BOOK REVIEWS


This is "a considerably expanded version of material delivered as the Raymond Fred West Memorial Lectures at Stanford University, California, in May 1966" (p. v). Bishop Robinson's theological and pastoral concerns have remained essentially unchanged since the appearance of Honest to God in 1963. He still believes that so much traditional God-language is irrelevant and actually distracts from the reality it exists to express (p. 20).

In a useful autobiographical Prologue, R. insists that his entire intellectual development has been dominated by a quest for the personal, but clearly he is not satisfied with Boethius' definition of persona. The personal always implies and demands relationships; however, the representation of God as a Being in some special realm makes Him irrelevant to human relationships. Unless we can portray God in functional rather than ontological terms, He will rapidly lose all reality (p. 35). R. does not accept the death-of-God hypothesis as proposed in varying forms by Altizer, van Buren, and Hamilton. God-talk is not simply reducible to discourse about man; it stands for some reality beyond what we see. To deny this is to relinquish Christian faith (pp. 52-55). Accordingly, the task of radical theology is not one of reduction but of location—not in the sense of pinning God down here or there, but in the sense of designating the kind of reality we are talking about (pp. 57-59). To make reference to "God" is "to acknowledge a relationship, a confrontation at the heart of one's very constitution as a human being, of which one is compelled to say, in existential terms, 'This is it. This is the ens realissimum, that which is ultimately and inescapably true'" (pp. 66-67). R.'s argument here is very close to Schubert Ogden's (see The Reality of God, p. 37).

God must be recentered as "the within of things." To accomplish this recentering, R. proposes a triangular alliance consisting of the secular theology of Bonhoeffer and his disciples, the philosophical theology of Tillich, Buber, Teilhard, Hartshorne, and others, and a worldly mysticism represented by Teilhard, Berdyaev, the Victorian naturalist Richard Jefferies, the Rumanian novelist Petru Dimitriu, and even Dāg Hammarskjöld. R. calls his product Christian panentheism, or "the belief that the Being of God includes and penetrates the whole universe, so that every part of it exists in him, but (as against pantheism) that his Being is more than, and is not exhausted by, the universe" (pp. 86-87). In his final chapter R. tries to go "Beyond the God of Theism." He rejects the assumption that we are faced with one set of alternatives: either the personal God of theism or a
less-than-personal Absolute. He points, instead, to the powerful and perennial tradition in philosophy, mysticism, and Oriental religion which rejects dualism in favor of a coincidence of opposites, leading toward a higher, all-embracing unity. Christian panentheism, whose biblical charter can be found in 1 Cor 15:28 and whose principal theological prophet is Teilhard (God as “the Center of centers”), offers the best hope for a genuine renewal of our doctrine of God.

*Exploration into God* is more a detailed outline than a full-scale systematic argument. R.’s method is one of “opencast” rather than academic theology (see his article “Opencast Theology,” in *New Christian*, June 15, 1967, p. 13). It would seem unfair to judge his work by standards derived from a different theological method. He is digging nearer to the surface and is not particularly interested in quarrying rocks for a system. This book demonstrates anew R.’s peculiar genius (or his abiding folly, some might insist) for bringing together and synthesizing apparently divergent theological traditions. But syntheses are not often wrought without a price.

Someone else must provide us with a careful analysis of the “claim situations” where man encounters the reality of God. On what basis do we conclude that the reality of God is radically personal and at the same time a milieu or a “field”? Can we really have it both ways? In other words, is R.’s three-cornered alliance a genuinely viable union? His brief discussion of creation, providence, miracles, and evil does not thoroughly test the hypothesis, and critics are increasingly demanding some serious consideration of the problem of death. Can Christian panentheism assimilate the newer eschatological perspective of Moltmann, Pannenberg, and Metz, with its emphasis on the God who is-not-yet, the God who goes before us? In what way, finally, is Christ the model and the window of the divine reality? What does St. Paul mean when he says that “God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself” (2 Cor 5:19)?

R. hints that there may be a Christological sequel to this book. If he produces it, one can safely predict that its style and method will be the same. R. erects signs rather than settlements; he supplies leads and pointers rather than final solutions. It will be another sample of “opencast theology” which the professionals in the deeper regions of the theological enterprise cannot responsibly ignore.

*God-Talk: An Examination of the Language and Logic of Theology.*

Theology is a form of discourse which professes to talk about God, and
yet it consists of a very strange kind of language. If God is beyond thought and therefore beyond expression, what can it mean to talk of God at all? Approaching the problem from the other direction, what can it mean to say "God speaks"? Such unique and exalted speech must surely shatter a merely human form of discourse.

The problem of how to talk of God or how God can talk to man is scarcely a new one, but it has received considerable emphasis in recent years. Modern theories of language have called much God-talk into question, and theologians have not always been as astute in framing their answers as has John Macquarrie.

His studies of religious thought in this century, and especially his work in the existentialist thought of Heidegger and Bultmann, plus his close acquaintance with British philosophers of language have moved him in recent years to devote himself to this fundamental issue. His own outstanding gift of using language assures the reader of clarity wherever clarity is possible, and of genuinely evocative language when clarity must fail. M. excels at evoking the wholeness of a situation. In contrast to reductionist tendencies which provide clear and orderly presentation by eliminating complicating factors, M. always strives to light up the situation in as comprehensive a way as possible.

M.'s book is based on his Hastie Lectures given at Glasgow University in 1962, and on further lectures given in the United States in 1962–66. It should not, however, be thought of as merely a collection of loosely-related essays. His prior concern with the problem turned the series of lectures into a progressive and integrated approach to its resolution.

This book, then, is most opportune. It resumes the evolving history of the debate on language and seeks to speak in the name of theology to the more recent form of language philosophy. For if it once was axiomatic (e.g., in the early Wittgenstein) that whatever can be said meaningfully can be said clearly, i.e., in a language which directly refers to its referent in unambiguous fashion, now there is increasing interest in indirect kinds of language: myth, symbol, analogy, parable.

M.'s language theory reflects the thought of Heidegger, Josiah Royce, and Wilbur M. Urban. Language needs always to be viewed within the living context wherein alone it functions. Language constitutes a triadic relation the three terms of which are: the person who says something, the matter about which he says it, and the person to whom he says it.

Theological language is a special form of language which is rooted in experiences such as faith, grace, creaturely feeling, the sense of the holy, adoration, etc. It seeks to bring to expression "total existence," i.e., the
whole range of our being-in-the-world in its cognitive, affective, and conative dimensions alike. It seeks to represent one's encounter with holy Being, but cannot do so in the manner of "metaphysics," which M. takes to be a product of speculative reason which yields a system of objective, neutrally descriptive truths. "Metaphysics shares with mythology, though in a different manner, the serious fault of appearing to talk of God and other theological themes as if these could be made objects for our inspection" (p. 142).

Theological language must be existential, and yet it cannot become the expression of a purely subjective state of mind. M. sees a way to ground theological statements by making the passage from the language of existence to the language of Being in the manner of Heidegger. The great advantage of this analysis is that it begins on the level of existence and, as it moves to ontological language, it does not speak of Being as an object but as something in which men's existence is grounded. Theological language, then, communicates by awakening the person to whom it is addressed to the encounter with holy Being, and it does this by interpreting and lighting up a shared existence at the deepest levels.

Theological language employs various types of discourse (myth, symbol, metaphysical arguments, empirical assertions), but all of these are rooted in what M. calls the "basic logic" of theology, the language of existence and being. Even here, the author is careful to acknowledge that "the language of existence and being includes images and symbolic elements, and many of its concepts have very ragged edges indeed" (p. 239). The use of such language, however, does have the advantage of moving from symbols proper to a limited historical community to a language more universally intelligible.

Still, the great problem remains. If one begins on the level of phenomenology, how does one guarantee the passage to ontology? If it is true that God can never be an object for us so that we can talk about Him in detachment, we may only talk of Him as He impinges on us. We run then a serious risk of talking only of ourselves.

M.'s response to this difficulty is very measured. He avoids the temptation of trying to prove (and thus denature) faith. A believer must live with the possibility that his faith is an illusion and refers to nothing beyond his own states of mind. Nonetheless, the author's analysis of God-talk in all of its various forms reveals a basic coherence which makes faith a reasonable stance for man to assume.

Georgetown University

William C. McFadden, S.J.

In five compact essays Dr. Richardson offers a fresh analysis of the contemporary ethos, delineates its challenge to theology, and explores the possibilities inherent in the American religious experience for constructing a theology based not on the redemption-centered "God for us" theology of Continental Protestantism, but on the creation-oriented "God with us" theology of the American tradition.

Richardson faults the "death of God" theologians for an evolutionistic view of history which views today's public atheism as unique and inevitable. No new phenomenon, atheism arises when the intellectus or matrix of meaning in a given age cannot deal with the challenge of a new cultural situation. New challenges invite criticism in which prophetic atheism as a criticism of the "holy ultimate" of a society is the leaven of change. The present challenge is not the well-worn scientific mentality but the "socio-technic" age—an age where society applies rational techniques to the control and organization of the fabric of society, an age interested in the unity of the metadisciplines. Secular Christianity is no response to this power of society, for secularism is a form of idolatry where men form the cosmos in their own image. From Augustine to the present, the Church has transformed the secular intellectus by opening it to divine transcendence. Augustine counters the pride of the Gnostic mystical intellectus with fides quærens intellectum, creating Christian Platonism. The modern intellectus is relativistic, tending to crystallize relative positions into absolute structures such as Marxism. Christian faith stands before this as fides reconcilians intellectum, breaking down the desire for autonomy of conflicting ideologies, and stressing a unity open to the divine.

A language of theology is not found, according to R., along the path of demythologizing, which is based on a misunderstanding of the function of myth. Myth does not, à la Bultmann, distort reality, but expresses it in terms of felt wholes which crystallize a total experience. What is called for is not demythologizing but an interpretation of myth on all its semantic levels. The reality of a mythical assertion is not found by peeling off the layers of myth, but is itself part of the mythic mode of expression, so that "the myth is the message."

Having examined the modern intellectus as interested in unity but prone to bifurcation into exclusive absolutes, R. then constructs a philosophical and theological response to this intellectus. On the level of philosophy, he calls for a "henology" where the basic category of experience is not being but unity. A proof for the existence of God suited to our age is not from the
multiplicity of being to being itself, but from the multiplicity of unities to unity itself.

Theologically, the response is a “God with us” theology of creation and sanctification of the secular, rather than surrender to it or redemption from it. This theology proceeds from an understanding of the American experience interpreted theologically; concretely, from the Puritan emphasis on the sacredness of the Sabbath day of rest, the day given to the recollection of God’s glory manifest in creation. Christology has been unduly influenced by a “God for us” theology of the Incarnation where the motive of the Incarnation is the need of man. R. calls for a creation Christology where the reason is “something which God seeks for his own sake, namely his holiness, the glory of God” (p. 161). Corresponding to a Christology stressing “God with us” in the person of Christ is a doctrine of the Spirit stressing the indwelling as “God in us.”

In the face of the problems underscored by the “death of God” theology, R.’s work suggests possibilities for further discussion on the level of promise rather than pessimism. Reservations about his conclusions may be adduced to the following points. Though original in intent, his attempt to construct a philosophy of “henology” turns out a bit too eclectic to be systematic. A fuller treatment of cult and sacrament in the Christian communities might soften the dichotomy between creation and redemption which permeates the work. Finally, it is surprising that, while acknowledging his debt to Lonergan early in his work, he does not allude to him when discussing his doctrine of the Spirit as “God in us” based on a creation theology—ideas familiar to readers of Lonergan’s Divinarum personarum. Truly ecumenical in scope and execution, R.’s work points to the formation of a truly trans-confessional theology—an enterprise in which his present and future work will play a significant role.

Hopkins Hall, Chicago

John R. Donahue, S.J.


Because the history of religions is so vast in its range and so difficult to manage, Helmer Ringgren, Professor of Old Testament at Uppsala in Sweden, and Ake V. Ström, Professor of History of Religions at Uppsala, have joined in producing this survey as a basic guide and reference work in this field. Now in its third Swedish edition, this volume is more comprehensive than most other one-volume presentations of the universal religious
development of mankind. It is not overburdened with an excessive amount of space given to western religions. After a brief survey of the religions of preliterate peoples on every continent, it presents the higher religions of the Mediterranean and Eurasian worlds. Because of the all-inclusive nature of its content, this work has a certain encyclopedic quality. Data is presented with little effort at any depth comprehension. Such a prosaic, factual, objective presentation does not permit any central focus in discussing these religions. Nor do we find here any real communication of the inner life of these religions, nor even an effort in this direction. There is only a listing of scriptural sources, beliefs, practices, historical moments of development. Significant listings surely, but they are of limited value in such an indifferent context. Nowhere does a living vision emerge of any one religion or of the universal religious development of man.

A much better work could be done within the same compass and with the same material. The difficulty is not with the size, nor is it primarily with the data. The difficulty is with living comprehension and presentation. Presentation is always delicate. Yet the material itself, properly understood, reveals its own spiritual significance, if only it is permitted to do so. Without a more significant, more unified context the reader cannot even absorb the data that is presented. The very facts take on false or defective meaning. So with the presentation here of the religious traditions of the West. It is precise enough, true enough. Yet nowhere is there adequate mention of the historical vision and historical dynamic of the biblical religions, especially of Christianity, in contrast to the cosmological, ahistorical orientation of the other religions of the Eurasian world. This deprives Christianity of one of its most distinctive aspects.

Because the authors are unable to respond to their subject matter, or consider that this is a betrayal of their scholarly procedures, the very content of their writing is affected, particularly in their presentation of Buddhism. Concerning Buddha we read such inexact and misleading statements as: “He does not face life with piousness and reverence but is coldly analytical and perceiving” (p. 370); “Buddha rejects all the traditional social institutions” (p. 373); “Buddha is not really a Preacher of Morals” (p. 371); “Chinese Buddhism was above all consolidated by Bodhidharma” (p. 401). Concerning Confucius we read: “Ethics is to him mainly negative” (p. 399); “Ethics is without any religious motive” (p. 399); “He recognizes the existence of the gods, and of demons and spirits, but all offering and ritual are to him of exclusively subjective value” (p. 399). All of these are oversimplified, inexact statements that indicate a lack of subtlety in understanding these traditions.
Yet for all this, the work does provide a step forward in the comprehensive nature of its undertaking. The failures of judgment concerning Buddhism and the East Asian developments are common enough and are in part compensated for by the sections on the classical religions of the Mediterranean world. The book in its entirety probably has a greater array of factual content than any of the other single-volume studies of this subject. The bibliographies are extensive and quite valuable. But here again there are regrettable omissions, especially as regards the Asian religions. Some of the most valuable source books of recent years are missing: the three-volume series edited by Wm. T. de Bary: *Sources of Japanese Tradition* (1958), *Sources of Indian Tradition* (1958), *Sources of Chinese Tradition* (1960); Wing-tsit Chan, *Source Book in Chinese Philosophy* (1963). There are also valuable works such as R. C. Zaehner, *Hinduism* (1962), which give such a superb presentation of the basic Hindu religious experience, especially of the devotional life of Hinduism, which is given little consideration in the present work. The outstanding work of Jan Gonda, *Die Religionen Indiens*, has been completed with the second volume since 1963, although only the first volume is mentioned in the present work. This study by Gonda must be considered the standard comprehensive study of Hinduism at the present time. Concerning Buddhism, the outstanding omission is Etienne Lamotte's *L'Histoire de Buddhisme indienne* (1963). Govind Pande's *Origins of Buddhism* (1954) might also have been mentioned. Among the works concerning Chinese religions, omissions include Henri Maspero, *La Chine antique* (new ed., 1955); Kenneth Chén, *Buddhism in China* (1964); C. K. Yang, *Religion in Chinese Society* (1961). Yet the most valuable help to the reader in such a survey would be a highly selective bibliography in which explanatory comments would be made and some indication given of the value of the items listed. Mere lists of authors and titles are of limited value.

In general, this work is not strong in its presentation of the religions of India, China, or Japan. The important developments in devotional Hinduism after the Upanishadic period are not well understood or presented. The religious-spiritual developments of China and Japan are given in too sketchy a manner. All of this raises the question of method in presenting any such survey of the religious traditions of mankind. On the whole, this presentation is helpful in providing extensive data and an over-all framework within which the religious history of mankind can be seen. Yet we might hope eventually for a more effective portrayal, one more unified in its treatment of the individual religious developments, one that would present the central religious experience of these traditions as well as the mechanics of their religious life. This last is needed and can be extremely useful. But apart
from their vital context, the externalities of a religion are unassimilable by the human mind, simply because their inner meaning has disappeared.

**Fordham University**  
**THOMAS BERRY**


There are two ways to approach the Gospels today: either from the standpoint of their synoptic relationship or from that of their individual redaction. Though Gospel study has advanced far beyond the Synoptic Problem as such, yet there will always be an advantage in approaching the Gospels synoptically. Only when one does so, does one detect the features in them which have led to the other approach, Redaction Criticism (*Redaktionsgeschichte*), which seeks to distinguish tradition and redaction and to discover the theological purpose of the individual Evangelists. The publication of K. Aland's *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum* (Stuttgart, 1964), replacing the older, well-known *Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* of A. Huck and H. Lietzmann (9th ed.; Tübingen, 1936), has indeed strikingly illustrated the permanent value of such synoptic study, and even extended it to parts of the Johannine Gospel. A disadvantage in the synoptic approach to the Gospels is its tendency to distract from the over-all concern of the individual Evangelist. Necessary as it may be at some stage or other, it must eventually yield to a more synthetic study of the Gospels, dominated by Redaction Criticism and an effort to unfold the purpose of the Evangelists. Of these two approaches, Vawter has adopted the first; his introduction to the four Gospels is predominantly synoptic. However, many of his comments on various passages reflect the modern discussions of Redaction Criticism.

In the arrangement of the Gospel texts V. has mainly followed the order of Aland's *Synopsis*, and he intends the reader to take up the four Gospels concurrently. For this purpose he recommends the use of an English *synopsis* of the Gospels (which he unfortunately terms a "harmony"—this word should more properly be reserved for the concordistic approach to the Gospels which strung together phrases from the four of them à la Tatian, A. J. Maas, et al., an approach which the synoptic study of the Gospels did well to replace). V. describes his work as "less a commentary on the Gospels than... an explanation of what they are about... Exegesis in the technical sense of the word is rare in this book, and still less often have I taken up the challenge of the many theological issues to which the Gospels give rise especially in modern times" (p. 7).

V.'s introduction to the Gospels is an outgrowth of his earlier book, *A Popular Explanation of the Four Gospels*. It is, however, entirely new both
in content and in format, though some chapter headings and some sentences have been retained. V. insists that “this is an introduction to the Gospels through a reading of the Gospels,” and he therefore dispenses with the usual introductory material, which can easily be found elsewhere. The result is that he quickly leads the reader to a consideration of the crucial problems which the synoptic study of the Gospel texts invariably detects. He has likewise dispensed with footnotes and bibliography, save for a dozen titles or so mentioned in the last two paragraphs of his Foreword.

The over-all impression which the book makes is a good one. V.’s recognized ability to interpret biblical texts and to grasp their meaning is once again manifest here. Despite its succinctness, his commentary on many of the Gospel passages is excellent.

Naturally, there are times when one wishes that V.’s judgment were a little more critical, his explanation a little less simplified. Exaggerated indeed is his claim that we can identify Luke “with almost utter certainty as a non-Jew” from “the obvious sense of Col 4:14” (p. 23). I personally incline to this identification of Luke—with a qualification which I shall propose elsewhere—but we should recall the opinion of W. F. Albright, who insists that “he was Jewish” (see “Luke’s Ethnic Background,” in J. Munck, The Acts of the Apostles [AB 31; Garden City, 1967] p. 264). Similarly, it is far from certain that Luke became Paul’s “inseparable companion” (p. 24) after the episode recounted in Acts 16:9–10. The evidence of the We-Sections of Acts, to which V. refers, suggests rather that Luke may have joined Paul in Macedonia at the end of Mission 2 (see Acts 20:5); he may have stayed in Philippi all the time Paul was in Achaia. Again, I wonder if “commentators would generally agree” that Luke “has succeeded admirably” in carrying out his intention to follow up all things carefully from the very first (p. 47). A more realistic judgment distinguishes today between Luke’s protestation to write as a historian and many instances in his writing where his concern is other than that of a historian. The literary form of Lk 1:8 ff. can scarcely be designated as “midrash” (p. 49), even with V.’s qualification; the reader will do well to consult A. G. Wright, “The Literary Genre Midrash,” CBQ 28 (1966) 105–38, 417–57, especially 454–56. Not all will agree that “the theophany” at the baptism “had a trinitarian meaning for the evangelists” or that it “is also a portrayal of the doctrine contained in the ancient christological hymn in Phil 2:6–11” (p. 79). The last statement may be defended in some restricted sense, I suppose; but as it stands, it says too much. There are many aspects of Christology in that hymn that have no portrayal in the baptism scene at all. Again, the treatment of the sign of Jonah (pp. 193–94) is quite inadequate. V. rightly states that for Luke
“Jesus comes before his generation as Jonah came before his, as a prophet.” But his explanation of Matthew’s version (that it does not “necessarily see in Jonah a prefiguration of the resurrection”) is oversimplified; it does not reckon with the typically Matthean addition which has allegorized the saying by post-Easter hindsight, so that the sign of Jonah in the first Gospel is really double. V. repeats the usual explanation of the cockcrow at Peter’s denial as a designation of a period from midnight till three a.m. (p. 347), whereas the Marcan form of the saying undoubtedly stresses the rapidity of Peter’s denial: “today, this very night, before a cock has time to crow twice, you will deny me thrice” (Mk 14:30). Further similar details could be mentioned, but they would be minor in comparison with the over-all impression noted above.

Given V.’s purpose and his preliminary point of view, his book is a success. However, at the end of it there lingers a doubt that its effect on the reader may be that it is the modern substitute for the Life of Christ. The extent to which V. has successfully avoided this will surely vary with the reader.

The English style of the book is often involuted and should have been polished up a bit before publication. Doubleday’s copy editors must have been drowsy in letting pass such solecisms as “to all extents and purposes” (p. 20), “a relatively tardy period” (p. 52), etc.

Woodstock College and Yale Divinity School

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Introductions to the Gospels have become so numerous that one appreciates the sort of work in which the usual introductory questions are treated briefly and the bulk of attention is given to the analysis of crucial or characteristic passages. Such is the plan of the present book. Fr. Lynch’s prefatory explanations on the three stages in the formation of the Gospels, on the necessity of linguistic analysis and of attention to literary form and redactional context are in the best tradition of contemporary Gospel criticism and are set forth as the basis of the author’s aim to expound “the literal sense intended both by God and by the human authors of the Gospels” (p. xi).

One has the feeling, however, that the rest of this book does not, by and large, carry out this programme satisfactorily. Too often it lapses into a sort of existential or romantic interpretation which, valid or not, overlooks more fundamental theological preoccupations of the Evangelists. Too often a given Evangelist’s thought is presented without sufficient attention to its development over earlier source material. Such, e.g., is the case with L.’s all-too-brief treatment of the title Son of Man in Mark. On the basis of Miss
M. Hooker's recent work on that subject, one might be willing to accept L.'s view that this title summarized for Mark "the perfectly human Jesus ... mankind's child" (p. 6); but even a beginner would have profited from a discussion of such problems as: What was the background of this title in Jewish literature? Did Jesus use the title as a self-designation, and in what sense? And did the use of this title by the tradition and by Mark in any way add to Jesus' own use of it? Such, likewise, is the case with the author's exegesis of the Matthean beatitudes, where no attempt is made to reconstruct their prehistory on the basis of a comparison with their Lucan parallel, or to show how Matthew has reinterpreted them in function of a new Sitz im Leben. Such questions, in this reviewer's opinion, cannot be dismissed on the score that one is treating "only the final level" of the Gospel tradition (p. xi); "interpres ... solletet ad tria tempora traditionis attendat" (AAS 56 [1964] 714; emphasis added).

One looks in vain, moreover, for any attempt to correlate the literary structure of a given Gospel with its theological idée-maîtresse. Again, L.'s portrait of the Matthean Jesus overlooks the import of the finale of that Gospel, which, as W. Trilling has shown, so compendiously resumes Matthew's preoccupation with Jesus as the Lord of the Church, and provides the key to his ecclesial interpretation of the tradition about Jesus. And what appears to be an overly romantic view of the joyful Lucan Jesus bypasses the more basic Lucan insight regarding Christ's place in the history of salvation—an insight which commands Luke's editing of his sources, the structuring of his diègesis, and his including the Acts as the second volume of his work. It also explains, incidentally, L.'s one-sided choice of Lucan pericopes, which do not sufficiently typify the range of this Evangelist's theology.

Finally, one regrets that the same rigorous exegetical method that is applied to the Matthean and Lucan infancy narratives is not applied to all the passages selected. It is difficult to agree, e.g., that the descent of the Spirit "as a dove" (Mk 1:10) is a reference to Gn 1:2 (cf. J. de Cock, Bijdragen 21 [1960] 349–76; A. Feuillet, CBQ 21 [1959] 468–90). Nor will all agree that Mk 1:10 contains an allusion to Ps 2:7 (cf. J. Dupont, RSR 35 [1948] 522–43); the allusion to Is 42:1 is sufficient to point out Jesus as the prophet-Servant of Yahweh, without conflating that with such other titles as "expected redeemer" or "Messiah." Nor, again, will all agree that the baptism story (Mk 1:9–11) provides a basis for seeing this event as a privileged moment in Jesus' developing human consciousness of His divine sonship (p. 13). Development of self-consciousness there certainly was in Jesus; but if anything is to be said on this subject in connection with the
Gospels, the more significant thing is, in this reviewer's opinion, not that the Gospels attest to this psychological development as such, but that they provide a basis for believing that Jesus' self-awareness, at least before the Resurrection, may never have been clearly articulated in terms of divine sonship in the transcendent metaphysical sense.

It is to be hoped that a new edition of this book may better integrate the results of recent redaktionsgeschichtliche studies of the Synoptics; for these results are not only essential to an understanding of these Gospels, they are also fairly common knowledge by now. And at a time when this type of literary-critical approach to the Gospels is so much needed, one can easily sin by omission in withholding such information from one's readers in favor of more secondary and sometimes subjective views.

Woodstock College

EDWARD J. MALLY, S.J.


With the identification of the Codex Neofiti I of the Vatican Library in 1956 as a complete copy of a Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch, the study of ancient Aramaic translations (targûmîm) of the first five books of the Bible entered a new phase. Various Targums of the Pentateuch had been previously known: the Targum Onqelos (the one most commonly used and now available in the handsome critical edition of A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic 1 [Leiden, 1959]), the Palestinian Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan (or Jerusalem Targum I), the Palestinian Fragmentary Targum (or Jerusalem Targum II). Fragments of Palestinian Targums had been found toward the end of the last century in the genizah (or storeroom for worn-out biblical scrolls) of the synagogue of Old Cairo. Some of them have been published by P. Kahle, A. Diez Macho, and W. Baars. Meanwhile, Codex Neofiti I lay on the shelves of the Vatican Library for decades—perhaps even for centuries—with a false label on its spine, Targum Onqelos. So labeled, it was regarded merely as another Renaissance copy of the common Targum, and in effect was disregarded. A student of P. Kahle, A. Diez Macho, M.S.C., a Spanish confere of the author of the book under review here, came across it in 1949; after several years' work on it, he established that it was in reality not a copy of Onqelos but of a Palestinian Targum. At first it was thought to be a complete copy of the so-called Fragmentary Targum; but it has since been recognized as a different Palestinian Targum, though related to it. Codex Neofiti I has not yet been fully published. M. informs us (p. 29) that Diez Macho will soon publish the editio princeps in Israel (Academic Press) and
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that it will serve as the basis for the critical edition of the Palestinian Targums in the forthcoming *Biblia polyglotta Mairitensis*. The import of this newly discovered codex will not be appreciated until that text is available. Nevertheless, interest in ancient Targums has been revived by this discovery. An example of such interest is M.'s dissertation, written at the Biblical Institute under the direction of S. Lyonnet.

From the title, this book would seem to be a study of the relation of ancient Palestinian translations of the Pentateuch to the *NT*. This it is, indeed; but it is far more than that. It is a work that no one interested in Targumic studies will want to do without. Whether one agrees or not with the minutiae of M.'s interpretations—his comparison of *NT* texts and different Targumic passages—or with his conclusions, one must recognize the undoubted heuristic value of his book, and especially of its lengthy Introduction. Its brief sketch of Targumic studies (chap. 1) and its essay on Targums in general and of Palestinian Targums in particular (chap. 2) are invaluable. The brief sketch surveys Targumic study prior to the nineteenth century, during its golden age (*ca.* 1850–1910), at the time of its change of approach (1930–50), and the state of the question at present. The essay traces briefly the origin of Targums, the liturgical reading of Scripture, and the relationship of the different Targums. In this part one will regret the all too summary treatment of Targum Onqelos and its connection with Palestine, especially since M. will later cite it along with Palestinian Targums. One will also regret M.'s tendency to speak of the Palestinian Targum (note the title of his book), when the complexity of the material he deals with makes it clear that one must really reckon with Palestinian Targums to avoid oversimplification.

The bulk of M.'s study falls into two parts: (1) consideration of some Palestinian Targum texts apparently closely related to the *NT*; (2) examination of some general and particular themes in the Palestinian Targum and in the *NT*. In Part 1, three chapters deal with (1) traditions relating to Moses, Jannes, and Jambres in the Palestinian Targum and in Paul; (2) the divine name and the "second death" in the Apocalypse and in the Targums; (3) some examples of doctrinal and linguistic relationship between the Targums and the Gospels. In Part 2, three further chapters treat of (1) biblical personages as viewed in the Palestinian Targums and the *NT*; (2) certain themes in the Palestinian Targums and the Apocalypse; (3) some messianic themes in the Targums and in the *NT*. Chap. 9 sums up M.'s thought on the relation of the Palestinian Targums to the *NT*: "from what we have considered . . . the *NT* in general seems to favour an early date of the PT as a whole; . . . the greater part, if not all, of the PT paraphrase was
already in existence in NT times and has been transmitted to us, essentially, as it then was" (pp. 257–58).

This brief survey of the contents of the main part reveals the disparate nature of the material used by the author. In some instances the relation between the Targumic material and the NT is less convincing than others. Yet this disparate data and the fluctuating validity of the comparison must be stressed, for in the long run it constitutes scant support for the sweeping claims made by M. for the age of Palestinian Targums and their influence on the NT.

The major problems in M.'s thesis are the dating of Palestinian Targums, the extent to which they incorporate Palestinian traditions "coming down from pre-Christian times," and the influence such traditions—and then Targums—have had on NT writings. These are three, perhaps four, important and distinct questions, which M. should have handled separately. Because of a tendency to say everything about a given text, his treatment suffers from a lack of clarity.

In one sense M.'s book is premature. Until we have at our disposal critical editions of the various Palestinian Targums and a mode of dating them independently of the NT material, comparison of such material with the NT will continue to repeat the arguments of circular reasoning that one meets all too frequently in this field of research. M. does well to object against the opinion of Díez Macho, who, while admitting that the Neofiti Targum was copied in the sixteenth century, insists that the text it reproduces goes back to the second century A.D. (p. 45). M.'s provisional judgment is that Neofiti has a basis that is "very old, but its present recension is from later and talmudic times" (p. 63). But how do we get back from such a period to "the PT paraphrase already in existence in New Testament times"?

One way in which M. would do this is to quote ancient texts which seem to have the same mode of translation or paraphrase of the OT that the so-called Palestinian Targum has. In this he cites rabbinical texts and the NT. His brief history of the Palestinian Targum (pp. 45–66) makes use of this method. However, it is far from certain that the texts quoted are really "citations" of the Palestinian Targum; the same Aramaic translation of an OT passage in a datable midrash may bear witness to a common Palestinian way of translating the passage. But it does not yet argue to the existence of the Palestinian Targum "as a unit" (p. 257); nor does it mean that the midrash "was citing the PT as we now have it in these texts [Peshitta, Fragmentary Targum, Neofiti glosses]" (p. 54). That such a common mode of translation of an OT passage reflects a Palestinian tradition, no one will
deny; but the early attestation of it does not permit one to conclude immediately that the Targum itself existed in a text form.

A similar lack of rigorous distinction and methodology is detected at times in M.'s discussion of NT passages. His discussion of "the second death" (Ap 2:11; 20:6, 14; 21:8) in its Targumic parallels is vitiated by the fact that two of the six are found in Onqelos and three of them in the Targum of the Prophets (which has nothing to do with the "Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch"). Again, we may cite his treatment of Paul's argument in Rom 10:6-8, which alludes to Dt 30:12-14. Paul seeks to contrast the ease of the new righteousness through faith with the difficulty of the old righteousness tied to the Law and its commandments. Paul seems to be quoting Scripture when he says, "Who will descend into the abyss," and glosses it, "that is, to bring Christ up from the dead." The Pauline argument is involved; but the point here is that the descent into the abyss is not in the Hebrew text of Dt 30:13, "who will go over the sea for us" (RSV). M. cites, however, Neofiti, which paraphrases Dt thus: "Neither is the Law beyond the Great Sea that one may say, 'Would that we had one like the prophet Jonah who would descend into the depths of the Great Sea and bring it up for us and make us hear the commandments that we might do them.' " M. adds in a footnote that the "Great Sea" ordinarily means in the OT the Mediterranean, into which Jonah was in fact tossed in the story. But, says M., "'The depths of the Great Sea' of PT Dt 30:13 are to be understood in the sense of 'abyss', nonetheless" (p. 75). This is far from obvious. The only reason why much is made of this Targumic phrase, "the depths of the Great Sea," in this discussion is because of Paul's reference to the abyss. Who would ever have thought of this in reading the Targum? The first step is to ascertain what the Targum itself means and not to be facilely misled by superficial, verbal similarities.

M. then proceeds to date this Targumic tradition about Dt 30:12-14 by establishing contact between its text and Pseudo-Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (15, 6) and 4 Ezra 3:18. "These two texts from the 1st cent. A.D. are in themselves an argument for the early date of the PT which represents the same terminology and concepts" (p. 76). Granting for the moment (but not admitting) the first-century date of Pseudo-Philo and that the contact indicated is valid, we follow M.'s argument further. "The conclusion that seems to flow from the facts of the case is that Paul knew of this paraphrase of the text of Dt and adapted it for his own purpose" (p. 77). The next paragraph begins: "The text of the PT as Paul found it was very apt for the doctrine Paul expresses in Rm 10:6-8." Thus we arrive at the point expected: from similarities in expression which may suggest the
over-all relation of the Palestinian Targum to the NT and its early date we
are led to the use by Paul of "the text of the PT."

I do not want to give the impression that M.'s work is wholly of this sort;
but there is enough of it to warn the reader that certain interpretations and
arguments need rigorous control. Minor criticism of the book must include a
host of English solecisms, many typographical errors, and the omission of
several frequently-used sigla from the list of abbreviations (HT, Nmg, P,
etc.).

Woodstock College and Yale Divinity School    JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

MARTYRDOM AND PERSECUTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH: A STUDY OF
A CONFLICT FROM THE MACCABEES TO DONATUS. By W. H. C. Frend.

This work was first published by Blackwell (Oxford) in 1965. In 1967 it
was published in the United States as a Doubleday Anchor Book, and it now
appears as a hardback under the New York University Press. In the Ameri­
can edition the notes, which in the original English edition follow the
respective chapters with which they are concerned, are relegated to the end
of the main text. Hence there is a wide discrepancy in the pagination of the
English and American editions.

The book is a major contribution to our knowledge of the early Church.
The author, who is favorably known to the scholarly world by his learned
articles but in particular by his elaborate monograph The Donatist Church:
A Movement of Protest in North Africa (Oxford, 1952), has now investigated
at length the problem of martyrdom and persecution in the early Church in
all its aspects from the beginnings to the Donatist period. Not only has he
brought to his task an unusual knowledge of the literary, epigraphical, and
archeological sources; he also exhibits an intimate acquaintance with the
organization and administration, and with the social, economic, intellectual,
and religious life, of the Roman Empire throughout its eastern and western
provinces. His treatment of the Maccabees indicates his familiarity with
Hellenistic Judaism, and with the Seleucid monarchy and its Hellenizing
program.

The list of chapters will give the reader a concrete idea of the compre­
hensive character of the work and of the treatment in detail that F. has
given to the various aspects of his subject: Introduction; 1, The Martyrs of
Lyons; 2, Judaism and Martyrdom; 3, Martyrdom in the New Testament
Period; 4, Rome and Foreign Cults; 5, The Legacy of the Hellenistic East to
A.D. 41; 6, The Church in the World to A.D. 70; 7, Old Israel and the New,
70–135; 8, Lord Caesar or Lord Christ, 70–138?; 9, The False Dawn, 135–

Persecution at the regional and local level is described in detail, and the attitudes of the persecuted and the persecutors are analyzed. In his treatment of Jewish and Christian martyrdom, especially in the case of Christians who sought and welcomed martyrdom, F. emphasizes repeatedly the influence of the example of Eleazar and the mother and her seven sons in 2 Mac 6 and 7. At the same time he deals fully with the moderate and more typical views on martyrdom adopted by Christian leaders like Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Cyprian. Jews and Christians were hated by the pagans for their exclusiveness, and outbreaks against Jews and persecutions of Christians were often inspired by popular charges of atheism, odium generis humani, and other crimes. Jews were excused from emperor worship, often in a grudging spirit of tolerance, but Christians who refused to participate in the imperial cult were regarded as enemies of the state and guilty of treason. F. seems preoccupied with the Christian fear of Jewish influence on Christian belief and practice and with a corresponding Jewish fear of Christian influence on Judaism. He stresses the tensions between Jews and Christians in the period before Constantine and maintains that there was a marked Jewish collaboration with the Roman authorities against Christianity—which was so repugnant to Judaism—especially as long as there was hope that Christianity could be destroyed.

The book is invaluable because of the richness of its content in detail, for its assembling of evidence from all possible sources, and for the generous citation of source material and of the pertinent modern scholarly literature in the copious notes. However, a number of criticisms must be made. As in his The Donatist Church, F. often injects into his exposition strong personal opinions that lead him to make statements or to formulate generalizations not warranted by the extant evidence. He tends to exaggerate the contemporary influence of Jewish ideas on martyrdom on the early Christians, forgetting that the *OT* in Greek had become a part of the Christian scriptural tradition. Scripture itself should certainly be regarded as the primary source of *OT* ideas and practices among Christians. Furthermore, Jewish influence, in any case, was confined to the relatively small number of large urban centers in East and West. Our knowledge of Jewish communities and their activities in the smaller centers is scanty or practically nil. As regards
collaboration of the Jews with the Roman authorities in the persecution of Christians, it should be observed that in the period from A.D. 70 to 135 at least, the violent conflicts between the Jews and the Roman authorities in Judea, Cyrene, Alexandria, and Cyprus ruled out any appreciable collaboration. On the contrary, in the last years of Hadrian, the Jewish religion itself came temporarily under the ban. The Jews were excluded from Jerusalem, and the Holy City itself became officially Aelia Capitolina.

F. overemphasizes the role of the Apocalypse in shaping the Christian attitude towards the Empire. The teachings of St. Paul were much more typical and influential in this respect. The significance of the Christian refusal to participate in the imperial cult is stressed as an official ground for persecution, but not enough is said about the vitality of the local cults of the pagan masses and of the universal popular hatred of the Christians as atheists and as the cause of plagues, droughts, and all manner of other calamities. Again, as in The Donatist Church, F., perhaps under the spell of Rostovtzeff, has gone much too far in setting up a sharp opposition between the Catholic Greco-Roman city dwellers and the rural peasantry of Berber extraction in North Africa. Nor does the evidence support his thesis that the persecutions led to the ultimate formal and permanent division of East and West. In the fourth century and in the early fifth there were close relations between East and West. It should be remembered that Christian Neoplatonism is central not only in the teachings of the Cappadocian Fathers, but also in Ambrose, Marius Victorinus, and Augustine. Finally, it must be noted that the work contains some factual errors and numerous misprints.

There is no indication that any corrections have been made in the American edition.

But this review should end on a constructive note. The misprints and factual errors can be taken care of in a revised edition. The book must be regarded as a major contribution to the history of the early Church and one that is destined to retain its value for a long time.

Catholic Univ. of America

MARTIN R. P. McGuire


Prof. Brown's book is far and away the best comprehensive biography of Augustine to have appeared thus far in any language. The enterprise is one that had already discouraged many a seasoned Augustinian scholar. To appreciate its magnitude, one needs only to be reminded of the 5,502 items included in van Bavel's bibliography for the 1950-60 period alone, or of the
430-odd titles listed each year in the Bulletin published by the Revue des études augustiniennes.

B.’s approach is at once chronological and topical. The book is divided into thirty-six short or relatively short chapters, each one of which focuses on some important theme, issue, or event relating to the life and thought of Augustine. Although obviously well acquainted with the more important recent disputes among historians and scholars, B. has generally refrained from entering the lists on one side or the other and has preferred to deal with controversial points in an expository and nonpolemical manner. The same serene objectivity marks the unusually thorough and well-balanced treatment of such complex issues as the Donatist and Pelagian controversies. Not the least of the book’s many attractive features is the manner in which Augustine’s thought is constantly related to the historical situations that constitute the matrix within which it took shape or out of which it evolved.

The result is not only an up-to-date account of Augustine’s life but a new assessment of his entire literary activity and of his many-sided personality, based on a judicious use of ancient sources and the best findings of modern scholarship. As such, the book could serve as an excellent starting point for the study of virtually every major aspect of Augustine’s life or thought. Its usefulness is further enhanced by a series of tables which relate the major events of Augustine’s life to contemporary events and list his works in chronological order, along with all existing English translations of these works.

As the Preface indicates, the plane on which B. has chosen to move lies somewhere between the routine of Augustine’s daily life and the heights of his philosophic and theological speculations. The question that immediately arises concerns the extent to which one can exclude Augustine’s highest principles from one’s purview and still do full justice to the subject matter at hand. A case in point is the somewhat misleading, if not erroneous, statement that for Augustine “the ‘highest pitch’ of wisdom was available to any moderately educated and serious mind” (p. 120). Augustine appears to have been anything but an egalitarian in that sense, as he himself has often intimated (cf. De ordine 1, 1, 1; 2, 5, 16; 4, 16, 44; De beata vita 1, 1, etc.).

The fact that the characters of the early Dialogues do not at first glance constitute a particularly promising group is no proof to the contrary, since one of the purposes of the dialogue form in the ancient philosophic tradition is precisely to draw attention to the natural differences among men and to the crucial significance of these differences in any philosophic or theological discussion. Equally perplexing to this reader are B.’s remarks about prayer
as a recognized vehicle for philosophic enquiry or of philosophy as a concentrated act of prayer (pp. 165–66). A closer examination of the famous statement to that effect in *Enneads* 5, 1, 6 would probably reveal that for Plotinus, as for Plato, true piety is philosophy or the very antithesis of prayer as Augustine understands it.

B.’s analysis of Augustine’s allegorical method of interpretation is likewise open to criticism on certain points. It would perhaps be more accurate and helpful to say that the position taken by Augustine is analogous to that of Plato rather than to that of Freud (cf. p. 261). Augustine’s conception of the Bible as an organic and perfectly intelligible whole, whose obscurities and apparent contradictions are an invitation to ferret out hidden meanings in the text, draws heavily upon sources that may be traced back to Plato’s thematic discussion of books and book writing in the *Phaedrus* and has little in common with Freud’s anal science of interpretation. What is really at stake in this matter is Augustine’s whole theory of hermeneutics, of which unfortunately there exists no first-rate treatment at the present moment. B. observes rightly, as others have done before him, that Augustine hardly ever attacks contemporary forms of pagan worship and that his lengthy critique of pagan cults in the *City of God*, based for the most part on Varro, is largely anachronistic. According to B., Augustine’s method of procedure is explained by his conviction that the pagans of his time could best be reached through their libraries (p. 305). There are reasons to believe, however, that Augustine and his audience were less bookish than some recent scholars are inclined to think. In keeping with Augustine’s own principles, one might venture to suggest that this great “secularizer” of the pagan past (p. 266) showed classical restraint in dealing with civil religion and was considerably less “secular” in his approach to this problem than most of his latter-day disciples.

Finally, B. detects an inconsistency in the fact that Augustine occasionally ridicules certain popular attitudes (e.g., the belief in the value of dreams), while appealing elsewhere to these same beliefs to bend the shocking hardness of reasonable pagans (p. 415). It cannot be denied that Augustine contradicts himself; but these “contradictions” do not necessarily imply a compromise with the opinions of the multitude or an evolution in his thought. They are often explained by the different audiences to whom his remarks are addressed. This simple rhetorical device was by no means an uncommon one. It reminds us, among other things, of the method used by Plato, who sides with the vulgar against the Sophists or with the Sophists against the vulgar, as the circumstances of the case demand.

The foregoing observations are offered less as a criticism than as an ex-
ample of the limitations inherent in B.'s approach. They leave intact the
many other merits of this outstanding and timely book. Augustine lived in
an age of rapid and dramatic change. As a learned, indefatigable, and un-
usually penetrating man, he was able to renew Christianity by adapting it
to the circumstances of his time and thus shape its destiny for centuries to
come. In Augustine, more than in anyone else, traditional or so-called Hel-
lenized Christianity may be said to have received its classic expression.
In this important respect, B.'s book adds a much-needed historical dimen-
sion to the current debate concerning the de-Hellenization of Christian
thought.


ERNEST L. FORTIN

MARTIN LUTHER'S 95 THESSES. Edited by Kurt Aland. St. Louis: Con-

Aland is Director of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research
in Münster and Professor of Church History in the Münster Protestant
Theology Faculty. Many will know him from his exchanges with Joachim
Jeremías over the evidence for the practice of infant baptism in the early
Church. Another phase of A.'s productivity is his scholarly work on the
young Luther. In Der Weg zur Reformation (Munich: Kaiser, 1965), he
marshaled arguments in agreement with Ernst Bizer for the 1518 dating of
Luther's liberating discovery of the doctrine of justification implicit in
Rom 1:17. The present translation is the collection of texts A. contributed
in 1965 to the debate over the historicity of Luther's theses-posting on Oct.
31, 1517.

A.'s Introduction, revised in February 1967, first situates the events of late
1517 in the course of Luther's career from 1512 to 1520. After a brief de-
fense of the credibility of Melanchthon's 1546 narration of the theses-post-
ing, A. turns to the five groups of texts which make up the body of the book
(pp. 23–96). First, there are three retrospective accounts from Luther and
Melanchthon on the beginning of the Reformation. Luther's ninety-five
theses and "Sermon on Indulgence and Grace" follow. The third part gives
letters from Luther which pertain to the debate. Fourth, there are ten ex-
cerpts from Luther's Table Talk; last, two other recollections in which
Luther spoke of the events of late 1517.

The essential part of this book is A.'s notes (pp. 97–116) on the docu-
ments. Here he carries on his controversy with E. Iserloh (cf. TS 28 [1967]
412) and K. Honselmann, both of whom contend that Luther simply sent
his theses to the Archbishop of Magdeburg and Mainz on Oct. 31, and with
Hanz Volz, who argues for a posting on Nov. 1, 1517. We can summarize
A.'s argument for a public posting on Oct. 31 in four points. (1) A. accepts the reliability of Melanchthon's 1546 account. (2) He finds the posting implied in a letter of Nov. 4 or 5 to Georg Spalatin in which Luther mentions how people are talking about the theses. (3) A. gives an elaborate reconstruction of the correspondence of the Nuremberg lawyer C. Scheurl, arguing that by Nov. 5 Scheurl had a copy of the theses which had been sent to him from Wittenberg by someone other than Luther himself. (4) The form of the theses and standard university practice indicate that the theses were intended for use in a disputation and not for perusal by the bishops.

There are, however, difficulties with these arguments. (1) There is no explanation forthcoming for Melanchthon's long silence about the theses-posting during Luther's lifetime, e.g., in the chronicle he published under the name of J. Carion in editions of 1532, 1537, and 1543. (2) Honzelmann recently brought evidence that the letter to Spalatin must be dated in February 1518, and so is not immediately relevant in reconstructing the events of Oct. 31, 1517 (Theologie und Glaube 57 [1967] 358 f.). (3) Hans Volz has presented strong evidence to show that the theses Scheurl had on Nov. 5 were Luther's ninety-eight theses against Scholastic nominalism from early September (Luther 38 [1967] 135-37). (4) Iserloh's argument is not that Luther wrote his theses for the bishop, but that he did in fact include them with his letter to Archbishop Albrecht on Oct. 31 and that he then waited two weeks or more for some answer before he circulated them among his friends and colleagues.

More important than these details is A.'s failure to deal adequately with four statements by Luther himself which weigh heavily against a posting on Oct. 31. A. gives these texts (pp. 25, 35, 75, and 76), but he passes over the way Luther argues in them that the bishops were at fault for not using the time he gave them to respond to his warning about Tetzel. For example, Luther wrote to the Saxon Prince-Elector Frederick in November 1518: "Not even any of my intimate friends was aware of this disputation except the Most Reverend Lord Archbishop of Magdeburg and the Lord James, Bishop of Brandenburg. For as it was in their interest to prevent such monstrous abuses, I humbly and reverently warned these men by private letters, before I should publish the disputation, that they should watch over Christ's sheep against these wolves" (given by A., p. 76). If Luther's version is honest and straightforward, then there was an interval between the sending of the theses to Albrecht on Oct. 31 and their publication and further circulation.

Further, it seems in place to remark that the debate over the nailing or mailing (only) of the ninety-five theses is a side issue in the scholarly enter-
prise of research on Luther and interpretation of his theological work. The readers of TS will soon find the main "action" in the work of a new generation of Catholic scholars like Harry McSorley, Otto Pesch, and Peter Manns, to name but three, who are beginning a new substantive dialogue on questions of grace, freedom, justification, and faith. Removing the hammer from Luther's hand on Oct. 31 is a small gain, which does in fact serve to clarify Luther's intention of going through correct channels in his pastoral intervention over the worsening situation in indulgence preaching. Those, however, who accept A.'s conclusion will save their Reformation Day heroics, but lose this more just and engaging image of Luther.

Bellarmine School of Theology

JARED WICKS, S.J.

STRASBOURG AND THE REFORM: A STUDY IN THE PROCESS OF CHANGE.

The period of the Reformation offers a fertile field in which to observe the interplay between ideas and institutions. C. takes her point of departure for this study in intellectual history from the small geographic area of sixteenth-century Strasbourg. Perhaps what distinguishes her study most from the excellent studies of G. Strauss on Nuremberg and Monter on Geneva is indicated by the treatment of her material in (1) a study of major institutions prior to the Reformation, (2) an examination of the process of change during the Reformation, and (3) a determination of the impact of the new ideology on the traditional government institutions, the old established structure, and the customary social patterns.

Under Part 1, C. examines first the economic structure and discovers Strasbourg to be in a geographically advantageous situation and suffering no significant economic depression prior to the Reformation. Then an analysis of the sociopolitical structure reveals a period of mobility from the thirteenth century to the sixteenth, with an emergence of a permanent group of committees in political control out of "an oligarchy controlled by a small, self-contained and self-perpetuating group drawn from a commercial patriciate" (p. 14). C. attributes the great stability of this structure between 1480–1789 to an emotional response for an ordered society as opposed to the desire for change and the existence of the political, social, and economic inequalities. A helpful chart is provided to view this emergence from 1200–1450 in the various governing civil and ecclesiastical bodies. As in other cities of reformative activity during the period, ecclesiastical offices, functions, and power were gradually assumed by civil authorities.
The intellectual milieu was awakened by a group of young Christian humanists who either immigrated to Strasbourg or returned from studies at Freiburg, Heidelberg, Basel, Erfurt, or Bologna. Their religious preoccupations were reflected in pietistic and nationalistic poetry as well as in such controversies as the interesting one on the Immaculate Conception. A full-fledged debate raged in the city and in Alsace from 1509 to 1512, with Brant and the humanists defending the Immaculate Conception and the Dominicans rejecting it. Doctrinal development is dynamic!

The brief account of Geiler von Kaysersberg's efforts to promote internal reform reads like a partial account of Gerson's or Savonarola's careers. I would have preferred greater clarity and coherence in the discussion on Geiler's opposition to the appeal of the clergy to the pope to keep their concubines. C. claims that the pope ruled that convents should be left as they were even if the nuns and monks sinned (p. 70). But is this not a response to the problem of laxity within the religious communities rather than to the problem of clerical concubinage?

In the second part of C.'s study, certain protagonists actually effect reform during the years 1520-34. A handful of intellectuals, both pro-Lutherans and the influential people's priests like Bucer, Capito, Zell, and Hedio, and a significant number of civil magistrates with a laissez-faire attitude combined with the preachers of a "pure word of God" doctrine. By 1525 the equalization of the clergy and burghers, the establishment of an almost exclusive liturgy of the word (though liturgical reform was a slow, tenuous process terminating only in 1529), and the confiscation of ecclesiastical property by the city mainly for charitable purposes had been achieved.

C.'s discussion of Bucer's important role in the reformation of Strasbourg and his influence on such a personage as Calvin reminds one of the serious need for a current and more definitive English study of his ecclesiological, Eucharistic, and ecumenical impact. It also reminds one that in terms of the present reform one should be wary of legislative morality and institutionalism or the supposition that discipline in religious matters makes men more holy. Bucer, perhaps as a "disappointed Dominican, a vigorous perfectionist," was unduly influenced by this perspective, which in turn influenced Calvin. However, the former was not successful in forming a copartnership with the civil authorities, as was the latter.

The survival of the "old church," i.e., the Roman Catholic Church, occurred due to the retention of basic financial units, viz., chapters, courts, and episcopal administration. Is this a corroboration of the cliché "real power lay with money"? The reformers sought sincere dialogue and recon-
ciliation with the bishop, but he refused to accept any major reform of the Mass or to permit a married clergy.

The new church was a state church, and only in the areas of education and welfare did the reformers create a change close to their original conceptions of what the church should be. But education and spiritual renewal were interdependent to the reformers. By the late 1530's an impressive system of education had been established ranging from the centralization of administrators to adult and theological programs. The undergirding and original contribution of the Strasbourg reformers was that the common good (gemeinen nütz) would benefit from the education of the individual.

Reform of the public-welfare sector was a normal outgrowth of preceding developments with the acquisition of this sector by the Ratsherren. The average burgher did not accept his social responsibilities unless they assured him of eternal rewards. The economic life remained remarkably stable in spite of a degree of inflation. The laborers discovered a new sense of dignity through the promotion of a theology of work. Though minor success was achieved in the equality of clergy and burghers, social fragmentation occurred in the creation of a series of separate groups. Through all this the political power remained in the same hands and the constitution remained unaltered from 1480-1789.

C.'s style has a pleasant vitality and her sources are of the first order. She should have included the early studies of J. Smend and F. Hubert on particular elements in the Strasbourg reform, those of W. Pauck and G. J. van de Poll on Bucer, and A. Ganoczy on Calvin. This is a competent and useful contribution to Reformation studies.

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont. JOHN R. MEYER


Historians have long argued the importance of St. John Fisher as a promoter of humanist educational reforms, as an able apologist for the Catholic faith against the Protestant Luther, and as one who together with Thomas More stood in opposition to his king's renunciation of Queen Catherine and the related enforcement of royal supremacy over the Church of England. It has been recognized that this friend of Erasmus and More was a critic of the Church, a promoter of the study of Scripture and the Fathers in the humanist mode. But it has also been recognized that the
Bishop of Rochester was more conservative than Erasmus, a stanch defender of the authority of the Church and its hierarchy over Scripture, a man whose fidelity to his Catholic conscience led to violent death by execution on Tower Hill in 1535. As with More, it has long been realized that there was a marked development in Fisher from a strongly Christian humanist position before the advent of Luther as reformer to a more conservative, though still markedly humanist, position thereafter.

In this scholarly book by Prof. Surtz we are confronted by a serious attempt to locate the “position” of Fisher. Thus S. says that his purpose is to see Fisher “against the intellectual background of the Renaissance and the Reformation,” and “to ascertain his precise position on such key points as the nature and function of a university, humanism and Scholasticism, Greek and Hebrew, corruption and reform, orthodoxy and heresy, faith and justification, grace and the sacraments, the Church and the pope, the bishops and councils, priesthood and laity, tradition and Scripture, and so on.” And he seeks to do this by means of a detailed examination of Fisher’s writings, both English and Latin. Here it must be noted that this is the first detailed, scholarly examination of all of Fisher’s writings; for this reason alone the book is of great importance.

The quest for an understanding of Fisher’s position in relation to the Renaissance and Reformation leads through a close examination of his writings during three periods. The first (1497–1517) is that of the Catholic humanist, chiefly involving sermons and the statutes for the two Cambridge colleges he founded. The second (1517–27) is that of the ecclesiastical protagonist, and the writings here consist chiefly of works against Jacques Lefèvre d’Etaples, Martin Luther, and Oecolampadius. The third (1527–35) is that of the royal antagonist, and involves writings against the royal divorce and devotional works prepared at the Tower. In the first chapters S. briefly reviews Fisher’s life in relation to his writings; he then examines the contents of all the writings to determine Fisher’s position vis-à-vis a number of important issues ranging from the authority of the Church in relation to Scripture and tradition to Fisher’s education philosophy and his promotion of Greek and Hebrew; in the final chapters he reviews the writings once more, now in chronological order, discussing Fisher’s method and style. In this last part S. reveals most clearly his ability as a historian of literature. All this he does with many helpful references to the background in Renaissance and Reformation and with copious footnotes in which, among other things, he discusses contributions by modern scholars on the subjects he is treating.

The result is that S. finds Fisher to have been both a Christian humanist,
akin to Erasmus and More, and a Catholic churchman, vehemently opposed to heresy as he understands it in the light of the Church’s approved teachings. He held a very high view of the Church and its authority and was convinced that “the pope iure diuino is the head of the vnyuersall chyrche of christ.” And yet he strongly urged the reform of the Church, reform which could be achieved in harmony with his views of the Church and the papacy; for he meant “the renovation of the Christian life, not a change in Christian teaching or theology.” Nevertheless, S. concludes, with considerable support from his research, that Fisher was a Christian humanist and that his position is to be located among the great figures of the Renaissance; for although he was medieval in doctrinal systematization and synthesis, yet he was of the Renaissance “insofar as in this synthesis there are new emphases, e.g. on exegesis and patrology.” Much more ought to be said here, and I would note the interesting way in which S. summarizes Fisher’s teachings on grace, which he believes bear resemblance to those of the Protestants.

This study confirms what many of us have known on the basis of a more limited acquaintance with Fisher’s writings. S. may be correct in stating that the Cardinal was a significant figure of the Renaissance, but I must contend for a more moderate conclusion in the light of the understanding that the Renaissance involved an intellectual revolution, philosophical and theological, at the heart of men’s convictions, issuing in time in such modern skepticism as that of Hobbes. Fisher remained at heart a Catholic churchman, whose spirit revolted against all that threatened the heart of faith. In this regard he was more with the Reformation than with the Renaissance, although he differed violently with Luther.

Cambridge, Mass.

JOHN E. BOOTY


The word “Modernism” is so often heard that it is quite startling to realize how few, if any, competent works on the subject we have produced in America. John Ratté of Amherst here presents us with a historical study which introduces two major figures and one minor figure of the movement.

The tone of the work is admirable. There is no strident attack or justification. R. presents his characters with full sensitivity to the problems they faced. Loisy as a person still remains an enigmatic figure, but R. offers a sound chronological introduction to his main ideas as found in his early works, especially in the pseudonymous Firmin articles and in L’Evangile
et l'église and Autour d'un petit livre. Harnack's ideas, which Loisy used as a foil for his own publication, are discussed at length.

R. brings out well the flesh-and-blood character of Tyrrell, the melancholy which hangs over his writing and spirit, and the confusing bewilderment which arises out of his dialectic, paradox, quip, and mordant wit. R. holds that what Tyrrell produced was not a work for "the faith of the millions" which he so cherished, but rather a way out of an impasse for himself. But I think that he ended in a tortured grappling with problems which did not satisfy even himself. Sullivan, who was not of the same intellectual stature as Loisy or Tyrrell, was an American Modernist, a Paulist who became a Unitarian minister but maintained a large attraction for Catholicism and a dissatisfaction with Unitarianism. R. has done original documentary work on Sullivan's letters and diary, and this section is the most satisfactory part of the book as well as the most intelligible.

R. seems to take too lightly the biblical criticism of the Modernists. "They mistook the bare beginnings of the scientific study of the Bible for a mature and infallible discipline." While this is true, many of their basic questions are still definite problems, and R. offers little light in showing where their work is compatible or incompatible with Catholicism or with modern scriptural and theological work.

The section on Tyrrell, filled with quotation, is almost as bewildering as Tyrrell's own thought. R.'s evaluations are rather elusive and not incisive. One would look for a better sifting of currents leading to an effort at synthesis and an evaluation of some length. The section on Tyrrell is more descriptive than analytic, and Tyrrell needs careful analysis if Catholics at least are to profit from him. Tyrrell's ideas on "the Church of the future" are given ample space, as well as his battle both with orthodox Catholicism and with liberal Protestantism. One notes in certain circles a growing sympathy for Tyrrell. But I think it is still painfully clear that, even after all the diatribe is sifted off, his Church of the future has no theological or even common-sense continuity with Roman Catholicism as it has always presented itself. The pope, councils, and certain dogmas are rejected without any careful, sympathetic endeavor to study the genesis of the problems. What is this gigantic phenomenon which we call Roman Catholicism? To reject it in Tyrrell's way is to set up greater problems than one has thought he has solved. But many of Tyrrell's peripheral positions, as on some questions of authority, were farseeing and are still significant.

R. gives a genuine taste for the agonies undergone during the Modernist period. He supplies the reader with good bibliographical data on the Modernist movement and in many cases has gone to the original sources, especially
for Tyrrell and Sullivan. At the same time there is not enough endeavor at clear-cut, if tentative, evaluation, a delicate task no doubt but one which even the historian must essay. I think the main problem is that R. has tried too much. Tyrrell or Loisy alone deserves a full study. However, the book is a needed contribution to the study of Modernism by Americans, and the scholar will find here much valuable information made easily accessible.

Fordham University

JOHN J. HEANEY, S.J.


This is the first of a projected series of eight volumes collecting Schillebeeckx’ scattered writings. Five further titles in the series will be: God and Man; World and Church; Priest and Layman; Jesus, the Christ; Church and Sacrament; the last two volumes will deal with spirituality and the religious life. Some of these eight divisions may be further divided; that is the case with Revelation and Theology, the second part of which is already on the way.

We must be extremely grateful to the publishers for making this series available in English. Let me stress the word “available.” In this age of symposia the reader has an enormously complicated task just keeping track of his favorite author’s publications; they are apt to be hidden away in any unknown volume of proceedings or appear under the most unlikely title. And, of course, available in English: the Dutch (or Flemish) language in which S. writes so much of his work is not yet a world language, and we are especially grateful to N. D. Smith for his smooth-running translation. All in all, this is a most promising publishing venture.

The date of original publication of writings in this first volume ranges from 1945 to 1963. Most were dictionary articles for the three-volume Theologisch Woordenboek, which came out in 1952, 1957, and 1958; a few appeared in periodicals; one was S.’s contribution to the symposium Dogmatic versus Biblical Theology. From his Preface we learn that S. has not changed the original to any extent and is anxious to preserve its documentary character. This purpose will surely commend itself to any theologian with an eye for the historical, but the execution does not avoid lapses. For one thing, the titles are often changed. I insist on the gravity of this apparently small point: it quite disorients the reader and is not fair to the author when an article called “Lex orandi lex credendi” appears as a chapter with the title “The Liturgy and Theology”; the content of this chapter,
quite normal under the original heading, is definitely inadequate under the new title. I suspect that some editor along the way wished to give the chapters of this volume a superficial unity; however, this method of achieving unity defeats the author's purpose.

It remains true that the general title of the book is well chosen and that the topics included are of special interest just when the role of theology itself and its relation to Scripture, to life, to everything under the sun, are so much in question. S. writes on revelation, Scripture, tradition, and teaching authority, on revelation in reality and revelation in word, on the development of dogma, on what theology is, on its relation to the Bible, on the creeds, on the loci theologici, etc. He has a reputation as a thinker and his ideas are worth pondering, but what especially struck me was the balance of his theological judgment. For example, on "existential" and "dogmatic" faith there is no one-sided pleading, but a sane respect for complementarity (p. 216); a similar attitude appears in his position on the theocentric and the Christocentric in theology (pp. 127-28). No doubt the original dictionary context aided this sobriety in many of the articles, though even there S. does not fail to show his individuality.

Perhaps I may say that, though his positions are sober, S.'s style does not quite correspond. Words like "always," "every," "only," "completely," occur with noticeable frequency. "Always" is a fine old Catholic word but is extremely hard to verify. I believe this rather minor point is something of a key to the sort of work S. is trying to do in theology and to the role these contributions may play in the longer history of the science. We have here neither the treatise with its carefully defined statements nor the thoroughgoing monograph with its full coverage of a narrow point. What we have, when S. is most personal, are the intelligent reflections of one who is very much involved in making theology a force in the world but perhaps for that very reason is prevented from doing work of the sort we used to call "monumental."

This is not to complain that S. wrote these essays and not something else I think he should write, but it is meant to set his contribution in perspective and to point up a real problem of our times. S.'s great fellow Dominican, Thomas Aquinas, was very much involved in his world, far more than most people realize, but the information explosion today makes it almost impossible to emulate his achievement, to be very much in the world and yet see all things steadily and see them whole. That underlines the problem, for vast information does not eliminate the need for sweeping vision and intelligence; it simply makes the need more urgent.

Regis College, Willowdale, Ont.  
F. E. Crowe, S.J.
LE PÉCHÉ ORIGINE DANS LA TRADITION PATRISTIQUE ET THÉOLOGIQUE.

At a time when so many novel theories are being proposed in interpretation of the doctrine of original sin, historical study from the hand of a scholar so ably equipped as Rondet is especially welcome. The present volume, which worthily complements his Gratia Christi, is divided into three sections: (1) from the origin of the doctrine to Augustine; (2) the Augustinian tradition; (3) original sin and modern consciousness, which concludes with R.'s own interesting "working hypothesis."

Augustine is the pivotal figure in the first two sections, which trace the sources of his doctrine and indicate its prevalence through subsequent centuries. Accepting the exegesis of A.-M. Dubarle, R. is impressed by the relative silence of Scripture on the doctrine as it came to be classically formulated—a strange silence which prevails likewise in the early Church. Though strong in their stress of the redemptive work of Christ, the Apostolic Fathers and the Apologists relate man's sinfulness not to Adam but to Satan, "the father of lies from the beginning."

It is only with Irenaeus that we find the beginnings of our present doctrine and, interestingly enough, his teaching bears a much closer resemblance to current hypotheses than to the traditional Augustinian synthesis. Adam's sin was not a catastrophic calamity, but a misuse of freedom which set the direction for other and greater sinners. However, in God's good providence, sin plays a positive role, leading men to deeper love of God in gradual spiritual progress towards the fulness of Christ, who is the recapitulation and term of all history and mankind. In substantial agreement with Irenaeus are Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Chrysostom, all of whom serve, in R.'s view, as a healthy corrective to the Augustinian emphasis.

Augustine draws his inspiration from Philo (the first to introduce the marvelously privileged Adam, whose punishment was enslavement in the tomb of the body), from Tertullian (whose theory of traducianism held great fascination for Augustine), and from Origen. These influences, added to his faulty Latin translation of the Greek text of Rom 5:12 and the pressures of Pelagian optimistic naturalism, formed the matrix of Augustine's famous doctrine. His basic formulation remained substantially unchanged, as R. points out in his second section, down to the present time. In 1920 Billot was still asking how all mankind was contained in and therefore fell with Adam, our physical first father.

After searching for traces of this doctrine in modern philosophers (Kant, Spinoza, Herder) and non-Catholic theologians (Kierkegaard, Schleiermacher, Berdyaev), R. situates present thought on Gn 2–3 and monogenism,
thereby setting the stage for his own hypothesis, which is more Irenaean than Augustinian. “Adam” is all mankind, whose countless personal sins constitute the Fall. Created unto Christ, sinful man can be redeemed only by Christ, who is the Alpha and the Omega of all creation.

R.’s book has the merits and the disadvantages of a brief survey. A more thorough treatment is appearing in a series by J. Gross entitled Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündedogmas, two volumes of which currently cover the period from the Bible to the early Scholastics.

Loyola College, Baltimore

JAMES L. CONNOR, S.J.


This slim but stimulating volume develops more fully some Christological convictions expressed by the author over a period of more than twenty-five years, notably in The Church and the Reality of Christ (1962), The Death of Christ (1958), and in three works of the 1940’s subsequently collected in Jesus: Lord and Christ (1958). Most characteristic of Knox’s viewpoint is his insistence on the social and ecclesial character of the Incarnation, which takes place primarily in the Church, and in Jesus only as the central and initial phase or verification of the Church.

The present work offers first in three chapters an interpretation of Christological development in the NT. In and around the “Incarnationism” of NT Christology, K. believes it possible to discern three stages, to which he assigns the names adoptionism, kenoticism, and docetism. Though neither John nor Paul nor Hebrews simply embraced any of the three Christologies, the tensions and even inconsistencies of these writers in expressing the mystery of Christ are highlighted.

The three remaining chapters present, on the basis of this understanding of NT Christology, K.’s own views. His basic concern is the full humanity of Jesus. Pre-existence is accepted as a “story,” that is, an imaged effort to express the reality of the saving event that took place in Jesus. But when one is speaking of reality and not of “story,” there is no room for conceiving that a divine person became a man in such a way that the eternal Son of God and Jesus of Nazareth would be one and the same “he.”

One must admire the honesty and courage of a Christian theologian who for a quarter century has struggled for an ever-deeper understanding of the mystery of Christ. And this volume contains much that is valuable and stimulating. It is one more voice in an almost unanimous chorus today which insists that we let Jesus be a man. But mention must be made of
what are, in the present reviewer's mind, real shortcomings. As with not a few works today, one has the uneasy feeling of being exposed to a kind of hermeneutical extrapolation, in which the inspired passages serve as little more than clues. The use of later terms like adoptionism to designate the less reflective early Christologies is probably unwise. The lack of serious attention to the functional-ontological distinction employed by Oscar Cullmann, Gregory Dix, and now commonly, is a sign that even a modest effort of interpretation cannot entirely dispense with questions of genre and mentality. Logical contradiction is too readily affirmed between pre-existence and the fulness of humanity. One looks for clear proof of several assertions: e.g., that "the affirmation of Jesus' pre-existence was all but implicit in the affirmation of God's foreknowledge of him" (p. 10).

The source of K.'s insistence that a sin-free humanity cannot be "normal" would seem to be not the NT writings themselves, as inspired or inerrant; for K. is convinced that the NT development has been sometimes distorting. One finds it hard to avoid the impression that the root of K.'s Christology is a (very contemporary) concern for Jesus' full kinship with us. One may share this preoccupation without seeing an essential incompatibility with other aspects of the integral mystery of Christ, and within an interpretation of NT development which sees deeper understanding where K. sees deviation.

It is ironic, finally, that this antidocetic Christology lays itself open to a certain functional docetism. In a revealing sentence K. asks: "Was the event significant because of what God did or because of what Jesus was?" (p. 60). He clearly chooses the former alternative, and speaks repeatedly of our salvation as an event. That it was indeed an event, and that its primary aspect was God's deed of power, is inescapable. But to neglect the fact that who and what Jesus was makes all the difference for the character of the event is immeasurably to reduce the event from its full significance. And to slight the fact that the great deed of Yahweh in human history was precisely a human reality, the sacrificial and redeeming love of a human heart, seems a kind of Christological occasionalism which, by missing the greatness of this man, misses also God's glory. A too exclusive concern with the action of God in Jesus can yield the paradox: one struggles to the death to assert a full humanity which, in the end, receives or channels, without actively communicating, human salvation.

Woodstock College

THOMAS E. CLARKE, S.J.

A most frequent subject of ecumenical discussion and writing is the sacrament of baptism. The title of Dr. Moody's book at first sight would seem to indicate a study of this kind, considering baptism as the foundation of unity among Christians. Closer inspection reveals that it actually deals with a very specific aspect: a critique of the theology and practice of infant baptism. In this sense the title is too generic and does not indicate that a most specific aspect of baptism is the subject matter of the entire study.

The major portion of the book surveys the discussions in the various Protestant traditions, and M. has used well the primary and secondary sources as a basis for his conclusions. Certainly the various theological and historical issues involved have obvious ecumenical repercussions. "Between Pedobaptists and Baptists the problem of infant Baptism has been more of a barrier than claims for the episcopacy" (p. 14).

After an introductory chapter that is a survey of the problem as it now appears in both the Roman Catholic tradition and in the ecumenical movement, the major discussions on infant baptism in the various Protestant traditions are interpreted for the light they provide for Christian unity. These chapters treat of the Reformed tradition, the Lutheran tradition, the Anglican tradition, and finally the Free Church tradition. Certainly the tension born of the dilemma with the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century still persists in the Protestant communities and accounts for the diversity of practice in infant baptism. Though lineally unrelated to the Anabaptists, those who do not practice infant baptism show doctrinal affinity with them. What is so valuable in this study is that it offers a major survey of recent thought on the question.

In his conclusions M. shows well the historical problem found in attempting to prove the universality of the practice of infant baptism from the very beginning of Christianity. This is accomplished by setting forth the debate between Joachim Jeremías and Kurt Aland. In his practical conclusions M. indicates several proposals for reform in both theology and practice that hold some promise of progress in the striving after Christian unity. The more recent Anglican approach is called most promising. It tends toward a rejection of infant baptism, since it would do away with the basis of such a practice, original sin. Adult baptism would be the norm, and children born in Christian households would be enrolled as catechumens. After preparation and personal profession of faith, the three sacraments of Christian initiation would be received at the same time.

From the ecumenical viewpoint M. points out that a dual position as an interim solution seems to be the only way. In other words, infant and adult baptism would be accepted as alternative practices, though he thinks that
one of the two forms will increase while the other decreases. He puts it this way: "in a renewed church reaching those outside Christian households in great numbers, conversion-baptism or believers' baptism may increase, but infant baptism will no doubt prevail in a situation in which the baptism of Christian children is routine. Reunion alone will have limited value if it is not associated with reform radical enough to promote renewal. Baptismal reform will remain a part of the unfinished reformation if this is neglected" (p. 304).

In a work treating of the problems of the theology and practice of infant baptism, the inclusion of the Roman tradition would seem logical enough. Actually, in an ecumenical work of this type this could have been accomplished very easily by stating the Catholic position on the absolute necessity for salvation of the actual reception of baptism for infants, adding some of the explanations on how faith is supplied by the Church in their case. Instead, M. gives the impression that there is much reaction and reinterpretation in the Roman tradition. In showing this, he cites authors and their theories as regards the fate of infants dying without baptism. The variety of opinions in this area is well known, but there is not the least disagreement about the theology and practice that gives rise to this knotty problem. Moreover, is it correct to speak of these theories as related to three monastic orders: the Benedictines, the Dominicans, and the Jesuits? Those devising such solutions at times happen to be members of these orders, but the orders as such do not represent distinct schools of thought in any way. It is unfortunate that M. does not handle this portion of the book with greater precision and clarity. Ecumenically it gives little understanding of the Catholic position, and the reader will leave this section misinformed or at best confused and bewildered. Apart from this, M.'s book is most valuable in helping us to understand the ecumenical implications resulting from the variety of teaching and practice in the Protestant traditions as regards infant baptism.

_Sacred Heart Monastery, Aurora, Ill._

**PAUL J. HILL, M.S.C.**


The title of this study is derived from words used by Charles Wesley to refer to his preaching and administration of the Lord's Supper. The problem undertaken is the correct interpretation of the phrase in a Eucharistic context: Roman Catholics, says Hildebrandt (Philadelphia Professor of Christian Theology at Drew University), offer Christ in one way (sacrifice) and classical Protestantism in quite another way (proclamation). The
first section deals with the Roman thesis, the Reformation antithesis, and several attempts at synthesis. Having established that there is a basic opposition between Roman Catholic teaching and that of the Reformers, H. then takes the case to the forum of Scripture. Here the witness of the Epistle to the Hebrews decides the case in favor of the Reformers. On scriptural authority, therefore, it is incorrect to say that the Church is united to Christ in the offering of the one acceptable sacrifice of the Cross during the Eucharistic liturgy. Rather one must say that Christ is offered to men in the Eucharist and they respond with an act of thanksgiving for the gift received. The sacrifice of praise made by the community is the only sacrifice offered to God in the Lord’s Supper, and it is offered as a response to the Eucharistic gift. This is the viewpoint sanctioned by Hebrews, which teaches that “we are now in the post-communion stage after the redemptive work of our great High Priest is completed” (p. 199).

The Roman thesis concerning the sacrifice of the Mass is, in general, correctly presented. At times the interpretation of the common opinion of theologians and disputed points leaves something to be desired. The effort to present in a compact way a good deal of material often results in ambiguity. For example, the statement is made that “it is beyond debate that the Mass works ex opere operato” (p. 18). From the context one would gather that all Catholic theologians hold that salvific effects are produced just because a Mass is celebrated, that it is impossible to conceive of an unfruitful Mass from the viewpoint of the sacrificial aspect. This is, however, incorrect and one wonders whether H., who refers to an important article of K. Rahner in this context and frequently elsewhere, has really grasped his opinion on this point (cf. ZKT 71 [1949] 257–317). It would serve no useful purpose to enter into a detailed criticism of this chapter of the book. However, it may be noted that H. does not give evidence of having read very widely in Catholic sources and his choice of references is not always the best. In a revision it would be advisable to correct the first paragraph of this chapter, which quotes chapter 2 of Trent’s Session 22 but designates it as canon 2 and assures us that “not everything is defined here” (p. 5).

At the close of the chapters dealing with the classical Reformation viewpoint and attempts to reconcile Rome and the Reformers, it has become quite clear what the decision of the higher court will be. In the ensuing exegetical section, true to the procedure of classical Protestantism, the argument against Rome is drawn almost exclusively from Hebrews. More is obviously required than this. The letter does not formally envision the precise problem raised by H. At least one would have expected a thorough treatment of the words of institution which would take into consideration
modern exegetical studies. This is lacking. Moreover, no serious consideration is given to the nature of the Church and grace in a biblical perspective—two very relevant questions. One can sympathize with the concern to stress the *ephapax* character of Christ's redemptive work, but it is disconcerting to find a theologian content to remain here without making some serious effort to discover the full meaning of the *hyper hymôn* of Christ's sacrifice in view of the Incarnation: the movement by which the Son comes to us, unites us to Himself and draws us to the Father.

This book could have been written many years ago. It shows the basic deficiencies of former studies on this subject, both Catholic and Protestant: (1) failure to exploit the basic principle of intelligibility in theology: the relationship of one mystery to another; (2) absolutizing of one perspective on the mystery of salvation to the extent that all possibility of further penetration is excluded: the worst kind of relativism. Undoubtedly H. has done a great deal of work (see the more than one hundred pages of footnotes); but he has simply attempted too great a task at this stage of his research.

*Weston College*

**Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.**


The two parts of this volume indicate the scope which the author, a German Protestant, assigned to his work. In the first place he describes what he calls the "prehistory of the modern Roman Catholic concept of tradition"; in the second he studies this modern concept. The first part takes the story from the sixteenth century to the reaction against Modernism in the first decades of the twentieth; the second covers the ground from the definition of the Assumption of Mary to, and including, the Second Vatican Council. In thus defining the "modern" concept as one which came to the fore since 1950, Boeckler does not follow the usual practice, which sees, rightly or wrongly, the modern concept of tradition as arising in the theology of the nineteenth century.

The story is told very objectively, with few ventures into critical judgments. One section of the second part is consecrated to the interrelationships between the modern Catholic concept of tradition and the theology of Protestantism, especially in its Lutheran form. Yet even there B. abstains from personal opinions, but rather gives an adequate account of recent dialogues between Catholics and Protestants on the matter of tradition.

The story is told with sufficient information and detail to provide the reader with a good historical account of the periods in which the author
has divided the historical development of his topic: the sixteenth century; the theological revival of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which includes the theology of the Enlightenment, the Tübingen School, and the thought of Newman; the Neo-Scholasticism which took shape in the nineteenth century around the time of the definition of the Immaculate Conception and the First Vatican Council; the Modernist crisis. The contemporary period is divided into two sections: the discussions around the definition of the Assumption, and the more recent controversy around Geiselmann’s interpretation of Trent, which leads directly into the positions taken by Vatican II.

Although the story is well told, with many useful quotations from the relevant authors, it has several remarkable gaps, some of which are truly astonishing in a study which obviously aims at being nearly exhaustive.

That B. has nothing of significance to say about the theology of tradition in the seventeenth century is forgivable, insofar as he has clearly borrowed most of his historical datum from the two standard Catholic histories of the question, written by Yves Congar (La tradition et les traditions: Essai historique [Paris, 1960]) and Johannes Beumer (Die mündliche Überlieferung als Glaubensquelle [Freiburg, 1962]), neither of which gives much importance to the seventeenth century. There is a rather wide gap in the history of the theology of tradition as most theologians know it, a gap I hope to fill up soon with a substantial volume on this forgotten period.

A second void in B.’s documentation is more important. Apart from the works of Newman and Owen Chadwick’s volume From Bossuet to Newman: The Idea of Doctrinal Development (Cambridge, 1957), he is totally unacquainted with the English-language literature on the question he studies. He draws extensively on German and French publications, but obviously does not know that he could have found valuable material in English. John Murphy’s The Notion of Tradition in John Driedo (Milwaukee, 1959), my own Holy Writ or Holy Church (London and New York, 1959), which he could also have consulted in its French version, and several articles in THEOLOGICAL STUDIES would have contributed to a better knowledge of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century theology and to a deeper acquaintance with the recent controversies. J. P. Mackey’s The Modern Theology of Tradition (New York, 1963) would have helped him to place the nineteenth century in focus. Gabriel Moran’s Scripture and Tradition (New York, 1963) would have given him other insights into the contemporary debates, since it covers much of the same ground as the second part of B.’s book. That the scholarship which the author shows throughout his volume should
have come to a sudden end facing Catholic theology in English is truly incomprehensible.

A third gap in the history of the theology of tradition as told by B. should now be mentioned. Although the nineteenth century occupies a prominent place in his book, there is no allusion to the school of traditionalism, which had considerable influence in France in the first half of the century: the Roman condemnation of some of its basic theses, especially in the form that Lammenais had given them, promoted this school to notoriety, and it still attracted the attention of Vatican I in its dogmatic constitution De fide catholica.

I believe, however, that B.’s fourth lapse is the worst. We are now in the contemporary scene, set around the two foci of the dogma of the Assumption and Vatican II. Granted, much of the discussion of tradition in Germany was occasioned by the decision of Pius XII to define the doctrine of the Assumption in 1950. However, the French side of the controversy had no connection with Mariological developments. B. at this point lumps the French and the German discussions together, with the result that he fails to see what happened in French theology in the period under survey. The question of tradition and the related one of development of doctrine suddenly assumed considerable importance in France because of Garrigou-Lagrange's wild attack on Henri Bouillard’s volume (not mentioned by B., who thus misses the relevant material contained in the book’s conclusion), Conversion et grâce chez saint Thomas d’Aquinas: Etude historique (Paris, 1944). In answer to Garrigou-Lagrange’s strictures and to those of Garrigou’s epigoni against what they called “la nouvelle théologie,” Henri de Lubac published his important article “Le problème du développement du dogme” (1948), which B. studies at length but having placed it in the perspective of a supposed controversy about the Assumption of Mary, which he fails to provide with the correct background for its interpretation. Concerning the interpretation of Trent, the French discussion started in 1949 with an article by Edmond Ortigues, again with no reference to the Assumption. (Ortigues, by the way, was not a Jesuit but a Marist.)

I would not like to give the impression that this is not a good book. Its treatment of the topic is most adequate, outside of the points I have mentioned. But some of these happen to be of great moment for a final assessment of the development of the theology of tradition since the sixteenth century.

Pennsylvania State University

GEORGE H. TAVARD

The mentality of the present decade of the twentieth century, reflected and fostered by Vatican II, requires involvement in efforts to promote the betterment of mankind. Understandably, we do not yet have a theology of involvement. Fr. Faricy has made an important contribution to the formation of such a theology by gathering together the many and highly original ideas, insights, and convictions of Teilhard de Chardin on this subject. His years of reflection on the hundreds of Teilhard's writings, published and still unpublished, have issued in this carefully planned and intelligible synthesis. Many readers who have desired acquaintance with Teilhard's thought but may have desisted out of sheer bafflement can find here a renewed stimulus and an experienced guide.

Teilhard's thinking on the Christian's function in the world advanced along three lines. The first is his scientific phenomenology or generalized physics of evolution. From the beginning, evolution has had a direction toward life and eventually toward man. Once the threshold of reflective consciousness has been crossed, evolution slowly proceeds toward the unification of mankind and converges on a personal, pre-existing center, the Omega Point.

On the basis of this theory of evolution Teilhard, now turning to revelation, constructs a theology of Christ. The personal center toward which the universe has always been converging is identified with the risen Christ, the true Omega Point. As the modern evolutionary vision has replaced the more static concept characteristic of ancient and medieval times, so a dynamic theology of Christ can at length develop many aspects of a Christology that was formerly conditioned by a static world-view.

The third level of Teilhard’s synthesis sets forth a morality and spirituality of human endeavor attuned to the cosmogenesis that in reality turns out to be Christogenesis. No longer may morality be regarded merely as a fixed system of rights and duties, with the aim of maintaining equilibrium among individuals. Morality must transcend protection and undertake the higher task of fostering the best development of the person and society. The only correct use of life and talent is that which is put to the service of mankind.

The book faithfully presents this design, which F. has unfailingly detected. In accord with his purpose, he devotes half of the volume to the third stage, a mystique of human effort in the world of today and of all time to come. As he works it out, he emphasizes some features of Teilhard's thinking with
an acumen that has not often been attained by previous commentators and that should enlighten some critics.

A good example is his exposition of Teilhard's methodology, so frequently the target of attack. As the theology of St. Thomas is based on revelation and Scholastic philosophy, so Teilhard's theology is based on revelation and his own version of scientific phenomenology. Like Thomas, he uses two sources to form a single theological synthesis, but he never mixes up the two sources. To the charge that his thought is a kind of concordism, he replies simply that "one should not confuse concordism with coherence."

Another instance is found in Teilhard's desire to make theology acceptable to modern man. Over and above all traditional attempts to commend Christianity to mankind, he proposes to construct a theology of creation, the Incarnation, and redemption that will make as much sense as possible in the light of all data available to us of today, and that will provide the maximum of motivation for contemporary human activity. Thus he points out that man is not only an instrument used by God but a living extension of His saving power. What we ourselves do on behalf of Christogenesis is very important, for our activity is a co-operation with God's action. The kingdom of God is surely coming; but before it comes, man must first conquer the earth; and that is why Teilhard was so completely convinced that human work is sacred.

*St. Louis University*  
Cyril Vollert, S.J.


Most moderns agree that religious liberty is proper public policy in today's world. Not many have probed deeply the reason why they so believe. Such is the enterprise successfully pursued by Philip Wogaman, Associate Professor of Christian Social Ethics at Wesley Theological Seminary. The result is a clear and careful contribution to a complex issue. The author finds that "those aspects of historic Protestantism which account for its existence in separation from Roman Catholicism are also the most decisive Christian grounds for a doctrine of religious liberty..." (p. 8).

In W.'s opinion, the doctrine of the sovereignty of God provides the most important theological basis of a religious liberty understood in terms of the freedom of God as well as the freedom of man. It is precisely this point which W. thinks incompatible with Catholic claims of infallibility and authority. Could it be, he asks, that Vatican II's Declaration on Religious Liberty was adopted "in spite of" Catholic teaching about the Church?
If so, might not future Catholic thinkers once again assert absolute claims for the Church they believe to be the objectively true one?

W. examines five possible foundations for the principle of religious liberty—all of them inadequate when taken alone. (1) National tradition and constitutional authority, as invoked by POAU for example, does not come to grips with the complexity and uncertainty of the American tradition nor does it resolve the problem of the relationship between the “free exercise” and “no establishment” clauses of the First Amendment. (2) The approach which endorses religious liberty as the surest guarantor of peace in a pluralistic setting may be good political policy but fails to root the principle in religious faith. Moreover, it does not answer the question of how great a degree of diversity is required to warrant religious liberty. (3) The concept of the dignity of man, W. says, is a necessary though not wholly satisfactory foundation. The difficulty is that in a social context the freedom of some will frequently have to be limited for the protection of others. Hence the need for a supporting juridical dimension. (4) Likewise, the ethical argument which bases religious liberty on love falters in the practical arena where viable social policy is fashioned. (5) Finally, there is the view that derives the principle of religious liberty from the inherently limited nature of the state, in line with Christ’s admonition, “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s and to God the things that are God’s.” W. points out that this line of argument can be and has been used to support liberty for “one true church” to the detriment of general religious freedom.

In sum, all of these possible foundations are insecure and subject to erosion when “held in common with an absolute conception of the truth or with an absolute idea of necessary means of salvation” (p. 84). As evidence of this danger, W. cites well-known instances of religious persecution by members of the Hebrew-Christian monotheistic tradition. On the other hand, he makes it clear that this same monotheism can and should lead to an attitude of humility and a policy of tolerance towards those with a different notion of God. Indeed, what genuine Jewish or Christian thinker today would claim finality for his present understanding of God’s revelation? W. favors a bit of skepticism about every claim of absolute truth and value. On this score he faults the Roman Catholic doctrine of infallibility. His explanation, however, fails to make clear the distinction between “infallible” and “authoritative” teaching (p. 117). Neither does it include the current tendency to situate the magisterium in a historical context, with the consequent openness to change and development.

In discussing the political aspects of religious liberty, W. shows the relationship between Protestant theology and the “responsible state.” Essen-
tial to this notion is the dialogue of free men who live together in society and enjoy the right to participate in the political decisions of that community. Here W. suggests the positive aspects of the sovereignty of God as the basis for religious liberty, namely, belief in the direct access of every man to the divine. This balances the negative factor, which opposes as idolatry every absolutizing of human symbol or institution by which God is represented.

Selected applications of principle to existential problems make up the last section of this work. W. thinks that religious establishment involves some denial of religious liberty. This does not necessarily extend to church-related health or welfare institutions, which may legitimately receive government aid if they serve a public purpose and operate without discrimination and in accordance with designated guidelines. In the matter of education, he opts for public funds for public institutions only, teaching about religion in public schools, released-time and shared-time programs. Predictably, he espouses a moderate role for the Church in political action. Approved functions include (1) education of members through dialogue, (2) public pronouncements of a general nature on policy matters, (3) lobbying activities vis-à-vis decision makers. No militant stance is indicated in the critical areas of race and poverty, war and peace, urban turmoil.

W. looks forward to an “exciting new dimension of ecumenical dialogue,” not confined to Christians but embracing all men in a pluralistic world. For it is in dialogue, he concludes, that “the sovereign God is best able to make himself known” (246).

Maryville College, St. Louis

PATRICIA BARRETT, R.S.C.J.


The subject that Catholics call moral theology falls, in much Protestant writing, under the title of Christian ethics. The two overlap but are not coterminous. Moral theology is a narrower study, confining itself to the data of revelation, the teachings of the Church, and the opinions of professional moral theologians. Christian ethics is both a religious and a philosophical study of morals, undertaken both independently of any religious commitment and under the inspiration of the Christian point of view.

The difference is doubtless a heritage of the post-Reformation and pre-ecumenical era. Catholicism’s historical tendency to issue official pronouncements on faith and morals to its people, making it the business of theologians to explain and defend them as well as to assist the Church in developing them, is opposed to the whole genius of Protestantism, with its insistence
on the freedom of the individual conscience and the nonauthoritarian character of the Church as they see it. Catholics, recognizing the at least semiofficial and hence nonphilosophical temper of their moral theology, consider moral theology and ethics as two separate but related disciplines, whereas Protestants prefer to fuse them into one comprehensive study of morals. Post-Vatican II thinking may incline Catholics more toward a Christian-ethics type of approach.

There has been so much writing on Christian ethics recently that a convenient dictionary is a crying need, supplied with eminent success in the present work. It is difficult to write a review of a dictionary, which is not meant to be read from cover to cover like an ordinary book. Only a general impression can be conveyed.

Dr. Macquarrie has assembled a formidable array of eighty contributors, half British and half American. His editorship has not interfered with the individuality of each contributor, yet has managed to establish a certain unity of manner in presentation. Most of the articles are written in a clear and attractive style, with a minimum of technical terms and eruditional apparatus, with enough cross references to be helpful without being distracting. The level of exposition is scholarly but not pedantic, learned but somehow familiar, deep enough to be satisfying yet within the capacity of the educated layman.

The articles, in alphabetical order as becomes a dictionary, fall into several categories. Topics such as goodness, value, conscience, duty, and other abstract terms that belong in any work on ethics are mostly written by philosophers and from a philosophical standpoint. In the same vein are articles on the great philosophical ethicists, on Plato, Aristotle, Kant, Bentham, Nietzsche, and on the main ethical systems such as utilitarianism, relativism, pragmatism, and existentialism.

Since it is a dictionary of Christian ethics, the religious and theological side is stressed equally with the philosophical. There are articles on faith, grace, sin, the ecumenical movement, the law and the gospel, and the ethics of the Old and New Testament. The great religious thinkers from the early Fathers of the Church to Barth and Tillich and Bonhoeffer are adequately represented. Moral theology with its main terms and topics is not overlooked.

The application of ethics to psychological, anthropological, economic, political, and sociological problems has been handled with judicious selectivity. There are articles on war and peace, industry, poverty, social service, medical ethics, sex, marriage, race relations, juvenile delinquency, and other phases of the modern social scene. Here editorial decision seems to have been exercised with great prudence.
The dictionary is particularly helpful to one who needs a quick briefing or refresher on a definite topic. This is its specifically dictionary use, and a very handy tool of learning it is. It is not a dictionary of short definitions, but more like a small encyclopedia with articles of sufficient length to have some meat on them.

This reviewer found greater satisfaction in the browsing facilities the work offers. One article would stir up interest in another, not necessarily one explicitly referred to, but various *obiter dicta* that lead in an almost endless chain across the whole book. Incautious and inveterate browsers are warned that they may find that an hour or two has slipped by while one thing leads to another and they drift miles away from the original point looked up. While guilelessly abetting some scholars' undisciplined mental habits, the possibility of this temptation says a good deal for the interesting character of the articles.

Readers of *TS* would be interested in the usefulness of this dictionary for Catholics. Care has been taken to have articles on specifically Roman Catholic subjects written by persons of this faith. Articles of a general nature incorporate the Catholic position, where there is one, together with the other views, and, it appears, present it very fairly. Evaluations and criticisms, where they occur, are such as Catholics themselves generally give on such matters. On the other hand, the dictionary is a mine of information for the Catholic who wishes a quick briefing on some Protestant tenet with which he may be unfamiliar.

No human work is ever perfect and M. himself would acknowledge that not all the articles are of equal quality. Most of them, however, so outstandingly fulfil their purpose that this dictionary is recommended to all who are seeking a competent summary of the available material on a topic in Christian ethics.

*University of Santa Clara*     \hspace{1cm}  *Austin Fagothey, S.J.*


After expressing thanks for the accomplishments of Vatican II, Maritain launches into a lengthy attack on "the neo-modernist fever." This illness, raging throughout Christendom, affects not only our Protestant brothers but also many "advanced Catholics." Its origin, falsely ascribed to the Council, is none other than the Father of Lies, whose very existence naturally is denied by his *avant-garde* victims, preoccupied as they are in evacuating
the faith of its “objective content” through “demythizing” its most essential doctrines: original sin, hell, the Cross and redemption, transubstantiation, even the Incarnation and the Trinity. Indeed a thorough work of demolition, effected by the dual services of “the phenomenological method” and “form criticism”!

The name of these “new Modernists” is legion. “Except for some rare Thomists,” along with Bergson and possibly Blondel, these misguided zealots seemingly include all the “post-Cartesians.” Being Idealists (or better, “idea-ists”) and not Realists, they are “ideosophers,” not “philosophers” (pp. 98–102).

Despite the wit and humor of his thrusts, heavy with irony, M. is battling for a “Church” which he sees to be endangered from within by phenomenalizing theologians and Teilhardian evolutionists much more subtly (and hence lethally) than from without by atheistic Communists and existentialists. The theological interest of the book centers around this intraecclesial “peril” provoked by the former pair.

Now these two are one in committing a common metaphysical mistake: the identification of being with becoming. Little wonder, then, that they, as “chronolators,” “kneel before the world” (pp. 53–58). For these “grandchildren of Hegel,” the distinction between the temporal and the eternal “inevitably becomes blurred” (p. 57). They necessarily deny a really transcendent Deity, an order of grace above nature. For them, “nature” taken collectively is only “cosmogenesis.” This new breed of “gnostics” (cf. pp. 119 ff.) obliterates the indispensably Christian distinction between the kingdom of God on the one hand and the world on the other. This may be said to be the net effect of the destructive work of the “neo-modernists” in our midst.

M.’s prescription for meeting the crisis in Christianity engendered by them is mainly twofold: the “cultivation of contemplative love” and the “liberation of the intelligence” through “authentic Christian philosophy and theology” (pp. 84, 172, 200). The latter is the open, affirmative, indefinitely progressive wisdom of Thomas Aquinas, as distinct from, and opposed to, all the forms of post-Cartesian “ideosophy,” including every “phenomenology” (pp. 143–46, 107–11, 130); for “all our phenomenologists presuppose Husserl and are prisoners of his Refusal” (p. 107).

Now “Teilhardism,” being essentially “a Gnostic cosmo-theology of a Hegelian type” (p. 268), entails in fact a rejection of all traditional Christianity. Teilhard himself was an extraordinarily gifted poet, not a philosopher or theologian: “If we remove the element of myth from Teilhard, there remains of his personal contribution little more than a powerful lyrical
impulse..." (p. 269). M. considers it highly significant that no trace of "Teilhardism" is found in the documents of Vatican II (p. 125).

One asks: What is the upshot of (a) M.'s over-all polemic and (b) his conception of "Christian philosophy and theology"? As to the first, I agree with James Collins (America, Jan. 13, 1968, p. 30) that the Old Layman has failed to use the resources of modern existential phenomenology in interpreting the meaning of the "secularization" of the world today; that there are valuable things here which have been ignored or dismissed out of hand. Also, one of the ironies of this work is M.'s own indulgence in that very "chronolatry" against which he inveighs. Truth, as M. repeatedly insists, is not a function of time. Now it is highly doubtful whether even most "post-Cartesian" philosophy is "ideosophic."

As to M.'s theory of "Christian philosophy and theology," let it be said that the sources of "realism" are more extensive than the six principal ones signalized by him, namely, our prephilosophical knowledge, poetic images and myths of Eastern religions, Greek thought, the Bible, the teaching Church, and St. Thomas (pp. 14-20, 131, 170). Although these six are perennially fruitful, there are others. Indeed, no source, not even the demonic, is altogether uninformative. (As St. Thomas remarked, no noncontradictory statement is totally insignificant.) While loose syncretisms, in philosophy as in theology, must be eschewed, nothing is excludable a priori. Understandably, M.'s noble conception of the "Church"—and of "Thomism" in it—is insufficiently prospective, excessively retrospective. If the famous "Protestant principle" (that everything whatever, save God alone, is subject to limitations) is true, it is because it is the "Catholic" fact.

M. expresses (p. 168) his "lack of sympathy" for the "disciplinary regulation" (canon 1366) requiring the teaching of St. Thomas in "Catholic schools." He desiderates "an explicit statute of freedom," appealing to all that have ears to hear... how eagerly the Church wants the living tradition of St. Thomas to go on growing and expanding from age to age (pp. 169-70). The identification of "the Church" with the magisterium is so common even among our best theologians as to be practically a reflex.

One now poses the crucial question: What is this "living tradition"? If it is the stream of thought initiated by St. Thomas, its incompleteness must obviously be admitted—echoing its originator's insistence. For example, is there any real sense in which the discoveries of Darwin and Freud (big with moral and theological, and not only "scientific," implications) are actually within this "stream"? Again, what significance for Christian wisdom (if any) is to be found in Marcel's "phenomenological"
existentialism, in Nietzsche's "atheism," in Kierkegaard's "subjectivism," in the Reformers' "protests," in Berdyaev's "Orthodoxy"? And so on. In short, is anything valid or intelligible unassimilable by Christian "tradition"? One replies: not if it is unconditionally "Catholic."

_Louisiana State University_  
JAMES F. ANDERSON


This volume contains the original Latin text of _Perfectae caritatis_ together with a French translation, a brief (pp. 51-72) and therefore intentionally nondefinitive history of the Decree, an extensive commentary on it (pp. 73-539), and three appendices. The scope of the book is limited, and yet the historical sections do suggest the vast amount of work and the wealth of ideas (Schema 4 alone prompted 68 interventions and about 14,000 _modi_) that lie behind the accomplishments of Vatican II. Sister Jeanne d'Arc, e.g., remarks that "of the 14,000 _modi_ which were to assail this schema, 1,042, if my count is exact, dealt with poverty, riddling this paragraph of 63 words!" (p. 408). The history of the text justifies the remark that "sometimes too ready critics [of the Decree] prove a too hasty reading; the words are often richer in meaning than appears" (LeBourgeois, p. 70). Yet more than once a further enrichment of _Perfectae caritatis_ was hampered by the fact that at the last session of the Council new sections were submitted to a yes or no vote with no possibility of modifications or observations. The biblical thrust of Vatican II is illustrated by Sister Jeanne d'Arc's remark that in the final no. 13 on poverty there are eight explicit references to the _NT_, while in the first schema of 1962 there were none.

Bishop Huyghe finds three formulas expressive of the inner unity of prayer and apostolate: pursuit of God, incorporation into Christ, consecration to the Church. In his praiseworthy desire to correct past neglect of the apostolic dimension of the religious vocation, we would have wished him to appear less reluctant to admit the primacy of contemplation apropos of action, a primacy the Council teaches in several documents (Liturgy, no. 2; Religious Life, no. 2e; Pastoral Office of Bishops, no. 33). Tillard's discussion of this relationship is more open and comprehensive. H.'s explanation for the traditional emphasis on asceticism and contemplation in Christian literature does not wholly coincide with what I have found in Scripture and the specialized studies of the influence of Platonism (as compared with biblical influence) on patristic writers. Perreault notes (p. 400) that the sign value of consecrated chastity is said in _Perfectæ caritatis_ (no. 12)
to be caused by its relationship to its love motive. We would add that the Council's thought is corrective of assertions that assign to the witness value of virginity a rank above its ontological value. What a person is ontologically is more basic than how he appears to others. Signification follows being; it does not precede it. Voillaume's essay on contemplation was disappointing, but the fault is not all his. Of the dozens of texts in the Council documents dealing with contemplation, the most striking and theologically fecund are not found in *Perfectae caritatis*. Though V. mentions a few thoughts of the Decree, he does not give a history of his subject in the sessions of Vatican II. We agree with V. that contemplation is meant for all in the Church (this is the main concern of his contribution), but we would have preferred him to give us a study of the Council's over-all thought. The chapter on institutes wholly vowed to contemplation done by a team of nuns was also disappointing in that it merely commented on the *Perfectae caritatis* text without tracing its intraconciliar evolution. The same is true of Tchidimbo's chapter on the religious life and the missions. On the other hand, Besret's article on no. 9 of *Perfectae caritatis* is, happily, a combination of a history of the conciliar text and an enlightening commentary on its meaning for contemporary monasticism. Beyer insists on the fact that secular institutes are not religious institutes. The contention is true (*Perf. car.*, no. 11, plainly asserts it), but it needs reconciliation with Pius XII's statement in *Provida mater* that the consecration in a secular institute is "religious in substance." B. should have tackled some of the problems Karl Rahner raises in Volume 2 of *Mission and Grace*, even if he were to answer them in an opposite sense. But perhaps he had not seen Rahner's essay.

Parts of this volume share the defect of so much current renewal literature: a tiring repetition of ideas—valuable ideas, yes, but ideas put into print too frequently. We now need less writing and more doing. Yet the strong points of this work outweigh the weak. It is the product of competent men and women, an indispensable tool for anyone interested in the current mind of the Church for religious. Yves Congar calls the book a *summa* of the religious life according to Vatican II. It is.

*Marycrest College, Davenport, Ia.*

THOMAS DUBAY, S.M.


In the Preface Dan Sullivan writes: "The question of human sex is not only a question of the history of the man-woman relation, but, more precisely, of woman's relationship to herself." For it is as an individual person
that woman must retain that mystery which is the food of love. Accordingly, Jeanniere regards allocating a special psychic function to either sex as curtailing and prejudicing human freedom; he asks why woman should be singled out as being any more for motherhood than man is spoken of as being for fatherhood. "It is only history that divides the couple's inseparable parenthood into the roles of paternity and maternity."

Woman's freedom from the very beginning of her life is more decisive than her biochemistry or anatomy in determining what kind of person she is going to be. Unfortunately, early and continued stereotyping frustrates her from becoming what she could become. We have allowed organs and gametes to define the female temperament instead of seeing woman primarily in terms of her relationship to the world and to herself. From very early years sexual stereotyping goes on. The little boy is asked: "What will you want to be when you grow up?" The little girl is simply told how pretty or charming she is.

Going beyond J.'s observations, studies made in England and America indicate that sexual stereotyping begins at eighteen months and fixes the sexual self-image before the child is three years old. Boys and girls, dressed and treated as members of the opposite sex during this period of their lives, manifest permanently all the psychological characteristics of the learned sex. So deeply engrained is this learning process (usually taking place in homes where parents were determined to have the opposite sex) that both study groups (Leeds and Johns Hopkins Universities) recommended that, wherever possible, surgery and hormone therapy be used to make the organic and genital sex fit the learned sex. Such would be less disturbing to the child than trying to reverse its self-image back to the other sex. Like these studies, J. questions traditional concepts of male-female polarity and complementation.

The attraction of man for woman is not primarily the result of an urge for completion in the other person; it is based upon the mysterious uniqueness of the other, which fosters still deeper union. It is a perfectible, dynamic relation rooted in the history of the couple.

J. sees human sexuality as not merely repeating the animal level but restructuring it. Sexuality is an expression of the unity of human nature, but it is the unity of a mobile genesis. It establishes one's identity before world and self. Through his bodily sex, man is in the world and related to others. So the experience of sex becomes the experience of transsubjectivity, which is the root of all interdependence. Since sex reveals interpersonal dependence, it becomes man's fundamental guarantee of self-transcendence. One develops his person only in relation to the sexual other, whom one knows and by
whom one is recognized. "The person becomes such only at the interior of a personal relation. . . . Man becomes man only in the face of an absolute, personal other."

Man has humanized his sexuality, but his human love is not a sublimation of sexuality. There is no encounter in animal mating, but "when two humans come together, they invent a union which can be expressed and confirmed by sexuality"; but sexuality did not prepare them for this union. "Animal sexuality does not achieve meaning in human sexuality; on the contrary, man gives meaning to animal sexuality."

J. regards eroticism as one human manifestation of animal sexuality. Eroticism is "the search for sensual pleasure in the immediate satisfaction of desire—but in a human manner." It both denies and spiritualizes. It spiritualizes the acts of love. But in its desire for totality, eroticism does not draw the person out of his own ego, but leads to the negation of the partner. "He will separate himself from his partner precisely because she is a subject who cannot and will not be ruled as an object by the will of another." The purely erotic human ends up in isolation instead of communion.

On the other hand, when human love has integrated eroticism in a total fashion, then it is free. "Neither a characteristic of the sexed individual, nor simply a biological function, nor pure physical determinism—sexuality becomes a dimension of human liberty even while it is the abyss from which liberty arose and into which it can sink again and be lost. It cannot be identified with the generative need which it transcends when the species is no longer the end of the human person, nor the libido insofar as it is the expression as well as the sublimation of the highest personal sphere. If sensual pleasure is the primary law of sexuality, it drags man down to orgiastic ecstasy and death; if ruled by the spirit, it is a dimension of all human communion."

J. does not accept the psychoanalytical differentiation of man and woman found in such classical works as Helene Deutsch's *Psychology of Women* (2 vols.; New York, 1944). The male-female relationship changes from one culture to the next and must be explained in terms of a given or contemporary culture. Because of "inevitably relational character," sexuality is inseparable from human growth and genesis. Beginning before birth, sexuality is not a definitive and definable characteristic. Its mobility must be seen in the context of the reciprocity of the sexes, which involves at times seeming contradictions when both man and woman want to be both subject and object for themselves and for each other. "Thus, in determining what is masculine and what is feminine, we cannot take into consideration either particular characteristics objectively verifiable or capacities proper to each
sex because, however real these characteristics or capacities might be, they could very easily have been determined by cultural and social conditioning. We should not attribute determinative qualities to each of the sexes: believing that we are describing a characteristic, we build up a conditioning structure which it would perhaps be well to modify."

The vocation of woman to motherhood is not prescribed beforehand by biology or by a certain "feminine nature," but is known by an existential analysis of the feminine mode of existence in the world, which is care for and presence to others. The masculine mode of existence is some form of work, the effort to transform nature for a given purpose. Yet in reality male and female elements are found in each of us, and even the maternal character can be independent of the sexual body. One might point out that not only man's sexual nature is quite plastic, but his very human nature. Man adapts his humanity and sexuality to the influence of the culture.

J. believes each human finally accepts his sex in somewhat the same way that an actor agrees to play a certain type of role. As already mentioned, one accepts his role from the very earliest years, playing it out in the modes of love, conflict, and defiance of the other sex.

One is oneself only through the other. "The opposition of masculine and feminine is the translation, the manifestation within a culture of a fundamental relationship. The encounter comes first, the encounter and confrontation of man and woman discloses at the same moment their being for the other and their alterity...."

J. does not recommend an identification of the two sexes in "insipid equivalence." Woman's subjection to man is purely a historical creation within a given culture. Since the relationship between man and woman is a fundamental dynamism, something to be achieved, it is subject to failure and rejection. "Beyond the various manifestations of sexuality the deep reciprocal responsibility embodied in a shared life reveals itself. . . . Sexuality does not lead us to invent love; love reveals to us the meaning of sexuality. . . . In its free decision, sexuality appears both as a promise because of its irradiation throughout the whole psychic structure, and as a threat because of its tendency to go to the limit."

Turning to the reality of conjugal intimacy, J. warns of its fragility. While bodily union can perfect the marital bond, it can also bring out confusion and separation. The gift of the body should be the expression and not the culmination of love. It should be the foundation of a new history, that of children and the family. But conjugal love does not mean fusion. "Love desires a union in which the lovers are present to each other in what is particular and unique to each. The individuality of each becomes a source
of happiness to the other, for their union is based upon this individuality."

The generosity of love is willing to risk the child, who is the third person in the conjugal relationship. Neither parent knows how their child will turn out. But the child remains the supreme expression of the love of parents for each other. Sometimes this love for the child is distorted, but this contingency must not keep us from loving: "Many people mistrust passion and its harshness; yet the worst danger is loving less in order to be undisturbed."

Unfortunately, the rich content of this book gives the careful reader the impression that J. has not yet thought through all the implications of his speculations on the meaning of sexuality and womanhood; the chapters are like the brilliant jottings of a fertile mind which need further refinement. With good reason Sister Mary Aloysius Schaldenbrand joins Dan Sullivan in reproaching Jeanniere for lacking rigor, but for different reasons (National Catholic Reporter, Nov. 1, 1967, p. 11). Schaldenbrand views J. as unable to maintain consistently the unity of sex and person. Sullivan believes that J. slips into the old dualisms about eros and logos because he must separate sex and person in his defense of celibacy. Schaldenbrand disagrees with Sullivan, showing that sex has more than one form of expression, and that the free person finds multiple modes of realizing his sexuality. The debate will continue, hopefully, with further clarifications from J. He has created a dialogue which may also clarify the meaning of celibacy.

DeSales Hall School of Theology
Hyattsville, Md.

JOHN F. HARVEY, O.S.F.S.


This volume is a kind of Secunda secundae: the second part of the second part of a larger and as yet unfinished work. Its author is a professor at the Sorbonne, a phenomenologist, Protestant philosopher-theologian. In 1950 he published the first part of his great enterprise Philosophie de la volonté, under the title Le volontaire et l'involontaire. This aimed at a purely phenomenological description and understanding of the structure of the human will, prescinding from questions of sin and transcendence. It considered functions like project, motive, choice, effort, consent, etc. In 1960 he published the second part, Finitude et culpabilité, itself consisting of two parts: L'homme faillible and La symbolique du mal. The first of these appeared in English as Fallible Man (Chicago, 1966) and dealt with the possibility of sin in man, based on his capacity for suffering and misery and the fragile quality of his
affective life. The English translation of the second is the volume being reviewed here; it deals with the reality of sin, its actual emergence from human fallibility, as this is discoverable in the symbols and myths of evil, especially in Greek and Hebrew literature. The third part of the whole project has not yet appeared; it is planned as a philosophical discussion of the will and evil, enriched by phenomenology and the power of symbol.

The essential methodology of this book is reflected in a favorite expression of the author: “The symbol gives rise to thought.” Symbols, as they recur historically in our cultural and religious past, possess a dynamism which orients the mind toward an understanding based on the experience of the race and not simply on the short-range investigation of introspective psychology. The language of confession, in which man embodies his actual experience of evil, is a language of symbol. In this area no direct, nonsymbolic language exists. The primitive symbols are basically three. In order of antiquity they are: stain or defilement, sin or deviation before God, and burden of guilt. In all these cases the symbol has a first intentionality of something directly experienced in the world, and then a second intentionality in and through the first, so that evil is never simply stain, deviation, or burden, but like these. There is an inner progression of interiority in this series of symbols from the stain, which seems to infect almost by external physical contact, to the violation of the covenant with God, whether intended or not, and finally to the inner acceptance of responsibility for deliberate evil. But this progress in interiority is accompanied by a kind of impoverishment; and hence even the most primitive symbol, that of stain, persists to signify a certain exteriority in evil, as something outside the sinner that leads him captive.

This symbolism of evil is finally recapitulated in the servile will, which cannot be grasped directly and conceptually, but only as the term toward which the symbols tend, a coincidence of captivity and freedom, the unavailability of freedom to itself. It is not simply fallibility, but an event within freedom whereby freedom in its exercise infects and enchains itself.

The primitive symbols of fault generate the narrative or dramatic symbols of evil: myths. Their function, according to R., is neither historical nor etiological but illuminative of the actual human condition. They do this by gathering all of mankind under the sign of an exemplary man, Anthropos or Adam. Then they grasp the dramatic quality of human evil by placing it between a beginning and an end. Finally they explore the division within man by describing the passage or leap from innocence to guilt.

To explore the meaning of myths, their infinite variety is reduced to four types. Three of these root evil in something prior to man, the fourth in man
himself. The first three types are creation myths, tragic myths, and orphic myths. In creation myths the world and man come to be by victory over a primordial evil chaos, so that redemption is simply the continuation of the creative process. In tragic myths man is the victim of a fatal evil destiny, against which he strives unsuccessfully. Orphic myths ascribe evil to the imprisonment of the exiled soul in an evil body. The fourth myth is the Adamic myth of Genesis, where human choice is at the root of the pain of the human condition.

To prevent this typology from being a static cataloging, it is necessary to integrate the various types from within the stance of a privileged myth, the Adamic. Since this includes the narrative of the temptation as well as of the fall, it gathers to itself, especially under the symbol of the serpent, the notion of evil as already there, attracting and seducing man. It is the other side of evil, which comes to be only if man posits it, but as posited is already there.

Unquestionably this is a significant work both for its hermeneutic of biblical symbolism and for its general indication of method in the human enterprise of reflection and speculation. It is at least debatable, however, whether all reference to history and etiology may properly be removed from the symbolic narratives of the Bible. But in the more general area of method, R.'s wholesale rejection of Cartesianism has great advantages. Instead of searching for some first truth, to the neglect of all others, which may ground the whole knowing enterprise, he begins reflective thought from within the completeness of human experience and the fulness of language enriched by symbols. But although this shows great promise, we will be able to evaluate its success more adequately when the third and more properly philosophical part of R.'s complete work has appeared. Here, too, it is questionable whether his oft-repeated contention is true, that certain valid insights given in symbol and myth are simply untranslatable into nonsymbolic, conceptual language without destroying their validity.

Alma College


The demon and the dove, of course, are you and I. We each have both demon and dove, good spirit and bad, within us. The theme of this book is that human beings must confront their demons and doves and deal with them in order to grow fully. Van Kaam is a psychologist, while Healy is an
English professor and poet. Their collaboration is meant to indicate that psychology and literature share the same function: facilitation of growth by assisting man, directly or vicariously, to confront creatively his demon-dove personality.

With this in mind, the book is divided into two main parts. Part 1 is an excursus into existential psychology; Part 2 is an application of basic principles of existential psychology to five pieces of literature.

Psychologists tend to meet more demon- than dove-oriented people; as might be expected, Part 1 reflects this fact. Confronting one's demon is seen as the first step toward redemption, which is defined as a positive choice to overcome and transcend the limits imposed by negativity. It is a process of chosen death, which leads to rebirth and resurrection. "The death wish, when permeated by the desire for restoration of my personality, is crucial in my life. It expresses the fundamental structure of all human growth" (p. 64).

This idea is a good indication of how an existential approach to psychology is related to, yet different from, more traditional approaches. The death wish is, of course, a Freudian concept. But here it is put in the context of human growth, seen as a part-process, which is not just to be brought to consciousness and then made ineffectual, but continually encountered and transcended on successively higher (hopefully) levels. A further difference from traditional models is the thrust toward a more ultimate transcendence which overflows into a general theology. Van Kaam notes that this openness to the call of reality is not just a human achievement. It is also something received. It is a gift.

The psychological section comes off rather nicely if one does not become too annoyed by the jargon. Everything, it seems, is "existential." The phases of death and rebirth just described are "existential crisis; negative phase," and "existential crisis; positive phase." Guilt is "existential guilt"; decision is "existential decision"; anxiety is "existential anxiety" (at least it is not Angst). One wonders whether all this could not be just left in the "nonexistential" vernacular and say the same thing. Presumably the term suggests a context somewhat broader and deeper than is usually dealt with in psychological analyses. It does indicate a philosophical point of view, but after a while the word loses whatever semantic significance it may have, and becomes just a stimulus for rather negatively valanced emotional reactions on the reader's part.

Part 2 analyzes five literary characters' successful or unsuccessful search for their authentic personality in terms of the conflict between demon and dove. Angelo, in Shakespeare's Measure for Measure, tells us how to achieve
our identity by discovering the inauthentic dimensions of our personality. *Anna Karenina* demonstrates the impossibility of living two incompatible projects of existence. She is destroyed because she cannot transcend the conflict between demon and dove. Marcher, in James’s *Beast in the Jungle*, says that the power to love may depend on my confrontation with my own demon of egotism. Camus’s Clamence, in *The Fall*, also points up the need of confronting my own motives in their naked reality. Querry, in Greene’s *Burnt Out Case*, asks if life must be boring and meaningless. He answers with an “existential decision”: a man must love someone, for only love gives meaning to life.

The literary analyses seem logical and coherent to me. They reflect the stress on broad context, deeper meaning, and the process dimension of life seen in Part 1. The average reader may tire a bit of all the profundity, and prefer just to enjoy a story on a more superficial level. It is important for us to confront and transcend our “existential crises,” but it is also important to have some relaxed enjoyment. Those who read literature to satisfy their legitimate escapist tendencies will not like this book. However, there is a good deal of wisdom in both parts, and it would not do anyone harm to look it over. Van Kaam and Healy raise some rather basic questions and give some rather impressive, if sometimes ponderously stated, answers.

*Woodstock College*

**CHARLES DONNELLY, S.J.**

**SHORTER NOTICES**

*A Dictionary of Angels*. By Gustav Davidson. New York: Free Press, 1967. Pp. xxxii + 387. $15.00. We can surely assume that the value of a lexicon depends upon its comprehensiveness and its accuracy. On both scores the *Dictionary of Angels* fails to meet the test. Though it is massive, containing over 3400 entries, and though it purports to be a compendium of demons as well as of angels, the material appears to have been chosen haphazardly and to have been assembled without any critical judgment and, worse, without any internal correlation. Under one heading, e.g., we are told that the OT knows nothing of a fall of the angels, whereas under several other headings we are advised that this is described in Gn 6. Some of the biblical misinformation is incredible: Azazel, we read, is not named in Lv 16; Nergal (sic) is King of Hades “in Scripture”; the term Elohim “derives from the female singular ‘eloh’ plus the masculine plural ‘im’ God thus being conceived originally as androgynous”! The lion’s share of entries deal with the angels and demons who proliferate in medieval, largely kabbalistic,
Jewish literature, though items culled from Islamic, Iranian, Hindu, and Gnostic sources are included. The extent of D.'s grasp of such subject matter can be gleaned from his twice-repeated description of Vishnu as "the first avatar" and from his totally uninformative notice of Prajapati, about whom he has nothing to say other than "to be compared with the Rishis who are, it is said, the 7 or 10 Vedic spirits from whom all mankind is descended." That is like saying of God "to be compared with the seven antediluvian patriarchs." Why the numerous benign and maleficent spirits in Greco-Roman mythology are omitted is unexplained. Hermes psychopompos is given a few lines, but there are no Harpies, no Lemures, no Erinyes, no Lares or Penates. Perhaps we should be grateful. Whether or not readers should be grateful to the publishers will depend upon the degree of amusement they can obtain from a specimen of high camp.

St. Michael's College, Univ. of Toronto


The second edition of G.'s Introduction aux livres saints (1963; first appeared 1954) has now been made available in several other European languages (see Elenchus Bibliographicus Biblicus, Biblica 48 [1967] 4*, no. 61). The present volume, a revision of the second French edition, is a welcome addition to the biblical introductions now available in English. The approach is a combination of the critical and the theological. The biblical text is discussed in topically and historically linked groups rather than book by book; within each section G. presents the relevant biblical material in the light of its historical and cultural background, and dwells on its relevance for the Christian reader. Appended to the chapters are subsidiary texts, fifty-five in all, illustrating or further expanding on them; the texts are a well-chosen and varied group, including translations of ancient extrabiblical literature, patristic documents, and selections from modern writers. (A remark on one of these texts may be in place here: the Mesopotamian flood-narrative from the Epic of Gilgamesh [Text 6, pp. 69–71]. Though this is the best known of the Mesopotamian versions of the story, it is itself derivative and abbreviated; the recent discovery and publication of the Old Babylonian redaction of the Atra-šasis Epic [Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum, Part 46; London, 1965] have illuminated the Vorlage of the Gilgamesh version and the wider context in which the flood-narrative should be placed.) A final chapter on "The Bible, Word of Life" is appropriately placed after detailed discussion of the Bible, and approaches general theological questions on the Scriptures: the human and divine character of the
Word of God, the response of faith, Scripture as a crystallization of tradition, the unity and diversity of the Bible, the relation of Church and Bible. As we would expect from G.'s competent technical studies and theological discussions of the Bible over the past decade, his Introduction is both scientifically reliable and successful in presenting the Bible as the Word of God.

PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL INSTITUTE, ROME

THE WORLD OF THE PATRIARCHS. By Ignatius Hunt, O.S.B. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967. Pp. vii + 178. $5.95. The third volume to be published in the Backgrounds to the Bible Series affords the educated but nonspecialized reader an opportunity to "get behind" the patriarchal narratives related in Gn 12-50. Using a topical approach to explore this obscure and much-debated period of biblical history, H. makes judicious use of recent archeological findings concerning Near East ethnic groups of the second millennium B.C. Following an introductory survey of a number of excavated sites germane to Gn 12-50, and a consideration of groups having linguistic and ethnic affinities with the patriarchs, the major part of the book is devoted to an excellent synthesis of the laws and customs, ways of life, and religious beliefs of people of the ancient Near East. It is now evident that the Genesis narratives fit into the contemporary Near Eastern background with considerable ease, and that OT notions such as sacrifice, prayer, covenant, blessings, and afterlife must be judged in the light of their historical context. Of special interest is H.'s analysis of the literary forms of Gn 37-50, a treatment that not only supports an authentic Egyptian background to the Joseph stories, but also lends considerable credibility and depth of understanding to these narratives. H. next examines the various literary forms prevalent in ancient times (e.g., myths, legends, sagas, and etiologies), as well as the bearing these particular forms may have had on the manner in which the patriarchal narratives were recorded. A brief study of the chronology and the use of numbers in the patriarchal stories leads to a concluding chapter in which H. evaluates the historicity, reliability, and religious value of these stories. Moving away from the Wellhausen school, most biblical scholars are now inclined to accept the basic historicity of the patriarchal narratives. As H. indicates, however, no matter what archeological discoveries might turn up, we will never be able to write a real history of the patriarchal period. We can never hope to possess what the Hebrew narrators never intended to give, i.e., a biographical history of the patriarchs. It is the theological content that is of importance, and that has been sufficiently grounded in the second millennium B.C. to give us confidence in the basic historical and religious value of
these chapters of Genesis. The text is recommended for college teachers of OT as a highly readable, provocative, and well-documented account of the patriarchal era (Middle Bronze). The more specialized reader will be rewarded with valuable citations and references scattered throughout the text, a list of selected readings at the end of each chapter, and more than forty additional titles and source materials.

*College of the Holy Cross*  
*Worcester, Mass.*

**THE GOSPEL OF ETERNAL LIFE.** By Dominic Crossan, O.S.M. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967. Pp. xvi + 180. $4.50. To publish a commentary on the Johannine writings today—in the face of Dodd, Barrett, Bultmann, Brown, and Schnackenburg—requires courage. C. explains the source of his own in these terms: "the exegete has not adequately fulfilled his function until he has also rephrased John in terms of immediate relevancy for his own readers." As one reads this book, it becomes apparent that C. sees the Johannine corpus as expressing a single dominant idea: eternal life is "authentic human existence within a community of love and concern" (p. 107; see also pp. 81 and 90). It is this interpretation which enables him to link the Gospel to the Apocalypse, since "only the rule of concern structured into love can establish peace upon this earth for people and for nations. Apocalypse expresses this hope in the ultimate victory of love upon earth" (p. 154). What we have here, in fact, is a commentary on the Johannine books written from a Teilhardian point of view (see especially pp. 62 and 114). It must be allowed that this is an original approach but not necessarily a defensible one. Many will find C.'s exegesis of John's key concepts somewhat strained and his acceptance of Apocalypse as a "vision of cosmic hope" surprising, to say the least. On the other hand, the book is, in almost every other respect, an admirable piece of scholarship reflecting an excellent grasp of the vast literature on the Johannine corpus. Perhaps the majority of contemporary students of John will applaud C.'s stress on the Hebraic character of the Gospel and first Epistle (accordingly he remarks that the second half of Dodd's *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* is possibly "of more lasting value" than the first), but this reviewer is not among them and feels that this persuasion has led him, e.g., to posit a larger number of septenary patterns in the Gospel than is warranted and to neglect entirely the Hellenistic elements in the first Epistle.

*St. Michael's College, Univ. of Toronto*  
*J. Edgar Bruns*

**THE BIBLICAL MEANING OF MAN.** By Wulstan Mork, O.S.B. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967. Pp. xi + 168. $4.95. This brief, readable, popular, but
not superficial presentation of biblical anthropology points up the deficiencies of the traditional teaching on “the spiritual life.” Because of the Greek philosophy which undergirds it, especially the Platonism of the Fathers, traditional spirituality has always exaggerated the dichotomy of soul and body and regarded the latter as the enemy of the former and an obstacle to man’s attainment of his supernatural destiny. Apart from the implied insult to the Creator, this traditional teaching does not square with the biblical anthropology, which always views man as a unit, as a whole. The biblical “flesh” is not the Greek “body,” nor is the biblical “spirit” the same as the Greek “soul.” Both biblical terms name the whole man under different aspects. “Flesh” is man as distinct from God, mortal and corruptible. “Spirit” designates man as directed Godward, capable of communion and union with God. However, M.’s equation of bashar and ruah with the theological concepts of natural and supernatural is inexact and a reading into the biblical texts. The final chapter, which points up the significance of the biblical anthropology for Christian living, is exceptionally good. To the Christian the city is not technopolis but Incarnopolis. A “worldly man” is not a person involved in the activities of the world and sincerely interested in the advancement of science, technology, and the arts and in the betterment of human existence in this world. He is not even one who enjoys life in the world and its pleasures. Rather he is a man who does these things with no reference to God and to the Incarnation. This book will give the reader a better understanding of the Incarnation and the mission of the Christian to the secular city, and a deeper appreciation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh.

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

THE SAYINGS OF JESUS IN THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR. By A. J. Bellinzoni. Leiden: Brill, 1967. Pp. 152. 24 gld. B.’s monograph is a revision of his Harvard doctoral dissertation; he attempts to give a definitive solution to the vexed problem of the Gospel and noncanonical quotations in Justin. It is a work of great care, with the Greek textual evidence clearly set out, so that any scholar may analyze the problems further. For the study he has used only Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho and the First Apology, to avoid the problem of authenticity. Further, discoveries at Nag Hammadi, including the Gospel of Thomas (a Gnostic sayings-collection), have encouraged the author (p. 5) to renew the investigation of the sayings of Jesus as preserved in Justin. B. has too much reliance, I feel, on the reliability of the manuscript tradition, when there is only one fourteenth-century Paris manuscript (with a sixteenth-century copy or twin in Cheltenham, England) to reconstruct the text. How can he say “there is good reason
to believe that [the] manuscript tradition is not substantially different from Justin's own autograph manuscripts” (p. 6)? Few scholars who have worked with texts would venture such a statement. At any rate, building on a suggestion of Otto A. Piper in the *Journal of Religion* in 1961, B. comes to the following conclusions. (1) He refutes for the most part the Semisch-Jahn theory that Justin does his quoting from memory (with the exception of one case [Dial. 122.1]); (2) there is little or no foundation for the view that Justin used pre-Synoptic material; (3) rather B. shows that he relied on several postcanonical sources. (4) The three non-Synoptic sayings are also explored: “There shall be schisms and heresies,” from an early Christian manual; “Unless you are born again you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven,” from a liturgical baptismal text; and the famous “Where I find you there shall I judge you” (a variant of a saying of Ezekiel found in four or five other authors), probably from another early manual. Thus B. attempts to locate Justin’s sources in Christian catechetical manuals and in several collections of sayings; especially does he point to a Gospel harmony of the Synoptics, perhaps the work of Justin and his school, leaving it for Tatian to harmonize the Synoptics with St. John. The result is therefore a very satisfying analysis, even though the hypothesis of Justin’s sources must necessarily be left in the vague.

*Fordham University*  
*Herbert Musurillo, S.J.*

**TERTULLIAN AND THE BIBLE: LANGUAGE–IMAGERY–EXEGESIS.** By T. P. O’Malley, S.J. *Latinitas christianorum præeva* 21. Nijmegen–Utrecht: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1967. Pp. 186. 19.50 gld. Anyone who has taken the trouble to read Tertullian is aware of the importance of his work for biblical studies, especially textual criticism, the history of exegesis, and the development of the canon. In spite of the valuable source material to be found in his writings, no one has as yet attempted a comprehensive study of Tertullian and the Bible. The limited scope of O.’s work is indicated by its subtitle. In his first chapter he reviews the evidence which has been brought forward to prove that Tertullian cites Scripture from Latin translations available in North Africa at the time he wrote. He discusses in order (a) passages from Tertullian which are not affected by the controversy with Marcion, (b) passages in which Tertullian glosses the language of Scripture, and (c) passages which relate to the Marcionite controversy and bear on the question: In what language did Tertullian read his Marcionite NT? It is O.’s judgement that the best evidence supports the view that Tertullian knew and frequently cites existing Latin translations of at least some parts of the Bible. In support of this view he has done valuable research on the
use of amartia/delictum, stuprum/fornicatio, and other doublets in Tertullian, where the second word represents a traditional reading (usus), and the first does not. O. has also studied in detail the comments which Tertullian makes on biblical words which, for one reason or another, he finds unsatisfactory: e.g., spiritus, where Tertullian would prefer flatus, and sermo, which Tertullian uses in all but one place in citing Jn 1:1, but with which he is not completely happy as a translation of logos. In his second chapter O. illustrates points of comparison and contrast between Tertullian’s use of imagery (e.g., water, warfare, athletics, clothing, the sea, bestiary symbols) and parallel uses in the Bible and classical literature. This serves as a transition to the third chapter, on exegesis and its vocabulary: aenigma, allegoria, figura, portendere, simplicitas. Here O. treats of the unity of the two Testaments and the application of allegory to their interpretation, Tertullian’s rules of exegesis, his preference for readings which are nudae and simplices rather than those which need to be interpreted as aenigmata and allegoria, the control of exegesis by the regula fidei, the distinction in Tertullian’s exegesis between figura and allegoria, his principle that the allegorical interpretation is to be used when the literal is impossible (“the absurd is the sign of allegory”), and the difference between his viewpoint on exegesis during his Catholic and Montanist periods. Although a few misprints have escaped his notice (e.g., Robertson for Roberts in the bibliography), O. has done his work carefully, and his book may be read with confidence. Its appearance raises the hope that the interest in Tertullian which has been stimulated in recent years by Orbe and others in Europe will lead to further studies of his writings by scholars in America.

St. Mary of the Lake Seminary

William LeSaint, S.J.

REIMBALDI LEODIENSIS OPERA OMNIA. Edited by Charles de Clercq. Corpus christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 1966. Pp. vi + 184. 450 fr. (bound); 350 fr. (unbound). Reimbald, cleric of Liège (d. 1149 or shortly after), is not a well-known figure (the only encyclopedia entry I know of is a few lines in LTK 8 [1963] 1138 by F. Stegmüller); nor does he deserve to be. “Inter scriptores minores saec. XII haud parvipendendus est Noster; certe, magis eruditione praecellit quam eloquentia; sed, mente pacificus et prudens, illis temporibus multis praecessit” is the editor’s somewhat ambivalent judgement, and R.’s few works are edited in Corpus christianorum on the principle stated in the prospectus: “in the Continuatio Mediaevalis... only those writers will find a place for whom there exists no good edition, or one difficult of access.” The works include: Itineraria, seu exhortatoria Dermatii cuiusdam Hybernensis, profiscientis Iherusalem
(an exhortation both to Dermot the pilgrim and to all readers to aspire to the heavenly Jerusalem); De vita canonica, with an accompanying letter to Wazelin, prior of St. James at Liège, a reply from Wazelin, and a further letter from R. (Stegmüller lists the De vita canonica as lost; what C. edits is an eighteenth-century transcription); Stronzata seu de voto reddendo et de paenitentia non iteranda; Libellus de schismate Anacletiano (exhortation to both parties in the disputed election to exercise charity; Honorius II was elected pope, but Cardinal Pier Leone was shortly afterward elected pope by another group, with the name Anacletus II); Chronicon rhythmicum Leodiense (assigned with probability to R.; describes events from 1117 to early 1119).

Fordham University

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

THE COMMENTARIES ON BOETHIUS BY GILBERT OF POITIERS. Edited by Nikolaus M. Häring. Studies and Texts 13. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1966. Pp. xv + 437. Until about the last thirty years, the reputation of Gilbert II, Bishop of Poitiers (d. 1154), was largely determined by the views of St. Bernard, who did not understand his teaching and sought, without success, to have him condemned by Pope Eugene III at the Council of Rheims in 1148. H. has long been interested in the rehabilitation of Gilbert and, to this end, in providing critical editions of the writings of Gilbert and his school. He edited Gilbert's Commentary on Boethius' De Trinitate I and II in Studies and Texts 1 (1945); on Boethius' De hebdomadibus in Traditio 9 (1953); and on his Contra Eulychen et Nestorium in the Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge 21 (1954); and though many more manuscripts of these works have since come to light, "this considerable increase of manuscripts has not necessitated a revision of the text published" (p. 14). One helpful change, however, in this edition is the division of Gilbert's text according to the chapter numbering of E. K. Rand's edition of Boethius' opuscula in the Loeb Library (1918). In an Appendix, H. reconstructs the text of Boethius on which Gilbert commented. This admirable volume is a most valuable tool for studying the role of Gilbert in the development of medieval theology.

Fordham University

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

GOD HAVE MERCY: THE LIFE OF JOHN FISHER OF ROCHESTER. By Michael Macklem. Ottawa: Oberon, 1967. Pp. 277. $6.75. This judicious biography, interested in both the historical and the universal significance of Fisher, comes from a scholar with evident sympathy and admiration for St. John of Rochester. It may well become a standard life. The
biographer's basic conception is that of a bishop who, conservative and medieval, becomes increasingly isolated and lonely, and who is concerned most about the pastoral care of the common people and the fate of the Catholic Church, to both of which even Catherine of Aragon's cause appears secondary. English patriotism and nationalism are viewed as decisive. The chapters on Fisher's earlier years are new and enlightening. Two thirds of the book, however, is devoted to Henry VIII's marriage, the Nun of Kent, and the spiritual supremacy. Here the faithful, literal, and full transcriptions of original documents are especially valuable. M. scores on many points: e.g., Rochester House was not next door to, but two miles from, Winchester House; Elizabeth was John Fisher's sister and not half sister; and P. Friedmann's theory about Fisher's release from the Tower for six weeks in the winter of 1534–35 is proved untenable. In view of countless complex and obscure questions, surprisingly few points (if this reviewer reads the statements properly) need to be explained or rectified: e.g., Saint Albans is better than St. Alban's; Erasmus was admitted to the degree of doctor of divinity at Turin, not at Cambridge, and dedicated his Ecclesiastes to Christopher of Stadion, not to Fisher; and the defense of Lefèvre by Clichtove (never bishop of Tournai) was directed against Marc de Grandval, not against Fisher. Fisher, stated never to have belonged to the king's council, attended meetings of the whole council until 1512. Many Fisherian problems still await definitive solution: a calendar of letters to and from Fisher, the years for Fisher's study of Hebrew, the identification of Ulrichus Velenus and Simon Hessus, the years of publication of R. Wakefield's Kotser codicis and Syntagma, etc. M.'s style is clear, direct, and readable, often with flashes of wit and vivid descriptive details. The Notes are full and valuable, as is the Bibliography of Manuscripts. The Acknowledgments contain a delightful Morean touch in M.'s reference to his young son's discovery and contribution.

Loyola University, Chicago

Edward Surtz, S.J.

The Church of the Lutheran Reformation: A Historical Survey of Lutheranism. By Conrad Bergendoff. St. Louis: Concordia, 1967. Pp. xv + 339. $9.00. Tracing Protestantism to its origins has been an enduring task for scholars. In recent decades it has become clearly revisionist in character, challenging the syntheses of the nineteenth century, particularly that of Jacob Burckhardt, which set a firm cause-and-effect relationship between the Renaissance, Reformation, and Counter Reformation. This book, appearing on the 450th anniversary of the Protestant Reformation, further upsets these earlier views. B., a theologian and former president
of Augustana Lutheran Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., indicates that the Lutheran Church is not essentially German, but has its roots in primitive Christianity, and is therefore “related to the church catholic of all times” (p. xv). Moreover, the Reformers were not innovators but Christians dedicated to the restoration of spirit within the Church: “Not the initiation of a new church, therefore, but a reaffirmation of the church of the Word was the genius of the Lutheran Reformation” (p. 303). In affirming this thesis, B. presents a survey from the pre-Reformation Church to the present period with its motions towards internal unionism as well as towards ecumenism. He does not neglect the difficult years after Luther, when attempts at reunion with Rome became hopelessly mired in the political ambitions of princes, and when the papacy felt at last the stirrings of new life and the need for corporate reform, soon to be implemented by the Council of Trent and the approval of religious orders, notably the Jesuits, whose founder, Ignatius of Loyola, he calls a “spiritual Don Quixote” (p. 82). By far the best part of the book is the history of Lutheranism in more modern times: its missionary activities on five continents, its synods, the crisis that arose in Hitler’s Germany, recent mergers, and its spiritual health that has allowed it to grow in 1967 to global membership of seventy million. Regrettably, the use of this informative book is hampered by the absence of notes and by a defective index; e.g., within a page and a half (pp. 28-29) thirteen names are not indexed, including Wessel Gansfort, Thomas More, John Colet, John Standonck, and Juan Luis Vives.

Alma College

Edward D. McShane, S.J.

CHRIST AND ORIGINAL SIN. By Peter de Rosa. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967. Pp. 152. $3.95. Fr. de Rosa is Assistant Director of the National Catechetical Center, London, and his practical kerygmatic concern is evidenced here by his lively tone, clear expression, and genuine enthusiasm for the gospel which Christ is. He succeeds in his attempt to translate recent thought in the areas of Christology and original sin into language which will appeal to the educated but professionally untrained reader. Moreover, he is to be congratulated for treating original sin in the precisely Christian context, a synthesis he makes near the end of the book: “Christ’s role is not only to restore, but to complete the world’s making by reproducing his life of glory in men” (p. 129). Part 1 is an introduction to the Incarnation and original sin, Part 2 deals with the Incarnation, and Part 3 treats original sin. As for the Incarnation, major stress is laid on recalling the “forgotten” humanity of Jesus. The author, of course, would not deny the statement that “Jesus is God,” but he finds that as a primary formulation it tends to immobilize our theology to the point of material Docetism.
develops his Christology from the human knowledge and consciousness of Christ. Here especially, though elsewhere also, is he indebted to Karl Rahner. In Part 3 there is a summary of the traditional Catholic teaching on original sin, followed by a description of the difficulties with which this synthesis is currently faced. These stem from the reinterpretations of Gn 2-3 and Rom 5:12-21, as well as from the scientific theories of polygenism. Restatements of the doctrine which attempt to reconcile all the known factors are presented: Dubarle, Smulders, and Schoonenberg. As a text for the upper years of high school or for college or as recommended reading for adults in study groups or in private, this book can be warmly commended. It begins to fill the still very empty gap between the scholar's study and the layman's den.

Loyola College, Baltimore

James L. Connor, S.J.

THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH. By John Powell, S.J. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967. Pp. xii + 226. $5.95; paper $2.50. A volume in the Ecclesial Theology section of the Contemporary College Theology series edited by J. Frank Devine, S.J., and Richard W. Rousseau, S.J. The purpose of the series is "to present a rich and deep understanding of Christian revelation in such a way that today's college students would be able to respond with a Christian faith and life that are both culturally mature and scientifically precise" (Editors' Preface). P.'s book follows the outline provided by Vatican II's Constitution on the Church. He discusses such topics as the mystery of the Church; biblical images of the Church; the historical foundation of the Church; authority, free speech, and public opinion in the Church; the liturgy; Church and state; the call to holiness; laity and religious. The book includes a rather full and contemporary bibliography and an index. It is characterized by a heavy reliance upon Scripture and the documents of Vatican II. P. regularly cites well-known contemporary theologians such as Congar, Häring, and Karl Rahner. For this reviewer, the most notable omission is the failure to develop in greater detail and from a historical perspective the link between Peter and the bishops of Rome on the one hand and the apostolic college and the episcopacy on the other. The question of visible structures is supremely important today. Still, the college student who reads this book thoughtfully will understand the Catholic Church much better.

Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Norwood, Ohio

Edward J. Grätsch

events: a children’s quarrel, a love affair, a research scientist’s encounter with an intense and socially concerned young man, a family meeting to decide where to move, an English Separatist community, and St. Benedict’s community. From her analysis H. draws a theology of law and grace, flesh and spirit, conversion and community, charism and institution, Church and liturgy. The transformation of man (the break-through of spirit, conversion, grace) is prepared for and conditioned by formation (law, institutions, ritual). Transformation creates community and expresses itself by the same means which prepared for it, but which assume new meaning as a result of transformation. Both formation and transformation, law and grace, institution and charism are necessary elements of the Church but are in constant tension, and the option for transformation alone deprives future generations of the preparation necessary for conversion, while the option for formation alone smothers the spirit and defeats the purpose for which the Christian community exists—transformation. H. admirably provides concrete meanings for many familiar theological words. She makes these words point once again to experienced reality. Not clear is what basis H. has for declaring the results of her analysis to be theological factors of conversion and community. They look suspiciously like psychological factors which are given biblical labels. No doubt she is describing the empirical aspect of grace, which, after all, is granted to us in visible, human form. But the danger of reducing Christian grace, spirit, etc., to the best that is in man lurks in this approach, which nevertheless is most useful today and increasingly the style of contemporary theology.

Aquinas Institute, Dubuque, Ia. Christopher Kiesling, O.P.

Essai sur le repas du seigneur. By Jean-Jacques von Allmen. Cahiers théologiques 55. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1966. Pp. 124. This essay, undertaken at the request of the Faith and Order division of the World Council of Churches, affords an excellent synthesis of the major components of the Eucharistic mystery. Proceeding from its fundamental dimension (anamnesis-epiclesis), the Lord’s Supper is described as (1) revelation of the limits and fulness of the Church, (2) communion with Christ and the brethren, (3) living bread and sacrifice, (4) place where prayer and response coincide, (5) base from which the apostle departs and to which he returns to celebrate God’s love for the world. This reviewer agrees with the suggestion that an epiclesis be introduced into the Reformed and Roman liturgy after the words of institution. It would be unfortunate if the architects of the new Roman liturgy failed to give the anaphora an explicit Trinitarian structure—and thereby play down an important aspect of the Eucharistic
mystery—on the pretext that it would seem to be favoring an unacceptable
theory of the epiclesis associated with the Eastern churches. Some good
observations are made on the problem of changing the Eucharistic elements
in “missionary” lands. The position advocated in regard to intercommunion
is balanced and approaches that of Rome. The reasons offered for the disap­
pearance (?) of the epiclesis from the Roman Mass are unsatisfactory (p. 34).
The surprising assertion is made that the Church of Rome, from Trent to
modern times, has not taken a clear stand regarding theological opinion
which would separate the Cross from the Mass (p. 101, n. 88). The allusions
to the Encyclical *Mysterium fidei* (p. 83, n. 24; p. 86, n. 30) betray a com­
mon failure to recognize the intent of Paul VI: to guard the mystery but not
to hinder progress in Eucharistic theology. The author calls attention to
the Reformed Church affirmation: *extra usum a Christo institutum, nihil
habet rationem sacramenti*. He understands this to correspond in principle to
the attitude of the ancient Church which wished that the Eucharistic
mystery terminate with its celebration (p. 86, n. 35). A great deal could be
said about this formula, which implies Calvin’s theology of worship (involv­
ing his peculiar concept of the ascension of Christ) and his opposition to the
medieval devotion to the Eucharistic presence which, in his estimation,
resulted from the doctrine of transubstantiation. It will suffice, however, to
point out that in the ancient Church the time of celebration seems to have
been understood as coextensive with the possibility of fulfilling the command
of Christ to take and eat, and thus, in a real sense, as coextensive with the
existence of the Church. This viewpoint allowed for the practice of carrying
home the consecrated bread from the Sunday liturgy for daily reception as
well as reservation for the sick. Only a theology which fails to appreciate the
intimate link between Eucharist and Church will find these practices ob­
jectionable.

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

**The Ecclesial Dimension of the Sacrament of Penance from a
Catechetical Point of View.** By Ludwig Lehmeier, S.V.D. Cebu City,
Philippines: Univ. of San Carlos, 1967. Pp. xii + 277. The first half
is a balanced review of contemporary theological explanations of the ecc­
clesial or social dimensions of sin and penance, heavily dependent on Xiberta,
Poschmann, Rahner, de Lubac, and Anciaux. The major value of the book
resides in the stimulating second half, a lively and practical discussion of
how to make the sacrament of penance more meaningful. L. discusses how
children should first be taught about sin, the proper age for first confession
(after first Communion, about 8), the proper age for learning the distinction
between mortal and venial sin (about 10). L. has excellent suggestions for communal celebrations of penance for children (pp. 128–38, 162–201), with critiques of several celebrations which are printed in appendices (pp. 218–54). His concluding chapter proposes a wider use of general absolution, not only when there is a shortage of confessors, but as a better regular introduction to the sacrament for young children. The book will be particularly valuable for diocesan directors of religious education, for members of diocesan liturgical commissions, and for others charged with the responsibility of making practical decisions about initiating children to the sacrament of penance.

University of San Francisco

Francis J. Buckley, S.J.

FAITH AND DOUBT. By Olivier A. Rabut. Translated by Bonnie and William Whitman. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1967. Pp. 119. $3.75. The French title of R.'s book, *La vérification religieuse*, suggests more precisely its character as an essay in religious methodology. It is not so much concerned with faith and doubt in themselves as with the proper way of approaching them. Though directed equally to the unbeliever and to the theologian, its principal focus is the situation of the un-Catholic or doubting believer. Starting from the principle that in matters of faith "the essential is not taking place at the level of reasons formulated by man" (p. 89), it argues that profound faith is compatible with real uncertainty at the level of doctrine. One can, according to R., achieve a deep-seated adherence to the best in Christianity without necessarily taking a definitive stand on the truth of particular teachings. This adherence, which is founded on certain "elementary religious perceptions," available even to those outside the faith, can become the basis from which one can move to a "critical verification" of the Christian doctrines. Unfortunately, this process is only proposed as a legitimate method by R., not exemplified in detail. The fundamental religious perceptions or "parent intuitions" from which he begins include "the happiness of being righteous," "the value of sympathy, good faith, and forgiveness," the awareness of transcendence which appears in the experience of suffering and the confrontation with death. It is his description of these intuitions that will probably constitute the main value of R.'s book for the general reader, who will otherwise experience difficulty with a style and approach at once elliptical and abstract. The Catholic philosopher or theologian may wish that R. had somewhere attempted to define more precisely the relationship between belief and faith, i.e., between the dogmas themselves and what Rabut terms "a metadogmatic truth accessible through the dogmas but independent of their specific content"
But few today will quarrel with his starting point, that Christianity has "a modest and very sound center" which is directly experienced rather than argued to, that "there is a hidden spark in the lives of really religious men, a spark which in itself constitutes a truth" (pp. 18-19).

Justin Kelly, S.J.

**Faith in a Changing Culture.** By Allan D. Galloway. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967. Pp. 122. 25s. Faith is ultimate concern, yet it must be embodied in finite, historical forms. Some of the aspects of this paradox which G. deals with are: Authentic vs. Inauthentic Faith (the latter "identifies the essentially and unassailably ultimate, toward which culture presses, with elements and possibilities immediately present in culture"); Identity and Change ("the real unity and self-identity of the Christian tradition—its true catholicity—has never depended upon static definitions" but upon "the sensus communis fidelium, a notion correlative with that of the Holy Spirit"); Cult, Covenant, and Election ("It is integrity of response in the immediate situation, not the successful defense of cultic forms, which preserves the true identity of a covenant people"); Christ and Culture ("Jesus was a Jew of the first century and subject to all the limitations which that implies in language, concept, custom and cultural horizon. Yet we take his words and his life and his person as having absolute and eternally valid significance. . . . The question about the correlation of faith and culture becomes a question about the person of Christ"); Catholic and Apostolic ("whenever the apostolic character of the church is affirmed in defiance of catholicity, it fails to be truly apostolic, but also whenever the catholic character of the church is affirmed in defiance of its apostolicity, it fails to be even truly catholic"). G.'s theology of culture is in the tradition of Paul Tillich, to whom he acknowledges his debt. The influence of H. Richard Niebuhr seems to be present also, especially in his discussion of radical monotheism. G. has packed many valuable ideas into this dense little book. Yet it suffers hardly at all from the weakness of so many books of this type: vagueness and dubious generalization.

James Carmody, S.J.

**Bultmann and Christian Faith.** By René Marlé, S.J. Translated by Theodore DuBois. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1968. Pp. vi + 106. $3.95. A brief synthesis of the essentials of Bultmann's theological thought, together with a criticism both positive and negative. Over-all, the book is a success; for M. is faithful to Bultmann and is just in his own remarks about a type of thought which, even in a period which can be called with some
justification post-Bultmannian, not only continues to have influence but even more than heretofore. Are not many of the newer writings about faith and the Church of Roman Catholics based on thoughts of the famed Magdebuerger? In criticism of M.'s own thought, one can make the same kind of remarks which he makes against Bultmann: his views do not take into account enough. Thus, while some indeed do show an interest in the reality of tradition and of sacramental symbolism, there are many (and not just hippies) who totally despise the past and what it can teach us, and there are many who want to find God not in cultic settings but in the midst of nature. It is impossible to generalize about modern man; there are modern men but there are different categories of modernity. This brief work is well worth reading if for no other reason than that it may lead one to reconsider much of what is being said today about Jesus the Christ, faith and the Church; much reconsideration is in order now.

Saint Charles Seminary, Phila. John J. O'Rourke

SCIENCE AND FAITH: TOWARDS A THEOLOGICAL UNDERSTANDING OF NATURE. By Eric C. Rust. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1967. Pp. xiii + 330. $6.50. To one with an educated interest in God or man or nature, and especially to one interested in all three, this book is most informative. To one who responds in faith, who believes in God and in God's presence in man and in nature, this book is an experience. It deals with such diverse fields as the new physics, revelation, depth psychology, the Trinity, evolution, etc. Despite this extensive character of the book, R.'s treatment in depth of these areas appears to be accurate in its facts and eminently sensible in its evaluation of the facts; above all, the book is exciting in its unity and creative synthesis. For instance, R. presents an analysis of the intuitive, imaginative, and creative character of knowledge in the physical and life sciences which amounts to an honest presentation of the scientific method in terms of what scientists do and how they do it. Because of this honesty and accuracy, he can, after a lengthy analysis, present such a synthetic statement as: "The alternation between patient observation and investigation and critical moments of intuitive insight makes up the history of scientific discovery, and the intuitive insights arise in situations much akin to those of personal disclosure" (p. 315). R.'s treatment of revelation in terms of personal disclosure is excellent. When he advances his discourse to a linking of the Spirit with the intuitive and imaginative leaps in scientific discovery, the reader is drawn to a reluctant affirmation, reluctant because of the novel character of R.'s insight. Finally, when he speaks of man and
evolution, he gives solid meaning to those insights which in Teilhard are so exciting but all too often nebulous and evanescent.

Rathfarnham Castle, Dublin

George V. Coyne, S.J.

A GOD FOR SCIENCE? By Jean-Marie Aubert. Translated by Paul Barrett, O.F.M.Cap. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1967. Pp. vi + 154. $4.25. A. tries to meet a contemporary crisis "provoked by the disharmony that results from the sudden growth of scientific research, full of exciting promises... and the immobility of a traditional religious outlook," by helping the young believer-scientist to unify his life through a better understanding of the twofold stream that nourishes him. A. discusses first the conditions under which we must try to unify science and religion. He concludes that faith and science cannot contradict each other on the psychological level. He tries to clarify what is meant by matter and spirit; for the Christian solution to the problem is spiritual, whereas the scientist is concerned with matter. He treats the phenomenon of life and its place in the duality of matter and spirit. Secondly, A. presents a way of achieving the union by expounding the classical teaching of finding God in the universe and trying to show how the scientist can use his work as the continuation of creation. The scientist by making his contribution becomes incorporated into the life of charity that animates the Church. A. presents Teilhard as one who achieved this unity, and concludes by pointing out how the higher hope of the believer-scientist can act as a guarantee of his hopes in temporal affairs. A believer-scientist would perhaps be disappointed with A.'s failure to treat more extensively the presuppositions behind the Thomistic approach (especially in the treatment of "matter"), with the restricting of man's imaging of God to the soul, with the mere repetition of the classical proof of man's immortality (an important point in A.'s synthesis) from the "simplicity" of the soul, and with the footnotes (distracting and unhelpful). He would certainly be helped by A.'s care and order, and inspired by much, especially the sections "Christ's Cosmic Mission" and "Christian Hope."

Oude Abdij, Drongen, Belgium

Robert S. Fitzgerald, S.J.

DIALOGUE BETWEEN CHRISTIANS. By Yves M.-J. Congar, O.P. Translated by Philip Loretz, S.J. Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966. Pp. vii + 472. $12.00. Many of the articles in this splendid collection are already familiar to specialists in the field of ecumenism, but it is well to have them collected and translated as a monument to the author and for the convenience of a wider public. These essays, composed from 1935 to the beginning
of Vatican II, reveal C. as a consistent and progressive thinker who understood the importance of the ecumenical movement almost a generation before it became popular among Catholics. The studies on Eastern Orthodoxy, Anglicanism, and Protestantism alike reveal a vastness of erudition, a meticulous accuracy, a synthetic power, and a clarity of exposition which have led many to look upon C. as the leading Catholic ecclesiologist and ecumenist of the present century. In addition to the republished essays, this volume contains a fifty-page Preface in which C. outlines his career as an ecumenist from 1929 to 1963. One cannot read this without being impressed by the depth of his faith and prayer-life, his exceptional modesty, and his patience in adversity. If one were to pick out a single observation which epitomizes the spirit of this book, the following might be proposed: "When a man divests himself of habits of confessional self-justification and controversy, inherited in the course of centuries of opposition, he begins to tap the springs which are common to all and to perceive that at the root of our differences there are many problems which have been badly posed and wrongly approached. In such circumstances much will become possible which previously seemed excluded forever" (p. 442). For C., ecumenism is not only a science; it is a spirituality.

Woodstock College

Avery Dulles, S.J.

THE NEW MORALITY: CONTINUITY AND DISCONTINUITY. Edited by William Dunphy. New York: Herder & Herder, 1967. Pp. 192. $4.95. Despite the connotation which "the new morality" has in the minds of many today, this is not a description or discussion of "situational," "contextual" ethics. Rather, it constitutes a challenge "to see both where we have been and where we now are as minimal requirements for accepting the ultimate responsibilities to create the ways we are to journey towards our future morality" (p. 13). It is this aim alone that gives the book unity: its nine essays are written from varying standpoints and in the perspective of different disciplines. Although the contributions are of unequal quality and there will be disagreement with some aspects of the analyses presented, the volume makes valuable reading, and this even more because of the stimulus it provides than because of its content. If, e.g., the reader accepts with Leslie Dewart that not only must a legalist morality be eschewed but even a legal morality today is limiting, so that we must "reconceptualize the Christian moral experience in terms adequate to the historical situation" (p. 106), he will want a fuller description of such reconceptualization than Dewart's brief examples furnish. Gregory Baum's presentation of Vatican II's anthropology will make him eager for a more profound study of its
"wide implications for moral theology" (p. 168), which are here barely alluded to. It is the same with the other essays (from David Belyea, J. Edgar Bruns, Stanley Kutz, Marshall McLuhan, Michael Sheehan, Edward A. Synan, and Albert Wingell). They leave the reader unsatisfied, impatient because the answers are not here, yet alerted to many of the issues involved and to the general lines of direction in which the answers must be sought. This surely was the effect that these essayists were aiming to achieve.

Holy Cross Seminary, Templestowe, Australia Nicholas Crotty, C.P.

CONFLICT AND CONSENSUS: RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL. By Richard J. Regan, S.J. New York: Macmillan, 1967. Pp. 212. $5.95. Conflict, rather than consensus, dominates post-conciliar debate on freedom in both Church and state. It follows the same pattern which characterized the protracted struggle over the Declaration on Religious Freedom at Vatican II. R.'s careful presentation of the legislative path of that document describes an important episode in recent Church history and indicates the urgency of dealing with the equally crucial question of freedom within the Church. The work includes a detailed consideration of the various texts of the Declaration which were discussed at the Council; the pressures at work in shaping and reshaping the statement; the power plays behind the strategy and tactics of protagonists on both sides of the argument. It is an interesting and valuable case study in the development of doctrine. The evolution of Catholic thought on religious liberty shows the influence of particular historical situations on the substance of the teaching and on the process by which it is articulated. Leo XIII and Pius XII operated within the orbit of an "established Church." Both related freedom to equality, though with different emphases. "For Leo paternal society's denial of political equality implied limits on the freedom of the ruler's subjects; for Pius the political equality of citizens implied their freedom" (p. 8). It remained for John XXIII to assert explicitly that religious freedom is a human right, rooted in the dignity of man. In the now famous passage of Pacem in terris, "Every human being has the right to honor God according to the dictates of an upright conscience, and the right to profess his religion privately and publicly." The Declaration on Religious Freedom, adopted by the Council on Dec. 7, 1965, does not answer all questions but does symbolize the new openness of the Church in the face of continuing change. Based on the distinction between state and society, it denies to the former any competence in matters of religion. On the other hand, it encourages Church responsibility in secular social concerns. Current controversy over civil disobedience and the role of churchmen in revolu-
tionary activity is challenging the boundaries of present teaching and ex­
panding the frontier of the rights of conscience. R. has rendered a real
service by bringing the record up to date and suggesting lines of further
development.

Maryville College, St. Louis Patricia Barrett, R.S.C.J.

PEACE AMONG CHRISTIANS. By Augustin Bea and Willem A. Visser 't
Pp. 236. $4.95. A collection of addresses by two of the leading figures
in the ecumenical movement in our time, the President of the Secretariat
for Promoting Christian Unity and the former Secretary General of the
World Council of Churches. The interest and value of this collection is
historical rather than theological. With the exception of a few items, the
addresses date from the period of Vatican II and constitute a record of the
critical steps toward greater understanding taken on both sides during and
following the Council. This record is important for students of the ecumenical
movement. Though some of the positions reflected in these pieces are no
longer pertinent, the respect, the tact, the desire to understand that are
shown here remain important lessons and models for any ecumenical activity.
Bea's contributions on “Unity among Christians in the Decree on Ecu­
menism” and on “The Church and Religious Freedom” are of particular
interest, as is the last selection, “Pluralism—Temptation or Opportunity,”
by Visser 't Hooft. It is regrettable that the editors did not take the trouble
to give the details of the exact origin and circumstances of each selection.

Marquette University William J. Sullivan, S.J.

THE CATHOLIC EXPERIENCE: AN INTERPRETATION OF THE HISTORY or
AMERICAN CATHOLICISM. By Andrew M. Greeley. Garden City: Doubleday,
1967. Pp. 308. $4.95. The stated theme is “that American Catholicism
has been for two centuries caught in an ambivalence about the society of
which it has become a part.” To G., this ambivalence is reflected in the
contrasting approaches to the process of acculturation of the “Americani­
zers,” who argue for a more general and generous response of the Catholic
Church to American institutions, and the “anti-Americanizers,” who urge
caution and elicit warnings to the Catholic community lest in the process of
assimilation the Church be subverted by bigoted and misinformed foes. In
developing this theme, G. has carefully selected men and episodes that
reflect these two trends. Included among the “Americanizers” are John and
Charles Carroll, John England, Isaac Hecker, James Cardinal Gibbons,
John A. Ryan, John F. Kennedy, and others, while in the other camp are
men like John Hughes, Bernard McQuaid, and Michael Corrigan. The episodes range from the signing of the Declaration of Independence, through the nativist problems of the nineteenth century and the emergence of liberal Catholicism (here G. parts company with Robert Cross), to the victory of the "Americanizers" over bigotry in the Kennedy election of 1960. G., a confirmed "Americanizer," glories in the contributions to American ecclesiastical and secular society by the Carrolls, Gibbons, Kennedy, and the others, while he treats rather harshly those whom he consigns to the role of "anti-Americanizers." To state categorically that Hughes's influence can only be considered a major disaster for the Church in the United States and then conclude the survey with a declaration that Kennedy might well be a "confessor" of the faith and that he served with "brilliance for three crisis-ridden years" reflects a bias that is somewhat annoying. While giving lip service to the historical milieu in the struggles of Hughes, McQuaid, and others, he seems to dismiss the variables of the milieu in his evaluation of these men. A nationally known sociologist, he uses the published works of historians, but the historians have perhaps failed to provide him with enough research in the way of letters, diaries, newspapers, and documents of the periods under review. "No Irish Need Apply," "Dogs and Irish Not Allowed," the KKK, the APA, abolition of German studies in many schools at the outbreak of World War I, "isolationism" and restrictive immigration laws following the Great War, are realities that confronted the immigrant and made him suspicious of his reception in this land of liberty. It should not seem strange that certain prelates rejected labor's bid for organization in the late nineteenth century; many Americans did likewise in the wake of the crippling strikes in the 1870's and 1880's. One might not agree with the judgment of these ecclesiastics, but one should be able to understand it. The absence of footnotes, an index, and a bibliography is disconcerting. The historian will recognize most of the source material, but he would prefer having observations, quotations, and the like documented. The general reader can peruse the book with profit; the historian will recognize that more co-ordinated work must be done between the sociologists and the historians in the presentation of the American Catholic story.

Loyola College, Baltimore  
Francis G. McManamin, S.J.
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