whether human or divine.

The translation is poor throughout, and an even greater blemish in a book of this kind is the use of the Knox scriptural text. For Knox consistently paraphrases out the essential key words and expressions that link together scriptural passages. One particularly deplorable instance occurs on p. 19. There is a quotation from Mal. 2. 13-15: 'And anon, weeping and wailing, you drench the Lord's altar with your tears! What marvel if I heed your sacrifices no more, gift of yours is none can appease me? And the reason of it? Because the Lord bears witness to her wrongs, that wife of thy manhood's age, whom now thou spurnest, thy partner, thy covenant bride. Yet doer of this is the same man as ever, the will of him is unchanged; he asks nothing better, now as before, than to breed a God-fearing race; to that will, men of Juda, keep true'. Père Henry's comment runs: 'Malachias emphasizes the unique existence of those who exchange their breath of life, of those at least whose breath of life God himself unites. If before God they are now only one "breath", each one must care for his own life if he is to be faithful to his spouse . . . '.

But what has this to do with the scriptural text being illustrated? 'Breath of mine is none to find', as the producer of it might have said. Reference to the Jerusalem Bible, which presumably Père Henry was quoting, gives a line that may be translated 'Has not he (God) made of you a single being, with flesh and breath of life?', and the mystery is solved. In Knox it has been reduced to 'Doer of this is the same man as ever'. The point is not one of style (the quotation may there speak for itself) or accuracy (the text is a difficult one, and Knox gives a more literal version in a footnote) but simply of allowing a translated comment to correspond to a translated text. Perhaps editor and translators feel that scripture is just meant to be difficult anyway.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

ANSELM: FIDES QUAERENS INTELLECTUM, by Karl Barth; translated by Ian W. Robertson; S.C.M. Press; 25s.

Thirty years after its original publication we are fortunate at last to have an English version of Barth's book on Anselm. In the preface to the second edition of 1958, of which the English version is a translation, Barth writes: 'Only a comparatively few commentators, for example, Hans Urs von Balthasar, have realised that my interest in Anselm was never a side-issue for me or . . . realised how much it has influenced me or been absorbed into my own line of thinking In this book on Anselm I am working with a vital key, if not the key, to an understanding of that whole process of thought that has impressed me more and more in my *Church Dogmatics* as the only one proper to theology'. He says, too, that of the comments made upon his book when it first appeared, 'the Roman Catholic observations were more pertinent, more reasonable and more worthy of consideration than the others'.

The English-speaking reader is now able to see why this could have been so,

for the topics with which Barth is pre-occupied are the nature of faith, the relationship between our acceptance of the whole extension of the faith objectively and our penetration into the faith in depth—the relationship between credere and intelligere. To this Barth relates the question of the sense in which Anselm's Proslogion and Monologion contribute towards proof of the existence of God, for Barth sees such proofs as part of the process of intelligere which follows in the wake of a faith which requires no adventitious aids. "There is absolutely no question at all of a requirement of faith. Anselm wants "proof" and "joy" because he wants intelligere and he wants intelligere because he believes . . . Thus on no account can the given-ness or non-given-ness of the results of intelligere involve for faith the question of its existence'.

English-speaking Catholic theologians will rejoice to see these questions being raised by an evangelical theologian in language which is not strange to them; and they will certainly appreciate how these questions must lie at the heart of Barth's doctrine. It might be expedient for a Catholic theologian to take up Barth's argument point by point. The dialogue would no doubt find some focal points, as in the statement on p. 24; 'To that extent it is not possible to give concrete definition to what Anselm understood by the verbum praedicantium Christum. But whatever it may be, Anselm's subjective credo has an objective Credo of the Church as its unimpeachable point of reference—that is, a number of propositions formulated in human words'; or in that on p. 34: 'Are faith and knowledge of faith matters of the heart? Most certainly; but for that very reason also matters of the will'.

In writing this book, Barth no doubt had in mind first of all the refutation of the type of natural theology associated with the name of Paley, and the liberal Protestantism of the Harnack era. Such a design may have been more important thirty years ago than it is now. Today Barth has touched a more lively and fruitful issue by asking those questions which lie behind all the detailed differences between the Catholic and the Protestant mind: What is the structure of faith, and what is the authentic channel of the Word of God?

RONALD WALLS

THE EVERLASTING PRIEST, by A. M. Carré, O.P.; Geoffrey Chapman, 12s. 6d. NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, by P. M. Laferrière; Harvill Press, 18s.

These two books form very fine complements to one another. The Everlasting Priest is, apart from its style (French high euphoric), an excellent little book. It is made up of a set of Lenten sermons delivered at Notre Dame in 1959, and forms one of the best introductions to the theology of the priesthood that I have ever read. It is a book that moves one considerably with its excitement and is, I think, the best kind of spiritual reading. It has that felicitous combination of theological insight relying considerably on scriptural authority with an ability to see the kind of situation in which we are meeting the men who form his