

as they judged necessary in accordance with the new findings in the fields of textual, archaeological, linguistic and more general historical studies. They have also sought to get rid of archaic or ambiguous expressions; but have otherwise avoided tampering with the style. It is, in fact, in no sense a new translation but strictly a revision or correction of the old. Over the detailed merits and demerits of this revision there could be endless argument; but that it does in many ways contribute to a more accurate reading of the Bible could not be questioned. So in this doubly Revised Authorised translation we have a work which no serious student of the Bible would be happy to be without. It is not the ideal translation: it cannot be said to give us *the* Bible. But it might be said to give us *a* Bible, and not just one more imperfect rendering of it. Like the Vulgate, it is not just a copy-book, but a world in itself, a sort of satellite world to the Bible.

RICHARD KEHOE, O.P.

THE TWO SOVEREIGNTIES: The Relationship Between Church and State.
By Joseph Lecler, S.J. (Burns Oates; 16s.)

The study of the relations of Church and State which Fr Lecler has undertaken is one which should prove of the greatest practical value to the student of such matters, whether the author's ultimate conclusions are or are not accepted. Broadly it may be said that, in Fr Lecler's view, the medieval claim to a sovereignty, almost direct, over the secular power, like the converse Caesaro-papalism which preceded it, was justified by the particular circumstances of the time and that, in our day, the Popes have commended a rather different approach, extending to a claim normally to a *potestas indirecta*, and no more.

Thus, of Caesaro-papalism the author writes that it was 'a solution consonant with a phase of history which has now vanished. No contemporary government claims to be the guardian of the Church's discipline or the arbiter of the Faith.' Then, of the 'six-century-long absence of laymen from the field of culture and political science', Fr Lecler comments: 'How could the ecclesiastical power, constantly called upon as it was by the princes to supply them with information and advice, avoid coming to regard as normal its far-reaching interventions in the temporal sphere? Were not the civil power and the ecclesiastical power both in churchmen's hands?' He speaks of Pope Nicholas I threatening to anathematise Lothair II, and, of course, cites the familiar cases of Gregory VII and Innocent III as examples of acknowledged supreme papal power in the secular sphere. As was said by John of Salisbury, 'The Pope possesses the two swords'—and justifies the theory of 'direct power', a papal jurisdiction over temporal affairs.

These medieval claims were not maintained intact. 'As the modern period wore on, the Church's interventions in temporal affairs became

progressively rarer' and 'in more recent times, Papal interventions closely affecting politics have been rare'.

This tendency the author approves; today it is principally in Encyclicals that 'the Holy See recalls to the nations and to their governments the great Christian principles which should govern political, social, economic and international affairs'. So, finally, the process is thus described: 'In other days the Holy See led the still infant nations by the hand and took to task their princes. Nowadays where adult nations are concerned, it is no longer by means of such temporal procedure that the Church asserts her pre-eminence; she does so instead by means of teachings, the magisterial character of which commands respect.'

Thus, paradoxically, it is the Christian doctrine about the civil power which lies at the root of the secular idea of the State, a notion alien to the early pagans. John of Paris as a disciple of St Thomas stresses that the State is founded in the natural order and must there be given recognition. The Encyclicals of Leo XIII and other more recent pontiffs emphasise the fact that the State lies in the natural order, the Church in the supernatural.

Unfortunately, however, in an agnostic or heretical modern world, outside the faithful, the vital distinction between the orders has largely been lost or become meaningless; so while this book may be most valuable to an instructed Catholic, for the mass of the people it is feared it will be almost unintelligible. Still, we must persevere with patience to educate, and this study will be of no small utility to help to educate the educators.

HENRY SLESSER

EUSEBE DE CESAREE. Livres I-IV. Texte grec. Traduction et annotation par Gustave Bardy. (Sources Chrétiennes: Les Editions du Cerf; 1,350 frs.)

Eusebius is one of our primary sources of knowledge for the first three-and-a-half centuries of Christian history and it must be maintained that both in his use of sources and in his interpretation he is worthy of the title of historian. His thesis was to show that there was a 'succession' in the whole life of the Church, but it is perhaps not surprising that he allows his own personal bias to influence his judgments. He was no lover of Athanasius and his own views colour strongly what he says of the Logos in his first Book.

The present edition uses the classic text of Schwartz, but M. Bardy does not here elaborate on the difficult questions connected with the revisions the *History* underwent at Eusebius's own hands. What notes there are, and there are not nearly enough, are illuminating, while the translation is scholarly and lucid.

This work forms part of a great project which hopes to present texts