people constantly hide their real nature from me behind the masks they allow me to see. God is indeed a hidden God; but what is to be made of that statement if everything is hidden in the same way?

Dr Hawkins writes from a somewhat similar standpoint to that of Dr Mascall, though his philosophical analysis is closer. Essentially both are trying to get away from the Cartesian dualism which has controlled so much modern philosophical thinking. Therefore I find it odd that both of them feel the need to attack the method of linguistic analysis, which seems successfully to escape this snare. Surely it is precisely a Cartesian fear to imagine that language may somehow get between one and the world one is trying to know. To take a single example from Dr Hawkins, what need is there to criticize Wittgenstein for saying the soul is a myth since '*A believes P, A thinks P, A says P,* are of the form "*P*" *says P*'? The soul Wittgenstein rejects here is the Cartesian soul, the ghost in the machine. In fact, he adds the words (though Dr Hawkins does not quote them) 'as it is conceived in contemporary superficial psychology'. But this is not the place to continue such analysis. Sufficient to say that Dr Hawkins brings the weight of his great learning to pursue the influence of Cartesian 'disembodied awareness' in all the major philosophers up to the present day. His book is too close-packed to make easy reading, but like the other two, despite criticisms of detail, well worth the efforts of concentration it demands.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

GOD AND HIS CREATION. Theology Library, volume 2. Edited by A. M. Henry, O.P. (Mercier Press; 21s.)

This has not been an easy review to write. The French original of this work, volume II of *Initiation Théologique*, has, together with its three companion volumes, been widely acclaimed as an outstandingly successful piece of *haute vulgarization;* and the Mercier Press is to be congratulated on having recognized its value and undertaking an English translation. So much must be said in all fairness to the brilliant and devoted collaborators who produced the original work and have continually revised it since its first appearance (it should be noted that the present translation is made from the first edition of 1951 and differs frequently from the third edition with which I have compared it), and also to the publishers for their enthusiasm and insight. But what must also be said, however painful it may be to have to say it, is that the present translation is a shameful and shoddy travesty of the original. As someone with considerable experience of theological translation into English, I am not unaware of the problems with which the translator is faced; and my criticism is not primarily directed against the clumsiness or harshness of innumerable passages in this translation.

My main criticism is twofold: firstly, that the translator clearly has only the sketchiest acquaintance with the French language; secondly, that even apart from his ignorance of the language from which he is supposed to be translating, an elementary acquaintance with Scripture and theology, or even simple commonsense, should have told him that some of the statements for which he has made himself responsible were either false or meaningless—but this has not been the case.

Let me begin by noting inadequacies which would disfigure any production of this kind but which are trivial set by the side of the enormities to be noted later. (I should point out that I have read the first ten pages of the translation and only sampled the rest: it seemed futile to pursue any careful examination.) The bibliographies of the original are retained, a praiseworthy practice in itself, but not when the English translations of some of these works are listed a second time in the English bibliographies. In one case the French bibliography supplies a long list of scriptural references; this too has simply been retained *without* translation in the present volume. Again the translator has not, apparently, thought of consulting the *Catholic Encyclopedia* or even the Bible for the normal English spelling, in particular, of proper names: we find 'Marcel' of Ancyra, 'Amphiloque', 'Pneumatomaques'; we also find 'Chananean', 'Lackish', 'Kobar', 'Siserah', and, unbelievably (yet at least four times, including the analytic list of contents for chapter I), 'Ezechial'! 'Ezechial' by the 'Kobar'! We are beginning to take the measure of the fantastic illiteracy of this translation.

I have said that I could stand no more than ten pages of this translation: these ten pages must contain some fifty errors of translation (I say 'errors', not 'infelicities'). By way of example: for 'L'arche de sa présence' we have 'The arch of his presence', instead, of course, of 'The ark . . .'; the prophets 'experimented with' God's presence instead of 'experiencing' it. Pronouns are repeatedly referred to the wrong antecedent, subjects of verbs mistaken for objects, whole sentences distorted so as flatly to contradict the original. Obviously I cannot list all these errors here: for a particularly fascinating example of sheer incomprehension I might refer to page 468, where we are told of the 'sinister pair of the epistles (*sic*) to the Romans: *hē hamatía* and *ho thánatos*, sin and death (in Greek the classes are reversed)'. Puzzled by this enigmatic parenthesis, we turn to the original to find that P. Bouyer has merely remarked in passing that the *genders* (*genres*) of the two words are reversed in French and Greek.

This translation is a disgrace: a disgrace to the translator, a disgrace to the censor of the University of Notre Dame, a disgrace to the publishers and to the original authors, who, however unwillingly, must inevitably be associated with this lamentable by-product of their

labours; ultimately, indeed, a disgrace to the Church—so *this*, a non-Catholic might say, is Catholic theology! The only honourable course open to the publishers is to withdraw the book from circulation and see that it is submitted to the most searching revision, preferably by another hand; for as it stands, it is certainly not fit for publication.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

In the Editions du Seuil series 'Maîtres spirituels' Mme Jeanne Ancelet-Hustache has published the latest of her valuable contributions to the study of late medieval mysticism, an anthology with introduction, *Maître Eckhart et la mystique rhénane* (Paris, 1956): and this has now been published in an English version made by Hilda Graef (who has translated the French introduction but, most commendably, has gone as Mme Ancelet-Hustache did to the medieval German originals of the selected works) *Master Eckhart and the Rhineland Mystics* (London, Longmans, 1957, 6s.).

The author gives us an exceptionally well-informed if somewhat cursorily executed account of Eckhart's background. The chief omission is any mention of the German and Dutch heretics who had before him preached a Dionysian 'deification', and had on that account been condemned. Such mention would have given even further point to her insistence that the resemblances in Eckhart to pseudo-Dionysius are superficial, and that the true centre of his doctrine is his teaching of the birth of the Word in the soul, which she expounds as the doctrine of the mystical body, with valuable allusions to those places in St John and St Paul to which Eckhart went for his proofs. Though, in common with all who love Eckhart as a teacher, she is distressed by his condemnation, she is scrupulously fair in her treatment, even pointing out those places in the translated works where condemned propositions occur: but such places generally merit our close attention. Thus in the sermon *In hoc apparuit caritas* we have one such proposition, word for word: 'All that (the Father) ever gave (to the Son) in His human nature is neither more alien nor further removed from me than from Him'; but what the Bull *In agro dominico* does not say is that Eckhart goes on at once to say: 'Be as certain of this as of my life; if we are thus to receive from Him, we must be in eternity, lifted above time'. We need not ask for any more striking illustration of the words of reproof which Tauler uses later to address to Eckhart's audiences, reminding them that their master had talked to them of the things of eternity, but they had misinterpreted his words as referring to this earthly life.

Yet in considering the circumstances and the terms of his condemnation, we must remember the hair's breadth which sometimes