

we believe that it is, then we cannot identify it with the coming of Christ. Finally it must be pointed out that 'faith in the future' is not an adequate interpretation of what is meant by 'faith' in the Christian tradition. Unfortunately the notion seems to undergo this reduction in

meaning when Teilhardism attempts to put Marxism and Christianity into the same biological container. If this volume makes anything clear it is that they are both separately too large for it.

ALBERT RUSTON, O.P.

QUIS CUSTODIET? The Newman Association, Journal of the Legal Studies Group, No. 14/15, Hilary and Easter, London, 1967. 50 pp.

Quis Custodiet? began its life in duplicated form five years ago as the journal of the Newman Legal Studies Group. The combined Hilary and Easter number for 1967 was the first issue to appear in printed form. This new presentation is to be welcomed for itself and for the growth in circulation which it must reflect. It is to be hoped that the presumption of the title is redeemed by a genuine stress on the interrogative. That might best be shown by inviting contributions from lawyers of other faiths and none, as well as from non-lawyers, Catholic or otherwise. The implication of the group's 'term of reference', set out on the inside cover, is that a commitment to natural law is the only philosophical position proper to a Catholic lawyer. This was perhaps more to be expected in 1961 than it would be today.

Such carping criticism is not meant to detract from the real value of *Quis Custodiet?* There is undoubtedly plenty of scope for a law journal of Christian orientation with a scholarly commitment to canon law, comparative law, and international law as well as our legal system. With a major reform of both English and canon law a continuing prospect, there is plenty of work to be done. Whether or not the

Church would welcome any proposals the Newman Legal Studies Group may care to make, the Law Commission will certainly listen to their suggestions should they wish to endorse any proposals as a group. Two of the articles in double number of the Journal are excellent examples of what can be done. Dr Brown's article on 'Secrecy in Ecclesiastical Nullity Trials' is a most effective criticism of the maiden-auntly absurdities of the present procedure. It destroys the usual apologetic arguments in a quiet and deadly way. Mr McEwen's comments on the current proposals for the reform of our divorce law are perceptive, realistic and enlightened. One must have reservations, however, about a separate system of civil marriage law, enforced by tribunals distinct from the ordinary divorce courts, for those who make a Catholic or other Christian marriage. This would seem not only a possible instrument of religious tyranny, but likely to produce even more scandal and confusion than the differences between canon law and civil law create at present. It must be said, in fairness to Mr McEwen, that he gives this idea only passing support.

A. J. BOYLE

A QUESTION OF CONSCIENCE, by Charles Davis. Hodder & Stoughton, 1967. 30s.
THE McCABE AFFAIR, by Simon Clements and Monica Lawlor. Sheed & Ward, 1967. 15s.

One who wishes to write about the affairs of Charles Davis and Herbert McCabe had better begin by putting his cards face upwards on the table. Herbert McCabe has been a friend for many years. Charles Davis I have never, to my knowledge, even met. I greatly admired both men as editors, though I admired Father McCabe's writings while quite failing to share in that admiration for Charles Davis's theological writings that seems to have been widespread among English Catholics and, to my very great surprise, among non-Catholic theological journalists on such newspapers as *The Guardian*. When the news of Herbert McCabe's dismissal was made public I immediately wrote in *Common-sense*, whose British representative I am, that

'a full rehabilitation [i.e. including his restoration to his editorial chair] would be the only satisfactory end to this disgraceful affair'. This is still my view, though I do not look upon his replacement by another as a reason for not contributing to *New Blackfriars*. I even have to confess to thinking well of Archbishop Cardinale who, except in relation to Father McCabe's editorial, seems to me to have played an honourable and distinguished part in the affairs of the English Church. His violent remarks on the subject of Father McCabe's very moderate remarks, in the celebrated editorial, I find quite inexplicable, without even a Machiavellian explanation. Finally, I am not above the battle as, say, a Quaker or a Greek