

was that they themselves were perfectly convinced that they were doing the right thing. Little Marykuty did not matter and neither did I. She was a nuisance for coming back and I was a nuisance for bringing her. There seemed to be no charity in these people, no human understanding, let alone divine' (p. 85). One is tempted to apply these words to Miss Dougal herself. However, in all fairness, she does say some charitable things about Indian priests and nuns, but they sound most unconvincing when set against all the bitterness.

I cannot help thinking that if Miss Dougal wanted to do a serious study and make a contribution to the complex question of the nature and training of priestly and religious vocations in India, she should have stayed longer than a week in India and consulted and read more widely. She could have consulted members of the Episcopal Commission on vocations, the vocation directors of various congregations and dioceses, and read the statements of many Indian bishops, priests and nuns on the 'Kerala scandal', as the media called it. Above all she could have studied more carefully the findings of the Vatican inquiry into the matter. She dismisses these findings in three curt paragraphs.

She complains that the Vatican inquiry took seven months to complete. The superior of my religious community was in charge of that

inquiry and went to endless trouble to be accurate, objective and comprehensive. There was an unbelievable amount of interviewing, cross-checking of facts and on-the-spot investigation. The accusations of the mass media were very serious and nothing but a full-scale investigation would satisfy Rome. Naturally, an enormous amount of the material gathered could not be published because it was highly confidential in the sense that evidence was given on the understanding that the witnesses would remain anonymous. Besides, I shudder to think what would have happened had the material got into the hands of someone like Miss Dougal. Yet, even with these limitations, the published Vatican report was absolutely authentic and sufficiently full. It was a pity Miss Dougal did not study it more carefully.

My overall impression is that Miss Dougal just could not wait to get into print. Because of her hurry she has merely intensified the gross distortion of the facts spread by the mass media. Whatever may have been our reaction to the mass image media coverage, it must be given the credit of hastening the full-scale Vatican inquiries which was a good thing. This having been done, what can Miss Dougal expect to achieve? I cannot wait for the day this book goes out of print. Until then, I strongly recommend that people do not read it.

BEDE MCGREGGOR, O.P.

**FROM COLERIDGE TO GORE: A Century of Religious Thought in Britain**, by B. M. G. Reardon. *Longman*, 1971. 502 pp. £3.25.

In the preface to this excellent survey Dr Reardon says that he had to resist a temptation to discuss the wider bearing of his materials lest his history became a platform for merely personal opinions. It is a testimony to the general sureness of those particular judgements that he does allow himself that I became increasingly impatient of Dr Reardon's self-denying ordinance and wished he had followed Storr's example and had presented the reader with a view of the higgles and piggles of events and persons and theologies. A deal about individual liberals, for example, is no substitute for something on liberalism in this century.

There is, however, one tremendous gain from the divisive manner. It has become a commonplace of modern criticism that all roads lead back to Coleridge, and Dr Reardon's method lets us take a second look at this opinion. Lets us ask whether Coleridge was really so important for his own time. Lets us notice that the impressive Christian life of Dr Arnold gave a

greater excitement to liberalism in nineteenth-century England. Lets us notice that F. D. Maurice was putting himself through rhetorical paces in his preface to the *Kingdom of Christ* when he was ambiguously acknowledging a debt to Coleridge.

Paradoxically, Dr Reardon on this matter attempts to give some connective hints by means of a sentence linking Coleridge and Arnold, a paragraph on Coleridge and Newman, and a page on Coleridge and Hare.

Dr Reardon's other bookend, Gore, certainly loses in intelligibility when not put in comparison and company with others. Gore has been selected before as the cardinal of English theological history, the hinge on which the period from Coleridge and that to the second Temple flap; he is less interesting than Coleridge but enjoys a less questionable claim to be a 'great Anglican'. Dr Reardon makes much of him. *Lux Mundi* here, as in other accounts, is set in parallel with *Essays and Reviews*.

This is surely a mistake of some magnitude and demonstrates simply how easy it is for an historian to succumb to the fascination of external forms. *Essays and Reviews* articulates an intellectual adventure of some risk. The collection constitutes an active voice of great distinction in the history of Anglican apologetic. *Lux Mundi* is quite another sort of thing. And what sort of thing could only be demonstrated in a history of ideas. Something of real interest might be made, for example, from a comparison of Gore's heavy essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' and Jowett's allusive and imaginative writing 'On the Interpretation of Scripture'. And much might be learnt from a consideration of Gore's approving in 1914 a more conservative faith being required of clergy than of laity. It is a question what sense it makes for such a man, who worked long after the hunting of the Essayists and Reviewers, to refer to himself as a 'liberal

Catholic'.

Between these two personages of English theologizing Dr Reardon has placed a grand procession of greater and lesser men and treated each with a remarkably even-handed justice. The book is full of good things. There is, for example, a proper appreciation of R. D. Hampden, and a dismissal of John Newman's *Elucidations* of that theologian's writings as 'a work of more skill than scruple'. And it is full of surprises. For example again, it is astounding that Dr Reardon, after his huge reading among these men, should still be ready to make as respectful a bow to Wescott and Lightfoot as to the great Hort.

Dr Reardon's book is a most useful buy for any student who wants a reference survey of theological worthies of this period which combines an encyclopaedic thoroughness with an humane enthusiasm.

HAMISH F. G. SWANSTON

ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE. Vol. LIII: The Life of Christ (IIa xxxviii-xlv), by S. R. Parsons and Albert Pinheiro. *Blackfriars; Eyre and Spottiswoode*, London; *McGraw-Hill*, New York, 1971. xx + 220 pp. £2.50.

The title which the editors have given this volume must not be taken as suggesting that St Thomas wrote a 'life of Jesus' in the sense which those words might have had for Renan or Paterson Smythe; it simply indicates certain incidents of the theological importance which lie between Christ's birth and infancy on the one hand and his passion and resurrection on the other; more specifically, his baptism, his asceticism, his temptation, his teaching ministry, his miracles and his transfiguration. The introduction is quite brief, the notes are almost entirely restricted to textual references, but the six appendices are up to date, penetrating and highly relevant. In particular the use which is made of such recent information and insights as that provided by the Qumran scrolls is most commendable; and, in spite of a tendency to what many people today will consider as fanciful typologizing, most of St Thomas's discussion, especially that of Jesus' relation to the Baptist and his baptism, loses very little of its theological validity. (In passing, I think few

'curious students of theology' will wish to follow the editors' advice to skip qu. xlv, art. 2, ad 2, with its long exposition of the views of Origen, Dionysius and Chrysostom of the nature of the solar eclipse at the time of the crucifixion!)

A few slips have been noted. On page 35, line 8, 'impassable' should be 'impassible'. On page 72, last line, *quie* should be *qui*. On page 153, line 1, *donec* should surely be rendered by 'until', not 'unless'. On page 155, line 19, 'not' should be deleted. In places (e.g., page 109, line 19; page 125, line 30; page 157, line 8), the italicization of the translation does not seem to correspond with that of the text. These are, however, small blemishes, and I would repeat my admiration of the appendices, as succinct theological expositions in their own right, especially those on the Baptism of John, the Baptism of Christ and the Transfiguration.

E. L. MASCALL