

(p. 233). To be sure, Hamilton says that our recollection of events in which God was once present are especially effective in transforming our lives today; and Christ's life, as it contributed to God's 'consequent nature', is 'particularly accessible to us'. But perhaps it needs to be pointed out that this represents a considerable departure from the traditional idea of 'the living Christ', rather than a reinterpretation of it in new conceptual categories.

The book is clearly organized and its style very readable. There are a few minor inconsistencies which might be challenged. For example, it is dubious that 'a stone has feelings' (p. 74); it is, in Whiteheadian terms, a 'corpuscular society' which is not the scene of any unified events. An appendix comparing brains

and computers concludes that the mind uses the brain as an 'operator' uses a computer; this would surely be incompatible with Whitehead's objections to all mind-matter dualisms. But on the whole the consistency and clarity of the volume are commendable. Since I find that his interpretation of Christ, rather than his doctrine of God, constitutes the most novel section—and one which will be controversial—I can only express the hope that he will make it the subject of further more detailed exploration. Perhaps questions of methodology might also be treated; for example, how does one reconcile Whitehead's insistence on the universality of metaphysics with the Christian understanding of revelation in unique events? I look forward to Hamilton's next book. IAN G. BARBOUR

SCIENCE AND FAITH IN TEILHARD DE CHARDIN (Teilhard Study Library, Vol. 1), by Claude Cuénot. *Garnstone Press*, London, 1967. 109 pp. 8s. 6d.

EVOLUTION, MARXISM AND CHRISTIANITY (Teilhard Study Library, Vol. 2), by various contributors. *Garnstone Press*, London, 1967. 110 pp. 8s. 6d.

Contributors to volumes on Teilhard, and reviewers of the same, have as their first temptation the urge to make assessments of the importance of Teilhard's Thought. Few succeed in overcoming the temptation and consequently lapse either into straight hagiography or into diatribe. In the first volume of this new series put out by the Teilhard de Chardin Society of Great Britain M. Cuénot barely escapes the former. If only the Teilhardians would leave this kind of writing behind they might find a yet wider audience for the genuinely important aspects of Teilhard's thoughts. When M. Cuénot does at last get round to the difficult questions which appear at the borderline of science and theology he unfortunately does little to inspire confidence in the Teilhardian position. It is, for instance, one thing to demythologize the biblical aetiology of original sin but quite another virtually to throw out the doctrine because 'grave sin, the rejection of the prevenient grace of God, presupposes an enormous progress in human reflection. . .'. If a fulness of reflection is a necessary precondition for the love of God or the rejection of God it would be difficult to escape the conclusion that God is more interested in intellectuals than in anyone else. Whatever we say about evolutionary preparation we ought to maintain that the appearance of man with the ability to love was the appearance of something really new. And with the ability to love comes the ability to sin. But it does not seem necessary to believe that the perfection of our parents was anything but the perfection of

being fully human at the beginning of things, with all the boundless possibilities of development which that implies. Fortunately, it seems possible to say that the catastrophe of original sin was the rejection of possibilities rather than of an actual perfection. This would, moreover, give an absolute importance to the Incarnation and Redemption—i.e. that of restoring the possibilities which the human race had forfeited—which does not seem to be given with any consistency in the writings of the Teilhardians. If there is any merit in this book, it lies not so much in any real clarification of Teilhard's writings as in the vigorous profession of faith of the author who clearly hopes for the appearance of really new things in history. The chief enemy of all Teilhardians, as of this reviewer, is the conservative whose only conception of human unity is that the first principle of conduct is to 'look after number one', whether it be one's self or one's nation, and that nothing else can be expected in view of the fact that 'you can't change human nature'. If the Teilhardians make this attitude less easy to take they will have achieved something.

The second volume in the series is of uneven quality and of uneven relevance to the subject of its title. The first three papers—on the origin of life, the question of orthogenesis and on human embryology—may be of some interest to the beginner, but they add nothing either to biology or to Teilhard. A number of papers on various subjects filled out with risky generalizations does not make, nor does it contribute to, a synthesis. In this case they do

Spirituality for Today

edited by

ERIC JAMES

This volume collects together the main papers given at the 1967 Parish and People Conference. Contributors include the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Durham, Dr H. Guntrip, Dr C. Boxer, O.P., Colin Alves and Miss Mollie Batten.

12s 6d net

Theology for a New World

HERBERT

RICHARDSON

It is Professor Richardson's thesis that much of recent theological discussion, notably that inspired by Harvey Cox, has failed to reach the crux of today's crises. He therefore offers a series of studies which seek to move out of outmoded patterns towards a theology which is really for a new world. Many of the questions which occupy us most today, from the secular city and the death of God to myth and faith, are dealt with in an exciting and provocative way.

30s net

S C M PRESS

little more than illustrate how much the use of the word 'evolution' has been stretched to breaking point in order to cover everything from the appearance of the first proteins to the Second Coming. The most interesting contribution might have been that of the Marxist Roger Garaudy on Teilhard's contribution to the dialogue between Christians and Marxists. Unfortunately he is unable to go much further than to raise two cheers for Christianity for having caught up at last with Marxism in the discovery of evolution. Perhaps this is because he is in the end unable, as a Marxist, to make much real contact with so unpractical a movement as Teilhardism. It is perhaps unfair to criticize the movement for not being what it does not pretend to be, but it ought to be said that no movement which has no issue in politics can be a fruitful point of contact between Christianity and Marxism. A dialogue with Marxism which ignores the political imperative leaves itself open to the charge of being merely a game of intellectual snap. Garaudy sees the deficiency when he writes: '... he (Teilhard) gives us hardly any means of solving the problem of transforming the world into a more human place, owing to the fact that he regards social progress as merely one of the aspects of biological progress.'

Another contributor, A. O. Dyson, seems at first reading to be more aware of the political imperative. But going deeper as he does into the theology of the 'dialogue' he exposes more clearly the rather alarming theology on which it is founded. *Is it true to say that evolution 'subsumes the whole purpose of creation, incarnation and redemption' such that 'the role of the Christian and the Church is to foster evolution as a growth in spirit and personal fulfilment in the realm of knowledge and love'?* And is the stand for an 'immediate and transcendent relationship to the Person of Christ' a Docetist aberration of true Christology which 'knows only of a mediated relationship with Christ'? If this really is part of Teilhard's message it is no wonder that theologians with a knowledge of the Tradition have been alarmed by it. The trouble with a purely 'cosmic' Christ is that we can decide what to make of him at our own will according to the fashion of the age. The Christ of the New Testament is greater than that. Moreover, only if we do not assume that we know what is meant by evolution can we say that the role of the Church is to foster it. It is something that is precisely *not* under our complete control. If, like many Teilhardians,

we believe that it is, then we cannot identify it with the coming of Christ. Finally it must be pointed out that 'faith in the future' is not an adequate interpretation of what is meant by 'faith' in the Christian tradition. Unfortunately the notion seems to undergo this reduction in

meaning when Teilhardism attempts to put Marxism and Christianity into the same biological container. If this volume makes anything clear it is that they are both separately too large for it.

ALBERT RUSTON, O.P.

QUIS CUSTODIET? The Newman Association, Journal of the Legal Studies Group, No. 14/15, Hilary and Easter, London, 1967. 50 pp.

Quis Custodiet? began its life in duplicated form five years ago as the journal of the Newman Legal Studies Group. The combined Hilary and Easter number for 1967 was the first issue to appear in printed form. This new presentation is to be welcomed for itself and for the growth in circulation which it must reflect. It is to be hoped that the presumption of the title is redeemed by a genuine stress on the interrogative. That might best be shown by inviting contributions from lawyers of other faiths and none, as well as from non-lawyers, Catholic or otherwise. The implication of the group's 'term of reference', set out on the inside cover, is that a commitment to natural law is the only philosophical position proper to a Catholic lawyer. This was perhaps more to be expected in 1961 than it would be today.

Such carping criticism is not meant to detract from the real value of *Quis Custodiet?* There is undoubtedly plenty of scope for a journal of Christian orientation with a scholarly commitment to canon law, comparative law, and international law as well as our legal system. With a major reform of both English and canon law a continuing prospect, there is plenty of work to be done. Whether or not the

Church would welcome any proposals the Newman Legal Studies Group may care to make, the Law Commission will certainly listen to their suggestions should they wish to endorse any proposals as a group. Two of the articles in double number of the Journal are excellent examples of what can be done. Dr Brown's article on 'Secrecy in Ecclesiastical Nullity Trials' is a most effective criticism of the maiden-auntly absurdities of the present procedure. It destroys the usual apologetic arguments in a quiet and deadly way. Mr McEwen's comments on the current proposals for the reform of our divorce law are perceptive, realistic and enlightened. One must have reservations, however, about a separate system of civil marriage law, enforced by tribunals distinct from the ordinary divorce courts, for those who make a Catholic or other Christian marriage. This would seem not only a possible instrument of religious tyranny, but likely to produce even more scandal and confusion than the differences between canon law and civil law create at present. It must be said, in fairness to Mr McEwen, that he gives this idea only passing support.

A. J. BOYLE

A QUESTION OF CONSCIENCE, by Charles Davis. Hodder & Stoughton, 1967. 30s.
THE McCABE AFFAIR, by Simon Clements and Monica Lawlor. Sheed & Ward, 1967. 15s.

One who wishes to write about the affairs of Charles Davis and Herbert McCabe had better begin by putting his cards face upwards on the table. Herbert McCabe has been a friend for many years. Charles Davis I have never, to my knowledge, even met. I greatly admired both men as editors, though I admired Father McCabe's writings while quite failing to share that admiration for Charles Davis's theological writings that seems to have been widespread among English Catholics and, to my very great surprise, among non-Catholic theological journalists on such newspapers as *The Guardian*. When the news of Herbert McCabe's dismissal was made public I immediately wrote in *Common-sense*, whose British representative I am, that

'a full rehabilitation [i.e. including his restoration to his editorial chair] would be the only satisfactory end to this disgraceful affair'. This is still my view, though I do not look upon his replacement by another as a reason for not contributing to *New Blackfriars*. I even have to confess to thinking well of Archbishop Cardinale who, except in relation to Father McCabe's editorial, seems to me to have played an honourable and distinguished part in the affairs of the English Church. His violent remarks on the subject of Father McCabe's very moderate remarks, in the celebrated editorial, I find quite inexplicable, without even a Machiavellian explanation. Finally, I am not above the battle as, say, a Quaker or a Greek