

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

---

## **Church History and Aggiornamento: Historical Problems of Church Renewal**

Review Article: John N. Schumacher

*Philippine Studies* vol. 14, no. 2 (1966): 328–331

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 27 13:30:20 2008

Thus the concept of the civic culture, "a mixed modernizing-traditional" culture, is to be developed, empirically supported and readied for export to the emerging world.

This goal leads to a revision of the classical participatory theory of politics in the manner of Berelson *et. al.* in *Voting* and James Q. Wilson in *The Amateur Democrat*, among others. This goal forces Almond and Verba to draw a series of conclusions regarding democracy and the democratic citizen which do not grow from their data naturally. For example, they write: "In light of an individual's nonpolitical interests, it might be quite irrational to invest in political activity the time and effort needed to live up to the rationality-activist model. It may just not be worth it to be that good a citizen." The authors have abandoned their concern, as behaviorists, with what is, and now are using what is as the basis for statements about what ought to be.

Almond and Verba have done their work conscientiously and competently. Anyone interested in the technique of interviewing and the behavioral approach in general should find the book instructive. The cross-national nature of the study is distinctive, and the information collected shed new light on the structure of several different democratic political cultures. Unfortunately, the shallowness and stiffness of the analysis often overshadow these virtues; and, particularly in the latter portion of the book, the authors' missionary zeal for democracy and the civic culture completely overwhelms them.

FRANK GNIFFKE

## CHURCH HISTORY AND AGGIORNAMENTO

**CHURCH HISTORY: HISTORICAL PROBLEMS OF CHURCH RENEWAL.** Edited by Roger Aubert. *Concilium: Theology in the Age of Renewal*, vol. 7. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965. ix, 179 pp.

Many who have been interested in the series *Concilium* as a means of being brought up to date with the theological developments leading to and given expression in Vatican II, may wonder at the inclusion of a volume on Church history. Yet the fact is that recent historical studies have been a major factor in the theological developments associated with Vatican II. Conversely, the theological and pastoral questions raised in the course of the Council have sent historians and theologians alike back to a re-examination of many a phase of Church history for the light it might throw on the questions at hand. Only thus is it possible to distinguish what in the theology and practice of

the Church belongs to her divinely-willed structure, and what is merely the expression of a concrete situation or a mode of thought belonging to the past. For the Church, committed to her own continuing reform by the Council, it is more than ever necessary to look into her own past to gain that deeper self-understanding which is the necessary prerequisite to any fruitful reform for the Church as a whole no less than for the individual Christian in his own life.

Many, even bishops inside the Council itself, found themselves bewildered at a number of ideas discussed there these last few years. Accustomed to the dogmatic statements of theological and catechetical textbooks of a not too distant past, they were unaware of the impact recent historical studies, particularly since the War, had had on theology. A glance at the contents of this volume under review makes clear how relevant the historical articles here are to major issues of the Council.

One of the most far-reaching decrees of the Council in its long-range effects is the recognition of the doctrine of episcopal collegiality—the sharing of the bishops as a body with the Pope in the government of the whole Church. This new insistence on the collegial nature of Church authority is a long-needed corrective to the one-sided emphasis on papal authority which has been current since Vatican I, and, to a certain degree, since the late Middle Ages. A series of articles on this general subject show that the centralization of modern times has not been characteristic of the Church during much of her history. Marot shows the development of collegial action on the part of the bishops from the early centuries proceeding parallel to the development of the primacy of the Roman bishop. The bishops of various regions of the West, acting through provincial councils, generally ruled their churches with only rare intervention from Rome. In the East, the great patriarchates governed the churches of their jurisdiction with even greater autonomy, intervention from Rome, usually resulting from an appeal, being the exception. Both the government by metropolitan councils in the West outside Italy, and the autonomy of the patriarchates of the East remained up to the late Middle Ages wholly compatible with the primacy of Rome, and disappeared not as a result of the doctrine of the primacy, but of the centralizing tendencies of a “Roman school” linked with the medieval papacy.

Brian Tierney’s “Collegiality in the Middle Ages” complements Marot’s study by showing how the great medieval theologians and canonists endeavored to maintain the balance between these complementary, not contradictory, doctrines of the primacy of the Pope, the collegial authority of the bishops, and the corporate structure of the whole Christian community. However, these sound doctrines of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries were not incorporated into the juridical structure of the medieval Church, partly because of the Church-State

conflicts, which led secularist philosophers to develop collegial doctrines in an anti-papal sense, partly because of the great abuses of the authority which had been so highly centralized in the Roman Curia, which led to anti-papal attitudes on the part of the bishops whose jurisdiction was being destroyed.

The results of this failure to develop a sound juridical structure in the medieval Church were seen in the Great Schism of 1378-1417, when two and even three rival Popes disputed the Chair of Peter, until the Council of Constance finally resolved the impasse. But the Council of Constance has remained an object of controversy ever since for its decree subjecting even the Pope to the authority of the Council, the doctrine of conciliarism. A lengthy article by August Franzen sums up the results of the extensive historical research on this Council in recent years. The problem lies in whether and in what sense this conciliarist decree of Constance was accepted by Pope Martin V, and if so, how it can be reconciled with the dogmatic definition of papal primacy at Vatican I. Franzen shows that the majority of the Fathers at Constance never accepted radical conciliarism, but understood the decree only in the earlier medieval sense (discussed by Tierney) of the right of the Council to depose a Pope in case he should fall into heresy. Thus it was not a doctrinal decree, contradicted by Vatican I, but rather an emergency disciplinary measure designed to solve any future case such as had occurred in the schism just ended. The later effort of the extreme conciliarists to use this decree to subject the papacy to councils is the reason for the unjust disrepute into which the Council of Constance fell.

Other topics prominent in Vatican II receive historical orientation in remaining articles of this volume. Aubert's article on nineteenth century Catholic teaching on religious liberty does much to explain the evolution which has taken place in Catholic doctrine on this point over the past century. Fontaine's study of the early Christian attitude toward military service is relevant to the Council discussions on the right of conscientious objection and the condemnation of nuclear warfare. Alberigo's analysis of recent studies on the Council of Trent show how the "Tridentine era", ended by Vatican II, came into being. Weiler surveys post-War studies of Church authority and government in the Middle Ages, a subject likewise pertinent to the question of collegiality; while Tüchle, in a somewhat disappointing survey, examines the question of whether the triumphalism of apologetic rhetoric on the Church, denounced by many of the Fathers of Vatican II, finds its roots in the Baroque Catholicism of the Catholic Reformation.

One reading the principal articles in this volume cannot help but be impressed by the extent to which recent historical studies have had their influence on the renewal of the Church which has been initiated by the Council. Were the liturgical renewal not the subject of a

separate volume, and therefore not mentioned here, it could provide even more striking examples of the importance of historical studies in the renewal of Church life. The Church, as a living and continuing organism must always renew herself through a return to the sources of her being. But for such a return to be authentic, it must be based on sound historical knowledge, of the type represented in this volume.

JOHN N. SCHUMACHER

## BACKGROUND TO THE PACIFIC WAR

THE UNITED STATES AND THE FAR EASTERN CRISIS OF 1933-1938. From the Manchurian Incident through the Initial Stage of the Undeclared Sino-Japanese War. By Dorothy Borg. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964. 674 pp. Bibliography. Notes. Index.

On 7 July 1937, Japanese troops conducting field maneuvers near the Marco Polo Bridge, thirteen kilometers from Peiping, clashed with soldiers of General Sung Che-yuan's 29th Army. The Chinese and the Japanese, as usual, reported different versions of how the shooting started. But Joseph C. Grew, United States Ambassador to Japan, was not unduly alarmed—the incident was another irritant in Sino-Japanese relations, but unlikely to assume crisis proportions.

By 31 July, however, the Japanese were in control of Tientsin and by this time Grew had revised his initial assessment of the Marco Polo Bridge Affair. In concluding one of his reports to the State Department, he wrote: "I should like to feel that history will regard the record of American action in this most critical and pregnant period in Far Eastern affairs as exhaustive, constantly helpful, and impartially correct (298).

History has been less than kind to Ambassador Grew and his colleagues. Whatever the merits of American diplomacy in the 1930's may have been, it was apparently not effective enough. It is easy to assume that the failure to prevent war was the failure of the diplomats. This is, of course, to oversimplify matters. The efforts of the diplomats must be assessed in the light of the limits that historical circumstances impose upon the operations of diplomacy. Equipped with a knowledge of both the diplomatic record as well as the historical framework,<sup>1</sup> Doro-

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Far Eastern diplomacy also formed the burden of an earlier work, *American Policy and the Chinese Revolution, 1925-1928* (New York: The American Institute of Pacific Relations and the Macmillan Co., 1947).