

working dedicated and disciplined priest, but what of the chances of its success being applied widely? Are there many more like him ready to do as he does? He wants the rural parishes to hand over some of their finance and full-time clergy to urban churches. Logically and ideologically the solution might seem to be correct but whether it will mean the survival of the Church of England or churches with a similar immediate policy is questionable.

This is a provocative book for Anglican study groups and raises interesting questions for those of different denominations.

The other book which appears under his name is clearly not for parish groups, although from what Gill says about anti-intellectualism he might recommend it to them. Clearly those readers of the *Reader in Sociology and Theology* are likely to be theological students and professional theologians.

Since sociology is primarily concerned with analysis and method and theology is more a matter of substance involving widely different methodologies, the points of contact between the two disciplines are many and varied. A *Reader* should reflect the fact and this is achieved by Gill's selection of 28 items which cover such subjects as methodology, the sociology of knowledge, the Old Testament, the New, the early church, secularization, ministry, pilgrimage. But ritual does not get all it deserves and popular religion, so much on the lips of clergy these days, is not at all popular with Gill. His chips from the classics might well have been omitted, for such an approach never does justice to writers like Durkheim, Weber, Marx and Troeltsch.

It is assumed that those who read the book know what sociology is all about. That is questionable. Rather than give a résumé of the items in the introduction, it might have been devoted to the nature of sociology and its alleged godlessness.

The introductions by Gill to each section are good and the presentation by numbered paragraphs of each item has much merit for teaching purposes. However, the referencing to ch. 27 falls down badly.

In brief, the *Reader* is quite unique and is to be much commended.

One can put these books down at least convinced that if sociology cannot save us; it certainly makes us think. Indeed, that is its role.

W.S.F. PICKERING

THE SPIRIT OF LOVE by Brian Gaybba *Geoffrey Chapman Theology Library, London, 1988, pp. 290. £12.50.*

This is the sixth volume in a series that started life about five years ago as 'Introducing Catholic Theology'. The object of the series is to provide up-to-date text books for readers who are seriously interested in Christian, and specifically Catholic, theology—whether or not they are formal students of theology. The general editor in his foreword to this volume also stresses the ecumenical dimension which is desired for the series.

Professor Gaybba succeeds completely in meeting these requirements. He has provided a really excellent text book, full of all the necessary information, in continuous dialogue with the theology and experience of other traditions, particularly of course in this sphere, of the Pentecostal Churches and the whole charismatic movement, and equipped with a very full bibliography and useful indices.

I hope I won't be misunderstood; Gaybba has written a book on the Holy Spirit, not an encyclopedia or a dictionary. His own theology of the Spirit is clear and simple (a simplicity that does not eliminate profundity or mystery, and even in its historical development all sorts of complexities). It is given in his title, *The Spirit of Love*. His basic text, applied in the best Augustinian tradition, is 'God is love', and the book ends with a brief meditation on that passage (1 Jn 4:16).

The book is in two parts, the first devoted to the historical development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, the second to a systematic theology of the subject. This inevitably involves

some repetition, but that is not really a drawback. The systematic part, which indeed does something more than organise the fruits of the first part into a system, still remains firmly anchored in the historical part—which means, in good old-fashioned language, firmly anchored in scripture and tradition.

In short the book is so good it doesn't need any more puffs from a mere reviewer, who can happily devote the rest of his space to picking a few bones with the author, secure in the knowledge that this will not detract in the least from the value of his book.

To begin with trivia and a point of style. The general style is easy and lucid, a little colourless, perhaps. But what I regard as a bad habit is treating the word 'above'—properly an adverb—as a kind of glorified demonstrative pronoun. We have paragraphs beginning 'All the above', 'The above', 'From the above' (at least five times), 'The above developments', 'In the above', 'In the above paragraphs', 'The implication of the above'. In all cases the ordinary demonstrative pronoun 'this/these' would do just as well, and would avoid that slight flavour of a conscientious town clerk's report on his administration.

There may have been a scholastic theologian called Gilbert of Poitiers (p. 71, 87), but the man whom Gaybba so calls was in fact *Gilbertus Porretanus*, who in modern translation becomes Gilbert de la Poirée; 'of Poitiers' would translate into *Pictaviensis*.

Sometimes Gaybba is content just to echo his secondary sources somewhat uncritically, without referring to the primary sources himself. Thus in interpreting the descent of the Spirit of Jesus as a dove, he follows G.T. Montague (*The Holy Spirit; Growth of Biblical Tradition*) in what strikes me as a glaring omission—no mention of the dove sent out of the ark by Noah as a model or archetype for the new testament baptism scene (p. 19).

Again, he relies on E.J. Fortman (*The Triune God*) for repeating the commonplace misunderstanding (as I see it) of Augustine that 'his emphasis on the unity of persons is so strong that it blurs the sharper distinctions maintained by the East as regards the individual role played by each divine person in the work of salvation' (p. 60). In my opinion, this reads back into Augustine's thought later exaggerations which derived partly from him and partly from other patristic sources, and also reads back too far in patristic history the big divergences between Greek East and Latin West. In the same vein I don't think he is right, at least as regards Augustine, in so tightly linking the theology of 'appropriation' of certain names to particular divine persons with the doctrine that all divine activity *ad extra* is that of all the persons without distinction (p. 85).

On p. 110 he appears to say, what I am sure he does not mean, that Newman's *On Consulting the Faithful in Matters of Doctrine* was in effect the 'repudiation of that idea'—what idea?—as the paragraph stands, the idea of 'the Spirit as guide of the entire people of God'. It is a case of rather careless composition. The author presumably means the idea sketched in the previous sentence but one, that 'The Spirit became to all intents and purposes the guarantor of the magisterium's decisions'.

On a rather more serious matter, I think Gaybba is wrong, or at best confused, on the question of the sinlessness of Jesus as a consequence of his being the divine Son (p. 149/50). He doesn't actually put the antecedent like that, which is the way it should be put. He talks of Jesus' 'personal unity with the Father'. And he says 'Jesus could theoretically have sinned. If he had freedom, then theoretically he could sin'. Then he goes on to say, 'I agree that Jesus was *in fact* (his italics) incapable of sinning ... This was because he loved so much'. But he was theoretically capable of sinning, in spite of sharing God's divine nature in perfect equality with the Father.

I don't think the whole passage will stand up to rigorous analysis. Why did Jesus love so much? Was it not because he shared the divine nature? If so, then his sharing the divine nature was what made him incapable of sinning. In other words, he could not, logically, simultaneously share the divine nature and sin.

Those are quite enough bones to pick for the time being. Read this excellent book, and join in the arguments.

EDMUND HILL OP