

quotations with which he establishes his traditionalism, and perhaps his orthodoxy.

For the path of orthodoxy has not been made easier for Père de Lubac's thesis by the form of Pius XII's condemnation in *Humani generis*: *Alii veram 'gratuitatem' ordinis supernaturalis corrumpant, cum autem Deum entia intellectua praedita condere non posse, quin eadem ad beatificam visionem ordinet et vocet (Acta apostolicae sedis 42 [1950] 570)*. To an innocent eye, the conception of a state of 'pure nature' would seem to be firmly, if unspokenly, embedded in the contrary of this proposition. But Père de Lubac is apparently anxious to pick his way between the Charybdis of Baius and the Scylla of Bellarmine's 'pure nature', without yet scuttling the barque of *Humani generis*. I am not sure that this feat is possible, or desirable.

Père de Lubac had in fact first put forward his thesis before the publication of *Humani generis*: in *Surnaturel, études historiques* (Paris, Aubier, 1946), and 'Le mystère du surnaturel', *Recherches de science religieuse* 36 (1949), 80-121. His two more recent volumes are a reworking, and in places a straight transcription, of part of these two earlier studies. For a critical examination of Père de Lubac's earlier statement of his position readers may like to refer *inter alia* to *Theological Studies* 8 (1947) 483-91 and 9 (1948) 213-49.

Both Père de Lubac's latest volumes have now been translated into English. The more recent translation of the two, Mr Sheppard's version of *Augustinisme et théologie moderne*, struck me as a good deal less lively than the French. Verbal comparison of original and translation showed why.

On the first page of text (p. 9 in the French edition, p. xi in the English translation) 'ainsi gémit Gerberon' is reduced to 'these are the words of Gerberon'.

On the same page the play of tenses in 'les

historiens de la théologie . . . qui pensent que le baianisme est un fruit authentique de l'augustinisme, comme l'avait été pour une bonne part la doctrine de Luther et comme devait l'être plus encore celle de Jansenius' is flattened out to become 'historians of theology . . . who hold that Baianism was the genuine consequence of Augustinianism, as to a great extent was the teaching of Luther, and still more that of Jansenius'.

More seriously, a couple of pages later (p. 13 and p. xv), 'Pour le baianisme en particulier, plutôt qu'un augustinisme excessif, un augustinisme systématisé, raidi, poussé à ses dernières conséquences, ne serait-il pas un augustinisme faussé, travesti?' is rendered both clumsily and meaninglessly as, 'For Baianism in particular, rather than an exaggerated Augustinianism, would not be a systematized, rigid Augustinianism, taken to its ultimate conclusions, but a falsified version, a parody of it'. This is clumsy, because the lightness of 'ne serait-il pas' is transmuted into the single monosyllable 'but'. It is meaningless, because the French offers a simple alternative, marked by 'plutôt que' and 'ne serait-il pas', whereas the English offers three disjunctions, marked by 'rather than', 'would not be', and 'but'.

On the next page, 'des perspectives qui engendrèrent la théologie "post-tridentine"' is mistranslated as 'the viewpoints engendered by post-Tridentine theology' (my italics).

These examples all come from the Introduction. I have not checked the translation for verbal accuracy throughout. But clearly a reader seriously intent on following Père de Lubac's historically fascinating account of the eclipse of the supernatural in post-Tridentine theology, and his own attempted resuscitation of the idea, would do well, for the Augustine volume, to provide himself with a copy of the French original.

DENIS O'BRIEN

**ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE.** Latin Text and English Translation. Introduction, Text, Appendices and Glossaries. Vol. LI: Our Lady (III, xxvii-xxx), T. R. Heath, O.P. *Blackfriars*. London: *Eyre and Spottiswoode*. New York: *McGraw-Hill*. xvi + 130 pp. 42s.

Fr Heath rightly remarks that not all of St Thomas's teaching about our Lady is to be found in the four questions that compose this volume, but they certainly contain much that is informative and inspiring, and they are, as he says, based on the principle that 'she cannot be understood except in relation to Christ, or perhaps more broadly, she cannot be understood in isolation'. These questions 'have come from a profound consideration of the meaning

of the Incarnation, the union of God and man (which itself came from somewhere else) and they are going on towards an existential consideration of Christ her Son, who was born, lived, suffered, died, rose from the dead, and thus saved us from our sins'. They deal successively with her sanctification, her virginity, her betrothal and her annunciation. The delicate question of the Immaculate Conception is courageously handled, both in a footnote

and in an appendix. On the *virginitas in partu* it is remarked that 'an increasing number of theologians hold today that this doctrine is not *de fide*'. Other appendices contain a historical survey of the writings of St Thomas on our Lady and an account of recent studies on our Lady in the New Testament; both of these will be really useful to students.

This is an inspiring volume by an inspiring scholar. On the principle that Mary cannot be studied in isolation, Fr Heath asserts that St Thomas's 'insistence on that principle may very well be his contribution to our age of ecumenical dialogue and search for unity among all Christians' and that 'the opportunity this book gives for seeing him work out that principle in his Marian studies might be the best justification for this book today'. The remarkable success of the Ecumenical Society

of the Blessed Virgin Mary would seem to confirm this judgment, and we may recall that Vatican II, albeit by a small margin, decided not to expound its Mariology in isolation but to place it firmly in the context of the Church. Two small points of dispute. On page 11, line 17, *non potest intelligi* should surely be rendered by 'must not be understood as', not as 'is unintelligible'. And on page 39, lines 28ff, is not the argument that the Hebrew equivalent of *mulier* includes, but is not simply interchangeable with, 'virgin'? But here is a lovely passage to end with: 'The "doubt of discussion" is behind every article of the *Summa*; the "doubt of wonder" is, of course, behind the whole vast enterprise of theology. Theology, as well as philosophy, begins in wonder' (p. 24, n. 22).

E. L. MASCALL

**ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE.** Latin Text and English Translation. Introduction, Text, Appendices and Glossaries. Vol. XVI: Purpose and Happiness (I-II, i-v), Thomas Gilby, O.P. xvi + 170 pp. 42s. Vol. XXIII: Virtue (I-II, iv-lxvii), W. D. Hughes, O.P. xxii + 258 pp. 50s. Vol. XXV: Sin (I-II, lxxi-lxxx), John Fearon, O.P. xviii + 268 pp. 32s. *Blackfriars*. London: *Eyre and Spottiswoode*. New York *McGraw-Hill*.

These are three key volumes of the *Prima Secundae* and it is good to have them together. The treatise on the end of man (happily and contemporarily rendered by Fr Gilby as 'purpose in life'), with which the Second Part of the *Summa* opens, sets the key for everything that follows, and indeed it is only if its overarching assumption is kept in mind that the fully Christian character of St Thomas's moral theory can be clearly discerned and its contrast with the purely secularist Aristotelianism be appreciated. The problem which has exercised so many subsequent theologians and on which in recent years Fr de Lubac has thrown so much light, of reconciling the truth that only in the vision of God can man find perfect bliss with the truth that the vision of God is a gift of pure

grace which man's nature can, of itself, neither demand nor attain, is not discussed in detail, but a very useful appendix is devoted to its statement. Fr Gilby's notes to this volume are as sprightly and illuminating as we should expect them to be. From this starting-point the other two volumes appropriately follow, for virtue is the means by which man's end is to be achieved and sin is the obstacle which impedes it. The plodding and somewhat complacent exposition of the Stagyrite receives at the hands of the Angelic Doctor flashes of theological illumination and of psychological insight which altogether transform it, and to these the translators and commentators of the present edition have given full expression.

E. L. MASCALL

**THE CHURCH AT PRAYER: Introduction to the Liturgy**, ed. A. G. Martimort; ed. of the English edition, Austin Flannery, O.P., and Vincent Ryan, O.S.B. *Irish University Press*, 1968. Vol. I, xvi-246 pp. 42s.

Many Eastern Orthodox Christians and even some not-too-high Anglican friends—not to mention a sizable number of those Roman Catholics who do bother to reflect on what they are about on Sunday mornings or evenings—are shocked at the speed and direction of liturgical reforms and experimentation in the Catholic Church today. Some tend to see the entire movement as a massive sell-out to the spirit of the age. Nor does this criticism arise from peevish conservatism but from a concern

for theology and faith. They feel safer with revitalizing traditional forms of worship while relegating experimentation with new forms to the harmless tinkering with accidentals. Even a Dutch Protestant renewal-theologian such as Albert H. van den Heuvel, in writing on worship in a secularized world, says: 'We whose minds work differently, should never try to walk with our heavy Western shoes through the rosebeds of the Eastern tradition. Maybe it is there that the tree, the leaves of