

Sélection Naturelle comme un choix effectué par la Nature (p. 138, 1971 ed.)

as

One deceives oneself completely when one reproaches Darwin with imagining natural selection as a choice brought about by nature (p. 83)

instead of

It was a complete mistake to reproach Darwin with conceiving of natural selection as a choice made by nature.

(Here the error is compounded by the failure to recognise the imperfect tense of the verbs.) When Gilson describes Darwin (p. 139, 1971 ed.) as pleased by an article because it was "élogieux" (laudatory), the translator renders this (p. 84) by the nonsensical "elegiac". Sometimes he reaches the level of the schoolboy howler: when Gilson writes (page 156, 1971 ed.) "(D)ans l'ennui le patient dit: le temps me dure" (i.e. "in boredom the sufferer says "time drags""), Lyons renders (p. 95) "in boredom the condemned man says: "time is hard on me"", apparently supposing that the verb *durer* is mysteriously formed from the adjective *dur*. I have not attempted a comprehensive comparison of the translation with the original, which should surely have been the task of a linguistically competent publisher's reader. The errors cited, themselves merely a sample of a substantial number revealed by a fairly cursory inspection, are however sufficient to show that the translator was not up to the job.

At £15.00 this return trip is not worth the price of the ticket, even with a more reliable guide than the translator has proved to be.

C.C.W. TAYLOR

**THE LANGUAGE AND LOGIC OF THE BIBLE. THE EARLIER MIDDLE AGES.** by G.R. Evans. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984. Pp. XIX + 199. £18.50.

Thanks chiefly to the pioneering work of the late Beryl Smalley, the medieval Bible is more and more studied, and these last years have seen a crop of interesting and valuable contributions. Among them is Dr Evans new book. Its special value comes principally from the unusual starting point of her research. The greatest part of the studies on exegesis of the Middle Ages focuses either on a given commentary or on the treatment of some difficult scriptural pericope, or on some of the theological problems treated by monastic or university masters.

Dr Evans has chosen to study the interaction between Biblical exegesis and the arts of the *trivium*. So her book is a kind of development of some chapters of her former *Old Arts and New Theology* (Oxford, 1980), but viewed from a different standpoint. The difficulty of the task lay in the need to be familiar with the works of medieval theologians and exegetes on the one hand and, on the other, with the grammarians and logicians. The author has not only a very wide knowledge of printed sources and studies but has also consulted some important works still available only in MSS, such as Peter the Chanter's *De Tropis Loquendi* and Thomas of Chobham's *Ars Praedicandi* (the critical edition of which is presently being prepared at Geneva by F. Morenzoni). This broad knowledge of the matter allows Dr Evans to pass from one side (Bible, theology) to the other (grammar and dialectic) with great ease and to show how each of the disciplines helped for the progress of the others. If grammar and logic allowed theologians to explain more accurately passages where there was some apparent contradiction, exegesis afforded to the *trivium* a lot of fresh questions to try to solve. Until now the interdisciplinary relations were chiefly thought of and studied only as successive fecundations of theology by Greek, Jewish and Arabic philosophies. There is no question of denying this aspect, but there was also a not unimportant correlative influence of theology on philosophy; and it is one of the attainments of this book to have illustrated some cases of this influence of exegesis on grammar and logic; very typical is the parallelism from Peter the Chanter's *De Tropis*

*Loquendi* and the *Fallaciae Londinienses*, the link between the two treatises being perhaps Peter's pupil William de Montibus.

But the chief intent of Dr Evans's study seems to be to show how the progress of grammatical skill and of logical reasoning helped medieval exegetes to look more and more favourably and earnestly on the literal sense; an increased ability to solve grammatical problems and logical fallacies helped them greatly to give to the most obscure passages an acceptable meaning without having to resort to the other higher senses.

This very interesting book suffers somewhat from a few cases of carelessness which may amuse or irritate the reader according to his temper: Isaac for Esau (p. 81), Abraham's two daughters (p. 109: if this is not some recent feminine conquest in exegesis), Berthold of Constance for Bernold (p. 136—no reference in the Index), *De sacramento altaris* instead of *De Errore Guillelmi de Conchis* (p. 188, note 6). More damaging are some lapses in the list of sources: there is—fortunately—no edition of Aquinas's *De Veritate* by P. Marc (p. xi); *De gloria et honore Filii Hominis* is placed under Gilbert of Poitiers, which would not have pleased Gerhoch (p. xiii); Dugauquier has edited Peter the Chanter's *Summa de sacramentis* but not the *Summa Abel* (p. xiv). The bibliographical notes are somewhat surprising in their choices: there are entries for authors quoted only once (if we may trust the Index) such as Isidore or Anselm of Havelberg, but we have nothing on more thoroughly studied people such as Cassiodorus, Odo of Soissons, Petrus Helias or William de Montibus.

But these are minor defects and they should not conceal the great value of this book. Many people will certainly be delighted, as I was, to read such clever and sympathetic pages about Rupert of Deutz, Abelard, Peter the Chanter, and, of course (as Dr Evans is one of his most affectionate scholars) Anselm of Canterbury. Also I think that many theologians will be interested to find some clear explanations of technical words and expressions of the esoteric languages of grammarians and dialecticians and, perhaps more deeply, to understand the mechanisms and grounds of some medieval reasonings which may appear at first glance awkward but are actually much more profound than they may seem.

I have left out many other interesting features of Dr Evan's study, such as the development of *disputatio* out of *lectio*, but I hope that this too brief review will incite many people to take profit and pleasure from reading this book.

LOUIS J. BATAILLON OP

**THE CODE OF CANON LAW: A TEXT AND COMMENTARY**, edited by J.A. Coriden, T.J. Green, D.E. Heintschel. *Geoffrey Chapman*, London. 1985. pp. xxvi + 1152. £29.95

Sporadically, canonists have alarmed Rome. As in other theological disciplines so in canon law, for centuries there have been different schools and tendencies but the existence of tribunals and other decision-making mechanisms means that intellectual trends in law can take on high visibility and practical consequences. Roman authorities have from time to time considered aspects of this generally desirable pluralism to be harmful deviations. A couple of centuries ago, Polish courts were criticised for excessive freedom and it was deplored that Polish marriages were dissolved with undue ease. Of late, various tribunals in the USA have been cautioned against introducing divorce under some other name. In the presence of the pope, Cardinal Felici (then Prefect of the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura) drew attention to the abnormal increase in declarations of nullity and, in an obvious allusion to the USA, noted an increase of 5000 per cent over a ten year period. Greater than usual attention is therefore likely to be focused on the work under review. It is more than a tome—it is an epitome of the legal culture of US Catholicism, a distinctive contribution only possible there. Study of a commentary commissioned by the