

CHR, Vol. 52
(July 1967) 285

Dictionary of Political Science. Edited by Joseph Dunner. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1964. Pp. xxii, 585. \$10.00.)

With nearly two hundred contributors it is impossible either to maintain an even point of view in dealing with the materials of politics or a precisely identical style. Still, Professor Dunner has done an excellent job in selecting contributors, assigning subjects, and determining the length of articles. The purpose of the editors has been clearly to make a dictionary of primary use for current issues and problems of recent history. Eastern Europe is well represented, and the various articles on communism and related issues constitute one of the strengths of the volume.

The editors profess to include all of the relevant terms, concepts, and data used in the fields of political science, government, and politics. Concise biographies of former and contemporary political leaders throughout the world are a virtue of the volume, as well as the description of old and new nations which international law recognizes as independent political entities. Considering the general ambiguity of contemporary political science in the use of concepts, it is of especial note that this *Dictionary* attempts to give the reader and student useful definitions. In this way, the editors have sought to strike at some of the semantic confusion prevalent in the language of modern political scientists.

On the other hand, it is impossible to avoid explanations of concepts in the light of ideological, or let us say philosophical and methodological positions. One interested in the field of historical political theory will note with regret the absence of an article on Otto von Guericke or on the late, great Ernest Barker. Many who might be interested in sovereignty will regret the essentially narrow view of the subject presented in the article on this concept of public law. A considerable number of ideas related to Christianity are missed, and for a Catholic many notions are omitted which are essential. For instance, there is no article on "indirect power" or on the "confessional state." But it would seem that within the realm of secular ideological positions a serious attempt is made to achieve some dispassionateness, as in the material on "Liberalism." And Russell Kirk is the author of the article on "Con-servatism."

However, the short statement on "Roman Catholic Church" is hardly distinguished by its insight. Let us quote the paragraph: "Western branch of the imperial Christian Church of the Roman Empire from about 476 A.D. to the Great Schism of 1,054 A.D.; separately and independently governed and administered since 1,054 but maintaining the claim to be the true lineal descendant of the original Roman Church; once the established and only lawful church in many countries of

Western Europe; disestablished in many countries since the Protestant Reformation (1517-1555)."

University of Illinois

FRANCIS G. WILSON

The Political Thought of Pierre d'Ailly: The Voluntarist Tradition. By Francis Oakley. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1964. Pp. xiv, 362. \$8.50.)

Mr. Oakley's substantial book fills a distinct gap in the literature available in English on the thinkers of the Conciliar period, though, as he emphasizes in his Preface, he is concerned not so much with d'Ailly's contribution to ecclesiology as with "—those political and legal ideas which he formulated independently of his more famous ecclesiastical theories and prior to them" (p. vii). In particular he aims at bringing out the full significance of d'Ailly's belief "—that the community is the ultimate human source of political authority" (p. 238), a belief which Mr. Oakley places against the background of earlier medieval political thought and the connection of which with later developments "from Constance to 1688" (a line of thought previously suggested by Figgis, Laski, and others) he briefly shows. In this expository side of his work Mr. Oakley is admirably clear and concise; the sections on "Historical Perspectives" which are prefixed to some of his chapters might indeed almost serve as a miniature textbook for a survey of the main modern conclusions on medieval political thought. At times, it is true, one feels an inappropriate intrusion of historical hindsight, as when d'Ailly is congratulated on evading the implications of the *dominium* theory, which would have been "a logical barrier to the elaboration of a political theory that could have much weight with, or influence upon, a later and more secularized world" (p. 84).

Mr. Oakley's interpretation of d'Ailly's political theory is linked to the assertion that it is an example of what the author calls "the voluntarist tradition." Mr. Oakley means by this the current of thought associated with William of Ockham and his followers of the Nominalist school (Mr. Oakley rightly considers "voluntarist" a better definition of the Ockhamist outlook than the more classic "Nominalist" appellation). On this argument d'Ailly's views on politics were necessarily influenced by his "voluntarist" philosophical and theological position, particularly by his use of the concept of God's *potentia absoluta*. Mr. Oakley's approach here is very reminiscent of G. de Lagarde's treatment of Ockham; the present reviewer finds both far from conclusive.

Mr. Oakley concedes that d'Ailly's theories of the natural law, the power of the community to ensure its own common good, the virtues