

Volume XIII Number 2

Autumn 1990

KING'S

Theological Review

Person and Community <i>Brian Horne</i>	33
Leaving things as they are: a response to John Hick and Paul Badham <i>Beverley J. Clack</i>	37
Resexing the Trinity: the Spirit as Feminine <i>Andrew Walker</i>	41
Martin Rade — 50 Years after <i>John Clayton</i>	45
BOOK REVIEWS	50

BOOK REVIEWS

Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians

James D.G. Dunn. SPCK, 1990. Pp.x + 277. £15

The book comprises nine essays and lectures which Prof. Dunn published in various places between 1982 and 1988, together with an account of more recent writing on the same topics, often in response to Dunn himself. The pieces are arranged in topical order, moving from the Gospels to Paul. Thus it is argued that the radical attitude of Jesus to sabbath, food laws, etc. goes back to the historical Jesus himself (in a rather less aggressive form than we have it in Mark); that the Pharisees were active in Galilee in Jesus' lifetime, influential and passionate for their halakot, and that their hostility to Jesus is likely to be historical; that Paul's sense of mission to the Gentiles was a central part of his Damascus road experience, and probably derived from a pre-Pauline use of the "curse" argument of Gal.3.13; that the Greek of Gal.1-2 implies a recognition by Paul of the authority of the Jerusalem apostles; that the Antioch dispute in Gal.2.11-14 was about ritual purity, at a time when Jews felt their religion to be under mounting threat; that Paul was not against the Law as such, but only against "works of the Law", i.e. circumcision, food laws, sabbath, etc., the "boundaries" of Jewish self-definition, trust in which was a wrong attitude leading to "boasting"; and that Gal.2.16 shows the apostle in process of radicalising his gospel.

There can be no hesitation in admiring Dunn's learning and industry, and the sharpness of his mind. The footnotes are a testimony to the breadth of his reading, and provide an up-to-date bibliography on many of the topics in current discussion; and the argument is forceful and well-documented. Furthermore, there are valuable insights here. The sense of mission to the Gentiles is central to Paul's Damascus road experience, and not a corollary of it; the admission of the Gentiles is indeed the basic thrust underlying all Paul's theology; the Law was a function of national identity, not the basis of individual claims to be righteous; there must be some bridge between Paul and Jesus; there are some persuasive suggestions about the basic argumentation of Galatians.

Nevertheless hesitations do arise, over Dunn's judgement: I found myself not really agreeing with any of the pieces fully. Even over the centrality of the Gentile mission the Gal.3.13 explanation seems artificial: surely Paul's conviction that God willed the salvation of the Gentiles was there before his conversion, and accounts for his persecution of Hellenists for admitting them on what he had at first thought were the wrong terms. It is this universalism which at Damascus suddenly saw its resolution in Christ, and it is this which is glimpsed but not made really basic to the "new perspective on Paul". I do not think that Paul ever thought of Jerusalem as having authority over him; he is only able to speak of "not running in vain" because he had talked the pillars over. Nor is it at all believable that Paul would have commended his gospel by having Titus "keep a high standard of ritual purity" in Jerusalem: the issue at Antioch was the straightforward one of which butcher the meat had come from for the agape.

The second essay gives a good impression both of Dunn's sophisticated argument, and of the reasons for suspecting it. Did Jesus really challenge the food-laws by saying that nothing which goes into a man defiles him (Mk.7.15)? Well, some of

the expressions are Marcan, so the Marcan form is probably edited; the Matthaean form goes more easily into Aramaic than the Marcan, and is less aggressive; Jesus' original words probably came down to both evangelists in oral form, and Matthew has substituted the earlier, softer version; a form like Matthew's also comes in Thomas, which seems to be familiar with our Q traditions, so Matthew probably had the wording from Q; the context suggests that the historical dispute was about purity. It is a puzzle why Paul does not cite Mk.7.15 to answer the problems over food in his churches, but his similar language in Rom.14 shows him to be familiar with a line of reflection that grew out of Jesus' teaching. So Jesus sowed the seeds of radicalism which were to find a fuller expression in Mark and Paul.

I do not think any of this is right. Mark has "edited" (written) the whole Gospel so his expressions are to be found everywhere. Matthew is more purely Semitic than Mark, so his Greek goes more easily into Aramaic; and his conservative sympathies lead him constantly to water down Mark's radicalism. Matthew is simply softening Mark; and the repeated *stoma* in his version is one of his favourite words. If Q is allowed to expand to fill the parallels with Thomas it will cover many of the M sections and Matt.R sections (as here) and will end up as Matthew's Gospel. Paul does not cite any version of Mk.7.15 because none yet existed; the saying was inferred by the Marcan community from their "Pauline" image of Jesus. Peter and James stood by the traditional food-rules at Antioch for the same reason.

Dunn is probably the leading British NT scholar, and he has a world reputation; but for all that his book contains good things (and is compulsory reading for scholars), it seems to me to be flawed by a hidden agenda. It is not an accident that the conclusions are all so reassuring. It turns out that Jesus said something very close to the radical things in Mark and Paul; that the Pharisees formed a constant opposition to Jesus' Galilean ministry, despite Sanders' scepticism; that the Jerusalem leadership were fine Christians as well as Paul; that Paul does not habitually contradict himself over the Law, as blinkered Räsänen claimed. It is difficult not to see a doctrinal association with so many comforting results; and, as the apostle says, doctrinal associations corrupt good scholarship.

Michael Goulder

The Johannine Question

Martin Hengel. SCM, TPI, 1989. Pp xvi + 240. £10.50

The volume of scholarly literature which addresses issues of the Johannine writings and their context is immense. It is all the more welcome that we have in this book the analysis and hypotheses of one whose erudition has contributed so much to our understanding of the origins of Christianity and its world. The material of this book represents the expansion of the Stone Lectures given at Princeton in 1987 and the 'preliminary sketch' of findings yet to be published in a fuller German manuscript. The present text, translated by John Bowden, follows the pattern of Hengel's previous publications of having extensive endnotes, which must amount to at least half of the total manuscript length and even in smaller type set take up 86 pages.

Hengel addresses the question of the authorship and con-

text of the Johannine corpus (including the Apocalypse), concluding that the entire body of literature should be seen as the work of one man, the elder John, who is the 'beloved disciple' of the gospel, but not to be identified with John, the son of Zebedee. He begins with a reappraisal of the second century evidence. There are strong indications, both in writers from the period (Irenaeus, Tatian, Apollinaris, Melito, Justin, Papias, Valentinian gnosticism, apocryphal gospels and acts) and from the strength of early attestation of the gospel (from the second century: P⁵², P⁹⁰, probably P⁶⁶) that the gospel was widely accepted. The attempt by the Roman elder, Gaius, to dispute its authenticity and attribute it to Cerinthus is the product of doctrinal disputes with Montanism, not of historical tradition, and still operates with the common assumption about the gospel's date (Cerinthus was a contemporary of John). Irenaeus had reliable sources of information about the gospel (Papias, the Roman archives, Asia Minor traditions). These spoke of 'John, the disciple of the Lord' and Hengel argues that they reflect a wider tradition which enables us to speak of the elder John at Ephesus, who headed up a school of major influence in Asia Minor around 60 - 70 and lived till the time of Trajan (98-117). Papias' list of disciples shows he knows the Johannine tradition (especially John 1:35-51 and 21:2). It includes both John the son of Zebedee and at the end, in a separate listing, Aristion and John the elder. Eusebius has suppressed his mention of the early martyrdom of John, the son of Zebedee, attested in Philip Sidetes, and his probable mention of the elder's authorship of the fourth gospel. Papias had known John as the great teacher in Ephesus, called 'elder', not as a designation of office, but because of his age and authority. Hengel buttresses his claim that this elder John wrote the gospel by appealing to his hypothesis concerning gospel titles, that these must have been published with the original, so that the writings could be identified for liturgical use. 'John' was not a common name in Asia Minor and reflects a Palestinian origin. Accordingly, it was this John, not one of the twelve, but a disciple, who established the Johannine school at Ephesus and to whom the corpus should be attributed.

Turning to the corpus, Hengel counters arguments about difference in style and theology between the gospel and epistles by pointing out difference in occasion and purpose and by appealing to the phenomenon of old age. The letters, 2 and 3 John, owe their preservation to publication along with the so called first epistle, which is best understood as a homily written for circulation and reading in worshipping communities. All three reflect the situation where trouble has arisen within the community, particularly through the intrusion from outside of teachers. The Johannine community is not a sect. It belonged within wider mainstream Christianity in which Gnosticising tendencies flared up in a number of places. John warns that not all itinerant teachers are to be believed (1 John 4:1). The false teachers and the secessionists dissolve the unity between the man Jesus and the Messiah the Son of God (4:2f), equally important for future hope (2 John 7). They espoused the view of Cerinthus or one close to it and taught that the Christ came upon Jesus at his baptism and left before his crucifixion. This left no place for understanding Jesus' death as atonement, stressed realised eschatology and encouraged ethical complacency. But, in sharp contrast to many recent reconstructions of the Johannine history, Hengel argues that the heresy did not arise from a reading of the fourth gospel, for it was still in preparation and John was reluctant to publish. Rather the gospel itself indirectly reflects the struggle. 'The Word became flesh' has clear antidocetic intent, as have the accounts of the spear thrust and of the post Easter display of the wounds. The

gospel does not express naive docetism. Even the miracles reflect an antidocetic stance.

The final redaction of the gospel took place after John's death, i.e. some time after 98 CE. John had worked on it over his decades of teaching. Hengel assumes he had known the first three gospels. Written works took little time to become widely known and used. John wrote his gospel in antithesis to the Synoptic gospels, intending it as a new kind of scripture. A group of his disciples published the final work, identifying him as the beloved disciple and deliberately blurring the distinction between him and John of Zebedee in order to enhance the link with Jesus. The final chapter of the gospel reflects real experience: some had thought the old man would survive to the parousia. John's earliest extant work is probably the Apocalypse, written in response to the persecutions of Nero, and perhaps reworked by a pupil in the time of Trajan.

Hengel has made a strong case of cumulative evidence for the influence of John the elder in the Johannine community and beyond. It depends on a very positive assessment of Papias' testimony, on the postulate of continuing independent tradition in Roman archives and of the Asia Minor connections and on his gospel superscript theory. Against the latter is the absence of such a use of 'gospel' in Justin.

But Hengel's handling of the primary texts, the Johannine corpus itself, raises many questions. How credible is it that John would not have published his gospel in some form during his teaching career? The lack of manuscript evidence for earlier versions or the speculation about reluctance to publish are not convincing arguments. Hengel's argument that the gospel material would not credibly support or reflect naive docetism is offered without sufficient substantiation and fails to take into account the effect of the dramatic irony technique which inevitably produces stage figures larger than life. Johannine miracles are hardly analogous to those of other men: in the gospel they are signs of the divine sent one.

Hengel strongly rejects hypotheses which portray the gospel as the product of a community, 'a quarrelsome collective', and argues for the stylistic unity of the gospel and epistles. Yet his own hypothesis is only relatively different from this position. His final redactors do far more than append the final verses of the gospel. It lay before them 'probably in small parts' (p.99). He concedes they possibly added the passages about the beloved disciple. They also inserted passages based on the 'elder's notes or sketches, perhaps deriving from his oral lectures' (p.105). Has Hengel adequately assessed the extent of such redaction and what it means for the argument from stylistic unity? Must John have been the kind of a teacher who kept all writing tasks to himself? And, looking to the proposed common authorship of gospel and epistles, Hengel's glossing over the differences in terms of imperative and indicative focus and of the alleged Greek of old age does not adequately support his argument against multiple authorship. His assertions, for instance, of the centrality of vicarious atonement in the gospel are very much open to question, as I have shown recently in my *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*. The proposed common authorship of the Apocalypse too requires much fuller argument if it is to convince many.

A related question concerns his rejection of signs sources or gospels, particularly theories according to which they are reworked polemically. This makes me look forward all the more to Hengel's more detailed analysis to see how he, in turn,

explains the claim that John is written 'in opposition' (p.91) to the Synoptics. Such questions, including the way the collections of signs which he presupposes for the community (p. 102) have been integrated in the gospel, can only be dealt with adequately through analysis of specific passages.

Hengel stresses the presence of aporia and rightly cautions against finding a source seam at every point of unevenness. The strength of Hengel's presentation is precisely this caution which marks most of the work. It calls for a critical and open reappraisal of positions well -argued in the past and too often neglected, and retains appropriate tentativeness in offering its own hypothesis. The careful blending of an extensive survey of the external evidence and tentative scholarly reconstruction whets the appetite for a presentation of the hypothesis which argues it through a more detailed treatment of the internal evidence, the Johannine corpus itself.

William Loader

Beyond New Testament Theology. A Story and a Programme

Heikki Räisänen. SCM/TPI 1990. Pp xviii + 206. £6.95

Historical exegesis is one thing, theological exegesis of the results should come later. Experience is the primary goal of New Testament exegesis, its interpretation is secondary. These linked distinctions are explained, nuanced and urged in a review of essays in 'New Testament Theology' from the eighteenth century (J.P. Gabler) to the present day. And, yes, Räisänen knows well that there is no value-free historical exegesis and that interpretation accompanies all experience and experiences. But our ideal aim in study of the early Christian documents should be to discern the kinds of experiencing that are likely to have elicited the particular cultural expressions that are there preserved for us, and then present a coherent overview of findings to date. Having reached our conclusions we are certainly free to allow them to inform our own 'actualising' interpretations of existence, our own more or less systematic theologies. But our results may well be no more than interesting, helping us understand our cultural origins. And, on the other hand, we also have to accept the risk that we may find ourselves estranged.

Within the compass of two hundred pages or so the options are effectively illustrated and clearly explained. We are reminded of the names that figure on most rolls of western (mostly European) New Testament scholars of the last two centuries, and introduced to others we are (kindly) not expected to recall. We note the temptation to look to find a normative, timeless core (say, the teaching of Jesus or of Paul - or Luther), or a strong underlying coherence; or, in particular, to avoid the embarrassments of eschatology. We are warned that exegetes who announce their approved good intentions can be found doing worse than others who promise less.

Who (apart from those already convinced) is meant to be persuaded — and how? The target appears to be colleagues in 'the Academy' who still seem to Räisänen to jump from rigorous papers and monographs to pious syntheses determined by the church market. They should realise that the only proper but also the only likely selling points are a concern to understand the roots of western culture, and an interest in some

of the possibilities of religious experience: openings within the wider Academy and through it among the general public. Pitting my unresearched guesses against Räisänen's I'd have thought there is little call to go back to such distant and enigmatic roots. At most there may be some demand for what he occasionally mentions, 'the history of the (recent) influence' of the New Testament and of a few select passages, such as Romans 13.1-7. Christian origins as such could well be subsumed under late classical studies, and left as a struggling minority interest. Christian religious experience would be better culled from more recent and more promising data, for the religious studies, sociology, social anthropology or psychology departments.

The only obvious demand for the kind of 'history of early Christian thought in context' proposed would seem to be precisely the churches, and there only the minority of members whose commitment to Jesus as God incarnate is seen as entailing a continuous quest for 'What must the truth have been, and be, if it appeared like that to people who thought and wrote as they did' (L. Hodgson). For the rest what is wanted is apologetics with touches of historic verisimilitude, or the kind of literary approach in which the New Testament canon could as well have been written (in whatever form) yesterday for me to 'read', more or less sensitively and consistently, as I will. (I do not think Räisänen appreciates how different from his own main proposals are the 'reader response' approaches he also welcomes.)

Just one detailed comment: Räisänen discusses the difficulties of talk of 'experience' and (as noted above) is aware that experience does not come naked waiting for us to choose how to clothe it, interpret it, even if fresh experience can still lead us to re-interpret something past. He also refuses to concentrate on any narrowly defined 'religious' experiences among early Christians, insisting much more on ongoing experience in everyday contexts. This is surely to be welcomed. By contrast he also notes how little in the New Testament and other early Christian writings is at all attempting to express 'experiences' — and still wants to concentrate here. Yet what does much more come to expression in the documents are series of attitudes and aspirations. For sure, (interpreted) experience is implicit in them. We presuppose similar experience(s) in others who do and say what we do and say unless firmly disabused (Wittgenstein). But there is little point asking about 'the experience itself'. It is in shared or meaningfully disputed attitudes and ideals and aims and their attempted realisation or avoidance in action that we find common ground with our contemporaries, and may hope in some measure to understand them. This is often what the first Christians chose to write about. We do best to concentrate here if we wish at all to understand their writings.

If Räisänen is right, what we do with any understanding we achieve has to be another question again. Only if we agreed to share the aims, attitudes and aspirations we found might we in fact share the experience — without being able to tell that we were. Experience sounds like a strong selling point, but is probably the most elusive.

F. Gerald Downing

A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation

Edited by R.J. Coggins and J.L. Houlden. SCM Press, 1990. Pp xvi + 751. £35.00 (hb)

Theology has become such a wide-ranging and diverse study that its many component parts seem impossible to manage within any co-ordinated framework, so that one needs a kind of telephone directory to make one feel that one is getting around comfortably. SCM have provided us with a number of useful alphabetical arrangements of theology in their series of dictionaries, the latest of which affords a glimpse of the vast variety of approaches to the Bible that now exists, a variety that the present dictionary has by no means exhausted. This dictionary is not like other Bible dictionaries; its principle concern is not so much with the contents of the Bible as with its interpretation. This is a subject whose importance seems to have come into sharp focus in recent years, reflecting, among other things, a certain loss of confidence in the main line approaches to Biblical interpretation.

A host of distinguished scholars have contributed articles ranging over such diverse topics as magic, the Bible in music, poetry and pastoral care, literary criticism, historical criticism, structuralism, feminist interpretation and psychological interpretation, to name but a few. There are articles on the biblical books themselves, which as well as introducing their particular contents and characteristics, also outline the history of their interpretation, and their resulting significance for the interpretation of the Bible as a whole. The other main areas covered include articles on significant movements and periods in the history of interpretation, discussions of methods and approaches, and technical terms used. There are also articles on some, though by no means all, of the important figures in the history of Biblical study. To list all such scholars would have been tedious, repetitive, and probably impossible, so the editors have limited themselves to those of special pre-eminence, or who do not tidily fit into any of the principal categories, or whose influence has not generally been recognized. Thus, for example, one will find an article on Karl Barth, but not F.C. Baur, mention of whom one must trace by reference to the index.

The index is very selective, so that there is the possible criticism to be made that there might have been greater consistency of approach throughout this volume. Whilst the editors point out that it was enormously difficult to be comprehensive, it might have been possible to give clearer guidance as to the importance and inter-relationship of the material in the course of its presentation. To take an example, the figure of Rudolf Bultmann was clearly considered of sufficient importance to merit the excellent two page article by Robert Morgan. As a result no mention is made of Bultmann in the index. A large number of asterisks guide the reader to other topics of interest and relevance to Bultmann, scattered throughout the dictionary. At the end of the article the reader is referred also to the articles on form criticism and the historical Jesus, subjects of undoubted importance to Bultmann, but without prior knowledge or the desire to work through the asterisks systematically, one might not notice the very detailed discussion of demythologization by D.E. Nineham, which is devoted almost entirely to Bultmann, and outlines a very important area of his work. One asterisk among so many others seems inadequate to draw the reader's attention to those articles which might guide him or her towards a more complete comprehension of the subject in hand. A similar criticism can

be made in other areas: for example, the outstanding articles on the historical Jesus and modern Christology cover closely related questions, they even duplicate a number of points, so that one wonders whether they might not have been brought into closer association. The medium of dictionary is not wholly satisfactory.

Despite this, the dictionary very definitely draws its reader into a world, a very fascinating and exciting world, precisely because its possibilities seem so endless. Perhaps for this reason, and because the subject of biblical interpretation is so compelling, this dictionary (probably more than its predecessors) produces a very enjoyable and rewarding read in its own right. One is sent scurrying from page to page, and in the process the vastness of the subject opens up before one. This, however, makes it difficult to know which are likely to be the most fruitful approaches to biblical interpretation, and, of course, this is something about which the reader himself has to decide. It would be inappropriate to level the charge of arbitrariness or confusion at a dictionary. It must be seen as a starting point for exploration, an overall geography of the terrain, the bibliographies listed at the end of each article providing the means of more detailed investigation.

As to the articles themselves, in the nature of the genre, it is beyond the competence of a single reviewer to provide detailed comment. There are a number of outstanding, and, one is tempted to say, very important contributions, and these are snapshots of the present state of the subject. Other contributions, depending upon one's perspective, seem of minimal value and quality. Nevertheless this is a valuable contribution to a subject that will become increasingly important in years to come.

Peter Wibroe

God and the Cosmologists

Stanley L. Jaki. Scottish Academic Press, 1989. Pp.xi + 286.

Stanley Jaki's latest book, which repeats and extends some of his previous work on the theological significance of modern science, is in effect an extended elaboration of the cosmological argument and a sustained polemic in favour of Roman Catholic Christianity. Sitting ducks are exploded, flying ones winged and, sometimes, missed. The great strength of this writer is that he knows where he stands, but there is a corresponding tendency to underestimate his opponents (Kant, for example), personalize arguments against them and ascribe what he holds to be their mistakes to errors in logic.

Not that he fails to expose the desperate attempts of some scientists and philosophers of science to evade what he takes to be one of the crucial implications of science since Einstein: that we are, once again, faced with the question of the universe, and must therefore be prepared to ask the question of its origin and meaning. 'Most reliable philosophically is... the message that the universe is real, and that it is no less specific than any real thing' (p22). This he believes many modern thinkers are systematically evading, and his most withering hostility is reserved for Copenhagen theorists of all kinds.

The particularity and specificity on which modern science depends become the basis for assaults on the positions of those who would hold that the universe as it is now revealed to us can

derive from some homogeneous matter or can in some way create itself. Jaki cites the words of Eddington, that 'undifferentiated sameness and nothingness cannot be distinguished philosophically. The realities of physics are unhomogeneities, happenings, change' (p.37), and many instances are given of the quite astounding particularity and contingency of the universe and its contents. It is here that the book is strongest, as it is in exposing the absurdities of attempts to evade the facts and the claiming of scientific sanction for positions which are reached on unscientific grounds (for example, Weinberg's) on the supposed meaninglessness of the universe.

The author has without doubt produced some remarkable and convincing evidence of almost a desperation on the part of both philosophers and scientists to avoid asking the cosmological and theological questions that arise in connection with recent discoveries about the evolution of the universe. They parallel the similar phenomena charted by Peter Fuller, in which modernist interpreters of art fundamentally misinterpret their subjects in order to bring them into line with modernist presuppositions. It is almost as if some moderns wish to remain blind to the theological questions that have not gone away despite centuries of attempts to make them disappear.

However, the weakness of sustained assaults on modernity such as this is that they tend to subvert their own bases. From one point of view, science is a, perhaps the, characteristic modern activity. 'Modernity' is undoubtedly not the same as modernism, and yet there is a mediaevalizing air about Dr Jaki's polemic which seems to protest too much. Now, one must grant, and gladly, the historical thesis that modern science owes as much, perhaps more, to the Middle Ages than to the Enlightenment. The treatment of Pierre Duhem by rationalists who were simply unprepared to accept a revision of their beliefs is evidence for much of what this book has to claim.

And yet to hang so much on the cosmological argument, and to propound instant dismissals of Protestant and Anglican theology for their failure to adopt this supposedly self-evident approach, is to miss two major points. The first is the historical link between Reformation, and particularly Reformed, theology and the development of modern science. It was, for the most part, not in Catholic countries that the new sciences flourished. The second is a philosophical point, as is appropriate in a review of a book which makes such play with the philosophical incompetence of others. The fact is that there is not so great a difference between Aquinas' and Spinoza's definitions of God, even if they did shape them in a radically different way. We owe to Hartshorne a spelling out of the logical closeness of Aristotelian natural theology to pantheism, Dr Jaki's — justifiably — sworn foe. It can be argued that the essential link in all this is a trinitarian one, for only by trinitarian conceptuality can one relate God and the world, while affirming at once the reality, contingency, rationality and goodness of the created order. There are brief references and no more to the incarnational determinants of the tradition this author wishes to recommend. It is therefore in the limited range of Dr Jaki's theological armoury that is to be found the real Achilles' heel of his otherwise entertainingly argued and, it seems to me, fundamentally correct thesis.

Colin Gunton

The Gospel in a Pluralist Society

Leslie Newbigin. SPCK, 1989. Pp.xi. + 244. £8.95

Quite a lot of recent theological material on the question of religious and cultural pluralism has come from those writing in the liberal theological tradition (see chapter 12 of this book for evidence). Newbigin's book provides a penetrating critique of, and alternative to, this tradition. Plurality is an unalterable and welcome part of British society, pluralism is not. He defines pluralism as the "belief that the differences between the religions are not a matter of truth and falsehood, but of different perceptions of the one truth" and suggests that this is a "widely held opinion in contemporary British society" (p.14). Newbigin's project can be placed firmly within the "postliberal" ethos, so clearly articulated in the works of Michael Polanyi, Alasdair MacIntyre, Peter Berger, George Lindbeck (from whom I borrow the phrase "postliberal") and others. Newbigin draws from all these writers (although less so from Lindbeck) and from Barth through the filter of Hendrikus Berkhof. The value of the book is at least threefold. First, it is lucid and forcefully written, going to the heart of the epistemological issues. Secondly, it is certainly a book that successfully introduces to a popular audience many of the debates taking place in academic circles. Finally, it offers a critique of "pluralism" that must be answered. I shall address some of the book's weaknesses in due course.

Newbigin's argument is one that he has put forward in other recent publications, and although he applies it differently, fundamentally he does not move far into uncharted waters. He sets about uncovering the presuppositions of modern western secular liberalism, child of the Enlightenment. This world view distinguishes sharply between objective "facts" (science) and subjective "beliefs" (morality, religion), the latter being relegated to a matter of private choice and relative taste. Autonomy, freedom and critical doubt are virtues as opposed to tradition, revelation, and dogmas. He criticises the epistemological roots of this tradition using the model of scientific enquiry based on Polanyi's writings. The modern fails to recognize that all world views (including her own) operate within a tradition, which thereby has authority, and with certain presuppositions that are matters of "faith". One must always ask on what grounds the relativist deems that her theory of relativity is true. There can be no neutral recourse to reason for as MacIntyre has shown, reason does not operate in a vacuum but within different forms of life and cannot be exalted as a cross-cultural universal arbiter. Newbigin argues that it is only society's "plausibility structures" that force religious truth claims into subjectivity rather than good solid arguments. Before developing this vision of postliberal biblical Christianity, he attends to the apparent problems of relativism that might follow from this understanding of religion (which are often raised in relation to Lindbeck and Phillips for example). Here Newbigin is not always sensitive to the problems of incommensurability potentially implicit in his model. If Christianity is totally immune to the critiques of the Enlightenment, might it not also be the case the other way round?

The middle part of the book goes on to argue for the credibility of God's election of a chosen people, his revelation in history, the centrality of Jesus Christ for our understanding and worship of God and for the clues found therein to the meaning of history. Mission is seen as the only natural expression of the reception of the good news. In the final section (my

distinction) of the book, Newbigin explores the issues of pluralism in its cultural and religious senses. Here there is some penetrating writing where he uncovers the ironies of contextualization (indigenization) and argues that the only core within Christianity that is transcultural is the "Bible, the sacraments, and the apostolic ministry" (p.147). In passing, he also criticises liberation theologies (which he sees as allied to feminist and black theologies) for the way in which scripture often serves a predefined cause; or, when the cause of the oppressed and poor is located in scripture, for the imbalanced analysis of scripture. He offers a searing critique of a number of pluralist theologians (such as John Hick and some leading World Council of Churches officials), showing how many of their central assumptions are precisely those he has criticised earlier in the book. He then explores the way in which the gospel, though always rooted in a culture (any culture), is also capable of offering a critique of that culture. He suggests that the only way Christians can cure their own culture-blindness viz. the form of the gospel they preach, is to be in communion with Christians from other cultures. There are also chapters dealing with supernormal powers drawing heavily on the work of Walter Wink and some interesting reflections on 'The Congregation as Hermeneutic of the Gospel', whereby the life of the churches is the testimony of the gospel. Newbigin is thoroughly Trinitarian and ecclesiocentric.

I have a number of reservations about Newbigin's book. While I agree with much of his critique, I think he draws the battle lines too sharply which could eventually undermine his own cause. Let me give an example. All too often Newbigin criticises movements and trends rather than dealing with their representatives in specific detail. For instance, in his criticisms of liberation (and black and feminist) theologies, not a single representative author is cited. The radical diversity between liberation writers goes deeper than Newbigin's two fold distinction and many have addressed precisely the types of criticisms he makes. This can also be said in relation to his treatment of Marxism, Roman Catholic theology (regarding reason [p.52ff] and Rahner [p.174]), and his treatment of Islam (as if it were entirely monolithic) — to name a few topics. This lack of attention to nuance weakens his case. My other main reservation is that, despite words to the contrary, it is difficult to know how Newbigin has learnt from the Enlightenment or any of the world religions. Less important, but irritatingly, some publishers of books cited are given, others not; some scholars are mentioned with little consequent discussion (eg. Hans Frei, p.99), proving them redundant except to the initiated; and *The Myth of God Incarnate* is incorrectly called *The Myth of Christ Incarnate* (p.211). Nevertheless, this book provides a stimulating and much needed balance to the debate.

Gavin D'Costa

Different Gospels. Christian Orthodoxy and Modern Theologies

Andrew Walker (Ed.). Hodder & Stoughton, 1988. Pp. 253. £7.95

For detective stories it is usually bad advice to start reading the book from the end. Knowing 'who dunnit' does not help sustaining a sense of suspense as the plot unfolds. *Different Gospels* is, of course, not a detective story and there seem to be good reasons for beginning with the last contribution, an address by the American sociologist Peter L. Berger which lent the whole volume its title and provides a useful perspective for

interpreting the whole enterprise. Berger's reflection on 'the social sources of apostasy' combines two lines of approach: a sociological analysis of social conflicts in mainline American Protestantism and a biblical meditation on Gal. 1:6-7,9, Paul's condemnation of those who preach a 'different gospel'. The divide that has opened up in American Protestantism is for Berger part of a larger cultural conflict which is to be analysed in terms of a class struggle: the battle between the old middle-class, based in the business community and the traditional professions, and the new middle-class centred on the service industry and within that sector especially the 'knowledge-industry' (comprising educators, communicators, therapists, bureaucrats concerned with life-style engineering and, of course, lawyers). This class conflict has produced a 'religious fall-out' in which clergy, church officials and intellectuals have, in Berger's view, joined the bandwagon of the new knowledge-class with its left-of-centre politics and its progressive cultural agenda, while large sections of the church membership remain devoted to the preservation of the political aims and ethical and religious values of the old middle-class. Berger makes no secret of his sympathies in this conflict, his preference for the cultural values and political aims of the old middle-class, and he does not hide his irritation with the new worldliness he encounters from the pulpits. ('I am always amused when clerical types who only yesterday emerged from some pietistic underworld to discover politics and sex, take it upon themselves to lecture me on worldliness: *the world is my proper vocation* — I know it fairly well; I especially know it in its modern and modernising structures; I spend most of my days weltering in the affairs of this world — *I don't need you to tell me about worldliness.*' [237]) His main concern, however, is that the churches have assumed a role in this class conflict which reduces them to 'military chaplaincies...doing what chaplains have always done on battlefields — solemnly blessing the banners of their side and assuring the troops that their cause is God's.' (231)

Berger contrasts this tendency with the Pauline teaching in Galatians: the church is constituted by the Gospel of Christ. The liberation from sin and death which is the primary liberation of the Gospel brings with it a 'lesser liberation', that of 'relativizing all the realities of this world and all our projects in this world' (236). Consequently, Berger interprets the politicizing of the church (by left and right alike) as a new form of 'works-righteousness', as taking leave of the Gospel which ultimately turns the church into a cultural and political pressure group. This process denies the church the only catholicity it can possess, the catholicity of the Gospel, and has ultimately self-damning effects. Berger's *ceterum censeo* is therefore: 'Serving the church today, I believe, must begin with an understanding of the specific forms of apostasy that confront us today, to recall the true meaning of gospel, church and ministry, and then to put our ecclesial houses in better order.' (244)

Berger's contribution is the last essay in the third part of the book which is devoted to 'Contemporary Issues Facing the Church and Society'. This part begins with Colin Gunton's 'The Spirit as Lord: Christianity, modernity and freedom', theologically the weightiest paper in the collection. It is also characterised by a sense of balance that is not everywhere present in this volume: the critique of modernism, Gunton argues, must attempt to realize the legitimate aims of modernity without simply replacing the old authoritarianism with the new authoritarianism of modernist ideology. How such a response to modernism might proceed, is demonstrated in a critique of the a-historical and individualistic understanding of

freedom in some strands of modernist thought and its concomitant immanentist understanding of God. Colin Gunton contrasts this with a conception of freedom developed within the framework of trinitarian theology, where freedom is seen as the gift of the Spirit as Lord whose personal otherness is interpreted as the constitutive ground of personal freedom in community. Such an understanding of freedom, Gunton argues, does not commit humanity to the abortive attempt at self-divinisation, but enables us to be freely what we are: humans. This paper is followed by a thoughtful critique of the Theology of Liberation in Latin America by Alan J. Torrance, who raises the question whether it might perhaps show signs of an incomplete liberation from the dualist framework of the European Enlightenment, and by a decisively argued analysis of current theories of religious pluralism by Gavin D'Costa.

Part II of the book is headed 'Doctrinal Issues in the Light of Modernist Thought'. This title is perhaps a little misleading, because only the first two contributions are concerned with classical doctrines: a fine reflection by Thomas A. Smail on the Trinity and the resurrection of Jesus and a rather conventional apologetic article by Alister McGrath on the resurrection and the incarnation as foundations of Christian faith. The difference between these two articles points to illuminating differences in the strategies of presenting the anti-modernist case. While Smail uses the doctrine of the Trinity as the hermeneutical framework of the interpretation of the Easter event in attempting to explore the internal coherence of Easter faith, McGrath takes the reductionist criticism of the incarnation and resurrection as his starting-point and then encounters the difficulty that theological content cannot be generated by simply criticising the critics.

The strength of Keith Ward's contribution on 'Miracles' is that he does not only counter Hume's criticism of miracles as violations of a law of nature, but that he places the whole question in the context of a comprehensive reflection on divine agency. From this perspective miracles can be seen as 'points at which the dynamic power of God breaks into the world in manifestation of his purposes' (109). His article is well supplemented by the geneticist R.J. Berry who describes the reductionist denial of the possibility of miracles as an act of faith which cannot claim superior scientific support. This part of the book concludes with three contributions on the uses of scripture: an illuminating and informative essay on C.S. Lewis' reflections on biblical exegesis by Alasdair Heron, a passionate plea by J.D.G. Dunn for the historical value of the New Testament as the basis for Christian beliefs about Jesus and a piece by Peter Toon and the Bishop of London with the title 'Meditating upon Sacred Scripture' which seems somewhat misplaced in this collection.

The first part of the book comprises four interviews: a thoughtful dialogue with Metropolitan Anthony of Sourozh, reflecting on his 40 years in Britain, and a talk with Cardinal Suenens, calling for a spiritual renewal of the church. The interviews with Lesslie Newbigin and Thomas F. Torrance offer a lively reading experience. Newbigin pleads for the attempt at understanding reality from the perspective of the Gospel and represents a decisive case for defining Christianity from its centre in Jesus Christ and not by drawing dogmatic demarcation lines around its periphery. Torrance eloquently defends the need for a unitary and comprehensive view of reality, based on the Christian Gospel and developed in close contact with 'hard science'. Torrance's contribution is also remarkable for his defence of Barth's theology against its

evangelical critics who are roundly accused of representing 'a positivism of holy scripture' which amounts to 'a mythologising, an anthropologising of God' (52).

A book like *Different Gospels* is bound to be controversial; it is intended to be. Some whose theological outlook is determined by the assumptions underlying European thought since the Enlightenment (which are interestingly identified in Andrew Walker's introduction), will no doubt dismiss the book as a reactionary attempt to restore the glories of a bygone era. Others who have become increasingly sceptical about the benefits of the modern intellectual situation in the West as it is shaped by the principles of the Enlightenment will welcome the book as a call to return to the resources of the Christian tradition in the attempt at dealing with the problematical after-effects of modernity. Whatever one's sympathies may be, *Different Gospels* indicates an important change in the cultural situation in the West. This situation is now characterized by a new openness in which the cultural and intellectual assumptions which defined for almost two hundred years the perimeters of theological debate — for the heirs of the Enlightenment as well as for their critics — are now themselves under scrutiny and no longer serve as the boundaries for discussion. Whether this new situation will deteriorate into a relativism where 'anything goes' or will open up new possibilities of creative theological dialogue will to a significant extent depend on the willingness of all parties concerned to commit themselves to a process of shared exploration which is motivated by a common concern for the truth of the Christian message. It seems that the essays in *Different Gospels* which are devoted to the constructive exploration of the resources of the Christian tradition have more to offer to this endeavour than those who concentrate on the anti-criticism of Christianity's modernist critics.

One issue which is raised by the book is the way in which 'Christian orthodoxy' should be understood. The very fact that the authors come from very different denominational, cultural and intellectual backgrounds indicates quite clearly that their concern for 'orthodoxy' is an eminently ecumenical concern. They also agree in the rejection of a traditionalist attitude that attempts to go back behind the Enlightenment and in their (sometimes scathing) refutation of a simplistic fundamentalism. Nevertheless, there seem to be at least two distinctive approaches to the question of orthodoxy. The first is that represented in paradigmatic form by Peter L. Berger's and Lesslie Newbigin's contributions where that which prevents theology from preaching a 'different gospel' is expressed in terms of the Gospel of Christ interpreted as justification by faith (cf. 236, 241) or as the definition of Christianity by its centre in Christ. The second approach is most clearly expressed by Walker (but also present in McGrath, Metropolitan Anthony and others), where the foundations of Christianity are understood as 'the common credal truths of the historic church' (7). The one approach defines what is essentially Christian in terms of the act of faith as a response to the Gospel (the *fides qua creditur*), the other sees orthodoxy as referring to the credenda, specific doctrinal contents of belief (the *fides quae creditur*). The difference of approach is not a new one, but the questions it raises are far from resolved: Is it possible to be orthodox in the sense of the unconditional trust of faith in the promise of the Gospel without subscribing to the 'common credal truths of the historic church'? Can assent to those credal truths define orthodoxy or can that become a kind of theological 'works-righteousness' (in Berger's sense, cf. 233) that entirely misses the point of the Gospel? Or is it possible to construe the relationship in such a way that the *credenda* of the Church

describe the conditions for the possibility of faith? It is at this point that theological reflection is called to make progress, if the appeal to 'Christian Orthodoxy' is to provide orientation in the post-Enlightenment era.

Christoph Schwöbel

Theology and the Justification of Faith. Constructing Theories in Systematic Theology

Wentzel van Huyssteen. Eerdmans Paternoster 1989 Pp.xcxi + 205. £14.95

This book is to be welcomed because it comes from South Africa, even without the euphoria that greeted Mandela. And most of us, unlike Mandela, have not studied Afrikaans and so the learned contributions of a Professor of Theology in Port Elizabeth who has been writing about Pannenberg, about Thomas S. Kuhn and others, in various books and articles over the last twenty years have been isolated from us until the publication of this edition in English. In turn he gives us useful summaries of various German texts by Gerhard Sauter and again Wolfhart Pannenberg which have not been translated.

Coming from South Africa you may expect what you will not find here. The Preface speaks of 'doing theology in the present complex South African situation' but apart from a tantalising reference to an argument with John De Gruchy who had accused our author of tending to depoliticise theology so that it could not speak directly to political issues — a charge which Van Huyssteen denies — we are not conscious of being in the front line, for or against apartheid. Unlike De Gruchy, Professor Van Huyssteen was not one of the *Kairos Document* Signatories but then neither was Desmond Tutu or Allan Boesak! The tone is more detached but the author's commitment clear. He writes in South Africa, is a member of the Reformed Church and says the key question about heresy now is not the unity of Christ, as at Chalcedon, but the unity of the church and its denial by apartheid.

The author's aim is to help Christians give 'a credible and critical theoretic account of our Christian faith'. The emphasis could be on *our* faith, for chapter by chapter we examine some challenges to theology from logical positivism, the critical rationalism of Karl Popper, the accusation of William Bartley of theologians 'retreat to commitment', the paradigm theory of Thomas S. Kuhn and the attempts of different theologians to make a creative response and one which merits a hearing in any university. 'Theology', we are told, 'is an attempt to reflect as authentically and creditably as possible on whatever we have, through our religious commitment, come to know and experience as God's revelation'. There is no one way of doing this and no theologian, it seems, gets full marks. This makes this work a useful commentary on other theologians and for those who, like myself and the author, inhabit the Reformed tradition, some useful self-criticism about our use of the Bible.

Of those criticised I felt that Barth was treated least fairly. It seems unfair to criticise a man who died in 1968 for what he last wrote in 1928 and 1932 and it seems unfair to brand as a ghetto theologian the man who even in the Barmen Declaration of 1934 steered the Church for her struggle against the racist policies of Adolf Hitler. And before anyone repeats the standard charges of a 'positivism of revelation' they could usefully ponder a study by Simon Fisher on Barth's earliest

theology and the precise meaning of Bonhoeffer's elusive phrase. But then if a book makes you read other books, it is a good book for any theologian in a pastorate or college to have. It is a challenging read.

Donald W Norwood

God is Green

Ian Bradley. DLT Pp. x + 118. £6.95

Professor Gunton's assertion that "the victory of Christ is in part the re-establishment of the rule of God over a demonized creation, so that it too may reveal and praise its creator" (*Actuality of Atonement*, p.80) summarises well Ian Bradley's concern in *God is Green*. His aim is, essentially, an apologia concerning the essential 'greenness' of the Christian faith against the criticism that Christianity fundamentally encourages the present ecological crisis.

Bradley's aim in writing this book is twofold. Firstly, his major concern is "to show that the Christian faith is intrinsically Green, that the Good news of the Gospel promises liberation and fulfillment for the whole creation and that Christians have a positive and distinctive contribution to make to the salvation of our threatened planet and the preservation of the natural environment" (p.1).

But subordinate to this concern are three less explicit but equally important concerns: to show how the original Christian message has been distorted; to suggest that we return to the model of incarnation in order to understand better the goodness of creation; and to see the greenness of Christianity get through to the person sitting in the church pew.

The book is divided into five easily digestible sections: in fact, it is a short systematic ecology. Chapter one outlines the Christian basis for God's concern for all creation. Here, Bradley refutes the notion that the Christian faith is inherently anti-matter, and consequently a major contributor to the rationale underlying the present exploitation of nature. Rather, the author seeks to show that the Bible gives a clear foundation for protecting creation. One of the major means by which we may re-apply this Christian rationale is to extricate ourselves from the anthropocentric paradigm that has for so long been the curse of western theology. Instead of interpreting Genesis 1 in terms of man's dominion over nature, we should interpret it as "God's total lordship over the entire cosmos" (p.16). It is God's lordship over creation that sets the ground-rules by which human beings treat the natural world.

By contrasting the Hebrew world-view with that of the Greeks, and highlighting the significance of the Jubilee year, the Sabbath year rest and gobbets from the book of Job, the author shows that God's concern for the created world goes far beyond the human and embraces the extra-human.

In chapter two, 'The dance of creation,' Bradley is concerned with reinstating into our perception of creation the sense of its sacredness. The loss of the sanctity of creation has resulted in its being "seen as a laboratory rather than as a mystery," (p.34). The "pervasive power" of both "human anthropocentrism and the dualistic philosophy of the Greeks and Gnostics" are the causes of nature's profanity. However, a brief survey of the psalms combined with various devotional

writings dispels this myth. Indeed we need to recover the "idea of the dance of creation...from its biblical and medieval roots if we are to restore the Green heart of Christianity" (p.44).

In chapter three Bradley attempts to deal with the Gordian knot of any Christian ecology: the doctrine of the fall. He rightly points out the catastrophic damage the western interpretation of the fall has had on subsequent doctrines of creation: nature is seen as shameful and guilty, ultimately demonic. Rather, we should opt for a more eastern and teleological interpretation of the fall, interpreting it as the outworking of necessary chaos; necessary because without it, creation would merely be a perfect machine. Here Bradley is at his best, comparing the Christian story of creation and fall with current issues. For those wishing to preach in a manner that brings the greenness of Christianity to the pew, then this will provide ample stimulation.

It is in his christological chapter that Bradley displays his allegiance to Irenaeus' doctrine of recapitulation by the *cosmic* Christ. It is the book's shortcoming that it does not more fully expand the significance of the incarnation to ecology, for in many ways this chapter is its weakest link. However, the book is not intended to be a doctrinal 'heavy' as can be perceived by the practical and modern last chapter on "The role of human beings" where the author's own literary and poetic interests serve to show how the "concept of dominion... fits our unique status as beings created in the image of God and our unique ability to communicate with him...(making) us as much the servants of nature as its masters."

The book makes very easy reading. It is not by any manner of means the last word on the greenness of Christianity, but its usefulness lies in introducing us to a possible paradigm within which to begin our much needed search for a clear and theological response to the current ecological debate.

Graham McFarlane

Still Living with Questions

David E. Jenkins. SCM, 1990. Pp.x 226.

Journalistic jibes about his 'doubts' notwithstanding, David Jenkins is conspicuous among contemporary ecclesiastics for his relentless pursuit of the *meaning* of Christian belief. If his episcopal office requires him to defend the faith it is not inappropriate for him to enquire just what it is that has to be defended. In any case defence should not mean simply protection, whether from questions or anything else. The best way of defending the faith is to live it and take it into daily engagement with the challenges facing individuals and society today. That is Jenkins's instinct.

What is remarkable about Jenkins is not that, as a bishop, he believes a reduced creed, but that he believes so much, and so passionately: "The answer we give to the question whether Jesus Christ is Lord makes literally all the difference in the world and to the world"; 'If Jesus Christ is Lord, then — starting from him — we may be clear that God is, that he is properly thought of as the Father with purposes consistent with his holiness, righteousness and love, and that God the Father can be relied upon as being involved in this world with a view to bringing his purposes out of it.'

These two statements come from a paper given by Jenkins in 1965. *Still Living with Questions* is largely a reissue of *Living with Questions* (1969) with the inclusion of some more recent material. It is hard to detect any essential change between the earlier and later Jenkins, least of all in the two Easter sermons of 1969 and 1989 respectively. In both, the message is that if Christ is not risen, then our contemporary and future history, personal and communal, is in vain. But it is not in vain 'for Christ is risen, he is risen indeed.' Throughout these sermons and addresses there is a passionate desire to release the gospel into the enterprise of being human in today's and tomorrow's world. This is abundantly clear regardless of his audience, whether clergy or theologians, doctors, students, educationalists or members of other faiths. This is the dynamic which generates his questions, and if Jenkins has doubts they are not about the gospel but about the facility of institutional Christianity to express that gospel adequately. Jenkins rightly diagnoses a neurosis in contemporary church and society which yearns only for simplistic affirmations and guaranteed survival.

It is important that Jenkins is taken seriously in contemporary theological discussion. That does not mean uncritical acceptance by 'liberals' any more than dismissal by conservatives as a mouthpiece of heresy. For example the authority of tradition and the roles of doctrine and theology in relation to personal faith — perennial and age-old questions — emerge anew in these pages. There is no authority on a par with God himself (p.221) and therefore in face of God all theology and doctrines are relative. But does this justify our saying that 'the only theology which does justice to the reality defined by Jesus Christ is a broken theology in which all theories are systematically and constantly being broken up so that they may be open to further possibilities' (p.88)? A crucial insight has prompted a rather cavalier statement here, rather like saying that because my car has a built-in obsolescence I may as well drive it up the nearest lamp-post now and get another right away. That there may be a grave inadequacy in all theologies could equally mean that they need careful handling for the sake of preservation *until* the 'further possibilities' are discernible.

Keith W. Clements

What Language Shall I Borrow? God-Talk in Worship: A Male Response to Feminist Theology

Brian Wren. SCM Press 1989. Pp. xi + 264. £9.95

Brian Wren's argument goes like this. Every naming of God is a borrowing from human experience. Language slants and angles our thinking and behaviour. Our society makes qualities labeled 'feminine' inferior to qualities labeled 'masculine'. Women and men are formed with identities steeped in those labelings, in structures where men are still dominant (though shaken) and women still subordinate (though seeking emancipation). It follows that using only male language ('he', 'king', 'father') to name and praise God powerfully affects our encounter with God and our thinking and behaviour. Male dominance and female subordination, and seeing God only in male terms, are not God's intention but deep human distortion and sin. Women and men are called to repent together from domination and subordination. We can name and praise God 'in ways less idolatrous' and more freeing, in ways 'more true to the Triune God and the direction of love' in Jesus Christ. (See pp. 1-2).

What, according to Wren, follows about Jesus and us? Jesus knew and named God as Father in a patriarchal society, but in such a way that it was called into question, as he inaugurated the loving community in which all human beings are to be treated as equal. Then, women in society had no hope of emancipation from male control. To name God in female terms was not an option. Now is different. Naming God as Father is still one important way of meeting God, but that name no longer has the power, in our context, to subvert patriarchal norms. Now, naming God in female terms is faithful to Jesus's intentions, shows the equality of women and men, shows women are fit to image God, and powerfully questions our patriarchal society. Jesus coined the right metaphor for his experience, life-style and time. We can and must be faithful to his way in ways which are not limited to verbal imitation. (pp.186-187). The above arguments have problematic features which readers can trace and sort out for themselves.

For Brian Wren, the prime function of biblical God-language is to affect the imagination and evoke an active response to the Holy One who encounters us (pp. 104-5). Like G.B. Caird and R. Otto, he thinks that possibly the language of experiential encounter with holiness is the only non-metaphorical Biblical language for naming God (p.95). 'Allowing God-images to *clash* is important, because it reminds us that we are approaching that which is beyond all images' (p.132: this illuminates the phrase 'less idolatrous', p.2 — quoted above).

The traditional pious tone of such iconoclasm may sound less plausible in a more linguistic idiom. Wren claims, "There is no point in pontificating about what metaphors like "God as father" *ought* to mean. There can be no dogmatized or delimited set of approved meanings once such metaphors enter the public domain..." (p.107). However, elsewhere he appears to attempt what is here called pointless and impossible.

The inconsistency is significant, raising or strengthening questions about Brian Wren's understanding of metaphor, language and meaning. How far is he influenced by a notion of meaning as private intention (i.e. intention outside 'the public domain' to name things or experiences sincerely), rather than relying on shared, regular and regulative usage, within and across social and cultural contexts? A type of individualism is implied by Wren's notion of meaning. Why should we imagine that the naming of experience is the essence of language, or that the meaning of words is given by the objects (whether mental or non-mental) for which they allegedly stand? Wren seems not to appreciate the later work of Wittgenstein.

Questions about Brian Wren's understanding of meaning connect with others about his theology. Is the point of his trinitarian expressions to be found in the clash and transcendence of images, or in the importance of loving relationships (p.108, 132 and ch.8, etc)? He may need both interpretations. For, without the first interpretation, how could the second be distinguished from the view that trinitarian theology is the projective displacement of the human loving family, as in Ludwig Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity*? See Feuerbach chapter 4, 'The Mystery of the Trinity and the Mother of God', — essential reading for all concerned with feminist theologies. Without the second interpretation, how could the first be distinguished from a value-neutral agnosticism? Arguably, trinitarian theology should try to do better than the dialectic of these two interpretations, and the overcoming of misunder-

standings of language may belong to such a better way.

Brian Wren seems closer to a better way when he writes of, '...the otherness of a mysterious closeness, ungraspable by us though embracing all things...' (p.57), and of holy love, as follows: 'The best God-metaphors are those that move us deeply and enable us to encounter or be encountered by the dynamic dance of incandescent love that Christian experience names Trinity' (p.107). Why not then go on to articulate the trinity of God as his being true to himself in being true to us in the humanity of Jesus, and in enabling us to enter truthfully into this truthfulness? Is ideological abuse of Christian language and imagery, to 'justify' unjust relationships, etc., only possible when the transforming actuality of God in Christ is underestimated, as in deficiently trinitarian thinking of God, humanity and creation?

Brian Wren's title is taken from the hymn, 'O Sacred Head, Sore Wounded', where the phrase relates to the atonement achieved in the death of Jesus. 'What language shall I borrow/ to thank thee, dearest friend?' Wren's response to the language and imagery of the atonement includes a note concluding '...All these metaphors...describe something, for someone, about the unnameable experience of salvation' (pp. 257-8, note 1). Elsewhere, he expresses with considerable confidence aspects of the experience which he takes to be the literal essence of Christianity. Generally, he does not attend sufficiently to the relativity of distinctions between literal and metaphorical language. (See E.F. Kittay *Metaphor* 1987 and C. Gunton *The Actuality of Atonement* 1988).

Brian Wren reminds us repeatedly of how women have been and are treated unjustly, superstitiously and stupidly by men, who abuse the name of God in so doing. He reminds us, too, of the promise of more authentic forms of being female or male. It would be helpful to have more critical discussion of the notion of patriarchy and of relations between biological sexuality, cultural gender, personal identity and notions of freedom and equality. A more considered response to feminism would take more account of economic and contraceptive changes. A more trinitarian approach to the concept of sin would not need to hand it over to a tradition of sociological diagnosis. How all of this relates to Christian traditions and what we should be doing in this situation may become clearer to those who learn from Wren's arguments, instruction, entertainment, difficulties and provocation. His book has been praised by a variety of reviewers on both sides of the Atlantic. The style is the author himself. This spirited work deserves spirited readers.

Ian McPherson

Keeping the Faith. Essays to Mark the Centenary of Lux Mundi.

Edited by Geoffrey Wainwright. SPCK. 1989. Pp. xxv + 399. £17.50.

The chance both to assess how well the original remit of *Lux Mundi* has progressed, namely, 'to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems', and to develop that original intention satisfactorily, is surely an impossible task for one book to accomplish. Other centenary editions have attempted to present a somewhat narrow and restrictive Anglican (liberal-catholic) response, (*The Religion of the Incarnation* Bristol Classical Press, 1989). This book, however, resists such a temptation, and proffers the

original issues to a more catholic scholarship which reflects "the different climate of the twentieth century." In so doing, it acts as both a response to the issues raised a century previously, and an insight into the direction in which theology must go 'if the church is to succeed in keeping the faith' and 'be bold enough to proclaim Jesus Christ as the "Light of the World".'

Not surprisingly, then, it is a christological hermeneutic that pervades the various contributions. However, if the intention of *Lux Mundi* was more concerned with "the religion of the incarnation" than with the incarnation itself (p.99), to paraphrase Alasdair Heron's christological contribution, the question begs asking as to what extent this preoccupation has altered over the ensuing century? In other words, to what degree is this christological hermeneutic any more applied here than by the original contributors?

One of the interesting factors about these essays is the way in which they serve to build up a composite analysis and criticism of western, Enlightenment theology and, in turn, present the meaningfulness of Jesus Christ and Christian tradition to modern issues. A clear example of this approach can be found in Daniel Hardy's, "Rationality, the Sciences and Theology" which argues that a christological understanding of Wisdom enables us to affirm the 'intrinsic connection of knowledge and rationality, as mediated in materiality and history, to the nature and presence of God,' (p.281). It is in Jesus Christ that the materiality of human existence and the wisdom of God meet, and it is a materiality into which the Church is called.

When applied to Christian ethics this hermeneutic is used by Keith Ward to show how the 'Christian vision of morality' (p.237), in participation with the Holy Spirit and as disclosed in the cross of Jesus Christ, transcends and transforms our natural morality. Indeed, this element of transformation is continued in Leslie Newbigin's contribution, "The Christian Faith and the World Religions." It is the life's story of Jesus Christ that 'makes sense both of one's personal story and the story of the human race' (p.335). It is an affirmation both that Jesus Christ's life, death and resurrection is the central and particular affirmation of the oneness of the human story and that the Church does not contain the full story this side of her own transformation.

An equally satisfying development is the way in which other contributors extend the incarnational to the trinitarian. This trinitarian necessity is not lost by Robert Jenson who concludes his contribution, "The Christian Doctrine of God," with a clear trinitarian riposte; 'It is time and past time to let the tradition and our necessities teach us of God's triune "uselessness"' (p.51). Alasdair Heron applies this critique to the original contributors who failed 'to think through the implications of their incarnational concern for the doctrine of God... (who) did not even begin to develop the idea of a *trinitarian theology of the crucifixion*' (p.121).

What, however, is the strength of this collection of essays, its christological and trinitarian insights, is also its weakness, but a weakness not sufficient to tarnish the benefits derived from the collection. The western preoccupation with the religion of the incarnation rather than the incarnation itself remains visible with a minority of the contributors. Perhaps no more so than in Richard Norris' contribution, "Human Being." Whilst it is a clear critique of Augustinian anthropology, the christological

omission to his argument suggests a caveat in need of addressing if Heron's criticism of *Lux Mundi* is to be overcome by present christological scholarship.

Graham McFarlane

The Making of Orthodoxy — Essays in honour of Henry Chadwick

Ed. Rowan Williams. C.U.P. 1989. Pp xxv + 340

This volume of sixteen essays, in honour of the doyen of English Patristic scholars, covers a wide range. It is not possible to comment on all of these and attention is drawn here to only a few. Professor Frend studies the non-theological factors which influenced the development of orthodox and schismatical movements and shows that the variety of opinions anathematized by Councils of bishops indicate a diversity of interpretations of Christianity. Frend issues a timely warning against the dominance of textual studies in Patristics and argues that a balance with other branches of learning needs to be restored. Too great a concentration of authority in the hands of scholars of one discipline can have far reaching and damaging effects on the situation of others. The demise of early Church history in many English theological faculties makes his warning even more timely.

Dr Bammel studies the interaction between Origen's cosmological ideas and his exegesis of the figure of Adam. She argues that, for Origen, Adam symbolises Christ and Eve the Church. Adam follows his bride in her descent to this world. It is always difficult, and usually a mistake, to systematize Origen's scattered hints but I think Bammel makes a good case for Adam being a real historical figure in Origen's thought whose fall took place at a lower level, and after, the fall of rational creatures. The difficulty with Origen is however that his emphasis changed with the particular text he was interpreting. A recent study has shown that this was true of his teaching on Subordinationism and it seems likely that his treatment of Adam was likewise variable.

T.D. Barnes studies 'Panegyric, history and hagiography in Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*'. He follows the arguments of Giorgio Pasquali in 1910 that the *Vita* is not seriously interpolated, as Norman Baynes and others later believed, but is a conflation of two drafts which was unfinished when Eusebius died in 338. It was published after his death by another hand. Barnes thinks that this explains the divergence between the speech in the *Vita* about the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem which concentrates on Constantine's motives for its building and the speech which the text of the *Vita* promises to quote which was to deal with the costly decoration of the Church. I think that Barnes' reconstruction of what happened (pp 101-102) is unduly complicated and the simpler explanation that speeches vary according to audiences addressed is more likely. Barnes however correctly stresses the substantial accuracy of *Vita Constantini*; Eusebius was not an imperial propagandist but an honest scholar who sought to write a reliable history of his times.

Benedict Green studies the reception of Matt. 28,19 in Eusebius and argues that doctrine, in this case, influenced liturgical formation and not vice-versa as has often been thought. This article contains many good things but the attempt to show that Justin Martyr may have been converted

to Christianity in Syria and that he was baptised with the Syrian form seems far-fetched. Moreover where is the evidence that Justin's trinitarian language in the *Apology* has an anti-Marcionite ring?

The late Richard Hanson, with characteristic lucidity and pugnacity, discusses the achievement of orthodoxy in the fourth century. His contribution is a summary of the argument of his *magnum opus*, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Hanson holds that orthodoxy did not exist in 318, the traditional date of the beginning of the Arian controversy. It was only achieved in the fourth century by a process of trial and error — in other words it was a construct. This essay contains many *obiter dicta*: 'We have no right to assume that Athanasius or Basil of Caesarea or Meletius of Antioch were mere power seekers because they engaged in politics as well as in theology, any more than we have to make the same assumption about Thomas a Becket or Oliver Cromwell....'; 'By 381 Marcellus was dead and his followers were anxious to assure everybody that they did not believe that Christ's Kingdom would have an end. But there the clause remains, a fossilized protest against an extinct heresy This Clause (in the Creed) can be regarded as a kind of Tutankhamun of theological controversy.'

In a highly original, if controversial, essay, J.C.O'Neill argues that early Christian monasticism did not begin with Antony and Pachomius but had always existed in the Church as a direct continuation of Jewish monasticism. Much of the inter-testamental literature such as the *Testament XII Patriarchs* and a host of other MSS was handed down in Christian monasteries in the first and second centuries. The weakness of this theory lies in the paucity of direct evidence for monastic communities in this period. O'Neill's interpretation of *Ep. Barn.* 4,10, *Ep. Diogn.* 5 and Tertullian *Apol.* 42 seems forced. While it is true that institutions can exist unnoticed underground this does not explain the suddenness with which monasticism appeared in the third century. O'Neill speculates that certain N.T. books, such as Colossians, were addressed to monastic communities but again what is the evidence for this? The weakness of this essay is that the writer confuses asceticism with monasticism. Asceticism certainly existed from the time of Jesus — and always has. But this does not necessarily lead to monasticism, i.e. living either as solitaries or in communities.

Sister Charles Murray is the only contributor to this volume who does not subscribe to the view that orthodoxy is a construct, rather than something given from the earliest age of the Church. She has much of interest for the student of Christian art in showing that doctrine can be communicated non-verbally as well as conceptually. However Dr Murray does not consider the strong objection to artistic representation made in certain circles in the early Church in the period before Iconoclasm. Is it true that art as a theological idea always perpetuates orthodoxy? The belief that the existence and nature of orthodoxy was taken for granted by the whole Church (p.289) is refuted by many other contributors to this volume.

There has only been space to mention a few contributions to this notable *Festschrift* which also contains a full bibliography of Dr Chadwick's writings. Overall the book represents a fine tribute to a great scholar.

L.W. Barnard.

Past Event and Present Salvation: The Christian Idea of Atonement

Paul S. Fiddes. DLT, 1989. Pp.x + 243. £10.95

This excellent book sets out to offer a non-academic introduction to the doctrine of the atonement. The author sets his discussion in the framework of our post-Enlightenment historical consciousness by focusing on the question, "How can a particular event in the past have an effect on our experience of salvation today?" He rightly perceives that salvation cannot be handled in detachment from theodicy, and that the image of healing — both of the fragmented personality and of conflicts within and between groups — governs contemporary thinking about salvation.

Fiddes' style is clear and persuasive — a model of theological exposition. Though seldom excitable, his writing is frequently touched by pathos, as is appropriate to his theme. The standard of accuracy is high: the only typographical errors I noticed were E.P. Saunders (p.44) and Karl Jung (p.121). The book was evidently completed before publication of Colin Gunton's *Actuality of Atonement*.

Fiddes wants to overcome the sterile (and unworkable) dichotomy between objective and subjective interpretations of the atonement, that manoeuvres us into postulating either a change in God but not in humanity or a change in humanity but not in God, through the atonement. Fiddes insists that, through his Christological participation in our human plight, even unto death on the cross, there has come about a "change in God" — one that effects a "change in us". Like the process theologians, Fiddes postulates an openness in God to new "experience". Through Christ, God "faces what is new for him, not in order to change his attitude, but to change ours". I would guess that we need to turn to Fiddes' previous book, on divine passibility, for a defence of the viability of this concept.

Fiddes' distinctive contribution is found in his development of Abelard's view, freeing it from the constricting assumption of divine impassibility, and giving a larger role to the Holy Spirit. Fiddes commendably vindicates Abelard from the persistent charge of "exemplarism" (Christ's death as the supreme example of the human response to God). In both Abelard and his interpreter here, the "showing forth" of God's love on the cross is at the same time a "pouring forth" of the Spirit of love into our hearts, effecting a real transformation.

Altogether a pastorally helpful study, that lends itself to both theological education and private reflection — "middle-brow" theology as its best.

Paul Avis

Theology and Church

Walter Kasper. SCM, 1989. Pp. x + 231. £12.50.

Walter Kasper, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Tübingen, is one of the best guides to Catholic theology currently available. Highly respected for his orthodoxy and churchmanship, as well as his scholarly breadth and engagement with modern questions, his works convey an unusually keen sense

of balance. The present volume is a collection of essays in two parts, the first devoted to theological anthropology and the second to ecclesiology (without doubt two of the most pressing topics on the current agenda of dogmatics). Like all such collections, this book requires the reader to adapt to a certain repetitiveness and a rather lurching progression of thought. Nonetheless, it makes rewarding reading for anyone seeking a critical but essentially positive treatment of the challenges of post-conciliar Catholic theology, and indeed of modern theology generally.

Kasper is occupied throughout by a constant concern over the present 'estrangement between church and culture,' the same cleft which so exercised the Second Vatican Council. For Kasper, this is 'the real drama of our times.' In his introductory essay on theological method we find him already struggling with the relationship between theory and praxis, now rendered so intractable by the breakdown of religion and metaphysics as an integrated framework for holistic thinking. While firmly rejecting any retreat into neo-scholasticism as an answer to the crisis of modern theology, he does not shy away from a positive solution: the reformatting of a theological method that is at once churchly (i.e., bound to the ecclesial *communio*), scientific (i.e., sharing a scholarly commitment to objective truth along realist lines), and praxis-oriented (i.e., open to the challenge of the here and now). According to Kasper, *fides quaerens intellectum* remains 'theology's great programme.'

It is also, he says, the programme for a new humanism. Western humanism is in need of the reshaping which an open, thoughtful Christian theology can give it. After laying a foundation for what follows by means of a discussion of the personal nature of God as trinitarian Love, he moves on to the burning question of the relation between theonomy and autonomy. It is this matter which dominates the remainder of Part One. Kasper maintains that theonomy and autonomy are not contradictory notions, though they have often been treated as such both in the church and in the world. Theonomy rather presupposes human freedom/autonomy as its necessary condition, and brings the latter to its own proper fulfillment 'in the encounter with infinite freedom.' The corollary of this position, however, is that a theological definition of human freedom entails a critical perspective on 'all ideologies and utopias.' If the former represses human freedom, the latter 'expects too much of it,' with the result that freedom 'is ultimately deified and hence demonized.' It needs instead to be oriented to God through the eschatological determination which is given it in the person of Jesus Christ.

The final two essays in Part One, which deal with Christ in relation to man and to the Trinity respectively, attempt to press this approach further. Working on the Thomistic principle (modified away from its usual dualistic framework) that 'grace presupposes and perfects nature,' Kasper argues for a christological method which 'outbids' secular anthropology, rather than either rejecting it or merely reproducing it: with Jesus we find man 'surpassing everything that is possible in purely human terms.' In this way the question of God is not sidelined by the question of man, nor the reverse. Theology can again speak to modern man. The ultimate significance of christology for anthropology proves to be bound up with Christ's remarkable 'being for others,' which can only be interpreted successfully within a trinitarian framework — all of which must lead to a new relational metaphysics centred on the person and love. Along the way Kasper draws openly on central Orthodox and Reformed insights, as well as touching sympathetically on the

development of modern perspectives on human being (though his appraisal here appears to be more cautious than Pannenberg's, for example). He continues to hammer away at the above/below distinction in methodology which he began to confront some time ago in *Jesus the Christ*.

Part Two offers essays dealing with the church as "a universal sacrament of salvation," as "the place of truth," and as "communion". A penultimate chapter homes in directly on the ongoing challenges presented by Vatican II: in the face of serious conflicts over its interpretation, Kasper insists "that the council's hour is still to come." The "identity/relevance dilemma" which faces the modern church in a pluralistic culture — not just the Roman church, though here he speaks specifically of a "crisis of Catholic identity" — remains prominent and supplies the tie which binds the book together. Quite appropriately, then, the final chapter deals with the Eucharist, even if Kasper does not exploit this area in terms of his theme to the degree one might expect.

Kasper's main sparring partner throughout would appear to be Karl Rahner, whose approach to the relevance problem is thought to compromise the church's identity. He is critical of Rahner's attempt "to bring about a complete reversal in the interpretation of the sacraments," in which, instead of proceeding from the spiritual reality of the sacramental event to its worldly effect, "he wanted to effect a movement from the world to the sacrament." This (if nothing else) ignores "the apocalyptic vision which starts from a continual struggle between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the world, a conflict which does *not* gradually come to an end with the progress of history, but which, on the contrary, reaches a climax and is intensified as history draws to a close." Rahner's approach puts the church at risk of becoming only "a religiously solemn elevation of the world, and hence its ideology." Here Kasper touches on a matter that is no small difficulty in contemporary theology (in spite of our apparent fascination with the adjective "eschatological").

The essay on the church as communion may be singled out as worthy of close scrutiny by those with an ecumenical interest. According to Kasper, "the revival of the ancient church's concept of *communio* represents a turning point of the first order in the history of theology and the church." For Rome it marks a departure "from the one-sided 'unity' ecclesiology of the second millennium of the church," which has in fact contributed to its division. Kasper believes that it is only by the full reception of this *Leitmotif* of the last Vatican council that the church can both recover its own harmony and provide a meaningful answer to the world's longing for community. Here it is most important that the church also recognize that it is not *itself* the answer to this longing, except insofar as it serves as a sign and instrument of fellowship with God through Christ and in the Spirit.

Two comments will have to suffice by way of conclusion, though any number of issues might well be raised in response to this wide-ranging volume, the arguments of which are generally presented in too sketchy a fashion to be fully convincing. First, it may be questioned whether Kasper's — largely implicit — *integration* of anthropology and ecclesiology is as profound as his larger programme (especially a new relational metaphysics) might lead us to expect. Further probing in this direction would have been helpful. Second, it may be wondered whether Kasper's ready division between anthropology and cosmology (the latter is more or less set aside) betrays a

failure to stay abreast of modern speculation in both areas, and of the questions modern man is asking. Likewise, his supposition that the *humanity* of Jesus is not a problem today — a claim often heard, to be sure — seems to bypass the whole problem of the *meaning* in today's world of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, i.e., of the climactic events in which it is alleged that he "surpasses purely human possibilities" while yet remaining human. Connected with this, of course, is the question of the intelligibility of Christ's "enduring presence in the church," on which the notion of *communio* rests. Exploration of these and related matters is essential to the programme of anthropological and ecclesiological dialogue which Kasper wishes to encourage.

Douglas Farrow

Karl Barth: Centenary Essays

Ed. S.W. Sykes. CUP, 1989. Pp.171. £22.50

In his Introduction, Stephen Sykes identifies the common aim of the five essays in this volume as that of helping to remove the obstacle of 'Barthianism' from the path of intelligent discussion of Barth in contemporary English-language theology, and of helping to stimulate dialogue with other systems of thought.

Ingolf Dalferth is the first to put his shoulder to this two-fold task by plotting Barth's basic philosophical position as an ontological, semantical, and epistemological realist. Barth's realism, however, is not of the classical sort, for the reality to which his theological statements refer is eschatological: the living Christ present in the power of His resurrection. Although this reality is not given in our normal experience apart from the Spirit, it is in fact most concrete, being both ontologically and criteriologically prior to empirical reality. The world of common experience is only enhypostatically real. Accordingly, Barth's dogmatic proceeds in two basic stages: first, the generation of basic theological categories; and second, the *tour de force* of presenting a vision of empirical reality in terms of those categories by way of the *analogia fidei*. Dalferth concludes that Barth has given theological method one of its decisive turns by establishing that there is no external, 'empirical' perspective which in principle cannot be interiorised into the perspective of faith.

Colin Gunton follows with an essay on human freedom and the triune God. Against a common line of criticism he argues that for Barth human freedom is 'determined' or 'caused' — rather than displaced — by God. The logical coherence of 'caused freedom' lies in the nature of the cause, the triune God. This renders causality non-compulsory; for, Gunton tells us (though with more tantalising suggestiveness than satisfying precision), it is personal rather than mechanical, consisting in the divine accompanying of the creature by Word and Spirit. Nevertheless, he concedes that the logic of Barth's too-modalist doctrine of the Trinity does militate against an adequate account of human freedom; for the Christological over-determination of his dogmatics marginalises the work of the Holy Spirit and identifies divine and human operations too closely.

Barth's contribution to ecumenical ecclesiology is the subject of Stephen Sykes' own essay; and he finds it pre-eminently in the understanding of authority in the Church as

a by-product of a spiritual ascesis of openness to correction by the Word of God. On this point, he shows a fine grasp of what really makes Barth tick, when he muses on the 'strange thought that we might, in the long run, be able to treat this formidable Calvinist dogmatician as a spiritual writer' (p.83). But for Sykes Barth's understanding of authority in the Church poses, without answering, the unBarthian question of how the innovative Word is to be 'managed' in everyday, sociological reality.

It is in order to surmise why the theological conversations which Barth had with his Catholic counterparts in September 1966 reinforced his positive disposition to the Second Vatican Council, that Philip Rosato sets out to reconstruct them. He discerns two general foci of concern in the set of questions formulated by Barth and published in *Ad Limina Apostolorum*. The first asks whether Vatican II conceives the Church to be primarily in the business of transmitting biblical revelation or in that of engaging in dialogue with those possessing non-biblical conceptions of God. The second asks whether the Council thinks of the Church's primary calling as that of providing the sacramental mediation of grace or of bearing witness to the Gospel. Rosato surmises that the Catholic responses to these questions were, respectively, that multi-faceted dialogue was an internal factor of biblical transmission from the very beginning, and that sacramental mediation is a permanent guarantee of evangelical testimony. He doubts, however, that Barth would have found these answers acceptable, and concludes (rather limply) that the reason for his positive assessment of Vatican II lies in its orthopraxy of ecumenical openness.

Richard Roberts provides the concluding chapter by giving an interpretative account of the Protestant reception of Barth's theology in the Anglo-Saxon world. He begins by tracing the history of its initial reception. In Britain (especially England) the earliest reactions to Barth were determined by an ancestral estrangement from things German exacerbated by a suppression of the theological challenges posed by the trauma of World War One. After the publication of E.C. Hoskyns' translation of the 2nd edition of the *Roemerbrief* in 1933 the tendency to 'normalise' Barth's extreme dialectical rhetoric grew stronger, and 'the partial, fragmented, and delayed' reception of Barth was redeemed only by the work of Hoskyns, the biblical theology movement, and then T.F. Torrance. During the post-war period Barth has only had occasional influence upon some of the episodic developments that have constituted British theology. In the USA, which also didn't see itself as being in a state of cultural and theological crisis, dialectical theology initially seemed just as alien and extreme as in Britain; but American Neo-Orthodoxy, dominant from the late 1930s to the late 1950s, later constituted 'the most impressive indigenous assimilation of the theology of crisis' (p. 141). Since the collapse of the Neo-Orthodox hegemony, Barth's influence has been disseminated but integral to the succeeding stages of development in post-war American theology. After describing 13 different types of response to Barth's thought, which were made after it had taken root, Roberts concludes that Barth has been a major but not a decisive influence upon Anglo-Saxon theology, which has yet to pass adequately through his theology and its total *Sitz im Leben*. He judges that the forging of such a passage might not only help to displace the dominant Anglo-Saxon interpretation of the theology of Karl Barth as totalitarian, but would involve us in the task of healing the rupture between tradition and modernity that lies at the heart of 'the torn soul of European culture';

and 'to dare to venture a healing there,' he tells us, 'would be to probe a universal wound' (p.158).

Though slim and expensive, this is a good book. It should cause Barthianism to give a little more ground to Barth.

Nigel Biggar

Christ, Ethics and Tragedy: Essays in Honour of Donald MacKinnon

ed. Kenneth Surin. Cambridge University Press, 1989. Pp. xi + 206.

In post-war British theology, Donald MacKinnon, erstwhile Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, occupies a prominent place. Erudite, subtle, often allusive and opaque, his work covers a vast range of topics in philosophical theology. It is appropriate that a writer who prefers questioning to answering, and articulates his questions in such a profound and engaging way, should generate a series of essays which, without exception, move far beyond MacKinnon himself.

Richard Roberts demonstrates the influence of Barth on the 'early MacKinnon' theology and suggests that a partial and qualified rehabilitation of this theology would do much to shake the Church of England out of its doctrinal malaise today. Kenneth Surin provides a subtle essay on kenosis and incarnation which will become required reading for anyone working in this area. Inevitably, the issue of theological language is given substantial treatment. Fergus Kerr discusses MacKinnon's obstinate support of realism (as against idealism), rightly questioning some of the assumptions behind the idealism/realism debate; a sensitive piece on representation and resemblance comes from Patrick Sherry; and Roger White offers a thoroughly practical treatment of parable.

MacKinnon's essays on tragedy and atonement in the 1960's receive much attention. Brian Hebblethwaite, in the most vigorous essay of the book, directly opposes MacKinnon, revealing his well-known allegiance to universalism. Rowan Williams, toward the end of an essay on Trinity and ontology, observes the lack of an adequate doctrine of the Spirit to ground MacKinnon's convictions about the tragic. In what is to my mind the most compelling (and moving) essay, David Ford proposes that the notion of 'the face of Christ' provides an especially fruitful perspective on the question of atonement and tragedy.

Ethical concerns are taken up by the remaining writers. Barrie Paskin, Lecturer in War Studies at King's College, London, argues that in international affairs, a proper sense of pride can sit alongside the Christian virtue of humility. John Millbank believes that a number of strands in MacKinnon's work have failed to escape certain pervasive, but unhelpful, strands of post-Kantianism in modern theology, and includes comments on Hauerwas (who is given the right of reply).

A recent writer characterised MacKinnon's thought as 'a combination of self-consciousness, openness and ethical realism'. It is a tribute to the influence of the book's redoubtable dedicatee that all three are much in evidence here.

Jeremy Begbie

The Ocean of Truth. A Defence of Objective Theism

Brian Hebblethwaite. Cambridge University Press, 1988. Pp.x + 165. £7.50

The underlying problem addressed in Brian Hebblethwaite's text is not simply that two members of the Cambridge Faculty of Divinity have argued with one another for a long time without either being able to modify the other's position. It is that it is improbable that at any time they both professed the same sort of Christianity. They would always have needed to argue with one another about the appropriate linguistic mode in which Christian truth is to be expressed. It is not necessarily the case that truth is best expressed metaphysically; nor that the 'objective' reality of God may not be discovered via an 'interiorised' conception of religion.

The very title of the book takes a swipe at a brilliantly successful TV series and book which has presented just about the only material on religion which has come anywhere near the intellectual clout of Bryan Magee's series on philosophers. Brian Hebblethwaite's writing is as ever, elegant, lucid and beautifully organised, and he is trying to persuade us that the heart of traditional doctrine can be set out in terms which indicate its possible transcendence of any historical and cultural setting. The trouble is that the terms in which he commends the doctrine themselves can seem to float weightlessly and indifferently beyond the believer. The strength of his case (p.39) is to reconsider religious language and ritual as highly expressive modes of discourse and action. To say, however, that this is the only context that can be supposed capable of sustaining religious values in the world (to poach some more of his language) is to propose that we need sustained argument (which we do not have) for the central importance of appropriate liturgical forms, and should be to deny that 'metaphysical' philosophy is the right mode in which to signify 'factual' belief and divine transcendence. And it is all very well to talk of divine presence as 'grace', but like courage and hope, it is among the most neglected topics in theology, so it is no wonder if self-assertive making of value seems preferable. Women at long last have learned that being *derivatively* free and dependent, receptive and responsive in subsidiary creativity has hardly begun to solve their problems, so the position represented by Don Cupitt may exhibit the fact that males rumbled the point a long time ago.

Brian Hebblethwaite engages in a critique of Don Cupitt's eclectic scavenging among some of the most brilliant and complex writings of the last few centuries with Wittgenstein a primary bogy, and advances his own phalanx of theological realists in order to make a pincer-attack on Kant and Buddha as the two most important figures for Don Cupitt. What Brits make of either is again a problem, but what is even more fascinating is the values Brian Hebblethwaite expounds in his chapter on 'The grounds of theistic belief'. We may indeed agree with him about the importance of finding or creating things of surpassing beauty, and about the fact that human beings can and do manifest transparent moral goodness. We may rejoice in the evidence of affection, friendship, 'the ecstasy of sexual love' and 'the other-regarding, sometimes self-sacrificial love of the neighbour'. His commendation of theism unfortunately does not exhibit these values in their *lived* possibilities, and our present liturgical incompetence and indifference both to beauty and to ecstasy are all too powerfully manifested in the banalities of church life. It is Don Cupitt's sheer gusto and appetite for what is going on now that does as

much to commend his position as anything, not the strength or weakness of the formal arguments. Of course, Brian Hebblethwaite is right to think that 'objective theism' is central to the Christian tradition, and to comment in an appendix on the problematic status of Christian ministers who do not believe it. One of his most important paragraphs (p.145) includes his sense that it is the failure of Christians to live by or convey this truth that enables people to experience as *liberating* what he calls 'this pale, diminished shadow of authentic Christian faith'. Yet his own intellectual tradition at present seems to lack the capacity to re-present that authenticity as an exhilarating intellectual possibility and as a central element in 'joie de vivre'.

Ann Loades

For the Sake of the Gospel

Edward Schillebeeckx. SCM Press. 1989. Pp. x + 181.
£9.50.

One of the most consistent complaints against western theologians is of their detachment from the practical life of the world. Words like 'academic' and 'university' are used of theology and theologians in a purely pejorative sense. Edward Schillebeeckx gives lie to this accusation in almost every page of this volume. The genre of the book first dispels any such criticism: it is largely sermons given, Sunday by Sunday, to a particular Christian community. Even where the pieces are longer and more sustained theological arguments, however, they remain rooted in the problems and questions raised by living the Christian life.

Schillebeeckx's homiletic style is a model for all preachers who wish to produce sermons based on biblical exposition. It is more didactic than the average English sermon style. The sermons often begin with a direct reference to the Gospel or to one of the other scripture passages used in the liturgy. This is not always the case, however, and virtually always the sermon's conclusion is applied. It relates to everyday realities of the Christian life. Schillebeeckx is effective, when he feels it is necessary, at painting something of the first century Palestinian landscape. He is effective also in describing the theological themes implicit in the minds of the biblical writers. Often, particularly in the case of his exposition of John's gospel, this exposes a latent existentialism in his thought. One might reasonably criticise him for falling into some of the same traps which ensnared Bultmann in some of his New Testament scholarship two or three decades ago. Also, on occasions, the morals to be drawn lack an allusive quality; they can be too obvious. In a sermon on the Johannine 'cleansing of the Temple' he asks rhetorically whether our Temple, that is the Church, needs cleansing.

This leads us into another area where Schillebeeckx cannot be attacked as pure theoretician. Throughout, the political implications of the gospel are crystal clear. This is true when he is expounding Luke's portrait of Jesus as 'the friend of the poor and the outcast'. It is true also in the more overtly political pieces relating to the 8th May movement in the Netherlands, which has been strongly critical of the Papal line on politics and the gospel with a defiant clarity. He notes at one point: '(God) gives a divine future to the goodness and justice people really bring about and have brought about here on earth in a fragmentary but real way'. Throughout the book, the commitment to God's Kingdom coming on earth as well as in heaven

is explicit. He is always concerned, however, to make it clear that politics does not cover the whole of reality. The Church is also a mystical body. Spirituality and pastoral care are an integral part of what he believes the gospel message to be.

The comments which are critical of the Papacy are part of a wider concern in these writings for ecclesiology. Schillebeeckx has become well known for the radical implications of his writings on ministry in the Church. His concerns in these writings relate particularly to the notion of leadership in the Church. He points to the unhealthy pyramidal models of the Church, and argues instead for co-responsibility and conciliarity. He is particularly concerned that throughout the Roman Catholic Church there is a move away from the principles of Vatican II towards what he calls an anti-conciliar attitude. In his sermon on the Papal visit to the Netherlands he identifies two roots to this anti-conciliar movement. The first lies with the present Pope. It is the tendency, toward a personal charismatic centralised leadership. He writes: 'Moreover it is not just my impression but also that of many others that the manifold visits of the Pope implicitly bring with them an undervaluation of the local bishops and of what they think good in their situation for the believers who are entrusted to them.' This leads him to identify the second anti-conciliar root, in the collusion of the local bishops with this centralised model. They too undervalue the distinctive colour of their own local church.

This second point directs us to a corollary of Schillebeeckx's arguments on anti-conciliarity. This is implicit throughout the book and relates to the tension between the local and the universal. He is keen to emphasise the importance of retaining the local end of this tension. Undoubtedly this remains high on the ecumenical list of priorities, and it will certainly continue to be a significant issue in dialogue between Anglicans and Roman Catholics. Arguably, Schillebeeckx's favourite text throughout these essays is particularly relevant: II Corinthians 1:24, which he translates as: 'Not that we lord it over your faith, but we work with you for your joy.' For Schillebeeckx this is the conciliar text par excellence, the text for a co-responsible Church. Certainly Schillebeeckx's arguments on ecclesiology could bear much ecumenical fruit if taken seriously by both Catholics and non-Catholics alike.

The areas that we have mentioned focus Schillebeeckx's main concerns in this book. It would be an oversight, however, to miss out one further genre. This includes a number of pastoral biographical addresses. They include addresses on Dominic, Thomas Aquinas, Pope John XXIII and Cardinal Alfrink of the Netherlands. They also include a homily on the jubilee of his profession and that of Lucas Grollenberg. In each of these there is a delightful sense of the domestic, combined once again with sharp theological insights. Theology, pastoral discernment and spirituality remain part of one clear integrity.

Schillebeeckx's writing is always clear, warm and engaging. The sheer breadth of his academic achievement is remarkable. He is at home in philosophy, New Testament exegesis, pastoral theology and even historical reflection. Perhaps the criticism which springs most immediately to mind is Schillebeeckx's failure to criticise his own liberalism. That, however, may rather be a criticism of his own Church rather than Schillebeeckx himself. It is particularly a criticism of current Roman Catholic ecclesiology. The very centralisation which he attacks fails to engage with its liberal critics. Instead it snipes from under the cover of a fossilised and over-bearing tradition. The

paradox is that no-one reading this book could ever come away believing that Edward Schillebeeckx is ignorant of the tradition or uncommitted to it.

Stephen Platten.

New Religious Movements. A Practical Introduction

Eileen Barker, HMSO, 1989. Pp xxi + 234. £11.95.

On radio I once heard Eileen Barker being accused of being 'soft on cults'. There are also some Evangelical groups who fear that Dr. Barker's brain-child, Information Network Focus on Religious Movements (INFORM), fails to warn of the true dangers and heretical teachings of the cults.

Both these views of Dr. Barker's work strike me as unfair. A renowned sociologist of religion, Eileen Barker has taken the trouble to come out of the proverbial academic tower and write in beautifully constructed and literate English on the thorny issue of new religious movements (NRM's). She speaks from the Academy but to the general concerned reader: parents, relations, friends of members of NRM's and also for pastoral and counselling services.

Her book, *New Religious Movements*, which describes itself as a practical introduction, is not then for the academic audience, but for the general public. The fact that this practical guide is under the imprint of HMSO publications (and very handsomely produced it is too) indicates both the level of support that INFORM has from the Home Office, and also of the concern that governmental agencies have with the new cults.

The book has two aims. First to give some general background information about the NRM's, and second to offer some preliminary suggestions about what should be done when friends, relatives, parishioners (or whoever) become involved in a NRM.

Eileen Barker makes it quite clear in her introduction that she will not enter into theological controversies. Neither will she assume all NRM's cause irreparable harm. INFORM, the organisation she founded and directs, aims to give out clear information, put worried people in touch with support groups, and help point people towards counselling if it should be needed.

Of course the line between descriptivism and prescriptivism is a fine one. One wonders how Dr. Barker (who eschews theologising) does her moral philosophy? On what grounds can it be said that one movement is harmful but another is not? Eileen Barker is acutely aware of these difficulties (though as I shall later argue, I am not sure she adequately tackles them). She wants to play 'honest broker' between the cults and a worried general public.

I believe that there are two assumptions underlying both INFORM as an organisation, and *New Religious Movements* as a book. Assumption one, which I share, is that people who join NRM's are much like you and me. The idea that cultists are the weak or the dispossessed is not supported by empirical data. Neither can it be clearly shown that NRM members have a similar psychological profile.

I also share Dr. Barker's second assumption which, stated baldly, is the view that most people who join a NRM join voluntarily, and a great many voluntarily drift away.

These two assumptions are not based on blind prejudice but on familiarity with the field. In fact this familiarity leads to an overarching paradigm of Dr. Barker's work: the world of NRM's is so complex and diverse that it is impossible, at this time, to make sweeping generalisations about the nature and influence of such movements.

It is here that Eileen Barker's 'handbook' comes into its own. We are shown both in the main text and in several appendices the vast range of New Religious Movements and the syncretistic nature of so many of them. NRM's are a function of modernity that are made possible because of world travel, immigration, social pluralism, and the cross fertilisation of ideas. But Dr. Barker shows that whether we are looking at the so called human potential movements, the Unification church, or the neo-evangelicalism of the London Churches of Christ, we need to keep in mind that most of these movements are volatile. Perhaps of greater importance is the fact that most of them are also tiny.

Dr. Paul Booth, INFORM's executive secretary, told me that they are investigating some 80 movements many of whom have only a few hundred members. Very few have thousands of members in this country. Indeed the so-called house-church movement (which figures only in bibliographical reference) has more adherents than all (genuinely new) NRM's in this country put together. Given that her organisation certainly investigates them, one wonders why Dr. Barker does not say more about them in her book? Perhaps this is a question of definition of New Religious Movement (to which I shall return).

The fact, however, that Dr. Barker's practical guide to the cults demonstrates that most of them are tiny, and many dwindle away almost as quickly as new ones arise, enables us—the general public—to gain some sense of their social importance and moral danger. It is also no small matter to discover that whilst there are undoubtedly cults that can and do harm people, many of them are merely stopping posts for people on their way from crisis to crisis, or on their way to maturity.

This, of course, is small comfort to those families who have lost children to Scientology or the Unification Church, but it does help us to gain some sense of perspective when approaching the emotive subject of cults.

As a practical introduction to the cults, *New Religious Movements* is hard to fault; it is clear, informative, and as sensible as an English pair of brogues. I have two criticisms of the book, however, that I feel are not totally unwarranted. The first concerns the definition of the term New Religious Movement. This issue is ducked throughout the book and is not addressed (somewhat oddly) until appendix 2. When we get there I cannot help but feel that despite the fact that many things are said about this recent sociological nomenclature, the term New Religious Movement turns out to be barely more than a friendlier way of saying cult. It is not often clear how NRM differs from the sociological category of sect. This problem is compounded by the fact that in practice INFORM investigates not only some of the older sects, such as the 'Mormons,' and the newer sectarian style Christian movements, but also the more syncretistic Eastern/and or Western

non-Christian organisations.

Of course we may say, with some practical sensibility, that we are basically looking at religious movements since the Second World War. But how do we differentiate between a cult and a contemporary sect? Are Opus Dei, Restorationist House Churches, and the amorphous New Age Movement all to fit snugly under the rubric, New Religious Movement? I grant that this might be considered a pedantic criticism of a book that does not offer itself as an academic textbook, but if there are real problems with the explanatory power of the term NRM's, it would surely be better to deal with it straightaway in the introduction.

My second criticism is of a different order. INFORM as an organisation has self-consciously entered not only the information market, but the moral arena. As far as *New Religious Movements* goes Dr. Barker in her concluding remarks (pp. 137-139) offers a number of views which are contentious. Consider number 4:

'The vast majority of those who become involved in an NRM suffer no serious damage as a result of their involvement. Many will testify that they gain considerable benefit.' (p.137)

But how are we to measure this morally? Who is to decide issues of 'serious damage', and 'considerable benefit'?

And then in her fifth point Eileen Barker outlines what she italicises as potentially dangerous situations in regards to NRM's. Here they are (with some questions of my own in square brackets):

1 A movement cutting itself off (either geographically or socially) from the rest of society. [Could this not equally apply to monasticism?]

2 A convert becoming increasingly dependent on the movement for definitions and the testing of 'reality'. [Could this not also fit Sufism and The Salvation Army?]

3 A movement drawing sharp, unnegotiable boundaries between 'them' and 'us', 'godly' and 'satanic', 'good' and 'bad' — and so on. [Is not this what we find in Fundamentalist Islam, Eastern Orthodoxy, and Charismatic Christianity?]

4 Important decisions about converts' lives being made for them by others. [Buddhist and Christian monasteries would be apposite here.]

5 Leaders claiming divine authority for their actions and their demands. [St. Simeon the New Theologian, St. Francis of Assisi, Charles Fox, John Wesley, Jonathan Edwards, etc — not to mention Charles the First or Oliver Cromwell — could meet this charge. And certainly this would be true of St. Paul and Jesus of Nazareth.]

6 Leaders or movements pursuing a single goal in a single-minded manner. [Mother Teresa for example?]

My attempt to introduce a disjunction between the list of potentially dangerous situations and a list of people we might think ought not to exemplify them (but nevertheless seem to fit) is to highlight the problem of differentiating between problems of cults and the 'problems' of any religious (and

perhaps political) organisations.

Indeed as Canon Martin Reardon has pointed out in his paper to the Anglican Board for Mission and Unity, pastoral guidelines need to be drawn up which should be normative for any religious movement whether new or old, traditional or cultic. (GS Misc 317. Gen Synod of the Church of England). Are New Religious Movements so different in their methodologies and techniques from charismatic Christianity in the Church of England? Is the Bugbrooke Christian fellowship more demanding than Opus Dei? Is it more difficult to leave the 'Moonies' than forsake holy orders in the Roman Catholic Church?

Personally, I object to many so-called New Religious Movements on theological grounds, but moral grounds are more difficult to define given a commitment to religious toleration and freedom. If we are to establish a code of conduct for religious movements it runs the risk of a) encroaching on all religious freedom, or b) establishing a code which is for a pre-selected (and possibly arbitrarily selected) group of religious movements or cults. Given this, the issue of definition in regards to New Religious Movements is no small matter.

Eileen Barker is sensitive to most of these issues as a careful reading of *New Religious Movements* will show, but she is not always clear on them. The problem, it seems to me, is that INFORM, which informs the content of her book, is trying to be descriptive and yet cannot avoid being prescriptive on some matters. I applaud the boldness of this, and admire Dr. Barker for emerging from behind the safety of academic neutrality, and actually trying to help people.

New Religious Movements succeeds admirably on the level of information, and is a balanced and sensible approach to the whole issue of cultish religion. It is less convincing when it comes to defining for us what actually constitutes a new religious movement and how its dangers differ from other religious formations. Lastly, INFORM, it seems to me, needs a code of ethics which is not only even-handed — it is already that — but morally intelligible.

Andrew Walker

Irish Biblical Apocrypha. Selected texts in translation

Máire Herbert and Martin McNamara. T. and T. Clark, 1989. Pp. xxiii + 196.

Martin McNamara's introduction to these translations sets the texts in the context of the broader problems of classifying apocryphal material. The Irish material has still not been thoroughly looked at but it is possible to see the outlines of its history. A huge store of Christian mythical lore, based on Scripture and the Latin apocrypha, together with legends which came from the continent and eschatological and cosmic imaginings, was abroad in Ireland in both the earlier and the later Middle Ages; a proportion of that which disappeared or went underground in continental Europe continued to be used in Ireland, indeed to be held in respect, and employed with a freedom not found elsewhere. The Norman conquest in 1169 overlaid the traditional Irish apocrypha with new influences from the continent, and introduced a new era. But in the primitive material remained embedded what may be apocrypha of very early, perhaps of Eastern origin, which may have

arrived in Ireland by way of Visigothic Spain.

The choice of texts in this short collection has been determined by the need to represent Old and New Testament examples, and to cover the life of Christ, apocryphal acts of the Apostles and stories concerning Mary, with matter on the world to come. Some well-known examples are included, for the sake of balance, but an effort has been made to concentrate upon unfamiliar items. The translations are plain, but there are following notes, grouped together at the end. Because it is not yet possible to summarise the position, no attempt has been made to discuss textual questions in detail. There is, however, an outline of the issues which arise in connection with each text. This is a most valuable introductory volume to the genre. It would perhaps have been helpful to have included in the introduction an account of the relationship of these texts to miracle stories and other cognate genre.

And here and there a fuller apparatus would have been welcome. But the volume admirably serves its purpose of whetting the appetite and should prove a much-needed tool of research in this field.

G.R. Evans

BOOKS RECEIVED

Rubem A Alves *The Poet, The Warrior, The Prophet*. SCM Press Pp. 148.

Michael Banner *The Justification of Science and the Rationality of Religious Belief*. Clarendon Press Pp. x + 196.

Ian G Barbour *Religion in an Age of Science*. SCM Press Pp.xv + 299. £15.00

Fiona Bowie & Oliver Davies *Hildegard of Bingen, An Anthology*. SPCK Pp.xiv + 157 £6.99

David Brown *Newman - A Man for Our Time, Centenary Essays*. SPCK Pp.viii + 168 £5.99

James H Charlesworth (Ed) *Jews and Christians, Exploring the Past, Present, and Future*. Crossroad Pp.258. \$19.95

Bruno Chenu, Claude Prud'homme, France Quere, Jean-Claude Thomas *The Book of Christian Martyrs*. SCM Pp.viii + 215 £9.50

Don Cupitt *Creation out of Nothing* SCM Pp.x + 213

Robert Davidson *Wisdom and Worship* SCM Pp. 148. £9.50

Sheridan Gilley *Newman and his Age*. DLT Pp.x + 485. £25.00

T J Gorrige *Discerning Spirit, A Theology of Revelation*. SCM Pp.vi + 144 £8.95

Kenneth Grayston *The Gospel of St John*, Epworth Commentaries. Epworth Pp.xxv + 177. £7.50

Basil Hall *Humanists & Protestants 1500 - 1900*. T & T Clark Pp.x + 380.

Morna D Hooker *From Adam to Christ, Essays on Paul*. CUP Pp.viii + 198.

Stanley L Jaki *The Savior of Science*. Scottish Academic Press Pp.vi + 260 £10.50

Kathryn Kerby-Fulton *Reformist Apocalypticism and 'Piers Plowman' - Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 7*. CUP Pp.xii +

256.

George Lawless, OSA *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule*. Oxford Pp.xix + 185.

Daniel Liechty *Theology in Postliberal Perspective*. SCM Pp.xiii + 114 £7.95

Ann Loades (Ed) *Feminist Theology: A Reader*. SPCK Pp. 340. £9.99

John Macken SJ *The Autonomy Theme in the Church Dogmatics, Karl Barth and his Critics*. CUP Pp.ix + 232. £27.50

Rex Mason *Preaching the Tradition, Homily and Hermeneutics After the Exile*. CUP Pp.ix + 235 £35.00

Dominique Morin *How to Understand God*. SCM Press Pp.ix + 117 £6.95

Aidan Nichols OP *From Newman to Congar*. T & T Clark Pp. 290 £9.95

Helen Oppenheimer *Marriage* Mowbray Pp.xi + 129 £5.95

Michael Pearson *Millennial Dreams and Moral Dilemmas*. CUP Pp.x + 328 £32.50

Heikki Raisanen *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark's Gospel*. T & T Clark Pp.xvii + 289 £17.95

C S Rodd *The Book of Job*, Epworth Commentaries. Epworth Pp.xviii + 142 £6.95

Efraim Shmueli *Seven Jewish Cultures*. CUP Pp.xv + 213 £30.00

David Bruce Taylor *Job, A Rational Exposition*. Merlin Pp.309 £16.95

Gerd Theissen *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. T & T Clark Pp.xiii + 210 £16.95

Hans Urs von Balthasar *Mysterium Paschale*. T & T Clark Pp.xi + 297 £19.95

Claus Westermann *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament*. T & T Clark Pp.211. £8.95

Ben Witherington III *Women and the Genesis of Christianity*. CUP Pp.xv + 273 £8.95

John Ziesler *Pauline Christianity*, The Oxford Bible Series. OUP Pp.ix + 166

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Beverley Clack teaches Philosophy of Religion at Roehampton Institute of Higher Education.

John Clayton is Reader in Philosophy of Religion in the Department of Religious Studies, Lancaster University.

Brian Horne is Lecturer in Christian Doctrine at King's College.

Andrew Walker is Lecturer in Religion and Education at King's College.