

gracious counterpart. But good heavens, the man was a Christian, not the fabricator of any such grotesque symmetries as double predestination. 'This grim topic', shudders Dr Outler; 'a doctrine of grace imprisoned in a rigid logic', nods Professor Burnaby. But surely the Pelagian doctrine of unmitigated justice is really far grimmer, and its logic much more stiffly artificial than Augustine's defence of grace, which is the co-efficient of mercy. That the final grace of salvation is not in fact granted to all was not invented by Augustine, but found by him in the tradition, and shared with him by his opponents. The truth cannot be served by sweeping him off into any such generalizations.

Professor Burnaby is least acceptable from the Catholic, not to say historical, point of view in his introduction to the *Homilies on I John*. The matter in hand is the anti-Donatist polemic. The Professor's sympathies are clearly with the schismatics, the 'Covenanters' of the late Empire, standing out against the official conformity. Augustine, it is suggested, was obliged to give many a deft twist to received orthodoxy in order to make good the Catholic case. His distinction between the efficacy and the validity of the sacraments administered outside the Church has been almost exactly reversed, we are told, in modern thought; Catholics will now recognize that such sacraments have some efficacy in their fruits, though being invalid in the sense of irregular. Ingenious, and just a little disingenuous.

The fact is of course that Augustine is not regarded as an authority by either of his translators. Nor is it realized that he himself was a man under authority, the Church's authority, and saw himself as such, and that it was in that role he took up the cudgels against his opponents, the Donatists above all. For, as in any schism, the question at issue was which side was being true to tradition, and had the authority of tradition behind it. Both claimed the distinction. Professor Burnaby, by suggesting that Augustine and the 'Catholic' party (his inverted commas) were the innovators, appears to see in the Donatists the direct and genuine heirs of the apostolic tradition; which is, as a matter of mere history, rash.

E.H.

THE MYSTICAL THEOLOGY OF ST BERNARD. By E. Gilson. Translated by A. H. C. Downes. (Sheed and Ward; 12s. 6d.)

It is pleasant, after fifteen years, to have a reprint of M. Gilson's *Mystical Theology of St Bernard*, translated by A. H. C. Downes. This edition is a pleasure to handle as the print and binding are both excellent. One regrets the omission of the frontispiece to the French edition (mentioned in the present text in Appendix I, p. 157) which is a

reproduction of a charming Roman mosaic depicting a skeleton lying on one elbow and bearing the caption 'Nosce Teipsum'.

St Bernard's mystical theology is based on the premises that man is made in the Image and Likeness of God. Even after sin he retains the Image, that is freewill and reason, but he has lost the Likeness, namely the power always to choose the good and to carry it out. All St Bernard's teaching is directed towards showing man how he may emerge from the *Regio Dissimilitudinis* and regain the lost Likeness. John Donne, nearly four hundred years later, seems to put forward the same idea, although he uses the word Image where St Bernard would have used Likeness:

Burn off my rusts, and my deformity,
Restore thine Image so much by thy grace,
That thou may'st know me,—

(Good Friday, 1613. *Riding Westward*.)

M. Gilson with his usual brilliant clarity, has reduced the copious Bernardine texts to a comparatively brief and coherent synthesis, amply illustrated by selections from the Saint's works. The appendices are as interesting as the thesis, particularly those dealing with William of St Thierry and the problem of St Bernard's possible connection with Courtly Love.

A word of criticism concerning the translation; was it really necessary to translate *volonté propre* (*voluntas propria*) and *conseil propre* (*proprium concilium*) as 'proper will' and 'proper counsel' respectively? Especially as later on *sens propre* (*sensum proprium*) is rendered as 'our own opinion'.

A. J. MEIKLE.

LA MESSE: LES CHRÉTIENS AUTOUR DE L'AUTEL. Par Les Prêtres de la communauté sacerdotale de Saint-Séverin. (Desclée de Brouwer; n.p.)

In 1948 Cardinal Suhard appointed a group of five diocesan priests to the parish of Saint-Séverin, with a mixed congregation of rich, poor, teachers, students, intellectuals, workers. Their task was to establish unity and some sense of community in this crowded district of Paris whose inhabitants were spiritually and intellectually isolated from one another. They began with themselves; though they are in no sense a religious order they live as a community, discussing and planning their work together and, more important, praying together. Three times a day they sing office in church: Prime in the morning, Sext at midday and Vespers and Compline in the evening. The people's liturgy is the Mass and after instruction the congregation began to take an active part. This book is the fruit of all that work: the first half is the instructions and the second an account of the practice. Dialogue