

they are to be states of the same person, without succumbing to the charge of circularity. This charge—made famously by Bishop Butler against Locke—claims that what Shoemaker calls ‘remembering from the inside’ must presuppose personal identity, and so cannot constitute it (pp. 81 ff and 98–101). Further brief but informative remarks follow, inter alia, on Unity of Consciousness and Self-Consciousness, and on Personal Identity and Animal Identity. There is a particularly fine analysis of what can be meant by ‘amnesia’, partial or total—this latter called a ‘brain zap’ (pp. 86–8).

In his reply, Swinburne makes two points. He attacks the functionalist account of mind, and claims that Shoemaker’s account of personal identity, particularly in the ‘Brain-State Transfer Device’, does not do justice to what he (Swinburne) sees as the actual hopes, fears and motivations of persons. Shoemaker’s Reply goes more carefully and at greater length through Swinburne’s essay, pointing out areas of agreement as well as disagreement. (This last section will be particularly useful pedagogically). Typographical errors, by and large, are rare and undisturbing, but one should be noticed. On pp.17–18 Swinburne is made to write that he is ‘adopting’ Bernard Williams’ famous ‘mad surgeon’ story. He must have meant to say ‘adapting’, since his version differs importantly from Williams’. (It involves a brain bisection and separate transfers, which were not in the original). Unwary beginners, or those relying on memory for Williams’ views here, might easily be misled about the relation of Williams’ arguments to Swinburne’s.

STEVEN COLLINS

**LUIS DE LÉON : THE NAMES OF CHRIST.** Translated and edited by Manuel Durán and William Kluback. *SPCK*, London, 1984. Pp. 385. £12.50

*The Names of Christ* is unquestionably one of the masterpieces of Spanish Golden Age prose, just as its author, the Augustinian Fray Luis de León, is a major writer of that period, famous in the Spanish-speaking world above all for his poetry, and almost unknown in this country. He was a gifted Biblical scholar and theologian, who valued and loved the Bible so much that he wrote the *Names* to compensate as far as possible for the fact that the glories of Christ in Scripture were forbidden to literate lay people who could not read Latin. The result is a great work of art, passionately evangelical in the best sense, a serene and burning witness to the universal and the personal Christ.

Fray Luis spent almost five years (1572–76) in the cells of the Inquisition, denounced for his interpretation of the Tridentine decree on the Vulgate’s authenticity and for various other reasons, among which envy and malice were conspicuous. The *Names* was born in prison and finished after his vindication, when he became Professor of Bible at Salamanca. This is the first full English translation (Schuster, London, 1955, only translated parts). The fourteen names are those ascribed in the Bible to the humanity of Christ—Bud, Face of God, Way, Shepherd, Mountain, The Everlasting Father, Arm of God, King of God, Prince of Peace, Husband, Son of God, Lamb, Beloved, Jesus. Fray Luis’s theory of names at the start outlines his philosophical and theological principles, which, like his allegorical and mystical exegesis, are foreign to us. But in spite of this the *Names* is a classic of devotional christology: Christ unlocks the meaning of the universe and personal experience. The christocentric cosmology is Pauline, a rare voice in post-Tridentine Spain, and the breadth of the theological and Biblical exposition gives tremendous strength and integrity to the writing.

In the original, sentences are often long, elaborately constructed, abounding in parallelisms and antitheses and a highly developed imagery, though there are passages of lively and realistic dialogue between the three friends who converse about the names. The translators have opted for ASB and NEB English rather than Book of Common Prayer and KJV, but the Biblical quotations are from the latter (not always matching it, e.g. pp. 2f1–12), differentiating them from the dialogue therefore, unlike

201

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