

which we may see the world in a multiplicity of different guises, and the scientist should be receptive to all of them. Feyerabend's idealistic pluralism raises many philosophical issues which are currently being discussed in the literature, but in relation to the other themes of this volume one question in particular seems to emerge. One may reject metaphysical and analytic constraints upon science as being both philosophically ill-grounded and (as Feyerabend would have it) pragmatically undesirable. But there remains the suggestion that something like Newton's inductive rules are innate in a much more material sense—

namely that they are physiologically determined, and presumably the products of organic adaptation and selection (compare Chomsky's structuralism of language). If so, then there must be some limit to the flowering of theories under the stimulus of experience; it is not the case that any idea or ideology can equally be circularly defended (Feyerabend, p. 169). Newton's Rules, or something like them, turn out to be at once more permissive than the constraints of *a priori* metaphysics, and also to escape the hermeneutic circle by an openness to the empirical which alone makes science possible.

MARY HESSE

**GOD THE FUTURE OF MAN**, by Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P. *Sheed & Ward*, London and Sydney 1969, 207 pp. 18s.

Readers will be disappointed who look here for a whole book by Fr Schillebeeckx on the topic named in the title, for only the sixth chapter is devoted to concept of God as the future of man. The rest of the book consists of the prepared texts of five lectures he gave during his 1967 tour of the U.S. on secularization and related themes. But the discussion arising from these lectures caused him to search for the elusive idea eventually embodied in chapter VI. The earlier chapter on 'Secularization and Christian Belief in God' is more tentative.

Thus before he set out, his attitude to secularization was somewhat detached, as though 'we' were happy with our concept of God, and merely had difficulty over communicating it to others: 'people no longer understand what we are talking about' (p. 72). But after his American experience and his contact with 'death of God' theologians he is more conscious of the fact that believers are themselves affected by secularization, and are searching for a way of thinking about God which is valid in spite of it.

He accepts secularization as a social fact (i.e. man's increasing power over nature obviates the 'God of the gaps'), but not as a total description of contemporary culture. There is still room for an affirmation of God as 'the one who is to come'. 'The God whom we formerly, in the light of an earlier view of man and the world, called the "wholly Other" now manifests himself as the "wholly New", the One who is *our future*, who creates the future of mankind anew' (p. 181). The believer in such a God will never be satisfied with any human situation, but will always

have a 'critically negative' attitude, impelling him to yet further advances, until the ultimate fulfilment that is to come.

Is this really a 'new concept of God' (p. 183)? Or is it simply a change of emphasis? Fr Schillebeeckx is too scholarly to forget that although there is a solid biblical basis for speaking of the God of hope, the Bible founds its hope on 'communion with God here and now' (p. 188). Equally biblical, of course, is his insistence that such a doctrine of God will be credible only if its adherents show that their hope is capable of changing the world. Thus we have here a nuanced account of future-oriented theology that can give pause both to anyone who regards it as the only valid theology and to those who take it to be secondary.

He refers to the biblical foundations obliquely in his opening lecture: 'Towards a Catholic use of Hermeneutics.' He rightly points out that the task of interpreting the Bible across the centuries and thus within vastly different historical situations is not a discovery of Bultmann's but an essential element of Catholic theology. Only we call it the 'development of dogma'. Thus he criticizes Bultmann not because he asks the Bible questions that are important to contemporary man (*any* interpretation must do that), but because his questions are too often restricted to ones of an existential kind. As to how we are to understand the continuity within the development, he argues (pp. 10-13) that the theory of the unchangeable kernel and the variable mode of expression is valid retrospectively but useless during a period of transition.

The remaining chapters deal with liturgy, dialogue and the authority of the Magisterium on political matters. (This last is already available in *Concilium* VI, 4.) It is a deeply

thoughtful book, and, thanks mainly to N. D. Smith, the English reads well.

NIGEL COLLINGWOOD

LA RESURRECTION DU CHRIST ET L'EXEGESE MODERNE, by P. de Sury and others. *Les éditions du Cerf*, Paris, 1969, 191 pp.

THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST, by P. Benoit. *Darton, Longman and Todd*, London, 1969. 342 pp. 50s.

There was a time when Bishop Barnes caused a sensation by roundly asserting that the resurrection never happened. But those relatively simple days are over. He would now be met with the interminable questions: 'What never happened?', and 'Anyway, what do you mean by happened?'. So complex is the question now that a large number of exegetes met at Angers in 1967 to try to think it all out. Paul de Sury subsequently collected the papers read and has now published them as volume 50 of the *Lectio Divina* series.

As the essays are by exegetes, they do not go into the philosophical problems of what events or facts are. But there are plenty of other problems left over, as Pierre Grelot makes clear. He outlines the main difficulties for any reader of the Bible in the first essay on the '*arrière-plan biblique et juif*'. He shows how Christians have traditionally thought of resurrection in general according to the categories of soul and body, and are therefore at one remove from biblical thought at the very start. Moreover, many people have subconsciously thought of the resurrection of Christ as 'a coming back to life', ultimately on the same plane as the raising of Lazarus from the dead. A close study of the Bible and its presuppositions is necessary to exclude this approach. Grelot complains that while most intelligent people now see the inadequacies of patristic and medieval exegesis on this point, they are still culpable of neglecting literary and historical criticism (p. 52, note 82).

The challenge is taken up by M. Carrez in his essay on what St Paul means by resurrection. He states emphatically on page 61 that for the apostle resurrection does not mean '*revivification*' but '*transformation profonde et définitive de l'être*'. This leads to the special problem of what Paul understood by the resurrection of Christ. In the famous passage of 1 Corinthians 15, 1-18 he is not acting like an historian objectively examining the facts. But neither is he thinking purely subjectively.

As Carrez puts it (p. 68), the resurrection of Christ is, for Paul, a fact independent of his own being, because he explicitly states that other people, like Cephas and the twelve, are witnesses of it.

Still the Western mind wants to know what really happened. A. George and J. Delorme, therefore, get down to examination of the earliest Gospel accounts of the resurrection. Delorme's essay is the most complete and interesting. It confines itself to the earliest account of all in Mark 16, 1-8. Delorme insists that we can only get from this story what Mark wishes to tell us. We should like to know what actually happened at the tomb, what the women really saw and did, and in what order. But Mark was not interested in this. The women are his *dramatis personae* for the drama of faith, not history. Delorme pertinently asks (p. 138) whether any account of the burial and tomb was ever given which was not seen in the light of the resurrection faith? 'Brute facts' dear to older historians are difficult to come by in this case. The resurrection was unique and not actually seen by anybody. The only objective fact the historian has to go upon is the coming of the women to the tomb and finding Jesus was not there (p. 144).

A useful summary of the main points is given by Léon-Dufour in the final essay. Among other things he tries to find a satisfactory middle term between 'objective' and 'subjective' to describe the apparitions of the risen Christ. He insists on the active part taken by Christ, which proves that the accounts wish to make it clear that the resurrection is '*non-subjective*'.

Pierre Benoit's book is meant for a much wider audience. In fact the colourful dust-cover says it is for the 'non-specialist' reader. The passion narrative is examined in a series of chapters, with the four gospel accounts given in parallel columns at the beginning of each. This makes for easy reference. Although the discussion of what each Gospel says separately, seems at first awkward, one