

experience of the Spirit indicated in the New Testament, and there are equally Christians who have *not*. For better or worse, they have adopted the term 'baptism in the Spirit' as a way of providing a scriptural theory of this.

And here comes my second methodological difficulty. 'Baptism in the Spirit' appears thematically only in Luke, and was not taken up in the early Church, which concentrated much more on baptism, as understood by Paul, and John's 'rebirth from water and Spirit'. Acts 2, 38 shows that even for Luke baptism was the normal occasion of receiving the Spirit. It is thus far from clear what theological use we are to make of the phrase 'baptism in the Spirit'.

The two occasions in Acts where it is mentioned are Pentecost, and the Cornelius episode. Both times the outpouring of the Spirit takes place apart from baptism (as JD points out); but it is also (*contra* JD) distinguished from Christian initiation. I do not see what sense there is in saying that the apostles were not 'really' Christians before Pentecost; and the whole point of the Cornelius story seems to come in water baptism, which, on JD's view, should have been rendered superfluous by the descent of the Spirit.

Our use of these texts is complicated by the fact that in neither case is anyone actually stated to have been 'baptized in the Spirit'. The phrase comes in the prophecy contrasting John's baptism with the eschatological, messianic baptism; and these two occasions are cited as manifest fulfilment of this prophecy. And the Pentecostals are, in a way, equally justified in acclaiming a fulfilment of the same prophecy in their own experience. But it is of the nature of such cases that the experience comes first, and is then recognized as a fulfilment of prophecy; it does not necessarily make it helpful to generalize the application of the prophetic text to a regular Church practice, especially where, as here, it leads to confusion with the traditional use of other texts (especially John 3, 5 here).

The critical case for all concerned is Acts 8, the Samaritans who were baptized, but did not

receive the Spirit until the apostles came and laid hands on them. We must resist the urge to try to cope with this in Pauline terms. For Luke, *pneuma* was primarily a phenomenological term, something you can see and hear. And he was not concerned to distinguish between a basic, implicit salvific indwelling of the Spirit, and a visible charismatic empowering. JD may be right in inferring that the Samaritans were only half-converted, as well as deficient in charismata. Their baptism is not impugned; but something seems to have gone wrong.

This is a recurrent problem. It was one of the factors that led to the Western development of Confirmation, as the sacrament of the bestowal of the Spirit to those validly but fruitlessly baptized outside the Church. It is the problem which gives rise to Pentecostalism.

And it is theoretically and practically important to make the distinction Luke does not make, between *gratia gratum faciens* and *gratia gratis data*—although we must recognize that even the latter is not intrinsically *ad extra* (tongues 'builds up' the recipient of the gift himself). What the Pentecostals call 'baptism in the Spirit' may involve, on the one hand, a revivification of baptismal grace, and, on the other, a charismatic equipping of the believer. Though both may be experienced simultaneously, the distinction is not otiose: there may be many a Christian who is alive in the Spirit, who would resist any suggestion that he was not 'baptized in the Spirit', but who could still be open to a more explicit experience and more manifest gifts, for his own comfort and the good of the Church. 'To *each* is given the manifestation of the Spirit' (1 Cor. 12, 7).

We need to follow JD, then, gratefully, into a renewed and perhaps humbling investigation of the New Testament doctrine of the experience of the Spirit; but we need also to be much more sensitive both to the diversity of language within the New Testament, and to the delicate interplay of exegesis and experience. Who knows? Perhaps for James Dunn himself, this is but the beginning of a road to Damascus!

SIMON TUGWELL, O.P.

METAPHYSICS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE, by Gerd Buchdahl. *Basil Blackwell*, 1970. 105s.

This difficult but impressive and rewarding book is a study of the development of theories of knowledge and its relation to the world during the classical period of modern philosophy, from Descartes to Kant; and the

relevance of this development to the nature of empirical science. The book as a whole is a salutary corrective to any tendency to see the history of philosophy as a smooth progression of positions, counter-positions and reconciliations.

The trouble with this preconception, as is here demonstrated again and again, is that the meaning of a term used within a system of philosophy can only be understood fully within the context of that system. 'The Kantian system, like most philosophical systems, is a self-contained linguistic enterprise, and we must always beware of introducing concepts from positions with a different range of philosophical ideas before making the required re-translations' (671). It is fatally easy to leap to the erroneous conclusion that what seems at first sight an answer in the work of a later philosopher to a problem raised by one of his predecessors really *is* the answer to that problem as originally raised. To accuse a philosopher of a contradiction, again, may only indicate one's assumption that terms used in his work have just the same meanings as they acquired only as a result of the work of his successors. All the same, real progress was undoubtedly made in the period under review, which seems to the author to culminate in the philosophy of Kant.

We learn from the book not only how deeply the philosophical theories of these great thinkers were affected by the scientific discoveries and speculations of their time, but also how the problems which concerned them, though announced so frequently to have been solved once and for all, remain to plague contemporary theorists of science. One question in particular recurs again and again: What is the nature of the causal link? Is the connexion a matter of logical necessity, as suggested, of course for purpose of refutation, by Hume? Does it pertain to the real world as it would be quite apart from our attempts to explain it, or is it a function simply of such attempts? Does it correspond to anything 'metaphysical', and what would such a 'metaphysical' link be?

There is no doubt that this book will be immensely enlightening and useful both for those who are interested in the philosophy of science, and those who wish to understand the significance of the period in the history of philosophy which is covered. HUGO MEYNELL

SCHOOL FOR PRAYER, by Archbishop Antony Bloom. *Darton, Longman and Todd*, London, 1970. 75 pp. 10s.

LEARNING TO PRAY, by Bernard Bro, O.P. *Ecclesia Press*, Shannon, Ireland. 176 pp. 35s.

THE CLIMATE OF MONASTIC PRAYER, by Thomas Merton. *Irish University Press*, Shannon, 1969. 154 pp. 35s.

THE EXPERIENCE OF PRAYER, by Sebastian Moore and Kevin Maguire. *Darton, Longman and Todd*, London, 1969. 130 pp. 16s.

It may be a reassurance to those of us who go on reading books on prayer, that the flow of new writing on the subject also does not cease. We have hundreds of books at our disposal already, the teaching of the centuries, but still we seek a living voice, the experience of our contemporaries to inspire and feed us: we are always hoping for that personal spark to kindle our hearts in sympathy.

Of the four books under review, only one (that by Archbishop Antony Bloom) has this contagious personal quality. Here is a voice speaking to us not so much about prayer as out of prayer. Like a man living in a loved country, he speaks naturally in the language of that country and describes its paths and climate out of familiar experience. Unselfconsciously, unwittingly, he betrays the manners of that country and its beauty, and we are charmed and long to be with him and like him.

This book tells us very simply but deeply how we may follow. The writer, with a beautiful courtesy, seems to be always with us in the difficulties and weaknesses he describes. He tells us the physical, the mental, the

emotional disciplines we must practise, for this is a wholly practical book. With its help no matter how weak we are, we too can become dwellers in the land of prayer.

Father Bro's is more in the nature of a work book. Here are the rules, here are the references, and if this book is to be studied properly, it must be read with a Bible. Some paragraphs are dense with biblical references, and together with its subdivision into headings and a six-page Appendix of biblical references, its appearance is rather austere. It is, to repeat, a book to *work* with, and the author's description of prayer as 'the great paedagogy of God' sets the tone. We are being taught, and very well taught. The book is divided into six sections, four of which are followed by 'Readings', consisting of short passages of prose or poetry from a variety of authors, from 'the Early Christians' (*sic*) to Julien Green, Isaiah to Emmanuel Mounier. These forty-six pages are a mistake in a book of this nature: the passages themselves are not all of them sufficiently distinguished; the translations are very uneven (two do not make sense); the