

crucified Lord 'and climb along his sacred breast', are religiously re-defined by Dr Cousins from their most particular excitements into general expressions of 'fellowship' with Christ and 'the desire to reverence and celebrate him'. After this, it is no surprise that Dr Cousins does not notice what is going on when Habington waits on God: 'Upward to thee lie force my pen'.

Intending to establish Crashaw as 'the greatest Catholic religious poet of the English Renaissance', Dr Cousins leaves aside just those elements in Crashaw's verse which interested Pope and Coleridge and Swinburne and T.S.Eliot, and which provided paradigms for Shelley's most famous poem. His biggest bother with Crashaw is neither what to do about the notorious 'walking baths' figure for the Magdalen's tearful eyes, which does not rate a mention, nor where to place the insistent sexual puns on 'dying' with Christ in the 'Hymn to St Teresa', where the poet is happy to say of the six years old little girl that 'She can Love & she can Dy' though 'she cannot tell you why'. At this point, Dr Cousins enters a remark about 'her necessary ignorance of theology'. He is much more worried by the 'theological difficulties' of Crashaw's being well aware of a gracious enablement to compose his hymn 'To the Name above Every Name' and yet not venturing in the body of his verses to pronounce the name of Jesus. This, at any rate, does strike him as 'curiously problematic'.

Readers, therefore, who are interested in the ways a sensitive soul may vibrate in Christian harmony with poets whom he supposes to be articulating a Theocentric, Logocentric, Christocentric, appreciation of our being, and Dr Cousins seems often to take those terms to be univocal, should get a deal of pleasure from this book. 'For a contrary view', as Dr Cousins observes, 'see H.Swanston, "The Second Temple", Durham University Journal, 56 (1963), 14-22'.

HAMISH F. G. SWANSTON

THE LOGIC OF SOLIDARITY: COMMENTARIES ON POPE JOHN PAUL II'S ENCYCLICAL 'ON SOCIAL CONCERN'. G. Baum and R. Ellsberg (ed.), Orbis, Maryknoll, New York, 1989.

This book presents the text of the encyclical *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* of 1987, and a number of commentaries by social scientists and theologians. The title stems from the Pope's claim that extensive poverty in the Third World, and in the North, the product of economic, political, cultural and military domination, of the 'logic of blocs' (8), needs to be opposed by the 'logic' of the virtue of solidarity (38). P. Land and P.J. Henriot applaud the continuation of the structural analysis of development of Paul VI's *Populorum Progressio*, whose twentieth anniversary the encyclical commemorates and whose teaching it seeks to deepen. The issues are examined in the light of previous social teaching and in his practical suggestions Pope John Paul II avoids opting for the capitalist or the communist model of development. These authors,

410

together with D. Dorr, who compares S.R.S. with key concepts of P.P., Goulet, who relates these to secular themes, and Antoncich, elaborates on the theological perspectives of the Pope, who welcome the deepening of the Pope's concept of 'integral human development'. Goulet shows S.R.S.'s analysis of this concept to be in harmony with current views of development which also acknowledge the need to go beyond the economic to embrace the social, political, cultural, and transcendent dimensions of human beings. He traces Paul VI's insight here and on the priority of 'being' over 'having' to the French sociologist, Lebrét, but entirely endorses John Paul II's claim that development is, therefore, a moral matter, requiring active solidarity for its progress. Dorr is impressed by the recognition of inter-dependence, of the fact that the prosperity of some people and nations entails the poverty of others and of the claim that solidarity should respect particular cultures and avoid imposing Western values. Along with Land, Henriot and Antoncich, he approves of the classification of this multi-dimensional poverty as structurally sinful. Antoncich's illuminating article pursues the theological reading of the issues conducted in S.R.S., treating solidarity in the context of the struggle between sin and grace in history. The Eucharistic dimension of solidarity is not a pietistic, individualistic reduction, but envisages the Risen Christ active in the Church and in the world grounding and fostering an authentic solidarity with those yearning for justice and freedom. This harmonises fully with the social and transcendental perspectives of the encyclical. Addressing the American surprise at the encyclical's equating of liberal capitalism and communism, J.A. Coleman thinks such a view misses S.R.S.'s central critique of their underlying materialism and neglect of the centrality of persons in social life, culturally and politically, as well as the economically. The Pope's challenge to such idolatry is needed in the American context too. His call to solidarity and to the preferential option for the poor to combat this situation is justified. G. Baum takes the same line on liberal capitalism and liberal democracy. The Church rightly challenges their free market dogma and their belief that enlightened self-interest of itself will serve the community's best interests and properly calls for people to be treated as subjects, not objects, of social institutions participating in all levels of social life. He gives qualified approval to the attention given to social sin, especially to its non-voluntary, almost automatic aspect through the operation of greed, power and ideology.

Bishop Claver of the Philippines is pleased with the structural analysis and with the care taken not to propose an ideologically inspired Marxist concept of development as a satisfactory alternative to Western capitalism and neo-colonialism. Participatory solidarity, respect for traditional culture and especially the clear articulation of Gospel values admirably reflect the needs and prophetically challenge the situation in his country.

M. Riley criticises S.R.S for its failure to give any attention to the

feminist perspective, which is central, not peripheral. The critique is overdone when the political, cultural and military domination which the encyclical berates is attributed to a "pandemic patriarchy", whose desire to dominate is "the original sin" (pp. 190, 196). Baum and Tabb challenge the Church to implement the teaching on solidarity against unjust structures of sin within the Church itself. The major criticism of the encyclical is that the Pope does not undertake a critical social analysis. Thus, he appeals to moral conversion and reform, but neglects the social forces which create the poverty in all its dimensions. Some authors (Baum, Hobgood, Tabb) feel that he thus tacitly assumes the Western capitalist model of analysis, ignoring or rejecting the liberationist model, which seeks to empower the deprived classes to claim their rights from the prevailing powers. For Dorr solidarity in S.R.S lacks the experiential and practical thrust of *Laborem Exercens* (8), which had encouraged workers to act together in support of their rights. Baum thinks the Pope, in line with *Reconciliatio et Paenitentia*, but in contrast to Medellín, puts too much emphasis upon the personal responsibility for social sin. The call to conversion, solidarity and preferential option for the poor fails to say 'whose social project is to be sustained' (pp. 120-21) and in effect only seeks the reform of existing institutions. Such a functionalist view of society and of the common good reflect a growing attempt to curtail liberation theology and its implications. Tabb cites Fidel Castro to give the encyclical the practical incisiveness it is said to lack. The West could cancel Third World debt without provoking distress for their own peoples if they reduced the military expenditure which leaves much of the world in their grip. No account is taken of the structural sin which left Cuba dependent upon the Soviet Union and diverted vast sums of money from social programmes in the Second World, leaving people there in great deprivation.

These critiques operate with defective hermeneutical assumptions. For them the reversal of Third World poverty requires a solidarity of progressive and Church groups with the poor, raising revolutionary consciousness among the poor, and a class struggle against the liberal capitalism. Although aiming to convince an American audience that the encyclical rightly tackle profoundly unjust structures of capitalism, the neglect of a corresponding treatment of communism permits these outdated presuppositions to go unnoticed. The Pope's radical critique of both Western capitalism and Second World communism (or liberationism) in *Laborem Exercens* and *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, and lately in *Centesimus Annus*, is emasculated by those still wedded to Marxist analysis. The oppression of 'real socialism' is ignored, impersonal structures are over-stressed, and no concern is shown to protect the poor from manipulation by those who claim to know where their class interests lie. This approach ignores the truth that solidarity is only authentically Christian and human when it is solidarity *for* justice and not *against* other persons (L.E. 20). Integral liberation involves but surpasses the solidarity of sustained, collaborative human effort for

earthly justice and is God's gift of victory over sin and death, which it is beyond human capacity to attain in its fulness (*Gaudium et Spes* 39).

The aim of seeing how social teaching is received in the secular world is a good one, but this imposes obligations upon contributors and editors. To be fairly interpreted an encyclical must be read in the light of earlier teaching. Tabb seems unaware of Paul VI's challenge to the presuppositions of free trade and international financial manipulation. Interdisciplinary scholarship demands care in the handling of unfamiliar sources and concepts. Hobgood completely misunderstands John Paul II's remarks on solidarity and charity, seeing solidarity as isolated acts rather than as the systematic practice of a virtue (S.R.S. 38–40) and construing charity as the cold, unfeeling act of one disdainfully discharging a mere duty, instead of being the summit of Christian moral life and the virtue which embraces all others.

All in all, the book is a little disappointing. Material ranges from the theological to the sociological, from the global to the regional. It lacks cohesion and direction. The offerings are perhaps too disparate and some too uncritical of their own assumptions. They need to be read with discrimination. The title promised more. A more rigorous analysis of the concept of solidarity in its origins and in its content might have helped. Suggestions for the concerted implementation of the encyclical's proposals for effective solidarity, based not on ideologies of materialism, but on the Gospel, would have been useful. The underlying vision of development from the standpoint of Christian anthropology has been captured and sketched out by some of the contributors noted above and this will be helpful to anyone seeking to understand the contribution of this important encyclical.

G.J. WOODALL.

TIME AND ETERNITY, by Brian Leftow. *Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1991. Pp.xii + 377. £32.75*

When the hymn-writer Isaac Watts wrote the lines

Nature and time quite naked lie
To thy immense survey,
From the formation of the sky
To the great burning day

Eternity, with all its years,
Stands present in thy view;
To thee there's nothing old appears—
Great God! there's nothing new!

he was expressing what was then the common Christian understanding of God's relation to time. According to this view God exists in a timeless eternity, and the events of time are eternally present to him. This timeless eternity