

upon a particular situation, except that it follows the crucifixion; certainly some historical critical scholars have (mistakenly, I propose) sought to discover a particular ‘issue’ in a particular ‘community’ against which alone the Epistle can meaningfully be read, but part of Vanhoye’s greatness lies in showing that *Hebrews* can and should be read theologically, that its message is not determined by historical hypotheses. Such is not the case with *Galatians*. This letter has, since long before the rise of the historical critical method, been interpreted against a more or less explicit reconstruction of the situation in Galatia, a situation in which a group of ‘Judaising Christians’ is seeking, whether out of malice or out of theological folly, to impose Torah observance upon converts to Christianity from paganism.

Having such ancient roots, this historical reconstruction is not one of those ‘assured results of biblical criticism’ that are the product of post-enlightenment scholarly confidence, held by everyone in one decade, widely derided in the next. These a Catholic commentary can and should ignore, or at least not depend upon. But the story of the Judaising Christians in Galatia is as much a part of Catholic tradition (albeit with a very small ‘t’) as it is a central part of the Tübingen Hypothesis with its explicitly anti-Catholic reading of the early history of the Church. We should therefore not be surprised that Vanhoye and Williamson also take it as read. This is unfortunate, because I believe it to be a mistake, springing from a fundamental failure to interpret correctly – nay, really even to take seriously in its plain meaning – *Galatians* 6.12f, and from a failure to observe the vital distinction between those in Galatia who are acting hypocritically out of fear of persecution and those potential persecutors of whom they are afraid.

This dependence upon an insufficiently careful and nuanced reading of the historical situation behind *Galatians* is by no means fatal. The message of the Epistle is still the same, that the Cross of Christ is the source of all salvation and the fulfilment of God’s promises to Israel, the manifestation of his faithfulness; and that to preach anything other than Christ Crucified is a betrayal of the Gospel. Vanhoye expounds this axiom of Pauline theology with his customary brilliance and shows the consonance with it of the Catholic Faith in all its richness. If you want a commentary on *Galatians*, you could do a lot worse; but if you want to discover Vanhoye, you could do a lot better.

RICHARD J. OUNSWORTH OP

THE THREE DYNAMISMS OF FAITH: SEARCHING FOR MEANING, FULFILLMENT AND TRUTH by Louis Roy, *OP Catholic University of America Press*, Washington DC, 2017, pp. xii + 236, £36.50, pbk

Louis Roy begins by speaking of ‘the faith experience’ rather than simply ‘faith’. In spite of current scepticism, and widespread rejection of religion,

human beings continue to search for meaning, fulfillment and truth. His goal is to broaden the consideration of faith to include these aspects. It therefore includes also a dimension of hope, an affective as well as an intellectual dimension, a subjective but not necessarily subjectivist aspect (he relies significantly on Bernard Lonergan for whom genuine objectivity is the fruit of authentic subjectivity).

The book begins with the contemporary need for hope (chapter 1), a need that becomes clear when the spiritual quest is understood as a descent into the depths of human experience. Roy believes that this anthropological starting point opens the door to a more effective contemporary presentation of the gospel faith. At the same time, he distinguishes his method of ‘interrelation’ from Tillich’s ‘correlation’, the former meaning ‘a dynamic of mutually critical correlations between the Christian traditions and present-day perspectives’ (p. 16). It is not simply a question of trimming the answer of faith to the shape and size of human questions even while faith, understood in the broad sense that he proposes, does respond to those questions while raising even more.

The second part involves listening to voices from the past in regard to this human quest (chapters 2–5, the Bible, Aquinas, Newman, and Lonergan). Roy picks out just some points in what the Bible says about faith. One is to see it in the perspective of hope – ‘Christian faith is a hope founded on the resurrection of Jesus’ (p. 45). Another is to highlight what the Bible says about blindness and deafness, the need in human beings for illumination if they are to see and for healing if they are to hear, the need for witnesses of various kinds if faith is to be made credible. Much attention is given to the affective aspect of faith emphasized in the Johannine writings and to the need for faith in Christ, the Logos incarnate.

The consideration of Aquinas is also selective, picking out just those characteristics of faith in which Roy is interested. So he explains how, for Aquinas, faith can never be separated from love, is always affective and cognitive, is a matter of hope and assent, and furthers the reach of natural reason in its quest for the good of the intellect which is truth. He considers finally Aquinas’s use of Augustine’s distinction of *credere Deo*, *credere Deum* and *credere in Deum*, another way in which the complexity of the experience of faith is made clear.

Roy’s interest in Newman is concentrated on *A Grammar of Assent* with its distinction of notional and real apprehension, and its development of Aristotle’s phronesis into what Newman calls ‘the illative sense’, the sense that makes inferences based on converging evidence and thus justifies real assent in matters of religion. Although Newman might seem to go beyond Aquinas with a broader understanding of the experience of faith that includes imagination and moral action, a less rationalistic reading of Aquinas, as well as recognition of a shared indebtedness to Aristotle, will serve to strengthen the sense that in Aquinas and Newman we have two Christian believers thinking about the same questions in a very

similar way. The chapter concludes with a consideration of Newman's use of the triad priest-prophet-king, developed among others by Friedrich von Hugel with his threefold 'elements of religion' which provides Roy with a structure for the experience of faith that carries through to the end of the book. A healthy believing will balance appropriately the elements of royal, priestly and prophetic dynamisms (authority, emotion, reason). When things go wrong it is because the right balance of these three elements has been lost.

The turn then to Lonergan, home ground in a sense for Louis Roy, will not be as easy for many of his readers who might already be familiar with the Bible, Aquinas and Newman. He brings alongside the material already presented Lonergan's understanding of the different conversions that arise where the spiritual quest is faithfully pursued: moral, intellectual and religious conversions. Here, he says, 'faith is the knowledge born of religious love' (p. 133) – authentic subjectivity bears fruit in the recognition of objective truth. He considers objections to Lonergan coming from Lindbeck and Tracy but the sources he gives for these are somewhat dated and seem to reflect 'in-house' debates among disciples of Lonergan. If Lonergan's concern is method rather than presenting particular objects for belief, at what point is faith in Jesus Christ to be introduced? Or does the experience of faith, as Lonergan expounds it, remain open to the possibility of arriving at a variety of concrete religious positions?

The final part returns to the present situation and offers some pastoral applications (chapters 6 and 7, and the Conclusion). The three elements identified by Newman and developed by von Hugel are considered again, as three structuring dynamisms (or factors, or vectors: the language is fluid) within the experience of faith. These dynamisms serve fulfillment, meaning and truth, precisely the things human beings continue to seek according to the introductory chapter of the book. At this point there is a long consideration of self-deception (is all faith bad faith, wishful thinking?) and a consideration of the encounter with Jesus Christ as actualizing and concretizing these three factors. Explicitly Christian faith is always waiting in the wings, the moment in which it is meant to come centre stage is not so clear.

Roy anticipates that some will find his approach too progressive while others will find it too conservative. I wondered whether the book should have been either much longer or much shorter. A shorter book would have allowed for a more concise and precise presentation of what is an important argument. As it is the schematic consideration of the four main sources, with many passing references to other interesting contributions, may leave many readers dissatisfied. The chapters on Aquinas and Newman fit together whereas a bit more work seems to be needed to integrate Lonergan's methodological approach with those of his two classical predecessors. There is no doubt, though, that the pastoral concern that gave birth to the book – to offer contemporaries an informed reflection on the

experience of faith in its intellectual, affective and social aspects – is an urgent one.

VIVIAN BOLAND OP

THAT ALL SHALL BE SAVED: HEAVEN, HELL, AND UNIVERSAL SALVATION
by David Bentley Hart, *Yale University Press, New Haven and London, 2019,*
pp. 222, £20.00, hbk

In this short book David Bentley Hart, ‘an Eastern Orthodox scholar of religion and a philosopher, writer, and cultural commentator’, argues stridently in favour of universal salvation. He concludes not merely that this is one possibility among others, or that Christians may legitimately hope for this outcome, but that as a matter of fact, even of necessity, ‘all shall be saved’. Despite a pronounced tendency in modern theology towards some version of universalism, Hart presents himself as fighting a battle, even a hopeless battle, against a majority who support ‘infernalisism’. While infernalists conceive of hell as unceasing, Hart endorses a hell that will eventually come to an end, where punishment is always restorative. While infernalism is presumably in the majority in Eastern Orthodoxy, Hart focuses his assault firmly on the West: his chief adversaries are Calvinists, evangelicals who have become conservative Catholics, and Thomists. Hart refuses the moderation of academic caution: though in the minority, he is simply right, and his opponents are not to be treated lightly.

The core of Hart’s book is found in four meditations, the first on the identity of God, the second on the nature of judgement, the third on personhood, and the fourth on freedom. These correspond to four arguments, each of which appears in various places throughout the book. The argument from freedom charges that no genuinely free intellectual creature can reject God. Hart rejects the modern view of freedom as negative liberty, and shares with his Thomist opponents an ‘intellectualist’, dynamic, patristic view of freedom, where the perfect freedom of heaven in the presence of divine goodness excludes the ability to sin. However, what is surely at issue is not perfect freedom, but sufficient freedom: do those on earth have sufficient freedom to reject God definitively? Hart seems to recognise the point but does not focus enough on what his opponents might consider as rendering freedom sufficient for such a choice. Without such an extended engagement, Hart cannot make the requisite critique of his opponents’ position. To that extent his assault is wide of the mark.

Another of Hart’s argument is that no person can be in heaven while any other person is permanently excluded from it. It is an argument that surely touches all of us insofar as we wonder how we can be truly happy