

mere bearer and servant, and into which the transference may be resolved. One result of this is that Mrs de Forest—who was one of Ferenczi's analysants—obscures her subject in such a cloud of incense-laden hagiography that it is not always easy to focus the objective facts about her hero and his methods. It is a pity, for Ferenczi sets examples which no analyst should forget, and of which he needs constantly to be reminded.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

BORN CATHOLICS. Assembled by F. J. Sheed. (Sheed and Ward; 12s. 6d.)

In presenting a collection of essays written by Catholics who received baptism in the faith of the Church and not by their own act of faith, Mr Sheed writes a preface of great circumspection. He seems to be shutting every door where adverse criticism might find entry. We are assured that this book is not apologetic in intention, that it proves nothing, that the contributors assert nothing beyond their personal experience.

Part of the attraction of the essays is that they suggest the atmosphere of a party game at Christmas. Eighteen people at the party are asked to put down on paper their answer to the question why they remain Catholics, or rather an object is held up before them which they are to describe as they see it—the object being the experience of living in the Church. The answers are as diverse as could be imagined, and written with an equally diverse competence; in the case of some of the transatlantic contributors we cannot agree with the compiler that all the contributors were 'people with enough skill to get their experiences down on paper.' However it is all in the party spirit that there should be booby prizes to be won.

It is not for us to quarrel with individuals' experiences of the Faith which are here recorded with an honesty which commands respect. What we do quarrel with is the presentation of these essays merely as the reader's opportunity to meet some Catholics. That is doubtless the intention of the assembler (*finis operantis*), but the objective effect (*finis operis*) should also have been considered. And from this point of view *Born Catholics* is likely to do as much damage as good. It is all very well to listen in private conversation to some of the criticisms of the Church which make their appearance here; it is an entirely different matter to meet them given out to the public in what inevitably appears to be the form of a considered opinion. This is particularly the case with Miss Cecily Hastings' boisterous contribution—the most considerable both in extent and in depth. Indeed it is because she writes with such unexpected theological awareness that the harm done by voicing her grievance (that the Church appears to her to prefer to use coercion rather than spiritual means) is likely to be the greater.

It is necessary to make this protest against the publication of *Born Catholics*, because, while not being an important book, it is likely to be widely read. It will certainly be easily read, and its parts are interesting not only as personal records but as bearing witness to the diversity in unity which is the Catholic Church.

STANISLAUS PARKER, O.P.

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION. By Gerard Culkin. (Paternoster Publications; 6s.)

Father Culkin's small book is that of a scholar, but it is not written for scholars. It is in fact a concise summary of Reformation history from Henry VIII to Elizabeth packed into a hundred-odd pages; a book for students new to the subject apart from history text-book reading, for instruction of converts and for sixth forms, with plenty of reference for further reading. As such it is excellently done. It is free from partisanship and sneers, though certainly not impartial in any colourless sense, or uncommitted. Father Culkin is prepared when necessary to call a spade a spade. Of course, owing to limitation of space some statements seem rather stark and without the kind of qualification that deeper and more extensive treatment would have made; this however is not an adverse criticism. What he says is generally an incentive to further study.

One statement nevertheless does seem to be in need of clarification. On page 54 Father Culkin says: 'It may well be that the form used in the Ordinal (of Edward VI's second Prayer Book, 1552) would be sufficient for a valid ordination if the bishop using that form intended to ordain according to the mind of the Church'. The words 'using that form' in this sentence will be taken to mean 'using the rite in which that form occurs', since the sacramental form in ordination is never isolated from the rite which contains it. Moreover the introduction, at this point, of the ministerial intention of the bishop increases the ambiguity by seeming to imply that valid intention *of this kind* can render the intention *inherent in the form* valid. The result of the ambiguity will be that, read in this natural and obvious way, the sentence will be taken to mean that a validly consecrated bishop might well himself be validly ordaining when using the Anglican Ordinal; it would entail the possibility that in 1559 Bishop Barlow validly consecrated Archbishop Parker in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, and that in consequence Anglican Orders are not certainly null and void as Leo XIII declared in *Apostolicae Curae*, but possibly valid.

In that famous Bull the Pope, excluding from consideration the internal ministerial intention required in every sacrament, concentrated his whole argument upon the sacramental *form* in ordination, in so far