

UTOPIA AND A DIALOGUE OF COMFORT. By Sir Thomas More. (Everyman Library, No. 461, Dent; 3s. 6d.)

It is good to see that Everyman's have reissued More's *Utopia* and the *Dialogue of Comfort*. I have always been struck by the fact that this edition, published in 1910, was classified under Theology and Philosophy. Were the editors really informed or were they acting wiser than they knew?

*Utopia* is indeed a difficult book. With few exceptions it has been the subject of commentaries by scholars who knew little of More's theological background or of his life of sanctity. All such attempts to interpret *Utopia* are fore-doomed to failure. But people with little knowledge of St Thomas's other writings will continue to read *Utopia*. To include the *Dialogue*, More's greatest work perhaps, within the same cover provides the student with some sort of opportunity to get a balanced view of the writings of this greatest of Englishmen.

The spelling has been modernised in this edition and it contains a new introduction by Mr John Warrington which is a very brilliant little study. My sole criticism is of the bibliography. Dorner's *Meaning of Utopia* should surely be included under the critical studies while the omission of the E.E.T.S. edition of Harpfield's *Life of More* is even more surprising.

BERNARD FISHER

THE GLORIOUS ASSUMPTION OF THE MOTHER OF GOD. By Joseph Duhr, S.J. (Burns Oates; 8s. 6d.)

In 1946 Fr Joseph Duhr, S.J. wrote *La Glorieuse Assomption de la Mère de Dieu*, mainly to answer Dr Ernst and to show that the Assumption could be proclaimed as a dogma of faith. It was, inevitably, the sort of essay that presupposed not only a French, Catholic background in the reader but also a certain familiarity with theological thought and, above all, with the manner in which the French conduct their controversies. That this should have been translated and offered to English readers as 'A history and explanation of the Dogma from the earliest times to its proclamation as an Article of Faith' seems to be particularly unfortunate.

Fr Duhr no doubt intended the book as something rather better than an *oeuvre de vulgarisation*, yet not as a complete treatise on the subject. In English, with its 382 footnotes, it gives a misleading impression of definitive authority.

For students (who will not be misled by the words 'First published in 1951') it will be sufficient to note that nothing later than 1947 is quoted. The presentation is unexpectedly below standard. It is admittedly difficult to English this kind of book, but this translation hardly