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BOOK REVIEWS


In these days of ecumenism the problem of scriptural interpretation has a special importance. Christians are one in revering the Bible as the word of God, but starting from this common point they manage to arrive at very different conclusions. Sometimes our seeming unity about the Book can create an illusion: we assume an area of agreement, only to be surprised by serious disagreement. We are not, after all, tabulae rasa before the Bible. Presuppositions, religious and cultural, command what we find there. If we are to understand our disagreements (and charity needs the aid of understanding), it is essential that we become conscious of the principles which guide our interpretations. We can be happy, then, that the effort is being made to explore the problems of interpretation, an effort of which these very different books are evidence.

Mikkelsen’s work is the more wide-ranging of the two, a veritable summary of problems and techniques of interpretation. There is a brief history of biblical interpretation, with a separate chapter devoted to the issues most discussed in our times, such as demythologization and salvation history. The necessary tools, languages and historical sciences, are treated and their significance for understanding the biblical text is explained. Problems such as figurative language, poetic form, symbols, typology and many others receive chapters. Of necessity, the treatment of so many large topics within the compass of four hundred pages cannot be very full. It is especially regrettable that, while there is exposition of the rules which M. proposes as guides to interpretation, there is little or no reflex investigation of their validity and their implications. Thus, to take but one example, the NT’s use of the OT is explained by the fact that the NT community was the new people of God in which the OT was continued and fulfilled, but there is no notice of the questions this raises about the place of that people, the Church, in the continued use of the Scriptures. It might be possible to defend this omission on the ground that the book is an introduction, which cannot do everything. More serious, then, in a book aimed at giving the student a comprehensive survey of all that is involved in understanding Scripture is the omission of basic material: there is no real treatment of literary forms which the past fifty years of research have shown to be basic to any reading of the Bible, OT and NT. Nor is there any place for development here:
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prophecy and typology are treated according to categories and not in terms of an organic continuity between OT and NT, the only terms in which they can be understood.

Wilkinson's book is less general and more satisfying. As befits a man trained in linguistic philosophy, he is concerned with the problem of the meaning or meanings of the text. While the book is not a history of interpretation, it approaches this question historically, examining the principles of various significant figures in the early history of exegesis. Indeed, it even treats of pagan allegorizing of Homer, since this effort was the background of much patristic interpretation. These earlier efforts are shown to have raised points relevant to contemporary problems, even though these are put in far different terms.

It emerges from this study that meaning is not so simple. Language which is figurative, symbolic, even mythical poses a problem when we ask its "real meaning." How far is a figure, a symbol, to apply to the reality symbolized? W. makes the further point (one that deserves more attention than it gets) that in speaking of God all our language must be analogical, that the divine truth about which it is used is partly like and partly unlike the content of the statement. Determining the limits of likeness and unlikeness is a problem which can leave the way open to a plurality of meanings, especially when we compare, as we must, a number of analogous affirmations. If, then, it is not easy to limit the meaning of a Scripture text to a single, clearly defined intentio auctoris, we must face the problem: How can any meaning be affirmed with confidence? What criterion can we apply to find a valid meaning or meanings? W. finds the efforts of ancient interpreters relevant here. If, as they held, the divine plan of salvation is unitary, then it is legitimate to see the meaning of one part in terms of another, even though the literary connection may be slight or nonexistent. Interpretation must be in terms of context, but context is more than literary. It is historical and social—which is to say that a history guided by God according to a plan and a people chosen by God as carrier of this plan are themselves a context stretching through time, and it is necessary to interpret from this context. W. goes on to point out that the people of God is now the Church, and that the life of that community is also a guide to meaning: we can interpret the Scriptures in function of their utility in the life of God's people here and now. W.'s thesis, then, fits into the present tendency to emphasize the social or, better perhaps, the ecclesiastical dimension of inspiration and its correlative, interpretation.

The book's conclusions are stimulating enough, but in addition it tantalizes by raising points of great interest without being able to furnish a satisfy-
ing treatment of them. For instance, the discussion of the instrumental character of inspiration fails to take note of recent criticism of this concept (e.g., Rahner), criticism which is concerned precisely with the social aspect of inspiration and so should fit somehow into W.’s scheme. Again, W. notes that OT type-figures are real as well as symbolic, but he leaves untouched the problem of relating those which are clearly historical with those which are not. They are all types, but in the same way? Then if W. is right in accepting the mythic-ritual kairos as a constituent of revelation, what does this do to present-day insistence on history as the unique biblical category? Finally, the symbolist idea that a text once written is totally independent of author and context is of course rejected. However, justice is not done to the insight hidden there, an insight far older than the symbolists: language is suggestive and allusive, and so texts are not simple counters expressing point for point the author’s intentions. They can and do have a meaning in themselves beyond the author’s conscious aim. These are but a few examples; there are many more. Let us hope they provoke further thought and study.

St. Mary’s College, Kansas

DENNIS J. McCARTHY, S.J.


The theology of Gn 1–3, identified in the subtitle as the topic of this work, continues to hold the interest of readers of the Bible both here and abroad. One’s first impression on seeing R.’s book is that the problems of Gn 1–3 are not yet solved. Not that one is likely to think they are; but a study of these dimensions addressed to the general public is a weighty reminder that previous work has not been entirely satisfactory. This reviewer is somewhat surprised at the space which R. gives to such problems as creation from nothing, evolution, polygenism, and the historical character of most of the details of Gn 1–3. His approach hints that popular understanding of these questions is no more advanced in Europe than it is in this country.

There are a number of attractive features in R.’s presentation. Among these must be included his preliminary discussion of the nature of inspiration; apparently Europe too has its quota of those who believe that inspiration is a channel of information. Good also is his location of the creation and Paradise passages in the general context of OT salvation history. His discussion of the nature and meaning of revelation and the relation between revelation and the sources of Gn 1–3 is a valuable contribution both to the passages discussed and to the general theology of revelation.
It is not surprising that the book raises more questions than I can discuss in a review; any book on these chapters raises questions. I mention by preference those points in which my own opinion, published and unpublished, runs in somewhat different lines. It is still unsatisfying to me to say that the object of the creation account of P is to affirm monotheism. This passage is less explicit than much of 2 Isaiah, for example; and to say that the passage is intended to be a statement of monotheism seems to run the risk of missing the real point of the passage. I have long been convinced that the passage is a counterstatement against the creation myths of the ancient Near East; these myths are not statements of polytheism. What seem to be primarily excluded are theogony, theomachy, and the immanence of the divine in nature. The dependence of the cycles of nature on the ritual performance of the myth is also excluded. These were the points at which Israelite understanding of Yahweh was clarified.

I find R.'s treatment of the garden of Gn 2–3 somewhat obscure, in spite of its length. Evidently he is tilting against a too realistic interpretation of the garden; in his polemic against this remnant of fundamentalism he seems to move too far in the opposite direction. There is no doubt that the story is rich in symbolism; but the interpretation of symbolism can lead the interpreter to find in it a meaning which is modern rather than ancient. R. comes down hard for a spiritual symbolism of the garden which is extremely sophisticated for the tenth or ninth century in Israel. Effectively he seems to reduce the symbolism of the garden to conventional language on the elevation of man to the supernatural life. Yet the OT here as everywhere is concrete and material in its thought and expression. The material universe is involved in salvation history, as Beaucamp has recently shown; and the exegetical problems created by the imagery of the garden cannot be resolved by abandoning it.

The interpretation of the garden is related to a principle which R. states in this connection, and which is open to serious criticism: the principle of the distinction between the Semitic thought-patterns which he calls the vehicle, and the content. This is no more than an application of the classic distinction drawn by Franzelin between the verba vs. the res et sententiae to a similar problem. The task of the interpreter is not to unshell the content, so to speak, but to find meaning in the thought-patterns. The content dissociated from the thought-patterns is not the content of the Bible. The necessity for a statement of biblical doctrine in relevant modern speech is not met by detaching from the content just those features which make it biblical.

The literary criticism of Gn 2–3 has been discussed to the point where it
seems that no new statement is possible. R. seems ready to dismiss all criticism. This reviewer agrees that the narrative as it stands is the work of a single mind and a single hand, with no more than one or two brief passages excepted. This statement does not, it seems, do justice to the literary complexity of the passage. R. refers to the variety of forms which the story must have had in Israelite oral tradition—an allusion which this reviewer made in an article published several years ago. But there must be even more to the origins of the passage than Israelite oral traditions. The diversity of outlook implicit in many of the verses of Gn 2–3 must be noted, even if no consistent account of the origins of the passage can be given. Otherwise there is danger that the reader will assume a homogeneity in the passage which it does not have.

A final point of discussion is the sin of Gn 3. The reviewer has learned from experience how difficult it is to propose an interpretation which takes account of the sexual symbolism of the passage without opening one's self to misunderstanding. If sexual symbolism is mentioned at all, readers conclude that the interpreter means that the sin of eating forbidden fruit was illicit carnal commerce. One cannot quarrel with R. for not accepting an interpretation which refers the sin to the order of sex in some way; one could wish that he had given the sexual symbolism and the sexual atmosphere of the passage the attention they deserve. To ignore these features means that the mind of the writer is not apprehended in one important respect.

In future printings of the book the reference to Qoheleth 24:25–27 (p. 203) should be corrected to Sirach.

_Loyola University, Chicago_  
JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.


Without a doubt the most significant work produced in the twentieth century for the understanding of the _NT_ has been G. Kittel's _Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament_. Now nearing the completion of its seventh volume, and with one more to go, it stands today as a monument to German Protestant _NT_ scholarship. It is a lexicographical study of all the Greek words of the _NT_ which have any doctrinal significance. It is designed to supply for each word or word-group a meaningful philological and theological history. Normally it gives the recognized modern etymology of the _NT_ word, a survey of the usage of its Hebrew and Aramaic counterparts in the _OT_ and Jewish intertestamental and rabbinical literature, the nuances of
the word in the Septuagint and Jewish writers who used Greek, and finally a treatment of the word in its various NT usages. The whole discussion is replete with references, and the articles are often small books in themselves. Packed with information and bibliographical leads, these articles are the starting point of any serious study of the NT, its ideas, and its message.

G. Kittel, the original editor of the German undertaking, has since died and been replaced by G. Friedrich. The first three volumes were completed before the Second World War (1933, 1935, 1938), but were reprinted in 1949–50. This means, then, that Vol. 1, now appearing in English, actually dates from before 1933. But though thirty years have passed, and new information could be added from several areas—especially from the Qumrân discoveries in the articles on hagios, alētheia, bap tô, Beliar, ginôskô, to mention only one obvious area—yet the articles will remain an indispensable source of information for generations to come. The translator had a formidable task before him and has done it very well; save for a small slip here or there, the English version makes a good impression on one who has made many comparisons with the original. It is a pleasure, too, to see the Greek and Hebrew texts quoted accurately. Obviously the translator's decision to render the text of Vol. 1 just as it was is a wise one. We could not expect him to do this thoroughly and also add references to more recent literature and bring the complicated discussions up to date. The only place where this could have been done easily is in the list of contributors (p. xv). It would have been better to indicate those who have died (say, with an asterisk) and append in parentheses present academic locations (e.g., J. Jeremías at Göttingen, K. G. Kuhn at Heidelberg, etc.).

Our thanks are due to G. W. Bromiley, the translator-editor, for undertaking such a vast work. He is already famous for his editing of the English version of K. Barth, Church Dogmatics. The publishers, too, deserve a vote of thanks for the production of a handsome and readable scientific book. Though somewhat reduced in format from the size of the German Kittel, it is a full translation of the original. The translator and the publisher have achieved a remarkable feat: "even the pagination is retained except for a slight fluctuating variation of no more than two or three pages either way." So the customary references to TWNT will not be hard to find in TDNT.

As a full translation, it differs considerably from the Bible Key Words series, which has offered an English version of some of the main articles in Kittel: Love, The Church, Sin, Righteousness, Gnosis, Apostleship, Basileia, Lord, Spirit of God, Faith, Law, and Hope. But, as B. notes, "The chosen articles have undergone some abridgment and editorial redaction [in this series], quite apart from the fact that the main part of Kittel has not been
translated at all." A comparison of B.'s translation with that of the *Bible Key Words* reveals the care of the former to reproduce "Kittel" and the paraphrastic nature of the latter. Let one example illustrate this.

(Sin [BKW 3, p. 1])
The idea of sin is expressed in the OT by a great variety of terms, whose differing shades of meaning are not adequately conveyed, either by our word, 'sin,' or by the Septuagint *hamartia, adikia, anomia, asebeia, kakia* and their derivatives. One of the most striking and instructive illustrations of this may be seen in the fact that we generally use the word, 'guilt,' as the translation of the Hebrew *'asham, 'awon*, etc., whereas in the Greek Bible the latter is almost always represented by one of the words just mentioned, and the former either by one of them or by some other inappropriate expression.

(TDNT, pp. 267–68)
The concept of sin is linguistically expressed in many ways in the OT. Indeed, justice is hardly done to this variety either in the LXX with its summary use of *hamartia, hamartêma, hamartôlos, hamartanô, or adikia, adikos, adikeô, or anomia, asebeia, kakia* and their derivatives, nor by our modern translations, which neither express the richness of the original nor even catch the decisive point in some cases. In English, for example, some Heb. expressions like *'āšām* and *'āwôn*, and sometimes others, are usually rendered 'guilt' as indicating a distinctive aspect of sin, but in the Gk. Bible the same words (e.g. *'āwôn*) are usually translated by the terms adduced or sometimes (e.g. *'āšām*) by other equivalents which are even less appropriate.

The real value in B.'s translation lies in the retention of the scholarly apparatus of Kittel, which is, after all, the main reason for the existence of the work.

It is to be regretted that the translator did not use the more normal English abbreviations and titles for rabbinical tractates rather than depend so heavily on the original in this regard. E.g., *Yadaim* is the more usual English form (at least since H. Danby's popular translation of the Mishnah) for *Jadajim* (Jad.), *Hagigah* more usual for *Chagiga* (Chag.). *Ab.* is strangely explained (p. xvi) as *Pirge Abot* instead of *Pirqe Aboth*. The list of abbreviations (pp. xvi–xl) includes the identification of ancient authors which is found in the German original. But some of them have an amusing, if not misleading, sound in their English form. E.g., Josephus is the "author in Greek of the Jewish War and Jewish Archaeology, which treat of the period from creation to Nero" (p. xxvi). The German original at least put quotation marks around "Jewish War" and "Jewish Archaeology" (we usually call the latter "Antiquities").

Kittel has recently come in for some severe criticism from several quarters.
J. Barr, in his book *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (New York, 1961), found fault with its heavily etymological approach and its principle of organization according to word-groups, with a consequent neglect of sentence meaning—the only level on which semantic distinctiveness can be determined. Undoubtedly, Barr's criticism merits serious consideration, because no matter how well it is composed, no dictionary becomes a sole and absolute authority. His criticism, however, is merited in some cases, and in others not. Since it is mainly negative, and we have not yet been given any viable positive substitute for the Kittel approach, most NT scholars will continue to turn to the *TDNT* for direction. The frequent users would do well to ponder the criticism of Barr as a caution; cf. B. S. Childs, *JBL* 80 (1961) 374–77. Now that Kittel is appearing in English, it will undoubtedly influence many generations of Anglo-Saxon NT scholars.

This undoubted influence on the Anglo-Saxon world is feared, however, for another reason, and the authority and value of Kittel have recently been impugned from a different quarter. In a letter to the editor of the *New York Times Book Review* (April 12, 1964, p. 34), J. Taubes (of Columbia University) and M. Barth (of Pittsburgh) reminded us of G. Kittel's marked Nazi sympathies and feared that the English translation of the dictionary would unleash in the Anglo-Saxon world a new form of anti-Semitism. They believe that the treatment of rabbinical sources in Kittel is inadequate, and add: "'Higher criticism' has too long been a form of higher anti-Semitism as well." It *may be* that here and there in some article the anti-Semitic bias of a contributor has colored his presentation of data from rabbinical or other Jewish sources—this reviewer, at least, has not detected it. At any rate, it is not responsible criticism to associate all the contributors to this monumental work with the original editor's Nazi bias. Nor is it fair to think that Anglo-Saxon users will not be able to detect such bias, when and if it is really present. These critics were rightly answered by M. E. Marty in the same issue. Despite the criticism, the English Kittel will become the monument that the German is.

*Woodstock College*  
**JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.**


The expression "the Son of the living God" forms only a small part of Mt 16:16, and one might be surprised to find a whole book devoted to the study of it. But the subtitle reveals the book's real purpose, a contribution
to the study of the Christology of the Matthean Gospel. Since modern study of the Synoptic Gospels is interested not merely in their *concordia discors*, but also in the theological perspective of the individual Evangelists, the author believes that a key to the Matthean portrait of Christ is found in the use made of the title “Son of God.” He tries to discover the nuances that this expression has and how they contribute to a synthetic view of Matthean Christology.

The book has three parts. The first investigates the meaning of “Son of God” in Mt’s sources: in the *OT*, in Late Judaism, and in the Christology of the primitive tradition of the Church. This is followed by an analysis of the Matthean passages in which the phrase or its equivalent occurs (2:15; 3:17; 4:3, 6; 8:29; 11:27; 14:33; 16:16; 17:5; 24:36; 26:63; 27:40, 42–43, 54; 28:19). The third part is synthetic: it tries to bring together the main nuances of the expression and present the Matthean portrait of Christ as the obedient Son, the powerful Son, the unique Son, and of Christ as the Son related to the Church. The phrase is seen to have a double tension, one of relation to the Father, and one of relation to the Church.

There are many excellent insights into Matthean Christology in this book, but what the reader has to go through to get them is another question. De K., a Dutch priest, wrote this book as a dissertation for the doctorate in Scripture at the Biblical Institute. It unfortunately bears too many of the marks associated with dissertations which have to be published in order that the degree might be conferred. It is verbose, padded, and replete with typographical errors, bad punctuation, and misleading references. German is not the author’s native tongue, and this may be the reason why one has to reread sentences at times in an effort to puzzle out just what is meant. Let one example suffice. Early in the book De K. says: “So the theme of Yahweh is not too far removed from the theme of the Son of God….” A rereading of the preceding paragraph makes it clear that what he meant is: “So the theme of *Ebed* Yahweh is not…” (p. 8). These defects abound especially at the beginning of the book, so that the initial impression is very poor. Is it too much to ask that doctoral candidates be schooled in the elementary conventions of transcribing Hebrew (cf. p. 33: *MeStach*)?

In treating the sources of Mt’s use of “Son of God,” De K. is aware of the complications of the meaning of the phrase in the *OT* and Late Judaism. He discusses the *OT* use of it for heavenly beings, the people Israel, the king, the Messiah, and the upright individual. He agrees with O. Cullmann and others that it denotes divine election to a special commission and the obedience that this demands. But he finds this idea deficient in that it does not express the dynamic character of the expression, for it connotes a collectivity
as well as an individual, a figure of the present as well as an eschatological character. "The most important dynamism lies in the more or less clear, but never quite absent tension between the past, the present, and the future, between the original call to be Son, the present disloyalty making of the Son a 'No-Son' (Dt 32:5), and the expected and hoped-for ideal figure of the future, who becomes ever more and more a figure of the end-time and one in whom the fulness of sonship is realized" (p. 19). This is De K.'s notion of the OT "Son of God," and he proceeds to apply it throughout the book. It represents, however, a maximalist view in the interpretation of the expression as far as the OT is concerned, and will find few supporters. No one will contest De K.'s handling of the conflated titles of Jesus in Mt, but the question still remains whether and to what extent the terms "son of God," "messiah," "servant of Yahweh," etc. were conflated and centered on an ideal figure of the future in the OT. What he says of the OT in this regard amounts to mere assertion.

De K.'s treatment of the "Son of God" in Late Judaism is in general cautious, but precisely the state of affairs here should have made him aware of the nebulous character of the evidence for the conflation of "son of God" and messiah. Both 4Q Flor and 1QSa 2:11-12 point in the direction of a late Jewish belief in God's begetting of the Messiah. One can now add the information recently published by J. Starcky (Revue biblique 70 [1963] 481-505) and the rumors that there is further evidence in the unpublished Qumrân material "for the use of royal ideology, stating the Messiah's relation to God in terms of sonship" (A. D. Nock, Gnomon 33 [1961] 584; cf. A. J. B. Higgins, Canadian Journal of Theology 6 [1960] 202, n. 12). Phrases resembling Lk 1:32, 35 seem to be involved, but we have to await Milik's publication of the text to be sure. At any rate, the Qumrân material seems to be attesting the use of "Son of God" for the Messiah outside of the NT.

The best part of the book is the analytical treatment of the Matthean texts. Most of what is said in this part of the book is not new, but De K. brings together the best of modern, enlightened Catholic and Protestant exegetical opinion. Of special note is his treatment of Mt 14:33 and 16:16. He regards the disciples' exclamation in the boat ("Truly, you are the Son of God"), which is absent in Mk, as a Christian title inserted by Mt as a literary build-up for the important scene of Caesarea Philippi. His discussion of Mt 16:16b-19 is also good. Here he depends heavily on the views of A. Vögtle. He says on p. 81, n. 63: "The question, whether Mt 16, 17-19 is traditional material or Matthew's editorial work (so A. Vögtle, ...) is of little importance for our purpose." Then on p. 82 he lists "positive arguments" to show that 16:16b is "Mt's additional elaboration of the original
text." It is good to see such a frank discussion of these problems in a Catholic book with an imprimatur given in Rome itself. There are many points in this analytical part of the book that could be discussed, but the reader will find it on the whole quite enlightening and challenging.

The last, synthetic part of the book is more or less pioneer work. De K.'s views are in general acceptable, but they will have to be modified in terms of a less naive understanding of the sources of the expression "Son of God" in the OT and Late Judaism. Against the tendency to find the maximum of nuances in every use of the expression, the book of J. Barr, The Semantics of Biblical Languages (New York, 1961) could be recommended. De K.'s book is opening up a new area of theological interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels, and fulfils what it intended to be, "a contribution to the study of Matthean Christology."

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Prof. Dodd's first volume on John, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (1953), was recognized as a milestone in Johannine investigation. It was primarily an analysis of the background, leading ideas, and structure of the Gospel. Perhaps D. tended to give too much emphasis to non-Palestinian, Hellenistic influence on the fourth Gospel and to Philonian kinship (p. 133: "Rabbinic Judaism, Philo and the Hermetica remain our most direct sources for the background of thought..."); nevertheless, his emphasis was a refreshing change from the Gnostic extravagances of the Germans. In particular, D.'s structural analysis was most convincing; and he redirected Johannine exegesis toward a study of the transmitted Gospel, away from emboillment in ingenious rearrangements.

Although this first volume had obvious repercussions in estimating the historical value of John, only a short appendix was formally dedicated to "the historical aspect of the fourth Gospel." The present volume takes up that question exhaustively. That the fourth Gospel has little or no real value as a historical witness to the ministry of Jesus has remained one of the fundamental tenets (and weaknesses) of the Bultmannian and post-Bultmannian schools of exegesis. That a serious volume can be written on historical tradition in John by a scholar of D.'s status is a sign that a change is setting in.

In his study D. wisely eschews the problem of authorship, which remains a guessing game, pitting vague internal indications against a fairly solid
tradition. If there is historical tradition in the fourth Gospel, it must be established independently of whether or not that tradition comes from John, son of Zebedee. D.'s approach is through a comparison of John with the Synoptics. In the past, similarities between John and the Synoptics have led critics to the theory that the author of John borrowed themes, facts, and sayings from the Synoptics and used them as a basis for elaborating a theological synthesis. The foundations of this view were shaken by P. Gardner-Smith in *St. John and the Synoptic Gospels* (1938), when he maintained that John was not dependent on the Synoptics. If it can be proved that the parts of John that have parallels in the Synoptics (and therefore have a controllable historical element) are independent, then we must posit behind John a historical tradition which can stand on its own and is worthy of a hearing as a witness to the ministry of Jesus.

D. begins by studying the narrative scenes of the Gospel. The long Passion Narrative offers the widest area of contact between John and the Synoptics. Neither in the *OT* testimonies cited nor in the accounts of the arrest, trial, and death is there much evidence of John's borrowing from the Synoptics. In its peculiar details the Johannine narrative betrays a good knowledge of Palestine and the political situation before 70, and there is no plausible way in which these details could be the invention of the author's imagination. In the ministry itself D. examines such stories as the entry into Jerusalem, the cleansing of the Temple, and the anointing at Bethany, as well as miracles like the healing of the royal official's son (= the centurion's boy in the Synoptics) and the multiplication of the loaves. Once again there is no rational way in which the peculiarities of the Johannine narratives can be explained from a reshuffling of the Synoptic accounts. The most interesting comparison is in the study of the Johannine narrative about John the Baptist, where D. makes a very good case for John's possession of genuine tradition. In the last part of the book D. turns to a painstaking investigation of the sayings common to John and the Synoptics (or, at least, Synoptic patterns). The difficulty of explaining all the minor variants in John on the basis of a borrowing theory is insuperable.

Thus D. comes to the almost inescapable conclusion that there is a considerable nucleus of historical tradition in the fourth Gospel, independent of a similar body of historical tradition in the Synoptic Gospels. Sometimes the form of the tradition that underlies John seems to be more ancient than the form of the tradition that underlies the Synoptic Gospels; sometimes it seems more advanced. Perhaps this reviewer is prejudiced because D.'s view is close to his own, but in its broad outlines D.'s solution seems to be definitive.
We must note, however, the limitations of the solution. All that can be scientifically established from this study is that a considerable amount of the Johannine material represents early tradition. That this early tradition accurately represents what Jesus said and did still remains to be established, although, obviously, the earlier the tradition, the less chance of distortion. At times the tradition that underlies John differs considerably from the tradition that underlies the Synoptics, and each has evolved from still earlier stages of tradition that are very difficult to reconstruct. In other words, between the ministry of Jesus and the immediate pre-Gospel traditions as we can reconstruct them with reasonable surety, there still remains a period of some thirty years of development. Also, in D.'s method only part of John can be evaluated as deriving from historical tradition, namely, the part for which there is some Synoptic parallel to serve as a basis of judgment. In the course of the long discourses especially, there is much that is peculiarly Johannine. For this we have no scientific basis on which we may definitively decide what is truly a reflection of ancient tradition.

Inevitably there are many minor points that one would wish to discuss with D., but there are two major weaknesses that we find in his work. First, it is a brilliant tour de force to write a work such as this from one's own study of the Gospels without giving much attention to other literature on the subject. D.'s footnotes show only rare references to the studies done by other scholars. Nevertheless, so much has been written on John that we may ask if one can really afford to do this solo work. For many individual passages in John treated in this book the reviewer can name articles which are better than D.'s treatment and from which D.'s general thesis would have profited. Only D. could write this book, but even this book would be better if there were a wider control of the literature. To oversimplify, in Johannine exegesis the Germans read the Germans; the English read the English; neither seems to read much of the other; and no one reads the Americans or the French. Second, Dodd has answered the hypothesis of broad or fundamental borrowing by John from the Synoptics. But what about the possibility that after the independent tradition was incorporated into the Gospel, there was a final editing of John by one familiar with the Synoptic Gospels who added some harmonizing Synoptic retouches to the Gospel? In light of this, D.'s treatment of certain remarkable similarities between John and the Synoptics (e.g., the use of πίστις in the anointing by both John and Mark) does not seem to cover all the possibilities.

D.'s work will be received with acclaim by those who follow a more conservative view on Johannine origins, and so perhaps we should caution that his theory does present a difficulty on the authorship of John. Even though
D. does not deny the possibility that John, son of Zebedee, is the author, he recognizes (p. 17, n. 1) that such a view of authorship would require modifications in what is proposed in this book. In D.'s theory of composition, a Palestinian historical tradition dating from before 70 has been used and elaborated by the Evangelist, writing at Ephesus around 100. Since it is dubious that an eyewitness like John would elaborate a historical tradition received from others, it would ill befit D.'s theory to identify as John the Evangelist of the second stage of composition. Could the Palestinian historical tradition be attributed to John? D. believes that this tradition has evolved and that it has many characteristics like those of the Synoptic tradition, which is more or less a product of corporate experience. For D., the historical tradition behind John does not resemble the direct reminiscences of an eyewitness, but has roughly the same relationship to the eyewitness stage that the pre-Synoptic tradition has.

Thus we are a long way from the traditional view that at the end of a long life John wrote down the reminiscences of the Lord which he had thought over for many years. The reviewer would wonder if there is not a difficulty of method here. In isolating the independent historical tradition behind John, D. has taken pains to eliminate all the "Johannine" theological elements, because any detail that smacks of theological interest might be an invention of the author. But have we any real evidence that the historical tradition in the fourth Gospel was ever preached bereft of its Johannine theological interpretation? Is it not possible that the blend of history and theology that D. sees in the final composition of the Gospel took place all along the line in Johannine circles? In any case, we are still a long way from deciding the latitude to be allowed to the "according to" in The Gospel according to John.

D. was eighty on April 7. Please God, we shall receive still other works from his pen. But should this volume culminate his life's work, he may rest assured that, true to John, he has saved the choice wine until last.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


The biblical understanding of human solidarity has been studied by a number of scholars in recent years; and it is good that this fruitful field be explored. Interest in this question no doubt reflects the unsettled times in which we live; the relations of the person to the group and intergroup relationships are among the most vexing problems of our world. Failure to
face them can issue in catastrophe. If the Bible has anything pertinent to say on this urgent contemporary problem, the interpreters of the Bible should not be laggard in presenting their material.

The specific object of Shedd's study is the understanding of human solidarity in the Pauline writings, with particular reference to the origins of Paul's thought in the OT and in Judaism. The value of the book lies rather in its summary of the work of scholars than in its originality. The book was written as a doctoral dissertation for the University of Edinburgh, and dissertations are not the place to look for striking originality. Besides, a topic which has been treated by so many does not lend itself to originality. S.'s book has the merits a summary should have: it is clear and orderly, faithful to the scholars who are quoted, and moderately critical of their opinions.

The book is arranged into two major parts, each divided into two parts. The background of Paul's thought in the OT and in Judaism comprises the two divisions of the first part; the solidarity of unredeemed man and the solidarity of the new humanity in Christ are treated in the second part. The section on the OT is extremely brief for such an important part of the treatment, granted that S. felt he had nothing to add to previous treatment, particularly the works of H. W. Robinson and Johannes Pedersen. S. does little more than list the headings, such as family, tribe, covenant, and representative of the group, under which the solidarity of the group was conceived in ancient Israel. There is room here for a deeper penetration into the basis of group solidarity than the classic authors on whom S. depends have exhibited. Perhaps an attempt at such penetration would have carried S. beyond the scope of the work as he conceived it.

The section on Judaism, about the same length as the section on Israel, enters a question which has not been explored as deeply as the thought of the OT. S. treats Jewish ideas on the solidarity of Israel and the solidarity of mankind, both in its creation and in sin. Judaism modified the thought of the OT in all of these aspects. S. does not trace deeply the influences on Judaism which affected the Jewish conception; again, the scope of the work did not permit an extended exploration of this complex problem.

S. does justice to the original elements in St. Paul's conception of the solidarity of man. The important idea here is the solidarity of mankind in guilt, which is derived from the incorporation of the race in Adam. Paul transformed an idea which appeared in Judaism; his proclamation of the necessity and the universality of the saving act of Christ has no force without the idea of universal guilt. S. possibly exaggerates in his effort to systematize ideas which appear in the Pauline writings in scattered contexts.
and in various stages of development. Similarly, his treatment of the Church as the new humanity in Christ draws together themes which are not quite so easily assembled into a system. Paul's thought resists this kind of simplification; its consistency is not the consistency of a carefully elaborated scheme.

Possibly S. has attempted to introduce too many of the components of Paul's thought into the treatment of solidarity. To this reviewer at least, the second part of the book suffers from diffusion. The thesis is somewhat dissolved in a summary of Paul's theology of redemption and the Church. The summary, as noticed above, is clear and orderly, but it does not always advance the topic of the dissertation.

S.'s conclusion is that Paul's conception of solidarity is not indebted to any Hellenistic source, but is related entirely to the thought of the OT and of Judaism. There is, he says, no major conception or implication of solidarity found in the OT or in early Judaism which does not appear in the Pauline epistles. This conclusion is less controversial than it would have been a generation ago, but it can bear restatement. S.'s restatement is positive rather than controversial; he does not deal directly at length with the alleged Hellenistic sources of Paul's thought, nor need he do this; this examination has already been carried on by others. There is a danger of finding so many relations between Paul and the thought-world of the OT and Judaism that Paul may appear to be substantially dependent. S. avoids this distortion. His treatment would have been rounded off, I think, by a fuller discussion of the relations between Paul's theology and the proclamation and the teaching of the apostolic Church. S. shows his awareness that Paul cannot be studied in isolation; but many of his readers can take away the impression that Paul was very loosely associated with the other apostles and teachers of the Church.

_Loyola University, Chicago_  
JOHN L. McKENZIE, S.J.


A history of Christian spirituality by various hands is launched with this volume by Fr. Bouyer, which covers the period from the _NT_ to Gregory the Great and Pseudo-Dionysius. Five sixteenths of the space goes to the _NT_ alone, and this translated work improves on the French original (first French edition, 1960) by having copious indexes; too often French publishers think that by putting the table of contents at the end of a book they have provided an excuse for omitting the index. When writing this book, B.
was lecturing on spiritual theology at the Institut Catholique of Paris, but now, owing to the fracas occasioned by reviews of this and of another book that he published about the same time, he has removed to Strasbourg. One may find the documentation of the affair in *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 37 (1961) 213–34, 528–31.

Jewish prayer, Jewish warfare with the devil, and the Jewish mysticism of the Shekinah are used to give a background to the teaching of Christ and its interpretation by the Evangelists. Riesenfeld and Farrer are used to confound the critics who still want the priority of Mark to be maintained, and the Gospel of Matthew is presented as being “laid out according to the context of the Jewish liturgy” (this is what the translator gives us for “dans les cadres mêmes de la liturgie juive,” which is hardly the same). The Johannine writings form a corpus and are not to be shared out among a variety of authors, while Hebrews is basically Pauline; these positions are refreshingly conservative amid so much loose speculation on the part of Catholic exegetes today, but they will not enhance the author’s popularity. He makes good use of Jewish models for Christian prayer, in Clement’s *Epistle to the Corinthians* and elsewhere, and he could have been more emphatic here had the Qumrân liturgical document (published by M. Baillet in *Revue biblique* 68 [1961] 195–250) been available when this book was being written.

There is one notable omission in the treatment of the second century: nothing is said about Melito’s *Homily*, even though that homily lets us see a spirituality firmly based on typology (by contrast with the later allegorism) and a source from which the medieval *improperia* will come. What had happened to Jewish-Christian relations between the sending of Clement’s letter to Corinth and this homily is the massacre of Jewish Christians by their fellow Jews during the revolt of Bar Cochba. We now know, if only from the coins with their legend “first year of the redemption of Israel,” how impossible it must have been for a Christian Jew to join that revolt, and the Jewish-Christian community suffered for that impossibility. Papias, again, is dismissed too summarily, for he is the first Christian writer known to us to have taken the hexaemeron in terms of Christ and the Church. The whole mystique of Christian marriage and the nuptial theology of the Church alike depend on this link, and we would dearly love to know whether he got it from St. John. By an odd aberration Papias is said (p. 172) to be millenarist, while Irenaeus is let off; whereas it is Irenaeus, in fact, who preserves for us the fragment of Papias about the multiple clusters of the vine, and he does so in terms that cause embarrassment. One is disconcerted by these lapses, which are no doubt due to haste in composition, but they make
the book none too easy for the unwary to use. The judgment is so often sound and penetrating (as when the fragile hypotheses of Audet's *Didache* are distrusted) that one is pulled up with a start when these slips occur.

Monasticism has a large part in the story of the book. B. rightly distinguishes two stages, the simple and the erudite, and thereby offers the refutation of the theory (popularized by the late Dom A. Stolz) that monasticism was begun as a deliberate attempt to get back to Paradise by way of the desert. It is much more likely that the hide-outs which were used by Egyptian villagers on the approach of the tax collector were taken over by Christians, temporarily during a persecution, and then for good by some chosen spirits for whom the world was a wicked place. The summary of the position about the Benedictine rule and the *Regula magistri* is well done, and the role of Gregory the Great as propagator of the Benedictine rule is given a diminuendo, in keeping with the most recent research. It is over Evagrius that his French critics found most fault with B. and his book. Evagrius is a key figure in the development of spirituality, and yet an ambivalent one: at times he might be a Buddhist and not a Christian. The discovery of an unexpurgated version of one of his works (published in *Patrologia orientalis* 28 [1958]) just as B. was at work (his imprimatur dates from Feb. 22, 1960) was unfortunate for him. He put in a reference to the new work at the end of his chapter, but this reference is wrong and remains wrong in the English version.

The translator has stuck closely to the French text, but she would have done well to check the citations by a glance at the original passages. She has provided Polycarp with a habit of plugging his ears, but this is her own aberration, and she has gone astray (p. 329) on "the mountains of Antioch of Cyrene." A footnote is added to tell of the death of Werner Jaeger and of the progress of his edition of Gregory of Nyssa, but there might have been more polishing up of this kind to allow for the progress of patristic scholarship in the last three years.

*London, England*  
J. H. CREHAN, S.J.


The present three volumes have been issued as a unit in G.'s continuing series on the evolution of Jewish symbolism: they chiefly discuss the importance of the Synagogue at Dura-Europos, discovered by the Yale expedition under Michael Rostovtzeff in November, 1932. The Synagogue, built on an earlier one from the second century, was constructed in A.D. 245 and
decorated with some of the finest fresco work of the imperial period; about ten years after its construction, however, it was cut back to buttress the city walls during the Persian invasion and was finally destroyed with the sack of Dura in the middle of the third century. The lovely frescoes have been removed to the Archeological Museum in Damascus, where they have been set into the walls of a model synagogue. Thus G.'s discussion of the symbolism of the paintings constitutes the final stage of his work, which has stretched out to eleven volumes since 1953; a concluding twelfth volume will round out the summary.

G.'s thesis has always been that there were two streams in early Judaism: one, with which we are more familiar, was the orthodox tradition closely associated with a literal observance of the law; the other was made up of certain mystical and allegorizing tendencies of the sort reflected in Philo of Alexandria and, the author submits, in a vast quantity of Hellenistic-Jewish art and architecture. G.'s theory, if I understand it, receives its ultimate confirmation in the Dura Synagogue. Here again, in his analysis of the frescoes, he disagrees with Carl H. Kraeling (The Synagogue [New Haven, 1956]), who studied the Dura frescoes as part of the Yale University report on the excavations. For Kraeling, the frescoes are primarily narrative; for G., they are primarily didactic, with the narrative elements freely altered for instructional purposes.

Vol. 11 contains 354 photographic plates, many in color. The frescoes were freshly photographed for this volume by F. Anderegg; but some of the earlier photos here reproduced in black and white, made while the Synagogue was being excavated, represent elements which can no longer be observed in the original frescoes. Thus Vol. 11 constitutes a valuable tool in the study of Dura. In his establishment of an allegorical interpretation of the Dura frescoes, G. devotes many pages of Vol. 9 (124-74) to the symbolism of dress: how the color and design of the chiton and himation express divinity and mysticism, especially in the portrayal of the heroes of the OT. Further, G. shows how all the artistic devices of paganism were adapted and utilized in the Dura paintings. The discovery of the Synagogue, in his view, is comparable to the deciphering of the Dead Sea Scrolls; for the so-called philosopher who designed the frescoes was imbued with the highest tendencies of mystical Judaism in the spirit of Philo of Alexandria, while at the same time reflecting the best instincts of pagan religious belief: he "saw in the Torah something so great that it was beyond the Torah as a document, something so great that it promised material and messianic triumph, mystical association with the universe in its worship of God... To the reality itself, supremely revealed by the Torah, many ancient Jews lifted their hearts and
opened their minds. We cannot understand their Judaism or their paintings unless at least in sympathy we share in this sort of devotion to reality ourselves” (9, 210).

We eagerly await the twelfth, concluding volume of this magnificent work, which will become a landmark in the history of Judaic religious culture. The Bollingen Foundation is to be congratulated for their continuance of a splendid publication; the numerous plates, the full bibliography, and the excellent index leave very little to be desired. The author, now in his retirement, can well rest on the brilliant laurels which are the result of a lifetime of devoted scholarship.

Fordham University

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.


The theological discussion about infant baptism revolves around two questions: (1) Is the practice legitimate? (2) Was it employed in the first two centuries of the Christian era? Both Jeremías and Aland answer in the affirmative to the first question but differ in their evaluation of the evidence for this practice in the early Church.

The first of the three books we are considering was initially published in 1958. Since that time, Jeremías has reconsidered several of his conclusions and as a result has made some notable changes in the English edition. His aim is to present all the evidence available for the practice of infant baptism during the first four centuries. Of the forty sources which he lists, twelve are derived from the period prior to A.D. 200 and afford only indirect evidence. The first direct evidence is found in Tertullian’s De baptismo 18, 3–6. J.’s investigation proceeds from the NT and its environment (chaps. 1–2) and then considers the testimony of the second and third centuries (chap. 3). He concludes with a discussion of the reasons for the fourth-century practice of delaying baptism (chap. 4).

The NT evidence allows J. to conclude that children of parents joining the church were baptized regardless of age. (1) The “oikos formula” used in connection with the baptism of households was adopted from OT cultic language,
where it includes small children. (2) Family solidarity dictated the baptism of all children. (3) The eschatological effect of baptism, incorporation into the company of the redeemed, is not consistent with its postponement. (4) The parallels between Jewish proselyte baptism and the Christian counterpart in other respects allows for the assumption that Christians followed the Jewish practice of admitting the children of adult converts to the rite of initiation. (5) Acts 2:38–39 contains a challenge to have children baptized.

In the case of children born of Christian parents or of mixed marriages, the situation is not so clear. 1 Cor 7:14c cannot be used as the basis of an affirmation or negation of infant baptism. (In the German edition J. judged that this verse provided indirect proof that these children were not baptized.) Acts 21:21 informs us that circumcision of male infants was practiced in the Jerusalem church but not in the Pauline churches. J. argues that since baptism replaced circumcision in the Pauline churches (Col 2:11), it is "highly probable" that these children were baptized. (In the German edition, in the light of the former interpretation of 1 Cor 7:14c, J. had concluded that these children were not baptized.) The narrative of Mk 10:13–16 was used by the Church as authority for infant baptism. Jn 3:5 and Justin, Apology 1, 61, 4 reproduce the logion with explicit reference to baptism.

As further confirmation of the practice of infant baptism in NT times, J. appeals to the following: (1) There is no evidence in the first two centuries for two kinds of Christians, baptized and unbaptized. (2) In the same period there was no discussion of the legitimacy of infant baptism. (3) No special rite for infants was introduced in the third century, though this would have been a natural consequence if a new usage was being introduced. (4) Infant baptism was never stamped as a sectarian practice. (5) Both East and West are unanimous in tracing infant baptism back to apostolic times.

The practice in vogue in the second and third centuries confirms J.'s analysis of NT data. To show this, J. calls into play the witness of literary texts, inscriptions, and even the clay coffin of an Egyptian child dating from the early third century. The distribution of the evidence is uneven: the West offers more information. But the general picture is the same everywhere (with the exception of Eastern Syria, which was under Marcionite influence), i.e., infant baptism is an old and established usage. Nowhere can there be found any basis for the opinion that the baptism of children born of Christian parents was postponed. And only Tertullian advises the delay of baptism for children of pagans on the occasion of their conversion. Apart from this restriction, the available sources of the East and West are unanimous in naming the age of infancy (Irenaeus), or more precisely the first days after
birth (Origen, Cyprian), as the proper time for baptism. The inscriptions which began to appear in the West about A.D. 200 confirm this. In this period the explicit statements of Origen, Hippolytus, and Tertullian are of outstanding importance, for they carry us back to the second century.

A sudden shift away from the ancient custom took place in the fourth century. In the critical period, which lasted for the first two-thirds of this century, it became quite common to postpone baptism. This involved the children both of converts and of Christians. The great theologians do not openly oppose this new practice. In this period, only Asterius the Sophist stresses the duty of parents to have their children baptized. However, J. is careful to note, one should not conclude that infant baptism was completely abandoned at this time. Numerous Church orders testify to the survival of the practice, as does the Synod of Elvira (A.D. 306/312) and numerous tombstone inscriptions. Besides all this, there is the testimony of heretics (e.g., the Donatists) for the traditional usage. A reaction to this "crisis" set in about A.D. 365, and the literary sources begin to refer to infant baptism as a well-established practice and to justify it theologically. During the Pelagian conflict the question was definitively settled due to the influence of Augustine. To account for the "crisis," J. refers to the sudden influx of numerous pagans into the Church after the Edict of Milan. The superstitious conception of baptism which many of them had soon exerted a deleterious effect on Christians.

In a brief concluding note, J. stresses that only two theologians speak favorably of the postponement of baptism in the first four centuries. Tertullian does so, but confines himself to the children of pagans being converted, and even in this case makes an exception when the child is in extremis. Gregory of Nazianzus recommended the delay of baptism until the age of three years. Moreover, neither of these writers offers any theological justification for such a practice.

In his point-by-point refutation of J., Aland begins with a consideration of the period A.D. 200–250 (chaps. 2, 4, 6). He then passes on to second-century evidence (chaps. 3, 5) and concludes with a study of NT witness (chaps. 7–9). In chap. 10, reasons are offered for the sudden appearance of infant baptism at the end of the second century. A postscript is added to assure the reader that despite the failure of the primitive Church to employ infant baptism, it is altogether in accord with NT teaching.

A. finds direct evidence for infant baptism in the third century, but will not admit that this can be used as indirect evidence for a second-century practice. In addition, he believes that Tertullian advocates the postponement of baptism for children of catechumens and Christians against a contrary novel
practice which is gaining ground. This interpretation finds support in some third-century inscriptions which refer to the baptism of children *in extremis* who are in all probability the offspring of Christians.

In the second century A. discovers that all the evidence points in the direction opposite to that of J.'s thesis. Writers of this period uniformly presuppose that baptismal instruction is given to all candidates. In particular, Aristides clearly refers to the baptism of the children of Christian parents who are able to be instructed and hence are several years of age. J.'s appeal to Irenaeus is rejected, since his remark in *Adv. haer.* 2, 22, 4 merely states that children are sanctified by Jesus in that He lived all the ages of human life. The other testimony for infant baptism, which J. finds in the remarks of certain Christians that they were such "from youth up," does not prove the point. *1 Clement* 63, 3 uses the same term where it does not refer to infancy. Moreover, the remark of Justin that many Christians were "disciples of Christ from childhood" could only prove, contrary to J.'s intention, that their baptism was postponed until youth.

The testimony drawn from the first century allows no conclusion which would be favorable to infant baptism. On the contrary, 1 Cor 7:14 can be used as indirect evidence that the children of Christian parents and mixed marriages were not baptized. The analysis of Mk 10:13-16 does not show that the text was related to baptism, and J.'s hypothesis concerning a link between it and Jn 3:5 and Justin's *Apology* 1, 61, 4 is mistaken. J.'s contention that Col 2:11 indicates that baptism was considered a substitute for circumcision is groundless. Hence it cannot be used in conjunction with Acts 21:21 as indirect proof that children were baptized in the Pauline churches. The interpretation J. gives of Acts 2:38-39 is unconvincing, since *teknois* does not mean the children of the audience but descendants, the coming generations. Finally, the references to the baptism of "the (whole) household," where a conclusion can be reached, are concerned only with adults. Children are not envisioned.

To account for the introduction of infant baptism at the end of the second century, A. proposes two reasons. (1) The great increase in the number of children born of Christian parents at this period called attention to the question of their belonging to the Church. (2) Since baptism is a "bath of cleansing," only when the belief in the sinful state of infants gained a foothold would their baptism become a possibility. This situation prevailed at the end of the second century, supplanting the former view of the innocence of small children. Up to this time baptism was administered at the age which required purification from sin, presumably at the time of puberty.

In his reply to A., J. restricts himself to the controversial element: What
was the practice of the Church up to A.D. 200? A fresh look at the evidence already gathered and due consideration of A.'s criticisms only confirm J. in his original opinion. As in his previous contribution, J. begins with NT data (chap. 2). He expands his original treatment of NT texts which refer to the baptism of "the (whole) household." While he does not swerve from his previous conclusion, he does make one important correction. He now prefers to speak of the "oikos phrase" instead of the "oikos formula," since E. Stauffer's conjecture that it is a ritual formula taken from the terminology of circumcision is not confirmed from the sources. Once again J. appeals to Acts 2:38-39 and the analogy with Jewish proselyte baptism. The Pseudo-Clementine writings, which emphasize the rule that Christians may not eat with pagans, are stressed as indirect proof for the baptism of the children of the "house." In their earlier versions these writings go back to A.D. 220-230, but this rule is derived from an ancient Jewish prohibition. Since it referred to any member of the household, it presumes that when a pagan family was baptized, all received the rite. Otherwise the table fellowship of the family would be disrupted. Finally, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus provides J. with evidence for the continuing practice of the baptism of "whole households" reported in Acts.

In the following chapter J. deals with A.'s hypothesis that an age limit was imposed in the first two centuries. He concludes that the sources do not support this opinion. It cannot be shown that 1 Cor 7:14 was used to justify this practice, and the fourth-century "crisis" does not reflect a second-century custom. Neither Justin, Apology 1, 15, 6, nor Aristides, Apology 15, 6, favors A.'s position, because his translations are incorrect. Finally, the Marcianus inscription (third century), just as the other epitaphs of the same period, probably refers to offspring of pagans and in no instance can be proved to refer to children of Christian parents. Thus a fresh survey of the sources shows that there is not a single witness to prove that in the first two centuries fourteen years was the age required for baptism. On the other hand, there are numerous indications that children were baptized without age limit in this era. To show this, J. does not repeat the material presented in his first book, but offers additional observations with a special view to the hypothesis that there was an age limit for baptism.

Chap. 4 takes up A.'s final argument, which attempts to show that infant baptism was an innovation which took root about A.D. 200. Tertullian and Origen are supposed to give evidence of this. Again J. finds A.'s interpretation faulty. Not only Tertullian and Origen, but also Hippolytus and Cyprian, as well as Irenaeus in the previous century, are unanimous in their conviction that infant baptism is a traditional practice of the Church.
In the final chapter J. considers the reasons offered by A. for the introduction of infant baptism at the end of the second century. A. had argued that the sudden increase in the number of children born of Christian parents after A.D. 180 raised the question of their belonging to the Church. J. asks: What about the converts who had been coming into the Church? Did they leave their children behind? And why assume, without proof of any kind, that the number of children in Christian families before A.D. 180 was small, or that the problem of belonging to the church would only be raised with regard to these children? A. places great emphasis on the rise of the doctrine of original sin as the reason for the emergence of infant baptism. This will not bear up under close analysis. The concept of the innocence of infants may have been found in some parts of the Church in the second century, but it is not supported by the NT, not even by 1 Cor 7:14. Furthermore, J. argues, even if we suppose that the concept of the innocence of infants goes back to earliest times, this would not make baptism superfluous. A. seems to think so because he projects back to the NT period a narrow view of the effects of baptism which was popular in certain parts of the Church in the second century. In saying that baptism is a “bath of cleansing” and hence would be judged superfluous for small children before the development of the doctrine of original sin, A. has completely misunderstood the NT concept of baptism. While purification is an essential effect of the rite in the NT outlook, much more is entailed. This eschatological sacrament was understood to involve the bestowal of a new existence, a reception in anticipation of the complete fruits of redemption. Hence it would not be deemed useless even if small children were considered sinless.

In this writer’s opinion, J. has been successful in showing that the expression “the (whole) house,” when used in a baptismal context, can only be interpreted as signifying the whole family including infants, if there were any. Whether infants actually were present remains uncertain in all cases. Secondly, it seems that J. has made a good case for the proposition that the sources of the first two centuries do not envision an age limit. The value of A.’s contribution has been to point out the weaknesses of some of J.’s proposals. On the whole, however, he has been unable to shake the general conclusion of the Göttingen professor. A. gives the impression of a certain anxiety to minimize any evidence which would favor J.’s position. He is unsatisfactory in his handling of the testimony of Irenaeus and the indirect evidence of second-century practice drawn from Tertullian, Origen, and the Apostolic Tradition. A.’s attempt to explain the sudden introduction of infant baptism at the end of the second century is particularly unconvincing, and only serves to emphasize the difficulty of explaining the third-century
practice other than by assuming that it is dependent on an ancient tradition. While the debate is far from over, it would appear that through the efforts of J. the case for infant baptism in the critical period of the first two centuries must be accorded a high degree of probability. This is certainly significant in view of the fact that not so long ago the hypothesis defended by A. dominated the field.

We may conclude this review with one marginal note. J. asserts that the narrow view of baptism as a "bath of cleansing" was popular "in many places" in the second century. A. assumes that this concept was more or less universally held. Neither view does justice to the evidence at hand. While we may say that in certain areas of the Church the cleansing effect was stressed, it cannot be shown, as J. seems to imply, that "in many places" Christians considered it the unique effect. A survey of the teaching of the Apostolic Fathers and second-century apologists reveals the following common doctrine. (1) Baptism inserts the neophyte into the history of salvation by incorporating him into the Church. (2) It bestows an existential change which affects the whole being: it gives a new life. (3) This new life involves purification from sin and evil spirits, an illumination of the intellect, and a divine presence. (4) All this is brought about by the redemptive work of Christ which is operative in the rite. From the testimony of the second century writers, therefore, we can conclude that the common doctrine regarding the effects of baptism is compatible with infant baptism even if in certain parts of the Church the relationship between original sin and the necessity of infant baptism was not explicitly recognized.

Weston College

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.


Apparently the topic of limbo and the fate of unbaptized infants is more popular than might be expected. At least the publishing house of Sheed and Ward has found it worth while to issue two books on the subject within the space of three years. The study of V. Wilkens, S.J., From Limbo to Heaven (1961) and that of Dyer have much in common. Both are easy to read and have been blessed with coverage by Time. This latest contribution, an adaptation of a doctorate thesis (St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, 1955), is especially deserving of the attention of priests and teachers of theology. The author has traced the main lines of the history of theological thinking regarding the existence of limbo and the fate of unbaptized infants from the patristic period to modern times. While he throws no new light on the sub-
ject, he does present it in an accurate and clear manner. His book is an admirable example of how to write, in an interesting way, a historical study involving a very intricate theological problem. Particularly noteworthy is D.'s treatment of the post-Reformation controversy between the Jansenists, Augustinians, and Jesuits, as well as the final two chapters, which discuss modern theories regarding the salvation of unbaptized infants and the present state of the whole debate. This reviewer would not hesitate to recommend this work to all who are looking for a good comprehensive view of a yet unsettled question.

Some readers will, perhaps, be surprised to find that D. does not mention, either in the chapter concerned with the patristic period or elsewhere, the dispute about the practice of infant baptism up to the latter part of the second century. In neglecting this aspect of the question, D. is in line with most Catholic scholars who have written on the subject. However, the possibility that the Church as a whole or at least many areas of the Church did not baptize infants in this critical period is certainly relevant to D.'s discussion. D. does not seem to envision this as a problem and takes it for granted that the practice of infant baptism was universal from NT times. An indication of this frame of mind may be found in the first footnote of chap. 1 (p. 183). In this note he assumes that a passage from the Apocalypse of Peter (A.D. 125-50) is "the most ancient reference to the problem of unbaptized children." However, the passage in question (cf. M. R. James, The Apocryphal New Testament [Oxford, 1924] pp. 508-9) depicts the children who had been born out of wedlock or aborted as being in hell not because they were unbaptized but in order to inflict punishment on their sinful mothers. The author is merely employing a rhetorical device and makes no reference to the problem of unbaptized infants. While there are good grounds for the opinion that infant baptism was in use from apostolic times, direct evidence is available only from the beginning of the third century.

One might take exception to some of D.'s statements. Referring to the possibility of the salvation of infants dying without baptism, he states: "If we say that such a child is somehow saved, we have to reappraise the doctrine that the Church is necessary for salvation" (p. 4). This is poorly phrased. Authors who hold that infants may be saved without baptism of water do not deny that the prayer of the holy Church is involved in the salvation of all men. Again, D. states that only an authoritative decision of the Holy See could end the debate on whether the Council of Carthage defined against limbo (p. 22). This is too sweeping a statement. The decision of the Holy See was based not on some immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit but on historical data which was accepted by most theologians of the day. The
Holy See stopped the debate, which would have run its course in a short time in any event. These are only minor points, of course, and scarcely detract from what is easily the best semipopular treatment of an interesting, yet thorny, problem.

Weston College

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.


This study in theological methodology employs all the resources of literary depth analysis and is exercised on the entire corpus of St. Thomas’ Trinitarian theology. It focuses more narrowly on the one central problem of his use of the analogy of human knowing and loving with the resultant inner processions of concept and res amoris. Commonplace as this analogy is in Catholic tradition, St. Thomas’ employment of it was distinctive, located somewhat between St. Augustine’s and St. Anselm’s use of it. Is this Thomistic usage in any sense an apologetic one, that is, does it eventually assume the role of an a priori demonstration, albeit not an apodictic one, of the convenience of the mystery? Obviously, this is asked of the reflective process of an intellect already accepting the mystery from revelation and entering upon the properly theological act. Neither is the question so much one of St. Thomas’ explicit intentions as of the implications of the “argument” itself. The problem has been largely reraised by Vagaggini’s suggestion (in Spi-cilegium Beccense 1, Paris, 1959—a commemorative volume on St. Anselm) that St. Thomas’ procedure is an attempt to approach the rationes necessariae of St. Anselm as closely as possible, amounting to a sort of substitute process, “la plus parfaite possible, qui le remplacerait en quelque sorte et en donnerait comme l’illusion esthétique” (pp. 137–38).

Posed as precisely this, the solution is not as simple as might appear prima facie. St. Thomas surely understood the analogy as one of proper proportionality, maintaining expressly that production of a word is essential to intellection as such (In Joan. 1, 1, 25), and even further that the very notion of word involves a process of engendering that demands real distinction between speaker and word.

R.’s thesis amounts to a denial of any such apologetic perspective and rests largely upon determining exactly what the scientific process in theology is where an entitatively supernatural mystery is concerned. The finality here is not to prove but to explain—a distinction formulated by Passaic as
"explanation rather than verification" and by Lonergan as "understanding rather than certitude." That this is an authentic reflection of St. Thomas' own mind rests upon explicit declarations of his own intentions (e.g., Sum. theol. 1, q. 32, a. 1, ad 2m) and even more so on his discernment of the broad principles that determine theological methodology. This latter was worked out, to a considerable extent, within Trinitarian theology and finds its chief expression in the two Summae—in the "qualiter accipi, qualiter intelligi" notion developed in the Contra gentes and in the "ordo doctrinae" that dominates the structure of the Summa theologiae. In the first work, the initial methodological assumption is that the theologian seeks only an explanation of how the revealed data is to be taken (acci) and understood (intelligi), and not some imitation of an apodictic demonstration of the facts; thus does St. Thomas begin there with a detailed scriptural analysis of the facts. In the later Summa the procedure is not one of substantiating the revealed data at all, even on the authority of revelation, but rather of exposing the "ultimate ratio whose 'effect' or consequence has been revealed" (p. 208). R.'s arrival at this conclusion comes at the end of a painstaking analysis (wherein he shows himself a careful and trained historian) which deals with all seven of St. Thomas' Trinitarian treatises.

Any exegetical attempt to get at the interior of an author's words and intentions always involves a good deal of conjecture. It is to the credit of this present work that much restraint has been shown in this area. The chronological problem, of course, necessitates making certain options. In the main, the most recent scholarship is followed, e.g., Chenu's dating of the Compendium as earlier than the Prima pars. The gradual clarification in St. Thomas' own understanding of methodology is represented as quite marked, but convincingly so. The observation as to why St. Thomas leaves the question concerning how man knows the Trinity until the sixth question (q. 32) of the treatise in the Summa theologiae—namely, because he is developing the ordo rei and not the ordo cognoscendi—is a telling point. It is a bit disconcerting to find words such as "cause" and "emanation" used frequently of the processions without qualification, as is the occasional reluctance to distinguish between intelligere and dicere; these are at least minor improprieties of language.

Perhaps, too (though this lies somewhat outside the scope of a textual study), the intrinsic intelligibilities of the "argument" itself might have been given a more profound analysis. Especially is this true of the created analogue, where, after all, a word is required only because of the finiteness of the knowledge—because of the need for abstraction from matter, the absence of the object, and the potency of the faculty. None of this is operative
in God, where the *esse* of the knower and the *esse* of the known are one and the same. When St. Thomas says that production of a distinct word is essential to intellection as such, “he simply affirms what is ‘de facto’ universally true” and does not mean to suggest “that human reason has grasped this causal nexus in its own understanding” (p. 217). R. has stated this with exactitude, and elsewhere indicated the reason for it—the infraquidditative knowledge of God that is alone possible to us in this life.

*Dominican House of Studies*  
*Washington, D.C.*


Nicholas of Cusa’s *De concordantia catholicca* was his first work, written in 1433, at a time when conciliar ideas were at their height. In the earlier literature on his political views there was, consequently, a tendency to stress his relation to such thinkers as Marsilius of Padua and his anticipations of modern democratic ideals, especially the idea of popular consent and the theory of representation. More recently, however, there has been a trend toward re-evaluating Nicholas’ ideas in the light of their medieval background. His conception of a hierarchical universe has been emphasized as a counterbalance to his theory of consent. In addition, recent studies of the medieval canonists who provided the foundations of the conciliar theory have made possible a new approach to his relation to the conciliarists. It is this latter aspect of the background for Nicholas’ political ideas that this study, originally a Columbia University dissertation, aims especially at exploiting.

After a brief introduction concerning Cusa’s life, works, and position in the conciliar movement, W. discusses the question of the justification of political authority, the concept of the Church and the Empire, and the relationship between them. All of these subjects are considered against a broad picture of medieval theological, philosophical, and canonistic thinking, with a thorough analysis of the texts and the available literature. The conclusion is that many of Nicholas’ seemingly novel ideas are solidly based on the medieval tradition. The notion of representation, which seems at first sight so modern, reveals, when more closely studied, that Nicholas was thinking more of representation as personification than of representation as delegation. Similarly, his idea of popular consent is far removed from the modern individualistic conception. It is rather a theological notion: the harmonious agreement of all under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.
Neither of these conceptions—consent as harmony in the Spirit and representation as personification—can be adequately understood without reference to the hierarchical element in Nicholas' thought. Accordingly, W. looks for the sources of his views in Neoplatonism and particularly in Pseudo-Dionysius. Here perhaps a few precisions are possible. First, the terminology of Neoplatonism was common property in fifteenth-century Cologne and does not point to any special study of Dionysius himself. Indeed, the actual citations of Dionysius in DCC are very few. This accords with Nicholas' own statement (Apol. doct. ign.) that his intensive study of Dionysius did not begin until 1438, five years after DCC.

Secondly, the actual terms which Nicholas uses (DCC 1, 2) to describe the hierarchical structure of the universe—angelica, rationalis, sensitiva, imaginativa, elementativa natura—rather than being "unmistakably Pseudo-Dionysian," put one in mind of Ramón Lull, the extent of whose influence on Cusa has only recently come to be appreciated (E. Colomer, Nikolaus von Kues und Raimund Llull [Berlin, 1961]). Other clearly Lullian elements in DCC are the use of triadic concepts, the approach to the authority of the bishops as "figuring and signifying" their churches, the role of the "wise" in government (cf. the comparison of the later De pace fidei with Lull's Libre del Gentil in Colomer, pp. 115-17), the proposed plan for the election of the Emperor (cf. W.'s n. 27 on p. 141). To be studied would be the relation of Cusa's view of the bishop as personification of his church and Lull's concept of a persona comuna (Arbre de scientia, arbre apost. 3); also, the connection of Nicholas' treatise with the De potestate ecclesiastica of his teacher Heimeric van den Velde, in which extensive use is made of Lullian ideas.

There is question here not merely of another influence on Cusa, but of an important key to the understanding of his treatise. The second sentence of DCC defines concordantia catholica as "id, ratione cuius ecclesia catholica in uno et in pluribus concordat, in uno Deo et in pluribus subiectis," a definition which owes everything to the definition of the relative principle concordantia in the Lullian Art. The meaning of this term as Nicholas applies it to the structure of the Church becomes clear when we consider that the Church in his view is divided into sacerdotium as anima ecclesiae and imperium as corpus (a division also deriving from Lull; cf. the excerpts made by Cusa sometime after 1428 from Lull's Liber de consilio [Colomer, p. 125]). In the anthropology of Cusa, as well as in that of Lull, man, having been created in the image of the triune God, is composed of anima, corpus, and spiritus. Spiritus as amor, connexio, concordantia participates in both natures, uniting them and giving them life. So also the Church, another mys-
terious *signum Trinitatis*, is composed of the priesthood which is confided with teaching and sanctifying, the people of God confessing Christ in a free decision, and the sacramental gifts of grace, that is, the divine Spirit who as *concordantia* dwells in and inspires the Church. It is this principle which enables Nicholas to reconcile the notion of consent with that of hierarchy, and to synthesize such diverse elements of the tradition as Marsilius of Padua and the Church Fathers.

*Freiburg im Breisgau*

CHARLES H. LOHR, S.J.


These two books, in their different approaches, present together a valuable contribution to the theology of the Church. In addition, they do so at a time when the subject is highly topical and in process of clarification in the light of the new kerygmatic approach. For it seems, from the Second Vatican Council, that the traditional ecclesiology of the last four centuries will be outmoded and a much more fundamental, positive, and nonapologetic theology of the Church will emerge. This would appear clear from the conciliar treatment of the relevant schemata and the ancillary evidence of the new approach to Mariology in which the Blessed Mother is hailed as the type of the Church. Such a delineation of the Church's nature is at the same time a reflection of the new ecumenical approach and a valuable contribution thereto. The nature of the Church is the bedrock foundation of any progress in understanding her mark of unity.

Fr. Tavard's book is a specialized study in the development of High-Church Anglicanism. He examines, in fact, the changing concept of "Catholicity" in the Church of England from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. This concept, he points out, has always been the central one for those who claimed and still claim that Anglicanism has preserved the essence, and not just the vestigia, of Catholicism. He has deliberately left aside, therefore, the Low-Church ecclesiology, apart from the Elizabethan formative period, and has analyzed the changing notions of Anglican Catholicism in the Caroline and Restoration divines, the Nonjurors, the Tractarians, and the modern Anglo-Catholics.

In the earliest period, he shows us, "Catholicity" was deemed a fidelity to the Scriptures and the earliest traditions which could be ascertained by
purely doctrinal criteria. When the Puritan influence had to be counteracted, there was a development which introduced the institutional standard. Both criteria were inherent in the Caroline theology, and the Nonjuror mentality was a natural development. The Tractarians stressed the twofold theory again in the nineteenth century, with the added note of Catholicity as something not only to be preserved but more fully achieved; and it was this fundamentally which led Newman to Rome.

With Charles Gore, at the end of the century, Tractarianism changed into the sociological and eschatological Anglo-Catholicism which marked a further stage and developed into a dialectical encounter with Protestantism. And now Free Churchmen are writing on the Catholicity of Protestantism! Anglican Catholicity in our times looks to "the great Church of the future" rather than to something which existed in the past.

It would be wrong, however, to imagine that the new "Catholicism" in Anglicanism necessarily impairs the relationship with ourselves. It is, of course, true that the deepest dialogue in which the Church of England is now engaged is with Protestantism. But this is by no means "Pan-Protestant." And the new dialogue between Catholics and all other Christians, initiated by Pope John and intensified by Pope Paul, is reaping the benefit of the inter-Protestant dialogue, and the special dynamic contribution of Anglican Catholicism is providing something of a synthesis which has much in common with the spirit of the aggiornamento.

Fr. Hastings' book is a healthy reminder, in this context, of the true and essential nature of Catholicism. He is at the same time ecumenical in his writing and clear in his thought. His chapter on "Some Anglican Problems" can profitably be read in conjunction with Tavard's work. For while the latter analyzes and indicates the broad principles of the "Catholicism" preserved in the historical context, H. is contemporary in his approach. He takes to task such figures as Dr. Ramsay and Dr. Mascall in their own expositions of the doctrine of the Church, and while appreciating the contribution of Anglicanism to some aspects of ecclesiology, he indicates the deficiency of their teaching.

In a later chapter which he calls "The Catholic Synthesis," H. shows very clearly how the Catholic concept of the essential nature of the Church has developed especially in our own time, and he instances the contributions of Abbot Butler and Père de Lubac. "The Church," he says, "is not several communions; she is a communion." This is the deepest statement that one can make about her nature and her unity." "It was the common doctrine of antiquity," he goes on later, "that the unity of the Church was the proper, adequate effect of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it was its res. The unity
of the Church was held inexplicable in other than sacramental and Eucharistic terms." "It is to the Eucharist that Church authority is ordered, and the unity of the Eucharist and the Eucharistic society is necessarily shared by the authority which rules it. The unity of the Mystical Body, which is the res of the Eucharist, necessarily includes and manifests itself in the unity of one visible head."

If this doctrine has been insufficiently stressed in the last five hundred years, the correlative doctrine of this latter period of the Church's visibility as a divine society and as the Mystical Body helps to give the fuller ecclesiological picture. The Church is the visible fellowship of men made one by the Eucharist.

In God's loving providence, it is not for nothing that the Second Vatican Council has stressed the fuller apprehension of the sacred liturgy, which can convey to other Christians no less than ourselves the fundamental and central position of the Eucharist in the doctrine on the Church. This new stress can lead to new thought which should permeate the whole of the ecumenical dialogue and ultimately give it fruitful issue. The very fact that we can thus think traditionally but afresh about the Church's true and essential nature should be a great encouragement to those who have thought us so intolerably intransigent as to be preoccupied only with that visibility which they consider governmental but which for us truly proceeds from "the sacrament of unity."


We are fortunate in having nearly simultaneous translations of these two recent European works on the same subject. Rahner's appeared in German in 1952, with a second edition in 1958; Volken was able to use the latter, for his work came out in French in 1961. In their agreements and disagreements the two studies indicate the extent and limits of the present-day Catholic consensus and spotlight the questions still under debate.

The theological problem of private revelation centers chiefly about its finality. Is it a source of knowledge which could not otherwise be derived from the depositum fidei? If so, the object of Christian faith seems to be
capable of enlargement; and if not, it is hard to see why such revelations should be granted. R. solves the difficulty by maintaining that such revelations communicate no new truth-content: "Private revelations are essentially imperatives showing how Christianity should act in a concrete historical situation: not new assertions but new commands." As a corollary he concludes that particular revelations since apostolic times "display an essential qualitative difference from pre-Christian revelation," for the latter was constitutive of the deposit of faith. V. basically accepts R.'s view, but adds that even in biblical times there were pragmatically-oriented revelations which contributed nothing to the abiding object of faith: for example, the predictions of Agabus narrated in Acts. In this connection V. effectively calls attention to the teaching of St. Thomas, who holds that prophetic revelation, insofar as it is ordered to the knowledge of divine truth, ended with the apostles, but that such revelation, insofar as it is directive of human action, will continue to the end of time (Sum. theol. 2-2, q. 174, a. 6, ad 3m). Pope John XXIII, as V. points out, aptly quoted this passage in an address on the centenary of Lourdes.

In their discussion of the psychology of revelation, both R. and V. deal with the problem, sharply posed by modern experimental psychology, to what extent the visual and auditory elements in an apparition are objectively given by God, and to what extent they stem from the human psyche itself, operating under the stimulation of grace. Both writers agree that what the visionary "sees" or "hears" is not ordinarily present in the physical order. V., however, thinks that in the majority of cases God produces the species sensibilis by efficacious supernatural intervention, so that the appearance and the precise words are in their substance divinely guaranteed. R., on the other hand, maintains that even in genuine visions the imaginative aspects are a spontaneous overflow into the sensory faculties of a more interior and spiritual experience. Not being directly produced by God, they are not clothed with His authority. Both authors cite instances which tend to favor their theory in particular cases. The evidence marshaled by R. on this point seems particularly impressive. Salutary too are R.'s warnings against an uncritical acceptance of accounts composed some years after an apparition—as at Fatima, for example—whether by the visionary in person or by some promoter.

Both authors are conscious of the exceptional difficulty of constructing a criteriology of particular revelations. The obvious common-sense criteria, such as conformity with Catholic doctrine, freedom of the subject from evident neuroses, candor, honesty, and docility, are useful but often insufficient. R. mentions that profound humility often results from the revelatory ex-
perience itself. V. adds that the visionary often seems to be supplied with fortitude beyond the ordinary, as was the case with St. Bernardette. Recognizing the vast possibilities of subconscious projections, telepathy, and hallucination (both individual and collective), neither writer thinks it easy to demonstrate that the content of any given revelation surpasses the "natural" powers of the visionary. To the seer himself, God can no doubt guarantee His presence by indubitable interior signs. For others to be certain convinced, miracles will ordinarily be necessary. And it is rare, as both authors recognize, that the individual Christian can be sure that a miracle has actually occurred. V. at this point appeals to the authority of the Church in approving miracles. But he fails to show that the Church's approbation of miracles is more frequent or more forceful than her approbation of the alleged revelations, and therefore leaves the matter unsettled.

Precisely what is the force of the ecclesiastical approbation given, say, to the revelations of Paray-le-Monial, Lourdes, or Fatima? R. stresses the negative aspect. It means, in his opinion, "that such a revelation can show good grounds for human credibility and does not contradict the deposit of faith." The individual Catholic, he maintains, is free to withhold assent, provided he does so for solid objective reasons and not out of stubborn skepticism. V. tends to take a more positive view, emphasizing the prudence of relying on magisterial decisions. In the case of many apparitions, he believes, the Catholic can have legitimate certitude.

Can one assent to a private revelation on a motive of divine faith? R. contends that the immediate recipient of the message may be obliged to do so, and that this view represents the common teaching of theologians. V. admits that R.'s position agrees with that of Suarez and de Lugo and has an apparent basis in the teaching of Trent (DB 826); but he prefers to say that the visionary's certitude rests upon prophetic illumination or some similar supernatural influence other than the grace of faith. V.'s position has a solid foundation in St. Thomas (Sum. theol. 2-2, q. 171, a. 5) and seems to harmonize better with the view, mentioned above, that postapostolic revelation in no way extends the content of faith.

Each of these books is a valuable supplement to the other. V.'s is in many ways a better introduction, since he gives a useful (though sketchy) history of private revelations and provides clear explanations of the pertinent doctrines from Thomistic psychology and epistemology. In general, his study tends to bolster one's confidence in the authenticity of those apparitions which have appealed to Catholic piety. R., taking for granted a familiarity with basic facts and standard doctrines, presents an essay in theological reflection. He makes his critique from the standpoint of his own Maréchalian-
Heideggerian theory of knowledge, which is not directly set forth in this work. He poses problems more sharply than V. and is more exigent in his demands for credibility. Thanks largely to his learned collaborator, Theodor Baumann, S.J., R.'s book is richly furnished with data from experimental psychology and from the accounts of alleged apparitions. Where V. tends to be conventional and even tedious, R. is fresh and stimulating. R. has also been more fortunate in his translators, who have conveyed his thought smoothly, precisely, and pungently.

Woodstock College

Avery Dulles, S.J.


Nicholas Arseniev is the last of the Russian generation of scholars who lived in Tsarist Russia and there became specialists in Eastern Christian spirituality. In 1914 he lectured in the history of religion at the University of Moscow. After leaving Russia in 1920, he taught at the Universities of Königsberg and Warsaw and lectured in nearly all of the large universities of Europe. His books (e.g., Mysticism and the Eastern Church, 1926; We Beheld His Glory, 1936; Holy Moscow, 1940) did much to acquaint Westerners with Orthodox spirituality. He is currently professor at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary, Tuckahoe, N.Y.

In this book, written in French, A. brings a lifetime of study to a synthesis of the Russian religious soul. His balanced judgments steer the reader to a fair and objective picture. Lacking is the nostalgic canonization, so often found in books of this type, of a chauvinistic religion of messianism. Clearly pointed out are the failings and defects of Russian Orthodoxy along with its special, positive contributions to Eastern spirituality.

A.'s book serves as a fine introduction in general to the particular ways grace has worked on a nation in contact with a primitive, evangelical spirituality of the Eastern Fathers. The author traces with broad strokes this spirit common to all the Eastern Christians in their liturgical life, spirit of contemplation, and moral and ascetical teaching. Then he points out the role that rites and customs have played in the life of the Russian people, including the aberrations. His best chapter (4), on the profundity of this religious life, characterizes the two poles of contrast found in the Russian soul: the depth in realization of man's personal sinfulness and a spontaneous return through a tender simplicity of heart to the merciful God of the Gospels. He ends with two chapters on the various types of saints that formed models of sanctity for popular imitation.
A minor defect in this short, general book is that much of the material has already been presented by the author in his other writings, and a few chapters, especially the last two, seem a bit forced.

The West, to which Eastern Christian spirituality is a relatively new discovery, still awaits a more scholarly work that will fit the Russian soul and its unique contribution into the proper sources, such as the spirituality of the Fathers of the Desert, Hesychastic and Studite monasticism, and the Byzantine liturgy, from which it drew its inspiration and with which it shares much in common, but which is too easily generalized as peculiar to the Russian soul.

John XXIII Center for Eastern
Christian Studies, N.Y.

GEORGE A. MALONEY, S.J.


Paul VI's call for a livelier dialogue between the Church and the modern world lends timeliness to a book such as this, dealing with the relations between the two partners in the conversation. Canon Dondeyne, a leading philosopher of the University of Louvain, is an expert on matters of Church and state. This volume, a re-edited collection of some earlier papers, is not a completely organic whole and suffers from some repetitions, but has more unity than is normal in a collection of essays written over a period of years.

D. attempts to achieve a kind of via media between a clericalism which would subject all human enterprises to authoritative ecclesiastical direction and a secularism which would debar religion from any real influence in building a new world order. He argues that Church and world are mutually necessary and must listen to each other. The Church can learn from the world insofar as scientific progress opens the way for a better understanding of revelation, freeing it from faulty human conceptualization. The world, moreover, is the partner to which the Church must respectfully address the message of the gospel. "Only in free and sincere conversation does the word attain its true value, does it reveal and make free."

From the standpoint of the world, the Church is no less necessary. Religious idealism is needed to channel technological progress in the direction of human joy and peace. Atheistic humanism, by contrast, threatens human welfare insofar as it reduces man, in the final analysis, to "a mere passing moment in cosmic evolution, a handful of molecules which fall apart at death."
Some of the best pages in this book have to do with the Church’s relationship to the social order. D. contends that while Christianity pertains directly to the sphere of religious reality, it has an impact on the world by way of ethics. The Christian, by reason of his religious commitment, will attach greater importance to certain moral values, such as the rights of the person, the sanctity of marriage, and the free exercise of religion. Yet Christianity imposes no particular theory of government or social organization. One can speak of “Christian social doctrine” only in the very general sense that certain theories may be inspired by Christian ethical principles. So too, political parties may reflect religious concerns, but they ought not to be ticketed as confessional in the sense that all members of the Church would be bound to adhere to them.

From this broadly humanistic viewpoint D. makes some penetrating observations on tolerance. The term, he notes, formerly had a negative connotation—that of bearing with some evil which in principle ought to be repressed. Modern man, however, has learned to look on freedom of conscience as a fundamental human right and on tolerance as a positive value. The reactionary opinion that tolerance is a makeshift arrangement, permissible only under abnormal circumstances (the “hypothesis,” as it is said, rather than the “thesis”), is, on D.’s theory, a pernicious anachronism.

D. is evidently convinced that Christendom, in the sense of a civically established religion, is a thing of the past; and he has no regrets at its demise. The contemporary “Diaspora” situation requires more personal dedication on the part of the individual believer and therefore facilitates the work of the apostolate. Christianity, he believes, will recapture its youth when we regain the vision of the gospel as a joyful message of salvation.

In this connection D. takes occasion to analyze the sources of contemporary disbelief. He gives a succinct and enlightening presentation of the Marxist objections to religion. In setting forth his own vision of man, D. makes good use of modern existential philosophers, such as Heidegger and Jaspers, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. The brief meditations on historicity, solidarity, freedom, truth, and speech which are to be found in these pages are models of philosophic precision.

Quite evidently this book is written for a European rather than an American audience. D. takes for granted a general familiarity with contemporary Continental philosophers whose thought is relatively unknown in this hemisphere; conversely, he shows little awareness of contemporary trends in the English-speaking intellectual world. He seems, moreover, to presuppose that the Church is encircled by an anticlerical humanism of Marxist inspiration—which is scarcely true in this country. He omits practically all mention of
Protestantism, thus overlooking a major factor in American religious pluralism. The Catholic conservatism which he castigates is not the American "far right," but the restorationist type of mentality which hankers for an alliance of throne and altar in the style of the ancien régime.

Because so much of D.'s argument is directed to problems which differ from our own, this work will probably be less popular in English than in the original Dutch. But it should be added that the general principles upheld in these essays are eminently sound and, with some adaptation, capable of application to a situation like our own. We may therefore feel sincerely grateful to the author and his translators for putting at our disposal the seasoned wisdom offered in these pages.

Woodstock College
AVERY DULLES, S.J.


Fr. Rahner's book first appeared in 1945 and is a collection of lectures and essays previously published in various journals. Materially, the contents are at first sight quite diverse. Part 1, "Mysterion," contains a general statement of the relation between pagan (cultic) mysteries and Christian mysteries, and illustrations of this relationship by reference to the Cross, to baptism, and to sun and moon (Sun-day and Easter; Epiphany and Christmas as the triumphant coming of Christ the Sun; the moon [= Church and Mary] in the Christmas and Easter cycles). Part 2, "The Healing of the Soul," deals with the plants "moly" and mandragora as they appear in pagan and Christian symbolism. Part 3, "Holy Homer," takes up two passages from the Odyssey, on the willows that grow at Hades' mouth (10:508–12) and on Odysseus bound to the mast as he passes the island of the Sirens (12:160–62), and shows how they became symbolic for Christians. There is, nonetheless, in R.'s intention, a formal unity: "In its totality this work professes to be a kind of essay on ancient Christian psychagogy. Behind the concealing images of Greek mythology I seek to trace a way of ascent to the heights of Christian illumination... For all their wisdom, the Greeks could only express the goals towards which they were seeking to lead the soul in the form of myths. What they could not find words to convey was their intimation that a way existed. Only Christian interpretation would be bold enough to make its direction plainer and show that it led to Christ" (pp. xvii–xviii). This sounds much like Clement of Alexandria; indeed, the spirit of Clement dominates the book, and his works afford key citations throughout it. R. is, of course,
not the first nor the last to be attracted by Clement and his outlook; the reader will remember the passage early in Newman's *Apologia*: "The broad philosophy of Clement and Origen carried me away. . . . Some portions of their teaching, magnificent in themselves, came like music to my inward ear, as if the response to ideas which, with little external to encourage them, I had cherished so long. These were based on the mystical or sacramental principle, and spoke of the various Economies or Dispensations of the Eternal" (pp. 26–27, Longman's ed. of 1888).

R.'s book can be read in several ways. It can be read, first, as a historical essay on the relationships between Greek cultic mysteries and Greek myths on the one side, and Christian liturgy and spirituality on the other. From this viewpoint, the first essay is programmatic, the others all illustrations and applications. In the question discussed in the first essay, viz., the period, kind, and degree of influence exercised by paganism (especially in the form of the cultic mysteries of late antiquity, prior to and contemporaneous with early Christianity) on the Christian religion, R. is on ground which has not yet been fully cleared. A consensus has been growing, however, over the last three or four decades, among Protestants as well as Catholics, that at their origin in the *NT* neither the Pauline "mystery" nor the Christian sacraments of baptism and Eucharist have any genetic dependence on the pagan mysteries—whatever one may think of Casel's insistence that there is, even in the *NT*, a likeness of religious type and manner of expression. (I am speaking here of a consensus among scholars; popular literature, especially in the area of the history of religions, often still trades in clichés about dying and rising gods and sacramental magic.) Among *NT* scholars especially, the tendency has been more and more to find an adequate explanation of the Christian ideas and sacraments in the *OT* and Judaism as transformed by the specific newness brought by Christ. (It would have been advisable for R. or his translator to bring the bibliography of page 11, note 1, on "mysterion" up to date somewhat; I am thinking in particular of R. E. Brown's essays in *CBQ*, 1958, and *Biblica*, 1958–59.) Beginning with Clement and Origen and continuing through the third and fourth centuries, however, there is clear evidence of the adaptation, by a Christian theology already fully conscious and certain of itself, of terminology and thought patterns derived from contemporary experience, direct or literary, of the late pagan mystery cults.

Not all readers have been willing to grant the genuinely historical character of R.'s book. Earlier this year the classical scholar M. I. Finley criticized the book severely as a work of history in the *New York Review of Books*, March 5, 1964, pp. 14–16. F. argued that there were far more numerous influences of paganism on Christianity than R. allowed, and that
R.'s position on the Christian possessing what the Greek was striving for unknowingly, made of the book "not history as that word is customarily understood, but a witness, a testimony of faith." I do not think R. would deny that his claim for Christian fulfilment of Greek striving is indeed a testimony of faith. F.'s first statement is likewise true, but is it to the point? The reader ought to forget the publisher's blurb, which rightly annoyed F., that R.'s book is "perhaps the most authoritative modern statement of the relationship between Christianity and the myths of the Greco-Roman world." In fact, R. is speaking not of all Christians but first of the NT writers and then, and mainly, of the Fathers and ecclesiastical writers. He is describing the attitude of these men and of the anonymous composers of the Christian liturgies. Undoubtedly, a good deal of paganism often influenced the practical Christianity of the average man, just as Canaanite religion mingled in varying degrees with pure Yahwism among the Israelites. But, like the OT prophets, the NT writers and the Fathers are moving from a doctrinally conscious Christian outlook outwards and downwards to the pagan world, not upward (as the ordinary man of any period does) from paganism to Christianity, carrying with him unconsciously, in emotions, pragmatic judgments, and all that makes up an unreflective Weltanschauung, much that needs rejection or at least purification. Surely, too, it is with the NT writers and the Fathers, not with the man in the street and the gamut of lived syncretisms, that the scholars, of whatever intellectual persuasion, are dealing when they discuss the relations between Christianity and paganism. Within this accepted perspective scholarship has indeed, in the main, turned away from Reitzenstein and the school of thought that would find syncretism in the NT and in the testimony and theology of the Fathers.

A doubtless more legitimate question could be asked about the historical balance of R.'s studies: How representative are the passages he cites from the Fathers? In certain kinds of writing on the Fathers there is a tendency to create a "tradition" out of, e.g., a verse in a hymn of St. Ephraem and a phrase in a sermon of Maximus of Turin. This is an extreme example, of course. R. is in no danger of doing this type of thing. The balance of his essays on the Cross and baptism, on the sun and moon, will hardly be called into question (the reader should keep in mind, too, that the first part of R.'s book is in large measure a distillation of lengthy studies published in the Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie in the 1930's); the question is more difficult to answer in the second and third parts of the book, but R. is able to present as impressive a dossier here as can be offered for much that passes as "tradition."

The book can be read, secondly, as an essay on some aspects of the development of Christian liturgy and spiritual theology, viz., on the acquisition
of images and a rhetoric by which the central Christian mystery of the Incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ could be expressed, explicitated, and brought to bear on the concrete reality of pagan-man-in-the-world which is the starting point of every man’s life in Christ. But the glimpse given of such development is but a by-product of the book and is too fleeting to be of much service.

Finally, the book can be read as a call to revive in ourselves Christian-Hellenistic man’s sensibilities to the world of nature and to its character as a praeparatio evangelica cosmica. Rahner’s intention here is quite explicit: “We have become Barbarians and wish once again to be Hellenes” (p. xiii). If this meant only that we must respect the human as well as the divine, if it meant only that Christianity must seek incarnation in human reality and find in every culture the traces of the Logos, no one could but agree. But for R. it means more: his book is a threnody for the lost sensibility of a Clement or a Methodius or an Ambrose. Yet the Fathers are not normative for us insofar as they may have been “Hellenes” but insofar as they were men who carried the gospel into their contemporary world. We cannot become Hellenes in the sense R. seems to intend, any more than we can become OT Hebrews or early Christians. This is not to reduce the Fathers to a sort of purely formal model. Much that they discovered of the work of the Logos in the natural world and in the world of late antique culture is a permanent acquisition. But the world of the Fathers (by “world” here I mean the indissoluble complex of nature and culture and the eyes and mind that conditioned it and were conditioned by it), whether Eastern or Western, has, as a whole, sunk irretrievably below the horizon of history.

It seems to me we need to distinguish, as R. does not, the genuine “myths” (I use the word here of the permanent fundamental human situations and patterns of action that are reflected, e.g., in the story of Odysseus’ exile and striving for home or in the Orpheus story, and refer the reader to C. S. Lewis’ An Experiment in Criticism, chap. 5) from the details that cry for, and have received, allegorization, e.g., the moly and mandragora, the willows, the Sirens. R. has not allowed for the inevitable shifts in sensibility, in attitude to the natural world and therefore to the stories and symbols developed by a culture. Above all, he has not allowed for the radical shift in sensibility that has been going on since the Industrial Revolution and especially since the scientific revolution of the present century, a shift that will take no one knows how long to produce its own classic and permanently valid expressions and that will be paralleled, in its pervasiveness and comprehensiveness, only by the shifts that took place millennia ago when men first began to keep
flocks instead of hunting their food and then settled in one place to till the soil.

The problems raised by the present transition are deep-going and form one of the two great challenges which an effective liturgical renewal faces. What are the permanent Christian symbols, and which ones are dead beyond resuscitation? (It is one thing to study the Bible in order to grasp intellectually the symbolic values, e.g., of chrism and anointing; it is another to be able to restore to chrism and anointing an immediacy of appeal, to give them the symbolic connaturality which depends in such large measure on the symbol being part of human life outside the liturgical situation.) How awaken in men a sensitivity to these permanent symbols—in their everyday lives once again, and not only in the time and space of the liturgy? (The other basic problem of liturgical renewal is to awaken men to a sense of community, as opposed to simple “togetherness,” in the whole of life, so that they will be attuned to the liturgy as an essentially communal action.) These remarks on the liturgy may seem to take us far from R.’s book. But if we read him as he desires to be read, not simply as a recorder of a vanished past, but as an educator, in a modest way, of the contemporary Christian sensibility, then the remarks are pertinent. I do not think that what we need is a restoration of early Christian alertness to the symbolism of moly and mandragora, of Odysseus tied to the mast while the Sirens sing, or even of sun and moon or of the world of nature and man as illustrating in so many forms the shape of the redemptive Cross.

The translation reads well, and such inaccuracies as I have observed are too minor to be noted here. More unsettling to the reader will be the failure to translate a number of Latin quotations (though R., in his 1945 edition at least, provided in an appendix German translations of all Latin verse or prose not followed by a translation in the text itself).

Woodstock College

MATTHEW J. O’CONNELL, S.J.


This is a unique book. Its over-all title raises expectations that it will go far beyond the problems of courtship, the ethics of conjugal intimacy, and canonical legislation governing marriage, the stuff of which books on marriage are currently made. And yet the book is not quite a theology of marriage. There is no clear doctrinal development of marriage as a sacra-
ment, no explicit treatment of the properties of marriage, no attempt to assess the relative values of the various purposes of marriage. In fact, K. makes it clear from the beginning that "parenthood will not be considered here." Rather, his attention "will be centered on just one aspect of their [married people's] life together: the effort they make to improve each other" (p. ix).

The subtitle is more informative and descriptive of the contents of the book, and it is within the historical framework of conflicting attitudes towards sex and sanctity in marriage that the author attempts to answer two basic questions which have prompted his work, questions that are more ascetical than theological in the more restricted use of the word: "Does marriage demand a really basic change in a person's life with God? What connection is there between his spiritual growth and that of his partner in marriage?" (p. 255).

The first question is somewhat negative and is answered perhaps in the first two parts of the book, which deal with such questions as: Is marriage good in itself or is it the result of original sin? Has sex any other finality than that of procreation? Is marriage an obstacle to union with God? These are relatively easy questions to answer today, and many readers of K.'s work will be surprised that such questions were actually raised by the Fathers of the Church and the great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages. Some readers will be more than surprised, they will be perplexed, if not actually shocked, by the extremely pessimistic views voiced almost unanimously by Christian writers of the first fifteen centuries as dutifully recorded by K. Admittedly, these writers were anxious to uphold marriage as good against the denials of the Gnostics, the Encratites, and the Manicheans. But as K. perceptively points out, once the Church moved out of Palestine and a Jewish milieu which regarded a good wife as God's greatest gift to man and the normal companion on his way towards God, Christians were faced with an ancient pagan culture which "brutally demanded pleasure and yet had a deep suspicion and contempt for this whole area of human life" (p. 49). Without condemning marriage as a way of life, Christian writers did condemn almost unanimously the pleasure inherent in the marriage act. Unfortunately, all carnal or venereal pleasure was identified with libido, a lustful tendency which St. Augustine seems to equate with concupiscence and which he holds to be present in all intercourse, even between the best of spouses. In this context it is understandable why so many Christian writers, including the great Scholastic doctors of the Middle Ages, regarded carnal pleasure as the result of sin and as the operative element in the transmission of original sin.

At this point the reader will ask the disturbing question: How can theo-
logians almost unanimously and for the space of some fifteen hundred years propose views which are so completely at variance with the teaching of theologians today? And the even more disturbing question: May not the teaching of present-day theologians on contraceptive intercourse undergo a similar change with the passage of time? Although K. does not address himself directly to the second and more disturbing question, he does suggest a principle that may serve as a partial solution to both questions. In chap. 5, which is entitled "The Instinct of the Faithful," K. implies that the faithful were unaware of what was being taught in the schools. Unlike the question of birth control, the all but impossible ideals of marital relations upheld by the Schoolmen following Augustine and other patristic writers were sheerly academic and rarely influenced the thinking and conduct of ordinary Christians, who "lived by their general Catholic instinct and rarely felt the need of anything else" (p. 65). It is perhaps dangerous to appeal to the sensus fidelium against the sensus theologorum in arriving at the belief of the teaching as well as of the believing Church. And yet it is equally dangerous to use indiscriminately the argument from the consent of theologians as reductively the teaching of the magisterium.

Part 3 of K.'s book is perhaps an answer to his second basic question: Granted that marriage is good and not necessarily an obstacle to union with God, in what sense is it a means of mutual sanctification? Here we find some of the more positive values of marriage which are prized so much by contemporary writers, values which are encouraged by more recent theologians and by the pronouncements of the Holy See. It is here too that we find many citations from earlier sources which for pedagogical or other reasons K. omitted from his earlier sections. Our main quarrel with K.'s work is that these more optimistic passages were not introduced earlier to brighten the rather dour picture that is presented in the first two parts of the volume. And even here we would wish that more generous citations were given from Tertullian's treatise Ad uxorém and John Chrysostom's famous Homily 20 on the Epistle to the Ephesians, a homily which concludes: "If anyone marries in this way and with these ideals in mind, he will be but little inferior to monks; the married will be but little below the unmarried" (chap. 9). True, K. cites the conclusion but not the body of the homily, which is one of the finest encomiums of marriage in the patristic period. A little more of Chrysostom and a great deal less of Jerome would have enhanced and given a more balanced view of the manner in which Christians were instructed on the duties and opportunities given them in their state of life. Again, it is unfortunate that K. did not cite what is to my mind the most significant passage on marriage in the Council of Trent, a passage which stresses for the first
time the element of natural or human love in marriage, a love not to be sup­pressed but to be perfected and sanctified by the grace of marriage (cf. Session 24, DB 970). And yet the reader will be grateful at all times for K.'s own insights, his balanced judgments, his elegance of diction, and his final conclusions, which point the way to his final chapter, "Marriage, a Way to God."

The bibliography of primary sources is worthy of the most learned doctoral dissertation. The bibliography of secondary sources is quite skimpy, but for the most part selective and useful. Unfortunately, there is no index of topics or, what is more important in a book of this kind, of authors.

Fordham University

Paul F. Palmer, S.J.


Encouraged by the popularity of their Código de derecho canónico, now in the seventh edition, the BAC is offering a four-volume commentary on the Code of Canon Law by professors of the University of Salamanca, including, in addition to the authors of the present volume, L. Miguélez and T. García Barberena. The four books are to cover, respectively, the areas of canons 1-681, 682-1321, 1322-1998, and 1999-2414.

The form, as in the Código, consists in listing a group of canons (one or several titles) in the Latin text and Castilian translation arranged in parallel columns, then proceeding to comment at length, and in order, upon the canons. As the print, in some three fonts, ranges from small to almost illegible, this is evidently a very comprehensive commentary, perhaps the most comprehensive currently available.

The approach is traditional, in the sense that the emphasis seems to be placed rather on the aspects in which canon law resembles other forms of law than on the elements in which it differs. The method is, in other words, predominantly juridical; but the orientation is more practical than theoretic. It is a lawyer's commentary on the law. In the evaluation of disputed points the authors present their own arguments and viewpoints, often quite new and original, rather than mere compilations of opinion (though sometimes with too little identification of the sponsors of various views), and their conclusions are independent, often on the side of the minority, as in the following positions: the freedom of children under the age of seven from the law of the Eucharistic fast, and the subjection of the same children to the precept of Sunday Mass; the application to baptized non-Catholics of all laws of the
Church from which they are not expressly exempted; the sufficiency of delegated jurisdiction without knowledge or acceptation on the part of the delegate; the distinctive computation of puberty in the matter of liability to ecclesiastical penalties; the acquisition of voluntary domicile or quasi domicile on the part of religious in the same way as anyone else; etc. Although the various sections are attributed to particular authors and not to the group jointly, the characteristics of style, method, and attitude are pretty generally predicable of the work as a whole.

Among the many more or less extended expositions in the present volume, the following seemed especially noteworthy: the differentiation of common good and public order (can. 14); the verification of the concept of law, in the proper sense of the word, in the law of the Church (can. 8); the question of the so-called purely penal law (ibid.); the notion of complete and incomplete personality in the Church, in preference to the comparison of members and subjects (can. 87); the incapacity for jurisdiction on the part of the laity in general and of women in particular (can. 118); the motives for the exemption of religious (can. 615); the obligation to follow the religious vocation (can. 538); etc. Conversely, one is surprised at the absence of any significant comment on a number of controverted or complicated areas, such as the consequences of a superior’s not fulfilling the condition of consultation (can. 105); the obligation of the divine office, for which one is referred to the moralists and liturgists (can. 135); the nature of the internal and external fora (can. 196); the impediments to admission into the novitiate (can. 542); the automatic dismissal of religious (can. 646); and, above all, the whole matter of the religious vows and rules (can. 593), on which no comment at all is given.

It was a courageous venture to initiate a wholly new and extensive commentary on the present Code at the time when the revision of the same is not only projected but actually in preparation. Indeed, much of the set will have been published too early to incorporate even the modifications necessitated by the liturgical constitution of the Second Vatican Council and the Motu proprio “Pastorale munus” of Pope Paul VI. It is promised, however, that these latter will be provided for in an appendix to the fourth volume, with references to the exact places in the series where the corrections are to be made.

Woodstock College

John J. Reed, S.J.
LES SAGESSES DU PROCHE-ORIENT ANCIEN. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963. Pp. 207. Presents the twelve papers, with following discussions, given at the 1963 colloquium of the Strassburg Center of Studies in the History of Religions—a useful review, by eminent scholars, of the advances made in recent years in the study of ancient Near Eastern wisdom literature. The genre is particularly well represented in Egyptian texts, and seven of the papers are devoted to aspects of these texts; of particular interest to the student of the OT is Joseph Vergote’s study of the notion of God in Egyptian wisdom literature: V. concludes that traditional polytheism was reconciled with monotheistic tendencies of the wisdom writers by considering the gods as manifestations or hypostases of God. One paper, by Jean Nougayrol, is devoted to recent advances in our knowledge of Babylonian wisdom texts. The remaining four essays are on biblical wisdom literature. H. Cazelles discusses the origins of sapiential writing in Israel, especially in relation to the development of the monarchy; “wisdom” (hokmah), he suggests, connotes ability to rule rather than knowledge. S. Morenz (whose paper, like those to be mentioned below, is given in German) writes of Egyptological contributions to biblical studies, giving as an example the Egyptian conception of “time,” as a background to Qoh 3:1. W. Zimmerli discusses the theological setting and limitations of OT wisdom: the wisdom books represent a creation theology which abstracts from the historical interaction between God and Israel; the limitations of this theology are indicated indirectly in the speeches of Job’s friends, and directly in the strictures of Qoheleth. The critical position of the latter book in the history of OT wisdom is the subject of H. Gese’s paper. The volume as a whole, and in particular the contribution of Zimmerli, offers rewarding reading for the OT student.

Woodstock College Richard I. Caplice, S.J.

LA NOZIONE DI ACCOGLIENZA NEL NUOVO TESTAMENTO. By Sandro Vitalini. Studia Friburgensia, n.s. 35. Freiburg, Swit.: Edizioni Universitarie, 1963. Pp. 109. 12 fr. Three chapters of V.’s doctoral thesis. Because of the importance of the subject and the excellence of its presentation, it was judged worthy of publication in the new series of Studia Friburgensia. The Italian word accoglienza expresses nicely both aspects (passive and active) of that fundamental attitude which the NT insists is absolutely necessary for participation in the salvation God offers mankind in Christ. Accogliere “indicates the conscious interior acceptance of an initiative ex-
ternal to the subject.” It expresses poverty of spirit and the surrender of faith. The initiative in salvation is exclusively God’s. He intervenes with His saving activity in history. He sends His Son; He invites to His kingdom; He illumines with His light. In the presence of God’s saving action man is passive; he receives God’s gracious gift. But man is not a lifeless vessel into which God pours His grace; he is a living person to whom God offers His gift. Reception of the gift by man implies his conscious surrender to God in faith. The initial accoglienza of faith must perdure and express itself in obedience. For John, the word “love” expresses both God’s saving graciousness and man’s surrender in faith and obedience. V. concludes that the NT presents a dynamic concept of reception. Every NT author makes his own contribution to this notion, which is perfectly synthesized in the Johannine doctrine on love. Accoglienza implies the true drama of world history: God’s loving pursuit of His creature and the creature’s surrender in love to the embrace of God.

Passionist Monastery, Union City, N.J. Richard Kugelman, C.P.

Etudes théologiques. By Lorenzo Roy et al. Quebec: Laval Univ. Press, 1963. Pp. 205. March 26, 1963, marked the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of Quebec Seminary by Bishop François de Montmorency-Laval, which was expanded into Laval University in 1852. The present volume of studies (already printed as Laval théologique et philosophique 19 [1963] no. 1) by members of the theological faculty is a memorial of the occasion. The eight essays can be divided into four groups: (1) two biblical studies: Roland Beaudet on the Exodus typology of Second Isaiah, and Jean-Paul Matthieu on the two Salomsonian collections within the Book of Proverbs; (2) two studies in dogmatic theology, both on St. Thomas: Raymond Laflamme on the nature of the divine benignitas, and Benoît Gariépy on the examination of doctrinal errors as part of theological method; (3) two studies in moral theology: Bernard Morisset on the prudential syllogism, and Lorenzo Roy on certitude in moral matters, both essays concerned chiefly with St. Thomas; (4) two studies in Church history, past and present: Benjamin Fortin on problems of episcopal succession in mid-third century, and Bernard Lambert on unity in the Church (regarded in the light of Vatican II).

Woodstock College M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

Contemporary Studies in Theology. London: Mowbray. A series of occasional papers on aspects of biblical, systematic, or liturgical theology, some of them reprints, others written for the series or at least
first published here. Cyril E. Pocknee's *The Rites of Christian Initiation: Their Revision and Reform* (1962; pp. 46; 6s), originally three lectures at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Ill., surveys the problems of revision and reform in this area; many of his key statements on the patristic view of confirmation, on the disintegration of the baptism-confirmation complex, and on St. Thomas' theology of confirmation are open to dispute. Hugh Montefiore's *Josephus and the New Testament* (1962; pp. 39; 6s) is a reprint from *Novum Testamentum* 4 (1960) 139–60, 307–18. Eric L. Mascall's *Theology and Images* (1963; pp. 48; 6s6d) raises the problems implicit in the title (supplementing thereby his own earlier book *Words and Images* [London, 1957]) in the form of a critique of *Images of God*, by A. C. Bridge, artist-become-Anglican-priest. Theodor Klauser, well-known historian of the liturgy, in his 1961 lecture *The Western Liturgy Today* (tr. by F. L. Cross; 1963; pp. 42; 6s6d), complements his earlier essay, *The Western Liturgy and Its History* (1944; Eng. tr., London, 1952), by showing the development from the time of Pope Pius II (Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, 1405–64) to the present time. The second half of the lecture lists the changes K. would like to see made in the present-day Roman liturgy; some of these have now been entered upon by Vatican II (vernacular; revision of the Canon; revision of the Scripture readings).

*Woodstock College*  

**M. J. O'Connell, S.J.**

*Theologia Viatorum* 9 (1963). Edited by Rolf Rendtorff. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1964. Pp. xiii + 218. DM 28.— This volume of the Kirchliche Hochschule of Berlin Yearbook is a *Festschrift* for Friedrich Smend and contains thirteen articles. Of general interest will be Herbert Braun's comparison of the baptism of John the Baptist with the ritual washings at Qumrân; Günther Harder's essay on eschatological patterns in the Johannine Apocalypse; Hildebrecht Hommel's study of the iconography of the Flight into Egypt (with twenty-six illustrations); and Karl Kupisch's account of the life and work of Theodor Mommsen, for the sixtieth anniversary of his death (1903).

*Woodstock College*  

**M. J. O'Connell, S.J.**

published in two volumes. The first deals with the incarnation of the word of God in the human mind as faith, as theology, as mystery and symbol, and as dogma. Under these four headings (the first two sections are by far the longer ones) are gathered essays of widely varying length and importance, dating from 1923 to 1963, a forty-year span that shows nonetheless a remarkable continuity of theological concern. Here are found, along with welcome, usually short pieces from less accessible publications, a number of C.'s magisterial studies: the “Contribution à l'histoire du traité de la foi (2-2.1.2)” (from Mélanges thomistes, 1923) and “La psychologie de la foi dans la théologie du XIIIe siècle (2-2.2.1)” (from Études médiévales [Ottawa], 1932); “Position de la théologie” (from RSPT, 1935); “Vocabulaire biblique et vocabulaire théologique” (from NRT, 1952); “Lecture de la Bible et philosophie au Moyen âge” (from Mélanges Gilson [Paris], 1959); “L'Equilibre du scolastique médiéval” (from RSPT, 1940) and “La théologie au Saulchoir” (from Une école de théologie: Le Saulchoir, 1937); the two Maison-Dieu essays “Anthropologie et liturgie” (1947) and “Les sacrements dans l'économie chrétienne” (1952); and “Vérité et liberté dans la foi du croyant” (from Esprit, 1959). An index of names and of important topics makes this an even more precious collection.

Woodstock College

L'ÉPISCOPAT DANS L'ÉGLISE: RÉFLEXIONS SUR LE MINISTÈRE SACERDOTAL. By Paul Anciaux. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963. Pp. 111. 69 fr. A reprint of two articles, with an introduction to situate them within a larger framework. Specialized agencies have taken over many of the functions at one time exercised by the priest (social work, counseling, etc.); we are seeing today, too, a strong affirmation of the role of the laity within the Church and in the consecration of the world, and a consequent further removal from the priest of tasks he formerly had to do. What, then, is the sacerdotal function in this new and changing world? Are we in process of thrusting the priest back into the sacristy, not for the reasons offered by liberal rationalism, but by the simple narrowing of his cultural and ecclesiastical role? Once the role of the priest is decided, further questions become, if anything, more acute than in the past—especially the question of how secular and regular clergy are to co-operate without harming the special vocation of each or the apostolate as a whole. Further, what is the spirituality proper to the priest (as distinct from the monk or religious)? These and other questions are raised by A. in his Introduction; he seeks the basis for his answer to them by asking further questions: What is the relation of presbyter to bishop? What is the nature of the episcopate and of the sacra-
ment that transmits the apostolic function with a view to realizing the mystery of salvation? A.’s two articles are offered as contributions to the as yet unwritten treatise on the episcopacy and to the more developed ecclesiology which would condition such a treatise. “L’Eglise et le ministère apostolique dans le mystère de Dieu” appeared in Collectanea Mechliniensia 47 (1962) 441–65, and, as the title indicates, asks what role the Church plays in the drama of salvation and what role the apostolic office, in turn, plays within the Church. “L’Episcopat (Ordo episcoporum) comme réalité sacramentelle” appeared in Nouvelle revue théologique 85 (1963) 139–59; after describing the episcopacy as the liturgy of ordination presents it, A. sketches the place of the episcopal order as mediator between the Trinity and the Church, and its relation to the papal primacy. A. has many perceptive and helpful remarks; more importantly, he shows what questions have to be asked, and suggests both the difficulty and the promise of a developed theology of the episcopacy.

Woodstock College

M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

SEMANA ESPAÑOLA DE TEOLOGÍA 19 (1959): ALGUNAS CUESTIONES SOBRE LA FE TEOLÓGICA, Y OTROS ESTUDIOS. 22 (1962): TEOLÓGIA DEL EPISCOPADO. SEMANA BÍBLICA ESPAÑOLA 19 (1958): CONCEPTO DE LA IGLESIA EN EL NUEVO TESTAMENTO, Y OTROS ESTUDIOS. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1962. Pp. 298; 621; 363. Ptas. 160; 390; 210. The 1959 meeting of the Spanish theologians took as its chief subject theological faith, thus complementing nicely, in certain respects, the work done at the two previous meetings, on original sin and on justification. The most broadly interesting paper at the 1959 meeting is probably the opening one by Bernardo Monsegù, C.P., on present-day perspectives in discussing faith and on the general lines of modern work on it. The remaining six papers take up various problems connected with faith: Trent and the necessity of faith for justification, foundation of salutary faith’s supernaturality, role of the will in faith’s certitude, function of actual grace in faith, etc. There are three papers not related to the main subject: on the permission by God of moral evil; on two recent congresses that took up the subject of penance (an interconfessional conference in Germany [1957], and the annual conference of the Centre de Pastorale Liturgique [1958; cf. Maison-Dieu, nos. 55 and 56]), and on the “humanist” generation of Spanish theologians, 1500–30. The 1962 meeting, under the influence of the Council, dealt with the vital question of the episcopacy. Seventeen papers took up many aspects, speculative, historical, and pastoral, of this vast and difficult subject. It is not possible to discuss all these studies in detail, but one point may be noted. In the longest study in the book, Nicolas López Martínez concludes
on the basis of magisterial statements that there is no obligation to distinguish presbyter from bishop qua priest, and he concludes, from a study of the sources, that in fact there is no such distinction. Other papers study the question of collegiality, conciliar infallibility, the relation of episcopacy to primacy, episcopate as a state of perfection. The nineteenth Spanish biblical week, in 1958, took as primary subject of its discussion the Church in the NT and heard papers on aspects of the Church in St. Matthew, Acts, and the Pauline corpus, on the influence of Qumrân on the early Jerusalem community, and on extra ecclesiam nulla salus in the light of Pauline theology. In addition to these five papers, five more dealt with divers matters: the perspective of the hagiographer and its significance for exegesis; hyperbole, paradox, and reality in the Messianic prophecies; circumcision and baptism; the Gospel parables as doctrinal statements; the form of the NT blessings.
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ANNOUNCING CHRIST: THROUGH SCRIPTURE TO THE CHURCH. By François Varillon. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1964. Pp. 503. $6.95. This book originated as ten series of ten separate fiches, published anonymously from 1948 to 1955 at the Institut Catholique of Paris under the title Eléments de doctrine chrétienne. These were re-edited in book form, under the same title, in 1960 (Paris: Editions de l'Epi). The original framework was kept, as was much of the original text, but much too was rewritten, some parts being expanded, others dropped. The justification for the subtitle is less in the manner of presentation (the book is not a book of biblical theology) than in the following of the scriptural order: creation, OT history of salvation, NT, Church, sacraments, eschatology. A sober presentation of the essential Christian message.
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THE SIGNS OR THE NEW COVENANT. By Aimé Georges Martimort. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1963. Pp. xiv + 320. $4.75. This book (originally published in Paris, 1960) grew out of a course given to young Christian Brothers in order to provide a correct basic outlook on the sacraments and accurate fundamental ideas while avoiding excessively technical questions. As one would expect from its author, heavy stress is laid, and rightly, on the liturgy of the sacraments as the starting point for understanding. Thus, the baptismal rite is touched on in detail, and the whole of the Mass is investigated for an understanding of the Eucharist. Notable is the sequence of topics: orders is the first sacrament to be studied, followed
by the three sacraments of "initiation" (the table of contents speaks of "Christian Education," though the French is "L'Initiation chrétienne"), the Eucharist, penance, anointing of the sick, and marriage. The translators have made "revisions... in accordance with the needs of English-speaking readers, particularly in the bibliographies which have drawn on the wealth of material originally written in English or translated from other languages to substitute for the French works not available in translation" (p. iv). This laborious but necessary task is one that many other translators ought to take upon themselves; not all of them, of course, have the expertise of the Collegeville Benedictines, who for this book, as for many others, deserve our thanks.
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SOURCES or THE MODERN ROMAN LITURGY: THE ORDINALS OF HAYMO OF FAVERSHAM AND RELATED DOCUMENTS (1243-1307). Edited by S. J. P. Van Dijk, O.F.M. Studia et documenta franciscana 1-2. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1963. Pp. xvii + 293; x + 552. 98 glds. In 1960 D., along with J. Hazelden Walker, published The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy (Westminster, Md.: Newman), in which they showed how the modern Roman liturgy grew out of the liturgy of the papal court in the thirteenth century (itself the result of reforms by Innocent III and further revisions under his successor Honorius III [1216-27]), and was spread abroad by the Franciscans, whose own liturgy was adapted to that of the papal court by Haymo of Faversham, fourth Minister General of the Order. The book came into being as an extensive historical introduction to a critical edition of Haymo's liturgical writings, discovered by D. in Padua in 1939. The present work presents the promised edition. Vol. 1 contains (1) an Introduction, including a biographical essay on Haymo and the background of his liturgical activity (pp. 3-49), and a description of the contents of each of his works and of the related works to be edited, with a comparison between the liturgy according to his reform and the Franciscan liturgy as it had been up to that time (pp. 50-146); (2) a Description of Manuscripts; and (3) Indexes of mss., initia, and feasts, as well as a general index. The second volume contains the edition of (1) Haymo's texts: the Order of Action and Speech for Private and Ferial Public Masses; the Order of the Breviary; the Order of Grace (i.e., at table); the Order of the Missal. All these date from 1243-44, the last two years of Haymo's life. (2) Related texts: Ceremonial for Choir and Altar; Preface to Franciscan Gradual; Kalendar according to the Use of the Papal Court; Ritual for the Last Sacraments; Parisian Table of Ferial Antiphons before Christmas; and the Thirteenth-
Century Liturgical Statutes. (3) Indexes of mss., initia, biblical references, patristic references, stations, and feasts, and a general index. D. has provided a tool of major importance for understanding the prehistory of our present Roman liturgy, and gotten the new series, Studia et documenta franciscana, off to a most promising start.
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Studies in Pastoral Liturgy 2. Edited by Vincent Ryan, O.S.B. Dublin: Gill, 1963. Pp. viii + 315. 16s. This volume contains the papers of three sessions (1960–62) of the Irish Liturgical Congress; they have appeared already, for the most part, in the Furrow, but their publication in inexpensive book form enables them to reach the wider readership they deserve. The 1960 Congress had for subject the Church and the sick. The three main papers dealt with Christ and the sick in the NT, the history of the liturgy of extreme unction, and the care for the sick manifested by the Church in the Roman ritual. There is also a discussion of recent literature on the theology of the sacrament, and a bibliography on the subject. The 1961 Congress concerned itself with participation in the Mass. Apart from two papers on the principles of participation, one on the Mass as Christian assembly, and another on the secret prayers of the Missal, the papers were directed to ways of fostering participation in various ways and at various age levels. The liturgy and church architecture was the subject of the 1962 Congress.
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Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4 (1963). Edited by John H. Miller, C.S.C. Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides, 1963. Pp. 250. The format of the Yearbook is the familiar one: articles (five), the survey of periodical literature, and book reviews. The articles include: an obituary article on Fr. Gerald Ellard, S.J., with a bibliography of his writings (by his colleague Everett A. Diederich, S.J.); an article by the editor on education for the liturgy; a very interesting article by Charles H. Henkey on “liturgical theology,” developing the thesis that “liturgy is theology in the most proper and formal sense of the word” (p. 77) and has for its formal object Christian existence, not under the aspect of truth (dogmatic theology) or of personal goodness (moral theology) but of beauty; and an article by Massey H. Shepherd on “Eusebius and the Liturgy of Saint James,” a study of the Dedication Sermon which forms chap. 4 of Book 10 in the Ecclesiastical History. There is also a translation of the “Evangelical Mass” (Order of Mass, and theological explanation) drawn up by the Theological Committee.
of Pastor Max Lackmann’s League for Evangelical-Catholic Reunion. The survey of liturgical literature contains 1078 items, many of them with indication of contents.
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La liturgie et les paradoxes chrétiens. By Jean Leclercq, O.S.B. Lex orandi 36. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1963. Pp. 305. 12.60 fr. L. has gathered together in thirteen chapters (but several chapters each combine two or more articles) scattered writings on the liturgy and related subjects, dating from 1945 to 1961. Since “le mot paradoxe est maintenant à la mode” (p. 9), L. tries to make each article an illustration of one or other Christian paradox by supplying new titles. The procedure is rather artificial and certainly unnecessary. L. always has something to say, and we can only be pleased that such a collection has been made. There are chapters on the liturgical year (Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost), on the office and the Mass, on primary devotions (Sacred Heart and Blessed Virgin), on the liturgy and private prayer. While Scripture and the liturgical texts are copiously cited or referred to, the special value of these essays comes from L.’s mastery of patristic and especially medieval spirituality.
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Chrétiens de tous les temps. Textes du Ier au XXe siècle. Paris: Editions du Cerf. A new and promising series intended to show the educated and interested layman “Christian thought coming to grips with the problems of each age, in all the forms that this thought has chosen to use and all the roads that it has travelled. . . . We shall discover that the faith has, as a matter of fact, opened up immense areas to the mind and often transformed the action whether of individuals or of society.” The series appropriately opens with Les écrits des Pères apostoliques (1963; pp. 494; 14.40 fr.). Claude Mondésert’s Introduction (pp. 11–34) points out the abiding value of these writings (as does Louis Bouyer in his short Preface, pp. 5–8) and gives basic information and bibliography on each author. All the Apostolic Fathers are included in translations by various hands and with copious annotations by François Louvel, S.J. Especially helpful is the Appendix (pp. 451–90), “Naisance d’un vocabulaire chrétien: Petit lexique,” in which succinct descriptions are given of twenty-one basic Christian words (apostle, baptism, Catholic, etc.) as they occur in profane Greek, the LXX, the NT, and the Apostolic Fathers. Vol. 2 is Hugo Rahner’s L’Eglise et l’état dans le christianisme primitif (1964; pp. 367; 14.40 fr.). It is a translation of R.’s Kirche und Staat im frühen Christentum (Munich: Kösel,
1961), in which R. presented thirty-nine key documents, beginning with Clement of Rome's prayer for the state and ending with Nicholas I's Letter to Emperor Michael III in 865 (the Latin and Greek texts are translated under the direction of Claude Mondéert, S.J., and P.-Th. Camelot, O.P.), with a general introduction and special introductions to each of the five main sections (translated by G. Zinck). This 1961 volume was, in turn, a reissue of R.'s *Abendländische Kirchenfreiheit*, with the addition of the original Latin and Greek texts; the French volume thus equally represents either edition. In Vol. 3, *Saint Augustin: Prier Dieu—Les psaumes* (1964; pp. 208; 7.50 fr.), J. Perret translates texts from the *Enarrationes in ps.* selected by A.-M. Besnard, O.P. The texts are arranged under three headings: how Christ teaches us to pray; the dispositions of the heart in prayer; prayer in the whole of life. B.'s Introduction (pp. 9–52) is given over primarily to showing the theology of prayer which is present, though not systematized, in Augustine's Commentary. The latest volume to date, *Saint Bernard: Un itinéraire de retour à Dieu* (1964; pp. 222; 7.50 fr.), contains texts, chosen by Etienne Gilson and translated by Dom de Saint-Gabriel, which are grouped under thirteen headings to illustrate the subtitle of the book. The texts include almost the whole of the *De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae* (chaps. 1–21 and the end of 22) and much of the *De diligendo Deo* (chaps. 1–11); G. calls upon his profound knowledge of Bernard in his Introduction (pp. 9–47) on the life, the works, and especially the doctrine (pp. 17–40) of the Saint. This volume is only a reduced version of Gilson's earlier selection of texts, *Saint Bernard* (Paris: Plon, 1949); the Introduction is the same, except for pp. 41–44 (on Bernard's works), but the reading guide, the ordering of texts, the notes, and the appendixes are new. In all four volumes, chronological tables, maps, bibliographies, etc. have been added where helpful; Vols. 3 and 4 have short but useful topical indexes. All in all, a good deal of thought and effort have gone into making these books valuable to both student and general reader.
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*La foi et le culte de l'Église primitive.* By Oscar Cullmann. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1963. Pp. 222. C. reprints six studies, four of them out-of-print brochures, two of them periodical articles. C. rightly regards them as still of value and as having a certain unity. He also asks the reader to remember the original publication dates of these pieces, reprinted without change, but does not indicate these dates. Indication of the original form and date of the six studies, and of their translation into English, will be helpful to the American reader. "La royauté du Christ et
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**LA FÊTE DES PÂQUES DANS L'ÉGLISE DES PÈRES.** By Odo Casel, O.S.B. *Lex orandi* 37. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1963. Pp. 157. 10.50 fr. D.’s translation of “Art und Sinn der ältesten christlichen Osterfeier,” *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 14 (1934) 1–78, makes available to a wider circle of readers not only another important monograph in the Caselian corpus (cf. *TS* 24 [1963] 534–35), but a fundamental essay to which appeal is made in most present-day studies of the Church year as centered upon Easter. C. intended to document and explain the affirmation that the Pasch for the Fathers was the celebration of the whole mystery of redemption, i.e., of Christ’s death and resurrection inseparably, and not of His resurrection alone. He shows that in the first three centuries the “Pasch,” while celebrated centrally in the paschal vigil, embraced the whole period from Palm Sunday to Pentecost Sunday (“Pentecost” at that time meaning the fifty days, not the fiftieth day, and the fiftieth day not yet being the day of the Spirit’s descent, nor the fortieth the day of Ascension). After pursuing this idea through the writings of the first three centuries, C. in the central part of the essay, which gives its title to the whole, elaborates upon the meaning and form of the “Pasch” (in the direction I have just indicated). With the fourth century, the central position of the Pasch is reduced in the minds of the faithful by the growth alongside it of a second festal cycle: the Epiphany (Nativity) cycle, in which it is not the passion and resurrection of the Lord but the Incarnation and glorious manifestation of the Logos in flesh that are celebrated (this statement, while true, needs modification; cf. Rupert Ber-
ger, "Ostern und Weihnachten: Zum Grundgefüge des Kirchenjahres," Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 8/1 [1963] 1–20). The introduction of this new cycle led in turn to a desire to separate out the various moments of the Pasch (the *transitus*, consisting of death, resurrection, ascension, sending of the Spirit) and to assign them separate feasts; thus the paschal vigil became associated in the minds of the faithful primarily with the resurrection, though in the liturgy itself it is the celebration of the death and resurrection inseparably still (but even in the liturgy of the vigil this fact was obscured, and is still obscured, by putting the *praeeonium paschale*, which is the moment of the shift in mood from sorrow to joy, at the beginning of the service; the violet vestments worn by the celebrant during the *praeeonium*, and the deacon’s change back to violet after it, only point up the anomaly). There is, of course, no necessary incompatibility between the centrality of the Pasch and the existence of the Nativity cycle, nor between the existence of the Good Friday liturgy and celebration of both the death and resurrection during the paschal vigil. But a good deal of education is needed before the general Christian consciousness, and consequently Christian piety, become properly oriented. The saving grace is that the instrument of such education is at hand: the liturgy itself, especially as already reformed and to be reformed in the light of a mature theology of the liturgy. The translator’s notes are restricted to calling attention to later and improved editions of works used by Casel, and to later scholarly work that is essential on the questions C. raises.
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**The Elements of Theology.** By Proclus. Revised text with introduction, translation, and commentary by E. R. Dodds. 2nd ed.; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963. Pp. xlviii + 348. $5.60. Proclus (412–85) was not an original philosopher, but he is the most important representative of later Neoplatonism and managed to influence a good deal of medieval thought through Pseudo-Dionysius and through the *Liber de causis*, which was ascribed to Aristotle but was in fact a translation of an Arabic work based on the *Elements of Theology*. This latter is Proclus’ compendium of the principles of Neoplatonism and of his own modifications of it. D.’s edition first appeared in 1933. The second edition differs from the first only through the correction of misprints and minor errors in the text; updating is done by adding a list of *Addenda et corrigenda* (pp. 341–48). Thanks are due the publishers for making available once again this fundamental book along with D.’s minute commentary on the text in the light of Proclus’ own principles and of his sources.
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B., well-known medievalist, editor of numerous texts from the early medieval period, expert on medieval Mariological literature and theology, here offers a book which is quite simple in structure and intention but could be written only out of immense knowledge. It contains seventy-five prayers, ordered chronologically and geographically, and ranging in time from the eighth- or ninth-century Book of Nunnaminster (i.e., the women's abbey at Winchester) and the early ninth-century Book of Cerne (southwest England) to the three genuinely Anselmian Orationes meditativae. All are prayers to the Blessed Virgin, written in prose and for private use. After a chapter indicating the three literary forms of the preces devotionis upon which he is to draw (orationes peculiares; libelli precum and psalters; orationes ad s. Mariam), B. describes the patristic expressions of Marian devotion, with which medieval piety is in continuity. This is a richly detailed chapter on the Marian poetry, sermons, and liturgical texts (prayers, antiphons, responsories) of the early centuries. For the seventy-five prayers of the later period B. supplies not only a critical text but a context: the author, if identifiable, and the facts known about him; the kind of piety he represents; the various manuscripts in which the same prayer or its variants are found, with some attempt to trace the passage of the prayer from place to place; and, most importantly, contemporary expressions of Marian piety, whether general prayers, verses, litanies, liturgical antiphons, or sermons, which cast light on the prayers being edited and aid in evaluating their place in the developing Marian devotion. B. does not attempt to supply such a history of development, but this volume, with its immensely detailed information, its occasional discreet indications of thematic continuity in the Marian prayers, and its frequent references to B.'s numerous published essays on Marian doctrine and devotion, makes it evident that he is extraordinarily well equipped to do so. The book offers a mine of evidence for the correctness of Jungmann's analysis of medieval shifts in Christian piety ("The Defeat of Teutonic Arianism and the Revolution in Religious Culture in the Early Middle Ages," in Pastoral Liturgy, pp. 1–63). More proximately, it supplements and admirably illustrates Leo Scheffczyk's Das Mariengeheimnis in Frömmigkeit und Lehre der Karolingerzeit (Leipzig, 1959), to which B. often refers his reader. It likewise provides a companion piece for, and the larger context within which to read, G. G. Meersseman's two-volume Der Hymnus Akathistos im Abendland (Freiburg, Switz., 1958–60), which is a collection of liturgical and paraliturgical Marian texts, in prose and verse, illustrating the difference made by the translation into Latin of
the Akathistos hymn in the early ninth century. B.'s book is, happily, well
indexed: there are indexes of initia, mss., and Scripture, a Vocabulaire
marial (not a lexicon, but a list of words occurring in the texts), and a good
general index. Such careful indexing befits a book that is an important con­
tribution to the history of Marian devotion and, indirectly, to Marian
theology.

Woodstock College

M. J. O'Connell, S.J.

La doctrine du mépris du monde, en Occident, de S. Ambroise à
Innocent III 4: Le XIe siècle 1: Pierre Damien. 2: Jean de Fécamp,
Hermann Contract, Roger de Caen, Anselm de Canterbury. By
120 fr. These two slim volumes are the first to be published of six
tomes (eleven volumes) on the theme of contemptus saeculi. A distinct series
is also in preparation, which will deal with the theme of the dignity of man
in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. The two series are united under the
rubric of “Christianity and human values.” In the context of contemporary
discussions of Christian secularity and the theology of the terrestrial, the
timeliness of these historical studies can hardly be exaggerated. In general,
all the authors are found to miss the values of profane reality. The fault is
placed partly with a dualist Hellenic anthropology and partly with the
tendency to identify the monastic and the Christian life. The Introduction
to the first volume states the character of the enterprise, but is too brief
and imprecise to meet the problems which arise regarding methodology and
presuppositions. Does the author proceed merely as a historian, without
philosophical or theological commitment? If so, what is the basis of his as­
sumption that there really is a realm of profane values which must be re­
spected for their own sake by any authentic Christian spirituality? Does
the contemptus saeculi of the authors studied, though couched in different
language and shaped in part by other intellectual currents, differ substan­
tially from the dualism found in Scripture itself? By what norms does one
distinguish religious substance and anthropological framework in attitudes
towards earthly goods? Fortunately, the opening volume of the series, soon
to appear, will outline the problem and doubtless provide the clarification
needed. In the meantime, these two volumes will be welcomed for their
extensive erudition and pointed questioning of a traditional theme.
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Church History 2: The Middle Ages. By Karl Bihlmeyer and Her­
mann Tüchle. Translated by Victor E. Mills, O.F.M., and Francis J. Muller,
O.F.M. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1963. Pp. xvi + 534. $9.50. This translation of the second volume of Bihlmeyer-Tüchle will be welcomed by all students of ecclesiastical history who do not read the German language. It covers comprehensively the entire period from the Early Middle Ages commencing according to B.-T. with the year 692 (the Trullan Synod) and extends to the end of the pontificate of Leo X (1521). The rise of the Protestant Reformation is not directly treated. The translation, which seems to be a careful piece of work, is built on the thirteenth German edition but "has been scrupulously compared with the seventeenth edition for accuracy of detail." The chief excellence of this volume, apart from its systematic treatment of the history of the medieval Church, is its valuable presentation of source material and current literature. Though I have not been able personally to examine the seventeenth German edition, it appears that the translators have augmented the original bibliographical listing, which they have qualified here and there with notations such as "an excellent summary," "standard," etc. This should prove an invaluable aid to students who do not know their way through the literature. Every theological library should have this standard reference book in Church history.
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STUDIES ON THE REFORMATION. By Roland H. Bainton. Collected Papers in Church History 2. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963. Pp. 289. $6.00. A series of eighteen essays which "center about two foci, the radicals of the Reformation and Luther." It represents a bound collection of separata—various articles published over a period of more than thirty years, though "those essays which have appeared in other volumes are not included in this work." In view of the fact that the content of this work is readily accessible elsewhere, the price is rather high. The variety of themes which the editor offers within the framework of "studies on the Reformation" is satisfying, though his treatment is far from even in quality. In addition to nine essays on Luther and the Reformation, there are six essays on the left wing of the reform movement and three on various struggles and controversies in the post-Reformation era. Perhaps the best contribution in the collection is the series on Martin Luther; the treatment of Sebastian Castellio is entertaining and informative; but the essay St. Ignatius Loyola's Methods of Religious Instruction is almost worthless. There are eight illustrations, a selected bibliography, and an index. One statement (p. 218) is curious: "Protestants expiate the intolerance of their forbears by expiatory monuments, Catholics by footnotes." It is hard to understand a remark such as this from the pen of a scholar. Perhaps it was not intended to be taken seriously.
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ST. TERESA OF AVILA: STUDIES IN HER LIFE, DOCTRINE AND TIMES. Edited by Fr. Thomas, O.D.C., and Fr. Gabriel, O.D.C. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1963. Pp. 249. $4.75. The editors have assembled twelve Teresian studies of widely differing interest and value. All but one or two have generous references to the works of Teresa, with the notes arranged at the end of each essay. There are perhaps three essays of general interest. Fr. Gabriel, O.D.C., gives a well-documented analysis of the interaction of the doctrine of the two great Carmelite saints in the essay “St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross.” He attempts to show that “the teaching of St. Teresa would not of itself be sufficient to form a school of spirituality; it needed the expert systematization of a St. John of the Cross.” “But in reality, there are no contradictions nor antinomies between the two saints, although there may be contrasts” (p. 43). Fr. Ermanno, O.D.C., contributes an essay on “The Degrees of Teresian Prayer.” Of special clarity and insight is his analysis of the prayer of quiet. Fr. Norbert, O.D.C., attempts to indicate a dogmatic and ascetical basis for “The Prayer of Active Recollection” in a very short study that should be of general interest. Studies in “Mystical Ecstasy according to St. Teresa” or “The Doctrine of St. Teresa on Spiritual Betrothal” together with such studies as “St. Teresa and the Jesuits” will not be of more than limited interest.
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BENEDIKT UND IGNATIUS: MARIA LAACH ALS COLLEGIUM MAXIMUM DER GESELLSCHAFT JESU 1863-1872-1892. Edited by Theodor Bogler, O.S.B. Liturgie und Mönchtum 32. Maria Laach: Ars Liturgica, 1963. Pp. 112. DM 4.50. A set of essays to commemorate the taking over of Maria Laach as a scholasticate by the Society of Jesus in 1863. After more than seven hundred years of continuous Benedictine possession, the monks were expelled from Maria Laach in 1802 by the French army of occupation. The growing Upper German Province (located entirely in Switzerland) of the restored Society of Jesus was expelled from Switzerland in 1847 and acquired Maria Laach as a house of studies in 1863, only to be banished from Germany in turn in 1872, although a few priests and a sizable number of lay brothers remained to take care of the house and estate until 1892, when these were transferred back to the Benedictines of Beuron. This history, told in four essays (by Clemens Otten, O.S.B., Erwin Bücken, S.J., Drutmar Cremer, O.S.B., and Emmanuel von Severus, O.S.B.), is prefaced by Heinrich Bacht’s comparison of the spiritual physiognomies of Benedict and Ignatius. There are, further, studies (by Ludwig von Hertling, S.J., Wilhelm Koester, S.J., and Josef de Vries, S.J. respectively) of three Jesuit
enterprises that had their origin at Maria Laach: the Stimmen aus Maria Laach, which began as an irregularly issued series of brochures (the first twelve numbers, 1865–69, were occupied with explaining and defending the Syllabus of Pius IX), became a periodical in 1871 (called Stimmen der Zeit since 1914); the Cornély–Knabenbauer–Hummelauer Cursus sacrâe Scripturae, though no volumes appeared during the Maria Laach period, was planned there by Cornély (who had Knabenbauer and von Hummelauer as students there); the Philosophia Lacensis, under the editorship of Tillmann Pesch, was likewise planned at Maria Laach and derived thence its name, even though no volume was published during the Maria Laach period. Benedikt und Ignatius contains a great deal of interesting historical information and is a pleasing tribute to Benedictine-Jesuit friendship and co-operation in Germany.
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L'ÉGLISE DANS L'ŒUVRE DU PÈRE LACORDAIRE. Texts chosen by Yvonne Frontier, presented by H.-M. Féret, O.P. Unam sanctam 45. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1963. Pp. 218. 14.70 fr. F.’s selection draws primarily, as is inevitable, on the seventy-three Notre Dame conferences (1834–51) and secondarily on L.’s letters to his friend and patroness, Mme. Swetchine, and on his other sermons, letters, and writings. The texts are grouped under three headings: the fact of the Church as the revealer of God (the fact of the Church in past and present; the four notes); the constitution of the Church (in its sources [Scriptures, tradition, foundation by Christ]; in itself [its hierarchy and mission]; in relation to temporal society; in its eternal destiny); the action and influence of the Church (on minds, souls, and society). F.’s valuable introduction is concerned chiefly with determining the kind of theological work which L.’s writing, especially the conferences, represents. F. sees L.’s conferences as theological in substance but oratorical in expression, i.e., the exposition is determined by the mentality and problems of his contemporaries, not by an objective consideration of the theological material and of its links with other truths of faith. F. points out, in this context, how closely the explicitation of the faith in a living tradition is primarily realized in pastoral preaching, bringing the once-given word of God to bear on new situations and new mentalities (here the Fathers of the Church but also Scripture itself provide the ever-valid models). L. had a strong sense of the reality of what F. calls “opinion,” meaning the ethos of the age, and was thus able to meet very diverse men and groups of believers and non-believers, even those antagonistic in their expressed philosophy of life. The ethos of the age was, on all sides, positivistic; L. appealed to this, made use
of it by approaching the Church, and making others see it, as a fact of the present and the past. Hereby he gave the believer a suitably realistic basis and forced unbelievers at least to reflect upon the perduring and unavoidable fact of the Church. He met the needs of the age most profoundly in his stress upon two points: (1) the link between the Church and liberty: he made into a living, pertinent doctrine the Gospel and Pauline concept of the liberty, rights, and duties of the Christian, and the Christian idea of the respect due to every man’s call to share in the liberty of God’s sons; (2) the Church, consequently, as in dialogue with men: not in the spirit of doctrinal relativism but seeking out the good wherever it exists.

Woodstock College M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

IGLESIAS DE ORIENTE 2: REPERTORIO BIBLIOGRÁFICO. By Angel Santos Hernández, S.J. Santander: Sal Terrae, 1963. Pp. 742. In 1959 S. published Iglesias de Oriente 1: Puntos específicos de su teología, an introduction to the theology of the Eastern Churches (cf. TS 22 [1961] 343–44). The work is now completed by an extraordinarily full bibliography almost exclusively of books (a few especially important brochures and periodical articles are listed). There are three main divisions: (1) Orthodox Churches: works on the doctrine and history of each Church, with numerous subdivisions on the doctrine and spirituality of the Byzantine Churches; (2) the Catholic Churches of the East: here works on the history of each rite are first given, then at great length works on the liturgy (Mass, music, divine office, liturgical books) and law of these rites both in early times and in the modern codification; (3) the ecumenical movement: general works; the unionist councils; modern ecumenism (Anglican activity; World Council of Churches; Lutheran, Reformed, and Catholic activity). Each entry is followed by a résumé of its contents. At the risk of seeming ungrateful for the vast amount of work this bibliography represents and for the great value it has, I must express regret that S.’s own critical evaluation, at least to the extent of singling out what, if anything, a particular book is especially valuable for, has not been added. There are over 2250 entries in the bibliography; without some guidance in the form of critical judgment by an expert, the nonexpert can easily become discouraged before such a mass of literature.

Woodstock College M. J. O’Connell, S.J.

LE DIEU DU MAL. By Hervé Rousseau. Mythes et religions 47. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963. Pp. 131. 7 fr. R. tries, in his Introduction, to rouse our sense of wonder before the existence of radically dualist religions by showing how much we take for granted, after the hist-
itorcal meeting of Greek philosophy (God as the first mover, as the Good) and biblical thought (God who creates and who is Love), the idea of a unique transcendent infinite God, and how difficult consequently it is for us to take seriously the idea of two equally substantial, uncreated, eternal creative beings, one as absolute in evil as the other is in good (although the former is, in every known dualist system, inferior in power and knowledge to the latter, and is therefore ultimately vanquished). R. then examines the more than bimillennial stream of thought that runs from ancient Iran to France and Spain in the West and China in the East. His concern is not simply to recite facts but to try to plumb the (to us) strange mentality at work. How did men come to believe in a god of evil, equal to God? How did they justify this belief and relate the god of evil to God and to creation? R. describes representative moments in this history: dualism among primitive peoples; Zoroastrianism; post-Zoroastrian Iranian dualism (the post-Gothic parts of the Avesta; Ahriman; Zurvanism); Satan in the OT and the NT; the Gnostic demiurge; the Manichean Prince of Darkness; the Bogomils and Cathars. The interesting fact emerges that it is in monotheistic religions, with their strong sense of the opposition of moral good (and the divine goodness) and moral evil, that dualist thought develops as a simplified answer to the problem created by this opposition. R. ends with a brief outline of the answers (eleven in all are described) to this problem, running from the unreflective idea of the early OT that God has directly created everything, good and evil, to properly dualist positions. A stimulating book on an unpromising subject.

Woodstock College

M. J. O'Connell, S.J.

DIEU ET LA PERMISSION DU MAL. By Jacques Maritain. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963. Pp. 116. 84 fr. This small volume reproduces three "seminars" given to the theological students of the Little Brothers of Jesus at Toulouse in May, 1962. M. here repeats and clarifies his well-known Thomistic explanation of the problem of evil, and replies to some objections raised against his Existence and the Existent (New York, 1948) by J.-H. Nicolas. The two key points on which M. parts company with traditional Bannezianism are (1) his rejection of antecedent negative reprobation, and (2) his conception of a motion brisable, the impulse towards good given by God which, if not resisted, flowers without need of further determination into a motion imbrisable. The basic asymmetry of good and evil is cogently argued, and is, of course, one of the essential elements of the mystery of evil. Only the most adept and sympathetic will have the patience for the highly subtle analysis of the voluntary nonconsideration of the moral norm.
in which St. Thomas places the cause of sin. In sum, the eminent philosopher is here repeating, with refinements, his understanding of liberty, concursus, and sin, a position which, without ceasing to be Thomist, softens some of the harsh features of Bannezianism.

Woodstock College

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. Lectures of Maynooth Union Summer School 1961. Edited by Kevin McNamara. Maynooth: Furrow Trust, 1962. Pp. xii + 191. 16s. This symposium is distinguished not for originality and creativeness but for an unusually high level of professional competence in its contributors. The essays vary in style from Bishop John Wright's sprightly report on non-Catholic criticism of the Church in the United States to Msgr. Josef Höfer's rather ponderous essay on the word of God in the Lutheran-Catholic dialogue in Germany. Francis Clark's two chapters on Anglicanism and on the Mass (the latter taken chiefly from his important monograph *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*) are remarkable for both scholarship and readability. The chapters on the ecumenical movement, on the Eastern Churches, and on the papacy (the last of them by Bernard Leeming) are concise and informative. Enda McDonagh's paper on religious freedom recapitulates very clearly and convincingly the basic theses of J. C. Murray and A. Hartmann. The concluding chapter, on the theology of Christian unity, by Kevin McNamara follows closely along the lines of Gregory Baum's *That They May Be One*. But McNamara's opinion (p. 164) that the faith of the unevangelized does not even implicitly include Christ in its object is surprising and apparently at odds with St. Thomas (cf. *Sum. theol.* 2-2, q. 1, a. 7). While this collection deserves an honorable place among Catholic works on ecumenism, its very broad scope and relative brevity will prevent it from being of much help to the serious student.

Woodstock College

Avery Dulles, S.J.

CONFESSION AND PSYCHOANALYSIS. By Andreas Snoeck, S.J. Translated by Theodore Zuydwijk, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1964. Pp. viii + 132. $3.50. S. presents very brief descriptions of confession and psychoanalysis and then discusses the points of comparison and contrast between them as he sees them. His treatment of the practice of confession is sensitive and insightful, but his treatment of psychoanalytic therapy does not come up to the same standard. It is my feeling that in striving to clarify the differences between them he has permitted a certain artificiality to insert itself into his distinctions, which do not reflect the reality of the situation. One has the impression of a conception of psychoanalysis which is quite
constrained and restricted. He argues at one point that in psychoanalysis “... the spiritual layers of the personality prudently and discreetly step into the background.” This is, on the one hand, a violation of the free-association principle, since it would segregate the most essential part of the personality from analytic examination; on the other hand, it bespeaks a suspicious dualism in the conception of human spirituality which finds itself able to isolate the spiritual dimension of human personality from the bodily entanglements of libido, drives, and emotions. It can be hoped, along with the author, that his contribution to an admittedly problematic area will inspire others to follow the lines of positive thinking which he has laid down.

St. Andrew Bobola House, Boston

W. W. Meissner, S.J.

MONASTIC ARCHITECTURE IN FRANCE FROM THE RENAISSANCE TO THE REVOLUTION. By Joan Evans. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1964. Pp. xliii + 187 + 822 ill. $27.50. E., author of several well-known books on medieval life and art (Monastic Life at Cluny [1931]; Art in Medieval France, 987-1498: A Study in Patronage [1948]; Life in Medieval France [1925; rev. ed., 1957]), carries her study of French art into the Renaissance period; Renaissance palaces, châteaux, and town houses have received full study, but monastic architecture (buildings of orders living under vows) has gone relatively unnoticed. The study of the subject is made more difficult because the Revolution put the monastic buildings, if they were recent and in good condition, to many practical uses, so that their monastic origin has often been forgotten. At the Restoration, the returning orders generally built new houses instead of trying to regain the old ones. The older buildings which were not put to use by the state were allowed to go to ruin; thus many of them have survived only in fragmentary fashion, and relatively rare are the buildings where the atmosphere and feeling of the period can be recaptured. Many buildings of the older orders had already been in bad state by 1500 due to the Hundred Years’ War. The period after the war saw renewed building activity, but it was followed in turn by the destructive Wars of Religion. When these finally ceased in 1593, the king obliged himself to build a convent or monastery in every province in reparation for those destroyed by the Huguenots. Characteristic of this last pre-Revolutionary wave of building was the influence, except upon the Benedictines, of contemporary secular architecture. Nonetheless E.’s study shows characteristic forms and tastes in the architecture of each order. She examines in turn the architecture of the Benedictines, Cistercians, Augustinians, Carthusians, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, and lesser orders. Her analy-
sis and the many photographs make it possible to summon up, in rather shadowy fashion, a period that is, in its architectural monuments, far more remote from us than the Middle Ages. A splendidly produced and valuable book.

Woodstock College

M. J. O'Connell, S.J.

TREATISE ON SEPARATE SUBSTANCES. By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Edited and translated by Francis J. Lescoe. West Hartford, Conn.: Saint Joseph College, 1963. Pp. x + 194 (pp. 35–162, double pagination). $7.50. I. T. Eschmann, O.P., wrote of the Tractatus de substantiis separatis in 1956: “One of the most important metaphysical writings of Aquinas, whose critical edition is a major desideratum in Thomistic studies. It belongs to the small group of works in which St. Thomas directly confronted the powerful stream of mediaeval Platonizing influences” (“A Catalogue of St. Thomas’s Works: Bibliographical Notes,” in Etienne Gilson, The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, p. 412). Fr. Lescoe has supplied the needed edition and a translation to boot. His Introduction discusses the date and plan of the work, and describes the twelve manuscripts on which the edition is based; the notes are limited to identifying sources, cross references, etc., and to occasional bibliography. L. had previously issued the critical text and the translation in separate volumes. His work will have a permanent place in the small row of genuinely critical editions of St. Thomas.

Woodstock College

M. J. O'Connell, S.J.

ETHICS, ADVERTISING AND RESPONSIBILITY. Edited by Francis X. Quinn, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Canterbury Press, 1963. Pp. 165. $2.95. Though constituting but a relatively small part of the marketing process, advertising presently represents an annual investment of twelve billion dollars and is closely involved in the total economy. As early as 1906 it was found necessary to legislate a Pure Food and Drug Act against patent abuses. Additional legislation followed in 1914 and 1930, and in recent years, especially with the development of television and the payola scandals, there have been renewed and widespread complaints and questionings with regard to the conduct and guiding philosophy of the advertising media. The advertising industry has not remained insensitive to these protests, especially since they often hint at the need for further government regulation. In this book we have a collection of thirteen essays on the moral aspects of advertising, contributed for most part by businessmen actively involved in one way or another—through advertising agencies, networks, better business bureaus, and federal regulatory commissions—with advertising and communications.
(The papers appear to have been originally presented as addresses at a meeting of an institute of social ethics and were meant to be followed by discussion.) While of uneven quality and significance, they make informative reading in revealing the complicated nature of problems the layman and moralist are innocently apt to simplify. For those who may have been conditioned, through long exposure to the "wasteland," to think of advertising in stereotyped terms of Madison Avenue villains stimulating artificial needs, debasing the public taste, and softening the moral fibre of the nation, it may be reassuring to follow these reflections of thoughtful and knowledgeable men seriously concerned with their responsibilities and with some complaints of their own to air against a public resistant to the appeal of a superior television program (witness the frustrations of CBS Radio as reported by its president, Arthur Hull Hayes) and also against the moralists who have so far failed to articulate an informed and practicable "moral theology of business."

St. Peter's College, N.J. Joseph V. Dolan, S.J.

Dynamisme volontaire et jugement libre: Le sens du libre arbitre chez quelques commentateurs thomistes de la Renaissance.

By Louis Leahy, S.J. Studia: Recherches de philosophie et théologie publiées par les facultés S.J. de Montréal 16. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963. Pp. 171. 165 fr. This lucid, well-documented study interprets four commentators of St. Thomas writing at the turn of the sixteenth century: Bellarmine, Suárez, Bañez, and John of St. Thomas. L. presents chronologically and evaluates their views on the sinuous problem of relating intellect and will in man's free choice. St. Thomas enuntiated the distinction and the unity of the acts of the two faculties in freedom without probing more precisely. Robert Bellarmine, in placing a negative laissez-passer of the will before the predetermining, practical judgment, exposed himself to Suárez's telling criticism, but brought in relief the dynamic complexity and unity of true human freedom, the rendering present of a good by the commitment of the total subject. Moreover, a negative, partially free admission by the will does constitute the eligible judgments, the milieu of deliberation in which the choice, the first intrinsically and totally free act, arises. Suárez incisively eliminated any predetermining judgment and saved the mysterious, unique contribution of the free preference of the will, illumined by a practical judgment of the intellect, but arising in active indifference and independence. It was Bañez who explicitated that the very free preference of the will is at the same time a judgment produced veluti in exercitio, lived, conscious. John of St. Thomas, seeking systematization, re-
turned to the indefensible predetermining judgment, but rightly underlined the exigencies of intelligence in free choice. Moving in a Scholastic problematic, L. thus works out through historical criticism his own solution, invoking support from "moderns" such as Blondel, Maritain, Sertillanges, de Finance, and Lebacqz.

Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y. John G. Milhaven, S.J.

JAHRBUCH FÜR ANTIKE UND CHRISTENTUM 5 (1962). Edited by the Franz Joseph Dölger-Institut, University of Bonn. Münster: Aschendorff, 1963. Pp. 201, 12 plates. DM 28.— Like its predecessors, this volume of the JAC is marked by continuations of previous articles. Part 5 of the late Franz Joseph Dölger's "Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens" is concerned with confession of Christ and dedication to Christ by extending the arms in the shape of a cross, and with the sign as used in the baptismal liturgy (special attention is given to Ephraem and Theodore both here and in an appendix on the anointing at baptism). D.'s series of articles finds a complement in Erich Dinkler's "Kreuzzeichen und Kreuz," on the use of the Hebrew tau and the Greek chi in the theological explanation of the Christian cross as stauros. Part 5 of Theodor Klauser's series on the origins of Christian art, and Part 2 of Klaus Thraede's on the origin and history of Christian poetry are the other continuations. Three articles present the discussion between Arnim von Gerken and Klauser on the interpretation of the finds at the catacomb of St. Sebastian and under the Vatican. Leo Koep writes of the process by which the terms religio and ritus were taken into Christian use; Otto Nussbaum on the values assigned to the positions "left and right" in the Roman liturgy; and Alfred Hermann on some contributions by Egyptian archeology to the iconography of late antiquity and the early Church. Two notes, five reviews, and two further contributions to the RAC ("Aischylos" and "Aristophanes," by Ilona Opelt) complete the volume.

Woodstock College M. J. O'Connell, S.J.

THE TRUE FACE OF THE KIRK. By Stuart Louden. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1963. Pp. x + 148. 21s. Contrasting reactions attend the reading of this examination of the ethos and tradition of the Church of Scotland. There is appreciation for the light it throws upon the beliefs of its community. Thus it is informative to see how for L. the true preaching of the word, the right administration of the two sacraments, and a godly discipline mark the Kirk as the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church in Scotland. Enlightening, too, to find baptism viewed as the initiation of a process which continues throughout life in faith and repentance, and the Lord’s Supper presented as a Real Presence not tied to the consecrated elements wherein Christ offers Himself to believers in the midst of a community. For L., the ministry is a function rather than a status; a presbyterian structure is seen only as an adequate reflection of the practice of the primitive Church. In ordination, the presbytery acts as the Lord’s instrument in commissioning ministers to preach and dispense the sacraments after the apostolic pattern, though the actual office of the apostles is not prolonged. While little store is set upon the monarchical episcopate (which is largely identified with prelacy), it is recognized (p. 97) that “in the hoped-for fulness of the Church, the episcopate . . . presently exercised corporately through Presbytery within the Kirk, is likely to be given a place.” But it is distressing to discover a uniformly negative attitude taken toward the Church of Rome. L. apparently shares the national mood that this is “a false church because a church which cannot be altered and reformed” (p. 12)—this in the age of Vatican II—with which the Kirk is “in such radical and fundamental doctrinal separation . . . that direct ecumenical conversation on matters of church government, the ministry and worship is not at present possible” (p. 99).
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