

the myth, and the war and violent revolution which it promotes, has had a useful evolutionary purpose. It was one way of adapting to conflict: it enabled decisions to be made that had to be made. But we must move on, or back, to another way of doing it: perhaps the ritualized conflict (the stag's antlers are good for ritual, bad for killing) which is so much more characteristic of the beasts than the 'nature red in tooth and claw' in which our ancestors, by a self-projection, so fondly believed.

In the light of a current debate, must we fear, with Adrian Cunningham, that Evil is by this writer being 'ontologized': represented as an aspect of existence *as such*? I think the answer is yes, but that the fear is itself part of the Holy War mythology. 'I cannot imagine the end of the world before the victory of truth', said Teilhard. If Last Judgement (End of the World) is in fact *one* with the victory of truth: then Evil is one aspect (the inert, negative aspect) of materiality as such: Put another way: if the world is a statement, *in the medium of space and time*, of God's nature, then when that statement is completed, time will not continue. Perhaps evil (cf. the Buddha) is indeed an aspect of the material world as such: but intimately part of its creative possibilities. It could be in this area that the dualist insight can be incorporated into a new philosophy of being: deeper than either its acceptance or rejection.

Both the quotations from Teilhard which I have used above come, not from Mr Windass's book, but from *Hope and History* by Josef

Pieper. Professor Pieper represents what is best in the Thomist tradition: a well-tempered (good-tempered) philosophical mind, unfailingly open, unfailingly critical, sensitive to modern (existentialist) language; clearly marking the line between philosophy and revelation, and submitting each issue to the test of both. It is a measure of his relevance that all Mr Windass's main themes are echoed in one or other of the two books under review; but it is a fairly different world. Thus the concept of death as punishment for sin is scrutinized, and found, of all the possible pictures of death, to be 'absolutely radiant, a supreme testimony to hope and light': 'for it is inherent in the concept of punishment that it makes up for the fault: that it makes good again.' Thus (in opposition to all forms of historicism) the perfection of man, for which he 'hopes', is placed ineluctably outside and beyond history: for hope is seen to transcend the object hoped for, and to reject its claim to define and limit it. If man is defined by transcendence, then there can indeed be no end to it. Plato's Banquet of 'true being' is what we existentially hope for; and only the revealed dogma of the resurrection places this back in the *midst* of the historical world: stating, in faith, that no jot or tittle will be lost 'of all that is good, true, beautiful, well-made and healthy'.

We need to remake our eschatology. Both writers under review would be necessary contributors to such a project.

JULIAN DAVID

DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE: SOME HISTORICAL PROLEGOMENA, by Jaroslav Pelikan. *Yale University Press*, New Haven and London, 1969, 149 pp. 52s. 6d.

Professor Pelikan says that, while Newman's *Essay* is 'the almost inevitable starting-point for an investigation of development of doctrine . . . this is not to be yet another book about Cardinal Newman: he is not the subject of it, only the provocation for it' (p. 3). Thus, for example, his summary of Newman's seven 'notes of a true development' is only designed to provide him with a convenient set of categories from which, after a trenchant critique of Dewart's *Future of Belief* for its 'refusal to take history seriously' (p. 28), he can build up the thesis that insufficient attention has been paid, in studies of doctrinal development, to the way in which 'Christian doctrine has in fact developed' (p. 4): 'The tough questions in the development of Christian doctrine will not finally be settled by any historical research, but they can be faced

theologically only when such research has been done' (p. 53). In other words, the purpose of the book is accurately stated in the subtitle.

Accordingly, the second part is devoted to a case-study of three important instances of doctrinal 'development' (the subject-matter of each of which had interested Newman): Cyprian's doctrine of original sin; Athanasius' Marian theology, and the problem of the 'Filioque' as it emerges from Hilary's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity. The importance of these examples, according to Pelikan, is that they indicate various different 'methods of development of doctrine' (p. 91).

Too often, as Pelikan points out, '*Dogmengeschichte* has concentrated not on the history of what the Church believed, taught, and confessed, but on the history of erudite theology' (pp. 46-7). Whether he is correct in

suggesting that this bias has produced 'the impression that the development of Christian doctrine is far more erratic and fitful than it has in fact been' (p. 49) is, perhaps, open to question. However, I would strongly agree with him that one of the merits of Newman's *Essay* is precisely the emphasis which it places on the 'total life of the Christian community' as the 'matrix' of doctrinal development (cf. p. 144).

Only a few years ago, the 'status quaestionis' of the problem of doctrinal development was such that so generous and scholarly an intervention by a Protestant theologian in a debate largely conducted amongst Catholics would

have been an important ecumenical event. If, now, this little book disappoints, it is because the whole framework of the discussion is rapidly shifting. Some of the questions which most seriously need to be put to this book are not directly questions about Christian doctrine, but rather about that conception of *historical* method which underlies the discussion of the crucial issue of 'the interrelation between history and theology' (pp. 33-6). For a fuller discussion of these problems one looks forward with considerable interest to Professor Pelikan's promised 'multivolume' study of the history of the development of Christian doctrine (cf. p. 146).

NICHOLAS LASH

ADVERTISEMENT

originally published in *Johannesburg Sunday Times* of 18th January, 1970, and signed by 70 leading South African Reformed, Protestant and Roman Catholic churchmen and laymen in view of the General Election to be held in South Africa on 22nd April.

Twelve statements for the consideration of all Christian voters in the Republic of South Africa

"Every Christian has an inescapable political responsibility, especially he who has the vote.

Politics concerns itself with the arrangement of society and therefore most intimately affects the lives of people created in the image of God.

It is the Christian's duty to contribute by his vote towards the establishment of a government which shall promote law and order, and shall work for the welfare of the whole community over which it is appointed, in accordance with the Biblical commandments of truth, justice and love.

Any arrangement of a people's life which is not in accordance with the commandments of truth, justice and love opposes the common good, endangers law and order, conflicts with the will of God and therefore leads to the downfall of such a people.

In His acts of creation and of salvation, God reveals that He is deeply concerned about human society as well as about the life and fate of every individual. This is why the Christian recognises the intrinsic value of society and the dignity of every individual.

The Christian shares in the responsibility for the arrangement of society in accordance with the revealed commandments and promises of God. Hence, in his political witness and action, he should be obedient to the revealed will of God and reject anything which conflicts with it.