

THE PENTECOSTAL MOVEMENT IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, by Edward D. O'Connor, C.S.C. *Notre Dame*, 1971. \$1.95.

This is alleged by the publishers to be 'the definitive study of a dynamic spiritual rebirth from the standpoint of Catholic theology'. The author is rather less ambitious. He retells the story of how the Catholic Pentecostal Movement in the U.S.A. began, and how it has developed, and offers various theological reflections on it, on its consistency with classical (i.e. scholastic) theology, and on various dangers; in an Appendix, he reproduces the statement of the bishops' Doctrinal Commission of 1969. The story is exciting and bears retelling, and in fact much of the material offered here has not been published before. The author's reflections are in general cogent and sensible. I am sure many people will be greatly helped by the book.

And yet, in a funny sort of way, it is a self-refuting book. It is offered as a 'defense of Pentecostalism', and seeks, basically, to establish that the Pentecostal Movement in all the churches is a bid to regain the fullness of New Testament Christianity. But the more successfully this is done, the less it can actually serve to defend, precisely, the Pentecostal Movement. If it is really New Testament Christianity, it cannot be claimed for any Movement less than the whole church.

This is not just sophistry. Perhaps Fr Ed (as he is known) doesn't appreciate the strength of his own case. He makes a very good claim that the groups he is discussing embody a serious attempt to reclaim the fire of the first Pentecost. But if this is so, then surely they should not be preaching (let alone defending) a 'Pentecostal Movement', they should be preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ. Otherwise, they are seriously open to the suspicion that they are trying to set up a 'true' church within the church; and some of the things Fr Ed tells us about point ominously in this direction. The Pentecostal community, for instance, seems to have appointed—half seriously—its own 'elders' (presbyters). And they are looking for their own apostolic and social outreach. One can sympathise, deeply, but isn't this the archetypal trap for all renewal movements, whether they eventually move out of the church, like the 'Spiritual Franciscans', or whether they stay within it, institutionalised and tamed, like most religious orders? Fr Ed seems quite unaware of this danger.

It is partly a matter of labels. Fr Ed opts for

'Pentecostalism' even in preference to 'Catholic Pentecostalism'. He explains that by this he means that it is fired by the Spirit of Pentecost, but in fact all that he writes about shows that he is really concerned with a development that has direct historic links with the Pentecostal denominations. And surely this is a rather less comprehensive label to operate under than Catholic. One of the purposes of the Vatican Council Decree on Ecumenism, if I read it aright, was to try and salvage the word 'catholic' as meaning whole, entire; to rescue Catholicism from being simply one sect among others. In fact, to try to make the word more 'transparent' to the simple, whole, reality of the gospel, as it has not been, perhaps, since the counter-reformation. Catholics are no longer simply to be 'non-Protestants'. We are no longer to be concerned to 'defend' Catholicism; we can once again be free to proclaim Jesus Christ (and this makes it clear that all the things Catholics are traditionally het up about, such as infallibility, must find their place in the kerygma). While recognising how much we must learn from other Christians, the Council urges us to assimilate all this into our own Catholicism, precisely in view of a deeper reintegration and realisation of our own Catholicity. I do not see that we can aid the church in this inspiring project by setting up under some other label. And the more comprehensive the label (and Pentecostalism is a very comprehensive one), ultimately the more serious the problem.

Of course, a lot of the trouble comes from the kind of Catholicism that is presupposed. Fr Ed works almost entirely from a scholastic, counter-reformation Catholicism, which tends, almost automatically, to be fragmented. Spirituality and doctrine are two separate concerns, so that Fr Ed can say that 'Pentecostalism is not a theology, but an experience'. Surely a very unsatisfactory, not to say dangerous, state of affairs! Again, aren't we urged now to seek out a Catholicism which is integrated in itself, drawing up all the sap that is to be had from its own deepest roots? Isn't this what the return to the Fathers is all about, and the kind of holistic theology which Newman exemplified? Mustn't we aspire towards a situation in which the separation between theology and experience is simply unthinkable?

Of course, we are a long way yet from that

haven of peace, and, one gathers, the church in America is especially fragmented. I am not condemning Fr Ed nor the Pentecostal Movement. Only it seems a pity to present a typical product of the American *status quo* as being 'the definitive study'. I hope that in Europe, for instance, Catholics can catch the authentic Pentecostal fire without recourse to a 'movement'. And if we can, there is hope that we may be able to do so without losing touch with other stirrings in the church (for instance, the Pentecostals have hardly begun to explore

the spiritual riches of Eastern Christendom; and I do not see that their doctrine of the 'baptism in the Spirit' can stand up at all to sound exegetical procedures, and I rather doubt whether their spirituality, at present showing, can easily coexist with a serious attempt to recover the full sense of the sacraments. One could go on *ad nauseam!*).

Within its own terms, I think this is a good book. But I am not happy about the terms.

SIMON TUGWELL, O.P.

CONSCIOUSNESS AND FREEDOM, by Pratima Bowes. *Methuen*, London, 1971. £2.75.

A critical but sympathetic study of widely divergent views is nowhere more worthwhile and timely than in the philosophy of mind. I would strongly recommend this book not only to all those who are in fact interested in the topic, but also to that large class of persons, including many empirical psychologists, who ought to be so but are not.

The author compares and contrasts three general accounts of the human mind: the behaviourist-materialist, the phenomenalist-existentialist, and the Sāmkhya and Vedānta. The first is apt to treat consciousness as though it did not exist, while the last two talk as though consciousness were the very essence of man. Central to Dr Bowes' thesis is the conviction that each of these views really consists in a value-judgment concerning what is important about man, rather misleadingly expressed as what is true about man, what man really is. It is shrewdly pointed out that the prejudice against intuition is in fact more deeply rooted in scientific philosophy than in science, though it is frequently justified in the name of the latter. Husserl and Sartre, on the contrary, are apt to exaggerate the significance of consciousness; and the Indian theories discussed also find it the most important thing about man. According to them, consciousness

is a kind of witness to what goes on in one's psychophysical personality. In effect, they urge that the crucial division in man is not between mind and body, but between psychophysical unity on the one hand and consciousness as reflecting this on the other. Thus a dualist of this school would apparently be able to dismiss as irrelevant attacks on his position based on the behaviourist or materialist reduction of the psychical to the physical.

Problems in the philosophy of mind are not of merely theoretical significance; they issue in conflicting theories of how we should treat people, as may easily be seen from even a superficial survey of disputes in contemporary psychiatry. It is good that the wisdom of more than one culture should be brought to bear on these confusing and urgent questions. Philosophy of mind is neither a new nor an exclusively Western subject; important work on it, from which much is still to be learnt, was being done before the time of Plato, let alone that of Wittgenstein. The kind of breadth of comprehension necessary to understand and expound it is unfortunately not too common among contemporary philosophers, especially in combination with the powers of analysis and criticism shown in this book.

HUGO MEYNELL

THE NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGICAL HYMNS, by Jack T. Sanders (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, 15) *Cambridge University Press*, 1971. 163 pp. £3.60.

The sub-title of this monograph is 'their historical religious background'. After an interesting discussion of the various analyses which have been made of the more important hymns to Christ in the New Testament (the prologue of John, Phil. 2, 6-11, Col. 1, 15-20), the author launches into a well-documented discussion of that fascinating subject, where the ideas behind these hymns originated. For

some it is still axiomatic that the Christology of the New Testament must have sprung fully armed, so to speak, from the head of the Christian community, or even from Jesus' own words. To others it is quite acceptable, and in a way more enriching, to find that Christianity acted as a catalyst, uniting to express what it had to express about the unprecedented figure of Jesus, many forms of religious language