

votes for his friend Karol Wojtyła – but, as Hebblethwaite says, we all “simply under-estimated the courage and imagination of the College of Cardinals” (p. 154). The risks for the Catholic Church, and for the Polish people, are very great; but it was Krakow from which John Paul II was taken.

Summing up Pope Paul’s ministry of fifteen long difficult years, Peter Hebblethwaite rightly lays emphasis on the immense achievements that far outweigh his inconsistent practice of collegiality and the “paralysing caution” that overtook him on some (important) matters. He will be remembered as the pope who opened the Vatican to the Third World and who inaugurated reconciliation with the Orthodox Church. It is interesting to learn that his last reading was a chapter from Jean Guitton’s latest book. Paul VI was “intellectually formed by Pascal, Bernanos and Simone Weil”, and “theologically formed by reading Maritain, Congar and de Lubac” (p. 2).

Despite being taught while he was a seminarian by Ottaviani, Pope John Paul I not only became a friend of Lercaro but regarded Rosmini’s great work, *The Five Wounds of the Church*, as the greatest single theological influence on his

thinking. The five wounds were: the separation of the people from the clergy in worship; the defective education of the clergy; disunity among bishops; the nomination of bishops by the secular power; and the Church’s enslavement to wealth. The book was placed on the Index in 1849; but, a century later, and even now, is not a bad guide for a young bishop. Though plainly neither of the intellectual power nor the stamina of his predecessor or his successor, Albino Luciani was not a joke pope. By abandoning the titles – Vicar of Christ, Supreme Pontiff, Head of the Church – in favour of Pope, Bishop of Rome, and Supreme Pastor, John Paul I made a highly significant, and (we may surely hope) irrevocable shift in the understanding of the papal function. Peter Hebblethwaite concludes with an interesting “Theological Appendix” in which he charts the movement, as he puts it, “from papacy to Petrine ministry”: a movement that at least leaves hundreds of years of papal triumphalism behind to open a new era, to which Pope John Paul II is surely committed, when the Roman Church may once again become the church that “presides in love” (Ignatius of Antioch’s phrase for her).

FERGUS KERR O.P.

THE MYSTERY OF THE INCARNATION by Norman Anderson, *Hodder and Stoughton*, London 1978. pp. 162, paper £3.50.

Norman Anderson stands as a pillar of orthodoxy amidst the christological tempests of the Church of England, which benefits the Chairman of the House of Laity of the General Synod. Professor Sir Norman Anderson, OBE, LL.D., QC, DD, FBA, is a distinguished lawyer and on his own admission an amateur theologian who was invited to give the Bishop John Prideaux Memorial Lectures at the University of Exeter early in 1978 and he used the opportunity to contest the liberal theological opinions which are increasingly prevalent in Anglican debates on the nature of Jesus Christ. His range of interests is fairly narrow and in two chapters on ‘The Contemporary Debate’ he confines himself to criticisms of John Knox (the American, not his illustrious Scottish forebear), John Robinson, Dennis Nineham and Geoffrey

Lampe with his ‘Spirit Christology’, and open to criticism they certainly are. So are John Hick and Frances Young, contributors to *The Myth of God Incarnate*, dealt with in another chapter on the relationship between the historical tradition of the resurrection of Jesus and comparable myths in Hinduism and Buddhism. By contrast Anderson allies himself with Eric Mascall and F. D. Moule.

Anderson’s beliefs and theological conclusions would stand any test of orthodoxy but I am not sure that his arguments are so convincing. While not a fundamentalist, he is very conservative and relatively uncritical of the New Testament which he accepts as an authority of the utmost reliability. He explains his christological principles which may be expressed thus: he accepts the Chalcedonian christology of

two natures in one person because it derives from orthodox soteriology; he accepts the doctrine of salvation through Christ's death on the cross and subsequent resurrection because we find it in the New Testament because –

“if God did in fact act uniquely and decisively, in Jesus for the world's salvation . . . then it seems to me inherently unlikely that he would have left the basic facts and implications of that action without any reliable records and trustworthy teaching about their meaning”.

He accepts that God acted in Jesus for the world's salvation because he is convinced of the truth of the New Testament, it would seem, because “if God did in fact act, uniquely and decisively . . .” *vide supra*; and so on presumably *ad infinitum*. On reflection the author may perhaps have resolved this circular argument, but that is how it stands on pp. 137-8.

Just how uncritical of the New Testament Anderson is can be seen when he says that “For myself, I am content to believe that John 17:5 represents a memory of Jesus's *ipsissima vox*.” This verse reads,

“Father, glorify me in your presence with the glory which I had with you before the world was made”, and I wonder whether there are any non-fundamentalist New Testament scholars who would now accept that as one of Jesus's own sayings.

Yet it would be unfair to call Professor Anderson ‘conservative’. That label might well stick to Hick, Nineham and the other preservers of the dreary liberal theology of nineteenth century Protestantism which we find above all in David Friedrich Strauss. Anderson is more radical than that, for he wants to return to the orthodox fathers of the early church and beyond that to the New Testament. The problem is that in the final chapter his own views do not offer anything new because they are proscribed by the conceptual limitations of the Chalcedonian Definition of 451 AD. That document remains a touchstone of orthodox belief and Anderson is right to criticise his protagonists for failing to meet the test of Chalcedon, but a new perspective is needed outside the static concepts of ‘person’, ‘substance’, ‘nature’.

GEOFFREY TURNER

MARX'S THEORY OF POLITICS by John M. Maguire. Cambridge University Press. pp. 251. £9.00.

It is a tenet of Marxist theory that you cannot decipher the power-relations of a society by assuming that the economically determinant class is necessarily identical with the politically dominant one. The English bourgeoisie, for example, were economically determinant long before they gained access to political power. Various Marxists, however, have failed to grasp this point – among them, as Professor Maguire points out in this remarkably learned and lucid study, one Karl Marx. For the Marx of the *Communist Manifesto* just does seem to assume that parallel to the bourgeoisie's growing economic dominance will run an increasing political hegemony; and it is this naive faith in the bourgeoisie's political capacity which Marx is forced to revise in the light of European history after 1848.

What actually happened in that period, as Maguire skilfully illustrates, was from a Marxist viewpoint a good deal more depressing. In England, the political appar-

atus remains stubbornly dominated by the aristocratic oligarchy, with whom the industrial bourgeoisie enter into uneasy alliance on the basis of the long-standing *capitalist* nature of English landed society. In France, the bourgeoisie was unable to sustain the political hegemony it had wrested from the *ancien regime*, “abdicating” that rule in 1851 to the supposedly class-transcendent Louis Buonaparte. In Germany, a chronically weak bourgeoisie remains subordinate to an authoritarian bureaucracy right into the twentieth century.

This is simply one of the issues illuminated by Professor Maguire's scrupulous dissection of the much-neglected area of Marx's specifically *political* thought. Marx's politics have on the whole proved less attractive to commentators than his economics or philosophical anthropology; and indeed in this they have taken their cue from Marx himself, who, as Maguire reminds us, tended to give politics a fairly low profile. Yet it is only recently being