



Review

Author(s): Charles Allen Dinsmore

Review by: Charles Allen Dinsmore

Source: *The American Journal of Theology*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Oct., 1909), pp. 625-628

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3155078>

Accessed: 15-09-2015 20:15 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Theology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

social and political institution of the Middle Ages. This impression, however, might very likely be due to the rapidity of treatment and it does not affect materially the discussion. It is, however, unfortunate that in treating the elements of the social mind from which Anselm's view arose Professor Foley has not more effectively handled some of the ideas of chivalry. He has, however, given full weight to the *Wehrgeld*. The most original and valuable work of the book is its exposition of *Cur Deus Homo*. Professor Foley follows the lead of Harnack and of Stevens but has obviously done original work. An interesting feature is the tracing of the influence of Anselm upon scholastic theology, for it is a field which the ordinary student of theology does not often till; yet it is of the utmost importance to the man who would trace the development to that body of doctrines which Protestantism inherited. The latter part of his discussion, which deals with the value of Anselm's work, is admirably discriminating, and is to be commended to all those mechanical theologians who like to play with the words, "satisfaction" and "debt."

Professor Foley adds to the volume an interesting appendix composed of the views of a large number of writers on the atonement. This collection of opinions is valuable theological anthology and ought to be read by all those who think there is a universally accepted view of the atonement.

Taken all together, the volume is one that ought to be read not only by teachers of theology, but by all ministers. It is one of the anomalies of our theological situation that there is no consistently and uniformly accepted view of the atonement. The reason for this will be, if not altogether apparent, not difficult to infer from a study of Professor Foley's work. It is in brief this: the Anselmic view of satisfaction for the injury done by sin to the honor of God was so thoroughly mediaeval as to become unintelligible or perverted in the same proportion as it has persisted in a non-feudal age.

SHAILER MATHEWS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE MORAL SYSTEM OF DANTE'S "INFERNO"

Even the casual reader of the *Divina Commedia* cannot fail to note a similiarity and a contrast between the classification of sins in the "Inferno" and the "Purgatorio." In the "Purgatorio" there is no room for confusion. The seven ledges of the Holy Mount distinctly classify the seven capital vices or dispositions which keep the soul from God. Pride, envy, wrath, sloth, avarice, gluttony, lust—one above another they are limned by the great artist. But in the "Inferno" there is no such lucidity of meaning.

Unchastity, gluttony, avarice, wrath are unmistakably indicated; yet pride, envy, and sloth are not in evidence. Was the poet following a different moral system in the "Inferno," or for artistic purposes did he conceal the three last-named sins in some disguise? This difference in design between the two parts of the *Comedy* has given rise to much learned debate. Moreover there is the sin of heresy which is punished in fiery tombs in the sixth circle of hell, and which Dante himself fails to classify in his famous description of the plan of the lower world given in the eleventh canto of the "Inferno."

In a very suggestive essay appearing in *Dante-Forschungen* thirty years ago Dr. Karl Witte contended with great plausibility that the penal codes of hell and of earth are analogous in taking account of deeds only, not of propensities. "When there is an overt act, the essential significance of the deed itself receives a terrible emphasis from the fact that, in principle at least, the punishments of Dante's hell consist in the unceasing continuance of the sinful activity itself." "It is the act that is punished, not the sinful motives that prompted it." Dante from the needs of his art and to make impressive his ethical teachings chose to portray in his lower hell the crimes resulting from envy and pride rather than to depict the sinful propensities themselves. Slothfulness, being also a propensity and not a deed, has no place in Dante's hell and is punished this side the dark river Acheron in the limbo of the cowards. Thus does Dr. Witte argue with rare ingenuity for the seven capital vices as the framework of the "Inferno."

Dr. Edmund Moore, of Oxford, than whom there is no more careful and fair-minded commentator upon Dante problems, gives a different reason for the divergences between the first and second canticles of the *Comedy*. He does not think it improbable that there is some foundation to Boccaccio's story of a break in the "Inferno" after the completion of the first seven cantos, and that Dante when he resumed his task in later years somewhat changed his plan. If he had contemplated constructing the "Inferno" on the seven deadly sins, he had completed five of them in the first eight cantos, leaving twenty-six cantos for the other two, or perhaps three. On again taking up his task he enlarged his design, adopted Aristotle's distinction of the broad difference between sins of impulse and sins of habit, and, as regards the latter, borrows from Cicero's *De Officiis* the discrimination between sins of violence and sins of fraud—bestiality, which Aristotle mentioned as the gravest of iniquities, being omitted entirely.

Mr. Reade, in a volume of vast and almost bewildering erudition,¹ takes

¹ *The Moral System of Dante's "Inferno."* By W. H. V. Reade, Tutor of Keble College. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. 443 pages. \$3.00.

issue with these two eminent scholars. He steeps us in St. Thomas, his conceptions, his methods, his use of words. One cannot but marvel at Mr. Reade's accurate and seemingly inexhaustible knowledge of mediæval lore. He contends that Dante made no effort to have symmetry of classification in the "Inferno" and "Purgatorio." In the latter the church had determined the number and grade of the sins, but regarding the sins punished in the circles of hell there had been no official pronouncement, and the poet was more free to follow his genius. He adopts, therefore, Aristotle's division of sins into those of incontinence, malicious wickedness, and bestiality. Luxury, gluttony, avarice, wrath are indicated not because Dante was following the classification of the church, but because these sins were to be found in any list with which the poet was familiar. Mr. Reade accounts for Dante's failure to classify the sin of heresy to the fact that in his thought it occupied a position between the sins of incontinence and the sins of malice. It is traditionally associated with pride, and therefore Farinata is introduced in this circle to bear witness to the truth that this sin of the *intellectus speculativus* results from vain glory. Instead of angling for pride in the depths of hell our author asserts that the evil propensities that are purged on the Mountain of Pain are included in the first six circles of the "Inferno." All the sins of force and fraud which are punished in the pit below the glowing sepulchers of the sixth circle must necessarily be omitted from purgatory as they are sins of malice. Repentance destroys malice. Hence it can have no place in the purifying process. It belongs to hell and not to purgatory. Witte's attempt to trace the deeds punished in the basso inferno must consequently be gratuitous. Neither can Dr. Moore's position that bestiality has been left out be considered tenable. Dante certainly did not introduce the word in canto xi without a purpose in unfolding his scheme of the lower world. In the seventh circle with the violent, Mr. Reade believes is to be found its appropriate assignment, and Brunetto Latini is its most conspicuous exponent. So long as it was thought that "force" and "fraud" were borrowed solely from Cicero, asserts our author, commentators were in a false position, but the weighty evidence adduced by Mr. Reade to prove that St. Thomas thought the same distinction was in the mind of Aristotle makes it impossible to leave bestiality out of Dante's terrible picture of final retribution.

One hesitates to pass judgment upon a work so elaborate and erudite. Its wealth of evidence is confusing. Questions which most scholars have discussed in an essay are here elucidated in an imposing volume of over four hundred pages. The author carries us into the heart of the Middle Ages and compels us to interpret our Aristotle and Cicero through the mind of

St. Thomas. He throws light upon every subject he discusses, and quite firmly fixes bestiality in the seventh circle. Yet Dante went among the truly dead to learn of the nature of sin and its consequences. Sin is to be graded by its results as well as by the intention of the criminal. There are so many evidences that Dante had this old Roman principle in mind that one closes Mr. Reade's monumental work with the feeling that the constructive thought in Witte's theory has not yet been disproved.

CHARLES ALLEN DINSMORE

WATERBURY, CONN.

TWO BOOKS ON THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

The two volumes discussed in this review¹ are singularly alike in object and method. Both have definitely in mind not the elucidation of a single religion but contributions to the science of religion or (*pace*, Mr. Jordan!) to comparative religion. And the endeavor is by the same road, viz., comparison with a definite set of religious facts assumed as a basis. But the set of facts is in each case different; M. Foucart uses the religion of Egypt, M. Le Roy employs the religion of the Bantou races of Africa. The results of the researches embodied in these two books are of very unequal value. M. Foucart's book (without index and with a very inadequate table of contents), in eight chapters justifies the comparative method of study, defends the choice of the Egyptian religion as a standard of comparison, and discusses animal-worship (including totemism), sacrifice, magic, ancestor-worship, morals, the priesthood, evolution, and composite psychology.

M. Foucart's choice of the religious phenomena of Egypt as a standard is justifiable on many grounds, but chiefly (a reason which the author does not advance) because they are on the border-line between those of the organized or stereotyped religions and those of the "primitive" beliefs. The Egyptian religion, so to speak, never grew up, never reached the period of maturity; it remained in the stage of adolescence. Consequently if any light is thrown by M. Foucart it is on the earlier phenomena of religion. Speaking strictly, no advance in knowledge is made by this volume. When it is right, the work recites what is well known to the scholar and what is better told elsewhere for the student. Serious mistakes are made, as when

¹ *La méthode comparative dans l'histoire des religions.* Par George Foucart. Paris: Picard, 1909. 237 pages. Fr. 3.50.

La religion des primitifs. Par Mgr. A. LeRoy, Evêque d'Alinda. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne & Cie, 1909. viii+518 pages. Fr. 6.