the profound challenges posed to Catholic women's colleges by the combined effects of the changes in the religious sphere flowing from Vatican Council II and those in the realms of gender relations and higher education stemming from the broader cultural upheaval of that era. The number of sisters is now less than half what it was forty years ago, and the average age of the remaining cohort "hovers around seventy." As if that were not enough, many communities of religious women shifted their emphasis from higher education to other forms of service more directly related to social justice, usually carried on by individuals or small groups, rather than by sisters living in community. The combined effect of these trends over the past three decades—particularly what she calls "the disappearance of sisters"—leads Morey to suggest that "the

unique identity of Catholic colleges founded by women religious" can survive only by "effectively pass[ing] the torch to the laity."

In the book's "Conclusion," Jeanne Knoerle, former president of St. Mary-of-the-Woods College and the moving spirit behind the whole project, and co-editor Tracy Schier likewise touch upon this possibility. Besides citing Morey's point, they themselves observe that while the existing colleges founded by nuns are likely to survive, the continued involvement of the founding communities is problematic. They also acknowledge that maintaining the Catholic identity of these colleges requires continuing attention, and they take critical note of a "diminished emphasis on the intellectual life" among women religious over the past four decades. Although these reservations qualify Knoerle and Schier's positive review of past accomplishments, they profess confidence in the future, writing that Catholic women's colleges face it "with determination and a committed—albeit guarded—optimism."

The other contributors are more consistently upbeat. Thus, in setting them within the larger context of women's higher education, Jill Ker Conway opines that Catholic colleges for women were less affected than "elite schools" by "ambiguities about their mission." However, the claim is not developed by Conway or followed up by other contributors. Monika K. Hellwig's chapter on the "spiritual heritage" of colleges founded by nuns is brief and generalized. Kathleen A. Mahoney's discussion of their "historical origins" goes back to medieval and early modern times, but is sketchy on the more relevant academies for girls operated by American sisters in the nineteenth century. Rather than investigating the evolution from academy to college, which most of the latter went through, Mahoney concentrates on Trinity, the only one among the first group of Catholic women's colleges to be founded *de novo*. By contrast, Karen Kennelly opens her chapter on "Faculties and What They Taught" with the observation that their academy experience was crucially formative for the nuns who founded colleges. She then proceeds to cover much the same ground as Oates, but in rather more impressionistic fashion.

The celebratory note present in varying degrees in these chapters becomes dominant in the two remaining. Jane C. Redmont's survey of alumnae reactions is strictly anecdotal, being based on the responses of twenty graduates from nine selected institutions. The flavor of this "qualitative study" is aptly conveyed by the chapter's title: "Live Minds, Yearning Spirits." In their review of the "patterns of innovation and accommodation" adopted by Catholic women's colleges in recent decades, Dorothy M. Brown and Carol Hurd Green rely heavily on information provided by the administrative officers of some thirty institutions. Not surprisingly, the resulting "stories of persistence and success" are warmly gratifying.

One might question other interpretive points, but factual errors are few and not very important (e.g., the famous convent burning occurred in Charlestown, not Charleston, Massachsetts [pp. 39, 42], and DePaul University—then called

St. Vincent College—opened in 1898, not 1914 [p. 81]). All in all, the volume succeeds quite well in opening up a historical topic that deserves a great deal more study.

PHILIP GLEASON

University of Notre Dame (Emeritus)

Fray Angélico Chávez: Poet, Priest, and Artist. Edited by Ellen McCracken. [*Pasó por aquí* Series on the Nuevomexicano Literary Heritage.] (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press. 2000. Pp. xi, 156. $24.95.)

With assistance of nine scholars whose specializations are diverse and far-ranging, Ellen McCracken embarked upon an ambitious, gallant effort to reconstruct from documentary fragments and perspectives the complex life of Fray Angélico Chávez as poet, priest, and artist. The outcome is not a full biography, but a compendium of essays by writers who either knew Fray Angélico personally or who, through analyses of his multi-faceted works, became vicariously acquainted with the subject.

Two of the essays approximated the design of biographical framework. Marc Simmons, prominent southwestern author, tapped a variety of sources (both primary and secondary) to inject imagination, vigor, and depth to Fray Angélico's gradual development as a serious researcher and writer of history. A confrere in New Mexico, Jack Clark Robinson, sorted through a windfall of original materials in the Angélico Chávez File, curated in the Saint John the Baptist Province Archives in Cincinnati, to narrate the educational and spiritual formation of a Franciscan aspirant for the priesthood. Fray Angélico emerged as the first native New Mexican to be ordained in his homeland. Like two sturdy buttresses supporting a massive center, Simmons and Robinson inserted hooks into the biographical scaffolding upon which the other writers suspended their respective essays. In an introductory treatise, "A Rose for Fray Angélico Chávez," the editor provided an intellectual framework for the volume. Each writer addressed a particular subtheme of Fray Angélico's life journey: religiosity and the friar's staunch advocacy of Hispanic New Mexico's place in the chronicles of North America (Mario T. García); a comparative overview as "History and Fictitious Autobiography" of the pictorial representation of *La Conquistadora*, traditionally associated with the reconquest and reoccupation of New Mexico in 1692 (Luis Leal); Fray Angélico as writer of short stories (Thomas J. Steele, S.J.); the Gospel as depicted in poetry and painting (Manuel M. Martín-Rodríguez); a seminarian's literary quest for Saint Francis of Assisi (Murray Bodo, O.F.M.); and a rigorous search for the roots of New Mexican families (Clark Colahan).

Provocative essays by Ellen McCracken and Thomas E. Chávez completed the anthology. As editor of the series, McCracken reserved the center stage for a discussion of Fray Angélico as artist and historic architectural conservationist in the remote parishes (Peña Blanca, Golden, and Domingo Station) in which he served the faithful. An impressive gallery of photographs depicted Chávez' con-

tributions to ecclesiastical iconography that fell under the wrecking ball of material progress. Rounding out the collection of essays, Thomas E. Chávez, a historian, shared poignant reflections of his uncle as priest and scholar.

This well-balanced volume is an elegant summary of Fray Angélico Chávez' contributions to New Mexican art, history, and literature.

FÉLIX D. ALMARÁZ, JR.

The University of Texas at San Antonio

Defining Mission: Comboni Missionaries in North America. By Patricia Durchholz. (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America. 1999. Pp. xiv, 353.)

The birth of the nation of Ghana in 1957 marked the beginning of the achievement of independence for the nations of Africa and an end to colonial imperial rule. With it came the revisiting of the ecclesial question of the role of a missionary. But for the Comboni Missionaries to Africa (also known as the Verona Fathers, since their headquarters were in Verona, Italy), the challenge to their service in the Churches of Africa came from the European political conflicts sparked by Hitler twenty years earlier. The Africa in which they served was ruled by England and France, the new wartime enemies of Italy.

Dr. Patricia Durchholz's *Defining Mission* reveals the pressures and the paroles of the congregation as it struggles to maintain its vocational commitment to serve the people of Africa. The missionaries sought English-speaking non-Italian vocations to work in Africa, thus maintaining the charism of the society. Their strategy brought them to the shores of the United States in 1939. On the one hand, their dedication made them a valuable asset to certain bishops, but on the other hand, their life-style and their successes challenged the Comboni traditions and made them subject to the ridicule of being "unfaithful to the rule" in the eyes of their confreres.

As a student of American Catholic history, I find that Durchholz's investigation brings to light another challenge to the spiritual strength and morale of the new Italian *religious immigrants*, which is rarely recorded in the American Catholic experience. The Comboni came to work among the Negroes and Native Americans of the United States. In the Mid-West they were "caught between the biases of Whites and the needs of Blacks, [thus] they could find the truth difficult to discern in the undercurrents of racial politics." Contrary to ministry to American people of color, their work in Africa had taught them the importance of utilizing the talents of the people with whom they worked. In the west, they were unaware of the "heritage of violence" which had devastated the Native Americans for over two hundred years. Thus the ambivalence on the part of the Native American community was confusing.

In each new situation, Dr. Durchholz enlightens the reader on the specific historical context into which the Comboni Fathers are called to serve. The text offers penetrating pastoral insights, especially, given the pressures brought to bear

by the society's desire for more vocations and funds for the missions and the desire of those Comboni priests in the United States for better pastoral service to their parishioners. Due to the author's keen sense of the positive qualities of each Comboni missionary, one comes away with a sense of having met each of the major players personally. Yet she does not overlook their failings. She is forthright and honest in her review of their history, of their painful internal struggles after Vatican Council II. Their staggering renewal of the spirit, vision, and life of the community in a North American context leads the Catholic reader to recall his own journey through those years of change.

Durchholz offers us a balanced and perceptive presentation of an immigrant religious community caught in the Church's ambivalence and occasional hostility regarding its service to its people of color. Yet in unexpected ways, they come to reaffirm that the job of missionaries is to work themselves out of a job.

THADDEUS J. POSEY, O.F.M.CAP.

University of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota

Latin American

Juan Ignacio Molina. The World's Window on Chile. By Charles E. Ronan, S.J. [American University Studies, Series IX: History, Vol. 198.] (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc. 2002. Pp. xvii, 318. $60.95.)

Juan Ignacio Molina was one of the more notable of the Creole Jesuits exiled from Latin America in 1767. In the Papal States he wrote several natural and civil histories of his homeland, Chile, and thus became the "World's Window on Chile." Ronan's work on the life and works of this exiled Chilean Jesuit constitutes a new and important contribution to the body of literature on the exiled Jesuits. Earlier authors who had written on the topic—Miquel Batllori, Antonello Gerbi, and Ruben Vargas Ugarte—covered the exiled Jesuits in a general way. With the exception of the Peruvian Jesuit Juan Pablo Viscardo y Guzmán, there were few detailed works on individual figures. But Ronan himself significantly filled in that vacuum with his masterful biography on Francisco Clavijero (1977), the famous exiled Mexican Jesuit. This current study complements that work. Ronan acknowledges his indebtedness to Walter Hanisch, a Chilean Jesuit who had written considerably on Molina. But Hanisch's writings, though thoroughly academic, were generally very brief sketches on aspects of Molina and did not reach a wide audience outside of Chile. Ronan's work, much wider in scope and more thoroughly documented, will certainly reach that wide audience.

Ronan traces Molina's life from his early Chilean years to his exile in Bologna. At the same time he analyzes in depth all of Molina's various histories of Chile. Molina's natural history of Chile includes detailed descriptions of its mineral wealth, its fauna and flora, all based on the Linnaean system of classification. He

describes the Araucanians (today Mapuches) in great detail, their customs and traditions, especially for the benefit of European readers, and in so doing sought to dispel many of the fantastic myths and distortions created by certain pretentious European authors who wrote about America without ever having been there. At the same time Ronan notes that Molina tended to romanticize the Araucanians, and to present a somewhat simplistic view of Araucanian-white relations. Ronan analyzes one by one all of Molina's sources, some of whom Molina did not acknowledge. Readers will find it interesting to note that Molina was also a great admirer of Washington and Franklin, a fact that attests to his broadminded intellectual curiosity.

Molina is also famous for a modest contribution he made to the theory of evolution, a contribution which also attracted unwanted attention from the Roman Inquisition. Ronan covers in detail that crisis in Molina's life. Molina never returned to his homeland when the Society of Jesus was restored in 1814, probably because of his advanced years and the fact that he was a well-respected scholar in Bologna. But he also never re-entered the Society of Jesus, even though he was a priest and on good terms with other exiled Jesuits. In Ronan's book it is not entirely clear why Molina chose not to re-enter the Society, if presumably that option was a real possibility. Furthermore, as the author notes, some scholars have seen a divorce between Molina the Christian and Molina the scientist. Ronan is at pains to show that no such divorce existed. Nevertheless, as the author admits, Molina's references to God all seem to fit eighteenth-century Enlightenment and even deist categories.

Ronan does not hesitate to qualify Molina as the most "outstanding" of the exiled Jesuits, including Clavijero, for his intellectual accomplishments. Ronan's study of Molina, his life and works, is balanced, critical, and solidly documented. It will undoubtedly become the standard work on Molina, as it deserves to be, for many years to come.

JEFFREY KLAIBER, S.J.

The Catholic University of Peru, Lima

African

A History of the Church in Africa. By Bengt Sundkler and Christopher Steed. [Studia Missionalia Upsaliensis LXXIV.] (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2000. Pp. xix, 1232; 8 maps. $140.00.)

Bengt Sundkler made a splendid reputation as a missionary, teacher, and scholar during his lifetime, in which he is best known for his painstaking and groundbreaking studies of African Independent Churches. His first major work, *Bantu Prophets in South Africa*, published in 1948, is widely recognized as a path-breaking study of African religiosity and the syncretic merger of African and Western Christianity. He was also widely regarded as being more sympa-

thetic to the Africans than many churchmen had been, even though as a leader of the Lutheran church he had necessarily to regard the Independent Churches he studied as rivals, and as possessing a less than perfect form of Christianity. Still his reputation was such that Sundkler was challenged in the 1970's to write a comprehensive history of the Church in Africa. He died in 1995, before the work was completed, and Christopher Steed, his close associate, finally brought the work to press five years later.

The Church in Africa is necessarily an ambitious book, over 1,200 pages long, for the Christian church has deep roots in the African continent, and Sundkler was prepared in theory at least to take all of it on—the ancient church in Egypt and Nubia, St. Augustine's church in North Africa, the long and tangled, if not fascinating, history of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, and the Catholic missionary churches in Kongo or Angola after European expansion. And of course, Sundkler had to deal with the tremendous spread of Christianity in Africa with the evangelical movement in Western Europe and America from the mid-nineteenth century, culminating in the colonial church.

A quick look at the composition of the work quickly reveals Sundkler's own priorities. The ancient Church receives a scant thirty-five pages, and another section of less than forty pages covers all the pre-nineteenth century missionary churches as well as the history of the whole Ethiopian Church up to 1800. While this shortchanging of early history certainly deprives the book of its ostensible claim to be a history of the church in Africa as a comprehensive book, it does make the work a very serious and careful survey of the modern church in Africa.

For his chosen topic, Sundkler approaches his topic systematically and comprehensively. He covers all the various denominations, Protestant, Catholic, and Ethiopian Orthodox, and covers all regions of Africa. The book is organized regionally and chronologically, and one has the impression that every region and denomination received careful, equal weight. Sundkler's learning and research, not always represented by his footnotes, which are largely to secondary literature, is impressive. One gets the feeling of solidity, comprehensiveness, judgment, and care throughout the later chapters of the book.

Yet, for all this scholarship and knowledge founded on half a century of personal experience in the church in Africa, one feels that Sundkler did not always engage his topic fully. In his introduction, Sundkler quotes the historian Jacob Ajayi as saying, "a bitter pill which the majority of writers of Christianity and missionary activities in Africa should swallow is that they have not been writing African Church History." He takes this as his watchword, and declares that he will try to take up Ajayi's challenge. To some degree, Sundkler succeeds in writing the African history of the church, including the Africans in his considerations, and de-centering the missionary. One does get a feel that the African lives in this history as more than simply the recipient of European religious dispensation. This is real history, not hagiography. But at the same time, Sundkler never really addresses African religious systems of thought, never examines

their internal dynamics, or what conversion might have meant in terms of these systems. While African indigenous religiosity is addressed frequently in passing, the new church history of Africa and a substantial amount of new research make these absences a significant problem. Thus, he never addresses how Christian evangelization had effects even on those people who did not join the Church, or ended up joining and identifying with Islam. This is surprising for a man whose work on the independent churches was so critical in seeing the churches as true expressions of Christian identity and not simply crude imitations of the European-led churches from which they were spawned.

Another problem in the book is its failure to take on those critics of the church who argue that it was the handmaiden of imperialism and the tool of colonialism. Certainly the claim has been made with exaggeration and emotion, and there are grounds on which it might be met. But Sundkler simply does not address the issue at all. Rather, Sundkler's chapters on these long periods are primarily about the church's organization and formal spread, and the achievements of its leaders, both European and African. It is not short on the celebration of the African role in the triumph of the church, and it is prepared to accept their dynamism within the church itself, but it is not prepared to defend the church effectively against the charge that it provided fairly weak challenges to the colonial order, or that its workers were often less than model leaders.

These criticisms are really challenges for what the book is not, but it is not to take away from what it is. The book is an invaluable starting point for church history, at least for the post-nineteenth-century period. It is a good guide to the literature that would allow a student to follow the issues it addresses farther, and it would be a valuable reference work. At the price, it is unlikely that the book will be owned by many outside of libraries.

JOHN K. THORNTON

Millersville University of Pennsylvania

Asian

Handbook of Christianity in China. Volume One: *635–1800.* Edited by Nicolas Standaert. [Handbook of Oriental Studies/Handbuch der Orientalistik: Section Four: China, Volume Fifteen (15/1).] (Leiden: Brill. 2001. Pp. xxviii, 964. Dgl. 361.41; €164.00; US$201.00.)

In a word, this volume is indispensable for anyone with any degree of research interest in the topic.

In his introduction to the *Handbook of Christianity in China*, Nicolas Standaert justifies its publication by pointing to what he calls a "paradigm shift" in the study of the roles of a Mediterranean religion (to use a euphemism for the moment) in Ming and Qing China to 1800. Standaert suggests that before about 1960, the main thematic question was something like "How did the missionaries introduce and present Christianity in China?" (p. ix). The presentations by

researchers writing in Chinese and in European languages tended to reflect their own religious affiliations, to include apologetic implications, and to deploy terms such as Christianity unproblematically. The center of focus was Matteo Ricci, S.J. (1552–1610), the main period was the long seventeenth century (from Ricci's arrival in Macao in 1582 to the Yongzheng Emperor's prohibition decree in 1724), and the main players seemed to be Jesuits and their literati collaborators. The main but by no means exclusive concern was with the transmission of Christian teaching and practice to audiences in China.

According to Standaert, after about 1960 the main thematic question was something like, "How did the [*sic*] Chinese react, positively or negatively, to the introduction of Christianity and other aspects of Western culture?" (p. ix). This question still foregrounds the introduction of Christianity, but implies a relative shift of emphasis from European-language sources to Chinese ones, from European missionaries to Chinese literati, and from religion to ancillary parts of the Western "package" that was delivered to China. The emphasis moved to reception rather than transmission, and these are not quite two sides of the same coin. I will confess that I recognize myself as one of the participants in this shift depicted by Standaert. When I began working on this sort of topic in the 1960's, I did not conceive of what I was doing as following in the footsteps of the pre-1960 researchers, although I incurred an enormous debt to them as I drew on their research. Looking back, I suspect an important formulation in marking this shift was John K. Fairbank's source book called *China's Response to the West*, which raised questions like Standaert's, but mostly for a later period. Instead of Fairbank's "response" (a noun) or Standaert's "react" (a verb) or other rubrics such as "influence" (a verb and noun), the preferred terms now might be "incorporate" or "inculturate." More attention is given to the processes by which certain (but not all) Chinese thinkers and sectors of society adapted and embodied certain (but not all) ideas from European countries as their own. This is underscored by the suggestion made at the end of the discussion in the *Handbook* of the first accounts of Christianity in China in the seventh century and its key documenting text, a stele inscription dated to 781: "The whole question how Chinese Nestorians have inculturated Christian thought still deserves new study on the basis of recent methodologies of cultural translation" (p. 37). Culture rather than religion is the overarching term. The suggestion applies as well to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Standaert is correct in pointing out that a change occurred in researchers' collective approach. However, I am not convinced we should perceive it as a "paradigm shift," even if we could agree on whether paradigmatic thinking (in Thomas Kuhn's original sense) is involved. I would settle for "stages" in the expansion of this field. As this *Handbook* amply demonstrates, both the transmission question and the reception remain viable as research motifs. In the *Handbook* Matteo Ricci still is mentioned twice as often as any other individual.

What the *Handbook* itself succeeds in showing is that this field of studies is into a third stage. The questions being asked in the recent literature are on the

one hand more specialized and detailed, and on the other hand are dispersed over an extended horizon of inquiry. More details, more cases, more sources, and more researchers. There are conceptual changes, too, that have been accomplished. Crucially, the handling of "Christianity" is no longer unproblematic and apologetic but in the *Handbook* itself is critical and nuanced, which will set a standard for this field. Rather than assuming that all users of the *Handbook* know what Christianity is, Standaert and some of his co-authors seek to explain what it was at particular junctures in an ongoing historical process. Standaert goes out of his way to devote a few pages to the "Theological background" in Europe (pp. 592–599) with a synopsis of lingering medieval theology and world view along with brief discussion of the motives for sending missions to the heathens, the implications of inter-Church disputes over doctrine, and the commitment to establishing a *christianitas* in China. In his introduction Standaert is able to put quotation marks around the term "Christianity" as he emphasizes and the *Handbook* achieves inclusion of sources and discussions of a full ensemble of denominations as well as the other churches (Nestorian or East-Syrian, Russian Orthodox, Dutch) represented in China before 1800. Most importantly, and perhaps controversially, Standaert points out that for the *Handbook*, "Christianity" in China is not to be construed as a strictly religious phenomenon involving faith and practice, but also as an inclusive cultural phenomenon, embracing a full range from astronomy to clocks, from philosophy to crafts. In a switch that may be related to his seeing a "paradigm shift" from the 1960's, Standaert seems to suggest (p. x) that for the *Handbook* "Christianity" should be understood as a back translation of the prevalent late-Ming term *Tianxue*. In the *Handbook, Tianxue* is rendered literally as "Heavenly Studies," although I still prefer my term "Learning from Heaven" if we understand *xue* as a lived, transformative process more than as objects of mental accumulation, and *tian* both as the sky with its sun, moon, and stars (our most certain and constant of experienced phenomena, extended to mean Nature), and as the Lord of Heaven, their Creator and source of moral certainty and salvation, extended to mean Religion. This Christianity is a complicated, multifaceted, historically changing cultural phenomenon that constituted a major part of the mental baggage carried by Christians who traveled to China or others who accepted core parts of that baggage in China. Unless we understand "Christianity" in a broad sense, as Standaert proposes, we miss the full import of what was going on. Even with the inclusive understanding of "Christianity" along with *Tianxue*, there also seems to be a further, unstated expansion of the term to accommodate even more activities that are judged to be relevant for the *Handbook*. This expansion is quite fuzzy at the borders. For example, Giuseppe Castiglione was undoubtedly a Christian, but must we regard his paintings as part of "Christianity" in China when he functioned as one of the emperor's favored court painters under the name of Lang Shining (a name which does not appear in the pages discussing painting)? I suspect that finding this border will prove to be even more difficult for the anticipated Volume Two on "Christianity" in China after 1800. Most importantly, as the *Handbook*'s authors' reviews of the sources

and issues make clear, the best recent work stands on good grounding in both European and Chinese language sources and cultural traditions. The *Handbook* itself is a model of this third, expansive stage.

The *Handbook of Christianity in China* has a grid-like organization. For each of the three periods considered—the Tang (from the seventh through the ninth century), the Yuan (in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), and the late-Ming to Qing to 1800 (the late sixteenth through the eighteenth century)—the presentation is arrayed under the four headings of Sources, Actors, Scene, and Themes. In addition to critical discussions of the primary sources in the various languages and aids for using them, the Tang and Yuan "acts," to follow the theatre analogy Standaert invokes in his introduction (p. xi), have appended bibliographies which list the primary sources and main secondary literature in the relevant languages, but mostly in European languages and Chinese. (Japanese secondary literature receives less attention than it might.) Because of the paucity of material relating to Christianity in the Tang and Yuan periods, a condition which is unlikely to change until further inscriptions are recovered archaeologically, these two sections are relatively brief but usefully instructive. The discussion by Pénélope Riboud of how and what we know about Christianity in the Tang period is the most judicious and accessible account of which I am aware.

The third "act," on Ming and Qing to 1800, occupies the bulk of the nine-hundred-page *Handbook*. Its discussion of Sources alone takes up more pages than the Tang and Yuan "acts" together. Rather than overwhelming users with a single, massive bibliography of primary and secondary literature on the Ming-Qing period, the *Handbook* provides nearly fifty specialized bibliographies attached to the subsections contributed by nearly twenty authors. Combined with discussions of primary sources, these bibliographies will serve researchers for years as reliable lists of what is available. One of their strengths is their catching items from publications that might easily be overlooked.

The subsections on Actors, Scene, and Themes in the third "act" do not aim for a consistent tone. Many are informative summaries of the present state of knowledge, almost like entries in an encyclopedia. A refrain in many of them is that much research remains to be done on this particular topic. Herein lies another of the strengths of the *Handbook*. It does not pretend to be definitive, but offers a plateau from which further research will take off.

A few of the subsections are in the form of short, sharp, even provocative essays. Among them, three might be mentioned. Standaert addresses the issue of what is meant by "conversion" in his subsection on "The four principal converts (1600–1620)" (pp. 404–411). His subtle analysis of the conversion process in the four related cases draws on the sociology of Lewis Rambo and presents a framework that future research must confront. The essay on "Key theological issues" by Erik Zürcher addresses some of the main problems involved in Chinese understanding of Christian theological tenets on several "levels of response," from commoners through literati and officials up to the emperor himself.

Zürcher's distinction of levels would seem to preclude simplistic assertions about what "the Chinese" in the sense of all Chinese thought about foreign ideas and foreigners. He also introduces the useful notion of "encapsulation" to indicate the process by which the imperial court could reduce and limit the role of missionaries. Whether encapsulation explains what happened to the missionary effort in the eighteenth century remains open, in my opinion. Another approach to these issues is in Ad Dudink's essay, "Sympathising literati and officials" (pp. 475–487). Suggesting that the high point of literati sympathy for the missionaries' new learning may have come as early as before 1616 (p. 480), Dudink points to the missionaries' diverting (p. 482) their activities away from literati and officials (*shi daifu*) toward the emperor at the capital and commoners and lower degree holders in the provinces. Such formulations imply the missionaries were choosing their audience. Dudink also suggests that "During the Shunzhi period (1644–1661) literati support almost completely vanished" (p. 484). Zürcher notices that "the bulk of late Ming anti-Christian polemical tracts was written by Buddhist authors" (p. 637). Dudink points to unspecified "upholders of orthodoxy" (p. 483) as seeking to restrict missionaries' efforts. (Dudink and Zürcher both discuss the term "orthodoxy" and qualify its easy applicability in the Ming-Qing period.) All of these generalizations concern who was doing what to whom, and when. Were missionaries converting literati, were literati converting themselves, and, we might even ask, were literati converting missionaries? Were missionaries manipulating emperors? Were emperors manipulating missionaries? And then put commoners into these questions. And then account for the changes over time. I am not suggesting the *Handbook of Christianity in China*, Volume One, does or should resolve all such questions and more. It has the strength to raise more questions. For researchers from now on, there is no better place to begin.

Willard J. Peterson

Princeton University

BRIEF NOTICE

Taylor, Wilma Rugh, and Norman Thomas Taylor. *This Train is Bound for Glory*. (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Judson Press. 1999. Pp. 382. $45.00.)

Subtitled "The story of America's Chapel Cars," this book can be more properly called an archive of local history, America's railroads, and the spread of the Gospel in America's South and West. Obviously a work of love by a devout Baptist lady and her husband, it seems no stone was as left unturned in their effort to get all the details on the thirteen chapel cars built between 1889 and 1915. There is a full chapter on each of the three Episcopalian, three Catholic, and seven Baptist cars, followed by eleven floor plans of the cars, forty-six pages of detailed logs of each of the cars and the railroads they used, and at the end, seventy-five pages of a very complete index.

The Episcopalians led the way under the leadership of a bishop who saw such a car on the Trans-Siberian Railroad, where it brought the services and sacraments of the Russian Orthodox Church to the workers on that great project. The Baptists came right on the heels of the Episcopalians, so close indeed that some of them wanted the honor of being first.

The Catholics came third to the project when Father Francis Clement Kelley, who founded the Catholic Church Extension Society on the example of the Methodist Extension Society, visited the Baptist chapel car at the St. Louis World's Fair in 1904. The magazine *Extension* told the story of these cars and was a valuable source for this book. There was also a book authored by Kelley himself.

Among passing mention of other special rail cars, there is the one that departed Grand Central Terminal in New York on June 16, 1926. It consisted of seven stunning cars newly painted in cardinal red trimmed with gold carrying the Papal Legate and his entourage to the Eucharistic Congress in Chicago.

A video tape on the subject, very dependent on this book, is entitled *Railway to Heaven*.

JOHN R. MCCARTHY

Cleveland, Ohio

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

General and Miscellaneous

Krisis der Geschichte—Krisis der Kirchengeschichtschreibung. Kirchengeschichte nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg auf der Suche nach ihrem Grund und Gegenstand. Peter Gemeinhardt. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (2, 2002), 210–236.

Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global Modernity. Ryan Dunch. *History and Theory*, 41 (Oct., 2002), 301–325.

Quarante ans de Discours Pontificaux sur la santé (1939 à 1978). Regards de Pie XII, Jean XXIII et Paul VI sur le monde de la santé. Françoise Caravano and Pascal Ide. *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 39 (2001), 151–289.

L'enseignement du Collège Romain sur la justice et les origines de la pensée contemporaine. Joseph Joblin, S.I. *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 39 (2001), 105–127.

Der Rechtsstatus des Heiligen Bergs Athos. Christos Papadopoulos. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 376–390.

Studio storico-giuridico sui titoli del patriarca dei Greco-Melkiti. Ivan Zužek, S.J. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 68 (1, 2002), 175–203.

Nuestra Señora de la Esperanza de Ocaña. Su cronista, el P. Eusebio González de Torres. Antolín Abad Pérez. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 225–250.

I francescani si confrontano con la propria storia: ricerca storica e trasformazione istituzionale. Giuseppe Buffon, O.F.M. *Antonianum*, LXXVII (July–Sept., 2002), 557–573.

Algunas orientaciones sobre el estado actual de la historia de la Provincia Dominicana de Aragón (Siglos XIII–XIX). Alfonso Esponera, O.P., and Vito T. Gomez, O.P. *Teología Espiritual*, XLVI (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 7–39.

Escritoras en la historia de la Provincia Dominicana de Aragón. Celedonio Fuentes, O.P. *Teología Espiritual*, XLVI (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 59–72.

A Comparison of Nicholas of Pelhřimov and the Taborite Restoration with Alexander Campbell and the American Restoration Movement. Allen Diles. *Restoration Quarterly*, 44 (4, 2002), 241–254.

Die Laienmitglieder der ‚Famiglia Pontificia'. Hartmut Benz. *Römische Quartalschrift*, 97 (1–2, 2002), 123–145.

Legacies of a Slavic Pompeii. Kristin M. Romey. *Archaeology*, 55 (Nov.–Dec., 2002), 18–25.

Ancient

The Apostle Paul and Justin Martyr on the Miraculous: A Comparison of Appeals to Authority. James A. Kelhoffer. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 42 (Summer, 2001), 163–184.

Durchdachte Konfusion. Plinius, Trajan und das Christentum. Angelika Reichert. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche*, 93 (3/4, 2002), 227–250.

Surveying the Heavens: Early Christian Writers on Astronomy. Daniel F. Stramara, Jr. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 46 (2–3, 2002), 147–162.

Anti-Judaism and Care for the Poor in Aphrahat's *Demonstration* 20. Adam H. Becker. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 10 (Fall, 2002), 305–327.

Überfüllte Kirchen. Bischof Athanasius über den Kirchenbau in Alexandrien, Trier und Aquileia. Heinz Heinen. *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift*, III (2002), 194–211.

Why the Portiana? Reflections on the Milanese Basilica Crisis of 386. Marcia L. Colish. *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 10 (Fall, 2002), 361–372.

Edessa to Cassino: The Passage of Basil's *Asketikon* to the West. A. M. Silvas. *Vigiliae Christianae*, LVI (3, 2002), 247–259.

Die Donatistischen Konzilien von Cebarsussa (393) und Bagai (394). Bernard Kriegbaum. *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*, 124 (3, 2002), 267–277.

Frühchristliche Kirchen im Gebiet des Ammon-Tempels von Luqsur. Peter Grossman. *Römische Quartalschrift*, 97 (1–2, 2002), 17–39.

Sources et signification de Chalcédoine (451). G.-M. de Durand. *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques*, 86 (July–Sept., 2002), 369–385.

Une étude inédite de Franz Cumont sur le vocabulaire des inscriptions funéraires chrétiennes de Gaule. Bruno Rochette. *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, LXXII (2002), 5–44.

The Mosaic of the Transfiguration in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai: A Discussion of its Origins. A. Andreopoulos. *Byzantion*, LXXII (1, 2002), 9–41.

Saint Benedict's Biography and the Turning Tide of Controversy. Francis Clark. *American Benedictine Review*, 53 (Sept., 2002), 305–325.

Medieval

Traité acéphale arménien sur les trois premiers Conciles et son attribution probable à Jean Mayravanetsi. Michel van Esbroeck, S.J. *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 68 (1, 2002), 89–174.

Ritualité et chant sacré dans l'*Ordo Romanus primus* (VII-VIIIème Siècle). Franck Quoëx. *Aevum*, LXXVI (May–Aug., 2002), 253–265.

Die letzte Papstreise nach Byzanz: Der Besuch Papst Konstantins I. in Konstantinopel im Jahre 711. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Papstreisen. Klaus-Peter Todt. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (1, 2002), 24–50.

Northumbrian Whithorn and the Making of St. Ninian. James E. Fraser. *Innes Review*, 53 (Spring, 2002), 40–59.

Theodore of Studium Against the Iconoclasts: The Arguments of His Letters. Georgios Metallidis. *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 46 (2–3, 2002), 191–208.

Heresy and Empire: the Role of the Adoptionist Controversy in Charlemagne's Conquest of the Spanish March. Cullen J. Chandler. *International History Review*, XXIV (Sept., 2002), 505–527.

Die Privilegierung des Klosters Murrhardt durch Ludwig den Frommen. Heinrich Wagner. *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 57 (2, 2001), 421–450.

El poblamiento eclesiástico en Asturias (s. IX, X y XI). Rosario Carril Álvarez. *Studium Ovetense*, XXIX (2002), 271–295.

Le centre canonial de Saint-Martin de Tours et ses domains périphériques en val de Loire (IX^{e}-X^{e} siècles). Hélène Noizet. *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest*, 109 (2, 2002), 9–33.

Pontifices ovetenses (905–1012). Manuel Carriedo Tejedo. *Studium Ovetense*, XXIX (2002), 115–146.

Scandinavians Swearing Oaths in Tenth-Century Russia: Pagans and Christians. Martina Stein-Wilkeshuis. *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (June, 2002), 155–168.

Zur Gründung des Benediktinerinnenklosters Notre-Dame de Bouxières. Eine wiedergefundene Urkunde des 10. Jahrhunderts. Klaus Oschema. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, 110 (1–2, 2002), 182–190.

Un nouveau document à attribuer à Étienne II, évêque de Clermont (*ca* 950–*ca* 960). Jean-Pierre Chambon et Christian Lauranson-Rosaz. *Annales du Midi*, 114 (July–Sept., 2002), 351–363.

Donation pieuse et contrôle familial. Le cas de l'église Saint-Martin de Magrens, fin du X^e^–début du XII^e^ siècle. Hélène Couderc-Barraud. *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 45 (July–Sept., 2002), 217–236.

Un domaine négligée de la litérature médiolatine: les textes hagiographiques en vers. François Dolbeau. *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 45 (Apr.–June, 2002), 129–139.

Das Papsttum in der Chronik Thietmars von Merseburg. Pius Engelbert, OSB. *Römische Quartalschrift*, 97 (1–2, 2002), 89–122.

God and the Normans. David Crouch. *History Today*, 52 (Oct., 2002), 11–17.

Beobachtungen zum antiken Rom im hohen Mittelalter: Städtische Topographie als Herrschafts- und Erinnerungsraum. Steffen Diefenbach. *Römische Quartalschrift*, 97 (1–2, 2002), 40–88.

The Underclass in the First Crusade: A Historiographical Trend. D. Malkiel. *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (June, 2002), 169–197.

The Troubled Deathbeds of Henry I's Servants: Death, Confession, and Secular Conduct in the Twelfth Century. David Crouch. *Albion*, 34 (Spring, 2002), 24–36.

'Historiae spiritualis auctoritas' (*Dei gesta per Francos, Praefatio*) e 'Retrovaga Vestigia' (*De vita sua* II, 4): storia e memoria autobiografica in Guiberto di Nogent. Maria Lodovica Arduini. *Aevum*, LXXVI (May–Aug., 2002), 271–307.

Hermits and Hairshirts: The Social Meanings of Saintly Clothing in the *Vitae* of Godric of Finchale and Wulfric of Haselbury. D. Alexander. *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (Sept., 2002), 205–226.

Manuscripts in Polish Libraries Copied Before 1200 and the Expansion of Latin Christendom in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. Constant J. Mews. *Scriptorium*, LVI (1, 2002), 80–118.

Les ordres militaires et la ville (XII^e^–début du XIV^e^ siècle): l'exemple des commanderies urbaines de la basse vallée du Rhône. Damien Carraz. *Annales du Midi*, 114 (July–Sept., 2002), 275–292.

Zur päpstlichen Delegationsgerichtbarkeit im Mittelalter und in der frühen Neuzeit. Peter Herde. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 20–43.

Annatenerhebung und Patronatsrecht. Der Annatenbesitz des Stifts Saint-Victor vor Paris im 12. und beginnenden 13. Jahrhundert. Stefan Petersen. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 159–282.

Ein Stück religiöser Frauenliteratur aus dem 12. Jahrhundert. Hartmut Hoffmann. *Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters*, 57 (2, 2001), 501–514.

Il vescovo Sicardo di Cremona (1185–1215) e la fondazione del monastero di San Giovanni del Deserto. Elisabetta Filippini. *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento*, XXVII (2001), 13–55.

Die päpstlichen Register im Spannungsfeld zwischen Rechtswissenschaft und päpstlicher Normsetzung: Innocenz III. und die Compilatio Tertia. Andreas Thier. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 44–69.

I documenti originali Pontifici di Bari (1199–1400). Contributo all'*Index Romanorum Pontificum ab Innocentio III ad Martinum V electum*. Isabella Aurora. *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 39 (2001), 9–103.

L'iconographie de deux bas-reliefs de Saint-Jean-in-Tumba à Monte Sant'Angelo (Pouilles). Narration de la Passion et liturgie de l'Eucharistie. Alessia Trivellone. *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 45 (Apr.–June, 2002), 141–164.

Le portail du Jugement de Santa María la Mayor de Tudela. Julien Lance. *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale*, 45 (July–Sept., 2002), 255–274.

Un'isola nel Valpergato: il priorato benedettino di Belmonte. Luigi Bertotti. *Bollettino Storico-Bibliografico Subalpino*, XCX (1, 2002), 195–217.

Thirty-Nine Days and a Wake-up: The Impact of the Indulgence and Forty Days Service on the Albigensian Crusade, 1209–1218. Lawrence W. Marvin. *Historian*, 65 (Fall, 2002), 75–94.

Tipologia dell'insediamento minoritico in Terra di Lavoro (1217–1250). Gennaro Bove, OFMConv. *Miscellanea Francescana*, 102 (Jan.–June, 2002), 337–362.

Die Domannexstifte im Reich. Zusammenstellung und vergleichende Analyse. Frank G. Hirschmann. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 110–158.

L'abate Ardengo Visconti e il patrimonio del monastero di S. Ambrogio a S. Sepolcro presso Ternate (anni 1227–1240). Gerolamo Lozza. *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, LV (July–Dec., 2001), 395–438.

Athanasius' Life of Anthony as Monastic Paradigm for the First Life of St. Francis by Thomas of Celano: A Preliminary Outline. Sean Kinsella. *Antonianum*, LXXVII (July–Sept., 2002), 542–556.

"Doch wegen der Ehre des Kreuzes standen wir zusammen . . .". Östliches Christentum im Itinerar des Wilhelm von Rubruk (1253–1255). Peter Bruns. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (2, 2002), 147–171.

Saint Louis législateur au miroir des Mendiants. Jacques Krynen. *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome, Moyen Âge*, 113 (2, 2001), 945–961.

Die Konstitutionen Alexanders IV. (1255/56) und Clemens' IV. (1265/1267). Eine neue Form päpstlicher Gesetzgebung. Martin Bertram. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 70–109.

La Succession de l'archevêque Gilles de Nicosie (1268–1269). P. V. Claverie. *Le Moyen Age*, CVIII (2, 2002), 333–343.

Aspetti storici della missione di Giovanni da Montecorvino nel Cathay. Pacifico Sella, O.F.M. *Antonianum*, LXXVII (July–Sept., 2002), 475–502.

Conversion, Sex, and Segregation: Jews and Christians in Medieval Spain. David Nirenberg. *American Historical Review*, 107 (Oct., 2002), 1065–1093.

La duplice redazione della *Historia septem tribulationum* di Angelo Clareno. Gian Luca Potestà. *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, XXXVIII (1, 2002), 1–38.

A Fourteenth-Century Homiliary for Nuns. Barbara Crostini Lappin. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 95 (1, 2002), 35–68.

Il Catechismo del Concilio di Valladolid (1322). Luis Resines. *Itinerarium* (Messina), 10 (2002), 167–184.

Christian Days and Knights: The Religious Devotions and Court of David II of Scotland, 1329–71. Michael A. Penman. *Historical Research*, LXXV (Aug., 2002), 249–272.

La nef de l'ancienne cathédrale de Tréguier et la formation d'une architecture gothique régionale. Anne-Claude Le Boulc'h. *Annales de Bretagne et des Pays de l'Ouest*, 109 (2, 2002), 35–58.

'Non-controversial Lollardy'?: the Lollard attribution of the 'Diuers treateses of Joh. wiclife in English' (John Rylands Library, English MS 85). Richard Melia. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 83 (Spring, 2001), 89–102.

Chaucer and Wyclif: God's Miracles Against the Clergy's Magic. William Kamowski. *Chaucer Review*, 37 (1, 2002), 5–25.

Die Exemption des Bistums Meißen. Brigide Schwarz. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 294–361.

The Arrest of William Thorpe in Shrewsbury and the Anti-Lollard Statute of 1406. Maureen Jurkowski. *Historical Research*, LXXV (Aug., 2002), 273–295.

Sub Utraque Specie: The Arguments of John Hus and Jacoubek of Stříbro in Defence of Giving Communion to the Laity under Both Kinds. Hieromonk Patapios. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 53 (Oct., 2002), 503–522.

Über den Processus Iudicii des Johannes Urbach aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. Knut Wolfgang Nörr. *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 119, Kanonistische Abteilung 88 (2002), 283–293.

Credit and Parochial Charity in Fifteenth-Century Bruges. M. Galvin. *Journal of Medieval History*, 28 (June, 2002), 131–154.

Orthodoxie Byzantine et culture hellénique autour de 1453. Gilbert Dagron. *Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Moyen Âge*, 113 (2, 2001), 767–791.

Fiscalità pubblica e chiesa locale: l'estimo del clero di Padova del 1488–1492. Ermanno Orlando. *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, LV (July–Dec., 2001), 439–469.

Mass Conversion and Genealogical Mentalites: Jews and Christians in Fifteenth-Century Spain. David Nirenberg. *Past and Present*, No. 174 (Feb., 2002), 3–41.

Sixteenth Century

Auto de Fe in Palermo, 1511. The First Executions of Judaizers in Sicily. Nadia Zeldes. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 219 (Apr.–June, 2002), 193–223.

La identidad capuchina en los Anales de Zacarías Boverio (1524–1556) (I). Policarpo Felipe Alonso. *Naturaleza y Gracia*, XLIX (Jan.–Apr., 2002), 7–126.

"Es ist warlich eyn geringe lust darbey". Erasmus als Eheberater im Luthertum. Angelika Dörfler-Dierken. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (2, 2002), 172–189.

Henry VIII's Ecclesiastical and Collegiate Foundations. Richard Rex and C. D. C. Armstrong. *Historical Research*, LXXV (Nov., 2002), 390–407.

Riforma religiosa e lingua volgare nell'Italia del '500. Massimo Firpo. *Belfagor*, LVII (Sept., 2002), 517–540.

Sisters in Spirit: The Nuns of Sant'Ambrogio and Their Consorority in Early Sixteenth-Century Florence. Sharon T. Strocchia. *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXXIII (Fall, 2002), 735–767.

Creating the Image of a Martyr: John Porter, Bible Reader. Ronald E. Shields and James H. Forse. *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXXIII (Fall, 2002), 725–734.

Women and the Confraternity of Misericordia in the Early Modern Portuguese Seaborne Empire: Goa, Salvador da Bahia, Nagasaki. Haruko Nawata Ward. *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft*, 58 (4, 2002), 241–260.

"Be Fruitful and Multiply": Genesis and Generation in Reformation Germany. Kathleen Crowther-Heyck. *Renaissance Quarterly*, LV (Autumn, 2002), 904–935.

O Cardeal Infante D. Henrique, Arcebispo de Évora. Amélia Polónia. *Itinerarium* (Lisbon), XLVIII (Jan.–Apr., 2002), 103–200.

Vatican Secrets: Some Unpublished Correspondence of Sixteenth-Century Papal Nuncios at the French Court. Elizabeth Bonner. *Innes Review*, 53 (Spring, 2002), 60–78.

Censura e pauperismo tra Cinque e Seicento. Controriforma e cultura dei "senza lettere". Giorgio Caravale. *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, XXXVIII (1, 2002), 39–77.

From Cicero to Tasso: Humanism and the Education of the Novarese Parish Clergy (1565–1663). Thomas B. Deutscher. *Renaissance Quarterly*, LV (Autumn, 2002), 1005–1027.

Banqueros e inquisidores: el Condado de Módica y la financiación del proceso del arzobispo Carranza (1573–1578). Henar Pizarro Llorente. *Miscelánea Comillas*, 60 (Jan.–June, 2002), 129–142.

Une procession à nulle autre pareille. Pierre Hurtubise, O.M.I. *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae*, 39 (2001), 129–149.

Closing the Circle: Nicholas Owen and Walter Owen of Oxford. Alice Hogge. *Recusant History*, 26 (Oct., 2002), 291–300.

Tyrwhitt of Kettleby, Part I: Goddard Tyrwhitt, Martyr, 1580. Patrick Martin and John Finnis. *Recusant History*, 26 (Oct., 2002), 301–313.

Fray Mateo de Oviedo, OFM, Arzobispo de Dublín (1600). J. Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 327–344.

The Imprisonment of David Kinloch, 1588–1594: An Analysis of Newly Discovered Documents in the Archives of the Spanish Inquisition. Adam Yagüi-Beltrán and Laura Adam. *Innes Review*, 53 (Spring, 2002), 1–39.

Richard Hooker's Reputation. Diarmaid MacCulloch. *English Historical Review*, CXVII (Sept., 2002), 773–812.

"Subtiltie" Exposed: Pastoral Perspectives on Witch Belief in the Thought of George Clifford. Scott McGinnis. *Sixteenth Century Journal*, XXXIII (Fall, 2002), 665–686.

O Convento do Bosque: Na sombra de Casa de Bragança—séculos XVI–XVIII. Samuel Lopes do Rego. *Itinerarium* (Lisbon), XLVIII (Jan.–Apr., 2002), 83–101.

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

Ordine politico e coscienze nel Seicento in area cattolica. Miriam Turrini. *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento*, XXVII (2001), 391–415.

Du judaïsme au Catholicisme: les aléas de la foi au XVII^{e} siècle. Natalia Muchnik. *Revue Historique*, 126, CCCVII (July–Sept., 2002), 571–576.

Constituciones de la Orden de las Escuelas Pías. Génesis del texto fundacional. Severino Giner Guerri. *Archivum Scholarum Piarum*, XXVI (No. 51–52, 2002), 3–182.

Il capitolo della cattedrale di Trento durante il governo di Carlo Emanuele Madruzzo (1622–1658). Un corpo ecclesiastico tra politica e giurisdizione. Maria Albina Federico. *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento*, XXVII (2001), 73–106.

A disputed legacy: Anglican historiographies of the Reformation from the era of the Caroline divines to that of the Oxford Movement. Peter B. Nockles. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 83 (Spring, 2001), 121–167.

Madame de Gondi: A Contemporary Seventeenth-Century Life. John E. Rybolt, C.M., and Barbara B. Diefendorf. *Vincentian Heritage*, XXI (1, 2000), 25–43.

Revenant et exorcisme à Liège. Quête de reliques en Sardaigne (1634–1652). Philippe George. *Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire*, CLXVII (2001), 253–305.

Discord in Drogheda: A Window on Irish Church-State Relations in the Sixteen-Forties. Patrick Little. *Historical Research*, LXXV (Aug., 2002), 355–362.

Dal combattimento spirituale alle fondazioni carismatiche. Pratiche religiose e sacralizzazione del potere in Italia nell'età delle Paci di Westfalia. Guido Mongini. *Annali dell'Istituto storico italo-germanico in Trento*, XXVII (2001), 315–345.

Saint Vincent and Islam. Yves Danjou, C.M. *Vincentian Heritage*, XXI (1, 2000), 1–23.

Fictions of Privacy: House Chapels and the Spatial Accommodation of Religious Dissent in Early Modern Europe. Benjamin J. Kaplan. *American Historical Review*, 107 (Oct., 2002), 1031–1064.

La politique, de la pratique à la théorie: Bossuet dans les derniers feux de la fronde condéenne (Metz, Octobre 1653). Martial Gantelet. *XVII^e Siècle*, 54 (July–Sept., 2002), 485–510.

L'Explication de Fénelon: "marquer précisément ce qui est bon et de l'expérience des saints, en la réduisant à un langage correct". François Trémolières. *Rivista di Storia e Letteratura Religiosa*, XXXVIII (1, 2002), 79–99.

Entre Madrid et Bruxelles. Les nonces et le jansénisme à l'université de Louvain à la fin du XVII^e siècle. Agnès Vatican. *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, LXXII (2002), 45–90.

El voto de pobreza en la Provincia descalza de San José en el siglo XVIII. Daniel Vaquerín Aparicio. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 305–326.

Why is the Holy Image "True"? The Ontological Concept of Truth as a Principle of Self-Authentication of Folk Devotional Effigies in the 18th and 19th Century. Joanna Tokarska-Bakir. *Numen*, XLIX (3, 2002), 255–281.

La guerre des Cévennes (1702–1707). Camisards, catholiques civils et troupes royales: De l'affrontement bilatéral au triptyque insurrectionnel? Chrystel Bernat. *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses*, 77 (3, 2002), 359–383.

L'epistolario di S. Alfonso Maria de Liguori fra norma "classica" e lingua d'uso (1725–1763). Simona Longo. *Spicilegium Historicum Congregationis Ssmi Redemptoris*, L (1, 2002), 1–422.

Memoriales de franciscanos, misioneros en China, en el siglo XVIII. Manuel Castro y Castro. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 345–432.

Folio Editions of English Catholic Bibles and Testaments: A Comprehensive Bibliography. Sidney K. Ohlhausen. *Recusant History*, 26 (Oct., 2002), 259–290.

Data, Documentation and Display in Eighteenth-Century Investigations of Exeter Cathedral. Sam Smiles. *Art and History*, 25 (Sept., 2002), 500–519.

Limosna y Caridad en los Arzobispos de Sevilla (1755–1795). Manuel Martín Riego. *Isidorianum*, XI (2002), 415–476.

"Versuch eines fruchtbaren Auszugs aus der Kirchengeschichte". Johannn Salomo Semler über die Bedeutung und Aufgabe der Geschichte der Alten Kirche. Silke-Petra Bergjan. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (1, 2002), 51–74.

Dix lettres inédites de Giuseppe Garampi datant de sa première visite à travers les Provinces Unies, les Pays-Bas autrichiens et la Principauté de Liège en 1762 (Biblioteca Gambalunghiana de Rimini, Fondo *Eredi Garampi*). Dries Vanysacker. *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome*, LXXII (2002), 91–108.

A Community Apart? The Closure of the Scots College in Paris during the French Revolution, 1789–1794. M. G. Rapport. *Innes Review*, 53 (Spring, 2002), 79–107.

Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

El estudio de la lengua árabe entre los franciscanos de Marruecos. Creación en Tánger, en 1800, de una escuela de Árabe. Ramón Lourido Díaz. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 251–304.

William Bramwell: The Last of the Ancient Methodists. Charles Goodwin. *Asbury Theological Journal*, 54 (Spring, 1999), 59–66.

Antonio Rosmini e i Frati Minori Conventuali. Faustino Ossanna, OFMConv. *Miscellanea Francescana*, 102 (Jan.–June, 2002), 382–391.

Black Christian Republicanism: A Southern Ideology in Early Liberia, 1822 to 1847. Carl Patrick Burrowes. *Journal of Negro History*, LXXXVI (Winter, 2001), 30–44.

Die deutsche Kirchengeschichtsforschung und die Entstehung der Disziplin Kirchengeschichte als universitäres, theologisches Lehrfach in Finnland. Tarja-Liisa Luukkanen. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 113 (1, 2002), 75–90.

The Library of the Fathers. Austin Cooper. *Pacifica*, 15 (Oct., 2002), 294–306.

Newman and Dean Church. Edward J. Enright, O.S.A. *Downside Review*, 120 (Oct., 2002), 271–292.

Catecismos publicados en Asturias. Aportación bibliográfica. José Manuel Feito Álvarez. *Studium Ovetense*, XXIX (2002), 147–202.

Creating a Missionary Vicariate in Natal (Southern Africa). Economics in Catholic Missionary Culture. Part 2: The Economics of a New Vicariate in Roman Curial Culture. Stuart C. Bate. *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft,* 58 (3, 2002), 197–221.

Franz Overbeck: Ein Dissident der Moderne. Martin Arndt. *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte,* 113 (2, 2002), 190–209.

Le catholicisme social en Limousin de 1875 à 1914. Louis Pérouas. *Annales du Midi*, 114 (July–Sept., 2002), 319–329.

La Spagna e la questione romana: i pellegrinaggi carlisti a Roma (1876–1882). Marcella Aglietti. *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento*, LXXXIX (July–Sept., 2002), 381–406.

Distinguishing Catholics and Protestants among Irish Immigrants to Clydeside: A New Approach to Immigration and Ethnicity in Victorian Britain. John Foster, Muir Houston and Chris Madigan. *Irish Studies Review*, 10 (Aug., 2002), 171–192.

Those Horrible Iron Cages: The Sisters of the Church and the Care of Orphans in Late Victorian England. Rene Kollar, O.S.B. *American Benedictine Review*, 53 (Sept., 2002), 264–284.

Himmlischer Schutzpatron oder Ausgeburt der Hölle?—Ignatius von Loyola im Kontext des baskischen Nationalismus. Antje Bräcker. *Saeculum,* 53 (1, 2002), 127–155.

O Estado e a Igreja na 1.ª República. A. Reis do Carmo. *Humanistica e Teologia*, XXIII (1, 2002), 31–46.

British Catholicism and the British Army in the First World War. Michael Snape. *Recusant History*, 26 (Oct., 2002), 314–358.

Catholic Representatives in Parliament: The North West of England 1918–1945. John Davies. *Recusant History*, 26 (Oct., 2002), 359–383.

Bishop Daniel Cohalan of Cork on Republican Resistance and Hunger Strikes: A Theological Note. Pádraig Corkery. *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 67 (Summer, 2002), 113–124.

Modernism, Tradition and Debates on Religious Art in Ireland, 1920–1950. John Turpin. *Studies*, 91 (Autumn, 2002), 252–266.

The Life and Times of Vendelín Javorka: A Russian Odyssey. Constantin Simon. *Diakonia*, XXXV (1, 2002), 5–22.

O Papa entre Antígona e Creonte: Pio XI e a condenação do nazismo. A encíclica "Mit brennender Sorge" (14–3–1937). João Medina. *Humanistica e Teologia*, XXIII (1, 2002), 3–29.

The 'Holy Land', Zionism, and the Challenge to the Church. Michael Prior, C.M. *New Blackfriars*, 83 (Oct., 2002), 471–489.

De plain-pied au Concile: Albert Prignon, acteur et témoin à Vatican II. Jan Grootaers. *Revue théologique de Louvain*, 33 (July–Sept., 2002), 371–397.

On the Threshold of Modernity: Australian Bishops at Vatican II (The Third Session: 1964). Jeffrey J. Murphy. *Australasian Catholic Record*, 79 (Oct., 2002), 444–468.

Enrico Bartoletti tra concilio e post-concilio: il primato dell'evangelizzazione e la "commissione donna." Massimo Faggioli. *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia*, LV (July–Dec., 2001), 471–500.

American

Father Gregorio Bolivar's 1625 Report: A Vatican Source for the History of Early Virginia. Edward L. Bond, Jan L. Perkowski, and Alison P. Weber (Eds.). *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography*, 110 (Jan.–Apr., 2002), 69–86.

Private Lives [excerpt from the book *Common Whores, Vertuous Women, and Loving Wives: Free Will Christian Women in Colonial Maryland*]. Debra Meyers. *Maryland Historical Magazine*, 97 (Fall, 2002), 268–302.

Eusebio F. Chini nel Pantheon di Washington. Giuliano Raffo. *La Civiltà Cattolica*, 153, III (Sept. 7, 2002), 384–391.

Remembering Peter Faneuil: Yankees, Huguenots, and Ethnicity in Boston, 1743–1900. Jonathan M. Beagle. *New England Quarterly*, LXXV (Sept., 2002), 388–414.

Catholic Parish Life in the Antebellum South: Columbus, Georgia, 1830–1860. Michael J. McNally. *American Catholic Studies*, 113 (Spring–Summer, 2002), 1–30.

Beyond Self-Interest: The Political Theory and Practice of Evangelical Women in Antebellum America. Mark David Hall. *Journal of Church and State*, 44 (Summer, 2002), 477–499.

Infant Piety in New England: The Legacy of Horace Bushnell. Norman Pettit. *New England Quarterly*, LXXV (Sept., 2002), 444–465.

Protestantism, Progress, and Prosperity: John P. Clum and "Civilizing" the U.S. Southwest, 1871–1886. Douglass Firth Anderson. *Western Historical Quarterly*, XXXIII (Autumn, 2002), 315–335.

Religion, Gender, and the Lost Cause in South Carolina's 1876 Governor's Race: "Hampton or Hell!" W. Scott Poole. *Journal of Southern History*, LXVII (August, 2002), 573–598.

Admission Records of the St. Joseph Orphan Society, Louisville, 1888–1925 (part three). Mary Margaret Bell. *Kentucky Ancestors*, 37 (Winter, 2001), 98–101.

American Catholics and World Religions, Theory and Praxis: 1893–1959. Angelyn Dries, OSF. *American Catholic Studies*, 113 (Spring–Summer, 2002), 31–50.

From Religious Outsiders to Insiders: The Rise and Fall of Pacifism in the Churches of Christ. Michael W. Casey. *Journal of Church and State*, 44 (Summer, 2002), 455–475.

The Other Radio Priest: James Gillis's Opposition to Franklin Delano Roosevelt's Foreign Policy. Richard Gribble, C.S.C. *Journal of Church and State*, 44 (Summer, 2002), 501–519.

Crossing the Digital Divide, Alone and Together: The View from the Catholic University of America. Timothy J. Meagher. *American Catholic Studies*, 113 (Spring-Summer, 2002), 51–63.

The Genealogy of "Heresy": Leslie Dewart as Icon of the Catholic 1960s. William L. Portier. *American Catholic Studies*, 113 (Spring–Summer, 2002), 65–77.

An "Inevitable" Campus Controversy: The "Heresy Affair" at the University of Dayton, 1960–1967. Mary J. Brown. *American Catholic Studies*, 113 (Spring–Summer, 2002), 79–95.

Latin American

Los franciscanos y la cultura en México. Jaime Gonzálex Rodríguez. *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, LXII (Jan.–Aug., 2002), 1–224.

La Música y el canto en la Evangelización Novohispana. Juan Carlos Casas Gracía. *Efemerides Mexicana*, 20 (May–Aug., 2002), 231–266.

Los Prelados centroamericanos del siglo XVI. Circunstancias y Dificultades. Manuel Leal Lobón. *Isidorianum*, XI (2002), 393–413.

"To Lose One's Soul": Blasphemy and Slavery in New Spain, 1596–1669. Javier Villa-Flores. *Hispanic American Historical Review*, 82 (Aug., 2002), 435–468.

Infidels, Virgins, and the Black-Robed Priest: A Backwoods History of Ecuador's Montaña Region. Eduardo O. Kohn. *Ethnohistory*, 49 (Summer, 2002), 545–582.

The Virgin and the Inca: An Incaic Procession in the City of Cuzco in 1692. David Cahill. *Ethnohistory*, 49 (Summer, 2002), 611–649.

La Historia de la Iglesia en Colombia a través del Boletín. Luis Carlos Mantilla R., O.F.M. *Boletín de Historia y Antigüedades*, LXXXIX (July–Sept., 2002), 653–683.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

Aubert, R. (Ed.). *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques,* Fascicule 164: Julien de Cividale–Kalamona. (Paris: Letouzey et Ané. 2002. Cols. 513-787. Paperback.)

Banki, Judith H., and Eugene J. Fisher (Eds.). *A Prophet for Our Time: An Anthology of the Writings of Rabbi Marc H. Tanenbaum.* (New York: Fordham University Press. 2002. Pp. xxxii, 376. $45.00 cloth.)

Barth, Karl. *Protestant Theology in the Nineteenth Century: Its Background and History.* New edition. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 2002. Pp. xx, 652. $45.00 paperback.) First published in German as *Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert* (1947). English translation by Brian Cozens and John Bowden (1959).

Becker, Marvin B. *Florentine Essays: Selected Writings of Marvin B. Becker.* Collected by James Banker and Carol Lansing. (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. 2002. Pp. xi, 312. $60.00 cloth.) Among the eleven articles republished in this book are (2) "Florentine Politics and the Diffusion of Heresy in the Trecento: A Socioeconomic Inquiry" (1959); (4) "Church and State in Florence on the Eve of the Renaissance (1343-1382)" (1962); (8) "Heresy in Medieval and Renaissance Florence: A Comment" (1974); and (11) "Aspects of Lay Piety in Early Renaissance Florence" (1974.)

Burke, Nancy J. "Pre-Paid Phone Cards," "*Cosas,*" and "Photos of the Saints: Transnational Santería Practices in a Southwest City." [Latin American Institute, Research Paper Series No. 38.] (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico. 2002. Pp. 42. Paperback.)

Campbell, Julie (Trans. and Ed.). *Isabella Andreini, La Mirtilla: A Pastoral.* [Medieval & Renaissance Texts & Studies, Volume 242.] (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies. 2002. Pp. xxix, 105. $26.00.)

Connolly, S. J. *Priests and People in Pre-Famine Ireland, 1780-1845.* (Dublin: Four Courts Press. Distributed in the U.S. by ISBS, Portland, Ore. 2001. Pp. 285. $29.95 paperback.) Originally published by St. Martin's Press, New York, in 1982 and reviewed by Maurice R. O'Connell *ante*, LXX (October, 1984), 589-590.

Contreni, John J., and Santa Casciani (Eds.). *Word, Image, Number: Communication in the Middle Ages.* [Micrologus' Library, 8.] (Florence: SISMEL—Edizioni del Galluzzo. Distributed by Brepols Publishers, Turnhout,

Belgium. 2002. Pp. 457. Paperback.) Among the fourteen essays published here is "Sacred Oratory and Audience: Preaching in Medieval Italy," by Santa Casciani (pp. 247-262.)

Daley, Michael J. (Ed.). *Catholic Questions, Wise Answers.* (Cincinnati: St. Anthony Messenger Press. 2002. Pp. xxxiii, 543. $24.95 paperback.)

De La Torre, Miguel A. *The Quest for the Cuban Christ: A Historical Search.* (Gainsville: University Press of Florida. 2002. Pp. xvi, 202. $55.00 cloth.)

De Meester, Conrad, OCD. *With Empty Hands: The Message of St. Thérèse of Lisieux.* Trans. Mary Seymour. (London and New York: Burns and Oates. 2002. Pp. vii, 142. $14.95 paperback.)

deSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha*: *Message, Context, and Significance.* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic. 2002. Pp. 428. $29.99 cloth.)

Ganty, Étienne, Michel Hermans, and Pierre Sauvage (Eds.). *Tradition jésuite: Enseignement, spiritualité, mission.* (Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur; Brussels: Éditions Lessius. 2002. Pp. 184. 19,70 € paperback.)

Hall, Christopher A. *Learning Theology with the Church Fathers.* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press. 2002. Pp. 307. Paperback.)

Heyck, Denis Lynn Daly. *Surviving Globalization in Three Latin American Communities.* (Orchard Park, N.Y.: Broadview Press. 2002. Pp. 299. $18.95 paperback.)

Hill, Brennan R. *8 Spiritual Heroes: Their Search for God.* (Cincinnati: St. Anthony Messenger Press. 2002. Pp. x, 333. $14.95 paperback.) The "spiritual heroes" uncritically sketched in this popular attempt at "biographical theology" are Mohandas Gandhi, Dorothy Day, Martin Luther King, Jr., Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Oscar Romero, Edith Stein, Daniel Berrigan, and Mother Teresa.

Hollenbach, David, S.J. *The Common Good and Christian Ethics.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2002. Pp. xvi, 269. $65.00 hardback; $23.00 paperback.)

Hoose, Bernard (Ed.). *Authority in the Roman Catholic Church: Theory and Practice.* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate Publishing Company. 2002. Pp. xii, 253. $79.95.)

Keane, Eamonn. *A Generation Betrayed: Deconstructing Catholic Education in the English-Speaking World.* (New York: Hatherleigh Press. 2002. Pp. xxii, 316. $34.95 cloth.)

Kerr, Fergus. *After Aquinas: Versions of Thomism.* (Williston, Vt.: Blackwell Publishing. 2002. Pp. viii, 254. $26.95 paperback.)

Lambert, Malcolm. *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation.* Third edition. (Williston, Vt.: Blackwell Publishing. 2002. Pp. ix, 491. $34.95 paperback.) Originally published in 1977

by Holmes & Meier Publishers, New York, and reviewed by Jeffrey B. Russell *ante,* LXV (April, 1979), 350-352.

Linafelt, Tod (Ed.). *A Shadow of Glory: Reading the New Testament after the Holocaust.* (New York and London: Routledge. 2002. Pp. xi, 258. $24.95 paperback.)

Madrigal Terrazas, Santiago, S.J. *Estudios de Eclesiología Ignaciana.* [Biblioteca de Teología Comillas, Vol. 4.] (Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas; Desclée De Brouwer. 2002. Pp. 399. Paperback.)

Martin, Regis. *Unmasking the Devil: Dramas of Sin and Grace in the World of Flannery O'Connor.* [Gateway to Literature Series.] (Ypsilanti, Mich.: Sapientia Press. 2002. Pp. xxii, 66. $8.95 paperback.)

Perry, Richard D. and Rosalind W. *Maya Missions*: *Exploring Colonial Yucatan*. 2nd edition. (Santa Barbara: Espadaña Press. 2002. Pp. 256. $20.00 paperback.) Originally published in 1988 and reviewed by Marta Espejo-Ponce Hunt *ante,* LXXVI (January, 1990), 162.

Powell, Mark Allan. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Christian Music.* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers. 2002. Pp. 1088. $29.95 paperback.)

Ruland, Vernon, S.J. *Conscience Across Borders: An Ethics of Global Rights and Religious Pluralism.* (New York: Fordham University Press. 2002. Pp. xvi, 201. $15.95 paperback.)

Senior, Donald, Paul J. Achtemeier, Robert J. Karris, and George W. MacRae (Eds.). *Invitation to the Gospels.* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press. 2002. Pp. x, 406. $19.95 paperback.)

Smith, Jennifer Nimmo (Translated with an introduction and notes). *A Christian's Guide to Greek Culture: The Pseudo-Nonnus Commentaries on Sermons 4, 5, 39 and 43 by Gregory of Nazianzus.* [Translated Texts for Historians, Volume 37.] (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press. Distributed in the U.S.A. by Hopkins Fulfillment Service, Baltimore, Md. 2002. Pp. xlviii, 156. Paperback)

Sperber, Murray. *Shake Down the Thunder: The Creation of Notre Dame Football.* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 2002. Pp. xxii, 634. $24.95 paperback.) Originally published by Henry Holt and Company in 1993.

Sullivan, Maureen. *101 Questions and Answers on Vatican II.* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press. 2003. Pp. xiii, 133. $14.95 paperback.)

Vattimo, Gianni. *After Christianity.* Trans. Luca D'Isanto. [Italian Academy Lectures.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 2002. Pp. vii, 155. $24.50 cloth.)

Verhulst, Adriaan. *The Carolingian Economy.* [Cambridge Medieval Textbooks.] (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2002. Pp. ix, 160. $50.00 cloth; $18.00 paperback.)

Vermigli, Peter Martyr. *Commentary on the Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremiah.* Translated and edited, with introduction and notes, by Daniel Shute. [Peter Martyr Library, Vol. VI; Sixteenth Century Essays & Studies, Volume LV.] (Kirksville, Mo.: Truman State University Press. 2002. Pp. lxviii, 223.)

Walter, James J., Timothy E. O'Connell, and Thomas A. Shannon (Eds.). *A Call to Fidelity: On the Moral Theology of Charles E. Curran.* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 2002. Pp. viii, 310. $44.95 cloth, $27.50 paperback.)

Wiley, Tatha. *Original Sin: Origins, Developments, Contemporary Meanings.* (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press. 2002. Pp. vii, 276. $19.95 paperback.)

Wood, Diana. *Medieval Economic Thought.* [Cambridge Medieval Textbooks.] (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2002. Pp. xii, 259. $55.00 cloth; $20.00 paperback.)