second Person incarnate. God the Son took a human nature, and it is not *in* him, so much as joined *to* him.

It was non-natural, rather than unnatural, for God to become man, in the sense that it was not a necessity of the divine nature that he should do so. It was a free voluntary act that God in his merciful wisdom decided to perform, but need not have done. God could have become anything else he liked, an animal or a stone; there would have been nothing inherently contradictory in this, and we can put no limits to what God can do. But as far as we can see there would have been no point in it.

So to your last question the answer is that it is possible that there are other incarnations of God on other planets. But the Christian revelation, which is our only source of information about God's incarnation on this planet, says nothing about it, because it is, as yet, none of our business. The only purpose we know of in God's becoming man is to save man, and other possible incarnations have nothing to do with that.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

ANGLICAN ATTITUDES

DEAR EDITOR,

I am an Anglican who appreciates your usually eirenic tone, but in the August-September issue Dennis Salt, writing about the Catholic Evidence Guild in the Potteries, comments on certain customary Anglican attitudes with an obtuseness which cannot serve the cause of peace.

First there is the reference to 'Church Re-union Week' and the Anglican vicar who apparently did not realize that the re-union meeting would 'lack something' without a speaker representing the largest Christian communion. In fact no Anglican priest who keeps the Church Unity Octave ever overlooks the need for Roman Catholic participation. We long for it, but when we try to get it our experience is very variable. I have a two-sentence letter from a Roman Catholic chaplain in a university blankly refusing my suggestion, as Anglican chaplain, for a scheme of participation in 'Church Re-union Week'. His successor in the

office, however, did take part the following year, with resultant access of mutual love, in an exactly similar scheme.

Secondly there is the vicar's wife and her admission, in the face of a blandly impassive husband and a choking C.E.G. man, that there was some doubt if Anglicans have a specific position. This is a very common Anglican attitude, but it does not indicate of necessity that we are spiritually bankrupt and know it, thereby provoking the charitably suppressed snorts of our more fortunate brethren. Rather it may point to our belief that we—as a part of the Catholic Church—'hold no specifically Anglican doctrines, but only Catholic ones' (Archbishop of Canterbury); and this is also why we can envisage with equanimity and without disloyalty the disappearance of the Anglican communion as a distinct institution.

We believe that our membership as Anglicans has admitted us to something much more important—union with the Catholic Church; and *this* is why we can quote 'Catholic authors from apostolic times' as if they were our authors, which we believe they are, and *this* is why the vast majority of Catholic-minded Anglicans are not engaged in 'reading themselves into the Church'.

Would not Mr Salt be wise to aim at better information about us when next he yields to the enchanting temptation of our fascinating company?

Yours etc.,
DAVID STEVENS

[Mr Salt is so beset with pressing preoccupations that he has asked me to reply to Fr Stevens on his behalf. I cannot deny receiving the distinct impression that Fr Stevens writes with a chip on his shoulder, and that he is taking offence where no offence was either intended or given. Such touchiness is as prejudicial to real mutual understanding as insensitivity. I cannot, in short, see any substance in Fr Stevens' first objection, because it is quite evident from Mr Salt's whole article that he is on the side of the nice polite Roman Catholic chaplain and not of the nasty rude one. As regards Fr Stevens' second point, I am grateful to him for clarifying an attitude that is indeed not readily understood by Catholics (Roman). But I would point out to him that the only mention of spiritual bankruptcy in connection with the Anglican communion occurs in his own letter; Mr Salt made no

such suggestion. Both Mr Salt and I are only too anxious to be better informed about Anglican attitudes, but we will find information easier to assimilate if it is unaccompanied by an emotional discharge.—ED.]

REVIEWS

FOUNTAIN OF JUSTICE. By John C. H. Wu, LL.B., J.D., LL.D. (Sheed and Ward; 18s.)

The sub-title of this interesting book is 'A study in the natural law', but neither that nor the title itself is any real guide to the contents. In fact Dr Wu, formerly Chief Justice of the Provisional Court of Shanghai, is now an American professor of law, and this book is an essay on the relationship between the common law as it has developed in England and the United States of America, and the natural law. Some guidance to the author's point of view may be gained by referring to the source from which he drew his title; this is apparently the remark of Lord Mansfield, addressing the High Court of Chancery as counsel: 'a statute seldom takes in all cases, therefore the common law, that works itself pure by rules drawn from the fountain of justice, is for this reason superior to any Act of Parliament'.

Essays on legal philosophy, if not actually unreadable, are usually repellent, particularly to lawyers. The practitioner often feels conflicting emotions as regards such works: on the one hand, he is overawed by the mountainous erudition, particularly references to Savigny, Ihering, Hegel, the Stufenbau, the neo-Kantians and similar institutions; on the other hand, he often suspects that the writer knows little of what he is talking about, because law is something that happens every day, all the time, and lawyers have to advise with assurance on practical problems with which the theories appear to have little to do. This book is however written with a difference—several differences, in fact. For one thing, it is readable. Any lawyer with the slightest interest in legal philosophy, and indeed any layman with an interest in philosophy and a smattering of legal knowledge, will be able to read it with interest. For another thing it is modest: the author explains his personal philosophy of law, without claiming to explain every aspect of it in terms of original thinking. Again, it is written with careful regard to the practice of the law.

But the most important characteristic of Dr Wu's book is that it sets forth a Christian theory of law. This is admittedly not original, and indeed no claim to originality is made. It is nonetheless unusual