

difficult book to read, lacking clarity in exposition. Its attention is really focused on debates of contemporary theologians. Its conclusion apparently is that the soul is related to each of the divine persons by a proper relation, but the term 'proper' has been so watered down as to be identical with 'appropriated'.

STANISLAUS PARKER, O.P.

FUNDAMENTALS OF CATHOLIC DOGMA. By Ludwig Ott, edited in English by James Canon Bastible, D.D. (The Mercier Press, Cork; 30s.)

Accuracy is to be expected of a book of positive theology as it is of a logarithm table. Those who buy Dr Ott's *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* in its present English edition will look in vain for this quality. The misprints are to be counted by hundreds, and they occur precisely in the formulas of the faith. The canon of the Vatican Council concerning the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is so misquoted as to make nonsense. The errors are not only typographical, e.g. page 213, 'Mary' should read 'Christ', page 414, 'baptism' should read 'penance'. The Council of Vienne appears throughout as that of Vienna. Authors' names have as many as three guises. The use of capital letters is quite unaccountable. These serious faults do the author a disservice, because one can discern that the original book must have been very useful. If anything its scope is too ambitious: besides the facts of dogma and historical notes there is usually a compressed account of the opinions of theologians, and it appears that the last word has been said before any discussion takes place. It is to be hoped that an emended edition will soon be published.

STANISLAUS PARKER, O.P.

DEMYTHOLOGIZING AND HISTORY. By Friedrich Gogarten. (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.)

The occasion of this book is a controversy among Protestant theologians in Germany arising from Bultmann's idea of 'demythologizing' the Gospels. But in fact the book is concerned very little with the actual question of 'demythologizing' the Gospel. It is a very profound study of the historical character of the Christian message, which the author regards as the real question at issue. He starts from Luther's conception of the Word of God as the living reality through which God communicates himself to man and of faith as the response of man to this living Word. Now this Word, in Luther's view, is communicated through the Bible, but this does not mean that the Word derives its authority from the Bible, but on the contrary that the Bible derives its authority from

the Word. The Bible is not to be considered simply as a historical document to be judged by rational analysis, but as the witness to the Word of God which can only be grasped by faith. This Word is essentially a historical message; it is a *kerugma*, a heralding of a divine event, which took place in the life and death and resurrection of Christ. But the historical event cannot be separated from the divine message and judged by merely human standards. 'The person and history of Jesus are present in the *kerugma*, present with the same historical presence as that with which He is present on each separate occasion both with the disciples and with the Church of our own day and the Church of the future.' This conception of Christ as present always in the Church communicating himself to his disciples through his Word is one which a Catholic will have no difficulty in accepting. We should only differ in our conception of the precise nature of the Church and in our belief that the Word communicates himself primarily through the Church as the 'Spirit-bearing' community and only secondarily through the Bible.

Professor Gogarten bases his view on a very profound conception of man as an essentially historical being, which owes much to the philosophy of Heidegger, but it is a pity that he finds it necessary to reject not merely the dualism of Descartes, but also the whole metaphysical system of Christian thought and to claim that 'metaphysical thinking has been superseded by historical thinking'. In actual fact there is no difficulty in reconciling this historical conception of Christianity with orthodox Christian doctrine. It was already clearly formulated by Origen and developed by St Augustine and so passed into the medieval tradition. Doubtless we are more definitely aware of this fundamentally historical character of man and of Christianity than before, but it is a development of doctrine, not a supersession.

BEDE GRIFFITHS, O.S.B.

THE EASTERN SCHISM. Steven Runciman. (Oxford University Press; 21s.)

Dr Steven Runciman is one of the major historians of our time and his present study is a vitally important contribution to our slowly increasing knowledge of the developments of the schism between Greeks and Latins. It is essentially a supplement to his three volumes on the Crusades and would have been best described by the cumbersome title of 'the effect of the crusading movement on the growth of the Eastern schism'.

This is a subject which has never before been adequately explored, but Dr Runciman reaches the same conclusion as other scholars who are specializing on other facets of the schism. It is becoming increasingly