BOOK REVIEWS


The title derives from a study of Ex 15, one of the collected essays which make up this volume. The subtitle strikes off the nature of the book, a sort of Christian conversation with the OT. Some of the essays have been previously published: "Formation of the OT," "Inerrancy," "Song of Moses," "The Greatest Commandment," "Buber's Translation of the Bible." Others are published for the first time: "The Narrative of the Fall," "Freedom," "Law and Grace," "Man and Death." L. has already distinguished himself with scholarly studies of Deuteronomy, and the present volume contains first-class contributions to biblical theology. The reviewer read them all with interest and profit, and never failed to be stimulated by L.'s insights, many of them quite original. The readers of this periodical deserve a detailed discussion of his essay on inerrancy, which has already provoked considerable reaction (J. Coppens and R. Marlé, as opposed to K. Prümm and E. Gutwenger) since its first appearance in Stimmen der Zeit, June, 1964.

How is the question of biblical inerrancy to be posed? L. discusses three approaches: the inerrancy of the biblical writer(s), of the individual book, and of the Bible as a whole, and he concludes that the last affords the right basis for discussion. The tendency of Catholic theology has been to emphasize the inerrancy of the biblical writer, and this is also the direction of Providentissimus Deus, which presupposed a limited and even definite number of "inspired writers" (Moses, Solomon, etc.), who would have written (complete) "books." Scholarly research has shown that the process of the formation of the OT eliminates such a presupposition; one simply cannot give an approximate number to the "inspired authors" for the "books" which have been formed by addition, glossing, and completing. If one holds that the final author or editor of a given "book" is the "inspired author," this is merely mechanical without being realistic. Rather, one would think that all who contributed to the work were inspired proportionately. Even in this view, however, the book seems to resemble an archaeological tell (L.'s appropriate metaphor) of inerrant statements made by inspired authors. This point of view hardly commends itself.

Perhaps, then, one should speak of an inerrant "book"? But is a biblical "book" such a fixed quantity? A biblical book does not have the individuality of a book that has been selected, purchased, and finally placed on one's shelf. This point also has been illustrated by modern insights into the composition of the biblical works; one thinks of the combination of tradi-
tions in the "five" books of the Pentateuch. More important, this concept of a biblical book creates the illusion of an independent and independently inerrant book—with total disregard, e.g., of the concrete differences between the Deuteronomistic history and the Chronicler's history. Each book becomes a static quantity, and ultimately one is reduced to the old "proof-text" method, except that now one can oppose one inerrant book against another. The reviewer has always felt this difficulty in the case of the wisdom literature. Surely here one must recognize opposition and contradiction; the various currents in the wisdom literature are critical of each other: Job, of the conservative positions represented in Proverbs, etc. There is no one "inerrant" book, just as no text can be absolutized in its "inerrancy." Here we come to the heart of the matter: the recognition of the unity of the entire Bible, instead of disparate units put together in a merely additive fashion. This unity was willed by God and ultimately recognized in canonization. The "books" themselves show that they were read and glossed and expanded in the light of "the analogy of Scripture" (L.'s phrase). In fact, the OT itself cannot be separated from the NT in this view. As long as the canon was in the process of formation, no individual "book" had its definitive meaning. And when the canon of the OT was definitively closed (paradoxically, by being taken up as OT along with the NT), there was provided a final context in which the OT was to be read. Hence we should properly speak of the "inerrancy of the Bible."

I trust that the above remarks are a fair indication of L.'s thoughts. His slender essay (along with that of O. Loretz in his advocacy of the Semitic notion of truth) should be recognized as a valuable contribution to the problem which has been raised in the aula of St. Peter's during the third session of Vatican Council II (among others, by Cardinals König and Meyer). The reader may find it interesting to know that steps are being taken for an English translation.

**Catholic University of America**

**ROLAND E. MURPHY, O.CARM.**


With the renewed interest in biblical studies and the great themes of salvation history, it is well to remember that the inspired authors have also spoken to us in homely detail about the problems of personal happiness and the successful conduct of daily life. Moreover, they speak in a universal tone which is quite distinct from the Law and the Prophets. The study of Israel's wisdom literature has shown that the Israelite wise man was in contact with the intellectual life of the ancient Near East. These original
thinkers were not only able to assimilate much of the common tradition of human wisdom, be it popular or learned, native or foreign, but they also gave to this common heritage a peculiar religious stamp. They succeeded in integrating it into their own religious past without destroying its universal appeal. Barucq's commentary on the earliest collection of Israelite wisdom in the series *Sources bibliques* offers an excellent introduction to a less well-known area of contemporary biblical study. The wise men of Israel were concerned more with the individual and his personal happiness than with the great themes of election, covenant, people, law, messianism, and eschatology. Thereby they established a bridge between human learning and revealed religion.

Barucq presents the Book of Proverbs in an original and independent manner. His own translation adheres most closely to the Masoretic text, which he always seeks to understand. Corrections and conjectures are therefore more rare in B. than, for example, in *CCD, BJ,* or other critical commentaries. The extensive critical notes are primarily concerned with LXX and Coptic variations, in so far as these may throw light on the meaning of the original Hebrew. Such close attention has not been paid to the LXX since Mezzacasa's study in 1913, upon which B. is heavily dependent. In addition, he has been able to profit from the recently published Coptic texts of Papyrus Bodmer 6. Because of the independent and axiomatic character of the material in Proverbs, the book does not lend itself to a verse-by-verse commentary. B. has wisely adopted a synthetic approach, following the order of the text in chaps. 1–9, but dealing with the material topically in the other collections, especially in the two Solomonic collections.

For B., the book as a whole witnesses to the evolution of Israelite wisdom from its oral sources in pre-Solomonic days and in extra-Israelite culture until the early fifth century, to which he assigns chaps. 1–9 and the final redaction of the various collections. In Israel, the royal scribes respected family and popular traditions and did not limit their concerns to success at court. Yet the wise men who finally put together the collections of Proverbs were strongly influenced by the Deuteronomic and prophetic traditions as well as by the Psalms. Thus ancient tradition was personally rethought and an attempt was made to integrate practical human concerns into a religious view of things. The rich appeal to biblical literature in B.'s commentary makes it abundantly clear that the postexilic wise men were not as independent of the national tradition as has sometimes been thought. This link is made by attributing all wisdom to God and by conceiving the beneficent figure of divine wisdom calling men to her school. An excursus on
Prv 8 (pp. 93–97) concludes that this literary personification prepares the way for further revelation, but does not anticipate the revelation of Christ.

An extensive introduction (pp. 11–42) deals, among other things, with the contacts between biblical and extrabiblical wisdom literature. B. sees these contacts as indicative of a community of concern rather than a mark of literary dependency. An excursus on Prv 22:17—23:14 and Amenemope (pp. 175–79) compares the two texts in detail, but fuller citation of Amenemope would have made the author’s comments more readily understandable. He refrains from discussing Drioton’s thesis of Israelite influence upon Amenemope, being satisfied to suggest that the cosmopolitan character of the New Empire may have occasioned the influence of pre-Israelite wisdom in Palestine upon the predecessors of Amenemope. B. is not sympathetic to Dahood’s attempts to find indications of an afterlife in Proverbs, nor does he even mention Skehan’s literary studies; in fact, B. does not consider that an alphabetic method of composition can be presupposed as normal.

There are frequent typographical errors in references from the translation to the critical notes, and occasionally in the text of the notes and commentary as well. Three lines of commentary are out of place at the bottom of p. 234. Homoeoteleuton is the more obvious explanation for the LXX omission of 11:10b–11a (p. 108). Many of B.’s comments suggest highly refined and arbitrary nuances of meaning which this reviewer finds hard to justify on the basis of the text, e.g., the moralizing tendency of the LXX exhibited in 2:22 (p. 57).

The positive merit of B.’s commentary is to make us aware of a constant and living tradition of wise reflection upon the conduct of human life in the light of experience and of faith. He has suggested that cosmopolitan and popular traditions were incorporated into Israelite religious tradition by the redactors of Proverbs and that the LXX translators further adapted this tradition to changing circumstances. He invites further research into the character of the LXX tradition and into the moral use made of Proverbs by the Christian Fathers.


The object of study in this book is indicated by the subtitle Israelite Prophecy and International Relations in the Ancient Near East. G. defines his objective as twofold: to canvass the prophetic references to international relations, and to draw some theoretical conclusions about the nature of
the political outlook of the prophets, particularly their view of international affairs. To achieve this objective, G. first surveys the ideas of the state in the ancient Near East, then proceeds through the preliterary prophets and the canonical prophetic books, taken in the accepted chronological order. A concluding chapter presents the theoretical conclusions promised in the Preface. Not all the prophetic books are treated: Haggai, Jonah, Malachi, Obadiah, Joel, and all of Zechariah except 9:1–8 (dated just before the fall of the kingdom of Judah) are omitted. The omission of 2 Zechariah is a little surprising, as is the omission of Jonah; the other books contribute nothing to the object of G.'s study. G. apparently does not consider apocalyptic literature as included in prophetic literature, and the distinction is proper in the rigorous sense.

The task is large, and I suspect that most reviewers, like this one, will praise the book in general for the way in which the issues are raised and handled, but with reservations about the treatment of the prophets and the conclusions. The exegesis of the prophets suggests a number of questions of detail which cannot be discussed within the limits of a review. It should be noticed that G. is more definite in assigning an occasion and a date to particular oracles than interpreters generally have been. As a result, he accepts considerably more of the prophetic oracles as original than have most interpreters. The identification of the historical background of particular passages is sometimes daring. On the other hand, it has to be assumed that the speaker or writer delivered his words with some occasion in mind, and one has often been impatient with that type of criticism which prefers to relate an oracle to some obscurely known event in the postexilic period rather than to a more clearly-known event in the period of the monarchy. G. makes extensive use of the Babylonian Chronicle to find a *Sitz im Leben* for various utterances.

In discussing the theoretical conclusions, it is necessary for this reviewer to confess that he comes to this question with certain formed judgments. These judgments, I hope, are not beyond revision, but they do determine the reviewer's stance. These formed judgments have been that the prophetic view of politics, domestic and international, is ultimately determined by eschatology; and this would place the reviewer in the camp which G. calls "idealism" or "utopianism," I imagine, rather than in G.'s own position. On the other hand, I find it difficult to formulate G.'s position clearly; it is too nuanced—or perhaps too fluid—to be put in a capsule. Here certainly G. is faithful to the prophetic literature itself, which does not exhibit a uniform set of political ideas. One point of agreement is that Israel experiences the saving and judging acts of Yahweh in its politics; this is the key
to the prophetic interpretation of politics, if there is a key. But do the prophets—admitting that the question should really not be put so generally—envision politics as moving towards a term which is political in structure and character, even though its reality is something other than merely political? Are the prophets realists in the sense that they have political answers for political problems? It is the conviction of this reviewer that they do not.

Possibly the difference which I feel between G.'s thesis and my own is not as great as it seems. G. concludes by saying that the prophets left the question of Israel's future political identity open. I think they did not, but this is only a superficial difference; G. means that the prophets leave open the possibility that Israel's future identity will not be political, and he does not carry his own analysis beyond this point. There is no reason why he should be obliged to carry it further.

I said that most reviewers will praise the book for the way in which the issues are raised and handled. I would like to close by repeating it. The OT is meaningful for the Christian not only for his purely personal life—which actually no Christian is able to live—but for his life as a man in society. G. turns our attention to one of the most fundamental components of life in society, an area in which in recent times we have allowed the Bible to say very little. At the risk of misunderstanding the Bible, we have to let it speak in this area.

Loyola University, Chicago

JOHN L. MCKENZIE, S.J.


This is a veritable summa of the OT doctrine on mediatorship. The first sixty pages study the ideas of mediatorship found in the ancient Oriental milieu, which had very developed ideas on mediatorship; a man hardly dared approach the great gods directly, but needed the intervention of his personal deity or the king or the priest. Even though these ancient religions were largely trapped in hopes which were merely worldly and material, they did have possibilities toward a higher significance which are developed in the religion of Israel.

The larger section of the book is devoted to the survey of the idea, or rather the ideas, of mediatorship which appear in the various writings of the OT. S. does not at first attempt to subsume these things under categories imposed from the outside, even categories derived from the Bible. He simply presents the various ideas of mediatorship which appear in the...
various literary strata of the OT. As is normal in the OT, there is no explicit text dealing with the doctrine as a doctrine. It must be deduced from the descriptions of the activities and offices of those men who appear as mediators. Some points of particular interest in this survey follow. In the view of the Yahwist writer, the mediator par excellence, Moses, was a mediator largely because he was able to intercede and obtain God's blessings for his compatriots, while the Elohist sees the essential Mosaic mediatorship in his receiving and handing on the word of God. The intercessory function of mediator was not continued regularly; it appears in the later prophets but does not seem to have been part of the royal or the older priestly office in Israel. These official mediators between Israel and Yahweh could be media of punishment as well as of blessing. Thus, in the Deuteronomist view, the failure of the kings to live up to the fundamental law of exclusive worship of Yahweh brought ruin on the people. However, the prophetic message makes clear that the people are punished not simply for the sins of the king but for joining in the sins of the king. Israel itself sometimes appears as a mediator, but up until the time of Jeremiah merely as a sign to the nations, from which men might learn the truth about God. After Jeremiah, Israel is thought of as a true mediator of grace to the nations.

This survey of the ideas about mediatorship in Israel is very erudite. But inevitably it points up a problem of biblical theology: in handling such a vast mass of materials the author must depend upon solutions developed by others, and he must choose among possible alternative interpretations of the many important passages about whose meaning we are still in doubt. For instance, S. interprets the Servant Songs as referring to the prophet himself, and he uses this in an argument that the function of a suffering mediator or the idea of expiatory suffering is related to the prophetic office, and perhaps the prophetic office alone. This may be, but we know that there are other interpretations of the Servant passages in the field. This is not to disagree with S.'s procedure; it is simply to point out the inevitable difficulty of any attempt to organize an over-all view of an important OT doctrine. Inevitably, some steps of the argument must be based on interpretations of texts which are at best only hypothetical, so that conclusions, insofar as they depend upon these steps, are hypothetical and subject to revision.

The final section of the book is an attempt to synthesize the OT idea of mediatorship. The oldest mediators were charismatic figures, called individually to their office. Men like Moses and Joshua functioned as mediators who made or renewed the covenant between Yahweh and His people, a function continued by the judges—note especially Samuel—and then
taken over in large part by the kings under the monarchy. Thus, what had been the function of a charismatic became a function attached to an office. The greatest of these mediators, Moses and David, were media for God’s grace, not only for their own generations but for the whole people in the time to come. The priests also were mediators, although their earliest function was teaching the people the law. Also, in the earliest times they sought God’s will by means of oracular devices. Only in later times did sacrificing become the exclusive privilege of the Aaronids, and it is in the very latest books, Daniel and Maccabees, that the priests function as intercessors. The prophets also were mediators who communicated with God directly and passed on His word. We have also seen that S. thinks that the idea of expiatory suffering was exclusively applied to the prophets. He also proposes that the prophets were true mediators of covenant, because they preached conversion, essentially a call for the people to return to the covenant.

The final conclusions of the study are that in God’s mysterious providence mediatorship was essential: He gave His grace to men not directly but only through other men. The mediator was often a feeble instrument, thus making God’s power even more evident. The mediator belonged to God, but equally he was a part of the people in blessing or suffering. The function of mediatorship was always within the framework of covenant, and the object of mediatorship was God’s blessings, which were understood to be life and union with God in this world and in cultic worship. Finally, the mediator could bring evil as well as good. If he were rejected, the rejection would be sinful and bring punishment; if he should not live up to his office, he misled the people to ruin.

There is little with which one can quarrel here. The catalogue of the conceptions of mediatorship is valuable, even though there may be occasional reservations about this or that point. However, I have the feeling that the conclusions do not really flow from what went before. There is no contradiction, but they seem somehow unattached to the carefully collected data. This points up a fundamental problem in all “biblical” theologizing. What is to be our principle of organization? There seem only two possibilities. One is to trace the development of a doctrine through the OT; the other is, to view the Bible as a whole, which it is, and interpret the older in the light of the later. This latter procedure is perhaps the more valuable, but in the present state of research it is impossible. We know that the canon was intended to be read as a whole, but the detailed research into the interrelations of the parts of the canon still remains to be done.

Another point of view would be that of development. S. does devote considerable space to tracing the history of ideas of mediatorship. And yet,
somehow it is not entirely satisfying. There is, in fact, great difficulty in this procedure. The Bible was not given us as a history of doctrine. It is a theological whole, but it is not necessarily a historical whole. We may well not have the data within the Bible which will allow us to trace the actual development of its ideas. We have simply testimony to various stages of doctrine. But the dialectic which produced them may well be hidden from us, and some stages may even be passed over in silence. An obvious example is that of angelology. The first introduction of “messengers of God” was an early effort to avoid anthropomorphisms. Then, in the latest books of the OT, we suddenly have a thoroughly developed angelology, ideas of exalted beings whose names are known and whose functions can be described. We know that in fact this development depended upon contact with Persian ideas, but we know it not from the Bible but from ancient history. If we confine ourselves to the biblical data, we simply cannot describe the development of the doctrine. This is a general problem with biblical theology.

This is not to say that the present book is not useful; on the contrary, as a catalogue of important ideas in the OT and as a description of various stages in which those ideas appeared, it is excellent. Even the problems it raises are a valuable contribution. It gives us a concrete example of the problems and the limitations of biblical theology.

St. Mary's College, Kansas

DENNIS J. McCARTHY, S.J.


In this day of intensified biblical scholarship, there is no want of good commentaries. B. has guarded against making his book just another superfluous addition to the list. He has fashioned his work along a line that has not been pursued by many commentators. Rather than focus upon the grammar, the style, or other such considerations—all unquestionably relevant—B. has preferred to lay the principal stress of his commentary upon the milieu within which the Gospel of Matthew came into being. He seeks to explore the relevance that a particular pericope must have had for the community within which it was written. He is persuaded that this is the most fruitful way to study Matthew. In this connection he notes approvingly the work of L. Goppelt, who in studying the Christianity of the first two centuries has, according to B., thrown much light on Matthew.

B. designates the literary form of the Gospel as being at once personal and community-oriented. He considers it personal in the sense that it is meticulously worked out, well accomplished. He finds it to be community-oriented in its regular references to the Christian community within which
it gradually took form. It is precisely the tracking down of such references that B. has set himself to do in this commentary: "c'est ce que nous avons essayé de montrer dans notre exégèse" (p. 7).

Time and again he has honored this resolution. The following may serve as instances. In exegeting 4:13, B. is careful to point out that the area where Christ opened His public ministry was a fact of special significance in Matthew's perspective as B. understands it. Christ began to preach in the very border region between Syria and Palestine, where the first Gospel was conceived and first saw the light of day (p. 48). In contrasting the parable of the lost sheep as found in Luke (15:3-7) with the same in Matthew (18:10-14), B. concludes that the Matthean version would be more relevant for a Syro-Palestinian community in the 80's A.D. (p. 271). Again, B. calls attention to the milieu of the Gospel's formation when he raises the difficult matter of fixing the responsibility of the crowds for Christ's death (27:20-23). He is of the opinion that the Christians for whom Matthew wrote were less concerned with placing the blame on anyone than they were with commemorating a great salvation event, the Crucifixion (p. 398).

Among the special virtues of the book are the concise summaries of the views of other commentators. These are introduced wherever the exegesis of a passage is disputed. At such points, B. sometimes takes the position that each of the viewpoints, though quite diverse, has a grain of truth in it. He does this, e.g., in his discussion of the temptation of Christ (4:1-11; p. 42). This approach must not be construed as a lack of firm conviction on B.'s part. When the occasion demands, he can be forthright in expressing his point of view, even when it conflicts with an authority as impressive as the Bible de Jérusalem (p. 363) or Ernst Lohmeyer (pp. 382, 396).

Rather unusual for a commentary of these dimensions is the short Introduction—a scant eight pages. For a fuller exposition of the problems posed by Matthew's Gospel, B. prefers to refer his readers to other authors who, he considers, have already done justice to these matters.

It is a fact that B.'s commentary does not yield a unified impression of the Gospel as a whole. The reviewer feels that this is due to B.'s commendable mistrust of large, facile, comprehensive conclusions. It seems quite legitimate to credit B. with being wary of generalizations. In another frame of reference, e.g., he warns against imprisoning Matthew's narratives in set molds. He thinks such attempts at systematization are dangerous because they may be arbitrary (p. 7).

As one would expect of a scholar of integrity, B. shows that he can rise above sectarian positions. In the course of his painstaking analysis of 16:18, he affirms that "rock" must be referred to the person of Peter and not to
his faith or his confession, "as Protestant polemic has maintained." It might be remarked that B. finds that the promise of Christ must be understood as applying strictly to Peter and does not carry even the slightest allusion to Peter's successors (p. 245).

B. has turned out a well-crafted commentary. It keeps the message of the Gospel always in sharp focus and for that reason can deliver an exegesis that is especially meaningful and gratifying to the modern reader, who tends to be impatient with marginal considerations but is eager to find out as directly as possible what the Gospel sought to say and to imply to its contemporaries. The style is clear, fluent, and precise. In every way this is a useful and welcome study of the first Gospel.

Darlington Seminary, Ramsey, N.J. 

JAMES C. TURRO


No one can seriously doubt that Rudolf Bultmann's Das Evangelium des Johannes (1941) is one of the most important commentaries ever written on John. Yet, in many ways it is an exasperating book. It has no introduction, but on p. 1 starts abruptly with the first line of the Prologue. Nevertheless, there are a great number of presuppositions underlying the commentary, presuppositions that the reader must know if he is to understand Bultmann. For instance, B. proposes that the original Gospel represented an amalgamation of three separate major sources. In some way this original Gospel got badly out of order, and what we have now represents a redactor's rather unsuccessful attempt to put it back into order (as well as his attempt to exercise theological censorship on the overly individualistic stance of the Evangelist). B. comments on the Gospel in what he thinks was the original order.

Now, how does one learn about this theory of composition? How does the reader discover B.'s ideas about the nature of each source, and about the apportioning of parts of the Gospel to the various sources and to the redactor? Before he wrote the commentary, B. expounded his theory of Gospel composition in a series of articles, not always easy to obtain. One may consult these articles, or else ferret out the information from remarks scattered in the commentary and its footnotes. Neither alternative is very satisfactory. Therefore, it is with a deep sense of gratitude that every student of John must hail this volume by D. M. Smith, who has given a systematic exposition of B.'s theory. In other words, S. has given us much of what should have been in the introduction to B.'s volume.
There was an earlier partial American attempt along this line; for in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* 65 (1946) 143-56, B. S. Easton isolated the material belonging to the Revelatory Discourse source (*Offenbarungsreden*), printing out the source in English translation. And, of course, many introductions to the *NT* have at least listed by number the passages belonging to the various sources. But now S. prints fully in Greek the material that B. assigns to each source. One may read through each source in the original form posited by B. with all the rearrangements and omissions, and thus have an excellent opportunity to judge the ingenious character of the reconstruction. In particular, this is extremely useful for the Revelatory Discourse source, which is supposed to have a poetic format; for with S.'s Greek text one can study the principles on which B. divides the lines of poetry. Each source is thoroughly analyzed, as is the work of the redactor.

If the author had done no more, he would already have done much. But in the second part of his volume he summarizes everything of importance said by scholars in the last twenty years about B.'s theory. Attention is given to the incisive critiques of B. by Jeremías, Menoud, Käsemann, E. Schweizer, and Ruckstuhl, as well as H. Becker's attempt to confirm B.'s Revelatory Discourse source. The new theories of Johannine composition by Noack, S. Schultz, Wilkens, Morton and Macgregor, and Aileen Guilding all receive efficient analysis. Thus, S.'s book constitutes a complete and very clear introduction to the most important trends in postwar Johannine research.

The third and fourth parts of the book represent a dispassionate evaluation of B.'s thesis in light of all the objections brought against it. Patently, S. attempts to be just, carefully avoiding all the facile objections usually hurled against the German exegete. Certainly this reviewer has come away from S.'s study with an even deeper appreciation of the subtlety of B.'s thought. Indeed, S.'s fairness gives more weight to the instances where he renders an unfavorable judgment on B.

In detail, the third part of the volume is a long study of B.'s rearrangement of John. The Greek of the reconstructed original Gospel of John is printed out on pp. 179-212. S. observes, as Easton did before him, that B. has never offered an explanation of how the Gospel could have become as disarranged as he supposes it did. Not only sections of the Gospel, but individual sentences got out of order. Was the original Gospel written on scraps of papyrus? It is not enough to say that B.'s rearrangement must be right because it is obviously more orderly than the present Gospel.

Moreover, B.'s source theory labors under heavy difficulties. Schweizer and Ruckstuhl have shown that the characteristics peculiar to John may
be found rather evenly distributed in material from all the sources posited by B. How could the Evangelist have imposed such a uniform style on the material he was borrowing, especially when, in the material from the Revelatory Discourse source, he preserved the poetry and much of the word patterns of the original? As Pierson Parker has well remarked, it seems that if the Evangelist used sources, he wrote them all himself. In the reviewer's opinion, the part of B.'s source theory that has best withstood criticism (and perhaps better than S. indicates) is the positing of a Sign source. It is quite probable that the two Cana miracles (Jn 2:1–12; 4:46–54), which have characteristics all their own, were once a unit. But this is a very small fragment to salvage from the imposing structural analysis that B. worked out. And if one adds to the many difficulties reported by S. the painfully thorough research by Dodd that establishes the presence of primitive historical tradition in the fourth Gospel, one is likely to conclude that the solution to the composition of the fourth Gospel lies in a direction other than that of a source theory.

The fourth part considers the supposed additions of the ecclesiastical redactor, who in B.'s theory was a primitive-Church censor. Many of the sections that B. marks as additions do seem to be added, and one cannot escape some theory of editing or redaction in this Gospel. But it is not so easy to be sure of the motive that B. attributes to the redaction process, e.g., to introduce sacramentalism in a nonsacramental Gospel. And once again Ruckstuhl's study of Johannine characteristics, even though it is guilty of certain exaggerations, does raise the question as to whether the additions are as non-Johannine as B. would posit.

In general, then, S. gives us a very well balanced evaluation of B.'s strong and weak points. Perhaps his view of B. may be best summed up in a statement that he makes on p. 178: B. has made the undeniable literary difficulties in the fourth Gospel stand out in sharp relief, but B.'s explanation and resolution of them is not completely convincing. The reviewer wholeheartedly agrees.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


DAS PROBLEM DER ABHÄNGIGKEIT DES BASILIUS VON PLOTIN: QUEL-


These five volumes introduce to the scholarly world a new series of patristic texts and studies, edited by Kurt Aland and Wilhelm Schneemelcher for the Patristic Commission of the Göttingen, Heidelberg, and Munich Academies of Sciences, and the Mainz Academy of Sciences and Literature. Each volume and each individual editor or author reflects the extraordinary philological and historical competence we have come to associate with the general editors. The series should prove increasingly significant in providing basic materials for the contemporary efflorescence of patristic studies.

Martin Tetz presents the first complete edition (introduction and twenty-one chapters) of “a dissenting voice” in the Nestorian controversy, a sharp polemic (original title not now determinable) directed against Cyril of Alexandria and his followers by Eutherius, Bishop of Tyana in Cappadocia and faithful friend of Nestorius. Not particularly important on the level of author or content, the work assumes significance because it is one of the rare documents of “the other side.” Tetz describes in detail the manuscript evidence and the testimonia, and indicates the convincing reasons for assigning authorship to Eutherius. The text, attractively printed with apparatus, is followed by a reproduction of the other extant works of Eutherius as edited by E. Schwartz (only twenty-two pages altogether, in Latin), to facilitate the reader’s access thereto. There is a helpful index of Greek words, from which one can gather at a glance the importance of *duo* and *heis*, *anthrôpos* and *theos*, *sarx* and *Logos*, *ousia* and *physis*, *prosôpon* and *hypothesis*.

The *Gospel according to Philip* is one of the forty-four Coptic treatises, almost all of them Gnostic writings, discovered in 1945–46 at ancient Chenoboskion near the modern village of Nag'-Hammâdi, some sixty miles north of Luxor in Upper Egypt. Only a handful of texts (e.g., the *Gospel of Truth* and the *Gospel according to Thomas*) from this precious corpus have thus far been edited. *Philip* is a collection of varied long “sayings,” arranged without any genuine interconnection; only a small proportion are given as dicta of
Jesus, though He holds a prominent place in the work. As R. McL. Wilson has asserted, it is most improbable that the apostle Philip had anything to do with the composition of the Gospel: it derives from the Valentinian school (though it is not Gnostic throughout) and may be dated into the second century. Till's edition is constructed not on a firsthand examination of the manuscript itself (dated ca. 400), but on the photographic reproduction in Pahor Labib's *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo 1* (Cairo, 1956). He gives only an edition of the text, with a German translation and nine pages of "remarks." For commentary, he refers the reader to the rich material in Wilson's *The Gospel of Philip* (London, 1962); the two men had worked together on the text and its interpretation in Manchester. There is a fine index of Coptic and Greek words with German translation.

Dehnhard's study of Basil's dependence on Plotinus reproduces almost unaltered a dissertation that was accepted in 1961 by the philosophical faculty of the University of Marburg. The detailed investigation, which yields a number of significant specific results (e.g., the authenticity of the small work *De Spiritu*), leads to the following general conclusion (pp. 87–88): "In Letter 223 Basil defines the goal of his theology: to complete the pneumatology of Gregory Thaumaturgus. A substantial element in this theological effort is the utilization of Plotinian concepts. It is not advisable to speak of an 'influence' of Plotinus on Basil, because this would waken an erroneous idea of the relation between them. . . . Basil uses Plotinus primarily because of certain affinities the latter has with Gregory Thaumaturgus and Origen. His approach here corresponds totally to the principles set up in his address To Young Men on the [Christian] attitude towards pagan literature (PG 31, 568): If the doctrines are akin, knowledge of them is useful; if not, establishing the differences in confrontation contributes greatly to establishing the better. . . . The true doctrine on the Holy Spirit Basil found above all in the words of Gregory Thaumaturgus, words frequently framed and enclosed in motifs of Greek philosophy. . . . That Basil's knowledge of Plotinus is not restricted to *Enneads* 5, 1 can be concluded from the fact that he knows Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica*, in which *Enneads* 4, 7 finds a place. The scope of this research did not envision the relation of Basil to Porphyry; still, the study of the sources did reveal that Porphyry could not have been very significant. In any event, there is no evidence of dependence on Porphyry in any specific passage."

Macarius the Egyptian (ca. 300–390) achieved remarkable fame through a collection of fifty *Spiritual Homilies* attributed to him several generations after his death. "These homilies," as Johannes Quasten remarks (*Patrology* 3, 162), "entitle their author to a pre-eminent position in the history of
Christian mysticism and have proved a source of inspiration to modern mystics." Their actual author has proved annoyingly elusive. It is hardly Macarius of Egypt, despite Bardenhewer's bent in that direction. Villcourt's discovery of Messalianism in the homilies cast strong light on the problem, and the manuscript discoveries and intensive research of Dörries led him to believe that the author is Symeon of Mesopotamia, a leader of the Messalians. The hypothesis of Messalian origin, however, has been challenged within recent years by Werner Jaeger (cf. Quasten 3, 164-65, 274).

In any event, we have in the Dörries-Klostermann-Kroeger work a splendidly critical edition of the homilies based on all the known manuscripts in East and West, with a running commentary that is highly informative from a historical and theological standpoint. There are useful indexes of scriptural passages and of those Greek words and ideas that have called for commentary in the course of the edition.

The *Epistula apostolorum* allegedly records conversations of Jesus with His disciples after the Resurrection. The original Greek text is lost; the work is complete only in an Ethiopic translation (therefore, the controlling factor), is available for the most part in a Coptic version (more valuable than the Ethiopic, because a direct descendant of the original), and has left some rather unimportant palimpsest fragments in Latin. Hornschuh's primary purpose is to determine the place of *EA* "in the play of forces between primitive Christianity and Late Judaism, between Gnosticism and early Catholicism." He sees this new evaluation demanded for *EA*, as for so much of ancient Christian literature, by the Nag'-Hammâdi and Qumrân finds. He sees the purpose of *EA* briefly as an effort "to avert the inroads of Docetist and antiapocalyptic Gnosis" (p. 7). The book proceeds, therefore, to investigate the relation of *EA* to the Gospel tradition and to the canonical books of the *NT*; *EA*'s detailed paraphrase of the parable of the ten virgins in Mt 25:1-13; the person and work of Christ in *EA*; revelation and salvation; Jewish influences; the commanding significance of the Eleven; *EA*'s stance toward Paul and the mission to the Gentiles; orthodoxy and heresy; the place of composition (more probably Egypt than Asia Minor) and the date (first half of the second century).

Hornsuh's conclusion (p. 120): "Three factors determine the author's basic stance: (1) the religious heritage of a specific syncretistic-heterodox Late Judaism; (2) a Christianity of the kind that had found its climax in the Synoptics, linked with the strong influence of the Johannine Gospel; (3) Gnostic and Hermetic speculation.

"The *Epistula apostolorum* may not be understood as a document of either primitive Christianity or Gnosticism or early Catholicism. What separates
it radically from primitive Christianity is its different conception of the
person and work of Christ—and this despite the fact that it is precisely in
questions of Christology that the author intends to uphold the primitive
Christian viewpoint against the Gnostics. The author distinguishes himself
from early Catholicism in that the Church and the ministry have no signifi-
cance for him. He shows himself unfamiliar with the typically early Catholic
norms of belief.

"In the Epistula apostolorum is mirrored the situation of a small anti-
Gnostic group forced by the sheer numbers of its adversaries into a small
community. In what region of the Church the apocryphon arose is not ascer-
tainable with absolute certainty. Weighty reasons speak for Egypt. And yet,
the composition of this pseudo-apostolic encyclical is not so guaranteed for
Egypt that one could unhesitatingly use it as a source for the investigation
of the beginnings of Christianity at the Nile."

Woodstock College

WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J.

THE CHRISTIAN CENTURIES 1: THE FIRST SIX HUNDRED YEARS. By
Jean Daniélou and Henri Marrou. Translated by Vincent Cronin. New

This is the first volume, in translation, of the Nouvelle histoire de l'église
planned several years ago by L. J. Rogier of the University of Nijmegen,
M. D. Knowles, then Regius Professor of Modern History at the University
of Cambridge and now Emeritus, and Canon R. Aubert of the University
of Louvain, with Msgr. J. T. Ellis, then of the Catholic University of America
and now of the University of San Francisco, as Consultant for the Western
Hemisphere. The title The Christian Centuries has been given to the English
translation and, in the reviewer's opinion, is not an entirely happy one. The
whole work is to have five volumes, and each is to appear more or less
simultaneously in the French original, and in Dutch, English, and German
translation. In the original French, Vol. 1 bears the title Nouvelle histoire de
l'église 1: Des origines à Grégoire le Grand. The announced French titles and
the authors for the remaining volumes are: 2: Le Moyen-Age (600–1500), by
M. D. Knowles; 3: La Réforme et la Contre-Réforme (1506–1715), by H.
Tüchle (Munich); 4: Siècle des lumières, révolutions, restaurations (1715–
1848), by L. J. Rogier and G. de Bertier de Savigny (Paris); 5: L'Eglise
dans la société libérale et dans le monde moderne (1848 à nos jours), by R.
Aubert and L. J. Rogier.

The scope and character of the New History of the Church is described at
length by Aubert in the "Introduction générale" to Vol. 1 of the French
original (pp. 7–26), and more briefly in the new "General Introduction"
written for the English edition by Ellis (pp. v–xii). Both introductions are very good, but they are somewhat different in their respective approaches. Hence it would have been desirable to retain Aubert's "Introduction" beside that of Ellis. The *New History of the Church* is much shorter than the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte* being published under the editorship of H. Jedin, and its notes and bibliography are reduced to the indispensable minimum. However, it is intended to be scientific in the best sense, i.e., it intends to state what is true, and what is really true is scientifically true. The Church is to be presented as a truly divine institution, but one that has often suffered in the course of its history from the shortcomings of its human shepherds of all ranks. It is to be treated not in isolation, but in its relation to the world in which it lives and works. Unlike most other histories of the Church, it is to be truly universal in character, reflecting the ecumenical spirit of Pope John XXIII, and will not confine itself exclusively to the history of the Roman Catholic Church—and still less to the "quadrilateral Vienna-Brussels-Cadiz-Naples." On the contrary, it will include, if more briefly, the doctrinal and spiritual life of the Eastern Churches not in union with Rome, and of the Protestant Churches. In so doing, it will emphasize in their teachings and practices those elements which belong in an essential way to the common Christian tradition. Throughout, adequate attention is to be given to the various forms of spiritual life in the Church as well as to formal doctrine and ecclesiastical administration and politics. Finally, the role of the laity in the history and life of the Church is to receive the full recognition it deserves.

It would not have been possible to select better qualified authors for Vol. 1, which falls into two almost equal parts. Père Daniélou, in Part 1, covers the period from Pentecost to the end of the third century. As in his excellent volumes devoted to the *Histoire des doctrines avant Nicée*, he has pieced together whatever evidence can be gleaned from heterodox as well as orthodox sources into a panoramic survey of the Church, its teachings, its institutions, and its life in the political and complex cultural environment in which it developed. Special attention is called to these chapters: 3: "The Crisis of Judaeo-Christianity"; 6: "Judaeo-Christian Customs and Images"; 8: "Heterodoxy and Orthodoxy"; 10: "Alexandria"; 12: "Christian Society in the 3rd Century." The treatment of Hippolytus and Callistus in chap. 14 is also very penetrating. In Part 2, which extends from the persecution of Diocletian to the death of Gregory the Great, Marrou divides his presentation into two sections. In the first, the fourth century, the following chapters deserve formal mention: 15: "Christianity on the Eve of the Great Persecution"; 17: "The Church in the First Half of the Fourth Century";

In the second division, the fifth and sixth centuries, these chapters are especially welcome and significant: 26: "The Widening Gulf between Eastern and Western Christians"; 31: "The Fate of the Churches outside the Empire"; 32: "Eastern Monasticism in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries"; 33: "The Eastern Empire As a Christian Empire"; 34: "The Byzantine Church and Byzantine Piety"; 38: "Medieval Christianity Emerges."

The English translation reads smoothly and is generally accurate. However, on p. 325, the meaning of the original French is not that "Constantine forbade the clergy to belong to the curiales," but rather that Constantine "did not permit the curiales to enter the ranks of the clergy." The English edition is much more attractively printed than the French original, and has been furnished with forty-eight well-executed plates, with accompanying descriptions. Unfortunately, the illustrations are undoubtedly responsible for the high price of the book—more than double that of the French original. The maps in both the French and the English editions are of mediocre quality, and in the English version contrast very unfavorably with the fine plates. The English edition, as the French original, has a Chronological Table and a Bibliography, but much better Indices—at least in their arrangement.

The reviewer regrets that he must criticize severely the slovenly editing of the English edition. A number of proper names and technical expressions appear in a French form or in distortion, Greek words are repeated in transcription immediately after the Greek itself has been given, and the bibliographical references swarm with errors. There are a few slips in the French original, but the vast majority of mistakes are found in the English edition only. The list which follows is merely a sampling. Page xxiv: for Marcus-Aurelius read Marcus Aurelius, and for Commodus (3 times) read Commodus. Page xxix: for Sidonius Apollinaris read Sidonius Apollinaris. Page 9, line 2 from end: for desposynes read desposuoi. Page 41, lines 14 and 13 from end of main text: for o read of, and for Polycarp read Polycarp.

Page 42, line 3: for Apollo read Apollos. Page 78, line 7 from top: the Greek form of arche is printed incorrectly. Page 83, line 6 from top: for Manius read Manlius; and at line 11 from end of text, for Scorpiacum read Scorpiace.


The List of Abbreviations (pp. 461–62) omits some important works cited in the French original and classifies Eusebius under a section “Series.” Page 463: for E. Duhl read E. Diehl, and for Selvagni read Silvagni; at end of page, for Venice read Vienna. Page 464: for Litzmann read Lietzmann. On the same page the statement on Van der Meer–Mohrmann should read: contains the essential monumental sources, not the most important maps. Page 466, line 4: for Rev Quar read Rev Qum. Page 475: Stein should be cited, as in the French, in the French translation of Palanque; for Seek, read Seeck; Altaner should be cited in the English translation. Page 477: following a statement on Fliche-Martin, the English then has a heading “Other Modern Works,” but the works in question are simply the first four volumes of Fliche-Martin. But it would be profitless to continue listing such mistakes. The New History of the Church is an excellent work, but the English edition of Vol. 1 needs a thorough re-editing.

Catholic University of America


The necessity of drawing the strings together and presenting an integrated account of Christianity’s first thousand years in the form of a cultural history of its inner spirit or Geist has been recognized by the renowned Munich professor Alois Dempf as proper to his function as a philosopher and historian of Christian culture. His immediate purpose is to demonstrate the inner consistency of the authentic Christian experience in the formulation of its doctrines, law, and spirituality, and the human reaction that accompanied the transformation of Christ’s gospel into a viable religion. This took place first in the Judeo-Christian milieu of Palestine, Syria, and the Near East. D. follows the majority of recent investigators into this heretofore obscure period, and feels that the doctrinal, moral, and liturgical evolution of primitive Christianity was conditioned as much by etiology as by the charismatically gifted personalities entrusted with preaching the Christian message. Unfortunately, only their shadows protrude in such postapostolic
documents as the Didache, the Letter of Pseudo Barnabas, and Clement of Rome's Epistle; but ample evidence for the primitive theological development is offered by the apocryphal writings and the apologists.

It is now evident that Hellenico-Christian relations proved a two-way street; and while the Greco-Roman culture provided a language, philosophical concepts, and an anthropological structure in which the Christian message was explained, both Judaic thought and the unique contributions of Christ's teaching concerning God, His own divinity, and a teleological significance for history created a new Christian culture that eventually transmuted the old classical concept.

D. briefly assays the syntheses offered by Harnack, Loofs, Sohm, and Jaspers, and concludes that their efforts, if combined, would strip the Christian experience of its accomplishment, by reducing its \textit{elan} to \textit{Ungeist}, \textit{Byzantismus und Romanismus}. This book seems directed, in particular, at correcting the impression left by Spengler's \textit{Volkseistlehre} or mythology of Jewish, Christian, and Arabic culture, synthesized in an irrational apocalyptic that has resulted in world anxiety. D. is equally opposed to the opposite extreme supplied by K. Schneider's \textit{Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums}, with its reassertion of the discredited theory of syncretism, whereby the philosophy of antiquity, the Hebraic and mystery religions' experience, and the community myth of a pre-existent Christ explained the rise and success of the Christian revolution.

D.'s own touchstone of authenticity is based on an analysis of symbols as the representation of the unexpressed interrelation between the divine, the human, and the worldly concept of reality. The creation of a religious symbol must be sought in a transcendental method that reaches across the emotional, volitional, and intellectual character of the thinker to the reality of existence, life, and law. Using a Hegelian methodology, he distinguishes between a \textit{geistesphilosophische} and a \textit{geistgeschichtliche Methode} to analyze the Christian experience of faith, law, and the life of the spirit. He sums up this experience in two basic steps: \textit{Heilssorge}, or preoccupation with salvation; and \textit{Heilsgewissheit}, or salvation experience that is distributed in the voluntary pursuit of justice, the intellectual striving for truth, and the emotional seeking after requited love.

D.'s acquaintance with the patristic tradition is comprehensive and at times profound. His analysis of the political theology of Eusebius of Caesarea, the ascetical and mystical thought of Evagrius Ponticus, Dionysius the Pseudo Areopagite, and Maximus Confessor is adequate, as is his appreciation of the development of theology in Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Nestorianism, Monophysitism, Mono-
thelitism, and Iconoclasm. However, his claims regarding the etiological background of Pelagianism seem exaggerated. His attention to the dynastic and political development of the later Roman Empire, Byzantium, and the post-Carolingian period is enlightening.

It is precisely here, however, that the reader begins to get uncomfortable; for there are a large number of factual statements that are either untrue or unprovable, and mainly reflect the state of historical investigation of an earlier generation. The presence of Emperor Valens incognito at one of St. Basil's sermons, e.g., and the attribution to Basil of the concept and structure of the patriarchate as initiated at the Council of Constantinople (381) can hardly be substantiated (pp. 121, 234–35). Gregory of Nazianzus was consecrated bishop of Sasima, not of Nazianzus, although he did function as a bishop in his father's diocese. It was Rufinus of Aquileia, not Ambrose, who made Basil's Rules available in the West. There is no evidence indicating the conversion of St. Helena during the period of persecution (p. 90). The so-called Edict of Toleration was probably merely an agreement regarding the benevolent treatment of Christians and was suggested by Licinius with Constantine's concurrence. Far from meeting with preliminary resistance from Acacius, the Henoticon was probably authored by him and Peter Mongos; but it certainly did not favor the Council of Chalcedon, since it explicitly condemned any other statement of faith "be it of Chalcedon or any other council." Emperor Justinian did condemn the Three Chapters with an edict in 542 or 543; and he forced the issue at Constantinople II (553), despite the appearance of full liberty that he gave to the deliberations (p. 190). Recent investigation separates three Leontii in place of the Leontius of Byzantium to whom D. gives unconditioned credit as a theologian, postulating his basic but unacknowledged influence on both Boethius and John Damascene (pp. 169–75).

It is the questionable assertion of individual facts of this type that are possibly unavoidable when an author concentrates on the woods instead of the trees. But they give the plodding historian grave doubts about the reliability of the wider perspective achieved on the high plane of culture or Geistesgeschichte.

One thing D. does see clearly, however: the destiny of Christian culture is to serve as a ferment to transubstantiate human experience. Where it does not achieve this intimate entrance into other cultures because of inadequacy in its proponents at a particular time or place, or where its development is hampered by a rigid adherence to patterns or forms of a bygone age, it not only turns sterile, but can react in such fashion as to destroy its own proponents. D. brings this observation out clearly as he traces the growth
of Christian spiritual consciousness in the postapostolic period, through the writings of the Church Fathers, the Constantinian and Justinian experiments, and the parallel developments in Byzantine and Western society to the end of the first millennium. He is acute in describing the rise and demise of heretical movements, and the varied application of the ascetical and mystical Christian doctrines by Gnostics, Manicheans, logicians, and mystics. The book has a résumé of the ancient philosophical tradition by way of a postscript, a short but adequate bibliographical essay, and two indexes.

Academia Alfonsiana, Rome

Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R.


In the introduction to his study, Fr. Schmemann, Dean of St. Vladimir's Seminary, New York, states that the purpose of the book is to show the place of Christianity in the modern world. He does this by relating the world's problems and hopes to the "sacramental experience which has always constituted the very heart of the Orthodox worldview" (p. 7). S. goes on to treat of the seven sacraments and the liturgical year in the perspective of the Eucharist, which shows most clearly the cosmic dimensions of the Christian life. He stresses that one cannot distinguish the so-called profane from the religious life, and this is the great lesson learned from the liturgy. Especially does the Eucharist reveal that the whole world is a sacrament of communion with God. The same theme might be expressed in this way: all things come from God, belong to God, and therefore are holy. Consequently, man, who has been given the capacity to recognize this, must consecrate all things to God: himself and all that he experiences in life. Through this consecration, this blessing, most fully achieved in the Eucharistic liturgy, man realizes his goal: personal communion with God. Without doubt this theme is of utmost importance for the modern world, where the value of almost everything is seen in terms of the temporal, not the eternal, order. As a result, the deepest meaning of the Eucharistic sacrifice (sacrum facere) has been overlooked and the relationship between the liturgy and practical daily living has been misunderstood.

The fact that this work is intended for popular consumption may account for some observations which, in a technical book, would have to be qualified more accurately. One might question, e.g., the correctness of the statement that "the first meaning of our bringing to the altar the elements of our food" is to signify that we "offer to God the totality of all our lives, of ourselves, of the world in which we live" (p. 40). Again, one wonders what period of time, in S.'s estimation, is embraced by the word "always" in the statement:
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The fact that this work is intended for popular consumption may account for some observations which, in a technical book, would have to be qualified more accurately. One might question, e.g., the correctness of the statement that “the first meaning of our bringing to the altar the elements of our food” is to signify that we “offer to God the totality of all our lives, of ourselves, of the world in which we live” (p. 40). Again, one wonders what period of time, in S.'s estimation, is embraced by the word “always” in the statement:
"The Orthodox Church has always insisted that the transformation (metabole) of the eucharistic elements is performed by the epiclesis—the invocation of the Holy Spirit—and not by the words of institution" (p. 52).

In connection with this latter statement, S. argues that because "the whole liturgy is sacramental, that is, one transforming act," one cannot determine the precise "moment" when the sacramental Real Presence of Christ takes place through the "transformation" of the earthly elements (p. 50). Hence, even the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit should not be conceived as causative. Rather, through the epiclesis the Holy Spirit "manifests the bread as the body and the wine as the blood of Christ" (p. 52).

While it is beyond dispute that the whole liturgy is one transforming act in which the Mystical Body is sanctified through the ritual participation in the worship of Christ, it is another thing to say that the "transformation" of the earthly elements runs a parallel course. The least that can be said is that S.'s position does not harmonize with the overt teaching of the Fathers of the Eastern and Western Churches. Furthermore, it was not as a "good scientist" (p. 50), as S. contends, that the Church placed great stress on the importance of the essential ritual act of the Last Supper—and from the New Testament period, as is shown from the liturgical structure of the four accounts of the words of institution. Rather, it was because she realized that here and here alone the self-offering of Christ, the High Priest, is rendered visible in the ritual act of the Mystical Body. In performing the ritual act of the Last Supper, as representative of Christ, the priest "manifests" not only the actual presence of the once-for-all offering by which Christ consecrated the world to God, but also that the bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ. And because the ritual memorial manifests these things in the name of Christ whose word is efficacious, it effects their sacramental presence even as it did at the Last Supper. The epiclesis of the Holy Spirit, on the other hand, points out the important truth that this "transformation" of the bread and wine takes place through the personal intervention of the Holy Spirit.

A number of times statements are made which give the impression that S. believes that there really do exist Christian sacramental theologies which are concerned only with questions about conditions for validity of sacraments, essential ritual gestures and words, etc. Along the same line, he seems to have found a sacramental theology which explains the sacrament of penance "in terms of sheer 'juridical' power to absolve sins, a power 'delegated' by Christ to the priest" (p. 95). In both these instances, caricatures, formulated in the distant past by the exigencies of debate, have been presented which have nothing to do with the great theological systems of the Eastern and Western theological schools.
These criticisms, of course, are marginal in view of the main theme of the book. In so far as it shows that human life will be intelligible only if one understands the meaning of the liturgy in all its ramifications and will be fruitful only if one commits himself fully to the deepest meaning of the liturgical act, this essay realizes its goal. S. offers a number of valuable insights based on the liturgy of the Orthodox Church which should prove inspirational to all Christians.

Weston College Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.


Although its main title could suggest that this work is a practical homiletic textbook, it is actually a systematic theological reflection on God's message to men in both senses of Word and word. Part 1 deals with the Word within the Trinitarian life, God's word (it is not always clear whether we should read Word or word in given contexts) and work in external revelation, and His word in the Church. Part 2 studies the efficacy of the divine message and the causality of preaching in the production of grace in men's souls. S. points out that the fruitfulness of God's proclamation wherever it produces life in creation is patterned after the infinite fecundity of the inner Trinitarian uttering by the Father of His Word.

Not only are God's work and His word always joined together, but they mutually interpenetrate as two essential elements in one revelation. The work is the material element, the word is the formal, determining element. What the soul and the body are for a living man, that the word and work are for the divine revelation. God's self-disclosure is His word, which attains its "creative fulness" in His work. This interlinking reaches its climax in the Incarnation, for in Christ word and work are joined in a single unity.

S. relates the proclamation of God's word, a descending motion, to man's participation in the sacraments, an ascending motion. In answer to the divine message, man receives the sacraments and thus shares in Christ's death and resurrection, allowing Christ to grasp and carry him to his grace-glory destiny. Thus the ministry of God's speech and man's reply in the sacraments are like two phases of a dialogue, a "dialogic relationship."

In an interesting discussion, S. takes up the problem of the apparent conflict between the Tridentine teaching that all justification begins, increases, or is restored through the sacraments and the many NT evidences that speak of grace as flowing from the preaching of the word. Although he cites and agrees with Schmaus's judgment that we cannot describe exactly how God
works through the preached word, S. does propose the view that there is a
single reality of the word going forth on two levels, the content and its being
preached, each possessing a characteristic efficacy. The content of preaching
readies and disposes man as a material cause of his salvation, whereas the
preaching of this content also works actively (as Heb 4:12 witnesses) and
efficiently, but only in connection with and in view of the reception of the
sacraments. The preaching of the word as a symbolic portrayal of the Incarnation of the Word unites with the sacramental portrayal of the Word's sacrifice on the cross, and together they constitute a single symbolic por-
trayal and one cause of grace.

The limitations and deficiencies in this volume are not serious, nor do they
appreciably mar the real value it possesses. One would wish that S. had fol-
lowed or mingled his reflection on the data of Scripture with a study of pat-
tristic thought on the revealing character of the divine word and work. We
suspect that patristic insights would be particularly rewarding in this area,
but perhaps this is asking too much of one man. Admittedly, an investigation
of this type would be a vast enterprise.

Vatican I comes off too much as a deficient private theologian when S. at-
tributes to the Council's vision of the Church as a motive of credibility the
implication that "according to this view the communication of revelation
actually occurs through the preaching of the word alone, whereas the mar-
velous appearance of God's work is here considered [in the Council's state-
ment] not as itself a part of revelation, but rather as proof of the fact that
the Church's word transmits the word of God with substantial accuracy"
(p. 41). He grants that "this view" is "possible and correct" as long as it
does not pretend to tell the whole story.

S. comes closer to saying that God is the formal cause of man's sanctity
than we would care to come, when he speaks of God becoming, "so to speak,
a new soul for man." Grace "is God Himself who communicates Himself to
man, sinks into his innermost being . . . . This sanctification makes of man
a new reality not unlike the new existence effected by the soul when it ani-
mates the human body" (p. 155). From the stylistic point of view (to which,
it seems to us, theologians should pay more attention) the work is adequate
but not overly attractive.

Though The Preaching Word is not easy reading throughout, we feel that
it should have a place in a bibliography of background reading to be done
by seminarians in homiletics courses. And it would furnish priests in the ac-
tive ministry with a solid theological understanding of what they are about
in the pulpit.

Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans

THOMAS DUBAY, S.M.
The article "Fraternité" (col. 1141-67), J. Ratzinger examines the theme of brotherhood of all men within a spectral synthesis of pagan insight, scriptural imperative, and dogmatic inspiration. R. complements the ontological and ethical fundament of fraternity with the scriptural and patristic emphasis on the existential fact that the unity of all men is less a static, universal idea and more an emergent, vibrant, personal recognition of the self as related; the community of man is a "becoming" in the continuum of history; an ethical ideal, transecclesial in range, brotherhood finds its richest radication in sacramental encounter, especially in baptism and the Eucharist; it finds its ultimate paradigm in the subsistent relations of the Trinity. Thus the individual assumes the genuine responsibility of being an image of God; he translates himself, within the metaphysical limits of proper existence, into relation, and there reads that relation does involve mission, a communication of will, and that what is done in eternity must, pacifically but with kerygmatic intensity, be accomplished in time.

The article "Frères" (col. 1193-1240), a collection of studies, delineates the development of one of the first specialized vocations within the Church. From a sociological as well as a historical perspective, the specific ethos of the brother's vocation emerges as variegated, yet unified at a level deeper than local custom or domestic usages. To the men espoused to this vocation of being a convertus, implying a continuing conversion of the heart, there is offered a profound mystique of service prefigured by the testamental Servant. The generous, total oblation of such men must be matched by intelligent, creative direction which, with a sound sense of tradition and a shrewd appraisal of modernity, will guide them to contemplative and apostolic perfection.

The two articles "Frères mineurs" (col. 1268-1422) and "Frères prêcheurs" (col. 1422-1522) appear automatically established as classical loci for reference to the history and spirit of these two great orders of the Church. The documentation, always notable in this series, is here exceptionally fine. These studies, representing a blend of insight and analysis from a corps of scholars, enjoy a particular relevance at this period of proposed alteration in the spirit and forms of the families of the Church. Those who do not know history are condemned to repeat it. These columns afford arresting evidence that euphoria and enthusiasm in the Knoxian sense are perennial or cyclic challenges to genuine development; they offer still more impressive testi-
mony to the linear development of unique spiritualities, symbiotic with the life of the Church. History, as here elaborated, attests to the fact that change can only be authentically effected by men who possess the spirit of their order and who are thereby able to establish something more than an uneasy alliance between the *nova et vela.* The early vicissitudes of reorganization and consolidation of the Franciscans are sketched with exceptional clarity and awareness of the human difficulties involved in the pattern of the charismatic brilliance of Francis' illumination. The awesome range of Dominican accomplishment, apostolic, theological, and liturgical, gives copious witness to the constant vitality of the order's inspiration, *Veritas* and *Contemplata aliis tradere.* The felicitous combination of fidelity and adaptability has empowered these two great orders to make a contribution to the Church which is as precious as it is massive.

In a fine article, the notion of "Fruitio Dei" (col. 1546–69) is studied according to its gradual theological refinement. A major theme in the thought of Augustine, which he seems to have derived more from Varro than from Cicero, it reaches its fullest expression in the writings of William of St. Thierry. Affirming the goodness of creation against a Manichean bias, Augustine finds this *fruitio* to be a progressive transforming of the self, under the aegis of grace, which aligns the self with the Trinity. Thus the moral and the ontological order are coincident and love finds its subjective ordering in objective reality. Bernard develops the theme further to its mystical plenitude, notably in his commentary on the Canticle. To enjoy is to be transformed by the Spirit, not to an otiose, egotistic absorption but to an apostolic creativity. William of St. Thierry is styled the first theologian of the *amour de fruition,* *amour de désir.* As Malevez has shown, William founded his explanation on the biblical and patristic theme of the *imago Dei*; to this he added the best of Augustine and Bernard. For him, divine love is assimilative and transforming, and the measure of love is the measure of likeness. The progressive docility of the person leads him from inchoative to realized fruition. The same theme is echoed by the Victorines, especially by Hugh of St. Victor in the little-known *De arrha animae.* It is suggested (col. 1560) that later clarifications into more analytic terms by Bonaventure and Aquinas appear to have sacrificed some of the biblical intensity and spontaneity found in the writings of William.

A brief article, "Fruits du Saint-Esprit" (col. 1569–74), supplements the preceding neatly with M. Ledrus's insistence on the apostolic finality of the fruits.

Purged of syncretist elements and the detritus of Stoicism, Pythagoreanism, and Platonism, the concept "Fuite du monde" (col. 1575–1605) is
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founded not on a blighted cosmology but on a theological anthropology which reflects a hierarchical value-system, imbued with the biblical paradox of losing and finding life. The Christian's attitude toward the world will be conditioned to some degree by the world's attitude toward him; this realistic sentiment softens the acerb judgments sometimes leveled at segments of Christian history. Radically different from a Buddhist liberation from desire, closer perhaps to Heidegger's "authentic existence," the *fuga mundi* fosters a delicate "disponibility" of the creature toward the Creator. Current questions, treated in depth with historical perspective, give these columns a value in referral that verges on necessity.

*Weston College*

**WILLIAM J. BURKE, S.J.**


In this rather brief monograph dealing with the act of faith, C.-L. proposes a theory of intuition and personal knowledge whose roots are found in the phenomenological reflections of August Brunner and the metaphysics of Karl Rahner. Addressing himself to the classical problem of the act of faith, viz., the grounding of the essentially higher grade of certitude which distinguishes the assent of the act of faith itself from the assent given to the *praecambula fidei*, C.-L. seeks his solution through an analysis of the prepredicative intuitive grasp of and response to personal reality which is the ultimate ground of my knowledge of myself and of the other and to which all subsequent conceptual formulations must be referred as their source and norm. C.-L. distinguishes two specifically different grades of intuitive awareness of another person. The first is simple knowledge devoid of any affective overtones. The second, conditioned by a free decision "for" a person, leading to trust in him, is the truly personal knowledge which is faith. Only through faith, by which we open ourselves to receive the manifestation of the other, can the riches of his free inner core manifest themselves to us. Freedom, therefore, on the part of both revealer and receiver is a necessary element of the experiential act through which the human knower has access to the highest grade of being—personal reality.

C.-L. weds this theory of personal knowledge, derived from Brunner's *Glaube und Erkenntnis*, with a further development of Rahner's theory of the dynamism of the spirit. In common with all Thomists of the Maréchaliyan school, Rahner grounds man's ability to elevate his experience of the sensible singular to the level of intellectual knowledge and ultimately of the concept and the judgment in the a priori dynamism of the mind. It is because his mind is an a priori drive to the Absolute Horizon that man can
raise the phantasm to a higher grade of intelligibility and thus acquire the essentially higher form of knowledge which is intellectual.

According to C.-L., the human spirit is not simply an intellectual drive to the Absolute. It is also a drive to the Absolute characterized by freedom. Indeed, it can only grasp the higher levels of personal reality which are required to satisfy it as a drive to the Absolute through the free acceptance of the other in faith. The human spirit therefore has a "personal a priori," the drive to accept the other, to say "yes" to him and to let him reveal himself. And just as the necessary drive of the agent intellect has an elevating power which can found an essentially higher form of knowledge, so the free acceptance of the other which allows him to reveal his inner personal depths to us has an elevating power which enables man to possess this higher intelligibility in a qualitatively higher and more certain form of knowledge—personal comprehension.

Christ, who is a person, manifests Himself to us in His Gospels and His Church. We can know Him in His concreteness in the praemubula fidei. How, then, can the act of faith be an essentially different and higher form of knowledge? Because it is elevated by the special free decision "for" Christ which is made under the influence of grace and which enables Him to reveal Himself to us as the person who is God. The essential difference between the act of faith and the praemubula is located not on the level of the concept and the judgment but on the level of the free decision which precedes conceptualization and judgment.

The connection between C.-L. and Rahner is obvious. Because the human spirit is an a priori drive to the Absolute, man is for Rahner a potential hearer of the Word. Because that drive is a drive to free personal knowledge, man for C.-L. is a potential subject of a free decision "for Christ" and so can make the unique and absolutely certain assent of faith. Although not all will accept the theory of C.-L., all will welcome it as another example of the useful and provocative contributions to theology made by writers influenced by Rahner's metaphysics.

Loyola Seminary, Shrub Oak, N.Y. GERALD A. McCOOL, S.J.


Speaking of his excommunication as a teen-ager, Brendan Behan wrote: "when I got over it, my expulsion from religion, it was like being pushed outside a prison and told not to come back" (Borstal Boy, p. 301.). That this attitude expressed by Behan was widespread among Catholics, Fr. Jungmann experienced early in his priestly career. In his brochure Um Liturgie
und Kerygma, J. tells how as a newly-ordained priest he was struck by the difference between the Christianity he had found pictured in St. Paul and the outwardly faithful but inwardly impoverished and joyless moralism of the average Tyrolean villager. How did the change take place between the unified vision of the early Church with its joy in the gospel and the complex system of contemporary Roman Catholicism with its burdensome appearance? In 1915 J. wrote a long paper, which he never published, in which he put forward the thesis that Catholic piety and morality must become once again thoroughly Christocentric: the simple identification of Christ with God must be corrected, grace and the sacraments must be understood not as independent entities but as gifts of God's love given in Christ the Mediator. In 1936 this thesis was theologically and historically documented in Die Frohbotschaft und unsere Glaubensverkündigung (cf. my review of the American edition in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 24 [1963] 501-4). Although withdrawn from sale within three weeks because of complaints made to Rome that it was having an unsettling effect among the clergy, the book had already sold widely enough to influence the liturgical movement and to spark the theological discussion about kerygmatic theology and the catechetical research and experimentation which were to issue in the German Catechism of 1955.

If J.'s theological and historical labors did not already have an apologia pro vita sua in the decrees De ecclesia and De sacra liturgia of Vatican II, the present volume would constitute one. It presents substantially the same thesis as the 1936 Frohbotschaft, but illuminated by the work of a generation of theologians, religious sociologists, and catechetical experts. H. B. Meyer's study of Alcuin (Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 81 [1959]), for instance, further documents J.'s thesis that there occurred in the early Middle Ages a significant shift in emphasis in the teaching about Christ, the Church, and grace. The eclipse of our Lord's humanity in the ordinary Catholic consciousness is verified by studies such as that reported in Lumen vitae (1952), which found that fifty percent of a sampling of Catholics did not think that Christ had a human soul.

The book contains reflections upon past and present developments in Christology, Mariology, ecclesiology, the theology of grace and the sacraments, and Catholic devotional life. Noting the progress made in recent decades, J. nevertheless cites enough recent examples to show that bizarre and peripheral religious practices are still being fostered. To his criticism of Mariological extremes a generation ago, J. adds now a gentle remonstrance against an exaggerated Josephology.

In general, the present volume is more frank in its criticism than was the 1936 Frohbotschaft; yet it is never extreme. The same balance and Catholic
sense which marked the 1936 volume pervades this one. It is also more universal in its application, since it draws on Catholic writers from many nations. *Kulturkatholizismus* is just as possible in Alabama as in Austria.

In his final chapter “Religion und Welt,” J. remarks on the danger, already foreseen in 1936, that preoccupation with the liturgy can become an escape from Christian responsibility in the world: “Religion and liturgy are not self-contained activities but a summons, an attestation, that our whole life belongs to God” (p. 175). Our recent American experience of “liturgically advanced” parishes where homeless Negroes were not taken in illustrates the point.

To read a revolutionary manifesto on the morning after the revolution is both exhilarating and sobering. Today’s solutions inevitably raise new questions for tomorrow. Catholicism’s contemporary renewal through a return to its sources, a renewal to which J.’s book bears witness, is only a prelude to the tasks ahead. The issues raised by Bonhoeffer, Bultmann, and the *Honest to God* debate, although not directly referred to by J., are certainly implied, especially in the first and last chapters. In confronting these issues, two old truths can be freshly realized by reading *Die Frohbotschaft*. The first is that (to use H. Richard Niebuhr’s phrase) reformation is for the Church a continuing imperative. No existential restatement of theology, no missionary adaptation of kerygma and liturgy, no exorcising of bogeymen from the Roman Curia can obviate the necessity for a continual *metanoia*, a readiness to move whenever and wherever the cloud or the pillar of fire shall lead. The second truth is that zeal for change, a dynamic *ebrietas*, if it be authentically from the Spirit of God (who is not in the whirlwind), is always *sobria*. J.’s book breathes this peculiar genius of the Roman rite.

*Collegio S. Roberto Bellarmino, Rome*  
*James M. Carmody, S.J.*

**Mariologie et oecuménisme 1: Eglise orthodoxe: Doctrine mariale et influence sur l’Occident; 2: Positions protestantes face au dogme catholique; 3: Recherches catholiques: Théologie et pastorale.**


Continuing their custom of tracing a single theme through several annual meetings (cf. *Theological Studies* 24 [1963] 135–38, for three volumes on the spiritual maternity), French Mariologists now provide a set of studies remarkably in tune with two documents promulgated in November, 1964:
chap. 8 of *Lumen gentium*, on our Lady, and the decree on ecumenism. Vols. 1 and 2 present Orthodox and Protestant theologians with their Catholic counterparts, and Vol. 3 is an attempt by Catholics to set their own Marian house in better order, *in re* doctrine, cult, and pastoral practice.

The Pontmain meeting, September, 1962, on the eve of Vatican II, featured A. Kniazeff, of the Paris faculty of St. Sergius, on Mary's place in Orthodox piety. He traces the relationship between cult and the doctrines of theotokos, Mary and the image of God in man (with which the Western Immaculate Conception is judged incompatible), mother of men (much in piety and liturgy, if little in formal theology), and the role of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit's role appears in the transformation of the world—the old order changed, as in Mary's perpetual virginity, dormition/assumption, being model to the Church. M. Le Guillou, of the Centre Istina, describes as characteristic of Orthodox Mariology Mary's involvement in the "mystery" (in the Pauline sense): in the past in Theodotus of Ancyra and especially in the Akathist Hymn, and in modern times in, e.g., Boulgakov's sophiology.

H. Crouzel writes of "Mary, Model of the Holy Person (*spirituel*) and of the Apostle in Origen," an essay based on his introduction to Origène: *Homélies sur s. Luc* (*Sources chrétiennes* 87; Paris, 1962). Medievalist H. Barré is at ease, as usual, exploring the rich world from Ambrose to the tenth-century *Mariale* of the monastery of Reichenau. Cumulative evidence shows that the West received much from the East in the first centuries after Ephesus, but then became more independent in Carolingian times—e.g., in Ambrose Autpert. In "An Essay on the Part of the East in the Iconography of the West," J. de Mahuet explores an important area, unfortunately without the aid of any printed illustrations, though he gives many references. He shows the heavy and docile dependence of West on East prior to the eighth century. After the iconoclastic crisis, the West still borrowed, but developed its own forms more and more—the temporal face of Christian art. In the East the ikon, a center of prayer, never sold, never a museum piece, remained as witness to the timeless face of Christian art.

The 1963 meeting was held at Le Saulchoir in late August, because many members were involved in Vatican II, including the separated brethren. The exchange between Protestants and Catholics is a frank expression of differences about Mary. Spokesmen on the Catholic side are: M. Le Guillou on "Mariology and Protestantism"; H. Holstein on the development of Marian dogma (at greater length in *Maria: Études sur la sainte Vierge* 6 [Paris, 1961], edited by H. du Manoir). There are three Calvinist theologians: Pastors H. Roux, J. Bosc, and M. Thurian. To Thurian Le Guillou puts the question: "Why does M. Thurian's recent book *Marie: Mère du Seigneur, figure de...*
stop as if paralyzed before the question of the evolution from Mary, mother of God and figure of the Church, to Mary, mother of the faithful?” Le Guillou’s own answer is that the fundamental problem is the interpretation of Scripture.

J. Bosc writes of “The Mariology of the Reformers.” They wished to say no more than the Scriptures did, and evolved in their own attitudes within the Reform. Luther preached the exemplar value of Mary’s receptivity before God, stressing the divine *respexit* rather than the human *humilitatem*. The positive outlook of the Reformers themselves, lost to so great a degree in the anti-Catholic polemic of later times, needs to be reasserted.

Pastor Roux presents “The Balance of the Scripture from the Protestant Point of View.” Along with “our common presuppositions,” he offers sharply-delineated “presuppositions proper to each.” Christocentrism is his rallying cry. A Christocentric interpretation of biblical data must obtain in every discussion of Mary—relating her to the Incarnation, the redemption, the risen and glorified Christ, and the Church. Relative to King’s remark that a bilateral reform is required in the ecumenical approach to Mary, Roux finds the problem more radical: it is a question of the dogmatic presuppositions each brings to the task of biblical exegesis. The Protestant sets out from Christology to understand what the New Testament says of Mary; the Catholic tends to take first the Marian texts and then try to integrate them into Christology. The latter method imperils the central place of Christ. Using Feuillet’s division of *NT* texts on our Lady according to the time of their composition, Roux concludes that the later Lucan and Johannine passages do not supply any Mariological complement to the earlier Christology, but merely confirm what was stated earlier in the Epistles and in Mark and Matthew. No special value attaches to the person of Mary. In many of the papers of these volumes the ecumenical import of Mary’s person appears—whether in terms of her earthly life or of her present heavenly life. The cogency in Catholic thought of the Liturgical Constitution’s “inseparably joined to the saving work of her Son” (no. 103) is obvious. In Roux’s outlook, the Scriptures show no trace of Mary in the scenes announcing the glorification of Christ and the constitution of the Church, His body; hence her absence from the Transfiguration, institution of the Eucharist, appearances of the risen Christ, etc. And she is presently joined with Christ by no greater title than the rest of those who have died in the faith. As to current attempts to see Mary as the personification of the new Israel, Roux fears that they rest on a Mariological rather than a Christological interpretation, and asks if one might not with equal right concentrate on the sinful woman in the Saviour’s human genealogy to show that through pure grace sinful
humanity has been introduced into the covenant and made beneficiary of the faith.

Thurian's "Problèmes posés aux protestants par la mariologie" starts with the remark that to speak of Mary is to speak of the Church. Both have the fundamental vocation of maternity; in both maternity is the fruit of faith. Many of Thurian's points are developed at greater length in his recent book, but in this essay he also considers briefly such points of difference as the Immaculate Conception and Assumption. He finds an immaculate conception in opposition to the Protestant concept of the need for perpetual renewal of the gift of grace. The corporeal assumption (to which he links the queenship), even apart from the scriptural problems, seems to the Protestant to anticipate for Mary without reason the eschatological reality all Christians expect. "For the Protestant, if Mary is the figure of the Church, she is so insofar as she is in the Church; Mary cannot be called mother of the Church" (Thurian's emphases). The same emerges from Thurian's recent book. I cannot see that he has changed his position concerning the spiritual maternity from the view he expressed in Ways of Worship (London, 1951, p. 310): "The doctrine of the spiritual motherhood of Mary is directly based on the doctrine of grace, and on a physical participation of the Church and of the Christian in the life of Christ." Thurian has changed, however, with regard to the perpetual virginity of Mary, which he now accepts. Here he presents a threefold sign-value of Mary's virginity: consecration for the exclusive service of God, poverty calling forth God's fulness, the newness of the kingdom calling in question the ordinary laws of creation.

The 1964 session was held at Lyons, city of St. Irenaeus, a fitting patron for the theological endeavor to place our Lady in the totality of the Christian mystery. Le Guillou spoke of "convergences et divergences" in the Marian movement and the ecumenical movement. Up to now, Mariology cannot be said to have been significant in the ecumenical movement associated with the World Council, despite Boulgakov's intervention at the Faith and Order Conference, Lausanne, 1927. But, L. holds out great hope for the future of Mariology in the ecumenical movement, inclusive of Rome.

R. Lack writes of "Mariology and Christocentrism," insisting on the unity of the "mystery" (Eph 3:6) and the difficulty, yet need, of considering the created person who is Mary, without violating Christocentrism. He subjects the four secondary principles of Mariology to a searching analysis from the standpoint of Christology: singularity, fittingness, eminence, analogy with Christ. For example, under "eminence": we are to seek light on Mary's holiness not in the style of hagiography but from the mystery of the holiness of Israel and the Church (so Gelin, pace Roux).
H. Cazelles was invited to write of “Daughter of Sion and Marian Theology in the Bible,” as an example of modern biblical research. Mindful of the exegetical problems, he traces the term “daughter of Sion” from initial geographical usages (daughter towns) into OT and NT theological usages: Isaiah, Sophoniah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, the Psalms, implications in the personalist character of wisdom literature, and references in Jn 12:15 and Mt 21:5, both Palm Sunday narratives.

J.-H. Nicolas studies “The Mystery of Mary, Mystery of Grace.” In Mary, grace is supremely God’s free gift. Her share in the work of salvation forms part of the “economy” such as God has established it. He notes lyrically: “If the heart of Mary is filled with mercy, the source of this mercy is the heart of her Son.” A. Müller provides pastoral pointers in “Marian Piety and Education in the Faith.” The fundamental dogmatic basis of Marian doctrine as such is “activity by receptivity.” This also sums up the sense in which Mariology is the turning point of other dogmatic tracts. “Fiat mihi!” follows “fecit mihi.” Marian piety also places in relief the communion of saints—the point is barely raised but deserves and requires considerable unfolding in the ecumenical dialogue. M. concludes with some recommendations towards a theological enrichment of popular piety.

Thurian’s Mary, Mother of All Christians (U.S. edition), first published in French in 1962, is filled with charity. It is accurate biblical theology of our Lady, presented popularly and based on recent chosen studies, Protestant, Orthodox, and Catholic (some of them are so divided in the bibliography, which appears at the end with the extensive footnotes to the individual chapters). Readers familiar with Tappolet, Asmussen, Boulgakov, Lossky, Laurentin, Galot, etc., will find nothing new in Thurian, except possibly the warmth of his own clear presentation and his tremendous desire for Christian unity. The Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are omitted of set purpose. A few chapter headings indicate the range of materials: “Poor Virgin,” “Mother of the Messiah King,” “Mary and the Church.”

It is unfortunate that the American publisher did not retain the title as well when he reprinted the British translation: “Mary, Mother of the Lord, Figure of the Church” (London, 1963). That is the correct translation of the French original, and it avoids theological implications that can hardly be pleasing to Thurian.

A closing word: what is the balance? That Catholic Marian doctrine and devotion present obstacles to Christian unity is more apparent than ever from the essays here reviewed. All were drawn up prior to Lumen gentium, but it is unlikely that any author would express himself very differently were he rewriting his article. The remark of P. Fransen in a dialogue about grace.
with T. F. Torrance (cf. Eastern Churches Quarterly 16 [1964] 312–13) comes to mind, and I suppose the separated brethren feel that by changing adjectives it would apply as well to their Roman Catholic friends: "A truth crossing Catholic lips loses its original meaning when it has passed through a Protestant ear." But God gives the increase.

Catholic University of America

EAMON R. CARROLL, O.CARM.


General remarks on the character and value of this new translation have been made apropos of the first volumes published and need not be repeated here (cf. Theological Studies 26 [1965] 135–38).

The first of the new set—on knowing and naming God—is also the most immediately topical, due to the prominence given John A. T. Robinson's Honest to God and the questions he raises. Whatever may be said about the Bishop's own views, the questions he asks are indeed felt keenly today, as may be judged by the reactions in England, on the Continent (especially in Holland), and even in America. Perhaps the greatest need in such a discussion as R. has started is to avoid throwing the baby out with the bath and not to confuse the often real failure on the catechetical level to translate dogma and theology into a soberly realistic popular speech with the supposed failure of the theologians ever to have penetratingly criticized man's knowledge of God. Herbert McCabe, O.P., translator of Vol. 3 of the Summa, wrote one of the best reviews of R.'s book (Blackfriars 44 [1963] 306–16; reprinted in Cross Currents 14 [1964] 25–34, and in The Honest to God Debate, edited by David L. Edwards [London, 1963] pp. 165–80), pointing out how much the first three chapters of Honest to God were hampered by an apparent ignorance of the history of theology. The "negative" theology of the Greek Fathers found its counterpart in St. Thomas' radical critique of our earthly knowledge of God in the two lengthy questions which form the contents of this Summa volume (on how God is known by His creatures and on theologi-
The title of question 13 is somewhat misleading, since the question is concerned almost entirely with denying to man on earth the possibility of immediately knowing God and with elaborating the conditions and scope of the intuitive vision of Him enjoyed by the blessed. Only the last two articles take up man's knowledge of God here below, and one of them concerns knowledge by faith. But the balance is restored, in a measure, in question 14, which, despite its title, is not a manual for the rhetoric of piety but, implicitly, a further investigation of the possibilities and limitations of man's knowledge of God via creatures—in terms, however, not of the mechanics of this knowledge (what will be said in *Summa* 1, 84–90 holds for this) but of its objective validity.

The sparkling long introduction to Vol. 3 is the work of Thomas Gilby, O.P., who has thus written a major part of the first three volumes (whole of Vol. 1, appendixes of Vol. 2 on the proofs for God's existence, and introduction to Vol. 3). The introduction is a gem and, along with the other Gilby texts to which reference is there made (especially Vol. 1, Appendix 10: "The Dialectic of Love in the *Summa*"), should be compulsory reading for the present-day student who approaches St. Thomas for the first time. It will help to counteract a number of prejudices about the kind of thinking done by the Scholastics in general and by St. Thomas in particular, about their awareness of the complexity of man and reality, their modest estimate of the place and range of conceptual thought, their consciousness of the depth, extent, and importance of the nonconceptual matrix and dynamism of human knowledge.

Vol. 4, on God's knowledge, is the counterpart of Vol. 3 and shows us knowledge in its perfection at the other end of the scale from our shadowy twilight intellection. The impact of this section of the *Summa* makes itself best felt if one reads through it at a sitting, steadily moving from the modest opening question ("Is there knowledge in God?") through the reduction of all God's knowing to His self-identity and the infinite simplicity of His being, to the climactic statement that in Him all things are life, where the Johannine prologue yields some of its inexhaustible fulness of meaning as the wave of the argument, mounting through twenty-five articles, reaches its crest. Fr. Gornall's introduction is brief, but valuable because it concentrates on method and, most importantly, insists in various ways that our knowledge of God is analogous and that attention to this fact shows up the pseudo character of a number of questions we are tempted to ask about God, especially in His relationship to His creatures. There are no appendixes, but in the short glossary key-terms are explained more fully than in other volumes.

The doctrine of the Trinity (Part 1, Vol. 6) is at the heart of speculative
theology and also at the heart of Christian spirituality. In the latter, indeed, the theology applied is rather the Trinitarian theology of Scripture: the Trinity conceived of in its relationships to men. Fr. Valecky admits that for contemporary men St. Thomas' approach to the Trinity in the *Summa* (following the *ordo essendi* and beginning with what is most fundamental for understanding the Trinity *ad intra*) is not the best one for an initial approach to the doctrine; St. Thomas himself adopts a more biblical approach in the *Contra gentiles*. But the kind of questions St. Thomas raises in the *Summa* will sooner or later be asked by the theologically minded, and they are being asked today. Bernard Lonergan, S.J., has been giving a fresh interpretation of St. Thomas' answers; others are trying a different approach, e.g., Bertram Schuler, *Die Lehre von der Dreipersönlichkeit Gottes* (Paderborn, 1961), who uses a psychological analogy but one based on a triplicity of faculties in man (and an analogous triple activity in God), i.e., will, intellect, and affectivity, hierarchized in that order and used to express the specific personality of Father, Son, and Spirit respectively.

The *Secunda secundae* from question 47 on is, outside of professedly and consistently Thomist circles, probably the least well known part of the *Summa*. This description can be extended, with perhaps the substitution of "understood" for "known," to sections of the *Prima secundae* which are important for grasping what will later be said about the cardinal virtues, viz., on the "habits," virtues, gifts, and beatitudes (1–2, 49–70). Questions 49–54 on the "habits," a now misleading word in English which is here translated as "dispositions," are a straight piece of philosophical analysis, and Mr. Kenny, trained it would appear in the Oxford school of logical analysis, does an excellent job with it. His analyses of the argument in the introduction should bring out to the reader, if need be, that the questions St. Thomas is asking are legitimate ones, the kind in fact which we are constantly asking, even if more or less confusedly, in many areas of life. This realization is necessary in order to counteract a sort of *stupor intellectus* that seems to affect people at times, especially young people, when they deal with "virtue": they think that it is unworthy to analyze and be down to earth in the understanding of their own moral make-up and that we should speak only of love in our dealings with God. Their attitude is perhaps only a reaction against moralism and a deadening presentation of the virtues; if so, Mr. Kenny's pages will help them gain needed balance. His introduction, notes, and appendixes perform another function of the teacher (whom the *Summa* supposes, if it is used, according to its intention, as a textbook for beginners): to give examples that are expressive for the contemporary student; otherwise a basically simple exposition may become obscure. The analytic method of the
present-day logician has the further merits of alerting the reader to inconsistencies in the application of principles and methods; of bringing into play a more subtle empirical analysis of judgment and other mental operations, revealing rigidities in the Aristotelian logic inherited and largely used by St. Thomas; and of helping the reader, at numerous points, over pitfalls of language (cf., e.g., Appendix 6, p. 121, on difficulties felt in Latin and Greek which the indefinite article obviates in English). Despite his efforts to be as uncomplicated as possible, K. will not be easy going for many readers, but their perseverance will be rewarded. Their minds will be stretched a bit, and they will, at the very least, take away with them a realization that is valuable in itself and important for understanding the doctrine of the virtues: the understanding that virtue is not "habit," or that habit, in St. Thomas' sense of the word, is not "mere habit" (cf. S. Pinckaers, O.P., "Le vertu est tout autre chose qu'une habitude," Nouvelle revue théologique 82 [1960] 387-403).

In order to present a rounded treatment of original sin in one volume (Vol. 26 of this series), the editors have decided to cut across the lines of St. Thomas' divisions within his treatise on vices and virtues (1-2, 71-89: Section 5: the cause of sin [75-84]; Section 6: the effect of sin [85-89]) and to join together his discussion of the nature of original sin (treated in the Summa as one of the outside forces—another person's acts—which help bring about a man's personal sins [81-84]) with what he has to say about the effects of original sin (85). "This choice appeals for justification simply to the prominence original sin must have for any Christian theologian because of its bearing both upon the meaning of man's history of salvation and upon any normative judgment about his moral situation" (p. xix).

The notes to this volume are quite full. This is all to the good, for they will be genuinely helpful to the present-day reader (e.g., to take but one minor example, p. 38, note f, on the divergent uses of "formal" and "material"). So too are the Appendixes, where we find for the second time in this series of volumes (there were three short Appendixes in Vol. 6 on the scriptural, patristic, and medieval presentations of the Trinity), but on a larger scale this time, an effort to situate St. Thomas historically. Appendixes 2-6 give a concise outline of the key moments in the history of Church teaching on original sin from the Fifteenth Council of Carthage in 418 to Humani generis in 1950; a conspectus of Catholic doctrine as formulated at Trent; the OT and NT data; the theology of St. Thomas in relation to his predecessors.

The volume is also an especially timely one. The doctrine of original sin is one that has never been neglected in theological literature, but recent years have seen increased interest. There has been a full-dress (but polemical)
historical interpretation of the theological tradition (up to the eleventh century thus far): Julius Gross, *Geschichte des Erbsündendogmas* (2 vols. Munich, 1960–63). There have also been, on the Catholic side, new speculative attempts. There was room to at least advert to these under the heading of "Contemporary Attitudes" at the end of Appendix 1 ("Attitudes toward Original Sin," pp. 105–9). The contemporary attitudes here illustrated from nontheological sources come down to seeing original sin as consisting in man's situation of lostness and alienation, the reference to "origin" being either vague or, at times, mythical. To cite Teilhard de Chardin in such a context (without comment and with the accidental substitution of "nature" for "malice" and, less importantly, of "of" for "or" towards the end) can be misleading. Teilhard is not speaking formally of the nature of original sin when he says in the passage quoted: "... is it really sure that, for an eye trained and sensitised by light other than that of pure science, the quantity and malice of evil *hic et nunc*, spread through the world, does not betray a certain excess, inexplicable to our reason, if to the normal effect of evolution is not added the extraordinary effect of some catastrophe or primordial deviation?" (*The Phenomenon of Man* [New York, 1959] p. 311; italics Teilhard's). This statement is not only true but, even if theologically inadequate, it is all that can be said from the phenomenological viewpoint which is Teilhard's. As for a full theology of original sin, Teilhard's "vision" has become the (at least partial) impulse behind several serious contemporary essays in this area, notably that of Piet Schoonenberg. The reader wishing to catch the difference of inspiration and accent between St. Thomas and such present-day essays might well start with Piet Smulders, *La vision de Teilhard de Chardin* (Paris, 1964; translated from third Dutch edition of 1963), Appendix 3, "Evolution et péché originel" (pp. 173–200); he will find there the traditional theology put into proper perspective, an introduction to contemporary efforts, and a presentation of Teilhard that is sympathetic, even if combined with a finally negative judgment.

The first volume of the *Secunda secundae* to appear presents the first half of the treatise on the virtue of religion (Qq. 92–100 concern the opposite vices). After deciding on the list of virtues which form "potential parts" of the cardinal virtue of justice, i.e., virtues related to justice but not embodying, for one or other reason, the complete reality of justice which is the full rendering of what is *due by law*, the treatise goes on to deal with the virtue of religion itself; with its internal acts, i.e., devotion and prayer; and with its external elicited acts (acts whose specific content and immediate purpose is cultic), i.e., adoration, sacrifice, oblations, tithes, oaths and adjurations, and the use of God's name in prayer and praise. The bulk of the editorial comment is in the six Appendixes (pp. 253–68).
In Appendix 1, "The Setting," Fr. Velecky (author of Appendixes 1, 3, 6) remarks: "The framework of the treatise inevitably influences what is discussed and how. Prominence is given to what by long-standing tradition are included under 'due returns,' for instance first fruits and tithes. Moreover, it is to be expected that little attention will be paid here to some matters closely connected with being religious—for instance contemplation and the sacraments; that is why we must also look elsewhere if we are to fill out what religion meant to St. Thomas" (pp. 253-54). The last sentence, concretized still further in the Appendixes on prayer (p. 259) and sacrifice (p. 262), points to a general misconception to which an uninstructed reader of the Summa can fall prey: to think that a subject is exhausted by its treatment in one article, question, or series of questions.

One result of the treatment of material necessitated by the framework of the Summa and, in particular, of the splitting up of material on sacrifice is that the substantial continuity between St. Thomas and Augustine's rich doctrine on sacrifice (De civitate Dei 10, 1-6, 19-20) may be masked. In the formal treatment of sacrifice under the virtue of religion, St. Thomas is concerned in recto, as Fr. O'Rourke points out (p. 262), with the external act of sacrifice, and indeed from the viewpoint of the act itself, not of the doer or the gift. In other words, St. Thomas is really giving a theological justification of the special place which ritual sacrifice has in human history. Unless this purpose is understood and one learns to look carefully at the replies to objections and at other parts of the Summa, too, for complementary material, St. Thomas' formal discussion of sacrifice may appear to be a narrowing of the Augustinian vision. Doubtless St. Thomas applies distinctions which Augustine did not, perhaps could not, make; doubtless, too, the immediate religious impact of Augustine's thought is greater than that of a medieval Summist. But as far as the central ideas go, they are present in St. Thomas and operative in giving context and inner meaning to ritual sacrifice, as they no longer were in post-Tridentine Scholastic thought on sacrifice up to the present century.

A further seeming limitation of the treatment of sacrifice here is that it is placed under religion as a special virtue. To some this is already to compromise the Augustinian idea of sacrifice as the movement of man in charity toward full union with God. Thus, Yves de Montcheuil, S.J., says in his fine essay on Augustine ("L'Unité du sacrifice et du sacrement dans l'Eucharistie," in his Mélanges théologiques [Théologie 9; Paris, 1951]): "Sacrifice [for St. Thomas] tends to mean a manifestation of the special virtue [vertu particulière] of religion; and every good act can be called 'sacrifice' because from one point of view it comes under the special virtue of religion" (p. 61). But the particulière in its second occurrence indicates that de Montcheuil has perhaps
misunderstood St. Thomas. There is, in fact, a close parallel between the procedures of Augustine and Thomas in dealing with sacrifice. Augustine starts from the phenomenon of ritual sacrifice, for it is of this that the question is raised: are the Platonici right in offering sacrifice to angels? Ritual sacrifice is the *primum notum*, the first analogue that serves as necessary point of departure and yields the nominal definition *sacrum-faciens*. Augustine then passes to the inner meaning of this outward sign-action and, having reached a Christian understanding of what this interior reality must be if ritual sacrifice is to be effective, can speak of the inner reality as embodied in every good work (which thereby becomes a *verum sacrificium*). In similar fashion, Thomas starts from ritual sacrifice, moves to its interior meaning, and from the latter back to “every good work” (85, 3, ad 1um).

But the virtue of religion which commands every good work and makes of it a sacrifice is really no longer the special virtue of religion. It is one of the three general virtues (along with *justitia generalis* [our “social justice”] and *magnanimitas*). This means that religion is a virtue which can exercise an influence on *all* the other virtues, even the theological virtues, whereas prudence and charity *must* exercise an influence on every act of virtue if it is to be, respectively, a moral act and a perfect act of virtue, i.e., actually ordered to the real End, God, in the present supernatural order; and whereas every other virtue can exercise an influence on only *some* of the other virtues. (On the idea of general virtue, cf. V. de Couesnongle, O.P., “La notion de vertu générale chez saint Thomas d’Aquin,” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 43 [1959] 601–20.) The distinction between religion as a special virtue and religion as a general virtue does not concern the formal object and formal motive of religion in the two cases; these remain the same. The distinction concerns rather the elicited and the commanded acts of the virtue of religion. The distinction between the two kinds of acts and consequently between religion as a special and religion as a general virtue is more than a dialectical subtlety. It is rather a recognition of the fundamental fact that every human action has a triple dimension, a triple relationship: to God, to the human community, to man’s own perfection. For this reason, what de Montcheuil says of Augustine can be said equally, though not in quite the same way, of St. Thomas: “for Saint Augustine *cultus*, or the virtue of religion, is not one virtue among others, as we usually think it to be; it is the total, complete act by which the creature gives its Creator what it owes Him, that is, relates itself totally to Him” (p. 59).

At issue here is the subtlety and complexity of the whole concept of *virtus* in St. Thomas, and the assumption of the ancient concept of *religio* into a transcendent perspective; one can see all of this in action by an
attentive reading of *In Boetium de trinitate* 3, 2: “Quomodo se habet fides ad religionem.” Here it must suffice to explain the qualification made above on the agreement of Augustine and Thomas (“not in quite the same way”). Augustine makes no distinctions within the “total, complete act,” while St. Thomas distinguishes the motive power and “formative” (end-relating) principle behind every unqualifiedly Christian act of virtue, i.e., charity, from the general and special virtues which concern immediately not man’s supernatural end but the acts wherein charity finds its concrete expression in the details of human life.

This subordinate position of the virtue of religion has not pleased some contemporary writers. Two highly qualified dissidents may be mentioned. One is Dom Odón Lottin; in several articles and books, e.g., “Vertu de religion et vertus théologales,” *Dominican Studies* 1 (1948) 209–28, L. argued that acts of religion have for their object God and not simply acts ordered to God, and thought that St. Thomas was prevented from following out this line of thought only by an inherited tradition. This was to read St. Thomas too quickly and to fail to make a distinction that is for him fundamental. Only the theological virtues have God for their object in the sense that they immediately “grasp” God; the virtue of religion orders man’s cultic acts, which have God as their destinatory. Do these acts, elicited by the virtue of religion, themselves “grasp” God? No; but any actual act of cultus is a complex reality, it is dynamically ordered (“formed”) to God, who is, however, immediately attained only by charity itself. (Cf. the critiques of Lottin’s views in Antoninus Finili, O.P., *Dominican Studies* 3 [1950] 78–88, and, more importantly, in J. Tonneau, O.P., *Bulletin thomiste* 8 [1947–53] 719–35.) Dom Lottin’s feeling that the virtue of religion was being under-esteemed might have been alleviated, as P. Couesnongle suggests in the article mentioned above, by an understanding of the privileged place religion has in St. Thomas as one of the three general virtues.

The second contemporary writer alluded to above is Richard Egenter, “Das Wesen der religio und ihre Stellung im Tugendsystem nach dem heiligen Thomas von Aquin,” in *Der Mensch vor Gott: Festschrift für Theodor Steinbüchel zum 60. Geburtstag* (Düsseldorf, 1948) pp. 55–65. E.’s chief criticism is that St. Thomas does not allow for any natural theological virtue by which man’s natural acts of religion are ordered to God; but he finds in the same texts which Lottin uses (on God as “object” of religion) evidence that St. Thomas has room for a natural theological virtue, viz., a natural virtue of religion. But once the texts on God as object have been explained, this basis in Thomas is removed. As for a natural theological virtue, St. Thomas would answer that none such is needed to explain man's natural
knowledge of and tendency to God as the good; a theological virtue becomes necessary only when man's end is beyond his powers to know and to love.

To return to Fr. O'Rourke's volume for one final remark, which would presumably apply to any volume in the series: St. Thomas quotes Scripture from the Vulgate. Should not a note indicate where the Vulgate misunderstands, adds to, subtracts from the original text, and how the text should be translated? This is an added burden for the editor, but it may prevent a contemporary reader, filled with the back-to-the-Bible spirit, from discovering that the text St. Thomas adduces is inaccurate and concluding that his doctrine is thereby invalidated. Thus in 82, 4, Thomas confirms his analysis showing that devotion should produce joy by citing Ps 77(76):4a, "I remembered God and was delighted." But the text should be translated (as the parallelism with 4b would lead us to expect) as follows: "When I remember God, I moan"! In fact, of course, the analysis does not depend on the text. A Scripture text is for Thomas rarely a "proof." His starting point is the doctrinal and spiritual tradition of the Church, his tools are philosophical and phenomenological analysis, and the theological problems are for the most part problems arising out of dogmatic principles and facts and out of other theological principles, even though a Scripture text be offered as the starting point in a Sed contra. A good example of this is the question of the predestination of Christ (3, 24), which seems to spring directly out of the Vulgate translation of Rom 1:4: "Qui praedestinatus est filius dei in virtute," yet is in fact entirely independent of this text. It might remove an unnecessary obstacle to some readers if the editor himself called attention to such misleading translations. (It is more surprising to find Fr. Velecky, in Appendix 1, p. 255, repeating the Vulgate translation; but perhaps he intends here simply to paraphrase St. Thomas' text.)

The volume on "The Eucharistic Presence" contains six of the eleven questions on the Eucharist, yet it covers only the first of the major points to be discussed apropos of this as of the other sacraments: the sacramental sign itself with its matter and form; the following volume will deal with the effects of the sacrament, the recipient, and the minister with the manner of celebrating the sacrament. Fr. Barden adverts in his introduction to what is, for the modern reader, a great deficiency: the treatise on the Eucharist is centered on the Real Presence and the effects of Communion, rather than on the Eucharistic sacrifice. He is content to answer that there may be some truth to the conclusion that "a piety which would express the theological interest of St. Thomas might find its centre rather in the tabernacle and the monstrance than on the stone of sacrifice" (p. xxii) and to remind the
reader that the elements of a theology of the Eucharistic sacrifice do appear in the later questions of this treatise. Some years ago, in his commentary on this same first part of the treatise, A.-M. Roguet, O.P., argued that St. Thomas’ treatment of the Eucharist transcends the sacrifice-sacrament division, because the Eucharist is in its totality sacramental and St. Thomas is never talking about the Eucharist only as sacrament or only as sacrifice (cf. Somme théologique: L’Eucharistie 1 [Somme théologique des Editions du Cerf; Paris, 1960] 337-41). Whatever be the truth of this, the treatment in the Summa does appear to us today not to give the Sacrifice of the Mass its proper pre-eminence. This may well be a state of mind conditioned by the Reformation and its polemics, though the emphasis, in the Constitution on the Liturgy, for example, on the paschal mystery is hardly to be explained polemically. I suspect that there is much in what Fr. Roguet says and that St. Thomas has a much more unified vision of the Eucharist and its complex reality than we have (cf. 73, 4, for his awareness of the complexity). In any event, we cannot recapture St. Thomas’ outlook; too many doctrinal conflicts and theological debates have destroyed our innocence.

Fr. Barden will probably not find very many people outside the Thomist school to agree with him wholeheartedly that “it is in the Eucharistic theology of the presence of Christ as victim under the appearances of bread and wine that the Aristotelean doctrine of substance and accident proves most helpful” (p. xix). In three Appendixes, B. explains the sacramentality of the Eucharist (the tripartite structure of every sacrament: sacramentum, res et sacramentum, res), the varied presences of Christ in the Eucharist (as priest to the ordained priest, as priest to the faithful, as victim, etc.), and the metaphysics of the Eucharist (instrumentality). These Appendixes are written in a somewhat affective style that seems out of place and leads to some obscurity, especially in the continuous use of the verb “touch”: can it be said, for example, in Thomist metaphysics (or any metaphysics) that the species “can be thought of as touching him” (p. 199) or that Christ touches us, though not we Him, at the time of sacramental eating (cf. p. 211)? (On p. 207 a lapsus calami makes Christ the “principal cause” of transubstantiation; the following pages speak of Him correctly as instrumental cause.)

The preceding pages have failed to mention many of the merits of the volumes reviewed. If they have rather contained perhaps too much of the reviewer’s own thoughts on the difficulty of reading St. Thomas today, that is itself intended as a compliment to this excellent and greatly successful enterprise.

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

No movement of religious ideas has so profoundly affected the development of contemporary Christianity as the Reformation of the sixteenth century. The polemical bitterness which this great schism released divided Christians into confessional positions of firm rigidity. More conscious of their diversity than of their similarity, the two families, the Catholic and the Evangelical, soon lost sight of their common historical origin. This split in the Christian commonwealth has been, and is, a scandal to the vast nonbelieving world. Our own day, under the inspiration of the ecumenical movement, witnesses the birth and growth of a more irenic spirit in Reformation studies, whose insights and conclusions have been fruitful in establishing mutual understanding and confidence. Obedient Rebels ("Catholics who were also Protestants") is an example of this kind of scholarship.

P. takes as his point de départ the dichotomy (Paul Tillich's): Catholic substance, "the body of tradition, liturgy, dogma and churchmanship developed chiefly by the ancient church and embodied (but not exhausted) for Luther in the Roman Catholic Church of his day," and Protestant principle, "a summary term for the criticism and reconstruction of this Catholic substance which Luther and his Reformation carried out in the name of the Christian Gospel and with the authority of the Bible." The theme is developed in three principal stages: the attitude of Luther's Reformation toward tradition and Church history as "critical reverence"; the efforts of Luther's Reformation to achieve "unity despite separation"; and the evaluation of the relevance of "Catholic substance and Protestant principle" today. P.'s development of the first stage of the problem is by far the best section of the book. "Unity despite separation," which handles the grave crisis of diversity within the Reformation communities, is disappointing. For here P. might well have taken up the important question of Luther's reaction to Rome's attempts (however feeble and one-sided they might be judged) at reunion in the years before the Council of Trent. This would have thrown interesting light on the intention of the Reform movement, especially on the "Protestant principle" within the ecclesial context. Despite certain valuable insights, the last section of the book does not seem to cohere with the first two parts. It is not easy, therefore, to give a simple answer to the question whether the point of the book, "to make sense of Catholic substance and Protestant principle in Luther's Reformation," has been successfully achieved.

Luther's stand on Holy Scripture was decisive in the formation of his concept of the Church: "the point of intersection between Catholic substance and Protestant principle." The problematic of biblical hermeneutics is
ultimately contained in the question: who rightly interprets Holy Writ? Is it the individual ("I") or the community (the Church)? For Luther, the answer is to be sought in the individual and his response to the sacred text. Hence the relevance of the question supposedly posed to Luther: "Bist du allein klug?" Is the individual alone competent to stand up against the voice of Christian tradition at any one point of history? The conflict between individual and Church over the ultimate meaning of Scripture is not original to the sixteenth century; its origins go back to the early Church. Perhaps the most striking historical example of this dialectic is to be located in the celebrated Arian controversy. Both sides were Christian; both had the same Gospel text before them; presumably both were equally competent in Greek. Yet each read and understood differently. Was the one Spirit partial? Did it inspire contradictories? Whose understanding of the text was right? In accepting the nonbiblical formula *homoousios*, which subsequently came to be considered expressive of the essence of the Gospel, the Council of Nicaea affirmed the authority-principle in exegesis. The unity of the Church is indeed "to be sought, first of all, in the gospel, and not in anything external or human." But it is not a matter of indifference whether one believes that the Son is *homoousios* with the Father, or *homoiousios* or *homoios* or *anomoios*. Man responds to the Gospel in terms of his apprehension of it; but it was crucial in historical Christianity that his interpretation coincide with the Church's.

I raise this point here because the character of the Church, especially her authority in biblical questions, is paramount in the contemporary dialogue between Catholics and Protestants. It is a simple matter to speak of "Catholic substance" and "Protestant principle"; but it is not to be forgotten that it is invariably the "principle" which gives determination and meaning to the "substance." For it is the eye that sees the substance, and the mind that knows it. This is central. Catholic substance apart from Catholic principle can cease to be Catholic; interpreted by a new principle, it can become even a new substance. In interpreting Reformation history according to these categories, there is need of extraordinary precision.

Face to face with Catholic liturgy, Luther was "an obedient rebel." In terms of his concept of the Gospel (Protestant principle), he renovated, revised, and reformed the old order of worship (Catholic substance), converting it into what he believed would be an apt instrument for proclaiming the Word of God. This reform was badly needed. What no one dared (or cared) to do, Luther did (or tried to do). His reformed liturgy was ordered to expressing the Gospel. But the character of this renovation (as P. develops it) makes one wonder whether Luther's method was valid. Did his resentment of the liturgical style and practice of the late medieval
Church destroy his objectivity? As a product of the liturgical decadence of the fifteenth century, did he understand what liturgy really is? These questions are posed in view of the fact that for Luther (and for P.) rubrics and liturgy seem to coalesce. It is not surprising, therefore, that neither seeks the continuity of the Church in her liturgy. I say this despite the statement "Worship did not mean chiefly ceremonies for Luther." Catholic liturgy (the substance) is something "given" (traditum) by Christ to His Church. It is neither simply kerygmatic nor didactic nor external; it is rather ordered to uniting man to God by conferring the grace of Christ. It expresses the Church's continuance of the work of redemption. It is in the very heart of the Catholic concept of Christianity.

This book is ecumenical in spirit. The author is honest, conciliatory, and generous in handling the delicate questions which his theme embraces. It is due perhaps to this irenic disposition that certain Catholic-Protestant issues (both theological and historical) are omitted from realistic discussion. This is regrettable, since very few Protestant scholars are as well suited to discussing this dangerous "middle zone" as Prof. Pelikan.

Woodstock College

ROBERT E. McNALLY, S.J.


One of the more important benefits which seems to follow on interconfessional discussions is the discovery, on the part of Catholic theologians at least, that Catholic and even Tridentine theology is open to a far more "evangelical" interpretation than earlier controversialists thought possible. For P., Luther's understanding of the Christian's certainty of personal salvation is in fact so close to St. Thomas' theology of hope that he has been led to review the whole controversy on this fundamental doctrine of the Reformation. To establish the true issues in the controversy, he therefore starts from the apparently irreconcilable positions of Luther and Trent on the meaning of grace and on man's consequent certainty (or uncertainty) of his salvation. Having thus heightened interconfessional differences as far as possible, he then turns to Thomas' understanding of the certainty of Christian hope and, arguing from the fact that for Thomas God's perfect mercy and omnipotence are the sole grounds of our hope, concludes that "if by certainty of salvation we mean the unshakable trust that God forgives my sins and effects my eternal salvation, as long as I cling to him with complete faith and firm hope, then we must say: Aquinas taught the certainty of personal salvation" (p. 104). Finally, in what is perhaps the most interesting part of his study, P. re-examines Luther's own teaching and
concludes that, contrary to the impression that Trent might give, Luther not only did not hold for a presumptuous and subjectivist confidence of salvation, but is in fact in substantial agreement with St. Thomas on the perilous character of the Christian’s earthly situation.

Since P. presents his own conclusions as “provisional,” we shall have to wait for his proposed larger work in order to see whether Luther and Thomas really do share, as he believes, a common “kerygmatic” ground. As of now, however, it must be said that P.’s ecumenical enthusiasm seems to have led him into some of the oversimplifications which he himself recognizes as a danger in this kind of discussion. For although his study is sometimes quite interesting, especially on the limited significance of Trent’s decree and on the dialectical character of Luther’s theology, still his best-founded conclusions do not seem especially surprising and his most surprising conclusions do not seem especially well-founded. Thus, e.g., it is hardly sufficient to cite a few texts of Luther, as P. does, in order to show that Luther recognized, even at the end of his theological development, a legitimate insecurity within confident faith. Nor is it sufficient to say that Thomas considers the truly good work as “wholly” from God and then cite as evidence (p. 136, n.36) “I–II 114”—i.e., the whole question de merito. Finally, P. tends to circle rather than to face the fundamental issue which the very term “merit” suggests. For while it may be true that “the simultaneity of the divine and the human in the event of justification is ultimately beyond the grasp of the human mind” (p. 134), it is precisely this co-operation of the justified man in the achievement of salvation that Luther seems to deny and that Thomas —to the extent that he grants that man’s hope is ex gratia et meritis—affirms. Once, moreover, the significance of man’s own activity under grace is affirmed, it follows that his salvation is always endangered by his own creaturely weakness and that the Christian’s full confidence in God’s grace can coexist with self-doubt. Whether this self-doubt is a legitimate self-doubt or the reverse side of a self-confidence which denies the total gratuity of salvation, is the fundamental issue in this controversy between Trent and the Reformers. One who shares P.’s own Thomistic convictions may be ready to grant that he can explain man’s co-operation in such a way that total gratuity is not compromised. Until he works out that explanation, however, it is to be feared that those in the Lutheran tradition will judge that he has brought Luther and Thomas together only by suggesting that Luther could attribute to man’s activity a salvific significance which he believed himself, rightly or wrongly, obliged to deny.

Woodstock College

JOHN W. HEALEY, S.J.

Prof. van de Pol, of the Catholic University of Nijmegen, himself a former Anglican, has given us a most useful survey of Anglicanism today, as it appears in the many-sided efforts of the Anglican communion to promote ecumenical relations throughout the world. Thus two subjects, distinct yet related, constitute the topic of the work: Anglicanism, seen mainly as it exists in the Church of England, and the ecumenical perspective, from which the author reflects on Anglicanism and on the entire state of Christendom today.

The presentation of Anglicanism is marked by the puzzling absence of any treatment of Anglicanism in itself, as it is apart from any Anglican stance in regard to other churches and to Christian unity as a whole. Only a few pages (30-37) briefly describe "the Church of England and the Anglican communion" from a somewhat superficial standpoint which does not enter into Anglican theology at any depth. Readers unacquainted with the internal characteristics and ethos of the Anglican communion should refer to some of the volumes listed in the bibliography in order to see the present book against the background which it assumes as known. Bishop Stephen Neill's Anglicanism (1958) would provide a good introduction.

Even though van de Pol conceived his topic to include only Anglicanism in ecumenical dialogue, the absence of a preliminary study of Anglicanism in itself places him at a disadvantage in describing the conversations in which Anglicans have been engaged for a longer time than any other Christians. Taking account all but exclusively of what he calls "the official, authentic Anglicanism that is accepted by the greater number of Anglicans," he is led to imply that the Anglicanism of the Oxford Movement and its successors is inauthentic and of little account in ecumenical endeavors. In fact, van de Pol insists on the Protestant nature of the Church of England and explicitly rejects the Catholicizing interpretations of the English Reformation that Anglo-Catholics are likely to hold. As a result, the Anglicanism which he describes in conversation with other ways of Christianity is more of an abstraction than real Anglicanism is. And the Anglican comprehensiveness, which he holds to be a synthesis of complementary tendencies, could be seen, from a more complete survey, as an artificial coexistence of opposite theologies.

Van de Pol is at his best describing the details of the conversations with, and approaches to, other branches of Christendom in which Anglicans have taken part or which they have initiated. One could question some historical statements or point out flaws in the telling of the story; e.g., the difference
between Anglicans and Puritans seems to be underrated (p. 95); the Methodist Church was not constituted "around 1750," but only in 1795 (p. 97); Dr. Bell is called Bishop of Winchester on p. 158, and Bishop of Chichester on p. 169; to say that "official ecclesiastical declarations" of Roman Catholics are "pre-ecumenical" is to take no account of a number of statements and gestures by Popes John XXIII and Paul VI (p. 161). These blemishes detract from the value of the book in regard to details and specific points, although they cannot bring into question the general effectiveness of the author or jeopardize his thesis. Whether this thesis can stand or is sufficiently supported is, however, another matter.

Van de Pol surprises his readers by affirming at the start that he is working purely as a phenomenologist, who "must try to abstain from giving his own personal testimony" (p. 28), and yet proposing at the end a very definite plan for Christian unity. This plan would consist in restoring full intercommunion among all churches of the Catholic type (Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Old Catholic) and among all churches of the Protestant type, so that the Christian world would be made up of only two large groups, Catholic and Protestant; van de Pol sees no doctrinal obstacle in the way of this first major step. In a second step, or perhaps at the same time, the Protestant group of churches would acquire an episcopal structure from the Anglican communion. In a third step, the Catholic group would recognize the validity of Anglican orders as thus existing in the entire Protestant world.

My objection to this would be twofold. On the one hand, the very modest proposal toward the possibility of some *communicatio in sacris* between Orthodox and Catholics which has been made in the decrees of the Second Vatican Council has already encountered strenuous resistance among Orthodox prelates and theologians: this would show that the problem is more complex than van de Pol seems to believe. On the other hand, reunion by more and more extensive mergers, which the Anglican communion actually favors and which van de Pol tries to conceive at the universal level, does nothing to solve the more basic problem of unity in faith. From the standpoint of ultimate unity, it makes no difference whether discrepancies in faith separate churches or separate people within the same church. The urge toward Christian mergers, which is now felt throughout the Christian world, leaves intact the problem of unity in faith. Van de Pol has rendered an immense service by describing the contribution of Anglicanism to unity, which has been, so far, to inspire coexistence and to envision its own disappearance within ecumenical mergers. Even so, the contribution of Orthodoxy and of Catholicism must be to insist that Christian unity is a unity in faith.

*Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh*  
*George H. Tavard*
The present book is a well-blended collection of essays and articles by a leading ecumenical scholar. The unifying theme is the "new look" given to Catholic ecclesiology by the Constitutions on the Liturgy and on the Church, considered in light of John XXIII's speeches and directives.

As T. sees it, a great new awakening is occurring in the Church. It is preparing to face the world of tomorrow rather than to persist as a dwindling minority estranged from contemporary thought and life. The polemical and sociological Catholicism of the Counter Reformation is rapidly dying out. The sense of true Catholicity and ecumenicity is being recovered. The Church appears anew as a fraternity, a fellowship of pilgrims, and no longer as an army or power structure. The building-up of the Body of Christ in truth and love requires incessant reform, and to this each Christian, lay or cleric, can contribute by his personal sanctification. The liturgical movement is bringing back our practices of piety and our official worship to biblical and patristic standards, thus escaping from the decadence of the past few centuries.

This vision of the Church has profound ecumenical and missionary implications. The Church, as T. describes it, is by its very essence ecumenical; it is necessarily oriented, as Christ Himself is, toward all mankind and toward the whole cosmos. In order to carry on an effective dialogue with mankind, as they are called upon to do, Christians must be united among themselves. The unity of Christians must include a necessary correlation between life and structure, between spirit and institution. Ultimate unity, in T.'s opinion, must involve an integration of Protestantism within the Catholic-Orthodox Church pattern. Roman Catholics by themselves are too prone to a legalistic approach; in this respect they can learn from the Orthodox, who have kept more room for spontaneity.

The missionary task of the Church, according to T., must always be addressed to her own members rather than, in any aggressive way, to those who do not share her faith. "The Church's mission is not directly to save souls or to make converts... The Church is missionary when she announces the kingdom of God through the essential acts of her existence, through the 'eschatological' dimension of her life and doctrine" (p. 187). She must not adopt the posture of a pressure group or of a rival among rival sects, but reveal herself as the unique "Great Church" which she is. Her true defense, T. maintains, does not lie in polemics or apologetics, "but in witnessing to a glory which is not hers, but Christ's, to a truth which is not her own, but which owns her, to a faith which she does not grasp like a pos-
session, but which grasps her" (p. 184). While this emphasis on witnessing to Christ is excellent, one might question whether T. sufficiently esteems the direct apostolate to the non-Christian, a task heavily stressed in the NT.

In a chapter of particular interest to religious, T. examines the renewal of the religious orders through contemporary spirituality. He takes his cue from the Constitution on the Liturgy, in which he finds the idea that action and contemplation are two inseparable aspects of the complete Christian life. He notes in many institutes a certain tension between law and freedom. The constitutions and rules of such orders, he observes, often reflect the conditions of previous centuries, and must in any case be applied with great discretion in order to assist each individual to commit himself more perfectly to God in personal freedom. The liturgy, according to T., is the place where this tension is best resolved, for here the individual encounters the others in Christ and becomes most fully a person. In the setting of the liturgy, authority appears as a ministry, requiring the superior to give himself over to the service of those over whom he presides. For effective self-renewal, therefore, the religious orders must overcome their general tendency to hang on to antiquated and unliturgical traditions.

The religious vocation, as T. interprets it, is highly personal and individual. It is not automatically realized through the act of joining a particular order, but is progressively achieved through the gifts and charisms which a man receives in tending toward holiness. The religious community, in T.'s opinion, is "a fraternity of equals devoted to a common purpose according to the specific traditions of a religious order" (p. 93). The religious vocation is a special one but is not essentially superior to other vocations such as the married state or the diocesan clergy. In minds formed by the liturgical vision of the people of God, there should be no complacent feeling of being situated in a "state of acquiring perfection," as though the hierarchy of holiness could be successfully translated into static, canonical terms.

T.'s evaluation of the religious life in terms of the Constitution on the Liturgy could doubtless be enriched by consideration of the statements of the Constitution on the Church, chap. 6, regarding the evangelical counsels and the religious vows. But his suggestions are valuable and should be carefully pondered by those seeking to update the religious life according to the spirit and norms of Vatican II.

Like any responsible theologian, T. has his personal views and sympathies. He is inclined to stress Spirit more than Word, event more than institution, liberty more than law, renewal more than continuity, promise more than possession. He cannot be accused of any excessive favoritism toward Scholasticism or canon law. Notwithstanding these propensities, he has produced
a wise, challenging, and generally balanced synthesis. While this work lacks the precision and erudition of T.'s *Holy Writ and Holy Church*, it has excellences of another order. Only a scholar of wide theological interests, equipped with an unusual feeling for history, could have composed these essays. They are written, moreover, in an engaging style, with few of those unidiomatic expressions which have occasionally marred his earlier work. All who have not been surfeited with literature on *aggiornamento* in the Church may read these pages with profit. They radiate in an attractive and powerful way the prevalent spirit of the present Council.

*Woodstock College*  
Avery Dulles, S.J.

**SEMINARY IN CRISIS.** By Stafford Poole, C.M. New York: Herder and Herder, 1965. Pp. 190. $3.95.


Several books and a spate of articles have lately drawn attention to the truth that an *aggiornamento* in clerical formation is one of the most pressing needs of the contemporary Church. A special schema on the topic is one of the promised fruits of Vatican II. For one who is coming upon the problem for the first time, Poole's well-organized and well-written volume provides a splendid introduction. He discusses or at least touches upon all the issues: the historical origins of the seminary, its canonical organization, its professorial staff and student body, academic standards and curriculum, ascetical formation, authority vs. freedom, and the seminary's role in fostering and furthering vocations to the priesthood.

Calling upon a wide experience as teacher and administrator in major and minor seminaries, P. regards the present situation with misgivings. He deplores the fact that the Tridentine seminary "ironically, one of the most revolutionary innovations in the history of the Catholic Church, has grown into one of its most static and ossified institutions" (p. 55). He cogently argues that the plight of the diocesan seminary (religious scholastics are explicitly excluded from the discussion) stems from one principal cause: the seminary's isolation, not merely spiritual and academic, but in most cases even geographical, from the rest of the world. Because the seminary has not been forced to rub shoulders with other academic institutions (even with other seminaries), it has been able to continue educational policies...
which in a more normal academic environment it could neither conceal nor justify: low entrance-requirements, lack of accreditation, tiny, overworked, ill-prepared faculties, inadequate libraries, outmoded curricula, and an atmosphere hostile or indifferent to scholarship. Parallel with these academic failings is a spiritual program which exhibits its own glaring deficiencies: an overemphasis on obedience and conformity to the seminary rules, a monastic order of the day unrelated to the seminarian's later life as a priest, a tendency to equate spirituality with the performance of the prescribed spiritual exercises, etc.

Even where seminaries are fortunate enough to have escaped these evils all-too-frequently consequent upon isolation, their seclusion from the world is alone sufficient to condemn them. Consequently, P. insistently urges that "if the seminary is to keep abreast of the modern world, it is going to have to be reunited organically with lay education. Without losing its distinctive character as a professional school, the seminary must return to the university, influencing and being influenced by it." This is the thesis of the book.

The thesis is, of course, no longer novel. The location of the seminary within a university environment has been advocated within the last decade, on many occasions, by a wide variety of observers, European and American, clerical and lay, Catholic and non-Catholic. Hence, for one who has closely followed this literature, P.'s book will beget a certain tedium—one has encountered it all before. But if P. adduces no new arguments, he has, at any rate, produced a useful compendium of the arguments already advanced. And his voice is a welcome addition to a swelling chorus.

By a happy coincidence, the area rapidly explored by Poole is reworked and examined in far greater detail by the volume, of almost encyclopedic proportions, edited by Lee and Putz. Fifteen contributors, all of them connected in some way or other with the seminary effort in the United States, review the familiar themes: history of seminary education, selection of candidates, academic and administrative personnel, curriculum organization, spiritual formation. With the understandable exception of the two competent chapters on the history of seminary education by John Tracy Ellis, the other offerings are highly individual, novel, and, in some instances, refreshingly exciting essays. For anyone involved in seminary education, the book will prove fascinating, hard to put down, tempting him to stay up all night reading it.

The lion's share of the production, four chapters, amounting to some two hundred pages, nearly a third of the whole, is contributed by James Michael Lee, who is also one of the editors. As a professional educator, he discusses aspects of the seminary related to his field: academic aims, administration,
personnel and guidance services, curriculum and teaching. If the reader can tolerate the trade jargon, which occasionally becomes obsessive, he will scarcely fail to be impressed by L.'s sure command of a huge amount of data. Some of the material is painful to contemplate. For example: "Since World War II there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of American seminaries. In the period from 1945 to 1959, a total of 131 new seminaries of all kinds were founded. Even more astounding is that from 1959 to the end of 1963, a period of three and one-half years, 190 new seminaries were erected, or a 50 per cent increase from the pre-1959 figure! One gets the impression that there was not very much careful planning in this regard; rather these seminaries seem to have been erected primarily to have a seminary in this diocese or in that religious institute, instead of providing the highest possible type of ecclesiastical education" (p. 99).

On the basis of statistics drawn from the 1963 Catholic Directory, Lee estimates that the average enrollment in diocesan seminaries is 210 students per seminary, and in similar institutions conducted by religious orders for their own members is 70 students per seminary. Since he asserts that "most American educators are agreed that to provide an educational program of minimum quality (when judged by modern standards) a four-year school must have a total enrollment of not less than 600 students" (p. 97), he naturally suspects that the education dispensed in most American seminaries is not of very high quality. Efforts to dispel this suspicion are usually not successful. As Lee says: "Seminary education in the United States is a huge operation. By the beginning of 1965, there were nearly 50,000 youths in American Roman Catholic seminaries at the various levels. Despite the vastness of the seminary enterprise, there is an almost unbelievable scarcity of factual data about these institutions. Because of the Kremlin-like cloak of secrecy surrounding seminaries, a somewhat clear (though by no means complete) picture of seminary education must come from one of four sources" (p. 96).

The sources which L. enumerates are: a negligible amount of research in a few areas of seminary education; statements offered by seminary administrators; the testimony of former seminarians; and extrapolation from the knowledge and conduct of former seminarians. If this is, in truth, the sum of the data available to a professional educator, he can scarcely be blamed if he levels against the American seminary as a whole the accusation of defrauding its students and of disobeying repeated and explicit directives of the Holy See. If the charge is false, experts like L. are entitled to see the evidence disproving it.

Aficionados of the trenchant style of John L. McKenzie, S.J., will not be
disappointed on reading his chapter, "Theology in the Seminary Curricu-
lum." He argues powerfully that the Scholastic dialectical system of dog-
matic theology should be displaced from the central position it has held for
so long. As a substitute he proposes "... that theology should be studied
historically and critically throughout the course. This will be the central
thrust of the revised curriculum. The Bible, of course, recommends itself for
historical study; it is the recital of the acts of God in history, and revelation
is clearly seen as encounter and experience. The same methods should be
applied to the utterances of the teaching Church and to the writings of the
Fathers and the theologians. The scholastic synthesis has achieved unity and
simplicity by the exclusion of a number of notable elements of Christian
thought.... It does not reveal the historical context in which the dogmatic
statements and the theological thinking were developed. Each theological
movement was a response to the need of its time, a need which was often
political or social as much as it was theological. The heretical movements
were more than mere eccentric statements of this or that dogma; they were
different conceptions of the Church and her relation to the world, and they
compelled the Church to assert her own identity more clearly and firmly.
Yet all too often seminary classes tear these events from their roots in his-
tory and analyze them as purely logical propositions" (p. 421). This shift
in the center of gravity of the theological curriculum has, of course, been
advocated elsewhere by others. McK.'s contribution is unique for the pas-
sonate sincerity with which the case is argued. Even should they neglect
everything else in the S.-P. volume, professors of theology are almost morally
bound to read and ponder this article.

A similar charge might be laid on professors of philosophy with reference
to the contribution, "Philosophy in the Seminary Curriculum," authored
by Robert O. Johann, S.J. Writing with a comprehensive sympathy for
the needs and perplexities of the "new breed," J. pleads for a discarding of
the systematic approach to philosophy in favor of an approach where the
emphasis is on the historical and the problematic. In addition, J. offers some
luminous, arresting, and quite original reflections on the problem: what hap-
pens when a man of faith philosophizes? A short excerpt must suf-
fice: "... genuine philosophical reflection on the part of a Catholic is not a
matter of suspending his belief or of prescinding from it. Genuine philo-
sophical reflection is not a work of natural reason untouched by the light of
faith. Such a reflection is not a question of seeing, as it is sometimes put,
how far reason can go on its own power with the idea that faith, temporarily
left out of consideration, can then step in to answer the questions which
reason asks. For the work of reflection is not something which 'reason' does,
but which I do, I who am a Catholic, I who as a person am already committed to Christ and His Church, I whose experience, the subject-matter of reflection, is already structured, ordered, transformed by what I believe.... Philosophical reflection for the Catholic, therefore, is not a question of prescinding from his belief nor of trying to operate with some kind of 'pure reason.' Rather, it is simply the effort he makes, in common with any philosopher, to formulate for himself, on the basis of his experience, a consistent and comprehensive world view. The fact that the faith is included in this view as part of the experience it interprets, coupled with the fact that the view succeeds (if it does) in harmoniously relating this dimension of life with everything else that experience discloses about the person and his vocation—these facts no more militate against the view's being philosophical than the fact that the experience interpreted is a Catholic's makes it any less experience. The effort is philosophical because it is the individual's attempt to come to grips with the whole of experience and, relying on his own powers of discernment, to make the best sense he can of what he finds there" (pp. 472 ff.). Though J.'s contribution is urgently commended to the attention of seminary teachers, they should be forewarned (possibly the preceding citation has already alerted them) that they will find the chapter unsettling. Not least of the problems it raises has reference to the present separation between seminary philosophy and theology. Is it a good arrangement? Not surprisingly, J. doubts that it is.

With apologies to their authors, the remaining contributions to the S.-P. symposium can be but briefly noted. In his chapter, "Selection of Seminarians," William C. Bier, S.J., makes some sane and balanced comments on the value of testing the psychological aptitudes of candidates for the priesthood. In a chapter entitled "Sociological Dimensions of the Seminary," Robert M. Brooks, O.Praem., expresses the hope that measures of seminary reform, including the move to a university campus, will be based not upon untested assumptions, but rather upon empirical knowledge. Dennis J. Geaney, O.S.A., writing on "Social Action in Seminary Education," warns that social science courses in the seminary will be all but useless if not complemented by field trips into "the real, if sordid, life situations, which provide not only facts but which also develop empathy and compassion" (p. 492). Both Adrian van Kaam, C.S.Sp., and Maur Burbach, O.S.B., treating of the spiritual formation of seminarians, have valuable suggestions regarding the presentation, in a positive way, of the ideal of priestly celibacy. A study on "Psychological Aspects of Seminary Life," jointly authored by George Hagmaier, C.S.P., and Eugene C. Kennedy, M.M., may be coupled with the preceding chapter on "The Intellectual Climate in Seminary Life,"
written by Sergius Wroblewski, O.F.M. Both essays wrestle with the problem: how does the seminary build maturity? The chapter contributed by Louis J. Putz, C.S.C., "The Layman in Seminary Education," is really mistitled. It is actually a study of the theology of the layman. An essay on "Protestant Seminary Education in America," contributed by Franklin H. Littell, suffers by comparison with the other contributions, largely because the author is obliged to survey in one chapter the topics to which the other contributors devote sixteen chapters.

In a short epilogue written by the editors, a practical suggestion, designated as an "unmet needs conference," for seminary improvement is described in naive detail. Example: "The discussants meanwhile return to the auditorium where the rector thanks them for their assistance, and then indicates that seminarians are ready to conduct anyone who wishes on a guided tour of the plant." Almost equally ingenuous is the following: "A strong, external regulatory agency should be established to supervise the standards and activities of seminaries. Only in this manner can professionalization of seminary education be realized. This professional association—perhaps called the Association of Roman Catholic Theological Seminaries (ARCTS)—should be given carte blanche by the bishops and religious superiors with power to enforce its decision on both the local and national levels" (p. 559). To insure proper "professionalization," the executive committee of this association will be composed, it goes without saying, of "professionally-prepared educators and specialists with definite and pronounced views on Catholic education, not men who are selected chiefly because they are 'safe' or who 'won't rock the boat'" (pp. 559 f.). One wonders what instruments this committee of boat rockers will employ to "enforce its decision" on a recalcitrant seminary faculty.

The major shortcoming of the two books reviewed so far is that, although both stress the need of a revision of the seminary curriculum, neither shows concretely how this goal might be achieved. For suggestions along this line, the Keller-Armstrong paperback, which contains the addresses delivered at the Second Christopher Study Week (New York City, July 20-24, 1964) may profitably be consulted. In the area of fundamental theology, Avery Dulles, S.J., voices this complaint: "In most textbooks, moreover, the bonds between revelation and salvation are pictured too extrinsically, as though salvation were a kind of prize which God bestows on those who have performed the 'good work' of believing whatever He has said. Contemporary theologians, however, tend to view revelation as essentially salutary. The very fact that God stoops to speak to man is itself a transforming grace. The content of revelation is wholly designed to bring man, as an intellectual
being, into deeper communion with God. Proposed in this way, revelation appears as a signal blessing rather than as something to be accepted as a sheer duty” (p. 114).

After exposing a few other weaknesses of the course as commonly taught, Dulles describes the seven phases of a course which he feels does better justice to what revelation actually is and which would provide a more effective spur to apostolic zeal. In a paper entitled “How Should We Teach the Treatise on Grace?,” Peter Fransen, S.J., likewise first criticizes current practice and then depicts in satisfying detail the type of course he would offer as a substitute. Despite several excellences, the substitute will prove disappointing to many, since it makes no attempt to close the present distressing gap between the treatise *De gratia* and the treatise *De sacramentis.*

In his paper on ecclesiology, Frank B. Norris, S.S., suggests items that might be included in the treatise to make it more relevant to the contemporary religious scene. The contribution labors under the unavoidable handicap of having been written and delivered before the publication of Vatican II’s *Constitution on the Church.* Concluding the suggestions for the reform of the curriculum in dogmatic theology, Bernard J. Cooke, S.J., explains five ways of shifting the treatise on the sacraments from thing-orientation to person-orientation.

In discussing “Method and Purpose in the Seminary Scripture Course,” Myles M. Bourke urges the need of “a scientific preparation in biblical studies” for those destined to teach the word of God. As he notes: “While it is conceivable that such instruction could be given by a priest who is himself familiar only with the conclusions of biblical study, it is not likely that one whose knowledge of the scriptures is of that sort will be able to present his subject so effectively as he would if he had experienced the discipline of scientific study. Inspiring syntheses are always the fruit of technical work which is often hard and tedious. If the priest has done some of that work himself, he will be better equipped to pass on the synthesis with stimulating conviction. Moreover, in this age of ecumenism, the priest who is engaged in the pastoral ministry often finds himself in dialogue with non-Catholic clergy, Protestant or Jewish, who have had a good scientific training in the Bible. If he is not able to meet them on that level, the Church will inevitably suffer” (pp. 89 f.).

Now this is all very well and very wisely said, and yet it is difficult not to be disappointed in Bourke’s failure to draw from his argument the apparently inevitable corollary. A “good scientific training in the Bible” seems to demand, as an essential prerequisite, some measure of competence in the biblical languages. Indubitably, B. may legitimately claim that such com-
petence is implied throughout the several paragraphs in which he urges the scientific study of Scripture. The point may be conceded, without relinquishing the wish that he had raised the issue in explicit fashion. For at a time when the Scholastic dialectical approach to theology is gradually being replaced by a historical biblical approach, the problem of equipping the seminarian with the necessary linguistic tools will loom larger and larger. And the dimensions of the problem will be compounded if, as seems likely, Catholic seminaries will seek a greater measure of rapprochement with Protestant divinity schools. Are we approaching the day when a proved ability to handle, say, elementary Hebrew and intermediate Greek will be a sine qua non for ordination to the priesthood? Or is such a view utopian? In this era of biblical renewal, ecumenical dialogue, and seminary reform, the views of a Scripture scholar on these questions would be as welcome as they are needful.

Bernard Häring, C.SS.R, once more deserves praise for demonstrating how dogmatic, moral, and ascetical theology mesh intimately one with another to form the total evangel. By repeating the same message, H. contributes mightily to the cause of lifting moral theology from those weird shallows where, as he alleges, "Noldin, Prümmer and others enumerate some 200 obligations 'under mortal sin' concerned with the administration of and reception of the sacraments" (pp. 117 f.). At the same time, it might be added that H.'s suggestions for the rejuvenation of the moral-theology course would be more useful if he sought to show how "a moral of responsibility, initiative, and spontaneity" is to be combined with a moral which accurately distinguishes grave from venial malice. Both, it seems, are needed. H. is fond of quoting St. Paul: "Bear one another's burden and so fulfill the law of Christ" (Gal 6:2). It is useful besides to recall that the Apostle's grasp of moral theology extended also in the opposite direction, so to speak, enabling him to decide that incest deserved summary excommunication. H. contends: "The law of Christ is the very power of the love of Christ that presses us, not merely a law imposed from without, not a law of the least possible" (p. 183). To which observation one might offer a respectful demur. However much we may deplore their lack of generosity, there are and presumably, despite all our exhortations, there always will be Catholics intent on minimal compliance and on getting into heaven by the skin of their teeth. Since the love of Christ includes them, His law is, in some sense, a law of the least possible. These Catholics will surely ask the priest "whether such and such is a mortal sin." And the law of Christ seems to indicate that a priest should possess the information enabling him to phrase a clear and accurate reply. That aspect of the sacerdotal office H.'s paper does not appear to
stress; and it seems a pity. For surely we are all agreed that no gain will come to the Church if seminaries cease graduating Tridentine juridicists and substitute instead all-permissive Pollyannas.

Recent interest in the theology of preaching makes the paper of James M. Connolly, "Meaningful Preaching within the Present Framework of Homiletics," particularly timely. Teachers of sacred eloquence will find his schematic outline of a course in homiletics both impressive and helpful. Richard Armstrong, M.M., in "The Priest's Role in Stimulating Vital Careers," offers some extremely suggestive ideas for those interested in that newly emerging dogmatic treatise, the theology of work. In the final entry to the K.-A. paperback, Prudencio Damboriena, S.J., gives an account of the genesis and results of the seminary survey—a thorough investigation of the theological education given to the native clergy in Protestant territories in Asia, Africa, the Pacific Islands, and Latin America—undertaken by the International Missionary Council of the World Council of Churches. Perhaps the most illuminating chapter in the entire collection, D.'s paper is earnestly recommended to the attention of anyone seeking new openings for seminary participation in the ecumenical movement.

Regrettably, the twelve other contributions to the volume can here be given only a general commendation. Each of them contains helpful suggestions for seminary professors anxious to intensify the pastoral thrust of their courses. The book includes a statement of the aims of the Christopher Study Weeks and a summary of the conclusions reached in the sessions of 1963 and 1964.

_Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass._

_John Walsh, S.J._


This volume, which the author says is "by an historian" and "directed chiefly to historians," does however have several things to say to "those whose primary interests center on philosophy or political theory." It locates Pierre d'Ailly with admirable precision in his appropriate intellectual context, making more credible J. N. Figgis' and Lasky's insistence on the importance of the Conciliar Movement (in which d'Ailly was perhaps the most important theorist) for the development of Western constitutionalism.

Paradoxically, Oakley gives us both more and less than the title of his book promises. There is significantly more to be learned in these pages about the intellectual style of late-fourteenth-century and early-fifteenth-century Scholasticism, which Oakley designates as the "voluntarist tradition" in
preference to the "nominalist tradition," than about d'Ailly's specifically political thought. Perhaps this is as it should be, because only within that voluntarist tradition, which braved the problems of nominalism and moral relativism in order to affirm the freedom, omnipotence, and unity of God, could d'Ailly's often involuted reasoning be fully appreciated. Yet, after all due credit has been given to the voluntarist tradition, the question still remains: Was there really anything specifically "voluntarist" about d'Ailly's political theory?

D'Ailly's political theory is, on the surface, quite simple and is distinguished from a Thomistic or natural-law theory only to the extent that it pushes further than Thomas ever did the institutional check on power within a mixed form of government. He agreed with Thomas that authority existed in and for the community, that its purpose was the achievement of the common good, and that, although the exercise of authority might be entrusted to one man, a king or a pope, it nevertheless was residual in the community and, if the king or pope used it in a way harmful to the community, authority could be withdrawn or transferred. D'Ailly went several steps beyond Thomas in spelling out precisely how this limitation on the exercise of authority might be handled in a peaceful, regularized fashion—the essence of constitutionalism. To control the *plenitudo potestatis* of the Church, he thought "it would be the best form of government for the Church if, under one Pope, many men might be elected by and from every province, and that they should be Cardinals who, with the Pope and under him, might rule the Church and temper the use of the *plenitudo potestatis.*" This emphasis on the role of the cardinals, interesting particularly today as the Church experiments with collegiality, developed in d'Ailly's writings after he himself had been appointed to the cardinalate by the John XXIII of unhappy memory. D'Ailly's concern was obviously the Church, but, as O. notes, there is no reason to doubt that d'Ailly believed his conception of limited government was applicable to any "rightly-ordained polity."

The surface simplicity of d'Ailly's political thought and its similarity to Aristotelico-Thomistic natural-law thinking were complicated by the voluntarist distinction between God's *potentia absoluta* and His *potentia ordinata.* The distinction is always there, never pushed vigorously but rendering every statement tentative. This Christian relativism suggests a number of interesting questions, as does d'Ailly's nominalism. Concerning his nominalism, one wonders how he could justify a theory of the common good for a political community without resorting to a leviathan such as that of Hobbes.

Some of the most useful features of this volume, at least for those interested in the history of political ideas, are the discussion of the concept of
"dominion," which casts light on medieval man's unpolitical way of looking at what moderns would consider essentially political relationships, and the discussion of d'Ailly's influence on political writers of the following two centuries in France and in England, on John Ponet, George Buchanan, Theodore Beza, and the author of the *Vindiciae contra tyrannos*. A valuable bibliography and several important Latin texts of d'Ailly complete the volume.

*Fordham University*  
*JAMES C. FINLAY, S.J.*


Has the prolonged leadtime required to gain acceptance of the progressive Catholic doctrine of Church-state relations made it obsolescent before operational? The question is not discussed as such in the book under review, but is suggested by the author's careful and penetrating study of a complex struggle. It will probably occur to readers of modern freedom literature with its characteristic existentialist emphasis, focus on history, and antimeta-physical bias. How adequate are traditional categories of Church-state theory in conveying permanent truths to the contemporary mind? Have we been overcommitted to a juridical approach and underconcerned with personal and community aspects? More heed should, perhaps, be paid to the emerging view of the Church as the "people of God," sharing the mission of Christ in the world, a service of truth, justice, love, and freedom.

Thomas T. Love, an ordained elder in the Methodist Church and professor of religion at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, has written a scholarly analysis of the development of Fr. Murray's thought on the Church-state problem. The book is also a rich source of information about an always challenging and often baffling issue. L. deals systematically and thoroughly with three periods in the evolution of M.'s thought: "a period of dissatisfaction and confusion (1942-46), a period in which he made his first major constructive proposal and first criticized the conservative Catholic position (1948-49), and a period in which he systematically restated and defended his view (1951-54)." An Epilogue brings the record up to date with an evaluative summary of the document prepared just prior to the third session of Vatican II: "The Problem of Religious Freedom at the Council."

An initial sketch of the "conservative Catholic position" provides background and a starting point for the main matter of the book. Selected as expositors of this allegedly traditional position are Frs. John A. Ryan, Joseph C. Fenton, Francis J. Connell, and George Shea. These writers adhere to the familiar terminology of Catholic social thought: Church and state are per-
fect societies, in the sense that each has within itself all the means necessary to attain its own end. The Church, a supernatural as well as a natural institution, has a higher purpose and so enjoys primacy over the purely natural, time-bound civil society. The state, as creature of God, is obligated to worship God as God wills, that is, according to the rites of the true religion. The principle applies only to "Catholic" states, however determined. In such instances, conservatives claim, political restraint of theological error is justified for the sake of the common good. Error, they insist, does not have the same rights as truth. The argument is strictly logical and disarmingly simple. If, however, Catholics are a minority in a given political society, they are to favor religious freedom for all. Since this is the status likely to prevail in the foreseeable future, it has been labeled "hypothesis," to distinguish it from a condition of "thesis," which requires some type of privilege for the true Church. L. intentionally gives only the barest summary of the conservative stance. He moves next to an exposition of the development of M.'s constructive restatement of the Church-state problem.

The first period, 1942-46, marked a break-through beyond the traditional tight defense of an "ideal" union between the two powers that govern the life of man. Many levels, M. noted, are involved in an adequate presentation of Catholic Church-state theory: ethical, theological, political. Freedom of conscience, in terms of natural law, must be respected and harmonized with the order of faith. Political authority is directed to the common good of society. The term "state" is used in a more comprehensive sense than in later writings. To it is assigned the task of promoting public religion and prohibiting atheistic or secularistic propaganda. It is not clear, L. observes, just how the ethical, theological, and political levels are related in the practical order. Nor is it evident precisely how the human person, in his dual role of Christian and citizen, can serve as medium for the exercise and co-ordination of political and religious authority. There is a troubling transition from the state's respect for personal conscience to the state's obligation to recognize the freedom and authority of a religious society.

Developments in M.'s writings during 1948-49 center on (1) the task of the theologian, which is to construct a theory of Church-state relations that will be relevant to all historical conditions; (2) the spiritual power of the Church is limited to spiritual matters and reaches the temporal order only indirectly, through the consciences of men; (3) characteristics of the American lay state, which could scarcely be placed under obligation to endorse the Roman Catholic mode of worship, since matters of divine positive law are beyond its competence; (4) clarification of the terms "society," "state," and "government," which expanded the Church-state focus to the wider one of
the Church's relation to human society. "State," in the writings during this period, meant the particular subsidiary functional organization of the body politic, which imparts a special form to "society," the prepolitical matter. "Government" is not the state, and bears only "a portion of the action which is the state" (p. 77). L. praises the attempt to introduce some flexibility into the meaning of terms, but judges the effort incomplete at this stage.

In summary, M.'s 1948-49 writings contain certain trenchant objections to the conservative position. He denied the basic, unexamined argument that error has no rights, and asserted instead that rights belong to persons. This shift from an abstract formula to the human person has had significant and far-reaching effects. Probing the thesis-hypothesis dichotomy, he suggested that what is involved is the development of Catholic doctrine in relation to historical circumstances. No concrete constitutional arrangement, such as the "religion of the state," is defensible as an "ideal" permanent exigence of Catholic doctrine. The freedom of the Church is the unchanging requirement.

M.'s views in 1951-54, formulated in answer to the conservative challenge, contain three main elements: (1) a theoretical articulation of the problematic of Church-state relations; (2) a polemic directed against the conservative position; (3) an extensive analysis of the writings of Leo XIII which, according to L., is faulty in attributing to Leo insights that reflect a political reality unknown to him. Noteworthy developments include (1) endorsement of a functional rather than a substantive notion of the state; (2) a shift from the narrow problem of legal relations to the broader view of Church and human society (begun in the preceding period); (3) emphasis on the futility of employing nineteenth-century-inspired categories to discuss twentieth-century political realities.

L. concludes his book with a summary of "The Problem of Religious Freedom," the document which sparked much of the discussion surrounding the controversial declaration on religious liberty at the third session of the Vatican Council. Rejected by M. is the abstract essentialist approach to Church-state doctrine. Rejected, too, is the "single-insight" starting point of some progressives. "One must rather begin with a complex insight wherein the personal question (theological-ethical) and the constitutional question (political-juridical) of religious freedom are equally primary, i.e., one must begin with the insight of a free human person under a government of limited powers" (p. 213). This juncture between the growth of man's personal consciousness and his political consciousness M. cites as a significant "sign of the times," in the words of John XXIII. The late Pope also linked the freedom of the Church with the freedom of all men. As M. sees it, this means that the competence of the public power with regard to religion is limited to safe-
guarding religious liberty. Its care for the Church is likewise limited to a care for the freedom of the Church and does not extend to the protection of her doctrine, authority, or prestige.

In sum, M.'s position is a brilliant and comprehensive elaboration of Pope John's affirmation of man's right "to honor God according to the sincere dictates of his own conscience, and therefore the right to practice his religion privately and publicly" (*Pacem in terris*).

L.'s painstaking account of a still unresolved debate deserves wide reading and serious study. Three minor points need clarification or correction. On p. 168, e.g., Leo's authority seems to be equated with "the argument from revelation." On p. 205, we read that the dualism of societies (Church and state) is premised on the two ends of man. Catholic doctrine, however, teaches one last end. Finally, is it not an exaggerated claim that the third session of Vatican II exhibited a lamentable lack of touch with the contemporary world (p. 222)? Some there were who lacked it, but more there are who have it.

It is gratifying to anticipate a future work in which L. plans to trace the legislative history of religious liberty at the Second Vatican Council.

Maryville College, St. Louis

PATRICIA BARRETT, R.S.C.J.


Père de Broglie's purpose is a formal and not merely pragmatic defense of the right to religious liberty, which he views as a particular aspect of the general right to liberty of action. This latter right, which is limited not by the rectitude, objective or subjective, of a proposed action but by the exigencies of the common good (properly understood according to the norms of political prudence and hence calling for a measure of tolerance of evil), is defended not by any romantic appeal to freedom as its own end but as being a requisite of the common good itself. This can be realized only in a genuinely human environment, where citizens are free to initiate actions they judge good. In this part of the work is included a severe and forceful critique of the position, incorporated into the schema on ecumenism proposed at the second session of Vatican II, which would found the right to religious liberty on the "rights of the sincere conscience." The author's principal point here is that an objective right cannot depend for its recognition on so unverifiable a factor as a good conscience, but he goes on to add that under the term "conscience" are often included superstitious fears and taboos unrelated to any concern for moral rectitude, that the erroneous conscience is often enough a guilty one, and
finally that the pressure of laws enforcing sound values can be instrumental in its correction. For that matter, the "moral sentimentalism" latent in the appeal to the rights of the sincere conscience simply because it is sincere becomes apparent once its logic is transposed from the order of religious values to the profane. Nevertheless, even where a line of conduct militates to an extent against the common good, there are grounds in equity which in consideration of the individual, as well as of the common good itself, make it fitting that the erroneous conscience be treated with special regard. (If it be objected that we thus appear to found this title to equity on the same unverifiable sincerity, apparently the answer would be that, especially where groups are involved, general good conduct can establish the presumption of good faith.)

Turning to the question of religious liberty in particular, B. finds new fault with the schema for its weak argumentation in basing its affirmation of a natural right on a combined theological premise (the freedom of the act of faith) and ecclesiastical law (can. 1351, banning forced conversions). The basis of freedom here is rather the interior nature of the act of adherence to religious truth, which removes it from the scope of law. By the same token, neither can the state command a formally religious external act, which derives from the interior adherence all其 significance and value. As for the power to restrain from such acts, the same norms apply as in the case of human conduct generally.

So much as regards the individual. In the second half of the work B. treats of problems involving the attitude of the state toward religious groups and their public activity. He rejects the thesis of radical incompetence of the state in religiosis, his judgment being that the view which demands an absolute neutrality and indifference toward all religions is rooted in an irrational reaction against the abuses of the Inquisition—a reaction which sees the confessional state as not only outdated but as being of necessity oppressive (un état persécuteur). Admitting past injustices and horrors and analyzing the occasions for them (the aberrations of the Catharists and the undue assimilation of the spiritual power to the temporal, to mention but two), he argues that with the lessons since learned and with a heightened appreciation of the person and his dignity, there is still a normal role for the confessional state. He is aware of the danger to authentic religious life where it is a matter of conformity, and counts for support on legal and social structures. Religion does, however, have its social dimension, and there would be nothing prejudicial to the rights and dignity of a religious or irreligious minority were a significantly large majority of citizens to incarnate in its public institutions
its particular vision of the common good (with its spiritual and even supernatural dimensions) and its commitment to specific religious truths and values. Societies are not abstractions nor are states, and the structures, cultural and legal, of a civil community will ordinarily reflect its scheme of values. The neutral state itself, for that matter, may consistently favor one or several or all religious groups, if not in endorsement of the truths they proclaim, at least on the basis of their recognizable "social fruitfulness." Evidently, since the common good is the good not of the majority but of all, there must be nothing in the stance of the confessional state which would affront, or imply inferior status for, the dissident minorities. Indeed, it should show itself positively well disposed toward all religious groups within it, since ordinarily they contribute significantly to the good life of society.

The right to propagate a supposedly false religious doctrine admittedly poses a special problem for the Christian confessional state, which cannot but view the aims of such propaganda as a social evil. For this reason it has been argued that only the neutral state can be congenial to this freedom. There are, however, considerations drawn from the political order and founded on human psychology which warrant toleration. Distinguishing between ill-intentioned acts and human error, B. points out that in this democratic age especially and given the relative sophistication and literacy of today's citizen, the proper way to counter the contagion of error is by recourse not to the arm of the law but to the arms of truth (armes de lumière). Apart from the indignity and hardship imposed on numbers of well-disposed citizens, the price of repression would be high in the resultant civic discord and resentment against the Church that could only confirm the dissidents in their error. The scope of this last consideration is significantly widened when we think of the common good in larger terms than that of the individual state involved. For great harm is done the cause of Catholic truth through the odious impression on world opinion, which is bound to judge things from the neutral corner and thus see in the suppression of an ordinary civil liberty like freedom of the press not only a violation of justice but the evidence of weakness and fear of the truth.

Despite the energetic attack on nineteenth-century concepts of liberty, B. defends a position which is, in his own words, fort libérale. At times one senses a need for a sharper distinction between state and society, as when it is noted (p. 104) that the state is bound to investigate the truth of a religion or when it is seemingly implied (p. 126) that the state is competent to judge the merits of a doctrine (monotheism or the immortality of the soul) not only quantum ad usum but as truths of speculative reason as well. These
minor points apart, the book is written with a fine sense for political realities and an awareness of the “difformity of matter” which modifies in practice the application of general principles to determinate situations.

**Fordham University**

**Joseph V. Dolan, S.J.**


The centenary of Maurice Blondel’s birth in 1961 evoked a flurry of books and articles in French as a belated testimony to his importance. But in the English-speaking world he has been scarcely discussed, except in an occasional periodical article. The present volume, the first of his works to be translated, is hopefully the harbinger of a much larger Blondel literature to come.

In a valuable hundred-page introduction the translator-editors have provided a good survey of B.’s life and work, including some of the leading principles of his thought. One’s admiration for him grows from an acquaintance with the difficulties of his career—his sensitive temperament, his uncertainties regarding his vocation, his sufferings under an anticlerical educational system, his need to defend himself against reactionary Catholics on the right (including *Action française*) and Modernists on the left, the resulting cloud of suspicion that overhung his orthodoxy, and the blindness, headaches, and partial deafness of his “last period.” Throughout all these adversities he was steadfastly loyal to the Church and faithful to the “inner light” which sometimes bade him publish when others thought it would have been more prudent to remain silent.

B.’s so-called *Letter on Apologetics*, which forms the second part of this volume, powerfully argues the case that philosophy is not truly itself unless it faces up to the religious problem, including the question of man’s need for a further gift which it is not in his power to secure. This thesis has, of course, occasioned much discussion as to whether B. was compromising the gratuity of the supernatural. The editors of this volume, following Bouillard, defend B. on the grounds that he was not speaking of abstract human nature, but of man as he is actually constituted in the present order; the demand of which B. spoke, moreover, was only conditional and inefficacious; and finally, the gift demanded was not necessarily the Christian supernatural, but simply an “undetermined supernatural.” While these various defenses have their value, one must acknowledge, as the editors do, that B. spoke with less than the
desired clarity. His merit is not in having solved the question of man's need for grace and the supernatural, but in having posed that question with inescapable urgency.

The last third of this book reproduces B.'s 1903 essay on History and Dogma, a work not sufficiently well known. It is a brilliant treatment of tradition in the widest sense, steering a middle path between an excessive dogmatism which would docetically overlook the human and historical elements in the Bible, and a historicism which would erect technical and critical history into a judge of religious truth. B. ably contends that dogmatics and history, while they are distinct and relatively autonomous sciences, are never hermetically sealed off from each other; rather, they are in dialectical intercommunication. In this connection B. shows the complexity of approaches necessary in order to deal with the question of the real as distinct from the merely historical Christ, and to probe the delicate question of the "Messianic consciousness." In advance of his times, B. clearly saw that many of the historical objections against the OT were due to a failure to reckon with its literary forms. Most important of all, he developed a dynamic notion of tradition which anticipates some of the best thinking at Vatican II. He perceived that tradition is a principle of development which presses toward the future while maintaining communion with the past.

B., in English as in French, makes considerable demands on the attention of his readers. His thought is subtle and sustained, his vocabulary personal, his sentences long. Much of the time, he is feeling his way through unexplored territory. To some extent, moreover, his writing is conditioned by the controversies of his own day, including especially the Modernist crisis. But for anyone who wishes to grasp the true situation of Catholic philosophy and fundamental theology in the twentieth century, a firsthand acquaintance with B. is indispensable. A truly prophetic thinker, he forged new paths which have become the highways of contemporary Catholic thinking. He saw through the shallowness of much Neo-Scholastic intellectualism, and apprehended the value of thought as an expression of the total dynamism of human life. In his quest for "real" knowledge, he developed an authentically dialectical and existential philosophy. His speculations on the problem of the supernatural prepared the way for Maréchal and, less directly, for Rahner's "supernatural existential." He also exercised an immediate influence on Teilhard de Chardin, whose "Panchristism" he accepted. Much of the best writing on the question of Christian philosophy since the 1930's, including the recent views of Duméry, Nédoncelle, and others, is heavily dependent on B.'s pioneering work. For all these reasons, it is to be hoped that the two
essays so ably translated and presented in this volume will be widely read and deeply pondered.

Woodstock College

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


The nonimprecatory references to atheists during Vatican II, as well as the setting up of a special commission to discuss with nonbelievers, indicate that the Church is now willing to consider the problem of atheism in its own dimensions and depth. Of all the reorientations, this one may be the most difficult to achieve, since it involves factors which lie outside every sort of ecclesial institution, Christian or otherwise. The questions cannot be resolved through any policy decisions, any appeal to a common religious heritage, or any attitude of mutual respect and forbearance. Such moves are useful only in bringing one to the verge of considering the problem of atheistic living, but the dividing issues spread out at this point. There is no instant way in which Christians can overcome their long-nurtured unpreparedness for recognizing the strength and persistence of the atheistic appeal in the modern world. The act of recognition, now that it comes, does not dissipate that strength or appreciably shorten that persistence.

For a long while, the problem of atheism was kept at arm's length by the simple expedient of debating about whether or not there could be any genuine atheists. The distinctions propounded in this debate will still prove useful in clarifying some of the meanings of atheism, as seen from the standpoint of Christian faith and the workings of Providence. But the real need now is to learn how the modalities of atheism shape themselves from within the atheistic perspectives themselves. Inevitably, this will be a slow and complex process, requiring the co-operative labors of men in many disciplines, reaching far beyond the limits of philosophy and theology. One thing which we can prudently expect is that an attitude of generous recognition of values present in the atheistic outlook will not be enough to resolve any of the basic grounds of disagreement. For this attitude will be countered by an equally generous recognition, on the part of all but the most obtuse atheists, of humane values resident in the religious positions. The discussions which count in a radical way will be those which take place after this mutual acknowledgment of values is made and a basis is sought for reintegrating them. The romantic expectations of some Christians about the consequences of admitting their own shortcomings and appreciating the positive contributions of atheists can only be attributed to inexperience in conducting civilized discussions with perceptive atheists.
Another point which disturbs me is the ambiguity which crops up in current usage of "nonbelievers" as a synonym for "atheists." It is clear enough, from the context, that reference is being made to those who do not accept the proposed meanings for "God" or "the divine." But there are two connotations which often accompany such usage and which indicate that the atheist's position is not being grasped in its full power. One thought is that, although the atheist may reject this or that meaning of God with which he is culturally acquainted, he will not reject an exquisitely reformulated meaning known to the believer. Yet, what makes atheism a truly radical spiritual problem today is precisely the principle of total refusal of God and the divine, no matter how they may be conceived in distinction from nature. A second overtone in the current usage is that the discovery of some sort of believing act on the part of a professed atheist is sufficient to render him just that much of a non-nonbeliever and therefore that much of a non-atheist. This interpretation might carry some weight against a naively rationalistic atheism, but it overlooks a relevant process in modern thought: the naturalization of the believing act. A reflective atheist today will admit the need for some believing acts and attitudes on man's part. He will only add that human belief is enclosed within the natural totality, as far as its methodically controlled meaning and truth are concerned. The presence of a believing condition does not open up a wedge in the human subject for treating him as an implicit searcher for God and the divine. At least some independent argument must be developed at this point, since it is not enough to indicate the sheer presence of some believing act.

Luijpen's book gives a timely introduction to some of the major components in the formation of the modern atheistic position. He includes Kant among the antecedents, insofar as the criticism of proofs for God's existence made in the first Critique leads to a speculative agnosticism about God. Although many people can install themselves firmly and permanently in speculative agnosticism, contact with their attitude often triggers a rapid movement toward atheism on the part of other minds. L. does not deal at length with the moral theism proposed in Kant's other Critiques, but he admits that the Kantian limitation of man to moral faith in God is not a manifestation of scientism, but rather an instrument against it. What might be made clearer here is that Kant himself is not agnostic and that the moral evidencing of belief in God calls into question the purely speculative basis of agnosticism.

Comte's positivism is rightly viewed as a major stage on the road to atheism. It leads L. to reflect upon the closure of the physicist's realm with respect to questions of existence, especially those which concern a reality existing distinct from the scientifically described world. Relying heavily
upon Heidegger's account of the relation between physics and metaphysics, L. places philosophical reasoning to God in the field of metaphysics. Comte did not accept a metaphysical interpretation of experience, and hence did not have the methodic means for breaking out of an atheistic shell. As for Heidegger's own refusal to extend metaphysics in its present constitution to God, L. points out the need to accompany every affirmation about God by a negation and to avoid that meaning of "proof" which would make God a thing, manifested to our mind and bereft of mystery.

The seventy pages devoted to Marx's atheism provide an excellent condensation of a field which has by now been worked over by many scholars. To insure as sympathetic an approach as possible and one which reflects the actual manner of Marx's influence, L. concentrates upon the early writings. Here Marx displays his ardent humanistic naturalism, which opens itself to positive evaluation in the phenomenological framework used by L. The Marxian perspective is that of man as a being-at-the-world, actively working upon it and transforming it into his own human history. The main criticism brought forward here is that the presence of human labor in and at the world can be maintained at full strength without absolutizing it and cutting off the personal subject's ethical tendencies beyond the labor situation and humanly-made history.

In the closing chapters a phenomenological analysis is made of atheistic strains within phenomenology itself and existentialism. L. reformulates in terms of the present problem the remarks he had made in an earlier book, Existential Phenomenology, about Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. He draws a crucial distinction between the anthropological meaning of contingency as the freedom of the human subject, and the metaphysical meaning of it as the need for a ground of being. In defending the integrity of the anthropological sense of contingency, Merleau-Ponty has not really silenced the metaphysician, who must still ask about contingency in a sense which embraces the free subject as well as the world of objects. There is also a valuable analysis of the projection theory of religion, both as propounded by Freud and as developed in some detail by the Dutch psychologist F. Sierksma. Religious projection is examined here as an instance of a general theory of projection. The main difficulty concerns whether every instance of perception is a projection, and whether the projective act permits a distinction between objectivity of meaning and an objectivist reduction of every reality. If the latter distinction is admitted, then in the religious order there need not be an objectivist projection for every statement of believed meaning.

This book contains a clear and orderly presentation of a phenomenological interpretation of atheism. It will help anyone to understand and evaluate
the positivist, Marxist, and existentialist types of atheistic thinking and action. Especially in our own country, however, there are many intellectual sources of atheism not comprised within these types. Hence L.'s analysis has to be supplemented by studies of Hume and the American naturalists.

Saint Louis University

JAMES COLLINS


This is the first of the several works I have read comparing Heidegger with Thomistic ontology in which the author's grasp of Heidegger is as profound as his understanding of St. Thomas. From his previous works, we knew that Hans Meyer penetrates to the very spirit animating the thought of the Angelic Doctor; and we knew that he is a very competent historian of modern philosophy. But seizing the deepest sense of a contemporary philosophy is always another matter. And when that philosophy is one which sees itself advancing beyond the whole Occidental metaphysical tradition, then coming to grips with it is especially difficult. Meyer has succeeded—at least partially—where Fr. Lotz, despite long studies with Heidegger, and G. Siewerth have not.

But only partially. And indeed M.'s failure to push just a little farther to the point of a definitive Auseinandersetzung between the realism of Thomas and the existential phenomenology of Heidegger is rather puzzling. For his insight into both philosophers is far-reaching, original (in the good sense: personal but faithful), and essential. But when all is said and done, he succeeds neither in showing what is really new in the dimensions of philosophical inquiry opened by those transcendental philosophers from Kant to Husserl of whom Heidegger is rightful heir, nor in seeing that perhaps the philosophers in that tradition do pose a real difficulty for Thomistic realism, one which I personally am convinced it can answer, but the ignoring of which I am equally convinced poses a threat of impoverishment at least and the risk of irrelevancy at most.

M. brushes past the problem in the following way. Heidegger, he says, is a philosopher of finitude. He builds his conception of being from the standpoint of human-being. St. Thomas never would have allowed himself to get caught in such a trap. For Thomas, being is from the start transcendent being, grounded in the infinity of the divine Pure Act. This realization protects Thomism from the relativism inevitably plaguing a philosophy which conceives being from the point of view of the limited spectator, the human actor in time.
But the whole point of Heidegger's criticism of "metaphysics" is that the philosophers in the metaphysical tradition fail to see that the "Absolutes" which they posit beyond (meta) the sum-total horizons of the experienced world (ta physika) as "ground" of the reality of the things within our experience, are themselves products of an imagination itself a finite part of that historical experience. Hence the various Absolutes are themselves understandable only in terms of the historical unfolding of the philosophers' worlds out of which they are born. One cannot break out of the "Hermeneutic circle of interpretation." If anything of what the "transcendental philosophers" have been saying is grasped, then this basic fact will have to be faced up to: one sees everything from a point of view; the horizons of that point of view are formed by the historical situation; by acts of "originative thinking" new horizons of interpretation may be opened up, and thus things seen as they have never been seen before, thus revealing more of what is. But even these acts of new interpretation grow out of and are conditioned by the past. There are no transcendent leaps beyond historical interpretative horizons, and hence every new conception of "the Absolute" is itself historically conditioned, and so not absolute.

This is stating very crudely just one aspect of Heidegger's objection to traditional metaphysics. And although I am convinced myself that this objection and the others he offers it can be met, I do think they ought not be ignored. Until they are met, rather than skirted around as M. does, the real thrust of a realism-transcendental philosophy dialogue is absent. No matter how rich the individual insights and the particular comparisons such as are found in this book, they cannot bear their real fruit. A book like this, on such a theme and with the excellent particular analyses it contains, ought to point the way beyond, to that point where philosophy can retain the truths about historicity, creativity, and subjectivity brought to light by transcendental philosophy, without having to accept the inadmissible price of historical relativism which Heidegger, despite himself, seems ultimately forced to pay.

Indiana University

THOMAS LANGAN


Adam, Lord Gifford of Edinburgh, really started something. His bequest of £80,000 for an annual series of lectures to bear his name and to treat subjects in the field of natural theology has produced some of the most important intellectual landmarks of our century. Gilson's The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy, Dawson's Religion and Culture, and A. S. Eddington's
The Nature of the Physical World are a few examples. Prof. von Weizsäcker's lectures enter gracefully into such company. He is known to physicists for his important contributions to the theories of the origin of the solar system and for his work in nuclear physics. He is known to philosophers for his analyses of the significance of physics, of The World View of Physics, as an earlier book of his phrases it in its title.

Being a practicing scientist, W. starts the present work with an open avowal of the dominating position of science in our age. This dominating position of science, he feels, is due to its truth content. His aim is then stated as an examination of the truth of science, its meaning, limitations, and ambiguities.

Science, W. notes, is the religion of modern man. If by faith one understands a trusting abandonment of oneself to a higher power, modern man has certainly abandoned himself into the arms of science, and science has become the object of his faith. If we consider scientists themselves to be the priests of this modern religion, then science has its own hierarchical structure. If we recall that a modern machine always arrives with a set of operating instructions, then science even has its own ethics. Science viewed in this manner as the faith of modern man W. calls scientism. His primary objective in this series of lectures is to trace the rise of scientism, note its growth, and expose its nature.

Before beginning his historical study of the rise of scientism, W. delays to dwell on the ambiguities of the successes of science. Science has expanded man's life expectancy, but by so doing has created the problem of overpopulation. Here good seems to create evil. But evil sometimes creates good. The weapons created by science have made total war so terrifying that the major powers have repeatedly backed down from confrontations that might lead to it. The weapons of war have through sheer terror produced a measure of international peace.

The ambiguous nature of the successes of science, W. feels, undermines its position as a possible faith for modern man. Science has given man power, but the ethical greatness needed to bear the responsibility power brings with it science cannot supply. Scientism becomes, then, the modern false religion.

The major portion of W.'s book centers not on scientism as such but on the history of its rise. W. uses the topic of cosmogony to trace man's attitudes toward nature and the study of nature. Beginning with the ancient Babylonian and Scandinavian creation myths, he goes on to an up-to-date study of the Genesis creation account (which he calls quite appositely an antimythical myth), moves to Greek atomistic and Platonic thought, treats
the scientific revolution of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, glances briefly at Darwin's work, and ends with a study of modern scientific cosmology. At each stage he explains man's view of science and the factors tending to change that view.

In his final chapter W. considers the secularization of modern man. A secularized monastery is a monastery handed over to the control of civil society. The building remains a monastery, but its uses are no longer religious. The structure of modern society, W. asserts, similarly comes from Christianity, but the Christian spirit no longer animates it. Modern society is the child of Christianity, but children can experience the death of their parents. The way out for Christianity is to recognize the world in which it lives, to realize that it must speak a language this age understands, to accept with humility the great discovery of science that every intellectual field is imperfect and must undergo a constant process of self-correction. (Theologians would say not "self-correction" but "development.")

W. closes with the remark that a study of the rise of scientism is incomplete in itself. It must be followed by a detailed analysis of the nature and validity of scientific thought, which W. promises to give us in a later volume of Gifford lectures.

Wheeling College

FRANK R. HAIG, S.J.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE CITY OF THE GODS: A STUDY IN MYTH AND MORTALITY. By John S. Dunne, C.S.C. New York: Macmillan, 1965. Pp. lx + 243. $5.95. Fr. Dunne has addressed himself to a difficult, magnitudinous task: to trace the mythic resolutions of the problem of immortality from the Gilgamesh Epic to modern man. With the figure of Gilgamesh himself as a kind of archetypal paradigm, D. wanders through the history, culture, and works of Mesopotamia, Egypt, archaic and classical Greece, Rome, the medieval cosmos and the modern world, represented by Hegel, Kant, Nietzsche, and Heidegger, in his attempt to treat the life-death problem in its mythico-cultural representations. Not surprisingly, the numerous solutions vary from the coalescence of life and death to their total disjunction with all the various shades and nuances possible—the shared experience of life and death, the appropriation of the dead by the living, immortal fame and the immortal past, the uniformity of life, immortal status, autonomous life and autonomous death. D. claims for himself a perspective that is influenced by Heidegger; his methodology, however, particularly in the first eight chapters, supports
Whitehead's view that the philosopher as abstraction-critic should consult
the poets, so that his abstract formulations might be tempered by their more
concrete intuitions. Although D. evidences the intrinsic shortcomings of
man's solutions (witnessed by the endless process of the repudiation of earlier
myths by new mythographers), he is optimistic about even these faltering
efforts: partial insights are better than no insights at all. The kaleidoscopic
nature of the work forbids a detailed analysis of the contents, but some criti-
cisms would not be out of place. A chapter on the Hebraic solution of the
OT might have strengthened the argument; D. treats the Genesis story of
the tree of life, but leaves a whole later mythic structure untouched. The
important and significant attitudes of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides
receive scant attention, and the reader must make for himself the nexus
between the Homeric view (and a somewhat controversial one it is) and the
Socratic-Platonic. D.'s point on the fixity of medieval hierarchial society is
well taken, but the argument based on Shakespeare's place, degree, and
form is a bit thin. Chap. 9, on the mysticism of the hidden God of the six-
teenth and seventeenth centuries and the dead God of the eighteenth and
nineteenth, is seminal and therefore somewhat underdeveloped. A book of
this type invites detailed criticism rather than these few generic ones; this
is, in the present instance, a virtue, not a vice. D.'s work is provocative and
deserves a careful reading; admiration is the only attitude in the face of the
breadth of his knowledge and skill. Whether the reader will agree or dis-
agree with individual points of analysis, the force of the total work cannot
fail to impress. D. has more than demonstrated that man, like the lord whose
oracle is in Delphi, "neither speaks out nor conceals, but gives a sign," and
man's sign for immortality is myth.

Woodstock College
Karl W. Kleins, S.J.

INTERPRETING THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Walter Harrelson. New York:
directed his book to the person who wishes to read about the OT rather
than to teachers and students; it is not intended to be a textbook, although
its use as a textbook is very likely. He wishes to give the serious reader a
comprehensive view of the criticism, history, and theological interpretation
of the OT—a large order, but filled to satisfaction. H.'s method is that of a
running commentary; he does not attempt to treat the entire text, but selects
those portions which are most significant. The commentary is not written
verse by verse—which is usually one of the most unreadable forms of com-
mentary—but a study of particular passages as literary wholes. The results
are generally felicitous. The books are treated in an order that is generally
chronological, but the threefold division of the OT into Law, the former and the latter Prophets, and the Writings is retained. The bibliography both in the text and in the separate Appendix is extensive and will be of use to scholars as well as to the serious reader to whom the work is directed. The book is a compendium of most of contemporary scholarship, judiciously assembled and criticized, and is guaranteed a wide use.

Loyola University, Chicago

John L. McKenzie, S.J.

Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964. Edited by W. Eltester and F. H. Kettler. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964. Pp. viii + 299. DM 58.— It is a rare Festschrift that brings together such an array of NT scholars and essays. In general, the articles are of high quality and range over a vast area. In describing them, I shall group them somewhat. First, articles of a general nature: G. Bornkamm deserts the NT domain proper, to contribute an interesting discussion of OT prayer forms, “Praise, Confession, and Offering”; R. Bultmann continues his Auseinandersetzung with E. Kasemann, in denying the latter’s thesis that “apocalyptic” is the mother of Christian theology, and substituting for it “eschatology”; W. Marxsen proposes an approach for solving some of the problems which the conflicting NT data on baptism present; and M. Black contributes exegetical and critical notes on Heb 11:11, Jude 5, Jas 1:27. In a volume honoring Haenchen, known for his monumental commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, there are surprisingly few contributions on Acts: C. K. Barrett studies the meaning of Stephen’s words in 7:56, which depict Jesus as “the Son of Man” (using the title which otherwise occurs only in the Gospels) and as “standing at God’s right hand”; P.-H. Menoud shows that the verb porthein, used in Acts 9:21 and Gal 1:13, 23 of Paul’s “ruining” the Church, was chosen designedly to express the violence of his theological persecution of it. Four Pauline studies have been contributed by G. Delling (“The Death of Jesus in Paul’s Preaching”), E. Käsemann (“The Liturgical Cry for Freedom” [Rom 8]), E. Lohse (“Christology and Ethics in the Letter to the Colossians”), and W. Foerster (“The Date of Composition and Purpose of Galatians”). In the realm of Johannine studies three contributions will be of interest: K. Aland makes some telling remarks on the problem of glosses, interpolation, redaction, and composition in this Gospel from the standpoint of textual criticism; one of the editors, W. Eltester, critically examines recent discussions of the Johannine prologue in “The Logos and His Prophet”; N. A. Dahl studies the related phrases of Polycarp, “the firstborn of Satan” (7:1), and John, “the
father of the devil" (8:44). Two articles are devoted to Lucan questions: J. Dupont seeks the specific meaning of the Lucan version of the parable of the Sower, and W. Michaelis investigates "Luke and the Beginnings of Infant Baptism." In the area of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the NT Apocrypha: an important contribution comes from James M. Robinson ("The Hodayot-Formula in the Prayer and Hymns of Early Christianity"), in which the influence of the Qumrân Thanksgiving Psalms is assessed; W. Schneemelcher studies the relationship between Acts and the *Acta Pauli*; W. Schrage compares the Gospel quotations in the Oxyrhynchus *Logoi* and the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*; the "opened heavens" in the revelation of the *Apokryphon of John* is explained by W. C. van Unnik; and P. Vielhauer tries to determine the meaning of *anapausis* in the *Gospel of Thomas*. The essays are preceded by a six-page bibliography of Haenchen's writings.

Woodstock College

Joseph A. Fitsmyer S.J.

**Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 2: Δ–Η.** Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1965. Pp. viii + 955. $20.50. With remarkable rapidity the translation of the second volume of Kittel has followed on the heels of the first, which appeared less than a year ago (see *Theological Studies* 26 [1964] 424-27). The bulk of the second volume is greater; unhappily the introductory list of abbreviations has not been repeated. Once again the editor and the publishers of the English version have achieved the noteworthy feat of retaining the pagination of the original German edition except for a slight fluctuation of about two pages; so the customary references to *TWNT* 2 will not be hard to track down in *TDNT* 2. The articles in this volume that will interest most readers deal with the various forms of *didaskō* ("teach"), *dikaiosynē* ("uprightness"), *doxa* ("glory"), *doulos* ("servant"), *egō* ("I"), *eikôn* ("image"), *eirènë* ("peace"), *eleutheros* ("free"), *elpis* ("hope"), *episkopos* ("overseer"), *euaggelizomai* ("preach the Gospel"), *zōē* ("life"), and *hēmera* ("day"). Of these the following have already appeared in an English form in the *Bible Key Words* series: *Righteousness* (London, 1951) and *Hope* (London, 1963). But once again there is no comparison between the full text of the articles now available in *TDNT* and such condensations. One need only compare the treatment of *dikaiosynē* in Josephus' writings in *TDNT* 2, 193-94 with that in *BKW* 4, 27-28. The specified points of minor importance which we singled out for negative criticism in Vol. 1 are continued in this volume—but then how could we expect the translator to change in midstream? We have once again checked many passages in this volume with the original and are impressed with the accuracy
of the translation. It is faithful even to the point of reproducing the not infrequent verbosity of the German text. One minor slip might be indicated: Is "in the inter-test. period" (p. 931) the correct translation of "in nach-neutestamentlicher Zeit" (p. 933)? If it is, then footnote 13 on the same page makes little sense. Users of the second volume of TDNT should recall that it was finished in 1935 and that in some instances recourse must be had to newer material, especially to what the Dead Sea Scrolls have brought to light. E.g., the article on Elias (pp. 928-41) now needs some revision. Modification is also in order for the article on dikaiosyne (cf. S. Schulz, Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 56 [1959] 155-85, for Qumrân material on this subject), on exousia in 1 Cor 11:10 (see New Testament Studies 4 [1957-58] 48-58), on ergon (especially for Paul's phrase "deeds of the law," cf. 4QFlor 1:7 in Journal of Biblical Literature 77 [1958] 352), etc.

Woodstock College

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. By Bo Reicke. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964. Pp. viii + 257. DM 28.— Reicke is Professor of New Testament at the University of Basel, Switzerland. In this present work he outlines the profane history which formed the background and the environment of the primitive Church. Judaism, Hellenism, and the Roman Empire were the forces with which the Church came into contact. Since the return from the Babylonian exile marks the origin of Judaism, R. begins his history with the year 539 B.C. and extends it to 100 A.D. Although his chief interest centers around the political, social, and economic conditions of that period, yet throughout his work he has to face questions of direct interest for the theologian and the exegete. With regard to Ezra and Nehemiah, he defends the traditional order of their appearance in Jerusalem. He favors the year 4 B.C. as the year of Christ's birth. He feels it necessary to mention that Christ was of purely Jewish descent and that no Aryan blood flowed in his veins. The paragraphs concerning the Jewish administration in the days of Christ, concerning the priests, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, and Qumrân are especially crammed with information. Christ and His apostles celebrated the Last Supper on Thursday, but they ate no lamb. The modern discussion about who killed Christ is for him anachronistic, since the Israeli is as distinct from the Jew of the Bible as is the Italian from the Roman. He recognizes the natural beauty of Gordon's Garden Tomb, but considers the traditional Holy Sepulcher as the authentic site. The Epistles of James, 2 Peter, and Jude he assigns to the early part of Domitian's reign. In the Anchor Bible Commentary on The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude
(Garden City, N.Y., 1964) he defends the same position. A good bibliography, a fairly complete index of names and subjects, and five clear maps make the work an easy and rich source of information.

Regis College, Willowdale, Ontario

Fidelis Buck, S.J.

THE FRAMEWORK OF THE NEW TESTAMENT STORIES. By Arnold Ehrhardt. Harvard Univ. Press, 1964. Pp. ix + 336. $7.00. A collection of articles published over the last twenty years by the late Prof. Ehrhardt of Manchester University. They cover a wide range of subjects: biblical history, NT theology, biblical criticism, early Christian documents, early rabbinic history, etc. In the Introduction E. says that these articles were used as points of departure for discussion in NT seminars. They would suit this purpose admirably, for they are provocative and reflect a questioning mind. In almost every article E.'s solution to the problem is too unusual to gain unqualified support, but the reader will go away from this book less certain of many points that he had thought could be accepted without question. E.'s erudition is impressive, although his somewhat facile assumption of a controversial and often minority view on certain NT writings is disconcerting, e.g., on Hebrews as a message of consolation from the Church of Rome to Christians in the Holy Land after the fall of Jerusalem (p. 109), and on the second-century dating of the Pastorals. We can only sample the articles. In "The Birth of the Synagogue and R. Akiba," E. claims that Akiba was responsible for the emergence of the synagogue as an institution, for it was Akiba who made the law the life-center of the Jewish nation. Thus, Origen was correct in calling the synagogue the little sister of the Church, for the synagogue is more recent than the Church. In "Jewish and Christian Ordination," E. questions Lohse's thesis that Christian ordination was modeled on rabbinic ordination by imposition of hands. According to E., the earliest form of rabbinic ordination was elevation to a vacant chair, and before 70 this elevation was to a chair in the Jerusalem Sanhedrin. In both Judaism and Christianity, ordination by imposition of hands was of second-century origin, arising from the earlier custom of laying on hands to communicate the Spirit. In "Christianity before the Apostles' Creed," E. takes a view much like that of W. Bauer, namely, that there was no normative Christianity before the end of the second century, when the creed became the touchstone of orthodoxy. In the early years Catholic, Gnostic, and Marcionite Christianity flourished, each with a certain predominance in a specific region of the Church. Only gradually did Catholic Christianity gain for itself acceptance as orthodoxy, thus rendering the other forms of Christianity
heterodox. Other articles worth attention touch on the Muratorian Fragment, the formula *creatio ex nihilo*, and the relation between baptism and Roman law.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore

Raymond E. Brown, S.S.

**FOUNDATIONS OF BIBLICAL SPIRITUALITY.** Translated by Joseph A. Grispiño, S.M. New York: Alba House, 1965. Pp. 142. A translation of seven essays on biblical spirituality by contemporary French scholars: Lefevre, Salet, Lochet, Lyonnet, and others. Lochet discusses love and the Trinitarian life; Ghysens writes an interesting essay on peace; Lyonnet explains once again (and it is worth repeating) his teaching on Christian freedom in St. Paul. The last article is the best, in style and in new penetration. Prolific Sister Jeanne d'Arc shows her grasp of Scripture, theology, and philosophy in a refreshing study of poverty and detachment, a study quite free of the tottering thinking too often undergirding discussions of this subject. The book is slightly marred by several mechanical errors (pp. 13, 21, 47, 67) and statements one may question: "clearly, then, faith is humility" (p. 111), and the citation of Phil 2:13 to illustrate God's suggesting of beneficial thoughts to a man (ibid.). More important, we would wish Scripture writers on the spiritual life to follow papal example (Salet does it effectively) and enrich their analyses of biblical spirituality from the vast mine of still valid patristic thought. The value of this slim volume suggests a need for a more extensive anthology of biblical spirituality that would include, together with outstanding contemporary studies issuing from many nations, well-selected excerpts from the unsurpassed masterpieces of the great patristic commentators.

Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans

Thomas Dubay, S.M.

**THE ANCIENT POPES.** By E. G. Weltin. *The Popes through History* 2. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1964. Pp. xv + 369. $4.50. In 1961 *Eugenius IV*, by Joseph Gill, appeared as Vol. 1 in a new series, *The Popes through History*, edited by Raymond Schmandt. The real beginning of this important enterprise is W.'s volume. It contains just about all that is reliably known about the first forty-four successors of St. Peter to A.D. 440, stopping short of Leo the Great. The popes before Leo have not left any extensive record of their activities or policies. In fact, the record is so meager that it is quite impossible to write a biography of any single one. It becomes necessary to treat them as representatives of an institution rather than as personalities in their own right. W. sketches the civil and ecclesiastical background of each age, follows the extant papal letters and fragments very
carefully, and squeezes the most he can out of the remaining sources. His material is arranged in nine chapters, with catchy titles, e.g., “Blessed Are the Meek” and “Solomon in All His Glory” (referring to Pope Damasus). His analysis owes something to the methods of modern sociology and even of political commentators. Many of his emphases reflect the interests awakened by Vatican II, especially on the collegiality of the episcopal office. He disavows any intention to write for specialists, but his general bibliography and the notes at the end of each chapter are sufficient pointers to the best in modern research. His conclusion sounds a little bit like a journalist writing from Rome during the sessions of Vatican II: “The papacy . . . deliberately embraced such Roman attitudes as intellectual simplicity, conservatism, institutionalism, legalism, common sense discipline, and practical justice. Pope after Pope, as we have seen, showed in his conduct of his office how these values could be combined with the Christian theological objectivity, ethical security, and basic human equality.”

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Francis Glimm
Huntington, N.Y.

Great Heresies and Church Councils. By Jean Guitton. Translated by F. D. Wieck. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. Pp. 101. $4.00. It is unfortunate that the original title of this work, Le Christ écartelé: Crises et conciles dans l'église, has not been preserved in the more prosaic English, which misleads to the degree that a history of heresy might be expected. Obviously, historical facts cannot be avoided, but the book itself is a thesis work, approaching the various Church crises in a highly personal fashion. This is not to say that the work is subjective, but rather to suggest that it is interpretative. Its form might best be described in musical terms: theme with seven variations. The theme, Augustinian in its roots, suggests that man’s intellect can only develop a limited number of solutions to any problem; heresies are the solutions or choices as regards the central mysteries of Christianity—particularly the mystery of Christ as ichthus. These choices, each a partial dismemberment of Christ, have two aspects: the obviously negative one of secession (succinctly summarized by an anathema) and the less clearly visible positive one of incession (an obscure promise of a movement towards reintegration). G. strongly suggests that the affirmations of the choices, once detached from the negations, form a series of converging lines capable of joining in an ultimately richer unity. The seven variations presented on this theme are: Judaism, Gnosticism, Arianism, Mohammedanism, Catharism, Protestantism, and Atheistic Humanism. (Obviously, G. is using “heresy” in an analogous way, indicating doctrinal crisis.) History
strikes G. as a spiral, and he carefully develops these doctrinal crises in terms of this historical view. The results are gratifying in that the inner meaning of each heresy is encompassed while its relation to present problems is illuminated. History treated in this spiral fashion produces some interesting results: the attitude towards being of Gide and Sartre as rooted in Basilides and Valentinus; Caesaropapism as a consequence of Arianism; the Pure Ones of Catharism as ideological consorts of the perfect Party Member of Communism. Perhaps the most significant element of this work is to be found in the masterful way that G. has seized the core of each of these doctrinal crises; history becomes the servant, not the master, and yet the historical is in no way violated. It requires, for example, sheer genius to cut through the morass of Gnostic phenomenology and to decipher that Gnosticism, stripped of its cosmogonic emanations, is still very much a theme of our times. All these doctrinal variations play on this same theme, so that G.'s methodology makes a fugue of our present status; the seven them-variations are the basis of the polyphony of this period, and G. has provided us with the contrapuntal rules governing the development. G.'s own non-polemic spirit marks the composition andante moderato; in appreciation, the reviewer can only suggest that the work be played da capo al fine.

Woodstock College

Karl W. Kleinz, S.J.

Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina: Supplementum 3, fasc. 1–3. Edited by Adalbert Hamman, O.F.M. Paris: Garnier, 1963–64. Cols. 1108. Hamman's Supplement to PL 1–96 (Tertullian to Bede), projected for four volumes (cf. TS 21 [1960] 64–65; 24 [1963] 448–49), has for its twin purpose (1) to render more useful what is already in Migne by adding the latest results of scholarly criticism, and (2) to complete and enrich PL by presenting the text of patristic works which were forgotten by the original editors or were discovered later, and are now scattered in periodicals or scientific tomes not always easy of access. PLS 3 (= PL 49–65, Cassian to Fulgentius of Ruspe) now has three of its four fascicles in print. Some of the more significant texts published in these fascicles are: Hilary of Arles, Expositio in epistolas catholicas; Peter Chrysologus, a number of sermons, some spurious; an anonymous (Arnobius?) Liber ad Gregoriam in palatio constitutam; Quodvultdeus, sermons De accidentibus ad gratiam and De tempore barbarico; three doubtful sermons of Leo the Great: two De Macchabaeis, one De ascensione; the Liber testimoniurum fidei connected with the name of Faustus of Riez, his Epistola ad Benedictum Paulinum, and several sermons and a Tractatus de symboło doubtfully his; the large collection of sermons known as Collectio Eusebii Gallicani, ascribed by some scholars to
Faustus, by others to a number of different homilists; Gelasius I, *Tractatus de duabus naturis adversus Eutychen et Nestorium*; Epiphanius (Latinus), *Interpretatio evangeliorum*; Dracontius, *Romulea* and *Orestis tragodia*. Important, too, is the wealth of information (e.g., on authorship of disputed works) which Hamman has extracted from patristic research and presented in splendidly concise and usable fashion.

Woodstock College

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.

**LES CONDITIONSPOSITIVES DE L’ACCESSION AUX ORDRES DANS LA PREMIÈRE LÉGISLATION ECCLÉSIASTIQUE (300-492).** By Paul-Henri Lafontaine, O.M.I. Ottawa: Ottawa Univ. Press, 1963. Pp. 392. Before the period covered in this book (from the Council of Elvira, ca. 300, to the election of Pope Gelasius I), there had been canons established for orders by earlier councils and popes, but such action was sporadic and in response to particular circumstances. Once Christianity acquired state recognition, councils became frequent and legislation more or less universal; by the end of the fifth century the fundamentals of Church law on access to orders were fixed. L. considers masculine sex, baptism, freedom of commitment (conditions of validity), age, purity of life, knowledge, proper progression through the stages to higher orders (conditions of liceity). Juridical sources are primary (conciliar canons, papal decretals, imperial constitutions), but L. sets them in the historical context which reveals the origin and point of the laws. For example, chap. 1 on masculine sex as a requirement: L. points out that this legislation was an answer to the encroachment by women in the domain of clerical functions and to their resistances and claims to be justified on doctrinal grounds (especially in heretical sects); L. goes on to explain the quasi-clerical institution of deaconesses which was accepted by the Church. Thus the legislation comes to life as its historical roots are revealed. These same historical conditions have now disappeared for the most part, and thus the claim can be made that today the question of masculine sex as a requirement for orders ought to be re-examined. L. is not in a position, nor does he attempt, to show that the requirements are immutable; what he does show is that they were not arbitrarily introduced.

Woodstock College

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

problems that could not be given adequate treatment in Vol. 1 because of its plan. In this first fascicle, chap. 1 is an exegetical study on the Marian content of Ap 12. S. devotes a number of pages to the structure of the Apocalypse, because too often exegetes relegate Mary to a secondary role from a false apriorism in determining the general theme of the book. The woman of Ap 12 is neither Sion of the OT nor the Church, but Mary, the mother of Christ and of Christians. Contrary to S., the reviewer feels that the Church of the OT and of the NT cannot be excluded altogether from the image of the woman. But, though one does not always agree with S.'s conclusions, one can only gain a better insight from examining his argumentation. In chap. 2, S. carefully analyzes the documents of the early Church till the end of the fourth century relative to Mary's spiritual motherhood. He rightly rejects the view of some modern scholars who claim that the early churchmen argued from the Church's spiritual motherhood to Mary's, and he correctly rejects the exaggerated and inexact notions of some outstanding scholars that Mary's spiritual motherhood has little basis in the writings of the early Christians. In chap. 3, S. gives a picture of Mary according to Leo the Great, showing how pregnant with Marian thought are the often concise statements of this great doctor of the Incarnation.


Sacraments: The Gestures of Christ. Edited by Denis O'Callaghan. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964. Pp. xii + 194. $4.00. Ten essays, delivered at the Maynooth Union Summer School in 1963, on the more recent orientations in sacramental theology which are linked with such authors as Casel, de Lubac, Semmelroth, Rahner, and Schillebeeckx. The general theme: the saving work of Yahweh for the Hebrew nation (sacrament of the divine Presence) foreshadowed the saving work of Christ (sacrament of God), which is re-presented for the benefit of mankind through the Church (sacrament of Christ) in her essential activity (word and sacramental rites). This approach alone can do justice to the religious significance of the seven sacraments and satisfies contemporary demands. All the essays are interesting and informative, if not equally penetrating. The contributions of D. O'Callaghan (“Christ, Sacrament of God”), C. Ernst (“Acts of Christ: Signs of Faith”), K. McNamara (“The Church, Sacrament of Christ”), and S. Fagan (“Sacramental Spirituality”) are particularly good examples of the current theological endeavor to show the relationship between the various aspects of this sacramental economy of salvation. There is also a good summary, by T. Marsh, of the historical development of the theology of the sacramental character. One small point: three times the text of St.
Augustine's *Epist.* 187, 34 (*PL* 38, 845) is quoted (pp. 25, 76, 157). It should read: "Non est enim aliud Dei mysterium, nisi Christus, in quo oporteat vivificari mortuos in Adam." However, twice *sacramentum* is substituted for *mysterium*. This misquotation, very popular in the last few years, is, I believe, traceable to the first Dutch edition of Schillebeeckx' *De Christus-ontmoeting als sakrament van de Godsontmoeting* (1957), where it is given a prominent place on the first page of the first chapter. This error was corrected in the French, German, and English translations by the simple expedient of omitting the quotation altogether (I was not able to check the later Dutch editions). Nowhere in his writings does Augustine refer to Christ precisely as *sacramentum*.

*Weston College*  
*Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.*

**Yearbook of Liturgical Studies** 5 (1964). Edited by John H. Miller, C.S.C. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1965. Pp. 195. $4.50; $2.50 paper. Taking the Liturgy Constitution as subject, *YLS* 5 offers commentary on some aspects of it. After a short essay by Lewis H. Briner, of McCormick Theological Seminary, on his reactions to the Constitution (singling out the emphasis on Scripture, on worship as a community activity, and on the vernacular), three studies take up "Preaching and the Constitution on the Liturgy" (W. Toohey, C.S.C.), "Bible Devotions" (T. Kelly, C.SS.R.), and "Distribution of Liturgical Roles according to the Constitution" (J. H. Miller, C.S.C.). This series of articles is disappointing, not in what it says, but in what it does not say. Perhaps the editors felt that the more doctrinal sections of the Constitution have been adequately covered in other commentaries and in books on liturgical theology in recent decades. There has certainly been a great deal written; but "covering" often does not mean coming to grips with basic questions. The commentaries I have seen avoid, e.g., saying anything helpful about the presence of Christ in His word when the Scriptures are read (Constitution, n. 7). Doubtless this is a difficult subject, but the point is important, especially since this presence is often quickly extended to the sermon or homily. Thus, Fr. Toohey cites paragraph 33 of the Constitution about the liturgy being instruction as well as worship, for "in the liturgy God speaks to His people and Christ is still proclaiming His gospel," and then goes on to say: "The instruction, explanation, exposition is, then, not mere religious information about God—it is God's own announcement and communication to His people. . . . The homily must be an actual instance of Christ announcing the gospel in the present moment" (p. 22). Whether these statements about the homily are true or not—I am not sure even of what they mean—it is not evident that the
Constitution is speaking of the homily at all here. Current Catholic enthusiasm for "the word," laudable and necessary though it is, has produced a tremendous crop of clichés (I am not alluding now to Fr. Toohey's generally fine and instructive essay), and the Constitution has, if anything, increased the yield. In this atmosphere, perhaps we need to be reminded that the liturgy decree merits the same remarks as Fr. Charles Davis recently made about the Constitution on the Church: "The method adopted here [chap. 1], and retained as far as possible elsewhere, is to set forth the biblical and traditional data. This approach has its advantages and its limitations. Its advantages are to present an exceedingly rich doctrine and to do so in a way that corresponds to the liturgical and catechetical needs of our time. . . . The limitations may be summed up by saying that the contribution of an organizing theological understanding is slight. The data are intelligently arranged, but little more is achieved. The work of genuine synthesis, unifying the data from one or several higher and more general viewpoints, still remains to be accomplished" (Clergy Review 50 [April, 1965] 281–82). It is not enough to quote the Liturgy Constitution as though it were what it is not; that would be simply to engage in the conciliar fundamentalism that has plagued us far more than "Scholastic" theology.

The "Survey of Liturgical Literature" is marked by the effort to give at least a brief résumé of the contents of as many items as possible, where the title itself does not already indicate the scope.

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

Liturgisches Jahrbuch 13 (1963), 14 (1964). Münster: Aschendorff, 1963, 1964. Pp. 256, 292. DM 22.—each. Among the articles of more than local German interest in the 1963 volume, the following may be noted: John Hennig, in "Haeretica pravitas" (pp. 9–21), traces the history and meaning of this formula; in determining the meaning, he is helped by the fact that the phrase was removed from the new baptismal ritual for adults, but not from the seventh oratio fidelium on Good Friday; this latter prayer has now been totally rewritten, but this does not affect the validity of H.'s analysis. H. also contributes an interesting essay on methodology, "Zur soziologischen Betrachtung der heiligen Messe" (pp. 202–12). Another primarily historical article is Philipp Hofmeister's "Der Handgang in der Kirche" (pp. 238–49); it traces the custom of a cleric, consecrated virgin, etc., placing their hands in the hands of the bishop or other superior as a gesture of dedication and submission: its origin, use, disappearance in many cases (leaving behind various in manus formulas, e.g., "emissio votorum in manus"). Two articles suggest cycles of readings for Mass: Otto Stevens suggests a four-year cycle, one year for each Gospel; Heinrich Kahlefeld
likewise proposes a four-year cycle (for the first reading as well as for the Gospel), but all the readings would also be done in a single year by putting them on Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday; in the second year the Wednesday reading would move to Sunday, and the former Sunday to Saturday and so on—this so that the faithful who would usually attend Mass only on Sunday may hear the whole cycle in four years. Two other articles also concern divisions of Scripture: Joseph Pascher on the distribution of the Psalms in the breviary, and Rolf Zerfass on the function of lectiones in the breviary. Attention should be paid to the critical review of the German edition of J. Daniélou's *Bible and Liturgy* by Alfons Kirchgässner (pp. 250–52). The 1964 volume prints the Constitution on the Liturgy in German and Latin, along with other important documents from the Holy See, the Congregation of Rites, and the German hierarchy. The translation of the Constitution is accompanied by several articles of commentary: Emil Lengeling on the principles and historical significance of the document, Ferdinand Kolbe on the practical measures taken, Franziskus Lock on the introduction of the vernacular, and Joseph Pascher on the ecclesiology of the document. Two noteworthy articles outside the series of commentaries are Franz Mussner's "'Cultic' Aspects of the Johannine Picture of Christ" and John Hennig's interesting "Man and Woman in the Liturgy."

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

THE CHURCH AND THE LITURGY. Edited by Johannes Wagner. Glen Rock, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1965. Pp. viii + 191. $4.50. The second volume in the *Concilium* series, with a view to putting "some of the ecclesial aspects of this [Liturgy] Constitution in focus" (p. 3), concentrates in its articles on the role of the bishop: "The Bishop and the Liturgy" (C. Vagaggini, synthesizing the data of the Constitution); "Relation between Bishop and Priests according to the Liturgy Constitution" (J. Pascher, on relation between presbyter celebrating liturgy and his bishop); "The Juridical Power of the Bishop in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" (F. R. McManus); "Liturgy, Devotions and the Bishop" (J. A. Jungmann). There are two other articles: a short one on "The Role of Sacred Music" (J. Gelineau) and an excellent long one on "The Place of Liturgical Worship" (G. Diekmann); three bibliographical surveys: on church music, concelebration, and Communion under both kinds; a documentation on an odd subject for such a volume: "Evolution of the Concept of Economic Expansion" (R. Scarpati); and a short chronicle on "The International Congress on Education for the Priesthood in Western Europe."

*Woodstock College*  
*M. J. O'Connell, S.J.*
Relevant Liturgy. By Leslie W. Brown. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965. Pp. vii + 87. $1.50 paper. B. is Anglican Archbishop of Uganda and Rwanda-Urundi and has been active in drawing up new forms of Eucharistic liturgy for the Church of South India and later for the Anglican provinces of Africa. It is out of this practical background that he speaks of what is needed to make Christian worship relevant to contemporary man, i.e., intelligible and capable of evoking the response proper to an alive liturgy. For appropriate comments on the nature of Christian liturgy, B. quotes frequently from the Report on the Prayer Book of the 1958 Lambeth Conference, the Report on Worship of the Fourth Faith and Order Conference at Montreal, 1963, and the Constitution on Liturgy of Vatican II. These he rightly sees as converging in a remarkable way (if we consider past centuries) and as aware of common, fundamental problems. The informed reader will find nothing new on the nature of Christian liturgy here, but B. does not pretend to novelty or to special insight. His contribution is to increase our awareness of the practical problems of making ancient liturgies speak to our contemporaries while remaining true to their nature and function. Even here B. deals almost exclusively with the liturgy in non-Western cultures, although he is aware that the problem there is quickly becoming the problem of Western culture, viz., that all traditional culture is being swallowed up by the technological culture of an urbanized society. He offers no theoretical solutions to the problem, but does present a pragmatic one: the “Liturgy for Africa” drafted in 1963 and to be used experimentally for a few years. It has many attractive elements in it and could well be meditated by those in the Roman Church who may be engaged in revision of the liturgy.

Woodstock College

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

Einheit und Glaube: Johann Adam Möhlers Lehre von der Einheit der Kirche und ihre Bedeutung für die Glaubensbegründung. By Paul-Werner Scheele. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1964. Pp. viii + 352. DM 26.— Unity of the Church and faith are correlative realities for Möhler, as they are for Christ in Jn 17, which is the central biblical inspiration of M.'s theology. The two realities are again at the center of religious thought in the ecumenical age: the consciousness of unity both as largely given and as a goal to be striven for, and of faith as a necessary foundation of and way to full unity. S.'s concern is to show the significance of M.'s doctrine for the genesis and being of faith, i.e., for Glaubensbegründung in an extended sense: “Zu ihr wird nicht nur das rationale Element gezählt, das zum Glaubwürdigkeitsurteil durch die Vernunft führt, sondern alles, was das
Werden und den Vollzug des Glaubens wie seine Konkretgestalt begründet” (p. 8). To this discussion, which forms the bulk of the work (pp. 127-339), S. prefixes an analysis of M.’s doctrine on the unity of the Church. This provides him with the points of reference for the main part of the book. The manifold facets of unity developed by M. are set forth most fully in the last section, on the significance of the Church’s unity for the life of faith, with an aspect of faith as vital activity corresponding to each aspect of unity: Trinitarian origin of the Church, faith as personal communion with the triune God; the unity of the Church in truth, faith as act of knowing; the unity of the Church in its sacramental life, faith as a sacramentally determined event and process; unity in love, faith productive in love; unity in hierarchy, faith as a social act; the unity of the Church in history, faith as a historical act. These headings alone indicate the wealth of ideas which S. draws from M. and relates to present-day concerns.

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

THE HEART OF REFORMATION FAITH: THE FUNDAMENTAL AXIOMS OF EVANGELICAL BELIEF. By Heinrich Bornkamm. Translated by John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. Pp. 126. $3.00. Heidelberg’s distinguished professor of Church history undertakes to summarize the major themes of the Reformation faith. He expounds the fundamental axioms (“by faith alone,” “by grace alone,” “Christ alone,” and “Scripture alone”) and presents some salient points of Luther’s theology: theology of the Cross, ecclesiology, views of God and man. In a key chapter B. sets forth what he regards as “the abiding validity of the Reformation.” In general he states the issues between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism very sharply. In his view the breach is absolute, since Catholicism demands faith in the Church’s possession of the truth, while Protestantism arrives at truth through an unauthoritative interpretation of Scripture. In his rejection of the natural knowability of God and of any normative tradition, B. is adamant. Further, he maintains that it is impossible for the Catholic Church to accept the ecumenical movement—a position Catholic readers will find surprising. The translator states that this book, “without a trace of polemics or apologetics,” will be helpful to those engaged in ecumenical dialogue, both Protestant and Catholic. But B. would seem to have written for the benefit of Protestants, and more specifically for conservative Lutherans. Catholic readers will regret that he does not show more appreciation of the ecumenical developments in Catholic theology during the past few decades and that he fails to situate Luther within the Augustinian tradition. In the absence of this context, the reader gets the impression that Luther was expressing orig-
inal insights even when he was simply repeating commonplaces of medieval theology.

Woodstock College

Avery Dulles, S.J.

ROME AND REUNION. By Frederick C. Grant. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1965. Pp. v + 196. $5.00. A welcome addition to the small but growing shelf of works addressed primarily across the Roman Catholic and non-Roman Catholic divide. The papacy is a delicate subject to discuss across this divide, since, whatever the situation in other controversial loci, the ecumenical movement has thus far found it difficult to do anything but register disagreement about the papacy. G. makes the papacy the central topic of his book, and for that all should be grateful. It is his contention that the basic source of Roman–non-Roman disagreement is not the papacy itself but the highhanded and historically naive way in which the claims of the modern papacy are “found” in the *NT* and in the Christian literature of the early centuries. It is his further contention that, if and when the papacy exercises Christian leadership of such nature that non-Roman Christians can recognize the presence of the Holy Spirit in that leadership, the papacy will no longer be the divisive factor it has been for so long. The scriptural and historical arguments will not be decisive, if for no other reason than that they fail, according to G., to establish a papacy of divine right. What will be decisive will be the pragmatic test. G. raises many issues, though owing to the brevity and informality of his book these are sometimes not analyzed in what would seem the necessary detail. Most important, it is not always clear just what is meant by “the papacy.” Or rather, the question is not quite focused whether “the papacy” shorn of its *NT* trappings and justification remains “the papacy” in a sense meaningful to Roman Catholics. It is an important service of G.’s book to focus attention on the need, within Roman Catholicism, for a confrontation between history and dogma with regard to the papacy. G.’s charge that the Roman Catholic interpretation of the *NT* and the early history of the Church has been tendentious cannot be gainsaid, whatever one’s disagreements might be with the details of G.’s own interpretation. As this tendentiousness is reduced, the situation in the Church will doubtless change, though at present it seems most unlikely that the change will be of precisely the sort for which G. is calling.

Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa. James J. McCue

THEOLOGIE ALS ÖKUMENISCHER DIALOG. By Paulus Wacker, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1965. Pp. xv + 571. DM 49.— Josef Hasenfuss (Würzburg) has himself written or, as here, inspired others to write numerous books
SHORTER NOTICES

on Hermann Schell, original and wide-ranging theologian (1850–1906) whose work, once put on the Index, has been rediscovered and its genius appreciated. W.'s subtitle, Hermann Schell und die ökumenische Situation der Gegenwart, indicates the direction of his book. He is intent on showing the wealth of Schell's ideas in major areas (idea of God, Christology, Mariology, soteriology, justification, ecclesiology, revelation, the Church's catholicity, unity, and reform), situating them in relation to the mainstream of Evangelical-Lutheran doctrine as it has developed since Reformation times, and showing how Schell's work can promote the ecumenical purpose. Each section, rich in details, comparisons with other theologians, and insights into the ecumenical theological situation, ends with a set of "theses" that are intended simply to focus the main points of Schell's doctrine, whether it be corrective of Reformation ideas or a genial penetration of Catholic dogma or a happy widening of Catholic theology to show points where the separation between the confessions can be narrowed. All in all, a valuable book.

Woodstock College

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

SCRIPTURE AND ECUMENISM: PROTESTANT, CATHOLIC, ORTHODOX AND JEWISH. Edited by Leonard J. Swidler. Pittsburgh: Duquesne Univ. Press, 1965. Pp. vii + 197. $4.95. The nine articles in this volume, originally read as seminar papers at Duquesne, do not deal with any single problem, though six of them, as the editor points out in his introduction, are primarily focused on the relationship between Scripture, tradition, and magisterium. Albert C. Outler notes the improvements in the revised schema De revelatione, but comments that even in its new form it is not worthy of being promulgated as a dogmatic constitution. Robert McAfee Brown gives a clear summary of Karl Barth's doctrine on Scripture and tradition. John Meyendorff maintains that since the living truth is its own criterion, no juridical norms (such as papal approval) can be finally decisive. George Tavard argues that all revelation is in Scripture, but only according to its "spiritual sense," which is unveiled by the Holy Spirit, eluding all methods and techniques. Markus Barth, protesting against a legalistic and idolatrous use of the formula "sola Scriptura," holds that the Bible's authority is always subordinate to the Holy Spirit, who gives understanding and life. Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., notes the increasing agreements between Protestants and Catholics in OT exegesis and biblical theology. Rabbi Steven S. Schwarzschild contends that the Christian's acceptance of the Jewish Scriptures cannot provide a basis for common understanding unless the Talmud is also accepted. David Noel Freedman surveys the accomplishments and hopes of the movement toward a common Bible. Anthony A. Stephenson, S.J., closes with a weighty
inquiry into the respective strengths and weaknesses of biblical and Scholastic theology. Rarely does a symposium achieve such a consistently high level of scholarship, theological acumen, and articulateness. If some of the contributors have been forced to write too compactly, this is an almost inevitable result of the format of the book. But as it stands, this collection gives an excellent conspectus of the tensions between letter and spirit as currently felt in the various religious families which honor the Bible as the word of God.

Woodstock College          Avery Dulles, S.J.

THE OTHER DIALOGUE. By Joseph Gremillion. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965. Pp. 308. $4.95. The “other dialogue” to which Msgr. Gremillion refers in his title is not the aggiornamento discussion within the Church provoked by Pope John, nor the consequent dialogue among Christians, but the dialogue which Pope Paul “explicitly commits the Church to continue, and to expand and deepen . . . with these ‘profound voices of the modern world . . . beyond the frontiers of Christianity’” (p. 10). G. attempts to show the overriding necessity for such a dialogue in today’s world and to stimulate all members of the Catholic Church not only to take part in it but to do so intelligently. He takes as his starting point the fact that social relationships have indeed multiplied in the modern world, reviews briefly the rise of the first “great civilizations” to show that it was only through the multiplication of social relationships in city life that what we call civilization was possible, and then shows how Pope John dealt with the modern multiplication which he called socialization (pp. 23–57). G. then deals with the revolutions of the West under the rubrics of “conflict and renewal,” “Christian universalism,” and “world westernization” in thirty thought-provoking pages. Next he turns to the substance of his book, “The Great Issues,” i.e., the problems of race and nationalism (where he shows insight and personal concern), of property and work, of the relationships between the developed and the less developed countries, of the reforming and revolutionary ideologies in Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Asia and North Africa, and finally of population growth. In dealing with these problems, G.’s point of view is the effort being made by the Church to discuss these problems with all men and to bring all her resources to bear on their solution. At times he tends to overwhelm the reader with listings of ameliorative agencies, but he makes the necessity for broadly based institutional help on the international level overwhelmingly clear, and his own Christian concern is an ideal exemplar of the spirit which must suffuse such institutional aid if its goal is to be attained. His ten-page treatment of the population problem is blunt and
effective, although no new insights are offered. G.'s book is for the hopefully ubiquitous "general reader," to whom it can demonstrate the Church's practical concern for the people of the world and in whom it may well spark intelligent Christian concern for world-wide problems.

Fordham University

Robert J. McNamara, S.J.

CATHOLICS AND BIRTH CONTROL: CONTEMPORARY VIEWS ON DOCTRINE.

In the face of the slowly erupting phenomenon of the mass media of communication, the theologian is confronted with at once the capability and the need for dialogue, not only with other theologians but also with the whole people of God and their contemporaries. But with the rapid occurrence of theologically relevant facts and countless opinions, e.g., in the birth-control controversy, there is need for a new genre of theological writing. B.'s work is further evidence that such a genre has arrived in book form. It may be called the genre of "theological reportage." Her work illustrates the qualities that such reportage must contain: it will have to be responsible, honest, courageous, dispassionate, unslanted, unbiased, factual, thoroughly informed, and well documented. These qualities, as B.'s chap. 8 explicitly points out, are ones in which theologians too might well seek renewal. Also, theological reportage will have to be informative rather than didactic. And to the extent that personal opinions, summaries, and conclusions are sometimes necessary, they must be clearly distinguishable as such. B.'s failure is rather that of not presenting any summaries or conclusions at all, thus leaving the reader with a thirst for a greater sense of continuity and direction. Closer collaboration with theologians and other specialists might minimize such a liability. And in B.'s work it would also have prevented her from omitting the important contributions (made before the fall of 1964) of Bishop J. M. Reuss and Frs. Alfons Auer, L. Weber, and R. T. Francoeur, as well as the key points made by L. Dupré and Frs. W. van der Marck and M. O'Leary. Since keeping up with the opinions of these and countless others has been a rather full-time hobby, especially in the bumper-crop year of 1965, it is hoped that B. will write another book continuing where she left off in the fall of 1964. The work of this non-Catholic author provides an example of what excellent service can be given by theological reportage.

Conception Abbey, Mo.

Roderick Hindery, O.S.B.

DIE PHILOSOPHISCHEN WURZELN DER THEOLOGIE ALBRECHT RITSCHLS.

This monograph responds to a recent tendency in German theology to find
a pattern of similarity between the dominant theological positions of the present time and those of the last century, thus raising a hope that progress can be made beyond the present. The contrast between the revelational stress in Barth and the anthropological stress in Bultmann and Gogarten resembles the contrast, in the 1840's, between the Hegelian theologians and Schleiermacher. But Albrecht Ritschl found a way out of that dilemma, and perhaps his example will provide encouragement for creative work today. Not only in his main work on justification but also in a separate treatise on theology and metaphysics, Ritschl turned to philosophy for liberation. The present work examines the two philosophical roots of his conception of theology: the methodological-epistemological and the ethical-religious. In both cases he went back to Kant for guidance, and it has been generally assumed that Ritschl brought out the religious virtualities in the Kantian philosophy and established its firm claim to be the philosophical transcription of the spirit of Protestantism. But W. shows that this is too simple an account of the relationship between Kant and Ritschl; by bringing out some complicating factors, he does a service to both. On the epistemological side, Ritschl did not study the first *Critique* directly but always through the eyes of the Neo-Kantians and Lotze. While reproving Lotze for having a hypothetical ontology, R. borrowed from him the basic doctrine of the reciprocal relationship of subject and object. This furnished a formal rule of their inseparability, which affected Ritschl's interpretation of every historical event in Scripture. As for the ethico-religious root, W. is specially severe upon Ritschl for misreading Kant. It is Ritschl, not Kant, who absolutizes the ethical law and submits all religious meanings to the criterion of man's ethical self-understanding. It is to Ritschl himself, not to Kant, that must be traced the "identifying transposition" of practical reason with the will and actions of God. One might conclude that Ritschl cannot therefore preserve the independence of revelation in Scripture; but he does permit the man of faith to treat the transposition from a scriptural basis, using it to resolve the Kantian antinomies about God and man. W. helps us to keep Kant himself distinct from the Ritschlian interpretation of him, thus suggesting that there may be other ways of reading Kant which will lead beyond the perpetual exegesis of Barth's and Bultmann's writings.

Saint Louis University

James Collins

_The Future of Man_. By Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. Translated by Norman Denny. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. Pp. 319. $5.00. The twenty-two papers here gathered under a common title are variations on one great central theme, Teilhard's vision of the future. Most of the articles were
published in French periodicals; six have not previously appeared in print. Since the greater number were written from 1945 on, after *The Phenomenon of Man* and *The Divine Milieu*, they convey the author's mature thought. The perspective is consistently evolutionist. T. never wearies of repeating that the universe is not static; the cosmos is a cosmogenesis. Man himself is immersed in an evolutionary process; mankind is an anthropogenesis. The race is heading toward ultrahuman unification. In reaction to the pressures of population growth, human society will increasingly organize itself. Individuals are initially compelled, and eventually desire, to arrange their communal lives more efficiently, first to preserve and later to enhance their freedom of action. Closer association will reveal and release forces of attraction between men that are as powerful in their way as nuclear energy. At the present time a grave problem confronts Christianity. Religion has traditionally sought to perfect man by directing him upward toward God, and has been little concerned with purely human progress. But men are now convinced that they can complete themselves by moving forward, and find little to interest them in the Church. The vital question is whether human salvation is to be found by looking above or by looking ahead. T. insists that no such choice is imposed; the two movements must be combined. The supernaturalizing Christian Upward must be incorporated into the human Forward. And so faith in God will recover all its power to attract and convert. In Christ, who carries anthropogenesis forward and upward to its final goal, we can believe wholly in God and in the world.

*St. Mary's College, Kansas*  
*Cyril Vollert, S.J.*


Not Teilhard the scientist but Teilhard the mystic addresses us in this collection of short works. Most notable among them is "The Mass on the World," written during a scientific expedition in China's Gobi desert. Lacking the bread and wine needed for celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, T. endeavored to fulfill his priestly office as best he could by offering the entire world to God. He was able to do this the more readily since he had for years appreciated the cosmic function and planetary dimensions of his daily Mass. The second part, "Christ in the World of Matter," consists of three brief stories composed in the style of Robert Hugh Benson, whom T. greatly admired. In varying ways these mystical tales bring out Christ's power of permeating all reality. The next item, "The Spiritual Power of Matter," is also cast in narrative form. It extols the utility and nobility of matter for the construction and well-being of man. The hero "felt pity for those who take
fright at the span of a century or whose love is bounded by the frontiers of a nation.” Opposed to such pettiness is the truth that universal matter and immeasurable time “by overflowing and dissolving our narrow standards of measurement reveal to us the dimensions of God.” A final section, “Pensées,” is a compilation of excerpts from many of the author's published and unpublished writings. Some of the passages, illuminated by memorable sentences, clarify his basic insight that the focal point of the evolutionary process is the Man on the Cross, unifying center of the world. T. once expressed his desire to be the apostle and evangelist of Christ in the universe. This book contributes evidence of the extent to which he realized that ambition.

St. Mary's College, Kansas Cyril Vollert, S.J.

CHRÉTIENS DE TOUS LES TEMPS: TEXTES DU 1RE AU XXE SIÈCLE. Paris: Editions du Cerf. Kierkegaard: La difficulté d'être chrétien (1964; pp. 310; 12 fr.), edited and introduced by Jacques Colette, O.P., is, as the title hints, not a general introduction to K.'s thought, but a selection of texts to show what K. meant by “becoming a Christian.” The texts are given under three main headings: “Autobiographie,” “Un itinéraire existentiel: De l'ignorance à la révélation,” “Un itinéraire existentiel: De l'angoisse à l'amour.” There is little annotation, but this is compensated for by the second part of the Introduction (pp. 35–88), which analyzes in detail K.'s progress “from ignorance to the hearing of the Word which saves, from Angst to love.” There is a helpful chronological table (events correlated with the writings) and a detailed analytic Guide de lecture to French-language translations of K. and literature about him. Cardinal Suhard: Vers une église en état de mission (1965; pp. 368; 14.40 fr.) contains a wealth of texts and an introduction by Olivier de la Brosse, O.P. The editor has been able to draw not only upon S.'s published writings but upon the many unpublished materials collected by his confre, H. Bouëssé, O.P., for a biography. The Introduction (pp. 9–43) sketches the development of S.'s career and thought. Added are two chronological tables whose value to the general reader will extend far beyond the present book; the first correlates public events in France with events in Church life from 1870 to 1927; the second, far more detailed, correlates, for 1928–49, events in S.'s life (made bishop of Bayeux and Lisieux in 1927, died in 1949), in the Church at large, in French public life, and in French Catholic intellectual life. In Saint Thomas d'Aquin: L'Homme chrétien (1965; pp. 263; 12 fr.), A.-I. Mennessier, O.P., presents texts to show the specifically Christian thought of St. Thomas, which for many readers remains hidden behind the Aristotelian framework and the Scholastic apparatus. More particularly, M. apparently wants to bring out the salvation-history movement
which others have recently been at pains to show is present in Thomas' thinking. After an introductory series of texts on “Christianisme et religion,” there are three main sections: “L'Ombre des biens à venir” (on OT sacred history, the law, the old covenant), “La réalité chrétienne” (grace, Christ, sacraments), and “Liberté du chrétien.” In addition to a short general introduction to St. Thomas' work, M. provides an introduction to each main section of texts and even to the subsections, a glossary of technical terms, and a brief Guide de lecture to French books on Thomas. It would obviously be too much to say, without qualification, that “St. Thomas is (salvation-) history-minded,” and M. would presumably accept Y. Congar’s judgment to which M.-D. Chenu alludes in his brief Postface to this volume. But as Chenu points out and as M.'s texts show, there is no need to choose between Thomas and a salvation-history theology (whatever this last might mean), except possibly on the level of elementary theological instruction, nor to cultivate a theological schizophrenia by keeping the two in separate compartments. There is need, indeed, of a synthesis of the two, but is such a synthesis actually possible at present?

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

MITTEILUNGEN DES GRABMANN-INSTITUTS DER UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN
Hermann Kunisch's Meister Eckhart: Offenbarung und Gehorsam (1962; pp. 37; DM 5.80) is an essay reprinted from Meister Eckhart als Prediger: Festschrift zum Eckhart-Gedenkjahr (Freiburg, 1960) and is an interpretation of Eckhart's mystical experience in the terms indicated in the title; K.'s expertise is in medieval philology and he has written a number of essays on the medieval mystics as well as edited an anthropology of Eckhart, Tauler, and Seuse. Ludwig Hödl's Die neuen Quästionen der Gnadenlehre des Johannes von RupeUa OM (+1245) in Cod. lat. Paris. 14726 (1964; pp. 91; DM 15.—) is an edition of three questions on grace by John of La Rochelle, which H. discovered in the National Library, Paris. John handled the same questions, but in treatise form, in the already-known but unpublished Vatican ms.; H. edits the pertinent section of the Tractatus after each of the three Paris quaestiones. The long Introduction (pp. 7–49) deals with the Vatican and Paris mss., with Scholastic method and the question as a literary genre, and with the distinctive orientation of thirteenth-century theology of grace, as seen in John's second and third questions (Is grace created or uncreated? Is grace distinct from the virtues?). As an appendix, H. edits the Tractatus de gratia from Philip the Chancellor's Summa de bono, for Philip was the source of John's ideas. This is a valuable contribution to the growing library of medieval theological texts. So, in its own
much more limited way, is Richard Heinzmann's Die "Compilatio quaec- tionum theologiae secundum Magistrum Martinum" (1964; pp. 44; DM 8.80). The Compilatio belongs, in H.'s opinion, among those works which are not worth the effort and cost of printing, yet which ought to be made known, in the form of a table of contents, to scholars interested in the origin and development of theological problems and in the theological concerns of a period. The identity of Master Martin is not certain, but the Compilatio can be dated ca. 1190-1200.

Woodstock College

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

ENCICLOPEDIA DE ORIENTACIÓN BIBLIOGRÁFICA 1: INTRODUCCIÓN GENERAL; CIENCIAS RELIGIOSAS; 2: CIENCIAS RELIGIOSAS (CONTINUACIÓN); CIENCIAS HUMANAS (FILOSOFÍA). Edited by Tomás Zamarriego, S.J. Barcelona: Juan Flors, 1964. Pp. lviii + 829; xlv + 793. A Spanish-language bibliographical encyclopedia, intended to indicate within each area of organized knowledge (with major emphasis on the religious and human sciences) the recognized basic books and other more specific standard books and articles (written in Spanish, French, English, Italian, German, Portuguese, Latin, the only translations noted being those into Spanish) and to inform the student of their orientation, content, and scientific value. A tool, therefore, for students (envisaged are postbaccalaureate students), teachers, and librarians. More than six hundred specialists from twenty-nine countries have been called on to do the choosing, summarizing, and judging. The individual entries are not numbered, but each subheading is. Thus, under Scripture, New Testament, General Question, n. 215 = Textual Criticism, Codices, Families, and contains three items (Lagrange’s two-volume introduction, V. Taylor’s Text of the New Testament, and L. Vaganay’s Initiation à la critique textuelle néotestamentaire). Under Dogmatic Theology, Chapter 3: Grace, Virtues, Sacraments, Article 3: Sacraments, Section 4: Eucharist, n. 457 lists works on the Real Presence; the five items given are Karl Rahner’s article on word and sacrament, R. Masi’s Italian book on the Suarezian theory of the Real Presence, E. Núñez Goenaga’s Spanish book on St. Thomas’ doctrine, and two articles (by C. Colombo and F. Selvaggi) from the recent physics-transubstantiation discussion. The selection could be bettered. But even though one may dissent from the selection given under any heading, the Enciclopedia will certainly be very useful. One unfortunate editorial policy has been to list only the Spanish translation, where it exists, instead of the original; thus much of K. Rahner’s writing, e.g., is given only in the form of its Spanish translation and under the date of the latter.

Woodstock College

M. J. O'Connell, S.J.
SOCIAL PRINCIPLES AND ECONOMIC LIFE. By John F. Cronin, S.S. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1964. Pp. xxiii + 429. $6.50. Not a retread, no warmed-over version of C.'s Catholic Social Principles. This new work includes the latest papal writings on social morality as well as data and examples from the current American scene. Though excellent, indeed without peer, the work has limitations. When C. deals with sociological in contrast to economic theory, these limitations appear. The terminology of the "lonely crowd" is misapplied to law instead of public opinion: other-directness is a concern with the opinion of other men, not the legal code. Again, the basic sociological concepts of custom and institution are treated in a casual manner. The gigantic problem of population pressures is oversimplified. John XXIII saw what others did not: the developing nations desire not bread alone, but a higher standard of living. In Social Principles, cultural differences are lightly dismissed. Even in the food we eat, culture plays an important role. True, the cultural aspects can be changed, but change comes about slowly in a tradition-oriented society. And the cultures of the developing nations are traditionalist, with a frequent overlay of sensitive nationalism. The treatment of racial discrimination is thorough and balanced; here the impact of civil law on public morality is succinctly but adequately discussed. One hopes that C.'s plea for teaching the social morality of the encyclicals in colleges will soon be heeded. The value of this book is enhanced by an annotated bibliography. Indispensable for courses in moral philosophy and theology and for confessional practice.

Loyola College, Baltimore

James J. Conlin, S.J.

THE UNIVERSITY IN PROCESS. By John O. Riedl. Milwaukee: Marquette Univ. Press, 1965. Pp. 96. $2.50. In this 1965 Aquinas Lecture, R., professor of philosophy at Marquette, examines the problems of the contemporary university, citing in particular the difficulties observed in the advancement of learning (with its concomitant problems of the place of research and the need for freedom), the role of theology, and the demands of professional education. In each area he is careful to delineate the historical factors which have shaped the present situation, thereby underscoring the crucial part played by extraneous forces in the development of formalized higher education. Although the wealth of material cited by R. in his presentation indicates commendable familiarity with the literature of the field, reliance upon it as corroborative evidence has apparently prevented him, within the limited confines of a single lecture, from offering anything particularly original or incisive. The germ of such an idea is found when he speaks of the university as autonomous in deciding its own end, but this
potentially exciting line of thought is left undeveloped. A plethora of problems faces higher education today, and R. has mentioned or alluded to almost all of them. The scope of the lecture is too wide for a significant contribution to the field. One would have hoped that the Aquinas lecture might provide a forum for the much-needed philosophical analysis of the contemporary university; R. has not utilized the opportunity as he might have done.

Woodstock College

Michael P. Sheridan, S.J.

**PRAEPOSITINII CANCELLARI DE SACRAMENTIS ET DE NOVISSIMIS.** Edited by Daniel Edward Pilarczyk. *Collectio Urbaniana* 3/7. Rome: Editiones Urbanianae, 1964. Pp. [42] + 121. For a better understanding of the theological atmosphere in which the thirteenth-century masters wrote, some knowledge of the twelfth-century Scholastics is a necessity. For St. Thomas, Praepositinus is an *auctoritas*, one of the few he cites by name, yet his work is almost entirely unedited. Fr. Pilarczyk here supplies a critical edition of the fourth part of P.'s *Summa theologica*, on the sacraments (“The Old Law: Its Efficacy and Reward”; “From the Old Law to the New”; the seven sacraments) and eschatology (only two questions: Do the Church's suffrages help the damned? and eternal beatitude). An introduction gives the few facts known about P.'s life, catalogues his works, and examines the mss. of the *Summa*. A modest but valuable book.

**DEUX CONGRÉGATIONS ET EXPOSITION DU CATÉCHISME.** By John Calvin. Edited by Rodolphe Peter. *Cahiers de la Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 38. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1964. Pp. xxxiii + 49. 8 fr. The *Deux congrégations* (two conferences on Gal 2:11-21) and the *Exposition du catéchisme* (Calvin's explanation of part of his own catechism) were published together in 1563 and reprinted in 1564. All copies seem later to have disappeared. P. found one and here reprints the text with brief notes on literary and other allusions and with an introduction chiefly on the literary genres of the two works.

**BIBLIOTECA DE AUTORES CRISTIANOS.** Madrid: Editorial Católica. Volumes in this series since the last notice (TS 24 [1963] 737-38) cover many areas: Bible, Fathers, apologetics, ascetical theology, and history. In a class by itself is *Obras selectas de Mons. Angel Herrera Oria* (BAC 233; ed. by J. M. Sánchez de Muniáin and J. L. Gutiérrez García. 1963; xxxix + 894; ptas. 125). Bishop Herrera of Malaga has long been one of the most influential figures in the Spanish hierarchy; the writings gathered here, selected by the Bishop himself, are divided into six parts, which show the range of the
Bishop's interests: political thought, the press, historical sketches, social doctrine, apostolate of the laity, and spirituality and pastoral activity. The book is graced by an introduction, summarizing H.'s thought, from the pen of the Apostolic Nuncio, Archb. Antonio Riberi, and, like all the books in this series, is fully indexed. Nos. 234 and 240, along with 225, complete the Comentarios al Código de derecho canónico and will be reviewed together in a later issue (on Vol. 1 cf. TS 25 [1964] 466–67). No. 236, Azar, ley, milagro: Introducción científica al estudio del milagro, by José Ma. Ríaza Morales, S.J. (1964; pp. xx + 375; ptas. 95), is what its title claims: a study of chance and its laws, law in science and how it is reached, and natural laws, leading up to the question of miracles; there are three appendixes: the text of three discourses of Pius XII; the miracles of Lourdes; miracles in beatification and canonization processes. Isabel la Católica: Estudio crítico de su vida y su reinado, by Tarsicio de Azcona, O.F.M.Cap. (no. 237; 1964; pp. xi + 774; ptas. 130), relies heavily on unedited materials; the author refers throughout the book to an appendix giving the texts he is using, but unfortunately the appendix had to be cut down considerably when the time for publication came and it now contains only a sampling of the documents. The full documentation would have increased immensely the value of the book. Nos. 239 and 243 are Vols. 5 and 6 of the Biblia comentada (both 1964) by professors of the University of Salamanca. No. 239 contains the commentary on the Gospels by Manuel de Tuya, O.P. (pp. viii + 1329; ptas. 150), and no. 243 the commentary on the letters of St. Paul (Hebrews is included) by Lorenzo Turrado (pp. xi + 790; ptas. 125). The final volume will contain the rest of the NT and indexes to the whole series. The two volumes of patristic writings are bilingual editions, an advantage which the BAC has over many other modern collections of the Fathers. No. 235 is Obras de San Agustín 19: Enarraciones sobre los Salmos 1, edited by Balbino Martín Pérez, O.S.A. (1964; pp. 83* + 780; ptas. 125), and contains a long introduction by José Morán, O.S.A., and the Enarraciones on Psalms 1–40; the indexes will appear in the final volume. No. 241 is a complete Obras de San Cipriano, edited by Julio Campos (1964; pp. 744; ptas. 125). The editor's introduction (pp. 1–75) deals with the life, works, theology, and influence of Cyprian; the text of the letters is Bayard's, of the treatises Hartel's. The last volume to be noticed here is La vida religiosa by Antonio Royo Marín, O.P., who has already contributed six volumes to the BAC (1965; pp. xi + 664; ptas. 115). The present volume deals with religious life under three headings: the canonical, the theological, and the ascetico-mystical, the last being also the lengthiest section, and the theological being concerned chiefly with the nature of the religious state.

BOOKS RECEIVED

[All books received are listed here whether they are reviewed or not]

Scriptural Studies


Doctrinal Theology


*Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgical Questions*


*History and Biography, Patristics*


*Pastoral and Ascetical Theology, Devotional Literature*


*The Preacher's Encyclopedia 1: Lent and Eastertide*. Ed. by A. Herrera; tr.


Philosophical Questions


**Special Questions**


Hugo Rahner, S.J., *Our Lady and the Church* (pp. x + 131; $1.25).


---

*THEOLOGICAL STUDIES*


### SIGLA

#### OLD TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old Testament Title</th>
<th>SIGLA Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>Gn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus</td>
<td>Lv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>Nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>Dt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Jos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges</td>
<td>Jg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Samuel</td>
<td>1, 2 S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Kings</td>
<td>1, 2 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Chronicles</td>
<td>1, 2 Chr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra</td>
<td>Ezr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
<td>Neh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Est</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>Ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proverbs</td>
<td>Prv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes)</td>
<td>Qoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
<td>Ct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>Is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>Jer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Macabees</td>
<td>1, 2 Mac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NEW TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Testament Title</th>
<th>SIGLA Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Mk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Lk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romans</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Corinthians</td>
<td>1, 2 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatians</td>
<td>Gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephesians</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippians</td>
<td>Phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Thessalonians</td>
<td>1, 2 Th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Timothy</td>
<td>1, 2 Tim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>Tit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td>Phm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td>Heb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Macabees</td>
<td>1, 2 Mac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ap Apocrypha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>SIGLA Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Thessalonians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Timothy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philemon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colossians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Macabees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3 John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>