

order and the quotations from non-Catholic sources more carefully chosen, there is too much that is of only very passing interest and this detracts from the real impact that the rest should make.

But there is a more serious criticism that must be made. The kind of source book that we have suggested is needed could aim at complete impartiality. But Father Leeming has adopted an attitude that might be charged with that very 'false irenicism' that he so disarmingly says he must accept on faith as existing, for the Council speaks of it, though he has never met it. By playing down the real issues in contemporary theology he leaves any reader who is unaware of them with the impression that what is really needed on our side is simply more piety. But, as St Francois de Sales pointed out, piety without intelligence can do much harm. What is needed is theological insight. The Catholic Church has suffered too long from uninstructed piety.

In the section on the Eucharist and the Sacrament of Order Father Leeming gives a long quotation from an article by Professor G. D. H. Lampe. The matter is of such importance and illustrates our point so well, that perhaps your reviewer will be excused if he gives the substance of it. Professor Lampe says that if a valid ministry is defined in terms of the intention to continue not merely the pastoral ministry of Word and sacraments as the English Ordinal believes it to have existed in the Church from the beginning, but also the pre-Reformation conception of that office which defines it in terms of *potestas ordinis*, then the clear imprecation of the Ordinal is that Anglican orders are in this sense invalid. He goes on to say that Anglicans will look with hopeful expectation to the present striking development in the 'Catholic' (both Roman and Anglican) theology of eucharistic presence and sacrifice, with increasing confidence that in the light of the revival of biblical study and fuller understanding of patristic theology the concepts which have dominated the Catholic-Protestant controversy about 'sacrificing priests' will before long be drastically modified. Further it has often been said that the Anglican Ordinal forbids Anglicans to recognise

an equality of episcopal and non-episcopal ministries. Professor Lampe says that if this means that they may not ascribe to the latter the same degree of regularity and authority, this may be true. But if it is taken to refer to the possession by the former of a *sacerdotium* which the latter necessarily lacks, the Ordinal offers no support to the contention; 'for it knows of no *sacerdotium* but that which is the essence of the priesthood: the ministry of Word and sacraments by which Christ's priestly meditation is made effective for all believers . . . the Ordinal offers no ground on which Anglicans can refuse to recognise a fundamental equality between these ministries in respect of the grace of the priesthood.' Father Leeming comments, 'Professor Lampe in this statement disagrees with what I believe the vast majority of Anglicans now hold.' It is difficult to prove or disprove such statements without statistical evidence. But I think that Father Leeming's assertion misrepresents the issue. An Anglican may reject non-episcopal ministries because they lack apostolic succession; but he may still agree with what Professor Lampe has said about the nature of the ministry: *potestas ordinis* is just not a concept that the 'vast majority of Anglicans' use.

However Father Leeming does claim to see 'even in this most painful subject . . . signs of a new dawn.' And he quotes a statement by the Nottingham Conference of Faith and Order of 1964 on the priestly action of Christ and the Eucharist. But surely he should also have quoted what the Council documents have to say on the work of the ministry, and they have a good deal to say *à plusieurs reprises*, as a ministry of Word and sacraments. Is it possible for us any longer to put forward the view of non-historical orthodoxy that sees ordination in terms of *potestas ordinis* in isolation, and not in terms of the ministerial office as a whole? And, if so, will this not have consequences on the way in which we conceive of such concepts as 'character' and *potestas*? Ecumenism needs work on both sides, and it is the failure to come to grips with the real implications of this that makes this book both disappointing and misleading.

BASIL DE WINTON C.S.SP.

THE COMMITTED CHURCH, ed. by Laurence Bright and Simon Clements; Darton, Longman & Todd, 42s.

'In the old days', a friend of mine complained about the title of this book, 'it used to be sins that were committed'. There is, in fact, a third use of the term, one falling between the language of the

confessional and the language of this title: 'committed', like 'engaged', can be used as a synonym of 'concerned'. It is important to see that this is not the use which the editors of this

seventh Downside Symposium have in mind: 'concern', as a moral posture, sometimes seems more effective in proportion to its lack of a precise object. To say that the church is committed must be to say that it is committed to *something*, and the purpose of this volume is to make it clear that for christians this has to be the Left. The posture the title indicates is thus not a pervasive, brooding sense of caring but a commitment strong in proportion to its precision, selecting some attitudes and rejecting others.

The dust-jacket note begins this emphasis with the reminder that christians are not free to *choose* whether or not to play a part in the world's serious issues, and the editors' admirably lucid introduction develops the point: the uncommitted liberalism of much recent christian thinking, concerned with values but reluctant to locate or embody these in institutional life, must yield to an engagement with actual structures, if the church is to be relevantly in the world; but that engagement can never be a merely neutral pre-occupation with efficiency. If it is to be moral it must in some way be directed, and although the slant cannot simply be prescribed in accordance with a rigid model – (the introduction, anticipating the objection that the whole christian church can't follow a rigid party-line, reminds us that 'the forms our commitment takes must be as complex and various as those of secular society') – it is equally true that a moral engagement with society must take the shape of a *case*, a commitment.

Stuart Hall's excellent chapter on 'Political Commitment' (it is appropriate that the book should start with the account of a non-christian radical humanist) analyses our present political condition through this focus: what is happening in our society is that issues properly political, concerned with the structure and quality of life, are being de-gutted and de-fused into disconnected fragments of experience, Radical politics, Hall argues, is the language in which they can be re-welded and given a shape; he demonstrates how this can be done in a particular case by disclosing the class-bound nature of our society beneath the specious air of classless, middle-ranged balance. John Benson follows this with a thoughtful chapter on the idea of community, applying the insights of philosophy of a language to show how society can creatively be thought of in terms of a network of roles, and thus individual life as always political, without this hardening into a rigid system of 'functions'. The analogy of language, where definition and flexibility are fused, is an exciting one. James Halloran then

gives a sociologist's account of community in industrial society, beginning with a criticism of generalising thinkers but agreeing finally with some of their central conclusions, that our society shows a substantial and disturbing lack of community. The establishing of a common culture – what Halloran calls 'shared perspectives' is essentially this – will be, he thinks, perhaps the most important task for our society. This first section, on structures of community, ends with a detailed account by Anthony Spencer of the structure of the Roman church in England and Wales: the section's easy combination of this kind of vital statistical work with philosophical analysis is typical of the achievement of the whole book.

Part Two examines some specific problems of community: all the chapters are useful, only one or two poorly written, and a few are excellent. David Armstrong's packed and dense exploration of the experience of alienation in modern work-processes, difficult as it is, is a crucial piece of work, testing out the validity of radical social concepts in actual work-experience and finding them to hold. Simon Clements, in spite of some lack of clear focus, draws together aspects of education, culture, politics and the arts into a common concern with 'quality of life'; Roy Shaw documents some areas of the contemporary cultural debate in a balanced, cautious yet finally firmly committed way, distinguishing between extreme reactions to 'mass-art' of patrician pessimism and flippant optimism and centring his own reasoned criticism of 'mass-society' between the two. There are good chapters in addition to these on the family, the new estate, coloured people, and delinquency.

The third, theological section tries to establish a theology of church and world which can sustain and direct the sense of social urgency gathered in the previous sections. Piet Fransen looks at the church as 'servant'; Joseph Rymer examines some scriptural images of the church as community; Laurence Bright explores the political significance of liturgy. Fr Bright's point – that human community provides the entry-point for Christ into secular society, and that all community is in this sense liturgical – is the book's theological lynch-pin. It is the political implications of Christ's presence to the world – one, Fr Bright argues, prior to his presence to the church – which provides the perspective within which the particular, specialised accounts of social problems and ideas gain coherence. The emphasis of the whole book – the essential connection of theology and politics – is given in the

introduction: 'The church is in the world not simply to bring the world into her fold but to restore the world to humane cultural values through political commitment'. The final section continues with Brian Wicker's excellent analysis of the notion of community through the idea of representation, individuals embodying a whole way of life, an analysis which again connects the ordinary experience of community and human language with that particular embodying of the whole community in Christ which is the experience of each member of the church. The final authoritative chapter by Fr Leo Alting von Geusau emphasises the church as the imperfect, historical community always reaching out to its end but thoroughly involved in history.

'The Committed Church' represents the work of the seventh Downside Symposium; an eighth symposium, extending this work by arranging an encounter between Christians and the most significant radical thinkers in Britain today, is already being planned. Meanwhile, there can be few more penetrating examples of the church's immersion in the political world than this book, and the editors are to be congratulated on the way they have orchestrated so many excellent but specialised accounts into a total pattern of commitment which completes but does not falsify the components. For those who want to see what has already been achieved in serious Christian political thinking, this is a vital and indispensable book.

TERRY EAGLETON

CHRISTIAN BROTHERHOOD, by Joseph Ratzinger. *Sheed & Ward* Stagbooks, London, 1966, 9s.

The theme of this little book by one of Germany's main theologians fills a long-standing gap, though not quite. After four or more centuries of undiluted individualism in Western culture and religion the answer to the question: 'Who is my brother?' has been crying out for theological treatment. Its limitation is partly due to the fact that this book was originally a paper read at a Theological Congress held at Vienna in 1958.

Perhaps the clearest way of dealing with this book here is to quote the key sentence and conclusion of the book on p.81: 'And so at last we arrive at the Christian answer to the question of the idea of brotherhood raised at the beginning: the problem of the two zones of ethical behaviour. *In contrast to the Stoics and the Enlightenment, Christianity affirms the existence of the two different zones (of ethical behaviour) and calls only fellow believers "brothers".*'

This does not mean that Ratzinger turns Christianity into an in-group, but its brotherhood is a separate thing altogether though essentially outward-looking and meant to serve those who are not yet brothers.

In order to prove this the scriptural texts are somewhat arbitrarily declared to be more limited than an unprejudiced exegesis would allow for. To say that John 'never speaks of the love of all men' (p.37), relying for this statement on the small domestic letter of St John (3 John, 5-8), is hardly conclusive evidence. Again, to limit the interpretation of the capital text of the last judgement in Matthew 25 so that the 'least of my brethren' refers exclusively to the poor and even to suggest a translation that is forced for this purpose is not really acceptable. In the same

way, all that Hellenism, the Stoics and the more important thinkers of the Enlightenment have said about the universal brotherhood is not necessarily to be rejected because it does not bear the Christian label. This is not good theology which, on the contrary, accepts a ground for the Christian message in the natural order.

It seems to me that what Ratzinger is really concerned with is not the 'brother' at all. It is rather that throughout his treatment he is desperately worried about a notion of brotherhood that justifies the Church as an *institution*. And so the really pertinent questions such as the common human nature in which we all share (so brilliantly worked out by Gregory of Nyssa and other Fathers), the common sin, the common promise and the universal redemption are not really dealt with as they should. I cannot see any room in Ratzinger's thesis for Schillebeeckx's 'anonymous Christians'.

This is rather a pity because it is not the institutional aspect of the Church that the work of Christ and the People of God are most in need of. It is rather a new emphasis on the *witness* from *within* and *on the basis* of the universal brotherhood. It is really strange to me as a non-expert in theology to see how the great theologians of today keep on skirting around the key issue of the Council, the Church as institution, the Church as movement and the very relevance of Christ within this human situation. And this requires a basic reassessment of our metaphysical, religious and practical concept of the brother without loving whom we cannot love God.

THEO WESTOW