

*De Causis*, quoted on p. 61, is supposed to support the thesis that 'things are knowable because they are created'.

Professor Pieper maintains that the knowability and the unknowability of things are involved in a kind of circumincession, as it were: an insight which we are grateful to find expressed so lucidly. But it is not easy to see how this unknowability of beings can be so neatly pinned down and explained in terms of the unknowability of the relationship of imitation between creature and Creator. I do not deny that this is true *systematically*; within the 'system' of St Thomas's thought, that is to say, a statement of this sort can and should be made. But the unknowability, the mystery, of beings is what we encounter first in our experience of beings; it is precisely this unknowability which invites the mind to make the ultimate affirmation *that God is*. It seems paradoxical, or at any rate 'dialectical', to bring in the Creator in order to explain or to locate the unknowability of the creature; is the Creator known or unknown, philosophically, except through the knownness and unknownness of the beings with which and with whom we enter into existential intercourse? The mysterious intelligibility of Being is experientially and philosophically prior to the mysterious intelligibility of God. Perhaps Professor Pieper might gain from a re-reading of Heidegger's studies of the Presocratics here.

The translation seems very adequately done, as far as can be judged without comparison with the original. It should however be noted that the reference to a commentary on 'St John's epistle' on p. 38 is erroneous; St Thomas did not write such a commentary, and the text in question is to be found in the commentary on St John's *gospel*.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND MYTH. By L. Malevez, S.J. (S.C.M. Press; 25s.)

The S.C.M. Press and Dr Olive Wyon have put us still further in their debt by publishing this excellent translation of Fr Malevez's extremely sympathetic and lucid exposition of the theology of 'demythologization' developed by the Protestant scholar Rudolf Bultmann. The present publication has the further advantage of providing a translation (by Bernard Noble) of a later study by Fr Malevez of Bultmann and Barth, which appeared originally in the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*.

Fr Malevez's great merit as an expounder of Bultmann is his calm detachment. It is not easy to be detached about Bultmann; and in fact his views have stirred up the most passionate controversy among German Protestant theologians. At the same time there is no denying his learning and insight, and his existential impetus; and there is no

doubt that his theses strike at the heart of faith in Christ. It would not be a great exaggeration to say that all recent work on the historicity of the Christian message, the *kerygma*, has taken the form of an *Auseinandersetzung* with Bultmann.

Fr Malevez's last chapter, 'The Verdict of Tradition', where he attempts to 'place' the teaching he has so clearly analysed in earlier chapters, is rather disappointing. Surely the Catholic theologian can make a more positive response to the challenge of Bultmann than Fr Malevez's somewhat pale apologetics. It would be possible, for instance, to revive the scholastic theology of the *res gesta* as the revelation-reality proclaimed in the revelation-word: a *res gesta* which is much fuller than a mere *res facta* or *acta*. And Fr Malevez has shown elsewhere that he is capable of more creative theology than this.

Finally I feel bound to protest against the extraordinary mistranslation of Heidegger on p. 31; Heidegger may be enigmatic, but he does not talk *nonsense*. Why 'his own self-disclosure'? The phenomenological method consists in allowing what shows itself to be seen in its own terms, according to the very manner in which it shows itself. The essay referred to on p. 29 is by Hugo and not by Karl Rahner. It would be preferable to speak of 'the *Dasein*' rather than just of '*Dasein*': *das Dasein ist ein Seiendes*.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

RUYSBROEK'S DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRITUAL BASIS FOR THE SOUL'S ASCENT: II. By Albin Ampe, S.J.

Albin Ampe, S.J., divides the second part of his monumental study of Ruysbroek's teaching, *De Geestelijke Grondslagen van den Zieleopgang naar de leer van Ruysbroec* into two volumes: and in the first of these, *Schepping en Christologie* ('Creation and Christology', *Studien en Tekstuitgaven van Ons Geestelijk Erf*, Tielt, 1951) he is concerned with a further aspect of the *Bildtheologie* in the works, with an exposition of what Ruysbroek believed and taught about the nature of man as he is made in the likeness of his divine exemplar. Although Ampe carefully abstains from treating of the attacks upon the soundness of this doctrine which have been made, it is none the less plain that as he writes he constantly has such critics as Gerson in mind; and this study benefits greatly from its author's care to show, as Ruysbroek himself protested, that his views were wholly incompatible with, utterly averse from, pantheism. To the many who today still remember the old charges and look askance at him, one would commend this very careful and detailed critique. The lucid explanations which we are given of such topics as the union between the creature and its Creator ('a unity of relation, not a unity of identity'), the implications of difference in the doctrine of 'likeness', the Word as image of God, are