

danger of overstating the opposite case. There are a few places where Fr Carmignac may be thought to have done this. He does not always distinguish between primitive strands of the New Testament and the later elements which come closer to the full development of Christian doctrine. It is true that the Scrolls do not give any indication of the doctrines of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and Redemption. But Jesus himself did not teach these as dogmatic propositions, though they are to be inferred from the New Testament teaching as a whole. For the purposes of comparison of Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness, it would have improved his case if he had shown that even the most rigorous criticism of the Gospel records still reveals a fundamental opposition to the doctrinal tendency of the Scrolls. For instance, the teaching of Jesus about the Holy Spirit is consistent with the ideas of late Judaism, stemming from the Old Testament conception of the Spirit of the Lord. On the other hand, the Scrolls tend to equate the Spirit with an angelic being, which never happens in the New Testament. Arguing against the claim that the Teacher was expected to reappear 'at the end of days', he asserts that *yoreh sedeq* in the crucial passage (Damascus Document VI 11) is not equivalent to *morch sedeq* = teacher of righteousness. This may be so, but it does not preclude the fact that the Sect probably expected a righteousness teacher in the last days. It is probably better to hold, with Gaster, that they thought of *another* person who would fulfil this function. If so, he would presumably be the Prophet, who, according to the Manual of Discipline, will come with the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. In any case there is no question of a return or second coming of the original Teacher.

The controversy concerning the Teacher of Righteousness has been a conflict between scholars, which has attracted public attention. It is natural for the layman to suppose that the Christian scholars have a vested interest in resisting the impact of the Scrolls on the foundations of the faith. What both these books do in their different ways is to show that in this issue the boot is on the other foot. No reproach can be levelled against the integrity of those scholars who find nothing in the Scrolls which undermines the Christian faith, but rather welcome them as shedding a flood of light upon the Jewish matrix in which Christianity was formed.

BARNABAS LINDARS, S.S.F.

THE MEANING OF EVIL, by Charles Journet, translated by Michael Barry; Geoffrey Chapman, 30s.

Of all the problems which overlap the borders between the domains of philosophy and theology, there can hardly be one which is so venerable and yet of such contemporary importance as the whole topic of evil and why and how an infinitely wise and powerful creator can permit it. If it is a venerable question, going back in Christian theology to before St Augustine, it is also a highly topical point, constituting an obvious stumbling-block for many a present-day enquirer. In view of the amount of recent writing from an agnostic standpoint

on the subject (such as Professor Flew's essay 'Divine omnipotence and human freedom' in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*), it is indeed surprising, as Abbé Journet himself remarks in his foreword, that the professional theologians seldom devote a special treatise to the problem. Thus the volume under consideration deserves a warm welcome from students of all camps for its careful and competent restatement of traditional Thomist and Augustinian thought on the problem of evil.

In ten chapters all the usual aspects of the subject are covered. An introductory first chapter on the scandal of suffering displays a merciful lack of that smugness in the face of human problems which, unfortunately, seems sometimes to be engendered by seminary theology. 'How can we eat without remorse, knowing that two men out of three suffer from hunger, or go to sleep, thinking about the affliction of the sick or about the crowds of refugees who lack the warmth of a home . . .' (p. 20). All this is well said, for often scholastic treatments of these ethical problems show no more concern for the human realities of what is discussed, than one would expect were the topic something as academic as symbolic logic. In the second and third chapters the author comes to grips with the heart of the traditional Thomist account of the issue, the definition of evil as *privatio boni debiti*, the absence of a good feature or quality in a person or object which ought to have it. In successive chapters this viewpoint is developed: evil is related to the nature of God, why should animals suffer, why should human beings suffer, how can God permit sin? The seventh chapter, a very moving one, is above all relevant to the agnostic's dilemma; it expounds the doctrine of hell in all its complexity of harshness and mercy. 'For us the revelation of hell and its eternal coexistence with the infinite goodness of God remains a mystery which terrifies us by the light it throws on the hidden places of our hearts. But we know that mystery does not have anything in common with absurdity or contradiction; and that the one is to be revered, the other detested. Those who refuse the revelation of hell by calling it nonsensical always begin by disfiguring it and then they are criticizing mere caricatures of the real thing.' (p. 213). This criticism, voiced by Journet against the objector who takes propositions about the eternity of punishment in hell and considers them in isolation, is a fair point. It is one the theologian often finds himself compelled to make against the analytic philosopher. The analyst is certainly too ready to take single theological statements and consider them apart, as if they were laboratory specimens. The theology of evil cannot be considered in isolation but must be seen as part of a whole which centres round the love of God made manifest to sinful man in the redeeming mercy of the crucified and risen Christ. Chapters eight and nine deal with evils in our present day to day lives, and with evil as an element in the philosophy of history, respectively. Finally, the tenth chapter, on the right attitude to evil, centres the problem where it must be focused; here, the whole question of pain, suffering, punishment and hell, is nailed to the cross of Jesus, is seen in the light of the agony of Gethsemani and the psalm of dereliction pronounced by the crucified saviour.

What is the value of this book? Very different, I think, according as the reader is a believer or an agnostic. True enough, both will find an accurate, neat account of the doctrine of *privatio boni debiti* for Abbé Journet shows clearly how the notion of 'privation' maintains a razor-edged position between opposing viewpoints, between those who would err by denying importance and reality to evil and those who would err by considering it as having positive metaphysical being. The traditional view is exceptionally well set out and this is the chief value of the book for every serious reader. But, for the believer, there is much more than this, for the author writes as a theologian and so relates evil to the doctrines of creation, the angels, the fall, redemption, the last things, and so on. However, the agnostic will hardly fare so well for this book is a theologian's work, written for theology students or at least for believers. True enough, there is an impressive account of various trends in European philosophy and their relationship to the Thomist theology of evil. References are frequent to such names as Plato, Plotinus, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz and many other continental philosophers but I do not think that it is mere British insularity to find it rather odd that the index contains no mention of that very cogent objector, precisely on the topic of God and evil, David Hume. Of course, as is pointed out in the first words of the foreword, the book is written from a theological viewpoint. As such, it succeeds very well but it remains one for the converted. It would be worse than churlish to complain that it does not happen to be the particular sort of book that we in Britain stand in need of at the moment. We cannot blame the author for not writing a book he never intended to write. But the absence of Hume's name is symbolic; it serves to remind us that, as long as we rely so heavily on translations of continental works, just so long Catholics will remain intellectually juvenile in the eyes of the general academic public of Britain. Perhaps the best success that this translation from the French could achieve would be to inspire one of our own growing number of scholars, trained in speculative theology and analytic philosophy, to produce a book more directly beamed at the thought patterns of our Anglo-Saxon contemporaries, more easily adaptable as a basis for discussion with them.

JOHN SYMON

THE GLORIOUS GOSPEL, by Aidan Pickering; Darton, Longman and Todd, 25s.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL?, by J. M. Paupert; THE SOURCES FOR THE LIFE OF CHRIST, by François Amiot and others; Faith and Fact Books; Burns and Oates; 8s. 6d. each.

Here are three books to remind us that the Gospel is ever new and to help us to know and savour it even more. *The Glorious Gospel* is best assessed in terms of what it sets out to be, namely, a more complete set of Teachers' Notes to