

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

rests on man's unshakable adherence to God's grace, by which he is delivered from the agony of insecurity and fear that is the product of a religion of self-sanctification. The problem is a real one and the Lutheran reply to it is basically a rejection of the tendency to equate holiness with self-effort and ritual exercises. Father Pfürtner argues that there is no flat contradiction between the decrees of Trent and the Lutheran view since each has a different understanding of what is meant by terms like faith, knowledge and cer-

tainty. The most interesting part of the book is his attempt – largely successful – to show that the values for which Luther contended can be rendered in the language of St Thomas by speaking of man's absolute assurance of God's mercy given in the theological virtue of hope. Father Pfürtner is to be congratulated on writing a little book that will, without doubt, have an important role to play in the ecumenical dialogue.

*Ian Hislop, O.P.*

OBEDIENT REBELS. Catholic Substance and Protestant Principle in Luther's Reformation by Jaroslav Pelikan. *S.C.M., 25s.*

There is a growing literature in English concerning Martin Luther, and a knowledge of his thought and the circumstances of his reformation are increasingly recognized as important in ecumenical discussion. The aim of ecumenism is a return to origins; there is considerable ground for hope that such a return is bearing, and will bear fruit, among divided Christians in the West, in a process of slow convergence towards unity in belief. This is illustrated in a number of trends among the Christian Churches, including our own. These are to be seen in the work of the Vatican Council, especially in new thinking in ecclesiology and in liturgical reform. They are to be found too in studies of the Faith and Order Commission, especially for example in that on *Tradition and Traditions*, presented to the Montreal Conference in 1963, after more than eight years of preparatory work by a joint Commission of European and North American Sections.

Professor Jaroslav Pelikan was closely associated with this work, and there can be no question of his competence and expertness in the field he has chosen in *Obedient Rebels*. Luther's whole career as a reformer was a paradox, and, in consequence, the interpretation of what he said and did is open to either/or treatment in several directions, Catholic and Protestant. Professor

Pelikan is not either/or, he presents Luther and explains him in terms of a combination of Catholic substance and Protestant principle. Catholic substance signifies the body of tradition, liturgy, dogma and churchmanship developed chiefly by the ancient Church and embodied in the Roman Catholic Church of his day, but there overlaid with much that Protestant principle rejected. Luther never ceased to believe the Roman Church to be a true Church, in spite of his fierce antagonism to the papacy as he saw it. Protestant principle was simply fidelity to the supremacy of the Bible as constitutive of revelation, God's Word to men.

Professor Pelikan himself holds that these two principles belong together not only in Luther's reformation but in the life of the Church and in the very message of the New Testament. However that may be, his, and what he holds to be Luther's, critical reverence for tradition is a valuable point of contact in the present ecumenical dilemma, and the sympathetic dialogue with which it must be approached and frankly discussed. His book is a valuable introduction to why this is so, especially his three final chapters on the relevance of the two principles to contemporary ecumenical theology.

*Henry St John, O.P.*