

Bauerschmidt's book will find many other quotations worth taking note of when it comes to what Aquinas has to say.

So I heartily commend his book as an excellent account of its subject matter. Insofar as I have reservations with it, I feel that it sometimes proceeds too quickly on the assumption that some key philosophical ideas of Aquinas pass muster. For example, I worry that Bauerschmidt does not refer to some of the problems that have been raised concerning Aquinas's theory of knowledge and his account of divine causality and human freedom. I also worry about what, given what Bauerschmidt says, is left of Aquinas's view of faith if, like many New Testament scholars, we do not suppose ourselves to have direct and historically accurate access to the words of Christ, or if we do not suppose we have as much access as Aquinas thinks we do. Aquinas holds that what he calls 'the articles of faith' cannot be demonstrated to be true, and he makes a very good case for this conclusion. So, on what does he take Christian faith to rest? He thinks that it rests on, and is derived from, the teachings of Jesus, who, as God, knows what he is talking about and is the 'primary teacher' of the faith. He holds that, for example, Christ effectively taught the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the Incarnation. In taking this view, of course, Aquinas (among other things) is assuming a very strong position when it comes to the historicity of the gospels and our ability to determine this. But what if that position is open to question given developments and disagreements among biblical commentators that have arisen since Aquinas's time? Bauerschmidt rightly emphasizes Aquinas's role as a commentator on Scripture, and, with many other good things to say, he provides a sensitive account of Aquinas's inaugural lecture as a Parisian Master of Theology, which focuses on *Psalms* 103:13, which Aquinas reads as providing guidance for those professing *sacra doctrina* (holy teaching equivalent to the articles of faith derived, he thinks, from the Bible). On the other hand, Bauerschmidt also observes that 'Thomas's approach to the sacred text might seem somewhat alien to us today, conditioned as we are to a largely historical approach to biblical texts' (pp.62f). He adds that the approach of Aquinas's biblical commentaries 'common in the thirteenth century, may well seem unfamiliar to us today' (p.63). And Bauerschmidt is right here. When it comes to the gospels, at any rate, Aquinas's somewhat fundamentalist approach (one presuming literal and historical inerrancy) is unusual in some circles, though clearly not in others. And this leaves me wondering what confidence can be given to Aquinas's assurance that he knows that Christ taught the articles of faith. At any rate, there is a question here on which readers of Bauerschmidt's book might care to brood.

BRIAN DAVIES OP

**GOD THE FATHER IN THE THEOLOGY OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS** by John Baptist Ku, *Peter Lang*, New York, 2013, [American University Studies: Series VII, Theology and Religion, vol. 324], pp. xvii + 378, £60.00, hbk

This work is a systematic and careful study of what St Thomas Aquinas says of God the Father. Obvious as this subject might seem, it appears that it has not been discussed extensively until now. In fact, as the author points out (p. 3), not just St Thomas's 'theology of God the Father', but the 'theology of God the Father' as such hardly exists as a separate area of study; witness the fact that we have 'Christology' and 'Pneumatology', but no corresponding word for this discipline, the term 'patrology' already being taken for another use.

Although the author is a Dominican teaching in the United States, the influence of what is sometimes called the Toulouse-Fribourg school is evident in his writing, in particular the work of Fr Gilles Emery OP. This manifests itself by an attention to similarities and contrasts between St Thomas and his contemporaries, as well as a consideration of the historical development discernible within Aquinas's own *corpus*. On the other hand the author does not consider the Thomistic tradition between the 13<sup>th</sup> century and the 20<sup>th</sup> century. More trivially, a French influence can be detected in the author's habit of referring to St Thomas as 'the Dominican master', this kind of periphrasis being common in French as a way of reducing repetitions, but rather unusual in English.

After a helpful introduction that explains the technical vocabulary that St Thomas uses when speaking of the Holy Trinity, chapter one presents the scriptural sources of trinitarian theology, with passages from some of Aquinas's commentaries, especially on St John's gospel. This chapter is a fairly gentle introduction to what becomes afterwards a more demanding read.

The rest of the book takes its structure principally from question thirty three of the first part of the *Summa Theologiae*, dedicated to 'the Father'. The four articles of this question give rise to chapters two to four and chapter six. Chapter five, dedicated to 'the Father as Spirator', is the exception to this structure, since St Thomas considers this subject later in the *Summa*, when writing directly of the Holy Spirit. The author's investigations, however, range across the whole field of Aquinas's writings, making use in particular of the *Scriptum* or *Commentary on the Sentences*.

Chapter two, then, considers the 'property' of the Father which is traditionally called 'innascibility', that is, the Father's not coming from any other principle. The author shows that St Thomas presents this characteristic of God the Father as a simple negation, and that in this he consciously separated himself from St Bonaventure, for whom innascibility was constitutive of the Father. For St Thomas, the Father is constituted as Father simply by paternity itself. On St Bonaventure's account, He would be on the contrary a 'superabundant source logically prior to mutually opposed relations between the divine persons' (p. 86). As the author observes, were that true, 'innascibility would seem to belong to the Father not as he is distinct from the Son and the Holy Spirit but as he is the divine essence'; and this in turn would suggest 'an innascible divine essence that cannot be communicated by the Father to the Son' (*ibid.*).

Chapter three, 'Father Principle', examines the great care with which St Thomas expressed himself in speaking of the Trinity. Unlike St Bonaventure and St Albert, he refused to use the term 'hierarchy' in speaking of the divine persons, even saying that it implied heresy (p. 148). The term *auctor* he prefers to reserve for the Father, saying that it adds to the idea of being a principle the note of not being from another. Unlike St Bonaventure, he will not speak of *subauctores* within the Trinity (p. 150). The author translates *auctoritas* as 'authority'; this does not seem quite right, since the English term implies the right to command. Chapter four, 'The name, 'Father'', considers why this term is the proper one for the first Person as opposed, for example, to 'Begetter' or 'the Unbegotten'. The author shows an important development in St Thomas's thought between the *Scriptum*, where the term 'Word' was taken to be both an essential term in God, equivalent either to intellection or to the divine essence as understood, and also a personal name for the Son, and the later writings in which it is said to be only a personal name (p. 216). He states that the angelic doctor was the first to achieve clarity on this point.

Chapter five, 'Father Spirator', addresses the famous question of the procession of the Holy Spirit. Although the author's presentation is, as elsewhere, both systematic and convincing, a couple of his expressions could be questioned.

He writes, ‘spiration formally belongs to the Father as *Father*’ (p. 257), which if it were strictly true would seem to rule out the *Filioque*. In various places he says that the Holy Spirit proceeds ‘principally from the Father’ (pp. 255, 279, 332, 336). While it is true that St Thomas uses the word *principaliter*, this seems to be more from piety towards St Augustine than to express his own thought; and also, the English word ‘principally’ seems unsuitable, as it is generally used to mean ‘mainly’ or ‘more’.

Chapter six, ‘The Father in the Economy’, offers a convincing rebuttal of the charge that the intra-trinitarian distinctions are irrelevant to St Thomas’s account of the christian life. While the author explains and defends Aquinas’s view that the whole Trinity can be addressed as ‘Father’ (p. 318), he also shows how, in the words of the *Scriptum*, ‘leading us back to the Father, as to the principle without a principle, Christ taught us to direct prayer to the Father through the Son’ (p. 324). In a particularly interesting passage, he suggests that the ‘quasi-experimental’ knowledge of God of which St Thomas sometimes speaks applies primarily to the Son and the Holy Spirit, since ‘the Father’s indwelling does not fill our minds with a likeness that corresponds to one of his properties’ (p. 321). But here he only alludes to a debate which lies outside the scope of his work.

This solid and pleasantly didactic work finishes with a summary of each chapter (pp. 328–34) and some proposals for further research. To this reviewer, the suggestion of examining the place which God the Father holds in St Thomas’s account of the hypostatic union and of the life of Christ seems particularly promising.

THOMAS CREAN OP

**THE FANTASY OF REUNION: ANGLICANS, CATHOLICS, AND ECUMENISM, 1833–1882, by Mark D. Chapman, *Oxford University Press*, Oxford, 2014, pp. ix + 329, £55.00, hbk**

This elegant and civilized study is perfect reading for ecumenical sceptics – and a worthwhile contribution to the Church history (European and, up to a point, North American) of the nineteenth century.

The opening chapter insists on the resolutely un-ecumenical character of the Oxford Movement, which in its origins was as opposed to Rome as it was to Protestant Dissent. The Tractarian concept of catholicity was ‘temporal’, which meant, in effect, identical with that of apostolicity. The claim that the contemporary Church of England was catholic turned on two premises. First, the patristic Church – at any rate before the deviation represented by the Seventh Council, Nicaea II, which counter-evangelically licensed the worship of images – was the Church of the apostles expressing itself in creeds and liturgies. Secondly, the Church of England was in her ministry in lineal descent from the patristic Church in the island of Britain, and thus carried an apostolic mandate to the inhabitants of its southern portion. Chapman’s presentation of the Tractarian Newman makes telling use, accordingly, of his 1840 essay ‘The Catholicity of the English Church’ for which all that is necessary in order to share in the essence of the Church is descent from a common origin – not relations of communion, much less ties of governance, with christians elsewhere. This coheres with Pusey’s 1839 open *Letter* to Bishop Bagot of Oxford, for which explicit – and exclusive – adherence to the teachings of the undivided Church of the ecumenical Councils of the patristic epoch is the *sine qua non* of catholicity. Here what Pusey termed the ‘first deeds’ are, so to say, the epistemological equivalent of Newman’s more