BOOK REVIEWS


The long-awaited English version of the renowned Bible de Jérusalem (BJ) has finally appeared. It is a handsome production, and generations of English readers of the Bible will be indebted to Alexander Jones and his team of twenty-seven competent translators and advisers for it. The overall impression it makes is one of excellence. It is a historic achievement, because The Jerusalem Bible (JB) represents the first complete translation of the Bible into English by Roman Catholics which is based on the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts—all previous Catholic translations of the whole Bible being based on the Latin Vulgate. Jones admits that the initial draft of a few books was made from the French BJ; this was then compared by him word for word with the Hebrew or Aramaic and amended where necessary to ensure complete uniformity with the ancient text. Otherwise the initial drafts were made from the Hebrew or Greek; they were simultaneously compared with the French so that when questions of variant readings or interpretations arose, BJ would serve as the norm. Only such a procedure would make sense in an English translation which was to incorporate the introductions and notes of BJ.

The advantages of this new English translation are many. First of all, it presents the Bible in very readable modern English, which has abandoned archaisms and "Bible English" and has not sought to preserve a hieratic, sonorous uniformity like the Elizabethan prose in which the King James Version (KJV) lies mummified. To quote Jones, that "rhetorical quality and orotundity of cadence ... belong more truly to the first Elizabethan age in England than to the Hebrew originals" (p. vii). Would that John Huston and Christopher Fry had realized this before 20th Century-Fox's recent attempt to film The Bible! Secondly, it has adopted the current English spelling of proper names in the Protestant tradition. This was called for by the common use of them in English language and letters. The flyer advertising JB refers to this spelling as that of KJV; but forms used in JB are obviously closer to the Revised Standard Version (RSV) than to KJV. For example, Zachary (Lk 1:5) of the old Douay-Rheims tradition appears in KJV as Zacharias, but in RSV as Zechariah; the latter is used in JB. Many other samples would parallel this; one need only look at the genealogies in Mt 1 and Lk 3 for proof. The advertising blurb also admits that some exceptions have been made "where modern linguistic research has resulted in more accurately spelled transliterations of the Hebrew or
Greek." Thirdly, it has by and large avoided Britishisms. However, a few have gotten in. To American ears it will sound strange to hear the servant in Lk 17:8 commanded "Get my supper laid," or to hear about the evil man "lurking unseen like a lion in his hide" (Ps 10:9). And the lamp put "under a tub or under the bed" (Mk 4:21) will suggest the image of the bedchamber and bath rather than what is intended. Here I detect the influence of another Britishism in the New English Bible, which has the lamp put "under the meal-tub." Finally, the new translation has had the benefit of consultants who are men of English letters. The list of the principal collaborators includes the names of J. R. R. Tolkien, James McAuley, Edward Sackville-West, and Robert Speaight.

The foreword mentions that JB is the "English equivalent" of the 1956 edition of BJ, adding that the introductions and notes have been "revised and brought up to date in some places—account being taken of the decisions and general implications of the Second Vatican Council" (p. v); what is meant by the latter is hard to say. The note, however, on the back of the title page indicates that the introductions and notes are the translation of the "one volume edition, 1961, ... modified in the light of the subsequent revised fascicule [sic] edition." From this one gathers that JB is the translation of a one-volume condensation of the forty-three fascicles of the original BJ. The introductions and notes in this translation, then, scarcely represent the completeness and detail of their justly famous counterparts in the fascicle edition. Moreover, the latter exists in a second or often a third revised edition (e.g., Gn, Sm, Kgs, Mac, and most of the New Testament). BJ was first published in fascicles between 1948 and 1954. That edition has been undergoing continual revision ever since, not only in the introduction and notes, but even in the translation itself. This revision has not been systematically applied to the one-volume edition. The English version in JB, then, normally represents the first edition of the French fascicles. To cite but one example, the exceptive clause in the divorce text of Mt 19:9 was translated in the first French fascicle "je ne parle pas de la fornication." The second edition translated porneia as "concubinage," and the most recent third edition uses "prostitution." But JB reads "I am not speaking of fornication." The note, too, on Mt 19:9 in the third edition is enlightened and gives a rather satisfying explanation of the Matthaean addition; but the brief note in JB reflects the comment of the first French edition. Hence one cannot simply speak of "the" Jerusalem Bible without distinguishing its editions.

On occasion the English translation has preserved and perpetuates what is an error in BJ. The French original sought to justify its decision to trans-
late Sirach from the Greek instead of the Hebrew text found at the end of the last century, by stating that "the Church recognizes the canonicity only of the Greek text" (p. 1034). It has, however, often been pointed out since the first appearance of the fascicle L'Ecclesiastique (Paris, 1953) that canonicity is the quality of a book of the Bible and not of its text, let alone its translation; cf. the remarks of R. A. F. MacKenzie, Theological Studies 16 (1955) 125-26, and of L. F. Hartman, Catholic Biblical Quarterly 23 (1961) 443-51.

Naturally one will not always agree with the English translation, either as an accurate translation of the original biblical text or as a reflection of the French. Here I shall limit myself to a few NT examples. Mt 2:1 translates magoi with the traditional misleading phrase "some wise men," where the French has simply "des mages." Goodspeed and the NEB call them frankly "astrologers," as they should be. Acts 1:9 wrongly translates the aorist participle tauta eipon by "As he said this"; the French reads "quand il eut dit cela," preserving the priority of action suggested by the original. Lk 16:9 translates tou mamona tes adikias by "money, tainted as it is," whereas the French preserves the adjective "malhonnête," which is the crucial catchword binding together the saying and the preceding parable of the "intendant malhonnête." And a number of other instances could be cited. In particular, S. Lyonnet's famous translation of ep委托ν hō in Rom 5:12 as "du fait que" turns up in JB as "because," despite all of Lyonnet's efforts to dissuade commentators from treating it as the equivalent of hoti or dioti. Generally speaking, the translation of the Pauline letters, for all their readability, is significantly unlike the French, which was at once far more literal and yet well rendered.

Persons who have complained about the modernity of the new English translation being used in the missals in this country will not be predisposed to approve of the JB translation with its short sentences, occasional contractions, lack of "Amen, amen," occasional use of "fellow" (Lk 22:59), and the rendering of the Beatitudes by "Happy the merciful," etc.

Such criticisms as I have made are minor and scarcely detract from the over-all excellence of JB. Indirectly, this English version stands as a well-deserved tribute to the French Dominicans of the Ecole biblique in Jerusalem who were responsible for this Bible from the beginning. One must wonder about the future of it, however, in the light of the recent decision of the Council and of Pope Paul VI himself to advocate a common Bible—an endeavor to which we all look forward with grateful hope.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.
The latest volume to be published in the OT section of the Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk follows the pattern already set for this series. The style is one suited to the nonspecialist, provided he is willing not simply to read but to study carefully both Bible and commentary. In only a few instances, and relegated to footnotes, do Hebrew words occur. The commentary ordinarily avoids even transliterations of Hebrew words, for the author presents the larger ideas of passages rather than the more limited sense of individual words. Readers can gauge the pitch of these commentaries from Artur Weiser's one on the Psalms, already published in an English translation.

With extraordinary clarity Westermann presents his conclusions about that most complicated problem, the formation of chaps. 40–55 and 56–66. An unknown genius-saint, whom we call Second- or Deutero-Isaiah, is responsible for 40–55, more or less as these chapters now stand in the Bible. The first six chapters originated in the moment of speaking, while 46–55 seem to have been written down first. Deutero-Isaiah's favorite styles were the hymn of praise and the Heilsorakel (an oracle of salvation in which God is thought to respond to the plaints of the people). The Songs of the Suffering Servant (42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13—53:12), though the first three were composed by Deutero-Isaiah, were all inserted later into the Book of Consolation by Trito-Isaiah. This latter person also added at the same time 42:6–9 and 49:7–12. Trito-Isaiah, another anonymous person, disciple of Deutero-Isaiah, lived around 530 B.C. in Yehud, the tiny and desolate land allotted the repatriated Jews in Palestine. His initial work consisted of 57:14–20; 65:15b–25; 66:6–16. W. proceeds to explain how this nucleus grew into eleven chapters: sometimes drawn from people's laments (59; 63:7–64:11); other times taken from pre-exilic prophetic passages (56:9–12; 57:3–6; 57:7–13a); usually continuing Deutero-Isaiah's universalism (which W. accepts as a major theme of Deutero-Isaiah) but sometimes added later to Trito-Isaiah's work to correct his "excessive" universalism (63:1–6).

In general W. follows the conclusions reached by Duhm, Marti, and particularly Volz in their classic commentaries. His own special insight seems to lie in uncovering points of contact with the Psalms and with Israel's tradition of prayer. He stresses in a particular way the influence of the cultic lamentation (Volksklage) upon both Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. A popular commentary like this one does not allow an author to argue scientifically. This limitation may explain why the reader may sometimes remain uncon-
vinced, i.e., when W. sees a clear parallel between Is 40:27 and Ps 44:25 or between Is 40:30 f. and Ps 33:16, 18.

What W. is doing, however—and here is one of the most valuable aspects of his commentary—is linking Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah with Israel's religious thinking and activity. W. reconstructs in a large, general way the prayer and liturgy of Israel, her ancient songs of praise, her more recent laments over sin, her constant understanding of Yahweh as Redeemer and Saviour; the reader is thus helped to plumb more deeply into the theology of Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah. While W. makes this theological contribution, he does not approach another commentator, James Muilenburg (in Vol. 5 of The Interpreter's Bible), in perceiving and explaining the literary forms, the poetic structures, and the figures of speech within Is 40–66. He has certainly written one of our finest commentaries in haute vulgarisation, much longer than C. R. North's Isaiah 40–55 (London, 1964) and much less discouraging to the nonspecialist than North's later work, The Second Isaiah XL–LV (Oxford, 1964).

Carroll Stuhlmueeller, C.P.


This is an important book, not only for the specialist in the study of the OT and its law, but for the theologian in general, and especially for the moral theologian. It should further the effort to find a solidly biblical foundation for the theology of law. Hopefully, then, it will receive the attention it deserves. The background of Gerstenberger's study is one of the basic insights of modern biblical research, Albrecht Alt's elucidation of OT law in terms of the distinction of case law from apodictic law. On this basis Alt points to the explanation of the origin and special character of Israelite law: it is a direct, absolute expression of the divine will. But the work is not yet complete. Much will be gained from a deeper study of these apodictic laws, as the present book shows.

One important element in it is the careful definition of case law and of apodictic law. First there is the problem of the proper distinction between the two forms. The tendency has been to lump the curse laws ("cursed be the man that does so and so") and the participial laws ("He who does so and so must die") and apodictic law properly so called. Actually these are both a kind of case law, since they explain the case and then give the penalty to be imposed on the man in the case. The difference from typical case law
is entirely external. The standard form of case law explains the case in a kind of conditional clause: “If a man has done so and so, he shall pay such and such a fine.” (Strictly speaking, one should not speak of “conditional clause” here, since the actual form is a noun clause: “Given the case that etc.,” but this is grammatical nicety which need not concern us here.) The curse laws and the participial laws simply use adjectives (participle) or relative clauses to do the same thing: describe a case. They suppose that something has been done and simply offer the proper definition of the act so that guilt or debt may be judged, and then they fix the penalty.

The true apodictic law is the simple command. This is more commonly negative, that is, a prohibition rather than a command, if one were to insist on niceties of language. Positive or negative, the apodictic law is simple. There is no explaining of cases and no statement of a penalty. Such laws, as G. points out, do not look at a past fact, as does every kind of case law. They are aimed strictly at the future. They give the individual a warning or a direction for his future conduct.

Then there is the all-important question of the locus (Sitz im Leben) of the apodictic law. Commonly it has been associated with the cult and the covenant. This is undoubtedly correct for the later period of Israel’s history, but it is not so certain that this association is the original source of this important form of law. The apodictic laws are associated with the cult somewhat externally by the addition of the cultic formula of Yahweh’s self-introduction “I am Yahweh.” This formula was a free form available for many different religious uses, but especially for attaching originally alien things to the formal Yahwist cult. This is to say, it was a part of a technique which fitted things from other spheres into the central fact of Hebrew life, the cult. This implies that the apodictic law had to be brought into the cult, that it was not originally at home there.

So also with the covenant. There is no doubt that apodictic laws are associated with covenantal forms. The question is: Is this their original place and origin? Since the oldest form of the covenant was an affair of ritual rather than of law, this does not seem to be so. Moreover, the apodictic laws now associated with covenants in the OT appear in units of ten or twelve members. G. shows that these longer collections are secondary. The earlier forms of apodictic laws come in smaller groups, usually of two or three, or alone. Thus both the form of the earlier covenants and the form of the laws actually associated with covenant in our present OT texts indicate that the apodictic laws and the covenant were joined together only later on. This was a natural development in Israel; for, as the people realized the
meaning of the covenant with Yahweh better, they realized that all aspects of the nation's life belonged to Yahweh, and so they drew more and more things into explicit relationship with the covenant. This was especially easy with law, since certain forms of the covenant encouraged it.

So far this is negative. We have found where the apodictic laws were not originally at home. What positive conclusions does the author offer? He finds the original home of the apodictic form in the wisdom of the clan. The admonition of the wise man, the man of experience who headed the tribe or the clan, naturally took the form of a command to do this or that, or a prohibition not to do this or that. This seems likely enough, but it is still a priori reasoning. However, concrete evidence is at hand. An analysis of the older forms of the wisdom tradition in Israel, here taken from the Book of Proverbs, and in extrabiblical material provides this concrete evidence. These remains of the earlier wisdom literature abound in such commands and prohibitions. These forms occur in small collections of two or three, just as did the original apodictic laws. They cover much the same areas of life. They have the same form. G.'s argument from his study of the very old wisdom traditions is a most convincing explanation of the origin of apodictic law.

So much for the more or less technical work in this study. It is done with skill and it is convincing. It is precisely such detailed and accurate work that must provide the data for further theologizing, for attempts to find a truly scriptural interpretation of the phenomenon of law. But having these data, what conclusions can a theologian draw? Probably first and most important should be that he needs more data, more detailed information drawn from such careful studies of the texts as are offered here. However, a study like this leaves us with more than this merely negative answer. If we do not have full data, we have enough to indicate the direction in which the theologian must look to find the solution to his problem of the nature and origin of law. Naturally the full answer to a question like this cannot be given here. It may well be given in G.'s book, and he himself offers some valuable theological commentary in his concluding section.

One point of considerable importance we have already mentioned. The law which is characteristic of the Hebrew legal system and differentiates it from the law of its neighbors is the apodictic law, even though such law was familiar to Gentiles. The difference is in its centrality to Hebrew thinking. As we have seen, this law is a guide for the future. It is not negative and past-orientated. It is not designed to be an aid in the examination of conscience, so that one can judge one's past actions. It is rather guidance and
direction for living on. This characteristic may not lend itself to concrete application, but it is important as defining a spirit which should pervade our whole theory of human conduct.

Another point worthy of examination in view of traditional Catholic theories of law is the possible distinction between case law and apodictic law in terms of a distinction between natural law and divine law. The case law of the OT is borrowed straight from the Semitic milieu in which Israel lived. It is a record of court decisions which were found to be useful. Thus it represents the experience of a society forming itself and coming to terms with its environment. This would seem clearly to be a form of law which is based upon normal human experience and normal human reflection, that is, an application of natural law in some wise. On the other hand, the apodictic law is represented as command coming directly from God, even though it is not necessarily strictly religious in its subject matter. Indeed, it is usually concerned with the life of man in society. This is divine law, because it is represented as the will of God and so these matters are understood to be under a divine sanction. Clearly this seems to set this sort of law off from more naturalistic case law. Is this a justification for our natural law–divine law division?

The answer seems to be no, and this for two reasons. First, it would appear that the case law ultimately depends on some sort of absolute demand such as appears in the apodictic law. The cases which form the precedents from which a rather complete corpus of case law was gradually built had to be judged according to some norm against which the rightness of the judgment was determined, so that the decision was deemed worthy of inclusion in the corpus. Whether in all instances such principles could have been made explicit is not important; in fact, the judges and the community so decided, perhaps from some instinctive application of principle. Thus the distinction between particular case law and absolute, universal commands is not so easy to maintain.

From quite another point of view the equation “case law–natural law, apodictic law–divine law” cannot be maintained. G. demonstrates that the ultimate source of the apodictic law is to be found in the directions which the head of the clan gave to the members of the clan in order to safeguard its existence. Typically these are expressed as commands guiding future conduct. But what is the source of such commands? Clearly it is the simple experience of life in this particular community. The apodictic laws express the code which is necessary in order to maintain the society. For instance, one important subject of apodictic law is incest. It forbids practices which would necessarily have broken up the family life which was basic to the clan.
Thus it is ultimately human experience from which the content of the apodictic laws was derived, even though they came to be expressed as absolute divine commands.

It is, then, difficult to maintain a sharp division between the law which is presented as direct revelation from God and the law which man develops out of his own experience, out of his living according to his nature and his reflection upon this life in the light of his nature. On the one hand, his apparently natural-law conclusions go back to ultimate principles which are given divine sanction; on the other hand, the content of the commands given in the name of God seems itself to depend largely upon experience.

To understand this, it must be emphasized that in the OT world law, even law which is derived from human experience, is never separated from the sacral context. The wise men of the clan may well have derived their laws from their observations of human living, but they were equally certain that such law was governed by divine will and a divine sanction. This is demonstrated by the fact (and others might be adduced) that in many circumstances the failure to keep such laws demanded a ritual purification of the guilty party or, sometimes, even of the whole group to which he belonged. This is clear acknowledgment that, even though the content of such laws was derived humanly from human experience, their ultimate sanction was seen to rest with the divinity who was the guardian of law, and who had to be propitiated if the law was violated.

Law, then, in the biblical sense cannot be sharply divided into the natural and supernatural. The OT admits a law which is natural in that it is arrived at by human reflections and human experience, but such law is immediately taken into the divine sphere, for it is God who guards such a law and ultimately demands that it be observed. The human law is based on principles conceived to be God's commands, and the content of God's commands is often the result of human experience. This would seem to justify both the use of a natural law which is based upon examination of man and his nature and the command that such law be looked upon as truly religious, truly sacred, truly divine. Moreover, since the apodictic law, the absolute commandment with its totally future-directed orientation, is the basic biblical law, surely in our attitude toward law we should be concerned with it much more as a divinely-given guide for future conduct than as a norm for judging the rightness of our past actions. Reflections such as these are very general and may seem rather jejune to the experts. One can only hope that they will give themselves over to the study of the law as it is given to us in revelation and so enrich our own ideas in the matter.

St. Mary's College, Kansas
Dennis J. McCarthy, S.J.

Prof. Schnackenburg's commentary on John has been awaited by the scholarly world for some years; as a summary judgment of the first volume, it is well worth the waiting. Of the Herder Kommentar, only Vol. 13 had previously appeared, dealing with the Catholic Epistles in three parts by Mussner, Schelkle, and Schnackenburg. S.'s outstanding commentary on the Johannine Epistles, now in its third edition (1965), has become a standard of reference, and not only in Catholic exegetical circles. His numerous articles on the Johannine Gospel, the substance of some of them being included in the present volume, have led us to expect the magisterial commentary now before us.

Although the fourth Gospel seems to raise more problems than any other book of the NT, we are in the fortunate position of having at hand an immense wealth of recent literature to deal with them. Much of this appears in S.'s very complete bibliography and in the notes throughout the work, and the whole shows an extraordinary familiarity with the literature. In many respects the critical views expounded by S. might be called "conciliatory," of the nature of the "mittlere Lösung" he adopts for the question of Johannine authorship, but this seems to me to indicate that there are growing trends in Johannine research toward a broadly acceptable picture of "the Johannine problem." It is all the more valuable, therefore, that we should find these trends being set forth by such a recognized master as the Würzburg professor.

The first volume of the commentary (three are projected, despite the remark on p. 524) contains a long Introduction dealing with the nature of John as a gospel, its relationship to the Synoptics, literary criticism, tradition and redaction, authorship, language and style, background and origin, theological tendencies, the text, and the history of Johannine interpretation. All of these chapters would merit some comment, were it only to point out the combination of vast learning and careful judgment in each of them. Some of S.'s positions may be noted here. The fourth Gospel does not depend on the Synoptics, probably not on any written sources except a possible sēmeia-source, but is familiar with the Synoptic oral traditions as well as with its own independent ones. In the evolution of the Gospel, there is a long period of growth from the tradition of the Apostle John down to the work of a redactor who is responsible for certain rearrangements and insertions in the text (e.g., transposition of chaps. 5 and 6, insertion of passages into chap. 3, addition of chap. 21, etc.). The evidence of redactional activity
in John is inescapable; it only seems to me regrettable that the commentary should follow the revised order that results from a redactional analysis, in this volume chap. 3 being treated in the order 1–12, 31–36, 13–21, 22–30. This makes the volume slightly awkward to use, though much less so than the prototype of rearrangement, that of Bultmann.

The reviewer finds S.'s introductory chapter on the "geistiges Milieu" of John particularly rewarding; his discussions of Jewish and Gnostic literature are extremely well informed. This examination of the religionsgeschichtlich background leads to the conclusion, already adopted by some recent writers on John, that at some stage of the development of Johannine traditions there was strong Syrian influence. But S. is careful not to deny the Palestinian origin of the traditions. The question of the relationship between John and Gnosticism is carefully treated also in the excursuses of the commentary section; this feature—somewhat characteristic of German scholarship on the fourth Gospel—greatly enhances its value. The discussion of a Gnostic redeemer-myth is unusually complete. John is not held to be directly indebted to such a myth, but S. is inclined toward the view that such a pre-Christian Gnostic myth did in fact exist. In general, he concludes that one may not use later Christian Gnostic writings to elucidate the fourth Gospel, but there are growing indications of a type of early Gnostic thought with which the Evangelist may have been familiar. His answers to the questions raised by the Gnostics are, however, radically different from those of the Gnostics themselves. It is significant that a Syrian influence on the Gospel might serve to explain the Johannine contact with both late Judaism and Gnosticism, and current researches into the beginnings of Christianity are tending to probe deeper into the nature of earliest Syrian Christianity. In the application of this material to the Johannine problem, this commentary is in the forefront of the discussion.

One other chapter of the Introduction should be singled out for its particular usefulness, that dealing with the textual evidence. Besides listing the textual witnesses, the author discusses the significance of the newest papyri, ρββ and p76, for the emerging picture of the text types, and also provides useful lists of all important variants in these papyri. He sums up a broad spectrum of literature in an equally useful listing of some important conjectural emendations based on theological considerations.

One could hardly do justice in a review to individual points of exegesis in the commentary. The presentation of arguments and views is immensely detailed, as the total of some 240 pages (not counting the excursuses) on the first four chapters indicates. The reviewer would have his reservations on some points: e.g., S.'s preference for reading ho gegonen with 1:3 rather than
with 1:4 seems to rest in part on a fairly rigid understanding of the notion of "life" in the Prologue (pp. 215–17), when it seems characteristic of the Prologue as well as of the body of the Gospel that key Johannine notions are to be understood in a fluid sense.

Finally, one of the most valuable features of this work will undoubtedly prove to be the seven excursuses on such points as the origin of the Logos concept, the ideas of pre-existence, sign and faith, the Son of Man, the titles of Jesus in Jn 1, and Johannine Christology. Each of these—some of them previously known in S.'s periodical articles—is an important essay in Johannine theology. In sum, the student of the fourth Gospel will find immense riches in this volume which he cannot ignore. The work seems destined to enjoy at least the success of its author's Johannesbriefe, and we may hope that the succeeding volumes will soon be available.

Weston College

George MacRae


About six years have passed since the appearance of the first volume in this invaluable series of NT monographs. It was the Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul, compiled under the direction of the learned and indefatigable editor of the series, B. M. Metzger (see Theological Studies 21 [1960] 643–44). Though not all the other volumes in the series have been of the same bibliographical character (see ibid. 23 [1962] 341–42; 24 [1963] 525–26; 25 [1964] 310–11, 645–47), our reviewers have not been restrained in their praise of it. Metzger's IPLAP has already become a vademecum of all students of the Pauline letters, and the two volumes noticed here will certainly take their places alongside it as indispensable aids.

The index to Pauline literature was slender indeed in comparison with the two bibliographies which have now been published. Part of the reason for this is the vast amount of literature on Christ and the Gospels, and the difference of the Mattill bibliography in content. IPLAP numbered 2,987 articles, drawn from 14 periodicals from their inception to the end of 1957 and written in 14 different languages. The new Metzger volume (IPLCG) numbers 10,090 items, drawn from 160 periodicals from their inception to the end of 1961 and written in 16 different languages. The Mattill volume (CBLAA) numbers 6,646 entries, drawn from 180 periodicals from their
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inception to the end of 1961 and written in "nearly a score of languages." CBLAA differs, however, from the two Metzger bibliographies in that it is not limited to periodical literature. It excludes titles of NT introductions and theologies, book reviews, homiletic and devotional works, and dictionary articles; but otherwise it attempts to "include everything else of scholarly interest that deals with Acts...from the time of the Church Fathers through 1961." This vast project, which has obviously succeeded in a remarkable way, reveals the immense utility of the volume.

In both the Metzger and the Mattill volumes the entries are listed topically. As an example, we shall list here the titles of the main sections of the Metzger volume (IPLCG); it will give a quick indication of the breakdown of the material surveyed: (1) bibliographical articles on Christ and the Gospels; (2) historical studies of the life of Jesus; (3) critical studies [both textual and literary] of the Gospels; (4) early noncanonical literature related to Christ and the Gospels; (5) theological studies concerning Jesus Christ and the Gospels; (6) the influence and interpretation of Jesus Christ and the Gospels in worship, the fine arts, and culture in general. The Table of Contents alone in this volume, which provides numerous subheadings for the above-mentioned breakdown, covers ten pages. It is a rich and orderly presentation of bibliographical material—another monument to Metzger's industry.

Needless to say, no one who attempts such a project will ever succeed in being exhaustive. There will undoubtedly be omissions which the user will note. But these will certainly be remarkably few in the face of the tour de force (in the good sense) which the compilers have achieved. They deserve our lasting thanks. And serious work on these NT writings which will depend on their contribution will not be hard to detect.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


The present volume is part of an important new series, under the general editorship of Jaroslav Pelikan, bearing the general title Makers of Modern Theology. It deals with F. C. Baur, perhaps the least well known of the major theologians of the German Idealist movement. Although regarded by Dilthey as the greatest theologian of the nineteenth century, Baur is usually dismissed in modern textbooks as the author of a simplistic and aprioristic "theory of tendencies" which supposedly sought to account for the developments in first-century Christianity on the pattern of the Hegelian triad of
thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Actually, Baur’s analysis of the tendencies in
the primitive Church was neither simplistic nor aprioristic; nor was it in­
spired by Hegel, whom Baur had not yet read when he excogitated his
type. In any case, as the present study shows, Baur’s main importance
lies elsewhere. Outstanding as a historian of dogma and as a theoretician of
historical theology, he explored “more intensively and creatively than any
major theologian” (p. 267) the connections between God and history, be­
tween faith and historical knowledge, between dogmatic theology and his­
torical theology.

The key to Baur’s system would seem to lie in his consistent use of dialec­
tical thinking as an instrument for overcoming traditional theological di­
lemmas. In Christology, for example, he argued for a dialectical identity
between the historical Jesus and the ideal, divine Christ. A nondialectical
identity, according to Baur, would undermine the distinction between the
two natures, whereas a simple nonidentity would involve a heretical separa­
tion. Similarly in ecclesiology, he contended that the Christian “idea” of
reconciliation is dialectically present within the various historical mani­
festations of Christianity, no one of which, however, can be unqualifiedly
identified with the idea of the Church itself.

Can Baur’s dialectical approach do justice to the traditional Christian
data concerning the supernatural? Baur avoided the category of the super­
natural, not because he wished to exclude the activity of God from history
(far from it), but because the term had in his opinion been spoiled by the
rigidly orthodox theologians whom he opposed. He wished to retain the
Chalcedonian faith of the Church, but on philosophical grounds he rejected
the full and absolute presence of the divine in Jesus Christ. Hodgson in this
study rightly objects that the perfect union between the divine and the
human in Christ in no way abolishes the true distinction of natures; Baur
unnecessarily diminished the contents of faith in his efforts to avoid the
pitfalls of Docetism. This being admitted, we may still feel tempted to ex­
plore the consequences of conceiving the “union of natures” along the lines
of a dialectical tension such as Baur describes. In this way it might prove
possible to establish a closer relationship between the ontology of the hypo­
static union and the psychology of Christ than is generally achieved in
current Christology.

With reference to the Church, Baur was convinced that Catholicism stood
for an undialectical identification between the idea and the concrete reality,
and thus was prevented from taking Church history seriously. Catholic
historians of dogma, he complained, were incapable of admitting a true
change which was anything more than an organic development of elements
already present. Since Vatican II, however, this question may perhaps be reopened. It is possible to be bolder than before in admitting a certain discontinuity in the evolution of dogma, corresponding to the genuine novelty of successive epochs. Furthermore, the conciliar documents seem at times to look upon the Church somewhat dialectically. *Lumen gentium* recognizes that the Church is at once righteous and sinful, and that the Church of Christ, although it “subsists in” Roman Catholicism, is not exclusively identical with it. These statements seem to open the way for a possible rapprochement with Baur’s ecclesiological principles.

Baur grappled long and hard with the relationship between God and history, and it is on this score that H. finds his system most wanting. He opted for a pantheistic monism derived from Hegel. Historical process, he maintained, is a function of the divine life explicating itself outwardly. While this supposition permits him to view history as a connected whole, it also runs the risk of collapsing human freedom and individuality into the necessary evolution of the eternal Spirit. Furthermore, it forbids him to look upon God as totally independent of the world. In his effort to relate God and history, Baur risks falling into an acosmism—which can easily, as H. observes, be inverted into a Feuerbachian atheism. H. severely censures Baur for lacking a satisfactory doctrine of creation. But was not this the price of the intimate relationship which he sought to establish between God and history? H. suggests that modern process philosophy, unlike traditional theism, makes it possible to affirm that God, while “first and primarily free and concrete in himself” (p. 269), is radically implicated in the events of history. Surely this is a line of thinking which merits exploration.

As the title of this study suggests, Baur’s most significant contribution lay in the field of theological method. He recognized a polar relationship between faith and history as two interdependent approaches which exist in mutual tension. Following out this line of thought, he laid the foundations for a historical theology which could be a genuinely theological discipline (involving the subjective commitment of faith) and at the same time rigorously critical (adopting the scientific stance of academic history).

While Baur’s efforts to clarify the principles proper to historical theology are significant and praiseworthy, this reviewer was somewhat disappointed in his achievement, at least as reflected in H.’s account. In Baur’s day historical science was still in its infancy. It was quite natural, therefore, that he should have lacked a complete theory as to how the aims and methods of religious history differ according to the theological concerns, convictions, and objectives of the historian. If such distinctions are made, it is not necessary to agree with Baur, as H. does, that the resurrection of Jesus is
the one exception to the rule that historical events are knowable through historical knowledge (p. 236). Baur will always deserve our respect for having objected to the "Gnostic" tendencies of Schleiermacher and Hegel and vindicated the authority of the historically given. In perceiving that historical fact and the attitude of faith are mutually prior to each other, he made an important contribution to the new discipline of historical theology. To carry out Baur's intention, making use of a more nuanced theory of history, is a major imperative for theology in our own day.

H.'s book is evidently the fruit of much difficult toil. To peruse the published and unpublished writings of such a prolific theologian must have been no easy task. H. has presented Baur clearly and succinctly, and has evaluated him judiciously from a basically conservative, moderately Barthian standpoint. In this first book the author shows obvious competence in both historical and systematic theology—a dual competence which locates him in the best tradition of Baur himself.

Woodstock College

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


These volumes are the first in a projected series of six, which will provide a new translation of, and commentary on, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers. When completed, this series will mark the fullest commentary in English on all of these writings since Lightfoot's monumental work in the nineteenth century. For this reason alone, Robert M. Grant, the general editor, and the authors of the other volumes deserve high praise; for these writings do, in G.'s words, "contain the earliest reflections of Christian life outside the New Testament" and are therefore most valuable for an understanding of what G. describes as a transitional phase of early Christianity: the period between the writing of the Scriptures and the first glimmering of formal theology with the Apologists and Irenaeus.

G.'s volume of general introduction explains the significance of the Apostolic Fathers, gives a certain basic amount of factual information on each, and attempts to give general assessments and summaries of the theology
(using this term loosely) found in the writings. He strives consciously for an objective, historical evaluation of these authors, and in general has succeeded admirably. The whole volume supplies a good deal of valuable information, but is rather scantily documented; this fact will limit its value for use in further research, but G. himself has, of course, made use of the standard scholarly works, and this is evident in the way he presents other theories along with his own evaluations.

G.'s treatment of the relationship between the Apostolic Fathers and Gnosticism is an excellent example of the balanced judgment for which he strives. The many undeniably Gnostic phrases and ideas in these writings have led many to see in the Apostolic Fathers examples of a Christian Gnosticism closely linked to the heretical Gnosticism that was so widespread in the early years of the Church's history. In his re-evaluation of this evidence, however, G. shows that the Gnostic elements must be considered in terms of the over-all viewpoint of the Apostolic Fathers. Thus, an author may use the language and even the ideas of his opponents without necessarily agreeing with them, and the conclusion is that, while there are links with Gnosticism, the Apostolic Fathers are not Gnostics.

Grant deals with Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians in the same way. This letter reflects many Hellenistic ideas and has strong ties with Stoic philosophy (especially in chap. 20, where the author discusses the order shown in Divine Providence). But G. does not see the letter as an example of Hellenism invading and corrupting the primitive Church; instead he notes many Judaic elements in the letter, and shows evidence finally that Clement was influenced, not only by Hellenism, but also by the Judaic Christianity of the Roman Church. Grant treats the theology of Clement at length in the first, introductory volume, which must therefore be used to supplement his commentary on the letter.

Holt H. Graham has produced an excellent treatment of the so-called Second Letter of Clement. This early Christian sermon is studied in the light of its relationships with the Roman Church's Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, and of its apparent affinities with Gnosticism and the Shepherd of Hermas. Of particular interest are G.'s comments on the use of the words "flesh" and "spirit," especially where they are used to explain not only man, but also Christ and the Church and their interrelationships. In this connection one should note G.'s brief but enlightening exegesis of chap. 14, where all these notions are brought together in a somewhat confusing concatenation of images and mixed metaphors.

The third volume, by Robert A. Kraft, is perhaps the best of the three. An excellent introduction studies most of the major problems connected
with Barnabas and the Didache, and throughout there are many cross references between the two works and to other related writings. It is the latter effort which causes a difficulty, noted by K. himself, in the reading of the translation; for, to use K.'s own word, the abundant cross references do leave the translation somewhat "cluttered," and perhaps in another edition a different method of notation could be devised. But K. supplies a special introduction to explain his system of notation, and this minor technical problem should not detract from the general excellence of the volume.

A major question in both Barnabas and the Didache is that of the "Two Ways" material, and K. has printed this in parallel columns, with repetitions and references to indicate omissions or relocations of particular sections. This procedure is most useful for a comparative study of the two traditions, and K.'s introductory study of the material provides an excellent basis for further research into this particular method of ethical teaching.

Perhaps the most outstanding quality of all three volumes is the fact that the commentaries are based directly on scholarly study of the texts. The personal theologies of the authors themselves do not intrude to any great extent; thus the reader can concentrate on the thought of the Apostolic Fathers themselves and, with this as a starting point, will hopefully achieve new insights into Christian theology, its origin, and its development. One may not agree with all that is said in these volumes, and they are by no means the last word in scholarly study of the Apostolic Fathers; but they are of high quality and should be of great assistance in fostering further inquiries into the writings of the postscriptural but pretheological Fathers called "Apostolic."

Woodstock College

GERARD H. ETTLINGER, S.J.


Marcel Simon's book is as fresh today as when it first appeared in 1948. Prepared as a dissertation under Charles Guignebert toward the end of World War II, it is still the only thorough and full-length study of Jewish-Christian relations during the formative years of the patristic Church. For years, NT scholars have been interested in Jewish backgrounds of Christianity and in relations between Christianity and Judaism during the early Christian centuries. Today the growing interest in Spätjudentum, Qumran, and rabbinic Judaism, renewed study of Jewish-Christianity, and more careful attention to early Christian exegesis make it difficult to overlook the
place of Judaism in the first century of the Christian era. What S.'s book offers, however, is something new; for his main subject is not the earliest period of Jewish-Christian relations, nor the Jewish backgrounds of Christianity, but the history of Jewish-Christian relations in the period after Christianity and Judaism decisively broke from each other and went in different directions. He tells the story of the interaction between Jews and Christians up till the fifth century.

Most historians of the early Church write this history—from the middle of the second century to Chalcedon—as if Judaism no longer existed. S.'s central thesis is that from 135 to 425 Judaism, far from coming to an end, was a real, active, and often effective rival and competitor of Christianity. The bitter animosity of Christians toward Judaism in the fourth and fifth centuries, as reflected in commentaries, liturgies, sermons, conciliar decrees, and imperial laws, is a sure sign, S. argues, of the vitality of Judaism in the Empire and its constant attraction to men within and without the Church.

The first two chapters are largely introductory and cover material known from other writers. Here S. treats the earlier history of Jewish-Christian relations and the political background for the later discussion. Then he turns to his main subject in a series of chapters on Christian writings against the Jews, the nature of their arguments, references to Christians in the Talmud, and the growth of Christian anti-Semitism. Against Harnack and others he argues that the opponents of Christianity mentioned in Christian writings are real opponents and not simply literary creations. On the question of the minim, he sets forth the important hypothesis that the minim are not Jewish-Christians (e.g., Hereford), that the term is actually a reference to Christians in general of the Gentile Church. In the postscript appended to the recent edition of the book, he observes that this view was not seriously questioned by his critics. In fact others, e.g., Prof. Kuhn of Heidelberg, arrived at a similar conclusion only a few years ago and independent of S.'s study.

Taken as a whole, these conclusions build an impressive case for contact between Christians and Jews from the third to the fifth centuries. S.'s analysis of the theological arguments between Christians and Jews shows how much the development of patristic theology owes to Christian polemics against Jews and how these debates had influence on Christian exegesis. Thus, such questions as circumcision, observance of the Sabbath, etc., pressed on Christians the problem of the relation between the OT and NT and encouraged a more intensive use of typology to justify their use of the NT as interpreter of the OT. For the historian of theology, S.'s book can be read as an oblique criticism of the Harnackian view of Church history; for S.
insists that we also consider Christianity’s relation to Judaism—and not simply Hellenism—in the development of patristic thought.

In the following section S. discusses the later history of Jewish Christianity, Jewish proselytism, Judaizing within the Church, and superstition and magic among Jews. The chapter on Judaizing tendencies shows again how seductive Judaism must have appeared to Christians and why such men as Chrysostom were so vitriolic in their comments on Jews. However, though Judaism continued to be attractive, Jews apparently stopped proselytizing and eventually turned from the Hellenism which had once marked wide sections of Diaspora Judaism. This confirms the conclusions of Tcherikower (Corpus papyrorum Judaicarum), who showed that Egyptian Jewry gradually turned its back on Philo and turned to the rabbis. For example, by 400 A.D. in Egypt papyri begin to appear in Hebrew instead of Greek.

By any standard this is a superior work and deserves much closer attention than it has received thus far. What S. has to say is important for the Church historian as well as the ancient historian and historian of religion, and for anyone today who wishes to be historically informed in the present Jewish-Christian dialogue. What S. needs now is a good translator.

*Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.*

ROBERT L. WILKEN


With a lead from the meticulous Jesuit scholar Ignacio Oñatibia on “La vida cristiana tipo de las realidades celestes” (Scriptorium Victoricense 1 [1954] 100–133), Günter Koch has pursued the unity of theological concept in man’s relationship with God in the Redeemer, the unity of the saved with the Saviour, and the unity of God, man, and Redeemer in the Church as discernible in the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia. But first he has had to investigate the unity of the two natures in Christ according to Theodore, a tricky problem that has taxed the investigative efforts of a number of contemporary patrologists and theological historians. He gives evidence of having sounded to their depths the opinions of the champions of Theodore’s orthodoxy, including M. Richard, E. Amann, P. Galtier, and A. Vaccari, and of the opponents, particularly M. Jugie, W. DeVries, and F. A. Sullivan, to conclude with J. L. McKenzie: “Theodore’s Christology is no more and no less than what we should expect it to be in a man living in his time and his theological milieu. [His] Christology is not the Christology of Ephesus and Chalcedon; nor do I think we should expect it to be. . . . The . . . hypothesis which I suggest is that Theodore had a Christology which was substantially orthodox but accidentally defective in its terminology and in some of its conceptions in detail” (Theological Studies 19 [1958] 370).
This well-balanced judgment K. demonstrates as valid while he threads through Theodore’s Neoplatonic typologizing concerning his Christological and soteriological perceptions as he explains the work of the Redeemer in relation to man’s creation, and the causality behind the redemption. With a persistence and assiduity worthy of the complexity of Theodore’s thought, K. pursues the unificatory realities of the Mopsuestian’s ecclesiology as he reveals the Church in its visible form actualizing man’s salvation through baptism and the Eucharist. He analyzes Theodore’s concepts regarding the forgiveness of sins and the necessity of the Church as the instrument of salvation for all mankind. Following a final synthesis of Theodore’s involuted admixture of scriptural typology and spiritual symbolism, he compares the univalence of Theodore’s construct concerning salvation with the doctrine of his master Diodore of Tarsus.

Some exception will certainly be taken to the continuity with which he insists on Theodore’s basic orthodoxy while not failing to point out the dangers in the deficiency of the Mopsuestian’s metaphysical terminology for achieving an unequivocal statement regarding the union of the two natures in Christ (pp. 52–57). K. denies the propriety of calling Theodore “the father of Nestorianism”—justifiably. In the confusion that accompanied the quarrel over Monophysitism at and after Chalcedon, Nestorius is reported to have claimed that he was not guilty of the heresy as it was elucidated by the opponents of Eutyches or Dioscorus. That the inadequacies in Theodore’s concepts could have led to Nestorianism is true; but it must not be forgotten that a one-sided reading of Cyril’s “one nature of the Word incarnate” buttressed by his twelve Anathemas was at the basis of all the later Monophysite troubles. And it was Monophysitism that was the danger much more than Nestorianism all during the reign of Justinian (518–65). The fact that a majority of the theologians during that period were confronted with dubious texts attributed to Theodore concerning his orthodoxy in the matter of the Incarnation led unhappily to a neglect of his soteriology and ecclesiology, and thus to a considerable loss in the Church’s theological tradition.

This dissertation is not easy reading. It has five- and six-page paragraphs of tight argumentation, and relentless returns to isotopic explanations of unity and redemption, obedience and sinlessness. It would have been helpful to have the results of this type of investigation presented with a little more consideration for the burdened scholar’s time and attention-quotient.

_Academia Alfonsiana, Rome_  
FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.
Hans Jorissen's *Entfaltung* is a historical study of an obscure doctrine (transubstantiation) during an obscure period (early Scholasticism) that is of considerable theological importance. I shall first summarize the historical findings, then say something of the theological significance of these findings.

J. begins by noting that he was surprised to discover that Albert the Great, though he opposed a doctrine of consubstantiation, did not consider it heretical; and that neither Albert nor Thomas Aquinas (and he could have added Bonaventure) appealed to the Fourth Lateran Council for dogmatic confirmation of transubstantiation against whatever advocates there might have been of consubstantiation. The historical researches grew out of this wonder.

It is within the consensus expressed in the Berengarian oath of 1079 ("panem et vinum... substantialiter converti in veram et propriam ac vivificatricem carmem et sanguinem Jesu Christi") that the authoritative definition of the doctrine of transubstantiation took place. We find the word itself rather widely used from about the middle of the twelfth century, and a form of it, "transubstantiatis pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem," is used (and thereby sanctioned) by a council for the first time in 1215 (Lateran II).

All this, of course, is familiar enough. The book's importance derives from its detailed analysis of the meaning and status of the doctrine of transubstantiation during the late-twelfth and the first half of the thirteenth century. What emerges from the analysis is that generally during this period—and this includes the generation of theologians who come after 1215—a distinction is made between the doctrine of the Real Presence and that of transubstantiation. The former is an article of faith, the denial of which is heretical; the latter is a theological opinion, favored by the majority of theologians but not a *sine qua non* of orthodoxy. The three competing positions might be termed transubstantiation ("substantia panis convertitur in carmem Christi"), consubstantiation ("remanente substantia panis... incipit sub eisdem speciebus esse caro..."), and a succession theory ("substantia panis... penitus adnihilatur et manentibus prioribus speciebus incipit esse caro..."). Not only those opposed to transubstantiation claim that their own theories are orthodox, but even its advocates recognize the orthodoxy of their opponents' views. Consubstantiation, for example, was not taken to be an implicit negation of the Real Presence, nor was it viewed as metaphysically or logically impossible. Indeed, one of the arguments
marshaled by Hugh of St. Cher (in 1263) against it was that it was not sufficiently miraculous.

Moreover, as the reference to Hugh of St. Cher might suggest, the situation was not abruptly changed in 1215. Though it is commonly said that Lateran IV formally proclaimed transubstantiation as a dogma, it is noteworthy that the theology of the generation following 1215 did not consider consubstantiation or succession heretical. Peter of Capua, writing in 1201/1202, had said: "Nec est articulus fidei credere quod sic vel sic fiat illa conversio [referring here to the three above-named theories], sed tantummodo credere quod corpus Christi ad prolationem illorum verborum sit in altari." The same judgment would be repeated commonly enough after 1215.

J. does not, unfortunately, study in any detail the actual proceedings of Lateran IV. Since the Albigensian challenge concerning the Eucharist was rather a denial of the Real Presence than an advocacy of one of the at least three positions possible within an affirmation of the Real Presence, the Council's transubstantiatis etc. was probably meant and initially understood as an affirmation of the Real Presence in terms of the most widely held theological view of what actually took place. But closer analysis here would have been helpful. To speak as J. does of a conciliar Entscheidung here (p. 8) would seem somewhat misleading.

J. points out the importance in all this of the highly fluid state of the philosophical vocabulary in the twelfth and early-thirteenth century. The term "substance" was not so understood that transubstantiation was a necessary means to the Real Presence. Even Albert the Great—the first according to J. to argue that the words of institution implied the doctrine of transubstantiation—finished by allowing the possibility in principle of consubstantiation. Even in the late De corpore domini, in which Albert is harsher in his censure of consubstantiation than anyone previously had been, he will not call the position heretical: "dico sine praejudicio, quod numquam mihi placuit ista opinio, quae quamvis non iudicetur esse haeretica, tamen est valde incauta, et haeresi valde vicina" (p. 47).

According to J., it is Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure who first condemn consubstantiation as heretical: "impossibilis et haeretica" (p. 50). Actually, Bonaventure is somewhat more reserved than is Aquinas. J. states: "Für Thomas—wie auch für Bonaventura—ist nämlich die Wesensverwandlung der (im absoluten Sinne) einzig mögliche Weg zur Vergegenwärtigung Christi im Sakrament" (p. 52). Unfortunately, J. does not give very close attention to the presuppositions leading to their position. Is it the case, for example, that it is the peculiar features of Aquinas' and Bonaventure's metaphysics that lead to the "impossibilis et haeretica"? This is a
rather important question, since the doctrine of transubstantiation taught at Trent is really first taught by Aquinas and Bonaventure and not by Lateran IV. It is often said that the doctrine of transubstantiation was framed prior to the introduction of Aristotle into the European universities, but it would seem that this is not quite the case.

It is also unfortunate, though understandable and certainly defensible, that J. ends his consideration of “die theologische Qualifikation der Transubstantiationslehre” with Aquinas, since it is only in the juxtaposition of the (at least) three distinct epochs in the medieval history of the doctrine of transubstantiation—down to Albert the Great, the generation of Thomas Aquinas, and Scotus and after—that the theological issues emerge most sharply. J. gives much of the relevant material in his notes, but he does not pull it together. In Scotus and Ockham we have a peculiar variation on earlier positions. In agreement with a minority of the writers in the earlier period, Scotus considers transubstantiation philosophically a less satisfactory position than some of the alternatives; yet Scotus now interprets Lateran IV as deciding for transubstantiation against consubstantiation or whatever. “Et breviter, quidquid ibi dicitur esse credendum, tenendum est esse de substantia fidei, et hoc post istam declarationemem solemnem factum ab Ecclesia. Et si quaeras quare voluit Ecclesia eligere istum intellectum ita difficilem huius articuli, cum verba Scripturae possent salvari secundum intellectum facilem et veriorem secundum apparentiam de hoc articulo; dico, quod eo spiritu expositae sunt Scripturae, quo condita” (p. 62, n. 183). This is substantially the position of Ockham and the Ockhamists, and it is the position that would seem to Luther so vulnerable.

This pattern of development (though the term may be a bit optimistic) suggests questions about dogma in general and transubstantiation in particular that cannot be treated adequately in a book review. They can, however, at least be pointed out. The consensus of fourteenth- and fifteenth-century theologians was that Lateran IV had affirmed transubstantiation to the exclusion of all else. This consensus would seem to be based upon historical error. Yet it was out of this consensus that Luther’s position was condemned at Trent, despite the fact that Luther’s position would have fit in easily enough with the theologies immediately before and after 1215. No one at Lateran IV, if J. is correct, would have considered Luther’s position heretical. What Luther was protesting against had not yet taken place at Lateran IV; yet it was out of fidelity to Lateran IV, wrongly understood, that the dogmatization of transubstantiation which Luther found so objectionable took place. Is Trent’s condemnation of Luther to be considered a mistake, or an instance of God writing straight with crooked lines, or what?
Moreover, most recent Roman Catholic writing on transubstantiation has stressed its necessary connection with the doctrine of the Real Presence. Yet with the exception of Thomas Aquinas, Albert the Great, Bonaventure, and their followers, medieval theologians did not consider the connection necessary. Presumably (though this would need closer study) this connection is necessary if one shares the ontology of one of these three, but not if one does not. But then transubstantiation either requires one of these three ontologies or else it is a dogma hanging curiously in mid-air (as it so obviously is for Scotus and Ockham), having neither source nor purpose. Neither alternative is attractive, but it is difficult to think of a third.

J.'s book raises and focuses these questions; it does not answer them. It is to be hoped that it will be read and pondered by all who are presently attempting to come to a deeper understanding of the Eucharist, the Lord's presence, and the whole difficult problem of dogma.

School of Religion
University of Iowa

JAMES McCue


Canon van Steenberghen has given us a stimulating, personally assimilated treatment of the way to find God today. One will not find a confrontation with the "man come of age" current, for the publication of the French original in 1961 precluded that. It is harder to explain why attention is not paid to existentialism and linguistic analysis. Still, anyone within the traditional framework will find his structuring of the problem of God's existence and the development of the answer definitely helpful and enlightening. Although Harvey Cox might well look upon this book as the product of "town" mentality in its pursuit of an ultimate explanation of life and the universe, it retains even today a genuine value. The Secular City is too exclusive in its emphasis upon "secular man." Man, to be authentic, must be what he is, and he is animal, product of tribe and of town as well as man in technopolis. Granted that contemporary man may require a very special introduction to God in terms of this world's values, he ought also to be led to recognize the problem of the ultimate meaning of life and to become aware of religious experience. Van Steenberghen can serve well for these latter two.

"To what extent can we know with scientific certainty that a Provident Creator of the universe exists?" Thus S. precises the problem within the relevant context of unquestioning believers, atheists, agnostics, Gallup polls,
and the origin of the idea of God as answer to the human and religious problems. The affirmative reply centers upon the "metaphysical proof," consisting of two steps: there exists an absolute; this absolute is infinite. An unraveling of the attributes implicitly asserted in this infinite absolute allows S. to establish an intelligent, loving, personal God who fulfils the requisites of a Provident Creator. The abstract reasoning so far involved descends into more human form by the analysis of arguments from religious experience. Since the book is not an academic exercise but a serious effort to lead men to God, the problem of evil is faced both philosophically and in terms of Jesus Christ.

Between the question and the answer the ground is cleared of erroneous methods, ineffectual arguments, and incomplete solutions. Not only is the way prepared for the true metaphysical proof, but the mind is conditioned to face the question seriously by a very valuable series of dispositive, though inadequate, arguments, which can provide psychological confirmation once the metaphysical proof has been established.

The heart of the matter, then, is the metaphysical proof, which lays bare the central insight of every valid argument to God's existence. Because of the personal element in every linguistic embodiment of a spiritual insight, there will always be differing opinions about the success of the articulation of ways to God's existence. S.'s first attempt to establish the existence of an absolute ("Since something exists, something is self-existent") fails to show the necessity of the consequence of the causal proposition, treating it really as two distinct propositions. To make evident the truth of the consequent, he disproves its contradictory expressed as "All that exists, exists in virtue of something else," but fails to consider an alternative interpretation. That this new proposition is false is shown by arguing that what is affirmed as "all" in the subject is denied as "all" in the predicate. But this is to take it as a simultaneous totality, and one must face the alternative of a successive totality. However, the second analytic argument given suffices to render the argument valid.

The passage from an absolute to the infinite is accomplished by the analysis both of the being and of the action of finite beings. The former employs an insight which occurs repeatedly in St. Thomas, but S. fails, I fear, to articulate its expression properly. At least, I would prefer that he insist, as does St. Thomas, that if anything is common to two or more beings, it cannot belong properly and per se to both or all. Either one must cause the others or both be caused by a third. Because esse is found to be common to all beings, any finite being must be caused. With this step
included, the argument proceeds validly. The analysis of the action of finite beings proves helpful and impressive.

Another original aspect of this work is the development of the attributes of God and the substitution of an appeal to the negative attributes to qualify the positive in place of the *triplex via praedicandi*. The metaphysical argument has concluded to God as being, absolute, infinite, and cause of the finite. Two of the attributes are negative (absolute or nonrelative and infinite), two positive (being and cause of the finite). Through reflection on the "absolute" character of God, S. shows that He must be immutable, simple, spiritual, eternal. The negative attributes serve to qualify and purify the predication of positive perfections of God. In the process he covers in a fresh manner the usual attributes of God, leading to an intelligent and loving person, who is then seen as the Provident Creator. The procedure is somewhat novel and stimulating, but it would be improved had he made use of the triple mode of predication; for such a mode of predication is needed to render intelligible even the negative attributes. In this way he would find himself in a better position to cope with the challenge of linguistic analysis in explaining theistic terms.

Many may spontaneously quarrel with S.'s jejune exposition of the *quinque viae* and his rejection of them as "incomplete solutions." But he definitely succeeds in underscoring the fact that the radical problem in the *viae* is the last step: "et hoc omnes intelligunt Deum." If one wants to hold that the Prime Mover, First Cause, or Necessary Being *is* God, one must, in an about-face, re-examine the "ways" on the level of existence in order to conclude to the pure act of existence. Doing this, I believe, one has as complete a solution as S.'s metaphysical proof; for he in turn needs to enucleate the various attributes of his infinite absolute to conclude finally to a Provident Creator.

Moreover, some of the author's criticisms of the *viae* reveal a misunderstanding of the arguments. For example, his objection to "Si igitur omnia possibilia sunt non esse, aliquando nihil fuit in rebus" fails to recognize that an infinite series of contingent beings would presuppose that matter was necessary.

We owe a debt of gratitude to Fr. Crowley for making this valuable work available in English. Although there are occasional infelicitous translations and at least one phrase is omitted, one reads along easily, forgetting it is a translation.

*Weston College*  

JOSEPH H. CASEY, S.J.

The classicistically oriented mentality of the nineteenth-century Church has gradually ceded in this century to the awareness of the historical. In theory and in fact, the notion of historical consciousness has been canonized in the documents of Vatican II and has opened the way to fresh dialogic movements and new theological insights. One area in which this thrust has been experienced is in the sphere of the arts; the "cultural lag" of the post-Tridentine Church has long been puzzling. In earlier centuries, great works of poetry, fiction, architecture, music, painting, and the plastic arts were nourished at the Church's bosom, but more recently these forms seemed to exist as the proverbial viper at the breast. Other Christian churches have for some time been working with the patterns of cultural man, but there were few Catholic theologians who expended energy on the creative works of man. Fr. Padovano's work may be placed in the rather broad category of the Church vis-à-vis culture, and the attempt is made to approach the atheism, guilt, and loneliness of much modern philosophy and of many modern creative minds within the structure of the tract De Deo uno. Unfortunately the attempt does not really succeed.

The first three chapters, grouped under the general heading "Modern Man in Search of Self and Meaning for His Life," gives a summary of Sartre, Heidegger, Jaspers, Kierkegaard, Marcel, Dostoevsky, Wolfe, Kafka, Camus, Salinger, Golding, Orwell, Hammarskjöld, and Bergman. Obviously, any overview such as this must suffer from a certain degree of superficiality. This might well be excused in light of the over-all purpose of the book, "to tell all men of the theology of God and of the Church's love for the God who made men and for the men who seek God." Less excusable, however, is a certain banality. In his treatment of this mixed bag of philosophers and literary figures, P. says little that is incisive or illuminative. Frankly, he is often trite and hackneyed. Hamilton and Vahanian from one point of view, and Scott and Lynch from another, have also touched upon some of these same people and themes, and a comparison between their conclusions and those of P. leads to the suspicion of some naivete on P.'s part. Some time ago Susanne Langer remarked that in our questions lie our principles of analysis; in P.'s case, one might comment that his a prioris are showing. Radically, much of the difficulty in these first three chapters is caused by the structure of the book, which will be more carefully treated below in the discussion of the last chapter. On a level closer to the surface, criticism could be leveled at P.'s lack of what might be termed, at the risk of seeming pedantic, a lack of literary or philosophic Gefühl.
It is, however, the fourth and final chapter that is the most distressing. Entitled "God as the Catholic Church Understands Him," it is fundamentally an uninspired and uninspiring résumé of a course in *De Deo uno*, constructed along the most traditional of lines. Throughout this section one can almost detect the classroom odor of chalk. That a tract on God, summarizing the scriptural, doctrinal, and theological data on the subject, plays a valid and necessary role in a seminary or university curriculum is not the point at issue. Rather what is to be criticized is that in approaching modern man in his search for belief, particularly the figures treated in the first three chapters, a clear and simple presentation of traditional teaching and nothing more is not the solution—not even a prolegomenon to a solution. Realizing and accepting the validity of the Church's vision of God, the problem is precisely how to articulate these concepts and make them meaningful to modern man. The stance adopted by P. would be incomprehensible or valueless for most of the philosophers and literary men cited in the course of the work. P.'s apparent lack of awareness of both the ideological and the semantic gap between his tract and the very men it is supposed to reach makes suspect once again the depth of his appreciation of just what are the problematics of modern man. The overused (and often misused and abused) words "communication" and "dialogue" are the missing factors in the book; the language P. employs, valid as it is in its own framework, and the ideas he proposes, orthodox as they are in the context of a lived Christianity, are not the tongue or ideological supposit of the very thinkers treated.

Frustrating as it may sometimes be, the theologian who writes in this particular area must be prepared to look for means of communicating with the non-Christian community of creative minds. No critic could expect the perfect communication, but there is the hope and expectation that some faltering steps will be taken in this direction—and the lack of such steps is exactly the fault of this work. P. presents, though somewhat superficially, the views of modern man and then summarizes the Catholic thesis on the other side, but there is little attempt at a *rapprochement*. Modern man may have constructed for himself a new mythology of unbelief, but the way to address him is not by the route of an old theology. It is the delicate and difficult function of the theologian to present the fruitfully germinal truths of revelation in a viable fashion; the schism between the Church and the modern temper is significant enough to demand a humble and searching inquiry on the part of the theologian to heal the wounds. In such an attempt the attitude to be avoided at all costs is that of smug complacency. It is not sufficient to determine phenomenologically what appear to be the problems and then apply a congeries of scriptural and doctrinal answers as a universal
anodyne; the theologian must patiently practice his role as a midwife and, in plying his maieutic function, may often bring forth what Plato long ago termed a "wind egg." Yet he may finally help to bring forth a true child—the common moment of vision when the problems of both the modern theologian and the modern creative spirit may be communally illuminated. Negative criticism often sounds like carping, but it appears that P. has failed in his attempt; hopefully, with the optimism that marks the good theologian, he will attempt again to fulfill the true maieutic role.

Woodstock College

KARL WELTON KLEINZ, S.J.


With the publication of this well-annotated volume, Père Saint-Jean adds one more valuable piece of documentation to the growing list of works dealing with Maurice Blondel’s writings and activities before and during the Modernist period. It supplements Correspondance: 1899–1912 (Blondel–Valensin), Lettres philosophiques (1886–1913), and Marlé’s Au coeur de la crise moderniste, the latter containing letters written by Blondel and to him by Bremond, Loisy, von Hügel, Allo, Wehrlé, and others (1896–1905). Along with this we have Tresmontant’s Correspondance philosophique (Blondel–Laberthonnière) and Père de Lubac’s Memoranda (Blondel–Teilhard de Chardin). Finally, from the same period, Volume 2 of Les premiers écrits de Maurice Blondel provides reprints of The Letter on Apologetics (1896), The Idealist Illusion (1898), and History and Dogma (1904), along with a number of important shorter works.

With this wealth of material one might suppose that most of Blondel’s productions for the twenty-year period beginning with 1893 have been made public. Actually, the Blondel Archives still abound in numberless inédits, many of them written during the same two decades, many of them of scarcely less value than what has already found its way into print. One of the more important features of Saint-Jean’s second book on Blondel (to be followed by a third) is the middle section, which gives us the gist of various unpublished essays on apologetics composed by Blondel between 1896 and 1905. The first and longest section deals with the history of Blondel’s published works up to 1913, providing the background for the controversies, and excellent analyses of such landmarks as the Letter, History and Dogma, and the articles on Monophorism. The last section contains S.’s synthesis of Blondel’s views on the epistemology of the act of faith from the point of view of the subject (le fait interne) and his discussion of the role of the Church in providing objective motives for belief in Christian revelation (le fait externe).
Oddly enough, Blondel’s entry into the field of Christian apologetics was a diversion. It was the last thing he had anticipated or desired. But *L’Action* of 1893 proved to be such a bombshell that he spent the next twenty years trying to defend his thought against those traditional theologians who maintained that his handling of the supernatural was heterodox, and against those secular philosophers who felt that he had abandoned the philosophical ideal of religious neutrality in favor of a defense of the Christian faith.

In the course of his attempt to defend himself against both sets of adversaries, Blondel was forced to work out a rigorously scientific approach to the problem of the relation between philosophy and theology. He found that both the philosophy and the theology of his day were so given to conceptual dogmatism that any hope of reconciliation would have to be based on a return to life and action. For Blondel, this return meant that he would have to undertake a phenomenological analysis of man’s inquietude on the existential plane of experience, in order to discern what forces entered into the dynamism of human action. His project was not to destroy reason in order to make room for faith, but to extend its range and scope to the maximum in order to show when and where the need for faith became inescapable.

The theologians were alarmed, since they interpreted this expansion of reason to mean that philosophy would henceforth sit in judgment on revelation and that it would attempt to rationalize the doctrines of faith. But Blondel’s method of immanence terminated in precisely the opposite conclusion: the inherent insufficiency of reason, even when pushed to the limit, necessarily engenders a need for a complement from on high. But this need is a rational one; it does not end in a leap. It is not for philosophy to endorse any religious doctrine, but only to show that, humanly speaking, faith and revelation, in a word, grace and the supernatural, are both inaccessible and necessary; and the necessity is a rational one. This provides the background for understanding the nature of Blondel’s apologetic method. The need for faith is not an abstract logical necessity, but an exigency that arises out of the analysis of man’s existential experience. His apologetics is addressed not to believers but to nonbelievers of good will. That is why he remains so contemporary in an era when unbelief calls itself a humanism and seeks to establish a secular city that will also be a church. In the face of the “death of God,” Blondel will continue to remind us that the insufficiency of any of the images we have of God is only a reflection of man’s insufficiency. We must always “go beyond,” for that is the nature of the dynamism of action, both human and divine. If we are dissatisfied with God, it is because we have an implicit faith that He must be more than we are and more than we can say about Him. Were this not so, He would not be God but only an idol.
Blondel never underestimated the value of the objective fact: the Church, miracles, revelation. But he felt that the problem of unbelief was rooted in an ignorance or misunderstanding of the interior fact that an integral apologetics should not be based merely on logical arguments demonstrating the objective truth of Christianity, but must also discover in the subject and to the subject his inner need for something like the promises and the vocation presented by the gospel and the Church.

S.’s book can be read with profit, not only by those interested in Blondel and the Modernist period, but by all who are concerned with the modern problem of unbelief and with the development of an integral apologetics.

*Fordham University*

J. M. Somerville, S.J.


All but one of the seventeen articles and addresses here gathered together were published in various French periodicals before being assembled to form a book. Several belong to the early period of Teilhard’s writings; most of them represent his mature thought. They all contribute toward a clarification of Teilhardian positions and insights that have become increasingly familiar during these latter years.

Many of Teilhard’s favorite themes are developed, with variations. Man is intimately connected with the earth, with which he “forms one body.” He is the end product of a gradual work of creation, the final objective long pursued by nature. The steps of life have always been directed toward the most richly differentiated nervous system; consciousness has been growing throughout geological times. Nervous organization and consequently psychological powers have reached their maximum in man, who may therefore be scientifically considered as a natural center of evolution of the primates. The two phenomena of mutation and orthogenesis (directed evolution) are not irreconcilable; there is no contradiction between the play of chance and the existence of fundamental orientations in the object of chance. Indeed, without such oriented development we could not speak of trends or phyla.

A striking fact about the appearance of man in paleontology is that when mankind first stands before us it is already very old, fully developed, and almost at its extreme expansion. A crowd of people has lived on our earth, and we can say nothing about them except that they had intelligence. The very first men will never be found. But that is not important, for nothing is comprehensible at its beginnings. The secret of man does not lie in the past stages of his embryonic life; it lies in the spiritual nature of his soul. But this
soul eludes science, which has the function of analyzing things in their elements and material antecedents. Only the inner sense and philosophical reflection can discover the human soul. Science and theology will gradually come to agreement on the subject of human origins. "In the meantime, let us take care not to reject the least ray of light from any side. Faith has need of all the truth."

As far back as we can trace man, we observe in him a drive toward social life. This tendency becomes especially noteworthy with the advent of *homo sapiens*. Mankind is at the present time beginning to form a society of planetary dimensions over the whole earth which, after being cultivated, is not being industrialized. The movement is not likely to halt; humanity is advancing toward greater collective consciousness. Our century marks the inauguration of true hominization, or rather, a second hominization. The age of civilizations has ended, and that of one civilization has commenced.

What is more remarkable, mankind now realizes that it has the power of foreseeing and planning its own further progress. A new threshold is about to be crossed; the future of cosogenesis is now in our own hands. We can, if we wish, advance more efficiently than ever before in the direction of planetary hominization, the Omega Point.

This thesis, so dear to Teilhard, has been repeatedly and fully developed in some of his other works. Here it finds renewed expression in the final chapter, written the year before his death. Under the title "The Singularities of the Human Species," it is the most important essay in the book, and is an excellent preparation for understanding *The Phenomenon of Man*.

Although we can have only vague ideas about the outline and shape of the human phylum at its origins, Teilhard holds that humanity is monophyletic. Search for the earliest men, he thinks, must concentrate on Africa, somewhere in the region of Lake Victoria or Tanganyika. There, in the heart of the Dark Continent, man most likely emerged in the midst of teeming families of hominoids. From this man, generally Pithecanthropine in form but much more progressive, a wave of hominization "progressively spread its centrifugal sheets from age to age, until towards the end of the Quaternary it covered the entire surface of the earth."

*St. Mary's College, Kansas*  
*CYRIL VOLLERT, S.J.*


During his life and since his death, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin has been a sign of contradiction. He has won enthusiastic followers and has annoyed scientists, philosophers, and theologians. He has been hailed as a genius who
inaugurated the movement for restructuring theology in tune with the evolving universe, and has been denounced as a rash innovator who strayed from his laboratory to distort Christian revelation. Reactions to his deeply original writings depend to a great extent on the critic's scientific and theological education, temperament, openness to change, and postures toward current trends of thought.

Although the works of Teilhard now available to the public indicate the main lines of his evolutionary vision, many detailed and developed aspects of his theological ideas can be found only in essays that have not yet appeared in print. This is especially true in the sphere of his Christology. Fr. Mooney has had access to all the known writings, published and unpublished. The years he spent in research have enabled him to present a synthesis of Teilhard's views on the mystery of Christ that surpasses previous endeavors in this area.

As a very young man, Teilhard was profoundly impressed by the evolutionary dimension of the world. His subsequent education in the sciences of prehistory, his numerous explorations in remote quarters of the globe in search of geological and paleontological evidence of origins, and his prolonged contemplation of his own and others' findings led to his perception of the direction of evolution. Cosmogenesis issues in biogenesis, and biogenesis issues in anthropogenesis. But after the emergence of the noosphere from the biosphere, what is in store for man's future? This question haunted and intrigued Teilhard. He could admit no diminution in the forces of evolution once the threshold from animal to man had been crossed. Evolution, understood as the progress of radial energy toward higher spiritual consciousness, had to continue. And eventually evolution must culminate in some definitive climax.

In the evolving cosmos Teilhard discerned a single pattern, a pattern that has always been oriented toward man. Through man, evolution traversed the threshold of reflection into the noosphere, the realm of person and consciousness. The movement must advance farther in the direction of supreme consciousness, since the function of radial energy is the production of greater unity from increasing complexity. Thus the universe is converging toward an ultimate center that may rightly be called "Omega," for it comes at the very end of the evolutionary series. The whole ascent toward life, of life toward man, and of mankind toward Omega, is effected not by a blind thrust from below, but by an attraction from above.

Although the state of collective reflection attained at the end of the evolutionary process may be termed Omega, Teilhard goes on to say that the real Omega is the supreme personal Being responsible for the process
itself. The energy of love, the only force that can spur free men toward unity, must be engendered by the personal and attainable; love requires coexistence. That is why the real Omega became man in the person of Jesus Christ, loving and lovable at every moment, the final goal, though by no means the product, of the entire evolutionary current. Natural human unity, sought by evolution, is a preparation and foundation of higher unity in Christ. Only Christianity can bring to achievement this natural movement of evolution, for Christian love is a supernatural unifying force among men that is incomparably more powerful than any force in evolution itself. Incarnated in history through Christians, love guides the natural process of growth and directs it toward supernatural union with Christ. Thus the genesis which is cosmic emerges in a genesis which is Christic. The history of the universe and of humanity is a vast phenomenon of Christification.

Such is Teilhard's solution of the Christological problem that challenged his mind during the best decades of his career. His desire to rethink the data of revelation in the context of the data of science bearing on cosmic and organic evolution disquieted him until he came to his insight that natural evolutionary tendencies cannot reach fulfilment without Christ. Evolution is unintelligible if it is detached from human destiny, for in the divine purpose cosmic history is salvation history. Progression from cosogenesis to biogenesis to anthropogenesis comes to its consummation in Christogenesis.

M. states at the outset that his book is “an attempt to organize the theological thought of Pierre Teilhard de Chardin into a synthesis which he himself outlined a number of times but never actually made.” In this endeavor he has succeeded well, and has assisted readers to understand more clearly various facets of Teilhard's thought that are developed in many works.

Yet M. is not an uncritical Teilhardian zealot. He uncovers deficiencies in Teilhard's theory of redemption, points out inadequacies in biblical exegesis, and recognizes the perils of vagueness in theological terminology. In spite of such shortcomings, he fully appreciates the tremendous contribution Teilhard has made toward a renewal of Christology as required by our increasing knowledge of the universe in evolution.

St. Mary's College, Kansas

Cyril Vollert, S.J.
truly becomes, when considered from this angle, the center of integration of our lives” (p. 173). This is the theme which Fr. Samson develops from the viewpoint of both priest and psychiatrist. The comparison drawn between our feelings concerning our earthly father and our heavenly Father will draw a response from the reader. After showing that God is not clumsy in His approach to us, S. continues: “To God we are still this little stammering creature who can hardly talk, stumbles about, gulps his food, and is naughty and stubborn. But God listens to these stammerings and the poverty of words in which we express ourselves...” (p. 24). But God remains the patient educator. He teaches us how to seek Him while we gradually get rid of all the protective images and props of childhood.

S.’s observations on those who search for false fathers from emotional needs (pp. 31–35) is followed by an explanation of the true way to the Father: through the Son (pp. 35–47). In the next section he shows how the spiritual richness implicit in the mystery of the Ascension can free us “from the hoard of senseless trivialities that we carry with us. We always have ample provision for a host of contingencies that never occur, or for ventures that we would not admit to ourselves or to others” (p. 57).

An element of the gospel message which is missing from the lives of many Christians is joy. We act as if Christ had not risen from the dead and ascended into heaven. We must do others the good deed of “bearing witness to joy” (p. 74). No matter how poorly we have communicated this message by word or pen, “a simple well-meaning act of kindness may become the word that God has chosen as the sacrament of his presence for the other person” (p. 106). The act of charity does not lie, but faithfully interprets God’s Spirit to unbelievers and believers.

S. provides valuable insights for professional people like himself who desire to grow more profoundly in the likeness of Christ. He recommends that they draw from their meditations on the Ascension a sense of detachment from their own opinions, a sense of “beyondness.” “When someone contradicts us, or with a quiet smile utters an opinion substantially different from our own, all the personal detachment that we think we have crumbles and gives way.... We are still too petty and limited for the Spirit of God to enlarge our heart and broaden our mind. God’s Spirit has been laid there, but it is, above all, our own spirit we want to defend” (p. 135).

Were we to meditate upon the success of Christ and of His kingdom as found in the mystery of the Ascension, we would be more likely to rise above many “self-centered concerns” (p. 147). With courage we must rise above personal difficulties. “... The kingdom of God is not a place to relax in easy comfort. You can be stretched on a cross but you do not lie at ease on it as
on a sunny beach” (p. 163). The point of both St. Paul and Fr. Samson is not preoccupation with purely psychological difficulties, but rather concern with the obstacles which the life of grace meets with in this world.

The attractiveness of the life of the senses can be an obstacle to our understanding of the Ascension as an integrating factor in our lives. We pray to the Holy Spirit who raised up Christ to help us in this work of integration. It is a long struggle demanding all our dedication, but even in our well-intentioned dedication selfishness creeps in. “Dedication and a craving for domination are too often blended together” (p. 186). Despite such deceptions, one can fulfil the work of redemption by the power of the Spirit. This struggle to achieve integration carries the person through several phases which S. details. In the last phase the joy of the risen and ascended Christ pervades all our thinking.

So much for the theme of the book. There are two sections which need minor correction. In discussing the Mass, S. shows how it can help an individual to overcome isolation. Unfortunately, the translator uses the word “solitude” where the context suggests “isolation.” Not solitude but isolation is the opposite of communion. Again, in developing the relationship between St. Francis de Sales and St. Jane Frances de Chantal, the translator refers to St. Joan instead of St. Jane. Incidentally, the analysis of the determination of both saints would have been almost impossible for an unbelieving psychiatrist.

Although written by a psychiatrist, this book manifests no predilection for any particular system of therapy as the alleged ally of spirituality after the fashion of Karl Stern or Victor White. Its message is that a truly spiritual life in the risen Christ is tough but joyful. “It tells us how to die like the fruitful seed.” “The sense of the message that Christ came to announce is not that you will find the kingdom of God by following the beaten path. . . . Something has to die: the seed. Otherwise, it remains alone” (p. 163).

De Sales Hall School of Theology

JOHN F. HARVEY, O.S.F.S.
Hyattsville, Md.


Grieves and Discontents presents a psychoanalytic thesis of profound implications and far-reaching consequences. Dr. Rochlin brings to his presentation the benefit of years of clinical experience, and the authority of a training analyst in the Boston Psychoanalytic Institute and Director of Child Psychiatry at the highly reputed Massachusetts Mental Health Center.
The thesis is presented that our griefs and discontents not only begin early in life, but also have profound and significant effects on our emotional life. The analysis takes its origin from Freud's statement: "Really we never can relinquish anything; we only exchange one thing for something else. When we appear to give something up, all we really do is to adopt a substitute." R. takes this point of departure to develop the thesis that the dread of abandonment and the experience of loss, whether in fact or in fantasy, are not just negative or painful events. Rather they are forces of dynamic change in our lives. The process of loss is never unrelated to the concomitant process of restitution. The cycle of loss and restitution repeats itself throughout the life cycle in a continuing process which profoundly shapes the pattern of our lives.

R. applies this basic principle of psychic life to a broad range of common human experiences. Of particularly forceful interest to the readers of this periodical are the implications of loss and restitution for religious belief. The origins of religious belief are located in the fear of death. As man approaches death, he prolongs life through his beliefs. Death becomes a passage to resurrection.

The significance of such a formulation should not be overlooked. The interplay of loss and restitution is not reductive. Restitution is not reduced to the elements of loss. Rather restitution represents the power of change by which the resources of the ego are brought to bear in the continuing process of adaptation to reality. The present work, however, illumines the intrapsychic mechanisms by which loss gives rise to, motivates, and provides the energy for change.

Thus, religious belief is not reduced to fear of death. The refusal to extend the argument beyond the limits of the evidence is one of the marks of the present study which distinguish it from early analytic studies of the religious process. This has the merit of short-circuiting a useless and dated historical polemic which arose out of an illogical misapplication of a sound psychological principle. With much of the deadwood out of the way, the avenues are cleared for a relatively fresh approach to the problem of religious belief.

The problem of religious belief is a perennial one for the theologian as well as for the psychologist. The theologian is continually searching to deepen his understanding of human capacity for faith, a capacity which is rooted in the inner dynamics of the human psyche. There is no doubt that the sort of investigation undertaken in the present work contributes significantly to that understanding. But understanding is advanced only when certain important methodological principles are kept in mind. The
psychoanalyst is not a theologian nor are his concerns theological. He is concerned only with the human aspect of the divine-human relation which evolves through faith. Consequently, in no sense can the psychoanalytic account of religious belief be regarded as exhaustive. But the significance of the present account does not lie in its exhaustiveness.

R. bases his analysis of the origins of religious belief on clinical material derived from his clinical experience in the analysis of children. He finds an awareness of the significance of death in children as young as three years of age. He shows that it is remarkable not only that the child should arrive at adult views of death, but also that the adult should cling to the child’s view of death and so readily revert to it. The child’s view of death is inseparable from the psychological defenses against the reality of death, and these form the matrix of beliefs which does not alter in the course of life. The adult believer, then, carries with him the residues of restitutive processes extending from the earliest years. From a theological perspective, the life of faith is a reflection of the life of grace. And the life of grace, therefore, must build upon fundamental psychic mechanisms which arise out of the matrix of loss and abandonment.

The present work, then, must be recommended as a work of mature clinical experience and sensitive intelligence. It is one of the few works dealing with the origin of religious beliefs which bases itself on the actual material from the study of young children. It marks the flowering of a more mature psychoanalytic attitude towards man’s religious life, recognizing it as one of the more significant, if not the most significant, aspect of man’s continuing effort to adapt to the continuing demands of life, death, and reality.

St. Andrew House, Boston

W. W. Meissner, S.J.


No Borrowed Light “is an effort to focus attention on segments of psychological knowledge which could benefit the structuring of the religious life so as to be conducive to mental health and ultimately to spiritual health” (p. 7). Brother Dondero is trying to increase the awareness of the psychological substratum of our religious life, so that we can be encompassed by conditions and circumstances propitious for growth in grace. This book more than lives up to the author’s promise. Many books on the market today treat of mental health for religious; this is one of the best.

It is not possible to read this book without realizing that D. is both well trained and widely experienced in the field of psychology as it impinges on
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the religious life. He is a religious with an obvious love and respect for the religious life. This does not blind him to the less healthy means that are sometimes used in the training and guiding of religious. This is a positive, forward-looking book, not a negative and carping one. Although D. warns that he will look at the religious life as a psychologist and not treat of the supernatural character and purpose of that life, he does show a thorough grasp of the theological foundations of the religious life—ascetical, dogmatic, and scriptural. He avoids psychologism and angelism.

The book is divided into ten chapters: the first two are introductory, the following eight cover most of the crucial areas in the religious life. Starting with the candidates, modern youth attracted to the religious life, D. tries to find out what characterizes them psychologically. He concludes: “One of the distinguishing characteristics of candidates to the religious life is that they have a more clearly formulated philosophy of life than the typical youngsters of the same age” (p. 48). On the negative side he finds, in assessing young religious and candidates to religious life, that in these young people there is a tendency to be on guard against involvement with other persons. He is not sure if this is a personality characteristic that individuals bring into religious life because they had it from the start, or picked it up when they decided to be religious; or is it something that is brought about or at least deepened in the religious training? In either case, we are confronted with young persons who have high ideals, a clear philosophy of life, and a fear of involvement with other persons.

The theme that runs throughout stresses the absolute importance of sound interpersonal relationships in the religious life. From his clinical experience D. concludes that those who are unsuccessful in religious life are the way they are because of a serious disruption in interpersonal relationships. Success in religious life seems to be built on the capacity to form solid, warm, mature interpersonal relationships. In his fine chapters on community, superior-subject relationships, adjustment, and training, D. stresses the importance of such relationships. For these to flourish, he indicates the need for better communication at all levels, more respect for and attention to the emotional aspects of our lives, greater respect for individual differences, more stress on inner attitudes and motivation and less on outward conformity in behavior, and a proper attitude toward humility. He is appalled by some of the training methods used in religious life which seem to develop deep feelings of inadequacy in the religious. Anything that militates against religious having respect for themselves or for their fellow religious cannot be psychologically or spiritually sound. “Where there is minimal respect for one another, there will be weak bonds
uniting the group. The tightest bonds for community living are forged not by using or needing others but by respecting them, by rejoicing in their dedicated autonomy, by pride in being associated with men who are ‘on target’ in living a life of charity” (p. 145).

Since many religious congregations are becoming more serious about the psychological aspects of their admittance procedures, the chapter entitled “Reshaping Admittance Procedures” should be helpful to major superiors and vocation directors. Here D. argues for the necessity of using some psychological testing in the screening of candidates. He takes up one by one the usual objections to this procedure and shows that they are not valid. In this chapter as in the whole book, he refrains from making exaggerated claims for psychology. He knows its limitations; but he asks that its merits be considered.

Although D. writes clearly, such a mass of material may be hard for some to digest. The reviewer believes that the book should have been twice as long as it is. The material could have been divided more logically. A summary at the end of each chapter would help, as would a fuller index. D. is quite successful in avoiding psychological jargon. However, even the terms he uses demand more knowledge of social sciences than most religious will have at their disposal. He could have defined, cited sources, and illustrated his material better.

Nevertheless, the book is a gold mine of psychological and spiritual information and principles. It is impossible to miss D.’s point: some changes are necessary in religious life. He warns us that if we do not plan these changes and adaptations, circumstances will dictate them to us. The book should be a real help for religious in planning these changes in such a way that they will not repeat mistakes of the past, which assumed that methods that were psychologically unhealthy could produce spiritually healthy religious. To all priests and religious the book is highly recommended. It should be required reading for superiors and those involved in training young religious.

Weston College

JOHN R. McCALL, S.J.


Fr. Bayne’s principal purpose is to delineate a philosophy of civil law, “a philosophy founded on the eternal and natural laws, dependent on the authority of a duly constituted state and elaborated from the central thesis that civil law binds in conscience” (p. 231). Secondarily he argues that
"the doctrine of the lex pure poenalis is not only unnecessary and historically ill-founded but inherently untenable" (ibid.).

My judgment is that B.'s philosophy of the law is sound, his historical study accurate and brilliant, showing clearly the ill foundation for the lex pure poenalis. But in arriving at his conclusion against the purely penal law (a conclusion I accept) he hinders and obscures the argument by analysis of certain nonpertinent cases.

I agree with B. that it is an abuse of moral judgment for a man to invoke the purely-penal-law doctrine while refusing to declare "several thousand dollars' worth of taxable articles" at customs. Yet some moralists allow such practices. B. also points out that the places cited by the moralists from the works of St. Thomas for this doctrine are not his questions on law but on the religious life, where the rules do not bind under sin, and on the virtue of vindicatio, whereby a penalty can be imposed for reasons other than moral fault, e.g., a priest removed from a benefice because of leprosy. B. holds that it is fallacious to argue from these texts to the existence of purely-penal civil laws, since the lex of the religious life is not a true civil law nor is the poena of vindicatio true civil punishment. I agree with that. And I further agree that the moral principles he cites in chapter 9, such as nemo tenetur ad impossibile, lex dubia non obligat, de minimis non curai lex, and especially epikeia, should be used rather than the purely-penal-law doctrine to help overcome the burden sometimes imposed by a multitude of positive-law mandates.

All of this is good and acutely in need of saying today, since reverence for civil law has, in the Church, been corroded by the doctrine of the lex pure poenalis. Vatican II laments in the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World: "Many in various places even make light of social laws and precepts, and do not hesitate to resort to various frauds and deceptions in avoiding just taxes or other debts to society. Others think little of certain norms of social life, for example those designed for the protection of health, or laws establishing speed limits" (no. 30). A lawyer friend of mine does not hesitate to say that those words mark the end of the lex pure poenalis and that the spadework done by a few European thinkers (whose work B. knows and builds on) attacking that concept has here reaped rich harvest.

But a defect of B.'s presentation is his citation of cases which are not relevant to his argument. For example, in answering the main objection to his thesis, namely, that penalties are de facto imposed when there has been no moral guilt, he underlines the inevitable defects in a human legal system and cites Donnelly v. United States as an example. Donnelly was convicted of murder by a circuit court and sentenced to life imprisonment.
Hearsay evidence that another man, now dead, had confessed to the crime was not admitted. The Supreme Court later upheld the decision. Donnelly, perhaps innocently, remained in jail. Was he the victim of a purely-penal law? B. does not ask that question. But the answer to that question is the whole point of the discussion.

The answer, it seems to me, lies in the nature of law. B. rightly defines it as a “rule of civil conduct” or “a rule for subjects.” The law in this case had to do with murder. The civil law forbids murder and that binds in conscience. The judicial decision of guilt followed upon the breaking of the law. Granting there may have been a mistake in Donnelly’s case, I do not see how that in any way admits the doctrine of the *lex pure poenalis*. I think the same can be shown for the other objections listed on p. 143: inadvertence, impossibility of fulfilling the law, etc. One must also keep in mind the moral principles excusing a man from fulfilling an objectively just law.

All just civil laws bind in conscience. B. tells why: “The ultimate rationale of the conscience obligation in the law lies in the absolute moral necessity incumbent upon any government to reach, or at least strive to reach, the one goal of any state—the peace, happiness, and domestic tranquillity of the citizens—the common good” (p. 101). With this I heartily agree, and if B.’s good book contributes to a swing in the pendulum away from the doctrine of the *lex pure poenalis*, as I think it will, it will have been worth writing. For me certainly, it was well worth the reading.

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

**THOMAS R. HEATH, O.P.**


John Lancaster Spalding seemed destined for greatness, but his temperament and events frustrated his destiny. That is the theme played throughout David Francis Sweeney’s biography of this important American Catholic ecclesiastic. Spalding’s family traced its roots to the Maryland Catholic settlement and the Catholic migration to Kentucky in the 1790’s. His boyhood in Lebanon, Kentucky, imbued Spalding from 1840–59 with the spirit of the pioneers and frontiersmen. Louvain and its seminary (1859–64) muted this rugged spirit by its Belgian asceticism. Yet Louvain did instil Spalding with a love for scholarship and for the Church’s role in the transmission of truth. But tension arose in his later life between the American liberal, frontier spirit and the Church’s role in transmitting traditional
truths. As the first Bishop of Peoria, Illinois, Spalding was a pioneer. His pioneer spirit was evident also in his work on the arbitration of the 1902–1903 coal strike. But his conservatism showed in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in his denial to priests of any freedom to vote for their bishops, in his opposition to Archbishop Ireland's experiment in Catholic education at Faribault and Stillwater. His love of scholarship prompted his clumsy defense of ontologism in 1867, his speech on seminary training in 1881, and his work on the Baltimore Catechism in 1884.

Spalding's greatest project was his continuous agitation for the establishment of a Catholic university; he envisioned a second Louvain rising in the United States. At the plenary councils and in his publications and letters he worked for its realization. His influence obtained the financial gift from Miss Caldwell which made the foundation possible. Thus Spalding was the natural choice to give the address at the laying of the cornerstone in 1888. This speech, according to Sweeney, ruined Spalding's career, because his admiration for German thought and a relativism of truth which could be deduced from the speech caused the Congregation of the Propaganda to mark Spalding as a man to be watched. This ambivalent attitude of liberalism and conservatism did plague him. Propaganda passed over Spalding in its choice of a new archbishop for Milwaukee in 1890 and in all subsequent choices for important sees, such as Chicago and New York. Yet in most church controversies Spalding spoke for the conservatives against the liberal bishops, such as Gibbons and Ireland.

S. has written a readable biography. It adds a necessary patch to the crazy quilt of American Catholic history in the nineteenth century. On p. 130 the author has Woodstock College functioning on September 5, 1860; Woodstock actually opened in 1869. A review of the list of theologians at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore would explain the deadlock regarding the proposed Catholic university mentioned on p. 169; many of the theologians advising the bishops were from religious orders which conducted colleges. But these are merely a few bits of shading; S.'s is a fine work.

St. Peter's College, Jersey City

EDMUND G. RYAN, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES

THE OXFORD ANNOTATED BIBLE WITH THE APOCRYPHA: REVISED STANDARD VERSION. Edited by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford, 1965. Pp. xxiv + 1544; xxii + 298; maps and index. $10.50. At long last Christians of the English-speaking world have a “common Bible,” and an annotated one at that. It is due to the efforts of Profs. L. A. Weigle, H. C. May, B. M. Metzger, P. J. King, W. Van Etten Casey, S.J., E. H. Maly, and to the co-operation of Cardinal Cushing. That all Catholics may now freely use the respected Revised Standard Version together with their Protestant neighbors is an obvious and tremendous boon. It is an ecumenical step which heals a four-century wound of division in the Christian body. And the effect of it will be long-lasting and liberating. I am referring actually to the 1966 reprint of the OABWA to which Cardinal Cushing has granted “an imprimatur,” as the new third paragraph of the Foreword in this reprint advises the reader. Besides this changed paragraph, fourteen substitutions or additions have been made to the annotations in the volume; a separate insert lists them for ready reference. At times they mention some “Catholic teaching” or some expression “regarded by Protestants” in a certain way. This suffices to indicate that there is a difference of interpretation and makes clear to the reader the distinction between “translation” and “interpretation.” In this regard the OABWA has avoided the error made by the British editors of the Revised Standard Version: Catholic Edition, who tampered with the translation of the NT itself (see THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 26 [1965] 674); for the text of the translation in the RSV now remains the same for all. Most of the changed annotations are good. The only one which I regret is the elimination of the enlightened note (in the 1965 printing) on Mt 5:32, which read: “Many scholars believe that the words except on the ground of unchastity were not part of Jesus’ teaching in this connection (or in 19.9), but express a Christian interpretation of his meaning.” I would have said “a Jewish Christian interpretation.” The 1966 reprint, however, has substituted a rather anemic comment: “The expression except... unchastity occurs also in 19.9; it is absent from the accounts in Mk 10.11–12 and Lk 16.18 (compare also Rom 7.2–3; 1 Cor 7.10–11).” This is all true, but why is it absent? Is its omission a “Christian interpretation”? And if so, the consequences might be even worse than those implied in the 1965 note. It is also good to have an imprimatur on the opinion expressed in the note on p. 1438 which espouses the pseudonymous authorship of the Pastoral Epistles (1–2 Tim, Tit). How far we have come from the responsa of the Biblical Commission of June 12, 1913, which forbade such a view (see Denzinger 3587–90 [2172–75]; Enchiridion biblicum 407–10)!

Woodstock College

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.
THE OLD TESTAMENT WORLD. By Martin Noth. Translated from the fourth German edition by Victor I. Gruhn. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966. Pp. xxii + 404. $8.00. Students of the OT are fortunate to have this clear and readable English translation of the latest German edition of Noth’s unique and encyclopedic introduction to the OT world. The contents and merits of the second revised edition have already been described in these pages (14 [1953] 459–61). From the time of its first publication in 1940, the volume has met a need which becomes more acute each year as new material from the Ancient Near East comes flooding in. This wealth of new data must be synthesized if it is to be serviceable and not engulf the student. As was to be expected, N. has thoroughly revised his latest edition,
a new section on the trade routes of ancient Palestine has been added, and the latest archeological results (such as those of Kenyon–de Vaux on Ophel, and Pritchard at Gibeon) have been incorporated. The translator has earned our thanks by his conscientious adaptation of both text and bibliography to English usage. In short, we now have a reliable summary of the present state of our knowledge, composed by one of the great masters of OT science.

Weston College Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.

The World of the Judges. By John L. McKenzie, S.J. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966. Pp. v + 182. $5.95. With this volume M. launches the new Background to the Bible series under the general editorship of B. Vawter, C.M. (twelve volumes are currently anticipated). M. surveys that period of OT history covered in the biblical books of Joshua and Judges—an important, complex, obscure, and elusive era known as the period of “the Israelite conquest.” In examining the biblical sources, and the historical, cultural, and religious backgrounds of the period of the Judges, M. repeatedly raises significant questions and suggests probable solutions based on the findings of present-day archeological and biblical research. Especially worthy of note is his insistence on the fact that the fundamental theological and religious values of Joshua and Judges must be viewed within the context of Israelite faith—a faith which was subject to development. Joshua and Judges reflect the earliest and least developed faith of Israel, and consequently should be read as the initial step in Israel's growth in faith. Secondly, M. correctly links “the Israelite conquest” with the theology of the covenant, a central theme in recent OT studies. The land is an element of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and His people; it is a sign of Yahweh's fidelity to His promises and of His power to bring about what He promises. The book is signalized by the author's vast knowledge of, and familiarity with, the archeological data of the school of W. F. Albright (F. M. Cross, G. E. Wright, G. E. Mendenhall, etc.), as well as the contributions of such OT scholars as Albrecht Alt and Martin Noth. The use of footnotes instead of parenthetic inserts within paragraphs would facilitate the reading of the text. The book is enthusiastically recommended for the nonspecialized reader interested in acquiring a more profound and enriched understanding of a crucial period in Israelite history.


book more than lives up to what one would expect from the pen of such a scholar. It is extremely readable, written in an easy and flowing style behind which lie—most gently—years of scholarship and erudition, incorporating the latest geographical, linguistic, cultural, and religious data. Beginning with Saul, whose kingship was principally that of leader of the league of twelve tribes, M. describes how the role of king broadened to new and powerful dimensions under David. David's military and administrative genius, resulting in Israel's elevation to the status of empire, the theological legitimation of David's dynasty through the Nathan oracle—all of these M. treats in a most thorough fashion. He then proceeds to indicate how the brilliance and power of kingship in Israel reached its climax in the reign of Solomon. Yet, despite external glory and magnificence, bristling with commercial activity and notable cultural achievements, the external picture was deceptive; for the inner vitality was being gnawed at by the very factors that contributed to that external glory. Neither does M. fail to take into account the various psychological factors in his delineation of the personalities of the principal characters. Problematic points are not avoided, but presented with the happiest felicity. Though one may be well acquainted with this period of Israelite history, M.'s presentation is such as to entice even the professional to read on. Aimed at educated nonprofessionals, each of the chapters terminates with a brief list of suggested readings, thus allowing the reader to delve further in a given area. The series should be issued in a paperback edition, so that it can be put readily into the hands of collegians.

Canisius College, Buffalo

Anthony B. Brzoska, S.J.

Psalms 1: 1-50. Introduction, translation, and notes by Mitchell Dahood, S.J. Anchor Bible 16. New York: Doubleday, 1966. Pp. xlvi + 329. $6.00. Like its predecessors in the series, this volume on the first fifty Psalms offers a new translation and an extensive commentary. D. notes that as much as twenty-five years ago, W. F. Albright wrote: "It is not too much to say that all future investigations of the Book of Psalms must deal intensively with the Ugaritic texts." Since recent works on the Psalms have not made much use of this material, D. states his purpose: "What is attempted here is a fresh translation, accompanied by a philological commentary, that lays heavy stress on the Ras Shamra-Ugarit texts and other epigraphic discoveries made along the Phoenician littoral." D. concedes that the stress he places on Ugaritic may not always be well founded; what he wants to show are the possibilities open to the modern student of the Psalms. And the possibilities are many. With regard to emending the consonantal Hebrew text, D. believes
that less than half a dozen changes are justified within the first fifty Psalms, and suggests that remaining textual difficulties can be resolved in the light of Ugaritic and Phoenician forms and constructions. Similarly with vocalizations in the Massoretic text. As for the ancient versions of the Psalms, D. depreciates their value; in his words, "Ugaritic embarrassingly exposes—at least in the poetic books—the shortcomings of the versions and seriously undermines their authority as witness to the original text." According to D., Ugaritic studies also have a profound influence on the dating of the Psalms, on their theology, and on Hebrew grammar and lexicography in general. Problems concerning the headings of the Psalms, their precise dating, their historical background and cultic settings he reserves for the introduction to his projected second volume on Pss 51–150. The greatest importance of this volume lies in its specialized and pioneering philological approach to the Psalms. The legitimacy and enduring value of such an approach will have to be measured against future work by biblical scholars in this area. D.'s translation of the Psalms is certainly new, and at times startling in its novelty. It is exact, generally free-flowing, but at times marred (for this reviewer) by rather unfamiliar terms (forgather, scud, Suzerain, etc.) and at other times by unnecessary Knox-like inversions of the word order (e.g., "in you trusted our fathers").

_Capuchin Theological Seminary_  
_Eric May, O.F.M.Cap._  
_Garrison, N.Y._

**ISRAEL'S SACRED SONGS: A STUDY OF DOMINANT THEMES.** By Harvey H. Guthrie, Jr. New York: Seabury, 1966. Pp. x + 241. $5.95. This rather small book advances through four major areas of OT history and shows how Israel was ever absorbing new forms of prayer and transforming these within her traditional Mosaic religion. G. presents excellent summaries: (1) of Hittite suzerainty treaties, for appreciating the Mosaic covenant and Israel's earlier Psalms; (2) of the cosmic myth, new year's festival, and royal ritual of the Ancient Near East, for interpreting Israel's hymns of praise and enthronement Psalms; (3) of the personal but social character of biblical religion, for praying the group laments; (4) of the wisdom movement, for evaluating the final formation of the Psalter. The key factor in G.'s interpretation is the early existence within Israel of a feast modeled upon the Babylonian new year's festival; this fact is still controverted, as H. Cazelles demonstrates in an excellent article "Nouvel an (fête du)," in _DBS_ 6 (Paris, 1960) 598 ff. Anyone acquainted with the Psalm studies of Gunkel, Mowinckel, Weiser, and especially Kraus will discover little new in this book;
but he will profit from G.’s rich, clear synthesis and his perceptive remarks about many difficult aspects of the Psalms, i.e., curse Psalms, “monotheism,” prophet, wiseman, and cult.

Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P.

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT 1: GOD. By Paul van Imschoot. Translated by Kathryn Sullivan, R.S.C.J., and Fidelis Buck, S.J. New York: Desclee, 1966. Pp. 300. $6.75. The original French edition of this first part of Canon van Imschoot’s Theology of the Old Testament was published a dozen years ago. Some who reviewed the work then questioned whether the logical, even Scholastic categorization of the concepts of God, His attributes, and His dealings with Israel really succeeded in highlighting the unity of the revelation to the chosen people “without doing violence to Israelite thought,” according to the disclaimer made by the author in his introduction. In the meantime Gerhard von Rad’s Old Testament Theology has appeared with its strikingly different methodology, which necessarily implies a criticism of the type of theological synthesis which van Imschoot’s work represents. For von Rad maintains that a theology which attempts to grasp the content of the OT under the heading of various doctrines (the doctrine of God, the doctrine of man, and so forth) cannot do justice to the basic credal statements of Israel’s faith, which are completely tied up with history, or to the grounding of Israel’s faith upon a few acts of salvation worked by Yahweh and an effort to gain an ever-new understanding of them. Even within the limits of his methodology the author’s discussion of the covenant is inadequate. This is all the more true now, since the original edition of the volume under review was written before the considerable literature occasioned by Mendenhall’s pioneer study of the significance of the Near Eastern suzerainty treaties for an understanding of the OT covenant was published. Some attempt to remedy this shortcoming has been made by the inclusion of seven books and articles dealing with the covenant in the two pages of additional bibliography appended to the English translation. Otherwise there has been no updating of the original edition. The translation is faithful to the point of reproducing French spelling conventions (e.g., “Echmounazar,” p. 40, n. 1) and erroneous citations of personal names (e.g., “F. W. Albright,” p. 212, n. 19; “Foot-More,” p. 213, n. 2) found in the original.

Woodstock College

James D. Shenkel

SHORTER NOTICES

Ivi + 920. $1.95; morocco $4.50. This is the latest addition to the many editions of the Greek NT in manual form, and it is a very welcome one from many standpoints. For some time now it has been recognized that our standard editions of Nestle and Merk have been in need of a thorough revision. This has been promised for several years in the case of Nestle and is apparently being prepared for Merk. In the meantime it has been achieved by a different project, sponsored by various Bible Societies in Europe and America. It is a beautifully printed, handsomely arranged edition of the Greek text of the NT, "specially adapted to the requirements of Bible translators throughout the world." The critical apparatus to the text is produced in a new form with these features: (1) it is restricted to variants significant for translators or necessary for the establishing of the text; (2) it indicates the relative degree of certainty for variants adopted; (3) it cites representative evidence for the variants selected. Its purpose, then, is not as ambitious as those of other manual editions. But the text can be heartily recommended to students of the NT. For those who are interested in the problems of textual criticism it will also be of great help, but they above all will know that no one edition is ever going to have all the answers, no matter how ingeniously the critical apparatus is worked out. This text will be used for a long time to come.

Woodstock College

THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 3: Θ-Κ. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1966. Pp. xii + 1104. $22.50. Once again we can only admire the rapidity and care with which the English translation of Kittel is being produced (see THEOLOGICAL STUDIES 25 [1964] 424–27; 26 [1965] 509–10). The present third volume continues the same characteristics that have been noted of the first two. The third volume is still stouter than either of the first two, and the price has unfortunately, but understandably, increased. The articles in this volume that will interest most readers deal with the various forms of thanatos ("death"), theos ("god"), hieros ("holy"), hilasmos ("expiation"), kaleō ("call", including ekklēsia, "church"), kauchaomai ("boast"), klēros ("lot, inheritance"), krinō ("judge"), and kyrios ("lord"). Of these the following have appeared in an abbreviated form in the Bible Key Word series: The Church (London, 1951), Lord (London, 1958), Life and Death (London, 1965). Yet once again there is no comparison between the full text of the articles on these subjects now available in TDNT 3 and such condensations. The reference to the latter in the Editor’s Preface, which is the same in all three volumes, has been
defective and uncorrected. Again it is good to remember that the articles in this third volume were all composed before 1938 and that they have to be supplemented by more recent material, especially by data available to us from the Qumran scrolls, the Gnostic texts of Chenoboskion, and other discoveries. For instance, the article on korban (pp. 860–66) needs to be supplemented by the inscription on an ossuary lid found at Jebel Ḥallet eṭ-Ṭūrī (see J. T. Milik, Studii biblici franciscani liber annus 7 [1956–57] 232–39; also Journal of Biblical Literature 78 [1959] 60–65). But in any case, we are again indebted to both translator and publisher for making a further volume of Kittel available in English with such speed and competence. A check of the translation in many places has shown that it is still being continued on the same high level of fidelity to the original which characterized the earlier volumes. As a result, the English Kittel is now becoming the indispensable and monumental work in NT studies that the German original has always been for those who could handle the language. May both translator and publisher see their way to the successful completion of this great work.

Woodstock College

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

THE ESCHATOLOGY OF PAUL IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN SCHOLARSHIP. By Henry M. Shires. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966. Pp. 287. $6.95. As the first full-length treatment of Pauline eschatology to appear in English in over a half century, S.'s book will be greeted with considerable hope, especially since there have been of late numerous articles and small monographs on this or that aspect of Paul's thought within his eschatological perspective, all of which have paved the way for a serious treatment in depth of his eschatology in its totality. It must be said at the outset, however, that S.'s volume is mainly derivative. It does provide a moderate synthesis of various strains in the Pauline eschatology, but one is at times undone by the all-too-frequent citation of contemporary writers. This is not really to condemn the book; for the fact remains that it is an adequate synthesis in which S. provides a series of handy reference points for further discussion. He commences with a quick mise en scène (Bultmann and Dodd) and then moves directly into the characteristics and development of Paul's ideas of the last things. He finds a substructure of key ideas, sometimes presupposed by Paul, which he reduces to eight basic propositions concerning time, mystērion, teleology, chronological progression, etc. With these principles firmly in hand, S. goes on to treat at length a series of central Pauline ideas: parousia, spiritual body, day of judgment, the unredeemed world of Satan, meaning of the present, initiation into the new life (sacraments), and
maturing in Christ. The concluding chapter attempts to translate this total picture into terms of contemporary relevance. Objections will be raised to certain minor points of his treatment and even to some of his major presuppositions (e.g., Pauline authorship of Colossians and Ephesians), but the work will remain as a valuable synthesis of an increasingly important area of Pauline research.

LaFarge House, Cambridge, Mass. Simon E. Smith, S.J.

SACRAMENTS IN SCRIPTURE. Edited by T. Worden. Springfield, Ill.: Templegate, 1966. Pp. 280. $4.95. Much of today’s theological writing on the sacraments is an emphasis on the liturgical and ecclesial aspects of the Christian sacraments, but rarely do we find an adequate treatment of their scriptural foundations. The present volume helps to fill this need. Its fourteen chapters by nine authors were originally published in the English quarterly Scripture, whose editor is the book’s editor as well. The contributors are primarily Scripture scholars, and so the reader should not expect the book to be a theology of the sacraments; rather we have here a critical investigation into the OT and NT background and teaching apropos of our sacramental rites. The essays on “Old Testament Signs” and “The Spirit of God” serve to introduce the volume. The sole essay on NT baptismal theology is by D. Stanley, S.J.; while confirmation lacks a spokesman, the Eucharist has three, viz., the literary formation of the “Bread of Life” discourse (E. Kilmartin, S.J.), the Johannine theology of the Eucharist (T. Worden), and an essay on the date of the Last Supper (L. Johnston). Penance is given adequate coverage in the biblical meaning of sin (T. Worden), the meaning of repentance (L. Johnston), and the various modes in which Scripture speaks of the remission of sin, whether it be through Christ, baptism, penitential practices, or penance (T. Worden). All three are exceptionally well done. Another excellent contribution is that of Kevin Condon, C.M., on the exegesis of Jas 5:14-15 and the anointing of the sick. Orders is, unfortunately, only indirectly treated in C. Spicq’s essay “Priestly Virtues of the New Testament.” Finally, marriage is discussed from three aspects, i.e., its meaning in the OT (J.-P. Audet, O.P.), its meaning as “mystery” for Paul in Eph 5:22 (L. Johnston), and Christ’s teaching on divorce (H. J. Richards). Even though this volume may lack some scriptural texts we would like to have seen treated, it remains an excellent collection (in fact, the only available collection in English) on the scriptural foundations for our sacramental economy.

Woodstock College Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.
JESUS CHRIST. By Yves Congar, O.P. Translated by Luke O'Neill. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966. Pp. 223. $4.95. C., well known as theologian of the Church and as one of the architects of Vatican II's Constitution on the Church, appears here in another role, as a theologian of the Incarnation. But is it so much another role as another aspect of the same? For C., the Church is an extension of Christ. The book has three parts. The first, and shortest, describes the significance of God becoming man, not just as a mouthpiece of God but as the instrument of our salvation. The second part discusses Christ's knowledge (and here I would say that C. has not said his last word), God's self-revelation in poverty (a subject near C.'s heart), Christ's prayer and preaching (here he deals with the parables). In the third part, by far the longest, C. enters the subject that is specially his own: the relationship between Christ and the Church. The section on Christ as Leader of the Church is particularly interesting, as C. is concerned with the guidance of the Church by the Spirit of Christ. He warns that, while there is a certain identity between the Church and Christ, there is also tension because of men's fraility. It is the idea of Jesus as Lord that dominates the last third of the book: Lord over the natural world and over the world of grace, Lord in the Church but also over the Church. Christ's Lordship is seen not only as a form of ruling but also as a prophetic role in which the Church has an important part to play. This is a discursive book, with only a broad unity of subject; but this has its advantages, because we are made to see our Lord in new lights and from new angles, much in the way our Protestant brethren have been meditating on Him for a long time.

Saint Louis Priory
Saint Louis, Mo.

EASTER FAITH AND HISTORY. By Daniel P. Fuller. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1965. Pp. xii + 279. $4.95. The large question of the intellectual justification of Christianity must somehow or other concern itself with the relation of faith to history, particularly the relation of the Easter faith to history. A variety of answers has been proposed. F. narrates approaches from Lessing on and through nineteenth-century Liberalism, dialectical theology, the New Quest of the historical Jesus, and the more recent responses of Barth, Grass, Campenhausen, Koch, and Niebuhr. In this excellent presentation there is a kaleidoscopic view of the Resurrection as explained through the centuries. This alone would make the book worth reading. F.'s own answer to the relation of history and faith is based on an analysis of Luke and Acts. His basic point seems to be that Luke proves the Resurrection from the Gentile mission, which is an empirical fact that
can only be explained by the factuality of the risen Christ. Thus, those a
generation or two removed from the Resurrection can believe in Christ
arisen from the observable phenomenon of the spread of Christianity. The
argument, as I understand it, is from observable fact to a necessary cause.
The influence of both Reicke and Cullmann is quite evident. Reicke, accord­
ing to the Preface, suggested that this work of hermeneutics center on a
very definite biblical text. The emphasis on the importance of redemptive
history is a familiar Cullmann theme. Whether because of these influences
or not, there is at times a slight antipathy to what we might call the philo­
sophical approach evident in the New Quest. For all of the complications
involved in the New Quest, it must be said that modern participants in the
quest do raise the serious question of how one is to approach an event por­
trayed in the light of faith. Combined with Pannenberg's approach, future
discussions will assuredly seek to come to terms with the causes of belief,
the occasion of belief, the possibility of belief, as well as the relation of the
Church to belief. These questions necessarily raise philosophical issues. In
providing his own answer to the relation of history and Easter faith, F.
deserves commendation. In addition to a thoughtful answer, he has pro­
vided the material from which future questions will most certainly arise.

Bellarmine School of Theology

**DE LA SCIENCE À LA THÉOLOGIE: ESSAI SUR TEILHARD DE CHARDIN.** By
Georges Crespy. *Cahiers théologiques* 54. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé,
1965. Pp. 124. Lectures which C. gave as visiting professor in winter
1965 at the Chicago Theological Seminary. This and the fact that C. has
already published a more substantial volume on the theology of Teilhard
(*La pensée théologique de Teilhard de Chardin*, Paris, 1961) explain here the
absence of proper references and documentation. The title chosen for the
lectures is justified mainly by the final chapter, in which C. correctly states
that Teilhard's thought does not originate only from the scientific world in
which he lived and worked, but also and even more from his faith. Teilhard
tries to harmonize Christian theology with the modern scientific evolution­
ary world view. C., however, does not go any deeper into the intriguing
problem: Does Teilhard perform an integration of the evolutionary world
view into theology, or does he rather adjust our theological thinking to this
new modern system of reference? I would prefer the latter alternative. Faith
is certainly not a product of scientific query, but the human understanding,
the reflex, scientific conceptualization of faith, must be dependent on the
human scientific progress. By right C. is very critical in regard to Teilhard's
position on the problem of evil. I would agree with him that Teilhard's
attempts in this matter are rather unsatisfactory. However, when C. refers to Berdyaev as the one who discovered that evil is a nonentity, I must insist that this point has been very clearly elaborated by the old Scholastics (evil as privation); what we have to do is only to transfer this insight from a fixist into a dynamic evolutionary system. In regard to Teilhard's Christology in its cosmic dimensions, C. does not clarify how the divine milieu (which is Christological and not just divine) is related to the famous Omega Point in which the pleroma of Christ is achieved.

Loyola College, Montreal

Charles C. Henkey

DE GRATIA CHRISTI. By Thomas Muldoon. Theologiae dogmaticae praelectiones 5. Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1965. Pp. xiv + 370. $5.00. M., formerly professor of dogmatic theology and dean of the theological faculty in the diocesan seminary of Sydney, Australia, and at present auxiliary bishop of Sydney, has produced a competent and useful treatise on grace. His bibliography, while by no means exhaustive, is up to date and fairly adequate. Notable omissions include the rich article "Grâce" by Bonnetain in DBS, outstanding monographs on the biblical theology of grace such as F. Mussner's ZOE: Die Anschauung vom Leben im vierten Evangelium, and the monumental works of A. M. Landgraf (Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik), J. Auer (Die Entwicklung der Gnadenlehre in der Hochscholastik), and O. Lottin (Psychologie et morale aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles). M. begins with a brief history of the development of grace as influenced by historical errors and by the intervention of the magisterium; this section should have been preceded by an adequate survey of the development of grace in revelation, especially in the Johannine and Pauline writings. In his exposition M. follows the general line initiated by H. Lange and adopted by K. Rahner in their manual treatises, namely a historico-dogmatic development focused on the evolving awareness of the magisterium, occasioned in large part by heresies. The modern trend toward unfolding the entire treatise from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit and the new creation is much more comprehensive because less unilateral; it is much more universal because less Occidental; it is much more fruitful, from both speculative and pastoral viewpoints, because the starting point is the fulness of revelation concerning grace and its relation to Trinitarian life, to the redemptive work of Christ, and to man's concrete situation. In the Lange-Rahner development followed by M., the Christological aspects of grace tend to be neglected. M. disagrees vigorously with de la Taille's theory on created actuation by uncreated act. It is difficult, however, to accept his conclusion that the consortium divinae naturae is not the formal effect of grace, but that grace itself
is the *consortium* (p. 185). This statement does not accord with M.'s assertions (p. 179) against the nominalist tradition that adoptive sonship is truly a formal effect of grace, and that adoptive sonship is constituted radically by the *consortium*, as a true regeneration of the just man by grace. M.'s work manifests a thorough and sure mastery of the theology of grace; it makes available to students of theology that basic intelligence of a most difficult treatise which is indispensable before one can assume the role of a "master in Israel." The necessity of treatises of this kind was impressed forcefully on all who heard him when Karl Rahner answered two questions proposed by two seminarians: "What is the most fundamentally important and necessary work we should accomplish during our undergraduate course in theology, in view of modern world crises and the crying needs of souls?" Rahner: "Nihil est magis necessarium et fundamentale ad salutem animarum quam ut manualibus theologiae dogmaticae laboriose studetis antequam remedia exquisita morbis mundi applicare conemini." "Do you not think, Fr. Rahner, in view of the modern mentality, the irrelevance of metaphysics and of speculative theology to modern men, that our theology should be exclusively biblical?" Rahner: "Theologia quae esset exclusive biblica esset non tantum immatura, sed etiam fidei valde periculosa."

*Weston College*  
Philip J. Donnelly, S.J.

---

**LA IGLESIA Y SUS ESPERANZAS: ALGUNAS OPINIONES MODERNAS ACERCA DEL PORVENIR DE LA IGLESIA.** By Antonio Matabosch Soler. *Colectanea San Paciano, Serie teológica* 12. Barcelona: Seminario Conciliar, 1965. Pp. 234. M.'s work, a dissertation whose topic was suggested by Maurizio Flick and written under his guidance, studies the opinion that Christ's Church is meant to enter upon a future golden age when Christian life and holiness will flourish throughout the earth, when the Church will exercise a universal influence and know a time of "notable triumph in the world." (M. is at pains to distinguish this position from millenniarism, which would mean "a visible rule of Christ on earth before the end of the world." ) What this glorious epoch implies is suggested by a passage in Pius IX's *Ineffabilis Deus* which seems to have made a considerable impression on some Catholic writers in the latter part of the nineteenth century; in it Pio Nono expressed great hopes that a new age of truth and freedom, of justice and peace, was about to dawn for mankind and the Church. M. investigates this theme in some forty rather heterogeneous authors, among them the Oratorian A. Gratry and the Jesuit Henri Ramière. It is Ramière's *Les espérances de l'église* (Lyons, 1861) which M. most closely studies and whose argument he most fully analyzes. The principal reasons adduced for these hopes are
taken up in turn: the direction of the laws of Providence; developments in contemporary society which are seen as leading toward the constitution of a truly Christian world; indications in the Scriptures (especially regarding the conversion of Israel), in private revelations, and in pronouncements of the Roman pontiffs. M.'s conclusion is that the "proofs" as given do not prove: there may be no arguments which definitively rule out the possible coming of a future golden age for even the pilgrim Church on earth, but the reasons given by those who propose such an expectation do not constitute solid argument that this hoped-for period will come. The topic itself is of undeniable interest and (as M. indicates) has its relevance for a theology of history, the study of the Church's relationship to human progress and culture, the current rethinking on missions, etc.

Loyola House of Studies
Quezon City, Philippines

NIKOLAUS VON DINKELSBÜHL, LEBEN UND SCHRIFTEN: EIN BEITRAG ZUR THEOLOGISCHEN LITERATURGESCHICHTE. By Alois Madre. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters 40/4. Münster: Aschendorff, 1965. Pp. xvi + 430. Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl (1360-1433) was one of the most significant figures of the early period of the University of Vienna. He is important as theologian and preacher, as influential participant in the Council of Constance, and initiator of the Melk reform movement. The extent of his literary production and the significance of the events in which he took part have long merited the attention of historians. Now, on the occasion of the sixth centenary of the Vienna University, M. presents us with a biobibliographical study of this influential figure. The first part of the work (pp. 7-43) concerns Nicholas' life. Magister artium in 1389, Nicholas served first in the Vienna arts faculty, often in such important posts as dean, rector, and emissary of the University. From 1409 to 1414 he was professor in the theological faculty, and from 1414 to 1418 at the Council of Constance as delegate of the Archduke Albrecht of Austria. There he took part in the conclave which elected Martin V. From 1418 to 1428 he was again in the Vienna theological faculty. The second part of the work (pp. 45-337) is a critical catalogue of Nicholas' works arranged according to literary genres: commentaries on Scripture (Pss, Mt, 2 Cor, Gal, Eph); on the Sentences (Quaestiones communes, Quaestiones magistralles, Lectura Mellicensis); sermons; treatises on contemporary problems (communion under two species, Huss, monastic reform, the council, etc.); doubtful and spurious works. Very extensive indexes complete the work (pp. 342-430). For each work are given incipit and explicit, a list of headings.
or questions, manuscripts and editions, date of composition and authenticity. A masterpiece of clarity based on patient and detailed study, the work is a model for the type of literary historical treatment of Late Scholastic authors which is necessary before an adequate history of the theological movements of the closing Middle Ages can be written.

Freiburg im Breisgau

C. H. Lohr, S.J.

JOHN CALVIN: A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS. Edited by Gervase E. Duffield. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1966. Pp. xii + 228. $5.95. No single volume of essays can give adequate portrayal to the many facets of Calvin’s life and work; nevertheless, these eleven essays by nine distinguished scholars do succeed in giving a line drawing of Calvin in his roles of humanist, pastor, biblical expositor, and theologian. Basil Hall’s two essays, “The Calvin Legend” and “Calvin against the Calvinists,” easily serve as an introduction, since his task is of an “apologetic” nature, to dissipate the legends which have surrounded the Reformer and then to lay the many distortions of Calvin’s thought at the door of his successor Theodore Beza, e.g., presbyterianism and limited atonement, doctrines which Hall insists cannot be found in Calvin but must be attributed to Beza and the Calvinists. The humanist element in Calvin is studied in an essay of high scholarship by Ford Lewis Battles, “The Sources of Calvin’s Seneca Commentary.” Jean-Daniel Benoit of Strasbourg has contributed two worthy essays: in “Calvin the Letter-Writer” he catches the Reformer’s rich personality, inasmuch as it is in his letters that Calvin gave of himself more than in any other of his writings; and in “The History and Development of the Institutio” he relates its growth from the pocket edition of six chapters to the eighty in folio. G. Walker’s offering is a compact but competent presentation of “The Lord’s Supper in the Theology and Practice of Calvin,” and that of J. I. Packer views “Calvin the Theologian,” who, in the words of Beza, “never set before the church one dogma about which he needed to alter his mind” (p. 152). In “Calvin the Biblical Expositor,” T. H. L. Parker claims and attempts to prove that the Reformer saw himself primarily not as a systematic but as a biblical theologian. There is one emphasis in all these essays: to know and to evaluate the authentic Calvin, he himself must be read. There is no substitute.

Woodstock College

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.

L’UOMO, LA DONNA E IL MATRIMONIO NELLA TEOLOGIA DI MATTHIAS JOSEPH SCHEEBEN. By Mariano Valković. Rome: Gregorian Univ., 1965. Pp. xii + 201. $5.00; L. 3000. If Scheeben had not died before com-
posing the sacramental section of his Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik, it would be much easier to synthesize his teaching about marriage. As it is, we are dependent on his rather brief but explicit treatment of the subject in Die Mysterien des Christentums and on the passing and oftentimes indirect remarks about it in his other books and numerous articles. Utilizing all this material, V. offers in this paper-bound volume five chapters which deal in order with S.'s theological anthropology, his theology of woman, the relationship of matrimony, sexuality, and generation to the plan of creation, the intrinsic nature of marriage's "two in unity," and finally the sacrament itself. Although intended to emphasize those aspects of matrimony that are beneficial for moral theology, the book, owing to S.'s speculative mentality and the nature itself of his writings, is by necessity largely dogmatic. Its originality consists, not only in its study of all available sources and in its manner of presentation, but also in the personal, though modest, judgments rendered upon disputed points about S.'s views (e.g., whether the conjugal act, performed for the first time or also in its subsequent repetitions, is sacramental). The résumés concluding each chapter (except chap. 3), as well as the general summary of the entire work, are very helpful. The bibliography is adequate, the typography excellent. The book is a solid contribution to an understanding of S.'s matrimonial teaching.

St. Mary's College, Kansas

C. McAuliffe, S.J.

THE INDWELLING SPIRIT. By Robert W. Gleason, S.J. Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba House, 1966. Pp. 119. $3.95. In a previous work, Grace (New York, 1962), G. treated the mystery of the divine indwelling in a wider context. Here his attention is focused on the indwelling as such and its theological explanation in terms of quasi-formal causality. Elements of biblical theology and of the Greek Fathers serve as a point of departure and context for situating this theory. The explanations of Suarez and Vasquez, of Gardeil and Galtier, are examined and criticized. Finally, those of Scheeben, whom G. regards as a precursor of de la Taille, and of de la Taille himself are explained and defended as theologically consistent, best designed to account for all the data of revelation, and particularly pertinent to the contemporary scene. While G. hardly intended this series of essays as exhaustive, the reviewer missed any significant consideration of such doctors as Thomas and Bonaventure, whose reflections on the mystery of the indwelling have hardly been exhausted by modern presentations, as well as a number of contemporary theologians, e.g., K. Rahner and H. Mühlen, who have made important contributions to this problem. Both professional theologian
and general reader will find much to appreciate in these distillations of G.'s long years of study of so central a mystery.

St. Anthony-on-Hudson Peter D. Fehlner, O.F.M.Conv. Rensselaer, N.Y.

CHURCH AND EUCHARIST. Edited by Michael Hurley, S.J. Dublin: Gill, 1966. Pp. 298. 21s. This book is the fruit of ecumenical studies of which the first meeting was held at Glenstal in June 1965, the second at Greenhills in January 1966. It contains in addition one paper from the 1964 Glenstal Ecumenical Conference. The participants included Methodists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics; they discussed the Eucharist and the Church from various points of view. The pattern of the discussion was this: one member explained his position on a subject, then two members of the group commented on the exposition. The book preserves this pattern in its presentation of the matter, a point which adds to its vigour and vivacity. It is an effort at practical ecumenism, an attempt to answer the question "How do I help and encourage my brother, how carry out my ecumenical duties towards him?" by proceeding to "help him renew and reform his Church-life according to the recommendations of his world confessional organization." It contains, besides, seven appendixes which deal with the nature of Christian worship and give the present-day Eucharistic liturgies of the Church of Ireland, of Scotland, of South India, and of Rome. The interest of the book lies not merely in its doctrinal and historical content, but much more in its revelation of longing and desire to reassess in order to repossess in its fullness and integrity God's gift in Christ of Church and Eucharist. While each group is anxious to understand more fully and to preserve its own particular heritage, it is also eager to learn of, to evaluate, and in the light of truth under the guidance of the Holy Spirit to accept from others what it has overlooked or neglected in the divine teaching.

Regis College, Willowdale, Ont. Michael J. Lapierre, S.J.

LE DIMANCHE. By Dom Botte et al. Lex orandi 39. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1965. Pp. 184. 16.20 fr. During the Liturgical Study Week of 1960 at the Orthodox Seminary of St. Serge in Paris, the annual convention of Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant theologians to discuss topics of common interest, the participants expressed the desire to publish the material presented on these occasions for the benefit of those not able to attend. The present volume contains the ten principal lectures of the ninth Study Week on the theme "The Sunday." In its first article Dom Botte explains
why the term "the Lord's Day" should be considered the specific Christian name among the three traditional expressions. A.-M. Dubarle, O.P., in a study of "The Religious Significance of the Sabbath in the Bible," shows that on the Sunday the Christian should live more fully his vocation as child of God, while J. Daniélou, S.J., clarifies from early Christian sources the concept of the "Eighth Day." Two theologians of the Reformed Church offer interesting considerations on the ethical significance of the Sunday and on the relationship between worship and abstention from work that are not very different from those found in recent Catholic publications. Of particular value for a complete and balanced view of the subject are the contributions of Bishop Cassien and E. Theodorou, who unveil the rich eschatological and mystical dimensions of the Sunday in Orthodox tradition. Three articles on the first Sunday after Easter, the Sunday observance in England, and the Sunday in Christian art complete the volume. All these articles are of high quality and make a worth-while contribution to the material already available on the subject of "The Sunday." The particular charm and merit of these truly international and ecumenical Study Weeks at St. Serge are, however, to be found not so much in the lectures, but rather in the subsequent frank and charitable discussions which help to extend already existing areas of agreement and to further clarify disputed questions. The failure to publish, along with the lectures, at least a summary of these discussions diminishes the value of this volume for all but the most perceptive reader.

**Humacao, Puerto Rico**

Agustín Cornides, O.S.B.

**This Time of Salvation.** By Bernard Häring, C.SS.R. Translated by Arlene Swidler. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966. Pp. 252. $5.50. Nineteen pieces are presented under five "Times": of Love, Renewal, Worship, Unbelief, Conversion. "Is the Moral Theology of St. Alphonsus Relevant?" enlarges to twenty pages a public lecture of 1960; the three pages of "How Shall the Foolish become Wise?" appears to be a homily opening a Pentecost novena; otherwise neither audience nor origin nor date of the pieces is revealed, though H.'s pages on the sociology of knowledge remind us that we must know the context to understand an author. The date given for the German is 1964. "The Salvation Teaching of Collectivism" is an interesting portrayal of Marxism as a religion with its own revelation, original sin, redemption, suffering servant, and final salvation. "The Encounter with the Zeitgeist" is a balanced analysis of the current tensions and needs of moral theology. I would describe the other chapters as proclamations rather than as "studies." These include sweeping generalizations,
loaded adjectives, false contrasts. H. often uses a biblical word to evoke the immenses of doctrine, and there is a danger that readers may seek salvation in slogans; some of the words are needlessly given in Greek—and provide the only misprints which I noticed. H.'s familiar messages are emphasized: primacy of God's initiative, priority of attitudes and intentions over individual acts, sterility of legalism, impotence of minimalism and of law, power of environment and need for new social structures, dynamism of responsive love. Taken in separate instalments, these pieces could be invigorating for the religious life of any educated Christian interested in theology, clerics included.

_Milltown Park, Dublin_  
James Healy, S.J.

**The Liberty of the Children of God.** By Bernard Häring, C.SS.R. Translated by Patrick O'Shaughnessy, O.S.B. Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba House, 1965. Pp. 135. $2.95. The value of this readable book is that it confronts some of the practical problems about liberty and law, especially ecclesiastical law, in the light of Christ. "As the Father has sent me, so I send you" (Jn 20:21) means that ecclesiastical authority must see and exercise itself as a gift of God's love to men. If the end of laws is a freer and more interior love of Christ, then authority is bound to concern itself with the growth of interior liberty and responsibility in the subject. There are two major practical conclusions: (1) authority must strive to present its commands in the light of the values to which they lead; (2) even for the immature, multiplicity of laws must be avoided as much as possible, so that the spirit of responsibility may be given more room for growth. From the viewpoint of the subject, there is the obligation to obey not blindly but with the heart and therefore, as much as possible, with the head. True obedience cannot be separated from reverence and love, because it cannot be separated from the freedom with which Christ has made us free, His own freedom; for the liberty of the sons of God is but a participation in God's liberty. While full and mature obedience strives to see the value in a command, it knows that not every command, even if it is not against the law of God and nature, will necessarily be just, insofar as its human source is fallible. The free Christian knows that Christ chooses to work through human instruments who will not always be able to avoid unnecessary laws which burden the growth of human liberty. Therefore, it will accept such laws in the light of the Cross to the extent that they are necessary for the sake of good order, the rights of others, and the reverence due for Christ's authority in the Church. In doubt, ecclesiastical authority is presumed to be right. H. could have shown more clearly (1) the criteria by which a law
is judged to be unnecessary and too burdensome, e.g., those which try to prevent normal conflicts of liberties which should be solved by the initiative of give-and-take; (2) how much of the apparent tension of law and liberty is actually between conflicting liberties.

*Conception Abbey, Mo.*

Roderick Hindery, O.S.B.

**Freedom Today: Theological Meditations.** By Hans Küng. Translated by C. Hastings. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1965. Pp. xiii + 176. $3.95. In traditional theology much has been written on authority and on obedience, but relatively little on freedom. Scholastic theologians have always defended the freedom of the human will, though not always in up-to-date terms. Very little attention has been paid to the existential aspects of human self-determination, especially in Church matters. Any claim for more freedom has been regarded suspiciously, almost as a rebellion leading to anarchy and endangering the unity and structure of the Church. Karl Rahner's famous essay *Free Speech in the Church* and other similar writings were hailed as courageous beginnings. They not only started genuine theological thinking on freedom, but were also crowned by the prevailing spirit in the documents of Vatican II. K.'s book is postconciliar. One still senses in it the reverberation of the great debates. However, these meditations, which do not pretend to be a doctrinal exposition with the necessary documentations, and are more kerygmatic than systematic, have reached the calmness of the deep waters. Thomas More and John XXIII are proposed as examples for the real freedom of the individual Christian, be he layman or pope. K.'s experiences in this country inspire the chapter on the freedom of the Church. Theologically, the finest are the chapters on the freedom of theology under the titles "The Theologian and the Church" and "The Freedom of Religions." The latter is a brilliant discussion of the old problem "no salvation outside the Church," but in the new setting, where the Church explicitly acknowledges truth and holiness in the non-Christian religions. From the first I wish to quote: "... in theology the center is concerned above all for unity and continuity, the periphery for life and progress. The center's love is for measure, rule and strict order, the periphery's for movement, multiplicity, discussion and vital development. The center concentrates on proclaiming general principles; it sanctions what is new and provides for safety. The periphery demands the application of principles to the concrete situation; it discovers new things, and calls for daring. The center must not harden into vain, uneccllesial arrogance and a reactionary state of mind; into centralism and a superfluity of authoritative interventions; into the demand for a formalist,
legalist sacrificium intellectus. Conversely, the periphery must not dissolve into self-assured, unecclesial presumption and a revolutionary state of mind; into decentralism and a superfluity of unbridled discussion; into the demand for a false freedom which is mere arbitrariness."

Loyola College, Montreal

Charles C. Henkey

FUNDAMENTALS AND PROGRAMS OF A NEW CATECHESIS. By the Higher Institute of Catechetics of Nijmegen, Holland. Pittsburgh: Duquesne Univ. Press, 1966. Pp. 312. $6.95. This summary report of the experiences of the Dutch catechetical research center has something to say about practically every aspect of the new thrusts in catechetics on the primary and secondary level. Much of it will not be new to those who have been close to the catechetical enterprise this past decade. The report sees the content of catechetics as truth in terms of encounter rather than propositions communicated from mind to mind. There are illuminating passages about the development of man’s image of himself from the preliterate Middle Ages through the Industrial Revolution to our own time of new social arrangements and a renegotiation of relationships. The report urges catechists to assume a personal, dynamic, and existential approach to religious education. It searches for a way to stabilize the present polarities between curriculum and need. Some curriculum is needed for the sake of direction and positive conceptual growth. On the other hand, catechists should become attentive listeners to their students in order to discover their real needs. Curriculum plans, more or less explicit, are offered for the primary and early secondary levels. Some are quite interesting, but I think their use for the American school system is mainly paradigmatic. As models they are evocative and so provide a creative lead for the American catechist. This book has more to say to a beginning catechist than to a veteran. At most, it could have an occasional new idea for an experienced catechist who has kept up on his reading.

St. Norbert Abbey, De Pere, Wis.

Alfred McBride, O.Praem.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY. By Michael Pfleigler. Translated from the German by John Drury. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966. Pp. x + 311. $6.95. There is room for a good modern book on pastoral theology, but this does not fill the gap. It is an almost senseless gathering of random notes on all sorts of things vaguely connected with pastors or pastoral work, poorly translated, confused and confusing in many matters, pastorally useless for the most part, erroneous in some statements, questionable in others, and useful in so little as not to be worth the price. One can blame the translator
or editor for the statement that the word "pastor" is derived from the Greek \textit{paroikos} (p. 45), as well as for such infelicitous expressions as the "excretion of gonad" (p. 239). Confusing and confused is the consistent use of \textit{voluntarium} as synonymous with \textit{instinct} and distinct from \textit{liberum} (pp. 240, 244, 245, 250, 253), and \textit{eros} as referring to a pure love of anyone or anything without sexual component (pp. 33, 248, 249). At least questionable are such unqualified statements as that the pastor "before anyone else can spot the seeds of a vocation" (p. 55), or that "if a candidate were to reject a valid call from God, it would be a sin against charity" (p. 15). Erroneous through some mix-up is a statement that stipends received "on other than holydays of obligation... must be set aside for the use of the diocese" (p. 50). An example of pastorally useless statements is that "the pastor must keep the parish archives" with no further comment on what, how, or why (p. 56). The little which may be helpful includes some pages on the assessment of subjective guilt in serious matters against purity, although even here appears the curious confusion of \textit{voluntarium} for \textit{instinct} (pp. 250–56). It is disappointing to see Newman Press publish such a book.

\textit{Alma College} \hspace{1cm} \textit{Joseph J. Farraher, S.J.}

\textbf{Pastoral Counseling.} By Raymond Hostie, S.J. Translated from the first French edition (1963) by Gilbert Barth, T.O.R. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1966. Pp. xii + 243. $5.00. A book on the art of pastoral dialogue, defined by the author as "the interpersonal relationship which is established when an individual approaches a priest to talk to him about his uneasiness, his confusion, or his distress so that some remedy may be found." In Part 1, H. situates the priest precisely in his role of spiritual counselor, and then prepares the reader for Part 2, which provides a thorough analysis of the principal stages of the pastoral dialogue in terms of the client-centered therapy expounded by Carl Rogers and his collaborators. Part 3 complements the study by reconsidering the same counseling process from the point of view of its progress and its success or failure. In his final chapter, H. briefly indicates the need for further studies on such related topics as spiritual direction and the "themes" or conflict-situations that provide the occasion for counseling. The work concludes with a basic, annotated bibliography. Although H. writes primarily for priests, Parts 2 and 3 will be of equal validity for all who are in any way engaged in counseling. The book is a serious, practical treatment of nondirective counseling in the context of the pastoral ministry. A cursory reading may satisfy the curious, but otherwise will be of little use. Rather, this is a work that must be studied in the light of one's own counseling experience, tested through further
counseling, and restudied, if its full value is to be realized. For this reason it is somewhat unfortunate that H. did not include an index. The absence, too, of an explicit treatment of the problem of transference might be cited as a defect. The defects, however, detract only a little from an otherwise excellent book.

*Woodstock College*  
*Sigmond J. Laschenski, S.J.*

In this readable little book S. shows the historical development that has led to modern man's attitude toward religion. Biographical instances (Hegel, Feuerbach, Nietzsche, Freud, and Jung) illustrate his thesis that philosophers and psychologists during the past 150 years have insisted that religious faith is an illusion invented by man to compensate for his weakness. In modern times the doctor has taken the place of the priest, and the search for God has been replaced by the existential quest for authenticity. After this historical introduction, S. gives examples from life and from literature to show that man cannot be content with authentic living, but in the end always has to reach out to something beyond himself. These examples lead to the conclusion that so far from being a neurotic weakness, "genuine belief in God is a sign and an expression of a healthy personal attitude" (p. 210) and that "loss of belief, and unbelief appeared as factors disturbing to the mental health" (p. 203). Thus far S.'s thesis is unobjectionable. But he goes on to insist that there is no neurosis or psychosis without some defect in a man's personal life or religious conviction. For instance, that Strindberg's mind never fully recovered from his psychosis is, he thinks, "very largely due to the fact that he had never fully deliberately decided to play his complete human role" (p. 158). There are many people who do not play a fully human role—one need only think of the perpetrators of brutalities in wartime or out of it—yet most of these men are neither neurotic nor psychotic. Conversely, religious faith does not protect from psychosis. Surely the fallacy of equating religious faith with illusion or neurosis can be shown up for the special pleading it is without making lack of religious faith the scapegoat for all mental disturbances.

*Loyola University, Chicago*  
*Magda B. Arnold*

In an age when the Catholic Church in America is taking up the social gospel, it is well to examine the history of the social
gospel among American Protestant theologians. This volume purports to do this with passages from the writings of the fathers of the social gospel: Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Richard T. Ely. Gladden (1836–1918) was an outspoken proponent of the social dimensions of Christianity. In his negative evaluations of rugged individualism, he spoke against the political machinations of the Tweed gang and against the acceptance of “tainted money” even for missionary activities. On the positive side, he preached and wrote to promote the solution of the capital-labor conflict by an infusion of Christian love and brotherhood. The social gospel, for Gladden, was grounded on liberal Protestant theology and an organic view of human society. Ely (1854–1943) was a professor of economics and provided much of the intellectual base for the social gospel. Reared in the environment of the German universities, he was sympathetic to a socialism limited to natural monopolies. For a public generally ignorant of American labor unionism, he wrote a history of the movement in which he urged that American labor-management relations, indeed all social and economic relations, be rooted in Christian morality. In an essay on social solidarity, Ely found the basis of the brotherhood of man in Adam and original sin. His big plea was for sacrifice for one’s fellows—the social law of service. Doubtless, the impetus given the social gospel by Ely was greatest in the academic sphere. Rauschenbusch (1861–1918) was the best known of the social-gospel exponents with his *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. He espoused a practical, evolutionary socialism which today is generally acceptable to most Americans but in its day was surprising, even scandalous to many. Materialistic and revolutionary socialism he denounced, urging a Christian sense of social responsibility. His social-gospel doctrine was wedded to liberal Protestant theology, and when the latter was rejected, the former died too. Those who are promoting the social gospel under Catholic auspices have much to learn from this volume.

*Loyola College, Baltimore*

*James J. Conlin, S.J.*

**THE MARK of CAIN.** By Stuart Barton Babbage. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1966. Pp. 157. $1.95. An attempt to examine in a most elemental fashion certain areas of contemporary literature as they are related to several recurrent themes (e.g., the Last Things, grace and the role of the will, modes of arriving at a knowledge of God) in the theology of the Christian faith. In a rather unpleasant and hackneyed style that mirrors a disappointingly fuzzy grasp of possible correlations between theology and literature, B. somewhat warily recharacterizes modern literature as a literature of anxiety which occupies itself solely with the gloomy themes
of guilt, alienation, and death. According to B., this portrayal of man as a lonely, wretched creature who is unable to communicate—not only with God and his fellow man, but also with himself—represents an accurate but incomplete picture. Again according to B., the unhappy characters we encounter in the pages of Dostoevsky, Sartre, Hemingway, and Golding are incomplete because they too often fail "to appropriate the benefits of an accomplished redemption to end alienation and to win acceptance." B. regrets that this is so, and regrets further that the Roman Catholic Church has so frequently obfuscated the possibilities of Christian artistic expression by foisting criminal and sanguinary doctrines on mankind. However, despite his wide acquaintance with "modern" authors from Sam Johnson to Oliver Quick, and an (in some respects) impressive dexterity with biblical texts, B.'s book must itself be considered rather regrettable by sensitive interpreters both of the Christian faith and of modern literature.

Woodstock College

Joseph L. Quinn, S.J.

THE NEXT CHRISTIAN EPOCH. By Arthur A. Vogel. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. Pp. xii + 111. $3.50. V. presents a spirited answer to contemporary "secular" theology. He identifies with the new theologians of secularity in so far as he accepts that our present time has witnessed a scientific break-through and consequently a new world view. But, for V., even this new world view is itself derivative, "sustained and found within another world prior to and more complete than it" (p. 9). It is this fundamental assertion of transcendence that V. begins with and maintains throughout. In a few pages he presents with considerable accuracy the thought of the school of linguistic analysis, in particular the weight of such thinking as it has emerged in the work of Paul van Buren. If such contemporary theological attempts are provoked by a transcendentalism that minimizes the real concerns of this world, V. could not be more than sympathetic. But when the secularist empties Christian theology of its cognitive aspect and attempts to reduce it to mere consistent ethical action in the world, V. affirms the transcendent reference of man as necessary and important. He insists on the intentionality of human consciousness, the awareness of the self as person and not merely function, and being itself as quest for meaning. The very plurality of language systems affirmed by van Buren is the result of man's unique abilities. Thus, the basis for the challenge of the language analyzers is the transcendence that makes for person: "only because we as persons can transcend a given point of view and adopt another, can there be different functional uses of words for analysts to investigate" (p. 43). For V., the crisis in contemporary morals is a crisis in
identity: the place, the task, and the significance of the human person. The question of God's existence is to be located only in the awareness of God through the transcendence of the self. Because few understand what it means to be a human person, Christian life in the world has become difficult. Solutions for modern man and the contemporary Christian dilemma are to be sought in the mystery of the Incarnation, for it is there that we come to see that man's loving service of God must be in and through the world and not apart from it. There is throughout this book a significant dependence on the existential tradition, and an explicit awareness of the best in contemporary Catholic thought. The book will be of value to college teachers of theology and might profitably serve as a point of departure for discussions.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N.Y. James M. Connolly

The Fourth Session: The Debates and Decrees of Vatican Council II, September 14 to December 8, 1965. By Xavier Rynne. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 1966. Pp. xiv + 368. $5.50. Xavier Rynne's four volumes on the activities surrounding, in, and behind the four sessions of Vatican II are most interesting and informative. The authors state what they saw and heard, calling knaves knaves and praising heroes when they thought honesty required. Their first volume cut away the wraps from many undisclosed activities of Session 1 and earned for them an A-plus in theological journalism. But the increasing openness of subsequent sessions reduced the activity still available for Rynnian disclosure. Consequently The Fourth Session is somewhat less exciting reading, though the cutting edge of R.'s "honesty" is still journalistically honed: Ottaviani's "revelation" (p. 18); Antoniutti's setting "a fine example of insubordination" (p. 179); "the abysmal ignorance" of "a select group of bishops" (p. 234). Technically The Fourth Session is quite well done. As previously, the authors supply numerous appendixes: eleven major papal statements made during the fourth session and three conciliar documents of R.'s particular liking: relation of Church to non-Christian religions, divine revelation, and religious freedom. There are detailed voting records and a meticulously complete index of proper names. Though the last chapter is entitled "Toward Vatican Council III," it highlights rather the nature of Vatican II's groundwork "for more extensive long-range changes than the prophets even dreamed of in 1959." No prophecies are ventured, but further volumes by R., journalizing the postconciliar rinnovamento as seen by those who obviously have a thorough knowledge of Western European languages (Latin included) as well as of theology, Scripture, and their way around Rome,
would be a most interesting and informative (perhaps even charismatic) diakonia.

Pontifical College Josephinum
Worthington, Ohio

Thoralf T. Thielen

A Dictionary of Scholastic Philosophy. By Bernard Wueellner, S.J. 2nd ed.; Milwaukee: Bruce, 1966. Pp. xviii + 339. $8.50. W. sets out to provide a comprehensive lexicon of all the common terms and phrases in the whole gamut of Scholastic philosophy. In commendable degree he succeeds. Nevertheless, this is a distressing book. To put no fine point on it, it is distressing that such a book could have been written in the first place, let alone reach a second edition. That a need for this sort of thing should be felt, and that the philosophies involved should be capable of stratification and categorization to such an nth degree as this book features, all speak ill for the status of Scholastic philosophy. The publisher’s blurb proclaims the book’s value for everyone connected with philosophy: the college undergraduate, the interested adult “anxious to grapple with questions of fundamental importance,” and the busy teacher seeking to whet his students’ appetite for truth. The book would probably be of value to the busy teacher; the college graduate, the interested adult, and anyone at all seeking to whet his own appetite for truth would throw up their hands in despair after the first two pages. The book contains a good number of well-executed charts that might be helpful. As a concession to postmedieval thought, a three-page appendix on modern logical notation is included.

Woodstock College

Martin D. O’Keefe, S.J.

Selected Sermons of St. Augustine. Translated and edited by Quincy Howe, Jr. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966. Pp. xiii + 243. $6.00. Of the five hundred (genuine or attributed) sermons of Augustine, H. has translated the thirty which he considers most representative of the Bishop’s thought and revelatory of his pastoral love for his flock. Whether the Bishop’s words instruct, admonish, or inspire, the reader meets the same warm Augustine he came to know in the Confessions. In this collection H. has included homilies preached on various liturgical feasts, instructions on pagans and heretics, and sermons treating the love of God, love of man, and the Christian religion.

edited a volume which will undoubtedly bring joy to the student of the English Reformation, principally because D. has made Cranmer available once more. The most recent editions of the Archbishop's works were those of the Parker Society in 1844 and the Jenkyns edition of 1833, both of which are somewhat rare today. D.'s volume has some excellent features: it contains the complete text of "Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament" on the Lord's Supper, and includes the thirteen letters that Cranmer sent to the Continental Reformers. An essay by James I. Packer on the theological development of Cranmer's thought introduces the volume, and D. concludes the same by reproducing the very interesting catalog of books and manuscripts which once found a home in Cranmer's library.

**The Sacraments of Life and Worship.** By John B. Schanz. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1966. Pp. xxiii + 310. $4.75. A textbook unlike (therefore, superior to) its predecessors in the area of sacramental theology and interpreting the sacraments of initiation. A companion volume, soon to be published, will treat the remaining sacraments. S. commences his presentation by establishing the basic framework of sacramental worship, and in so doing he introduces the student to the sacraments as necessarily related to and dependent upon Christ and His paschal mystery. There follows an explanation of the sign aspect of the sacraments (value and function) and how the seven signs are the saving acts of Christ and His Church. There follows an explanation of the sign aspect of the sacraments (value and function) and how the seven signs are the saving acts of Christ and His Church. When he begins to treat the theology of these sacraments, S. is somewhat brief; this brevity, however, may be advantageous, since it is a clear invitation to the professor to go forth on his own. Half the volume is devoted to the Eucharist, and again the work is rich in background, biblical theology, and exegetical understanding of the texts of institution. The theology of the Eucharist as (a) sacrifice, (b) meal, and (c) presence is explained at length, with references to modern Catholic and Protestant scholars. This text is not a new cloak covering an old manual; rather it is a clear post-Vatican II presentation of the sacraments, receiving its direction from the Constitution on the Liturgy, with the aim of making sacramental worship a dynamic participation in and communion with Christ and His saving acts made present in these signs of the new covenant.

SHORTER NOTICES

Excerpts from the Cardinal’s recent sermons and addresses, wherein he fearlessly speaks out against the religious discrimination and persecution of the Church in Poland, and indefatigably defends the dignity of the human person, insisting on a people’s right to freedom of conscience, religion, and public worship. This is the first time the Cardinal’s writings have appeared in English.

Myth and Symbol. Ed. by F. W. Dillistone. Theological Collections 7. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1966. Pp. viii + 112. 16s 6d. This volume, following the basic format of the S.P.C.K. series, contains a number of reprints selected by D. He has done an excellent job, and the various essays by Tillich, Eliade, Cox, Bridge, Ramsey, Stancliffe, and D. himself are representative of the authors and illuminative of the subject area. With the realization that both image and symbol have enjoyed a long history in religious contexts, the purpose of the essays is a search for significant links between theology and culture in the contemporary world. The general background is sketched by Dillistone, Tillich, and Eliade, while Cox deals with psychology and symbolism, Bridge with the life and death of symbols in art, and Ramsey with the biblical models and the modern world. There is also a rather interesting Christmas sermon by Stancliffe which is a kind of ad hoc example of the theory. This slim volume would serve as a perfect introduction to this important and difficult area.
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*Scriptural Studies*


*Plastaras, James, C. M.* *The God of Exodus.* Milwaukee: Bruce, 1966. Pp. 342. $6.75.


*Doctrinal Theology*


Pastoral and Ascetical Theology, Devotional Literature


BOOKS RECEIVED


*Philosophical Questions*


*Special Questions*


### SIGLA

#### OLD TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Book of the Bible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gn</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lw</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jg</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ru</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 S</td>
<td>1, 2 Samuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 K</td>
<td>1, 2 Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Chr</td>
<td>1, 2 Chronicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezr</td>
<td>Ezra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh</td>
<td>Nehemiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jb</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prv</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoh</td>
<td>Qoheleth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ct</td>
<td>Song of Songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Da</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos</td>
<td>Hosea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ji</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>Obadiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi</td>
<td>Micah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hz</td>
<td>Habakkuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zep</td>
<td>Zephaniah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>Haggai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Za</td>
<td>Zechariah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>Malachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis</td>
<td>Wisdom of Solomon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir</td>
<td>Ben Sira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NEW TESTAMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Book of the Bible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts</td>
<td>Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Cor</td>
<td>1, 2 Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Th</td>
<td>1, 2 Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Tim</td>
<td>1, 2 Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phm</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2 Pt</td>
<td>1, 2 Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3 Jn</td>
<td>1, 2, 3 John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>Jude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>Apocalypse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>