

to contemporary philosophy (continental of course), his evaluation of Judaism, his attitude to the Old Testament, and the significance of his teaching for religious education. I am not at all sure that I know what Logstrup is on about – he is certainly full of Scandinavian pessimism. ‘Any fool can make you think, but it takes real talent to make you laugh.’

The book ends with clear and charitable

answers by Bultmann to each of his critics. But he never begins to answer what seems to me the fundamental question to be put to him, which is this: In what sense is the cross of Jesus Christ a saving event, apart from the subjective attitude which some men choose to take to it?

HUGO MEYNELL

CONCISE THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY, by Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler. Edited by Cornelius Ernst, O.P. and translated by Richard Strachan. *Freiburg: Herder and London: Burns & Oates*, 45s.

This is a book one has to live with (hence the lateness of this review!). For surely the only way to appreciate a dictionary is to use it. That the dictionary under review will be a most useful addition to the already existing ones, of this there can be no doubt. It will not, of course, replace the great and standard works of the past, but it will help to complement them in its own particular way in the field of contemporary religious thought.

In this work, Fr Rahner and his pupil do not ask questions with the basic intention of stirring us out of our theological lethargy, a procedure so familiar to us from Fr Rahner's other works, particularly those generally known in this country. In this dictionary we are given simple but typically Rahnerian explanations of theological concepts guaranteed by the author's deep-rooted and extensive knowledge of the sources of all theology. It is not surprising, therefore, that the authors in their Preface are able to state that ‘having just gone over the text for the fifth German reprint, we note with some satisfaction that nothing whatever needs to be changed because of the Council: our approach seems to be a sound one after all’. This dictionary will consequently be of particular interest to students of Rahner's own underlying approach. Yet, even more than some of his other works, it should also prove most useful to a much wider public. The generous employment of cross-references will be of

great assistance to anyone looking for an overall view and also greatly increases the depth of the various individual entries.

As stated in the authors' Preface, this book ‘is intended to provide brief explanations, in alphabetical order, of the most important concepts of modern Catholic dogmatic theology for readers who are prepared to make a certain intellectual effort’. The very conciseness of this work (493 pages) inevitably demands such an effort on the part of the reader. Yet, in spite of the authors' further statement that these considerations of space forced them to dispense with bibliography, we cannot help feeling that the lack of bibliography remains a valid criticism. The inclusion of even the briefest of bibliographies certainly would have increased the possible fruitfulness of the intellectual effort demanded of the reader. This criticism, while pointing out a certain obvious limitation, is not of course meant to deny the great basic value of this book. Like any dictionary, it is a mine of information requiring constant exploration and its wealth will not be discovered at a superficial glance. We are fortunate indeed to have it in such a competent and readable translation. We eagerly await now the promised appearance of the English translation of the philosophical dictionary of Father W. Brugger, S.J., recommended by our present authors as a companion volume to their own.

KARL-H. KRUGER

THE MORALITY OF THE CRIMINAL LAW by H. L. A. Hart. *Oxford University Press*. 12s. 6d.

This book contains two lectures delivered by Professor Hart at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1964. Both of them are salvos in controversies in which Hart has been engaged before and in which he will no doubt be engaged again. In the first lecture his principal adversary is Lady Wootton; in the second it is Lord Devlin. Taking his stance in the middle-of-the-road liberal tradition. Hart defends himself against attacks from the Left and from the Right.

The first lecture considers the suggestion that the notion of criminal responsibility, or *mens rea*, should be allowed to wither away, so that the state of a man's mind at the time of his crime should no longer be relevant to the question whether to convict him. Hart agreed with the critics of *mens rea* that the legal situation at the time of writing, based on the McNaughten rules modified by the Homicide Act of 1957 and the Mental Health Act of 1959, was unsatisfactory.