

CHRISTOLOGY (*Collins*, 18s); CREATION and TEMPTATION (*S.C.M. Press*, 10s 6d); I LOVED THIS PEOPLE (*S.P.C.K.*, 5s), by Dietrich Bonhoeffer.

Bonhoeffer has begun to pay the price of notoriety. In England, he had scarcely had time to establish himself as a major theologian of the 1930's and 40's before the Honest to God debate reduced him to the level of a sort of German Mr Wren-Lewis, with the added edge of being martyred under Hitler. And now the relic-industry has caught up with him. His writings are translated, published, re-published with indiscriminate repetition and overlap. Two of the volumes under review contain material for the most part previously published in English in different form. The S.P.C.K. volume add little to what we know of Bonhoeffer from the deservedly popular *Letters and papers from prison*, and reproduces some of their content; the S.C.M. Press volume brings together two sets of sermons (for even the first, described as 'lectures', is nearer in its approach to this genre) previously published separately, and throws some useful light on Bonhoeffer's mind in the 30's. The greatest service an English publisher could perform to check this chaos would be by sponsoring an English translation of Bonhoeffer's *Gesammelte Schriften*.

Meanwhile, the appearance of a readable and competent translation of the lectures on Christology is welcome. The lectures were delivered in 1933, and are reconstructed from students' notes by Bonhoeffer's friend, Eberhard Bethge. They show Bonhoeffer engaged in one of the classical tasks of theological labour, and they show his mind at work at a stage before its encounter with the decisive challenges of the Hitler era. They are valuable for this very reason: they show us something of the intellectual equipment with

which Bonhoeffer went into the encounter. To anyone who knows Bonhoeffer exclusively through the pages of *Honest to God*, the argument of the lectures, standing, as it does, in the mainstream of classical Christology, will come as a surprise. There is no evidence whatever, that I can detect here, to justify Mr E. H. Robertson's judgement in his introduction to the book, that 'the classical discussion of the two natures seemed to him [Bonhoeffer] impertinent and certainly concerned with the wrong questions' (p.21). On the contrary, Chalcedonian Christology here appears as the foundation of what Bonhoeffer calls 'critical' or 'negative' Christology. Apart from a perceptive chapter devoted to the Chalcedonian definition and to the fundamental types of christological heresy, some of Bonhoeffer's finest pages (e.g. pp. 45-6) show him as working in his own idiom, in a profoundly Chalcedonian tradition. I should even be prepared to argue that only misunderstanding prevents him from using classical concepts, such as the patristic doctrine of *enhypostasia*, to help him formulate some of his own distinctive ideas, such as that which he calls 'the *pro me* structure of the God-man Jesus Christ' (p. 47).

All the same, this book will scarcely be read by people who wish to deepen their understanding of Chalcedonian theology or to express it in modern terms. It will be read by those who know Bonhoeffer through his *Letters and papers from prison*, or his *Ethics*, and who may want to see something of the intellectual structures which sustained the 'relevant pattern of holiness' to be discerned in these books. The *Christology* will not let them down.

R. A. MARKUS

THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND CHRISTIAN UNITY; a commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism of the Second Vatican Council, with a translation of the text, by Bernard Leeming S.J. *Darton, Longman & Todd*. 42s.

What kind of commentaries on the Council documents do we want? At this length and at this price we could expect a serious *instrument de travail*: the text in latin and in English, short history of the Decree with the earlier drafts, a selection of Council speeches and ecclesiastical pronouncements of importance, some account of the ecumenical movement and of the structure of the World Council of Churches, a classified bibliography, in addition to some necessary explanation or notes. Something like this, although all the documents that one would like might not be available, should have been pos-

sible within the limits set for this volume. But Father Leeming has chosen to give us something more general. This, I feel, is a pity. Much of the information given is hardly of the kind that a buyer of this book would stand in need of and belongs more to the columns of the Catholic press. For instance they will hardly need to be told that when a newspaper criticised the Free Church and Anglican clergy a member of the Catholic hierarchy wrote immediately to protest. Then the very considerable amount of information about the ecumenical movement in general could have been put into chronological

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