

the nuances that are reserved for the intellectually rich—than to believe that another Catholic who is passing over in silence certain cardinal truths is engaged in a sincere search for Catholic truth? When he judges, one can say, as one cannot say of a Protestant, that he ought to know better. One has even heard it said that the contemporary emphasis on 'salvation-history' is a deliberate retreat from the Catholic theology of grace into the ambiguities of an earlier age and style of presentation. No one who has experienced the riches of biblical theology will fall for this one, but it is not always quite so easy to decide the issues.

It is experience of this kind that forms the crux of the debate. What the opponents of Küng fail to recognise is that he is on to something wholly positive, and something more than rapprochement with non-Catholics—he gives us the sense of breathing anew which is the fruit of a successful *ressourcement* in any field of Christian truth. They will have none of this, and so for them Küng's silences are sinister—as are also, of course, the silences of Anglicans on Christology. Let an Anglican only state the uniqueness of Christ otherwise than by saying that he was God, and he is immediately taken to be denying the divinity of our Lord. The fact that he may be using the terms used by our Lord himself—in *logia* that must in an important sense have more revelatory force in them than any later proposition of the Church *about* him—is ignored. Indeed the silence is not all on one side. But what is of profound significance for the understanding of the present phase in Catholic history is the fact that not only Küng but also the four Cambridge evangelists manage to split the correspondents in any Catholic journal. That there are excesses few will deny. But neither can one deny that something crucial is happening in the Catholic mind.

I have suggested that Küng has experience on his side, but this is not entirely true. On this matter of the mass, for instance, he is in a position to counter-attack and point out that a tradition that unfolds harmoniously from the Supper Room into fully-fledged Catholic liturgy and devotion can nevertheless be shown in an unflattering light. For over a thousand years communion a few times a year was accepted as normal, an attitude difficult to reconcile with the intention of the eucharist. It seems that we still have a lot to learn of the indispensable practice of looking straight at the facts. We still have to overcome our tendency to *a-priorism* in every field. Against this, and against the spiritual torpor that it creates, this excellent collection of letters to young people is, amongst other things, a necessary counterblast.

DOM SEBASTIAN MOORE

THE PROTESTANT LITURGICAL RENEWAL: A Catholic Viewpoint, by Michael J. Taylor, S.J.; Newman Press, \$5.50.

It says a good deal for the patience and goodwill of the 800 Protestant pastors in the United States who responded to Fr Taylor's ingeniously constructed questionnaire of 21 questions on the place of sacramental worship in their churches. Altogether twice that number got the questionnaire but no amount of prodding

could get a reply out of all of them. The net of enquiry was cast chiefly in urban areas, and the plan was to gain some idea, by the sampling method, of the state of liturgical worship in Protestant churches.

The questionnaire itself centred around enquiries on the 'definition of a Sacrament'; 'is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper accidental or essential to worship?'; times and seasons of Eucharist observance; laymen's interest or otherwise; the teaching on the 'real presence'; sacrament and sacrifice. The upshot of the enquiry is that Fr Taylor is convinced that something is happening within the traditional worship pattern of the American Protestant churches to justify his use of the words 'liturgical renewal', by which he means 'giving greater stress to the Lord's Supper in worship'.

This enquiry and its resultant records are extremely useful to the growing understanding between the churches because, within an admittedly limited scope, we do see some evidence of the state of mind in local church life. It would have been, I imagine, an easy exercise for Fr Taylor—who is an assistant professor at Seattle University—to have dug into the various manuals of the Protestant Churches and come up with their official announcements on the place of the Lord's Supper in church worship. But here is factual presentation of what local ministers and their congregations are thinking and practising which is vital to any understanding of Protestant church life.

The ministers who got the questionnaire belong to the Congregational, Evangelical and Reformed, Methodist, Lutheran, and United Presbyterian Churches. The Baptists did not respond (46 out of 140) with the same zeal 'because it was apparent from the first response that the subject of our study was not of immediate and practical concern to pastors in this church'.

The Presbyterian response may be taken as an example. 'Pastors in favour of liturgical renewal' (50 per cent); 'Pastors opposed or indifferent' (40 per cent); 'Lord's Supper, a memorial but much more' (85 per cent); 'Lord's Supper essential to Christian worship' (88 per cent); 'Real, physical presence' (4 per cent); 'Symbolic presence' (45 per cent); 'A sacrifice in some sense' (50 per cent); 'Moment of presence' (85 per cent non-committal).

On these answers, and many other ancillary ones, Fr Taylor builds up his conclusions that for 'main-line' Protestant denominations in the United States the Lord's Supper is 'the Sacrament of *remembrance*, of *presence*, of *faith*, of *fellowship*, of *dedication*, and of *hope*.' His six pages of conclusions are an excellent summary of the generally accepted Protestant view of the Lord's Supper, but it is not a new revelation. On the whole Fr Taylor's investigations bear witness to the faithful 'observance' of the Lord's Supper in the various Protestant traditions. What is new are the signs he records of the lively interest in American Protestantism of concerns about worship, its content and practices, and trends in the thought of pastors and laymen. This gives his book very great objective value, and makes it a genuine contribution to ecumenical understanding.

In Part One of the book (pages 5 to 92) Fr Taylor looks at 'liturgical renewal' in history, in present ecumenical interest, and in the teaching of the Reformers.

All this is evidence of his wide reading and irenic understanding of the Protestant position. If there is a 'liturgical renewal' in the Protestant churches today then it is also a 'return' to Reformation teaching and practice about worship aided by the present ecumenical experiences of which Fr Taylor's book is so welcome an example.

CECIL NORTHCOTT

THE WORD OF GOD ACCORDING TO SAINT AUGUSTINE, by A. D. R. Polman, tr. by A. J. Pomerans; Hodder and Stoughton, 35s.

Dr Polman is a professor at the John Calvin Academy in Kampen, Holland. His learned and exceedingly thorough study gives welcome support to those right-minded students of St Augustine who think that his so-called neo-platonism has been very much overworked. The Calvinist theologian vindicates against many Catholic writers St Augustine's character as a Christian, and his vigorous independence of mind as a 'Bible Catholic Christian' from any philosophical *a priori*'s. He was one who had grown up in and always used neo-Platonist language, but soon grew out of the neo-Platonist world view. In this assessment of his subject Dr Polman is in closer agreement with St Thomas than are the Catholic authors he criticizes; more strength to his elbow.

One hopes too that his investigation of St Augustine's preaching will prove stimulating to Catholic theologians. In these days of dialogue it is on the theology of preaching that Catholics have most, perhaps, to learn from Calvinists, and there are indeed signs that they have begun to do so. Our debt to Dr Polman is that he shows us here how we can learn on this subject from St Augustine about the irreplaceable value of preaching as a means of salvation and of grace. But in his eagerness to make his point he does less than justice to the value that even Catholics allow to preaching in principle, and is not quite fair to the appreciation that a writer like Fr Van der Meer has shown of Augustine's preaching in particular.

On the debit side must be mentioned first of all faults of presentation and translation, which are not the author's responsibility. He does not indeed quote Augustine too much, as he fears in his Introduction that the reader might think; but the reader's eye is given no help whatever to distinguish between his quotations and his own comments. A little more judicious paragraphing would have made all the difference. The quickest way of telling when you are reading Dr Polman and when St Augustine is by noting the quality of the English; when it becomes noticeably stiff and awkward, it is the saint, not the doctor, that is being rendered. In one place a curiously conflated reading of the prologue of St John is produced: 'and without him was not anything made that was made. That which was made is life in him . . .' (p. 14). Augustine, like the most modern critical editions, but unlike the current Vulgate and standard English versions, always read this text punctuated thus: *et sine ipso factum est nihil. Quod*