

of Thomism and its sequel the condemnation of modernism by Pope St Pius X. P. Gardeil's chief contribution in defence of the Church against modernism was *Le Donné révélé*, in which he refutes the theories of Loisy and Tyrrel. In his earlier days he had been for ten years mainly occupied with studies in the philosophy of the sciences, experimental psychology, and the validity of human knowledge, and he did not cease later to be interested in these topics. He realized that destructive criticism is not enough, but that there is a need also of reconciling faith with modern scientific thought. He is outstanding as a master of methodical thinking in the light of principles learnt from St Thomas. His firm conviction was that the Catholic philosopher and theologian should be *au courant* with the latest scientific findings, and so be in a position to meet all comers on equal terms. He contrived by the written and spoken word to stave off error, to win to the faith enlightened minds, and to safeguard those in the Church from succumb to the wave of scepticism and positivism.

The newly founded Institute of Philosophy at Louvain won his admiration, and he was in close correspondence with the then Mgr Mercier, though he differed from him particularly on some points of his criteriology. He was broadly in agreement with the Spanish Dominican Marin-Sola in his teaching on the evolution of dogma.

At the bidding of the Master General he joined a commission with De Groot and Lagrange to draft a syllabus for Dominican studies within the Order, which received the special approbation of Pope St Pius X.

The book will serve as an introduction to P. Gardeil's published works seen in their context. Learned societies, when at a loss for a profitable subject to discuss, may perhaps find inspiration here. And it may be read with profit by those amateurs who busy themselves with playing down Thomist philosophy and theology in favour of more esoteric and eclectic ways of thinking.

AMBROSE FARRELL, O.P.

THE SELF AND THE DRAMAS OF HISTORY. By Reinhold Niebuhr. (Faber; 21s.)

In spite of the deserved reputation of the author in both theology and political ethics, two things will limit the popularity and value of this book among Catholics. One is a somewhat abstruse metaphysical style, to which we are not yet accustomed in this country and which is hardly used by Catholics anywhere, and the other is his gross misunderstanding of Catholicism, especially in its Thomist dress. As for the language, I have in mind abstract expressions such as 'principles of meaning', 'structures of meaning', 'rationally analysable

coherence', 'the divine power of creativity', 'the prophetic consciousness'. I will say something later about the author's incomprehension of the Catholic position.

These difficulties are all the more regrettable in that Professor Niebuhr's book is important, and conveys its message with a combination of Christian feeling, realism and common sense rarely found in this type of politico-philosophical theology.

The title indicates well the subject. By 'dramas of history', Professor Niebuhr refers to the many dramas in which individual selves become involved in their relationship with God, with other men and women, and with themselves. Such dramas are unique in each case, as they affect this or that individual, and this or that community; and there is no limit to the number of individual communities in which individual selves can become involved. The most important dramas are those recorded in the Bible, concerning God's covenant with his people, and the individual's relationships of freedom and involvement with regard to this people. Human life means a continual dialogue of the individual with himself, with other selves, and with God. This dialogue is unthinkable without a full recognition of the personality of each self, God's and man's. In the circumstances of our actual lives, the dialogue implies not only the freedom of each self and its complicated relationship to the community and other selves, but also a recognition of each created human self's fallen nature and consequent need of forgiveness.

It is the argument of the book that no philosophy or ideology outside of biblical faith recognizes these truths. Most modern non-Christian philosophies of human life have neglected the personality both of God and of man. They have denied or neglected, or at the opposite extreme exaggerated, man's freedom; and they have had no place for a free personality in God. Such erroneous views include liberal rationalism, mystical philosophies, and existentialism. They have led to various forms of political totalitarianism.

Professor Niebuhr, in his common-sense approach, insists on the unity of soul and body, and therefore on the importance of bodily resurrection. This, and his vindication of the dignity and uniqueness of every individual human life, together with its possibility of final salvation in and through Christ, are doctrines that every Catholic knows to be integral and central to the Christian faith. How distressing it is, then, to have to realize that Professor Niebuhr appears to have no conception that such doctrines are part of Thomist theology. He cannot have studied St Thomas and still assert—as he does—that his idea of God's providence can be reduced to the terms of a rational ontology! If he has never grasped St Thomas's doctrine of God's

providential guidance of each individual life to its ultimate union with Christ in heaven, he might at least have read the article in St Thomas where the latter shows how God guided the history of the world so as to culminate in the Incarnation, and made the Incarnation the beginning of a new era of the world's final perfecting! He thinks, moreover, that, for St Thomas, sin consists in sensuality, whereas in reality it consists in rebellion against God. He thinks that, for St Thomas and the medievals, the monastic life was primarily for the sake of subjugating the passions; whereas St Thomas explicitly regards the subjugation of the will as being its principal purpose.

Such blemishes nullify the force of any value-judgments made by the author against Catholicism or Thomism. One hopes that his judgments of Kant, Mill, Comte, etc., are more securely based!

H. FRANCIS DAVIS

TO WHOM SHALL WE GO? Gy D. M. Bailey. (St Andrew's Press; 15s.)
 KINGDOM AND CHURCH: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation.

By T. S. Torrance. (Oliver and Boyd; 16s.)

The late Professor David Bailey was, like his brother Dr John Bailey, a distinguished philosopher and theologian. The Bailey brothers came from Wester Ross and were formed in the strong and vital tradition associated with the Free Church revival in the fifties of the last century. To this was added the literary culture which became a characteristic of the Free Church ministry. In this book Professor Bailey appears, not in his role of a subtle and acute theologian, but as a preacher. It is interesting to read how a great scholar could, from the pulpit, deal simply and movingly with man's deepest problems. In his own quiet way David Bailey was a prophetic figure, and if a Catholic regrets that so good a man did not find the Ark of Truth, he can none the less be glad to find so much sound doctrine as there is in this collection of sermons.

Professor Torrance's book is rather different and it is the work of a distinguished scholar writing well up to the standard we have come to expect from one who is perhaps the most brilliant of the younger minds in the Church of Scotland. The work is a forthright exposition of the teaching of three great Reformers, and the Catholic theologian will find it of interest as it deals with the Reformers' doctrine from the the point of view of their eschatology: a subject much in the news today.

Dr Torrance states that the primary conviction of the Reformers was that we stand in history wholly dependent on the will of God. The Christian life is no mere mirroring of a fixed heavenly pattern, but is rather a reaching out after a future ideal whose perfect face does not