

**1975** Over the years the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* has proved an invaluable work-tool not only for the student but for the preacher and retreat director who believe in doing their homework. The latest volume to appear deals, among other topics of wide interest, with play, fasting, the Jesus prayer and the Book of Job. It also concludes the article on the Jesuits, left suspended in mid-sentence and mid-Germany in 1973. The WAY

**1977** The *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* continues to preserve the high standard of research and scholarship for which it is known. As usual one can divide the material into persons and topics. There are four major articles : *Liberté et Libération*, *Liturgie et Spiritualité*, *Luther*, and *Luke*. The first covers such an immense field that the authors have rightly limited the area. It deals neither with the psychological conditions for liberty nor with the theology of liberation - the latter no doubt because this is a comparatively new field of theological reflex ion, which has not yet taken a sufficiently defined shape. It is the work of four contributors - a moderate and balanced article. A shorter article, *Loi et l'Évangile*, might well be considered a pendant to this. The article, *Liturgie et Spiritualité*, is the longest and most complete, running to 67 columns, and is the work of 8 contributors. It moves from its first beginnings in the Old and New Testament to its development, expression, and reflection in the spirituality of East and West, and concludes with Vatican II, its place in the Christian life, in the life of prayer, and the theological problems that are raised. This is a valuable and timely article.

Two shorter articles deal with aspects of the liturgy in a wider sense under the titles of *Louange* and *Litanies*. The article on *Luther* is sympathetic in its treatment and brings out what is best in Luther's thought. The presentation is in a historical context, showing how his thought developed and concluding with an account of the matJre thought of Luther. In describing the spirituality which finds its origin in Luther — Luthériennes (spiritualités) — we are given some very clear and penetrating insights. The article on *Luke* gathers together the fruits of modern scholarship with a special application to the spirituality of St Luke.

The theme of Light is the subject of an article of considerable length (*Lumière*). Since it is a Biblical theme of great richness and pervades all Christian spirituality of both East and West, its treatment, in a work of this nature, is necessarily dense. It is a valuable article, the work of five contributors.

Amongst the articles on people three are probably of more general interest : the very full account of *Libermann*, which is completed in this number, and the articles on *Louis-Marie Grignon de Montfort* and *Louis de Marillac*, co-founder of the Sisters of Charity.

As usual there are valuable bibliographies throughout. The *Dictionnaire* remains a necessary instrument for anyone engaged in the study of spirituality, and is for those not so engaged a very valuable source of up to date information and, dare I say it, of inspiration.

Paul KENNEDY, The MONTH

1980

There is no need to say again how thorough and careful this work is.

The reviewer is only embarassed not to be able to present some of the detail which makes the whole so impressive. Respectful thanks and admiration is the first and last word, before and after all criticism. Very briefly I'd like to present and comment on the article on the Virgin Mary (Tome X, col. 409-482). More than seventy columns long it is one of the longest articles in this volume, perhaps second after the article on mysticism (col. 1890-1983). It is divided into six paragraphs, each the work of a recognized specialist : 1) *Mary in Scripture*, P. GRELOT ; 2) *Marian spirituality of the Fathers from the second to the eighth centuries*, D. FERNANDEZ ; 3) *Mary in the Middle Ages*, T. KOEHLER ; 4) *From the middle of the seventeenth to the beginning of the twentieth centuries*, S. DE FIORES ; 5) *The twentieth century*, R. LAURENTIN ; and 6) *The dogmatic grounds of Marian piety and spirituality*, R.

LAURENTIN.

The work of these historians is theologically valuable to the extent that it helps us to see how and why Marian symbols were meaningful and true in particular past cultural situations. This should aid us in understanding why these symbols do or do not function as meaningful and true today. Even though there are at the present time some signs of a kind of revival of Marian piety and devotion, I think that the overall situation is still one of crisis. That is to say that the memory of Mary is not experienced in a lively and transforming way. The historian and the historical theologian have an indispensable role in clarifying the factors and conditions which make particular symbols work in any cultural situation, in this case the Marian symbols of the Christian faith in today's western world.

Grelot's presentation of Mary and the Scriptures is clear, concise and balanced. Among the Old Testament themes that have played a part in the development of the Church's Marian memory and piety there is the personification of Wisdom in the Sapiential literature. Although the liturgy applies some wisdom texts to Mary and although Grignion de Montfort found in them expressions of his Marian piety, it must be carefully noted that the New Testament applies them exclusively to Jesus, never to Mary. This is important for the theme of mediation. Such texts cannot be used to develop an understanding of a Marian mediation similar to Christ's, as if Mary were without need of the redemption effected in the coming forth of Christ. With regard to the New Testament Marian texts Grelot is pretty much in the line of the most recent exegetical work. He excludes any reference to the virginal conception in the Pauline texts *Rom* 1, 1-4 and *Gal* 4,4. The text of *Mk* 15,40 makes clear that the "brothers" of Jesus in *Mk* 6,3 are only cousins. Of course not all would agree that this question of the meaning of "brothers" can be answered definitively in terms of the text itself. *Mk* 10,29 contains indirect praise of Jesus' parents in so far as we can attribute to them the education of Jesus to the perception of the priority of God's will over all human connections. The infancy story of Luke is a «theological reflection (which) carries forward in some way the interior meditations of Jesus' Mother». Grelot connects the sword in *Lk* 2,35 to Calvary. But I wonder if this can be Luke's meaning since he does not have Mary present at Calvary. Perhaps the sword symbolizes the inevitable and painful process of discernment and growth in faith. *In* 1, 13 is read in the plural, so it is not a reference to the virginal conception. If Mary at Cana is the model of perfect faith, why in 2, 11 are she and the brothers distinguished from the disciples who believed in Jesus through the manifestation of his glory ? Just as the question of the brothers' faith is settled in 7,5 with word of their unbelief, is not the question of Mary's faith answered in 19, 25-27 ? The text of *Rev* 12,1-5 has a primary meaning which supports the later dogmatic definitions of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption. Grelot concludes with this judicious comment on the importance of Scripture for control of all Marian piety and theology : «It's the only way to avoid going off into adventurous constructions of human logic or pure and simple fantasy. As for private apparitions, even those recognized by the Church, they can add nothing to the revelation of God's plan given once and for all in the apostolic tradition. The apparitions draw attention to certain aspects of this revelation according to the needs of one period or another. »

Fernandez makes clear that in the patristic period we find all the elements of authentic Marian piety and spirituality, as well as all that is essential to the Church's doctrine and faith with regard to Mary. It begins with Irenaeus' recognition of Mary as «cause of our salvation», «who intercedes for Eve», and goes ahead to the Byzantine authors whose enthusiasm for the Mother of God knew no limits: Germain of Constantinople (t 733) who says that no one is saved without Mary's intervention and that God obeys Mary his Mother. Tertullian and Origen insist on the "Virgin" Mary as model of faith and discipleship, with some ideas very similar to what we find in *Marialis cultus* : Mary is model of Christian worship as the prayerful and offering Virgin. Mary was model for Egyptian monasticism: woman of prayer, separated from the affairs of the world, living in the company of the angels, ridding every bad thought instantly. Ephrem

associates Mary with the Eucharist: the sacramental body of Christ is the one born of Mary. And Cyril of Jerusalem presents her in the baptismal catechesis regarding the incarnation. With regard to St. Augustine Fernandez notes the large place the Bishop of Hippo gives to Mary as model of faith and as type of the Church. The difficulties that Augustine had in situating Mary in the context of the universality of sin, while recognizing at the same time her special holiness, lead to the statement about her not being born in subjection to the devil, even though all are touched by original sin in the process of generation. Fernandez remarks : « It is a fact that the Augustinian doctrine was for a long time an obstacle to the admission of the Immaculate Conception by western theologians. Today there would be less inclination to admit a privilege for Mary than to suppress this law of sin which follows from a false interpretation of Scripture ». This reflects his interpretation of original sin as "situation of sin" rather than as a transmitted guilt and responsibility with the effects of lost justice and sanctity (cf. his *El pecado original*, 1973, pp. 125-128). Finally, after Ephesus, we find the finely balanced Mariology of Leo the Great who sees Mary always in relationship to Christ and the Mystical Body. The generation of Christ and of Christians is the work of the Holy Spirit who « dedit aquae quod dedit matri ». Koehler concentrates on Marian spirituality in the West. He considers Marian iconography and her growing presence in the liturgy and in private devotion. He gives special attention to the twelfth century as the great Marian century, then to the lights and shadows of Marian piety in the 14th-17th centuries. In the Eastern liturgy there are numerous connections between Mary and the Eucharist. An anaphora of the 10th century, is modelled on the Angelic Salutation : « Let your Holy Spirit come, let its shadow descend and rest on us and these offerings ». The breaking of the bread is seen as the separation of the body of Christ from the Virgin Mary : it's the mystery of Bethlehem. Two pieces of bread are placed on the paten. The first symbolizes Christ, the second is a remembrance of Mary. Overall Mary is presented in iconography, liturgy and homilies as one having special access to the world of the invisible, the spiritual. First Christ and Mary, then the angels and the saints, have unique access to the unseen holy. In both East and West the Virgin Mary is the symbol through which or in which we see the mystery of God as mystery of mercy and forgiveness, a mystery of justice grounded in love. If Jesus is the visible image of the Father, Mary is the image or sign of saving and redeeming incarnation. De Fiores presents the movement of Marian piety and devotion from France in the 17th century, to Italy in the 18th, then to England in the 19th. The rationalism of the 18th century brought about a limiting of Marian piety and theology, with exceptions of course, especially the work of St. Alphonsus Ligouri. In the 19th century, after the French revolution, there is the important phenomenon of numerous religious congregations with a markedly Marian spirituality. Theologically there is the contribution of the century's outstanding convert, John Henry Newman.

Laurentin's brief summary of the 20th century covers the work of Cardinal Mercier and his promotion of the doctrine of Mary's mediation, which Pius XII little by little left aside. Then there is the II Vatican Council which opted not to draw up a separate Marian document. In the postconciliar period we witness incredulity with regard to the virginal conception, the questioning of the latest Marian dogmas, reflections aimed at distinguishing the role of the Holy Spirit from that of Mary (under the presupposition that certain Marian piety obscured it), and the neglect of Mary in the recent theology of liberation (except for the appreciation of the Magnificat). On the other hand the renewal of popular religion and the theology of the feast tend to give attention to traditional Marian piety. An approach to Mary by way of the *via pulchritudinis*, in line with the esthetic theology of Urs von Balthasar has also contributed to a renewal of a theology of Mary.

In conclusion Laurentin sees in Mary's formal connection with the Incarnation and the Communion of Saints the ground of the memory of her lasting through all generations. It is in Mary as woman of faith, consciously and freely involved in the presence of Christ in the world,

and as woman inspiring hope in the community, that the memory of Mary is most alive in the Church today.

This rather long review is most of all an expression of appreciation for the work of these authors. In a relatively brief space they have given us an outstanding summary of the story of the memory of Mary in the first twenty centuries of Christianity.

MARIANUM John M. DOWD

**1981** Formerly we have noticed the succeeding fascicules of the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* under the rubric 'Spirituality'. But the completion of the letter M (tome X, *Mabille-Alythe*) gives us the opportunity to stress the Encyclopaedia's increasing importance for all the sacred disciplines. A very convincing illustration of this is the penultimate entry *Mystère-Mystique* (cols 1853-1984). Its developing quality is due in no small measure to the energy and expertise of its late director for twenty years, Andre Rayez S.J., *Lux perpetua luceat ei!*

The WAY

**1983** This double fascicle concludes vol. II of a work that is already a classic, indispensable point of reference for anyone seriously interested in Christian spirituality and allied questions. In addition to the numerous shorter pieces on lesser figures in the history of spirituality, of special interest to OCP readers will be the articles *Œcuménisme, Office divin en orient, Origène, Orthodoxe (Spiritualité)*. In a work of such immense scope, judicious selection must guide each author's synthesis. The same is true for the reviewer, limited by both space and competence to a few remarks on some of the mass of riches available here.

*Œcuménisme* could perhaps have given a more realistic picture of the actual situation regarding eucharistic sharing and hospitality, which, like it or not, is an established custom in some circles, and by no means limited to "quelques cas". Honesty requires one to ask whether, in spite of obvious abuses and superficiality, it is not time to face up to the statement such liturgies are making to the Churches today. I would have wished, too, for more development of ecumenism as a Christian spiritual outlook, based on love, that seeks to see good rather than evil, to stress what unites rather than what divides, and to love all regardless of past or present obstacles. Furthermore, I think credit could have been given to the enormous progress that has resulted in recent years from what I would call "ecumenical scholarship". This is the ecumenism that comes from simple scholarly honesty and objectivity on the part of those willing to view other traditions with honesty, fairness, and even sympathy.

The two articles on the Divine Office suffer from an East-West division that is helpful only after the end of Late Antiquity, and in fact the treatment of the 4-5th century sources is inadequate in both articles. For instance, the Egyptian sources, of overriding importance for the history of the monastic office, are treated *per modum unius*, though this is no longer possible since the work of A. Veilleux (who is not even cited in the bibliography). G.-M. OURY'S article *Office divin (en Occident)* treats the later history of the Latin office with greater care, though I would have given more space to the curial office and its adoption and diffusion by the Friars Minor, which had an importance far beyond the question of "private recitation". I would also have preferred a more critical view of the Vatican II reform : not for its teaching on the Liturgy of the Hours, which is exemplary, but for the office that ultimately issued from the reform. It is a monasticized prayerbook for the clergy, ill-suited for popular and parochial celebration. At least two members of the commission, J. Mateos and Hermann Schmidt, knew better, but they were voices crying in the wilderness.

Article 2 on the office "en orient" by M. ARRANZ is a misnomer : after a brief introduction on the early eastern sources, it is limited to the Byzantine monastic office of St. Sabas. The treatment of the Byzantine material is a masterpiece, but the introduction on the early sources is open to criticism. The discussion of the Palestinian office as described by Cassian implies

that there was a daily "vigile de la nuit comme en Égypte" (709). In fact, there was a *night* office neither in Lower Egypt nor in Palestine.' The Egyptians had two synaxes, before retiring and on rising. The fact that the monks went to bed earlier and slept less, so that the morning synaxis was a pre-dawn vigil, does not make either of these offices a proper night office. So the corresponding Palestinian offices in Cassian's description were vespers and what A. calls the "vigile pre-matinal". The night office was celebrated on Friday (*Inst.* III, 8-9). As for the origins of the Byzantine monastic office, I am not convinced that nocturns and lauds formed one single orthros as early as A. thinks. Is it not also possible that the original Basilian night hour was precisely this present nocturnal office now prefixed to orthros? The omission of mesonyktikon when there is a vigil uniting vespers and orthros, and the insertion of the resurrection vigil between nocturns and lauds on Sundays and feasts, would support my view that the psalmody at the beginning of today's orthros was once a separate office, the original Byzantine monastic nocturns. Further, in the amalgam of monastic and secular uses some account should have been taken of the monastic psalmody prefixed to lychnikon, which corresponds, it seems, to the Egyptian prayer after supper. Thus Great Compline would be comparable to the occasional night vigils of the ascetics rather than to the Egyptian late-afternoon synaxis celebrated at about the ninth hour. These night vigils were of private devotion except on weekends.

Parts 2-3 of A's article (710-720) are a superb summary of the formation and present structure of the Sabaitic office, a truly masterful synthesis by one whose command of the material is without peer. Not only is the evolution of the rite traced, but at every stage it is placed in the broader context of the history of the Byzantine Church and Empire. No better account of this material exists anywhere. Note, however, that the patriarch who authored the 14th-century diataxis is not Dositheus but Philotheus Kokkinos. And why is the bibliography on the office in other (non-Byzantine) Eastern Churches limited to the Syrian traditions, with no mention of the others? It is true that there is practically nothing on the Armenian office in western languages, but for the Coptic office we have the works of Quecke, Burmester and Brogi, and for the Ethiopian the works of Velat in PO 32-33.

*Origène* is by another undisputed master, H. CROUZEL. Theology owes so much to Origen that we sometimes forget his apostolic activities, his sufferings for the faith, and his personal holiness and spiritual doctrine. Origen was a spiritual master as well as an exegete and systematician. Nor can the three be separated, for his exegesis and theology, like that of all true theologians, was also the fruit of contemplation. It is from this point of view that C. presents his fine summary of Origen's anthropology and his teaching on ascetical and mystical theology, concluding with a section on Origen's enormous influence in the later history of Christian thought, an influence paralleled by no one except, perhaps, by Augustine in the West.

T. SPIDLIK'S article *Orthodoxe (Spiritualité)*, the fruit of long years of study as seen in his full treatise on eastern spirituality in OCA 206, treats Orthodox spirituality under the following characteristics: traditional, monastic, cosmic, social and anthropological. It would be difficult to find in so few pages a more complete and balanced synthesis. And the point of view is objective and ecumenical: like his mentor I. Hausherr, the founder of the scientific study of eastern spirituality, S. is not one of those that bend over backwards to find oppositions between East and West. Similarities and differences are recognized with the serene objectivity they deserve.

One can only greet the appearance of this conclusion to vol. II with the same gratitude and admiration that earlier fascicles of the DS<sub>p</sub> have deserved.

R. TAFT, ORIENTALIA CHRISTIANA PERIODICA

**1983** It is a pleasure to note the arrival of the latest fascicules (Ochino-Ozanam) of the

*Dictionnaire de spiritualité* which is a vital resource for any serious student of spirituality. There are major articles on ecumenism, the Office, prayer and orthodox spirituality.

The WAY

**1989** At the more academic end of the spirituality spectrum, the massive *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, inaugurated by French Jesuits in 1937, ninety-one fascicules ago, has reached the letter 'S'. The two latest sections, *Robert d'Arbrissel-Ryelandt*, and *Sabbatini-Savonarola*, include major articles on *Cisterciens* (under the title of Robert de Molesmes), *Rosaire*, *Royaume de Dieu*, *Russie*, *Sacerdoce*, *Sagesse*, *Saints* and *Salut*. The overall balance has shifted in comparison with the earliest volumes : the thematic articles now tend to be shorter and there are more biographical entries of less well-known figures in the history of spirituality, a service which no other reference book in the world offers so fully. As in previous volumes, the perspective is a deliberately Roman Catholic one and the strengths of the longer entries lie in their presentation of a historical survey of an institution, a movement, a country, a group of people or a particular theme. Bibliographies of sources and of selected secondary works in various languages are provided as well as some cross-references to relevant articles in earlier volumes.

David LONSDALE, The WAY

**1990** The latest volume of the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, 'Savaronola' to 'Spiritualité', is something of a bumper edition. With articles on sexuality and spirituality published cheek by jowl with solitude, salt, sun and sleep it appears to be making promises as extravagant as any holiday brochure. In the event, however, balance is assured by fascinating entries on Scupoli and the various Seraphims, amongst others. The collection remains faithfully true to the brief first elaborated in 1929. As a dictionary of ascetical and mystical spirituality it is concerned both with history-at which it excels-and with theology as well.

The WAY