BOOK REVIEWS


This intriguing little book tries to analyze the process of biblical interpretation in terms of three hermeneutic variables which L. calls parameters. Though it is obviously not a complete Catholic hermeneutic, it is certainly an imaginative beginning. Clearly avoiding both biblical positivism and uncritical spiritual exegesis, L. strives to maintain the hermeneutic importance of the biblical text itself without neglecting either its ontological-historical foundation or its existential import for the worshiping community today.

Two introductory chapters sketch the history and present state of hermeneutic theory and pinpoint the current problem areas in biblical research which demand further hermeneutic exploration. L. is well acquainted with German hermeneutic theory from Schleiermacher to Gadamer and with contemporary German Lutheran efforts to integrate such philosophical insights into a hermeneutic theology which grounds methodological considerations in an ontological analysis of the Word of God in human history. He feels this hermeneutic reflection may be of service to Catholic theologians struggling with such problems as the complexity of meaning of the inspired literary texts of the Bible, Christian interpretation of the OT, and the relationship of dogma to exegesis.

The heart of the book is L.’s effort to analyze and integrate what he considers the three essential dimensions of an adequate biblical hermeneutic. By way of a transcendental deduction, L. isolates three basic hermeneutic parameters. The esthetic parameter is the text itself, a literary work with one complex literary sense, demanding good literary criticism that respects its ambiguities. L. emphasizes what he calls the irréalité of the text, its liberation from the limitations of the here and now, its relative autonomy as a work of man the symbol maker. Nevertheless, the Bible exists concretely only as the sum of all the experiences of its authors and readers throughout human history: biblical interpretation is intrinsic to the “being” of the Bible itself. The ontological-historical parameter is the reality which lies behind the biblical texts and their later interpretation. However, faith must grasp this reality in contemporary interpretation just as faith guided the authors of these texts in their interpretation of historically distant events. The existential parameter is the import of the text for the contemporary interpreter, in his own historicality, within the community of believers. In fact, the text communicates its “objective” content only if the interpreter is himself subjectively engaged in dialogue with it.
Finally, L. completes his analysis of the three basic dimensions of biblical hermeneutic by insisting on their circularity, their mutual interaction. Hermeneutic efforts which neglect any one of them are necessarily inadequate. The three need not be analyzed in any fixed sequence, L. feels, though various sequences do appear to be proper to the different theological disciplines.

In a concluding chapter, L. adds some more general comments on the nature of biblical interpretation. Though interpretation of the Word of God in the human words of the Bible does not demand any special hermeneutica sacra, certain specific presuppositions are operative in Christian biblical interpretation. In the ongoing process of Christian tradition, biblical interpretation occurs within a believing community that gives witness to its faith under the guidance of the Spirit. Christian belief that God is the author of the whole Bible directs the exegete's search for radical unity amid all the Bible's diversity. Faith in a personal revealing God supports his conviction that he encounters that God through the Bible. Acceptance of a definite biblical canon for the community reflects his assurance that the Bible is a sufficient guide for the life of the Church. Finally, by the analogy of faith, community doctrines and practices, themselves interpreting the Bible, function indirectly as presuppositions of Christian biblical interpretation—though, like all presuppositions, they too are open to criticism in the light of the biblical texts themselves.

Understandably enough, L. has not been able to develop all the implications of his basic hermeneutic. His notion of canonicity needs further analysis. His emphasis on the limited irréalité of the biblical texts, their status as symbolic expressions spanning historical distance, could well be complemented by a discussion of the sacramental nature of words—perhaps in terms of Karl Rahner's theology of symbols. Finally, in his concern to avoid psychologism, L. seems to neglect the importance of personal witness as both the origin of the biblical texts and the goal of biblical interpretation. As Ebeling would say, reality (and not merely the mind of the author) comes to expression in the texts, but only through witnessing believers who aim at generating witnessing faith in others through their proclamation. The process of Christian tradition is a highly personal one, taking its origin in the personal witness of the first Christians to the Word of God incarnate and ordered to the presentation of that personal Word to future generations of believers in the concrete event of contemporary Christian proclamation. The proclamation-become-text must occur again as text-become-proclamation. Only in this way does the reality to which the texts bear witness, the Word of God in person, become concretely present in its
contemporary context. But L.’s analysis no doubt presupposes this dimension of the hermeneutic process of biblical interpretation.

Marquette University

Patrick J. Burns, S.J.


Since R. C. Dentan published his Preface to Old Testament Theology in 1950 (revised edition in 1963), his colleagues have been awaiting the work which should follow the preface. In 1963 he indicated that an OT theology should be written around the central theme of the OT, which is God. This work delivers the promise. Compared to most other theologies of the OT, it is extremely concise; but the student who uses it will find it clear and competent. D. does not call the work a theology of the OT, and so the reviewer should not demand that the work reach the dimensions of the works of Eichrodt and von Rad. But I suspect that D. would say that these writers have sometimes fattened their works by the discussion of topics which are not properly theological. D. has no treatment of biblical anthropology, for instance. He does have a brief opening chapter on Israelite society. He proceeds on the commonly accepted teaching that Israel knew God primarily as a God who acts in history. Both protology and eschatology are subsequent developments in Israelite belief. The “character” of God is the heading under which D. discusses the biblical attributes such as righteousness and fidelity.

This reviewer has for some time been deeply concerned with the problem of the structure of OT theology. When the problem is perceived with all its anguish, one is tempted to say—and I think D. means this—forget about Eichrodt and von Rad; theology is doctrine about God, and that is all we can write. But the problem simply emerges in another form. How can we speak of a doctrine about God which includes sources as diverse as J and P and the Chronicler, Proverbs and Job, Amos and Haggai? Then we will with von Rad collect theologies of the OT rather than create a theology; and we have to create it, because it is not present formally in the sources. But this is precisely theologies, and this we do not want. Now if we produce “a” doctrine about God, we shall almost certainly follow the categories to which we are accustomed; and we shall synthesize the stubborn material by selecting just those elements which hang together and which we with our religious understanding find easiest to grasp. Hence it has happened that OT theologies all read very much alike; they represent the doctrine about God which twentieth-century scholars formulate
with the aid of the OT. No doubt the main reason for the enduring importance of Eichrodt and von Rad is that their books do not read just like other OT theologies; and some criticisms of their works imply that they have disappointed their colleagues by being original.

Ultimately the OT theologian cannot write a doctrine about God; he can only write about Israel's experience of God—or Israel's belief in God, not to prejudge the basic question. There are many elements in this experience which remain foreign to us. For the Christian it is basic that the God of Israel is the God whom Jesus called His Father. Very few Christians have ever been conscious of what I have called the foreign elements in the Israelite experience; I do not mean foreign in the sense that they come from foreign provenance, but that they are foreign to us. Nor would von Rad allow me to speak of the “Israelite” experience of God; he would remind me that we can theologize only about the religious literature of Israel which has survived in the OT. If we are theologizing in the strict sense, we form our conclusions on the basis of credibility; if we are analyzing experience, we make no value judgments. All experience is equally experience. Hence, to return to the God of Israel as the Father of Jesus, we really cannot say that the Father is the God of the OT; He is the God believed and worshiped in late Judaism.

These remarks will probably confuse the reader; but they reflect a confused situation. I do not know why we cannot write a theology of the OT as we write theologies of other literatures and other periods. But every effort to do it seems to have an unsatisfactory result; critics say that the book is not a theology of the OT, although they would be embarrassed if they had to say what they thought a theology of the OT is. About D.'s book I will say cautiously that a doctrine about God does not seem to meet the demands of a theology of the OT; but, as I have observed, D. has not given his book the title "theology." Behind this, however, is the further problem: can one write a doctrine about God based on the OT?

University of Notre Dame

John L. McKenzie, S.J.


This is a reprint of a classic of Reform Judaism welcome in itself and for wider purposes which Prof. Blau's introduction points up admirably. Kohler, of course, must be seen in historical perspective. He accepted the rationalism and optimistic evolutionism of the nineteenth century. Specifically, this means Wellhausen's view of the Bible as a record of
a progress toward a higher religion. His problem was to reconcile this with some form of the Jewish tradition. His solution focuses on the ethics which were supposed to be the creation of the prophets. Messianism tends to become some kind of humanitarianism, while the practices of Orthodox Judaism are treated as a necessary step toward the "modern" emphasis on ethic rather than rite. Much of this sort of thinking has been superseded in and outside of Judaism, but it still represents a determinative stage in the development of American Judaism. Nor is it all so out of date.

If interreligious co-operation and the pluralist society are to be real, we must be able to understand and talk with our Jewish fellow citizens. This means that we must know what K. represented. We must appreciate the deep attachment to ancestral tradition he displays in his wealth of rabbinical learning (and he is a relatively easy introduction to this indispensable lore). We must also understand that Christians were a real, not just a remembered, threat (perhaps they still are). Hence the book's polemic relative to Christianity.

However, the book is more widely instructive. It has its uses beyond its place in the necessary effort to know something of what American Judaism is. K. wrestles with universal problems to which historical relativism is one easy solution. But is there revelation? If there is, it represents some kind of absolute, even within the limits of our changing human condition. This would seem to mean that revealed religion will always claim a plus value beyond any innerworldly value, and the secular city cannot exhaust religion. And yet the absolute must meet us, limited and relative beings. Paul Tillich has defined religion in terms of this tension. K. struggles with precisely this tension within his own tradition. To my mind, he hardly resolves it, because he is trapped within historical relativism. But it is an honest and illuminating effort. Its study might help those Catholics who are forever catching up with and proclaiming nineteenth-century liberalism (particularly in biblical interpretation) under the illusion that they are speaking of the present and the future.

St. Louis University Divinity School  
DENNIS J. MCCARTHY, S.J.


This collection of twelve essays on the Redaktionsgeschichte and related problems of the Synoptic Gospels is dedicated to Msgr. Joseph
Coppens as the second of a projected three-volume *Donum natalicium* for his seventieth birthday (see *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 44 [1968] 308). The venerable OT exegete of Louvain is thus honored by a small group of NT scholars who have recognized the bearing of his teaching and writing on NT study. The essays were originally papers read at the sixteenth session (September 6–8, 1965) of the *Journées bibliques*, held each fall in Louvain. Some of the essays appeared earlier in *ETL* 43 (1967) 1–129—those of X. Léon-Dufour, S. McLoughlin, F. Neirynck, J. Delorme, and A. George. As a group, these essays represent a modern European Catholic reaction to the critical study of the Synoptic Gospels in recent decades. The value of most of them lies not so much in their originality as in the useful summary or survey of the topics treated.

The first two essays deal with the Synoptic Problem as such. In “Interprétation des évangiles et problème synoptique” (pp. 5–17) X. Léon-Dufour complains against the widespread recognition accorded to the Two-Source Theory (Mark and Q) and seeks to push his thesis of no direct dependence of Mt and Lk on Mk but rather of literary contacts at a stage prior to their written composition. L.’s thesis is fully explained in A. Robert and A. Feuillet, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Tournai, 1965) pp. 250–86, but it has found little support. His new essay represents a plea to be heard, but scarcely adds anything new to the debate. Much more substantive is the second essay, by S. McLoughlin, who considers from a fresh viewpoint “the minor agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk and the Synoptic Problem.” His essay distinguishes, as others have done before him, the agreements into major and minor, negative and positive, significant and insignificant, formal and material; and he concludes to an almost total absence of significant agreements of Mt and Lk over against Mk. Thus, this essay points once again in the direction of the classic Two-Source Theory, or some modification of it. It is interesting to note how the better essays in this volume happen to be those in which the presupposition is some form of the Two-Source Theory. The pragmatic value of the theory has been its best defense; this is what is often called *Brauchbarkeit* argument.

The three following essays deal with each of the Synoptic Gospels from a general or comprehensive view. F. Neirynck’s essay surveys Matthean redactional composition and its bearing on the structure of the first Gospel. J. Delorme discusses the doctrinal aspects of Mk, as viewed from the standpoint of the redaction of the Gospel. The essay of A. George (“Tradition and Redaction in Lk: The Construction of the Third Gospel”) is heavily influenced by H. Conzelmann’s views on
Lucan theology, but seeks to eliminate some of the exaggerated points in Conzelmann's thesis (e.g., neglect of the Infancy Narrative, great emphasis on the delay of the Parousia as the reason for Luke's de-eschatologization of the sayings of Jesus). Neirynck's article is packed with information and makes many good points, but his outline of Mt is scarcely better than that of the so-called "Five Books" which he rejects. Of the three essays, that of A. George is certainly the best. Distinguishing three periods in Lucan salvation history (along with Conzelmann), G. emphasizes the experience of new events in the apostolic Church more than the delay of the Parousia as the basis of the distinction of the periods of Jesus and the Church.

The sole non-Catholic contribution in the volume is by P. Bonnard, whose essay deals with the "Composition and Historical Meaning of Mt 18." It is followed by two other essays dealing with the composition of individual Gospel passages, one by J. Lambrecht ("The Structure of Mk 13") and the other by E. Rasco ("The Parables of Lk 15"). In each of these essays the emphasis is on the editorial or redactional work of the Evangelist. Together with the three preceding general essays they justify the use of the word "rédauction" in the subtitle of the book. Of the three, the weakest is undoubtedly that of Lambrecht, which confronts the Marcan eschatological discourse and explains the structure of chap. 13 in too much reliance on the concentric, chiastic, and inclusive use of words. His structured text of the discourse (pp. 157–62) frankly admits its dependence on A. Vanhoye's analysis of the literary structure of Heb. No one will deny that such structures are found in the NT; but we are now being treated to a panstructuralism by writers who invent the structures more frequently than they discover them.

In the last four essays, which also deal with individual Gospel passages, an attempt is made to distinguish the Gospel tradition (prior to the writing) and the particular editing of the story inherited by the Evangelist. In each case there is a concern not only for the explanation of the Gospel material, but also for its theological significance. Thus, M. Sabbe analyzes the Synoptic accounts of "The Baptism of Jesus" (pp. 184–211), B. M. F. van Iersel devotes his essay to "The Call of Levi" (pp. 212–32), A.-M. Denis treats "The Walking of Jesus on the Waters" (pp. 233–47), and M. Didier interprets "The Parable of the Talents and the Pounds" (pp. 248–71). These essays justify the use of the word "tradition" in the subtitle of the book. Of the four, that of van Iersel is the best.

In all, the collected studies form a group that discusses many aspects of the Synoptic Gospels. Some of the analyses and explanations
are more adventuresome than others; but they make a good impression as a whole and the reader will certainly be rewarded by the careful and judicious views that are normally found in these essays. They form a handsome birthday gift for Prof. Coppens.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Nine tenths of this book is dedicated to a history of the exegesis of Jn 13:1-20 from patristic to modern times; Richter's own interpretation is squeezed into the last thirty-five pages. The historical part is well done; mercifully he has given a synopsis at the end of every small section, so that one can follow carefully without having to read the views of every author. Only from such studies shall we be able to write an adequate history of exegesis; for, as R. points out, our knowledge of the biblical interpretation of some periods, such as the Late Middle Ages, is still very inexact. As for the impact of the historical study on the exegesis of John, R. shows that the evidence for a baptismal interpretation of the scene is far less impressive than hitherto thought. The oft-repeated statement that the Latin Fathers related the foot washing to baptism, while the Greek Fathers saw it as an act of humility, needs considerable modification. Many of the Latin Fathers saw a reference to baptism in Jn 13:10: "The man who has bathed has no need to wash [except for his feet]"; but they distinguished the baptismal bathing from the foot washing—the bathing referred to the baptism of the disciples that had taken place earlier (e.g., by John the Baptist), while the foot washing was a symbol of the forgiveness of subsequent sin. The interpretation of the foot washing itself as a symbol of baptismal cleansing is found among the early Fathers only in Tertullian, Cyprian, Aphraates, and Cyril of Alexandria; and even in these instances there is some doubt.

Although it is enriched by his exhaustive knowledge of the pertinent literature. R.'s own interpretation has considerable originality. (It is also available in an article in the Münchener theologische Zeitschrift 16 [1965] 13–26, with an English summary in Theology Digest 14 [1966] 200–205.) R. agrees with Boismard and others that two different interpretations of the foot washing are found respectively in 13:6–10a, the dialogue between Jesus and Peter, and in 13:12–17, the discourse of Jesus. He wisely rejects Boismard's view that the latter interpretation (the foot washing as an example of humility and loving service) is the
more original and suggests that it was introduced into the Gospel at the same time that the moralizing and pastoral form of the Last Discourse (chaps. 15–16) was introduced. (R. accepts and presupposes the theory common today, especially among Catholics, that a shorter Gospel underwent stages of editing and that the final redactor was a Johannine disciple different from the Evangelist.) The dialogue of 13:6–10a represents the interpretation found in the original Gospel, an interpretation harmonious with the Evangelist’s stated purpose (20:31) of writing to show that Jesus was the Messiah. For many Jews, Jesus’ death on the cross was not reconcilable with the concept of a glorious Messiah; and to counteract this, John insists that the Passion was an essential part of the work given Jesus by the Father and that Jesus accepted the cross in conformity with the Father’s will so that He might save men (e.g., 18:11). At the beginning of the Johannine account of the Passion, Jesus washes His disciples’ feet as a sign. The key to the symbolism is found in 13:8, where Peter is told of the absolute necessity of this action: “If I do not wash you, you will have no heritage with me.” After His death (the “afterwards” of 13:7) the disciples understood that the foot washing was a sign of the humiliating death that Jesus had accepted to cleanse men from their sins.

I believe that R. has made a major break-through in the understanding of this difficult passage and would make only some minor qualifications. First, R. could have supported his thesis better by calling upon the frequent symbolic actions of the OT prophets as a parallel for Jesus’ acting out His death and its effects by way of the foot washing. Such a symbolic dramatization is no more unusual that Jeremiah’s or Ezekiel’s acting out the fall of Jerusalem. Second, while R. is adamant in rejecting all baptismal symbolism in the scene, the reviewer is still not convinced that a secondary sacramental allusion to baptism may not be found in 13:6–10a. It is true, the case for baptismal interpretation has been greatly weakened by R.’s re-evaluation of the patristic exegesis; but, by R.’s own evidence, the Fathers did not understand the scene, especially as regards the correct meaning of 13:10, where the bathing is the foot washing. Besides the standard argument that this verb “to bathe” is a term used in the NT for baptism, we point to the close connection between baptism and Jesus’ salvific death. If the foot washing symbolized Jesus’ salvific death, would not reflection on this symbolism have quickly evoked baptism, the washing by which Christians were brought into contact with Jesus’ salvific death and made sharers in His heritage? R.’s contention (p. 298) that sacramental symbolism has nothing to do with the expressed purpose for which the Evangelist wrote, i.e., to show that Jesus was
the Messiah, proves no more than that baptismal symbolism is not the primary meaning of the foot washing.

St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore Raymond E. Brown, S.S.


The aim of this book is a contribution to the study of Pauline anthropology. Though Sand recognizes that there is no systematic presentation of this anthropology in Paul's letters, he rightly finds the complex notion of *sarx* to be a key element in it and one deserving a fresh, close study. His book is a slightly reworked doctoral dissertation, written under O. Kuss at the University of Munich and finished in 1963-64. The detailed analysis of the Pauline passages dealing with *sarx* and his survey of the related literature make this monograph a very useful contribution to Pauline studies.

Four chapters in Part 1 survey the history of the problem, sketching the earlier treatment of *sarx* in various monographs and excursuses in commentaries. Here S. distinguishes three main periods: (1) the "konsequent-historisch" investigation of such writers as F. C. Baur, A. Ritschl, C. C. Holsten, R. Schmidt, H. Lüdemann, O. Pfleiderer, H. H. Wendt, H. J. Holtzmann, A. Juncker, and E. de Witt Burton; (2) the history-of-religions approach of such writers as A. Deissmann, R. Reitzenstein, F. Cumont, W. Bousset, A. Schweitzer, and W. Schauf; and (3) the historico-theological interpretation of K. Barth, R. Bultmann, E. Lohmeyer, E. Käsemann, W. Gutbrod, W. G. Kümmel, C. H. Lindijer, J. A. T. Robinson, and W. D. Stacey. This is a valuable survey; in many respects it is the best part of S.'s book.

In the three chapters of Part 2, S. discusses the passages in Paul's *Hauptbriefe* in which *sarx* occurs. By *Hauptbriefe* S. means six Pauline letters: Gal, Phil, 1-2 Cor, Rom, and Phm. One is not surprised at the omission of 1-2 Th, for the word *sarx* does not occur in them. But how does Phm rate as a *Hauptbrief*? The omission of the occurrences in Col and Eph seems to be due to a problem S. has with their authenticity. At any rate, he groups the uses of *sarx* in the six letters under three general headings: (1) those that clearly show their dependence on the OT usage of "flesh"; (2) those that designate a mode of man's earthly or "worldly" existence; and (3) those that reveal it as a term for man in bondage to sin. Under these general headings and further subdivisions of them, S. analyzes exegetically and theologically the individual Pauline passages. His analysis of the text is
close and balanced, in general; it is often carefully controlled by reference to standard commentaries and monographs. But one wonders about such a categorization of the Pauline passages, set forth at the very beginning of the analysis. Does it really allow "the Apostle to speak for himself"—a goal that S. proposes in his introduction (p. ix)?

Four chapters in Part 3 analyze the background of the Pauline notion of "flesh." Here S.'s treatment proceeds from the standpoint of the history of religions. The Pauline usage is compared with that of the Hebrew bāsār and related OT words such as lēb, "heart," nepēš, "vital principle," and rūḥ, "spirit," and with the LXX usage of sarx. Greek philosophical writers and the Corpus Hermeticum illustrate its usage in the Hellenistic world. The comparison of sarx with "flesh" in Jewish writings includes what S. calls works missing from the "Hebrew canon," apocalyptic writings (Enoch, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), the Dead Sea Scrolls, and rabbinical literature. Finally, Philo and Josephus serve as Hellenistic Jewish writers to give yet another point of comparison. Much in this chapter is a mere repetition of what was known before. Moreover, S. would do well to consult some of the writings of A. C. Sundberg on the so-called "Hebrew canon" (e.g., The Old Testament of the Early Church [Cambridge, 1964]; "The 'Old Testament': A Christian Canon," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 30 [1968] 143–55). This is, admittedly, a minor point in his presentation, but one worth noting in any case. More important is his extended treatment of "flesh" in Qumran literature. In this discussion S. has in many ways gone beyond others who have written on the subject. But his treatment would have profited from a number of discussions of the same topic that are strangely absent from this part of his book (e.g., R. E. Murphy, Sacra pagina 2 [Gembloux, 1959] 60–76; P. Hyatt, New Testament Studies 2 [1955–56] 276–84; D. Flusser, Tarbiz 27 [1958] 158–65; J. Licht, Israel Exploration Journal 6 [1956] 1–13, 89–101).

The concluding chapter is devoted to "the theological meaning of 'flesh.'" It is a good chapter but all too short. S. makes little effort to relate this to the larger view of Pauline anthropology, but this is a defect of the work that was a limited dissertation to begin with. Aside from the high price and a number of typographical errors, especially frequent in English quotations and titles, this is a handsome book, one from which the reader will learn much and be roused to independent thought.

Woodstock College

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

This introductory survey of theology is intended for students, especially for those beginning their theological course. Part 1, on the nature of theology, takes the position that theology, since it deals with God in His saving and life-giving activity, should be historical, Christological, ecclesiological, and anthropological. Part 2, on theological method, considers the positive and speculative functions of theology in their mutual interaction. In his treatment of positive theology, Latourelle calls attention to the various advantages and perils of both the genetic and the regressive methods. Part 3, a brief survey of the theological disciplines, gives special prominence to newly emerging fields such as pastoral, missionary, and ecumenical theology. Part 4 explores the connections between theology and the Christian life, including its bearing on the pastoral ministry and on spirituality. Part 5, on present orientations in theology, surveys and synthesizes a number of recent trends and movements. “Attention to history and to the historicity of the human condition, an anthropocentric outlook, a personalistic orientation, a commitment to dialogue and to service: these traits are to be found in the treatment of all the main themes of theology” (p. 250).

In this work L. exhibits the qualities which have distinguished his other publications. He writes with perfect lucidity, balance, and order. He shows an amazing familiarity with the present situation of many theological treatises, and provides exceptionally valuable bibliographies and footnotes referring to recent Catholic literature in many languages. Solidly grounded in the tradition, he is open to new developments, ienic, and optimistic. His entire work breathes a spirit of serenity and joy in the mysteries which form the subject matter of theology. He clearly delineates the relationship between theology and the interior life. “Authentic theology proceeds from a living faith, which seeks to understand in order that it may better love, and which loves in order that it may better understand” (p. 237). Excellent too is the treatment of the pastoral aspects of theology. Priests and seminarians will profit greatly from the observations on preaching, on moral theology, on the renewal of canon law, and on the personalistic interpretations of grace and sacraments.

The section on theological method is the briefest and, I think, the least satisfying in the book. For one thing, I found it difficult to reconcile L.'s statements regarding the aim of theology: is it primarily theoretical (p. 75) or practical (p. 201)? More importantly, I wonder whether it is still adequate to recognize only the three standard
sources of theology—Bible, monuments of tradition, and magisterial teaching. If it be true, as L. later affirms, that God speaks to us through secular history, it would seem to follow that the events and movements of secular history—and man’s reaction to them in cultural expressions—should be reckoned as theological sources. In general, L.’s conception of theology seems excessively ecclesiocentric. It takes little account of the “anonymously Christian.”

Further, I wish the section on theological method had gone more deeply into the question how the contemporary theologian is to get at the divinely intended meaning of the Bible and the testimonies of tradition, including magisterial documents. L. has no treatment of the senses of Scripture or of Christian exegesis. If theology today is, as he states, under the sign of history, it is important not to overlook the hermeneutical problem of interpreting documents that come to us from a remote culture.

Finally, I should have wished to see some treatment of the uses of disciplines such as psychology and sociology in systematic theology. It is my impression that theology has scarcely begun to grapple with the social conditioning of religious statements. For this very reason, it is perhaps unfair to expect that this difficult subject should be treated in a professedly introductory work.

As a descriptive guide to what Catholic theology is currently doing, this book should prove very useful. It will whet the appetite of the beginner and familiarize the veteran with postconciliar developments.

Woodstock College
  AVERY DULLES, S.J.

MEMORY AND HOPE: AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE PRESENCE OF CHRIST.

This is a difficult book to read, to comprehend, and to review. Not many readers, even among theologians, can match Ritschl’s mastery of a wide body of contemporary Protestant discussions of Christology and hermeneutics. Some such mastery would be needed for an adequate evaluation of the book’s main theses. The argumentation is often elliptical and obscure. R. observes in his preface that this volume represents a transition in his career: after seven years in NT and historical studies, he is now turning to systematics. The work is, indeed, situated at the border between the historical and the systematic, and so at what may be termed a theological weather front. A certain cloudiness is to be expected.

This is, however, an essay of considerable importance and value, if only because it puts forth a few distinctive and provocative theses on
points of central importance. The gist of the opening three historical chapters may be stated somewhat as follows. The neglect of the *Christus praesens* is due to the influence of Augustinianism. Whatever recent critics may have said about the Greek Fathers, they did keep theology in touch with worship as its living source; they saw the theological importance of the presence of Christ in liturgy. Once this is understood, then many Protestant objections to the “ontological” character of Greek theology fall away. The concept of deification, for example, is doxological, not ontological. Unfortunately, R. thinks, the West did not take over the best of Greek theology. Augustine combined a Latin ecclesiology with Greek (Neoplatonic) philosophy. His acceptance of eternal ideas, his individualizing of justification, the relative absence of Christ from his ecclesiology, and other deficiencies were passed on in the West as an unfortunate heritage which makes joyful adoration of the *Christus praesens* impossible.

The three chapters of the second, or systematic, part of the book have a contemporary context. R. first wrestles with the recent discussions of “talking about God,” particularly in the debate between Herbert Braun and Helmut Gollwitzer, and in the contributions of his former colleague at Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Paul van Buren. While R. rejects the thesis that we cannot speak meaningfully of God, he is open to the possibility that at the moment in America we may need to be silent for a while, as a remedy for excessive speech about Him and as adoration. In this chapter R. develops his views on the distinction between doxological and properly theological language. The next chapter contains his strictures, in the light of his *Christus praesens* thesis, on the “new morality” and “anonymous Christianity.” He finds the shadow of Augustinianism in both.

The three historical and two systematic chapters have prepared the way for R.’s expression of what he means by the *Christus praesens*, and how he conceives it as the starting point for Christology. Incarnation-theology leads, he feels, to an impasse, and the resurrection-centered Christologies of some like Pannenberg yield the “historical-resurrected” Jesus but not the *Christus praesens*. Prayer and the imitation of the priestly function of Jesus, i.e., His working not on behalf of Himself but for others, become central for the Christian who takes his point of departure from the *Christus praesens*. But just who is the *Christus praesens*? From the point of view of the Church, says R., He is “that ‘power’ or ‘interest’ (formally speaking) which makes the Church see that she is taken into possession, drawn into the history of promise and fulfillment, used in service, invited to hope; and this
'power' is called Christ because the Church recognizes it in no one else than the one whom she remembers as the earthly priest Jesus of Nazareth and whom she expects in the future, though in no other terms than those of the promises of the past" (p. 218). From the side of God, "the Christus praesens is 'that' in Yahweh which was manifest in the man Jesus of Nazareth who performed his unique priestly task; and this 'that' is nothing else than God's own covenantal will to remain man's partner through the course of his own history..." (p. 219). R. seems inclined to the view that the Christus praesens is identical with the Holy Spirit.

The historical canvas covered by R.'s essay is so vast that some distortions and oversimplifications are inevitable. To say, e.g., that "ever since Tertullian and Augustine, the world has not been seen as God's good creation" (p. 181) is to ignore the entire anti-Manichean corpus of Augustine as well as a whole dimension of later theologies of creation. Likewise, to speak of "the relative absence of Christology from Augustine's concept of the Church" (p. 102) and to refer to the imitation of the humilitas Christi as almost the only occurrence or necessary function of Jesus Christ in Augustine's doctrines of grace and the Church (p. 121) are possible only if one leaves out of consideration Augustine's extensive treatment of the presence of Christ the head in His body, the Church.

As regards the systematic aspects of R.'s essay, Memory and Hope is a timely reminder that present encounter with Christ is inseparable from the historical and eschatological dimensions of Christian faith. One must also welcome his attention to the theological import of the Church's worship, and his distinction between theological and doxological speech, though I wonder if he does not exaggerate the difference. And, in spite of his concluding chapter, the conception of the Christus praesens, which is not simply identical with the risen, living Lord present to His Church, remains confusing. It should not be too unsophisticated to ask for a clear indication of whether the Christus praesens whom the Church addresses in her worship is identically Jesus of Nazareth who was crucified, then raised up by God, and who is now living in His own person.

Woodstock College

THOMAS E. CLARKE, S.J.


From a theological point of view, both of friend and of foe, the value of Teilhard de Chardin's contribution to the understanding of the gos-
pel in and for our times rests on the validity of his Christology: for friend, on its originality and relevance to the problem of Christian secularity and of the compatibility of faith and science in a world now evolving under the impact of science (the intellectual side of the general religious problem of the secular and the sacred, of involvement in the world and detachment from it); for foe, on the equivocation that stems from the very same originality seen as a radical departure from the received tradition. For both, the debate is well summarized in the title chosen for this volume.

To illustrate the solidly traditional roots of T.'s Christological emphases, and thus refute one of the chief objections of T.'s critics, M. sketches in a series of five chapters the relation of Christ to the cosmos in the *NT* (Paul and John) and in the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene Greek Fathers. What M. presents is a summary of the fruits of scholarship; nor does he pretend to much more than a cursory and selective examination of a few themes helpful to his purpose, viz., of describing clearly the breath of vision and sense of unity so characteristic of an earlier theological tradition when treating the relation between Christ and the created universe. This is surely no small merit of M.'s work—to have outlined systematically those elements of a synthesis based on the early Greek tradition, and to have provided in an appendix a handy anthology of texts from the Greek Fathers to accompany the explanations.

In chap. 6 M. reviews T.'s Christological thought. On the one hand, T.'s vision of Christ includes elements, contentwise as well as stylistically, strikingly absent from a more recent theological tradition; on the other hand, T.'s view of Christ as the Omega Point of all cosmic and human development appears similar in substance to the older Christology described in the preceding chapters, and according to M. mostly neglected and forgotten since Maximus Confessor. T.'s originality consists not so much in the novelty of his theological insight as in the way he formulates this in view of modern, scientific ideas concerning the character of an evolving world.

In a final chapter M. applies both the traditional and the original insights of T. to the contemporary problem of the secular city: what its meaning might be in view of the convergence of the universe on Christ; what it means to be in the world but not of it; how a Christian can at once be detached from and positively involved with the world.

To note weaknesses in the presentation is not to fault M., for to a great extent these are the inherent limitations of the anthology genre which he employs. The judicious selection, arrangement, and com-
parison of texts brings to the fore the unified vision that stands behind and is partially hidden by all and each of them. But to do this it was necessary to leave aside that which tended to obscure or weaken the clarity of the vision. One may still wonder if the vision is more than a reconstruction, whether in fact M.'s main thesis would be fully verified from a historical rather than a logical arrangement of texts. In fact, M. draws almost all his patristic texts from those Fathers (Alexandrian and Cappadocian) who are often viewed as representatives of a Logos-Christology. Would an examination of texts from those representing what is called an Anthropos-Christology bear out M.'s conclusions? Or perhaps indicate difficulties in one theological analysis (Alexandrian) of the cosmic dimensions of Christ's work that could help in part to explain subsequent developments, e.g., the seeming neglect of a basic insight after Maximus? However one evaluates the contemporary relevance of the Franciscan school, it is difficult to understand how in the light of one of its principal concerns (the relation between creation and Incarnation) M. can imply that nothing of importance between Maximus and Teilhard was done to study the cosmic dimensions of the mystery of Christ.

Similar problems are encountered in the chapter on Teilhard. If there is a dualism incompatible with the gospel, so too there is a monism equally incompatible, an excessive and one-sided preoccupation with unity and continuity in history that blurs distinctions between creation and re-creation, between creature and Creator. One need not deny T.'s great merits in effectively bringing before the public the traditional insights obscured in so much Neo-Scholastic theology, nor reject the eminently Christian character of T.'s over-all vision, to be conscious of the critical problems and limitations of his thought on the "cosmic Christ" in doing full justice to these distinctions. An initial impression is left that T.'s Christology shares the grandeur but also the weakness of the Logos-Christology, which was a temptation to Monophysitism.

To note that T. and M. have not solved the Christological problems of the ages is not to fault either. Who of us will have the last word? It was T.'s unique merit to have focused our attention once more on a basic problem in an original and timely way; it is M.'s achievement to have clearly noted (as T. does not) the thoroughly traditional roots of T.'s interests and insights.

*St. Anthony-on-Hudson*  
*Rensselaer, N.Y.*

*Peter D. Fehlner, O.F.M.Conv.*
INFALLIBILITY AND THE EVIDENCE. By Francis Simons. Springfield: Templegate, 1968. Pp. 120. $4.95.

In this book Francis Simons, Roman Catholic Bishop of Indore, India, seeks to prove that the Church's belief in infallibility is mistaken because it is not clearly founded in the NT. S.'s grasp of current biblical studies may be seen from the following: "If the gospels are judged without prejudice about the possibility or not of miracles, they emerge as belonging to the most reliable contemporary writings we have of ancient times. On a fraction of their testimony we build most of our certainties of Greek and Roman history" (p. 48).

S. disagrees with the Second Vatican Council's criterion for the infallibility of the ordinary magisterium. "It is interesting to note that this statement omits one major condition mentioned in the famous words of St. Vincent of Lerin [sic] who demands that the Church retain as truly Catholic what was believed 'always, everywhere and by all.' In the statement of Vatican II there is no demand made that the proposition must have been believed 'always'" (pp. 116-17).

This statement is helpful in understanding S.'s position. He is not dealing with the living truth that was God's Word revealed to men but with static propositions understood in a conceptualist epistemology. For S., infallibility gives certitude which supplies added grounds for assent to propositions. S. does not need support for certain assent. S. maintains that after minimal historical investigation the meaning of the NT propositional revelation by Christ becomes conceptually clear to any man endowed with common sense. The believer's faith is certain, for he has rationally assented to the clear meaning of the gospel message. Hence S. radically reduces the role of the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation. "Even if the distinction between God's ordinary and extra-ordinary providence was not quite foreign to them [Jesus' contemporaries], they were unable to understand that special interventions of God are extremely rare exceptions instead of common daily events. It is obvious that this could easily lead them to believe in a divine inspiration of the bible—a belief shared by other ancient peoples about their religious books—and in a special divine guidance of the Church, on evidence that cannot satisfy people with a much better knowledge of the powers of nature and the human mind" (p. 110).

S. holds that it is the gospel alone that is normative for Christian belief, since it alone has been accepted "always, everywhere, and by all" Christians. In such a scheme of things infallibility serves no purpose and the magisterium serves no necessary function. "After so many changes in doctrine which were thought to have a secure foundation in the ecclesiastical magisterium, this alone can no longer provide a firm
basis of certainty. It must appeal again to what Christ taught, as it can be proved from the first-hand apostolic testimony preserved for us in writing in the gospels and other books of the New Testament" (p. 118).

It is ironical that in his abundance of certitude S. exhibits such a lack of understanding. With such presuppositions it is not strange that the question of the meaning of Jesus’ message and how it is to be lived through time by members of the pilgrim Church—the very core of the theological task of understanding infallibility—utterly escapes S. In his exercise in rationalistic fundamentalism S. never considers the Church to be a mystery and never once mentions the role of grace in the act of faith and the Christian life. Had S. theologized about infallibility, had he sought its meaning in its proper ecclesiological context, perhaps he would have begun to understand what he rejects with such certitude. Had S. but a minimal grasp of modern hermeneutics and ecclesiastical history, perhaps he would be less confident in dismissing a doctrine he has not begun to understand.

As a theological treatise this book is a complete failure. S.’s ignorance of even the fundamentals of theological method, coupled with his unfamiliarity with the doctrine of infallibility, makes his book unworthy of any serious reader’s attention.

Woodstock College

A.Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.


Publication of a course as recorded by a student is a hazardous venture. Both Paul Tillich and the recorder, Peter John, were aware of this. Their mimeographed edition, published during Tillich’s lifetime, stated that special permission was required to quote from these notes. This warning has disappeared in the printed text, and the Preface does not even mention Tillich’s reluctance to let all and sundry quote from this course.

This is all the more regrettable, as errors of one kind or another abound in this volume. T. was great in opening historical perspectives, but he never claimed to be a historian and did not particularly care about accuracy, historical or otherwise: e.g., p. 202, “archetype” is described as being a Latin expression; p. 208, “love of the enemies” is placed among the “monastic counsels”; p. 221, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is said to have become de fide in 1870; p. 233, the Bull Unam sanctam is quoted (without being named) as though it came after Luther.

T.’s theological bias appears clearly in this historical survey. His
treatment of the Fathers emphasizes the anti-Gnostic controversy, Origen, Pseudo-Dionysius, and especially Augustine. The Trinitarian and Christological controversies take relatively little space. Byzantine and Eastern Orthodox developments are not mentioned. A great deal of attention is focused on the Latin Middle Ages, but Joachim rather than Aquinas stands at the center of the picture. It is significant that “Roman Catholicism from Trent to the Present” comes before the Reformation, as an appendix to the Middle Ages. There are then long studies of Luther and Calvin, together with a sympathetic treatment of Zwingli. Protestant Orthodoxy, Pietism, and the Enlightenment are briefly covered at the end.

The main interest of this course for the student of T.’s thought lies in the pattern of history that T. had in mind. If time is both *chronos* (succession) and *kairos* (significant moment), T. tries to discover the *kairos* of each period rather than the succession of events, authors, and doctrines. This *kairos* he finds in a dialectical concept of the clash of doctrines, which T. commonly describes in military terms: the history of Christian thought is full of “attacks,” “threats,” “dangers,” “conflicts,” “victories,” “defeats.” The theologians and prelates he studies become “leaders,” “allies,” “defenders,” “accusers.” Such a way of telling history can be exciting, but it tends to fantastic reductions, generalizations, and simplifications. Thus T. writes: “The importance of Joan of Arc was that, in her, French nationalism first arose and came into direct conflict with the Pope” (p. 153). To say nothing of nationalism (of which there was very little in Joan of Arc), the story of her life has recorded no conflict with the Pope. Or again, “the Jesuits” (this was perhaps to be expected in a military pattern of the history of Christian thought, but it does little credit to T.’s scholarship) are presented as “undercutting . . . conscience . . . the authority of the bishops . . . the Church fathers . . . ” (pp. 119–220). Their concept of tradition is summed up in the belief that “there is only one father of the Church, namely, the living Pope” (p. 220).

In spite of his concern for preserving “the catholic substance,” T. understood little of Catholicism. His outline of Catholic sacramental theology is especially misleading, referring constantly to “magic.” One example will suffice: “The Roman Church was one in which the sacraments were administered in a magic way by the hierarchy, and only by the hierarchy, so that all who do not participate in them are lost, and those who do participate, even if they are unworthy, receive the sacrament” (p. 236). It seems unavoidable that a history of thought conceived as a swing between *sic* and *non* would harden differences into exclusive positions. No wonder that T. concludes, in a typically un-
ecumenical vein: "This is why a reunion of the churches was not possible.... You can compromise about different doctrines; you cannot compromise about different religions! Either you have the Protestant relation to God or you have the Catholic, but you cannot have both..." (p. 228).

The short Preface by Carl Braaten seems to overrate the importance of this course as revealing "the historical depth of Tillich's insights" (p. ix), for readers will need great discernment in order to use this text in a way that will do justice to T.'s more careful statements.

*Pennsylvania State University*

*George H. Tavard*


The sixth edition of this standard theological source collection is a new work in several respects. It is greatly changed from the fifth edition (1934), long out of print, which itself was a reprint of the fourth edition (1924). The editor is new: Mirbt (1860–1929) has been succeeded by another distinguished German Evangelical ecclesiastical historian, Aland. In one fashion or another, most of the contents are also new; only one fourth or so of the previous edition remains intact. All six editions have much the same format, but the latest one forsakes the occasional recourse to small print formerly practiced; it abandons the bibliographies accompanying individual texts, because these become dated so quickly; it supplies fuller and more precise information about the edition used for each document; it devotes more attention to footnotes; and it breaks with former custom by insisting on reproducing the orthography of whatever edition is cited. As before, texts alone are printed, without commentary, and with rare exceptions (as in the case of a few Old German passages, which are accompanied by a translation into modern German) solely in the original language, which means almost invariably Latin or Greek. Succeeding editions have been growing longer: the first (1895) had only 154 numbered texts, the second (1901) 506, the third (1911) 619, and the fourth 802. Whereas the fifth edition attained the terminal year 1566 in 489 numbers, 347 pages, the present edition requires 1094 numbers, arranged chronologically in 693 pages. About one document in five has been dropped from the fifth edition. A somewhat larger number of them reappear in the present volume, but in altered form, generally a longer one. Great care has been exercised in choosing the best editions, since the source of a given text
frequently differs from the one formerly used. Sometimes, too, the passage chosen to illustrate a topic from an ancient author is not the same as the one previously selected.

It would have been helpful if A. had revealed in more detail his norms for including and excluding texts. He does note his concern to supply the ecumenical dialogue with sound documentary bases, suited to a milieu vastly altered since Vatican II. In A.’s judgment, Mirbt devoted too much space to general Church history and to mission history. Some topics, once much in the forefront, have receded to the background. These and perhaps other considerations have resulted in the deletion of some famous documents, such as Pliny’s letter to Trajan, the latter’s rescript concerning the treatment of Christians, the Edict of Milan, the Athanasian Creed, the Edict of Worms (1521), the Religious Peace of Augsburg (1555), etc. A recurring theme among the retained texts is the prohibition against reading or translating the Bible. Yet the charge of anti-Catholic bias that used to be leveled against Mirbt can no longer be sustained; indeed, A. lists four well-known Catholic scholars among his advisers.

Many of the newly added texts are extracts from patristic authors, notably Eusebius. For the medieval period, however, more numbers have been dropped than introduced, with one striking exception. Instead of four citations from the *Summa* of Aquinas, occupying 4 pages, there are now 123, filling 123 pages. Four other changes, all dealing with the sixteenth century, deserve special mention. Nine pages of excerpts from the *Confutatio Confessionis Augustanae* represent an innovation. The *Spiritual Exercises* of St. Ignatius now pre-empt 33 pages in place of 2; Tridentine decrees 58 pages instead of 47; and the *Roman Catechism* 39 pages rather than 4. This volume, then, sustains its interest in key texts illustrating developments in the papal office, and it heightens its attention to developments in spirituality and doctrine. Vol. 2, which will contain the index, is promised in the near future.

*Weston College*  
*John F. Broderick, S.J.*


Robert Brentano, Professor of History at the University of California at Berkeley, describes his book as an “essay on two styles of ecclesiastical behavior” (p. ix). In particular, the book is an extended comparison of the methods and machinery of Church government in thirteenth-century England and in thirteenth-century Italy, and especially
of the contrasting attitudes towards that government in the churches of the two countries. The book is an examination of the institutions of the institutional Church. B. examines and contrasts, in turn, the administrative units and juridical instruments of the two churches ("Provinces, Dioceses and Paths of Appeal"), the origins, accomplishments, and ideals of the episcopacy ("Bishops and Saints"), the position and condition of the monks and friars ("Fortresses of Prayer"), the methods for conserving ecclesiastical records ("The Written Church"). Although B. makes an effort at selectivity and at recording for his reader only that detail which he feels is significant and meaningful, the examination of the two churches is meticulous. In his preface B. confesses that he finds "no truth or conviction without detail" (p. ix), and his book is testimony to the efficacy of his effort to elicit generalization only after exploration of detail. The detail itself is supported by impressive documentation from both printed and manuscript sources.

B.'s real intent, however, is to rise above detail. His intent is also to penetrate beyond generalizations concerning the institutional machinery of Church government in the two countries. What he wants to do is to contrast "two styles of ecclesiastical behavior." In other words, he wants to discern subtle differences of emphasis and reaction which indicate an underlying set of different attitudes and values. In a sense, he is attempting a portrait of two different ecclesiastical viewpoints, of two different ecclesiastical psychologies. B. is fully aware of how delicate such an undertaking is, and he very properly describes it as an "essay"—"an extended essay about the connected differences between the two churches.... It is meant to be a comparison of two total styles" (p. vi).

How do the two "styles" emerge in B.'s book? Perhaps the first point to be emphasized is that the churches share much in common, and that the two styles are articulated through the same institutions—episcopacy, monasticism, the new mendicancy, official relations with the papacy, etc. The difference in "style" lies in the differing functions, emphases, roles, and attitudes relative to these institutions. "The English Church was a church of bishops. They were its saints" (p. 347). The "pastoral care" deriving from a well-ordered diocesan government was the instrument of sanctification for the laity, who were its object, and for the bishops, who were its executors. The bishops believed in the importance of administrative continuity and an orderly governed Church. In the Italian Church, on the other hand, "reality... was differently defined" (p. 347). Episcopal administration was more intensely localized, due to the large number of bishoprics, and much less clearly structured. Less importance was attached to it
as an instrument of sanctification. Indeed, the episcopal office was to be eschewed as an office which led its incumbents away from the path of Christian perfection. True religion lay with the poet and the enthusiast, such as Francis, not with the bishop, such as Grosseteste. In the Italian Church there was more spontaneity and less trust for organization. The urban, lay, and literate society of Italy did not of itself encourage the development of an elaborate and separate ecclesiastical system of government and education, as did the more rural and less literate society of the northern country. The different social and economic environments in which the two churches found themselves helped very much to shape their different ecclesiastical "styles."

How successful is B.'s "essay" on "style"? Needless to say, any "essay" of this sort is almost bound to leave the reader with the impression that there is great room for the play of the subjective. B. is well aware of this (p. 345). On the other hand, such an impression can be deceptive. Is not "style" being used simply to describe a certain level of generalization which is desirable in all historical writing? B. has merely tried to bare for us the deeper realities which underlay the ecclesiastical institutions. This is "institutional Church history," therefore, with a difference—a very welcome difference.

University of Detroit

John W. O'Malley, S.J.


The polemical religious literature of Tudor England is often dismissed as unworthy of consideration. It is repetitive, violent, lengthy, and of little interest in our day. Not all agree to this verdict, however, and Pineas for one views this literature as important, not so much for its content as for the methods used and for its impact on subsequent language and literature. His book concentrates on the polemics of an acknowledged literary master, Thomas More, and on those whom he opposed, his chapters dealing successively with More's literary combat with Martin Luther, Johann Brugenhagen, William Tyndale, Robert Barnes, Simon Fish, John Frith, and Christopher Saint-German.

In pursuing his task, P. consciously attempts to read and to write objectively, siding neither with More nor with his opponents in their bitter disputes. To a large extent he succeeds, finding all of his subjects guilty of falsifying their opponent's position, twisting sources, and engaging in innuendo and sarcasm. And yet P. does occupy a definite position, that of the objective observer with an implicit judgment against Catholics and Protestants alike. He is an assistant professor of
English at York College, City University of New York, and as such concentrates on the evaluation of the literature with which he deals, considering literary technique and style in detail. He displays little interest in the men themselves or in the ideas which claim their allegiance.

His major conclusion is that the Reformers relied upon "the polemical use of secular and ecclesiastical history and the Scriptures" in waging their battles against the Church. He is convincing as he illustrates this conclusion, but he is not as helpful in elaborating it and its importance as is F. J. Levy in his recent *Tudor Historical Thought* (San Marino, 1967). Tyndale, influenced by Luther, was of major importance in developing the techniques of appeal to history and Scripture and set a pattern for future polemicians. More, in response, was limited by the techniques which the Protestants used, concentrating, however, more upon Scripture than history. Thus limited, he did not fare too well. He was much more effective when, in his early polemics such as his *Dialogue concernynge heresyes* and his *Supplication of Soules*, he relied upon his lively style, keen wit, and use of dialogue to discredit his enemies.

The over-all impression of the controversies, as presented by P., is that they had some importance, influencing the development of vernacular Scriptures, the discipline of history, the new Ramist logic, and English language and literature in general. But in and of themselves, they seem to reveal narrow minds, the minds of hotheaded, unscrupulous, deceitful controversialists who were seldom reasonable or fair to one another.

P.'s approach to this literature, as demonstrated in this book, is not altogether fair to the polemicists. More sympathy or empathy on the part of the author might have provided some evidence of the very real humanity and piety expressed beneath and through the polemics. I refer, for instance, to Frith's meditation on Christ's passion in his *Aunswere to Sir Thomas More* (Works, 1573, pp. 48-49), Barnes's exposition of Christ as all in all in his *Disputation between the Byshops and Doctour Barnes* (Works, 1573, p. 226), More's plea for humility in his letter on Frith (English Works, 1557, p. 837) or his Christian woman's prayer at the end of the same letter (English Works, 1557, p. 844). In these passages there shines through the methods, style, and vituperation something of the universal faith of the men concerned, which examined deeply enough leads to a common source.

It is this underlying faith and piety which is of value for our day. The common convictions the writers shared on both sides of the great divide were recognized by Richard Hooker at the end of the sixteenth century and by Richard Field at the beginning of the seventeenth. And
More himself seemed to know that there was something more important beneath the rubble of the vicious literary battle. As a humanist, he knew something of the common humanity under God which binds all men together in the human family. And thus he regarded the controversies with regret, writing: "Woulde God we were all of the mynde that every man thought no manne so badde as hymself. For that were the waye to mende both them and us. Nowe they blame us, and we blame them, and both blameworthy and eyther parte more readye to finde others faultes than to mende theyr own." (English Works, 1557, p. 225). Perhaps a more fruitful approach to More and Tudor polemics would be suggested by the post-Vatican II ecumenical historian who probes the literary contents and the lives of the polemicists objectively but with the passion of a Christian humanist. In his careful, well-documented study Pineas has put us all in his debt and paves the way for another kind of study which will probe the evidence more deeply and more sympathetically in an ecumenical spirit.

Cambridge, Mass. John E. Booty


In 1917 Gogarten was asked to prepare a selection of Luther’s writings for publication. He declined, saying that he did not fully understand the role of Jesus Christ in Luther’s theology. Now, fifty years later, G. has finally published a full study of that theology, with particular emphasis on its Christological core. The book represents a half century of theological reflection on Luther’s understanding of the gospel. It documents, in a way, the authentically Lutheran roots of the radical Christian personalism which G. himself has espoused since his break with liberalism after the First World War. It is also, appropriately enough, G.’s last book. He died, at the age of eighty, on October 16, 1967, just as the present book was being printed.

G. does not offer a strictly historical study of Luther. He concentrates on Luther as a guide to the Bible for contemporary Lutherans. This is at once the strength and weakness of the book. Ample quotations from Luther give a striking impression of the driving intensity of the Lutheran vision of Christian justification by faith apart from the works of the law. G. maintains the full force of Luther’s law-gospel dialectic, his theologia crucis, his analysis of man’s enslaved will. Man is never in any way an active agent in the process of justification. God’s Allwirksamkeit is an Alleinwirksamkeit. Christ is the Word of God for us precisely as Christ crucified, in His humiliation and aban-
Donment, as one who has become sin for us. Man's slavery to Satan under the law is not simply a matter of ethically evil acts: man's very person is sinful, apart from Christ. In the face of continuing efforts to domesticate the thought of the turbulent reformer, G. presents Luther's theology in all its uncompromising radicality. This is good, especially for the predominantly Lutheran audience for whom G. writes.

On the other hand, G.'s book is highly uncritical. Apart from a nod to the demands of contemporary historical criticism, no effort is made to compare Luther's exegesis with the text of the Bible itself. The claim that Luther's Christological interpretation presents the whole of the biblical kerygma is never challenged, not even in the area of church order. The chapter on Luther's hermeneutic is quite inadequate: G.'s exposition reflects none of the contemporary Lutheran concern for the importance of tradition in biblical interpretation, the acknowledgment of biblical pluralism, the role of community consensus in interpreting even a Bible which is *sui ipsius interpres*. Similarly, no attention is paid to the need to reinterpret in the twentieth century Luther's sixteenth-century interpretation of the gospel. (Perhaps this is at least partially explained by G.'s tendency to emphasize those aspects of Luther's theology—its personalism, its sense of history, its concern for the concrete realities of daily life—which anticipate later cultural developments in the West rather than those which locate the thought of the reformer in the declining medieval culture of sixteenth-century Germany.) Finally, Luther's central insights are never criticized or complemented in the light of other Christian traditions. Apart from his defense of Luther against Lortz's charge of subjectivism, G. shows little knowledge of contemporary Catholic interpretations of Luther. One has the impression that this book was written in an earlier, less ecumenical age. More basically, G. displays almost no awareness of the limitations of the fundamental Lutheran categories he analyzes so loyally. In this respect Gerhard Ebeling's otherwise similar study, *Luther: Einführung in sein Denken* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1964), gives a much more sophisticated hermeneutic analysis of the same basic Lutheran categories G. discusses. So, in fact, does the latest Catholic study of Luther's *Denkhorizont*, Otto Pesch's *Theologie der Rechtfertigung bei Martin Luther und Thomas von Aquin* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1967). All theological categories are at best relatively useful, relatively illuminating. All are imperfect and need to be complemented by other approaches. If G. makes it clear that it is the gospel which Luther interprets, he fails to make it clear that Luther does indeed interpret the gospel. His theology may not be identified with the gospel but must be criticized in its light.
G. has written what would once have been a good, one-volume introduction to Luther's theology. But for a generation of Christians working to build a pluralistic and unified Christian community, it is not good enough. No contemporary Christian can afford to ignore Luther's witness to the gospel, but neither may he listen only to that witness or confuse it with the gospel itself.

Marquette University

PATRICK J. BURNS, S.J.


Hasler's Gregorian University dissertation contrasts the presentation of Luther's teaching on justification in thirty recent Catholic manuals of theology with the view of this teaching in reputable contemporary studies on Luther. Most readers of TS know only too well the pessimistic, antirational, determinist, sin-centered, extrinsicist, and antinomian Luther depicted as adversary of the traditional theses. H. gives a thorough report on this portrayal and then, in dependence on such scholars as Althaus, Joest, and Peters, draws up a detailed and distressing list of the failures of the manuals. They take no account of Luther's idea of "nature" as one's very relation to God, which allows him to speak in simple totalizing terms of the effect of original sin. They pass over Luther's words on the positive role of reason in the lives of the just. They depict Luther's servum arbitrium as a thesis about the psychology of choice and not in Luther's sense as a confession of the absolute need of grace. The manuals have no knowledge of Luther's insistence on the sanative and effective side of justification itself, which leads him to speak of growth in holiness in a way they never mention. They oppose a caricatured version of Luther's teaching on passivity under grace and so miss the more refined point of serious divergence, the element of decision in faith. They treat Luther's fiducial faith in simplistic isolation from his words on knowing and loving God and on doing penance, which are all to be found clustered with fides in connection with trust. They never mention Luther's sharp rejection of spiritual security, which he frequently added when urging certitude of God's gracious will to save. Finally, the manuals see Luther's words about the ever-flawed character of good works as equal to affirming total sinfulness. The conclusion is that with very few exceptions these traditional textbooks give a twisted version of Luther's teaching.

H. finds two basic causes for this great discrepancy. With few exceptions, like Schmaus, Flick, and Leeming, the manuals relied mainly on
the Tridentine canons as their source for knowing Luther, a function Trent never intended to fill. Then both Trent and especially the handbooks repeatedly cast Luther's statements into their own discursive-explanatory mode of thought. But Luther's theological style was personalistic, concerned with God's actual word of grace, delighting in paradox, with every statement being intrinsically qualified by the speaker's immediate situation before God. This is an eruptive theology that is carried out mainly in terms of prayer and confession before the God of present judgment and grace. These discoveries do not mean that all controversy is simply set aside. There is still Luther's obfuscation of free choice both in sin and in saving faith, and the biblical teaching on merit remains not integrated into Luther's work. But the contemporary studies lead to a great advance as pseudo problems are swept away so that a fresh encounter can begin. Clearly, the conclusions of this book should be made known to all Catholic systematic theologians.

It does not derogate from the importance of this book to pose some further questions raised by it. An obvious one is about the current relevance of the manuals H. has studied. One wonders if any of them are in wide use in postconciliar Catholicism. Then there is the fact that H. makes heavy use of very recent studies, especially to derive Luther's idea of "nature" and to formulate his existence-centered theological style. Why is it only in our day of widespread personalism that this side of Luther has been discovered? Is it then realistic to fault the Tridentine fathers for failing to understand Luther's deepest concern and most characteristic theological style? After all, there was also a "Luther" who spoke to the objectifying, dogmatically oriented thinkers of classical Lutheran orthodoxy. Again, there was a "Luther" quite congenial to the liberal spirits of the nineteenth century. Will another "Luther" emerge when we complete the passage beyond personalism that is clearly beginning? This is not an attempt to save the twentieth-century manuals. They have taken indefensible intellectual short cuts. But this line of thought poses the question about the identity of the Protestant dialogue-partner with whom Catholic systematic theology should actually concern itself. Can it really be the ever-shifting "Luther" of the most recent studies? This historical kaleidoscope of interpretations is a serious problem, especially after official Lutheranism found itself unable in 1963 to deliver a representative contemporary statement on justification.

Lastly, does not recent work on St. Paul urge a serious critique both of Luther's engaged personalism and of the detached description found in Trent and the manuals? Stendahl, Cerfoux, Käsemann, and Stuhlmann are making clear the non-Pauline individualism of both ways
of presenting the work of God's "justice" in the world. Both narrow down the grand cosmic sweep of Paul's apocalyptic thought, in which God is establishing the new creation, not just the new man or the new community. This vision of God's saving dominion dwarfs both traditional ways of posing the problem of justification. This suggests that even after H. has cleared the ground, there remains a large common task of full biblical renewal imperative for all Christian theologies.

Bellarmine School of Theology

JARED WICKS, S.J.


This posthumous work was originally presented in 1951 as the Birbeck Lectures at Cambridge University, in whose Trinity College Evennett, who died in 1964, spent most of his life as student and professor, subsequent to his early education under the Benedictines at Downside. Counter Reformation history was his specialty, and this book is described by its editor as "the first serious attempt at a general understanding of the subject ever made by an English historian." Considering also the antipathy that has recently begun to manifest itself against this period, the present learned, clear, closely and interestingly written appraisal is most welcome and timely. Its six chapters are interpretative, reflective, and analytic rather than descriptive; therefore they can be appreciated at full value only by those who possess a knowledge of the subject. The aim is not to summarize the Counter Reformation or to pass final judgment on it, but to assess its true meaning and significance for European and world history. In preparing his lectures, E. was chiefly interested in better integrating into ecclesiastical history the history of spirituality, and in gaining a fuller recognition of the necessary organic similarities in the development of religious and secular societies. E. upholds two main theses: (1) the Counter Reformation was fundamentally a powerful religious revival; (2) the methods it devised for this end, spiritually and institutionally, were very much in accord with the general outlook and methods of contemporaries.

Chap. 1, "Towards a New Definition," begins by tracing the history of the terms "Counter Reformation," "Catholic Reformation," and "Catholic Restoration," and then measures their suitability. No new ground is broken here, but it is useful to have this brief summary of the labors of Continental scholars. Turning to the question of origins, E. maintains that the religious aspects of both the Reformation and
the Counter Reformation antedated the sixteenth century. To him the latter was basically a process of adaptation to a new set of world conditions. Far from being a mere conservative reaction to the challenge of Protestantism, it was creative. Its creativity consisted not in devising something completely novel, but in ensuring the survival of a world form of Christianity under a single, centralized control, and in constructing a spirituality characteristic of itself.

This spirituality supplies the topic for the next three chapters. Its essential elements, all within the framework of Tridentine doctrine, were the revival of sacramental life, the emergence of powerful, new techniques of meditative prayer and of Eucharistic devotions, and activism joined to self-mastery. Most attention focuses on the Jesuits as the chief representatives of this reinvigorated and reoriented spirituality. Jesuit spirituality being that of the Spiritual Exercises, an entire chapter is set aside to analyze the little book of St. Ignatius.

Preoccupying the last two chapters are institutional developments, first those affecting bishops, and then those concerning Rome. As E. notes, the Trinitarian reformers centered their efforts around a restored episcopate, and stressed the duties rather than the rights of bishops. Yet they sought to attain their lofty ideal by the elimination of practical abuses, not by overhauling existing structures or by defining the relations between episcopal and papal power. In the progress of papal sovereignty by administrative and executive action, E. is particularly impressed by the parallel centralizing trend in secular monarchies. As a striking example, he traces the declining importance of the Sacred College, which ceased to be a rival authority as the popes fashioned its members into useful, docile instruments in their Curial bureaucracy.

John Bossy, the editor and formerly a research student under E., makes a very considerable contribution to the book. Besides establishing the final text and supplying the footnotes, bibliography, and the title of the book and some of its chapters, he has composed a postscript (pp. 126-45). In it he traces the progress of Counter Reformation studies since 1951, and notes that they are largely confirmatory of E.'s views. B. also fills in a few of the lacunae in previous chapters. E. did not seek to examine all aspects of the Counter Reformation; he omitted some important ones, including Trent. Some recent studies have been very critical of Trent. Although B. does not agree with all of them, he believes with E. that this Council was less important than Jedin (to whom the editor devotes very little space) and others claim. The postscript can also point to very serious shortcomings in the papal development of the period. E. shows more interest in the origin than in the termination of the Counter Reformation. In his own effort to explain
the latter phenomenon, however, Bossy strangely bypasses the withering effects of the long religious wars.

Weston College

JOHN F. BRODERICK, S.J.


If this book had appeared six months ago, it would have been received as an interesting, well-written, and intelligent behind-the-scenes account of the condemnation of Anglican Orders by Leo XIII in 1896. It would have been praised for its ecumenical intent and for the kind of lively reporting which characterized Xavier Rynne's articles and books about Vatican II and the off-stage machinations which made the Council a global topic. Indeed, Hughes deserves more credit than the composite "Xavier Rynne" in that he brings to life with every bit as much zest and flair the very human elements of a controversy now more than seventy years old. All of this remains true of the book, but it has appeared now, at a moment the author could not have anticipated with any degree of certainty, and it is precisely its arrival at this time, when the whole question of papal authority and the manner in which that authority is exercised is being challenged, which gives it special importance.

That a pope could give an authoritative judgment about something as clearly theological as the question of the validity of sacramental orders was not questioned by Catholics of the last century, nor should it have been. What was questioned by some then, though not publicly, and by many more since, was whether or not the decision was rightly made, and whether or not it was infallible (two distinct points, since a decision may be infallible independently of the arguments used to support it). The pope is the guardian of faith and morals. In the case of Apostolicae curae the matter was speculative but rested on historical facts (could the intention of those who used the Edwardine Ordinal be determined by the rite itself?). The recent encyclical of Paul VI, Humanae vitae, deals with a practical matter but rests on speculative (philosophical) principles (artificial birth control is contrary to the natural law). The respective bases have been questioned: Were the facts correctly interpreted in the first instance, and were the theories correctly evaluated in the second? So far as the orders question is concerned, H. argues strongly that a nineteenth-century decision about sixteenth-century facts cannot claim finality: there are too many loose
ends, too much that cannot be recovered. The Holy See remains as a continuing authority but its occupants and their familiarity with changing situations are not the same. Understanding is never separable from the minds and conditions which produce it.

Readers who have become accustomed to thinking of the Roman Curia as obstructionist and of Anglo-Saxon, Dutch, and German theologians as progressive will receive a salutary surprise when they discover that if there are any liberal heroes in the Anglican Orders dispute they are the Curial Cardinals Rampolla and Gasparri—those “beggars,” as the English commissioners pressing for condemnation called them—not to mention Leo XIII. Mazzella, it is true, took the side of the English camp but he did so without animus. As for the then Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Vaughan, and his chief henchmen, Moyes and Gasquet, one can believe in their sincerity and even, at least in Vaughan’s case, respect it, but not without seeing them as hopelessly blinded by prejudice. Merry del Val, Leo XIII’s alter ego, worked hand in hand with the English commissioners but, extreme ultramontane though he was, he was no Italian.

As H. makes clear, the determination to issue *Apostolicae curae* was not based on a majority vote of the commission set up to investigate the question. Only four out of eight commissioners held that the orders were certainly invalid. Moreover—and this again is of no small interest—there seems little doubt that the “Gordon Case” which a much earlier Pope (Clement XI) had settled negatively (i.e., against the validity of this Anglican bishop’s orders) constituted the decisive factor in determining the important negative vote of Mazzella in 1896. What H. points out is that Clement XI was given a garbled and inadequate account of Gordon’s consecration.

As H. rightly suggests, a way out of the impasse created by *Apostolicae curae* lies along the path of a wholly different approach to the theology of the sacraments. What this would mean is that criteria different from those used by the framers of the 1896 Bull would be used in determining the validity of orders conferred outside the Church. It would not mean that Leo XIII’s decision was erroneous on the basis of the criteria he used, though the question will always remain whether he actually had sufficient information at his disposal to apply the criteria he did. In the wake of the tremendous revival of theological knowledge to which we have all been witness, it does not seem inconceivable that the Church might define the precise intention behind the 1896 Bull but go beyond it by proposing a broader concept of orders to which that Bull did not apply.

Altogether, *Absolutely Null & Utterly Void* deserves unqualified
praise as an engrossing study which no one interested in theology, Church history, or human biography will want to miss.

St. Michael's College  
University of Toronto

J. EDGAR BRUNS


The formation of Christendom, from its origins in the Judeo-Christian tradition through the rise and decline of the medieval unity, was the subject with which Dawson began his lectures as first occupant of the Charles Chauncey Sillman Chair of Roman Catholic Studies at Harvard, 1958–62. *The Dividing of Christendom* (published in 1965) and the return to Christian unity completed his lectures. The book under review restates with ease and fluency the fundamental ideas which D. has been propounding with erudition and conviction for over thirty years. His epilogue rises above the graceful but didactic tone of the bulk of the book, to an almost sublime expression of his faith: “Catholicism stands or falls with the belief in a universal, visible spiritual community . . . .” “The Incarnation and the church form one whole . . . two aspects of a single process . . . bound together not only by faith but also by the sacraments which provide the organic link between the Head and the Body. . . . The church therefore is not a voluntary religious association formed by the coming together of individual believers, but a supernatural divine organism which transmits the gift of eternal life to mankind.”

There is room for this present restatement of D.’s study of Christian culture, because he ventures once again to deal with the substantial relationship between theology and history. Theologians, especially those just below the level of expert, are prone with less than expertise to appeal to the sweep of history to support their positions; on the other side, to ignore the historically conditioned contexts in which theological positions have developed. They can profit from D.’s deep erudition in the fields of history and of cultural development; for he can validly suggest what interpretations can be made of historical data in which there are at work the simultaneous processes of “culture formation and change” and of “revelation and the action of divine grace which has erected a spiritual society and a sacred history.” It is in the light of the two processes that D. studies Christian culture.

With considerable insight and his peculiar ability to draw upon a vast amount of detail, he synthesizes the beginnings of Christian culture amid the complexities of the Greco-Roman Empire. He reaffirms his well-known thesis that the so-called “Dark Ages” were dark with
the darkness of the womb in which new life was coming to birth; and that Byzantine culture had, till the High Middle Ages, a spiritual and intellectual vitality which bulwarked Christian culture forming in the West. Above all, he reaffirms what is distinctive among other great world cultures, of Christian culture in the West: "the conception of the universe as an intelligible order has inspired the whole development of Western sciences; . . . the belief in God as first cause and creator of the order of nature, as well as the supreme governor and law giver of the moral world" has "established a link between the subjective order of human reason and an objective rational order in the universe. . . ." The achievements of modern science are hardly conceivable without this theological preparation in the patristic and medieval periods. One would wish that Dawson had dealt with more directness and detail with some of the real problems which present themselves regarding the formation of an authentic Christian culture in the Middle Ages, e.g., the problems of the Crusades and of the Inquisition.

Rosemont College

CARITAS McCARTHY, S.H.C.J.


In the introduction Rideau expresses his fear that the unusual length of the notes will be an inconvenience to the reader. The text itself runs to some 250 pages, and is followed by over 380 pages of notes—more than 1100 of the latter. This device does, indeed, relieve the book of encumbrance, and the notes enable the reader to make direct contact with many passages culled from Teilhard's writings. But the constant necessity of flipping back and forth is more than an inconvenience; it is a positive deterrent. The book seems badly planned. The publisher of the English translation is not to be blamed for this arrangement; he merely followed the format of the French edition.

Yet R. has made an important contribution toward a clarification of Teilhard's thought. He has based his study on as complete an examination as possible of all of T.'s available writings, and has profited from many recent books on the subject that preceded his own. Although aware of the difficulty of presenting in schematic form a living thought that grew throughout a period of more than forty years, he attempts to bring out the coherent structure that imparts unity to the long sequence of T.'s books and essays. T. had grappled with most of the problems that have emerged in our time as significant, and never failed to throw new light on them. But he himself never undertook to gather the many facets of his thought into a system.

T.'s work, regarded as a whole, is a phenomenology or "generalized
physics" of all reality and a synthesis of all the aspects of being. It is a science of the world, considered in its convergent evolution, and also of man, whose vocation and finality it investigates and the conditions of whose existence it studies. In the theological sphere, T. developed the doctrinal and spiritual consequences of the mystery of the Incarnation. With inspiration drawn from the cosmic Christology of Paul and John, he brought out the revolution inaugurated by Jesus Christ. He stressed the close union of man with God which was accomplished by the incarnate Word and which confers a divine value on history. For history is advancing, not toward a purely temporal success, but toward a universal love that joins men to one another and to God. The forward impulse that is pressing on towards a victorious issue to history must be complemented by the upward impulse that is stimulated by God's saving activity. T. has displayed to men the profound meaning and the ultimate orientation of the universe. The wide audience he reached and his power of conversion show that our contemporaries are not wholly content with materialism and that they thirst for God. What attracts them in T. is mainly the religious truth he expounds.

Within the synthesis he constructs, R. points out some phases of T.'s thought that are particularly relevant to the present decade. T. has some fine things to say about the Church, to which he was undeviatingly loyal. The Church is "the greatest collective centre of love that has ever appeared in the world." Outside the Church he saw no life-current that had any chance of success. In all that he wrote, he hoped and wished to think with the Church. The ascending axis of hominization runs through the Christic pole of the earth, that is, the Catholic Church. Toward the end of his life he wrote: "I find myself today more indissolubly bound to the hierarchic Church and the Christ of the Gospels, than I have ever been at any moment in my life." Within the forward-moving Church, the priesthood is a privileged and challenging vocation; the priest must show by his own life how human work and love of God can be combined. Similarly, the specialized life of contemplation renders most valuable service to mankind.

Appraisal of T.'s thought is not universally laudatory in this critical study. R. finds his phenomenology of history incomplete and his political sociology defective. He detects weakness in a line of argument that exaggerates present signs of human progress, to use them subsequently in order to extrapolate the curve of history's ascent toward a communion of persons as a necessary preliminary to the Parousia. Such unfavorable judgments do not prevent R. from perceiving that Teilhard was always true to his mission of preaching Christ to a stricken world, and that he
was a worthy and effective representative of the Church in the midst of living men.

Marquette University  

Cyril Vollert, S.J.


It has been said that for anyone trying to read an English translation of one of Rahner's works the following statements are true: (a) it is necessary to have a good knowledge of philosophy and/or theology; (b) it is helpful to have a working knowledge of German; (c) it is positively detrimental to have even a rudimentary appreciation of decent English style. Perhaps this is a canard, but it does have a certain application to this book. *Spirit in the World* is a translation of R.'s *Geist in Welt*, which dates from 1936 and was first published in 1939; a second edition was issued, in substantially unchanged form, in 1957.

It is important to realize the history of the book, for anyone who takes it up and looks for the usual Rahnerian freshness of insight will be somewhat puzzled by what he finds. Much of the book contains interpretations of Thomas which have become common Thomistic patrimony in the years between 1936 and the present. The reader must continually remind himself, however, that this patrimony is of fairly recent date; it is only because of the work of such men as Gilson, Pegis, Rahner himself, and others that Thomistic philosophy has come to mean a search and interpretation of the actual texts of Thomas himself, rather than an excursus through the maze of Neo-Scholastic manuals.

The book's general problematic is the Kantian one: In what viable sense is anything like a metaphysics possible? R.'s answer is based on *Sum. theol.* 1, q. 84, a. 7; text and interpretation of this occupy the first fifty pages. Perhaps the central point that R. wishes to stress here is the unicity of the act of knowledge, however much that act may involve sensuous and intellectual elements: "in Thomas there is question essentially of one human knowledge whose two roots ought not to be made independent as two cognitive powers complete in themselves" (p. 48), for it is only in and through the contributions of both roots to the single act of knowledge that man attains his knowledge of the world.

The second part, by far the major part, consists of a series of reflections on three major themes: sensibility, abstraction, and conversion to the phantasm. It might show the structure of the book more clearly, however, to rename these: sensibility, intellectuality, and the interplay
between the two. In the first of these, R. discusses, among other things, the nature of the sensible species and the function of space and time in human knowledge; the second entails treatments of two of the "acts of the mind" (conceptualization and judgment) and the role of the agent intellect in the separative judgment of existence; the third takes up the problem of the relationship between sensibility and spirit and points the way towards the viability of metaphysics. This latter point is then treated explicitly in the third major section.

Something should be said about the translation. It is uneven, ranging from the lucid to the unintelligible (an example of the latter being the discussion on the "original unity of being and knowing"). Furthermore, Fr. Dych insists on providing parenthesized German equivalents with annoying frequency. It is, I suppose, helpful to know that "To-be-in-itself" is intended to translate Ansichsein; it is unnecessary to be reminded of that fact several score of times. The same comment applies to a large number of other German words, e.g., worauf, Vorgriff, Beischichtsein, etc. Also, the book abounds with such multiple-word Heideggerian monstrosities as "being-able-to-be-present-to-itself," "reaching-out-of-the-past-into-the-future," and the like, used as substantives. These may, indeed, convey the general idea that the original German expresses, but they are not English. It is a curious turn of events that a book on Thomas, who was doubtless one of the clearest writers who ever lived, should come out in English dress in so incredibly beclouded fashion.

The book contains a Foreword by J. B. Metz (a former student of Rahner, and the man principally responsible for the 1957 edition), and an Introduction on "Rahner and the Kantian Problematic" by F. P. Fiorenza.

*Martindale University*  

MARTIN D. O'KEEFE, S.J.


Curran's book is the second part of the series *Christian Morality Today*. It consists of eight chapters, most of which have already appeared in periodicals, and an epilogue which summarizes the important themes and approaches of the book. Unfortunately, the printer's omission of twelve pages makes the epilogue unreadable. C. is well read. He is able to organize and present his material in a coherent and pleasing way. His writings, this book in particular, deserve careful reading and discussion.

At the beginning of each chapter, C. carefully states how he will
proceed and what he hopes to demonstrate. He often begins with a
history of the moral teaching. He admits that he is using secondary
sources (a legitimate method), but I find myself often dissatisfied with
the incompleteness of his surveys.

C. raises the right questions, but underlying these questions and
essential for the discussion are other more fundamental ones. Unless
one intends to make moral theology a study of natural ethics—C. does
not want to do this—these more fundamental problems have to be
solved. For instance, C. studies the relevancy of Jesus’ ethical teaching
(chap. 2). He sees, among other things, the radicalness of Jesus’ ethical
demands and the pain the disciple feels because he cannot fulfil them.
The radicalness and pain are both a reminder of our need for God and
a spur to find ever-new ways to fulfil Jesus’ demands. Nevertheless, I
believe we must ask further questions: Did the primitive Church,
which wrote the Gospels, intend to set down some concrete, explicit
demands because these expressed a community consensus about objec­tive Christian morality? If so, is this intent manifest in the patristic
teaching about Christian living? Is such teaching valid today?

In chap. 3, C. discusses absolute norms in moral theology. He does
not deny them; his thesis is that the Church is not “unalterably com­mitted to a generic insistence on absolute norms in ethical conduct”
(p. 74). He develops this by showing that the two sources from which
such a doctrine is derived, i.e., natural law and the hierarchic teaching
authority, are not an adequate explanation of absolutes in moral
theology. He goes on to indicate two other factors to which he attributes
an important role in the emphasis on absolute norms. The first is an
inadequate understanding of the Church which has characterized
theology since the Reformation. During this period the Church ap­peared as a society severely structured from the top down, with the
life and attitudes of the people completely dependent upon the
authorities (p. 102). Moral theology became dissociated from dogmatic
and ascetical theology and more closely associated with canon law. The
Church had all the answers. The newer, more complete view of the
Church in dialogue with the world given by Vatican II will encourage
the creativity and initiative of the Christian people. In such positive
perspectives the idea of absolutes is less important. The second factor
is the centuries-long perdurance of the classicist view of the world and
the theological methodology which follows from it. In this view there is
the tendency to be abstract, a priori, deductive, and ahistorical. There
is the attempt “to cut through the accidents of time and history to
arrive at the eternal, universal and unchanging” (p. 107). C. sees a
change to a more historically conscious methodology which will reduce
the importance of absolutes. The whole problem of the enduring validity of negative moral norms, tradition, and teaching in the Church is opened up.

_Alma College, Los Gatos, Calif._

ROBERT H. DAILEY, S.J.


Dr. Stein teaches pastoral psychology at the San Francisco Theological Seminary as well as at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. He has authored a previous work on the psychology of the Christian life, _The Stranger inside You._ The present work is apparently a labor of love. It presents a compilation of predominantly psychoanalytic and some theological sources, offering a sort of panorama of viewpoints on guilt.

The material has been well digested and what emerges is a well-executed patchwork of pertinent quotations. The disadvantage is that the result carries a more or less technical impress which comes across to a psychologically sophisticated reader but may fall on poor ground where the average religiously inclined reader is concerned. I found the sections on the psychopathology of guilt to be refreshing rehearsals of superego formation, functions, and malfunctions. These are the best sections in the book. The section on psychotherapy is weak and does not suggest much clinical depth. S. seems to come into his own in his more theological reflections.

This book left me in some dissatisfaction in so far as its compilation carries an underlying unicity of focus on guilt and the guilt-dynamic. Such theses run the risk of oversimplification. They require the corrective that man's religious engagement is not exclusively derived from guilt, or from anxiety, or from mere loss and abandonment. The movement is not irrevocably from terror in the face of projected hate to love in the direction of projected love. The psychology of man's religious response is as complex and multidetermined as the psychology of man himself. It is not univocally interpretable in one dimension. One has to note that the analysis of the religious phenomenon from the vantage of the guilt-dynamic is unidimensional, while the phenomenon itself is multidimensional. The present treatise must, therefore, be asserted _sensu aiente._

I would like to address myself to the distinction of normal vs. neurotic guilt. Catholic moralists have labored to articulate and preserve this distinction, but the distinction is neither very illuminating nor very useful. It seems to imply a view of psychological processes in which
some people can be normally guilty and others become psychologically sick so that they become neurotically guilty. The dichotomy is much more difficult to discern in reality. In actual fact, mankind is not divided into the normal and the neurotic; it is divided into the less neurotic and the more neurotic. The distinction was intended, as nearly as I can guess, to separate the guilt for sin which leads to repentance from the guilt for nonsin which leads to nonrepentance. From the point of view of the intrapsychic dynamics, however, these states are indistinguishable. The intrapsychic perspective is that of a totally subjective morality. In either case, the superego rage is experienced as guilt feelings—and the distinction rests on extrinsic factors such as the objective determination of the moral issue involved. The difference between normal and neurotic guilt rests not in the dynamic of guilt but in the failure of conscience by which objective morality is misjudged. And moral conscience is a judgmental function belonging to the ego.

The psychology of guilt, then, is basically a question as to why man should punish himself when he has done right, as much as to why man should punish himself when he has done wrong. We tend to presume the latter as obvious and examine the former as pathological. But the latter is not obvious and the former is not exclusively pathological. If morality is determined in terms of action and intention, then superego dynamics function at a level beyond good and evil and the ultimate issue of guilt is nonmoral. We would then find ourselves faced with the problem of guilt independently of any moral concerns. The guilt-dynamic can operate in a moral as well as an immoral context.

This brings us to the threshold of existential guilt, the basic failure to fulfil fundamental potentialities, the denial of such possibilities, the ontological condition of guilt. Existential guilt is central to man's religious condition. It is that inherent deprivation through which the religious concern is germinated in part. The essential deficit cannot be filled by man alone but must be filled from without. Existential guilt lies behind the salvation myth in an eschatological dimension. We can suggest as well that its inner psychic face is as yet unrecognized.


Pruyser is the Director of the Education Department at the Menninger Foundation in Topeka. He has been known for many years as an active contributor to the literature on the psychology of religion. The present volume is an amplification of the Lyman Beecher Lectures
at the Yale University Divinity School in the spring of 1968. The outcome is a well-informed and workmanlike book on the psychology of religion which is remarkable for its straightforwardness and readability.

P. sidesteps the troublesome and so often fruitless question of how to define religion. He rather takes a more or less “religion is what religion does” approach which enables him to give a somewhat different organization to his material. The book is structured in a series of chapters dealing with perceptual processes, intellectual processes, thought organization, linguistic functions, emotional processes, motor functions, and then relations to persons, relations to things and ideas, and relations to the self. This gives the treatment of religious phenomena a sort of behavioral cast which emphasizes the dimensions of religious activity from a psychological perspective which they share with other forms of human activity. One loses what it is about religious activities that distinguishes them as specifically religious. Thus the reader will find himself circling in on the fundamentally religious aspect of the described behaviors without ever having the feeling that he has arrived on target.

While this organization of the material has its weaknesses, it also has its strengths. P. makes a singular contribution in basing his work on a specifically psychological strategy. The style of books on the psychology of religion has been to use a plan of organization built around basically religious phenomena or ideas. The present work uses categories which are instead psychological and the result is a refreshingly new look at the old material.

Another significant contribution is the breadth of understanding and flexibility of treatment with which P. treats his subjects. He is able to embrace religion as something more than an emotive experience. He can recognize that religion has a large cognitive element, and a major portion of the book is given over to a consideration of this aspect. Consequently, the formulations he achieves are considerably more nuanced and intellectually competent than one can find in many more simplistic and reductionistic approaches. What is so often forgotten is that the history of man’s religious quest has not merely been concerned with a sense of numinous presence and power, but has involved a profound and sustained effort at understanding—fides quaerens intellectum. It belongs to psychology, too, to seek to understand this aspect of man’s religious behavior and to integrate it with the other complex emotional and vital concerns of religion. The theological and the religious are distinct, but their distinction does not permit us to separate and isolate them one from the other. All in all, this is a significant work.


In this slim book, Bakan attempts to explain disease, pain, and sacrifice as instances of "telic decentralization." Other such instances are growth, development, and reproduction. These paradoxes are the dialectical opposites which "telic decentralization" is supposed to explain. B. "resolves" another paradox, the fact that pain is a warning signal of tissue damage, but also impairs the sufferer's efficiency and eventually his will to survive, by pointing out that pain is a manifestation of telic decentralization and thus partakes of its ambiguous nature.

To come to grips with the existential dimension of pain, B. uses the Book of Job, which, he says, contains the central insight "that there is an intrinsic relationship among separation-estrangement, physical disease...and sacrifice" (p. 99). To psychoanalytic thinking as exemplified by B., "a fantasy of [Job's children] being killed suggests a wish that they be killed" (p. 106). That it is Satan who harbors the plot simply affirms for B. that Job's "infanticidal impulse" is projected outwards so that guilt disappears. Indeed, Job takes the child's role, deferring to the will of the father so as not to be killed by him. Sacrifice of an animal is a symbolic child-sacrifice which propitiates the father and opens up the "possibility of personal immortality." The disease that attacked Job's body is another type of sacrifice, that of the body, for the sake of the self. In the end, B. says, Job comes to see "that it is sinful to believe that God rewards the righteous with immortality" (p. 128).

The essential feature of man's condition B. sees expressed in Genesis: man ate of the Tree of Knowledge and so became "capable of wisdom, understanding, and knowledge, ... including generativity" (p. 125); he was expelled from the Garden of Eden "to prevent him from eating of the Tree of Life and living forever" (p. 125). This is a good example of the cavalier way in which B. uses his evidence. In Genesis, God commanded Adam and Eve to "increase and multiply" long before they ate from the Tree of Knowledge; generativity was not the fruit of that tree. True to psychoanalytic logic, Satan is equated with God, or even exalted over God, for Satan promised knowledge, God warned of death; Adam and Eve lost immortality by being driven out of Paradise because of their sin—but B. assumes that a jealous God withheld it from them arbitrarily.

The thesis of the book seems to be that man lives, grows, and dies by "telic decentralization." On the physical level, this promotes both healthy growth and disease (and finally death); on the psychological
level, it means both to function by virtue of pain and to rid oneself of pain; on the spiritual level, it is the attempt to propitiate the father by sacrificing what one holds dear, even oneself. The lesson B. preaches is that sacrifice puts death into the hand of man and supports the hope of immortality; but "an immortal father-God who might spare man is a hollow fantasy, and to believe it costs man his maturity" (p. 126).

B.'s uncritical acceptance of Freudian theory, including the "death wish," will not recommend the book to anyone but a Freudian. To those outside the fold, the use of the scientific-sounding term "telic decentralization" cannot hide the fact that Bakan neither spells out the mechanism of such decentralization nor specifies the conditions under which it becomes harmful. Hence, "telic decentralization" remains an empty word, no different from other pseudo explanations like "dissociation," "differentiation," and the like. The book as a whole reads more like a "midrash" on selected texts from Selye, Freud, and the OT than a scientific treatise.

_Loyola University, Chicago_  

_MAGDA B. ARNOLD_

**SHORTER NOTICES**


Campbell, who has already to his credit volumes on Eastern, Western, and primitive mythology, now attempts a synthesis for the guidance of modern man in his mythopoetic moments. He has come to the study of myths by way of James Joyce and Carl Jung; the archetypes, forms without content, are never far below the surface of his writing. A vital question in all such work has to be faced: What do similarities of pattern prove, once they are established? Is it real culture-borrowing, or chance mimicry, or is it a common trait of humanity peeping out? C.'s touch is here somewhat unsure. He cites the legend of Barlaam and Joasaph and its links with the Buddha, but does not seem to be aware of the importance of the Georgian version of that legend, recently studied by D. M. Lang. His authorities are sometimes the unreliable names Robert Eisler, Jane Ellen Harrison, or Spengler. Jane Ellen was the laughingstock of the Oxford lecture-rooms some forty years ago, and "Golden Bough" Frazer was not in much better case. C.'s reading of Joyce will not be upheld by everyone. Joyce was a reversion to an ancient Celtic type, of the seventh or eighth century, the type which produced_Hisperica famina_, that despair of the Latinist. He could hardly be said to be "struggling for the existential possibilities of faith" (p. 453), when what he described of himself in his _Portrait_ was "the silent lapse of his soul." One might almost build up a Daedalus myth on this fact: the foolish aeronaut of the classics, then the modern use of the name H. M. S. Daedalus for the shore-based naval aircraft establishment near Portsmouth.
Harbour which sailors call "Dead Loss," then Joyce wandering on the quays at Trieste that remind one of the Liffey at Dublin. This may be a parody of C.'s method, but it is one he should be aware of. He picks up a saying from Gregory the Great, that when Adam sinned, his soul died, without giving Gregory's qualification: "non absentia vivendi sed qualitate vivendi." Grasping at analogies is a danger for the philosopher no less than for the theologian.

Joseph Crehan, S.J.

Chinese Religions from 1000 B.C. to the Present Day. By D. Howard Smith. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968. Pp. xiii + 222. $7.95. This clear and comprehensive study is a valuable contribution to the accumulated knowledge of Chinese religions. It has an academic and general appeal, since it explains the complex Chinese religious mentality and provides a substantive review of the development of religious ideas from 1000 B.C. Two noteworthy features are its thorough analysis of the Chinese religious mentality and its detailed development within a historical frame of reference. The reader is provided with a correlative continuity in religious development and history as the structure of the chapters follows this design. They begin with the ancient religions and progress to the distinctive trends of religious thought and expression in a highly developed cult of ancestor worship linked to the belief in man's dependence on a Supreme Cosmic Will. From this point they proceed to a consideration of the resultant ethical emphasis and the expression of man's need for a ritual organization of life and society. The first five chapters provide an excellent exposition of Confucian creed. Other chapters represent a logical interpretation of the Chinese way of life. Buddhism in China is succinctly treated as existing always within the shadow of the state cult of Confucianism, blended, of course, with Taoism. While Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism are basic to the Chinese religious mentality, there were foreign religious influences whose penetration S. treats only briefly. Unfortunately, he fails to show how Christianity did in fact reinforce and revitalize Confucian ethics and filial piety. For this reason, the many facets of Chinese religious tolerance for such "foreign influences" were harmoniously achieved. From this point of view, the closing chapter, on the religious situation in modern China, could have been presented in a more lucid perspective, namely, why and how Communism as a sociological phenomenon could be combined with the distinct Chinese religious mentality without absorbing it. On the whole, the text is well annotated. A selective bibliography helpfully accompanies each chapter; a glossary of Chinese terms used in the study and a detailed index serve well to enhance the value of a book which provides reliable information on the complexity of the modern Chinese man.

Ludvik Nemec

Bible et Orient. By Roland de Vaux, O.P. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967. Pp. 542 + 10 plates. 48 fr. A collection of some of the massive output of articles published by de Vaux between 1933 and 1964. The author himself notices that the inclusion of some early pieces will evoke surprise, and assures us that they do not always represent his present thinking on these subjects. The articles are classified under five headings: theology and literary criticism, the history of Israel, OT institutions, the Qumran manuscripts, archaeology and the history of religions. Some of the
articles are widely known and much quoted; some others, as de Vaux points out, are often difficult to find. Such a collection is almost impossible to review in the usual sense. The material has almost all become part of the commonplace knowledge of biblical studies, and detailed criticism of the separate pieces is both impossible and unnecessary. The collection is a testimonial, if testimony were needed, to the extraordinary range of de Vaux's interests. There are never more than a few in each generation who can invoke such wide information for the solution of biblical problems. The value of the collection may be as much in the method which it illustrates as in the information and opinions which the articles contain. The collection needs no recommendation other than the name of its author.

John L. McKenzie, S.J.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 5: Η-Πα. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967. Pp. xiv + 1031. $22.50. With the appearance of the fifth volume of the English translation of Kittel, TDNT enters its second phase (see TS 25 [1964] 424–27; 26 [1965] 509–10; 28 [1967] 179–80, 873–74). The German original of Vol. 5 was completed after World War II in 1954, after a lapse of twelve years since Vol. 4. In the meantime the founder and first editor, Gerhard Kittel, had died; but his deathbed request made to Gerhard Friedrich to be the new editor assured the continuation of the famous Wörterbuch. The English editor's preface to Vol. 5 notes how postwar international contacts, especially with scholars of the English-speaking world, and new developments in biblical and theological studies, including discoveries like the Dead Sea Scrolls, influenced the second phase of the dictionary. Though "the break between the Kittel and Friedrich volumes" ran "the risk of adding to the final size of the work," the purpose, design, and structure of the dictionary remained the same under the new editorship. Of the important articles in Vol. 5, two have already appeared in an English form: orgē in an abbreviated form in H. Kleinknecht, et al., Wrath (Bible Key Words 13; London, 1964) and paîs theou in W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, The Servant of God (Studies in Biblical Theology 20; London, 1957). In the latter instance Bromiley has made a fresh English translation but was able to use the revisions that Jeremias introduced into the second English edition of the book (1965). In this one article, then, TDNT supersedes the German original. However, other important articles in this volume are now welcomed in English dress: hodōs, oikos, homoios, homologēō, onoma, horaō, ouranos, parakaleō, parthenos, parousia, paschō, and patēr. Because some of the articles in this volume were prepared shortly after the publication of the first Qumran texts and before the significance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the NT was sufficiently assessed, one still notes the absence of Qumran material in this volume. For instance, the discussion on pp. 89–90 about the origin of the absolute use of "the Way" as a designation of primitive Christianity in Acts 9:2, etc., needs to be modified today (see Studies in Luke-Acts [ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Nashville, 1966] pp. 240–42). By and large, one notes the same care and thoroughness in the English translation that characterized the earlier volumes. Occasional Germanicisms and typographical errors, however, are detected: e.g., "he was called away" (p. vii) instead of "he died"; Lochse...
(p. vii) for Lohse; never (p. ix) for newer; “on the one side” (p. 1) instead of “on the one hand,” etc.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

From Scripture to Prayer. By François Amiot, S.S. Translated by Norah Smaridge. 2 vols. New York: Alba, 1967. Pp. 398; 356. $12.95. Liturgical renewal received its stimulus in the various decrees of Vatican II. Since 1965, much has been accomplished in the short span of three years; however, much remains to be done. This is especially true in regard to preaching. Many priests would like to give a daily homily, and they have need of some concise themes for easy reading and prayerful reflection. A.'s book will offer just this—biblical themes easily adaptable to the needs of any community. The English edition, in two volumes, contains 290 homilies for Sunday and special feasts, and 66 meditations. Though several errors in English grammar have been found, the translation reads smoothly. A.'s twofold object in writing the book is "to place the reader in vital contact with the word of God in the New Testament and to enable him to participate intimately in the liturgy of the Church."

James F. Keenan, S.J.

By Oath Consigned. By Meredith G. Kline. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1968. Pp. 110. $3.75. K., Professor of OT at the Gordon Divinity School, has revised and expanded two of his articles published a few years ago in the Westminster Theological Journal. His thesis is that recent research into the ancient international treaties of the Near East and the study of their affinity to certain biblical covenants can help us deepen our theological understanding of the sacrament-signs of circumcision and baptism. After expounding the usage of "oath" and "covenant" in the OT and NT, and the meaning of "law covenant," K. concludes that both circumcision and baptism should be situated within the framework of law covenant, circumcision being the oath-sign of the old and baptism the new covenant. John's baptism was the final process of the old law covenant and constituted God's ultimatum to the Hebrews. Since this ultimatum was rejected by the infliction of death upon God's Son, as we know from the parable of the vineyard (Mt 21:33 ff.), God invoked the penalty enjoined for dereliction of the covenant. Baptism is the oath-sign putting a person under the jurisdiction of the new law covenant. It is, therefore, a sign of consecration and blessing, but also of ordeal and suffering. Moreover, both circumcision and baptism point to God's eschatological judgment with its potential of condemnation or salvation. However, baptism puts more stress than does circumcision upon the salvific alternative and promises a safe passage through the ordeal. Since law covenants bound the vassal king and all his subjects, even babies, K. reasons that the practice of infant baptism is legitimate. He also grants that baptism by infusion (called "sprinkling," p. 83), though less expressive than immersion, is valid. He would like to see the sacramental sign modified so as to express more vividly "the decisive encounter" denoted by baptism. An ample bibliography is provided in the footnotes. Indexes of authors, of Scripture references, and of names and topics round out the book.

Clarence McAuliffe, S.J.

Tradition & Change in the Church. By J. P. Mackey. Dayton: Pflaum, 1968. Pp. xxiv + 192. $4.95. M.'s position in barest outline is as follows. Tradition in Christianity is the
exact counterpart of tradition and change in daily life. In both, the concept of tradition postdates practice. Therefore one does not search for a theory on tradition in the early Church. It did not have such a developed theory. Reflex theory on tradition could develop fruitfully only after the emergence of the sense of history and of development. A study of tradition is a study of change and continuity. The formula for change in Christian tradition is this: the fusion of that which is newly come in Christ with that which is traditional and natural. This formula is very general but it is the best we can do at the moment. The material sufficiency of Scripture can be asserted while maintaining a genuine role for tradition. After giving a brief history of the relation between Scripture and tradition, M. ends with a philosophical analysis of tradition and change. There is no new breakthrough here either in the theory on tradition or in the historical samples handled: the Assumption which is tied to Scripture, the development of the episcopacy, confirmation, and contraception (treated before *Humanae vitae* and implicitly suggesting that the teaching be considered as a general ideal rather than as a law). M. writes that it “is not at all certain that we are even now in a position to produce a definitive theory of tradition and change.” It seems that, until we are able to approach the question from some totally new perspective, this judgment stands. The last chapter, a philosophical analysis of tradition, is an excellent contribution. Here we see the inevitability of tradition, its necessary disadvantages (it leads to suggestibility and emotional dependence and is handed on by imperfect men) and its values (it provides a substratum which is the nearest reflection of eternity in time and it tends to unite men, grounding our best hope for a universal brotherhood).

*John J. Heaney, S.J.*

**The Beginning of Eternal Life: The Dynamic Faith of Thomas Aquinas, Origins and Interpretation.** By James A. Mohler, S.J. New York: Philosophical Library, 1968. Pp. 144. $4.95. The modern accent in discussing the act of faith is on its personal dimension, as an act whereby a man expresses and achieves a growing degree of personhood. One might question, then, the advisability of a study of the act of faith in the Aristotelian categories of Aquinas. M. sees the value of such study in the fact that Thomas synthesized the whole Christian tradition to his time, that it provides the necessary background to understanding the faith of the Reformers (which was formed in reaction against the medieval theology of faith) and of Trent and Vatican I (which built upon Scholastic foundations). In fact, though the modern stress is different, “most modern theologians are quite familiar with medieval theology and have used many concepts and modified others from medieval times” (p. 12). In a heavily-footnoted survey (71 pages of text, 337 footnotes which fill 47 pages) M. reviews the important ideas about faith which occur in the tradition and shows how they are fitted into Aquinas’ synthesis. The methodology employed gives great substance to M.’s points, but involves him in considerable repetition. There is great emphasis on a dimension of Aquinas’ thought which may make it more acceptable to the modern mentality: the dynamic, eschatological élan of the act of faith according to which it is seen to be a foretaste of the vision of God, the initiation into Trinitarian activity, the beginning of eternal life. This is
achieved by bringing out the implications of credere Deo and credere in Deum. M.'s conclusions: there is no essential evolution of Thomas' doctrine on faith, nor did he say the final word on the subject. "However, modern subjective, existential faith and the objective, eschatological faith of Aquinas are not in opposition, but are complementary aspects of the same living faith. A blending of the two gives a well balanced Christian theology of faith" (p. 83).

William C. McFadden, S.J.

SERVANTS OF THE LORD. By Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by Richard Strachan. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968. Pp. 220. $4.95. Collected in this small volume are several of Rahner's articles and sermons on ecclesiastical office. The articles span thirty-four years of R.'s life; their subject matter varies from careful theological treatment of orders to deeply personal reflections on priestly existence. Even the simplest sermon at a priest's first Mass contains implicitly R.'s vast theological anthropology, and the reader will find that his mind and heart are engaged as he reads this book. The first article, "The Meaning of Ecclesiastical Office," contains a theology of hierarchy which serves as theological background for the remainder of the book. R. begins his theology of ministry where he begins all his theological reflections: the world as self-communication of a loving and merciful God. Further, God has definitively and victoriously manifested Himself within the very history of this world in the person of Jesus Christ. In this world there is to be a community to bear witness to Jesus and to attest the victory God has won for men. This community, because it is always embodying the same witness, must itself be one: the community requires order, cohesion, unity. Community office-bearers, then, authoritatively embody the Church's witness and the unity of her witness. R. feels that the function of hierarchical office in the Church can be understood as ministerium verbi. When the ministry "achieves its most central object, definitively committing Church and individual alike, we call it the sacramental word" (p. 28), but hierarchical witness to the Christ-event cannot narrowly be limited and reduced to this sacramental word. Office-bearers have no guarantee of holiness or charism—they are servants of the one, holy, and charismatic Church. In the diaspora situation the social prestige associated with office vanishes, and its efficacy must depend more and more on the voluntary love and faith of all the Church members.

William H. Dodd, S.J.

A THEOLOGY OF MARRIAGE: A DOCTRINAL, MORAL, AND LEGAL STUDY. By Charles P. Kindregan. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1967. Pp. xiv + 162. K. divides his book into four parts: (1) toward a theology of marriage; (2) preparing for Christian marriage; (3) living Christian marriage—the vocation to communion; and (4) the human law of marriage. A good bibliography is supplied for each of the four parts; the whole text is accompanied by an outstanding subject and author index. K. has produced a scholarly and competent work which never bogs down into heavy-handed language. It is a book for the classroom and discussion groups. Furthermore, it keeps always to its theme of a man and a woman achieving holiness in a communion of one flesh. K. overcomes the traditional dualism of the ends of marriage by following the thought of Vatican II with its emphasis on the missionary aspect of the People of God. Thus, education of progeny is essential to
all considerations of procreation, and this provides the broad base so much needed in a theology of marriage. Responsible parenthood, growing together in love by witnessing Christ to one another, makes possible the growth in the Christlike attitudes which they share with their children in the form of redemptive teaching. Marriage is a deepening of interpersonal relationships because it is based on a union of the People of God, and marital love becomes a liturgy of service and sacrifice; thus, "marriage is a Christian sacrament because it is a redemptive action of the body of Christ." K. comes to this theology by first considering several "negative" historical sets of data concerning the causes for the poor development of the theology of marriage and the failure of Christians in the past to appreciate sex as the gift of God. By a judicious use of history, he is able to give a cogent and precise development of the doctrine on marriage; and by a careful use of conciliar and papal documents, together with constant awareness of the existential bases these have in Scripture, he is able to discuss the biological aspects of marriage in terms of community, communication, and communion. K. provides that balance which is the major concern of Pope Paul in *Humanae vitae*. He provides the necessary empirical data and information for the mature and reasonable formation of salvifically sensitive and responsible Christian disciples. This seems to be an ideal book on the theology of marriage.

_Edward G. Zogby, S.J._

**THE EARLY CHURCH.** By Henry Chadwick. Baltimore: Penguin, 1967. Pp. 304. $1.45. This book, well calculated to profit _TS_ readers, is Vol. 1 in the six-volume *Pelican History of the Church*, five of which have appeared since 1960. An unusual feature of the series is that it is published originally in paperback, and it is a good opportunity to acquire an up-to-date, capably and interestingly written set at a very reasonable outlay. The present book does honor to the series. C., Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, demonstrates a familiarity

penal law theory, a theory which admits of various interpretations regarding the relationship of penalty to law, viz., the obligation to observe a law and/or its penalty, are clearly articulated in this doctoral dissertation. In an era of aggiornamento, when the vivifying spirit of Church law and the dignity of conscience are highlighted over the letter, it is good to be reminded that a study of penal law is "an important question for the leading of the Christian life, namely the attitude of conscience that is involved in our life under the law." D.'s historical approach, essential for a sense of perspective, is confined to Spain during the period covering the mid-fifteenth to the mid-sixteenth centuries, a relatively brief period but one which produced influential authors who helped to forge and refine this theory. It is a good study of the doctrinal context in which this devastating approach to "law" developed, but it is not always clear that the casuistry involved is any more than moral philosophy. Students of moral theology will find this study a worth-while contribution to a thorny question. D. himself makes a good case for the nonacceptability of the purely penal law theory.

_Dennis Doherty, O.S.B._

with the results of recent research. His tightly-written chapters seem to be addressed primarily to the well-educated. Because of the modest allotted scope, selectivity is essential. C.’s emphases reflect his special concern for early Christian thought, as is clear from the high proportion of space dedicated to patristic authors and to the theological controversies of the first six centuries, in which the frequently abstruse issues are not glossed over. Gnosticism, with its ramifications, receives considerable scrutiny; this is not surprising, because in C.’s judgment “the conquest of Gnosticism may be counted the hardest and most decisive battle in church history” (p. 286). Peter’s death in Rome is accepted as highly probable, but his primacy is doubted—“perhaps there were some Christians who believed Peter rather than James to be the supreme authority in the Church after the Ascension” (p. 18). The brief bibliography of titles available in English is helpful; it would be even more so if the recent synthesis by Baus were added.

**John F. Broderick, S.J.**


K.’s *Early Christian Doctrines* (London and New York, 1958; 2nd ed., 1969; 3rd ed., 1965), tracing the development of the principal Christian doctrines (Trinity, Christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, sacraments, eschatology) from the close of the first century to the middle of the fifth, has been recognized for a decade as a remarkably discriminating synthesis unusually useful for students (cf., e.g., C. Butler, *Downside Review* 77 [1959] 181). Introducing the translation, P.-Th. Camelot claims that the French fills a genuine need. On the Catholic side in France, the one manual of the history of dogmas is the classic three-volume work of Tixeront (1904 ff.)—and this despite the ceaseless advance in patristic research and the new theological climate. Moreover, the French version (Cerf) of Schmaus-Grillmeier has serious disadvantages in that only six German fascicles of their *Handbuch* have appeared in seventeen years. A distinctive service provided by *Initiation* is the updating of K.’s bibliographies. Camelot is convinced that K. can awaken and enrich in the reader the sense of tradition, “which is continuity and progress” (p. 8), and that this Anglican work on “the undivided Church” is a splendid contribution to the cause of ecumenism.

**Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.**

*Bibliographia synodorum particularium.* By Jacobus T. Sawicki. Vatican City: S. Congregatio de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatis; New York: Fordham University Press, 1967. Pp. xxx + 379. $8.50. This pioneering exploration of a vast area merits a place on the reference shelf of any sizable theological library. Its compiler, a professor of the history of Polish law in the University of Warsaw, has long been a student of Polish synods. In 1963 and 1964 he broadened the scope of his research by labors in several major European libraries, thanks to a grant from the Institute of Medieval Canon Law, directed by Stephan Kuttner of Yale University. The book’s contents include printed source materials, as well as books and articles about synods other than ecumenical ones. Of the 3448 entries, 391 occur under “Generalia,” confined to documentary collections of more than one synod, and to the literature treating the topic in broader fashion. The remaining items fall in the other main division, “Specialia,” which deals
with specific councils. Within each division the listing is alphabetical according to author or, in the case of anonymous publications, title. Three indexes (persons, places, and topics) facilitate the location of desired works. S. has not attempted complete coverage, especially of sources, as his norms for inclusion and exclusion make clear. His deliberate omission of "editiones officiosae" of individual synods explains the slight attention to synods held in the U.S., save for Baltimore. For information of this kind, S. must be supplemented by a work like E. Vollmar's *The Catholic Church in America: An Historical Bibliography* (2nd ed., 1963). On the other hand, S. has not confined himself to the various Catholic rites, although the overwhelming majority of the entries concern them; a sizable number of titles refer to Protestant gatherings, and a much smaller total to Orthodox and even Jewish ones. (For those in search of recently published studies of ecumenical synods, very rich bibliographies are available in the annual issues of the *Archivum historiae pontificiae* [1963 ff.], whose fifth volume [1967] catalogs 538 items on Vatican II alone.)

*John F. Broderick, S.J.*

**Scriptum in Librum Primum Sententiarum: Ordinatio.** By William of Ockham. Edited by Gedeon Gál, O.F.M., and Stephan Brown, O.F.M. St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute, 1967. Pp. 41 + 535. $15.00. The first of a projected twenty-volume critical edition of the theological and philosophical works of William of Ockham being prepared by the Franciscan Institute at St. Bonaventure University. Ockham's *Commentary on the Sentences* is popularly believed to consist of four books and is generally admitted to be his most important theological work. This volume in the new series contains the first book of the *Commentary*, which outranks in importance the remaining three books: it is more than twice the length of the other three books combined, and it is the most thorough work that Ockham wrote and, as Michalski showed some forty years ago, it is an *Ordinatio*, i.e., a text prepared for publication by the author himself, while the remaining three books are a *Reportatio*, a copy of lectures taken down by a pupil and polished for publication either by the pupil or the teacher. Prior to the Second World War, Dom Hildebrand Bascour of Louvain had begun to prepare a critical edition of the *Ordinatio*, and in 1942 Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M., writing in the July issue of *New Scholasticism*, stated that he was preparing a critical edition of the other three books. Bascour was forced to abandon his project in 1951, and Boehner died in 1955 before the completion of his part of the project. The *Ordinatio* exists in a rare Strasbourg edition of 1486. The other incunabula edition of the *Commentary on the Sentences* was printed at Lyons in 1495 and contains both the *Ordinatio* and the *Reportatio*. It is this more frequently used edition that has suggested the false opinion that all four books were in reality one work. The Lyons edition of the *Ordinatio* was most probably taken from the Strasbourg printed text. Boehner's research convincingly demonstrated that the Strasbourg edition is not a reliable guide to the *Ordinatio*, and working with seventeen manuscripts suggested Firenze, Bibl. Naz. A. 3. 801 as the basis for a critical edition. Gál and Brown have accepted Boehner's work and have presented a solid, critical text which is clear and serviceable.

*Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.*
DEFENSORIUM OBEDIENTIAE APOTOLICAE ET ALIA DOCUMENTA. By Gabriel Biel et al. Edited and translated by Heiko A. Oberman, Daniel E. Zerfoss, and William J. Courtenay. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1968. Pp. viii + 387. $12.00. On Oct. 22, 1462, Gabriel Biel (+1495) completed his Defensorium obedientiae apostolicae in support of Pius II and Adolf von Nassau in their conflict (1459–63) with the conciliar-minded Diether von Isenburg for the Archbishopric of Mainz. The conflict centered on the right of the pope to depose a bishop without a hearing and the validity of an appeal from a pope to a future council. In his Defensorium, Biel sees unity as the bulwark of the Church's authority and the pope as the center of this unity. This principle is first enunciated and then applied to the question of Pius' deposition of Diether. The Defensorium was printed often, six editions appearing between 1500 and 1520, all based on the Tübingen edition of 1500. For this new edition, the authors consulted two mss. written within a decade of the original work (Mainz Stadtbibliothek II 219, pp. 25–41; Vatican Pal. lat. 192, f. 186v–200v). The related alia documenta (1460–63) supply the context for the work. They consist of Pius' Bull Execrabilis, his sentence deposing Diether from the see of Mainz, Diether's German Defensionsschrift against deposition, a Replica to the pro-Diether polemicist Gregor Heimburg written by the curialist Teodoro Laelio, Pius' encyclical supporting Adolf for the see, and excerpts from Pius' Decretal In minoribus agentes on the Roman primacy. The editions of the alia documenta date from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The authors provide a clear and well-documented introduction concerning the history of the conflict, together with translations of the various documents. The introduction gives a major role in the polemic to Gregor Heimburg, but unfortunately none of his works are included among the texts. The translations are readable, if at times somewhat free.

Joseph F. Kelly

THE GREAT LIGHT: LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. By James Atkinson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968. Pp. 287. $5.00. Atkinson's passionate brief for the sixteenth-century reformers serves as Vol. 4 (mistakenly given on spine and jacket as Vol. 1) in a series of popular histories by Anglican evangelicals, "The Advance of Christianity through the Centuries," edited by F. F. Bruce. The preface sets the tone by speaking of Luther's stand "on the unshakeable ground of Bible, conscience, and common sense" and of Calvin's effectiveness "by the sheer power of his pellucid and profound theology." Against these two paragons was the papacy, "never more immoral, frivolous, irresponsible, and irreligious, never more deaf to God and the Gospel." This, obviously, is not history written from a critical distance with scholarly objectivity. A.'s personal confession seldom gives way to a passion for primary evidence. A first result is a series of factual errors. In 1518, Luther did not argue that the thesaurus of indulgences was Christ, as A. puts it on p. 51, but he held that it was the power of the keys exercised in the Church. Leo X did not condemn the forty-one propositions of Exsurge as heretical (p. 62), but qualified the condemnation so globally that the judgment on any one proposition remains uncertain. At Augsburg in 1530, the Catholics did not remain adamant on six points (p. 104) but on two: the restoration of the Canon of the Mass and the return of confiscated monastic property.
Worse than errors of fact are the jarring emotional tones, as when A. speaks of the hated Catholic priesthood (pp. 20, 55, 58, 90, 94) or when he exudes his enthusiasm for Thomas Cranmer. It is disturbing to realize that a Protestant writer, who is Professor at the University of Sheffield and member of the Catholic-Anglican Preparatory Commission, could relate the ecclesiastical history of the sixteenth century with hardly a trace of that self-critical spirit found so widely in present-day Catholic assessments of the Catholic tradition.

Jared Wicks, S.J.

THE HISTORICAL ROAD OF ANGLICANISM. By Carroll E. Simcox. Chicago: Regnery, 1968. Pp. xiii + 235. $6.25. A summary history of Christianity in England from Roman times to the present day. Throughout the medieval period it is the Church in England. In the sixteenth century, however, certain acts of Parliament do their utmost to sever the Church from all relationship to the pope and to western Christendom and to transform it into the Church of England. S. writes: "The statement that the English reformation was an act of state is quite accurate" (p. 105). As a consequence of these parliamentary proceedings there was some reform of medieval abuses, but no thoroughgoing reformation was achieved. Rightly enough, he stresses the nineteenth-century reformation of the Church of England which is commonly known as the Oxford Movement. His descriptive chapter on it is appropriately headed "The Catholic Revival." The book concludes with accounts of the Church of England in America, known as the Episcopalian Church, of the world-wide spread of Anglicanism, and its future. There are two appendixes: eighteen questions and answers succinctly delineating modern Anglicanism, and a short bibliography.

Eric McDermott, S.J.

THE SACRED CANOPY: ELEMENTS OF A SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY OF RELIGION. By Peter L. Berger. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967. Pp. vii + 230. $4.95. By the author of The Noise of Solemn Assemblies and The Precarious Vision, this is a jewel of a book which "seeks to apply a general theoretical perspective from the sociology of knowledge to the phenomenon of religion." In his endeavor, B. draws upon the fresh methodology and sociological theory which he and Thomas Luckmann proffer in The Social Construction of Reality—A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge. B.'s concern is not to judge religious commitments or institutions, but to account for them as products of society. Man has always constructed a world of meaning out of the facts of his experience, quite apart from any warrant reality itself might add to the effort. B. makes no claims about "the ultimate ontological status of this alleged reality." Rather, he attempts to relate religion to the construction and maintenance of this world of meaning which "reveals the pressing urgency and intensity of man's quest for meaning." In the process he provides a neutral assessment of theodicy and alienation which begs attention. In the second major section B. turns to the current phenomenon of secularization in both its institutional and individual forms. His question is that of the secular ecumenist: Can the Judeo-Christian tradition be the focal point for the meaningful ordering of man's world? Does religion face a "crisis of plausibility"? Can it legitimate itself? For the theologian who has some concern for answering these types of questions, B. provides appendixes which trace out the implications of
the sociological theory for theology. The value of the book is that it shows that these answers are not self-evident.

James W. Thomasson

RELIGION IN A SECULAR AGE: THE SEARCH FOR FINAL MEANING. By John Cogley. New York: Praeger, 1968. Pp. xxi + 147. $5.95. How traditional religions are to come to terms with modernity is not only the most existentially pressing one for theologians today, but also one that involves the most fundamental theoretical issues. C. correctly labels his contribution to this area a “journalistic compendium,” and herein lie both its usefulness and its limitations. The clarity, conciseness, and comprehensiveness of C.’s survey of the varieties of religion and their confrontation with the modern secular world will make this an invaluable handbook for the general reader. The professional theologian, however, should turn to Peter Berger’s The Sacred Canopy (New York, 1967) for an indepth sociological study of the relation between religion and its cultural “infra-structures.” C. is in harmony with Berger at all significant points of contact; but one must go to Berger to understand the dynamics behind the phenomena C. describes. Otherwise, C. handles his material competently and objectively. His own liberal standpoint only serves to reinforce the detachment with which he outlines the corrosive effects of modernity on traditional religious positions. His one serious lapse comes when he attempts to assign Neo-Orthodoxy its role in the history of modern theology. Nineteenth-century liberal Protestantism, not Neo-Orthodoxy, was the forerunner of the secular theology of the fifties and sixties. As Berger shows convincingly, Neo-Orthodoxy was an accidental, retrogressive interlude in the liberal movement, which has now resumed at a quicker pace (Berger, pp. 157–66). Current theological trends should be classified as neo-liberal reactions to Neo-Orthodoxy. Moreover, Karl Barth, not Reinhold Niebuhr, is the “most influential and prolific” Neo-Orthodox writer. In conclusion, C. finds no “hopeless conflicts” between religious tradition and the modern mentality; Berger’s readers may feel less easy.

Anselm Atkins, O.C.S.O.

MATER ET MAGISTRA: TEXTE LATIN, NOUVELLE TRADUCTION, COMMENTAIRE. By Paul-Emile Bîlste, S.S. 5 vols. Montreal: Université de Montréal, 1968. $40.00. Those who are acquainted with B.’s nine articles on Mater et magistra that appeared in Studia Montis Regii from 1963 to 1967 will be familiar with much of the material in this work. B. has translated the text of Mater et magistra and utilizing his former research has compiled a four-volume commentary on the Encyclical. The commentary consists of fifteen hundred citation-filled footnotes to the text. The work is more than a thorough treatment of Mater et magistra; it is an encyclopedia on the social teaching of the Church. Helpfully indexed, rich in historical detail, B.’s work has deservedly won the commendation of such authorities as Calvez, Cronin, Hamelin, Jarlot, Land, and Nell-Breuning. B. is to be complimented for turning out a most useful research tool for understanding the development of the Church’s teaching on social questions in the seventy-year period from Rerum novarum to Mater et magistra. This work is highly recommended; no theological library should be without it.

Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.
The Mirror of Language: A Study in the Medieval Theory of Knowledge. By Marcia L. Colish. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968. Pp. xxiii + 404. $10.00. C. sets out to establish that Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, and Dante have fundamentally the same view on the function of signs in the acquisition and communication of knowledge. Basic elements in this shared sign-theory are (a) the notion of an objective order of being, prior to knowledge and measure of all knowledge, and (b) confidence that sensible signs can lead to an accurate knowledge of this objective order of being. The medievals, mainly concerned with knowledge of God, stress also the inadequacy of knowledge, its dependence on God, and its partial dependence on love. The confidence in signs is found in classical philosophy, especially in Aristotle. There is a shift, first formulated by Augustine, to stress on signs as basically verbal. Hence the common theory is called a linguistic epistemology. This new stress comes naturally from Christians' belief in revelation and most obviously from the doctrine of the Word Incarnate. It receives added thrust from the verbal disciplines of the liberal arts curriculum, rhetoric, grammar, and dialectic. C.'s main contention is that changing emphasis from one to the other of these disciplines accounts, at least in part, for apparent theoretic differences among the authors under discussion. Thus all express the same basic view, but in different modes. Augustine's mode is rhetoric, Anselm's grammar, Aquinas' dialectic, Dante's a poetics conceived in terms of rhetoric. The discussion is always interesting, frequently enlightening. What does not appear, however, is an adequate indication that through the Middle Ages there was a genuine development in Christian theology and incidentally, most notably in Aquinas, a genuine development in cognitional theory. Strip the medievals of their theoretic differences and you find a rather basic Christian realism.

Cornelius O'Donovan, S.J.

The Beginnings of Dialectic Theology 1. Edited by James M. Robinson. Translated from the German by Keith R. Crim and Louis De Grazia. Richmond: John Knox, 1968. Pp. 380. $12.50. An edited translation of the first two volumes of Anfänge der dialektischen Theologie originally edited by Jürgen Moltmann. Since the beginnings of dialectic theology had not been shared by, and therefore lost to, the present generation (i.e., of the 1960's), Moltmann collected the basic articles, reviews, and speeches relating to this new theology. As editor of the English translation, R. has rearranged the selections, but Parts 1 and 2 basically correspond to those of Vols. 1 and 2 of the German. Some essays which appeared in Moltmann's edition are here omitted because of their availability in English (e.g., some essays by Barth), and some which Moltmann himself omitted because of their accessibility in German have been added (e.g., the public correspondence between Barth and Harnack on the critical historical method). Part 1 considers the advance from "Religious Socialism to Barthianism" with essays by Barth, a discussion of his Epistle to the Romans by Brunner, Gogarten, and Bultmann, the Barth-Tillich debate on the concept of paradox, and finally the Barth-Harnack correspondence. Part 2 consists of the early writings of Bultmann and Gogarten under the general head "Christianity and Culture." The value of this volume is self-evident; it has been judi-
ciously edited. R. offers the English reader an entirely new contact with the beginnings of dialectic theology, and not just another collection of previously published essays. In his introduction R. indicates other writings of these theologians which should be read in conjunction with the volume at hand, in order to discern the development of dialectic theology. The selections in the present volume cover the years 1919–33, and R. projects a second volume (which will correspond to the German third) that will contain material from the early period of the confrontation with Nazism.

The Cambridge Platonists. Edited by Gerald R. Cragg. *A Library of Protestant Theology*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968. Pp. xiii + 451. $8.50. A selection of writings from that small but influential group of Cambridge University teachers of the latter part of the seventeenth century who championed liberty of conscience, freedom of will, and the place of reason in the realm of faith. Though born and educated in Puritanism, their theology was in vigorous opposition to the Calvinism of their time, finding predestination repellant and the denigration of man erroneous. For this volume C. has drawn mainly from the works of Whichcote, Smith, Cudworth, and More, with fewer passages from Culverwel and Norris. Since these men have suffered from neglect, C.’s introduction is especially enlightening and valuable; he briefly identifies the members of the group, sketches the intellectual atmosphere in which they operated, and epitomizes their basic teaching. C. prefaces each extract with a note concerning its significance and arranges the selections according to headings which highlight the chief theological concerns of the Cambridge Platonists.
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