

suffers) the spread of 'non-European theologies' in the decades to come.

In the second group of essays Rahner discusses such matters as 'maturity in faith'—'Educated Christians must forge for themselves a concept of God and of his eternal salvation grounded in Jesus Christ. It need not be a cause for alarm if they do not know exactly what an indulgence is or how many sacraments there are. By managing the explicit contents of their minds in this economical way, people can quite properly reduce the number of things which are enormously overburdening and cluttering their minds' (p. 122); agnosticism and 'the true agnosticism which is required of Christians' (p. 136), atheism and 'theistic ecumenism', and the 'hierarchy of Truths'—'given no more than a quarter of an hour can you tell pagans in one of Europe's big cities who have never experienced a really challenging encounter with Christianity what a Christian really believes?' (page 167). In the essay on faith it is a pity that Rahner's reference to George Tyrrell (whose name is misspelt or misprinted) is so far off the mark (page 158). Far from holding that revelation is 'nothing more than a consequence, in itself unimportant, of a naturally religious disposition', as Rahner asserts, Tyrrell would have been closer to Rahner's own view of 'the material contents of historical revelation as verbalized objectifications of *the* "revelation" which is already present in the gratuitous radicalizing of human transcendentality in God's self-communication'—except that Tyrrell could never have written such a phrase.

In the final section Rahner deals with Christological questions, once again defending the 'classical formulations', insisting that Christology should not be separated from soteriology as it was in pre-Vatican II textbooks, and recommending transcendental Christology and anonymous Christianity—after all, as he says (page 238), 'if I were not in reality already a crypto-Christian thanks to the grace of God I receive from the Spirit of Jesus, I could not make any sense of what is being said about this Jesus as the Christ'. Such splendidly simple encapsulations of his most characteristic theses enliven the otherwise rather familiar arguments.

FERGUS KERR OP

RUSSIAN RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY: SELECTED ASPECTS. By Frederick C. Copleston. *Search Press/Notre Dame*. 1988.

We all owe an enormous debt to Copleston. Very few scholars could possibly rival the range of his erudition in the history of philosophy. Now, late in life, he caps it all with another major work on *Philosophy in Russia*, with this present, much shorter 'spin-off' concentrating on its religious aspects. In this case he does not seek to achieve anything very profound. There are only some brief critical comments, and virtually nothing by way of attempting to carry discussion further. But then that was not his aim, and so it would be churlish of a reviewer to complain of what was never part of his plan. For in fact the book succeeds admirably in its own terms, which is to introduce the main authors and leading ideas of modern Russian religious philosophy.

Here the dominating, almost inescapable influence is that of Vladimir Solovyev (1853—1900), and in particular his *Lectures on Godmanhood*,

attended by both Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Of the writers discussed only Shestov (d. 1938) is seen as establishing a real independence from the ideas of Solovyev. In him we have the Russian Kierkegaard; indeed not only a Kierkegaardian long before he had read Kierkegaard but also someone prepared to criticise Kierkegaard for not sufficiently disentangling himself from the trap of Hegel's dialectical method. By contrast the other three major writers discussed, Bulgakov (d. 1944), Berdyaev (d. 1948) and Frank (d. 1950) are all seen as very firmly in Solovyev's debt. Though the very much greater, Kantian stress on freedom in Berdyaev is noted, even here the wider context of the development of a philosophy of history comes from Solovyev, not Kant.

If one wants markers in the western European tradition, it is undoubtedly to Hegel and Schelling that one must turn. The kind of philosophy of history being developed reminds one of Hegel, while the panentheism that is used to describe God's presence in the world in some ways recalls Schelling's notion of a world soul. But, though Copleston notes such influences in passing, he is careful not to allow them to prevent the reader from assessing the Russian presentation in its own right. Indeed, he is so successful at this that one cannot fail to appreciate the relevance of some of Solovyev's leading ideas to contemporary theology.

Two in particular merit attention. The notion of Godmanhood, the coming to consciousness of union with the divine, is seen as an immanentist, evolutionary process that has its decisive, anticipatory disclosure in the Christ figure. This reminds one of modern western christologies as varied as those of John Robinson and Teilhard de Chardin. Secondly, there is the initially rather strange sounding terminology of Sophiology, Sophia being used to describe the immanent aspect of the transcendent Logos. Bulgakov in particular saw this notion as the only really effective bridge between monism and dualism: the world is caught up into God's relationship to himself through the divine nature inherent within it. Once again, the relevance for recent attempts to take the status of the natural world more seriously would seem obvious.

So, in short, we are indebted to Copleston not just for an excellent historical introduction but for one which opens up the possibility of a useful and fruitful dialogue with the recent Russia past.

DAVID BROWN

LONDON JEWRY AND LONDON POLITICS 1889–1986 by
Geoffrey Alderman. Routledge. 1989. pp.vi + 186. £25.

The political history of the religious and ethnic subcultures of modern Britain is a neglected subject, but a Roman Catholic reader of Geoffrey Alderman's fine study of Jews and London politics might be impressed by some of the parallels between British Judaism and Roman Catholicism. Both were small and predominantly affluent communities which suffered the social embarrassment of being swamped in the nineteenth century by the immigration of pauper co-religionists, Jews from eastern Europe, Roman Catholics from Ireland. Both were the victims of violent native prejudice, racial and religious; both looked first to the Liberals for emancipation against Conservative bigots, and then, towards the end of the Victorian era, evolved