

this book first appeared, in 1970, it was so up-to-date that it is a pity it has not here been updated, but it is still the best book of its kind. On the other hand, *Keep the Faith Baby* reveals Leech's shortcomings.

Attempts to locate the hippy phenomenon in a wider context are made by our other authors, Mills tending to concentrate on individuals and Speck on social networks. Both men are aware of the shortcomings of traditional techniques or sociological investigation when applied in this field, and to some extent abandon them. Of the two, it is Speck who has aimed to encompass the more and who has been aided by an expert research team, but it is Mills who has given us the better book.

What helps to give Mill's conclusions weight (and they drive him to argue against the present law controlling cannabis, against 'conformist' therapy, against the relative rigidity of the present educational system, against a housing policy that does not provide for communal structures) is that clearly he is himself by temperament unadventurous, a self-confessed 'square'. His book relies on 'the description and explanation of that common structure of meaning which hippies impose upon the world', and he believes 'this meaning derives from experiences and feelings which are largely independent of the social structure itself'. So he sets out to show how 'feelings, intuitions and experiences interact to form that vision of oneself and the world from which individual behaviour and social circumstances derive'. And what is fascinating about the book is that, in spite of his failure to convey effectively in his descriptive sections a convincing 'hippy's eye-view', simply because time and again at crucial moments his achievement-orientated criteria blind him (with the result that long passages read like humdrum Sunday-heavy journalism), nevertheless in the synthesis in the closing chapters he comes remarkably close to realizing his

ambitious aim. It is here, surprisingly, that this author shows himself to be an interpreter of society of sensitivity and imagination; it is here that there is least evidence of dependence on the now very questionable presuppositions of sociological orthodoxy.

Dr. Speck's book, by contrast, would be much better if there were a little more evidence in it of the academic discipline that undoubtedly went into the copious background research. Speck is a man full of exciting ideas, and there is a gap between the data we are given and the conclusions he draws: by and large, the conclusions are much more exciting than the scrappy and frequently ill-organised data would seem to justify. Both Speck and Mills, working from different approaches, conclude that for the majority of youth who become hippies the function of the drug-culture is to structure what is only a period of transition and yet nevertheless the passage through that 'period of transition' seems to have a lasting effect on an hippy's world-view. However, Speck's team venture on to announce that a central discovery of their work is that 'the use of so-called psychedelic drugs, currently so disapproved of by the larger society, represents a sort of training process for a new society'. They may be right, but the facts Speck gives us do not justify a 'discovery' anything like as radical as that. Moreover, one has the impression that even in the field Speck has frequently projected his own ideas into the social networks he and his team have been investigating. The team itself was certainly aware that it initiated the development of group consciousness in some of the networks it visited.

And so we constantly confront the question with which we began . . . and we will continue to do so, it seems, as long as the distinction between 'insider' and 'outsider' preserves its present connotations.

JOHN ORME MILLS, O.P.

THINKING ABOUT THE EUCHARIST by the Church of England Doctrine Commission. SCM Press, London, 1972. 95 p. vi+122 pp.

Liturgical renewal must be based on sound theology. It was consequently wise of the Church of England Liturgical Commission, when engaged in preparing the Series III order of the Eucharist, to seek theological guidance from the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine. The volume under review is the collection of the short papers which individual members of the Doctrine Commission wrote in response to this request.

Most important aspects of eucharistic doctrine are covered. John Lucas writes on some of the philosophical issues involved. Dr. A. R. Peacocke explores with the mind of a scientist

the connection between the Eucharist and creation. John Baker examines the institution-narratives of the New Testament. The very important subject of symbolism is treated in two papers by Professor C. F. Evans and the Bishop of Kingston, Hugh Montefiore. Leslie Houlden analyses the history and meaning of the term 'sacrifice' in the eucharistic context. Professor H. E. W. Turner has valuable comments to make on the real presence. In a final essay Professor Maurice Wiles argues convincingly that a diversity in eucharistic theology is needed in order that the doctrine may be expressed in all its fullness. The much-lamented Ian Ramsey,

late Bishop of Durham, contributed a short preface.

It is instructive to compare this co-operative process of consultation and communication with parallel procedures in the Catholic Church. The most obvious point of contrast is between the Anglican instinct for making such deliberations available to the public and the Catholic preference for confidentiality. Concern for open debate and public accountability commends the first method; care that people's faith should not be disturbed and that decisions should not be unduly influenced by external pressures favours the second. The next point to strike one is the academic background of all the contributors; all but two currently hold university posts, not all of them in theology. The result is that the authors bring to the subject a high degree of academic competence, not only the competence which each possesses in his own field, but also a general ease in the presentation and evaluation of evidence.

However, this very strength of the contributors has an unfortunate consequence: the papers are if anything too academic. I do not mean by this that the authors are insufficiently aware of pastoral considerations; granted their terms of reference, I do not think the contributors can be blamed on that score. What I mean is that the essays, for all the expertise that they contain, sound sometimes like papers read to a university discussion-club and containing penetrating observations by very intelligent men on subjects that fall slightly outside their main field of competence.

Paradoxically I find this weakness most marked in two of the papers that I find most helpful—the papers by Houlden and Turner. Turner has evidently read many books by Catholic theologians, but still, in his interpretation of the terms *ex opere operato* and *sacramenta significando causant*, is quite clearly groping his way to the meaning of the terms from outside; he takes no account of the explanations given nowadays by theologians like Karl Rahner. Houlden in one paragraph condemns centuries of thought about eucharistic sacrifice as (not just one-sided but) 'a mistake'. Surely, too, Montefiore would not have spoken quite so categorically about the 'brevity and terseness' of Latin collects if he had ever had to translate them.

Nevertheless these essays contain many perceptive insights which have a value for other bodies besides the Church of England Liturgical Commission, even though one may wish sometimes for further discussion. Lucas, for example, after indicating the philosophical difficulties involved in speaking of our association in the Eucharist with Christ's self-giving (but does he consider sufficiently the implications of the fact that the Christian lives his life 'in Christ?'), goes

on to point out that 'the ways in which the modern eucharist can properly be understood in terms of self-giving should be based, not on a *a priori* argument, but on what we believe our Lord intended.' This is an illuminating remark; but is it not possible that the Church, guided by the Spirit, has legitimately transcended the explicit intentions of Christ at the Last Supper? And can we, on the basis of the New Testament, reach back with certainty behind the mind of the Church into the mind of Jesus at that point of history?

Baker, after examining the New Testament texts, offers three tentative conclusions. First, the actions with the bread and wine are the only mandatory parts of the Eucharist. 'We are not obliged to use the institution narrative or the words. . . . What we say should be composed of the faith by which we live, as we see it . . . , bringing out of our treasures new things and old.' Secondly, 'the eucharist is not a re-enactment of the Last Supper; it is a fellowship-meal with the risen Christ . . . , at which we look back with gratitude to the sacrifice which made this blessedness possible.' Thirdly, Jesus did not interpret his actions at the Last Supper in terms of any particular Old Testament institution, such as sacrifice or covenant. 'He himself simply implied that his body and blood were "for us"'. It is ours to decide in his Spirit what that "for us" involves.'

Montefiore points out that 'a change of emphasis through symbolic action . . . can reorient the rite far more than an alteration in the theological wording of an eucharistic prayer.' This is a timely reminder for those who assume that liturgical reform is largely a matter of changing words; style, or what Michael Argyle calls non-verbal communication, is at least equally important.

Turner's aim is 'to set the doctrine of the eucharistic presence in a personalist and not an entitative framework'. The assertion of entitative presence by the use of such terms as substance or change is designed to safeguard the objectivity or givenness of the presence. However, to say that the presence is personal is not to deny that givenness, but simply to insist that Christ's presence is not inert but redemptive.

Those who have doubted whether the Windsor Statement accurately reflects the full spectrum of opinion in the Church of England could profitably read this book as a commentary on the statement; for though, as the preface points out, 'each paper carries the authority only of its author', nevertheless these writers are the official advisors of the Church in matters of doctrine.

E. J. YARNOLD, S.J.