

apophatic over against the cataphatic, that recognizes a “pure simplicity” (162) beyond all limitations imposed by language and concepts. While not every reader will be willing to accompany the author to the ultimate point of her critique here, her examination of the poem and its implications invites a salutary reexamination of presuppositions and conclusions about the relationship of wisdom on its most profound level to all efforts to articulate that wisdom without distorting it.

In his Foreword to this volume, Peter Ellis alerts the reader to Sonia Petisco’s consistent effort in the chapters that follow to respond to Merton’s poetry in a way that is “not simply scholarly enquiry” but that is “dedicated to changing the damaged and damaging thought structures of the modern world itself” (15). This collection of essays, he suggests, finds its “depth and meaning” in continued engagement with issues that were important to Merton and remain important today, “concerns with violence and war, with racism, with cruelty” (14), as viewed through the lens of worship and contemplation. “Their author’s reaction to our world condition is not simply to point out its lies, as Merton did, but to follow him in seeking for seeds of hope, newness and change” (14). This thoughtful and stimulating volume provides evidence that these seeds of contemplation and wise action first sown by Merton more than a half-century ago continue to germinate and put forth fresh shoots in our own day.

Patrick F. O’Connell

PAULSELL, William Oliver, ed., *Merton & the Protestant Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Fons Vitae, 2016), pp. vii + 200. ISBN 978-1-891785-74-0 (paper) \$25.

Merton and the Protestant Tradition is the sixth volume in the Fons Vitae Thomas Merton series, a project that seeks to study the “world religions through the lens of Thomas Merton’s life and writing” (x). The project is ambitious and important. Merton thought the study of other religious traditions should be an engaged discipline, one that seeks “to introduce into our study of the humanities a dimension of *wisdom* oriented to contemplation as well as to wise action.”¹ In other words, he thought the study of world religions should not only inform but also transform students in their relationship to God and the world. His perspective and example is sorely needed in our universities and in the world today. My own experience bears witness to this: I was first introduced to Merton as an undergraduate student at the University of Calgary in a course on religious

1. Thomas Merton, *Mystics and Zen Masters* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1967) 80.

autobiography. I was a young evangelical Protestant student working my way through a degree in Religious Studies, and like many undergrads I was wrestling with existential questions of my own religious identity. Is it possible to learn from the teachings of the Buddha, for example, or must the Dharma be rejected outright as an example of idolatrous religious striving? Merton became my guide, and I began to learn that a grounded faith could explore other religious traditions in search of wisdom and understanding without devolving into a syncretistic slew. He also became my example as one who discovered great joy in befriending persons of other religious traditions. In the process Merton also challenged my own inherited misconceptions about Catholicism and introduced me to a vast tradition of theological and spiritual treasures.

This particular volume, edited by William Paulsell, is in several ways a different sort of book than others in the series. It is divided in two parts: the first is an overview of Merton's "evolving attitude toward Protestants found in his books, letters, and journals" (xiii-xiv); the second is a collection of personal essays by Protestants reflecting on Merton's influence in their own lives. The first five volumes in this series, in contrast, consist primarily of critical essays focused on particular themes, sometimes interspersed with Merton's own essays. Perhaps this is understandable: Merton did not write on Protestantism in the same sustained way that he did on Buddhism, for example; and while he read Protestant authors his experience of the tradition was significantly shaped by his personal encounters with seminarians who visited the monastery. Yet despite my appreciation for the personal essays in this book, the unique editorial approach makes this volume a less scholarly effort than the first five in the series.

Part I of the book (1-107), written by Paulsell, is a conglomeration of Merton's disparate comments on Protestantism. It is great to have these references in one place, to see them in relation to each other, and Paulsell provides commentary that helps to contextualize and explain their meaning. For this reason I will certainly refer to it in the future. But Part I is also inadequate in many ways. For example, the structure lends itself to repetition: we cover the same historical ground first in Merton's "Books" (where is *Opening the Bible?*), then in his "Journals," his "Letters," and finally in the section on "Ecumenical Visits." This means that the same people and themes arise again and again, which makes the first half of the book feel like commentary on a list of undigested research notes. I would have preferred a single historical narrative of Merton's development drawing on all four of these sources. Paulsell's section on "Merton and the Theologians" is probably his best, organized as it is on the thought of individuals, but the few pages he devotes to figures such

as Barth, Bonhoeffer and Bultmann, among others (where is Jacques Ellul?), simply does not do justice to their influence on his thought. This is especially the case since Paulsell makes no reference whatsoever to the growing secondary literature on Merton's interest in these figures. This leads me to ask: why was this section not parceled out to scholars with expertise on Merton's various Protestant interlocutors? Such a division of labor would have resulted in original research and a far weightier analysis. Finally, Part I is marred in its entirety by numerous stylistic and typographical errors that should have been caught by the publisher. I will develop this claim after discussing Part II. I would like to say, in Paulsell's defense, that these latter issues should have been caught by the publisher.

The second part of the book is written by scholars and ministers from a variety of denominational backgrounds – Episcopal, Methodist, Mennonite, Quaker, Disciples of Christ and Baptist. These essays are personal, generally insightful, and well-written; some are poetical, others historical and still others theological. Together they are an example, despite Merton's absence, of ecumenical dialogue in which parties lay down their arms and really seek to understand one other. And while they all describe being profoundly changed by their encounter with Merton's books (only James Baker had personal contact with him), none became Catholic.

The first essay, "Thomas Merton's Living Influence," is written by Paulsell's daughter, Stephanie A. Paulsell, Professor at Harvard Divinity School. Paulsell offers a beautiful reflection on the influence of Merton in her own life. I resonate deeply with her own experience of dissonance at encountering the alien religious vocabulary of Merton's Catholicism, "images and phrases" that still somehow managed to act on her imagination "as a kind of poetry that opened a space for thought and wonder" (112). Beyond Merton's writing she also describes how his influence came to her "intertwined with the relationships that meant the most to me," through "people who loved him and shared his commitments" (113). Most notable of these mediators, of course, are her parents, but she also mentions her sister, her father's students and her own students; special attention is given to Father Matthew Kelty, a former novice under Merton and his eventual confessor as well as a close personal friend of her father. "To encounter Merton," Paulsell concludes, "is to encounter a universe of others – writers he loved, people with whom he corresponded, the monks by whose side he worked out his vocation in fear and trembling, frustration and joy" (118).

Stephen V. Sprinkle, Professor at Brite Divinity School, begins his essay, "The Broken Silences of Thomas Merton," by reflecting on what he calls "the original sin of my tribe": "reducing flesh-and-blood to thought"

(119). Once again, I deeply resonate. In fact, few of Merton's writings have had more influence on me than the opening page of *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander* in which Merton attempts to interpret "Barth's Dream" about Mozart. In the dream Barth "was appointed to examine Mozart in theology," but Mozart, who claimed that "Protestantism was all in the head," remained silent in the face of Barth's questions. Merton comments:

Each day, for years, Barth played Mozart every morning before going to work on his dogma: unconsciously seeking to awaken, perhaps, the hidden sophianic Mozart in himself, the central wisdom that comes in tune with the divine and cosmic music and is saved by love, yes, even by *eros*. While the other, theological self, seemingly more concerned with love, grasps at a more stern, more cerebral *agape*: a love that, after all, is not in our own heart by *only in God* and revealed only to our head.²

Sprinkle never met Merton; in fact, it was a visit to the Abbey of Gethsemani almost three years after Merton's death that sparked his interest in Merton. He goes on to describe the growth of "Cistercian spirituality" in his own Protestant life and ministry, a maturation that helped him to reconcile "an active Protestant ministerial life" with "the contemplative values of Christian spirituality I had discovered at the Abbey" (120-21); and he suggests that "the secret of [Merton's] writing remains the silences between his words: the silences before words and after them, forming the power of his prose and poetry" (123). Perhaps Merton – and the silent response of the monastery which he has visited for more than thirty-five years – is for Sprinkle what Mozart was for Barth; or perhaps he is for me.

Libby Falk Jones, Professor at Berea College, pieces together a collection of her personal journal entries in her essay, "Thomas Merton and Me: Signposts on a Continuing Journey." Jones's journey with Merton, which began in 1993, is focused on the power of word and image. Yet she also recognizes, quoting Merton, that "My real business is something far different from simply giving out words and ideas and 'doing things' – even to help others. The best thing I can give to others is to liberate myself from the common delusions and be, for myself and for them, free. Then grace can work in and through me" (133).

In "Two Gifts from Thomas Merton," Brian L. Cole, rector at Good Shepherd Episcopal Church in Lexington, Kentucky, considers the influence of Merton on his own life after the death of his father in the early '90s. The two gifts he credits Merton with giving him are silence and

2. Thomas Merton, *Conjectures of a Guilty Bystander* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966) 3; subsequent references will be cited as "CGB" parenthetically in the text.

conversation: the former draws us into “right relationship with self, others, and God,” and the latter leads us back into the world to “encounter the stranger” (138, 139). Cole grew up in a “conservative Southern Baptist congregation” and now serves as an Episcopal priest (137). In discovering silence, the contemplative tradition, Cole describes his temptation to feel “smug in comparison to all those noisy Protestants” (139). However, he recognizes, especially in memory of his father, this “was not the goal. The goal was to find a place of love, for me, for others, especially for those noisy Protestants, and to trust that love was God’s native land” (139). Thomas Merton “made me a better Protestant,” he writes, “a better pilgrim in seeking wholeness” (141).

Bill J. Leonard, Professor at Wake Forest University, begins his essay by reflecting on the “profound *stamp of grace*” that Merton placed “on [his] own memory,” and then he poses the question: “Is Merton still a viable guide [for Americans] in the quest for the *stamp of grace*?” (143, 145). The *stamp of grace*, Leonard explains, is for Merton “the presence of Christ within the individual” (144). He finds four expressions of this presence in Merton’s life: (1) “the grace to nurture contemplation while also writing prose and poetry” (146); (2) the grace to “nurture community and let community nurture us” (146); (3) the grace to seek after “spirituality and solitude” (147); and (4) the grace to “take spirituality into the world and do something about it” (149). Contemplation and action, solitude and community: I have a hunch that Merton will remain a guide for some time to come!

Gary Hall is a British Methodist presbyter, teacher and co-editor of *The Merton Journal*. His essay, “Heart to Heart,” offers a sprawling reflection on the meaning of the separation between Protestants and Catholics in the light of Merton’s intuition that “we are already one” (157). “To talk of accepting this fractured reality does not mean either approving or justifying any of it, but simply means a willingness not to reject that we are related, interconnected, more profoundly than I can imagine” (153). He acknowledges the necessity of structures and the value of institutions (156), but he also argues that “the Church is always coming into being . . . overwhelmed by a Spirit which disrupts our structures and habit and ways of seeing the world” (159).

In “Thomas Merton: Son of a Quaker and Friend to Friends” Alan Kolp (unfortunately misspelled as Klop throughout), Professor at Baldwin Wallace University, reflects on how Merton helped him to grow in his own faith tradition, a theme that is in various ways at least implicit in most of the other essays. He imagines Merton as a metaphorical bridge between the “Trappist monastery” and his own “Quaker meetinghouse,”

a bridge that helped him gain a new perspective from which to evaluate and appreciate his own theological heritage (162). Kolp notes four “key theological points” that describe his own spiritual journey: (1) “there is that of God in every person”; (2) “there is one Christ Jesus that can speak to our condition” (164); (3) “All things are sacramental” (165); and (4) “we are all ministers and, as such, are to ‘walk cheerfully’ in service to the world” (168).

James Baker, former Professor at Western Kentucky University, has the distinction of writing the first Ph.D. dissertation on Merton. In his essay, “The Enduring Presence of Thomas Merton,” Baker describes three personal encounters with Merton, and thus presents a unique window onto Merton’s life and personality. The first encounter took place in 1962 under the tutelage of Glenn Hinson, Baker’s professor of medieval church history at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville. Baker describes the ominous atmosphere of the monastery through the eyes of a young Protestant, and he contrasts this with the energy and humor of Merton:

Then in bounced Father Louis, Thomas Merton. . . . In contrast to the abbot and the other monks we met, all of whom carried an air of sad resignation to the inevitability of surviving this vale of tears, he was a dashing figure, still very much a man of the world while being a man of the abbey. He could hardly sit still as he asked us more questions than he answered. What led us to the ministry? What were we reading at our seminary? What did we think of Rudolf Bultmann. . . ? What did we think about the goings on at Vatican II in Rome? When someone suggested that the abbey should have sent him to represent the Trappists at the Council meeting, he clapped his hands together and said wistfully, “Oh do I wish!!!” When one of the students asked him about an old monk he had seen breaking up rocks in the garden, whether it was some kind of punishment for transgression, Merton broke us up by saying, “Oh no, it’s just senility. He likes hammering away at rocks.” (171-72)

Having listened to several of Merton’s lectures to the novices on CD, I can hear his voice and laughter in these words. Baker’s second encounter (and first private meeting) with Merton came in 1967 when he was in the final stages of research for his dissertation. Merton answered Baker’s questions; they discussed the Civil Rights movement, the war in Vietnam, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the presidential election, which Baker suggests Merton was “only vaguely interested in.” After the dissertation had been completed Merton invited Baker to visit him again. They met

in the summer of 1968, just prior to Merton's Asian journey, and Baker here relates other interesting anecdotes. The remainder of Baker's essay catalogues the influence that Merton retained on Baker's imagination up until the present.

Justin D. Klassen, Assistant Professor at Bellarmine University, presents an original contribution to Merton scholarship in his essay, "Thomas Merton and the Integrated Life." He reflects on two critical theological issues that divide Catholics and Protestants: the relationship between faith and works and the relationship between nature and grace. Situating his encounter with Merton's writings in the context of his own Protestant, and specifically Mennonite, heritage, Klassen describes Merton as "a thinker who integrates" in the face of "Protestant modes of disintegration" (182). With respect to the relationship of faith and works – the doctrine of justification – Klassen describes living as a young person between an Evangelical theology, on the one hand, which by promoting *sola fides* reduced works to the realm of mere ethics, and an Anabaptist critique, on the other, which reacted by negating the inner experience of faith for the sake of promoting social ethics. Merton, however, knits faith and works together. In Klassen's words, "Because faith implies acknowledgement of the true Source of my life, it is therefore inseparable from a process of transformation, whereby I am empowered to become the person God created me to be" (184). In my judgment, without necessarily rejecting juridical categories, Merton (like Trent before him) reframes the issue in ontological categories so that salvation becomes a matter of growth in Christ for the sake of the world.

The second issue concerns the relationship of nature and grace. I find Klassen's analysis here penetrating and illuminating. "Many Protestant traditions are known for their iconoclastic rigor, affirming Jesus Christ as the sole material deposit of divine truth, and judging all other creaturely forms harshly in terms of their capacity for mediating God's reality. Thus the typical Protestant suspicion of sacramentality and iconography" (188). Klassen rightly addresses the influence of Karl Barth on this aspect of Protestant theology. For Barth the truth of God in Jesus Christ is utterly other than the truth of the world – the "gospel truth . . . becomes a synonym for alien truth" (189). Klassen comments later: "For Barth and much of the Evangelical Protestantism he continues to inspire, one almost gets the impression that the redemptive action of God is directed not simply against sin but against the whole created world" (191). Of course, this presents no inconsequential obstacle to Christian environmental action, which is Klassen's primary concern. Merton exceeds Barth, therefore, even the later Barth, in that he emphasizes the unity of God's creative and redemptive action. And this is why – Klassen rightly turns to Merton's

interpretation of “Barth’s Dream” – Merton can understand the silence of Mozart in the face of Barth’s theological examination (190-91). Despite significant agreement with Merton’s theology, Klassen concludes by encouraging Protestants to return “to read their [own] sources a little more closely” and so discover this integrating perspective (194).

It is now necessary that we return to the problems I encountered in Part I, first by addressing the criticism of repetition. In his section on *Contemplation in a World of Action* (13-16), Paulsell discusses Protestant monasticism, and in particular Taizé. At the end of the section Paulsell points out that in his meeting with two monks from Taizé Merton was “put off by their concern to clear everything with Catholic officials” (16). Paulsell quotes Merton who writes: “What is the good of being Protestants if they abdicate their freedom?” (16). There are minor technical issues that I could point to here: in this last quotation Paulsell abbreviates Merton’s question and gives no indication such as using ellipses; and in the sentence following this quotation Paulsell quotes Merton word for word – “necessary for the ecumenical movement” – but does not place these words in quotation marks. The real problem, however, is that only eleven pages later Paulsell, now in his discussion on *Learning to Love*, addresses the exact same journal entry in a slightly reworked form. This time he quotes Merton’s question in full: “What is the good of being Protestants if they abdicate their freedom and get into this ludicrous tangle of telephone wire and red tape?” (27). Once again, the phrase “necessary for the ecumenical movement” is used without quotation marks. But the point is that Paulsell’s paragraph-long summary of the event adds nothing new to his previous discussion; it appears to be a simple oversight of duplicated material.

Of course, such an oversight is understandable and something to which every writer is susceptible. But this is not the only instance. On the very same page Paulsell discusses Merton’s reflections on his own faithfulness to Christ and the Catholic Church. The problem is that he discusses the same passage twice, first by directly quoting a longer section from Merton’s journal and then, with only a paragraph in between, by selectively quoting the same passage and paraphrasing the remainder. This is an obvious editorial oversight. There are also minor issues in these same paragraphs that one could point out: although the same passage from *Learning to Love* is referred to in each paragraph, the first citation directs the reader to page 358 and the second to page 359 when both pages should be cited in each case. Moreover, in the first paragraph the word “truth” is quoted (incorrectly) without a capital “T” and in the second (correctly) as “Truth” (27).

These are only two of the more obtrusive examples, but Paulsell also succumbs to repetition that is inevitable due simply to the structure of Part I. We are introduced to A. M. Allchin four times (11, 24-25, 29-31, 72-74), and although Paulsell is aware of this he often covers the same subject matter and even quotes the exact same lines (see 30 and 72). The death of Martin Luther King, Jr. is discussed three times (31, 74, 88): the first two times Merton and Allchin hear the news on the radio and the third time Paulsell mistakenly suggests they “saw the news of King’s death in Memphis on TV” (88).³ Killian McDonnell is discussed three times (23-24, 43-44, 66), the latter two times in relation to Karl Barth who each time is described by Merton as “almost the one among theologians alive today that I like best” (44, 66). Each time that Paulsell considers Professor Jean Hering he quotes Merton’s line that Hering was “one of the few Protestants I have ever met who struck one as being at all holy” (7, 40). And twice the Anglican journal *Theoria to Theory* is mentioned with much the same commentary and Merton’s remark that Catholic publications were, in comparison, “too formal and still a bit triumphalist” (41, 59). Much of this should have been noticed by the copy editor (if there was one), and most (if not all) of it could have been avoided by composing a single historical narrative. Paulsell justifies his decision not to write a continuous narrative by contending that to sort out the chronology of the letters “would be confusing, and a violation of the integrity of the editors of the volumes. There is value in seeing correspondence to individuals in one place” (29). While his last reason has merit, this concern could mostly be addressed in a section of critical essays on Protestant theologians. I do not, however, see how writing a single historical narrative would violate “the integrity of the editors” (this is the role of any biographer), and in neglecting to sort out the chronology of the letters in relation to Merton’s life Paulsell has simply passed the confusion on to the reader.

Next I will consider what I am calling stylistic errors, the most serious of which is a lack either of understanding or of concern for convention when it comes to quoting, paraphrasing and summarizing sources. The examples are too numerous to discuss here, so I will focus on one short (slightly more than two-page) section with particularly egregious examples (21-23). (Not everything I point out is of equal concern, but the

3. Merton writes in his journal that he and Allchin watched Martin Luther King on TV “talking the previous night in Memphis,” and then after leaving they heard “on the car radio . . . the news that he had been shot . . . Later, long before we were in Bardstown, it was announced he was dead” (Thomas Merton, *The Other Side of the Mountain: The End of the Journey. Journals, vol. 7: 1967-1968*, ed. Patrick Hart [San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1998] 77-78).

overarching picture is telling.) Paulsell begins the section by summarizing Merton's experience at Fourth and Walnut. His summary contains a mixture of direct quotes, paraphrase and commentary. In one sentence he neglects to place Merton's phrase "waking from a dream" in quotation marks; he correctly places "special vocation" in quotation marks, but he neglects to indicate that Merton himself puts "special" in scare quotes; and then after "special vocation" he uses Merton's words "to be different" but neglects to place them in quotation marks (21). In the next sentence Paulsell correctly quotes Merton's realization that he was "still a member of the human race," and the significance of this since "the Word was made flesh"; but immediately following this he paraphrases Merton's words – "and became, too, a member of the Human Race!" – with only slight variation and without quotation marks: "and became a member of the human race" (21). While nothing serious of Merton's meaning is lost, his direct words should be placed in quotation marks, "too," should be replaced with ellipses, and the words "human race" should be capitalized. After a final quote from Merton, Paulsell offers a footnote for the entire paragraph; however, the footnote refers the reader to page 234 of *A Search for Solitude* but Merton's experience at Fourth and Walnut is actually described on pages 181-82 (21).

In the second paragraph of this section (21-23) Paulsell both quotes and paraphrases Merton thus: "Merton believed that Catholicism lacked the medieval spirit of 'broadness, universality, compassion, joy,' in its understanding of human nature, a cosmic outlook, eschatology, asceticism, mysticism, and poetry" (21). When I first read this sentence I paused in confusion: what can Merton possibly mean that "Catholicism lacked the medieval spirit"? It makes no sense. So I went back to Merton's journal to see if I could better understand his meaning. Here is what Merton actually writes:

Maybe what is wrong with American Catholicism is that it is in large measure *Protestant* rather than Catholic. Whether this be true or not, one would look in vain for any of the trace of the spirit of Medieval Catholicism in America or in this monastery – its broadness, its universality, its all-embracing compassion, its joy, its understanding of man and his nature, its cosmic outlook, its genuine eschatology; its asceticism; its mysticism; its poetry.⁴

Paulsell fails to utilize (anywhere in this section) the vital adjective

4. Thomas Merton, *A Search for Solitude: Pursuing the Monk's True Life. Journals, vol. 3: 1952-1960*, ed. Lawrence S. Cunningham (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996) 234; subsequent references will be cited as "SS" parenthetically in the text.

“American.” It is *American* Catholicism that lacks “the spirit of Medieval Catholicism” in Merton’s estimation; and this, he postulates, is because it has been so influenced by Protestantism.

Moreover, when he uses quotation marks to describe the qualities of Medieval Catholicism Paulsell paraphrases Merton instead of quoting him word-for-word. Why is “broadness, universality, compassion, joy,” in quotation marks while the rest of the list is not, when the entire catalogue has been paraphrased (rather awkwardly) by Paulsell? And in the second and final sentence of this two-sentence paragraph Paulsell quotes Merton inaccurately. Merton writes: “Asceticism? – Yes, we have it here all right – but it is protestant self-discipline, dour, individualistic, puritanical” (SS 234); Paulsell quotes the latter part: “Protestant, self-disciplined, dour, individualistic, and puritanical” (21). I count four errors in that short quotation: a capital “P”; a comma after “protestant”; a “d” on the end of “self-discipline”; and an extra “and” before “puritanical.” The first could be solved with square brackets; the second and third combine to alter Merton’s meaning, and the fourth could again be solved with square brackets.

Paulsell then goes on, in the third paragraph of this section (21-23), to summarize Merton’s list of what he calls the “Protestant features of Catholic life” (21), but what Merton in fact calls the “Protestant features of our life – and Catholic life as a whole” (SS 234). The context is clear that by “our” Merton means *American Catholic monastic* life, and that with “Catholic life” Merton is referring to Catholic life *in America* as a whole. The entire list is indented, which should indicate direct quotation, but Paulsell’s summary is in fact a mix of word-for-word quotation and paraphrase that sometimes obscures Merton’s original meaning. Following the list Paulsell quotes Merton’s conclusion: “We are much more akin to those new Puritans, the Communists, than to our Catholic forefathers” (22). Again, I thought, what can Merton mean by this? So I checked the original and found that Merton’s comment does not end where Paulsell closes it off (and Paulsell provides no ellipses to make note of this excision). Merton concludes: “We [still referring to American Catholics] are much more akin to those new Puritans, the Communists, than to our Catholic forefathers (except, of course, in theory)” (SS 235) – a not insignificant parenthetical qualification! In context of the original it is clear to me that Merton only means to suggest that American Catholicism lacks the “broad tolerance of the Middle Ages” and not that it is in any way aligned with the ideology of Communism, which is my natural assumption in reading Paulsell’s bare conclusion (see SS 235).

Very briefly, on the remainder of this short section (22-23): Paulsell neglects to place in quotation marks Merton’s phrase, “pamphleteer-

ing about church unity”; he drops the vital modifier “primarily” when paraphrasing Merton’s denial that ecclesial unity should be “primarily a matter of submission to Papal authority”; he misses the capital “T” in Merton’s intentionally capitalized “Therefore”s; he suggests that Merton quotes Jesus when Merton simply offers a very loose paraphrase of Jesus’ words in Luke 18:8, and in quoting Merton here he misses the word “the” near the end of the question; he neglects to italicize the word “right” in quoting Merton; and he places a paragraph of parenthetical information about “The United Society of Believers in Christ’s Second Appearing” in the main text when (arguably) it belongs in a footnote.⁵ To be clear, none of these errors warrants the charge of plagiarism; at least, nothing that I have highlighted above is unethical or intentionally misleading, only careless. But it is the kind of carelessness that conspires to render Part I of the text untrustworthy. Further evidence of this need for revision could be exhibited by grammatical issues,⁶ inconsistency in the formatting of footnotes,⁷ or in a list of typographical errors that were immediately obvious to me.⁸

I am aware at this point that I live in a glass house. No one person can write a review, much less a book, without making mistakes. But what I have documented above is a consistent pattern of carelessness that should have been identified and rectified in the revision process. That it was not is uncharacteristic of *Fons Vitae* (though is apparent in some of the previous volumes of this particular series). Still, what we have in *Merton and the Protestant Tradition* is far from a failure. Paulsell has offered a service to scholars, such as myself, who are interested in Merton’s interaction with Protestants; and the essays in part two of this book are a beautiful witness to the power of ecumenical friendship. Like Merton who was “able

5. Other examples of useful or interesting parenthetical information that detracts from the narrative and therefore belongs in a footnote include a section on the history of Taizé (13), a personal reflection on Roman Catholic–Disciples of Christ ecumenical dialogue (23–24), a personal note about Father Matthew Kelty (44–45), an historical observation on Southern Baptist Seminary (100) and a personal consideration of the influence of Merton on Protestant seminarians (104).

6. The most distracting example is Paulsell’s consistent use of the past tense to introduce Merton’s living words.

7. After the first footnote for each source Paulsell abbreviates the title of subsequent references; however sometimes he uses a phrase and other times only one word, e.g.: “*Run to the Mountain*,” “*Entering*,” “*Search*,” “*Turning*,” “*Dancing*,” “*Learning to Love*” and “*The Other Side of Silence*” [repeatedly used in error for *The Other Side of the Mountain*] (17–28).

8. Here listed according to page and line: xiii.18; 15.28; 17.3; 32.15; 41.34; 49 n. 77; 52.32; 52.36; 53 n. 88; 54.14; 62.15; 62.22; 74.1; 75.36; 77.18; 81.14; 85.2; 89.24; 143.10; 165 n. 4; 181 n. 3; 193.1.

to read Barth and identify with him in much the same way as he would read a Catholic author like Maritain” (*CGB* vi) these scholars and pastors have returned the favor by showing that Protestants can read Merton and identify with him to such an extent that their lives are forever changed. Published on the eve of the five hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, this book represents a step toward unity.

Ryan L. Scruggs

FOX, Matthew, *A Way to God: Thomas Merton's Creation Spirituality Journey* (Novato, CA: New World Library), pp. xiii + 308. ISBN 978-1-60868-421-2 (paper) \$18.95.

Matthew Fox was invited to speak at Bellarmine University in 2015 on the centennial anniversary of Merton's birth, which gave birth to the reflections in this book. The invitation proved to be more provocative for Fox than perhaps he recognized at first, for he re-discovered a kind of silent dialogue partner in Merton by realizing how closely their two paths had paralleled for decades. Fans of Fox's writings will not want to miss this book, for it is very much a hardy reflection on his own life's work. Merton readers may not learn anything new about Merton here, but they may experience another reader's joy in rediscovering a somewhat belated identification with Merton.

The book contains eleven chapters between an Introduction and a Conclusion. The Introduction is short but essential to understanding and appreciating the rationale of this work. Fox explains that, as he prepared for his talk in 2015, the “the closer [he] looked at Merton's journey,” the more “connections” and “intersections” he found between their lives and their writings (xii-xiii). The most interesting paragraph in these opening remarks is a confession: Fox tells of his resistance, for years, toward “over-associating [himself]” with what seemed to him to be a “veritable ‘Merton industry.’” He admits to shying away from “institutional power trips wherever [he] sensed them” as Fox “forged” his own “theological and spiritual way.” Certainly known as a popular maverick for years, Fox says he simply “felt the need to keep [his] distance a bit from the ‘Merton machine,’ which sometimes seemed to suck all the air out of the room” (xv). And then Fox opens the dam through which the rest of the book pours:

With this project, however, I feel a certain reconciliation – with Thomas himself, and with Merton scholars and the institutions Merton was closely related to, including both Bellarmine University, where Merton left many of his papers, and the Trappist Order within which