

of course means the abandonment of the Two-Document Theory. The traditional view about St John, though finally rejected, is said to have 'much to commend it' and is well stated. Towards the Pauline Epistles Professor Sparks is more radical than the average. He denies the Pauline authorship of both the Pastorals and Ephesians, adducing mainly those familiar internal arguments which would deprive many long-lived writers of some portion of their output.

W. REES

MISSARUM SOLLEMNIA. Explication génétique de la messe romaine.

By Joseph-André Jungmann. Tomes I and II. (Aubier, Paris.)

When Father Jungmann's *Missarum Sollemnia* first appeared in 1948, scholars immediately hailed it as a work of major importance, and a writer in a recent number of *Worship*, December 1952, rightly described it as the standard book on the Mass. It is the most complete and up-to-date work, and in no single book can so much information be found on the Mass as in this. There are of course specialist monographs on particular points, and research continues. There is still a great deal we should like to know about the Mass; there is, for instance, the dark period between St Ambrose and St Gregory, a time of liturgical development of which we know very little. What would one not give for the manuscript of the first half of the so-called Leonine Sacramentary? Or a completely de-Gallicanised Roman Sacramentary? Meanwhile, and unless and until such documents are discovered, *Missarum Sollemnia* will remain the book that all must consult if they would understand the history of the Mass. Frankly, it is to be hoped it will finally put out of court books such as Gihl's which has purveyed quantities of decadent allegorism, in lieu of real explanation, to generations of priests.

Fr Jungmann's book is a very long one, in the German consisting of two volumes of over 1,200 pages. The French translation will consist of three volumes, of which the first two have now appeared. An English translation is in course of publication but we have not seen it. The French translation is very generally recognised as being accurate and it reads as easily as an original work. To all but those who read German with the greatest facility, the French edition will be a boon. Fr Jungmann's German is not easy, paragraphs occasionally run into pages, and the sheer quantity of erudition packed into a sentence, with references to copious footnotes, makes reading laborious. Another advantage of the French edition is that the longer notes, put somewhat inconveniently at the end of the second volume of the German edition, are here inserted in their right place under the text. On the other hand the German edition, although a little heavy to handle, is a beautiful piece of book production which is a credit to the publishers (Herder).

The first part of the book, which occupies almost the whole of the first

volume of the French translation, is a general history of the Mass from the early Church to modern times. It is a wonderful review, giving all the major phases of the development of the Mass, and showing clearly how it came to have the form or 'shape' it has today. It is of course fully documented and up to date. What surprised at least one reader was a long note rebutting the criticisms of the Hippolytean authorship of the Apostolic Tradition made by Dom Engberding as late as 1948 (French trans., p. 54). The late Dom Gregory's Dix's *Shape of the Liturgy* appears in the bibliography and is referred to in various places up and down the book, but it probably appeared too late for any extensive consideration of his *chaburah* theory. Fr Jungmann's own position in regard to the *sort* of meal the Last Supper was does not appear to be too clear. Indeed this first part on the Mass in the early Church is not as full as one would have expected it to be. Certainly the documentation on the early and later medieval periods is richer than one ever remembers seeing elsewhere. Nothing seems to have escaped the author, neither the obscurest source nor the latest study on it. That is one reason why the whole book is so valuable: it opens up the possibilities of research for others.

Another welcome feature is that Fr Jungmann does not eschew theology, and in a comparatively short section (t. I, pp. 220-243) he expounds a theory of the Mass which shows the influence of the late Dom Odo Casel without however being totally committed to his theory. The whole passage is worthy of prolonged consideration.

The second and larger part of the whole work is taken up with a history of the different parts of the Mass, very fully studied. The second French volume covers the ground from the beginning of the Mass to the Secret Prayer. Everything is considered, not only the text (e.g. Introit) but the chant, the gestures, the very positions (with diagrams) where certain things were said or done. The section on the readings, or lessons, is no less than seventy-three pages long and deals with the origin of the lessons, the choice of the lessons (in which Fr Jungmann gets as close to a complete explanation as we are likely to until fresh evidence is forthcoming), the liturgical presentation of the lessons, how they were sung, who sang them, and the liturgical *meaning* of the lessons; the Gospel, for instance, *is* Christ. Hence the ceremonial.

Not a great deal, perhaps in all these explanations is entirely new, but Fr Jungmann's treatment is so complete that he frequently throws new light on how things actually came to be. He rarely makes inferences; he produces the evidence and thus fulfils the highest standard set by Edmund Bishop. A good example of this is his treatment of the Secret Prayer. By considering all the evidence he is able to show (French trans. II, p. 370, and espec. note 6) that (a) the original name for the Secret was *oratio super oblata*; (b) the term *secreta* arose later, north of the

Alps, to describe a prayer that had *become* silent, and that (c) efforts made by Bosseut and Battifol (and incidentally taken over by Dom H. Leclercq in his very inadequate article on the subject in *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie et de Liturgie*) to explain the matter by speculating on derivations from *secernere*, are unnecessary and unsupported by any documents. It is in this way that Fr Jungmann is able to say the last word on certain matters (the *Kyrie* is another instance) that have long been disputed.

Finally, Fr Jungmann shows a complete mastery of liturgies other than the Roman, and is in the line of great comparative liturgiologists such as the late Dr Baumstark (it was a weakness in Edmund Bishop that his knowledge was narrow if deep) who insisted that many matters concerning the Roman rite could not be understood without reference to other liturgies. We are happy to note that Dr Adrian Fortescue's study on the Mass, which is in the same tradition, gets honourable mention although it is now forty years old.

To review *Missarum Sollemnia* properly one would need an erudition as great as the author's, and scholars are already discussing minor points and no doubt checking his references. We wish them joy of it. But perhaps we have said sufficient to show the unique value of this study of the Mass, and in particular the usefulness of the French translation. In this we regret to note a large number of misprints, principally of proper names. It has the tremendous advantage, however, of being cheaper than either the German or the English editions.

J. D. CRICHTON

JOHN LOCKE. By D. J. O'Connor. (Penguin Books; 2s. 6d.)

BERKELEY. Philosophical Writings, selected and edited by T. E. Jessop. (Nelson's Philosophical Texts; 10s. 6d.)

In many respects Mr O'Connor has written an excellent introduction to the philosophy of John Locke. The fact that he restates Locke's arguments in contemporary terminology is in the main an asset, as it relates Locke's position to the kind of problem the modern student discusses. This means that Locke impinges in a vital manner on the reader and that he is not treated as a mere period piece. None the less, in Mr O'Connor's hands the method has two serious disadvantages. First, it leads him to dismiss as unimportant the historically interesting development of Locke's treatment of substance which begins from a pure phenomenological analysis in the 'First Draft' of the Essay and later shows evidence of an increasing 'metaphysical' interest. Secondly, Mr O'Connor has his own very strongly expressed philosophical opinions. These intrude themselves into his interpretation in a very dogmatic manner. We are told that Aristotle's subject-predicate logic has been 'disposed of'; this is hardly the case; see, for instance, 'On the Philosophical Interpretation of Logic' (by P.