

fronting the synagogue with a missionary aim. Both Church and Synagogue are at the same time communities of saints and the assembly of sinners. Only when they are face to face can the church rediscover the Gospel she is sent to preach, and understand her true nature as the

servant of others in the Spirit of Christ. Any other confrontation with other religions cannot lead the Church to this. Unfortunately Dr Jocz limits his speculations to Protestant communities.

IRENE MARINOFF

SOMME THEOLOGIQUE, 1a2ae. 18-21. Les actes humains, Vol. 2. Saint Thomas d'Aquin. French translation by H. D. Gardeil, O.P.: notes and appendices by S. Pinkaers, O.P. *Cerf-Desclée*, Paris. n.p.

The Latin is the good text of ms 5347 Bibliothèque Nationale, the translation is crisp, and the notes are expert. The subject is that capital section in moral theology where St Thomas gets down to the cool difference between right and wrong. The present vogue may treat him as occupying a place in theology like that of Virgil in literature, less read than respected . . . if that; all the same it is noteworthy that two books on the same plan have appeared in the last publishing season, one in French, the other in English. A comparison of the two is inviting, but would be out of place for this reviewer. Enough to say that he envies the manner in which this one presents its treatise in the stream of historical theology, and does justice alike to its originality and its breeding . . . by Aristotle out of Peter Lombard. Not that it is left as a piece of medievalism, for the appendices show it living to fight Ockam's antithesis of law and

liberty and its consequences in the old casuism of the manuals. This, which may have been well enough in its place, now holds out only in pockets: it never matched the sweep of Christian morals to beatitude and friendship. Ill-assorted with it at first sight, another consequence also comes from the same stable. This is the moral theory of response exclusively to individual situation: it, too, discloses a nominalism about principles and kinds of action, and, though replacing the bone of legalism with the tissue of feeling, produces its own kind of casuism. Which is better, to be excused by a judge because you have found a hole in the law, or to be excused by a psychologist because you could not help yourself? Both, as the mandarin remarked at the final of a beauty contest, both are worse.

THOMAS GILBY, O.P.

THE THEOLOGY OF RUDOLF BULTMANN, edited by Charles W. Kegley. *S.C.M. Press*, 1966. 45s.

However mistaken the methods and aims of Bultmann's theology may be, there can be no doubt either of its range of influence or of its intellectual power. This book consists of a series of articles on the principal aspects of Bultmann's theology, and anyone who wants to decide whether to become a Bultmannite or not can find here any number of reasons *pro* and *con*.

Bornkamm's contribution is a very able defence of Bultmann's theology in general. Of the more radical criticisms, Owen's seems to me outstanding. He points out that it is at least as Catholic as Protestant to hold that revelation is not *primarily* a statement of propositions, but a communication of the divine life; and he questions whether Bultmann has realised the *secondary* importance of doctrinal formulations. Heinrich Ott reasonably complains that he can find nothing about the Last Judgment, and precious little about divine Providence, in Bultmann's writings; while John Macquarrie suggests that Bultmann's wholly negative attitude towards the non-Christian religions is

a pity, and not really consistent with the thorough application of his own principles. Schubert Ogden brings out still more forcefully the inconsistency between Bultmann's radically existentialist interpretation of the New Testament, and his insistence of the absolute uniqueness of Jesus Christ as bearer of the Word. He himself holds God's grace to be bestowed pre-eminently, though not solely, through Jesus Christ. Paul Minear, in an article whose turgid literary style tends to obscure the importance and good sense of the content, says that Bultmann has failed to take full account of the cosmological implications of the New Testament message. Cosmology and anthropology, Minear insists, are interdependent both for St Paul and for St John, and an eschatology which has as little bearing as Bultmann's on the actual future of the world seems hardly worth the name. I ought to add that nearly all of these objections are made in the context of a strong positive appreciation of Bultmann's work.

There are sections on Bultmann's relation

to contemporary philosophy (continental of course), his evaluation of Judaism, his attitude to the Old Testament, and the significance of his teaching for religious education. I am not at all sure that I know what Logstrup is on about – he is certainly full of Scandinavian pessimism. ‘Any fool can make you think, but it takes real talent to make you laugh.’

The book ends with clear and charitable

answers by Bultmann to each of his critics. But he never begins to answer what seems to me the fundamental question to be put to him, which is this: In what sense is the cross of Jesus Christ a saving event, apart from the subjective attitude which some men choose to take to it?

HUGO MEYNELL

CONCISE THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY, by Karl Rahner and Herbert Vorgrimler. Edited by Cornelius Ernst, O.P. and translated by Richard Strachan. *Freiburg: Herder and London: Burns & Oates*, 45s.

This is a book one has to live with (hence the lateness of this review!). For surely the only way to appreciate a dictionary is to use it. That the dictionary under review will be a most useful addition to the already existing ones, of this there can be no doubt. It will not, of course, replace the great and standard works of the past, but it will help to complement them in its own particular way in the field of contemporary religious thought.

In this work, Fr Rahner and his pupil do not ask questions with the basic intention of stirring us out of our theological lethargy, a procedure so familiar to us from Fr Rahner's other works, particularly those generally known in this country. In this dictionary we are given simple but typically Rahnerian explanations of theological concepts guaranteed by the author's deep-rooted and extensive knowledge of the sources of all theology. It is not surprising, therefore, that the authors in their Preface are able to state that ‘having just gone over the text for the fifth German reprint, we note with some satisfaction that nothing whatever needs to be changed because of the Council: our approach seems to be a sound one after all’. This dictionary will consequently be of particular interest to students of Rahner's own underlying approach. Yet, even more than some of his other works, it should also prove most useful to a much wider public. The generous employment of cross-references will be of

great assistance to anyone looking for an overall view and also greatly increases the depth of the various individual entries.

As stated in the authors' Preface, this book ‘is intended to provide brief explanations, in alphabetical order, of the most important concepts of modern Catholic dogmatic theology for readers who are prepared to make a certain intellectual effort’. The very conciseness of this work (493 pages) inevitably demands such an effort on the part of the reader. Yet, in spite of the authors' further statement that these considerations of space forced them to dispense with bibliography, we cannot help feeling that the lack of bibliography remains a valid criticism. The inclusion of even the briefest of bibliographies certainly would have increased the possible fruitfulness of the intellectual effort demanded of the reader. This criticism, while pointing out a certain obvious limitation, is not of course meant to deny the great basic value of this book. Like any dictionary, it is a mine of information requiring constant exploration and its wealth will not be discovered at a superficial glance. We are fortunate indeed to have it in such a competent and readable translation. We eagerly await now the promised appearance of the English translation of the philosophical dictionary of Father W. Brugger, S.J., recommended by our present authors as a companion volume to their own.

KARL-H. KRUGER

THE MORALITY OF THE CRIMINAL LAW by H. L. A. Hart. *Oxford University Press*. 12s. 6d.

This book contains two lectures delivered by Professor Hart at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 1964. Both of them are salvos in controversies in which Hart has been engaged before and in which he will no doubt be engaged again. In the first lecture his principal adversary is Lady Wootton; in the second it is Lord Devlin. Taking his stance in the middle-of-the-road liberal tradition. Hart defends himself against attacks from the Left and from the Right.

The first lecture considers the suggestion that the notion of criminal responsibility, or *mens rea*, should be allowed to wither away, so that the state of a man's mind at the time of his crime should no longer be relevant to the question whether to convict him. Hart agreed with the critics of *mens rea* that the legal situation at the time of writing, based on the McNaughten rules modified by the Homicide Act of 1957 and the Mental Health Act of 1959, was unsatisfactory.