

Volume XIII Number 1

Spring 1990

KING'S

Theological Review

Preserving God's Creation. Three lectures on Theology and Ecology. III <i>John D. Zizioulas</i>	1
Spirituality and the status quo <i>Grace M Jantzen</i>	6
On calling Islam 'Medieval' <i>David Martin</i>	11
The Academic's Dream <i>Peter Cameron</i>	14
The Resurrection — A new essay in Biblical Theology <i>Jeremy Moiser</i>	16
BOOK REVIEWS	20
FACULTY NEWS Insert	

BOOK REVIEWS

The Contemplative Face of Old Testament Wisdom in the Context of World Religions

John Eaton. SCM, 1989. Pp. x+150.

Putting together ideas and themes that are usually kept apart seems like a good idea in itself, and the combination and interaction of similar and dissimilar traditions may add even more excitement to the challenge. Most readers, especially students and those interested lay persons who like to search more widely in the scriptures than conventional stimuli permit, will find this book to be a good read. It has several merits, being clearly set out, having the good sense to cite most of the passages it deals with, and informing the reader about the many authors whose names are likely to be unfamiliar.

Its main thesis is fairly straightforward and easily explained: the collectors and writers of wisdom in the Old Testament have fastened on insights and an awareness of human spiritual need which finds a wealth of echoes in the contemplative traditions of many nations and religions. There is therefore something that transcends conventional religious barriers about their teachings, and, more importantly, there is a groundwork of spiritual awareness that is to be found in all the great religious traditions. Essentially this groundwork is contemplative, predominantly mystical and individualistic, and marked by a sense of knowing only in a very small part the truth of human creatureliness and God-dependence.

Where Eaton moves away from the mainstream of biblical scholarship is in his contention that the Hebrew wisdom teachers shared much of this rather mystical undergirding of spiritual truth.

The method of approach is consistently comparative, but, like many other such attempts, it pays little heed to the pitfalls inherent in such an approach. It is therefore more than a little disappointing to find a great many very superficial similarities mixed in with more profound ones. Overall the major proposition is assumed from the outset that all spiritual truth is about the same sorts of things, so all its assertions mean very much the same, however expressed. Probably biblical scholarship has at times been over-anxious to fend off claims that Israelite religion had any very strong strain of mysticism about it. Some features of it may point to a greater sense of the inward nature of faith and the very private nature of communion with God. Certainly biblical interpretation has often developed in such a direction.

Nevertheless the intention behind the varied and sometimes cryptic sayings of the wise, especially such a figure as Ecclesiastes, stand at a great distance from the more esoteric contemplative writers with whom they are here compared. The imaginative connections that are suggested are heavily outweighed by a lack of any detailed attempt to establish clear bases and principles by which the comparisons are to be made. The result is a book with a very mixed character. Its freshness clashes with its indifference to the demands of serious comparative examination and exegetical method.

Ronald E. Clements

Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society

Anthony J. Saldarini. T.&T. Clark, 1989. Pp. x + 326. £19.95

In November, 1989, I attended a synagogue service as a guest, accompanied by a group of Christian theology students. In his sermon, the rabbi spoke quite pointedly and with considerable feeling about that ancient group of observant Jews whom he considered to be the founders of rabbinic Judaism and therefore his own spiritual forebears. I refer, of course, to the Pharisees. He spoke with feeling because he was responding in part to press reports that the Archbishop of Canterbury had described Britain in pejorative terms as fast becoming a 'pharisaic' society.

Habits of language and the prejudices they sustain are notoriously difficult to change. They even become enshrined in our standard dictionaries, as the O.E.D. entry on 'Pharisee' shows. For Christians, prejudices about the Pharisees are in danger of being reinforced constantly by the general impression from the gospels that the Pharisees were powerful enemies of Jesus who were responsible for his crucifixion. It is common also to hear Christianity characterized as a religion of grace over against Pharisaic Judaism as a religion of legalism. Often, the 'conversion' of the Pharisee Saul is interpreted in such terms.

How important, therefore, is the task of careful historical investigation of the ancient sources about the Pharisees and other parties and groups in early Judaism. The past few decades have brought major advances in just this area. Amongst New Testament scholars, one thinks particularly of W.D. Davies, Krister Stendahl, Martin Hengel and E.P. Sanders. In Judaica, the field has been dominated by Jacob Neusner, in North America, and, on this side of the Atlantic, important work has been done by Geza Vermes, Sean Freyne and Martin Goodman, amongst others.

This new book by Anthony Saldarini, who is Assistant Professor of Theology at Boston College, will be seen as a major milestone in the scholarly study of the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees. In methodological sophistication, coverage of the sources (both primary and secondary), and organization of the debate, it builds upon and surpasses previous investigations. It is also written in a very lucid and uncomplicated style which makes it a pleasure to read.

The book has three main parts. The first is an analysis of Palestinian society from an historical and sociological viewpoint as the broad context within which the specific evidence about the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees has to be made intelligible. The second part works systematically through the relevant literary sources, with two chapters on Josephus, one on Paul the Pharisee, two on the evidence of the four gospels, and one on the rabbinic literature. Part three consists of an 'interpretation and synthesis' of the evidence and analysis of the first two parts, and attention is focussed on the respective social roles of the three groups under discussion.

As this is not the place to attempt a detailed account of Saldarini's analysis, I will note just some of the most interesting points. First, a major historical effort is made to situate the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees within the very wide diversity of groups, factions and movements of Jewish Palestine and within the social structure of the Roman empire as a whole. The effect of this is to correct the common view that the

Pharisees or Sadducees (or the Essenes, for that matter) were the only, or even the dominant, groups in first century Judaism.

Secondly, Saldarini makes explicit use of sociological and anthropological theory in order to develop hypotheses about the social roles of the Pharisees and others in a more analytically controlled manner. He writes:

Errors in the description and understanding of the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees have abounded. Scholars have often treated the Pharisees as a middle-class group, though there was no middle class in antiquity. They have characterized the Pharisees and Sadducees as religious groups separate from politics, even though in antiquity religion was embedded in political society and inseparable from it. The Pharisees have been seen as learned urban artisans at a time when artisans were uneducated, poor and powerless. These fundamental errors in perspective make clear that one has an assumed understanding of society whether one is aware of it or not. (p.12)

The model of society in antiquity adopted by Saldarini is a broadly structural functionalist one, and particular prominence is given, at the macro-social level, to the categories of class, status and power as described by Gerhard Lenski and S.N. Eisenstadt in their work on the sociology of empires. At the micro-social level of analysis, the roles and relations of the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees are analysed in terms of social networks, patron-client relations, ideas of honour and shame, interest groups, social movements, schools and sects.

Third, Saldarini is careful in his analysis to treat the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees as separate (though sometimes overlapping) groups. The effect of this is to sharpen our understanding of the identity and interests of each group independently and in relation to other groups such as that of Jesus and his followers. So the Pharisees and others are treated 'in the round'. The tendency to see them only in terms of what they believed is resisted. And the author's account makes it much more difficult to accept at face value the tendency of the gospels to lump together all the groups and factions with whom Jesus was in conflict (as, for example, in the tirade against 'scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites' in Matthew 23).

Finally, by analysing the sources separately, Saldarini shows that none is free from bias, whether Christian or Jewish. If the gospels have their own axes to grind in their general (though by no means total or undifferentiated) hostility to the Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees, so does Josephus and so do the rabbinic sources as well. Thus, Josephus describes the Pharisees and Sadducees as *haireseis* ('schools of thought') in order to accommodate the Jewish parties to Greco-Roman norms of civility; and overall, his evaluation of the Jewish parties is 'guided by larger political principles, especially the desire for orderly government and keeping the peace' (p.131). The evidence of the rabbinic sources for the pre-70 period is notoriously difficult to assess. The Sadducees are cast in a uniformly negative light, for example; and the sages and the Pharisees tend to be co-opted for the interests of the rabbis of the second century and beyond.

I am not surprised that E.P. Sanders is quoted on the dust-cover as describing Saldarini's study as 'the best single book on the Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees'. It deserves to be widely read by students of both early Judaism and of the world of the New Testament ... and by ecclesiastics bent on polemics about 'pharisaical' attitudes.

Stephen C. Barton

The Ethics of the New Testament

Wolfgang Schrage T. & T. Clark 1988. Pp. xiv + 369. £19.95 (hb)

This imposing book flatters to deceive. Its Introduction conveys a lively awareness of the importance of the New Testament's ethics for today, but this promise is not fulfilled in the book itself. Instead, we find an unsurprising account of eschatology and ethics in the teaching of Jesus, together with consideration of themes such as the Will of God and the Law, the love commandments, and 'concrete precepts' such as marriage and divorce, possessions, and violence in a state context. There follow two remarkably slight treatments of 'ethical beginnings in the earliest congregations' and 'ethical accents in the Synoptic Gospels', before the next main topic, viz., 'the christological ethics of Paul'. The Deutero-Pauline epistles - here 1 Peter joins Ephesians, Colossians and the Pastorals - sponsor an 'ethics of responsibility'. Parenthesis in James focuses on 'the law of liberty', while the commandment of brotherly love is the hub of a rather slight treatment of Johannine ethics. The book closes with a brief treatment of moral exhortations in Hebrews and Revelation.

Let it be said that there is much in this book that students will find helpful. It offers a systematic treatment, clearly written and informative if slightly dull in translation. It is the best of such books yet to appear and will be a standard reference book for some time to come. If it lacks adventure, at least it is reliable as far as it goes. At times the author allows himself to consider something of the nature of the ethics in question. *Agape* may be its centre and quintessence but it implies quite specific content and criteria: it is not an abstract formal principle (p.11). Jesus may have presented 'an ethics of intention', but this does not imply a low status for actual conduct (pp.43-4); love cannot be reduced to convenient formulas, but Bultmann 'exaggerates the element of the moment and scants the importance of specifics...' (p.80)

Why do I say the book flatters to deceive? *Neutestamentliche Ethik* as a genre goes back at least to Herrmann Jacoby in the 19th century and has tended to reflect the theological propensities of the interpreter and his school. One expects a new version to have something distinctive to say. Where does Schrage stand? One presumes, with *Redaktionsgeschichte*, yet it does not come through strongly, and one is left with the impression that while the book is based on sound scholarship and is in its own way comprehensive and informative, it is all so totally predictable and cautious that one reads it with a sense of *déjà vu*. Could it be, one wonders, that this genre is not as appropriate as it was a century ago?

What then prevents this from being the modern treatment for which one was hoping? One looks in vain for an effective harnessing of sociological approaches to the New Testament (cf. Theissen, Meeks and others). Little is made of narrative interpretation or the modern forms of literary criticism (the reference to Crossan on p.74 should read III.C.3.2). Reader response and rhetorical criticism would have provided enriching perspectives: to study ethics in the New Testament is, after all, to read the N.T. in a particular way. Above all, there needs to be a careful study of how one goes about such a study: hermeneutical problems are not fully elucidated in this book. The traditional paradigm was shaped by the assumption that to study ethics in the N.T. was simply an extension of historical-critical exegesis. This, I think, is no longer tenable. Schrage's

work certainly shows the limitations of such an approach. It is more important to relate ethics to its socio-historical context and to explore questions of development and continuity between contrasting N.T. positions rather than simply to have separate treatments of them. Coherence rather than comprehensiveness should be the aim; and priority should be given to the elucidation of moral teaching and practice rather than to following out an agenda adopted on other grounds. It goes without saying that this would produce a very different kind of book.

J. Ian H. McDonald

Jesus Christ. The Man from Nazareth and the Exalted Lord

Eduard Schweizer. SCM, 1989. Pp.96. £5.95

This brief book by the well-known Swiss New Testament scholar and commentator is a succinct summary of the author's reflections on Jesus. The book comprises three main sections:

(1) The opening chapter is entitled 'Modern Approaches to Christology', and starts from Bultmann taking us through to the 1970s (including a look at Liberation and Process Theology). After weighing different approaches Professor Schweizer expresses his view that 'Christian faith has to move like a pendulum from the proclamation of Jesus as Christ (which challenges us to look first at him) to the tradition about his whole work and experience up to his death and the experiences of his disciples, and from there to their understanding of his coming as that of the risen Lord and thus back to the testimony of the church' (p.13).

(2) The central section of the book is a survey of the New Testament evidence in three chapters, the first looking at the 'kerygmatic' statements about Jesus - pre-Pauline ideas and Paul's own views, the second at the narratives of Jesus - the 'Q' narrative (which is not Ebionite), the pre-Markan narrative and the four gospels themselves, and the third at Jesus himself - his sense of 'sonship', the 'Son of man' concept, etc.

(3) The final autobiographical chapter of the book charts the evolution of Professor Schweizer's own thought, describing his contacts and interaction with great names such as Bultmann, Otto and Barth, explaining some of the major issues and ideas addressed in his own writings and ending with a section on 'Jesus - the parable of God'. He refers appreciatively to recent work on the parables as metaphors, and speaks of learning 'to see in Trinitarian doctrine not a definition of God, but rather a narrative report about a living person' (p.89).

This is not a popular book on Jesus; indeed it is dense and difficult at times (though not always - see his helpful parable of the boy following his master's steps through the snow on p.72). It is too brief to be a textbook or a work that significantly furthers scholarly debate; indeed it has a slightly disjointed feel, and it does not engage with some of the most interesting recent work on Jesus (e.g. by G. Theissen). Nevertheless, as a personal statement of belief and conviction by a major New Testament scholar who has lived through a time of much social and theological upheaval, the book is illuminating. Schweizer's academic roots are in the Bultmann school, and Bultmann's influence is evident both in Schweizer's emphasis on divine grace and theological encounter (no academic theology with-

out involvement here!), and also in his commitment to criticism and his excessive historical caution (we do not learn a great deal about the historical Jesus of first century Palestine in this book.) But Schweizer moves on from Bultmann in many respects, rejecting his teacher's extreme scepticism, refusing to divorce the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, and incorporating into his thinking new insights and approaches (e.g. adopting an eirenic approach to other religions which some will see as in conflict with the Christian doctrine of judgment).

Whether or not we agree with his positions, we may be grateful for Schweizer's wrestling with hard questions - in this and so many other books.

David Wenham

Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: a commentary.

Gerd Ludemann, SCM 1987. Pp ix + 277. £15.00

This commentary is the sequel to Ludemann's highly original proposals concerning Pauline chronology published in English translation in 1984, under the title *Paul Apostle to the Gentiles*. That work gave methodological priority to the evidence of the letters for dating Paul's life and tracing the development of his thought. The discrepancies which appear between such a reconstruction and one based on Acts effectively rule out the traditional view of its author as a companion of Paul. Nevertheless, the traditions used by Acts are not historically worthless; sometimes sound historical data survive the later author's redaction. A good example of this is the reference to the purpose of Paul's final visit to Jerusalem at Acts 24.17, "to bring alms and offerings to my nation". Nothing is offered elsewhere in Acts to explain this motive, but the reference in Paul's letters to the collection for the saints, by which their relative chronology is often established, confirm the historicity of this fragment of Acts. At several points such as this, Ludemann's earlier work appealed to vestiges of sound tradition in Acts to support its chronological reconstruction based on the letters. In this volume he supplies the justification for that appeal. In the context of German scholarship on Acts, Ludemann occupies an interesting middle position, in between the radical redaction criticism of Haenchen and Conzelmann, and the conservative historicism of Martin Hengel.

In a short introduction, based on his inaugural lecture at Göttingen, Professor Ludemann argues that historical criteria, which alone are legitimate (*contra* Vielhauer), show that the author was not an eyewitness of the events he records. Secondly, he argues that there is no compelling proof of Acts' knowledge or the dependence on Paul's letters. It follows therefore that any reliable historical material in Acts derives from traditions. But although we can be sure that traditions are being used, there is no longer any way of reconstructing the oral or written sources through which they reached the author. This is because Acts is a highly literary work, weaving its material into a smooth continuous narrative. The detection of traditions is therefore difficult. One may appeal to apparent internal tensions, or strip away the characteristics of Lukan style, vocabulary, narrative art or theology, but in the end each passage has to be assessed in its own terms and according to its own peculiarities. Ludemann illustrates his procedure with examples, including Paul in Corinth (Acts 18). He detects two

obvious redactional features here: the emphasis on Paul's links with the synagogue, preaching every sabbath; and the positive portrayal of the Roman Governor, The concreteness of the other details in the chapter indicates that they derive from tradition, and some receive corroboration from the letters. But, it is suggested, the author has anachronistically compressed his material into one account; this could explain why two different names are given for the President of the Synagogue (vv.8 and 17). Thus, from his analysis Ludemann retrieves evidence to support his view that Paul first visited Corinth c. 41 AD - the date he assigns to the Edict of Claudius - and returned ten years later during Gallio's proconsulship, with I Thessalonians dated at the time of the earlier visit, and with a full decade of development intervening, both in the situation at Corinth and in Paul's eschatology, before the writing of I Corinthians. Ludemann exaggerates somewhat when he claims (p.11) that "most scholars all over the world" have given assent to his proposals; but he is at any rate accumulating independent evidence, through his researches into the traditions underlying Acts, which may eventually make his claim more plausible.

This procedure requires, of course, a close commentary on the whole of Acts, which is what follows. It is a commentary with a particular focus; it does not aim to be complete, or to replace standard works. Each section of text is treated in the same way: first it is divided into its component subsections; then analysed redactionally, in order, thirdly, to expose the traditions, which finally are assessed for their historicity. The ad hoc method makes some of the judgements appear arbitrary, and open to dispute. And the commentary lacks, perforce, the clarity and excitement of the synthetic argument, which it is designed to reinforce. But those who are already impressed by Ludemann's earlier volume, and are willing patiently to probe deeper into the evidence, will be duly rewarded.

John Muddiman

Critics of the Bible 1724-1873

Edited by John Drury. CUP, 1989. Pp. + 204. £9.95

One has the impression that, among the clientele from whom one might hope for the opposite, there has been in recent years a decline of interest in the twin pursuits, open study of the Bible and doctrinal understanding, held together; the former, yes, but as a specialist, self-contained endeavour; the latter, yes, but in terms of a body of beliefs floating in some detachment from realistic biblical roots. Anyone with the health of religion at heart who views this situation complacently or even as inevitable would do well to ponder this collection of texts, especially as seen through the eyes of John Drury, their editor.

In so far as the present situation represents a sort of truce between biblical criticism and dogma, these texts show various phases of the long struggle to establish attitudes to the Bible consonant with the claim of truth as opposed, mostly, to those of church authority. The texts are English; and that may be something of a surprise. People sometimes gain the impression that, perhaps with the exception of Jowett, serious English biblical scholarship began with Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort — trailing far behind the Germans who made all the major moves. While there is much truth in that as far as sheer scholarship is concerned, English thinkers made the running from the start in the crucial matter of seeing, with unfolding

clarity, the shape and scope of the problem, once the Bible is perceived through eyes unclouded by the doctrinal formulations of post-biblical times.

This selection of texts traces the process of learning to 'hear' the Bible in its own, varied, historically conditioned terms, from the satirical attacks by Anthony Collins in the 1720s on the traditional idea of prophecy, through Robert Lowth's sensitive literary analysis of Hebrew poetry, down to Matthew Arnold's plea for a 'soft' approach to doctrine if the essential moral purpose of Christianity is not to be submerged in a tide of incredulity and apostasy. Sherlock, Blake, Coleridge, Thomas Arnold and Jowett are also represented.

The path of this development is not straight. The rationalism of Collins is modified by Coleridge's sense of tradition. All the same, there is discernible a steady onward march as far as the main issue is concerned — the subjecting of the Bible to candid study in its historical contexts and a conviction of the error and the foolishness in treating it as a specially protected object.

The purpose of this book is to present a collection of texts. In such a task, the editor may exert himself minimally — or attempt something more creative. John Drury has provided material to introduce each of his authors and a substantial Introductory Essay. Almost every sentence he has written repays prolonged attention. He has the knack of seeing the 'innerness' of the developments he describes, and he shows how later movements in biblical criticism had their first stirrings long ago, scholars being not always as innovative as they seem. As long as the Bible continues to be found in both study and church, the tortuous story outlined here is unlikely to find easy resolution. But the truce I spoke of is a real threat to its continuance when patently there is more work to be done. Both study and church would suffer, in quite different ways, if that work remained undone.

Leslie Houlden

The search for the Christian doctrine of God. The Arian controversy 318-381.

R.P.C. Hanson. T. & T. Clark, 1988. Pp. xxxi + 931. £39.95(hb)

Richard Hanson died just before Christmas in 1988, and with his death the Church and academic community of England lost a most interesting and forceful character. He had a passion for truth and rational thinking which made his ministry as a Bishop in the north of Ireland incomprehensible to churchmen there, to whom loyalty meant more than objectivity. He had a voracious appetite for books and appreciation of literature, and was no mean poet, but had a deplorable tendency to think that the words of Scripture had to be read without finesse, and baldly regarded as true or false; he was left with a kind of eclectic modernism, rejecting fundamentalism, patristic exegesis, and radical criticism of the New Testament with equal contempt. He had an intense pastoral and evangelical zeal, but was often impatient of the follies and frailties of those around him, though these weaknesses were sometimes due to genuine insights which he himself persistently missed. He bombarded students and congregations with academic detail, and was puzzled by their

inability to accept the obvious truth of what he said. He achieved great distinction and wide recognition as a theologian and patristic scholar, and was well loved by multitudes who had not quailed before his abrasive style; there was no one he warned to so much as the person who gave him a good argument. Yet even in his last years he said and believed that his career had been blighted by a kind of Oxbridge theological Mafia. A few months before a death courageously faced he was able to see published his biggest and greatest book, which we now consider.

Hanson regards 'Arian controversy' as a misnomer for the scope of the book, though he covers the ground which the words usually imply. Much of the affair had very little to do with Arius, and 318-381 was a period when the churches had many controversies other than the one about the doctrine of the Son of God. Hanson attempts in this book to survey, evaluate and collate with exhaustive (and exhausting) thoroughness the material relevant to the development of the doctrine of the Trinity in the period. The argument proceeds like the trans-Siberian train in *Dr Zhivago*, stopping frequently at and between stations, and from time to time shunted up sidings.

At the start, he argues, no clear definition existed about the deity of the Son and the Spirit. The disputes were not a matter of defending orthodox faith against its 'Arian' corrupters, but of deciding what was, and what was not, orthodox. It was a search, in a debate complicated by the prepossessions of the parties, for an orthodoxy to defend. None recognized clearly what they were about: most saw themselves as defending the simple and traditional faith against its detractors. This was if anything more true of those whom hindsight declared to be Arian heretics, who are even blamed by Hanson for wooden conservatism. If there was a consensus with a long pedigree, it was 'the concept of Christ as the link between an impassible Father and a transitory world, that which made of him a convenient philosophical device, the *Logos*-doctrine', and it had to be abandoned. The same applies to the notion attributed to the Apologists, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, that, 'though the Son or *Logos* was eternally within the being of the Father, he only became distinct or prolated or borne forth at a particular point for the purposes of creation, revelation and redemption' (I would question the place of Irenaeus in the list, but the point is generally good). Theology had to move on, and old solutions would no longer work; that was why the 'Arians' were wrong. In this and other regards Hanson tries hard to umpire the debate fairly. He finds Athanasius repulsively odious as a man and as a bishop, but allows him the decisive theological advance which perceived that, 'The Spirit is not outside the *Logos*, but is in the *Logos* and in God through him.' Alexander of Alexandria is a subordinationist. Hilary not only condemned the much-maligned Photinians for teaching that Jesus Christ had a human mind, but held a thoroughly docetic view of the passion of Christ; yet his disquisition on the Trinity, and his understanding of the need for new theological terminology, are warmly commended. Arius and his friends might be wrong to defend tradition at the point where they did, but they have a clearer understanding of the suffering in God implied by the doctrine of Christ's death than their more reputable critics. Ultimately Hanson approves the conclusion of Meijering over the search: 'We have to maintain the view that any talk about a divine being which is not truly and essentially divine is mythology. ... There must be an inner movement in God which implies both identity and distinction.'

If that sounds unoriginal, we should bear in mind that with this book it is not the destination but the journey which counts. It is in fact a kind of encyclopedia of the theology of the period. As such it is a *tour de force* which must command admiration and respect. There has been nothing like it in English since Gwatkin, who is hopelessly out of date. The nearest to a comprehensive precedent is M. Simonetti, *La crisi Ariana* of 1975; one of Hanson's great merits in his familiarity with this and other excellent work of recent Italian patristic scholars. Its usefulness is enhanced by the historical assessments of the participants in the debate, and here his study of Athanasius is particularly useful; that of Arius suffers from the fact that Hanson could not include consideration of the radical reordering of the presbyter's career and documents in Rowan Williams' *Arius*. So thorough a survey of the original patristic sources and the modern literature will make this book the starting point for discussion of the range of topics which it covers, and possession of it is essential for anyone who wishes to obtain up-to-date understanding of the issues and available interpretations.

Since the book is such an encyclopedic mine of information, one looks for an index. There is in fact an articulated subject index, fairly full, and useful so far as it goes. But it has some of those disastrous features familiar to those who read indexes of British patristic works, and especially Hanson's books: entry after entry has huge strings of references, freely larded with 'passim' (a word anathematized in any elementary guide to index-making), and failing to enlighten the reader as to what the references are about. The purpose of an index is to make the book readily accessible to the reader, not to satisfy some subjective criterion of easy production by author and publisher; it needs expert attention. Reviewers are in part to blame, and should be much more critical than they are about the contemptuous attitude with which unskilled greenhorns are given the work of indexing. Still, we have half a loaf, and that is better than no bread.

The most serious weaknesses are in matters of detail. Accumulating the material over many years, Hanson wrote it with varying attention to detail. There are errors. Some are misprints - laudably few in general, and especially in the Greek. But sometimes a 'right' word is actually wrong. 'Constantine' appears twice for 'Constantius' on p. 242, making an already tangled skein of Athanasian intrigue utterly unintelligible. Sometimes it is due to a blind spot. None of the publisher's staff could be expected to pick up the systematic miswriting of the name of R. Lorenz as Lorentz, an error which permeates the bibliography and index. Considering Lorenz is the principal source of Hanson's analysis of Arius' ideas, it is obvious that generations of theological students are liable to be led into unguarded error. It was a kind of dyslexia: Hanson, I recall, invariably added an 'e' to the surnames of P.T. Forsyth and E.C. Ratcliff, and even 'corrected' the work of others by putting it in. We find also errors due to the long period of gestation of the book. His chapter 21.2 on Basil of Caesarea seems to go back before 1966, when Y. Courtonne completed his edition of Basil's *Letters* with the third volume; Hanson twice notes the difficulties of operating with only the first two volumes (p. 686 n. 21, p. 695 n. 72) and registers his want in the Bibliography (p. 880).

Sometimes it is difficult to see whether we are faced with a misprint, or an ill-digested effusion from notes. Hanson reports that, in arguing about the Spirit, Athanasius: 'says openly that the Son does not share in the Spirit in such

a way that this sharing ensures his abiding in the Father, but rather supplies him to everybody; and the Son does not unite the *Logos* to the Father, but rather he receives the Spirit from the Father' (p. 752).

The sentence after the semi-colon is unintelligible, and I went back to the original, which literally translated reads:

'The Son does not participate in the Spirit in order that thereby he too may come to be in the Father, nor is he a recipient of the spirit; rather he himself supplies this (Spirit) to all. And the Spirit does not connect the *Logos* to the Father; rather the Spirit receives from the *Logos*' (*Or. c. Ar.* III.24).

Hanson mistranslated the last clause, first taking τὸ πνεῦμα as object instead of subject, and then misreading at least two important words as a consequence; though 'Son' for 'Spirit' may be only a misprint.

The catalogue of minor errors and mistranslations is probably due chiefly to haste. Hanson was always an impatient man, and in the last stages of publication he knew he was doomed to die. But one error is particularly disastrous, touching a text of prime concern to the Church and to theology, the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. The story of the modern interpretation of this set of creeds, and the problems of the relation of N (Nicaea 325) to Caes. (Eusebius' Caesarean creed at Nicaea) and to C (the Creed of Constantinople 381 which the churches recite as 'Nicene'), and the precise origin and function of C, are major subjects of discussion and controversy.

Hanson's broad position, and most of his detailed exegesis, are excellent. He weighs the idea of A.M. Ritter, accepted by J.N.D. Kelly in the latest edition of his *Early Christian Creeds*, that C was intended as an olive branch to reconcile the Pneumatomachi to the Neo-Nicene majority. He rejects this theory, however, chiefly on the ground that 'who with (*syn*) the Father and the Son together (*syn-*) is worshipped and glorified' would be totally unacceptable to the Pneumatomachi, and in no way a mediating formula. As a previously convinced Ritterite, I am given pause. Hanson also rightly emphasizes the Marcellian character of the theologumena in N, and especially its anathema upon the doctrine that the Son is 'of another *hypostasis*' than the Father - an anathema which the Cappadocian Fathers could not have subscribed to without contradicting their main position. The suppression of that anathema at Constantinople is therefore not a formal but a theological matter.

The error comes in failing to see the significance of the clause, 'begotten from the Father before all the ages,' which is present in both Caes. and C, and absent from N. On p. 816 Hanson lists the differences between N and C. He registers twelve, but fails to include this one. Less significantly, the fact that the original text of C omitted 'God from God' is also overlooked. It is the first of these omissions which is so serious, both factually and theologically. Both N and C are set out in full both in English (pp. 163, 816) and in Greek (pp. 876 and 877); Caes. is given in English (p.159)). Hanson accepts the analysis of Kelly, to the effect that each of the three is on a different base: N is not a rewording of Caes., nor is C a rewording of N. They are of independent origin, as is demonstrated by numerous theologically non-significant divergences. Hanson is consequently prone to minimize the differences, and to reckon only the homoousios and connected words significant in comparing N with Caes., and only the words about the Spirit as significant in comparing C with N. But Kelly's hand is too heavy here. Eusebius has been persistently misread: it is

supposed that Eusebius thought that N was Caes., with only the *homoousios* added. So Hanson writes, 'What Eusebius is really saying is that the Council and Emperor approved of his own Creed, and then went on to produce another similar in content except for the word homoousion' (p. 164). The same view appears in the old translation of Eusebius still allowed to stand in W.H.C. Frend's revised edition of J. Stevenson's *A new Eusebius*; 'our most wise and most religious emperor reasoned in this way [explaining *homoousios*]; but they, because of the addition of Consubstantial, drew up the following formula: [N follows]' (p.345). Once the Greek word *prophasei* is correctly translated, we find Eusebius giving a very different statement: '.. but they, on the pretext of adding Consubstantial, drew up this'. Eusebius is well aware of the differences, and they are most unsatisfactory to him, requiring much fuller explanation before they could be accepted.

To Eusebius, the divinity of Jesus Christ was sacrificed by any theology which did not clearly assert his preexistence as a distinct person (*hypostasis*) beside the Father. The suggestion that he existed only as the Wisdom or Word inherent in the Father, which was at some stage in history or prehistory put forth, or which empowered and divinized a man Jesus, destroyed the Son's status as God, Creator and Mediator of all. This two-person scheme entailed subordination, so that the divine unity rested in the Father alone. So also Arius held, and Origen before them both. 'Begotten of the Father before all the ages' established the point. It was for that reason unacceptable to the Marcellian and Eustathian faction who dominated the drafting of N. The great title 'Onlybegotten' (*monogenes*) is followed in Caes. by 'first-born of all creation, begotten of the Father before all the ages.' In N 'Onlybegotten' is followed by, 'that is, from the being of the Father': God is one being, not two, and his *hypostasis* includes the Son. Not surprisingly, when at the Western council of Serdica (342 or 343) the doctrine of Marcellus of Ancyra prevailed, the idea of a pre-temporal begetting is part of the description of Arian error. But after Serdica the process slowly began of adjusting the Roman and Athanasian line to accommodate the preconceptions of the eastern majority, who could not abide Marcellus. Athanasius' council at Alexandria in 362 is famous for this. By 377 in a formal doctrinal document a council at Rome under Damasus claimed as Nicene the doctrine,

'that God the Word in his fulness, not put forth but born, and not immanent in the Father so as to have no real existence, but subsisting from eternity to eternity, took and saved human nature complete' (*Letter 2* in PL 13.352-353; Hanson seems not to use this document, perhaps because of doubts about its authenticity).

The definition of the Word engages with the easterners' concern that the Trinity be real and permanent, not temporary or economic.

By the time C was drafted in 381 therefore we can hardly see it as non-significant that the definition contained in N is replaced by one originally present in Caes., and dear to the hearts of Lucianists and Neo-Nitenes as it had been to Eusebius and Arius. While N reads:

'... in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, Onlybegotten, that is from the being (*ousia*) of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, True God from True God, ...'

C now has:

'... in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God,
the Onlybegotten,
who was begotten from his Father before all the ages,
Light from Light, True God from True God, ...'

The modern believer may not relish the thought that 'begotten of his Father before all worlds', as the Prayer Book words the 'Nicene Creed', is a doctrine of Eusebius and Arius, which Nicaea tacitly repudiated. Those who use the modern English version incorporated in ASB and many modern liturgies of various churches will meet only the doctored version, 'eternally begotten of the Father', which is Origenistic and anti-Arian. Nevertheless, it is a point of great theological interest, and Hanson should not have suppressed it, whether wilfully or accidentally.

So the book needs revision. But I have a suspicion it will be with us for some decades. Hanson in his Preface says that writing such a book 'resembles the attempt to photograph a running stream. The photograph gives a picture of what the stream was like at one instant, but the stream flows on and never remains the same.' Perhaps, like Gray's *Anatomy*, Hanson's *Search* will have its deficiencies corrected in more than one posthumous revision, and become a perpetual progress report on the study of the most fascinating creative period of Christian doctrinal development.

Stuart G. Hall

Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century

Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (eds.) (Vol. 16 of *World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest*). SCM, 1989. Pp. xxv + 502. £17.50

Spirituality would seem to be "flavour of the month" in religious circles. Following series, dictionaries and treatments of individual writers we now have in train a massive American-inspired 25 volume *Encyclopedic History of World Spirituality*. This book, a paperback version of the American original of 1985, it is the first of three on Christian spirituality. The attraction of spirituality for today's pluralistic approach to religion is undoubtedly its all-embracing polymorphous character. Unlike the doctrines and dogmas so out of fashion it eschews precise definition. Thus the preface to the series candidly admits that no attempt was made to arrive at a common definition of spirituality; it was left to each tradition to clarify and express its own understanding of the general consensus arrived at by the editors of the series.

Bernard McGinn, one of the book's editors, makes a virtue of the same admission in his introduction in which he describes the aim of the three devoted to Christian spirituality as "to present the inner message of Christian belief and practice in a way that will be at once historically accurate and existentially pertinent". The contributors were simply offered a brief working definition. The hope evidently was and is that a clearer and more adequate understanding of Christian spirituality would emerge from the book's 29 articles in 19 chapters, contributed by a deliberately ecumenical spectrum of experts of several nationalities, based mainly in the United States. The twofold aim - which has brought down many such efforts in the past - is both to offer the general reader a clear account of

the history of Christian spirituality and to provide something for a more advanced clientele. How well does it succeed?

The plan is good: after an introductory essay on Scripture as the foundation of Christian spirituality, Part 1 (Periods and Movements) traces the major stages in its evolution from about 100 to about 1200AD, while Part 2 (Themes and Values) deals with its central topics. In both parts distinctive Eastern and Western developments and approaches are treated separately. The blend of more general surveys with more specific topics works quite well and means that the book can be used selectively, for reference, as well as being read as a whole, although I must confess I found it heavy going at times. Inevitably individual contributions stand out, but overall the volume is valuable for the new insights and perspectives it offers on major figures and received views, and the - inevitable - tendency to overlap actually helps to build up a reasonable and coherent picture of the spirituality of the period. But the hope of a clearer definition remains a chimera, to the reviewer at least!

To turn to the individual contributors: Sandra Schneider's article, "Scripture and Spirituality", is a generally helpful survey of ancient exegesis which employs modern hermeneutics to cast a more favourable light on the fathers' "spiritual exegesis". In Part 1 John Zizioulas contributes a masterly article, one of the best in the book, on the early Christian community emphasizing the eschatological and ecclesial character of spirituality. The obligation felt nowadays to include the Gnostics in everything has led to Robert Grant's competent canter through familiar territory, revealing how peripheral Gnostic spirituality ultimately was. Charles Kannengiesser sets the great fourth and fifth century fathers of East and West in their historical context, if dwelling more on the Cappadocians than on Augustine, while the articles on monasticism Eastern (Jean Gribomont) and Western (Jean Leclercq) give a fascinating picture of the ascetic ideal, if offering little defence or definition of that form of spirituality. Paul Rorem contributes a learned and useful article on Pseudo-Dionysus and his influence and Roberta Bondi ("The Spirituality of Syriac-Speaking Christians") a valuable corrective to our bias towards the Greeks and Latins. Pierre Riche offers a brief but tantalising glimpse of Celtic and Germanic spirituality, their pagan backgrounds and distinctive practices. Karl Morrison summarises the effect of the Gregorian Reform and that great turning point, the twelfth century, is represented by four essays: Bernard McGinn's introduction; a stimulating piece by Benedicta Ward on Anselm as an influence on spirituality as much as on theology; Basil Pennington on the Cistercians and Grover Zinn on the Regular Canons, particularly the Victorines.

In part 2 Christology takes pride of place with John Meyendorff focussing on the central Christological debates of the fifth to eighth centuries in the East, and Bernard McGinn briefly noting the distinctive Western view, centring on Anselm and Bernard. Thomas Hopko contributes a particularly helpful article on the Cappadocian doctrine of the Trinity while Mary Clark outlines the Western view, stressing its practical significance. Of the two articles on the human person Lars Thunberg's on the Eastern view is technical and dense, Bernard McGinn on the Western very lucid and relevant. J.P. Burns offers one of the clearest expositions of the Augustinian doctrine of grace I have come across, while the theme of liturgy and spirituality gets a helpful if schematic and jargon-ridden treatment from Paul Meyendorff (East) and a most learned but

equally jargon-ridden approach from Pierre Gy (West). Leonid Ouspensky's article on icon and art is typically Orthodox both in its rather cavalier attitude to historical questions and its religious depth, while Kallistos Ware and Jean Leclercq offer characteristic treatments of prayer and contemplation in East and West respectively; Ware clear and balanced, Leclercq somewhat fanciful in high-flown Gallic style. Peter Brown gives a lapidary and memorable account of the real significance of virginity in the early Church and Sister Donald Corcoran a brief but fascinating summary of spiritual guidance. The final – and longest – article, by Jacques Fontaine presents a fascinating if idiomatic survey of the birth of the laity and lay spirituality.

If unable to answer all one's questions, the book fills an evident gap. It is well produced with helpful black-and-white illustrations. There are only a handful of errors and misprints, the translations are competent and the index comprehensive apart from a mess-up over Aphraat (omitted) and Apollinaris.

Alastair H.B. Logan

The Hermeneutics of John Calvin

T.F. Torrance. Scottish Academic Press (Monograph Supplements to the Scottish Journal of Theology), 1988. Pp. ix + 197.

It is an interesting time for Calvin studies, and Professor Torrance's book joins William Bouwsma's recent *Calvin: a Sixteenth Century Portrait* with a study of his hermeneutics, of which a major part is devoted to the mediaeval and other influences upon the Reformer. We have come to think of hermeneutics very much in connection with the problem of Lessing's 'ugly broad ditch'; the supposed gulf between modernity and the history witnessed in scripture. But Torrance's concern is with the theory of interpretation in an older and broader sense: with everything that has to do with the relation between language and reality.

Here Calvin is placed firmly in his historical context, which is threefold. He is a product at once of Parisian scholasticism, of the new humanist discipline and, of course, of the new Reformation theology. It is Calvin's inheritance from and development of the former two that provides the focus of this study, which concentrates on them perhaps rather at the expense of an account of Luther's influence upon Calvin. This the author tends to minimise, claiming that in many respects Calvin was relatively independent.

In the first third of the book there is treated 'the Parisian Background', with sections on Scotus, Occam and Major, two of them, it must be noted, from Scotland. Thereafter, the author turns for the remainder of the study to 'The Shaping of Calvin's Mind', in which he claims that while it was Luther who transformed the theological scene, it is to Calvin that we owe both modern theology and modern biblical interpretation. Here the main influences are late mediaeval piety and sixteenth century legal and humanist studies, which at once gave Calvin so much and led to tensions out of which came his mature theology and biblical commentary.

There are two chief conclusions. The first is that despite the continuing influence of his scholastic teachers on Calvin, the crucial break was from their continuing 'terminism', which can

be described unsympathetically as a playing with words in abstraction from the realities with which those words purport to deal. Torrance rightly sees Calvin's theology as concerned to engage with the reality of God, and not simply with inherited speech about God. Yet he also allows for the fact that at times Calvin failed to escape the worst aspects of his early training, and sometimes allows the logic of words to get the better of the logic of the object, as in his treatment, so fateful for later times, of predestination.

The second is that although humanist attention to the sources, to the original text, enabled Calvin to come to terms with the Bible, there was about humanism an anthropocentrism and lack of theological seriousness which, in its turn, was to be swept away by a stress on the majesty of God and the offence of the gospel. Even when it is a matter of Calvin's use of sources towards which he was fundamentally sympathetic, like Augustine, Calvin was essentially free and independent. How much more true was this of his relation to scholasticism and humanism. Like all great thinkers, Calvin belongs in a context while transcending it. (Here Torrance is a complement or corrective to Bouwsma, who tends to write Calvin too much into his context).

The Hermeneutics of John Calvin is not, therefore, simply a study in the history of theology, for the reader is regularly brought up against contemporary theological questions, and reminders that in many ways Calvin's problems were not so different from ours. Take the matter of Biblical interpretation. Towards the end of the book, the author gives a comparison of Calvin's early and humanist study of Seneca's *de Clementia* and the much later *On Scandals*, and reveals something of the tension between Renaissance and evangelical interpretations of Scripture. Does this not prefigure the tension in our day between a merely critical approach to Scripture and one willing to do justice to the intrinsic scandal of the gospel, centring as it does on 'the Incarnation of the Son of God and the atoning exchange it involved' (p.146)? What is the difference between a purely humanist – or critical – biblical interpretation, and one which does justice to the theological dimensions of the Bible? That is a question still far from resolved, and one to which this study of Calvin offers illumination. Yet the interesting point is to be found in the concluding judgement, that 'Calvin remained a "humanist" scholar when he became a Reformer.' The two approaches are not finally incompatible.

Colin Gunton

Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734–1984

Kenneth Hylson-Smith. T. & T. Clark, 1989. Pp. x + 411. £19.95 (hb)

This book, clearly an attempt not to revise Balleine but to replace it with a version appropriate to the needs of the present day, embodies much honest reading and exploits the results of innumerable graduate students over the last generation. Sad to say, it is a deeply disappointing work, and, in truth, achieves its ill-defined goals less well than Balleine achieved his. The trouble begins with the title. Balleine set out with the entirely proper objective of writing *A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England* and attained it according to his measure. Dr. Hylson-Smith's title bows to the recent fashion of asserting that because (as in every other party) the evangelical party in the Church has always embraced a range of opinion, it is therefore

not a party at all, notwithstanding the obvious fact that it usually possesses much more organisation than other schools or movements of opinion in the Church. The dates, too, which suggest some kind of 250th anniversary, seem not to signify; Wesley and most of the other characters with which the book begins were not evangelicals in 1734, and, though some pages suggest that the writing of the book finished in 1984, there seems no other significance to the cut-off date.

Where the history of evangelicalism is concerned, the interests of scholars and those of inquirers and general readers are for once at one. All need to know who evangelicals were, in what lay their differences with other parties in the field, and, so far as it can be elucidated, what the sources of their cohesion were and what subsequent history has done with them. The burden of the first should in time be eased for writers of general history by being undertaken fairly exhaustively by the *Dictionary of Evangelical Biography*, a work which English evangelicals allowed to founder years ago, but which has now been revived (with, happily, much English cooperation) from Vancouver. Meanwhile writers like Balleine and Dr. Hylson-Smith must make a bow in this direction; and the penalty of the present book's turning its back on the notion of party is that the earlier Parts read like a collection of entries of a mini-*DEB*, without ever achieving a notion of an evangelical succession of the sort J.S. Reynolds so successfully created in *The Evangelicals at Oxford*, while in the later Parts, where the same method is applied in staccato form to the world in which evangelicals moved, it becomes difficult to distinguish evangelicals from others. *Cognoscenti* will know, for example, that p. 326, beginning with the evangelical appeal to Biblical authority, and going on to the background of modern Bible translation, is not, mostly, about evangelicals. Many of the readers of the book will not.

The book is also insular, even allowing for the fact its theme is English. It is not just that it shows no awareness that some of the useful literature on Wesley is German, that much the best book on Fletcher of Madely is in German, and that most of the decent literature on millennialism is American. It is that the disputes between the early evangelicals and their high-church critics have many points of resemblance to those at issue between the Lutheran Pietists and the Orthodox. The elaborate investigations to which these have been subject bear out the Pietist (and evangelical) assertions of general orthodoxy. What then was it that led the two sides to fight like cats? There were some non-theological factors, but recent work comes down strongly on some points on justification and a different attitude to eschatology. In so far as the author's biographical approach leads to any conclusion at all on this question, it is that the evangelicals, like the second largest car-hire company, tried harder; and that conclusion is unjust to both the evangelicals and their critics. It is the same in the early-nineteenth century. Alexander Haldane, of course, gets his mention in connexion with the increasing strains to which the evangelical party was subject; what is not said at all is that he was symptomatic of a considerable Scots infiltration into the English evangelical world which did much to worsen its temper. In a give-away phrase (p.243) Dr. Hylson-Smith speaks of Harnack's *What is Christianity* helping 'to break down the normal isolation of English theology from the continental thinking', a phrase which betrays an unawareness of the factors which influenced the swing of the pendulum in England between the desire to go it alone and the desire to be part of a larger scene. But it indicates, as the author does not, a change which had come upon English evangelicalism. In the first generation it had been an important vehicle of German influence here; in the nine-

teenth century its 'World' conventions had been mostly, but not entirely Anglo-American; now its historian can assume that isolation was normal.

Enough has been said to show that this book is not the brief history of Anglican evangelicalism which that important subject deserves; how far its weaknesses are symptomatic of the present state of the movement had better be left to the movement itself to assess.

W.R. Ward.

Gore: Construction and Conflict

Paul Avis. Churchman Publishing, 1988. Pp. 123. £10.95(hb)

The centenary of the publication of *Lux Mundi* in 1989 provided a fitting opportunity for British theologians to reassess the significance of the theological achievements of the *Lux Mundi* school and its theological representatives. For a theological work that was once hailed by J.B. Mozley as marking 'the beginning of a new era' the absence of its theological ideas and of the theological conceptions of its contributors and their successors in contemporary theological debate is highly significant and, perhaps even slightly disturbing. Any attempt at assessing the achievement of this period of Anglican theology is therefore also confronted with the task of indicating why it is that its theological fruits are so widely ignored- not least by Anglican theologians.

Paul Avis' book - a reduced and revised version of his PhD thesis at King's in 1976 - gives a very useful and interesting introduction to the theology of Charles Gore (1853-1932) who is still regarded - as Lord Ramsey points out in his foreward - as the most significant Christian thinker in England during the first two decades after the turn of the century. Avis differs from James Carpenter's account in his important *Gore: A Study in Liberal Catholic Thought* (London, 1960) in that he makes Gore's avowed attempt at forging a new theological synthesis central to his investigation. The heuristic assumption is, therefore, that one can detect an underlying (though never fully explicit and never quite unquestionable) consistency of orientation and outlook in Gore's theology which unites the work of the 'young radical' who deeply upset people like H.P.Liddon of the previous generation of the Tractarians with that of the 'hammer of heretics' who did not hesitate to mobilise the forces of ecclesiastical authority against tendencies which he saw as destructive of the doctrinal integrity of the Church of England. The seeming inconsistencies of Gore's theological development and ecclesiastical career appear from this perspective as conflicts between different elements that formed part of his synthesis from the beginning.

The first part of the book presents the different elements that were integrated into Gore's constructive synthesis: Gore's commitment to an ideal of catholicism, interpreted as 'the brotherhood of all men in Christ', with its ecclesiological implications and emphasis on the authority of tradition; his factual acceptance of a Protestant understanding of the authority of Scripture which is curiously at odds with the distorted understanding of the Reformation Gore inherited from his Tractarian fore-fathers; his conviction of the legitimacy of critical exegesis - if it is balanced by an equally strong conviction concerning the factuality of fundamental dogmatic claims; his emphasis on moral perception as a corner-stone of any

viable theological outlook; and, finally, his consistently Platonising view of reality. When such divergent emphases are to be integrated within one constructive synthesis, it is not surprising that tensions and (at least apparent) contradictions occur. The question of overriding importance is, however, what can serve as the framework for the integration of these divergent elements.

In the 'Interlude: The "Holy Party" and *Lux Mundi*' which links the two parts of his book Avis draws attention to the fundamental significance of the relationship between nature and grace which structures Gore's theology. Gore's commitment to a view where nature and grace are seen as complementary, to be distinguished in an epistemological, but not in an ontological sense, serves as the key to a theological conception where divine immanence and divine transcendence are seen as strictly correlative and where the mode of divine immanence can be described in evolutionary categories. While Gore was chided for his inclinations towards immanent theology by Darwell Stone he distanced himself clearly from the 'higher pantheism' of thinkers like A.S. Pringle-Pattison. The task of keeping the balance between the emphasis on God's immanence in the world and the stress on divine transcendence which appears necessary for retaining a view of creation as a free act and of developing an incarnational Christology, appears in Gore as a stimulus for theological creativity as well as an incitement for a rather judgemental attitude towards theological conceptions (like those of Modernist theologians) that seem to jeopardize this balance.

The second part of Paul Avis' book, aptly titled 'Conflict', delineates the main areas where Gore proceeded with sometimes inquisitorial harshness against the Modernist tendencies in the England of his day: the relationship between dogma and criticism; his insistence on a Christology that does not equate immanence and incarnation; his continued allegiance to a high Tractarian doctrine of apostolic succession; and his attempts at enforcing the practice of subscription to the creeds as factual statements. Avis gives a very balanced account of Gore's ecclesiastical strategies and their theological motivations. However, it is difficult to explain the strange inversions that appear in Gore's thought; the risk that his emphasis on apostolic succession as the central warrant for the true catholicity of the church turn the Church of England into a sect (as B.H. Streeter feared), and the contradiction between Gore's ecclesiological triumphalism and his kenotic Christology (which Donald MacKinnon observed).

While Avis remains critical with regard to limitations of Gore's theology – his insufficient methodological reflection, his inability to deal with the contradictory implications of his conceptions and his over-emphasis on the evidential value of history – he nevertheless recommends Gore's attempt at theological synthesis as a 'paradigm of the ecumenical enterprise' which is informed by a 'profound sense of the shape and coherence of Christian theology'. However one might balance criticism and praise, Avis has certainly succeeded in directing contemporary theological attention to a period of the history of modern theology that remains highly instructive – both with regard to its achievements and with regard to its shortcomings. In that case of Gore many readers of this illuminating study will feel tempted to conclude with E.G. Selwyn (by no means one of Gore's theological foes):

'Gore's strength lay in the fact that he always said the same thing: his weakness lay in the fact that he always said it in the

same way. Not all the reasoning by which he defended or expounded the faith was as valid in 1930 as in 1900, even though the conclusions – or most of them – were.'

Christoph Schwöbel

Religion, Reason and the Self Essays in Honour of Hywel D Lewis

Stewart R. Sutherland and T.A. Roberts (Eds). University of Wales Press, 1989. Pp. xiv + 173 £20.00

This tribute collects nine new essays (in English) by seven philosophers of religion and two theologians, most of whom were colleagues of Lewis in Wales or London. The bibliography lists Lewis's Welsh and English writings. Meredydd Evans contributes a biographical appreciation in Welsh and Sutherland in English.

The writers express gratitude for Lewis's encouragement of philosophy of religion in Great Britain, and for his contributions. However, their contributions address current concerns with related topics, rather than discussing Lewis's work. In this they exercise 'independence of philosophical mind', which Sutherland recognises as 'for many (Lewis's) primary academic virtue...'

Concerning the book's title, almost all the examples and concepts of 'Religion' are Christian, and 'Reason' is used rather than discussed with reference to recent philosophical work on rationality, while 'The Self' seems in many respects to be free from elusive Cartesian dualism.

R. Swinburne's 'Meaning in the Bible' aims to show how Scripture should be interpreted if God is, in some sense, its author and if the Church is its intended audience, as well as its authoritative interpreter. He argues for, and with, general rules for interpreting texts, rules not peculiar to the Bible or the Church, but shared by many Fathers responsible for the Christian canon. As well as using the Fathers and recent philosophers, Swinburne uses recent Biblical interpreters, especially G.B. Caird (*The Language and Imagery of the Bible* 1980), but also B.S. Childs, J. Barr and J. Barton, amongst others. In tacit contrast with Caird, Swinburne maintains, 'The meaning of a sentence being a public thing, it is .. the social and cultural context which determines the meaning of what is said, not the intention... the truth of a sentence depends crucially on the context in which it is uttered; on who is the author, of what work the sentence is a part, and when and where that work is produced ...'. (Cf. Caird, op.cit. pp 39, 61, etc).

Swinburne summarises: 'what it would be like for the Bible to be true ... depends on whether the Bible is one book or many, and on who is the author and its intended audience.' Can this be right, if the Bible is at once both one and many books, and if the sense in which God is called its/their author, authoriser, interpreter, etc., neither rivals nor excludes genuinely human authorship, authorising and interpreting? Swinburne belatedly and revealingly half corrects himself: 'But why, then, a Bible with such complicated rules of interpretation? Why not a 500 page Creed ...? Because it matters that God allowed men to grasp those doctrines through an interaction with him in the context of human history...'

However, Swinburne's argument apparently presents this

as a weak compromise with the 'strongest sense' of God as the Biblical author who competes with humanity. While his argument offers some logical and conceptual insights, it remains problematic. What would it mean for Biblical interpretation to be guided by (doctrine of) the God who, in covenant with Israel and in reconciliation through Christ, is free in being true to his own, triune reality?

Swinburne distinguishes between what is said (or written) and what is presupposed in a sentence, arguing that if there are public criteria for distinguishing relevant from irrelevant elements of a sentence, truth-value belongs only to what is relevantly said, and neither to the way it is said nor to what is irrelevantly presupposed in saying it. This argument is clearly important for hermeneutics. However, Swinburne does not develop the point that the classical creeds and other authoritative doctrines, which guide Christian reading and other responses to the Scriptures, should be equally open to interpretation by his distinction between what is said and what is presupposed, if his argument is sound. Evaluation of his implied concepts of revelation and communication could be fruitful.

Sutherland on 'The Concept of Revelation' suggests a taxonomy of views. The succinctness of his essay may frustrate or stimulate readers. It can be read as a foreword and afterword for the whole collection, with implied criticisms, suggested developments and a potential overview for relating other contributors.

F.C. Copleston discusses sympathetically how Vladimir Solovyev could contribute to retrieval and development of a patristic, but non-Thomist, approach to the coherence of 'Faith and Philosophy'. This essay would be well read with T.F. Torrance's 'The Soul and Person, in Theological Perspective'. Here the doctrine of the Greek Fathers is argued to rule out cosmological and anthropological dualism, thereby requiring and empowering a Christian personalism (and anti-Cartesianism). The other theological essay is by H.P. Owen on 'The sinlessness of Jesus'. The possibility of relating this topic equally to regulative and ontological functions of theology is intriguing.

In 'Decision and Religious Belief' T. McPherson takes issue with B. Williams in *Problems of the Self* (1973), surveys varied examples of epistemological responsibility and finds among these a proper place for decisions to believe. T.A. Roberts discusses 'Religious Experience' with critical use of S.R.L. Clark, H.H. Price on J. Hick, and R. Swinburne, suggesting that an argument from religious experience might well attempt to establish that there are genuine private religious perceptions.

In 'The Issue of the Nature of Metaphysics' Ivor Leclerc advocates a (re)turn to metaphysics, to be foundational for natural science, post-Cartesian and non-reductive. D.Z. Phillips deals with another American philosopher, in 'William James and the Notion of Two Worlds', challenging James's attempts to bring together scientific research and perspectives on the dead. The presence and absence of the dead (in moral or other concern with, or responses to, them by the living) are, Phillips argues, phenomena of *Religion Without Explanation* (Phillips 1976), without foundations too, whether scientific or metaphysical. Beliefs in the reality of the dead can be evaluated for truth and falsity. Such beliefs are not to be appropriated or discarded arbitrarily. Their contexts can require them to be

judged in terms of 'allegiance and deviance, integrity and self deception, genuineness and distortion. Whether these beliefs can become truths for an individual depends on whether he can feed on them.'

This book is valuable both as a tribute and a quasi seminar on issues with which philosophers of religion and theologians must wrestle, in company with H.D. Lewis.

Ian McPherson

Church and Politics in a Secular Age

K.N. Medhurst and G.H. Moyser. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1988. Pp. xvi + 392.

For many decades Christian social ethics has concentrated in Britain on the 'middle axioms' approach, building up an impressive corpus of empirical data and theological reflection. At the same time such theologians have worked out a theological method which was heavily influenced by Biblical criticism and an incarnational theology. The field tended to be dominated by Anglican and Free Church theologians, with the occasional American contribution. However, the debate has changed quite dramatically in the 1980s, although it is fair to speak of evolution, not revolution. Contributors from a radical bias now question the whole 'middle axioms' approach, while others have asked how such theological reflection relates to systematic theology.

The approach which has been so dominant since the 1930s still continues. Nevertheless some theologians now discuss the grounding of social ethics in fundamental theology, and far more attention is paid to Barth or the Roman Catholic tradition. At the same time social scientists have begun to ask how social ethics are implemented by the Churches in Britain. Thus from both sides the 'middle axioms' approach is being rethought.

This book takes the sociological investigation of the British social ethics tradition a quantum leap forward. It is no exaggeration to say that it is one of the most important contributions to sociological awareness of how social ethics influences the world in the last decade. The immediate question which it raises in my mind is how sociological analysis of an ethical tradition relates to a dialogue between social ethicists and systematic theologians. Can the two sides meet? It is a difficult question to answer, and the danger is that two different debates will be carried on.

This is however not the concern of this book. It proceeds by four steps in its argument, using both clearly worked out conceptual criteria and empirical analysis. The first step is familiar enough, although it is well presented and cogently argued. In the twentieth century the Church of England has become further and further removed from its once-close association with national government. The creation of the General Synod mark the further erosion of the Reformation settlement. At the same time the emergence of a 'Secular Society' has further marginalized the Church's role in education, and diminished the numbers attending its services. Material concerns have become the staple diet of political life, and the decline of traditional middle-class values leads into a hedonistic consumerism. The authors note that this situation may now be the subject of some reassessment, pointing to Keith Ward's

writings and the desire for greater clarity in society about moral beliefs. Yet this situation must be juxtaposed with two others. First, there is a major crisis in socio-economic and political life. The 1980s have seen a breakdown in any consensus about government's role, and massive alienation among many voters about the possibility of improvement. Secondly, all churches, but especially the Church of England, have become polarized on issues of belief, liturgy and moral values, while the development of patterns of participation, such as synodical government, bureaucratic national and local agencies also deeply divide the Church of England.

If there is a moral vacuum at the heart of political life, with considerable uncertainty about social pluralism, can the Church of England respond in a new way which avoids the old identification of Church and State? Is it possible to bring to bear to the analysis of social problems the corpus of social ethics mentioned at the beginning of this review? The next three steps in the book's argument examine the nature of the modern episcopate, the members of the general Synod, and the staff of Church House, London, who produce reports for General Synod's deliberations.

The authors reveal that the new model of episcopal authority is participatory and bureaucratic. Bishops are no longer part of a regional social elite, whether construed in terms of inherited position, wealth or status. They see themselves as pastors, and as chairmen of synodical committees. Only a few of them espouse a prophetic stance. Significantly many of those who are prophetic have worked abroad, such as Bishop David Jenkins, who worked for the World Council of Churches. The general outlook of most bishops is less challenging of the present government, but there is a desire to explore new social possibilities in such fields as unemployment.

It is no surprise to find that lay members of General Synod are highly educated, and from a higher social status than clerical members (proctors). What is striking is the degree of support in the early 1980s for a centre party. While few wished to question the establishment of the Church of England, there are the stirrings of a distinctive theological approach to some issues. There is clearly a division within General Synod as to whether an organic view of Church and Nation is still to be welcomed, or whether a pluralist society must now be seen as the reality, with the Church of England as a distinctive pressure group. In this discussion the staff of Church House exercise a persistent influence, outlining a comparatively liberal social outlook, based on a theology drawn from a growing international theological consensus.

Will the Church of England continue to move away from its old identity as a politically conservative body, close to social elites in the regions? The answer depends on the nature of the continuing moral debate in modern Britain on the nature of politics and of wealth-creation, and on the internal debate within the Church of England on the nature of leadership and the values expressed by that leadership. But it is possible – just possible – that with bold leadership and a continuing moral vacuum in society the relevance of Christian social ethics to the search for a new social identity in Britain could be quite marked. How such a contribution would relate to the debate in systematics on the identity of Christianity is of course another question altogether. The authors of this book are to be congratulated on a superb treatment of the sociological expression of social ethics in the Church of England. It will become the definitive work in this field for years to come.

Peter Sedgewick

Science and Providence. God's Interaction with the World

John Polkinghorne. SPCK, 1989. Pp. 114. £5.95

With this book John Polkinghorne completes his trilogy about the relationship between science and the Christian faith. In it he argues that faith in a personal God who acts freely within the world can still be rational for a culture informed by modern physical science.

He begins by surveying recent responses to the problem of divine action. Deism (as advocated by Maurice Wiles) is dismissed as incompatible with orthodox Christian belief. Both fideism and existentialism are perceived to beg the question. Against such contemporary denials and agnosticism he affirms that the world is open to divine influence at a macroscopic level. He is more sympathetic towards Austin Farrer (who is, nevertheless, taken to task for his obscurity).

The idea that divine action may be understood by analogy with bodily action is explored in more detail in Chapter 2. The pantheistic view that the cosmos might be understood as God's body is taken quite seriously. However, Polkinghorne objects that it makes the degree of interdependence between God and the world too great for it to be easily compatible with orthodox theology. Furthermore, it suggests that the cosmos is eternal and best viewed as an organism, neither of which implications commends it to one committed to modern physics. A popular alternative, namely pansychism, is dismissed as failing to take account of the emergent character of mentality. Polkinghorne himself prefers to speak of mind and matter as complementary. This leads him to speculate about a 'noetic' realm: a realm of ideas in which human mentality participates. One might have wished for a more detailed account of this 'complementary metaphysics'. Complementarity has become something of a buzz word in the dialogue between science and religion and a clearer explanation of how Polkinghorne uses it would have been helpful.

Having, to his own satisfaction, argued that modern physics is sufficiently open textured to permit both human and divine freedom of action, Polkinghorne proceeds to tackle some of the major challenges to a traditional doctrine of providence. He begins by denying that providence is at odds with modern science. On the contrary, providence may be understood as continuing creation.

Special providence and faith in miracles are not easily reconcilable with a modern scientific world view. Thus, Polkinghorne devotes a chapter to the rationality of miracles. His understanding is orthodox in the sense that he believes miracles to be an unexpected but, nevertheless, real interaction between God and the world. However, they are not divine 'interference' since, "God's complete action in the world must be consistent throughout" (p. 50). He also dismisses the view, popularised by C.S. Lewis, that miracles may be viewed as the acceleration of nature. Jung's concept of synchronicity (or meaningful coincidences) receives more sympathetic treatment. The chapter concludes with a critique of Hume's account of miracles.

The problem of evil is treated in a similarly orthodox fashion. Dualism and the notion that evil might be mere absence of good are dismissed. Instead, evil is to be seen as a necessary part of a greater good (or harmony). How anyone can

maintain such a 'reasonable' view of evil after Auschwitz escapes me!

From evil he moves on rapidly to discuss prayer. He maintains an orthodox view of petitionary prayer, regarding it as a genuine collaborative encounter between God and the one who prays. The effect of such encounters is to create new possibilities which would not have been realised had the prayer not taken place.

The concluding chapters range more widely, touching on "Time," "Incarnation and Sacrament" and "Hope." The chapter on time is particularly welcome as most theologians who tackle this subject are handicapped by a profound ignorance of the implications of recent physical theory. By contrast, Polkinghorne is well acquainted with modern scientific understanding of time. Unfortunately, this acquaintance leads him to toy with the process notion of divine dipolarity as a device for maintaining both God's involvement in history and his eternity.

The notion of dipolarity reappears in his discussion of the incarnation. He suggests that we cobble together divine dipolarity and the doctrine of the Trinity in order to create a concept of a God who is able to act in history. Some forms of trinitarianism may need to be supplemented in this way. However, that may simply indicate the bankruptcy of those versions of trinitarianism. Also in this chapter, Polkinghorne defends belief in resurrection (on the basis of his complementary metaphysics) and makes some thought provoking comments on the nature of the sacraments. The work concludes with a brief reaffirmation of Christian hope in the face of the ultimately pessimistic extrapolations of modern cosmology.

My main reservation concerns Polkinghorne's understanding of the relationship between divine and human agency. The book paints a synergistic picture of double agency, i.e., the relationship is basically that of cooperation between free agents. However, this implies that divine sovereignty and creaturely freedom are mutually limiting. This may be consistent with post-Enlightenment ways of thinking but it is fundamentally alien to classical Christian theology. Far from being mutually limiting, divine and creaturely efficacy are there presented as mutually reinforcing: it is the absolute sovereignty of God which guarantees the real freedom of the creature.

My theological reservations apart, the trilogy of which this book is a part makes a useful introduction to the relationship between science and theology. However, contrary to the publishers' claims, it will not "inaugurate a new stage in the science and religion debate."

Lawrence Osborne

The Orthodox Liturgy. The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite

Hugh Wybrew. SPCK, 1989. Pp. x + 189. £8.95

In his foreword to this volume Bishop Kallistos of Diokleia begins with the question, 'What is the Church here for?' The 'least incomplete' answer, he suggests, is that 'the Church is here to celebrate the Eucharist.' Whatever chord this profound – yet easily abused – answer may strike in us, there can be little

doubt in today's ecumenical climate that Hugh Wybrew's examination of the development of the Divine Liturgy fills an important gap for the Western reader. His qualifications to write such a book are obvious, and the publisher's claim that it is 'splendidly readable' is largely true. If indeed the interest level lags here or there in the course of tracing out a somewhat intricate history, that is quite forgivable, and not without parallel in the observance of the Liturgy itself!

Wybrew (Dean of St George's Anglican Cathedral, Jerusalem) has aimed his book, quite successfully, at those relatively new to the subject and to the experience of Orthodox worship. The opening chapter provides a very simple overview of the Eastern rite, pointing out those features which are most surprising to a Western visitor. The rest of the book is devoted to explaining how the distinct features of the rite developed (chapters two through eight); a final chapter outlines a number of lessons which the Western Church might learn in pondering on it. We will turn to these in a moment, after making a few more observations about the book's contents.

The brief second chapter, 'The Sources of the Tradition' (which begins at the beginning, with the biblical context), already indicates the author's sense of balance between theological foci and the broader task of historical description. Both must be treated lightly in such a work, but their integration is generally quite satisfactory. Throughout, Wybrew attends steadily to the all-pervasive symbolism of the Liturgy, which incorporates the building and its decor as well as the actions of priests and people. This symbolism, though it has cosmological dimensions and implications as well, is largely oriented to the history of Jesus. The reader will want to make full use of the Comparative Table found on pp.182f., which provides a helpful summary of the evolution of the symbols and the shifts in emphasis this entailed. Given the number of technical terms which it is necessary to introduce in such a book, however, the lack of a glossary is disappointing. Likewise, the scattered diagrams might have been supplemented by one or two photographs, which would convey a good bit more to the reader without first-hand experience.

Wybrew's respect for the Eastern liturgical tradition is obvious throughout. Criticisms are not lacking, but are generally somewhat muted. The strong clericalism comes in for the most frequent negative attention, and notice is taken of the tendency of the historical or symbolic dimensions to distract from the sacramental character of the Eucharist. On the other hand, the 'inherent conservatism' of the East is largely justified by Wybrew in terms of the pressures of the political and social climate with which Orthodoxy has had to contend over the centuries; in any case the growing appeal of such stability for the all-too-unstable Western churches reinforces this favourable judgment. Such recent liturgical experiments as may be found are briefly summarized (especially those which move away from a clerically dominated and highly mystical form), though of course there is no real parallel here to the free-wheeling reform movement with which we are familiar.

When it comes to those lessons which the West might learn from the East, we are offered seven in particular: (1) the value of giving a sacramental cast to the building itself; (2) the usefulness of icons and the importance of the visual dimension of worship; (3) the benefits of involving the whole person – i.e., all of our senses and faculties, and not the intellect merely – in worship; (4) the balance between a strong sense of corporate synaxis (which Andrew Louth has stressed in his recent book

on Pseudo-Dionysius) and the personal freedom of movement or response by the individual worshipper; (5) the admirable preparation and seriousness which attends the Communion itself; (6) the richness of the contemplative aspect of worship; (7) the affirmation of the primacy of worship in the Christian life, which is in itself a way of witness to the world. These suggestions are not made without awareness of corresponding weakness in the East, and for that reason may be taken the more seriously.

Just here, however, one could wish for something further in the way of identifying the most pressing theological issues at stake between East and West, even if actual engagement with the same certainly lies beyond the scope of Wybrew's book. In particular, the question of the eschatology of the Eucharist, which in modern times is being recognized on both sides as a matter of urgent importance, requires some attention if the truly significant lessons of liturgical interaction are to be learned. Conflicting (and often inadequate) approaches do not produce a healthy balance merely by being thrown together. Here the relationship between eucharistic visions and the respective social histories of East and West might also be raised, for this relationship – even in the East – is surely not a unilateral one (as Wybrew seems to imply).

In any event, the remarkable timeliness of this book should not go unnoticed. Recent developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe augur well for a rapidly increasing interaction between Orthodoxy and the rest of the Church, in which each can – and indeed must – learn from the other to face the modern world with a vital eucharistic witness. Wybrew's book is a good place for the Western Christian to begin.

Douglas Farrow

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Peter Cameron teaches in the Department of New Testament Language, Literature & Theology at New College, Edinburgh.

Grace M. Jantzen is Lecturer in the Philosophy of religion at King's College, London.

David Martin was Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics. He is now Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at King's College.

Jeremy Moiser teaches at Truro School, Cornwall.

John D. Zizioulas is Metropolitan of Pergamon and Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at King's College. He is the author of *Being as Communion. Studies in Personhood and the Church*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- George Austin *et al* *Building in Love. The Vocation of the Church* St Mary's Bourne Street Pp. 136 £3.95
- Paul Avis *Eros and the Sacred* SPCK Pp. x + 166 £7.95
- Eileen Barker *New Religious Movements. A Practical Introduction* HMSO Books Pp. xii + 234 £11.95
- J. Christian Beker *Paul the Apostle. The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. T. & T. Clark Pp. xxi + 452. £12.50
- Peter Byrne *Natural Religion and the Nature of Religion. The legacy of Deism* Routledge Pp. xv + 271 £35.00 (hb)
- R. J. Coggins and J. L. Houlden (eds) *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* SCM Press Pp. xvi + 751 £35.00 (hb)
- John Drury (ed) *Critics of the Bible 1724-1873* Cambridge English Prose Texts CUP Pp. ix + 204 £9.95
- Ian Dudley *God is Green. Christianity and the Environment* DLT Pp. x + 118 £6.95
- Martin Dudley and Geoffrey Rowell (eds) *Confession and Absolution* SPCK Pp. xii + 212 £9.95
- James D. G. Dunn *Jesus, Paul and the Law* SPCK Pp. x + 277 £15.00
- John Eaton *The contemplative face of Old Testament Wisdom in the Context of World Religions* SCM Press. Pp. ix + 150 £7.50
- Duncan B. Forester *Beliefs, Values and Policies. Conviction Politics in a Secular Age* OUP Pp. vii + 110
- R. P. C. and A. T. Hanson *The Bible without Illusions* SCM Press Pp. 150 £6.95
- Martin Hengel *The Johannine Question* SCM Press Pp. xvi + 240 £10.50
- Stanley L. Jaki *God and the Cosmologists* Scottish Academic Press Pp. xi + 286 £10.50
- David E. Jenkins *Still Living with Questions* SCM Press Pp. x + 226 £10.50
- Alistair Kee *Marx and the Failure of Liberation Theology* SCM Press Pp. xii + 302 £15.00
- Graham Leonard, Ian McKenzie, Peter Toon *Let God be God* DLT Pp. 85 £3.95
- Gordon Munsell *Out of the Deep. Prayer as Protest* DLT Pp. 176 £7.95
- Leslie Newbigin *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* SPCK Pp. xi + 244 £8.95
- Aidan Nicholson OP *Theology in the Russian Diaspora. Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afanas'ev, 1893-1966* CUP Pp. xv + 295 £30.00
- Ronald Nicholson *A Black Future? Jesus and Salvation in South Africa* SCM Press Pp. xvi + 265 £9.50
- Heiki Räisänen *Beyond New Testament Theology* SCM Press Pp. xviii + 206
- Christopher Rowland and Mark Corner *Liberating Exegesis. The Challenge of Liberation Theology to Biblical Studies* SPCK Pp. viii + 205 £6.95
- Robert Runcie *The Unity we Seek* DLT Pp. viii + 161 £7.95
- Anthony J. Saldarini *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* T. & T. Clark. Pp. x + 325 £19.95 (hb)
- Marc Saperstein *Moments of Crisis in Jewish-Christian Relations* SCM Press Pp. 84 £4.95
- Edward Schillebeeckx *For the Sake of the Gospel* SCM Press Pp. 181 £9.50
- Kenneth Surin. (ed) *Christ, Ethics and Tragedy, Essays in Honour of Donald McKinnon* CUP Pp. xi + 206 £25.00 (hb)
- S. W. Sykes (ed) *Karl Barth Centenary Essays* CUP Pp. 171 £22.50 (hb)
- Simon Tugwell OP *Human Immortality and the Redemption of Death* DLT Pp. xii + 196 £12.95
- Godfrey Vesey (ed) *The Philosophy in Christianity* CUP Pp. xvi + 244 £10.95
- Heather Ward *The Gift of Self* DLT Pp. ix + 117 £6.95
- Rowan Williams (ed) *The making of Orthodoxy, Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* CUP Pp. xv + 340 £35.00 (hb)