

34). He further makes Rolle into a 'friend' of Dame Julian of Norwich, who, besides being all of seven years old when Rolle died, was also a recluse. And as for finding Rolle to be the best specimen of English mysticism and his experiences 'paradigmatic of most mystical encounters' (p. 31), scholars such as Knowles generally consider Rolle's experiences and writings to be inferior to those of Walter Hilton, Julian of Norwich and the author of *The Cloud*, several of whom opposed what they perceived as Rolle's mistaken emphasis on physical phenomena such as ecstatic warmth. Finally, for Greeley to assert blithely that 'British' mysticism was 'a tradition forgotten after the Reformation' (p. 27) is merely preposterous. For one thing, there never was a 'British' tradition, any more than there was a German tradition or a Flemish tradition or even a Spanish tradition. Secondly, the heyday of mysticism ended in England a century *before* the Reformation, as it did in other European nations with the exception of Spain. Thirdly, there were, nevertheless, plenty of English mystics during and after the Reformation, including Fr Baker and Gertrude More, George Fox, William Law, the Vaughans, Traherne, Crashaw, George Herbert, Blake, the Wesleys, Hopkins, Von Hügel, Underhill, Caryl House-

lander and probably C. S. Lewis—to name but a few.

Such errors and omissions are not exactly grave, but demonstrate clearly that, except for excerpts from popular anthologies, Greeley knows little of the field or sources he so avidly analyses. His total disregard for 75 years of truly critical work by scholars such as Von Hügel, Underhill, Inge, Poulain, Aristero, Graef, Denifle, Gardeil, Garrigou-LaGrange, Maréchal, Pepler, Maritain and even Bertrand Russell, not to mention Thomas Merton, Aelred Graham and William Johnston, adequately explains how he can not only arrogantly dismiss current interest in mysticism (other than his own) as faddism and yet be so patently wrong regarding both fact and interpretation. As for mystical enthusiasm itself, I am inclined to think it will survive its damnation by Fr Greeley, for, as W. K. Fleming remarked (in a different context) in 1913: 'All is not Mysticism that professes the name. But the true variety—what in Germany would be called 'der Mystik', as apart from 'Mysticismus'—is well able to take care of itself and of its secret, even though its reputation may be injured by people who go by hearsay, or who mistake for it its degradations of emotionalism or fanaticism' (*Mysticism in Christianity*, p. 2).

RICHARD WOODS OP

**A NEW PENTECOST?**, by Léon Joseph Cardinal Suenens. *Darton, Longman & Todd*, London, 1975. 38 pp. £2.50.

**CARDINAL SUENENS**, by Elizabeth Hamilton. *Hodder & Stoughton*, London, 1975. 254 pp. £4.95.

*A New Pentecost?* is a humble, personal book, in which Cardinal Suenens gives an account of the hope that is in him, a hope founded on God's promises and the living reality of the Holy Spirit. Although the Cardinal is evidently very specially enthusiastic about the 'Charismatic Renewal', the book is not simply another 'charismatic' publication: the author, in a warm, if not always profound, way, shows how the Church must always be the Church of Pentecost, and how in many ways the second Vatican council called us back to this; the liturgical movement and ecumenism are seen as major aspects of this, as is Focolare and Marriage Encounter.

As Elizabeth Hamilton's 'portrait' also brings out, Cardinal Suenens is a

man with contagious enthusiasm, with a profound, yet simple faith in God and love for the Church and for all kinds of people all over the world. It would be caddish and impertinent not to be appreciative of him. *A New Pentecost?* is a book which should inspire people, and help to clarify much that needs clarifying, and restore hope at a time when many people are too confused or fanatical to find it easy to hope. Similarly, the 'portrait', impressionistic as it is, and slightly, though not unpleasantly, precious, and fiercely partisan, introduces us to a kind of churchman that is all too rare, dedicated yet humane, orthodox yet unafraid, able to deal with crowds and individuals.

But still, however cheered one is to encounter such a man in such a posi-

is certainly not a blind adherent of it, and, like many people now, he disapproves of the term 'baptism in the Spirit'. But he does not seem to appreciate the much more radical problems raised precisely by the word 'charismatic', whose ambiguity he exploits, apparently without noticing it. He says that all Christians are charismatic, which is fair enough; but he never explores what is surely the immediate question that follows from this: what is the relationship between the word 'charismatic' as applied to *all* Christians, and the same word as applied to *some* Christians? It is not enough—as has been pointed out especially by Peter Hocken—to make a comparison with the liturgical movement. I for one want much more reassurance that the desired disappearance of the 'charismatic movement' does not entail, in fact, the swallowing up of the ocean in the river, rather than the other way about. And is it not rather tendentious to refer to our Lady as 'the first charismatic'?

Related to this is the problem, also indicated by Peter Hocken in several writings, of exaggerated reification, shown in talk of 'the' gift of whatever, 'the' experience of renewal, and so on.

diversity behind a narrowing of language and structures? Is it as simply true as the Cardinal implies that the 'charismatic movement' releases spontaneity, and especially spontaneous prayer? He refers to the danger of hierarchical intervention leading to a hardening of structures; but maybe hierarchical intervention might be necessary precisely to loosen structures? Episcopal panic will certainly not help; but is episcopal involvement the answer either? What of the real pastoral problem of people needing to be helped to escape or (more often) transcend the movement? Sympathetic people who are neither 'insiders' nor 'outsiders' could surely play a vital role, and one which would seem peculiarly appropriate to bishops and priests.

This is not to deny the help that the Cardinal and others testify they have received from the movement. It is rather to attempt to help it to deliver the real goods that it has to offer. Is this not a classic situation in which zeal without knowledge is fearfully dangerous? The Church can do with all the zeal she can get, certainly, and Cardinal Suenens is an inspiration to all of us in his zeal; but we must also be cunning as serpents.

SIMON TUGWELL OP

**LATIN LITERATURE OF THE FOURTH CENTURY**, edited by J. W. Binns. *Routledge & Kegan Paul*, London & Boston, 1974. 189 pp. £3.95.

First of all, some reservations about what is, on balance, a useful addition to the 'Greek and Latin Studies' series edited by members of the staff of Birmingham University. Title and brief introduction by Dr Binns are decidedly misleading: the first half of the Fourth Century is virtually ignored and the choice of authors given a chapter apiece is perverse. Ausonius, Symmachus, Paulinus of Nola, Claudian and Prudentius feature, but not Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose or Ammianus Marcellinus. Ammianus was doubtless omitted because he has already made an appearance in an earlier volume in the series but the other omissions are strange and calculated to bewilder a reader not already informed in some detail about their careers. For instance, the reader will be puzzled by Professor Frend's frequent allusions to Julian of Eclanum, unless he can identify him as the principal opponent of Augustine's anti-

Pelagian polemics and the man whose positive view of sex within marriage—he was himself a married bishop—was over a millennium ahead of its time.

As Dr Binns suggests, the literature of the period has significance not merely for those interested in the culture of the Western Empire at the end of the Fourth and beginning of the Fifth Centuries; every author treated in this book was confronted by a problem which has contemporary analogies, namely *how to relate the traditional culture in which he had been educated to a situation of rapid political and ideological change*, brought about in this case by the triumph of Christianity and the progressive collapse of the institutions taken for granted by the traditional culture. With one exception, however, the contributors to this volume are primarily concerned with only part of the problem, the relationship between the pagan classical and