

This is the trouble throughout. A Protestant article on the development of doctrine is followed by a Catholic one on the assimilation of form-criticism by our biblical scholars; though each is good, they have little in common. A powerful article by Barth on Catholic and Protestant understanding of the Church is denied rather than answered in a somewhat mediocre article by Fr Weigel. Coming on to the sacraments, we have a summary of the main themes of Schillebeeckx's great book on the sacraments, shortly to appear in English. This is Catholic theology at its best, and it is a pity that the translation, in this collection never up to much, here barely reaches the level of literacy. Also the Protestant position is rather weakly put here, for Max Thurian does not seem to understand the Catholic views he discusses. The last articles are on justification, by Professors Torrance and Küng—the latter interesting as always, but here rather too condensed for easy reading.

Given so much, it is sad to reflect that with more intelligent editing this could have been a really superb collection. On the other hand nothing good can be said of the standard of book production; what may be suitable for the United States, where it was first produced, will not do here.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA, by D. S. Wallace-Hadrill; Mowbrays,

The Revd D. S. Wallace-Hadrill informs us from the preface onwards that his book is an introduction to the various aspects of the personality and work of Eusebius of Caesarea rather than the exhaustive work for which historiography and patrology are still waiting. Nevertheless, he has deserved well of the two disciplines by setting out to cover the whole of his subject. His book forms an indispensable working tool; it is conscientious, well put together and searching in its interpretations. Thanks to him, it will henceforth be inexcusable to know only one of the many faces of Eusebius of Caesarea.

It is above all as a theologian that Eusebius is still too little known. However, there is no lack of material—quite the contrary—for the study of his teaching: I worked on it at the time of my research on Paul of Samosota and his condemnation. Mr Wallace-Hadrill devotes his fifth and sixth chapters to this aspect. The first of these expounds the christology of Eusebius and the second his attitude throughout the Arian controversy. I have said 'Christology'; it would have been better to have taken up Wallace-Hadrill's own title, 'conception of the work of Christ', in so far as it is true that Eusebius speaks of Christ above all in a historical cosmological perspective, while he always keeps rather vague on the concept of the hypostatic union. The author, moreover, does not stop at all on this point; it is a great pity for the data, scarce though they may be, are not lacking to suggest a very clear inclination towards the well known Word-flesh scheme. The only definite texts are found in *Contra Marcellum* and in *De Ecclesiastica Theologia*. I am surprised moreover, given the problems posed

by these two works as much from the point of view of internal criticism as from external criticism, that not even a single line of chapter II, which deals with literary questions, is devoted to them. In that part of chapter VI which describes the position of Eusebius in the great Trinitarian controversy of the fourth century, I am afraid that he has been inspired too much by certain notions which were more or less classical until the forties, but which are now more and more being subjected to revision, especially in Oxford. The author does not seem to be aware of the real nature and extent of what is currently called in England the 'conservative' trend and he is over-anxious to present Eusebius as a prudent traditionalist. The truth is much more complex and I confess that he leaves my hunger unsatisfied.

Meanwhile, even if I do not agree with all that he says, I can only admire the familiarity with the personality of Eusebius which has inspired the excellent portrait which he has given us in the final chapter and from which I quote these few characteristics which in my opinion are absolutely exact: 'Eusebius himself emerges from its pages, vastly learned, wholly lacking in delicacy, in lightness of touch and in humour, substituting for these virtues a crudely florid manner which in combination with his occasional outbursts of downright anger or irony suggest a formidable personality. It is not a pleasing picture, but it is not that of an imperial time-server. He was bishop of a great Metropolitan see, and refused the offer of a greater. He was big enough to draw the fire of Athanasius. What is lacking is spirituality. The absence of human warmth is venial; there is not much in Origen, though in Origen the rarefied atmosphere is illumined by the white heat of spiritual fervour. In the work of Eusebius we look for such illumination in vain. We do not feel that we might as likely find Eusebius on his knees as at his desk. His prose can kindle into rhetoric but never into warmth. His learning was praised even by his enemies, but we do not hear of his sanctity even from his friends.'

HENRI DE RIEDMATTEN, O.P.

*IN THIS WORLD*, by Dom Ralph Russell; foreword by Patrick Keegan; Darton, Longman and Todd, 6s.

The history of the modern lay movement in this country during the last thirty odd years has shown the great difficulty most English Catholics experience of distinguishing between the place of the laity in the Church and that of the clergy. So ingrown has become the presumption that the laity are merely the hands and feet of the clergy that very little ever is done in education and formation to correct it.

This explains to a large extent why very few among the clergy succeed in breaking through the accepted pattern of congregational life and revitalizing it. The author of *In This World*, a collection of talks given over the years to clergy and laity involved in the modern lay apostolate, is one of those few who not