

to be learned from this book which is not without philosophical significance. Wittgenstein says that 'philosophy is a battle against the bewitchment of our intelligence by means of language'. Part of what he has in mind is our tendency to construe a philosophical problem by means of analogies suggested to us by the superficial grammar of our language—to view the soul as a little man within, the causal nexus as a piece of string, the meaning of a word as an object and so on—where of course it is not merely chance that the grammar of our language does suggest these analogies. This tendency is not overcome merely by being pointed out, for even when, say, we realise that language is not an exact calculus and yet that we view it as though it were, we may still continue to treat it as if it were in a number of ways which go unrecognised. Wittgenstein has shown us that a large part of preparation for doing philosophy could well consist in unearthing and tracking down the ways in which we are led on a metaphysical wild goose chase by such false analogies. But what is important is that there are two ways of attacking a myth. One way is in fact at bottom not really an attack on the myth at all, but merely shows how deeply captivated we are by it, even when our intelligence is at its most critical. If I say that we have the idea that the soul is a little man within and wish to attack this idea I may say, 'There is no little man within', and think that in saying this I am committed to behaviourism. That is to say, the hold of the myth is such that in denying it I may feel that I am committed to denying the existence of mind. (I suspect that Ryle is not altogether free from this fault.) The other way of denying the myth is the far more complex task of exposing the real relationships between things, enabling us to use our language and not be misled by the analogies which it inevitably suggests. When Professor Van Buren is concerned with removing the myth that God is an old man in the sky, a myth which corrupts the theological thought of even the most sophisticated of us, he finds himself driven to deny the existence of God and to leave theology in the sadly depleted state of doing nothing more than evincing a fundamental attitude to life. If there is a theological task of enabling us to think of God in a way no longer dominated by this destructive picture, then to regard that task as achieved by denying the existence of God—for that is in effect what Van Buren does—is only to show how far we are captivated by a picture which makes havoc of our thought.

ROGER WHITE

THE MONASTIC ORDER IN ENGLAND, by David Knowles; second edition, C.U.P., 70s.

The typescript of the first edition passed from the author's hands to the secretary of the C.U.P. in October 1937. Much work on early English monasticism has been undertaken and has borne fruit since, in no small measure because of this book: if Dom David Knowles tried radically to revise his virtually pioneering synthesis, he would find himself embarking on a new book. This he has recognised—'Were it to be written again *ab ovo*,' he points out, 'it would doubtless

differ much in emphasis and treatment, but it would then become another book, and I have been content to eliminate or to change only those statements and passages which seemed to me to be either erroneous or outdated by subsequent research.' The photo-offset reprint process has given him small scope for change, but he has adroitly made 150 adjustments: these do not include the description of St William of York as the nephew of Henry II on p. 289 ('a very old error', quoth Hamilton Thompson) or the slip on p. 503 where Pierre de Celle is called *archbishop-elect* of Chartres. But it does include a significant change on the title-page: the *terminus a quo* is in this edition not 943 but 940—for it can now be shown by a charter issued by King Edmund 'to my faithful Abbot Dunstan' in 940 (within days a millenium before this book, a hymn of English monachism, was published), that this was the time of the entry of Dunstan into his abbacy at Glastonbury.

Certain issues, however, have arisen since 1937, 'important in themselves, though for the most part marginal to the main theme of this book'. These need an airing and the author has judged it best to leave the body of the book intact, and append ten pages of Additional Notes on eleven subjects, together with a reference to the principal scholarship, the decisive literature on each. With this is an Additional Bibliography of books which almost without exception have appeared since 1937, and which bear directly on the history of monasticism in England. A few titles of earlier date, overlooked in the first edition, are also included.

The first of the eleven subjects is the *Regula Magistri*. The author has separately made a remarkable study of the RM-RB controversy, which he delivered in February 1962 in the Birkbeck Lectures, since published in *Great Historical Enterprises* pp. 139-195. He felt that the moment was opportune for presenting medievalists with an account of the points at issue, with a narrative of the phases of controversy, and with an assessment of positive results. A note of one and a half pages can hardly do that, as this astonishing essay has done, and it is a pity that he has not made greater reference to it: better by far to read the essay than the note provided, particularly the essay's last dozen pages. An example will suffice: in the note Prof. Knowles writes simply that 'Dr R. Hanslik, the editor of the long-awaited text of RB in the Vienna Corpus (C.S.E.L. LXXV), has recently (i.e., in 1960) come out firmly in favour of the priority of RB.' But in the essay, after much discussion he reaches this conclusion—'the third view, recently sponsored by Payr (a pupil of R.H.) and Hanslik, is superficially attractive as a bolt-hole for the irresolute. It removes all awkward problems into never-never land . . . posits as the solvent of all problems an entirely hypothetical document . . . That Hanslik and Payr could revive the conservative thesis was due almost entirely to their concentration, to the exclusion of all else, upon purely textual points, and within that field upon a very narrow sector'. As it stands, RM is held to be prior, and St Benedict's authorship of the great chapters on Obedience, Humility and the Abbot is now in much doubt. Like Aquinas, hest andsat the summit of a movement, the most exquisite synthesis of two centuries of thought.

The second subject is the Benedictinism of Gregory the Great. Mabillon, Butler, *et al* were swept away by two scholars during 1957, Ferrari and Hallinger. It has been shown that the flight of the monks of Monte Cassino from the Lombards to the Lateran monastery at Rome is no more than a venerable tradition. The close literary ties between the two monks, Gregory and Benedict, are now believed to derive from common sources such as St Augustine and Cassian. Dom K. Hallinger especially (in *Studia Anselmiana* 42) has shown that the term 'Benedictinism' is an anachronism (and it is not for nothing that Dom David Knowles himself has called his book 'The Monastic Order'). All this of course has repercussions: Augustine of Canterbury wasn't a Benedictine, then, and the Roman monachism that he brought to Kent in 597 wasn't *secundum RB*. The first mention of RB in Gaul is Ab. Venerandus in c. 620-630; and in England is Eddius' *Vita Wilfridi* C. 14. This was the era of mixed Rules, and selections of what was 'optima' (Benet Biscop's phrase when he abstracted from seventeen Rules. Benedict of Aniane did no less in 815, but he was consciously looking for a critical text of RB). Was Bede's Wearmouth Benedictine, we may ask: did the best drive out the good and ultimately claim full attention?

The third subject concerns the initial Cistercian documents. J. B. Mahn was safe in avowing in 1951 that no Order had origins so clear and so simple: but already the young Jean Lefèvre had embarked on his doctorate and a series of articles that were to bring him fame, and to us a new understanding, after eight centuries, of the growth of the White Monks. The whole tale of research is unfolded in *Great Historical Enterprises* pp. 199-224 (and even this is being left behind by the sudden surge of research: Jean Leclercq in *Rev. Ben.* 1-2, 1963 has asked 'L'Exordium Cistercii et la Summa Cartae Caritatis sont-ils de S. Bernard?', and concludes that these two documents were composed not at Cîteaux but at Clairvaux). A discovery by Mgr Turk set the matter in motion in 1938: these things always happen before cataclysmic wars—*vide* the start of the RM-RB dispute, or the 1947 discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, where an enforced blanket of silence succeeded the first discovery of the issues. Cistercian archives throughout Europe were then combed, and new manuscripts came to light which showed the vulgate *Carta Caritatis* not to have been composed by Stephen Harding, who had a hand only in its seminal draft. Lefèvre revealed over the years 1954-1958 that the principal Cistercian documents represented not a gift from a genius, but a constitutional growth such as we expect from the humble mind of men, whose nature is to build, block upon block, towards Truth. What Prof. Knowles calls 'the traditional picture of an order springing fully fledged from the mind of Stephen Harding' must now bow to the more recognisable process of legislative development, spread across the forty-odd years of 1117-1163.

The fourth subject concerns the origin of lay brothers, and replaces the old inconclusive Appx xxiii, rendered obsolete. The terms *conversi*, *fratres barbati*, *monachi laici*, or *fratres exteriores* have all been translated by 'lay brother', and this has led to understandable confusion. Cluny, to add to the confusion, used the term *conversi* simply as opposed to *nutriti* (the *infantes oblati* of RB), monks who

come as adults and as often as not never sufficiently master the complex liturgical *ordo* to become cantors: as accretions intensified complexity it soon became only the *nutriti* who could at all master the *ordo*, and *conversi* grew to mean *idiota*, those who were half-trained. Citeaux's understanding of the term is very different; they were illiterate 'lay' brothers who formed part of the community and were employed in manual work. These from the outset were a separate class, incorporated into the monastic economy; and they soon became the masters in the fields, directing the manual labour of the choir-monks when they ventured forth. They appear to have taken their pattern from the Camaldolese and Vallombrosan *conversi*, and Spanish *semiconversi*. They grew up, of necessity, through the division of monastic labour, and through the monasticising of society.

Some of the other subjects touched are St Bernard (whose current Boswell is Dom Jean Leclercq), the foundation of Fountains (under D.Phil. scrutiny), Ailred (whose praises were sung since 1937 by Powicke and Talbot, no less), the division of revenue, and monastic illumination (practised by Harding, but driven out by Bernard's visual austerity).

It is no accident that it is this of all Dom David Knowles' works that he has chosen to revise in a new edition. This, together with his *English Mystical Tradition*, comprise the heart of the man, the monk and the scholar, as none of his other writings do; and the latter is already a revision of his 1927 *English Mystics*. A compliment in the first edition preface betrays its youthful author's hope, now surely accomplished, the compliment to *ce Mauriste de nos jours*.

ALBERIC STACPOOLE, O.S.B.

THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL IN LUTHER, by Thomas M. McDonough;
Oxford University Press, 30s.

It would be easy today to criticise Luther's approach to the question of salvation as a search for security, as a seeking of certitude within the framework of an anthropocentric world outlook. Such a criticism would apply not only to Luther but to countless works on morals and apologetics by Catholic authors, not excluding some of our contemporaries. While it is obvious that we must take issue on these points with our contemporaries, to criticise Luther in the same way betrays a lack of historical perspective. The same is true with respect to nominalism—Catholics of the period are deeply influenced by it.

Thomas McDonough not only succeeds in avoiding these pitfalls, but has achieved a rare combination of historical perspective and profound sympathy. Many Catholics writing in later periods have lacked the former, and Luther's Catholic contemporaries can hardly be described as sympathetic.

The author sees the Law-Gospel doctrine of salvation as basic: 'The Word of God, which Luther defends and believes in, is two fold: Decalogue precepts and promises and Gospel precepts and promises; or more simply, the Word as Law and the Word as grace. Together they produce in sinful man the dynamic dualistic struggle of self-righteousness against God's righteousness which, in so