

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS IN THE CHURCHES OF PAUL, by David L. Dungan. *Blackwell*, Oxford, 1971. 180 pp. £3.

This neat and penetrating little monograph examines the New Testament tradition of two sayings of Jesus, those on the payment of missionaries and on divorce. The starting point in each of the two halves is the version of Paul, but from there the author moves on to some very thorough work on the gospel texts, both what lies behind them and the work done by the synoptic writers themselves. He moves on a field beset with sacred cows, which jostle one to such an extent that it is sometimes difficult to breathe, although he strikes a shrewd blow at some of them, moving them resolutely out of the path he has planned for himself.

Dungan maintains that Paul disobeys the command of the Lord that the apostle should receive his livelihood from those to whom he is preaching: 'a startling impression of wilful disobedience to an explicit command of the Lord' (p. 33). He continues with a long explanation that Paul 'relativizes' all commands of the Lord if this is necessary for missionary purposes, for being all things to all men. Not only that, but Paul is dishonest to the Corinthians, because Dungan reckons that at the time he is high-mindedly refusing their contributions he is receiving them from other Churches. This is unnecessarily hard on Paul; it does not seem to me that Paul's pastoral suppleness justifies such strictures. But in any case the interest of the discussion is that in combination with the history of the saying in the synoptic gospels (however much one disagrees with the author's negative attitude to the Two Source theory), one can see mirrored in the development not only the history of the abuse which the Lord's permission occasioned, but more importantly the liberty with which the Church treated it, and the breadth of interpretation which they felt to be justified by

changing circumstances. The history of the command concerning divorce is dealt with lucidly and firmly. Dungan argues that remarriage is not envisaged by any New Testament text. Jesus' command is to be seen in the context of, and as opposed to, the current practice of frequent divorce and remarriage; to this the Lord opposes the teaching of Genesis about two in one flesh. Even Matthew's so-called exceptive clause is in fact only a supplement, recognizing *de iure* the *de facto* situation that the bond has been broken by the adultery of one of the parties. But even so there is no hint of permission to re-marry, and this would weaken the whole of Jesus' stand against current permissiveness. Jesus' ruling is compared to that of the Essenes in CD 4.20-21, where the prohibition of remarriage is based on the same text of Genesis. Less convincingly he views both prohibitions as eschatologically orientated; this is an attractive view, but not backed up by evidence (p. 117).

This is certainly an important contribution to the study of the history of the gospel tradition. So many positions in the long controversy about the relationship of Paul to Jesus, and the puzzling failure of gospel sayings to appear in his letters, have been based on *a priori* grounds. Dungan puts this failure to quote the sayings in the context of the general failure to quote them exactly evidenced in the early fathers before Irenaeus (e.g. Justin, Clement), which makes it seem much more plausible. Both Paul and the gospel writers seem to have treated the sayings of the Lord with a combination of respect and flexibility which later ages have failed to grasp or emulate, but which is certainly reminiscent of Jesus' own attitude to the Jewish Law.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION: THE HISTORIC APPROACHES, by M. J. Charlesworth. *Macmillan*, London, 1972. 216 pp. £2.50. (= 'Philosophy of Religion' Series, Gen. ed. John Hick.)

This book is concerned with the study of four possible logical structures within the philosophy of religion: four ways of relating philosophy and religion.

There is first the option for total identification, either by replacing religion by philosophy (Greek philosophers, including the Neo-

Platonists) or by turning religion into philosophy (Rationalist philosophers since Descartes).

For the more religious-minded thinkers, Jews and Christians, philosophy is merely the handmaid of religion, either confirming its claims (Philo, Augustine), or producing

rational support for them (Aquinas), or showing that religion is not impossible (Maimonides).

The third group, represented first and foremost by Kant and Kierkegaard, consider that the task of philosophy is to make room for religion.

Each of these attempts to bring philosophy and religion together has its positive and negative points, but the author is above all concerned with the danger of Reductionism, i.e. the tendency in philosophy to reduce religion to something that does not issue from revelation. This danger exists even in the third structure, for the refusal of philosophy to specify the object of faith may cause this to become irrelevant and religion then becomes a matter of a purely practical attitude.

Finally there is the opinion prevailing in the Anglo-Saxon world. This sees the task of philosophy as a purely analytical and therapeutic one, consisting in an accurate description of the language which is properly religious, distinguished from and not confused with others. Here the author would like to see again a greater sympathy for some sort of metaphysical discussion, for in order to show that the concept of God is not an illusory one, we would need to

demonstrate its instantiation in some way and not merely rest content with describing its use in religious discourse.

This book may well provide a good average introduction for beginners. But I do not think that it has anything more to say. It seems to suffer somewhat from the sharp distinction between natural and supernatural knowledge, which forms the basis of the discussion, and the author should certainly have had a closer look at the way in which he understands this distinction. A discussion of it in its original Neo-Platonic context would have been very illuminating, the more so as the author reproaches Neo-Platonism for bringing philosophy and religion too close to each other.

The historical approach, which was meant to be an engaged one, rather than a tracing out of a development in the past, failed to stir me. In fact I found it very standard, doing little justice to some of the more exciting works to which reference is made. This I would particularly stress for Jaeger's *The Theology of the Early Greek Philosophers*. Kant, too, suffers under this handbook standardization which never looks beyond the two first Critiques.

ROB VAN DER HART, O.P.

REFORMATION, John M. Todd. *Darton, Longman and Todd*, London. 377 pp. £3.75.

Mr Todd has set out to write a general account of the Reformation that will be acceptable to a certain kind of audience. Not Catholic but catholic, not Protestant but reformed: his book is imbued with the *ambience* of the ecumenical movement and such aspects of the Vatican Council acceptable to this *milieu*. The best thing in the book is a single chapter, which, however, takes up a third of the book, on Luther. Mr Todd has read a lot of Luther scholarship and some of Luther himself and he presents us with a moderate, rather conservative, existential, amiable, figure likely to be acceptable to those with more right than I have to criticize. He precedes this with a long introduction on the errors of the middle ages. This is simply dreadful. Mr Todd's middle ages—prepared, as he tells us, for those lacking time to read much—are all of a piece united at least in error about theology and the Church. St Boniface's strictures on a bizarre and perhaps half-pagan figure of the eighth century, Aldebert, are cited as though the affair were in some way typical. If one considers Aldebert's opinions as retailed by Boniface carefully, they show more resemblance to those of Henry

VIII than any medieval figure I can think of—except perhaps Gregory VII. Mr Todd thinks St Francis dominated the thirteenth century. This means he is the figure Mr Todd finds most sympathetic and convenient from that century, but I doubt if many contemporaries would have agreed, especially the miserable peasantry of the 'golden age of demesne farming'. On the Albigensians, we are told that when the heresy 'would yield neither to the preaching of St Bernard nor of St Dominic a "crusade" was called. War was declared on the Albigensians and the heresy destroyed in Europe by Christian soldiers, supported by the Dominican friar preachers.' (p. 68.) Is it pedantic to recall that St Bernard had been dead half a century before the Albigensian Crusade, and that the Dominican Order was not yet in existence? If Mr Todd would read what St Bernard actually wrote he would, I think, find that medieval religion was a little more complicated and a little less monolithic than he argues. He does give a good summary of the history of the Bible in the high middle ages, however.

Returning to the hundred pages or so Mr