

brought out more sharply for the reader the 'question-breeding' character of early scholasticism, and the frequency with which questions such as 'could God have redeemed the world in any other way?' were being raised. Moonan is able to show from convincing analysis of the texts that by 1230 the distinction was in regular use, and to go on to trace something of the process by which it was adopted as a more or less standard device. Here he takes in particular Roland of Cremona, Hugh of St. Cher and Alexander of Hales. Albertus Magnus and Bonaventure have a chapter each, Aquinas two, in which work by work and theme by theme the application of the distinction is traced. A penultimate pair of chapters explores the use of the distinction by lawyers (Hostiensis), and the way in which it travelled outside Paris to Oxford (Kilwardby . Bacon, Richard Rufus) and beyond (the Dominican Hugh of Strasbourg). The study ends with an essay which seeks to take stock of the distinction now that its detailed history in this key period has been set out, and to point to ways in which it is a worthwhile addition to the equipment of modern philosophy.

There is much that is valuable here, not least the undertaking itself. The close examination of sub-departments of the problem in particular works and specific authors makes this an extremely useful resource-book, as its author hopes it will prove. Engaging though the writing is, for the most part, there are, however, passages where one glimpses a submerged agenda. (the masters who brought philosophy back from the groves and cloisters to the [publicly-regulated] market-place' are not people this reviewer easily recognises among the familiar faces.) There are also moments when the conclusions being drawn seem a little forced, or awkward. But this is an experiment in genre and it is forgivable that it should sometimes seem a little unsure of its identity in that respect.

There is an *index nominum* and an *index rerum*, but the reader has to construct his own bibliography from the references.

G.R. EVANS

IN THE LIKENESS OF SINFUL FLESH, by Thomas G. Weinandy, O.F.M.Cap. T & T Clark, 1993. Pp xv + 168. £14.95.

Stephen Sykes once wrote that "the question about the humanity of Jesus is a doctrinal one, with far-reaching doctrinal implications, and not in the least to be presented as conclusively decided by the mere statement that Jesus was a man." Sharing this conviction, and taking as a principle the notion that "What is not assumed is not saved", Thomas Weinandy argues forcefully that "in the incarnation, the Son took upon himself, not some generic humanity, but our own sinful humanity." Weinandy insists that, though Jesus never sinned, and though he was free from the taint and effects of original sin, nevertheless his was the fallen humanity we all share. The basic emphasis of the essay is soteriological. "Ultimately our salvation is

unconditionally dependent upon the Son's assuming a humanity disfigured by sin and freely acting as a son of Adam."

Weinandy's previous book, *Does God Change?*, stands him in good stead to examine the christological tradition. After a brief but impressive summary of "the re-emergence of the human Jesus in contemporary christology", he turns first to the Fathers, then to Anselm and Aquinas, and finally to Irving, Barth and Von Balthasar to find support for his contention that Jesus' humanity was post-lapsarian. He freely admits that some authors do little more than hint at his theme, and acknowledges the ambiguity produced by the various arguments of Anselm he refers to. Pope Honorius I, he reminds us, seems to affirm the opposite position during the Monothelite controversy. Whilst Aquinas states unequivocally that the Son assumed a human nature "from the stock of Adam", the conclusions he draws from this relate more often to human weakness and passibility than anything else: he is reluctant to use the word "fallen". Ironically, Weinandy might have drawn further ammunition from Thomas' objections to some of the opinions of his day concerning the Immaculate Conception. (In the Foreword, Colin Gunton argues that Weinandy's position is incompatible with this latter doctrine, a claim the author disputes in an Appendix.) Of the later theologians to whom Weinandy refers, Irving is, famously, the clearest on the subject. Barth's approval of Irving suggests that, despite some ambiguity on this issue between early and late volumes of the *Dogmatics*, the author is justified in naming him as an ally.

This historical survey, wide-ranging and informed though it is, is subordinate to the latter half of the essay, a clear and imaginative discussion of the New Testament material. Weinandy touches upon many different aspects of the gospels and epistles, paying close attention to Paul, John and Hebrews. Though not a professional Biblical scholar, he writes persuasively and with conviction, the style and attraction of his interpretation coming not least from his close familiarity with the Patristic tradition. While one might not share his historical confidence, or his exegetical conclusions, it is gratifying to read christology which is comfortable with such a range of scripture and tradition.

Contemporary christology remains one of the most lively and significant areas of theology, and Weinandy's study can claim a small but important place within it. With the rise of "analytical christology", and the discussions of sin and human nature which feature so strongly therein, a work which shows itself familiar with the whole theological tradition, without being enslaved to it, is not to be undervalued. Weinandy's book should be read alongside the quite different works by Morris and Sturch, for example, and also contribute to the debates still being conducted concerning Hick, Wiles and others. The book is short, but this is not a fault. It claims to be, and is, an essay, an essay which covers a lot of ground. Like any good essay, it raises further questions,

such as those concerning what we mean when we talk about "fallen humanity". And, with some of the writers above in mind, one cannot help feeling that there remains room for a decent theological study of the doctrine of Jesus' sinlessness. That these questions remain is a compliment to Weinandy's efforts. His lucid presentation of an orthodox position (or, perhaps, a minor variant upon it) is well worth the attention of anyone interested in the doctrine of the person and work of Christ.

PETER GROVES

LANGUAGE, THEOLOGY, AND THE BIBLE: ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF JAMES BARR. Edited by Samuel E. Balentine and John Barton. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994. £45.00.

A pot pourri of essays, written and collected for the occasion of a seventieth birthday, is a gift with attendant problems. Not only are the contributors in danger of appearing to 'stop the clock', in that their choice of papers, with a backwards look, fails to give attention to any new studies which their celebrant may still be producing; but also, the selection of the contributions places constraints on how we perceive the full range of already published works, thus limiting rather than enhancing their appeal.

This particular collection is in fact a commendable achievement. Twenty-four international figures have engaged with the two most dominant themes in Professor James Barr's writings thus far — his linguistic and textual studies, and his critical theological works, as each theme relates to our reading of the Bible. The wide range of Barr's contributions in both these areas is fully explored — six essays on language and the Bible, with the remaining papers on theology and the Bible. Thus in this case, the selection of papers stands the test: the diversity of choice gives James Barr due recognition.

If the book has a failing, it is the unavoidable one of having to draw a line when Barr's literary output is still continuing apace. For his most recent books, on the creation stories (*The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*, 1992) and on natural theology (*Biblical Faith and Natural Theology*, 1993), are perhaps his most interesting and provocative to date; and they can hardly be his last word on the subject. So, although inevitable, it is disappointing that, other than a few pages in a chapter by John Barton, these more recent contributions to the contemporary debate have been given little attention.

Over the last thirty years of writing, Professor Barr's attempts to liberate the Bible from a particular linguistic and theological stranglehold have not left him free of critics. The demise of the Biblical Theology Movement and the undermining of the intellectual foundations of fundamentalism were largely attributable to his earlier works. Against this backcloth, the most important two chapters in the whole collection are probably those by the editors, for each offers