

icals, we are fortunately not committed to fundamentalism, and progress has been rapid, once off the mark. Had it been otherwise, the chances of making much headway in the modern world would have been appreciably less. This book of Fr Richards', should it have the use it deserves to have in our schools, is going to contribute substantially to a reduction in the lapse-rate.

His writing is bound to appeal to adolescents. It is downright, clear, and most important of all, he never talks down. For instance: 'If the book of Joshua has given such a complete account of the conquest, why does the book of Judges start the whole story again from the beginning and contradict it so flatly?' I'm not sure that I agree with the answer, which turns on the 'undisputed' fact that 'the same author wrote both books'; whatever may be said, they can't have the same *author* (the first is probably Elohism, the second Jahwism) and while they may have both been *edited* Deuteronomistically (which is to claim much less) even this is in dispute for Judges I. That, however, doesn't matter; what matters is that children are being trusted with searching problems, that the old paternalism is at last on the way out. Nor does it matter that others would have probably picked on different things to include; 64 pages isn't a lot to play with, and I would certainly have spent less time on the tired question of inerrancy, though no doubt some treatment is needed in the present bad state of teaching. On the whole the right things are all said, and in the right way. In short it is an excellent book, and a fine advertisement for the entire enterprise.

LAURENCE BRIGHT, O.P.

OBJECTIONS TO CHRISTIAN BELIEF, with an Introduction by A. R. Vidler; Constable, 12s. 6d.

There is no doubt that intellectual and moral honesty is one of the first duties in life, especially in religious life. At the same time one could not safely deny that this very honesty is continuously threatened and seriously endangered by our human callousness and insincerity. We all have tried to escape from an all too strenuous duty into the easy way of prefabricated solutions, either legalistic or intellectual. This is our human tragedy, the *pesanteur humaine* Simone Weil described so rightly. Therefore we can only approve when Cambridge divines think it to be their duty to bring before the court of our conscience the modern objections against our faith, either moral (D. M. McKinnon), psychological (H. A. Williams), historical (A. R. Vidler) or intellectual (J. S. Bezzant). But honesty does not exclude the sense of respect for our fellowmen, especially in such important and delicate matters as our faith in a revealing and redeeming God.

Therefore we read this book, we are afraid, with mixed feelings. Most of the objections are indeed real objections, though some originated from a rather primitive form of theological tradition, and a few were not completely free from a slight touch of hysterics. But objections are to be discussed, it seems, in a dialogue with people belonging to the same faith as much as with people who

do not belong to that faith. From this point of view we can only regret the scornful way in which the authors frequently speak of the 'churches', the theologians and the faithful, and those who do not belong to their circles; one would almost say, to their coterie. There is sometimes an aggressiveness of tone, without mercy for the simple, and without charity for those who might disagree. But this can possibly be understood when one considers the situation they may have found themselves in.

There is another point which we cannot understand so easily. They think it their duty as university scholars to set out the objections of our time, and rightly so. But it seems to us that there remains a more important and urgent duty for a man who has been set free (this is what is meant by the Greek word *scholè*) to think about the foundations of our faith; that is to answer those objections, or at least to start answering them. We found a few solid suggestions for an answer only in the paper presented by Canon A. R. Vidler. It is easy to find and to express objections in matters of faith, but it is by no means so easy to give the proper answers. Our objections always ground on a particular point of view, and are immediately understood, but to answer them and to be understood at the same time, one has to master the full implications of the problem in all its aspects. And that is what a divine is for, certainly at a Christian university. If we restrain ourselves to a mere accumulation of objections, we may be listened to without any difficulty, because everybody feels more or less the same, but are we not indulging, at least unconsciously, in a kind of intellectual masochism? And are we honest if we do? That Christianity does not possess clearcut solutions for everything is evident. That we have to find God in the night of our faith is true, but is it necessary to reduce Christianity to a metaphysical puzzle? Even in honesty there is a certain amount of balance and wisdom. Honesty destroys itself when overstressed.

P. FRANSEN

ON PAUL AND JOHN, by T. W. Manson; Studies in Biblical Theology No. 38, S.C.M. Press, 13s. 6d.

These studies of selected themes in St Paul and in St John represent a shortened version of some of the late Professor Manson's lectures in the late forties and early fifties. The first half of the book considers the significance for Paul of Christ cosmically, and as Saviour, and in the Church. This section is dominated by an excellent discussion of the atonement in Paul, one passage of which I shall comment on in a moment. In the second half of the book we are given a connected sequence of studies on important Johannine themes, such as life, light, truth, and especially love. Manson uses these latter chapters to delineate Jesus as the revealer of God and, more particularly, of God as love, since Jesus is himself love incarnate. An outstanding (and concluding) study on St John's Logos doctrine examines its origins as well as its significance in the fourth gospel and first epistle. Unfortunately, in the last few pages the author attributes to the evangelist