eirenical, he has failed. Can 'Christianity', for instance, be said to exist? Dr Carpenter is aware of the ambiguity and he writes, 'The diffused form of Christianity is only possible because there is a central core of life and fire' (p. 12), and he goes on to apologise for dealing with the more 'institutional' side of Christianity (p. 14). But a Catholic will feel that that is just the side he doesn't deal with. The book is really a synoptic review of Church history with some curious emphases. One wouldn't think that the Great Church was founded by Christ; one is given the impression that it just emerged. The position of the Papacy in the early Church is hardly hinted at; and if one did not know the sincerity of the author, one would be tempted to say that his account of the Reformation is disingenuous. For *what* reasons are we to be called 'Roman Catholics' somewhere after 1570 (p. 107)? Our Catholicism was just as Roman in 1535 as in 1570, St Thomas More just as much a Roman Catholic as Blessed Edmund Campion.

The radical defect of the book, however, is that Dr Carpenter seems to give colour to the view that there is a genus called 'Christianity' of which the 'Churches' are species, and the latter part of the book which deals with Reunion is notably vague. Speaking of the affinities between the Anglican Church and the Orthodox and Roman Catholic Churches on the one hand, and the Reformed Churches on the other, he remarks, 'It seems clearly desirable to keep the doors open on both sides, though there is a certain fear that the draught from a too widely-opened door on one side will cause the door on the other side to slam' (p. 165). Another, equally probable, fear is that the Church of England may catch its death of cold.

The book is written with grace, scholarship and a wide charity in understanding the Catholic position. One could wish that a Catholic scholar would write another that is equally acceptable to the ordinary educated layman and as readable.

J.D.C.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION. By C. E. Raven. (Cambridge University Press; 21s.)

In the first series of his Gifford lectures, Canon Raven has used his wide range of interests in theology, biology and the history of science to give a new and important turn to the debate on the relations of science with religion. He has set out to judge the various phases of Western theology according to their fidelity to the Incarnation, and to judge the development of science according to a view of nature in which the Incarnation is central. In this approach the problems lie close to the fundamentals of Christian thought, and it is to be hoped that it will be fully explored,

since the particular conclusions reached by Dr Raven will not be acceptable to everyone.

Dr Raven derives his principles of judgment from the biblical view of nature. In the Old Testament he finds nature regarded as created and upheld by the living God, and therefore as good and delightful though limited and imperfect. In the New Testament the union of the physical and spiritual in the person of Christ is a central fact; this must lead to a conviction of the worth of nature, which is explicit in the teaching of Christ and in the writings of St Paul and St John. But by medieval times the Gospel had become distorted; nature was separated from supernature, reason from revelation, secular from sacred. (Even St Thomas, whose teaching is that grace perfects nature, is not exempted from this criticism.) The view of nature was accordingly debased, and science languished. It was revived during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, largely by the work of naturalists who reinstated direct observation of nature in place of emblem and legend. While the New Philosophy was still whole and integral, it was welcomed by wholehearted Christians among scientists and philosophers alike—Boyle, Newton, Cudworth, Ray; this was a golden age, when the sciences and incarnational theology flourished together. In the eighteenth century, however, science became increasingly mechanistic, and it became common to think of the world as a machine. This unfortunate analogy led to deism and then to atheism, and contributed to the ethos of industrialism; it even invaded theology, so that the orthodox came to think of God not as immanent in the universe but as a mere divine watchmaker. If science and religion are to be brought into a right relation, therefore, science should be less mechanistic and theology should be more faithful to the Incarnation.

With Dr Raven's view of the debasement of theology the present reviewer is not competent to deal, but it will certainly be rejected by many of those who are, whether Catholic or Anglican. The view that science in giving mechanical explanations excludes attention to the living God also seems unsatisfactory. Science deals only with the internal order of nature; to consider the *Cause* of that order we must adopt a different method and point of view, that of Christian philosophy and theology. Problems of method such as this do not seem to engage Dr Raven's attention; he scarcely mentions the sustained effort, from Grosseteste to Newton, to hammer out the inductive method of science. But these are, comparatively speaking, disagreements about detail. Dr Raven deserves honour for the sincerity of his concern for an integrally Christian view of nature, and for his courage in attempting a reinterpretation of the history of science in accordance with it.

E. F. CALDIN