

relentless austerity; the ceaseless study and preaching: all this was only the lover's attempt to follow in the footsteps of Christ the Saviour 'for he thought that he would not truly be a member of Christ until the day when he could give himself wholly, with all his force, to winning souls, as the Lord Jesus, Saviour of all men, devoted himself wholly to our salvation' (Jordan of Saxony). Before preaching the truths of the faith he preached by the example of his own life the divinely human life of Truth Incarnate, the answer to the problems of every age, ours as well as his. And what is 'the Dominican inheritance of *Veritas*, the comprehension of one supreme Truth, attainable and maintainable on every level' (Professor Knowles), but the consequence

and application of that intuition of the wedding of divine and human reality in the Person of Christ which was at the heart of Dominic's life?

It is a far cry from the world of the Fourth Lateran Council to that of Vatican II, from Innocent III and the military crusade against the Albigenses to Paul VI in India and the Council Statement on Religious Liberty. Yet these are two key points in Christian history and a confrontation can deepen the understanding of both. In the original French, Père Vicaire's writings have been an inspiration and *ressourcissement* to many. It is to be hoped that the price will not prevent this book from doing the same service for the English speaking world.

Sister Mary Albert, O.P.

HENRY GARNET AND THE GUNPOWDER PLOT by Philip Caraman. *Longmans, 50s.*

Henry Garnet was superior of the English Jesuits during twenty years of active persecution (1586-1606). He was more than that. He was the organizer of the whole network of secret Mass-centres that covered England, and the leader, though not technically the superior, of all the priests in England. Add to this that he was a most prolific letter-writer, and one wonders why we have had to wait so long for a full-length life of him. For this book, in spite of its title, is a complete life. Fr Caraman traces him to his birth-place at Heanor in Derbyshire, to Winchester College and so to Rome. By carefully chosen quotations from his letters he draws a vivid picture of his apostolate and of the extraordinary tension under which he constantly lived. Some of this is from unpublished letters, but it is not easy to say how much of it is new because Fr Caraman refers always to the pressmark of the documents even when they have been printed elsewhere in full. It would have been more helpful to have referred readers to easily accessible sources for the full text rather than to archives as far away as Rome.

About a third of the book is devoted to the Gunpowder Plot in which Garnet was a prominent and tragic victim. On this important issue Fr

Caraman has given us no new documents but he has arranged the complicated material with clarity and assessed it with impartiality. Only on one important point do I find myself in disagreement. Fr Caraman assumes to be genuine the long statement dated 8 March 1606 preserved at Hatfield. I am convinced that this document is spurious, not for the trivial reasons given in a footnote (p. 376) but on internal evidence. Here is a document of nearly 4,000 words without a single correction. It is in a hand very similar to Garnet's, but more like the Garnet of ten years before. His writing appears much less firm in letters written after 1600. There is a passage that makes nonsense because a line or more has been omitted. This is more explicable in copying than in composing. Did Garnet never read over a statement on which his reputation, if not his life, depended? Could he physically have written in such a firm hand within twenty-four hours of being tortured? Fr Caraman argues that his torture could not have been severe because of this document (p. 375). When we remember the ghastly torture of Guy Fawkes and, just a week before, the death under torture of Nicholas Owen we may well wonder why Garnet was more gently treated. Torture in the Tower was a

judicial procedure. There was an 'interrogatory' or list of questions and there were scribes to take down the victim's answers. Yet for this crucial examination of Garnet no interrogatories and no rough notes of his answers survive – only this suspicious 'fair copy' that he is supposed to have dashed off, without a sign of hesitation or a single correction, in a very firm hand that he had not exhibited for years. But the main difficulty is that this document contains a passage that, from every point of view, sounds like an interpolation (though it is not interpolated in the MS). Garnet gratuitously drags in the name of an exile, Hugh Owen, and provides the only evidence that Owen was cognisant of the Plot. Had Salisbury succeeded in compassing Owen's extradition this evidence was enough to hang him. I don't believe Garnet capable of such wanton betrayal. This document is certainly suspect. It is probably a copy by a forger of a genuine statement, with additions that Garnet would have hotly repudiated. Surely that is why it was forbidden to be used at his trial. Surely it is the document that is much in evidence at his execution, when the Recorder constantly claimed that the authorities had proof 'under his hand' (Garnet's) that

Greenway told him of the Plot outside confession. Garnet challenged them to produce it. 'You will never show my hand contrary to what I have spoken.' Now this document does lend some colour to their claim. It insinuates that Greenway's knowledge was outside confession and it is very vague as to whether Greenway did in fact go to confession at the time he revealed the Plot. Indeed the whole account of this interview reads strangely. Neither Greenway nor Garnet emerges with much credit: Greenway blurting out Catesby's name at the very beginning; Garnet revealing that Catesby had offered to tell him the plot. It is hardly the grave consultation one would expect from two discreet and experienced priests. The government however dared not produce this document. There is a wealth of meaning in the Recorder's final words: 'If you will deny it, *after your death* we will publish your own hand'. It was not published till 1888 and then quite uncritically. It deserves more attention. It casts an ugly shadow over the zealous missionary, so shrewd, so honest, so loyal to his friends, as he is revealed in this gracious, stimulating and scholarly study.

*Godfrey Anstruther, O.P.*

LUTHER AND AQUINAS – A CONVERSATION by Stephanus Pfürtner, O.P., translated by Edward Quinn. *Darton, Longman and Todd, 15s.*

One of the discoveries of our age is how much we tend to be conditioned in our thinking by phrases. Very often these un-analysed phrases appear, to those who use them, to be quite self evident, so obvious that those who reject them must suffer from some moral fault. Nowhere is this found more often than in those controversies that have taken place between Protestants and Catholics. Statements, meaningful enough in their historic context, are given an absolute value and treated as if they exhausted man's power of expression and as prohibiting even any linguistic translation or reformulation. It has seemed quite obvious to most Lutherans that a Christian has assurance – indeed certainty – of salvation; while it has seemed equally obvious to Catholics that one

cannot know that one is in a state of grace. Not only are the opinions of Luther matched against the decrees of Trent, but the whole view of grace is distorted, being seen by one side as emerging from the subjective agony of a near psychopath or by the other as the product of an arid Pelagianism. For the Lutheran the Catholic does not allow for the sheer freedom of the gift of grace, while for the Catholic the Lutheran destroys the seriousness, under God, of man's response.

Today we are conscious that all this is insufficient, for the problems raised are not solved by either a distinction between religious attitudes, or by forcing Lutheranism or Catholicism into neat, but superficial, systems that contradict each other at every point. Historic Lutheranism