

difficult to see how, granted his basic conception, it ever could be. To speak of 'moral blindness', as he does in this connection, is surely itself to insist once more upon a subject-object relationship which may be proper to sense-perception but hardly to the apprehension of value. Value is no more (and no less) 'objective' than it is 'subjective'. It is properly speaking *transcendental*, i.e. manifest in a subject-object relationship but not itself the object in this relationship, whether, as in metaphysical goodness, this relationship is the universal *complacentia* of God's will in all that is; or, as in moral goodness, it is the consent of the human will to an intelligible situation which includes as an essential constituent the agent himself, orientated by his very spontaneity towards beatitude.

It is impossible in the course of these brief remarks to do more than hint at the abundance contained in this book of four hundred and seventy pages, and to suggest profitable lines of discussion. Whatever other reserves one may wish to make, it may at least be said without qualification that Professor Hildebrand's treatise is, by reason of its scope and depth, the most important work of its kind available to the English reader who has not explicitly rejected Christian and human values.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

NATURAL RELIGION AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By Victor Murray. (Nisbet; 14s.)

One way of bridging the gulf between religion and psychology is to make psychology itself a religion. It would be ungenerous to say that this is what Professor Murray consciously sets out to do. But it is difficult to avoid this kind of pan-religionism (or, if you prefer, mystical pan-psychologism), when it is taken for granted that 'despite the etymological derivation of the word . . . theology is a human science concerned with people, with what they have said or felt or concluded or recorded'. And it is even easier when one is reacting strongly against a theology that teaches the total depravity of human nature and justification by extrinsic imputation. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Jung's psychology, but Catholic Jungians will wish that Professor Murray had adopted Freud or Adler. Dr Jung is made to appear more 'religious' than ever, and a chapter on the strength and weakness of Jung as an exponent of Christianity upbraids him for his concept of 'psychological truth' and his disinterest (*qua* psychologist he deserves to be praised for this) in the objective criteria of religious dogma. For one who professes to be influenced by Jungian psychology, it is surprising that Professor Murray had not found the time to catch up in his reading with *God and the Unconscious*.

Although one cannot recommend this book as a welcome addition to the literature on the subject, nevertheless Professor Murray is to be praised and thanked for his effort. When he writes that 'this book has been written in the belief that the two sciences of psychology and anthropology . . . provide a new and more profitable approach to theology than the older approach through metaphysics . . .', he at least shows more understanding of the religious needs of people today than a well-known Catholic ecclesiastic and writer who complained that modern man in his quest for inner peace prefers to begin with psychology rather than with Catholic metaphysics. What a bore for Catholic metaphysicians, and how inconsiderate of modern man.

MURDOCH SCOTT, O.P.

PROPHECY AND RELIGION IN ANCIENT CHINA AND ISRAEL. By H. H. Rowley. (University of London, Athlone Press; 21s.)

These six lectures are published in accordance with the terms of the Louis H. Jordan Bequest Lectures in Comparative Religion at the School of Oriental and African Studies. Professor Rowley has sought to bring together two very different fields of study, while admitting, as all must, that 'it is hard for anyone to be a real specialist in two such widely different fields'. The comparison which he makes all through is between the sayings of Chinese sages of the classical period and the teaching of the Old Testament prophets from the eighth to the sixth centuries B.C. The result in effect has been a putting together of many valuable pages on the nature of prophecy, on the prophet as a statesman, as a reformer, on the prophet and the golden age, and worship, and God . . . the whole forming an immensely competent tractate on the phenomenon and fact of prophecy in Israel.

So much for the Hebrew prophetic side. But when we come to *comparison* between classical Chinese writings and the Bible, surely, speaking as one less wise, the comparison should be made in the domain of quite another *genre* of biblical literature. It does indeed seem that the writings of the Chinese sages bear much more resemblance to and could much more easily be compared to the sapiential writings in their full range, i.e. so as to include the deutero-canonicals or 'Apocrypha' of non-Catholic versions. It is difficult to be at all convinced that there is much resembling the Hebrew prophetic phenomenon in classical Chinese thought. The goal of all prophecy is Christ himself, and Christ was never in the purview of Chinese sages. For this reason too, the prophetic *genre* is *sui generis*. And though comparative religion may adduce parallels to Hebrew prophecy in other religions and climes, still these parallels are in the material origins and conditions of prophecy, and perhaps strikingly so; but not in the