

On this assumption, God's goodness is *moral* goodness. But should we think about God and evil as if that were so?

Many theologians have not. That God is good by human standards of goodness is not a biblical view. Compare, for example, what we find St. Paul writing in *Romans* 9. Again, consider all that St. Thomas Aquinas has to say when he speaks about God and evil. Aquinas wrote a number of commentaries on biblical texts, and was ever anxious to interpret them in what he called a 'literal sense'. But it never seems to occur to him that God is a morally good agent, someone who knows what his moral obligations are, or how he should strive to display his possession of what Aristotle had in mind when he wrote about human virtue. Aquinas certainly insists that God is good (cf. *Summa Theologiae*, 1a, 6). But, and even though he is clear that God made us in his image and likeness, he does not think of God as possessing human virtues, or as abiding by duties or obligations that people have. So, he does not engage in presenting or criticising theodicies (attempts to justify God on moral grounds) which assume at the outset that, if God exists, then God is well behaved, that God has morally sufficient reasons for permitting suffering and sin. Yet this non-theodacist approach of Aquinas (surely one of the most distinguished of Christian theologians writing about God and evil), receives zero attention in CCPE. In his informative chapter titled 'Anti-Theodicy', N.N. Trakakis alludes to it (p. 129), but does not develop his reference. And Aquinas's name appears only three times in the book (once in a footnote to Trakakis's chapter, and twice in the body of Ruse's text).

All of this suggests to me that a significant approach to God and evil is unfortunately just ignored in CCPE. In this volume we find a number of comparisons made between God and good human parents. Yet why should one presume that a proper approach to God and evil ought to proceed on the supposition that God is a member of a moral community, as you and I are? As far as I can see, that question is never directly addressed by any author in CCPE.

BRIAN DAVIES OP

**THE CAROLINE DIVINES AND THE CHURCH OF ROME: A CONTRIBUTION TO CURRENT ECUMENICAL DIALOGUE** by Mark Langham, *Routledge*, London, 2018, pp. xvi + 251, £105.00, hbk

The governing documents of this pioneering study are the Reports of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. The results of the dialogues of ARCIC I appeared between 1971 and 1981 and were gathered into the ARCIC *Final Report* in 1982. This was presented to both Communion in the strong hope that it would find acceptance and help

to resolve the differences of centuries on *Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination* and *Authority in the Church*. The Anglican Communion registered a fairly positive response in 1888 and the Roman Catholic Church a more reserved official response in 1991. Meanwhile, ARCIC II continued the dialogue, producing Reports in 1986, 1990, 1993, 1998, 2004. These covered *Salvation and the Church; Church as Communion; Morals, Communion and the Church, the Gift of Authority* and *Mary, Grace and hope in Christ*. Their impact, severally and collectively, was far less than that of the ARCIC I Reports.

Mark Langham has examined the thinking of the ‘Caroline Divines’ in a series of chapters concerned with each of the main ARCIC topics in turn. His Preface is a reminder that the theologians of the century after the divisions of the Reformation had become more or less fixed, and the Churches of Western Europe had fallen out of communion, have been neglected in ecumenical debate. This was partly a natural response to the decision of ARCIC I that it would produce short statements without references or footnotes; and partly perhaps a result of the choice of members of the Commission, whose expertise lay principally in Scripture and the Fathers.

With the Caroline Divines the modern enquirer is in an era analogous with that which followed the division of 1054, when a series of preliminary but unsuccessful attempts were made to mend the breach. They have acquired the label ‘Caroline’ because their work clustered in the reigns of Charles I and Charles II, but their endeavour was prompted by the need to justify positions arrived at in the Elizabethan settlement and some were at work in the reign of James I. The Bibliography provides a comprehensive list of individuals who may be included as Divines of the period in the first part, simply headed ‘Original Sources’. A preliminary chapter illuminatingly explores ‘features’ of their approach and their work and some of the issues with which they variously tried to grapple.

They would have faded into greater obscurity had it not been for the enthusiasm with which the Oxford Movement took them up in the nineteenth century, encouraging the publication of the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology* (1841–63). That brought many seventeenth-century works back into print and onto the shelves of a surprisingly wide range of readers. Hansard records numerous grapplings of Parliament with the reform of the ecclesiastical courts and rethinking of the relation of Church and State, with the perceived risk of Disestablishment of the Church of England, giving rise over decades to a variety of Bills on topics arguably in a grey area between the secular and the religious. Again and again an MP or a peer made a long and learned speech referring to the debates of the immediate post-Reformation period.

This book is a masterpiece of careful analysis of points raised by the Carolingian divines in relation to the issues as they looked to ARCIC and have arisen in the life of the Church in modern times. It is to be

hoped that it will bring back into active study a body of theological analysis which has more recently fallen out of sight.

G. R. EVANS

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY** by Roger W. Nutt, *Catholic University of America Press, Washington, D.C., 2017, pp. viii + 206, \$34.95, pbk*

I have taught Catholic sacramental theology both on the undergraduate and graduate level. As, I suspect, is the experience of many professors who have taught Catholic sacramental theology in recent years, I have had trouble choosing course texts. Available options can be archaic, like the old manuals; narrow, considering only certain aspects of sacramental theology but divorced from the whole of Catholic theology and separated from the sacraments' position within the whole Christian life; piecemeal, considering only particular sacraments but not all of them; shallow, being insufficiently grounded in the intellectual tradition of the Church; dubiously ecclesial, relating ambiguously to the Church's magisterium; or reductivist, considering only the sacraments in their sociological significance or in their place among the rituals of the world religions.

There has been no recent text that considers general sacramental theology in its context within the whole Christian life, grounded in the intellectual tradition of the Church, touching on the principles underlying the theology of all the sacraments, organically making use of the Church's teaching on the sacraments. Thankfully, Roger W. Nutt's *General Principles of Sacramental Theology* has now filled the gap. The fruit of Nutt's scholarship and years of teaching sacramental theology, his new offering is eminently usable in the classroom by both professors and students. It is clearly written, well organized, and of a length that works well in a semester class, especially one that might consider general principles of sacramental theology and then move to a consideration of specific sacraments and/or the liturgy.

As Nutt explains it, his book is 'ecclesial' and 'Thomistic'. Nutt develops his presentation of sacramental theology in concert with the various sources for sacramental theology within the Church's magisterium, including Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, decrees of councils, and documents of the papal magisterium. The documents of Vatican II and recent papal teaching, along with the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, are especially utilized. Alongside this broad approach to the sacramental teaching of the Church, Nutt also acknowledges the special place the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas has had in the Church's development of sacramental doctrine. St. Thomas's imprint is felt everywhere in the book. Others may prefer a textbook that is not so heavily Thomistic, or