

man's acceptance of the Church provides an example of how a man could still fulfil his deepest nature [Lawrence's point] by accepting one of the presented forms of current civilisation'. Is that what Newman was doing? But if we are at first startled to see it asserted that Newman and Lawrence meet 'in the sphere beyond personality, in what Newman called the Object and what Lawrence termed "the third ground"', by the end of the chapter we have at all events had this thesis marshalled in a fascinating manner.

It is altogether a book most disturbing in its diagnosis and most stimulating in its treatment; severe, but not unjust, and buoyant throughout. Curiously enough, though Maritain is nowhere mentioned, the philosophical Personalism of Mr Bantock is essentially of the kind that his Catholic readers will have learnt from Maritain's *True Humanism* and *Education at the Crossroads*. And they will be grateful for the incisive exposition that this book gives to it.

A. C. F. BEALES

THE BODY. A Study in Pauline Theology. By John A. T. Robinson. (S.C.M. Press; 7s.)

This is a brilliantly instructive study of the Pauline doctrine concerning the Church as the Body of Christ; intended above all to expound its realistic Christological meaning. The expression 'Mystical Body' is even accounted unfortunate, as tending to suggest a metaphorical sense. The Church is a Body, not because it is so close-knit a society, so powerfully informed by the one Spirit of Christ, that it is thereupon seen as deserving to be so represented, but because it is in reality one with the suffering, the eucharistic, the glorious Body of Christ himself. But does this not then simply require that the Body of Christ is to be conceived of according to some rarefied sense of the word? According to our ordinary conception of the Body, this surely would have to be said—if, that is to say, Body is conceived of in contrast to soul, as matter in contrast to form, as a principle of individuation and exclusiveness. This, however, is not what the Bible, not what St Paul, take Body, in its quite literal meaning, to signify. For St Paul, Body as such already has what we with our Greek way of conceiving of it can only reckon a highly mysterious meaning. Taken quite literally it can mean, for him, not one part of the whole human being, but the whole human being and personality, considered 'in the solidarity of creation', as made for God.

The great value of this book, then, is that it sets out with remarkable clarity this original biblical concept of Body (as also the kindred, yet strongly contrasted concept of Flesh), and, as it says, 'correlates all Paul's language on the body'. We can hardly fail in some degree to misunderstand St Paul if we substitute our

own rather earthly, limited concept of Body for his and then subtilise and mysticise it to meet the requirements of dogma. That is the way of cheap theology; and if we would avoid that way, this is the kind of book that many of us probably need.

RICHARD KEHOE, O.P.

RELIGION, SCIENCE AND HUMAN CRISIS. By Francis L. K. Hsu. (Routledge and Kegan Paul; 14s.)

Dr Hsu describes the basic problem of this book as being to decide on 'the nature of the relationship on the one hand, and the distinction on the other, between magic and science in human culture'. Roughly two-thirds of the volume is devoted to a detailed survey of the behaviour of the inhabitants of a town in the Yunnan Province of China in face of a cholera epidemic. It tells us of the prayer-meetings they held, the ceremonies they performed and what it cost them to perform them, and also what was their attitude to modern medical treatment. The latter part of the book sets these facts in the wider context of anthropological studies in various parts of the world and discusses at some length the new hoodoo of Western civilisation in a place like Chicago where magic has to be dressed like science. But what do all these facts mean? Throughout the discussion the reader is aware of a pathetic contrast between the care with which information is assembled and the lack of penetration with which it is interpreted, between the precision of the data and the vagueness of the thought that is brought to bear upon it. A great deal of space is given to the criticism of Malinowski's distinctions between magic, science and religion, but nothing very constructive appears to be put in their place. One feels it is a case of people who live in glass houses. After what he has said, has a writer who can conclude his book with the inept remarks about religion which appear on page 133 any right to be taken with complete seriousness?

A.S.

THE EXISTENTIALIST REVOLT. By Kurt F. Reinhardt. (Bruce Publishing Company; \$3.50.)

REASON AND ANTI-REASON IN OUR TIME. By Karl Jaspers. (S.C.M. Press; 7s. 6d.)

To classify certain philosophers as existentialist seems to be one of the simplifications by abstract thought that they have protested against. We think of them as a dissenting sect, because we have come to consider philosophy as something that deals with a set of problems, and chiefly with the problem of knowledge. The great European tradition that began with Socrates preferred to see it as a way of life, a reflection on the whole of our experience. Surely it is here that these philosophers belong, by their concerns if not always by their conclusions; and if this is so

D