

that 'this new Temple was subject to the requirements of purity that would ensure the retention of the divine presence'. For this reason Paul expressed membership of the Church in terms of purity: some association with unbelievers was unavoidable in daily life, but impurity in believers could not be tolerated for a moment, for it would mean an impure Temple, and consequent loss of the divine presence.

Newton's presentation is well balanced, for he sees that 'the concept of purity is not the one central concern of his letters. 'Paul uses it when it suits him. 'Just as the rabbis preserved, elaborated and extended the cultic symbols of cleanness and uncleanness after the destruction of the Temple, so Paul, after the earthly Temple had been made redundant by the saving act of Christ, applied the same symbolism to the life of the Christian community'. It seems reasonable to argue, as we have seen, that Paul did not always think of the Temple as having been replaced and made redundant, as Newton appears to think; but this excellent book helps us to understand a hitherto relatively neglected but revealing aspect of Paul's thought.

A.R.C. LEANEY

**PHILOSOPHY FOR UNDERSTANDING THEOLOGY by Diogenes Allen. SCM., 1985. £9.50**

Diogenes Allen, who is Professor of Philosophy at Princeton Seminary, has in this work provided us with a book that is both readable and comprehensive. Thus the whole sweep of western philosophy is surveyed from the Pre-Socratics to the present day, and, though the exposition is thus inevitably sometimes concentrated, it is always an enriching rather than an obfuscating density. Indeed, some of the thumb-nail sketches are the most rewarding bits of the book, for example his exposition of Plotinus or his account of the relation between Fichte and Kant. Its overall balance can easily be gauged by the fact that three chapters are devoted to the Platonic tradition, three to the Aristotelian and only one each to Kant, Hegel and all the major modern philosophical movements.

The front cover has a picture of a bespectacled bust of Aristotle reading Karl Barth. One might use this to illustrate a tension in the work. Are we being offered a history of philosophers who showed interest in theological issues (as this might suggest), or was the intention rather to provide some account of the influence that philosophers have had on theology, irrespective of their interests (as perhaps the title suggests)? Allen has not, I think, satisfactorily resolved this question, and so one feels that sometimes he has now one objective in view and now the other. For example, he begins his exposition of Plato by taking the *Timaeus*, which was the most influential of his dialogues for theology but certainly philosophically not the most important, or again Gregory of Nyssa's Letter 38 is quoted to illustrate the use to which Aristotelian logic was put. This would seem to indicate the latter aim. But his account of Descartes and beyond is much more straightforwardly expositional, without very much of an attempt to identify where their impact was felt, which suggests that it was the former objective that finally prevailed. But even in the medieval period we find him expounding the various arguments about universals without any clear explanation of why they were important for theology, for example with Roscelin and William of Champaux offering in consequence opposed accounts of the Trinity.

This I hasten to add is not in any sense intended seriously to undermine the value of the book. One cannot help but admire the breadth of Allen's learning and the clarity of his exposition. But it is to draw attention to the methodological problems in embarking upon what he set out to achieve. So, for example, there is the argument mentioned above for starting one's exposition of Plato with the *Timaeus*, but the net result is that Allen's account of the theory of Forms is bound to be much harder for the novice to follow. He begins by interpreting them as mathematical ratios, which in terms of Plato's later period makes some sense, but the Forms are so much easier to comprehend with the earlier

*Republic*, where their teleological rationale in subordination to the Form of the Good is not in doubt. Again, Bishop Butler is not mentioned at all, but in terms of the history of English theology, he is undoubtedly of more importance than Locke, though Locke is of course the more distinguished philosopher. By contrast, no history of philosophy could possibly omit Bishop Berkeley who was truly a great philosopher (though according to the author only properly discovered in 1865), but yet his influence on theology has been nil. So why does he appear at all? Again, Middle Platonism does not get the attention it deserves in terms of influence.

But then to any modern philosopher the history of philosophy as seen through the eyes of theology would seem very strange indeed, with minor figures writ large and some major philosophers banished from the scene. So perhaps Allen has after all pursued the wiser course, and left these two possible, conflicting aims unresolved.

DAVID BROWN

**IMAGES OF CHRIST : AN INTRODUCTION TO CHRISTOLOGY.** *The Seabury Press.* Minneapolis. 1964. Pp. xiv and 172.

This introduction to Christology proceeds by reflecting upon eight master images which Christianity has traditionally used in order to convey to the world who Jesus was and is and what he did. The images are: the sacrifice of the cross, the messiah, the word of God, the vision of God, the humanity of Christ, the divine man, the redeemed humanity, the Easter faith. Some strain is placed upon the term 'images' when it is made to apply to all of these entries, but if we let that point pass we find in each of the eight chapters an historical survey of the varying uses and receptions of the 'image' in question, a gentle persuasion at times to the effect that some of these are obsolete in contemporary culture, and an effort to distill the relevant Christian meaning for to-day.

The author claims that the book 'is designed first of all for the ordinary layperson', as a book which can be read and enjoyed. It does not assume any previous background in either theology or history; anything which would not be immediately understandable to the general reader is explained right at that point' (p. ix). That claim, I am afraid, cannot be allowed; indeed it is probably incompatible with the amount of historical, and at times, comparative religious material which the author tries to compress into each chapter. Take a sentence-and-a-half from p. 41: 'The great thirteenth-century synthesis had disintegrated. Occamist nominalism now ruled the theological faculties of the universities with an anti-metaphysical and Pelagian hand, the Avignon captivity and the Great Schism had destroyed much of the papacy's moral claim to international authority...' That would need a great deal of explanation 'right at that point', but it does not get any. A certain amount of background in both theology and history is in fact necessary in order to benefit from the author's range and vision. But the problem with the book then changes chameleon-like, in that the more background one has in theology and history the more one is inclined to be dissatisfied with or to positively argue with the necessarily brief surveys of, say, the development of Chalcedonian Christology (p. 97), or the meaning of Paul's resurrection experience (pp. 134ff.), and with judgements on Heidegger (p. 56) or Pelagianism (p. 76).

It is a good book on the whole, with many informative, insightful and persuasive passages. It is quite Protestant in its emphasis on sin (pp. 111, 119) and proclamation (p. 27). Not all of the substantial history behind the author's 'images' can so easily be distilled into such categories, or indeed into good preacher's sentences about the 'presence of God' or the love of God that reaches to every corner of the universe. And so the problem of the book's proper readership does remain. Perhaps it would best suit students of Christology in their second year of College or University.

J.P. MACKAY