

Unfortunately, as so often happens, the English—or rather American—translation is so literal and unliterary that it is likely to deter the general reader from the attempt to read it; although in German the book had a wide appeal, it is unlikely to be useful in English except to those not-so-general readers who wish to read an account of Professor Kümmerle's own position. For this, in fact, is what the book offers us: a distillation of one outstanding German scholar's understanding of the theology of the New Testament—or at least of its major witnesses, Jesus, Paul and John—together with a few pertinent but tantalisingly brief queries as to the relevance and appropriateness of this kind of faith in the twentieth century.

By contrast, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* is a highly technical discussion of Paul's methods of biblical exegesis. Professor Hanson here follows up the line of interpretation set out in his earlier book *Jesus Christ in the Old Testament*, and suggests that many of the Old Testament quotations used by Paul were understood by him to refer to, or to have been spoken by, Christ himself. By exploring Old Testament passages which may have been in Paul's mind, together with rabbinic parallels, Professor Hanson provides illuminating suggestions regarding Paul's methods and theology.

One difficulty with Professor Hanson's approach is that the significant passages which are important for his argument are frequently found only in the original context of the Old Testament passages quoted by Paul—in other words, precisely those sections which Paul himself does not quote: Professor Hanson sides firmly with those who argue that New

Testament writers quoted the Old Testament contextually, not atomistically. The links which he discovers between Paul's thought and the Old Testament passages are imaginative—too imaginative, indeed, to carry conviction in many cases. Parallels which are dependent upon passages not actually quoted need to be more impressive to be persuasive.

Yet Professor Hanson is surely right in stressing Paul's Christocentric interpretation of scripture. Though one may not be convinced, e.g., by his argument that the famous Habakkuk quotation in Rom. 1.17 and Gal. 3.11 refers to Christ himself, his instinct that what Paul says about the Christian depends upon a principle which applies first to Christ is correct: Paul does not simply use the Old Testament as a quarry for proof-texts—it is for him a book about Christ. This leads Professor Hanson in his final chapters to an interesting discussion of Paul's attitude to scripture as compared with that of his contemporaries, and to a consideration of our own hermeneutical problem.

If some of Professor Hanson's interpretations seem fantastic that does not necessarily mean, of course, that they are wrong! One ought to expect Paul's methods to be very different from our own, and we are probably totally unaware of many links between his thought and Jewish tradition. Though one may not be persuaded by Professor Hanson's detailed arguments, nevertheless in general he is more likely to be right in looking for Paul's background in Jewish exegesis than are those who dig around in Gnostic Redeemer myths. One hopes that this stimulating book will encourage others to explore this theme further.

MORNA D. HOOKER

THE STORY OF ANGLICAN MINISTRY, by Edward P. Echlin. *St. Paul Publications*, Slough, 1974. 174 pp. £2.95.

Some years ago the then American Jesuit, Edward P. Echlin, published his Ottawa doctoral dissertation under the title *The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective*. The book was a useful collection of material, much of it previously available only in out-of-the-way works familiar chiefly to specialists, showing the growth of catholic eucharistic belief in Anglicanism from the sixteenth century to our own day. Unfortunately the book's avowed aim of showing a convergence of Anglican and Roman Catholic doctrine remained unachieved due to lack of precision about the second term of the comparison. Having now divested himself of his Jesuit affiliation, Fr. Echlin has attempted a second historical survey of Anglican belief, this time with regard to ministerial priesthood, and based upon the Anglican rites of ordination.

Following an opening chapter on the theology implied by the medieval rites of ordination in England, we are given two chapters on the Reformation debate over priesthood between Stephen Gardiner (whom Echlin takes to be a spokesman for catholic doctrine) and Thomas Cranmer. This is followed by chapters on the Edwardine Ordinal and an outline of the slight but significant changes in the Ordinal of 1662. The book closes with the suggestion that Rome could and should now recognise the validity of Anglican orders, leaving the negative verdict of *Apostolicae curae* as an historical memory, valid for its own day but not for ours.

Most of the historical material in these pages is already familiar and readily available in other works. To its consideration Echlin brings no fresh approach or viewpoint. A more

serious defect, however, is the lack of theological and logical rigour evident at crucial points of the argument. Echlin is aware, perhaps too aware, that he is traversing a theological minefield. In his anxiety to avoid bringing any of the explosive charges surrounding him to detonation he tries too often to agree with controversialists of opposing views. The result is a work so sicklied o'er with the pale cast of indecision as to lack any sharp cutting edge.

Two examples must suffice of this attempt: to agree both with the central thesis of the old polemical attack on Anglican orders and with those who criticize this position as being based upon a distorted view both of history and of what in fact is authentic catholic belief about ministerial priesthood. In his opening chapter on 'The Sarum Background' Echlin argues effectively that the medieval rites of ordination did not imply a purely cultic view of priesthood. He is, however, unwilling to face the fact that the evidence he adduces was hardly adverted to by medieval catholics, who in practice *did* hold a view of cultic 'sacrificing priesthood' difficult if not impossible to reconcile with the evidence of the New Testament. Worst of all, at a crucial point Echlin conceals, through mistranslation, plainly superstitious language which was not expunged from the Roman Pontificale until after Vatican II. On p. 12 he tells us that at the end of the ordination of presbyters the Bishop admonished those whom he had just ordained to be careful to learn the Mass rite correctly 'because the things you are to perform are so serious'. In fact the Bishop told his new presbyters not that what they were about to do

was 'serious', but that it was 'dangerous' (*satis periculosa est*)! Taken together with the fact that many medieval altar missals had the word *Danger!* (*periculum!*) written in the margin immediately before the Words of Institution in the Canon, we are confronted with a mind-set which is sub-Christian at best, and which speaks volumes about the motivation and violence of the Reformers' protest. To argue, as Echlin does, that medieval belief about priesthood was sound and balanced (he prefers the term 'comprehensive') is to make the Reformation simply the assertion of a false position against a true one and to offer no explanation for its dynamic theological power and broad success. This will not do.

A second example of this kind of thing is to be found in the concluding discussion of *Apostolicae curae*, by which Pope Leo XIII in 1896 condemned Anglican orders as 'absolutely null and utterly void'. Echlin tells us that the Bull 'takes a restricted view of priesthood based on the teaching of Trent' (p. 164). Yet only a few pages previously he has ably summarised from other writers the evidence now widely available that Trent did *not* opt for a narrow theology of cultic 'sacrificing priesthood'. On this showing *Apostolicae curae* is based not on Trent but on a *misunderstanding* of Trent and thus of the church's authentic belief about the ordained ministry. Echlin's failure to perceive the logical force and thrust of his own argument vitiates his case at an absolutely crucial point. The final conclusion about the book must therefore be regret that the argument it seeks to advance has been so inadequately presented.

JOHN JAY HUGHES

SOCIAL SECURITY AND SOCIETY, by Victor George. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973. 154 pp. £2.60 hardback, £1.30 paper.

CURRENT ISSUES IN COMMUNITY WORK. A Study by the Community Work Group, The Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation. Routledge and hardback, £1.45 paper.

George. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973. 180 pp. £3.20

A Study by the Community Work Group, The Kegan Paul, London, 1973. 180 pp. £3.20

The problem for people who are poor is not only that they do not have enough money but they have no power to get it—power lies with others.

This rather obvious fact is often overlooked: the condition of poverty in England has at various times been presented as the inevitable lot of some, or even as a condition for which the poor themselves are to blame—idle, improvident, excessively fertile and otherwise defective in character as they are. More subtly: poor people are too attached to where they come from to move for work, or because of their special culture do not want the good things others have.

Moreover, by the time it was realised that the causes of poverty lie in our economic system that system was so firmly backed by the 'consensus' of our society that any determined effort to eliminate poverty can be presented not as a threat to the dominant interests of our society (which it is) but as a move against the *national* interest undermining the universally recognised values of our society.

This is the background that *Social Security and Society* sketches in for the emergence and functioning of social welfare. Professor George shows how social security became concerned solely with the relief of the rather artificially