

Machiavelli was both scientist and humanist, seeking new truth independently and conserving the wisdom of tradition. He saw the physical and intellectual dimensions of power but missed the moral dimension. It was his own unique personal experience which accounts for this blindness to the reality of spiritual forces in men and events. More grew up in a different environment but faced many of the same problems. In his *Utopia* he sought to describe the ideal society based on reason alone, but unlike Machiavelli's conception of society, More's was completely static. "To Machiavelli the real world is a continuous struggle for power between competing vitalities; to More, in *Utopia*, it is a world in which power can be controlled and disciplined, nay even rendered harmless." Whereas Machiavelli only took up his pen after losing his political position, More gave up his career as Christian humanist and social reformer to enter the service of his king. Harbison believes that the tension between their views of society and reform, i. e. between the realist and the moralist still prevails.

The other essays in the second section include a concise analysis of the Protestant reformation for laymen and two studies on Calvin, "The Idea of Utility in the Thought of John Calvin" and "Calvin's Sense of History". All the essays in this volume underscore the historical world's loss of a colleague known at home for his teaching and at large for his perceptive scholarship.

Nashville, Tennessee/U.S.A.

Gregory T. Armstrong

Friedrich Gontard: Die Päpste und die Konzilien. München (Kurt Desch) 1963. 638 S., 158 Abb., geb. DM 18.50.

ders.: The Chair of Peter. A History of the Papacy. Trans. by A. J. and E. F. Peeler. New York (Holt, Rinehart and Winston) 1964. 629 pp., 169 illustrations, \$ 12.50.

It is becoming increasingly common for important books to appear virtually simultaneously in two or more languages. Most often it involves books commanding a wide audience. Such is the case here, for Gontard has written his history for the general reader whose interest has been aroused by the current Vatican Council or the recent change of pontiffs. His work makes no claim to be a scholarly history of this ancient and complex institution. It presents rather a panorama of the popes, a lively but episodic narrative, concentrating on the personalities – sometimes famous, sometimes obscure, yet always fascinating. Thus although it is a big and handsome book with over 500 pages of text, it reads well, in translation as well as in the original. The scholar, however, will have occasion to ponder the source of the author's information and his conclusions.

Unfortunately no bibliography is provided, not even suggestions for further reading, although the German edition includes a long list of names of writers on the papacy. Likewise there are no footnotes. One learns from the American publisher that Gontard is a Protestant but could infer it from the absence of the imprimatur. His qualifications as a scholar are left unstated, and he must be judged by his product. Nevertheless, it would be unfair to expect what he does not intend to give, a scholar's account of the papacy. He makes no claim to be a Caspar, Seppelt or Ullmann, although their names are on his list. In reading him with a critical eye one ought not to underestimate the task which he has faced in compressing nearly 2000 years of history into one volume of fairly continuous narrative free from evident partisanship.

What then does the general reader find? First, he will be struck by the "flash-back" or "in medias res" technique which is used repeatedly. Gontard is disposed to skip from one exciting event to the next, picking up the intervening developments, including often several pontificates, in brief summaries. The net effect is twofold: a sense of constant forward movement and a confusion over chronology. Indeed even in discussing a single pope the chronology frequently appears jumbled. The author's skipping across decades and generations may not be judged a serious fault; it is a necessity if the narrative is to be held within bounds. Generally, Gontard has

chosen well in his omissions. He has captured the great personalities and provided some striking comparisons, e. g., that between the late John XXIII and Benedict XIV. Especially skillful too is the introduction of future popes as they were active in earlier pontificates. Still the book retains an episodic quality.

The general reader is likely to be confused by the many different currencies referred to in discussing papal finances, e. g., scudi, ducats, francs, florins, thaler, lire, and shillings, as well as pounds sterling and dollars in the English edition. There is also the addiction to superlatives – the firsts, the greatest, the most of papal history – which characterizes so many books written for the general public. Perhaps it is this practice that makes one suspect that Gontard is a journalist. One may question the appropriateness of some chapter titles and subtitles, e. g., “Peter Unchained” for the latter years of the ninth century. In one case however, “An unbaptized pope?”, the English edition omits the paragraph to which the subtitle refers, namely the report that Alexander VI was not baptized until the death of Savonarola (S. 337, p. 357). One also notes that the picture captions are occasionally clearer or more accurate than the text.

The first of eight major sections, “The Church of the Fishers of Men,” is marked by a heavy dependence on legend. The willing ness to follow the legends on Peter and Clement of Rome is at least understandable, for without legend there would be little to talk about except conflicting scholarly opinions. But the order of events in the account of Peter and Paul is monumentially confounded, and surely one must pause before such assertions as “Peter and Philip were married, but, like their wives, had no carnal desire.” (S. 51, p. 49). Is it accurate or necessary to use a subtitle. “The first papal chair is set up in Antioch”? (S. 52, p. 50) What evidence is there that the Christian community returned to Jerusalem from Pella after A. D. 70? (S. 54, p. 53) *Codex Alexandrinus* (5th C.) is scarcely the original manuscript of Clement’s Epistle. (S. 70, p. 70) One must also take exception to the statement, “According to the most recent researches, John’s Gospel originated in the monasteries of the Essenes, whose spirit is revealed in the papyrus rolls of Qumran.” (S. 71, p. 71) Moreover, even if one allows a partly historical, partly legendary, partly fictional re-creation of the first hundred or more years of the Church, one can by no stretch of the imagination picture Tertullian at the age of thirty visiting Irenaeus in Lyons, which incidentally is not “at the other end of the Roman Empire” from Carthage. (S. 79, p. 80) Tertullian was quite possibly not even a Christian at that date. Again, the author overlooks Basil of Caesarea and Pachomius when he claims that “Augustine’s was the oldest monastic rule in Christendom.” (S. 124, p. 130) The paragraph on the Itala (wrongly rendered “Italia” in the English edition) is completely and simply wrong in defining this Old Latin text tradition as Augustine’s translation from the Greek. (S. 126, p. 132).

The second section, “The Church of the Popes and Kings,” is much less given to the use of legend, especially and properly in the brief discussion of the “Regiment of Women” in the tenth century. In the third section, “Church Against Church,” one misses any explanation of the origin of the cardinal bishops, priests and deacons, important offices from Leo IX onward. Thus the catalogue of popes in the appendix may be a century ahead of itself in designating Felix III (II), who was elected pope in 483, a cardinal priest. It may also be stretching a point to term St. Peter’s “the oldest site of the Church in Western Europe” (S. 207, p. 220). Again is it accurate to speak of a centuries old schism between Rome and Constantinople prior to 1054? (S. 215, p. 228, et passim) The so-called second Photian Schism would seem to have been disproven by now. Unnecessary chronological confusion seems to enter the account of Innocent II.

With the opening of the fourth section, “The Church in Glory“, at the Fourth Lateran Council, the reader may well ask what happened to Pope Alexander III and Frederick Barbarossa. He will find them mentioned only briefly as antecedents to Innocent III’s pontificate. There are from time to time surprising factual errors in the text. For example, Thomas Aquinas was hardly born 100 years after St. Dominic. (S. 277, p. 293) Fifty years would be closer if we could even be sure of

Dominic's birth date. Or earlier, Leo IX is placed 60 instead of 160 years before the Fourth Lateran Council. (S. 250, p. 264) The reviewer is no military historian, but he wonders how Florence with a population of 50,000 to 60,000 around 1300 could support a standing army of 90,000. (S. 286, p. 302) Elsewhere it is just the arrangement of the narrative which is misleading so that Catherine of Siena appears to have become a nun by the age of 10. (S. 308, p. 326) Another sentence has Cardinal Robert of Geneva elected anti-pope seventeen years after the massacre of Cesena in 1377 and, in the same sentence, maintaining his claim to the papacy until his death in 1394. (S. 315, p. 334) Both the German and English editions date Wycliffe's death to 1348. (S. 321, p. 340) Perhaps the reviewer may also be permitted some skepticism about the authenticity of the "crown of Silvester I" which Benedict XIII carried off to Spain. (S. 325, p. 345) But probably one should not belabor such points too much.

The important sixth section, "The Struggling Church", from Trent to the middle of the eighteenth century paints a somewhat sketchy picture of events as a whole, but it includes three or four excellent characterizations – especially Sixtus V and Benedict XIV. Again questions of interpretation arise. Were the Jesuits "the first, as a body, to oppose the Church's identification with princship and secularism"? (S. 395, p. 420) Perhaps they were the first in the Counter-Reformation, but what about the Franciscans? On what basis is Giovanni Cardinal Morone considered English? (S. 407, p. 433) It would have been interesting to hear the story of how Alexander VIII, an octogenarian, obtained concessions from Louis XIV after Innocent XI had had so much difficulty, but some omissions must be accepted graciously. Several corrections in this section may be noted. 455 for the Vandal invasion, not 452. (S. 388, p. 412); Clement VII, not VI (S. 401, p. 426); Marcellus II, not III (S. 408, p. 434); 1625, not 1525 (S. 410, p. 436); Henry III, not II (S. 416, p. 443).

The seventh section, "Church and Nation", carries the papacy from 1769 to 1878. The reviewer wonders why the departure of Innocent IV for Lyons is cited as the last such papal journey from Italy until Pius VI in 1782. (S. 448, p. 478) Surely the Avignon papacy and perhaps even the Council of Constance were occasions when the popes left Italy. The last section, "The Church – The Conscience of 450 Million Catholics," brings the reader down to the Vatican Council of 1962, and, in the case of the English edition, to the election of Paul VI. The flashback technique is still being used at the end of the book, and the subtitles are still occasionally enigmatic, e. g., "The first cardinal created: the convert John Henry Newmann." (S. 484, p. 518) The brief reference to the end of the Second World War in Italy could leave the impression that Hitler poisoned himself in 1943. (S. 517, p. 556). Perhaps the question of whether Pius XII "planned to elevate the Mother of God to be the great mediatrix between man and God" should be left open rather than pronouncing, "His death prevented him from proclaiming this further doctrine." (S. 521, p. 561).

Altogether *The Chair of Peter* draws its life from the greatness and the variety of the institution with which it deals, from the strength of personality of those whom it portrays. This is not the definitive one volume study of the popes or the papacy. It has flaws but is also readable and informative. It is not exhaustive, not absolutely precise and clear, but it leaves the reader with a real impression of the popes. While the reviewer does not feel that this book comes up to the comments on its dust jacket, he values it as a balanced narrative history.

A brief word may be said about the illustrations. Except for the last plate where Paul VI is used in the English edition instead of a head of Christ, the pictures are identical. They are simply numbered slightly differently, e. g., 36 and 36a in the German. The arrangement and size of the pictures on the page sometimes varies between the two editions, but the quality of reproduction is about the same. The overall choice is excellent. One caption (Bild 70, Pl. 74) refers to Origen of Carthage instead of Alexandria.

The following remarks concern the English translation. The list of popes in the appendix omits the information on sainthood and martyrdom, does not use italics

for the anti-popes, and does not add the date of John XXIII's death although it adds Paul VI's name. There are some small omissions and rewritings apart from the expanded conclusion relating the death of John and the election of Paul as well as more about the work of the council. The handling of chapter headings and subtitles varies somewhat. The spelling of some names is inconsistent, e. g., Malachy (p. 449), Malachi (p. 568). Most Americans would prefer the capitalization of Negro. Origen is not a theologian of the Western Church. (P. 89) The German refers to 100, not 200, bishops in southern and central Italy around A. D. 250. (P. 95) Innocent I's dates are 401–417. (P. 125) Gelasius I did not succeed Hilarius as the dates given in the same paragraph clearly show. (P. 143) Otto I can be a descendent (*Enkel* in the broad sense) of Widukind (better than Wedukind), but not the grandson in the usual sense – they are nearly 200 years apart. (P. 205) The pope is, of course, Christ's follower (*Nachfolger*) but probably not even for Innocent III "Christ's successor." (P. 273) Martin IV, not V, was a friend of Charles of Anjou. (P. 299) "The Rovere pope makes a lot of money" as a subtitle is too colloquial for this reviewer's taste. (P. 366) Luther posted 95 Theses, of course, not 99. (P. 375) It is Paul III's instructions, not Paul II's. (P. 419) The letter to Cardinal Malvezzi is dated 1754, not 1759 – Benedict died in 1758. (P. 469) Clement XIII, not XIV, protested against the expulsion of the Jesuits. (P. 475) A "preponderantly Protestant America" would seem preferable to a "preponderatingly" one. (P. 564) The Schism dates to Leo IX, not Pius IX. (P. 570, note) The Pope is, of course, Patriarch of the West, not the East. (P. 586) Yes, these are details, but the net effect is irritating.

Nashville, Tennessee, U.S.A.

Gregor T. Armstrong

## Alte Kirche

Wolfgang Schrage: Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostischen Synoptikerdeutung (= BZNW 29). Berlin (Töpelmann) 1964. VIII, 213 S., geb. DM 48.–

Diese (überarbeitete) Kieler Habilitationsschrift des jetzigen Bonner Ordinarius schließt eine schmerzlich empfundene Forschungslücke: sie behandelt jene Sprüche im Thomasevangelium (im Folgenden abgekürzt: Th), die sich mit synoptischen berühren, indem sie dabei die koptischen Bibelübersetzungen heranzieht.

Auf ein Vorwort (S. V) und ein Abkürzungsverzeichnis (S. VII f.) folgt S. 1–27 eine Einleitung, auf die wir noch eingehen werden, und auf S. 28–200 das Hauptstück der Arbeit, die Besprechung von 170 Logien bzw. Logienteilen des Th. Ein Literaturverzeichnis gibt 1. Quellen an (S. 201 f.), 2. ausgewählte Literatur zu den Synoptikern (202 f.), 3. Literatur zum Th (203–205), Literatur zur Gnosis und zu den Apokryphen (205–207), 5. sonstige Hilfsmittel. Ein Register der ntl. Evangelienstellen (208 f.), ein Sachregister (210 f.) und ein Verzeichnis griechischer Begriffe (212 f.) beschließen das Werk.

Die Einleitung behandelt (I) die Frage, ob Th die synoptische Tradition voraussetzt, und bejaht sie (S. 2–4), geht dann (II) auf die literarkritischen und redaktionsgeschichtlichen (4–6) und die formgeschichtlichen Probleme ein (6–9) mit dem Ergebnis: Daß eine von den Synoptikern unabhängige Tradition benutzt ist, läßt sich zwar nicht in jedem Falle als unmöglich ausschließen – wir würden bei Spruch 60, 97 und 98 diese Frage erheben –; es zeigt sich aber deutlich die Abhängigkeit des Th von den Synoptikern. Zwar kann man hier – Mitte des 2. Jh. – schriftliche und mündliche Tradition nicht strikt scheiden; rein gedächtnismäßiges Zitieren scheint aber nicht vorzuliegen. Ein mit vielen Parallel-Lesarten durchgesetzter Text scheint benutzt zu sein. (III) Der innerkoptische Vergleich zwischen Th und den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen zeigt die erstaunliche Vertrautheit mit einer