

that we are told to obey the laws, and people in authority, but there is still something rather strange about the delight Catholics take in doing more than they need to do in this respect, especially when they show nothing like the same concern about helping people in distress.' (p. 206-7.) Professor Corção concludes by saying of the world (p. 210): 'It expects us to show by our behaviour that our vocation has an aim transcending this world. It expects us to be both zealous about the things of the world, and detached towards the world's standards of values.

'However strange it may seem, the world expects the Church to be in the world but not of it.'

EVERSLEY BELFIELD

THE METAPHYSICAL BACKGROUND OF ANALOGY. By Bernard Kelly. (Aquinas Paper No. 29. Blackfriars; 2s.)

This is not the place to discuss the doctrine of analogy at the peak where Mr Kelly considers it, but—after saluting the feat of breathing like a human being in that rarefied air which shows that he is a man after the heart of his hero, Cardinal Cajetan, who also combined the ability to pursue and classify abstractions with a cordiality towards life and letters—to suggest one consequence for devout contemplation.

Plain statements may be made about God in the sense that they are straightforward and outspoken, not that they are plane or their subject dead-level, or even contained in three or more dimensions. God's greatness, says St Augustine, is of power and perfection, not of size and weight. Their terms should not be applied like little discs, neat and smooth—though these perhaps are less beside the mark than rumbling and sweeping clichés, for it is likely that theology has been less misrepresented by scholastic logomachies than by rhetorical vulgarities—or rather, since they should be precise, let us treat them like notes in a musical score and remember that each interiorly allows for differences of pitch and tone, for subtle modulations when properly placed in harmony and melody, and set against silence.

Take God's justice. How we harden it when we picture it as a transaction within our scheme of things; as if we can do something for good or evil, then afterwards he is bound to apply the code for reward or punishment as the case may be. Take his mercy. How we soften it we compare it to a kindly judge making allowances. No, though we form distinct ideas about them, God's mercy is his justice, and vehemently so (see *Summa Theologica*, 1a, xxi, 4). He is beyond our categories, and we shall speak about him truly only if we are prepared to use them in order to tell us what he is not or, more hardily, by

keeping them on the move and open, to show perfections stirring in themselves from and to his pure actuality. Such is the role of analogy in Catholic theology, and far from being merely analytic it is prophetic.

THOMAS GILBY, O.P.

CHRIST'S CHURCH (DOGMAIC THEOLOGY: II). By Mgr G. van Noort.

Translated and revised by J. J. Castelot, s.s., and W. R. Murphy, s.s. (Newman; \$7.00.)

Text-books are necessary evils; one is tempted to consider that the most evil of such necessities are text-books of Apologetics. Granting their necessity in ecclesiastical academies, we would suggest that there is no necessity whatever to translate them out of Latin into the vernacular. A text-book by its nature requires to be expounded; a text-book of Apologetics read without the guidance of a qualified exposition can be dangerously misleading.

It is the style and arrangement of this book, rather than any of its positive content, which we feel is only too liable to put off (scandalize) any critical non-Catholic reader, and to misinstruct the uncritical but zealous Catholic apostle. It is divided into two halves: 'The Church Viewed from Outside (Apologetics)', and 'The Church Viewed from Inside (Dogma)'. The procedure in each half seems to be exactly the same: a proposition is stated and explained, given its dogmatic grading (of faith, theologically certain, etc.), and then proved, objections are raised and answered—perhaps you might say they are raised and lowered again. The proofs, as is to be expected, are of very various probative value, proofs from Scripture, used more, if anything, in the apologetic than in the dogmatic section, proofs from history, proofs from logical inferences of all sorts. It is precisely the presuppositions of all these proofs that require a lecturer's explanations. The unsympathetic reader will feel that they hardly ever fail to beg the question, and the uncritical Catholic student, mugging up his *De Ecclesia* by himself, will fancy that Catholic doctrine can all be proved demonstratively with mathematical necessity *Q.E.D.* He will know that there is a difference between Apologetics and Dogmatic Theology, because the book tells him so, but as both disciplines appear to proceed by apodeictic demonstration developing from presumably self-evident axioms, he will be hard put to it to say where the difference lies. And so he will go forth to convert the world, and when people do not in fact believe by divine faith what he thinks he has proved to them so conclusively, he will put it down either to their stupidity or their