

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