

six years more, which he made his penitents keep, was at once a symbol of the affection he felt for his old home, and perhaps the expression of a playful malice towards those who brought the Pope down upon him'. Newman then goes on to show how this love of room is an essential mark of the Oratorian vocation. The information about the cat has been assimilated into a view of the saint. Miss Trevor has certainly made attempts to be modern, she understands the need for demythologising the earlier accounts, but when it comes to the point her nerve too often fails. She can deal splendidly with the lewd devils that Gallonio hypostasised from the temptations Philip confided to him, and in the index she lists '*Miraculous*' events, suggesting by the inverted commas that she is sceptical to some degree. But she does not bring forward criteria by which one may distinguish between myth and fact. In talking, for example, of the trembling that overcame Philip when absorbed in prayer, she mentions the testimony of Domenico Migliacci that Philip's bench shook as he prayed, and then says 'to the men who were praying with him in his little room it seemed as if the whole place was shaking'. It is difficult to understand what 'seemed' means here. Is the room-shaking in the same category as the bench-shaking? 'Seemed' obscures a vital distinction in hagiography. It suggests that even if Miss Trevor has established her criteria she is not quite certain how to use them. A similar hesitancy occurs in Miss Trevors brave attempt to produce a psychology of Philip. In discussing his attitude to matters sexual she remarks that Philip's laundress, Fulginia Anerio, witnessed

that there was never any sign of nocturnal seminal emission on his sheets. His disciples 'were not at all surprised that personal chastity should be linked to a physiological event'. This is a piece of information. But what is to be done with it? Miss Trevor does not employ her evidence. She evades the obvious question as to whether she is more or less surprised than Gallonio. It is not that the reader wants some homespun analysis or psychological jargon, he wants simply to be told why the matter is mentioned at all, how it seems to Miss Trevor to aid our understanding of Philip. It is not enough that material is collected for future biographers to evaluate.

Miss Trevor seems not to care much for Ponnelle and Bordet, this is a matter of opinion, but it is not fair to say that they spoke of Philip's father as 'bitter and morose', and that their opinion rests 'on nothing more than their feeling'. I cannot discover a place where they describe Francesco Neri as 'bitter', and they cite his letters as evidence for his being 'morose'. Miss Trevor ought to have told us what she found when she looked up 0.21, fo. 26 in the Vallicelliana. Even though the price of books is steadily mounting, 55s. is a great deal to pay. Anyone who wants a penetrating and sympathetic view of Philip in a short compass would do well to buy *The Idea of the Oratory*, by Fr Raleigh Addington (Burns Oates, 30s.) where he will find also excellent chapters on Newman and Faber and the recent developments of the Oratory.

HAMISH SWANSTON

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF SOUTH INDIA by Michael Hollis. *Lutterworth Press*, 12s. 6d.

This is one of the Lutterworth Ecumenical Studies in History; the advisory board for this series has a distinguished list of scholars, including Fr Leeming, S.J. of Heythrop and Fr Dupuy, O.P. of the Saulchoir.

The Church of South India presumably interests all who are concerned with ecumenism, because it is at present the only church which unites Christians from the episcopal and non-episcopal traditions, and it is a sizeable body of over a million members.

No one is better qualified to give an inside account of this church than Bishop Hollis. He was the Anglican bishop of Madras for the last five rather stormy years of negotiations before the inauguration of the union; and this book shows a few scars of the battle. He became the

first Moderator of the United Church for six years and was the CSI bishop in Madras until he made way for an Indian successor. He then went as Professor of Church History to the United Theological College, Bangalore.

Bishop Hollis makes a strong case for the CSI approach to unity. In plans for future union between Anglicans and Protestants the negotiators seem to be coming to three agreements: namely, that the new church shall receive from the Anglican bishops and shall retain 'the historic episcopate'; that it shall have some at present undefined pattern of episcopal care; and that its bishops (though perhaps with others associated with them) shall ordain all the new ministers.

Interestingly enough an Australian scheme

for unity, which does not at present include Anglicans, looks like coming on pastoral and theological grounds to these same three agreements. The problem is how to get from where the churches are now to where they wish to be – without calling in question the full reality of any minister's ordination and ministry.

There are at present two methods. The CSI method was to increase the episcopate by the consecration of Protestant ministers at the hands of the Anglican bishops; but, apart from that, the ministers of all the uniting churches were accepted just as they were, without any additional rite; although there was the proviso that any congregation could demand an episcopally ordained minister. The second method is that, in addition to a similar consecration of new bishops, there shall be a rite of integration between the ministries of the respective churches. This is proposed for the Anglicans and Methodists in England when they enter into stage one of the union possibly in two or three years' time. In this rite God is asked to grant to each minister what He sees is needed for ministry in the new united church. It is stated explicitly that this rite is not an ordination, but a new rite *sui generis*. This seems not unreasonable to many Anglicans and perhaps to a few Roman Catholics, for we can hardly reckon a Protestant minister merely as a layman, if we now regard the church in which he was solemnly set apart by prayer and the laying-on of hands as a church or at least an 'ecclesial community' (*De ecum.* c.3. W. M. Abbott, *Documents of Vatican II*, p. 355). Bishop Hollis in this book begins a necessary re-investigation of how the word 'ordination' should be used in a divided Christendom; and this is carried a little further by Bishop Oliver Tomkins in *A Time for Unity* (SCM).

Such theological explorations and the negotiating of union schemes take a long time. The CSI took twenty-eight years. The question

arises how much ecumenical co-operation is legitimate on the local level during these years of negotiation. Clearly the churches should engage together in service in the secular community: but how far could churches, who have pledged themselves to eventual organic unity, be permitted, particularly in frontier situations, to share together in worship? There looks what might be a hint in this direction in Vatican II's decree on ecumenism when it says that '*communicatio in sacris* may not be used indiscriminately for the restoration of unity . . . yet the gaining of a needed grace sometimes commends it' (*De ecum.* ii 8: W. M. Abbott, *Documents of Vatican II*, p. 352).

Bishop Hollis has an interesting chapter on the evolution in CSI of new liturgical forms. Its eucharistic liturgy has been praised by Catholic liturgists. Quite as interesting but perhaps less well known is the ordinal, which is now invariably used. Both rites are in the *CSI Book of Common Worship* (Oxford University Press). The liturgy is not imposed on any congregation, but it is slowly winning its way on its own merits. This seems a sensible procedure in liturgical reform.

Bishop Hollis has not space in this book to weight up the impact of this scheme on the life of the church and on the people of South India. But that can be found in a survey by seven members of the church, all but one of whom are Indians – *Renewal and Advance* (Christian Literature Society, obtainable at 4 Bouverie Street, London, E.C.4).

I cannot end this review without a word of gratitude to Bishop Hollis and a word of admiration for CSI, who a couple of years ago invited me to a fantastic and unforgettable three months' tour of their dioceses and spoke so uninhibitedly to me of the problems and joys of a united church.

MARK GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.