

the original. Long periods have been broken into shorter units and the rhetorical flourishes tamed or omitted—the claim that ‘every word Luis de León wrote’ in the *Names* is here is not strictly true (p. 18, note). I missed some of the stylistic beauty so characteristic of the original.

There are some mistakes, among which I note that the ‘concept of Christ’ (p. 63) should be ‘conception’, ‘armies of buds’ should be ‘of birds’ (p. 91), ‘the night of our dark century’ should be ‘of our dark age’ (*siglo* meaning the latter here). ‘Poetry is only a communication of the celestial...’ (p. 112) sounds dismissive, whereas the reverse is meant: ‘Poetry is nothing other than...’ Sometimes the sharpness of theological or mystical language is dulled, especially when Fray Luis writes of deification (e.g. pp. 224–5). I do not know what ‘it is always borning’ means (p. 277) or where ‘he swayed in the winds of history’ (p. 325) comes from in the original. I have not encountered the convention of using capital letters after colons before, and found it odd. But in spite of such reservations I welcome the translation and think its authors have done remarkably well in a very difficult task. If they encourage more people to be moved and inspired by Fray Luis, they will have succeeded in the most important respect.

COLIN P. THOMPSON

**THE AUTHORITY OF DIVINE LOVE** by Richard Harries. *Blackwell*, 1983 pp 123. £3.96. Pb.

This is one of a series of books published to mark the 150th Anniversary of the Oxford Movement, in which various authors in the Anglo-Catholic tradition consider issues of current Christian concern such as Mission, the Bible, and Church-and-Nation.

The thesis of this volume is that we must rediscover true authority—the authority which derives ultimately from the creative and redemptive love of God—if we are to speak with relevance to a world which has had the bad odour of false authorities in its nostrils. The area of enquiry is pegged out between Newman’s (Anglican) ‘Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church...’, Bishop Butler’s ‘The Theology of Vatican II’, and the ARCIC conclusions. The author believes that Anglicanism having been propelled in a more Catholic direction by the Oxford Movement, and Rome having discovered a much more historical and critical approach to its traditions, there is a real convergence between the two bodies in their understanding of the authority of Doctrines, of Scripture, of Tradition and even, with some reservations, of Infallibility. He does not seem unduly discouraged by the Vatican’s ‘Observations’ on ARCIC, nor does his optimistic Catholicism allow him to give full weight to Stephen Sykes’ contention that a (commendably) deconfessionalised Anglicanism would be disastrously affected by unity with the very different Roman animal. After all, the reunion would be between moving bodies, not static ones. If Newman had lived now, he probably wouldn’t have felt the need to go over to Rome....

Newman mightn’t agree; he might suspect that the Anglicanism represented by the author, while appearing to accept the arguments of the Essay on Development, is still one which privileges the earlier Christian Centuries over the later ones; what then becomes of the church’s indefectibility?

My own main quarrel with this bravely hopeful tract is that it moves serenely in the hopelessly limited world of English and Welsh male clericalism; the language is ‘standard sexist’ in its choices of gender-specific generic terms; women are not noticed, except for Mary who is a Problem. The authority of divine love is not shown to be the turbulent, liberative authority celebrated in the Magnificat. While the author shows the need for an intelligent sense of tradition to counter the idiocy of some of Reagan’s fundamentalist colleagues and supporters, he doesn’t seem to believe that an option for the oppressed is inherent in the Christian tradition.

COLIN CARR OP