

given by several philosophers of science. He recognises the role of personal judgement in research (Polanyi), considers Kuhn's paradigm shifts to be 'very curious and greatly overdone', and dismisses Feyerabend as absurd. He defends the rationality of science against those who claim it to be socially-conditioned, and affirms robustly and correctly that scientists are embarked on the discovery of reality: 'scientific theories are corrigible, but the result is a tightening grasp of a never completely comprehended reality'. He is not impressed by Popperian falsification, or by the positivist and idealist accounts of science.

Many of the popular books about God and Physics show an exceedingly impoverished understanding of theology, and the chapter on the nature of theology should be a valuable corrective. God is a hidden God, who respects our freedom and cannot be put to the test. We cannot hope to comprehend God, but what we do know is not contrary to our reason. Although he is unknowable, he has acted to make himself known through the person of Jesus Christ. There are useful analogies between the ways of thinking in theology and science. To be intellectually respectable, theology must be coherent, economical, adequate and existentially relevant, and this is also true for science.

The scientific view of the world is characterised by ten qualities: it is elusive, intelligible, problematic, surprising, the result of interplay between chance and necessity, extended in space and time, tightly-knit, ultimately futile, complete (within its domain) and incomplete (considered absolutely). Each of these is considered in turn, with perceptive illustrations. This is followed by discussions of several points of interaction between science and theology, including miracles, design in nature, the origin of the universe, the anthropic principle, minds and bodies, and the nature of man. He is unconvinced by Capra's attempt to establish parallels between occidental science and oriental mysticism, but believes that modern science is raising questions that demand a theological answer. Our world is highly complex, and its many levels are unified by science. God the creator is the source of their connection, 'the one whose creative act holds in one the world-views of science, aesthetics, ethics and religion, as expressions of his reason, joy, will and presence.'

From the brief summary it will be clear that Polkinghorne has written a concise yet wide-ranging survey of many of the central problems of the interaction between science and theology. It would have been greatly enhanced by a more detailed consideration of the historical connection between science and Christian theology. It was precisely the very special beliefs about the material world inherent in Christian theology that made possible the development of science, and this shows the basis of their relationship. In several places in the book Polkinghorne affirms the essential indeterminacy of the quantum world, although it is possible to hold that this is no more than a feature of the present formulation of quantum mechanics. It is exceedingly hazardous to try to deduce such far-reaching conclusions from experimental results; as he so rightly insists elsewhere, the world is more subtle than we imagine, and there are certainly many surprises still in store. As a final theological comment, his account lacks a discussion of the role of the Church as founded by Christ with authority to teach in his name. It is here that some of the most delicate interactions occur.

PETER HODGSON

#### **AGAINST THE NATIONS: WAR AND SURVIVAL IN A LIBERAL SOCIETY.**

**Stanley Hauerwas.** *Winston Press, Minneapolis & Geoffrey Chapman, London 1985, 208 pp. £14.95.*

It would be hard not to be grateful to Stanley Hauerwas, who provides the study of Christian Ethics with an imaginative excitement which it generally lacks. His restless fertility has kept his thought moving from phase to phase, reacting to the stimulus of successive thinkers who have influenced him, taking up new problems at each turn. And it would be

hard not to be grateful to John Howard Yoder, who, apart from his other services to us, has been the inspiration behind the latest phase in Hauerwas' work (the third, by my calculation). *Hauerwas Three* is the best so far. If there was a time when we could fear that the methodological probing would never amount to a substantive ethical discussion; or that the claims for an autonomous intelligibility of differing community 'stories' would yield no more than another pluralist American meta-theology, that time is now past. Hauerwas has never spoken with a more decidedly Christian voice, and has never been more concerned with the central moral issues of our times. Witness this collection of essays, his first sustained address to the questions of Christian political thought.

The essays move from the methodological questions about the Christian voice in society, to substantive discussions of ideology and belief, and from these to the familiar casuistry of nuclear weapons and war. Hauerwas is illuminating on Rauschenbusch and the Social Gospel, paradoxical on the Holocaust and the Jonestown mass-suicide, surprisingly fresh in the concluding set-piece debate between pacifism and the just war. There is a short but beautifully pointed critique of Neuhaus's attempt to claim Christianity for Western democracy. Hauerwas' genius is to set conventional stances in unconventional lighting. He makes us see our most commonsense assumptions as wilful and quirky; the pious platitudes of liberal democracy show up as demonic fanaticisms. And his readers have to wrestle with the problem (which by now they must have come to expect) of knowing where the author himself stands. The more fervently he declares himself, the more hidden his positions become. Many times, for example, he assures us that he is a 'pacifist'. But just what does Hauerwas' pacifism consist in? At points it looks like a kind of just-war theory—and it is not without significance that the name of Paul Ramsey is linked with that of Yoder in the dedication. But then, in the final essay, he makes decisively as if to oppose the two. Does he actually do so? And does he really intend to? Happy the reader who has no doubts on the matter! There will be renewed appeals that Stan Hauerwas will please be so kind as to sit himself down somewhere. But *Hauerwas Four* will not come by that kind of watching; we will know it, as before, by the flash of intellectual fire on some new horizon, lighting it up from East to West.

OLIVER O'DONOVAN

**FREEDOM AND OBLIGATION: A STUDY OF THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS,**  
by C.K. Barrett *SPCK*, 1985, pp. viii, 120. £4.95.

A new book by Professor Barrett is always an important event, and in this instance especially because we are given his treatment of the remaining Pauline *Hauptbrief*, to accompany his commentaries on Romans, 1 Corinthians, and 2 Corinthians. This, however, is not properly a commentary, though it has some of the marks of one. He follows through the argument of Galatians, sometimes in much detail, and discusses how history, theology, and ethics as treated in the letter illuminate the twin themes of freedom and obligation, under the general rubric of the centrality and sufficiency of Christ.

There are footnotes, and sometimes extended discussions of the work of other scholars, for example on the question of whether Paul was fighting on two fronts at the same time, against legalistic rigorists and against antinomians. The final chapter, on the history and significance of the so-called Jerusalem Council, is an epilogue which began as a lecture in Oxford, while the bulk of the book originated as lectures in Australia. It seems that all the chapters were written in 1983, and this date is important because much of the writing that is causing a re-appraisal of Paul and the Law also dates from that year: E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*; H. Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*; and also J.D.G. Dunn, 'The New Perspective on Paul' (BJRL). Inevitably one wishes that Barrett's book could have taken account of their views. For example, one wonders how Professor Barrett reacts to the suggestion that 'works of the law' in Gal. 2.16 refers not to doing the