

probably *are* united in considering central, and that is the reality of power. Where society values the distinctive contribution of one group over another, the group that is deemed subordinate will not be given a voice or a means of valuing itself on its own terms. And that is why even Carol McMillan has not found it sufficient as a

woman to devote herself to motherhood, and to doing it well. She has needed to publish a theoretical and philosophical work in its defence, precisely because the public arena, and the theoretical model, are the only terms on which, under patriarchy, she will be heard at all.

JANET MORLEY

OSCAR ROMERO, BISHOP AND MARTYR by James Brockman S J
Sheed & Ward, London. £7.50.

Who in 1972 attacked the Jesuits of El Salvador for preaching 'false liberation'? Who chose an Opus Dei priest as his confessor and urged the Pope to beatify Mgr Escrivà de Balaguer? Who attacked Jon Sobrino's *Christology at the Crossroads* as leading to confusion? Who thought the seminary professors lax because they allowed their charges to doff their soutanes for sport? Answer: Oscar Romero. He doesn't sound like a 'progressive'.

Of course it will be said that he was 'converted' and 'radicalized'. So he was, out of obedience to Vatican II and Medellín and as a response to the oppression of his people. But he saw continuity in his life. He wrote to Pope John Paul II to defend himself: 'From the beginning of my ministry in the archdiocese, I believed in conscience that God asked of me and gave me a pastoral strength that contrasted with my "conservative" temperament'.

He trod a lonely path, despite the crowds. Among the bishops, Romero could count on the support only of Rivera y Damas, who succeeded him after an unaccountable delay of three years. The remaining four were in league with the Nuncio, Emmanuele Gerarda, and Cardinal Mario Casariego in nearby Guatemala. They all believed in giving governments the 'benefit of the doubt', a generous attitude, but there was no end to it.

They also thought that Romero had fallen into the clutches of the *marxisant* Jesuits and – it came to the same thing – had gone off his head. They bombarded Rome with memoranda urging his removal. Archbishop Quarracino of Argentina (now President of CELAM) made a visitation of the archdiocese. He recommended that an apostolic administrator should be named, while Romero would keep merely the title

of archbishop. He was killed before this catastrophic scheme could be put into effect.

Not esteemed by his ecclesiastical peer-group, Romero had, however, the support of the people and most of his priests. But that merely led his critics to talk of 'demagoguery' and 'personality cult'. He was a dangerous man because of the simplicity of his insights.

Here are two. In El Salvador 'the conflict is not between the government and the Church; it is between the government and the people. The Church is with the people and the people are with the Church, thanks be to God'. And he told Pope John Paul II: 'In my country it is very difficult to speak of anti-communism, because anti-communism is what the right preaches, not out of love for Christian sentiments, but out of a selfish concern to preserve its own interests'.

Just before the papal visit to El Salvador last March the second quotation was used on a poster showing Romero and John Paul together. The posters mysteriously vanished; no one would say who gave the orders for their removal. The Pope, having prayed at Romero's tomb, later pleaded with the crowd that 'no ideological interest should exploit his sacrifice as pastor'. Who was that aimed at? Clearly not the government: it wants Romero forgotten, buried once and for all. The remark was addressed to 'the left' or – since there is a civil war on – to the guerrillas.

Fr Brockman's admirable book is dry and unemotional in tone. He reaches the parts other episcopal biographers have never reached. Romero's father had a number of illegitimate children. On becoming archbishop, Romero had to pay the Congregation of Bishops \$750 for

'fees and expenses'. In the tense period shortly before his death, he exchanged his favourite campari for Scotch on the rocks. He used a psychologist friend, not exactly for therapy but, said Romero himself, 'to verbalize problems that with his help I try to solve in a calmer and surer fashion'. *Mon semblable, mon frère*.

But the dispassionate style of the contemporary historian is sustained by an underlying commitment. No special pleading is needed to present Romero as the type of the modern martyr. Curiously, though, Brockman does not deal with the question of who killed him and why. He should have scotched the preposterous notion put about by Cardinal Lopez Trujillo (and half believed by Pope John Paul?) that Romero was killed by a left-wing group in order to provoke a revolt.

CHRISTIAN SATISFACTION IN AQUINAS: Towards a Personalist Understanding by R. Cessario. University Press of America, Washington, 1982. \$13.25; p/b \$23.50 h/b.

The author has reconstructed Aquinas' theory of the role of satisfaction in Christian theology with a clear eye both for the development of Aquinas' thought and for the relevance of his solution to present-day thinking. The adoption of this double frame of reference enables him to stand back from Aquinas and at the same time to follow him sympathetically in his reasoning. He shows how Thomas moved from regarding Christ's task as one of making satisfaction for a debt, a mechanical act of restoration, to a picture of something far richer: a process of restoring man's communion with God to what it was intended to be at man's creation. The vocabulary in which this process is described (especially the word "personalist" itself) is not always straightforward and perhaps rather too much is claimed for Thomas's achievement in the end because it is expressed in high-flown language. But this is a solid piece of work and a valuable addition to the material on medieval soteriology which has been published in recent decades.

A number of useful distinctions are made: for example between Augustine's division of things from signs and the framework of 'going-out' from God and 'returning to God' within which Aquinas prefers to study theology (Hugh of St Vic-

tor should perhaps be given credit here for his own distinction of *opus conditionis* and *opus restorationis*). Dr Cessario is right, too, to bring back attention to the Biblical commentaries which lie at the base of Aquinas' theology; he discusses not only the assumptions on which they are based, but the continuing validity of their underlying principles. The emphasis on Biblical discussion of satisfaction within the plan of *exitus-reditus* theology brings out helpfully at the outset some elements which prove to be of importance in Aquinas' speculative theology, and show how intimately related exegesis and doctrine remained for him. Again perhaps something might be gained by reference to earlier work. The nine ways in which Christ can be thought of as 'for us' surely owe something to Gregory the Great and the late twelfth century invention of the *Dictionaries of Theological Terms* which made just such lists.

But his whole book refutes it anyway. Jon Sobrino, who recovered from Romero's early onslaughts to help him write his pastoral letters, remarked that he had revived the old Latin American tradition in which the bishop was 'the protector of the Indians' against the rapacious military and merchants. His 'new model' for a bishop was in fact a very old one. His successor has called him a prophet. Two weeks before his death, he told a journalist: 'You may say, if they succeed in killing me, that I pardon and bless those who do it. Would that thus they might be convinced that they waste their time. A bishop will die, but the Church of God, which is the people, will never perish'.

PETER HEBBLETHWAITE

The study as a whole is clearly set out, with a preliminary survey of Aquinas' life in which his works are placed, a discussion of aspects of satisfaction: propitiation and reconciliation; the satisfaction which may be made by members of Christ's body, (that is, penitential satisfaction and the moral sense of Scripture, with interesting pointers to Aquinas' revised view of Job);