
Dr. Mascall's Gifford Lectures offer a Grand Tour of recent work in the field where he is England's most learned, lucid and reliable guide—natural theology in the scholastic tradition, based on the cosmological insight (mislabeled 'argument') that the world's being is contingent, and therefore dependent, and therefore open to God and to enrichment by grace. Under Mascall's genial direction we review current argy-bargy about the ontological argument; the 'Transcendental Thomism' of Maréchal, Coreth, Karl Rahner and Bernard Lonergan, who set out from the Kantian Waterloo of critical epistemology but rock over to the scholastic Brighton Line at what Germans might call the Clapham-Junction-point; the Neo-Thomism of Gilson, who as it were starts his journey from Victoria by insisting that we really do know things and no idealist can tell us different; the self-cancelling relativism of Leslie Dewart, who cuts all theological knots by rejecting the notion of abiding truth (as if to cure ingrowing toenails by amputating the feet); and finally the God-shrinking immanentism of process theology, which posits a finite mutable creator evolving with—indeed, in—a finite mutable creation.

Nor is the book simply a survey of others' work; it makes good Mascall's claim to be offering 'a new survey of the basic structure of natural theology' (p. 6). His final sentence, 'We are not concerned with what is simple but with what is true' (p. 266), might have stood on the title page as a warning; since natural theology is no easier than any other branch of metaphysics, and because some of the men studied would be hard to follow if their theme were golf, let alone God, the book takes some chewing. Yet the clarity achieved, in view of the nature of the material, is extraordinary, and merits unstinted praise.

Four points struck me as specially noteworthy. First, Mascall's modesty. He insists that his is not the only valid way to do natural theology. 'As I see it, the function of natural theology is to locate precisely the point or points at which the natural empirical order impinges upon the transcendent and supernatural and opens towards it. In the text of the present work I have located that point in the dual character of reality and contingency inherent in the finite as such' (p. 216). Others, however, will with equal and comple-
mentary validity locate other points—like Peter Berger the sociologist, whose work is summarised appreciatively in an appendix. Second, Mascall's *theism*, which is very robust. I am not sure it is happy—I fear, indeed, it is rationalistic—to express the biblical thought of God's eternal consistency and independence by calling him timeless and changeless (p. 159), but the argument developed against process theology is masterly. Third, Mascall's *realist epistemology*. For him, as for Reformed men like Calvin, Kuyper and Lecerf (in Part I of his much-neglected *Introduction to Reformed Dogmatics*), theism entails the givenness of knowledge no less than of grace, and realism is the only account of human knowledge that squares with this. Fourth, Mascall's *correlation of faith and reason*. Mascall the Neo-Thomist seems as clear as any Augustinian Protestant that all actual knowledge of God is by revelation, and that the subject matter of natural theology can be no more than a 'common element' in this knowledge—one that is not in fact found alone; and Protestant Augustinians should not, I think hesitate, to leave Barth (who at this point left Calvin) and agree with Mascall that though revelation is only grasped by inward illumination, whence flows faith, yet the grasping process requires reasoning in the basic sense of thinking it through, and seeing it to be reasonable and more than reasonable, but not less. Isn't this, after all, where natural theology properly comes in?

J. I. PACKER


Mr. Cupitt's first set of Stanton Lectures is a contribution to the current philosophical debate about the meaning and logic of Christian theological statements. The book is energetic and enigmatic, stimulating and slippery. Its enigmatic quality flows partly from the author's habit of not developing his thoughts in full, partly from his insistence that the logical problems of theism are endless, and partly from his addiction to analytical tools sharpened for him by empiricist Philistines. The effect is to give a sceptical cast to what is meant (I think) as constructive Christian argument. Mr. Cupitt is certainly on the side of the angels in rejecting non-cognitive analyses of theological language; in affirming the usefulness of argument ('informal logic') in theology, both for inducing assent and for justifying beliefs already held; and in his robust assumption that the logical subject of Christological affirmations is the historical person, Jesus of Nazareth. Yet there is ambivalence here, which becomes plain when one compares the book's title with its layout. 'Christ and the hiddenness of God' suggests that the book will show how Jesus Christ qualifies that hiddenness, and traces of this purpose are certainly discoverable. But the first section, called in Manselish manner 'the limits of thought about God', is devoted to affirming that for theism God is incomprehensible in such a sense that the logic of theology must be relentlessly iconoclastic—for 'God must be spoken of, yet he cannot be spoken of... creator and creature can in no sense be two of a kind' (p. 92, my italics). Theology's task is to form images and then break them. And then the second section, called 'the structure of belief in Christ', argues that though sense can be made of talk about knowing Christ, knowing his presence, and knowing God through him, yet the self-cancelling logic of theism remains as it was, and indeed the gospels reinforce it. Much here depends on whether you can go along with Cupitt the form-critic in saying, as I can't, 'in
St. Mark Jesus does not understand what is happening to him, and is not in command of events: his plight is truly tragic’ (p. 212). If you have doubts about the criticism and the Christology which that statement reflects, you will have quite a lot of difficulty with Cupitt’s second section.

Developing the thesis (surely true), that ‘there is no judgment about Christ which does not make some historical claim, but equally there is no purely historical judgment which entails a theological judgment’ (p. 136), Cupitt argues that New Testament faith in the resurrection was the product of reasoning about Jesus’ life and death in the light of the Old Testament rather than of an empty tomb and visionary appearances. Here (where it would seem that complementary realities are being treated as alternatives) much depends on whether with Cupitt you can say, as again I can’t, ‘I can imagine [Paul] preaching and proving Jesus as crucified and risen Messiah without it being necessary for him to invoke a Resurrection-Event or eyewitness testimony to it. They are, I think, logically superfluous’ (p. 167). Again, the Christology and also the soteriology implicit here seem disturbingly inadequate.

Cupitt is right to highlight the logical opaqueness of transcendence, but if he had reflected more on the concept of the imago Dei, in connection with both the creation of man as a language-user and the incarnation of the Son as a divine teacher, he would I think have come out of this particular wood at a different point.

The book has that pleasant kind of index in which Black Muslims and William Blake, John Locke and Loch Ness Monster (in that order!), Mr. Pickwick and Pontius Pilate, and Van Buren, Paul, and Venus, Planet, rub shoulders with each other. J. I. PACKER


Mr. Cupitt’s second set of Stanton Lectures is meant to act on the Christian tradition as a dose of salts, purging out objectionable features and so toning it up by slimming it down. The book is thus (if an Oxford man dare say this) a typical horse from the modern Cambridge stable. The most digestible chapter is the first, which argues that the ‘story’, ‘drama’, or ‘cosmic redemption myth’ proclaimed by the New Testament, Augustine and most since is a largely unauthentic composite, fashioned principally to solve the problem of evil and failing to do so because it represents God Himself as on the whole bad. The fumes of the form-critical imagination seem to operate here as a kind of theological cannabis resin; less euphoria and more sense of the problems of this audacious thesis would have been in order. It needs to be said that a circumspect anthropomorphism is necessary if we are to think of God as acting in any sense at all (otherwise, like the girl in C. S. Lewis’ story, we are left with God conceived as infinite rice pudding); and furthermore that the Incarnation validates such anthropomorphism up to the hilt. What Mr. Cupitt would put in the place of the story he urges us to ditch does not appear. Nor is he fair to the story itself. ‘It must represent God as... being in a dilemma for which the Incarnation and death of Christ are the one and only solution. . . . God and Christ must be pictured either as like one human being or as like two,’ and if as two ‘then the Son is pictured as volunteering, because noblesse oblige . . .’ (p. 27). This is not telling the story as Paul, John, Augustine and orthodox Catholic and Protestant theology have
told it; this is guying it in the manner of Socinus, Tom Paine, and (unwittingly) degenerate Arminianism. Criticism of this sort is unworthy of Cambridge, even when it presses the Cur Deus Homo into service.

The rest of the book offers learned, sensitive and often acute comment on morbid elements in traditional asceticism, the subjection of women (on which the Bible viewpoint is not noted carefully enough), the cruel church-based intolerance and oppression which has sometimes gone with dogmatic faith, the 'stifling character' of dependence-imagery (where rationalism finally trips Mr. Cupitt up), spiritual utilitarianism, and the alleged phoniness of theology.

J. I. PACKER


This is an interesting book, and may become an important one. Professor Greeley is a rebel, and sets himself up against what he calls the conventional wisdom, according to which, with industrialisation, urbanisation and technocracy, religion by a necessary process is bound to lose its influence and probably in the end to disappear.

The book is not easy to read. Greeley, like most sociologists, writes at times in an esoteric jargon which is not easily intelligible to others. To make matters worse, a large part of the book consists of quotations from other sociologists, each of whom writes in his own idiom, and this, as even Greeley admits, is sometimes far from luminous. Of course the whole is written against an American background, which is alien to the ideas and interests of most British readers. But the intending student should not be deterred by these difficulties; the book contains a number of valuable insights (I myself found particularly valuable the discussion of the evidential value of the sense of moral outrage on pp. 208-209), and interesting perspectives.

Professor Greeley's main contention is that the religious needs of man remain much as they have been since neolithic times and that they continue to demand satisfaction. While it is probable that religious observance in the west has considerably declined, the evidence so far adduced is statistically defective, and of course no man can measure the decline, if any, in actual religious need. The mythical modern man, who has 'come of age' and therefore feels that he has no more need of God, exists mostly on University campuses and mostly among professors. The addiction of American students to magical practices and other strange forms of religion suggests that, if man's religious needs are not met through normal channels, modern man is quite capable of making for himself idols as odd as those of the Amorites and the Hivites. There is no reason at all to suppose that religion will just disappear.

So far the reader can cheerfully go along. But there are grave defects in the book. There is a serious lack of definition of terms. There is a definition of the word 'religion', though it is not one that every reader will find satisfactory. The crucial terms 'symbol' and 'myth' seem nowhere to be defined. This means that the longest chapter in the book, Myth and Man, is also by far the least convincing. A writer who can write of 'the Exodus myth' and 'the Easter myth', without saying exactly what he means by the phrases, is naturally under suspicion.

Professor Greeley has perhaps hardly grappled with the issue, so forcibly put before us by Sigmund Freud, that there is a great deal of bad religion
in the world. In this connection, what do the words 'good' and 'bad' mean? A qualitative judgment is not the first business of the sociologist; but can it be for ever avoided?

Again, less attention than is needed is paid to the question of truth. It is hardly satisfactory to be told that the truth of science and the truth of the myth are quite different kinds of truth. If science and mythology are saying much the same kind of thing in different ways, this may be acceptable; but is this always the case? The Massai in Kenya believe that, when God made the world, he gave all the cattle to the Massai, and that any claim by others to ownership of cattle, is invalid. What kind of truth is expressed in this myth?

Christianity is so radically different from anything else that has ever passed under the name of religion that any attempt to treat Christianity as though it was a species under the wider genus 'religion' is self-condemned to frustrating defeat. It is true that religion is in need of constant re-interpretation. But, if the churches carried out the kind of reinterpretation of the 'Easter myth' that Professor Greeley seems to recommend (p. 248), it is quite certain that within a generation the Christian faith in any recognisable form would simply die out.

So the critical reader is likely to have many reservations in regard to Professor Greeley's arguments. But, if he finds many of these solutions unsatisfactory, by careful reading of this book, he will be in a better position to find more satisfactory solutions for himself.

STEPHEN NEILL, BISHOP


How to suggest the flavour of Faith Facing Facts in terms of literary genre? I beg the use of two hyphens, to call it 'popular-lecture-sermon': a flamboyant mixture of wit and piety, vulgarism and rhetorical flourish, philosophical learning and anecdote. In the first and the last two chapters the sermon predominates, as Welsh as the author's name, with as strong an evangelistic appeal at the end as a moderate Calvinism will allow. The heart of the book is a good review of five topics in Christian apologetic: the meaning of religious claims, reason and faith, the scientific world-view, history, religious experience. Williams' positions lie well within the band of current orthodoxy: science and theology have different roles, belief in historical event is a necessary but not sufficient condition for Christian faith, arguments for the existence of God illuminate rather than demonstrate. Faith is an 'ultimate' understanding of the world in the light of direct experience of God. There is more concern for immediate encounter, less interest in the transcendent implications of natural human experience, than one might find elsewhere. Also a marked absence of emphasis on eschatological verification; is this, perhaps, why Williams is silent on theodicy?

The arguing is not of theclearest, too easily lost in illustration, quotation and rhetoric. But Williams' sound judgment and irresistible enthusiasm must have made these lectures entertaining and instructive to hear. There may be more than one opinion on whether they make a satisfying book.

O. M. T. O'DONOVAN
HE IS THERE AND HE IS NOT SILENT. Francis Schaeffer. Hodder. 96 pp. £0.95.

In his introduction, Dr. Schaeffer tells us that this should have been the third in his series of books, with The God who is There and Escape from Reason preceding it in that order. It is his continued challenge to modern philosophy and to the depersonalised outlook and pessimism of contemporary literature and art. The introduction goes on to list the proper order of his writings and the thrust of his thinking and witness. There follow four main chapters and two appendices, and the argument is deployed along the themes of the intellectual necessity for the personal being of God; the implications of this for the moral framework to living, and to understanding the nature of man as created, but fallen and the results of this for individual and social life and ethics. The final two chapters raise and deal with the problem of knowing; in the first with the collapse of positivism into existentialism and linguistic analysis, that leaves modern life with ultimate meaninglessness which has affected every area of thought and activity; modern man is lost in the blizzard of isolated events with no over-all or ultimate significance so that distinctions between reality and fantasy are lost, and individuals become increasingly alienated. The other, chapter four, takes up the form of the problem as evidenced by Wittgenstein and Heidegger in terms of language, but language which is not just playing games with itself, but reflecting a reality, a transcendent reference. This is met in the Reformed doctrine of Holy Scripture, the verbal form of the speaking of personal Being Who is God, to man in his own distinctiveness as a verbal communicator and himself created by God, within the structured universe. Schaeffer illustrates in many areas how it is that this divine communication is that which not only makes existence meaningful, but that many who ignore or reject it in theory, act and live pragmatically in the assurances of purpose and moral judgment which it alone provides. In the appendices, he defends as reasonable regard for Holy Scripture as actual divine revelation (‘Is propositional revelation nonsense?’) and has a short note distinguishing between faith as an existential leap into the unknown, and faith as a reasonable response to One Who has provided proofs of His faithfulness.

Altogether a chiselled argument that articulates the Christian philosophy as a ‘must’, not a best option, although surprisingly, especially in the light of the last pages of Escape from Reason, it does not include any reference to Jesus Christ as Himself the personal focus both of the revelation of the God who speaks, and of the Scripture that constitutes the continuing verbal form of that communication of God. Two details for comment which do not affect the argument might be mentioned; Aquinas did not primarily affect the ‘Byzantine world’ (p. 50) but moved in the West; and it is not true by any means to say that before his time there was no interest in ‘particulars’, for the twelfth century from Abelard onwards showed a growing nominalism which in one direction stimulated translations of scientific works from the Arabic. Also, it is not accurate Platonism to say that the multiplicity of examples of say, a chair, pointed to an ideal chair (p. 51), but rather to the idea of ‘chairness’, which is rather different, but a necessary distinction if the historic debates on hylomorphology are to be understood. But the book as a whole will surely help many who need a straight direction through modern chaos, and can stand on its own quite apart from the others to which Dr. Schaeffer relates it.

G. J. C. MARCHANT
the end of Genesis 9 indicates the complexity of Genesis 1-11, as well as arousing the suspicion that Westermann is trying to establish some sort of record. Within the severe limits of the series, how, for example, is one going to treat Genesis 1? Should the commentator dwell on the ancient near eastern background, or discuss the tenfold creative word, the eight acts of creation and the six-day scheme of creation? Should he expound the theme of creation and separation, or discuss the theological significance of the model of the creative word? Professor Davidson concentrates upon the ancient near eastern background, both illuminating the biblical text by reference to relevant parallels, and indicating the uniqueness of the faith of Israel. Within his own terms of reference, Professor Davidson's work is thorough, lucid, and often penetrating.

However, the reviewer cannot help regretting that concentration on the ancient near eastern background has given the author little room for interpreting Genesis 1-11 in the light of wider aspects of the biblical message. Professor Davidson acknowledges that Genesis 1-11 'are the fruit of reflection upon much that is found elsewhere in the Old Testament' (p. 8), in which case it would have been good to see more made of the themes of covenant and election in the Flood narrative; also, the themes of election and of the persecution of the righteous by the unrighteous in the story of Cain and Abel might have been stressed. Even granted that at least one of the authors of Genesis 1-11 deliberately cast his material in a manner antithetic to contemporary polytheism and moral laxity, the questions remain (1) how far readers of the material in its final form were aware of such antitheses and (2) whether the best level of interpretation is that in the light of a modern scholarly reconstruction of ancient near eastern religion. Professor Davidson could hardly be expected to deal with such questions in a commentary of this size; it is a pity, however, that they remain in one's mind even in the face of such a competent piece of work.

J. W. ROGERSON

GENESIS IN SPACE AND TIME. Francis A. Schaeffer. Hodder & Stoughton. 167 pp. £1.00.

Subtitled 'the flow of biblical history' this work seeks to assert the importance of Genesis 1-11 as a form of pre-secular history grounded in actual events rather than as myth in the sense of a story constructed to explain the cosmos to man's meaning seeking mind. His use of the term 'myth' is uncertain and varies from statements like, 'we are finding more and more that mythology in general often has some historic base to his opinion that flood myths all over the world are contorted'. This mishandling of the question of myth is unfortunate in a book concerned with relating early Genesis to wider Christian thinking.

On a theological front Schaeffer makes some interesting points with respect to the Trinity as an interpersonal communication system but leaves elaboration of this important theme to the reader. His argument that the descendents of Cain and Abel constitute two lines of humanity, one against and one for God seems weak especially when he uses this distinction to explain the reference to the sons of God and the daughters of men in Genesis 6. The new humanity in Christ is mentioned but not emphasised is this, perhaps, because his stress on the mannishness of fallen man is too great?

In hammering home the point that God acts in space and time the book is good; sympathetic readers will persevere to the end but learn little more
than this truth save, perhaps, that Neanderthal Man buried his dead in petals.

DOUGLAS J. DAVIES


The Norwegian scholar's book is a collection of essays (four of the seven previously published in journals) mainly dealing with the problem of Jews and Gentiles in the theology of Luke. The author's thesis is that for Luke there is one people of Israel, continuous with the people of God in the Old Testament: the preaching of the gospel leads to the purging from Israel of those Jews who refuse to believe and adds to Israel those Gentiles who do believe. The precondition of the mission to the Gentiles is not, as is usually said, the rejection of the gospel by the Jews but rather the successful proclamation of the gospel to the Jews. The Samaritans are regarded not as Gentiles but as part of Israel (provided of course that they believe). It follows that Jewish Christians continue to observe the law of Moses quite strictly. Paul and James are seen as figures who justify to Jewish Christians the legitimacy of a church which includes Gentiles as well as Jews.

This is a stimulating set of essays, and it helps to correct some one-sided views of Luke. But it is open to the charge of playing down evidence which points in other directions, especially Acts 13:46f. In some ways the one essay which stands apart from the others will be of most interest to conservative readers. In attempting to answer the question whether Luke had traditions about the history of the early church at his disposal, Jervell shows from the writings of Paul that such traditions certainly existed; reference to the missionaries who brought the gospel and to other groups of believers formed part of the message preached by Paul (e.g. 1 Thess. 1:8ff.; 2 Cor. 3:1-3; 2 Thess. 1:4). Thus the assumptions of Dibelius and Haenchen about the unlikelihood of Luke's having historical traditions at his disposal are unfounded.

Professor Wilson's book, a Durham Ph.D. thesis, takes issue with some of Jervell's conclusions. It is a carefully executed study of the attitude of Luke to the Gentiles, contrasting his outlook with that of Jesus and of Paul. He finds that Jesus expected an eschatological ingathering of the Gentiles into the kingdom but did not foresee the Gentile mission (cf. Jeremias). Luke, following further the lead given by Mark, saw the conversion of the Gentiles as taking place through a mission during the time of the church, planned and foretold by God, and empowered by the Spirit. This means that Luke had to modify Jesus' expectation of the imminent parousia to allow for the mission; the End is delayed, but still near. There follows a detailed study of the material in Acts. Wilson develops the point that Luke took a pragmatic approach to the Jew-Gentile problem, claiming that Gentiles who were pious were just as good as Jews and equally entitled to receive the gospel. But he stresses that there is no unified or developed theology in Luke. Luke's interests were not so much theological as practical; he was a pastor speaking to the situation in the contemporary church. 'He was far more concerned to produce an intelligible history... than he was to produce what we would call a theology' (p. 255). This is a significant criticism of
attempts to over-emphasise Luke's theological motivation. As a historian Luke did his best to produce a reliable, though schematised account, and if on occasions he is inaccurate, this is due to a variety of reasons which does not include wilful perversion of the facts as he knew them. Indeed the author frequently criticises the wilder views of radical commentators on Acts.

The book covers rather too wide an area of country, but throughout it is based on wide knowledge of modern scholarship. At several points its argumentation fails to convince, but despite the detailed criticisms that space forbids here it remains a fine piece of scholarship with much of value to offer to the student of Luke-Acts.

HOWARD MARSHALL


Although concerning different epistles of the New Testament, these two books have a good deal in common which invites comparison. Both are intended for the general reader. They are based on the RSV text, which is quoted in full. Despite the page difference, each book contains about 50,000 words. Even on that score, John Stott's is the better buy. Certainly it is by far the meatier of the two. One would think that Stott's level is rather beyond that of the 'average Christian' McDonald has in mind. Nevertheless, even with transliterated Greek, which could put off some unlearned readers, Stott makes the text live in a manner which is somehow lacking in McDonald. Perhaps the greater use of short sentences helps. The painting of word-pictures catches our attention. Details of the social and historical background keep our interest. Application makes the text relevant. I suspect too that making points by means of a frequent if slightly disguised 'first, secondly, thirdly' in Stott encourages the reader to believe that he is getting somewhere, whereas McDonald ploughs stolidly on, verse by verse. The fact that Stott is basing his text on material he has preached a good many times is part of the explanation. He talks to an audience. McDonald cannot see the faces looking up at him. The scholarship of both authors is hardly in doubt. But one can teach the other much about the art of communication.

NORMAN HILLYER

THE MEANING OF RIGHTEOUSNESS IN PAUL: A LINGUISTIC AND THEOLOGICAL ENQUIRY. J. A. Ziesler. CUP. 255 pp. £5.80.

This careful and close linguistic and exegetical study has a limited but important object: to answer the question whether St. Paul's use of words related to dikaiοω are only forensic, or whether they can sometimes be shown to have an ethical connotation. Dr. Ziesler is Tutor in New Testament at Trinity College, Auckland, New Zealand, and has presented a study that well merits the publication under the S.N.T.S. Monograph Series. He grounds his approach to Paul's use in a thorough examination of the Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, Inter-testamental literature and rabbinic writings, as well as the other New Testament books. The examination tests the use of the verb, noun and adjective and comes to the conclusion that the verb 'to justify' has a dominant relational meaning, often forensically, 'to acquit', while the noun 'righteousness' and the adjective 'righteous' are much more behavioural
in meaning, even though referring to behaviour 'in Christ'. Thus 'Christians are both justified by faith (i.e. restored to fellowship, acquitted) and also righteous by faith (i.e. leading a new life in Christ). These two are not identical, yet they are complimentary and inseparable'. Ziesler calls for an avoidance of interpreting the noun and adjective by the verb or vice versa. In this semantic exercise, he has taken to heart the warnings of James Barr as to etymological fallacies while noting also the important basic study by David Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, as an example.

In dealing with St. Paul's own writings, one chapter deals with all the Pauline corpus apart from Galatians and Romans; these two latter books are made the subject each of a separate chapter, in which the thesis is worked out exegetically in the teaching of each book. Before this, but after the chapter on the other Pauline writings, there is the statement of the thesis which is like a watershed in the whole: 'Righteousness in Christ'. Ziesler takes up the theme of the corporate Christ in Paul. 'To be "in Christ" is to be in relationship with Christ, but there is more than this—Christ is seen as an inclusive figure, in whom believers are incorporate. The life in Christ is the life of faith; to believe is to be in Christ. As faith is indivisible, there is no distinction of that faith which is a response to God's action in Christ (i.e. justifying faith) from that which is the Christian's continuing life' (p. 165). 'The whole incorporative notion thus includes both the facts of our redemption and the subsequent life of the redeemed; "Christ is the place" in whom believers are and in whom salvation is"'. The formula has these two foci about which it revolves, and each of which predominated in turn but which are always connected' (quoting from E. Best, One Body in Christ). Ziesler stresses that not only is the work of justification entirely dependent upon divine grace, received simply by faith, but also the ethical righteousness of the believer's life is never just his own, never a personal possession, but is a participation in Christ, again by faith, even though to outward appearance he will be living righteously. Because this righteousness is God's gift in Christ, it cannot rightly be described as 'imparted'; rather it is 'lived in'.

This general conclusion is derived from the argument that Paul is faithful to the background from which he had come, and that the use he makes of the verb, follows the far more frequent declaratory significance as to a relationship, with additional forensic overtones which derives from both Hebrew and Greek origins, while the noun and adjective are also used as in Hebrew, as a way of acting, and less the character of the actor, or his consequent status; it is in fact loyalty to the covenant terms. Ziesler admits that Paul may have stretched the vocabulary beyond the usual limits, and if the Jewish doctrine of merit is in view, can even have stood it on its head; but he mainly contends that Paul worked within the usual range of the main meaning of the words. Here the issues of exegesis will come to the fore and there will be a good deal of testing needed to justify the conclusions on some passages; there are parts of the argument on certain passages that may seem a little more confident than can be clearly sustained, as for example that on Philippians 3: 7-11. Nevertheless, what many have discerned as a twofold emphasis in Paul's teaching, taking into consideration, as Ziesler does, the important related truths of the power of the risen Christ and of the indwelling Spirit in the believer, has here been very effectively expounded.

Not, by any means, a minor interest in this study is the way Dr. Ziesler
sees this as a reconciling work between Protestant and Roman Catholic doctrine on this whole subject. He surveys the main threads of this discussion up to the present in the introduction, and offers a conclusion just before his final testing of the thesis in Galatians and Romans: 'While both "imputed" and "imparted" approaches are inadequate and inaccurate, nevertheless both preserve one part of Paul's two-sided doctrine and their basic affirmations must stand. Justification does not mean "make righteous", yet we do not need to make inferences from Paul's total theology in order to preserve ethical seriousness, for Paul does this in his juxtaposition of the twin doctrines of justification by faith and righteousness by faith' (p. 171).

While he affirms that the two aspects of the vocabulary were not separable for Paul, neither were they confused or interchangeable, and it has been here that the historic Protestant and Roman Catholic controversy has focussed. It is a pity that the above quotation dismisses the term 'imputed' without very much discussion; it requires more elucidation in terms of what the Reformers understood by the very phrase 'in Christ' which Ziesler rightly emphasises in this study of the two uses of 'righteousness'. That he is right in rejecting 'imparted' as a helpful term is one of the important results of this study, especially for the eirenical purposes he hopes it will serve. It may well assist some Roman Catholic theologians such as Kung, who have already gone a long way in the terms of this study, as well as clearing the area of discussion for future positive steps. If it could be coupled with a similarly thorough study of 'Grace', similarly ecumenically aware, we would be well equipped for progress. But apart from this important implicate of the study, it stands as a thorough piece of Biblical exegesis that all students of the Scriptures could work over for a long time with great profit.

G. J. C. MARCHANT


This book is one of a series under the title Church History Outlines, published for the Church Historical Society. One might therefore assume that it would be of significance largely to medieval historians, and that its main theme would be one of ecclesiastical thought. In fact this is not so. The Professor of Medieval History at the University of Southampton has written a book which ought to interest and stimulate a large number of people.

Clearly, a statement like this needs to be justified. Colin Morris' theme is that Western Christian civilisation, with all the impact that this has had on the culture of the rest of the world, is based on a concept of the individual which is not held by many other peoples: 'Western culture, and the Western type of education, has developed this sense of individuality to an extent exceptional among the civilisations of the world.'

The contrast of this with the 'group' identity (whether tribe or family or community) is apparent. Professor Morris does not look for the origin of this sense of individuality; rather he looks for the period when it first became the dominant theme in the culture of the West. This was not the Renaissance period as has so often been supposed; others, like Professor Ullman, have already pushed the origins of 'political individualism' back earlier. But it is left to Colin Morris to assert: 'If we concentrate more on the development of self-awareness and self-expression, on the freedom of a man to declare himself without paying excessive attention to the demands of convention or the
dictates of authority, then we may well find that the twelfth century was in this respect a peculiarly creative age.' Cautious words indeed for what is so convincingly demonstrated in the pages which follow.

The concept did not of course first arise in the twelfth century; the book shows this. But the core of the book is devoted to this period. And here the author amply proves his point. Whether one looks at art or religious thought, at the troubadour songs and other poetry or architecture, it is clear that what Professor Morris posits as his starting point is true. And it is here that this book, well produced, illustrated with eight splendid photographs, and cheap, will appeal to so many readers. The author shows his facility to use all sorts of evidence; he is at home whether talking about Abelard or Chretien de Troyes. And with a theme as important as his for the understanding of current assumptions, the book has considerable significance for today.

Indeed, its importance may well lie in the things it does not say as much as in the things which it so clearly demonstrates. For some far-reaching questions are provoked by it. Can we see in this theme of individuality a genuine unifying theme for human development in the West over the last 800 years? Is thus the medieval world really a part of our own world and not 'irrelevant', as is so often urged? The whole issue of the decline of individuality and the reassertion of the claims of the 'group' in modern society is not of course a new one, but can the discussion now be seen rather better in its context? It is not the purpose of this book even to raise such questions, but that it does so will demonstrate how stimulating and indeed compulsive this book is.

ALAN ROGERS


The Confutation is the longest of More's works and has not been reprinted since Queen Mary I's reign. Students of the English Reformation will be very grateful to the editors and to Yale University Press for this excellent edition, it is well printed and thoroughly and scholarly edited.

The text of the Confutation itself occupies 1,034 pages, the remaining 800 pages are given to commentary and appendices. The first appendix reprints Robert Barnes' treatise on the church in his Supplication of 1531, and also his answer to More in the 1534 edition of the Supplication. It is very useful for theologians of the English Reformation to have in a convenient form this important statement of the Reformed doctrine of the church as understood in the early days of the English Reformation. Amongst points of interest are the notes on the church which Barnes gives, namely two, the preaching of the pure Word of God and the fruit of good works in the hearers (p. 1048). The second appendix lists the title pages of 41 English protestant books printed abroad in the decade 1525-1535.

The last volume of the trilogy contains essays on More's polemical career, More's view of the church, the career of Robert Barnes, and a full commentary on the text of the Confutation with a glossary of words in the Confutation whose forms and meanings are not easily recognisable. There is also a very full index of more than 50 pages.

It will be seen that the three books which comprise Volume 8 of the Yale
edition of More’s works will prove a valuable aid in understanding the theological thought of the early English Reformation as well as the thought and character of Thomas More himself. The commentary, in particular, is invaluable for understanding the background and allusions of the text.

In so large a work as the *Confutation* it is natural that the author should canvas a large area of the protestant controversy but the main thrust is in the doctrine of the church. More could not understand the Reformers’ doctrine of the invisible church, invisible because of the spiritual nature of its relationship to Christ. He took the concept to mean, rather, an underground church, an alternative body to the known catholic church. Nor was he ever able to come to terms with the Reformers’ view that celibacy for the Religious was not grounded in the mind of God. The ‘marriage’ of monks and nuns, to be witnessed amongst the Reformers, is in his judgment sufficient for his readers to recognise the diabolical character of the protestant doctrines.

The re-publication of More’s book with the excellent aids to understanding his thought which this edition contains is timely. The doctrine of the church is still to be tackled in Christian theology. The Roman Catholic Church, as Vatican II witnesses, has accepted some modifications to its traditional doctrine of the church as, for example, reflected in More’s writing, and these modifications are likely to prove radical. On the other hand, protestants under the influence of ecumenism which the majority of their theologians have embraced have lost an understanding of the meaning of the invisible church which is crucial to protestant theology, and are moving back towards More’s position. But a biblical view of the church will be seen to be well in advance of Vatican II or even of Tyndale and Barmen. But this is still in the future. Students of the English Reformation as well as theologians of the doctrines of the church will be very grateful to have this old controversy available once again through these handsome volumes.

D. B. KNOX

CHRISTIAN MORTALISM FROM TYNDALE TO MILTON. N. T. Burns. Harvard/Oxford. 222 pp. £5.00.

Professor Burns has done some pioneer work in studying how the question of what happens to the soul after death was answered in the first century and a half after the Reformation. He shows how Luther was sympathetic to soul-sleep, and in consequence Lutheran churches never condemned it credally, while Reformed churches spurred on by Calvin and Bullinger disavowed soul-sleep. Professor Burns sees three groups; those who believe that the soul sleeps till the resurrection day, those who hold that the soul dies and is resurrected, and those heretics who held that there is no after life of any kind. He establishes without difficulty that all these Protestant radicals are trying to grapple with Scripture, and that secular philosophical influence is minimal. He takes the story through from Luther, from Tyndale’s disputes with More and Joyce to the sectaries like the Family of Love, and on into the seventeenth century to Milton, Overton, Browne and Hobbes when millennialism starts to be joined with soul-sleep. I doubt if Professor Burns has said the last word but he has opened up a field which urgently needs looking at, and his book is an important one even if his own Anabaptist sympathies occasionally intrude.

G. E. DUFFIELD

It is the common assumption of most of our history books that the Anglican Church was the continuation of the original church in England. To read a history that regards the Roman Catholic Church as the true link with the past after the Reformation at least makes for some fresh thinking. Mr. Reynolds' account is brief and readable. Its interest lies particularly in the period from the Reformation onwards.

While allowing for an obvious Roman Catholic slant, one is still a little surprised by some interpretations and omissions. That Cranmer strongly opposed Henry VIII on more than one occasion is not adequately brought out (p. 182). In a chapter entitled 'How did the Reformation happen?' no mention is made of the findings of the Consilium de emendanda ecclesia of 1538 to which Reginald Pole himself contributed—the most damning indictment of the church by its own loyal supporters. The account of the Elizabethan martyrs is rather oversimplified when in fact the Jesuit Mariana in Spain was advocating regicide (p. 239). To equate 'Puritan' with 'hot gospeller' (p. 254) is irresponsible in a serious historical writing. It is strange that there is no mention of Christopher Davenport (Sancta Clara) who anticipated Newman's Tract XC in the seventeenth century.

However, there are expansive areas where the Protestant histories are thin—for instance concerning the Elizabethan martyrs and Catholic fortunes in the eighteenth century. But such doctrinal issues as infallibility, Apostolicae Curae and Modernism are weakly presented. All in all this is a popular, slightly sentimental book that is unlikely to appeal to any beyond the bounds of Catholicism. JULIAN CHARLEY


The central problem to which Dr. Miller addresses himself is tucked away at the bottom of page 66: it is to explain why 'much of the politics of the period 1660-1688 was dominated by a virulent anti-Catholicism' at a time when the English Catholics 'were a tiny minority of the nation who lived quietly and on good terms with their Protestant neighbours who for their part recognised that they were decent harmless people'.

He finds much of the explanation in a historical tradition which, derived in the first place from Foxe and the fires of Smithfield, had a strong sense of the immediate relevance of past events to present situations. Current attitudes in Ulster remind us that this was not just a seventeenth-century phenomenon. The explicit basis of anti-Catholicism at that time was 'a succession of images, mostly lurid, which were the product of successive phases in the historical experience of English Protestantism'. This experience is closely examined in the book. The Roman Church—not without justification—was identified with arbitrary government, and although the number of acknowledged Catholics was small there were thought to be many thousands of secret adherents waiting only for the moment to declare themselves. James II shared this illusion, and Dr. Miller sees his policy as 'an expression of the faith and fantasies of a man more fool than villain'.

The book as a whole presents a balanced and sensitive interpretation of
the mutual (often wilful) misunderstandings that lay behind popular fears, fears whose ultimate effects may still distort the judgment of modern historians. This study will probably not cause any drastic reversals of opinion about the period and topics with which it deals, but for one reader at least it has revealed unexpected complexities. And Dr. Miller shows something of Christopher Hill's flair for weaving a coherent and readable narrative from masses of detail meticulously documented. My only criticism is with the index which, despite its length, contains no entry for at least half a dozen major topics that I tried to refer back to.

Owen C. Watkins


Overshadowed by the administrative genius of John Wesley, and the continuing popularity of Charles Wesley’s hymns, George Whitefield has suffered some neglect by biographers and modern students of Methodism. Now to add to a massive work by Arnold Dallimore, of which only one volume has so far been published, there comes this portrait by John Pollock to serve as a most welcome introduction for those who have little acquaintance with this important figure in the eighteenth century Methodist revival movement.

Written with the charm characteristic of the author’s other biographical studies, this account of Whitefield’s life and extraordinary preaching labours is of absorbing interest. Mr. Pollock carries his scholarship lightly, and indeed one could wish for a bibliography as an appendix, and even for a modicum of footnotes to enable more serious students to refer to the main sources of information. That having been said, one can only commend this book wholeheartedly, in particular to young people hitherto unfamiliar with its subject. Whitefield’s courage and overpowering enthusiasm to proclaim the Christian faith led him to preach in the open air to the coalminers of Kingswood, when the Anglican pulpits of Bristol were closed to him. Even more important, it was Whitefield who persuaded John Wesley to follow his example in this respect, with momentous results for the people of England in the years that followed. His work in America included founding orphanages (for which he constantly appealed for money in this country), and itinerating the whole length of the eastern seaboard from Massachusetts to Georgia. He crossed the Atlantic thirteen times in all, and these lengthy visits may account for his work being more appreciated in America than in Britain. Everywhere his preaching attracted vast crowds, and the flame of revival was kindled in many centres. By 1741 he had separated from the Wesleys over the old question of predestination and election, and though their personal regard continued unbroken, they remained theologically unreconciled.

But it is as an evangelist that Whitefield is best remembered. His oratory and the beauty and power of his voice made him equally acceptable to the uneducated masses in Britain and to the titled audiences invited to hear him in Lady Huntingdon’s drawing room. This book makes clear that while he could never have founded a movement, his influence over more than thirty-five years of constant and unwearied itinerant preaching was widespread throughout America and the British Isles in bringing home to those untouched by the established Church the message of ‘the truth as it is in Jesus’.

ColliSS Davies

Scholars and Newman lovers alike will be grateful for the magnificent work of the editors in continuing this story a further three years down to the end of 1869. Volume XXIII covers the final defeat of Newman’s last attempt to return to Oxford and provide a university education for Catholics by establishing an Oxford oratory. Newman wrote of the villain of the piece, Manning, ‘He will break me if he can’. Newman was obedient, but he was not broken, thanks to his courage and the support of his bishop and powerful lay friends. In Volume XXIV, he can be seen editing his Anglican sermons and writing A Grammar of Assent, his only work, as he used to say, written without a specific cause or stimulus. He had long wished to compose a Christian riposte to the rationalism of the time. He told James Hope-Scott that the Grammar was ‘half-theological, half-philosophical—something to do with faith and certitude’.

The background remains Newman’s work in the Birmingham Oratory School with which he had been involved since 1859. His preoccupations were teaching, terminal examinations, saying farewell ‘one by one’ to boys leaving, fear of epidemics, ‘the greatest of a schoolmaster’s crosses’. It is worth remembering that the ‘imperial intellect’ was primarily engaged in education.

The reader will be struck by the power of Newman’s intercessions. He wrote to Marianne Bowden in July 1867, ‘You are one of my most faithful friends—I have ever said Mass for you under that title’. To Catherine Anne Bathurst he wrote early in 1869, ‘I had been saying Mass for you a day or two before your letter came—and not to speak of others, have given you a share in each of 23 Masses in the course of the year.’

Many touches bring Newman alive: his gratitude to R. W. Church for the gift of a violin and to Sir John Harding at whose death he recalled to William Froude that ‘he was nearly the only person who was kind to me on my conversion’. He drank nearly a quart of cider a day—‘among other great benefits (it) has certainly acted as a tonic to my throat’. He disliked periods of convalescence in Switzerland in the ‘monotonous grim glare of those awful mountains, which are well enough as sights not as companions’. He was conscious of advancing years. ‘My age is such that I ought to work fast before the night comes—yet I never can work fast.’

ROGER JOB

MODERN THEOLOGY: 1 KARL BARTH; 2. RUDOLF BULTMANN; 3. PAUL TILLICH; 4. REINHOLD NIEBUHR; 5. DIETRICH BONHOEFFER, SELECTIONS FROM TWENTIETH-CENTURY THEOLOGIANS. Edited by E. J. Tinsley. Epworth Press. Approximately 96 pp. each. £0.45 each.

The five paperbacks in this series are designed to give representative samples of the writing of five leading Protestant theologians. They provide not only convenient source material for students working on essays and projects but also a cross-section of writing which is not easily accessible to clergy and laymen.

Each volume is prefaced by a biographical note and a more general introduction to modern theology. The latter looks at some of the ante-
ecedents of modern thought, contrasting it with the natural theology of Aquinas and Paley. Since the five theologians in question belong to the first half of the twentieth century, Professor Tinsley brings his account a little more up to date by commenting on Honest to God, Van Buren, and the death of God school. He sees future development in four main areas: (1) the ‘crisis of metaphor’, for theology stands or falls by its metaphorical language; (2) correlation between religion and the arts; (3) the significance of Christ especially his uniqueness and finality; and (4) dialogue with other religions.

It is a pity that the 24-page introduction is reprinted in all five volumes. It takes up a quarter of each book, and those who buy the set will buy it five times over. I myself would have preferred either a more substantial introduction to each theologian setting him more firmly in his historical context and giving a more detailed discussion of his thought, or a separate introductory volume giving a more thorough account of the origins and character of modern thought. Either of these could have been achieved at the cost of no more extra space. A number of slips have crept into the printing. But the series is very welcome. The selections are well chosen. It is always much better to grapple with a man’s thought in his own writings than take someone else’s word for it.


Owen C. Thomas is known to readers on this side of the Atlantic for his study of William Temple’s Philosophy of Religion and his anthology of Attitudes toward Other Religions. He is Professor of Theology at the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass., and the present work contains his introductory doctrine course. In Anglican terms, it covers G.O.E. Doctrine I and II ranging from Revelation, Authority and the Trinity to the Sacraments, Worship and Ministry.

The strength of the book is the way in which it relates doctrines to modern writings, giving brief quotations and detailed page references. In this respect it has no equal. But on the debit side some English readers may see in it the somewhat flat, scholastic character of a certain type of American teaching in which the student bases his work on a single textbook which he virtually learns by heart. His examinations consist of a series of specific questions on the text. Professor Thomas duly appends a series of questions to each chapter. But they are, as he indicates, questions for discussion and not simply questions of fact about the text.

The teacher who wishes to introduce his students to what contemporary theologians are saying and help them to see doctrines in more than one dimension will find this a valuable aid. It is a pity that the book is produced by photolithography of typescript instead of being set up in proper book type. It is nicely done, but it deserves something better.


This is a book for those who have more than a passing interest in the development of dogma (the formation and re-formation of doctrine) and who also read French (in which language are many short quotations). It is written primarily for Roman Catholics and reflects over a decade of research, reading
and thought by the Dean of St. Edmund's House, Cambridge. Lash wants to do justice to the unique character of the apostolic witness to Christ, to the dogmatic pronouncements of the Church in history, to our modern understanding of the complexity of the nature of the historical process, and to the need for a faith for today. He does not claim to provide a theory of development to solve all problems; rather, using insights from a variety of authors from J. H. Newman to E. Schlink and E. Schillebeeckx, he makes suggestions of guidelines for a viable contemporary approach to doctrinal change and continuity. In parts the book is too compressed and reads like a series of dictionary articles. However, the valuable insights it offers more than compensate for the potted style. I imagine that conservative Roman Catholics will be shocked by Lash's radical views of dogmatic pronouncements of the past. Conservative evangelicals will be unhappy about his view of revelation and will feel he has too easily abandoned the doctrine of propositional revelation. This said I feel that here is a R.C. theologian with whom I could have meaningful and useful dialogue concerning the doctrinal traditions of our Churches. There is truth in what Schillebeeckx has written: 'the problem of the development of dogma is the Catholic counterpart of what is known in Protestant theology as the "hermeneutical problem".'

PETER TOON


I try always to be a conscientious reviewer; but I have given much more time to this book than I am usually able to devote to the books that come to my table. The reason—I have long wished to discover the difference between an evangelical and a conservative evangelical, and I felt that this work by an acknowledged leader of the conservative evangelicals might help me in my quest.

Knowing God is not exactly a book. It is made up of essays contributed at various times to the Evangelical Magazine. This leads to a good deal of repetition and to some incoherence; but on the whole the essays do coalesce into a fairly complete statement of the doctrine of God from an evangelical point of view. My first impression is one of massive agreement. At least eighty per cent of what Dr. Packer has written corresponds exactly, sometimes even verbally, with what I have been trying to teach over fifty years—though it would be sad if I had learned nothing new in the course of so extended a ministry of the Word and Sacraments.

Where then do differences arise? The first, and perhaps major difference, is that the evangelical is much more Christo-centric in his approach. We have learned from wise old Staupitz, Luther's mentor, that, even when we are dealing with the doctrine of predestination, we must always start from the wounds of Christ. To be fair to Dr. Packer, Jesus Christ always does come in somewhere in his presentation of each theme, but sometimes at the end of an argument, where we would bring him in at the beginning. Like many dogmaticians, Dr. Packer seems to have a limited sense of history. In consequence, Scripture stretches out before him as a level plain, and lacks the hills and valleys that make the discovery of the Scriptures so exciting to the evangelical.

The evangelical, though willing to learn from many, is committed to the following of one Master only. Dr. Packer's Calvinism is less evident in this
book than in some others that he has written. But it is still there, and at points seems to lead him astray from the true evangelical path. When Paul writes, 'One died for all,' he means exactly what he says; to attempt to make him mean something else is to wrest Scripture from its true meaning to bring it into accordance with conclusions previously reached on other grounds. The cast of Dr. Packer's mind is still slightly scholastic. It is always dangerous to speak in terms of the attributes of God; these abstractions can conceal the fully personal nature of the One with whom we have to do. I think that an evangelical would avoid such an expression as 'to pacify the wrath of God'.

Dr. Packer is nearly successful in putting forward an evangelical doctrine of the atonement; a tendency to use traditional terminology sometimes mars the clarity of his argument. He writes of Jesus as our 'representative substitute'. But is this not *contradictio in adjecto*? A representative cannot be a substitute and a substitute cannot be a representative. Was it not the recovery of the truth of Christ as the Man, the full and perfect representative of the entire human race, by F. D. Maurice and other theological giants, which delivered evangelical theology from the impasse in which it had landed itself about the middle of the nineteenth century? More investigation of this theme seems to be called for.

Dr. Packer does not seem always to be aware of his own immense debt to those whom he frequently and abusively lumps together as 'liberal theologians'. Those great men did not always give the right answers; but they did ask the right questions, and challenged us to find better answers. They did set us free to recognise and teach that full and perfect humanity of the Lord Jesus which is so often and so movingly set forth by—Dr. Packer himself!

It would be possible to list a number of other minor differences. But let me return to the great and positive agreements. It is clear that there has been much development in conservative evangelical theology, and all of it, as I would judge, in the right and evangelical direction. Where do we still really differ? Are we fighting about names and words and shadows? It might be that, if we were able to be more open with one another, we should find that, almost without our being aware of it, God has been leading us into unity on a level deeper than we are always able to recognise.

**STEPHEN NEILL, BISHOP**


The eschatological systems of other religions may bring us glimpses of truth; but although Christians should examine them sympathetically, they will in the end be under no illusions as to their shortcomings. To illustrate this thesis, Mr. Duncan ranges over the Old Testament, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, the Tao teh Ching, and Qabalistic occultism. Much of this is confusing and confused, and those unfamiliar with the texts quoted will not find it easy to make much of it. But the conclusion is that all these systems are bounded by what Teilhard called 'the “within” of the phenomenal world' and are essentially earthbound and man-centred. The Christian knows there is no redemption save in a relationship with the Christ, and sees the Eucharist as a paradigm of eternal life.

So stated, there seems nothing exceptional or exceptionable about this
book. Unfortunately, it is marred by so many extraordinary statements (of opinion, or of opinion presented as fact) that readers of *The Churchman* will find it quite unacceptable.

For instance: after death, there is an intermediate state through which souls can be aided by the Eucharist, the meditations of the baptised, and by exorcism (though we should pray hopefully for the eventual redemption of Satan and his angels). The unbaptised or those that have fallen from grace go to Sheol, whence they are reincarnated (according to Karma) to have further opportunities for baptism; the baptised are released from this cycle, though they may voluntarily re-enter it. There is no discussion of the (to me) insuperable philosophical difficulties in such a concept, and the theological objections are merely skated over. With regret, therefore, I find myself unable to recommend this book.

MICHAEL PERRY


The Principal of St. John’s College Nottingham is, as his publishers say, a gifted evangelist and a New Testament scholar, and it is in his capacity as evangelist that he has located what has seemed to him to be a gap in Christian literature. That is, a book to put into the hands of people, who have come to faith in Christ, that will enable them to grow into mature Christians. This is the book which he has written to fill that gap, and it will doubtless be very widely read, like his earlier popular books. It has that same racy style, full of confidence in the message that is being put across.

The subjects covered are the ones we would expect; first the basis of the new life, then (surprisingly early in the book) doubts about that gospel, the new sense of life, the new perspective, the developing relationship with Christ, new attitudes on the issues of life, the growing Christian character, the new way in relationships, and a final chapter on New Society, that is, the church.

A book like this invites comparison with its predecessor, *The Way* written by Geoffrey Robinson and Stephen Winward back in 1945. The preface to each book shows that the intention is the same and the contents show a high degree of similarity. The greatest difference is in the style, for the questions asked and the answers given are substantially the same. In the present book half a chapter on church, and half a chapter on social involvement hardly seems to be adequate in a book for new converts, and even that seems not to have escaped the individualism that underlies the preceding chapters. Would one not expect in such a book some guidelines for further reading, and perhaps even a subject index?

B. N. KAYE


Reading this book while next door sixth-formers were doing their thing with flashing lights, guitars and a strobe, I thought that the title was misleading. As the author points out on page 121, it is the middle-aged who have dominated the counter-culture—the McLuhans, Learys and Ginsbergs—and given young people today outlets for energy.

This is far more than a book about young people; it is a guide to the proliferation of zany religions, crazes and causes that have engaged our attention since the 1950s. On this conducted tour of the Church of Satan, the Children of God, neo-astrology, the underground press, transcendental meditation (courses available in the U.S. Army), the Oxford Street changers,
Buzz and the Festival of Light, Mr. Leech has shrewd points to make all the way.

If, as Mr. Leech seems to suggest, young people are apparently only too ready to dash after the latest panacea and see hope in every charlatan who crosses their path, one can only sympathise. After all, what we older ones have to offer is a society 'in which the technologico-Benthamite ethos has triumphed'; we can hardly expect them to stand in awed silence at our achievements. But neither do we have to take seriously the crack-pot ideas that sometimes prove to be so appealing to youngsters. Rather than stamping on young people for their 'moody inarticulateness' (there speaks somebody who has met a teenager) we must extend our own consciousness of God so that it speaks willy-nilly to the needs of others.

JOHN C. KING

YOUR GOD IS TOO WHITE: AN ILLUSTRATED DOCUMENTARY OF CHRISTIANITY AND RACE IN AMERICA. Columbus Salley & Ronald Behm. Lion. 128 pp. £0.75.

Differences between the racial situation in America and Britain are important enough to discredit the simple assumption that American developments must be repeated here. But there are also enough similarities—notably the enduring wounds to family life and cultural identity caused by slavery, and the dilemmas of minorities stuck at the bottom of the social pile—to ensure that this book provides stimulating parallels for readers in Britain.

Perhaps the book's major value is its chronicling of the repeated failure of Christians to re-act as the 'salt of the earth' rather than just more members of a racially prejudiced and exploitative society. The authors' assumption that 'there are more answers available to us from an objective analysis of the facts than is commonly believed' makes good sense on both sides of the Atlantic; and their account of the slavery, segregation and ghetto periods of black history shows clearly the acquiescence of the churches in the ever-changing forms of social injustice. The conclusions of a social psychologist ring ominously true (p. 53): 'Our churches make words; they pass resolutions. But there is no evidence that the churches have found the strength, the courage or the practical know-how to use religious institutions as instruments for bringing about the kind of maturity (that is necessary for justice in race relations).'

A second important achievement is its positive assessment of black power as a means of creating a sense of identity and responsibility, which provides a valuable preparation for a gospel which emphasises man's created dignity, and his calling to work for righteousness and justice. Seen in this light the problem of black power in Britain is the fact that it doesn't exist.

The book concludes with suggestions of 'What the white Christian must do with his church.' Like the whole book it is emphatically not just for those living in multi-racial areas, for the core of the problem lies not in how we treat our next-door-neighbour, but those who work in the same enterprise, live (however distantly) in the same society, share the same educational system. It is injustice in these spheres that perpetuates racial inequality, and we urgently need this book's pointers in learning how to remedy our past ineffectiveness.

JOHN ROOT