KING'S THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Volume IV Number 2 Winter 1981

incorporating The Kingsman

it is a view I have often heard expressed. It is that agnosticism is, somehow or other, more 'intellectually respectable' than, say, atheism; that the agnostic is 'keeping his options open' in that, unlike the atheist, he is not committed to a view which may prove false. In short, agnosticism is sometimes construed to be a detached, uncommitted view. If my argument against agnosticism is correct then this general presumption is false. Not only may agnosticism be more closely allied to atheism than is sometimes assumed, it may also, at least in the form we have considered, be wrong. There can be no 'intellectual respectability' attaching to a view which is wrong.

Agnosticism, therefore, if it is construed in the way I have outlined it (which I suggest it often is), is impotent. 7

NOTES

1. *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, ed. A.G.N. Flew and A. MacIntyre, SCM, London, 1955.

2. See *New Essays*, op. cit., G.E. Hughes, pp.56-67, and A.C.A. Rainer, pp. 67-71.

3. I do not have space to argue this here, but it is not essential to the general thesis I will presently argue, viz., that one major form of agnosticism is impotent.

4. On the consequences of this belief see my 'The Logical Status of "God" ' in *Religious Studies*, Vol. 16., No. 2, June 1980, pp.217-228.

5. *Foundations of Arithematic*, para. 53, 'Function and Concept', p.38 in Geach and Black, *The Basic Laws of Arithematic*, para. 21.

6. Mr Christopher Kirwan of Exeter College Oxford suggested to me that if we take (b) as meaning 'God's existence is not necessary', someone who believes it will be committed to atheism if he also believes (1) (that if God exists then his existence is necessary). But, he argued, (b) could also be read, quite differently, as 'God's existence is not certain', which is a statement of agnosticism and which commits its proponent to no more than agnosticism even if he combines it with belief in (1). This, however, it seems to me, does not mitigate the force of my argument because 'God's existence is not certain' is elliptical for saying 'God might not exist'. Whilst the former is more a statement about an individual's beliefs and the latter *appears* to be a statement with ontological import the effects for the argument are the same. In modal terms, the two statements can still be expressed as 'It is possible that God does not exist' and this, after all, is exactly the statement I have considered throughout this latter section of the paper.

7. I have benefitted, in my consideration of this problem, from discussions with my students at Dulwich College, Adrian Crickmer and Richard Mico.

BOOK REVIEWS: CHRISTOLOGY FOR THE LEISURED AND OPULENT

CHRIST: THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD
by Edward Schillebeeckx. Translated by John Bowden.
pp.926. (London: SCM Press, 1980). £19.50.

When, on 13 April 1977, Fr Schillebeeckx gave to the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith a written clarification of certain points that had been raised concerning his book *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*, he explained that that book, vast as it was, was only the first volume of a projected trilogy on Christology, of which the second volume was already completed. The dogma of Chalcedon, he affirmed, was his undisputed presupposition, and he had deliberately rejected the views of Marxsen and Bultmann. More than two years later, in December 1979, he was asked to go to Rome for conversations with three "consultors", and just a year later—not an excessive delay, if they were adequately to read and ponder his two enormous volumes—he was officially informed that the cardinals to whom a decision fell accepted his clarifications, explications and adjustments but asked him to devise a means of making them known to a wider public. Fr Schillebeeckx's reaction was first to decline this invitation and then to publish what he describes as an *Interim Report on the books Jesus and Christ*; it has the (for him) moderate length of 150 pages. The reviewer of such a gigantic mass of material has been faced by the author and the publishers with a really impossible task. Bigger is not necessarily Better, and sheer size witnesses to nothing but the author's capacity and enthusiasm for writing and the privilege of his situation. Many of his assertions seem to me to be true and illuminating, many to be questionable and some to be quite definitely wrong, and if I cannot give it is a view I have often heard expressed. It is that agnosticism is, somehow or other, more 'intellectually respectable' than, say, atheism; that the agnostic is 'keeping his options open' in that, unlike the atheist, he is not committed to a view which may prove false. In short, agnosticism is sometimes construed to be a detached, uncommitted view. If my argument against agnosticism is correct then this general presumption is false. Not only may agnosticism be more closely allied to atheism than is sometimes assumed, it may also, at least in the form we have considered, be wrong. There can be no 'intellectual respectability' attaching to a view which is wrong.

Agnosticism, therefore, if it is construed in the way I have outlined it (which I suggest it often is), is impotent. 7

NOTES

1. *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, ed. A.G.N. Flew and A. MacIntyre, SCM, London, 1955.
2. See *New Essays*, op. cit., G.E. Hughes, pp.56-67, and A.C.A. Rainer, pp. 67-71.
3. I do not have space to argue this here, but it is not essential to the general thesis I will presently argue, viz., that one major form of agnosticism is impotent.
4. On the consequences of this belief see my 'The Logical Status of "God" ' in *Religious Studies*, Vol. 16., No. 2, June 1980, pp.217-228.
5. *Foundations of Arithematic*, para. 53, 'Function and Concept', p.38 in Geach and Black, *The Basic Laws of Arithematic*, para. 21.
6. Mr Christopher Kirwan of Exeter College Oxford suggested to me that if we take (b) as meaning 'God's existence is not necessary', someone who believes it will be committed to atheism if he also believes (1) (that if God exists then his existence is necessary). But, he argued, (b) could also be read, quite differently, as 'God's existence is not certain', which is a statement of agnosticism and which commits its proponent to no more than agnosticism even if he combines it with belief in (1). This, however, it seems to me, does not mitigate the force of my argument because 'God's existence is not certain' is elliptical for saying 'God might not exist'. Whilst the former is more a statement about an individual's beliefs and the latter *appears* to be a statement with ontological import the effects for the argument are the same. In modal terms, the two statements can still be expressed as 'It is possible that God does not exist' and this, after all, is exactly the statement I have considered throughout this latter section of the paper.
7. I have benefitted, in my consideration of this problem, from discussions with my students at Dulwich College, Adrian Crickmer and Richard Mico.

BOOK REVIEWS: CHRISTOLOGY FOR THE LEISURED AND OPULENT

CHRIST: THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE IN THE MODERN WORLD
by Edward Schillebeeckx. Translated by John Bowden.
pp.926. (London: SCM Press, 1980). £19.50.

When, on 13 April 1977, Fr Schillebeeckx gave to the Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith a written clarification of certain points that had been raised concerning his book *Jesus: An Experiment in Christology*, he explained that that book, vast as it was, was only the first volume of a projected trilogy on Christology, of which the second volume was already completed. The dogma of Chalcedon, he affirmed, was his undisputed presupposition, and he had deliberately rejected the views of Marxsen and Bultmann. More than two years later, in December 1979, he was asked to go to Rome for conversations with three "consultors", and just a year later—not an excessive delay, if they were adequately to read and ponder his two enormous volumes—he was officially informed that the cardinals to whom a decision fell accepted his clarifications, explications and adjustments but asked him to devise a means of making them known to a wider public. Fr Schillebeeckx's reaction was first to decline this invitation and then to publish what he describes as an *Interim Report on the books Jesus and Christ*; it has the (for him) moderate length of 150 pages. The reviewer of such a gigantic mass of material has been faced by the author and the publishers with a really impossible task. Bigger is not necessarily Better, and sheer size witnesses to nothing but the author's capacity and enthusiasm for writing and the privilege of his situation. Many of his assertions seem to me to be true and illuminating, many to be questionable and some to be quite definitely wrong, and if I cannot give detailed justification for this judgment he has no one to blame but himself. In reviewing the volume *Jesus (Religious Studies* XVI (June 1980), 242ff), I asserted that Schillebeeckx had failed tragically to question the secularist presuppositions of the "established" but already senescent methodology of Biblical study and had faced himself as a committed Christian with the impossible task of seeking some point of entry for the supernatural in a nature from which it had been antecedently excluded. In spite of the orthodox professions to which he is led after 800 pages of his second volume ("Is not this the dogma of Chalcedon?", 804) I feel obliged to repeat this judgment, but with a clearer understanding of what his method is. He himself tells us, in the Introduction to *Christ* (22):

> The perspective of this book is different from that of its predecessor, *Jesus. An Experiment in Christology*, of which it is a continuation. At this point I am not concerned, as in the first volume, with those features of the "historical Jesus" which may have led to the New Testament confession of him. Now I am immediately concerned with the New Testament elaboration of what Christians experienced in their encounter with Jesus the Lord. I might say that the first volume was a "Jesus book", though it did not neglect the Christ this second volume is a "Christ book", though it does not forget Jesus of Nazareth.

Many readers, and not only those of traditional or conservative outlook, may feel that this dichotomy is unsatisfactory and itself conceals certain tacit presuppositions, and their unease will be increased by the way in which the books of the New Testament are allocated to the two volumes: the Synoptic Gospels and Acts to *Jesus*; the Epistles, the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse to *Christ*. At least we may admire the honesty and humility with which Schillebeeckx himself writes:

> It is indeed the case that I did not know the Gospel of John well enough when I wrote my first Jesus book. I studied it only in preparing to write my second Jesus book. As a result of my study I could certainly have filled out the historical picture of Jesus in my first book, though this would not have altered its main lines [*Interim Report*, 45].

But it is important now to see what exactly are the structure and method of the book *Christ*.

Jesus, the Introduction tells us (19), is "the story of a new life-style", and the book is divided into four Parts of vastly different lengths, 54, 548, 17 and 194 pages respecvely. Part One is concerned with the basic question how what happened in the first century can be authoritative for us today; "experience", "interpretation" and "revelation" are the key concepts, and much is made of the principle that "Experience is always interpreted experience". What this involves in post-Kantian terms is not Schillebeeckx's immediate concern, which is expressed in his assertion that "because in this book I 'begin from' the New Testament history in which Christians articulated their experience of grace, it does not mean that my starting-point in Christian theology contradicts a starting-point 'from the other end', with our contemporary experiences" (78). One might expect a Catholic to lay more stress on the Church as providing the concrete and organic continuous experience between the experience of New-Testament Christians and our experience today. Perhaps that will come in volume three, but its earlier absence suggests a serious methodological structural defect in Schillebeeckx's system.

"The disciples' experience with Jesus", writes Schillebeeckx, "was the dynamic origin of a religious movement and thus the actual founding of the church" (65). Nevertheless the title which he gives to Part Two of the book, which occupies 65 per cent of the whole, is "New Testament Theology of the Experience", not of Jesus, but "of Grace", and, after an introductory discussion of Grace in the Old Testament, he expounds at length the Pauline and Petrine Epistles, Hebrews, the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse. The amount of material amassed is colossal, as the frequently interpolated bibliographies indicate; its precise relevance to the central theme is not always so clear. Much is controversial, but there are telling insights, as in the remark "There was never an originally 'religionless' Christianity; this is a scholarly invention" (552). The climax of this part comes in the account of the life of the New-Testament Churches as "exodus-communities" with an ethic socio-culturally determined yet arising out of the life of grace. This leads on to the very short Part Three, on the embeddedness of the saving action of God in Christ in human history: "Such an event can and even must be articulated in an inexhaustible way, with a constant variety of images and 'interpretative elements', when people in changing cultures want to give authentic expression to what the New Testament seeks to state, confess and proclaim. I would not call this demythologising, since it is certainly not that, it is rather the *inculturation* of the one datum of the Christian faith; to put it more simply, it is a matter of keeping alive the content of the Christian faith" (633f). Admirably said; but is there not needed a more thorough and adequate account than Schillebeeckx gives us of the relation between truth on the one hand and its media and modes of expression on the other?

Finally, Part Four—"God's Glory and Man's Truth, Well-Being and Happiness"—is concerned with the implications of Christology for politics and sociology in general. It is on the whole admirable, though I cannot help thinking that the same conclusions might have been reached more rapidly and simply by a more traditional route. It begins with the sentence. "Some readers who have followed the argument of this book thus far may perhaps want to ask, 'So what. What do *we* do with this view of the Christian Bible in the year 1980, in our modern world?'" But these words occur on page 647, and to get thus far, even without turning to the Scripture references or allowing any time for reflection, supposing he devotes six hours a day to the task, will take the reader nearly five days. So the number of people who are in a position to ask the question is likely to be small indeed. Human life, even the life of a scholar, being limited, what right has an author to demand such a slice out of it from his fellows or to expect such a demand to be granted if he makes it? If a man believes himself to be in possession of a truth of great and universal importance, is it not a moral duty to express it with the greatest possible lucidity and brevity, so as to communicate it to as many people as possible? Schillebeeckx has a sensitive social conscience and in the sentence immediately following that just quoted he indignantly declares that "while two-thirds of the world population is crying out for justice and love, a powerful block made up of the remaining third, in East and West, is concentrating all its knowledge and its science, its power, its diplomacy and its tactics and means of subjection, on keeping what it has." But is not something very like this in the realm of the spirit done by a Christian theologian who speaks the Gospel to the modern world in a medium accessible only to the opulent and the leisured, to those who can spend fifty pounds on his three gigantic volumes and three weeks of their lives on reading them? For Schillebeeckx is no minute researcher, concerned only with some remote area of scholarship of interest only to a few specialists, such as Seventh-century Armenian pilgrims on Mount Tabor or the Birthplace of Ecolampadius; "I have tried", he writes, "to bridge the gap between academic theology and the concrete needs of the ordinary Christian" and he claims to write "in such a way as one might suppose would put the contents within the reach of anybody interested" (*Jesus*, 5). That he recognises the problem of a technical vocabulary is shown by the careful glossaries which he provides, but these do nothing to mitigate the other problem of the sheer size of his work. What was originally to be one volume became two and then three, with an Interim Report on the side. Fr Schillebeeckx has said some important things and if he would limit his output he might receive that constructive criticism for which he has appealed. But at the moment he has simply run away with himself and created a dust-cloud in which his true outlines can be only dimly discerned.

E.L. Mascall

THE TRINITY AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD—THE DOCTRINE OF GOD by Jürgen Moltmann. SCM Press, 1981, pp.xvi, 256, £7.95.

Moltmann seems to me to have written a book that is, from many points of view, an exemplary piece of Christian theology. Thoroughly grounded in an orthodox faith, he accepts that the Church's traditional doctrines serve to structure that faith into intelligible patterns expressed in terms of God and of man and of the new relationship which is revealed to faith as existing between them. These patterns, in turn, provide the materials which continually challenge and guide the Christian theologian to work out interpretations of the faith which are contemporary, open and practical. In this way Christian theology may progress: on a circular path, to be sure, but a path that draws men, in an ascending spiral, towards a fuller communion of knowledge and love with the God of Jesus. Thus there is a true mystagogy involved in any theology worthy of the name 'Christian', and it characterises the work of the recent best: Barth, Rahner and (although both of these come in for a measure of criticism in this book) Moltmann. The precise mystagogy which Moltmann proposes here is best expressed in the title. nothing less is involved in a proper appraisal of the doctrine of the Trinity than a radical reinterpretation both of God and of his 'Kingdom'. Acceptance of the doctrine entails a vital shift from Kingdom to Fatherhood, from power to love.

In his rehabilitation of the doctrine of the Trinity Moltmann boldly tackles some big problems. First, of course, the problem that Christian faith continues to have with the impassible God of monotheism (Moltmann's name for theism): 'Anyone who starts from the experience of suffering and who perceives the mystery of the world in God's own sorrow is compelled to talk about God in christological terms. And he inevitably thinks of God in trinitarian ones . . .' (p.40). Then there is the problem of the biblical basis for the doctrine. Here Moltmann exploits the implications of the New Testament presentation of Jesus as 'the Son': 'A theological doctrine of the Trinity can only be biblically justified if the history of God to which the Bible testifies, itself displays trinitarian forms. It then has to follow these trinitarian forms. In the historical and eschatological testimony of the New Testament, we do not merely find one, single form of the Trinity. We find a trinitarian co-working of Father, Son and Spirit, but with changing patterns' (p.94f.). In other words, Moltmann's Trinity will be a flexible arrangement of Persons, open to an eschatological future, freely and actively involved in the created world's developing history. How this may be conceived is Moltmann's next problem. The notion of *opera ad extra Trinitatis* must give way to the difficult view that initially God somehow contracts, withdraws himself into himself to make an interior *nihil* which provides 'the space in which God then becomes creatively active' (p.109). The world is thus truly in God. And it is this 'self-humiliation of God' which 'is fulfilled in the incarnation of the Son. God permits an existence different from his own by limiting himself. He withdraws his omnipotence in order to set his image, men and women, free. He allows his world to exist *in* his eternity. The divine kenosis which begins with the creation of the world reaches its perfected and completed form in the incarnation of the Son' (p.118). In the light of this there follows interesting criticism of certain presentations of the doctrine of the Trinity, including some wise words on the *Filioque*, and some practical conclusions are drawn concerning the political, ecclesiastical and religious implications of the newly appropriated doctrine.

What we are confronted with in this book is a remedial critique and exploration of the Christian 'doctrine of God' 'remedial' in the sense that it calls for a basic revaluation of many traditional ideas —of the nature of the Christian God and the nature of Christian man: and also of creation, providence, consummation, love, freedom, suffering, knowledge and experience. This is liberation theology in the strictest sense: new meanings are released. 'All theological work on the doctrine of the Trinity is devoted to this transformation of meaning. The concepts and terms must correspond to and be suited to the thing that has to be conceived and comprehended' (p.162).

It will not be surprising if the reader of this broad attempt to christianise our theological concepts feels occasional doubts and reservations. For instance, the panentheistic position adopted by Moltmann still needs more rigorous clarification and precision from some appropriate philosophical discipline. And Moltmann's notion of the unity of God—an open, perichoretic, unifying at-one-ness and fellowship of the Persons—seems both inadequate in itself and ultimately destructive of the proper characteristics of those Persons. Can it really be the case that the monarchy of the Father 'only applies to the *constitution* of the Trinity. It has no validity within the eternal circulation of the divine life, and none in the perichoretic unity of the Trinity. Here the three Persons are equal; they live and are manifested in one another and through one another' (p.176)? Equal, certainly, but their personal distinction remains always, and in their operation, in the mutually *opposing* relationships between them. Again, Moltmann's apparent ignorance of Roman Catholic efforts over the past fifty years with regard to the theology of trinitarian indwelling, with the concomitant attempt to adjust and transcend the old categories of causality, leaves a gap in the book. Perhaps it is the more 'pastoral' emphasis of Vatican II that pushed this promising work into theological near-oblivion. On the other hand, it is pleasing to note Moltmann's appreciation of some older Anglican theology (C.E. Rolt, G.A. Studdert Kennedy). Overall, however, Moltmann is very thin on 'grace', a topic which might be thought important for his purposes. But this thinness is perhaps no more than a part of a general weakness in the Christian anthropology which corresponds to his remarkable theology. To be finally convincing a properly Christian theology must tackle not only grace but also sin and human freedom more directly than Moltmann does here. He is now intent on presenting 'a series of systematic contributions to theology' (p.xi), and no doubt he will be led to make good the deficiencies of this book later. But as it stands, we have here a first-rate opening attempt to present a crucially trinitarian hermeneutics of the Christian faith.

Robert Butterworth SJ
Roehampton Institute of Higher Education

CHRISTOLOGY IN THE MAKING by James J.G. Dunn. SCM Press 1980. 443pp. £10.50.

This learned and lucidly written book merits the careful attention of both New Testament scholars and doctrinal theologians. In it the author surveys the whole of the New Testament's testimony to belief in the Incarnation. He is especially concerned to answer the following question. To what extent does the New Testament express belief in the pre-existence of Christ as a divine figure who became man for our salvation? Holding (rightly in my opinion) the (by now traditional) view that, at least on crucial points of christology, the fourth gospel presents us with an interpretation of Christ from the standpoint of apostolic faith Dunn is obliged to rely on the synoptic gospels for knowledge of Christ's teaching and consciousness. According to these gospels, he maintains, Jesus, though claiming to stand in a unique relation to God as his Father, was not aware of himself as one who pre-existed as the Father's divine Son. The most obvious concept for establishing such awareness is that of the Son of Man; but here Dunn endorses Todt's conclusion 'that there is not a single Son of Man saying within the synoptic tradition which links up with the concept of pre-existence from apocalyptic literature' (p.89). At the same time apostolic belief in Jesus as God incarnate 'was, in the light of the whole Christ-event, an appropriate reflection on and elaboration of Jesus' own sense of sonship and eschatological mission' (p.254).

We are left, then, with the teaching of the apostolic church. Here, inevitably, Dunn is compelled to examine the ideas of Wisdom and Word in Hellenistic Judaism. His question, then, is this. Did Jews hold that these were objectively existing forms of divine being or did they regard them merely as personifications of God's power and activity? Dunn takes the second view. So he writes of pre-Christian Jewish literature that 'there is no clear indication that the Wisdom language of these writings has gone beyond vivid personification' (p.170) and that Wisdom signifies simply 'God's wise ordering of creation and of those who fear him' (p.173). Similarly he asserts that 'the Logos seems to be nothing more for Philo than God himself in his approach to man, God himself in so far as he may be known by man' (p.228). Judaism, therefore, did not provide a category of hypostatic pre-existence through which Christ's pre-existence could be interpreted. The next question, then, is this; By what stages did the primitive Church arrive at belief in Christ's pre-existence? Dunn's answer is clear. Within the New Testament the belief is found only in the fourth gospel. In John 1. 1-18 'beyond dispute the Word is pre-existent, and Christ is the pre-existent Word incarnate' (p.239). 'Here we have an explicit statement of incarnation, the first, and indeed only such statement in the N.T.' (p.241).

However, although Dunn finds evidence for belief in Christ's pre-existence only in the fourth gospel he maintains that Paul affirms Christ's deity and, moreover, affirms it by stating that Christ embodies the divine Wisdom. According to Paul 'divine wisdom is now to be recognised as *wholly identified* with Jesus, so totally embodied in Jesus that the distinctive character of divine wisdom is to be read off not from creation or in terms of speculative knowledge (*gnosis*), but from the Cross' (p.195). 'Jesus is the exhaustive embodiment of divine wisdom; *all* the divine fullness dwelt in him' (*ibid.*) The relevant passages in 1 Corinthians and Colossians cannot be reduced to a mere doctrine of Jesus as a man inspired by God; they pass beyond the language of inspiration to the language of incarnation in so far as they identify Christ with God (p.212). Furthermore although they do not affirm Christ's pre-existence they come very close to the affirmation. 'In the Wisdom christology (and mystery terminology) of the later Paulines we see the most immediate antecedent to the doctrine of the incarnation, the womb from which incarnational christology emerged, the explicit assertion of an ideal pre-existence of Christ which was not far from an assertion of Christ's real pre-existence and which may have been understood in the latter sense quite soon after the letters were first written' (p.256).

One further point in Dunn's exegesis of New Testament christology must be noted. Although he restricts the New Testament's assertion of Christ's pre-existence to the fourth gospel he warns us against inferring from this that all the other christological passages in the apostolic books therefore imply adoptionism. 'The danger of calling the early post-Easter Son of God passages "adoptionist" is that

"Adoptionism" is the technical term for that later view which *denied* Christ's pre-existent deity—he was *only* a man adopted by God as Son at his Jordan baptism. But the earliest use of Ps. 2.7 in reference to the resurrection of Jesus can hardly be designated a *denial* that Christ was already God's Son before his resurrection. Nor can we say that Mark was intent to *deny* Jesus' divine sonship prior to the Spirit's descent and the heavenly voice at Jordan. Nor indeed that the birth narratives were deliberately setting their face against the idea of a pre-existent divine sonship' (p.62). Towards the end of the same paragraph Dunn generalises as follows. 'In the earliest N.T. formulations the idea of a pre-existent divine sonship of Jesus does not yet seem to have crossed the threshold of thought, is neither affirmed nor denied.'

Finally, Dunn claims that there is no parallel in pre-Christian Jewish and Graeco-Roman thought to belief in the Incarnation—to the belief that in one figure of history a pre-existent divine person became man. Thus on p.22 he asserts, in words he repeats in his Conclusion, that 'there is little or no good evidence from the period prior to Christianity's beginnings that the Ancient Near East seriously entertained the idea of a god or son of god descending from heaven to become a human being in order to bring men salvation, except perhaps at the level of popular pagan superstition'. Again, he says that 'we have found nothing in pre-Christian Judaism or the wider religious thought of the Hellenistic world which supplies sufficient explanation of the origin of the doctrine of the incarnation, no way of speaking about God, the gods, or intermediary beings which so far as we can tell would have given birth to this doctrine apart from Christianity' (p.253). More specifically he states on p.243 that 'for Philo it was inconceivable that the Logos should *become* flesh, as it is inconceivable for Greek thought generally, as indeed also for Jewish'.

In assessing this book from a doctrinal standpoint it is necessary to distinguish between the two forms—a less and a more developed form—that belief in the Incarnation can take. According to the first it means simply (in terms of the Judaeo-Christian contrast between the Creator and his creatures) that Jesus was both God and man. According to the second it means, more specifically, that Jesus pre-existed as a divine person who was both identical with and distinct from the God whom, in his human state, he addressed as *Abba*. Dunn shows that in the first form the belief was enshrined in the first response of Christians to Christ as their risen Lord. To this extent his book valuably supplements C.F.D. Moule's *The Origin of Christology* in ruling out the idea that the apostolic church first regarded Jesus merely as an inspired man and then 'deified' him (perhaps by assimilating him to the gods of current mythology). The particular question that this book raises concerns the point at which first century Christians formulated the nascent doctrine of the Incarnation in its second form. When, in the evolution of christology, did the Church first come to believe in the divine Christ's pre-existence? Here I think that Dunn dismisses too readily the view that pre-Christian Jews regarded 'Wisdom' and 'Word' (though not, in my opinion, 'Spirit') as objectively distinct forms of divine being. I also think that Christ's pre-existence was affirmed by Paul and the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. Thus it seems to me unsatisfactory to assert of Colossians 1.16 ('in him all things were created') that 'this may simply be the writer's way of saying that Christ now reveals the character of the power behind the world' (p.190).

Nevertheless, Dunn admits that Paul comes near to affirming Christ's objective pre-existence and that he may soon have been understood as affirming it. In any case even if Dunn is right in asserting that Christ's objectively real pre-existence was affirmed only by the fourth evangelist, this assertion would be doctrinally sufficient. It was inevitable that at the beginning Christians should apprehend Christ's deity primarily in terms of the impact that he made on them as the agent of divine salvation and the founder of a new creation. Yet the attribution of a creative function to Christ as God's personally pre-existent Wisdom and Word was not an extraneous and inexplicable addition to apostolic faith. On the contrary it was an unfolding of the perception (first obtained within the order of redemption) that Christ was on the one hand distinct from God (as a son is distinct from his father) and on the other hand that he fully shared God's nature and power.

H.P. Owen

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, Volume IV. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids. Distributed in the U.K. by SCM Press. 1981. pp.xix, 493. £15.00

The *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* was inaugurated in 1970 and separate fascicles have been appearing at intervals since then. It was envisaged from the outset that an English translation would be undertaken, but this ran into early difficulties, and the original translation of Volume 1 had to be withdrawn. Eventually, however, the various difficulties were resolved; the current translator, D.E. Green, is experienced and very competent in producing a readable English version; and with four volumes now published a clearer picture of the whole enterprise becomes possible. It should be noted that, unlike the original New Testament 'Kittel', volumes and pages do not correspond with the German original; in the Hebrew alphabet the volumes so far published reach midway through the letter *heth*.

What, then, is a dictionary for? Most obviously, one might suppose, to give the meaning of words. But the recognition that that is not a wholly sufficient purpose goes back at least as far as Dr Johnson whose dictionary defined 'horse' as 'animal so called'. Dr Johnson then went on to illustrate the range of usage in which the word 'horse' could be found, and it is of course largely in that second sense that the TDOT is a dictionary.

But there is an important difference from the Johnsonian situation. He assumed, no doubt rightly, that his readers did not need to be told what a horse was. Such an assumption could scarcely be justified with regard to most of the terms here set out. Here is a major problem for the compilers of dictionaries of this kind: how are they to ensure that the reader can actually locate the information that he wants? The problem is not limited to the non-Hebraist, for whom *z*^{e}*'ēbh* and *hms* (the first and last entries in this volume) will be meaningless; it will not always be clear, even to the Hebraist, what topics will be covered within a particular article, or where he may find treatment of a particular theme, since theological issues do not always lend themselves readily to treatment under individual word-entries. Thus, to take one of numerous examples, the article on *zera*^{c} (seed) contains an excellent discussion of 'promise to the patriarchs': only the obligation of having to read all (or, in honesty, a substantial part of) the book for review brought it to the present writer's notice. In this volume, therefore, as in the first three, there is much excellent material, but it may prove infuriatingly difficult to know where to find it. If indexes are provided when the whole project is completed, they will clearly offer some assistance.

The corresponding New Testament dictionary, the original 'Kittel', was much criticised for some of its underlying assumptions. James Barr (*The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961) was particularly trenchant in pointing out the frequent lapses into the etymological fallacy, that is, the supposition that the 'root' meaning of a word somehow pervaded all subsequent usage of that word, and the tendency to think in terms of vague 'concepts' rather than precise meanings. In particular little consistent attempt was made in the original 'Kittel' to map out with any degree of exactitude the semantic fields of the words under discussion. In both of these respects TDOT marks a considerable improvement: etymologies are provided in the opening section of each entry, but their limited value is recognised. Frequent, though somewhat unsystematic, attempts are made to show the semantic range of a particular term by comparing its usage with that of other words of like meaning. At times, indeed, awareness of the danger of excessive reliance on etymologies leads to curiously little being said, as if caution were being carried to extremes. Nor is any significant attention paid to post-biblical Hebrew and the light it might throw on biblical usage. One final general comment: it does appear at times as if stricter editorial control might have been useful, e.g. by providing more systematic cross-referencing between articles on related topics, and by ensuring greater consistency in the usage of technical terms.

To comment on Volume IV in isolation is bound to be somewhat arbitrary. It is only possible here to draw attention to a number of articles that will deserve wider attention than they might find: those on *zabhach* and *chagh* both have important insights into the development and characteristics of Israel's worship; *za^{c}aq* deals interestingly with the theme of the people 'crying unto the LORD' in lament and prayer; and the Israelite understanding of life in its different connotations is well brought out in *chayah*. But these are only samples; others will certainly find plenty with which to disagree and from which to profit. All told therefore a worthwhile project, containing much valuable material but with the problems of communication still not entirely overcome.

Richard Coggins

PAULINE STUDIES. ESSAYS PRESENTED TO F.F. BRUCE. Edited by Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris. Paternoster Press, 1980, pp. xlii + 293. £10.

It has become fashionable to present scholars with volumes of essays to celebrate a birthday, but it is rare for one scholar to be the recipient of more than one such volume. It is some indication of the esteem and affection with which Professor F.F. Bruce is regarded, that the occasion of his seventieth birthday last year should have been marked by the publication of the third collection of essays to have been gathered in his honour. No doubt it will have given him particular pleasure that the contributors to this volume are former research pupils at Sheffield and Manchester. There can be no better tribute to a teacher than the scholarly work of those whom he has taught.

The present collection of essays is introduced by two brief appreciations of Professor Bruce, one by the editors, the other by Professor C.F.D. Moule. These are followed by 'a select bibliography' of his writings in the past ten years; the fact that this alone covers some fifteen pages is sufficient indication of Professor Bruce's immense industry. But anyone who does not know Fred Bruce and who skips the appreciations and begins reading at the bibliography will certainly get the wrong impression of a man whose humanity is as great as his scholarship, and his wit as keen as his judgments.

The editors have wisely limited the scope of the volume to one theme, and it is an appropriate one, since Professor Bruce has written widely on Paul. Many of the sixteen essays take up problems with which he himself has been concerned. In the first part of the book, Colin Hemer offers some 'Observations on Pauline Chronology', Paul Garnet discusses 'Qumran Light on Pauline Soteriology', and Swee-Hwa Quek looks at 'Adam and Christ According to Paul'. The Old Testament roots of Professor Bruce's theological understanding (and those of Paul himself!) are ably represented by the contribution of Ronald Clements, who discusses the theme of ' "A Remnant Chosen by Grace" (Romans 11:5)', and explores the Old Testament background and origin of the remnant concept. Dr Clements argues that the use of this idea in Romans demonstrates the way in which, at one and the same time, Paul's own interpretation of the identity of the remnant was 'a strikingly fresh and original creation' (p.119), while he nevertheless shared certain assumptions about the meaning of the concept and the use of the Old Testament with his Jewish contemporaries.

Other contributions in this first part (which is subtitled 'The Life and Theology of Paul') include an analysis of 'Thanksgiving Within the Structure of Pauline Theology' by Peter O'Brien, a comparison of 'The Christ-Christian Relationship in Paul and John' by Stephen Smalley, and a lively discussion of 'Interpretations of Paul in *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*' by Margaret Howe, who sounds a topical note by asking whether this apocryphal work is a 'liberation document'. She concludes, however, that far from being portrayed as a liberated woman, Thecla is regarded as capable of leadership only in so far as she suppresses everything that is essentially female, and 'exists only as an extension of Paul's influence and personality' (p.46).

Moving on to the twentieth century, we have an essay on 'Process Theology and the Pauline Doctrine of the Incarnation' by Bruce Demarest, who compares the two and reaches the unsurprising conclusion that they are in important respects very different. Although we may well agree with the author that 'it is irresponsible to dismiss the Pauline testimony' (p.139), it is arguable that he is himself too hasty in dismissing modern expressions of Christology when he contrasts 'the timeless truth of revelation' with 'the whims of the current philosophical fad'. Process theology may or may not be a fad, but the problems of cultural relativity are not so easily solved: nevertheless the demonstration of the differences between Pauline theology and process theology remind us of the folly of trying to read back twentieth-century ideas is contributed by Donald Hagner, who surveys the interpretation of 'Paul in Modern Jewish Thought', and shows how 'Jewish scholars have increasingly stressed Paul's authentic Jewishness' (p.155).

Two of the essays in this volume tackle the well-worn problem of Rom. 7. The first, by David Wenham, entitled 'The Christian Life: A Life of Tension?--A Consideration of the Nature of Christian Experience in Paul', argues in the direction that the title suggests. the struggle of Rom. 7 is that of the Christian living in two ages at once. The second, by Robert Gundry, entitled 'The Moral Frustration of Paul Before His Conversion' Sexual Lust in Romans 7 7-25', is found in the second part of the book (incidentally demonstrating the artificiality of the division between Part I and Part II, which is sub-titled 'Literary and Exegetical Studies within the Pauline Corpus'). Gundry adopts the autobiographical interpretation, and argues that Rom. 6:7-25 describes the experience of Paul *before* his conversion; the command not to covet which proved Paul's undoing is to be understood in terms of sexual lust, which is the most likely temptation to attack a boy at puberty, when he achieves the status of *bar mitzvah*. The possibility cannot be denied, though there is nothing in the context of Rom. 7.7 to point to sexual desire, and 7.8 seems to suggest that Paul had 'all kinds of covetousness' in mind. Nevertheless, Gundry's article is a spirited defence of a somewhat unfashionable view of this chapter.

Other essays in this section include 'Colossians 1:15-20', a useful exposition of that passage by Paul Beasley-Murray; 'The Pauline Style as Lexical Choice', a study of IN KEIN and related verbs' by Moises Silva a survey of the theme of 'Justification by Faith in 1 and 2 Corinthians' by Ronald Fung, and an interesting attempt to answer the question 'Why did Paul Write Romans?' by John Drane, who finds the answer to lie more in Paul's own situation than in the problems of the Roman church. Romans, he suggests, is a reformulation of the teaching of Galatians, 'as Paul now saw it through the spectacles of his experiences at Corinth' (p.223). The final essay, by Murray Harris, on 'Titus 2:13 and the Deity of Christ', sets out the arguments for believing that this verse refers to Jesus Christ as 'our great God and Saviour'—arguments that would be even more persuasive if the Pauline authorship of Titus were not assumed.

Most of the essays in this book are written, as one might expect, from a conservative stance. The fact that only rarely is this allowed to prejudge the issue is some indication of the influence of the scholar whom they honour.

Morna D. Hooker

A BASIC INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. A BASIC INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. Robert C. Walton (ed.). SCM Press. London. 1980. 234 and 216 pages. £3.50 each.

These books have a family history; they are descended from *The Teachers' Commentary*, published by SCM Press in 1932, revised and enlarged six editions later in 1955, and for almost forty years a valued friend (not to say refuge in time of need) to teachers, students, clergy, lay preachers and indeed anyone with a more than superficial interest in the Bible.

In 1970 the *Commentary* was succeeded by *A Source Book of the Bible for Teachers*, edited by Robert C. Walton,—succeeded, but never really replaced, for the *Source Book* was both broader in scope and more restricted in detail than the *Commentary*. The restriction lay in the replacement of the traditional introduction to and verse-by-verse commentary on the books of the Bible by a series of articles roughly following the chronological order of the Old and New Testaments, dealing thoroughly with critical problems, methods of study, ideas and their significance, but only very selectively with the text itself. The Editor summed up the change in the Preface when he wrote '. . . if the reader wishes to know, for example, what the Covenant meant to the people of Israel, he will find the information here. If, on the other hand, he requires a full exposition of such a phrase as "the covenant of an everlasting priesthood" (Num. 25.13) he will need to consult a commentary on the book of Numbers'. The assumption was that close textual study (apart from examinations) was less used and useful in schools than a general grasp of the sweep of events and the lives and ideas that lay behind them. The broadening in scope consisted in the inclusion of a series of articles by religious educationists designed to help teachers use the Bible not only effectively but also in accordance with the new ideas which had revolutionised Religious education following the research done in the nineteen-sixties by Ronald Goldman, Harold Loukes, Edwin Cox and others. Child-centred, life-orientated, topic-or-theme-based, socially relevant: these approaches needed much thought and scholarship if biblical teaching in schools was not to be reduced to the use of a series of convenient proof-texts. Teachers grumbled at the disappearance of the *Commentary*, but were grateful for the academic and paedagogical help offered by the *Source Book*.

Ten years and several educational revolutions later some, though by no means all, of the Religious Education articles have a dated look; the biblical articles, on the other hand, continue to provide solid basic material for anyone who uses the Bible in statutory or voluntary education. It was an excellent idea to make separate volumes of the Old Testament and New Testament chapters, prefacing each with Robert C. Walton's 'What is the Bible?', and John Bowden's 'The Biblical Scholar and his Tools'. The articles are reproduced unaltered (obviously deceased contributors could hardly be expected to re-write, and it is not difficult to guess how much extra cost in production and printing would have been involved in any radical revision). So the price remains reasonable, and the Editor has replaced with some photographs the tedious-looking maps of the *Source Book*, and has revised the books recommended 'for further reading'.

I was disappointed with both lists, admittedly it is difficult to know where to stop, but it seems extraordinary that whilst older books have been removed suitable newer ones have not always appeared to replace them. For example, John H. Eaton's *Psalms: Introduction and Commentary* (SCM Torch Series, 1967) had been excised, but his *Kingship and the Psalms* (SCM, 1976) has not been included; in the 'Miracles' section of the New Testament volume C.F.D. Moule's *Miracles* no longer figures, leaving only three books on the list. One concludes that *Kingship and the Psalms* is deemed too difficult for this readership (a judgment with which I venture to disagree), and that there is one book less in print on the subject of Miracles, (a state of affairs which I find hard to accept).

This carping aside, these books are splendid value. If you are a student or graduate of theology they may not tell you anything you have not been told already, but they summarise clearly, they are potentially considerable time-savers, and they give what they promise,—a *basic* introduction to the Old and New Testaments.

Enid B.Mellor

THE HUMAN POTENTIAL by P. Hinchliff and D. Young. D.L.T. 1981: 161pp: £4.50.

The Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury sets the scene of this book which he sees as an attempt to speak to "those many men and women who stand outside the Christian Church but who share the Christian desire for a better world, and the Christian search for ways of realising such a world". That the authors have this aim is clear from the welcome lack of theological 'in-talk' and, more importantly, from their desire to commend a lowest common denominator as regards man's view of himself and the reality of which he is a part, upon which then to construct a reasoned and progressive Christian apologetic. Whether or not they are successful is another matter.

The authors rightly conclude that we, in common with all mankind can no longer view God as a causal explanation of the way things are. The reasons why this is no longer possible are already well versed, they are, however, presented here simply and concisely. We are then presented with an alternative, to believe in God is to believe that the whole of reality is at basis 'personal'. Such a view is not new, the way has been well trodden by, amongst others, Temple and Whitehead, and here it shares the same difficulties previous attempts encountered. Is it really being true to the very accurate picture these authors paint of modern man and his demands, to so quickly abandon any attempt to commend God as an explanation (even if that word were to be somewhat refined and qualified) and to move so totally and readily to what is, admittedly a much more subjective, indeed poetic, description of God? Like it or not, right or wrong, modern man demands explanations, runs his life by, sets his parameters within that which is explicable, but nowhere in this book is any attempt made via 'personal' concepts and language to view God as an explanation. Surely a fatal error in a book claiming to address modern man "where he is".

We are then invited to consider Jesus as the 'stencil' through whom we view reality, our own life and conduct. Whilst the less-structured, less-dogmatic view here presented is refreshing and honest, the question remains as to what is the precise relationship between viewing Christ as the 'stencil' and viewing reality as 'personal'. Which comes first—or is that an inappropriate question? Does the honest enquirer need to be convinced of the 'personal' nature of reality before Jesus has sufficient attraction, not to mention authority to be seen as a 'stencil'; or does the enquirer, rather, have to make a leap in the dark and accept Jesus as the 'stencil' before any vision of 'personal' reality is at all possible? The authors would not wish to be committed to either of these alternatives and would view such 'temporal' considerations as inappropriate, for on page 105 they state that we "move back and forth between the way in which we see reality and the New Testament assertion that in Christ God has reconciled the World to Himself". No doubt here, they are providing a correct description of how our faith develops, we rightly monitor our claims and beliefs about Jesus by what we know of the world and our life in it, whilst at the same time 'nudging' and refining our vision of the world by what we see in Christ. That this is gloriously circular we know, and we are able to live with that knowledge, because within the Christian community we see that the circularity doesn't stop the process working. But, what about the honest outside enquirer who does not have the privilege of the insiders' experience. Will not he, analytical empiricist that he is, be at best put off, at worst totally alienated by such blatant circularity?

The reader is then led into a consideration of the Christian response. Great stress is rightly and clearly laid upon the corporate nature of Christian discipleship, and the balance finally kept between political involvement and political drowning for the Christian. There is a brief, perhaps too brief, treatment of Christian morality, motive rather than specific actions is what matters. Perhaps to ask for more is a little unrealistic in a book dedicated in just over 160 pages to such a vast and basic apologetic, but it surely can't have escaped the authors' notice that one very urgent and pressing area of debate between the Christian and non-Christian man of goodwill is that of moral action.

This book deserves to be read, it is a brave and refreshingly humble attempt at respectful persuasion rather than a self-satisfied frontal attack on secular man. As such, it will prove useful in parish as well as college as an example of the attitude from which all of us should be working. The questions which can be raised are not peculiar to this single book, but sadly they remain for the future.

Edward Morris

THE FIRE AND THE ROSE ARE ONE by Sebastian Moore. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1980. xv + 158pp. £4.95.

The words from T. S. Eliot's "Little Gidding" which Dom Sebastian Moore has chosen for the title of his new book aptly set the tone for a theological work in which he explores familiar ground in a new way, leading us "to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time". In his deeply personal search into the meaning of the crucifixion he chooses the way of the heart rather than of the intellect (as he says, from "inside out" rather than from "outside in"), and succeeds in achieving "that weddedness of mind and heart" which has been denied for centuries. He takes the feelings seriously and this together with the liveliness of his speculative intelligence gives the book its warmth and engages the reader's commitment.

Acknowledging a debt to Ernest Becker and Bernard Lonergan who helped his thought along the way, and equipped with a sound understanding of the insights of modern humanistic psychology, he begins his search by asking, what do all human beings desire? He finds the answer not in happiness but in the need to feel significant. This raises the question, significant to whom? and presupposes the existence of another or others; so the self cannot rightly be considered in isolation. On the level of human relationships, mature fulfilment comes through acceptance in love. On the deepest level the question about significance addresses itself with more urgency and anxiety than we consciously admit to the source of our being, the unknown reality. The transforming experience of religious conversion is the realisation that the unknown other is the loving God.

The counterpull to the radical desire to be of worth and to be loved is radical guilt, seen as isolation, withdrawnness, love in reverse; this pulls us out of our proper shape which is formed by the positive desire "to be myself for another." Guilt is tied up with a sense of worthlessness, it makes the other ugly, blames it and embitters relationship. Only the true sense of self given by love can dissolve it.

Jesus alone is without guilt, and therefore hears unimpeded the Yes of the Beloved; he lifts people up so that they too can shed their guilt and hear this voice. That was how the disciplies felt in those ecstatic days when they seemed to have entered with him the Reign of God. But then came the collapse, the ignominious death of Jesus on the cross. To his followers this failure, this eclipse of their new vision, must have seemed like the death of God. And indeed it was the death of the old perception of God whom man's guilt had seen as essentially powerful rather than essentially loving, in the Master-Slave relationship which had traditionally perverted the relationship between God and man. Through their desolation the disciples enounter Jesus alive and enspirited after death, and come to experience God as loving and as opening up his eternal vitality to us through lifting Jesus out of death. No wonder there was at first a "displacement of divinity" from God the Father to Jesus.

This is the major argument, but the book is difficult to summarise and touches on many other matters which are found relevant as the main thesis is pursued. A tendency to discursiveness is kept in hand by the short chapters and the division into three parts; there are summaries along the way, and some chapters are almost in note form (e.g. ch. 2); sometimes the language is obscure, as the writer seems to be wrestling with his thought (ch. 17), sometimes it rises to poetry (ch. 26). This variety of style is refreshing, and throughout the book is remarkably free from theological jargon.

For believers this book offers new insight into beliefs and formulas that have come to be taken for granted, for non-believing searchers it offers a statement of belief which starts from their own felt experience.

Helen Hudson