The Religious Crisis of the 1960s (review)

Michael J. Walsh

January 2010   Vol. XCVI, No. 1

THE CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL REVIEW

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS

➡ *For additional information about this article*

ership, understaffed churches, fall-off of church attendance, declining interest in ecumenism, arguments about liturgical changes, and tensions between so-called liberals and conservatives. Still, amid the numerous publications on the theology of the Church, McBrien's book holds a pride of place.

Boston College   MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.

The Religious Crisis of the 1960s. By Hugh McLeod. (New York: Oxford University Press. 2007. Pp. x, 290. $110.00. ISBN 978-0-199-29825-9.)

From the impressively wide range of reading Hugh McLeod cites in this volume, there is a consensus that the 1960s ("a time when history moved faster," p. 15) was a period of religious crisis. McLeod does not dissent, but is circumspect. He prefers to speak not of a decline in religious practice—although he does, and often—because this is quantitative, but of the "decline of Christendom," which he regards as a qualitative change. Christendom he defines as a society in which there are close links between the elites of church and society, where laws are said to be based on Christian principles, and where the majority of people are presumed to be Christian. A Catholic might be disposed to think that the end of Christendom, in the *integriste* sense, came with the Declaration on Religious Liberty at the Second Vatican Council, but that document is not mentioned. Indeed, although he acknowl-edges Vatican II as being of "pivotal significance" (p. 29) in the 1960s, along with the civil rights movement and the Vietnam War, he devotes relatively little space to it. He does not believe that it was particularly responsible in itself for the ferment within the Roman Catholic Church. More important than the Council itself, he seems to suggest, was the disappointment felt by many at the perceived failure to implement the Council's outcomes. Proponents of Vatican II had, he says more than once, unrealistically high expectations, but he does not explicate this charge further.

McLeod's is a vast canvas. He takes in the United Kingdom (but especially England, where he has access to primary sources), the United States, France, Germany, and occasionally Spain and Italy. The "white" British Commonwealth is also well represented, but as he remarks, he has little to say of the church in Africa and Asia. Unlike several of the authors with whom he takes issue, he proposes no "master theme" for the decline of Christendom. It was, he very sensibly argues, the result of a combination of factors, although he appears to favor especially the increasing affluence of the postwar period, followed by the decay of collective identity—although this may itself have been a conse-quence of growing prosperity. In the prosperity stakes, he suggests, the United States had a head start, which should have led to an earlier decline in church attendance. He has interesting things to say about the apparent dis-parity between religious practice in the United States and in Europe, always excepting, at this period, Ireland and Italy—Malta, also an exception, does not get a mention.

The major difference, he appears to suggest, between Europe and the United States is one of scale: in the United States, the Christian vote can be mobilized to make a difference, whereas this rarely happens in the United Kingdom or elsewhere. The apparent political clout of religion gives the adherents of the various denominations a sense of identity in a manner not available in Europe. While Britain, he says, had a "moral majority" before Jerry Falwell's, on the whole the churches in the United Kingdom were leftward-leaning. McLeod makes the point that much of the liberal legislation in the United Kingdom in the 1960s had the backing of the churches, including the abolition of the death penalty and, perhaps surprisingly in the current context, the relaxation of the law criminalizing homosexuality. Much of it, on the other hand, was ushered through Parliament by Roy Jenkins, a *bon vivant* with little overt commitment to Christianity. In the index to Jenkins's autobiography, notes McLeod, religion is referenced only three times, while champagne is mentioned five times and claret seven.

Heythrop College, University of London   MICHAEL J. WALSH

Ancient

Tertullian's Aduersus Iudaeos: *A Rhetorical Analysis.* By Geoffrey D. Dunn. [North American Patristics Society, Patristic Monograph Series, Vol. 19.] (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press. 2008. Pp. xiv, 210. $39.95. ISBN 978-0-813-21526-6.)

In his monograph, *Tertullian's* Aduersus Iudaeos*: A Rhetorical Analysis*, Geoffrey Dunn defends the integrity and authenticity of Tertullian's often neglected "pamphlet" on Jews and Jewish scriptural interpretation. Dunn argues that *Aduersus Iudaeos* provides evidence not only of Tertullian's attitude toward Jews but also of Jewish-Christian engagement in late-second-century Carthage. The major contribution of Dunn's study is to affirm the placement of the entire tract in the early Christian *Aduersus Iudaeos* tradition, alongside more well-studied texts such as the *Epistle of Barnabas* and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho.*

This monograph is a revision of Dunn's 1999 dissertation, and he retains a helpful review of scholarship on Tertullian, ancient rhetoric, and Jewish-Christian relations. In particular, he builds on Robert D. Sider's study of Tertullian's rhetorical practices to argue that the structure, argument, and style of *Aduersus Iudaeos* not only attest to Tertullian's training in classical rhetoric but also conform to his rhetorical practice in other treatises. Dunn demonstrates that *Aduersus Iudaeos* takes the form of a *controuersia*, a common exercise in juridical oratory. Whereas most examples of ancient *controuersia* addressed fictional cases, Tertullian used this mode of speech to provide "a template for Christians to use in future encounters with Jews in arguing about their religious truth claims" (p. 31).