tongue in front of mostly nontheological audiences [sic]' (p. 29). This completely ignores the subtlety of thought and genius of expression found in Eckhart's Latin commentaries on *Genesis*, *Exodus* or *John*; or his tenacious argumentation in the *Parisian Questions*; or his inspirational preaching found in his Latin sermons. Furthermore it renders insignificant the theological capacity of the women religious that constituted much of Eckhart's so-called 'nontheological audiences.' Secondly, Keel shows limited understanding of the last twenty years of research into the nature of the bull of condemnation when he states, 'And for this boldness he had to pay the price of being condemned for spreading heretical ideas' (pp. 297–98).

Perspective can be extremely valuable when it does justice to the wider realities. However perspectives can often be quite relative and partial. There is much of value in Keel's work: his delight in discovering Eckhart, his effort to engage Western Christianity and Asian thought, as well as his efforts at interreligious dialogue. But at the risk of seeming harsh, I must say that Keel's 'Asian Perspective,' while promising to achieve so much in its broad and general claims, could have done so much more. Unfortunately what could have fostered both interreligious understanding of Eckhart and the critical study of the divine and human dimensions of Christianity's Incarnation, and similar notions in the great Asian religions, was difficult to see.

MICHAEL DEMKOVICH OP

CAMBRIDGE THEOLOGY IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY: ENQUIRY, CONTROVERSY AND TRUTH by David M. Thompson *Ashgate*, Aldershot, 2008, pp. x + 208, £55.00 hbk

As every schoolchild knows, the two premier Universities of England are Oxford and Cambridge, both of which can boast, since the Reformation, a continuous history of theological study albeit outside the embrace of the mother who bore them. It befits the journal of the English Dominicans, who are planted in their groves, to allow some assessment of what these Faculties have been about. In what concerns the crucial nineteenth century background to twentieth and early twenty-first century endeavour, far more is known about Oxford than Cambridge. So David Thompson, professor of modern Church history at Cambridge, rightly remarks in explanation for writing this expensive but well-produced book. Why do I call the nineteenth century background 'crucial'? In institutions defined by traditions of learning, it was then that a frame was put in place for the epistemological issues raised by the secularization of the European mind. It was then, too, that fundamental decisions were made as to how to approach the emerging higher criticism of the Bible, theology's core text. Naturally, subsequent intellectual revolutions could not be ruled out. But when they occur they will generally be found to take their shape from accepting some features of an inheritance and abreacting – which is also a form of indebtedness – to others. A syndrome is constructed with which any *doctor catholicae veritatis* must reckon in this place and time.

Cambridge has known a continuous tradition of theological study – inevitably, since dons were clergymen and the University, until the late nineteenth century, was a part, in effect, of the Church of England. But a 'Theological Tripos' dates only from 1871, even if a 'Voluntary Theological Examination' was put in place thirty years earlier. Significantly, only the Lady Margaret chair, the creation of a major figure in the Catholic 'Pre-Reform', was well endowed. In what concerns systematic theology, as that discipline was known in Lutheran Germany, Calvinist Scotland, and Catholic Europe, Anglicanism was handicapped

© The author 2010
Journal compilation © The Dominican Council 2010

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2010.01360_4.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

by an institutional deficit – not least at Cambridge. As Thompson shows, this had (among signal disadvantages) one manifest advantage. The opportunity was to hand for theological energy to be dedicated instead to the felt issues of the hour. In this case, those issues were chiefly the apologetic defence of Christian truth claims, and the need to take up some view on the new biblical scholarship coming across the German Ocean. Still, the pre-eminent Cambridge professors of the latter part of the century, J. B. Lightfoot, B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, were, after all, in priest's orders, if not indeed, as the first two of that trio, eventually bishops. As Thompson shows, ecclesiality – the indispensable place of the *ecclesia* in doctrinal thinking, downplayed, except in a political sense, in the first half of the nineteenth century – certainly entered their thought.

It is good, though, that Thompson, himself a Disciple of Christ who accepted ordination in the United Reformed Church, has included in this survey the Protestant Nonconformists permitted to take up teaching posts from 1871 (though not to take degrees in Divinity till 1913). The star of his study, in my judgment, is the Congregationalist Peter Taylor Forsyth in whom the gift of constructive dogmatics was far more fully displayed than in any of the Anglican writers discussed. Perhaps I am influenced here by the deep respect in which Hans Urs von Balthasar held Forsyth's writings.

What should a Catholic reviewer make of this history, relayed as it is with an impressive panoply of reference to primary sources as well as a palpable mastery of secondary discussion? Thompson brings out the commitment, at least as old as Paley, to natural theology and apologetics, disciplines that have an honoured place in classical Catholic theology too. Paley's rejection, widely shared at Cambridge, of the 'habit of presenting the doctrines of Christianity before any consideration of its proofs' (p. 30) is a different matter. The organism of doctrine, in its beauty and power of illumination, is in itself, at the hands of successful dogmaticians, a suasion to faith. The primacy accorded by Cambridge to apologetics – including here the critical but believing study of the biblical text – helps to explain its lack of hospitality to systematics. The late twentieth century movement Radical Orthodoxy, which errs in the opposite direction, was Cambridge-born but cannot be said to have fared well at Cambridge hands.

In his epilogue Thompson remarks that the influential 1961 essay collection *Soundings*, by considering objections, philosophical or exegetical, to Christian belief, points to the twentieth century continuance of a recognisably Cantabrigian set of concerns. He also records the comment of its editor, Alec Vidler, that no theological synthesis lay behind it. In retrospect, it was a pity that Michael Ramsey, author of *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* as well as Christological studies open to the integration of exegesis with doctrine, did not stay long enough (1950–1952) at Cambridge to make his mark. Not that Ramsey could have furnished an epistemology fit for theology to live with. In that regard we might be inclined to regret more the evanescence of the influence of Coleridge – though Thompson's account thereof does not sound the depths once explored by Colin Gunton of King's College, London (not accidentally, perhaps, a fish from the same pond as Forsyth, if we allow the United Reformed Church to be English Congregationalism's legitimate successor). Of the two Roman Catholics who, in more recent years, have held an institutional chair in Cambridge Divinity (Nicholas Lash and Denys Turner), one was chiefly a methodologist and the other a (short-lived) philosopher of religion. Neither, unless I am mistaken, gave much of an impetus to dogmatics proper so called. Nor, with the flight to the Scottish Universities of such Oxford figures as John Webster and Oliver O'Donovan, can it be said that – despite the Tractarian imprint, and the subsequent Celtic visitations of John Macquarrie and Rowan Williams – doctrinal thought has currently a very favourable environment in the 'other place'. Sympathetic readers of *Theology in the Public Square* (2005), by Gavin d'Costa of the University of Bristol, may find

© The author 2010
Journal compilation © The Dominican Council 2010

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2010.01360_4.x Published online by Cambridge University Press

their prejudices confirmed by these indications of limits on scope in the premier league.

AIDAN NICHOLS OP

THE JUNG-WHITE LETTERS edited by Ann Conrad Lammers and Adrian Cunningham *Routledge*, London and New York, 2007, pp. xxxii + 384, £50 hbk

The exchange between Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961) and Fr Victor White OP (1902–1960), published for the first time as a whole in this volume, exemplifies one of last century's brilliant dialogues of faith and science. It illustrates the hopes of interdisciplinary work between psychology and Christian thought. However, it also brings to the fore one striking failure in the process of theoretical bridge-making.

The conditions for the encounter were ripe on both sides. Jung's novel stance in the psychological establishment of the early 1900s had set the stage by rejecting Freud's depreciation of religion and culture. Moreover, in the field of empirical psychology, Jung was making one of the most important contributions to the recognition of religious experience as a potentially positive psychological phenomenon. From the late twenties, the Swiss psychologist and founder of Analytic Psychology published several notable articles that made overtures to Catholicism. Jung expressed an appreciation for its sensitivity to the feminine (especially its veneration of the Blessed Virgin Mary), its respect for humanity and reason (in contradistinction to the *sola fide* vision that he received from his father, who was a Zwinglian Pastor), and its inclusiveness (integrating elements from diverse cultures and religions).

White had earnestly been engaging contemporary science from an orthodox Catholic perspective. His serious openness to the psychological sciences imitated the model of his mentor St Thomas Aquinas instead of the reified manuals that for centuries had tended toward legalistic and static views on ethics and philosophical psychology. However, as for Aquinas' dialogue with Aristotelian science and psychology, White ran the risk of incomprehension on two sides: both from those who did not understand the potential and place of contemporary psychological typologies, especially in the wake of Catholic resistance to reductionist trends in modern sciences (the Modernist crisis), and from those who misjudged the level at which insights from empirical psychology and world religions could be integrated into a Catholic metaphysical worldview and theological value-system.

White initiated the dialogue with Jung in 1945, at a time when the older man was open to finding a collaborator within the Catholic Church. White, one of the foremost English Dominicans of the time, boldly sent the Swiss psychologist several essays written between 1942 and 1945 that displayed his capacity to synthesize Jung's psychology with orthodox Catholic thought, cogently calling on Scriptural, Patristic, Medieval, and Magisterial sources. White expressed his understanding of and optimism concerning Jung's theories, for example, on individuation, collective unconscious, integration, agency, and the spiritual meaning of psychic energy and emotions.

Jung responded to the priest's letter and articles with surprising enthusiasm, reporting to White: 'You are to me a white raven inasmuch as you are the only theologian I know of who has really understood something of what the problem of psychology in our present world means. You have seen its enormous implications' (p. 6). From the start, nonetheless, Jung had to address questions that the English Dominican posed about the psychologist's notion of transcendence and Christianity. Jung was open and remarked, 'I would need some solid theological

© The author 2010
Journal compilation © The Dominican Council 2010

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-2005.2010.01360_4.x Published online by Cambridge University Press