

materialisation' can make any difference here. The question is, *could* God do something to a body (or to a door) which would make it possible for the body to go through the door? I see no reason for clearly saying No to that question. But I am far from clear that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is supposed to take us beyond this kind of point, into the bizarre realms of speculation about (for example) whether a man who dies with a sprained Achilles tendon will be resurrected with a sprained or a healed one. Are

we here not in danger of simply using the doctrine for a purpose it was not designed to carry out? If so, it is no wonder that, having asked a silly question, we get a silly answer. I don't think it is mere evasion to say that Keat's 'negative capability', i.e. the rejection of an 'irritable reaching after fact and reason' needs to come in here, as well as his doctrine of 'soul-making' which is an important element both of Hick's and Badham's thought about the after-life.

BRIAN WICKER

**EZEKIEL AMONG THE PROPHETS**, by Keith W. Carley. *SCM Press (Studies in Biblical Theology)*, London. 1975. 112pp. £2.80.

This little monograph, stemming from a doctorate thesis of 1968, examines the connection of Ezekiel to previous prophetic tradition, chiefly that betraying the influence of the Northern kingdom of Israel, and especially the movement which we see in Elijah and Elisha. The author, now a lecturer in Papua, New Guinea, works chiefly by following up expressions which are found frequently in Ezekiel and occur also in striking contexts in the sources. Thus Ezekiel is connected to pre-classical prophecy by such expressions as "the hand of Yahweh was upon me", "that you may know that I am Yahweh", "setting his face towards...". Connections with other major streams of Old Testament tradition are also discussed: to Hosea he is linked by some special uses of the prostitute theme (which occurs also in Isaiah and Jeremiah), to Deuteronomy by a number of minor themes and expressions. The link with Jeremiah is considerably stronger, and here the author has an interesting hint on the development of the

new heart theme: in Jeremiah Yahweh promises to write a new Law on their hearts, but by Ezekiel their irreformability is such that it will need a new heart and a new spirit.

There is little that is new or exciting in this book. The author seems to rely on studies already published, rather than trying out new ideas of his own. He does not seem to have any particular thesis which he is passionately anxious to prove. Much of the book is routine thesis material, on which the author has nothing to say (e.g. the section on the ecstatic element in prophecy in the Introduction). What he does say is mostly unexceptionable (though he is distressingly willing to postulate a claim for the miraculous in the accounts of Elijah running before the chariot of Ahab and the translocation of Ezekiel to Jerusalem), but it should have been possible to write a book both more profound and more interesting theologically on this topic.

HENRY WANSBROUGH

**IMAGINATION**, by Mary Warnock, *Faber and Faber*, London. 1976. 213pp. £6.50.

A writer who begins an investigation into 'imagination' with Hume and Kant risks the same fate as Conrad's Captain MacWhirr, whose investigation of the typhoon produced the general conclusion that it was 'a damned awkward circumstance'. Inevitably, so expert a witness as the author of the *Ancient Mariner* and of the *Biographia Literaria*, if measured by the standards of Hume and Kant, will be dismissed as 'not a professional philosopher'. He has no tools to do philosophy with. Mrs Warnock shows Coleridge the door, and it is Wordsworth who is preferred.

Now it is true that Coleridge was guilty of writing that 'philosophy begins in wonder'. It is also true that Wordsworth was the better poet, and might be regarded, therefore, as the more reliable witness. The snag is that abundant evidence exists to prove that Wordsworth owed the *intellectual* foundation of his vision to Coleridge. Not for nothing has he been facetiously referred to as Coleridge's masterpiece.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that half the book is taken up in reaching the main track-