

REVIEWS

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By George S. Hendry. (S.C.M. Press; 12s. 6d.)

Despite the central position which should be held by a theology of the Holy Spirit, it has not yet been fully developed in Western Christendom. This book, written from the point of view of the Reformed Churches, and suggestive rather than systematic, should be an incentive to further research. Catholics will be able to agree with much of what Dr Hendry says, and indeed may often find themselves closer to him than he seems to suppose. Since the themes are treated in historical order, this agreement will naturally be greater in the earlier part of the book. It begins with an admirable account of the relationship of the Spirit to Christ in the New Testament, and goes on to discuss the Spirit in the Trinity, treating the difficult question of the relation between his creative and salvific work, largely through a sustained criticism of Barth. In the third chapter, on the Spirit and the Church, one begins to feel uneasy about the misrepresentation of Catholic teaching; I cannot see how, after a careful reading of *Mystici Corporis*, which Dr Hendry quotes, it is still possible to maintain that our theology 'obliterates any real distinction between the body and him who acts through it', or that we deny the essential subordination of the apostles and their successors to the Spirit: the Pope specifically says that the Spirit is 'the source from which proceeds every single vital and effectively salutary action in all the parts of the Body' (C.T.S. p. 34). The same is true of the chapter on the inspiration of Scripture: the contrast drawn is too sharp, since a Catholic could certainly agree with the formulation 'the Spirit is in the Church only when it is a Church of the Word, and the Spirit is in the Word only when it is the Word in the Church'. In the final chapter Dr Hendry returns to his attack on Barth, maintaining the presence of a created spirit in man which can respond to the Spirit of God. Theologians will do well to ponder this stimulating book.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE. By Ian Ramsay. (S.C.M. Press; 18s.)

WORDS AND IMAGES. By E. L. Mascall. (Longmans; 12s. 6d.)

CRUCIAL PROBLEMS OF MODERN PHILOSOPHY. By D. J. B. Hawkins. (Sheed and Ward; 10s. 6d.)

Professor Ramsay investigates what he calls (perhaps rather too often) the 'logically odd' language in which Christians talk about God: scriptural images, and the analogical use of words in theology. Such

language, he says, appeals to our discernment and leads us to commit ourselves to certain beliefs. I think his treatment is in substantial agreement with St Thomas's view that the analogical use of words is an appeal to the listener to recognize in them a change not of meaning but of depth of meaning, where there is no possibility of translation into non-analogical language. This doctrine has been greatly obscured by the later transference of the word 'analogical' to statements, arguments, and even things, and by the widespread opinion that analogical words are somehow vague and hazy words, yet a good deal of important research has been done by scholastic writers in this field, and it seems a pity that Professor Ramsay should be completely unaware of it. This perhaps accounts for his attempting to analyse an impossibly large number of examples, with the result that his conclusions sometimes appear unnecessarily naive: he has started too far back.

Dr Mascall deals with the same theme in a more indirect and reflective way. But those who, as I do, admire his full-length studies will find this by comparison a rather sketchy work. When, for instance, he comes towards the end of the book to analyse the use of images in scripture, he excuses himself on the grounds that Dr Farrer has already done the job for him. But the fine passages he quotes from *The Glass of Vision* cry out for an extended treatment, for which we could well have spared the earlier discussion of Ayer and Braithwaite, about whom there is very little new to be said. The greater part of the book is concerned with the problem of knowledge, especially our knowledge of God. Dr Mascall develops two theses, though I am not sure that he ever shows them to be compatible. The first, from St Thomas, is that sensible phenomena are not what (*quod*) we know, but that by which (*quo*) we know things. At one point he interestingly, and I think rightly, suggests that scientific statements do precisely express this intelligibility that things show to the mind. But in general he seems to make too great a separation between the sensible and the intelligible, almost giving the impression that we have knowledge of two different worlds: he can talk of 'penetrating beneath the sensible phenomena to the real intelligible things that support them', and criticizes St Thomas for failing to see that 'this real intelligible world might not be structurally isomorphic with the world of sensible phenomena'. I doubt whether St Thomas would have thought in such terms at all: they belong more to the imaginative than to the intellectual order.

His second main thesis develops Marcel's distinction between problems and mysteries. I think it leads Dr Mascall into drawing too close a parallel between our knowledge of things, persons and God. They are not all mysterious in the same way; I refuse to believe that other

people constantly hide their real nature from me behind the masks they allow me to see. God is indeed a hidden God; but what is to be made of that statement if everything is hidden in the same way?

Dr Hawkins writes from a somewhat similar standpoint to that of Dr Mascal, though his philosophical analysis is closer. Essentially both are trying to get away from the Cartesian dualism which has controlled so much modern philosophical thinking. Therefore I find it odd that both of them feel the need to attack the method of linguistic analysis, which seems successfully to escape this snare. Surely it is precisely a Cartesian fear to imagine that language may somehow get between one and the world one is trying to know. To take a single example from Dr Hawkins, what need is there to criticize Wittgenstein for saying the soul is a myth since 'A believes P, A thinks P, A says P, are of the form "P" says P'? The soul Wittgenstein rejects here is the Cartesian soul, the ghost in the machine. In fact, he adds the words (though Dr Hawkins does not quote them) 'as it is conceived in contemporary superficial psychology'. But this is not the place to continue such analysis. Sufficient to say that Dr Hawkins brings the weight of his great learning to pursue the influence of Cartesian 'disembodied awareness' in all the major philosophers up to the present day. His book is too close-packed to make easy reading, but like the other two, despite criticisms of detail, well worth the efforts of concentration it demands.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

GOD AND HIS CREATION. Theology Library, volume 2. Edited by A. M. Henry, O.P. (Mercier Press; 21s.)

This has not been an easy review to write. The French original of this work, volume II of *Initiation Théologique*, has, together with its three companion volumes, been widely acclaimed as an outstandingly successful piece of *haute vulgarization*; and the Mercier Press is to be congratulated on having recognized its value and undertaking an English translation. So much must be said in all fairness to the brilliant and devoted collaborators who produced the original work and have continually revised it since its first appearance (it should be noted that the present translation is made from the first edition of 1951 and differs frequently from the third edition with which I have compared it), and also to the publishers for their enthusiasm and insight. But what must also be said, however painful it may be to have to say it, is that the present translation is a shameful and shoddy travesty of the original. As someone with considerable experience of theological translation into English, I am not unaware of the problems with which the translator is faced; and my criticism is not primarily directed against the clumsiness or harshness of innumerable passages in this translation.