

a more detailed discussion of its sacrificial character. This is not to say that Fr Lash is preoccupied with the sacrificial aspect but he is concerned to bring it into perspective. He finds the essence of the sacrifice in the Eucharistic meal; for him it is meaningless to ask whether the Eucharist is a sacrifice *or* a meal. It is in essence a sacrificial meal. The theology of his work is basically the same as the theology of Frs Powers and Schillebeeckx, but its presentation is lively, eminently readable and includes many telling examples to illustrate his meaning. His view of the Eucharist is total and dynamic. 'The death of Christ alone would profit us nothing . . . we must grasp Christ's redemptive act dynamically, as one sweep from cross to glory.' His vision of Christ's presence in the world is—just that. Christ's call to brotherhood, although it is most fully verified in the Eucharistic assembly, cannot be verified only there. 'To claim that it were, would be to

deny that God calls all men to the brotherhood of the kingdom.'

By way of prologue and epilogue to his treatise on the Eucharist, Fr Lash has much of value to say about theology, priesthood, ministry and intercommunion.

All these books are worthwhile reading. For an understanding of contemporary thinking about the Eucharist any one will serve if one must choose; but it would be a pity to omit any one, in that each of the authors offers valuable insights not contributed by the other two.

Eucharistic Theology Then and Now is a collection of essays by non-Catholic writers on the Eucharist—in Scripture, in the early Church, in the early Reformation era, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and in the theology of the present day. As supplementary reading, and a guide to non-Catholic theology of the Eucharist, it is both valuable and interesting.

JORDAN PEARSON, O.P.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION, ed. Ian G. Barbour. *SCM Press*, London, 1968. 323 pp. 28s.

PROCESS THOUGHT AND CHRISTIAN FAITH, by Norman Pittenger. *Nisbet*, London, 1968. 99 pp. 15s.

THE SPIRIT AND THE FORMS OF LOVE, by Daniel Day Williams. *Nisbet*, London, 1968. 306 pp. 35s.

'The God of the gaps' is the terse summary of the dissatisfaction that the scientist, as a scientist, feels with traditional theology, and it is the accusation that the contributors to *Science and Religion* are most anxious to avoid. The editor's balanced and articulate introduction indicates how existentialism avoids it by ignoring the problem altogether, and neo-Thomism, in its quite different way, by allowing of a 'gapless account of scientific secondary causes, while affirming God's primary causality at a totally different level'. The nagging insistence of modern man's feeling that religion and empirical observation cannot be dichotomized with such facility is at the root of the growing dialogue between theology and science. 'Why', as Frederick Ferré says in one of the best articles, 'just because the area of belief happens to be religious, ought we to abandon the critical concern for solid evidence that we have been taught as a basic obligation of responsible thinking in other areas?'

Alas, few of the other seventeen contributors show any desire to make a frontal attack on this basic problem, and one feels that the subtitle, *New Perspectives in the Dialogue*, is misleading in so far as only one party is represented in these pages. Perhaps if some of the articles had been by agnostic scientists this would have been

a more satisfying book. Not that it is unsatisfactory in itself—on the contrary it contains a wealth of insight—but it skirts the fundamental dilemma of the man who is committed to both science and Christianity: all systematic theology harmonizes faith with metaphysical philosophy, but how can faith be harmonized with a scientific (i.e. operational or predictive) philosophy? As with the ecumenical dialogue one so often feels that it is the hope and good will of the participants that are being voiced, so too here one finds little positive suggestion as to how to overcome the theological barriers. It is a measure of the confusion surrounding the central theological issue that there are in these three books no less than four quite different definitions of the word *metaphysics*.

More fundamental than this is the continual confusion between faith and theology. One of four Catholic contributors, Ernan McMullin, is the only one who is listed as specializing in the philosophy of science. Yet even he never questions that the 'realist metaphysical inheritance of the Christian' is the only philosophy that can act as a theological matrix for Christian belief. It is a sobering, not to say dismaying, statement to the reader who is convinced that Christianity is committed to a faith rather than to a philosophical attitude.

On the face of it the new-look theology of *Process Thought and Christian Faith* seems to offer more hope, for it proposes a *rapprochement* based on the philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead. The process theology of which Pittenger, and his mentor Hartshorne, are the best-known spokesmen presents its scientific credentials largely on the fact that Whitehead was a scientist. The fact that he was a metaphysician in philosophy, rather than an empiricist, is assumed as justification that he was qualified to speak on matters theological, although it is extremely doubtful that Whitehead can be considered a Christian in any meaningful sense. Indeed he went to some pains to deny that he was.

What Pittenger takes from him is the modern consciousness of reality as a process or continuum, in contrast with the more primitive description, so well formulated by Aristotle, of reality as a series of discrete categories. Process thought is the metaphysical frame (*metaphysical* being used here simply in the sense of a rational structuring or patterning of reality) within which traditional Christian beliefs must be re-patterned to make them communicable to modern man. Patently what we are dealing with here is a new system of theology, and in the scope of 99 pages it would be unfair to demand that the author provide anything but a sketch. Likewise a brief review cannot do justice to this sketch. To appreciate any new system is a slow matter of discovering the separate inadequacies of the old and then laying aside the system *in toto*, of establishing the premises of the new and then aligning all the old facts within the new frame. It takes a long time to do this, and the author has a right to demand that the sincere reader take that time. This being said, the two most obvious deficiencies of process thought (as process thought is defined, rather arbitrarily, in all these three books) are not hard to appreciate from the outset. First, and most significant, it is not only traditional Christian theology that is superseded but also traditional faith. In Whitehead's concept of process (but not, it may be noted in Teilhard's)

Christ becomes just another, though important link in the creative evolutionary process. Whitehead flatly denied, in *Process and Reality*, the possibility of mankind being incorporated as the body of Christ. Pittenger is more guarded, but his cautious wording does not hide his fear that he must agree with this conclusion: 'for any process thinker any claim for the uniqueness of Jesus and any notion of his "finality" would require careful restatement if they are to be accepted.' In this book and in his earlier *God in Process* he deprecates 'excessive Christocentrism'. Plainly a Christ who is the alpha and omega of creation cannot be fitted into this sort of process thought.

The second weakness, a major philosophical one, is that the arbitrariness and subjectivity of the technical terms Pittenger uses are metaphysical in the most pejorative and unscientific sense—e.g. 'the weaving of God's physical feelings upon his primordial concepts constitutes the *consequent* nature of God'. A theologian might conceivably accept this as poetry, but could any scientist accept this exuberant anthropomorphism as rational theology? Inadequate as Thomism is to describe a reality of process, one looks back with nostalgia for its limpid explication of a reality of stasis.

The Spirit and the Forms of Love is perhaps a surprising place to find Whitehead's philosophy again, but Daniel Day Williams too accepts him as the twentieth-century Aristotle. Having nailed his philosophical colours to the mast, however, he eschews a philosophical engagement and restricts himself to developing a typology of Christian love. The three types he decides upon are Augustinian, the Franciscan and the evangelical. This is a wide-ranging and perceptive work, but one appreciates its perceptiveness more when the author steps outside his self-imposed categories and talks more generally about atonement, self-sacrifice and social justice. The chapter on love and sexuality is a particularly sensitive treatment of this absorbing human and Christian problem.

FRANK C. PARKINSON

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY, by Joseph Lortz. *Darton, Longman & Todd*, London, *Herder and Herder*, New York. 2 vols, 488 pp + 348 pp. 180s.

The Christian historian is faced with problems of exceptional complexity which lie at the very heart of his profession and emerge with special intensity in the study of the Church herself. As an historian he has to purify his sympathies so as to examine with a humble openness that part of his study which he finds most alien;

and more subtly, that part which he regards as most congenial. As a Christian he must retain a constant and explicit devotion to the Church's doctrine and to her salvific role in history. To pretend that these simultaneous demands co-exist harmoniously from the outset would be to misrepresent certain important characteris-