BOOK REVIEWS


There is in our times a growing awareness and acceptance of the multiform religious tradition of mankind. This tradition is now the heritage of each human person. We can no longer be confined within some segmented area of man's spiritual development. The separate traditions isolated from each other are no longer adequate. The enlarged scale of man's vision and activity in the political and economic orders is now providing the context in which man's cultural and religious life must be lived. Thus the origin and significance of books such as this of Ninian Smart. His work is another in a long series of efforts to extend our religious thinking to its proper dimensions. We can notice a gradual improvement in the quality of thought, in historical accuracy, in spiritual insight in these works.

S. presents the various traditions as they have been experienced, expressed, and constantly changed by their followers through the centuries. This historical approach gives us a living contact with these traditions. This is infinitely better than those accounts that simply list the various beliefs, scriptures, and ways of worship of the traditions as though these were fixed, integrated, and easily explained realities. S. is well aware that all religions are still in process; none is a fully achieved reality. This next phase, of such great significance for mankind, will require much attention from religious historians, systematic theologians, and Scripture scholars. Our understanding of divine revelation, of the redemptive process, of ritual worship, and of spiritual discipline will all be affected by this new context of religious thought. Developments now in process will parallel in their significance the meeting of early Christianity with Platonism and Neoplatonism, medieval scholars with Aristotle, recent theologians with modern critical studies of the Bible. All of these have had great influence on the inner development of Christianity; yet this meeting of religions on a world scale may be more significant than any experience Christians have so far known.

S. is firm and clear in his statement that "it is absurd to hold that religious commitment must blind a man to the virtues of faiths other than his own" (p. 4). This attitude, that the spiritual experience of other peoples is closed to us, he considers "a dangerous thesis," since it makes men feel that they have no need to understand religions other than their own. Indeed, hardly anything can contribute so profoundly to understanding one's own religion as a thorough acquaintance with
other religions. The basic insights of each of the great religious traditions deserve at least discussion and communication if not always unqualified acceptance. Religions are no more mutually destructive than are men themselves. Because they differ, they have something to say to each other. Together they give us a multiform religious thought tradition in which, it is hoped, each will contribute something unique and each will itself be developed rather than destroyed by the presence of the others.

In considering the question of unity in world religions, S. avoids any suggestion of syncretism. He outlines in detail the profound differences in the doctrine of God, of creation, of spiritual development, of salvation, and arrives at two significant conclusions. First, it is hardly likely that a real unity of religions will be achieved in the near future, although an extensive dialogue is taking place and will continue. Second, the meeting of religions, the resultant dialogue, and the desire for greater unity will in fact produce a new diversity in man's religious life. This can be seen in the Sikh religion of India and in recent development of Bahai. At least it can be said that this is a period of vast religious change that must be managed with great depth of religious insight if the results are to be as beneficial as they could be to mankind as a whole.

As a basic book on the religious life of mankind with some real insight into each tradition and with appreciation of the type of dialogue that should presently be fostered, this work is recommended as possibly the best and most readable book available. It is not a definitive work, but it does raise the level of our thinking another notch. It also bears witness to the moderate success we are having with these studies and the amount of further and even better work that is needed in the future.

*Fordham University*  
Thomas Berry


It is a distinct pleasure to recommend warmly *The Jerome Biblical Commentary (JBC)* to all readers of *TS*. This is the best book value available today in the field of biblical studies. Both from the nature of the work and from the quality of its contents, I find it difficult to avoid the cliché superlatives that are sometimes the bane of reviews. But let me indulge, for no one who digs into this marvelous treasury will come away empty-handed. My assessment is made with some im-
partiality, since my own involvement in the work consists of a page or two on a minor and somewhat specialized topic.

The first question that must come to mind is this: In this day of ecumenical concern and dialogue on many levels, why produce a major commentary that is exclusively the work of Catholics? The question seems more appropriate when one realizes that dialogue among biblical scholars in particular long antedated the recent wave of ecumenism. But the editors of JBC faced this question frankly at the outset, and it would be difficult not to be persuaded of the tightness of their decision. For the obvious debt of the American Catholic biblical scholarship in these pages to Protestant and other interpreters should remove any lingering suspicion, outside or within the Catholic Church, that "confessional interpretation" is still a valid concept or a common practice. Catholics themselves will be reassured—if any still need to be—of the common ground of scholarly objectivity with which all Christian scholars may approach the font of their shared religious heritage. We may now only hope that if "Catholic" positions have to be cited, they will be cited from JBC and not from the manuals of what seems a rather remote age of apologetic defensiveness.

It is impossible in a single review even to catalog the riches of JBC, and this account will single out only some outstanding features, giving less attention to the OT than to the NT, in which I find myself more at home. The first volume is devoted to commentaries on the OT books and six more general introductory articles on the Pentateuch, the peoples of the Ancient Near East, the prophets, Hebrew poetry, postexilic thought, and the wisdom literature. There are also several general articles on the OT in the second volume, which is devoted expressly to NT and topical articles. These include a history of modern OT criticism by Sr. Alexa Suelzer and "Aspects of OT Thought" by J. L. McKenzie—both excellent. Since both volumes are bound together, this arrangement offers no inconvenience. The introductory articles are extremely useful, and of course they allow for economy of space in the work as a whole, but JBC, the editors rightly insist, is above all a commentary, and as R. E. Brown notes in his remarkably frank and helpful essay on hermeneutics, no one should allow general surveys or analyses to substitute for a study of the text with a commentary in hand. Though the commentaries vary considerably in style, viewpoint, method, amount of detail, and the like, all appear to be a valuable supplement to the biblical text.

The NT volume, in addition to the commentaries and introductory articles on the Synoptics, Paul, and the form of epistles, contains numerous essays on biblical history, geography, archeology, inspiration,
canon, texts and versions, Apocrypha, history of criticism, etc. In this category the last four essays, on OT theology (McKenzie), NT theology, principally Synoptics (D. M. Stanley and Brown), Pauline theology (J. A. Fitzmyer), and Johannine theology (B. Vawter), merit special mention. An index of their quality may be found in the success which Fitzmyer's work has already had in its advance publication as a separate little book. Among the general articles one misses a history of pagan religious thought in NT times, but one is grateful for such things as the balanced and informative assessments of Church pronouncements on the Bible by T. A. Collins and Brown, or Brown's account of the Qumran scrolls, surely one of the clearest and most up-to-date surveys now available. It is also gratifying to see a promising young scholar introduced to us in a fine survey of modern NT criticism, J. S. Kselman; my only preference in this article would have been for a more extended discussion of redaction criticism.

Among the commentaries there is again a wide range. With no slight intended to those not mentioned, I should like to single out for admiration the work of E. J. Mally on Mark and the combined work of R. J. Dillon and Fitzmyer on Acts; the latter have produced a superb short commentary on a notoriously difficult book. McKenzie approaches Matthew with flashes of the insight that is characteristic of all his work, but for a brief commentary I think I should still refer students to Stendahl's pages in Peake's Commentary. Of course one can always find points of scholarly disagreement in individual sections of the book. I would, e.g., be reluctant to agree with J. J. O'Rourke that 2 Corinthians is not a composite of two or more letters, or with G. A. Denzer that the pastorals are authentic, or with Vawter that it is "unthinkable" that John should have depended in some way on Gnosticism. In fact, the greatest area of my personal disagreement would lie in the understanding of John and 1 John presented here. But are not such disagreements merely proof that Catholic biblical scholarship is not monolithic, even if some general tendencies of Catholic authors can be (and are in JBC) fairly set forth?

The format of the work needs its own word of commendation. It is beautifully presented both typographically and in its arrangement. Excellent specific bibliographies on hundreds of points punctuate its pages. Realizing that the articles were first assigned in 1962, I have somewhat perversely sought evidence of "dated" bibliographies or notable omissions, but with singularly little success. My only regret with regard to format is that the margins do not indicate what chapters and verses are dealt with on each page.

Finally, one must offer a word of tribute to the three editors, who
are themselves deservedly among the foremost of Catholic biblical scholars. Perhaps only they and their collaborators will ever realize fully how much of this book, even beyond the many articles signed by them, is the product of their learning, industry, and concern for the word of God. But these credits are perhaps idle, for the only adequate monument to their work is the book itself.

_Weston College, Cambridge, Mass._

GEORGE MACRAE


A tragic curse, similar to the legendary one that struck down the defilers of King Tut’s tomb, seems to plague modern commentators on the fourth Gospel (henceforth FG). Like the original Evangelist, many of them have succumbed before completing their task. To the list of those who share this sad distinction (Bernard, Hoskyns, Lightfoot, Van den Bussche) one must add J. N. Sanders (d. 1961). Hence the combined authorship of the present volume, with Sanders responsible for the Introduction and chaps. 1-15, and Mastin, his pupil, for chaps. 16-21 and the appended Story of the Adulteress. A book composed under such difficult circumstances is never ideal, and the present volume does show some unevenness. The decision taken by Mastin was probably the wisest: “I could not myself by any means accept all the positions maintained by my former teacher, but have seen it as the major part of my task to permit him to speak for himself.... I have, however, endeavored to suggest in my own section of the Commentary the lines which my own thought would develop.”

Let us sample the general approach, contrasting it with positions familiar in Johannine scholarship. The major division of the FG between the “Testimony” (= the ministry) and the Passion comes between 11:54 and 11:55, instead of after chap. 10 or after chap. 12. The “Testimony” section includes six signs—not seven, for the walking “on” the lake in 6:16-21 is not miraculous. The Synoptic Gospels were not a source of the FG, and its independent tradition may faithfully preserve an aspect of Jesus’ ministry not found in the Synoptics. The pictures of Jesus found in Mark and in John may be compared to the pictures of Socrates found in Xenophon and Plato; both are necessary for really understanding the subject. Thus, S. is conservative about the historical value of the FG. Yet if the Gospel often remains close to Jesus in substance, a new form has been imposed on the material; and we are dealing with material that has been shaped by its use in ser-
mons delivered by a Christian prophet. Some of the speeches that the FG seemingly attributes to Jesus or to others really consist of the meditations of the Evangelist, e.g., 3:16–21, 31–36. The distinctive theology of the FG is to be explained from within Judaism (especially from the wisdom literature), as the Jewish heritage was illumined by the new insights which the experience of Christ had given men.

There is disorder in the FG. Although S. comments on the material in the traditional order, he favors some of the more commonly proposed rearrangements, e.g., chap. 6 before chap. 5. The disorder reflects the complicated history of the FG’s composition, and S. offers an elaborate and highly imaginative reconstruction of this history. The beloved disciple upon whom the FG draws was Lazarus whom Jesus raised from the dead, and his written testimony covered the part of the ministry that he witnessed, especially the last days in Jerusalem. The “other disciple” of 18:15–16 was John Mark, who eventually came to reside in Ephesus and served as the real author of the FG, incorporating into it the memoirs of Lazarus and other material. (He wrote 1 John as an introduction to the Gospel and was also the visionary of Revelation!)

As an over-all judgment, we would classify this volume as a good, but not a great, commentary on the FG; and unfortunately for S., the FG represents a NT area where we happen to have truly superior commentaries. Although there are many references to W. Bauer and to Bultmann, the literary criticism of the German school of commentators has not profoundly affected S.’s approach to the FG. For instance, the sudden introduction of the Sabbath motif in 5:1–18, the duplicated roles of Martha and Mary in chap. 11, and the plurality of crowds in 12:9–19 do not prompt a discussion of the composite nature of this material. The latest finds, such as the Bodmer papyri and the Dead Sea Scrolls, are known and used, but often with surprising lacunae (no references to the Bodmer evidence pertinent to 7:52 and 8:25). Perhaps we can sum it up by stating that Sanders is probably better than Lightfoot, not so good theologically as Hoskyns, and not so good in detailed criticism as Barrett and Dodd.

St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


This important study of the Apocalypse (hereafter Ap) has, as Myles Bourke notes in the Foreword, a pastoral purpose. M. is concerned
with discovering the relevance of this mysterious NT writing for the Church of today. He hopes to revive interest in this book which, because of its bizarre symbolism and exploitation by millennial sectarianists, is regarded with suspicion as an atypical NT writing with no message for present-day Christians. M.'s pastoral purpose, however, has not dulled the keenness of his scholarship. His book is a scholarly and important contribution to the interpretation of Ap.

The book has three parts. Part 1 is a study of Ap's major literary units. The unity of Ap is basic to M.'s interpretation. He offers, in passing, strong arguments in favor of its literary unity. Each section of Part 1 consists of M.'s own translation of the text, an analysis of the literary structure, and special topics for reflection and discussion, with a list of bibliographical material for further study.

Part 2, "Issues in Interpretation," deals with questions hotly debated among scholars. In view of the current theological debate on eschatology, the essays "The Earth" and "Heaven" are very important. M. challenges the prevailing eschatological interpretation of Ap as a prophecy about the end of the world. The difference between the world which passes away and the new creation is not spatial and temporal. The victory of God through the blood of the Lamb distinguishes the new creation from the old. Ap "stresses the intrinsic incompatibility of the old and the new, yet recognizes their compresence. Each is a structure of power with claims to sovereignty and actions of obedience. The new creation elicits the hostility of the old and uses that hostility as an occasion for victory" (p. 276). The "earth dwellers," allies of the beasts and the dragon, are the citizens of the world that comes to an end; the faithful disciples of Christ belong to the new creation; both groups inhabit the same earth, where they engage in combat which ends in the victory of the new creation. The last essay of Part 2, "Comparable Patterns of Thought in Luke's Gospel," corrects the concept of Ap as atypical of the NT and indicates the importance of this book for the understanding of the Gospels.

Part 3 consists of M.'s original translation, with annotations indicating the sources and reasons for his version. A complete bibliography concludes this stimulating and scholarly study.

Bourke in his laudatory Foreword takes issue with M. over his restrictive interpretation of the "earth dwellers," the allies of the beasts and the object of God's vindictive justice. M. identifies them exclusively with faithless Christians such as those threatened in the letters to the seven churches. Bourke pointedly notes the difficulty in describing Christians (even faithless) of the first century as "kings,
potentates, generals, millionaires and bosses." He also notes the inconsist­
ence in M.'s readiness to accept severe divine judgment against
faithless Christians while refusing to allow for such judgment against
the persecutors of the Church. I would agree with M. that Ap is a letter
exhorting Christians to constancy in their faith and am ready to include
among the "earth dwellers" those Christians who by apostasy have
allied themselves with the beasts. But is not Ap also a letter of conso­
lation promising the faithful who endure, victory with Jesus over all
the forces of evil, among which are the persecutors of the Church and
all who seduce men to blasphemy and idolatry?

St. John's University
Jamaica, N.Y.

Richard Kugelman, C.P.

The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference

This book is an important study of the Matthean and Lucan genealo­
gies of Jesus in the light of OT genealogies, the result of a doctoral
dissertation written at Union Theological Seminary in New York.
Almost all the standard questions raised by these conflicting Gospel
passages are studied anew and discussed in detail. The author has sub­
mitted them to a thorough analysis and assessed the earlier studies of
them; his analysis of the Gospel genealogies is well done and the book
is a work of which he can be justly proud.

Johnson's study is divided into two parts: (1) the purpose of OT
genealogies; (2) later Jewish genealogies and those of Jesus. In Part 1
two chapters are devoted to the Pentateuchal genealogies and those in
the Chronicler. In the Pentateuch there are the tribal genealogies
(Gn 19:36-38; 22:20-24; 25:1-6) and the Cainite genealogy (Gn 4:17-
22) of the Yahwist tradition; and then the Toledoth Book (Gn 5:1-32;
Nm 3:1-3) and the Chronology of the Priestly narratives. In later OT
books the genealogies are found in Neh 11:3-24; Ezr 7:1-5; 1 Chr 1-9.
In each case J. is at pains to study the relation of the genealogy to its
own context and to detect the motive or purpose for its incorporation.
Briefly, he finds that the OT genealogies serve to indicate existing rela­
tionships between Israel and its neighbors, to interrelate previously
isolated traditions about Israelite origins, to establish continuity over
periods not covered by such traditions (e.g., the gap between the crea­
tion-paradise legends and the patriarchal narratives), or to anchor
chronological speculation about world cycles. In some instances they serve to demonstrate the legitimacy of an individual in his post (especially to prove the pedigree of priests in the postexilic period) or to preserve the homogeneity of the race and the continuity of the people of God. The most frequent use of the genealogical form is found in writings emanating from priestly circles. In the Priestly source of the Pentateuch the genealogies were probably drawn from an existing compilation, the Toledoth Book, organized around pivotal figures and culminating in Aaron. They divide history into epochs and demonstrate the working out of a divine plan in history. The OT genealogy was thus clearly a work of art, composed for apologetic purposes, both nationalistic and theological.

Three chapters in Part 2 are devoted to the narrowing of genealogical interest in later Judaism and to each of the genealogies of Jesus in Mt and Lk. The narrowing of interest of the postbiblical period manifests itself in a concern for genealogical purity. The rabbis debated the degrees of legitimacy, priestly pedigrees, the need to trace one's descent by genealogical records, or indulged in genealogical speculation bolstered by midrashic exegesis to relate individuals to a biblical family. It also manifested itself in speculation about the ancestry of the Messiahs: Messiah ben David and/or Messiah ben Aaron. Against such a background of OT and rabbinic genealogical interest, J. seeks to show that "the two genealogies of Jesus, in different ways, reveal a knowledge of such Rabbinic discussion on the ancestry of the Messiah and are written on the basis of the same Midrashic methodology" (p. 140).

In discussing the Matthean genealogy of Jesus, J. surveys the classic attempts to harmonize it with Lk and rightly criticizes them for not considering "the function of the genealogical form in the first-century milieu" and for failing to "do justice to the function of the lists in the context of the gospels in which they are located" (p. 145). For him, the Matthean genealogy is the result of Jewish-Christian midrashic activity, as is the rest of Mt 1-2. Its most natural setting is Jewish genealogical and messianic speculation, such as is preserved in intertestamental and rabbinic literatures. Indeed, he regards the Matthean genealogy as a midrash on Mk 1:1, especially on the titles Christos and Huios theou. The first title is elaborated in Matthew's concern to present Jesus as the "Son of David," a title equivalent to "the Messiah." The second title is given a midrashic treatment in the pericope (1:18-25) on the virginal conception of Jesus. Together they introduce important Matthean theologoumena.

The genealogy in Lk 3:23-38, on the other hand, is a Lucan construction, not based on any actual genealogy, but inserted into a Gospel
framework similar to that of Mk (i.e., between the baptism and temptation of Jesus). It neither has an apocalyptic function, as explained by K. Bornhäuser (the 77 names symbolizing eleven world weeks preceding the age of the Messiah), nor exploits the Second Adam motif. Rather it has two functions. First, since it ends by calling Jesus "the son... of Adam, of God," it clarifies "the meaning of the divine voice at Jesus' baptism, 'Thou art my beloved Son...'") (p. 238). For J., this title in Lk "seems to be almost identical with 'Messiah'" (ibid.). He follows Conzelmann in maintaining that Lucan Christology is subordinationist and completely lacks the idea of pre-existence; he finds no trace of the tradition of Jesus' miraculous birth (1:26–37) in the rest of Lk 3–24. The genealogy, however, clearly presents Jesus as Son of God in a messianic sense. Secondly, the genealogy in Lk, since it traces Jesus' Davidic descent not through Solomon and the kings (as does Mt), but through Nathan, David's third son, thus supports the Lucan portrait of Jesus as a prophet. J. cites "esoteric Jewish haggada" and patristic evidence for a dispute that existed among the Jews in antiquity about the Messiah's ancestry. Some denied him a connection with David through the royal lineage which was cursed in Jer 22:24–30. Since the same tradition also identified Nathan as a prophet (by conflating him with the prophet of the same name in 2 S 7), J. finds the Lucan genealogy to be a prop for the Evangelist's portrait of Jesus as a prophet. Thus the purposes of the two genealogies of Jesus are explained.

This provocative book copes with most of the questions that the Gospel genealogies raise, and does so in a very competent way. If I must criticize some things, I would single out the following details. First, I am not happy with a general tendency of the book to take for granted that Jewish traditions in the rabbinic texts cited can all be traced back to the first century A.D. In some instances the rabbinic traditions have counterparts in Qumran literature or in Josephus, and these would be acceptable as first-century traditions. But in other cases one may question the antiquity of the sayings ascribed to various rabbis. To cite an example, J.'s treatment of the Lucan genealogy as a prop for the Lucan portrait of Jesus as a prophet is, in my opinion, the best solution that has been proposed. But none of the evidence for this interpretation (the Targum on Za 12:12 in the Codex Rechlinianus, Julius Africanus' Letter to Aristides, Eusebius' Quaestiones evangelicae) clearly points to a first-century Jewish belief about the Messiah's Davidic ancestry or to the conflation of David's son Nathan with the prophet Nathan.
Secondly, I find it strange that J. did not include some discussion of the knotty problem of "God's begetting the Messiah" in Qumran literature and its possible bearing on the Gospel genealogies (cf. R. Gordon, *Vetus Testamentum* 7 [1957] 191–94; T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* [London, 1957] p. 39, n. 13; M. Smith, *NTS* 5 [1958–59] 218–24; O. Michel and O. Betz, *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* [Festschrift für J. Jeremias; *BZNW* 26; Berlin, 1960] pp. 3–23; *NTS* 9 [1962–63] 129–30). Thirdly, the use of numbers (especially 7) in genealogies should have been given a little more serious attention. Was it possibly a mnemonic device? Even though J. rightly criticizes Bornhäuser's apocalyptic interpretation of Lk 3:23–38, the use of the number 7 in it seems to have had something to do with the list (and similarly one could discuss its use in the $3 \times 14$ names in Mt's genealogy). J. seeks to undermine the number 77 in the Lucan list, by appealing to variants in some codices and patristic writers. But, as I read the evidence, it is at least as strong for the 77 names as it is for the Marcan phrase *huiou theou* (1:1), which J. accepts (and weakly defends on p. 225), whereas this is omitted by Westcott-Hort and Nestle, and bracketed by Aland. In this matter of the use of 7 in the genealogies of Jesus, perhaps J. should have recalled the rabbinical text he cites on p. 27, n. 1: "All the sevenths are favourites in the world...." The sevenths in Luke's list should be examined. Again, is it sheer coincidence that when Josephus gives his own pedigree, he mentions seven generations, beginning with his great-grandfather's grandfather and ending with his own sons (*Life* §3–5)? Fourthly, perhaps J. should reconsider the sonship of Jesus in the genealogy in the light of the Infancy Narrative (1:26–37). Granted that Luke does not have the Nicaean notion of son, he may be suggesting a little more than Messiah (cf. A. George, *RB* 72 [1965] 185–209). Fifthly, J. rightly disposes of the explanation of Mt's use of three groups of fourteen names by gematria (i.e., that fourteen represents Jesus' Davidic descent because the numerical value of the consonants in *dwd* total up to 14). But he might have strengthened his argument by noting that though *dwd* is the spelling in the overwhelming majority of cases in the early *OT* books, the spelling is rather *dwyd* in the later books, and almost always in Qumran literature (the sole exception being the medieval copy of CD 7:16). In other words, the common way of spelling David's name in the first century would scarcely have given rise to the idea of fourteen, since *dwyd* would total up to 24. Lastly, J. should check the Aramaic text of the Targum cited on p. 241 with his sources; some he's have been written for *heth*'. 
As is obvious, these criticisms concern details and do not detract from the over-all value of this fine book.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.


With characteristic German thoroughness, the author—former student of and currently assistant to Karl Rahner, here introducing himself as "a systematic theologian on the school bench of the exegetes"—examines the formula or "confession tradition" (Bekenntnistradition), 1 Cor 15:3 ff., and specifically verse 4b. His purpose is to discern the meaning of (1) the "three days" formula and (2) "according to the Scripture." The subtitle "Earliest Christology, Confession Formation, and Scripture Interpretation in the Light of 1 Cor 15:3-5" reveals the basically systematic theological scope of this virtually all-inclusive, critical analysis of the relevant literature from the last half-century (including the most recent publications).

Through the centuries, from the time of the NT itself, this formulation of faith has been so completely taken for granted that its full theological meaning and salvific significance have been largely concealed. Part 1 exposes the structure of the confession formula, both its historical and its literary aspects, and with respect to Form Criticism and the "history of the transmission of traditions" (Traditionsgeschichte). Part 2 discusses various concrete interpretations which have been put forth, with respect both to their content and to the hermeneutical principles underlying the diverse interpretive sectors: in the NT itself; in the study of the history of religions; in terms of the so-called "argument from Scripture" based on Hos 6:2; in 1 Cor 15 itself, the parallel between verses 3b and 4b; from the intertestamentary Targumim and midrashim of the religious Umwelt of Jesus and His initial followers. Particularly in this latter, virtually unexplored sector Lehmann finds a non-Christian "theology of the third day" which, on the one hand, supports other evidence favoring the Semitic origin of the confession, and also clarifies its theological ("heilsgeschichtliche" [L.'s quotations]) meaning and reality.

Far from being a mere historical dating, the "third day" represents "the turning point toward new and better life, [when] God's merciful love and justice create a new 'time' of salvation, life, victory; through God's salvific act the third day brings a decisive matter to a definitive and history-making resolution" (p. 181; cf. pp. 261, 277).

L. also examines the use of the formula in the early Church, where
the absence of this theology of the third day, and the supposition of its historical character, appreciably influence the beginnings of Christological teaching. Long before Nicaea and Chalcedon, in the development of the "descent into hell" motif, very significant decisions occur in the progression toward the later doctrine of hypostatic union. A concluding chapter focuses the research results on today's complex theological problematic.

Attention to and critique of the methodological (viz., hermeneutical) principles and often unconscious, implicit presuppositions informing so much Scripture interpretation constitute the permanent value of this work: for on-the-job exegetes whose preoccupation with detail work often obscures awareness of their own systematic Vorverständnis; for systematic theoreticians whose various "theologies" are too seldom subjected systematically to the merciless criticism of exegetical detail and methodological analysis. L. moves through an awe-inspiring body of literature with great sobriety and perspicacity, explicitly avoiding every inclination to exegetical or dogmatic overkill. Especially significant are his comments on the ontological and heilsgeschichtliche dimensions of the confession formula illuminated by the "three days" expression: the Resurrection's "kind of reality," and Jesus' "ontological history" (Wesensgeschichte) in the thought of St. Paul. He also underscores the theological-Christological and existential-ontological unity of Jesus' death and resurrection.

With all due laud to the content of L.'s research findings, both as exegete and as systematic theologian, it is my opinion that the even more enduring significance of this study lies in its paradigmatic value and function for truly scientific theological research and interpretation (cf. T. S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions [Chicago, 1962]). This indeed, is "theology come of age," a major contribution to the field, a work which is already classic.

Catholic Univ. of the Netherlands

Robert C. Ware


If one proceeds upon the assumption that two thousand years (of human experiences encompassed within the development of a universal religion) can be adequately described in a single volume, then the Franzen-Dolan effort is probably worth while. Apart from a few faulty translations (e.g., p. 33: "Also in Carthage lived and taught bishop Cyprian . . ."), the authors have produced a readable narrative. From a general
point of view, they have covered each of the major events which mark
the past of the Roman Catholic Church. And where necessary, such de-
tails as names, places, and dates are given with unerring accuracy.

To its credit, A History of the Church reflects quite well both the
ecuminal overtones of the post-Vatican II era and the results of recent
scholarship. Its treatment of the Reformation is comprehensive and well
balanced. Moreover, the text extends generally charitable interpreta-
tions whenever schisms or heresies are considered; yet a fine line has
been drawn between the motivational aspects of human behavior and
their effects upon the one true faith. In each instance Catholic belief
and practice is vindicated in its proper context of time and place. Ob-
jectivity, therefore, does not involve compromise.

Furthermore, F. deserves a measure of praise for his logical approach
to so broad a topic as the history of the Catholic Church. Originally
published in Germany in 1965, the book reduces the expanse of time to
three easily understood eras: ancient, 1–604 A.D.; medieval, 500–1500;
modern, 1500–1968, updated after 1965 by editor Dolan. Each of the ma-
ior periods is then subdivided into two, four, and three epochs respec-
tively. And under the latter headings, subtopics are numerically intro-
duced and treated. The effect for teachers as well as students is to have
at hand a schematized view of a complex panorama.

Brevity, however, has its price. With but a few topical exceptions,
treatments of personalities and events are at best sketchy, at worst su-
perficial. Space limitations preclude any reasonable attention given to
secular causation of ecclesiastical policies. As a result, the institutional
Church becomes an entity worthy of study in and by itself rather than
as an integral part of human society. For the reader who is not versed in
the ebb and flow of the interpersonal relationships which constitute
the heritage of Western civilization, the Franzen-Dolan recitation of
facts would pose an insurmountable barrier to the understanding of re-
ligious influence in the lives of men. For the casual reader, much would
be lost in the effort.

Even with respect to internal ecclesiastical affairs, the development
leaves much to be desired. The Photian Schism merits only fifteen lines;
the Cerularian impetus toward the creation of the Orthodox Church is
allotted exactly two pages; classic confrontations receive short shrift, e.
g., Gregory VII and Henry IV, Boniface VIII and Philip IV. And for
those interested in the American contribution, eleven pages are devoted
to the entire period between 1492 and 1968. Many other examples could
be cited; they would merely confirm the warranted conclusion that only
a bird’s-eye view has been afforded to anyone perusing the volume.

Finally, it is disturbing that the book boasts neither a bibliography
BOOK REVIEWS

nor footnotes. Dolan in the Preface casually dismisses any such need with the words: “Simplification has been achieved by accepting established scholarship without lengthy substantiating data. Where interpretations are open to question, the position representing the most modern consensus is taken.” What emerges, therefore, is an arbitrary evaluation upon the authors’ part, one which deprives the student of the opportunity to weigh the facts in evidence. At best, then, A History of the Church merits only a qualified approval in that it will afford either a factual review or interesting reading.

Saint Pius X Seminary

JOHN P. GALLAGHER

Dalton, Pa.


In what could be appropriated as an intimidating remark for reviewers of medieval intellectual history available in English, H. Oberman recently remarked that reviewers of such must be particularly cautious and scrutinizing since (1) the field is so complex and (2) there has been a scarcity of significant studies in this field available in English. Though Leff’s work chronologically covers only some two hundred years, ideologically it is global, as some sixteen topics are examined under three main divisions: poverty and prophecy, union with God, and the true Church. This demands almost as many specialists to properly review the work. My task imposes its own limitations.

The prologue introduces the first serious problem in terms of an adequate definition of heresy. L. suggests that his study is of “heterodoxy passing into dissent and ultimately heresy” (p. vii). He is interested in focusing upon the making of heresy as it emerged out of the tensions within Christian society and then as it used unorthodox means to overcome these tensions. That it was an indigenous growth is a useful and positive insight, but this does not clarify the obfuscation in defining heresy. One has the impression that L. is implying that there was a neat, static system and a consensus of orthodoxy on the part of the established Roman Church. Perhaps it would have been more appropriate and less confusing to use the more generic terms of heterodoxy and dissent.

The first examples of heterodoxy are presented in the discussion of the Franciscan disputes over their founder’s legacy, the interpretation of poverty, Joachism, Bonaventure’s and Olivi’s resolutions, and the condemnation of the Spirituals. The recurring phenomenon appears in
which a movement critical of the ecclesiastical establishment and fraught with disciplinary and political interests eventually is condemned by the establishment. This action generally precipitates the strong appearance of apocalyptic and exclusivistic elements. Polarization takes place and suppressive measures are effective to the degree that the dissenters are in the minority within the various institutional structures. For the ecclesiastical authorities, unity was identified with a brand of arbitrary conformity which in the end seemed to work against the desired goal. That such a conceptualization of heterodoxy and authority exists today speaks poorly for the appropriation of historical lessons. Indeed, it has always been a difficult task to ascertain when the personalities of a movement genuinely have the commonweal of the Church as their objective and when egoism dominates. The antipapalism, the sharp criticism of abuses and aberrations of the personnel of the institution, and the apocalypticism were frequent expressions of a nostalgia for the idealized "pristine" and primitive Church.

This is particularly evident among the Spirituals, the Beguines, the Fraticelli, and the Michaelists. A disrupted papacy in Avignon followed by the Great Schism only aggravated heterodoxy. The conflict of authentic evangelical values and the existing lack of lofty moral fiber in the Church resulted in variegated responses. L. includes among these Eckhart's refuge in mysticism and Ockham's refuge in fideism. This is a curious juxtaposition of ideologies. Furthermore, it is questionable whether L. has really understood Ockham correctly. The latter can hardly be accused of unorthodoxy in his thinking on natural theology and concerning the Trinity (cf. pp. 294 f.). The confusion and inconsistency of the first issue have been eliminated in L.'s "Knowledge and Its Relation to the Status of Theology according to Ockham," Journal of Ecclesiastical History 20 (1969) 7-17. Still, L. would have done better to consult and recognize the contributions of Oberman on Ockham, even though they may strongly disagree.

The Free Spirit movement has generally been an enigma for historians of the period precisely because it lacked organization as a sect, it was so complex in its expressions and ramifications, and it interrelated with distinct sects as the Beguines and the Beghards. L. has done an excellent job of extricating the elusiveness. His inclusion of the item on the confession of sins (p. 313) and the condemnation of Olivi's teaching on the mutilation of Christ (p. 314) is a misrepresentation of the authentic meaning. The same applies to the issue of William of Hilderniss's attitude toward "elaborate vestments" (p. 398).

The initial chapter of Vol. 2 provides the doctrinal background for subsequent chapters on Wyclif, the Lollards, and the Hussite reforma-
Marsilius of Padua and Ockham are considered to be the progenitors of the political thinking of Wyclif and his followers. Indeed, Marsilius posed a real threat to the established theories on papal authority, but he was not the first to attack the Petrine claims as L. suggests (p. 420). D’Ailley, Gerson, and Dietrich of Niem join Marsilius and Ockham in the quest for the limitation of papal power or at least its proper use. The same preoccupation is found in the so-called “older heresies” of the Cathars, Waldensians, and Flagellants. The relevancy of this common concern to particular crises today is extremely interesting.

While L. situates the prime cause of Wyclif’s heresy in his extremism (pp. 500 f.), at the same time he is convinced that Wyclif’s metaphysics is the keystone for an accurate understanding of his teachings on the Bible, the Church, dominion, and the Eucharist. For this exclusive point of departure, L. has been severely criticized by Paul de Vooght (cf. Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique 63 [1968] 989-95), as well as for what de Vooght considers to be L.’s misunderstanding of Scholastic terminology. Judging from several acerbic footnotes in L. contra de Vooght, one wonders whether this scholarly confrontation is not more dialectical than dialogical.

Erastianism must have garnered much from the Lollards’ denigration of ecclesiastical authority. Purvey was just one of the Lollard extremists who elevated the laity by reducing the role of the clergy. However, L. should recognize that sacramental administration of baptism and marriage were always held to be within the competency of the laity (p. 581).

The analysis of the Hussite reformation is quite ambitious, since not only Hus is included but also Waldhausen, Milic, Janov, Jacobellus, and John Zizka. With the recent renaissance in Hussitology, L. should have been more dependent upon the studies of Spinka, Heymann, Hyma, and Seibt, and the translation of Peter of Mladonovice. Presumably the Taborites did not reject baptism but the use of holy water in the blessing of the baptismal font (p. 690), nor did Gerson accuse Hess of teaching that “not to be in grace was to be in sin”—an orthodox position—but rather that all the acts of man in mortal sin are sinful (p. 443).

In general, (1) examples are abundant of mistakes in the Latin quotations and their English rendition; (2) an almost exhaustive redundancy of introductory remarks, recapitulations, and footnotes exists. The scholar with access to primary sources can simply refer to them and has no need of a specific ibid. every other line, or a more complete and supportive reference should be used. (3) Learning from such peers as Oberman, Vigneaux, and de Vooght is indispensable. The chief merit
of this study is its availability in English as a comprehensive corpus of information, analyses, and syntheses on such a diversity of later medi­eval heterodoxy and dissent.

It seems to me that the historical value of such a work can be validated not only in terms of its technical accuracy but also in terms of its relevance and "source power" for the contemporary. L.'s study surely provides such, as we may gain helpful insight from the crises, dissent, and heterodoxy so similar to those that the Roman Church experiences today. To avoid some of the disasters of the former age, ecclesiastical authorities must appropriate an operable theory of unity amid diversity of theological pluralism. Students of religious and theological thought will need L.'s study in its present form as very useful reference. If it were revised with some necessary corrections and issued in a more economical form, it should be required reading in medieval int­ellectual or Church history.

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario

JOHN R. MEYER


The figure of Giles of Viterbo (Egidio da Viterbo, 1469-1532)—Pla­tonist in the tradition of Ficino, cabalist in the tradition of Pico, de­fender of Reuchlin and opponent of Paduan Aristotelianism, Hebraist and Arabist, humanist and poet, general of the Augustinian Order at the time of Luther's fateful visit to Rome, preacher and reformer, papal emissary and cardinal—is one which will always attract the at­tention of the historian of the Renaissance. Recent research, in addition to an effort to determine the details of his biography, has concentrated on the philosophical aspects of his thought, especially his cabalistic speculation. Some attention has also been paid to his role as reformer. But in general research has been hindered by the lack of published texts. Of Giles's early Sententiae ad mentem Platonis, written over a number of years up to 1512, while he was still predominantly under the influence of Ficino, only excerpts have been published. The Historia XX saeculorum, written between 1513-18 and dedicated to Leo X, is preserved only in manuscript. The Libellus de litteris hebraicis of 1517 and Giles's masterpiece Scechina, undertaken at the request of Clement VII, addressed to Charles V and completed in 1530, have re­cently been published. With regard to Giles's efforts toward reform, however, little material is available in print. A short treatise on the re­ligious life, De Iticetana familia, written between 1503-6 for the ob-
servant community of Lecceto, and his oration opening the Lateran Council in 1512 have been edited, but Giles's epistles and the registers of his term as general remain for the most part in manuscript. The present work, originally a Harvard University dissertation, is based on a detailed examination of this manuscript material, and makes available a large number of excerpts, especially from the Historia and from Giles's epistles. The author concentrates on Giles's concept of Church and reform, but intends to show the relation of his ideas in this regard to his philosophical speculation.

After three introductory chapters supplying the context for Giles's thought in various Renaissance traditions, especially the cabalistic movement of the early sixteenth century, O. takes up his concept of Church and reform. According to Giles, the Church is the mystical body of Christ. It has both teaching and sanctifying functions, and the duty of spiritual governance. Its structure is hierarchical, and its two heads are the pope and the emperor. Between them there is a diversity of function, teaching and sanctifying being assigned to the pope, and military and punitive measures to the emperor. Giles was never a conciliarist, and between pope and emperor the superior authority is in his conception enjoyed in the final instance by the pope. In its essence the Church is Roman. Parallels are drawn between Jerusalem and Rome, and the transfer to Rome is justified by the universal character of the new religion. The Church is conceived as revolving about the city of Rome as its axis, and continuing in sublimated form the traditions of the Roman Empire.

Giles's reform program, both within the Order and for the Church as a whole, is based on the principle "Men must be changed by religion, not religion by men." For the Augustinians he proposed an eremitical ideal, and even tried to generalize this as a Christian program. Although we can not infer from Giles's extremely exacting ideal of observance that any substantial decay had set in within the Order, a certain laxity does seem to have existed. The particular abuses he tried to combat were concerned with common life, liturgical prescriptions, silence, cloister, and sometimes more serious offenses. For the Church Giles also proposed certain reform measures, all reflecting the principle that external discipline is necessary for interior renewal. His measures concerned both doctrine and morals. For the former, antiquity and nearness to the source are the touchstones of authenticity. With regard to the latter, he emphasized especially obedience to ecclesiastical authority. And although he recognized the need for reform in the papacy and the Curia, he regarded schism, which followed on the failure to obey the pope, as the worst evil which could befall the Church. The agents by
whom reform was to be carried out were the Church itself, especially the pope, but also councils and canonical visitors, the lay powers, and even the Turks, as the avengers of divine justice.

O. emphasizes that Giles's conception of the Church and his program for its reform must be understood within the conservative frame of reference within which it took shape. Here the key concepts are those of history and providence. For his understanding of history Giles relied on the cabala and number mysticism. The world and its history are a reflection of the divine being and activity, a likeness of the ten cabalistic sephirot. Because the Psalms also reflect this tenfold structure, they provide a key to the course of history. Accordingly, in his Historia XX saeculorum, Giles distinguished ten ages for the OT and ten ages for the Church. The urgency which characterizes Giles's zeal for reform may be attributed to the fact that in his conception the ninth age ended with Julius II. The consummation will take place with the tenth age and will be initiated by Leo X. The reform of the Church, therefore, has to be understood as an aspect of the general religious renovation of mankind which will be inaugurated with this tenth age. This renewal will affect not only the Church but also the world, and will effect the renovation of theology in the spirit of Ficino, the revival of biblical studies with the acquisition of the spiritual sense through the cabala, the purgation of the Church from the errors of the Peripatetics, the rebirth of eloquence and the arts, the renewed hope for the religious unity of mankind springing from the discovery of the New World, and the firm determination to conquer the Turks.

This study is valuable for the texts it makes available and for the light it throws on the situation of the Church in the eyes of a sensitive observer at a crucial period in its history. Some more attention might possibly have been paid to Giles's evolution, and it would certainly have been better to have given an indication of the work cited in the notes instead of simply a reference to the manuscript folios. Above all, it is hoped that this work will be a stimulus to the publication of all of Giles's works.

Fordham University

Charles H. Lohr, S.J.


Luther's first course of lectures, the *Dictata super Psalterium* of 1513–15, is obviously of great importance in Christian history. But the text itself (over 1100 pages in Vols. 3 and 4 of the Weimar Edition) is a major obstacle to grasping the starting point and initial development of Luther's thinking. His interlinear and marginal glosses give tantalizingly brief remarks on all the Psalm verses; his often intricate scholia then elaborate a theological vision of salvation history, the trials of the Church, and Christian spirituality, as the young *Doctor biblicus* read these off his Psalm text. The first two fascicles of an improved text and a huge critical apparatus were added in 1963 (WA 55), covering Luther's treatment of Psalms 1–15. But one's approach to Luther is actually made more difficult by the wealth of medieval material in the new edition. Suddenly a little-known exegetical tradition looms across the background of Luther's theology. We must note where he borrowed and where he refused its help. Nicholas of Lyra, Paul of Burgos, James Perez of Valencia, and Faber Stapulensis must now be treated along with the Scholastics and the spiritual writers, if we are to situate Luther rightly. Such questions as typology, the fourfold sense of Scripture, "spiritual" exegesis of law and prophecy, and OT revelation itself take their place among the issues involved in understanding the Reformation. Life becomes complex.

Fortunately, some competent young scholars are also providing us with monographs that help decode large portions of the *Dictata*. Three recent ones, respectively from a Flemish Jesuit, a Tübingen Privatdozent, and a Harvard professor of Church history, advance our knowledge considerably and set high standards for future workers on the young Luther.

Joseph Vercruysse took the ecclesiology of the *Dictata* as the theme of his Gregorian University dissertation. Luther spoke concretely and descriptively about the Church between his correlation of the Psalm text with Christ's life and with the struggles of the individual Christian. Accordingly, V.'s outline is basically historical: the synagogue and remnant of Israel, Christ and the Church, the apostolic ministry of preaching, the eras of the Church's history, and the Church to come. The great theme is God's word and the crisis of faith. Where God's work comes to term in the submission of faith, the *fidelis populus*, which is the Church, comes into existence. Although convinced of the perenniality of the Church as God's merciful work, Luther did not hesitate to exorcize men of his own age for their decaying fervor. But V. sees him less a prophet of doom than a spiritual teacher of holy dissatisfaction with any present situation. The sacraments play next to no role in Luther's descriptions; for here God's words of judgment, testimony, and promise dominate the scene. V.'s work is a model reportorial study, which estab-
lishes the modest amount that can be said about Luther's earliest vision of the Church. We urgently need a survey to map out the surrounding terrain of ecclesiologies—conciliarist, papal, scholastic-explanatory, mystical-descriptive—on hand in the first decades of the sixteenth century.

Reinhard Schwarz's Habilitationsschrift treats Luther's conception of repentance (Busse, poenitentia, iudicium sui) in the Dictata against the background of the late patristic and medieval spiritual tradition. Half of S.'s book traces the concept from Augustine through representative writers down to the late medieval work on the monastic life. Thus we see the central spiritual theme of the Dictata against a rich and variegated background: Augustine's focus on harmony with God's judgment upon our sin—within a Eucharistically oriented community; Gregory the Great's concern to engender tears and confusion to reverse inordinate love of creatures; Bernard's compunctio as one step to union with Christ in selfless love; William of Auvergne's view of self-condemnation as a requirement of justice that free will must carry out aided by grace; Biel's systematic treatment of poenitentia as an acquired habit which grace perfects in bringing one to hatred of sin propter Deum; the devotio moderna's meditation in fear and affective compassion with the suffering Christ; Johann von Staupitz's attention to the concept "judgment"; finally, the monastic life understanding itself as the state of true penance.

Luther's affinities are with Augustine and Bernard. His frequent use of compunctio (not contritio) and his startling words on overcoming self-will in submission to the word of prelates (modeled after monastic superiors) indicate his roots in monastic theology. The Christian ideal of the Dictata is penitent self-condemnation (humilis accusatio sui) before God, and mortifying hardship in the world. Since God speaks a word of judgment over us, faith must entail self-accusation. Where medieval Passion piety immersed itself affectively in the past sufferings of Christ, Luther sees Christ now active in the heart to bring forth the transforming judgment of repentance.

S. argues that Luther radicalized the grounds for self-accusation, since for him it is not actual sins or the remains of sin, but original sin—as a present existential fact—that is to be humbly acknowledged. I would not attribute great systematic importance to the one text (WA 4, 497, 15) apparently saying this. In such a massive work as the Dictata one remark is not enough, especially in this case where Luther's thinking is partially set in the brackets of speculation about God's potestas absoluta. Our lack of willing hilaritas and the infection of self-
seeking are truly themes of the *Dictata*, and give better reasons why we must accuse ourselves before God.

James Samuel Preus worked under Heiko Oberman at Harvard on the hermeneutic of the *Dictata*. Like Schwarz, he strives to recapture the situation in 1513 by a detailed review of his topic from Augustine to Luther. His careful narrative of the medieval hermeneutical discussion is qualified by his pique over a Christianizing approach that saw the *OT* as a shadow and figure of what came. Only a small Spirit-endowed elite in Israel knew the Christian message actually intended in their own history, law, and poetry. Letter and Spirit divided the two testaments. The Franciscan Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1340) asserted the relevance of the plain literal sense of the *OT* and spoke against rampant allegorization. But Lyra could not stem the tide, and mystical-spiritual interpretation was even made responsible for declaring the literal sense, e.g., by Luther's contemporary Faber Stapulensis. Little importance was attributed to the roles of *promissio* and expectation within interpretation, although the promise of the Spirit to the interpreting Church was central where the perspective widened to include tradition and the magisterium. Promise served to establish a theological authority-principle. The doctrine of salvation through grace and charity (given by the Spirit) hindered giving theological relevance to pre-Christian existence.

In the *Dictata* P. finds first a "medieval Luther" who begins in unquestioned continuity with the tradition. Luther's prefaces to the *Dictata* propose a thoroughgoing Christological exegesis of the Psalms and include polemical shafts against Lyra. Luther's exegesis of the first half of the Psalter treats the text as "fulfilled prophecy" in which David described coming events in Christ, the Church, and the Christian man. The promises were fulfilled in Christ and have no further relevance for Luther's Christian hearers, who must rather be alerted to God's work of conforming them to the image of His Son. So far, P. has described the hermeneutic of the *Dictata* made familiar by Gerhard Ebeling in his basic articles of the 1950's.

But P.'s thesis is that a new Luther began to emerge at about Psalm 84. A new interpretative schema kept recurring, that of the three advents of Christ (in the flesh, in grace, and in judgment). In this framework God's word is promise and testimony, with Psalm 118 building a notable climax. Luther discovered that the advent existence of *OT* man was much like his own: both lived in faith under God's reliable and irrevocable promise to save. The literal sense of Luther's text regained its lost rights, the Psalmist was taken as speaking meaningfully to his
own people, and the whole people of God became one in their expectation. Here is an important phenomenon that Ebeling and many others, myself included, have not noticed and dealt with.

P. is clear about the theological consequences of this shift of hermeneutical principle. Saving faith becomes more reliance on God's promise than assent opening in love. Grace and charity recede in importance behind the word and certain expectation. Christ is ever the goal, and less the exemplar according to whom we are transformed. The Church has an open-ended existence like Israel, with her bona ever on the horizon ahead. This did not all become thematic in the Dictata, but P. is convinced that seeds were planted that unambiguously led to Reformation theology. This has been said before, but with little of the precision P. has introduced and no attention given to the shift in hermeneutics to concentration on promissio.

P. has charted an important development within the Dictata. His findings should become a standard part of our view of the initia Lutheri. But I hope a more balanced historical evaluation of medieval Psalm exegesis prevails. The commentators were doing a brotherly service for monks and clerics whose lives centered on praying the Psalms to God. Forbidding them to do this in Christ would have been impoverishing and in one sense false. Secondly, I doubt that P. will be able to show a smooth transition from the later part of the Dictata to Luther's subsequent lectures and sermons. The word of judgment featured by Schwarz dominates Luther's next course, on Romans, where promissio is hardly heard from. Is the Dictata perhaps yet even more complex than P. realizes? Lastly, I think P.'s explanation of why Luther shifted to his promise hermeneutic is far below the cogency and clarity of his main presentation. His final chapter gives us speculation about tropology breaking down because Christ was not a believer, about Luther's doubts regarding God's working in his life, and about the sacramental word. These strike me as constructions forced together to bridge a gap not documented in the Dictata. More likely, Luther noted the three-advent scheme in Bernard and simply tried it out as a variant form of Psalm interpretation. His pleasure with the results led to repeated use and consequent highlighting of promissio. Still, P.'s presentation of the tradition and of Luther's two phases in the Dictata remains an interesting and helpful study of a difficult chapter in the history of Christian thought.

Finally, we note that while the Catholic author restricts himself to a close reading of Luther's text, the two Protestant scholars also delve deeply into the medieval background and thus indicate significant lines
of continuity between Luther and the Catholic tradition. This is not a widespread phenomenon, but nonetheless a promising one.

Bellarmine School of Theology
North Aurora, Ill.

JARED WICKS, S.J.


In surveys of Luther studies it is usually said that Lortz represents a revision of previous Catholic approaches to Luther which might be generally characterized as character assassinations. L’s study, which appeared in 1939-40, has not been revised in subsequent printings. In the last thirty years a great deal has happened in Catholic theology and Catholic and Protestant Reformation studies. It is, therefore, difficult to find any reason why L.’s study should be translated into English thirty years later.

Much research has been done which challenges L.’s understanding of late medieval theology—particularly the areas of nominalism, mysticism, conciliarism, exegesis-hermeneutics, preaching as well as humanism (the only area that L. has singled out for any serious discussion of late medieval intellectual life). Much has happened since L. in the area of Catholic work on Luther. Hopefully, Catholic Luther scholars have moved beyond the attempt to explain "the tragedy" of the Reformation which is the burden of Lortz’s study (p. vii). One wonders what justification there is for a work even in 1939 that does not deal in normal scholarly fashion with primary and secondary sources (no footnotes).

In the 1960’s and even more particularly in the last two or three years there have been, in one count, a dozen general surveys of the Reformation in English. Why an expensive translation of a work thirty years old?

Now to be more specific. In his treatment of the pre-Reformation period, L. is at his strongest when he is pointing to societal and, more clearly, political elements of the pre-Reformation situation. His general statements about the tensions toward schism or disunity which originate in the societal complex throw into contrast the truly interrelatedness of Church, state, and society in this period. L. also describes the various problems associated with the decline of religious life among the Germans before the Reformation. It is clear that for him this is the major problem which occasions the theologically unacceptable positions of Luther and his followers. Perhaps the basic weakness of L.’s handling
of this period is what he calls the emergence of "the subjectivist tendency" (p. 11). This subjectivism becomes the key pin around which nearly all those attitudes detrimental to Christian unity revolve. Thus, the Reformation is basically a turn away from an absolutely fixed norm, the content of Christian faith (p. 4). "The issue of the Reformation is the issue between objectivism, traditionalism, and clericalism on the one hand vs. subjectivism, spiritualism, and laicism on the other" (p. 11).

When he appeals to the non-Catholic reader to have sympathy with his Catholic stance, L. reveals the full scope of his "Catholic" view. For L., Catholicism is at its base static, objective, and absolute. The base of the Reformation was dynamic, subjective, and relativistic.

While L. departs from the traditional character assassination of Luther, he still fails to see properly the positive value of Luther's contribution. He gives the impression that Luther's movement was only possible because the vague and weak theology of the times was not able to counteract Luther's positions. He seems to feel that if there had been a strong theology at the time and if the authorities had been quick in denouncing him, the movement would never have gotten out of hand. There is an underlying assumption in the book that Luther was entirely wrong and should have been dealt with efficiently and strongly. Perhaps the reason for L.'s shortsighted view of Luther's theology is his conception that in fact Luther was not a theologian at all. He describes Luther as a man obsessed with religion who was totally preoccupied with soul-searching doctrines. Luther's doctrine is viewed as subjective, arising from his own personal spiritual struggles, and highly influenced by his physical problems, his psychological difficulties, and his emotional imbalance. L. uses words like "eruptive," "turbulent," and "spontaneous" to describe Luther and his theology. It is a doctrine which begins with an overwhelming fear of God, a realization of man's depravity, and moves toward a realization, a certitude, of salvation in faith. This highly individualistic and subjective type of doctrine renders the pope, the Church, and the clergy superfluous. Luther, then, is not portrayed as a theologian but as a highly subjective preacher who is obsessed with the Word and tailors his doctrines to the masses. He expresses himself not in theological formulations but in polemics, hyperboles, and often contradictions.

L. views Luther as the father of modern individualism. The Reformation did not work. A selected history of Protestant thought allows L. to conclude that Luther's theology was wrong. Protestant subjectivism has led to "the colossal diminution of specifically religious life" (p. 339). Modern Protestantism is religiously impoverished.
supposedly accept that "each takes out of the gospel what is useful to him" (p. 341). "The sheer historical development through the centuries becomes a justification of the rejection of the Reformation by the Catholic church" (p. 342). The Reformation means for Lortz the merging and the emerging of subjectivism, nominalism, humanism, individualism, and relativism.

Marquette University

KENNETH HAGEN


This most recent of Baum's books does not find its origins in a compulsion to write but rather in the terms of the David S. Schaff Lectures which specify ultimate publication. The style is oral as well as popular, which may account for some of the criticisms or reactions this reviewer proposes or feels.

The Introduction registers the observation that "Changes are taking place in the Catholic Church because Catholics have begun to experience the Gospel in a new way." As in some of B.'s prior works, it is assumed that the Spirit is, if not identifiably operative, at least in the wings as the drama of evolving Catholicism unfolds. Divine revelation is said to be "an on-going reality in history" (p. 5), yet it is completed in Jesus Christ (pp. 5, 106 passim). This type of statement—change, the operation of the Spirit, the gospel, and revelation as ongoing—represents to my mind a very unsophisticated type of theological thinking. B. touches a topic of enormous scope and then turns to another subject. Further, there is the problem, illustrated by the above examples, that change may indeed be induced by purely sociological and psychological phenomena. Since the concept of faith as growing and developing in accord with the evolution of doctrine is central to the book, the above are not peripheral observations. I had the distinct feeling that the terms "change," "Catholics," "the Church," "people," and other equally generic terms might well be clarified by some type of definition. Assuredly it is an oversimplification to say that Catholics have been changed by a new understanding of the gospel and to imply that this procedure is all of one hue. I am certain B. is aware of the tremors induced by change, but it is still inaccurate to speak of "the new Catholic self-awareness" (p. 5) as if it were not multilevel, not to mention at times downright confusing.

A further problem: it is not clear what B. means by the Church. One can hardly speak of a Catholic awareness and affirm that this Catholic awareness is not found in ecclesiastical institutions. The problem leaves
me with the impression that B. is looking for a ghost of a rainbow, especially when he goes on to say that the magisterium is the interpreter of Scripture, the word of God, in the modern world. Certainly the ecclesiastical institution must be involved in this interpretation. And if the institution does not have the new awareness, I wonder of what pertinence its interpretation would be.

Admittedly there is a new experience of the gospel, i.e., of the Christ-event as it is refracted through the eyes of the early community and interpreted by modern literary and oral criticism. I should, however, like to see how many people this new experience affects, what precisely is meant by the gospel, and how this gospel is mediated, especially to those who openly claim to repudiate what we vulgarly call the gospel message. Even among believers, is the gospel institutionally mediated, that is, by the ecclesiastical institutions? The chapter on the Church as a hermeneutical principle would seem to say yes. The believers of my own acquaintance are simply not sure what the Church is saying. Hence they rely on their prior education and apply their own good judgment in selecting from among the competitors purveying meaning to human existence. I suggest that some of these difficulties could be clarified if there were more concern with some sociological studies that have been done in the area of religion and religious beliefs.

If the above seems somewhat less than gracious, it is only because the publishing market is filled with books of an elementary religious nature which occasionally touch on profound theological issues. I do not think I am opposing B.'s basic theses, except here and there, but rather stand in opposition to an underdeveloped approach to complicated questions. Chap. 1 is a case in point. B. is on the right track when he asserts that God's revelation is a modification of human consciousness and man becomes self-aware largely by external influences. These quiet verbal backwaters invite one to a voyage on the open sea, rather than a simple glance at the distant waters. Again, to read that faith is universal because men can experience it inside or outside the Church "in the important experiences of their lives" (p. 29) is provocative enough to make the reader wish again that B. would develop the idea. The statement quoted is actually used by some sociologists to make religion superfluous.

As in his book in answer to Davis, B. says enough in a favorable vein about the institutional Church to make one think that he is in favor of this ideal Church which he finds in Vatican II. At the same time he gives something to the more liberal element. This polymorphic thinking leads at times to theological confusion. Anyone who has studied Vatican I's decree on revelation and compared it carefully with the de-
cree of Vatican II could not say that the document emerging from Vatican II is significant—unless by significant he means that at least the Vatican II document replaced a version that would have put the Church back into an almost pre-Tridentine cast of mind.

The thrust of B.'s work—the construction of an apologetic comparable to that of Blondel's—is commendable. His observation that people become and remain Christians if the gospel explains their depth experiences (the holy, contingency, friendship, encounter, conscience, truth, human solidarity, compassionate protest) is accurate enough. But even in the midst of this broad perspective there is still the ambiguity of what B. means by the Church.

The final chapter portrays this Church as a hermeneutical principle. It is the Church which should discern the questions of the day, reformulate its doctrine, and preserve its identity by the very change it undergoes in the twofold process. It is the Church which interprets the biblical texts. But here again there is a problem. Let us repeat B.'s words: "Literary criticism may be able to establish what a biblical text meant when it was written; but in order to find its salvational meaning now, the Church is necessary" (p. 128). Literary criticism is done in the context of the religious. And the literary critic, I think, would also have something to say about the salvational meaning of texts. Historically, as a matter of fact, the institutional Church has said very little about biblical texts.

I doubt that readers of this journal will find anything new in this book. I am not that well acquainted with the general reader. The above reactions have very likely come from the subterranean fear that books of this nature may turn out to be modernized versions of Rodriguez.

University of Notre Dame

P. JOSEPH CAHILL, S.J.


Faith and Reflection is an anthology of representative texts drawn from eight of Duméry's major works. The translations, well done, preceded by Dupré's excellent introduction, give an accurate and coherent overview of a philosophy of religion which was much discussed in Europe a decade ago but unfortunately has been neglected in America.

A number of reasons have contributed to this neglect. D. is a metaphysician in the Blondelian tradition who has worked out an original
synthesis. Drawing on the phenomenology of Husserl, the existentialism of Sartre, and the Plotinian metaphysics of the One as interpreted by Trouillard, D. created a reflective philosophy of the dynamic human subject which, though Blondelian in origin, is very different from Blondel's own evolution of the philosophy of action, at least in his later works. D. is a controversial as well as an original thinker. He has come into conflict with other Blondelian exegetes, especially Henri Bouillard, and it is doubtful that orthodox phenomenologists of the Husserlian school would give their unmixed approval to his use of their master's method.

On the foundation of his metaphysics of the spirit D. built up a philosophy of God, freedom, value, historicity, and knowledge which has radical implications for the theology of revelation, grace, sin, providence, and prayer. Transforming Blondel's critical reflection on human action into a phenomenology of the rational structure of the act of faith, D. has produced a critical philosophy of religion which, he claims, by simply applying the Husserlian *epoché* to its existential commitment, may rightfully adjudicate the total content of the Catholic faith. The hostile reaction of theologians to this claim helped bring about the condemnation of five of D.'s books in 1959.

The prompt condemnation of these works and the change in theological interests after the Council led to a decline in interest in D. until rather recently. His own disinclination to continue his series of publications contributed to this decline. As their preoccupation with philosophy of religion and with the theology of revelation has grown, however, Americans have begun to rediscover Duméry. Articles on him have begun to appear recently. Nothing which has appeared in English to date, however, can equal the completeness, coherence, and concision of Dupré's introductory anthology.

Readers who have wrestled with D.'s voluminous and often difficult works will appreciate the skill and clarity of Dupré's editing. In his anthology the main lines of D.'s system appear sharply and in logical order. It will make an excellent text for a course in philosophy of religion or for readers who wish to make the acquaintance of an important thinker who has still a contribution to make to the theology of faith and revelation.

*Fordham University*  
GERALD A. McCOOL, S.J.


The foreword is promising. Dr. Benko, born in Budapest, American
citizen since 1952, minister of the United Presbyterian Church, and theologian, desires to promote ecumenical understanding in the area of Mariology. Since Protestants are not well acquainted with Catholic doctrine in Marian theology, he undertakes to inform them. He also wishes to instruct Catholics about Protestant attitudes. The book closes on a hopeful note.

Sadly and somewhat surprisingly, the chapters in-between tend to be more polemical than ecumenical. This spirit is notable in the discussion of Mary's perpetual virginity, the Immaculate Conception, and the Assumption.

The scriptural exegesis leaves much to be desired, and seems to be governed by the bias of preconceived positions rather than by scholarly investigation of the sense really intended by the sacred writers. Contrary to overwhelming manuscript evidence, B. places the Magnificat in the mouth of Elizabeth. Against the whole tenor of the Gospel narrative and all tradition, he argues that the "brothers and sisters" of Jesus are the children of Joseph and Mary. He tries to bolster up his case by urging that Mary's "first-born son" implies subsequent offspring, although this term in biblical Greek does not require such connotation and merely points to the first child's rights and dignity.

Catholic theologians may be mildly astonished by the assurance that for them the "dogma of perpetual virginity is by far the most important of the mariological dogmas." But perhaps the most startling of B.'s theses is his contention, based mainly on Mk 3:31-35 and its parallels, that Jesus repudiated His mother for standing outside the circle of early believers. This is strange exegesis; nothing else is conveyed in such passages than the truth that the claims of physical relationship yield to those of a spiritual nature. The same theme recurs in a later chapter that studies the connection between Mary and the Church. Here B. opposes not only Catholics, but Protestant theologians of the caliber of Max Thurian and John Macquarrie, "who gave whole-hearted endorsement to Pope Paul VI's declaration of Mary as 'Mother of the Church.'" In B.'s reading of Lk 11:27 f., Mary again lacks faith and so is rebuked by Jesus for siding with the Jews who do not accept Him; hence she is a figure of the synagogue, not of the Church. This line of reasoning comes to a climax in the interpretation of Jn 19:26 f.: since the beloved disciple stands for the believing Church, nothing is left for Mary except to symbolize the synagogue. However, if "the disciple is definitely the church" (B.'s words), and if Mary is assigned to him as his mother, what conclusion can be drawn if not that Mary is the mother of the Church?

B.'s frown deepens when he comes to his chapter on Josephtology,
which suddenly becomes "Josepholatry," promoted by John XXIII, who put Vatican II under St. Joseph's protection and inserted the name of Joseph into the Mass. Difficulty is found with veneration of St. Joseph as heavenly protector of the Church, on the ground that in Scripture Christ alone is head of the Church and its Saviour. The idea is also judged to be incompatible with the ancient image of the Archangel Michael as heavenly protector.

The final chapter proposes the kenotic motif as a new principle of Mariology, the adoption of which, B. thinks, would lead to fruitful discussions between Protestants and Catholics. Mary supplied the matter of Christ's flesh, and so became the instrument through which His self-emptying took place. What Jesus received from her was "the form of a servant." This maternal function accounts for her necessity; it also explains and about exhausts the importance of Mariology.

This book can indeed stimulate theological dialogue. Whether the conversations would long remain on a high ecumenical level seems questionable. Not only Catholics, but many Lutherans, Anglicans, and French Reformed theologians, as represented by recent publications, might find it hard to regard with loving patience the old hard line championed by Dr. Benko.

Marquette University

Cyril Vollert, S.J.


The author was the first non-Catholic after Vatican II to be invited to offer regular courses in a Roman seminary. The present volume stems from the lectures delivered during the spring term of 1967 at the Pontifical College of San Anselmo in Rome, operated by the Benedictine congregations. Overly repetitious and written in a popular style, clearly intended for oral presentation, this book discusses some of the central methodological problems confronting systematic theology today. In eight successive chapters Sontag provides answers to the following questions: (1) What kind of philosophy does theology need? (2) What are the current trends in Protestant theology? (3) What philosophical sources are available? (4) What do we need for a theology? (5) What kind of philosophy can we provide? (6) Is Protestantism necessarily antiphilosophical? (7) Is an American Protestant theology possible? (8) Can a Protestant theology be Catholic?

S.'s central thesis is roughly as follows. Protestantism, especially American Protestantism, is necessarily committed to doctrinal diversity.
Any unity which can be achieved can be achieved only within a framework which respects and preserves doctrinal diversity. Revelation needs philosophy in order to have its meaning exposed within a particular set of thought forms. No philosophical and consequently no doctrinal statement can ever be final, precisely because both must "express the truth" in human language, which is a "frail medium." Pluralism "requires a theology which, not only in fact but by its own theory, allows for other theologies and does not claim absolute truth for itself alone." "Revelation could be accepted as a single normative theological source only if its meaning were not in dispute; then theology might dispense with philosophy. As it is, however, any interpretation of the meaning of revelation is a task of philosophical definition." The main need of theology today is the development of a metaphysical concept of God. It is precisely here that the current philosophies offer us little help. Existentialism, phenomenology, and British analysis all seem, by their chosen methodologies, to be limited to elucidations of dimensions of reality which are necessarily egocentric. S. regards process philosophy as somewhat more promising, but has reservations about a finite God. At any rate, the theologian should feel free to adopt any philosophy, current or antique, which he feels may be suitable for his particular theological purposes.

S. regards the main difference between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism to be a philosophical one. Catholicism has always been more philosophically conscious than Protestantism, but, according to S., Catholicism has wrongly understood the singularity of philosophy and the kind of certainty which any verbal formulation may have. It is the great merit of S.’s work to have clearly exposed this issue as a philosophical one which must be argued philosophically. It is here, however, that S. is most disappointing. He simply sketches his view without providing any philosophical justification at all, as far as I can see. We are told to pick philosophies which we find "congenial," but nowhere are we told to be sure that what the philosopher says is true. Now I think we must insist that it is the main business of philosophy, whatever else it does, to make true statements and to expose false and nonsensical ones. If what a philosopher says is wrong or muddled, it must be corrected; if what he says is true, then it must be accepted, whatever the consequences for theology or any other discipline. Here I have simply stated my philosophical disagreement with S. But I think my case can be made plausible. To accept S.’s position is to accept a kind of Hegelian logic in which, given two inconsistent statements, it does not follow that at least one is false. It further involves an expressionist theory of language, a referential theory of meaning, a substan-
tive view of truth, and a concept of revelation in which philosophy and not revelation reveals. Most philosophers (at least in this country) will accept none of this, not because it is not congenial, but because such theories have received numerous and, it seems to me, conclusive refutations. S. certainly has the right to raise these issues again, but then sober philosophical argumentation is the order of the day.

We should note that, although S. regards the main lines of his position as an exclusively Protestant one (which was probably true at the time he delivered his lectures), several prominent Catholic theologians have since expressed views broadly similar to his. We can only hope that, if the remnants of Hegelianism in Heidegger, Rahner, et al. are to be exploited for the purposes of theories of doctrinal diversity and the development of dogma, the classical objections to the whole cluster of philosophical moves in question will be confronted and refuted.

University of Wisconsin

VINCENT M. COOKE, S.J.


In his Religion in the Making process thinker Alfred North Whitehead wrote: “Christ gave his life: it is for Christians to discern the doctrine.” Whitehead’s concern was to indicate that Christianity springs forth from historical fact, a particular and peculiar event which begs metaphysical explanation. For many years this same concern has been central to Norman Pittenger’s extended efforts at showing that process thought, so ably championed by Whitehead, Hartshorne, Teilhard de Chardin, and others, is congruous with—indeed, best suited to the discernment of—what is disclosed in Jesus “of the way God always is and always works” (p. 73). Now, in Process-Thought and Christian Faith, P. has provided a concise, erudite introduction to this new reconstructionist theology. Its clarity, simplicity, and brevity make this far and away the best introduction available for weighing the viability of this intersection of Christian theology and process philosophy.

Like Whitehead, P. insists that “the biblical narrative and witness demand a metaphysical interpretation” (p. 20). Granted this witness is pictorial and imaginative, and “its ‘science’ is outmoded” (p. 22). Nonetheless, the biblical record attempts to express “a basic view of the world which is grounded in reality itself” (p. 20). Central to this highly metaphorical and mythological expression is the notion that God is a living God, actively engaged with the whole of creation. The God represented in Scripture, whose activity is focused for Christianity in the Incarnation, is not simply an “unmoved mover,” nor a deus ex
machina. He is Alpha and Omega—on the one hand, absolute in the manner of His being and the steadfastness of His purpose; on the other hand, infinitely related to the created order, which “is integral to the purpose of God” (p. 23).

At this point P.’s treatment is refreshing, though perhaps questionable, because he focuses on the event central to Christianity, the Incarnation, as the point of intersection between process thought and the Christian faith. Earlier critics of process thought had jibed that it could not account for the Incarnation. P.’s argument is that process thought is requisite for understanding how God could be creator and redeemer. Drawing on Whitehead’s concept of “importance” and Hartshorne’s description of panentheism, P. contends that process thought provides the best conceptual framework for interpreting the Christ-event as the revelation of God actively present to and in the world, loving, suffering, sharing in the creative advance of creation.

What for so long passed as “orthodox” Christianity is radically challenged by process thought precisely because it insisted on the immutability and impassibility of God. A God who could “so love the world” as to become directly involved in it for the purpose of overcoming evil and directing the natural order toward its telos must be affected by what goes on in the world. As P. writes: “What happens matters to God” (p. 29). The Christian witnesses to a God of love. Process thought contends that “God is love because he is infinitely related; he is love because he enters into and participates in his creation” (p. 33). A two-way congruity seems inevitable: (1) process thought has an interest in Christian faith because it witnesses to the God who is “the supreme exemplification rather than the contradiction of metaphysical principles required to explain the world” (p. 29); (2) Christian theology has an interest in process thought because it focuses on Jesus not as a “great anomaly” but “as the exemplary instance of self-disclosure by God” (pp. 72-73).

On the whole, P. presents a quite balanced introduction. After noting those factors which either thwarted or encouraged the popularity of process thought, he gives a cogent treatment of the process thinker’s way of viewing God, the world, and the nature of man. By way of showing the appropriateness of this mode of thought for the interpretation of the Christian faith, he considers the nature of creative acts, God’s use of evil for the effecting of fresh possibilities for good, and the means for interpreting the destiny of man in terms of the Pauline notion that “in the end God will be all in all.” At the same time he cautions the reader that process thought itself cannot be appropriated by Christian theology without proper notice being given to key insights
garnered from the existentialists, new historical and hermeneutical methods, and modern psychological inquiry.

There is little doubt that the traditional Christian conception of God is in need of revision. Likewise, there can be little doubt that Christian theology will be turning more toward the conception of God as dynamic, changing, by His very nature organic, and by His steady action fulfilling His divine purpose through the mutual enrichment of the living world-process. One desiring a comprehensive and understandable assessment of the significance of process thought for Christian faith would do well to begin with P.'s book.

Georgetown University

JAMES W. THOMASSON


The field of Christian ethics is presently in tumult. Needed are surveys of the entire scene that trace out common lines of thinking in what is new as well as continuities with traditional patterns of ethical thought. Two excellent surveys have appeared: Long's Survey and James Gustafson's Christ and the Moral Life (New York, 1968). Neither writer offers a history of Christian ethics or a précis of important ethical systems or a typology of systems. Rather they are both concerned to disengage recurrent patterns or motifs of Christian ethics, i.e., ways in which theologians past and present have analyzed ethical issues. The perspective of Gustafson is theological: "Christ for us" and the different ways that can be understood and affect ethical decision. The perspective of Long is ethical: he never loses sight of the religious context, but the patterns he brings into relief are fundamentally the same as those found in secular ethics.

L. groups all patterns of Christian ethics under six motifs, which fall into two divisions. The first division deals with the standard-setting element of the ethical enterprise, the question of norms, ends, theory. The second division deals with the decision-implementing element, the question of means, application, practice. The three motifs of the first division are the deliberative, prescriptive, and relational. An ethicist employs the deliberative motif when he uses reason, or philosophy, in constructing his ethics. He may use reason as an autonomous source or master of Christian moral judgments, as do Aquinas, Tillich, and certain liberal Protestant thinkers influenced by Kant. Or the ethicist can put reason to the service of theological commitment by introducing philosophical categories to elaborate Christian norms, e.g., Harnack, Ramsey, Reinhold Niebuhr. The prescriptive motif offers guidance to
Christians by providing a series of ethical injunctions, practical, specific rules of conduct. It finds a place, alongside other motifs, in a wide range of ethical teaching, e.g., of Jesus, Paul, the Didache, Wyclif, Calvin, the Quakers, John Bennett, the classic Catholic moral theologians. The relational motif is found where "the direction of action is shaped by the sense of excitement or gratitude which arises from a live, dynamic and compelling encounter with the source of moral guidance." Thus the ethical norms of the Christian are determined in his response to the divine action in his regard. The relational motif permeates the ethics of the OT and NT and characterizes the syntheses of twentieth-century ethicists, H. Richard Niebuhr, Sittler, Brunner, Barth, et al. For most of the latter, the divine action is discerned principally in the concrete situation and in the context of the life of the community of faith.

The decision-implementing motifs concern the relationship of the Christian community to the world. The Church can modify the norms of the gospel by taking into its own life secular institutions, groups, and values. The institutional motif is its embrace of secular structures of justice and order: the city of man of Augustine, the natural law of Aquinas, the four orders of creation of Luther, the authority of the state according to Calvin, human society as understood by the Social Gospel. Contemporary writers, such as John XXIII, Brunner, Bonhoeffer, and Barth, clearly reflect the earlier tradition. With the operational motif, the Church embraces secular culture, not in terms of law, order, and institutions, but in the power structures of society and the political maneuverings by which laws are enacted. The motif is emphasized by Reinhold Niebuhr and recent books that work out how the Christian should contribute to politics and foreign policy. Another example of the operational motif is the use of nonviolent resistance to exercise power, taught and lived by Martin Luther King. In the intentional motif, the Christian community chooses, not to embrace but to separate itself from secular culture lest it corrupt or compromise the gospel. This pattern of ethical thinking is found in monasticisms faithful to the Church, but living in detachment from the world (including service-oriented orders such as the Franciscans), sectarian movements which would separate the entire Church from the world by shunning normal institutions and power realities of common life (Montanists, Waldensians, Anabaptists, Mennonites, etc.), and attempts to infuse new spiritual and moral earnestness into the life of the Church by the development of a core group (thus the message of Spener, Zinzendorf, Law, Wesley et al., and Protestant and Catholic retreat movements).

The extraordinary breadth of Long's synthesis compensates for the
inevitable and acknowledged shallowness of the analysis. The number and variety of possibilities of ethical reflection will undoubtedly surprise, instruct, and stimulate many readers. From his lofty point of vantage, Long can point to far-ranging and suggestive analogies in the history of Christian ethics and introduce the reader to perspectives he may not have thought of. His survey can bring needed light and diminish heat in the ethical discussion of Christians today.

Woodstock College

JOHN GILES MILHAVEN, S.J.


This book is based upon the doctoral dissertation of Albert R. Jonsen, S.J., the first Roman Catholic to enrol in and to complete the doctoral program in Christian ethics in the Department of Religious Studies of Yale University. J. reveals an ecumenical maturity and an extraordinary clarity. His book may become a classic among the pioneers in the field of responsibility; it could make a fine textbook for a graduate course in ethics.

The central core is an integration of moral philosophy and moral theology in which the dimensions of responsibility recover unexpected perspectives, especially since theologians have played up the element of vocation rather than accountability. The ethic of responsibility is concerned with man the decision-maker and creative moralist, working in community for the promotion of human life, as a co-operation and participation in God's worldly activity. Responsibility is emerging as the new unifying principle in Christian ethical thinking as it appears in Barth, Bonhoeffer, Häring, Niebuhr, and Johann superbly analyzed by Jonsen.

Before J. enters into this analysis, he makes a contribution to the language of morality as he elucidates the meanings of responsibility and its cognates through a documentation of its evolution, from which emerges the confusion here existing. During this elucidation J. offers illuminating remarks about responsibility and its relation to birth control and situation ethics.

J. applies his analytical precision to discover in the field of responsibility an arrangement or composition that reveals a design, a pattern. He distinguishes two fundamental patterns: attribution and appropriation. In the former, the judge's question about the propriety of praise and blame takes him into the issues of intention, motivation, deliberation, and character. In the latter, the agent's question about the development of self-possession takes him into the issues of consid-
eration, conscientiousness, and commitment. In general, the pattern of attribution is concerned with the moral causality of events, the pattern of appropriation with a problem of identity, involving the notion of the self in a phenomenon of transcendence.

J. feels that the notion of responsibility in contemporary Christian ethics is a mélange of the theological doctrine of total accountability portrayed in the Pauline writings and of the moral doctrine of specific accountability of the Christian ethicians. There is then an intertwining of theological and ethical accountability. This first becomes evident in Karl Barth, for whom all ethics worthy of the name must be done as a part of the doctrine of God, because all our true knowledge about man's works must derive from our knowledge of God's works towards us. Barth's remarks on responsibility constitute a theological affirmation or a statement offered as the conclusion of thoughtful consideration in faith upon the revealed word of God in the light of reflective human experience. J. feels that the appropriation of responsibility in this theological context demands that the theologians clarify the relation existing between man and God.

Häring's renewal aims to restore to moral theology the relevance of the Catholic doctrine of the supernatural. He intends to replace a human nature-finality approach with a person-value approach to ethics. This responsibility involves a response to definite value in definite acts. Bonhoeffer's is an incitement to get involved, without pointing out how or what. However, he cannot say "regardless of what the act might be," for the Christian knows clear limits: God and neighbor. Both in Bonhoeffer and in Häring responsibility (in theology) goes beyond philosophical patterns. The theological use has normative overtones. Bonhoeffer elaborates his ethic of responsibility within the context of a theological problem, Lutheran dualism, and with his theological answer to that problem, the reconciliation of all things through the Incarnation.

Richard Niebuhr is presented in his theory of the "responsible self" as an alternative to the problems tackled by Häring and Bonhoeffer in a position termed "conversionism," which plays up the role of "man the responder" as contrasted with "man the maker" (teleological theory of norms) and "man the citizen" (deontological theory of norms). Niebuhr compares his "fitting response" to Aristotle's mean. J. feels that Niebuhr's "responsible self" is a doctrine of norms for responsible action, that is, action which (in accepting and responding to each particular value) looks beyond this to the universal community and to the Universal Other. Thus Niebuhr seeks to draw into unity the multitudes of responses and the response to the One, who reveals
himself as sole Lord. Once again we see responsibility shifted from the peripheral position of attribution (praise and blame) to the central position in which a manner is sought by which the human ethical life is related to God.

The study of the metaphysical relationship between the responsible man and the Transcendent (without making any direct reference to revelation) is done by Johann, who claims to find in experience itself and in its implied metaphysics the meaning of responsibility. His masterful analysis of the ontology of responsibility is presented by Jonsen in a relevant manner, making explicit the ontology of the person implicit therein. Thus we have a transposed natural law, since the ought is not grounded in the structure of specific nature but in the nature of man "as a person" open to the Absolute. However, Johann's approach makes Jonsen ponder whether responsibility can be fully understood on the exclusively natural level, with all the force of a normative principle.

Jonsen concludes that the authors analyzed use responsibility not only as a unification of the ethical system but also as a normative principle. He points the way to a genuine theology of responsibility using these directive principles. He first seeks a unification of the patterns of attribution and appropriation in the language of responsibility. But it is in this unification that its meaning changes significantly, for it becomes a normative principle. Responsibility in the philosophical patterns is not a normative principle, but all four authors discussed choose to see the will of God manifested in the concrete moral experience of man and insist that the ultimate oughtness derives from the one Source of good and right. The language of responsibility lends itself to this significant shift in meaning. Thus we have in conceptual unity God and human morality.

J. plays up the emerging sense of human freedom and creativity in which God's task seems to be committed to human agents for implementation, and while he readily concedes that the ethic of responsibility as a critical and reflective system of ideas is still in the future, he forcibly insists that this science should always discuss these four distinct but related areas of moral discourse: the moral self, norms, values, and theological affirmations. These four areas he discusses with stimulating insights.

Scranton University

Edward J. Capestany

Psychiatrist Father Arnold Uleyn successfully integrates biblical wisdom with data of contemporary psychiatry. Both sources insist that man must confess his real guilt if he hopes for cure. The indirect method, such as is found in the biblical parables, is usually the more effective way of bringing man to confess his guilt. "As Pascal puts it, the parables contain enough light for those who want to see and enough darkness for those who do not" (p. 65). Since, moreover, all men suffer from at least partial spiritual blindness, they need some kind of mirror in which to get a glimpse of themselves. But the process of self-knowledge is both necessary and dangerous. To tear off a man's mask will not do. "Man is merely a series of masks, fitting into each other like the layers of an onion, but without a center" (p. 87).

To enable the pastoral counselor to understand the many defense mechanisms which serve exculpation, U. explains clearly repression, rationalization, projection, compensation, displacement, and minimization. He demonstrates the ways in which these phenomena help the individual to avoid full confrontation with responsibility. He believes that the inculcation of a healthy sense of guilt, and education in confession, should begin in the earliest years of a child's life, and that confession according to species and number helps to avoid the tendency of generalization, which really blurs the precise nature of an individual's weakness.

From contemporary psychiatry U. enlarges our perception of repression by showing that it operates also on the spiritual level. "Man can also repress his conscience or his principles and reject the experience of guilt" (p. 139). He concludes from the parable of Dives and Lazarus that "we all have a Lazarus seated somewhere behind our houses" (p. 144). Man can repress almost anything.

U. comments on the deviousness of the human heart in finding reasons for justification after the action has taken place. The question man must ask is "whether the present darkness is not the consequence of a refusal of light in the past" (p. 159). The failure of contemporary men, e.g., to become involved in urgent urban problems is often justified by a conflict of duties. One justifies inaction by withdrawing into "an artificial fog, made up of a plethora of problems" (p. 166).

So often by regarding some hesitation as a "temptation" we repress it and lose the opportunity to learn the truth about ourselves. In the name of conscience we refuse to look closely at conscience. Consequently, unconscious guilt feelings lead to a need for self-punishment, which may result in sadistic-masochistic tendencies. The harm resultant upon feelings of false guilt rests in the fact that genuine guilt is kept hidden. As long as false guilt triggers self-punishment mechanisms, the individual concerned must satisfy his needs to make amends,
sometimes by self-violence, even suicide. In many cases, U. says, scruples arise from anxiety, repression, and existential guilt. The scrupulous person wants accusations which exculpate him. "Thus, a man ostensibly assumes responsibility for a host of sins which are not sins in order to evade the admission of a genuine but unacknowledged fault" (p. 222).

U. criticizes the medical practice of attempting to dull the sense of guilt in the aged by means of sedatives. The confessor should aid penitents to go beyond obsession with a particular fault to the realization of a false fundamental option. As Ricoeur points out, "the real fault is a concealed fault" (p. 231).

U. shows that many confessors pay too much attention to instincts and drives, while minimizing the more spiritual and human experiences arising from conscience. Accordingly, confessors must not be too eager to palliate feelings of guilt, but by nondirective counseling should seek to help normal penitents to discover real but concealed faults. To a greater extent, the neurotic places a screen between self and genuine culpability.

The only reservation I have is U.'s oversimplistic attempt to reduce all philosophic theories contrary to Christianity to "the mechanism of rationalization with its goal of exculpation" (p. 162). An excellent psychiatrist should not venture into philosophy. Recommended particularly for younger clergy.

_De Sales Hall School of Theology_  
JOHN F. HARVEY, O.S.F.S.  
Hyattsuille, Md.


The keynote of this collection of essays (originally the Proceedings of the Thirteenth National Convention of the College Theology Society, 1967) is the introductory essay "Confronting Secularity" by Rabbi Eugene Borowitz. B. begins by warning that if some members of the clergy (and especially clerical bureaucrats) manage to ignore today's pervasive phenomenon of secularity, college teachers of theology cannot. For today's college students no longer accept teaching authority uncritically; in short, they are participating in the key quality of secular man: autonomy.

B. rightly points out the subject of secularity's autonomy as being the new generation. He also considers biblical faith the source of the idea of autonomy as a positive value to be striven after. This latter
insight does two things. First, it dispels a question any student of Tillich might raise: Is not autonomy (as well as heteronomy) an undesirable condition of man which can be healed only by theonomy? The question is dispelled because an autonomy springing from biblical faith is \textit{eo ipso} born of theonomy, because such autonomy is the freedom of the children of God (cf. Rom 8:21). Second, this insight distinguishes the secularity of Christian humanism from that of secular humanism.

Of all the essays in this book, James Megivern's "A Theology of Incarnationalism" comes closest to addressing itself to the "paradox" mentioned in the book's title. M. warns that the current enthusiastic interest in secularity is in danger of forgetting the eschatological and thus of upsetting the tension between the Incarnation and the eschatological—a tension so necessary for an authentic Christian theology. Moreover, an uncritical celebration of the secular city could easily lapse into the triumphalism which has infected the Church in the past. Hence, if the task of communicating the gospel to modern man turns out to be pure and simple accommodation, the role of the cross would disappear.

The eighteen essays which follow the introductory one are grouped under the following general titles: "Religious Commitment and Secularity on Campus," "Ecumenical Openings toward Contemporary Secularity," "Ethical Crises of Development in a Secular Age," "The Religious Phenomenon of Sex in a Secular Age," "Religious Secularity." Leslie Dewart's "Autonomy: The Key Word in Secularism" stands as the conclusion. While all the essays are interesting, many do not seem related to the general theme of secularity or have anything to do with the general title under which they were placed.

The key question in any talk of the secular is whether secularity is the mode in which the present generation can express its Christian faith or whether secularity is a rival perspective to that faith. This book does not raise the question explicitly and contributes to its solution only peripherally.

Loyola University, Chicago

James C. Chereso


In this amplified version of the author's eight Hulsean lectures at Cambridge in 1967, he marshals his ideas from many years of study, reflection, and extensive practical involvement. As Dean of King's College, Cambridge, and a member of that University's Faculty of
Divinity, he looks back not only to years of teaching and tutoring young persons at Oxford, but also to years of pastoral work among students under the auspices of the Student Christian Movement, and years of service as editor and managing director of the Movement's publishing house. The wealth of his experience is well reflected in the book. Also reflected are years of voracious, discriminating, and retentive reading over a wide range of contemporary thought.

In the six chapters of Part 1, E. attempts a descriptive account of world-wide changes in religion in the twentieth century. He considers religious experience, practice, convictions, and institutions. In successive chapters he discusses the general phenomenon of secularization, the impact of social factors on religion, the influence of psychological factors, and the consequences of contemporary education. In each of these four chapters he follows a very helpful basic pattern, in which he moves from a survey of theories in the particular field to a practical appraisal of the facts as he knows them.

In view of the comprehensive scope, his all-round competence is enviable. The relative weakness of the social chapter is due rather to the still prevailing state of jungle warfare among social scientists than to any failure on E.'s part. These first four chapters can be recommended without reservation to contemporary theologians.

The two final chapters of Part 1 are concerned with the Eastern religions and with "new religions" as possible substitutes for traditional Christianity in the West. Though well acquainted with the major authoritative accounts of the Oriental religions, E. lacks the sureness of long personal involvement which is such an attractive feature of the earlier sections.

Here, as elsewhere in the book, the treatment of the non-Christian religions is necessarily so sketchy that one wonders whether it serves its purpose. Yet all of us who have confronted the angry generation with explanations of the present predicament of the Church know the importance of setting this in its world context. The crisis is not specifically a crisis for Christianity, much less Catholic Christianity, but a crisis for religion. It ought to be set in a world-wide context, yet no one today could possibly be competent to do this in the depth which E. attempts, and a symposium would not serve the purpose of this book.

The two chapters of Part 2 are concerned with the possibilities of present and future restructuring of the Church, and present and future restatement of belief. These chapters are disappointing, because they do not present E.'s own proposals. Like all the earlier chapters, they
are surveys of existing achievements and trends, thoughtfully evaluated.

The possibilities for structural renewal considered are only loosely connected. E.'s sympathies and conjectures lie in much the same direction as Karl Rahner's, but he has not attempted any unified projection. The last chapter demonstrates that experience, creative imagination, and our characteristically scientific bent must all be factors in our theologizing. It suggests that the philosophy of being and process philosophy offer possible shapes for contemporary theology—the former as realized by Paul Tillich and John Macquarrie, the latter as not yet realized.

Throughout the book the footnotes are painstaking and extremely helpful. Another excellent feature is the skilled and methodical situating of ideas in their historical context. This is not a book of theology but it is very much a book for theologians. If they do not read it, the loss will be theirs.

Georgetown University

Monika Hellwig


Eberhard Bethge, in reviewing Heinrich Ott's Wirklichkeit und Glaube, remarked with seeming disappointment that there had at that time (1967) been no exhaustive studies of Bonhoeffer's thought published in West Germany. We theologians of the Anglo-Saxon world have been likewise wondering why the French-speaking theological community has failed to produce a single book-length analysis of B.'s life and thought. Now, with the recent publication of René Marlé's Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Dumas's volume, the waiting appears over.

D.'s work will undoubtedly be recognized as one of the most penetrating studies on Bonhoeffer to date. The affinity of his title with Ott's suggests a possible similarity between the two. In point of fact, they do agree on B.'s central intuition, namely, through incarnational Christology to recognize God's presence in reality. However, D. avoids the ambiguities stemming from Ott's pegging B.'s ontology to a multisourced, polyrelated array which includes Aquinas, Tillich, Teilhard, Karl Rahner, and Heidegger. The starting point in understanding B.'s ontology, according to D. (and I believe he is correct), should be Hegel. D. comes more to grips with B.'s nonreligious interpretation than Ott, who identifies this with the existential but never adequately answers the problem raised by the former category of the nonreligious.
Throughout his study D. shows that in B.'s theology the concrete social and political reality is the place where man encounters God. Christ at the center of this life points to both "the presence of God in reality and the presence of reality to God" (p. 235). The Church in this schema is not confused with the world, but is rather a structure of reality where Christ continues to live without boundaries as representative of God, as man for others.

In developing this coherent analysis, D. avoids the "two Christologies" of John A. Phillips' thesis, *The Form of Christ in the World*. D. rejects Phillips' contention that B.'s "Christ existing as Church" and his "Christ existing in the world come of age" represent split Christologies. This division would ignore the basic continuity of B.'s distinction between religion and faith or the *arcani disciplina*, themes said to be characteristic of the Bonhoeffer letters from prison, but which in fact appeared very early in his writings (p. 251).

This concern to maintain unity in B.'s thought brings D. into disagreement with Bethge, who discerns two turning points in B.'s life and thought: the first, when "Bonhoeffer the theologian became a christian"; the second, when "Bonhoeffer the christian became a contemporary" (p. 7). D. sees in this division a contradiction of his own thesis that the later Bonhoeffer is "in perfect continuity" with the theologian of *Sanctorum communio*. Here I believe that D. misses the point of Bethge's division. The existence of turning points in B.'s developing theology is not necessarily in contradiction with D.'s insistence that the Bonhoeffer of the prison letters "thinks in perfect continuity with his entire preceding work although in a more radically compelling context" (p. 180). D. admits only that the Tegel experience enabled B. to verify the unity between God and reality taking place in Christ. He allows that, at Tegel, the world's reality was discovered more strongly than before, but that, nevertheless, the principles of B.'s thought remained unchanged. D. fails to see that continuity of thought can exist with a more radical, more relevant expression of that thought prompted by external circumstances and the theological maturity which these circumstances occasioned.

Given D.'s concern for unity in B.'s theology, it is surprising to note the uneven and overweight condition of this book. The reader has to meander through eighty-three pages of introductory material before D. finally begins to present B.'s theology. One wonders why the initial chapter, on Bonhoeffer's "theological situation," was not spaced throughout the subsequent inquiry into B.'s originality. Chap. 2 is a forty-page biographical sketch which, based on existing and more complete biographies, adds little to the already-known facts. D. evi-
dently likes to study in isolated blocks the influences on B. and the theological developments claiming allegiance to B. Hence he traces the ecclesiology of Kant and Hegel before speaking of B.’s sociological ecclesiology. He likewise treats the reader to an eight-and-a-half-page history of the conflict between Christianity and religion before his consideration of B.’s “Christianity as non-religion.” Then, before his conclusion, he detours into a lengthy survey of other interpretations of B., which he simplistically categorizes into Lutheran, atheistic, and ontological. I am not arguing against the importance of any of the above in a study on B. My contention is that all these sections, which are appendage-like in their present form, could have been better integrated into the analysis of B.’s theology or relegated to explanatory footnotes, thus setting up an immediate dialectic for making more precise D.’s own interpretation and providing a more unified reading.

Since D. shows a desire to enter into dialogue with other contemporary interpretations of B., I am puzzled that he does not incorporate into his work the important contribution of Harvey Cox to Bonhoeffer studies. Secular theology and the writings of the so-called secular theologians are all but ignored, a strange omission in a development of B.’s theology of reality.

D. has presented the theological world a profound analysis of B.’s theology. He has carefully developed B.’s underlying theme, God’s presence in reality through Christ. This insightful book thus merits the attention of any serious student of B. or of the theology which looks to B. for its inspiration.

Louvain, Belgium
GEFFREY B. KELLY, F.S.C.


Jean-Paul Gabus, a French Protestant who studied under Paul Tillich at Union Theological Seminary in the 1950’s, devoted his doctoral thesis at the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Strasbourg to Tillich’s theology of culture. The present volume is a slightly revised version of the thesis. It is well informed and takes account of the growing literature on the subject. However, the thesis was finished in 1965, not in 1969. For this reason, few allusions are made to James Luther Adams’ Paul Tillich’s Theology of Culture, Science and Religion (New York, 1965), although this book is mentioned in G.’s foreword and in several footnotes. As the Tillichian documentation draws equally on the German and the American writings,
the approach to religion itself may be unfamiliar to American readers of Tillich. G. makes considerable use of an early German writing (1925) which has only recently been translated into English and published in America under the title *What is Religion?* (New York, 1969).

The book has ten chapters, a conclusion, and an appendix. After a general presentation of T.'s concept of culture, G. explains his understanding of religion, of the philosophy of religion, of history, and of symbolism. The principles thus described are then applied to several fields of culture in which T. was particularly interested: art, existentialism and psychotherapy, ethics, mysticism (treated, however, from the very limited angle of T.'s activity in "religious socialism" and of his relation to Martin Buber), and the communication of the message. The conclusion asks and answers affirmatively the critical question of the validity of a theology of culture along T.'s lines. The appendix sums up the topic by encapsulating T.'s doctrine on culture in ten theses. A long bibliography ends the volume.

G.'s method is good, though somewhat pedestrian. For each topic he focuses attention on one or two articles; he analyzes these and explains T.'s position in their light. Since the essays thus selected follow a topical rather than a chronological order, the reader can hardly discover an evolution or development in T.'s thought on culture. Yet T. lived successively in two types of cultures: the German, where he was raised and in which he worked for the first half of his life, and the American, in which he spent the second half of his life and published his major works, especially his *Systematic Theology*. T. often alluded to the problems raised by the comparison of the old European and the new American cultures. If his deeper interests never changed, his activities were certainly altered by the change of scene and scenery when he moved from Germany to New York City. If his acquaintance with psychologists and psychoanalysts gained from his exile from Nazi Germany, he found it impossible to entertain with the American world of painting the relationships he had enjoyed with German artists. He regretted the separation, in the U.S.A., between the academic world of universities and seminaries, and the world of studios and galleries, which is not effectively bridged by the art departments in the universities. Thus the rapport of a theologian to a given culture not only depends on theology and its conception of itself in relation to science, arts, and politics; it is also largely determined by the very orientation of the scientists, the artists, and the politicians. A theology of culture gains or suffers from the culture itself.

This is especially clear in T.'s political interests. He was closely connected with German socialism (even when qualified as "religious,"
this remained socialism); and the immediate reason for his expulsion from the German university system was his authorship of a book on "the socialist decision" (not translated into English). Yet Tillich abstained from this type of contact in the American political scene, not only because he started here as an alien, but also because American politics do not favor the cross-fertilization of thought and of disciplines in which T. excelled and which he saw as a powerful leaven of culture.

G. does not consider this sort of problem. This will constitute my only criticism of his very good study. For these questions are important. If a theology of culture is not to remain an abstraction, theology must relate to concrete cultures. Presumably, the reason behind this gap in the story lies in the fact that G., although he had spent some time in Manhattan, looked at his subject from the standpoint of Europe. T., however, tried to transcend Europe, just as he tried to transcend America.

Pennsylvania State University

George H. Tavard


Keen prefaces this book with six questions with which he hopes to deal. This series of questions sums up the general outline of the work: What is wonder? Why do we associate it with childhood? What part did wonder play in the self-understanding of premodern man? How did the skeptical spirit arise? How should wonder function within the economy of the healthy personality? Does wonder lead inevitably to worship and the development of a theological rhetoric?

According to K., primal man with his capacity for mythopoeis, Greek man living with the constant tension of the Dionysian/Apollonian dialectic (best synthesized in Plato), and Judeo-Christian man with a sense both of cosmological mystery (creation) and of historical mystery (event) had a capacity for, and were informed by, wonder. In all of these models, paradoxically enough, wonder was possible precisely because there was a conviction that order could be sensed in life and the world yielded meaning. But beginning with the Kantian idea that the mind creates rather than discovers order and meaning, the wonder-ful concept of the cosmos gave way to a contingent multiverse that is essentially unknowable and only partially controllable. Homo admirans had been replaced by homo faber.

Following this analysis, K. avoids giving in to the temptation to look nostalgically back to homo admirans as the very model of humanity, nor does he wish to exalt the homo faber of our culture. Both
bear the germ of destruction within them when pushed to extreme limits. Ultimately K. pleads for a recovery of the sense of wonder in life as a needed corrective to the overly Apollonian view of life and religion that we have inherited in our post-Renaissance culture. Essentially, K. argues, we must answer the question that G. K. Chesterton once raised in *Orthodoxy*: “How can we contrive to be at once astonished at the world and yet at home in it?” K. proposes the *homo tempestivus*, who organizes his life not in terms of space (abolishing or circumscribing boundaries) but of time. The *homo tempestivus* knows what time (*kairos*) it is; he moves with ethical commitment and yet conscious of the ambiguities that surround him; metaphorically he is a dancer who, ignorant of all the steps he will take, is nonetheless attuned to the music and sensibilities of his partner.

In a final chapter, subtitled “A Quasi-Theological Postscript,” the grace-ful life is seen as one that affirms by symbolic language “that the ultimate context of life is succoring and trustworthy” (p. 204). This affirmation flows over into a sense of gratitude that is responded to in worship and celebration.

*Apology for Wonder* is an *opus tempestivum*, a timely study. In an era when men are trying very hard to recapture the sense of wonder in ways as diverse as hippie communes and “meaningful” liturgies, it is valuable to possess a study that attempts to describe wonder phenomenologically and delineate its value and limitations for the human enterprise. My only criticism would be that the final chapter, which was an explicitly theological reflection, had to be so short. It would seem that K.’s ideas would have great applicability for contemplation and prayer, a subject that was not systematically treated. Perhaps K. will pursue this in further studies. In sum: a quite readable and informative work.

*Florida State University*  

**LAWRENCE CUNNINGHAM**

**SHORTER NOTICES**

*Synopticon: The Verbal Agreement between the Greek Texts of Matthew, Mark and Luke Contextually Exhibited* By William R. Farmer. Cambridge: University Press, 1969. Pp. ix + 229. $32.50. Unfortunately, few persons will be able to afford to buy this valuable new tool for the study of the Synoptic problem. F. presents an enlarged reproduction of Nestle’s twenty-fifth edition of the Greek text of Mt, Mk, and Lk, and uses four different colors to shade the words that agree in these Gospels. It is as if F. had used differently colored “Hi-Liters” (Carter’s felt-tip markers) to bring out verbal agreements. A thick blue line through the words indicates complete verbatim agreement between Mt, Mk, and Lk; a thick yel-
low line the same agreement for Mt and Mk; a thick red line for Mt and Lk; and a thick green line for Mk and Lk. Significant yet incomplete agreement between the various Evangelists is indicated by a thin line beneath the words, using the last three colors. The device is carried out even between words to reveal their sequence, and into the margins to show agreement in sequence running over lines. F. admits that his work has been inspired by the Synopticon of W. G. Rushbrooke, which appeared in 1880 and separated the Gospel texts by colors according to the Two-Source hypothesis. By printing each Gospel in full and shading the words according to his scheme, F. assists the student of the Synoptic problem to see the agreements “without reference to a particular source theory.” This is indeed an advantage. But one wonders if there is not some theory espoused when F. “hi-lites” in red passages of the Infancy Narratives (Mt 1:18-25 and Lk 1:26-35), and marks as agreements such inconsequential words as idou (Mt 1:23; Lk 1:31), ou(k) (Mt 1:25; Lk 1:34), Josepêh and Dauid (Mt 1:20; Lk 1:27). On the other hand, why should not some agreement have been noted between Lk 24:13 and Mk 16:12; and between Mt 28:19 and Mk 16:15? Even though the latter passages are found in the bracketed ending of Mk, F. has “hi-lited” words in a similarly bracketed passage elsewhere (e.g., Lk 22:20). The coloring of the texts is well done. Aside from the fact that the blown-up reproduction of Nestle’s Greek text is sometimes a little faint, both F. and the Cambridge University Press are to be congratulated on a real achievement.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

Theological Dictionary of the New Testament 6: Π-Ρ. Edited by Gerhard Friedrich. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968. Pp. xvi + 1003. $22.50. Since 1964, when Vol. 1 of Bromiley’s now famous translation of Kittel and Friedrich’s Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament appeared, this indefatigable translator has averaged more than a volume a year. This means he has rendered into uniformly readable English more than 6000 pages of complicated, often cryptic German prose, encumbered with many Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic quotations. No mean achievement for any man, even for one who previously left his mark by translating Karl Barth’s multivolumed Kirchliche Dogmatik! The sixth volume gives evidence of the same care in translation as the previous five (see TS 25 [1964] 424-27; 26 [1965] 509-10; 28 [1967] 179-80, 873-74; 30 [1969] 158-59). In the preface to this volume F. notes the growth of the Dictionary in bulk, because “many articles are longer than originally planned.” He ascribes this mainly to the “theological advance” that has taken place in the thirty years since the inception of TWNT. Eight volumes were originally planned for the German edition; but its eighth volume was recently closed off because of its bulk. It ends with hypsistos, and leaves four letters of the alphabet to be covered in the newly projected ninth volume. F. “trusts that this volume too will render service academically by combining philology and theology, ecumenically by leading beyond the confessions to the Bible, and practically by aiding pastors in their preaching and teaching” (p. vii). American pastors are by and large untrained in the biblical languages and will at first be put off by the technical aspect of TDNT; yet if they learn to use the work, they will discover its wealth of information and thoroughness which cannot be found elsewhere. It can only serve their important task of interpreting
God's word for those entrusted to their care. This volume contains important articles on peirasmos (temptation), Pentekostê (Pentecost), peritomê (circumcision), Petros (Peter), pisteuó (I believe), plérês (full) and its cognates, pneuma (spirit), presbyteros (elder), prosôpon (face), prophètes (prophet), and rabbi (rabbi). Two of them had appeared earlier in an abridged form in the Bible Key Word Series: E. Schweizer, et al., The Spirit of God (London, 1960), and R. Bultmann and A. Weiser, Faith (London, 1961). These are now available in a full form. The error on the spine of Vol. 5, "edited by G. Kittel," has now been corrected, giving due credit to Friedrich. But the dust jacket has not yet caught up with the change of editors that began with Vol. 5.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.

ETRE NÉ DE DIEU: JEAN 1, 13. By J. Galot, S.J. Analecta biblica 37. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969. Pp. 135. $3.00. Numerous and important modern scholars have contended that John 1:13 ("Those who were born [or begotten], not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God") should be read, not in the plural as a reference to Christians, but in the singular ("He who was") as a reference to the divine generation of Jesus or to His virgin birth. Recently the singular has been strongly championed by French-speaking Catholics (Boismard, Mollat, F.-M. Braun), and now Jean Galot gives it a most detailed defense. On the one hand, the singular reading has weak textual support: one Old Latin ms. (the important Codex Veronensis), the Curetonian Old Syriac (but confusedly: "Those who was"), and the sixth-century Toledo lectionary called the Liber comicus. On the other hand, it is sustained by citations from the early patristic period: Ignatius of Antioch(?), Justin(?), Epistula apostolorum, Irenaeus, Hippolytus(?), and Tertullian. G.'s defense is centered on a careful analysis of the patristic evidence and on collected arguments showing that the singular makes better sense in the framework of Johannine thought and style.

The study is honest and persuasive; yet there is room for dissent. Let us examine G.'s claim that all the early patristic evidence favors the singular. The chronological picture is not that monochromic. Ignatius and Justin remain problematic; and if one balances the evidence for the plural in Origen, the two Bodmer papyri, and the Diatessaron against the Epistula apostolorum, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, it is clear that both the plural and the singular readings were in circulation in the last third of the second century—and we are uncertain of the earlier period. As for which reading is more logical, there are good arguments on both sides. For instance, G. appeals to 1 Jn 5:18 to show that the aorist of ginesthai can be used of Jesus, but it remains uncertain that the epistolary passage refers to Jesus. When all is said and done, I would still opt for the originality of the plural. On textual grounds the major argument against the originality of the singular is that it has left no trace in a single Greek Gospel ms. On logical grounds it seems unlikely to me that a clear reference to the divine generation or virgin birth of Jesus would be so universally changed in favor of a reference to Christians. (G.'s appeal to Jn 1:9 [p. 93, n. 268] is unconvincing: there a participle can be read in either of two ways, but in 1:13 the text would have to be changed to accomplish a change of meaning.)

Raymond E. Brown, S.S.

THE BIRTH OF THE CHURCH: A BIBLICAL STUDY. By Jean Giblet et al.
Translated by Charles Underhill Quinn. Staten Island: Alba, 1968. Pp. 255. $5.95. A very rewarding scriptural study of the dimensions and nature of the Church. The essays, contributed by some of the finest exegetes, range from the OT concept of the People of God to Bultmann’s ecclesiology. J. Coppens contributes a commentary on Jer 31:31–34, underlining the complexities of OT theology and the possibilities open to NT theologians. A. Denis proposes, in “The Structural Evolution in the Qumrân Sect,” a chronological classification of the various available materials and the evolution of the religious movement that emerged into a religious association and cenobitic society. J. Giblet, writing on “The Twelve, History and Theology,” examines the problems relating to the historicity and significance of the Twelve in the original evangelical tradition. His stress is on the eschatological character of the selection of the Twelve. H. Van den Bussche, in “The Church in the Fourth Gospel,” purports to show how John was keenly concerned with the interior reality of the Church without being overly preoccupied with its structure. P. Andriessen treats of “The New Eve, Body of the New Adam,” offering some rather new views concerning the Church and the theme of the Body of Christ in Pauline theology. L. Cerfau, in “The Church in the Book of Revelation,” outlines the ecclesiology of that book, the composition of which C. situates in the latter part of the first century. He attempts to show that the notion of a universal Church remained fundamentally unchanged since Paul. J. Coppens, in “The Eucharist, Sacrament and Sacrifice of the New Covenant, Foundation of the Church,” reviews the most ancient formulas of the Eucharistic liturgy and discusses their meaning in both sacramental and sacrificial senses. M. Grelot subsequently offers an overview of “The Ministerial Vocation in the Service of the People of God.” Discussing various ministries in the NT writings, he carefully distinguishes the ministry of an apostle from other ecclesiastical ministries. The book concludes with two essays, one by W. C. van Unnik on “The Ideas of the Gnostics concerning the Church,” the other by René Marlé on “The Church in the Exegesis and Theology of Bultmann.” It is quite striking to observe how many of van Unnik’s remarks with regard to the Gnostics could also be applied to the system of Bultmann.

John Powell, S.J.

THE CHURCHMANSHIP OF ST. CYPRIAN. G. S. M. Walker. Richmond: Knox, 1969. Pp. 105. $1.95. Cyprian’s theology on the collegiality of bishops and on the unity of the Church forms the basis for the most important doctrinal affirmations of chap. 3 of Vatican II’s Lumen gentium. No. 22, which sets forth the major doctrinal point, reads as if its opening statement were penned by Cyprian himself. In the footnotes affixed to no. 22, the name “Cyprian” appears more often than any other author. Churchmanship is the key to C.’s theology and the key to the organization of W.’s book. It refers neither to C.’s theology considered apart from his deeds in the administration of his bishopric, nor to his deeds considered apart from his theology, but to both his theology and his deeds considered as a composite whole.

As for C.’s theology, he was no academic theologian. He was above all a man of action, and most of his literary activities were pastorally directed. Even his most independent and most influential work, De ecclesiae unitate, which is the clue to his personality and to all he wrote, was written to
combat the schism of Novatian at Rome, and later that of Felicissimus at Carthage. Nevertheless, to understand *De ecclesiae unitate*, one must not only understand what C. meant by "primatus," "cathedra Petri," and "ecclesia principalis," but also what he actually did in the administration of his bishopric at Carthage. From what Cyprian wrote (*CSEL 3/1, 436*) it is evident that he did not recognize the primacy of jurisdiction of the pope. From what C. did, or did not do, especially on the occasion of his controversy with Pope Stephen over the baptism of heretics, that is, C.'s refusal either to excommunicate Pope Stephen (which C. never even considered) or to break off communion with him, it is also evident that C. did not deny the primacy of jurisdiction of the pope over the entire Church, as some scholars maintain (H. Koch, E. Benson, and A. Ehrhardt). "In practice," writes W., "Cyprian continued to have a deeper respect for Rome than his strict theory of the church should have permitted." In fact, by his conduct, C. displayed a certain theological consciousness which he did not express in his writings. "His stature as a churchman," writes W., "appears from the fact that he was the only important Latin author among the Christians of his century who did not fall into a state of heresy or schism."

W.'s book is a judicious presentation of the leading conclusions of Cyprianic scholars. His evaluation of C. comes at the end of chap. 4: "For [C.] the solution [to Church unity] is to be found in terms not of theology but of love: *qui caritatem non habet, Deum non habet*" (*De unit. 14*).

Joseph J. Cieniawa, S.J.

**Iohannis Scotti Erigenae Periphrseon.** Edited and translated by I. P. Sheldon-Williams. *Scriptores Latin Hiberniae 3*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 1968. Pp. x + 269. $6.00. Among the literary remains of the ninth century, perhaps no single work is more fascinating to the philosopher and the theologian than Scotus Erigena's *De divisione naturae*. Yet, until now, no critical text of this work has been available. Thomas Gale, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, produced the first printed version of the work in 1681. His text was based on ms. *Cambridge, Trin. Coll. 0.5.20*, with a list of variants from *Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 12964* and the last twenty-two pages of *Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 12965*. In 1838, C. B. Schlüter printed an attempted critical improvement of Gale's edition which is practically valueless. In 1853, H. J. Floss collated *Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 12255* and 1764 (Codex Thuanus) with Gale's *editio princeps* and quite luckily produced the serviceable text which is available in *PL 122, 439–1022*. Sheldon-Williams, with the collaboration of Ludwig Bieler, has produced a brilliant critical edition of Book 1 of Erigena's major work. He has found four stages in the recension of *De divisione naturae* and has based this edition on three mss.: *Rheims 875*, which is the earliest extant ms. of the second recension and parent of the third and fourth recensions; *Bamberg Ph. 2/1*, which is the fourth recension; and *Paris, Bibl. nat. lat. 12964*, which is the third recension. The text which results from S.-W.'s painstaking work is an exemplar of modern critical paleography. *De divisione naturae* has been twice previously translated into English. William Larminie did the complete text and his unpublished ms. is at the National Library of Ireland in Dublin (MSS. *Dublin 290, 291*). Richard McKeon did part of the text (*PL 122, 762–81*) for his *Selections from Medieval Philosophers 1* (New York, 1957) 106–41. S.-W.'s translation of the new critical text is literate and lively.
290 tightly argued notes elucidate the translation and reveal the care and extensive patristic learning of the editor-translator.

The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies has presented that rare jewel, a masterpiece of the printer’s art that fills a long-felt need. This work is a brilliant contribution to a distinguished series. It is only to be hoped that soon S.-W. will publish the remaining four books of De divisione naturae as another volume in Scriptores Latini Hiberniae.

Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.

By Williston Walker. With a bibliographical essay by John T. McNeill. New York: Schocken, 1969. Pp. xxxvii + 456. $8.50; $2.95 paper. W.’s book was first published in the Heroes of the Reformation series in 1906; it merited praise when it first appeared, and after half a century it still remains a worthy biography of the Genevan Reformer. The present publisher has kept the original pagination but has omitted the illustrations, and has happily enriched it by adding a bibliographical introduction by the Calvin scholar John T. McNeill. McNeill’s introductory essay is entitled “Fifty Years of Calvin Study” and is divided into two parts: Part 1 reviews the literature from 1918–48 and is reprinted from Church History 17 (1948) 207–40; Part 2 spans the remaining years 1948–68 and appears here for the first time. Both parts follow the same division of five headings, but curiously Part 2 omits the third.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.

NEWMAN: PIONEER FOR THE LAYMAN.
By Webster T. Patterson. Washington: Corpus, 1969. Pp. 189. $7.50. The most comprehensive, best docu-
ing to the larger context of Newman’s over-all thought and certain of his idées maîtresses.

Thomas L. Sheridan, S.J.

**LE VOCABULAIRE DE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN.** By M.-C. Deckers, R.S.C.J. Gembloux: Duculot, 1968. Pp. xii + 212. A painstaking, well-organized examination of the Greek elements in Teilhard’s philosophical and theological vocabulary. Thought and language are, of course, closely and intrinsically related. This is more true for the French language than for English, and more true for Teilhard than for perhaps any other French writer of this century. Persons whose native language is French see their language as a beautiful structure to be preserved and polished, praised and defended, and used with great seriousness and zealous reverence. Francophones regard French with something of the same attitude that Americans hold toward their automobiles; and they find the American attitude toward language hopelessly casual and a sign of incompetence, much as an American motorist might stand appalled at the ineptness of a small-town French automobile mechanic. English-speaking theologians may have difficulty understanding the spirit that could produce such a detailed study of technical vocabulary. Nevertheless, it is the same spirit with which Teilhard used his language. This book will be of interest to Teilhard specialists for its study of certain important Teilhardian terms such as “Omega” (pp. 142–44) and “cosmos” (pp. 29–30, 100–101), as well as for interesting observations on T.’s use of language. The contribution of Sister Marie-Christine Deckers points up the sad fact that, though highly specialized studies of T.’s works are already appearing, much of his most important writing remains unpublished. That no one seems to know why makes the fact sadder. 

Robert L. Faricy, S.J.

**EINFÜHRUNG IN DAS CHRISTENTUM: VORLESUNGEN ÜBER DAS APOSTOLISCHE GLAUBENSBEKENNTNIS.** By Joseph Ratzinger. Munich: Kösel, 1968. Pp. 307. In 1967 R. delivered a series of lectures on the Apostles’ Creed at the University of Tübingen. The present book is a product of those lectures. A lengthy introduction analyzes the nature of Christian faith, its contemporary problematic, and the function of a communal confession of faith like the Apostles’ Creed within the Christian community. The bulk of the book is devoted to a running commentary on the Creed, under the headings “God,” “Christ,” and “Spirit and Church.” The emphasis throughout is on systematic import rather than historical detail. R. is interested in the Creed as a venerable expression of Christian faith with which contemporary Christians can identify and upon which the contemporary Christian community can build. He works hard to show the lasting significance of particularly difficult articles like the descent into hell. He does his best to explain the Creed’s classic categories to a contemporary audience beyond the post-Tridentine catechisms of their childhood and yet bewildered by the Dutch Catechism. Above all, he emphasizes the Positivität of Christian faith, its historical ground in particular events of human history, its scandalous dependence on a particular human person named Jesus of Nazareth. All this R., with his profound knowledge of classical Christian tradition and contemporary Christian thought, does well. Not brilliantly, but well. If the book reads a bit too apologetically at times, that is perhaps less a deficiency
of R.'s exposition than a reflection on a generation suspicious of tradition and impatient of qualifying statements. And if the book leaves unanswered a lot of the questions raised by those who are not bewildered by the Dutch Catechism, that is perhaps another confirmation that no one theologian can say all that is necessary for every audience any more.

Patrick J. Burns, S.J.

DIE FUNKTION DER THEOLOGIE IN KIRCHE UND GESELLSCHAFT. Edited by Paul Neuenzeit. Munich: Kösel, 1969. Pp. 407. DM 32.— A difficult book to review. The twenty-four contributions (nine by Protestant theologians) are quite diverse and of uneven quality. All were written specifically for the present volume, though not all address themselves directly to the central problem proposed by the editor: contemporary theology's function in Church and society. The contributors include such well-known theologians as Audet, Blank, Böckle, Gollwitzer, Koch, Lengsfeld, and Schoonenberg, as well as a number of unfamiliar names. The majority are younger men, of progressive tendencies, concerned with bridging the gap between Christian tradition and contemporary European culture. Several emphasize the connection between a theologian's personal faith and his theological productivity: theology is not a matter of objectifying thought. Others insist on a closer relationship between systematic and practical theology: ivory-tower theology and pietistic Church administration are both bad. Theology must help present the word of God to a worldly world, must learn to function within a pluralistic society, must work in conjunction with such nontheological disciplines as psychology and sociology. Above all, theology must be critical—of contemporary culture, of Christian tradition, of itself. To fulfill its critical function, theology needs freedom. A number of the contributing theologians comment on current conflicts between leading theologians and higher Church authorities. With one exception, they lay the blame for this tragic situation at the feet of shortsighted Church officials trying to place illegitimate (and ineffective) restraints on theological research. The one exception is the Mainz canonist Georg May; his blunt condemnation of much of contemporary theology is coupled with an eloquent plea for a place in the sun for conservative theology in the German universities. Among the strongest critics of Church officialdom is Hubertus Halbfas, whose contribution to the present volume created a theological furor in Germany last year when excerpts appeared in the public press. It is not difficult to see why. Neither is it difficult to see that there would be no market for Halbfas' conclusions if there were less evidence for the truth of his charges.

Patrick J. Burns, S.J.

DO YOU BELIEVE IN GOD? By Karl Rahner, S.J. Translated by Richard Strachan. New York: Newman, 1969. Pp. vii + 114. $3.95. R. is rightly concerned with the fact that today man's very ability to believe is being called into question, and not merely this or that particular dogma. Not only does R.'s series of essays continually call us to look at the one, single, total, comprehensive question man poses by the very fact of his existence, but we are also called to look at the way man existentially answers this question through the lived logic of his life. Although R. does see the importance of an explicitly lived and fully professed faith,
his real strength as a theologian flows from his ability to point to experience, to point to man's concrete life, and to explicit what may be there only implicitly. The real essence of faith is then shown to be a personal stance flowing from a core freedom which accepts life and self as meaningful and as haunted by a loving and pardoning mystery. Mystery haunts every man at his roots, and every man tastes this no matter how vague or confused this experience may be. And he who fully accepts himself and life as basically meaningful, accepts God at least implicitly; for this man has accepted his deepest, most fundamental experience "that everything is embraced, sustained and beheld by the necessarily unutterable mystery which we call God" (p. 72). Every man, then, is fundamentally an anonymous mystic who actually responds to the calling at the fine point of his soul or rejects it by the way he lives his life and not by the way he says he lives his life. Response or rejection of the fundamental mystery which calls man to delicious intimacy is the ultimate criterion of faith and unbelief.

Harvey D. Egan, S.J.

The Reasonableness of Faith. By Diogenes Allen. Washington: Corpus, 1968. Pp. xx + 140. $4.95. The basis in reason of religious beliefs has suffered many a severe jolt. As a result of the work of Hume and Kant, many feel there is no argument which proves God's existence from reason. In more recent years the writings of logical positivists and linguistic analysts have left many with the frustrating notion that the God-question can neither be framed nor answered in meaningful language. A. sets himself the task of showing that the reasonableness of faith is not the same as the reasonableness of any particular world view or theodicy. He grapples with that dimension of faith whereby it is interiorly self-justifying, although it continually seeks support in the operations of reason. This elusive dimension is most apparent when someone's "reasons" for belief are shown to be fallacious or insufficient, and yet he continues to believe while searching for new "reasons." Thus, when A. considers the challenges posed to Christianity by linguistic analysis and logical positivism, he maintains that the challenge is pressing only when one attempts to provide a rationale for faith, i.e., establish a case for the truth of one's religious beliefs. When, on the other hand, religious beliefs claim a man's adherence because they satisfy his desire to be healed and saved, he has relatively little at stake in questions disputed by philosophers. The claims of the gospel are, of course, truth claims, and a believer adheres to them as true, but not because he can demonstrate that Christian theism is the best possible metaphysical position. Rather, Christian faith is a response to needs of an individual, distinctive needs created by hearing the gospel, and whether or not a rational basis can be laid for the truth of religious beliefs, A. maintains it is perfectly reasonable to affirm religious beliefs on the basis of the needs which they satisfy, provided, of course, there are no reasons which count decisively against their being true. A. brings wide reading to focus on his question and sets down his response with great care for clarity, which leads him to restate a few of his points perhaps excessively.

William C. McFadden, S.J.

would expect to find a dogmatic presentation of Reformed teaching on the sacraments, but unfortunately this is not the case. Instead of the hoped-for exposition of Reformed faith, we have a polemic against all non-Reformed churches and especially against the Roman Church: e.g., the chapters on the number of the sacraments and their efficacy are intended as a refutation of the Roman position; the chapters on the Real Presence and manducatio indigorum are directed against Romans and Lutherans; in the chapter on the Lord's Supper as sacrifice, B. aims at the Romans with the usual four-centuries-old arguments. B. writes: "Roman Catholics have often complained that the Reformed camp has not understood the real meaning of ex opere operato..." (p. 63), and books such as B.'s rightly give rise to such complaints. Is it too much to ask authors (or translators) to quote accurately? B. speaks seven times of opus operantum for opus operatum (pp. 62 ff.) and has Trent, speaking of the difference between the oblation on the Cross and in the Mass, utter the following absurdity: "only the difference in the manner of offering is renewed" (p. 265), when Trent actually said "sola offerendi ratione diversa" (DS 1743). B.'s book is a disappointment. The true value in the Reformed faith does not emerge, since it is so heavy with polemic, and what is offered us in 1969 is actually sixteen years old, for the most recent source material used in preparing the book is dated 1953.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.

PASTORAL TREATMENT OF SIN. By Philippe Delhaye, Jacques Leclercq, Bernard Häring, Cyril Vogel, and Charles-Henri Nodet. Translated by Charles Schaldenbrand, Firmin O'Sullivan, and Eugene Desmarchelier. New York: Desclée, 1968. Pp. 319. $7.50. A translation of Pasteurale du péché, published by Desclée in 1961 as Vol. 8 of Bibliothèque de théologie, série 2. In the Introduction (pp. 11-27) Delhaye argues for the importance of the four topics discussed here and tries to create the appearance of unity among the four essentially unrelated essays which are gathered to form this one book. In the first chapter, on temptation (pp. 29-85), Leclercq considers the metaphysics, psychology, and theology of temptation and contributes an unimaginative repetition of the questions and answers found in traditional scholastic theology. It is particularly disappointing to find that the ideas of Rahner do not influence L.'s discussion of concupiscence and that the insights of Metz find no place in his discussion of temptations against faith. Häring's essay on conversion, printed as chap. 2 (pp. 87-176), is excellent. But this is news to no one; for H.'s ideas on this subject have had wide circulation through the first volume of his Law of Christ, and in 1964 Desclée already published an English translation of this same article, with minor variations, as chap. 7 of Christian Renewal in a Changing World. In chap. 3, on sin and penance (pp. 177-282), Vogel contributes a brief historical sketch of the development of the penitential institution from the postapostolic period to the beginning of the eighth century. V.'s contribution is scholarly and interesting, especially his discussion of the tariff penance, the immediate ancestor of our present discipline. Nodet's essay on psychoanalysis and guilt forms the final chapter (pp. 283-319), where he brings data from Freudian psychoanalysis to illumine man's experience of sin and guilt. With the exception of one reference to Shalom: Peace at the very end of Häring's article, there has been no attempt in
this translation to update the bibliography or the theology of the original work.

John F. Dedek

The Flesh: Instrument of Salvation. By Cipriano Vagaggini, O.S.B. Translated by Charles Underhill Quinn. Staten Island, N.Y.: Alba, 1969. Pp. 152. $3.95. The theme of this study is expressed in words of Tertullian, caro salutis est cardo ("the flesh is the pivotal point of salvation"). Sound anthropology, V. begins, is necessary for a true understanding of the Christian faith, and specifically the liturgy. But dualism has always threatened and even infected Christian anthropology. A study of the Bible, the Fathers of the Church, and St. Thomas Aquinas yields over a hundred pages of affirmation against dualism in favor of the body's importance in God's designs, and some explanation of what the body's role is in that design. This sound anthropology reveals how necessary the liturgy, with its bodily dimension, is for man, for whom the body is the pivotal point of salvation. No mention is made, however, of the insights of modern phenomenology into man's bodily being. V. never succeeds in getting into the body as a living reality, as Merleau-Ponty does. The body remains a dead thing, an object, which works mechanically with the soul, divine power, and so forth, however much the author wishes to say more than this. This book demonstrates the limitations of Scholasticism for elucidating the axiom caro salutis est cardo.

Christopher Kiesling, O.P.

The Death in Every Now. By Robert Ochs, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969. Pp. 159. $4.25. In the field of speculative, systematic theology this is a highly successful and fascinating orchestration of Karl Rahner's thought on death, freedom, and time; the selection of materials is instinctively judicious. The book is coherent in its discussion of the implications, for a theology of death and time, of Rahner's "person-nature" and "freedom-necessity" dialectic as man moves from the given "imposed liberty" to the chosen "free liberty." It is consistent in its development of death as a personal act which is always encountered when man comes to grips with his mortality: vulnerability, tension, anxiety, and continuing inability to be totally successful in his life's projects. O. says that "Death is an act, something we do." In this he builds on the principle that man (homo religiosus) does himself, his total self and life—he needs to mold himself in freedom, to the degree (with the help of grace) to which he is able. His will must agree with the will of Mystery on whom he is radically dependent despite his own growth in independent self-coherence. Yet he knows that the facts of everyday life and work show that suffering and death remain despite his radical reference to God, that life in this time before the full manifestation of glory is a mess which he cannot continually celebrate but only accept and affirm—because life is a continual dying. For "man is, by definition, emptiness without God. And what God does in becoming man, also by definition, is to share this emptiness." But man is made understandable by Christ. Thus the importance of the paradox of Christ's incarnation: "In Christ, the human aspiration to God succeeds absolutely, but the humanity remains nonetheless; it is not cancelled out." A free death for a Christian, then, comes down to dying together with Christ, who accepted (as man himself must) death in all its obscurity and emptiness. The full experi-
ence of death remains, after Christ, an experience of threatening guilt and meaninglessness.

Despite the fine contribution this book makes to systematic theology, several shortcomings could be indicated briefly. (1) This study could have been more profitable had O. mentioned Rahner’s treatment of the religious life as a rehearsal for death. (2) The book remains so highly speculative that even this “translation” of Rahner into a more popular medium needs its translator; it can appeal only to a highly select and articulate audience; its aid to homiletics and moral theology, where the problem of death is most neurally acute, is difficult to discern. (3) One senses that O. is more dependent on academic than on experiential needs and insights. (4) The book is a slave to its own inexorable language; metaphorically, this is a dry-bones book.

Edward G. Zogby, S.J.

THE MOMENT OF CHRISTIAN WITNESS.
By Hans Urs von Balthasar. Translated by Richard Beckley. Glen Rock, N.J.: Newman, 1969. Pp. v + 86. $3.95. Last year a preposterous article in Continuum purported to describe “the collision of Rahner and Balthasar”—on the basis of unnamed articles more than ten years old. The actual divergence of the former collaborators has concerned issues more fundamental than those described in Continuum and has been entirely one-sided, inasmuch as Rahner has declined to comment in any public way on the criticism directed against him in B.’s Cordula oder der Ernstfall (1966), now translated as The Moment of Christian Witness. B. wanted to suggest a personal criterion for the Christian who does not believe that it is “possible for him to make intellectual experiments concerning his faith unless his capacity for loving is fully engaged in this activity” (p. 44). He proposes Christian martyrdom as the best criterion, “because it forces us to face the Christian truth that our readiness to die for Christ is the only adequate response we can make to his willing sacrifice of himself out of love for us” (p. 59; see p. 85). In his opening chapter and concluding pages B. sketches this perspective with his usual power and grace, but he unfortunately chose as well to write two intervening chapters where he summarizes the philosophical system that modern thought offers as an alternative to Christianity (an indictment of German idealism in ten pages) and then decries the extent to which Christian theologians are being seduced by this alternative (pp. 60–68 comprise the explicit critique of Rahner). One cannot but regret the tone and level of the polemic, especially since questions of real import are involved here: Christocentrism vs. theological anthropology, the theological aesthetic of Herrlichkeit in contrast to other systematic theologies, the need for a theology of the cross, etc. Finally, the English-speaking reader will miss the Epilogue from the second German edition and must protest against the price of this translation—still more against a number of misleading and even false passages in it (e.g., pp. 58, 60, 72, 74).

Leo J. O’Donovan, S.J.

POWER WITHOUT GLORY: A STUDY IN ECUMENICAL POLITICS. By Ian Henderson. Richmond: Knox, 1969. Pp. xiii + 184. $4.50. This book first appeared in England in 1967. H. has not altered the American version, which proposes the thesis that the ecumenical movement is a new form of English imperialism. H., Professor of Systematic Theology at Glasgow University, believes that the ecumenical movement is dedicated to
construct "One Church" by power politics, which would be "a monopoly and monopoly means an unhealthy concentration of power." H. divides his book into four parts. The first part states his thesis; the second investigates the concept of oneness which H. believes to be more gnostic than Christian; the two concluding parts trace the main events in relations between the Kirk and the Church of England from the Reformation to the present day. H.'s anti-English bias, sweeping generalizations, and simplifications of the most complex historical and theological issues (such as apostolic succession) result in an intemperate display of prejudice with an intensity somewhere between a tantrum and a fit. Though H.'s performance is bizarre, it is never dull. That anyone could have produced this example of odium theologicum in this decade of the twentieth century proves beyond measure the churches' need of the ecumenical movement.

H. divides his book into four parts. The first part states his thesis; the second investigates the concept of oneness which H. believes to be more gnostic than Christian; the two concluding parts trace the main events in relations between the Kirk and the Church of England from the Reformation to the present day. H.'s anti-English bias, sweeping generalizations, and simplifications of the most complex historical and theological issues (such as apostolic succession) result in an intemperate display of prejudice with an intensity somewhere between a tantrum and a fit. Though H.'s performance is bizarre, it is never dull. That anyone could have produced this example of odium theologicum in this decade of the twentieth century proves beyond measure the churches' need of the ecumenical movement.

Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.

Readings in Social Theology. Edited by Everett J. Morgan, S.J. Dayton: Pflaum, 1969. Pp. xii + 332. $5.95. A collection of essays on the relevance of the Church and its theology for the world today. Mostly written by theologians and philosophers, the articles are neither narrowly scholastic nor overly erudite. They are not always consistent: situation ethics is rejected in a general article and then used in a later article on birth control. The spirit of poverty comes in for a twofold treatment: once realistically by Wulf, later idealistically by Berrigan. Legalized abortion is treated by Hellegers in an exhaustive method, as if the author were writing for a medical journal or one in forensic medicine. This is a problem of a collection where rewriting is not done. The section on Catholic education suffers from the same lack of rewriting. Besides, there is a dichotomy in the theoretical treatment of Catholic education and the practical problems of funding by the state for nonpublic schools. The articles on communism, atheism, and business ethics could be greatly improved in content. The volume, which is provocative and deserves careful reading, suffers from an identity crisis: it does not know whether it is theology or philosophy. Finally, it should have faced the problems of population, welfare, and war.

James J. Conlin, S.J.

Environmental Man. By William Kuhns. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 156. $4.95. "Man... does not live either by bread or the Word of God alone, but also by airplanes, telephones, automatic dishwashers, and television sets that surround and support him." So writes K. in this simultaneously frustrating and fascinating book. He is unquestionably on to something important. The Church does not address man as such, but rather the homo faber whose self-consciousness and sensibility have been shaped by the plastic, mechanical, and electronic environments he has created around himself. We ignore environmental feedback at our peril. Hence K. proposes to "explore the significance of man's contemporary environment for theology," following clues laid down by Marshall McLuhan, R. Buckminster Fuller, and others. He promises more than he delivers, particularly on the theological front. The book offers a series of probing essays on the human transformations effected by toys, weaponry, automobiles, films, music, architecture, shopping centers, TV, and computers. The essays are suggestive, provoking, and theologically very underdeveloped. Had K. the more modest aim of
merely introducing both a lay and a theologically sophisticated audience to an understanding of some of the actual and possible meanings of the distinctive twentieth-century human ecology, the book would succeed. But he attempts something bolder, involving the implications of this novel ecology for "the entire range of Christian beliefs and experiences." Because his own theological premises remain undefined and because he deals hastily and broadcast with complex theological issues which deserve precision, the strictly theological aspect of K.'s work left this reader with the feeling of having attended a disappointing picnic. The disappointment is the more acute precisely because of the undeniable importance of the theme, and the truth of K.'s contention that theologians have in the past ignored the bearing of a radically altered artifact setting upon the ways man feels, perceives, thinks, and hopes. Nonetheless, I strongly recommend K.'s book for all the rich grist it offers the theologian's mill.

D. S. Toolan, S.J.

Birth Control in Jewish Law: Marital Relations, Contraception, and Abortion as Set Forth in the Classic Texts of Jewish Law. By David M. Feldman. New York: New York Univ. Press, 1968. Pp. xiii + 322. $9.95. One criticism to be made of this excellent, useful book is its misleading title. The subtitle gives a better notion of its contents as does the sub-subtitle: "An examination of the relevant precepts of the Talmud, Codes, Commentaries, and, especially, rabbinic Responsa through the present day, with comparative reference to the Christian exegetical tradition." It is a lucid synthesis, carefully based on primary sources, of positions taken by the Jewish tradition on aspects of married sexuality particularly relevant to ethical inquiry today. Over one fourth of the book deals with positive aspects of marriage: marriage as independent of procreation, the mitzvah of procreation, the mitzvah of marital sex, and the legitimacy of sexual pleasure; hence elements of a theology of marriage are presented whose significance goes well beyond that of birth control. It is a valuable source book for anyone interested in the history of Western ethics (F. had to visit various European libraries to gather the documentation) and provides the Christian ethicist a provocative encounter with a tradition as religious and humanistic and morally upright as the Christian, yet bearing differently on ethical questions of our day.

In the Jewish tradition, temperance and self-control are recommended, but renunciation of the pleasures of this world is characteristically regarded as sinful ingratitude to its Creator. In particular, sexual asceticism was never accorded the dignity of a religious value. The belief of a good part of the Christian tradition that the sexual pleasure of married couples is never free from sin is foreign to the Jewish tradition, which extols marital pleasure in itself and in its relationship to the full human and religious life. The Jewish tradition never considers the fetus to be a human person and consequently approaches the question of abortion in a radically different way from that of Catholic moral theologians. F.'s explicit comparisons with the Christian tradition is quite brief and based on selected secondary sources. It yields an incomplete and at times misleading picture, but perceptively brings into relief suggestive points of contrast.

John Giles Milhaven, S.J.

Valsecchi. Washington: Corpus, 1968. Pp. xx + 235. $5.95. A digest of the literature on birth control since 1958. But the book is more than a string of summaries. It correctly identifies the major turning points in the discussion: the appearance of the pill; the discussion of the rape case; the articles of Janssens, Reuss, and Van der Marck; the work of Noonan, Vatican II, literature following the Council. As one reads, one gets the sense of the gradual nuancing and widening of principles, the increasingly theological statement of the question. Two qualities make the book a very useful tool. First, it is exhaustive. V. claims that he has been selective in the literature presented, but anyone who has followed the discussion closely will realize that V. has given us the most thorough bibliography we have; certainly no article or book of importance has been omitted. Secondly, though V. is not without a point of view, his content-summaries are remarkably accurate and restrained. Unfortunately, the book is cheaply bound.

Richard A. McCormick, S.J.

**Melanchthon and Bucer.** Edited by Wilhelm Pauck. The Library of Christian Classics 19. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969. Pp. xx + 406. $7.50. This latest LCC volume contains the translations of the first edition of Melanchthon's *Loci communes theologici* and Bucer's *De regno Christi*. The present translation is of the *Loci* of 1521 and is based on Engelhardt's text in *Melanchthons Werke in Auswahl* (Gütersloh, 1952). A translation of the greatly expanded 1555 *Loci* can be found in C. Manschreck's *Melanchthon on Christian Doctrine: Loci communes* (New York, 1965). The Strassburg Reformer Bucer's *De regno Christi* was written while he was Regius Professor of Divinity at the University of Cambridge in 1550, a year prior to his death. The translation follows Wendel's critical text in *Martini Buceri Opera Latina* 15 (Paris, 1955), and omits, without injury to the text, chaps. 22–46 (on marriage and divorce) because of their inordinate length. Both treatises were translated by Lowell Satre and revised by Pauck. Of some significance is the fact that this is the first time both works have found an English translator.

**Acta Congressus Internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II.** Edited by Eduard Dhanis, S.J., and Adolf Schömmetzer, S.J. Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1968. Pp. lxvii + 813. L. 8500; $14.50. The acts of the International Congress on the Theology of Vatican II held at Rome Sept. 26—Oct. 10, 1966. This volume contains the seventeen lectures and fifty-seven comments on various theological themes of the Council by the Church's most noted theologians, e.g., J. C. Murray, Y. Congar, K. Rahner, J. Daniélou, etc. Among the themes treated: the mystery of the Church, the presence of Christ in the community, collegiality, the missionary character of the Church, religious liberty, Scripture and tradition, ecumenism. The volume also includes numerous indices.

BOOKS RECEIVED

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

SCRIPTURAL STUDIES


DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY


Thomas Aquinas [Saint]. Summa theologiae 16: Purpose and Happiness (1a2ae. 1–5). Text, tr., introd., notes, append., and glossary by Thomas


**MORAL, LAW, LITURGY**


**PASTORAL AND ASCETICAL**


**HISTORY AND PATRISTICS**


**PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS**


**SPECIAL QUESTIONS**


# INDEX TO VOLUME 30

## AUTHORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atkins, A., O.C.S.O.</td>
<td>Neville's Dialectical Argument for an Indeterminate Creator</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beeck, F. J. Van, S.J.</td>
<td>Sacraments, Church Order, and Secular Responsibility</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crehan, J., S.J.</td>
<td>The Assumption and the Jerusalem Liturgy</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faricy, R. L., S.J.</td>
<td>Individual, Social, and Cosmic Dimensions of Salvation</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasser, J. W., S.J.</td>
<td>Man's Existence: Supernatural Partnership</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillerbrand, H. J.</td>
<td>Martin Luther and the Bull <em>Exsurge Domine</em></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiepling, C., O.P.</td>
<td>Bultmann's Moral Theology: Analysis and Appraisal</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilian, S. J., O.F.M.</td>
<td>Dialogue in Ecclesiology</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindbeck, G. A.</td>
<td>The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry: Catholic and Reformed</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCool, G. A., S.J.</td>
<td>Duméry and the Dynamism of the Spirit</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moffitt, J.</td>
<td>Christianity Confronts Hinduism</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neville, R. C.</td>
<td>Creation and the Trinity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North, R., S.J.</td>
<td>Soul-Body Unity and God-Man Unity</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter, C. J.</td>
<td>Renewal of Penance and the Problem of God</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond, R. X., S.S.</td>
<td>Infant Baptism: History and Pastoral Problems</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schillebeeckx, E., O.P.</td>
<td>The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheets, J. R., S.J.</td>
<td>Teilhard de Chardin and the Development of Dogma</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, J. J., S.J.</td>
<td>Resurrection Faith Today</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicks, J., S.J.</td>
<td>Luther on the Person before God</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zehnle, R.</td>
<td>The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ARTICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bultmann's Moral Theology: Analysis and Appraisal</td>
<td>C. Kiepling, O.P.</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Catholic Understanding of Office in the Church</td>
<td>E. Schillebeeckx, O.P.</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity Confronts Hinduism</td>
<td>J. Moffitt</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and the Trinity</td>
<td>R. C. Neville</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duméry and the Dynamism of the Spirit</td>
<td>G. A. McCool, S. J.</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry: Catholic and Reformed</td>
<td>G. A. Lindbeck</td>
<td>588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection Faith Today</td>
<td>J. J. Smith, S.J.</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacraments, Church Order, and Secular Responsibility</td>
<td>F. J. van Beeck, S.J.</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology</td>
<td>R. Zehnle</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soul-Body Unity and God-Man Unity</td>
<td>R. North, S.J.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teilhard de Chardin and the Development of Dogma</td>
<td>J. R. Sheets, S.J.</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRENT THEOLOGY

Dialogue in Ecclesiology. S. J. Kilian, O.F.M. 61
Infant Baptism: History and Pastoral Problems. R. X. Redmond, S.S. 79

NOTES

The Assumption and the Jerusalem Liturgy. J. Crehan, S.J. 312
Individual, Societal, and Cosmic Dimensions of Salvation. R. L. Faricy, S.J. 463
Luther on the Person before God. J. Wicks, S.J. 289
Martin Luther and the Bull Exsurge Domine. H. J. Hillerbrand 108
Neville’s Dialectical Argument for an Indeterminate Creator. A. Atkins, O.C.S.O. 90
Renewal of Penance and the Problem of God. C. J. Peter 489

BOOK REVIEWS

Bakan, D., Disease, Pain and Sacrifice (M. B. Arnold) 155
Baum, G., Faith and Doctrine: A Contemporary View (P. J. Cahill, S.J.) 719
Benko, S., Protestants, Catholics, and Mary (C. Vollert, S.J.) 722
Brandon, S. G. F., Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity (B. Vawter, C.M.) 498
Brentano, R., Two Churches: England and Italy in the Thirteenth Century (J. W. O’Malley, S.J.) 134
Carse, J., Jonathan Edwards and the Visibility of God (J. F. Woolverton) 366
Congar, Y., L’Ecclesiologie du haut moyen-âge (G. H. Taward) 503
Curran, C. E., A New Look at Christian Morality (R. H. Dailey, S.J.) 150
Curran, C. A., Religious Values in Counseling and Psychotherapy (W. W. Meissner, S.J.) 539
Dawson, C., The Formation of Christendom (C. McCarthy, S.H.C.J.) 146
De Jésus aux évangiles: Tradition et rédaction dans les évangiles synoptiques (ed. I. de la Potterie) (J. A. Fützmyer, S.J.) 117
Denton, R. C., The Knowledge of God in Ancient Israel (J. L. McKenzie, S.J.) 115
Dowey, E. A., Jr., A Commentary on the Confession of 1967 and an Introduction to the “Book of Confessions” (G. Driscoll, S.J.) 368
Dumas, A., Une théologie de la réalité: Dietrich Bonhoeffer (G. B. Kelly, F.S.C.) 737
Edwards, D. L., Religion and Change (M. Hellwig) 735
Forde, G. O., The Law-Gospel Debate (P. J. Cahill, S.J.) 517
Gabus, J.-P., Introduction à la théol-
INDEX TO VOLUME 30

ogie de la culture de Paul Tillich
(G. H. Tavard) 739

GOGARTEN, F., Luthers Theologie (P.
J. Burns, S.J.) 138

GUSTAFSON, J. M., Christ and the
Moral Life (N. Crofty, C.P.) 352

HASLER, A., Luther in der katholischen
Dogmatik (J. Wicks, S.J.) 140

HAUGAARD, W. F., Elizabeth and the
English Reformation: The Struggle
for a Stable Settlement of Religion
(J. E. Booty) 506

The Holy See and the War in Europe
1: March 1939-August 1940 (ed. B.
Schneider, S.J., P. Blet, S.J., and
A. Martini, S.J.) (tr. G. Noel)
(D. F. Wachtel) 534

Hughes, J. J., Absolutely Null & Utterly Void:
An Account of the 1896 Papal
Condemnation of Anglican Orders
(J. E. Burns) 144

The Jerome Biblical Commentary
(ed. R. E. Brown, S.S., J. A. Fitzmyer,
S.J., R. E. Murphy, O.Carm.) (G.
MacRae) 694

JOHNSON, M. D., The Purpose of the
Biblical Genealogies with Special
Reference to the Setting of the
Genealogies of Jesus (J. A. Fitz-
myer, S.J.) 700

Jonsen, A. R., Responsibility in Modern
Religious Ethics (E. J. Capes-
tany) 730

Keen, S., Apology for Wonder (L.
Cunningham) 741

Kohler, K., Jewish Theology System-
atically and Historically Considered
(D. J. McCarthy, S.J.) 116

KÜNG, H., Truthfulness: The Future of
the Church (L. Cunningham) 361

Langevin, P.-E., S.J., Jésus Seigneur et l'eschatologie:
Exégèse de textes prépauliciens (W. J. Dalton, S.J.) 331

Lapointe, R., O.M.I., Les trois dimensions de l'herméneutique (P. J.
Burns, S.J.) 113


Leff, G., Heresy in the Later Middle Ages: The Relation of Heterodoxy
to Dissent (J. R. Meyer) 707

Lehmann, K., Auferweckt am dritten Tag nach der Schrift (R. C. Ware) 704


Lortz, J., The Reformation in Germany
(tr. R. Walls) (K. Hagen) 717

Lubac, H. de, The Sources of Revelation
(tr. L. O’Neill). (G. H. Taw-
ard) 332

Maloney, G. A., S.J., The Cosmic Christ:
From Paul to Teilhard (P. D.
Fehlner, O.F.M.Conv.) 127

Marty, M. E., The Search for a Usable Future (L. Cunningham) 529

Minear, P. S., I Saw a New Earth: An
Introduction to the Visions of the
Apocalypse (R. Kugelman, C.P.) 698

Munson, T. N., Reflective Theology:
Philosophical Orientations in Reli-
igion (V. M. Cooke, S.J.) 531

Muschalek, G., S.J., Glaubensgewiss-
heit in Freiheit (R. J. Schachner-
Dionne, S.M.) 511

O’Brien, M. J., C.S.V., An Introduction to Pastoral Counseling (J. F.
Harvey, O.S.F.S.) 537

O’Connell, R. J., S.J., St. Augustine’s Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386–391
(E. L. Fortin) 341

O’Malley, J. W., S.J., Giles of Vi-
terbo on Church and Reform: A
Study in Renaissance Thought (C.
H. Lohr, S.J.) 710

O’Neill, R. P., and M. A. Donovan,
Sexuality and Moral Responsibility
(R. A. McCormick, S.J.) 353

The Paradox of Religious Secularity
(ed. K. T. Hargrove, R.S.C.J.) (J. C.
Chereso) 734

Pelikan, J., Development of Christian
Doctrine: Some Historical Prolegom-
ena (H. Musurillo, S.J.) 500

Pellegrino, M., The True Priest: The
Priesthood As Preached and Prac-
tised by Saint Augustine (tr. A. Gib-
son) (M. A. Schatkin) 345

Pineas, R., Thomas More and Tudor Politics (J. E. Booty) 136

Pittenger, N., Process-Thought and
Christian Faith (J. W. Thomasson) 726

Pol, W. H. Van De, The End of Con-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional Christianity</td>
<td>A. C. Outler</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine Science and Science of God</td>
<td>T. F. O'Meara, O.P.</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Presence and Absence of God</td>
<td>C. F. Mooney, S.J.</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Shadow to Promise: Old Testament Interpretation from Augustine to the Young Luther</td>
<td>J. Wicks, S.J.</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Dynamic Psychology of Religion</td>
<td>W. W. Meissner, S.J.</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus: Von den Anfängen bis zum Tridentinum</td>
<td>J. F. Broderick, SJ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearers of the Word</td>
<td>M. Richards, B. A. Nachbahr</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerygma and Dogma</td>
<td>J. W. Healey, S.J.</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obedience and the Church</td>
<td>R. P. McBrien, M. D. O'Keefe</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit in the World</td>
<td>W. Dych, S.J.</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Theology of Proclamation</td>
<td>J. E. Brooks, S.J.</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel</td>
<td>R. J. Daly, S.J.</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium: Geschichte ihrer Deutung</td>
<td>R. E. Brown, S.S.</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Thought of Teilhard de Chardin</td>
<td>R. Hague, C. Volterr, S.J.</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory and Hope: An Inquiry concerning the Presence of Christ</td>
<td>T. E. Clarke, S.J.</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Intelligence de la foi en la trinité selon saint Augustin: Genèse de sa théologie trinitaire jusqu'en 391</td>
<td>E. Cousins</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church against Itself</td>
<td>E. A. Weis, S.J.</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Der Begriff &quot;Fleisch&quot; in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen</td>
<td>J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J.</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gospel according to St. John</td>
<td>B. A. Mastin, R. E. Brown, S.S.</td>
<td>697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Eucharist</td>
<td>E. J. Kilpatrick, S.J.</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God the Future of Man</td>
<td>P. Chirico, S.S.</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Relevance of the New Testament</td>
<td>T. W. Leathy, S.J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogma 1: God in Revelation</td>
<td>C. Volterr, S.J.</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorgeschichte der reformatortischen Luzitotologie</td>
<td>J. Wicks, S.J.</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mankind</td>
<td>T. Berry</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Religious Experience</td>
<td>H. J. Ryan, S.J.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kierkegaard on Christ and Christian Coherence</td>
<td>L. Dupré</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilt: Theory and Therapy</td>
<td>W. W. Meissner, S.J.</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Philosophical Basis for Contemporary Protestant Thought</td>
<td>V. M. Cooke, S.J.</td>
<td>724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Human Aggression</td>
<td>W. W. Meissner, S.J.</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kierkegaard on Christ and Christian Coherence</td>
<td>C. McCuliffe, S.J.</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Function of Theology</td>
<td>L. Cunningham</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A History of Christian Study</td>
<td>P. Tillich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INDEX TO VOLUME 30

| Thought (ed. C. E. Braaten) (G. H. Tavard) | 131 |
| TREMELAS, P. N., Dogmatique de l'église orthodoxe catholique 3 (tr. P. Dumont, O.S.B.) (J. L. Monks, S.J.) | 502 |
| VERCRUYSSE, J., Fidelis populus (J. Wicks, S.J.) | 712 |
| WINK, W., John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition (R. E. Brown, S.S.) | 329 |
| WOOD, A. S., The Burning Heart: John Wesley, Evangelist (G. L. Vincitorio) | 364 |
| ZIEGLER, J. G., Vom Gesetz zum Gewissen: Das Verhältnis von Gewissen und Gesetz und die Erneuerung der Kirche (S. J. Kilian, O.F.M.) | 520 |

### SHORTER NOTICES

| Acta Congressus internationalis de theologia Concilii Vaticani II (ed. E. Dhanis, S.J., and A. Schönmetzer, S.J.) | 756 |
| ALLEN, D., The Reasonableness of Faith (W. C. McFadden, S.J.) | 750 |
| AMIOT, F., From Scripture to Prayer (tr. N. Smaridge) (J. F. Keenan, S.J.) | 159 |
| ATKINSON, J., The Great Light: Luther and the Reformation (J. Wicks, S.J.) | 165 |
| AUMANN, J., T. HOPKO, AND D. BLOESCH, Christian Spirituality: East and West (M. B. Pennington, O.C.S.O.) | 380 |

---

BERKOUWER, G. C., The Sacraments (tr. H. Bekker) (J. N. Tylenda, S.J.) 750
BLENKINSOFF, J., A Sketchbook of Biblical Theology (F. L. Mortarty, S.J.) 370
BOLTÉ, P.-E., Mater et magistra: Texte latin, nouvelle traduction, commentaire (H. J. Ryan, S.J.) 167
BULTMANN, R., Faith and Understanding 1 (ed. R. W. Funk; tr. L. P. Smith) (J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J.) 547
The Cambridge Platonists (ed. G. R. Cragg) 169
CAMPBELL, J., The Masks of God: Creative Mythology (J. Crehan, S.J.) 156
CHADWICK, H., The Early Church (J. F. Broderick, S.J.) 162
The Church As Sign (ed. W. J. Richardson, M.M.) (F. X. Hezel, S.J.) 552
COATS, G. W., Rebellion in the Wilderness (J. R. Donahue, S.J.) 371
COGLEY, J., Religion in a Secular Age: The Search for Final Meaning (A. Atkins, O.C.S.O.) 167
COLLINS, R. W., Calvin and the Libertines of Geneva (ed. F. D. Blackley) (J. N. Tylenda, S.J.) 550
CORBON, J., Path to Freedom: Chris-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christian Experiences and the Bible</td>
<td>V. Nevile</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Purly Penal Law Theory in the Spanish Theologians from Vitoria to Suarez</td>
<td>D. Doherty, O.S.B.</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Punishment of Sin</td>
<td>D. G. Dawe, S.J.</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodoxy but the Truth: A Survey of Protestant Theology</td>
<td>A. Brzoska, S.J.</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le vocabulaire de Teilhard de Chardin</td>
<td>M.-C. Deckers, R.S.C.J.</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Treatment of Sin</td>
<td>P. Delhaye, et al.</td>
<td>751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vielfalt der Kirche in der Vielfalt der Jünger, Zeugen und Diemer</td>
<td>P. J. Dias, S.J.</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary of the Council</td>
<td>J. Delhaye, et al.</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die Funktion der Theologie in Kirche und Gesellschaft</td>
<td>P. J. Burns, S.J.</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etre né de Dieu: Jean 1, 13</td>
<td>R. E. Brown, S.S.</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Concept of Man in the Bible</td>
<td>R. Kugelman, C.P.</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Birth of the Church: A Biblical Study</td>
<td>J. Powell, S.J.</td>
<td>744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faith of the Atheist</td>
<td>J. Reid, O.P.</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Restless Religious</td>
<td>T. Dubay, S.M.</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le prêtre selon saint Ambroise</td>
<td>W. H. Dodd, S.J.</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le plaidoyer prophétique contre Israël après la rupture de l'alliance</td>
<td>D. L. Magnetti, S.J.</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vom Sinn der Menschwerdung: &quot;Cur Deus homo&quot;</td>
<td>P. D. Fehlner, O.P.M.Conv.</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La perfection du chrétien</td>
<td>M. Olphe-Gaillard, S.J.</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The General Doctrine of Creation in the 13th Century</td>
<td>P. De Letter, S.J.</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power without Glory: A Study in Ecumenical Politics</td>
<td>H. J. Ryan, S.J.</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Book and Holy Tradition: International Colloquium Held in the Faculty of Theology, University of Manchester</td>
<td>F. F. Bruce and E. G. Rupp</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny</td>
<td>D. J. McCarthy, S.J.</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny</td>
<td>H. J. Ryan, S.J.</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theology in the Service of God's People</td>
<td>J. Mocelyn, O.P.</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation à la doctrine des Pères de l'église</td>
<td>C. Tunner, O.P.</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Theology of Marriage: A Doctrinal, Moral, and Legal Study</td>
<td>E. G. Zogby, S.J.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KLINE, M. G., By Oath Consigned (C. McAuliffe, S.J.)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUHNS, W., Environmental Man (D. S. Toolan, S.J.)</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASH, N., His Presence in the World: A Study of Eucharistic Worship and Theology (R. F. King, C.M.)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWTON, S., Pastoral Implications of Biblical Theology: Truths That Compelled (J. J. O'Rourke)</td>
<td>373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBRIEN, R. P., Do We Need the Church? (L. Cunningham)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKEY, J. P., Tradition &amp; Change in the Church (J J. Heaney, S.J.)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanchthon and Bucer (ed. W. Pauck)</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MÜLLER, M., Grundlagen der katholischen Sexualtheik (W. Daniel, S.J.)</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHS, R., S.J., The Death in Every Now (E. G. Zogby, S.J.)</td>
<td>752</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELIKAN, J., Spirit versus Structure: Luther and the Institutions of the Church (ed. J. H. Hexter) (J. F. McCue)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLING, D., The Last Years of the Church (P. D. Fehlner, O.F.M. Conv.)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAHNER, K., S.J., Do You Believe in God? (tr. R. Strachan) (H. D. Egan, S.J.)</td>
<td>749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAHNER, K., S.J., Servants of the Lord (tr. R. Strachan) (W. H. Dodd, S.J.)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATZINGER, J., Einführung in das Christentum: Vorlesungen über das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis (P. J. Burns, S.J.)</td>
<td>748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings in Social Theology (ed. E. J. Morgan, S.J.) (J. J. Conlin, S.J.)</td>
<td>754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAWICKI, J. T., Bibliographia synodorum particularium (J. F. Broderrick, S.J.)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHMIDT, C. B., Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (1469-1533) and His Critique of Aristotle (C. H. Lohr, S.J.)</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotus Speaks Today 1266-1966: Seventh Centenary Symposium, April 21-23, 1966 (P. D. Fehlner, O.F.M. Conv.)</td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMCOX, C. E., The Historical Road of Anglicanism (E. McDermott, S.J.)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITH, D. H., Chinese Religions from 1000 B.C. to the Present Day (L. Nemec)</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONTAG, F., The Crisis of Faith: A Protestant Witness in Rome (J. P. Hanigan, S.J.)</td>
<td>556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINKA, M., John Hus: A Biography (L. Nemec)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVICK, D. B., Civil Disobedience and the Christian (A. Fagottoy, S.J.)</td>
<td>558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THEological STUDIES

Thurian, M., The One Bread (tr. T. DuBois) (J. Cordoue, S.J.) 554
Trooster, S., Evolution and the Doctrine of Original Sin (tr. J. A. Ter Haar) (P. Burke) 551
Vaux, R. de, O.P., Bible et Orient (J. L. McKenzie, S.J.) 157
Walker, G. S. M., The Churchmanship of St. Cyprian (J. J. Cieniawa, S.J.) 745
Walker, W., John Calvin: The Organiser of Reformed Protestantism 1509-1564 (J. N. Tylenda, S.J.) 747
Walton, R. C., Zwingli's Theocracy (J. N. Tylenda, S.J.) 380
Zamoyta, V., The Theology of Christ: Sources (J. Carmody, S.J.) 376