

Quine have recently made contributions. It is surely significant that the notion of substance is not mentioned in the index; in this omission resides possibly one reason why this section of the discussion, admirably pointed and continually illuminating though it is, leaves the solution of its problems as far away as ever.

2. Symposiasts constantly advert to the questions raised by Anselm's so-called 'ontological proof'. This proof, continually refuted, is yet an 'unconscionably long time dying' and has recently been roused from a death-like coma by Professor Norman Malcolm of Cornell, to whose article in the *Philosophical Review* for 1960 several symposiasts refer. To ask whether on the whole the proof is accepted or rejected is to ask a misleading question; rather there is a pervasive sense that we have here a place where the domains of adoration, of self-examination, of metaphysical enquiry and of logic touch, and that if we probe what it is that led men so often to return to this kind of argument, our understanding of what theism is will be enlarged, and our grasp of its characteristic 'logic' deepened.

3. It is clearly realised (in spite of a plea by the late Professor H. Richard Niebuhr in an otherwise excellent paper) that the conflict between the authority of scientific methods and the claims of faith cannot be resolved, e.g. by facile apologetic suggestion that the 'principle of induction' is a 'matter of faith'! The discussion of the nature of faith contains much that is excellent in the way of comment on the relative roles of e.g. assent and trust; but its authority as a contribution to its topic is enhanced by its clearly recognizing that the man committed to the way of faith has to reckon continually with the searching interrogation of a largely triumphant empiricism.

4. The work is a symposium, not a treatise. Therefore the reader must seek not simply to read and notice, but also to overhear. It is hard therefore from constant reference, and frequent sidelong glance, to fail to perceive the cruciality, for the modern empiricist, of the so-called 'problem of evil' and of theodicy.

The form of the book makes it one for the professional, not for the amateur. But the fact that this lay symposium took place and is now published is evidence of the keen interest taken in problems of the philosophy of religion, and also of the extreme difficulties facing the subject.

D. M. MACKINNON

CHRISTIANS IN CONVERSATION; Newman Press, \$3.

Of the four papers read at an episcopally sponsored and papally approved meeting at St John's Abbey, Minnesota, and here printed, two are by Protestants and two by Catholics. Conversation requires a certain sympathy of mind, even a community of style; here three of the contributors talk well together while one remains stubbornly foreign in tone. For this, as for all the best conversations,

there are no shaping boundaries, the participants range free over a wide area of 'issues that divide us' and 'factors that unite us'. This must have been excellent enough in discussion but is rather disturbing in the more formal print.

The first paper is of a high standard. Professor Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale recognizes the primary importance of the idea of development for Catholic theology and his paper is a well-reasoned survey of Newman's suggestion and its corollaries, especially those concerned with the place of scripture in the Church. He makes some constructive remarks about *sola scriptura* and the historical context of the formulation of the principle.

It would have been better if the first of the two Catholic contributors, Fr Raymond Bosler, had paid some attention to the work of Geiselman, Holstein and Jedin about the history of the principle *scripture and tradition*. And for one who argues so much in the manner of a theologian, that is from authorities, he makes some surprising remarks about the presence of Christ in the eucharist, which he terms 'the touchstone of Catholicism' but thinks 'the High Anglicans and the Orthodox have it with the Roman Catholics'. Similar oddities occur in his discussion of justification.

In the third paper Dr Berthold von Schenk reveals a fine intelligence and a live appreciation of the immorality of the division of Christians. He presents an able demonstration of the fundamental coincidence of Protestant and Catholic thought on justification by Christ alone and complains appositely of the lack of a theology of the laity among Catholics and of an understanding of the central place of the liturgy among Protestants.

Dom Godfrey Diekmann, a leader of the present liturgical renewal, has, one suspects, little sympathy for the *derrière garde* of ecclesiastical legalists described by Dr von Schenk as clinging to a sectarian past like Southerners still fighting the Civil War. In a paper which is a model of careful charity and keen scholarship Diekmann takes up the central themes of the discussion, reassuring the Protestants that no Catholic supposes any individual definition to contain the fulness of truth, nor any Council, not even the impressive Trent, to have closed all subjects from discussion, and emphasizing the renewed vigour of scriptural studies among Catholics.

Dr von Schenk makes a passing reference to a report that has gone the round of such conferences—that Protestants and Catholics in Nazi concentration camps went together to communion whether the celebrant was Lutheran or Catholic. It would be interesting to have this substantiated, if it be true. If it be false it ought to be taken out of circulation with all convenient speed.

In a footnote Diekmann uses an image employed, independently doubtless, by Professor Hans Küng in a broadcast this autumn: 'If we Catholics sometimes apply the parable of the Prodigal Son to the problem of reunion, we should not overlook the fact that the father ran forward eagerly to meet his son'. It is pleasant to see such a charity at work in this book.

HAMISH SWANSTON, CONG. ORAT.