passion, metaphysical gleam and intermittent withering scorn. But the spaciousness of the man's vision presses him beyond the wit of the apologist to translucent, even serene conclusions. The essay on the contemporary humiliation of the papacy shows him at his most fearfully ironic, and is to be read by detractors and devotees of the papal office, if they dare.

Engagement with God is, subterraneously, a dialogue with the German 'political theologians' around J. B. Metz and, on the Lutheran side, Jürgen Moltmann. It claims, however, to encapsulate the meaning of the Old and New Testaments in their relation within its hundred pages. That audacity apart, it is a remarkable tour de force, although inevitably thematic — an arabesque on the theme of elect community and world touched at many points in *Elucidations*. Set out with great formal beauty is an analysis of the Christian corporate hope which gives that hope its proper tension with all atheistic schemes of human freedom. It is the *divine* involvement with humanity in the Church that must shape the 'logic' of her own engagement. The Church dare not serve on men Lucifer's 'Non serviam', but no more may she accept the world's agenda—for its own good. She knows from her Master's fate that just where men's actions cease to be outwardly effective there her work begins in earnest. Balthasar strikes here the authentic note of radical traditionalism. 'In a living tradition, at every moment the original *traditio* (that is, the surrender of the Son by the Father for the salvation of the world) is repeated. And in the process of eternally surrendering herself in imitation of God's act of surrender the Church lives in a perpetual process of death and resurrection within the living Source of tradition'.

Professor D. M. MacKinnon in his excellent preface to *Engagement with God* rejoices in the emergence of this 'professional rememberer' who, steeped in the Christian tradition from the New Testament witness to contemporary poets and novelists in half a dozen cultures, would re-smelt our primary theology of man before God in the furnace of the Trinity. Marred at times by the occasional below-the-belt swipe of priestly polemic, we have here, nevertheless, a kind of re-creation of the sensibility of the Fourth Gospel in modern form. For this is a theology born of prostrate adoration before God's glory and issuing in an anything but supine love of men.

AIDAN NICHOLS OP

VICTORY OVER VIOLENCE, by Martin Hengel. Introduction by Robin Scroggs. *S.P.C.K.*, London, 1975. 93 pp. £1.30.

Dr Martin Hengel, an expert on Jewish religion and politics in the first century A.D., wrote this little book against all those who are in favour of the use of violence to bring about social and political change. We agree with Hengel that Jesus denounced violence and that the use of violence seems to contradict its goal: freedom. Still, we cannot be very pleased with Dr Hengel's book. Only one chapter is devoted to the activity of Jesus and it is clearly the weakest part of the whole book. The other chapters make fascinating reading; they mainly deal with the history of the Jewish liberation movement. The chapter on Jesus falls short. Much more could be said about Jesus's tactics of non-violence, and the 'love of enemies' is not as innocent and nice as Martin Hengel seems to suggest. There are other, more daring, interpretations of Mark 12:13-17 too. According to Hengel Jesus's message was supposed to appeal to the heart of the individual, and if this were the whole truth nothing would be easier than denouncing violence. Jesus, however, was very much concerned with founding a new community.

It is a pity that Hengel is saying so little, for what we need is a much clearer understanding of what 'non-violence' means and what tactics can be used so that the policy of non-violence is taken seriously and can change the mighty of our time. One would like to hear someone in Latin America or Rhodesia defending non-violence: a German professor and a reviewer in *New Blackfriars*, both writing in comfortable chairs, are not very proper witnesses to the policy of non-violence though they too may speak their mind. I am quite convinced that I am not allowed to use violence in the present situation and I am willing to challenge Martin Hengel when he would use violence. But when someone in Latin America or Rhodesia is using or propa-

gating violence I become much more careful: who am I that I may sit in judgement? Is his violence not directed against me? Is my pleading on behalf of non-violence a subtle way of disarming my Latin American and Rhodesian 'enemies'?

At the end of the book, Hengel admits that certain situations may be contradictory and that one cannot always avoid bringing guilt upon oneself and upon society. We thus are back at the point from where we started. Could it not be that in certain circumstances using violence would be a lesser evil—though an evil—than accepting suppression? Generally it may be better to be suppressed than to use violence and to suppress oneself, but is this always valid? Is the distinction between violence and non-violence as clear? With Hengel we accept that violence can only be overcome definitively by dying in the way Jesus died but Hengel should have shown that Jesus's death was not simply a surrender to the powers that be and that a historical situation is never completely the same.

I have no sympathy for violence, either because I am a Christian or because my room is too comfortable to condone the use of violence, but the question of how to bring about change without violence is too important to be answered by simply saying that violence is out of the question.

ANDREW LASCARIS, OP

MOZAMBIQUE, MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTION, by John Paul. *Penguin*, Harmondsworth, 1975. 232 pp. 80p.

The author was an Anglican missionary in northern Mozambique from 1958 to 1970, in charge of Messumba, close to Lake Nyasa, a well-established mission surrounded by many thousands of loyal Anglican Christians. The Portuguese colonial presence had been minimal in these remote parts until the mid-1960s. Everything which did exist in the way of school and hospital had come from Messumba. The Catholic Church had been a latecomer in the area, largely concerned to poach Anglicans, while the government was always more or less distrustful of this 'foreign' mission with its considerable influence.

John Paul describes in a sober and highly reliable manner, with a great deal of detail, his work during those twelve years, the life of the mission, the traditional pattern of Portuguese administration, the coming of Frelimo and the war, the Portuguese reaction, the immediate disastrous consequences for his parish. From this summary it might well appear that this is a moderately interesting book but one of no great importance. John Paul is not a theorist and he was not in the centre of events of national importance—but then a guerrilla war really has no centre, and people living at some so-called 'centre' may see its true pattern least. In my opinion this is an immensely important and interesting book both for modern African history and for the Church. Just because of its very careful account of the doings and attitudes of many named, but not very important, people —both black and white—within a fairly small area over a number of years, it provides a picture of a very recent local African history at a time of critical change, which is unique. No other book of Mozambique can be compared with it and no other book on an African topic of which I am aware. He is so absolutely fair to individuals on both sides and several Portuguese officials come out of it pretty well.

From the viewpoint of the Church it shows an honesty which ecclesiastical writers of their memoirs or of near contemporary history almost never evince.

What emerges most clearly from the overall story is the disastrous character of Portuguese colonialism: at the best of times uncreative and bullying, providing almost no amenities with which to justify the assumption of domination over an alien people; then simply murderous as the war developed—murderous, yet wildly inefficient, torturing people without hesitation but almost always the wrong people. The method was exemplary as to how to alienate a rural population and lose a guerrilla war. Some civilian administrative officers continued to try honestly, if ineffectually, to behave decently and even protect people from their own side, but their efforts were nullified again and again both by the political police and by some army units.

Frelimo, on the other hand, appears as a remarkably gentle and restrained movement; its representatives went to quite considerable lengths, for instance, to ensure that white missionaries (both Anglican and Catholic) were not hurt