

means sure that Jung means the same thing by that word in 'The Phenomenology of the Spirit in Fairy Tales' (the first contribution) as he does in 'The Spirit of Psychology' (the last essay in the book). Nevertheless, if these essays are taken separately they are most rewarding, and if I may be allowed to single out several that I found particularly helpful I would note *The Transformation of the Spirit in the Renaissance* by Werner Kaegi, *Galileo and Newton* by Friedrich Dessauer, and *The Spirit of Science* by Edwin Schrödinger.

DONALD NICHOLL

LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN CLASSICS:

AUGUSTINE'S LATER WORKS. Translated by J. Burnaby.

CONFESSIONS AND ENCHIRIDION. Translated by A. C. Outler. (S.C.M. Press; 30s. each.)

Would that every translator of the Fathers, ere he commenced his labours, formally abjured, renounced, and eschewed all manner of archaism, lest it be suggested thereby to the modern reader that the thought of the said Fathers is as outmoded as the English wherein they are rendered. Both these translations, albeit accurate as befitteth the work of scholars, suffer from this defect. Dr Outler, in the *Enchiridion*, uses 'speaks' and 'speaketh', 'does' and 'doth', etc., with a fine indifference and no discernible method withal. Professor Burnaby has a weakness for subjunctives, shrinks not from the ancient mode of negating verbs, and takes pleasure in the odd 'whereto'.

All this is a pity, because these are both very useful volumes, especially the *Later Works*. This contains the *Trinity*, Books 8-15, in which Augustine explores the trinitarian image in the soul; *The Spirit and the Letter*, and the *Homilies on I John*. In an excellent introduction to the *Trinity* Professor Burnaby summarizes the doctrine of the books not translated, and explains the niceties of the theological terms employed.

Both translators are tempted in their introductions to oversimplify. According to Professor Burnaby, Augustine holds that the opposition of letter and spirit (II Cor. 3: 6) is not one of literal and allegorical interpretation of Scriptures. But this is inaccurate. Augustine says that this is not the only meaning of the passage, nor the one that concerns him. He does not deny that it is a meaning. A much more flagrant 'simplisme' is Dr Outler's, who saddles Augustine with double predestination and irresistible grace. Now that is sheer calumny; irresistible grace—perhaps, with qualifications; but *not* double predestination. For Augustine, predestination is a step to glorification, inseparably associated with grace, God's free gift. Predestination to damnation would be an absurdity, as though damnation involved some sort of real anti-grace, a back-handed gift of God as undeserved as its

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