

God's love—the only acceptable approach—is in line with tradition while being at the same time refreshingly original; at once lucid and sincere, the author has achieved a most convincing presentation of his theme. The evils which led to Calvary are all reducible to 'self-will, self-pleasing, self-love'. 'The sin that is in ordinary reputable human nature found itself face to face with the love of God in Jesus Christ, and what happened was the Cross'. One regrets only the suggestion, on p. 84, that death is not to be regarded as an immediate prelude to the Beatific Vision. The allusion is not to Purgatory; what seems to be envisaged is some other intermediate state—'a great pilgrimage through the ages of eternity'—before the final goal is reached. With what 'essential orthodoxy', to quote the Editor's Foreword, may this view be said to square?

A.G.

THE ROMAN CLAIMS: A Discussion by an English Churchman. By C. P. S. Clarke, Canon and formerly Archdeacon of Chichester. (A. R. Mowbray; 1s. 6d.)

Undoubtedly religious controversy, involving a polemical defence of one's own position by attacking someone else's, is necessary at times. But it is a pity, when it has to be undertaken, to waste time and exacerbate temper in attacking a caricature. This is what happens in the pamphlet under review.

To take a few instances only. Whatever faults it may be accused of the government of the Church is not an autocracy, but a graded hierarchy in which the constitutional rights and duties of each grade from Pope to parish priest are carefully regulated by law. Nor is the infallibility of the Pope (which is of course identical with and not separate from or independent of the infallibility of the Church) the meaningless and arbitrary claim it is made out to be. The author devotes a page and a half to the record of the Catholic Church in the matter of biblical criticism. He thinks that the Pontifical Biblical Commission 'dismissed summarily the whole fabric built up by half a century of scholarship and research'.

He should read, not von Hügel in a hasty and ill considered judgment written at a time of stress, when the nature of the answers given by the Biblical Commission was not yet fully understood, but, say, Sir Edwyn Hoskyns in the second chapter of his introduction to *The Fourth Gospel*. He might then realise both that his own outlook on the field of biblical studies is a little insular and that there is at least another side to the question of the supposed intransigence of the Biblical Commission.

What this pamphlet does indirectly show is the good that would come from personal contact and discussion between Catholic and non-Catholic theologians and biblical scholars.

HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.