

word oft repeated) to belief by the individual reader in 'the amazing claim that the chief character in the story is in fact God' (8). It may seem like a claim to us and Patrick Grant assumes that all the authors of these books expected Christ's divinity to be read and heard within their narratives and epistles as such a claim, indeed the central claim. These texts are then artfully designed to put the claim forward in its strongest form. But, with the possible exception of John, this assumption would be questioned in works written precisely for believing communities with varied concerns.

The New Testament writings seek to convey just what faith in Christ is and what it entails. Exhortation to repentance, teaching on riches, consolation in the face of death, the call to act upon belief, the articulation of faith already present in liturgy and community: all these things should not be reduced to or confused with a challenge to believe in the divinity of the crucified Christ. That they have been so reduced can be seen in Patrick Grant's omissions: how can Luke-Acts be described without mention of that work's concern for poverty and debt? How can John's Christology be described without stress upon its sacramentalism? Faith as virtue here swallows whole hope and charity. A second assumption lies behind the first: belief is something that Christians are likely to have come to as readers of the New Testament. Faith is talked of as 'our commitment and assent to the vision which the New Testament documents present to us' (8). Thus 'ways in which we are drawn through the literature towards the extra-literary remain to engage and compel us by means of a powerfully relevant narrative and the explanations of our conditions which it offers' (132). This is not the faith taught by children learning to say the 'Hail Mary' by the bed! Nor that found in the love of a spouse, or the death of a martyr in the arena, the assassinated catechist. Across the pages of this book flits the ghost of Luther reading in lonely anguish his copy of St. Paul.

RICHARD FINN OP

YVES CONGAR by Aidan Nichols, OP. *Geoffrey Chapman, 1989.*
Pp. xvii + 207

As any student of theology knows, the Second Vatican Council is unintelligible apart from the pioneering research of Yves Congar. More than thirty years of his theological investigations prepared the ground for the flourishing of much of what the Council had to say on such topics as tradition, church and ecumenism. Aidan Nichols' presentation of Congar's work helps us to understand how.

Consider, for example, the chapter on tradition. Nichols explains how for Congar the transcendent subject of tradition is the Holy Spirit while the immanent subject is the church herself. Although one must seek to discover the tradition through scientific research, ultimately tradition eludes the grasp of the detached observer, for tradition in its most profound sense, is the educative milieu of faith (p. 38). Thus, only the church as such is adequate to understand its faith which is always more than a matter of doctrine, embracing rather the whole of the church's being, including worship, prayer, the moral life, and the holiness of the saints. In Congar's exposition we see a foreshadowing of *Dei Verbum* 8: 'Now what was handed on by the apostles includes everything which contributes to the holiness of life, and to

255

the increase of faith of the People of God; and so the church, in her teaching, life and worship, perpetuates and hands on to all generations all that she herself is, all that she believes.'

Likewise, Congar's research prepared the way for *Unitatis Redintegratio*. Here we note that Congar's search for Christian unity dates back to 1937 with his book *Chrétiens désunis* and spans a half a century to his final reflections on the subject published in 1983, *Diversité et communion*. Prior to Congar's investigations, the Catholic position had been that no positive values were to be found in the non-Catholic Churches as such. Elements of grace could be found only in the individual believer in spite of his belonging to a heretical or schismatic group. The key insight of Congar was that it is incorrect to think in terms of schismatic individuals bound to the Catholic Church merely by means of an implicit desire. Rather, in the schismatic communities themselves there are preserved authentic elements of the *Una Sancta*. Each of the major non-Catholic communities such as the Orthodox Churches, the Lutherans and the Anglicans has elements of truth, often forgotten in the Catholic Church, which must be recovered. Such ideas of Congar found their way into the decree on ecumenism, for example in no. 3, where the Council Fathers state: 'Some, even very many, of the most significant elements or endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church itself can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church: the written word of God; the life of grace; faith, hope and charity, along with other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit and visible elements.'

A third area of theological and ecumenical significance is Congar's studies in pneumatology culminating in his three-volume work, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*. Of central importance here is his reflection upon the question of the *Filioque* which continues to divide the Church. Congar's conclusion is that in regard to pneumatology the East and West have developed irreducible theologies, both of which have their genuine insights as well as obvious limits. Such a divergence of theologies should not of itself lead to a division between the churches. Congar points out that the conflict about the *Filioque* has its roots in the problem of language, since the West has only one word 'procession' to indicate what Greek theology expresses with the two words *prōēnai* (a general coming from another) and *ekporeuesthai* (proceeding from an absolute original source). The second term can apply only to the Spirit's relation to the Father whereas the first covers also the Spirit's relation to the Son. Congar's own position is for dropping the *Filioque* from the Creed. Nichols is critical of this suggestion while being open to the possibility of omitting it on solemn occasions when Eastern and Western Christians worship in common.

What emerges from this study is that Congar is primarily an historical theologian whose massive knowledge of the past has opened up new vistas for speculative theology with enormous ecumenical import. The key word for his life's work is, in Nichols' judgment, *ressourcement*. By returning to the *fontes*, especially the Fathers, the ground for the future is broken. Congar has done for theology that which Heidegger hoped for philosophy, namely a *Wiederholung*, in which the future which lies in the past is opened up. If one pole of Congar's project is history, the other pole is speculative theology, but in Nichols' opinion, Congar has been less successful here.

Nichols suggests that the probable reason for this limitation is Congar's lack of a systematic philosophy. If Congar has failed to create an original systematic theology, he has nonetheless compiled dossiers of documentation which will serve the work of younger theologians who are bold enough to strive for a new theological synthesis.

Nichols' study admirably fulfills its task of offering the reader a lucid overview of the main themes of one of the twentieth-century's major theologians. The exposition is clear, the judgments balanced. A useful bibliography is provided at the outset. If I had any criticism to offer, it would be the desideratum that Nichols' presentation have a bit more of the *élan* which would not only explain his author but stir his reader to discover Congar for himself.

JOHN O'DONNELL SJ

YOUNG DOCTOR PUSEY by David Forrester. *Moybray*, 1989. Pp. xviii + 271. £30.00.

The news that a thesis is to be published is not usually an occasion for applause. This case is different, partly because, as a doctoral thesis, it was completed more than twenty years ago, but more seriously because it responds to the need—often expressed—for works to offset the concentration upon Newman in nineteenth century studies. Accordingly, Dr David Forrester's investigation into the intellectual development of the young Pusey is particularly welcome. It sheds fresh light on its subject, and that remark is not the truism it may seem at first glance.

Pusey was a formidable personality and those who approach him may easily be deterred. There is, first of all, the sheer quantity of his writings, his sometimes impenetrable style, and his encyclopedic approach. For example, at a later stage of his life, he suggested to Newman that reunion might be achieved between Catholics and Anglicans if the Roman Church would specify definitively what would have to be believed *de fide*. Newman, of course, replied that it would not be possible to dictate to the future in that way. Few exchanges illustrate so well the encyclopedic expectations of Pusey's cast of mind. But it is not only Pusey himself who may deter the aspiring scholar.

His biography was written by his devoted disciple, H.P. Liddon. It was published in four large volumes between 1893 and 1897. Its detail appears to be exhaustive and its pattern has had a great influence in shaping scholars' views of Pusey: the Preparation, the Movement, the Struggle, the Victory. Whatever validity that pattern may have for Pusey's later life, Dr Forrester makes it clear that it is a total misconception of what had gone before. Pusey's development was much more complex, much less even. Forrester tackles it with *élan*. In relaxed prose, he uncovers new material, opens up perspectives, and thereby deepens our knowledge.

His attention to the psychological aspect will probably attract most interest. Liddon's account gives Pusey a magisterial status. Forrester has underlined the extent to which he was dominated by his father and the way that domination left him in danger of being excessively dependent on others. There was also the matter of his love for Maria Barker, which was overwhelming, but upon which his father for years set an absolute ban. He