BOOK REVIEWS


This second volume of the Cambridge work has been held up for some years, since there was an earlier volume published in 1963. As a reviewer, I must at once declare my interest by stating that I was a contributor to that earlier volume; lapse of time may grant me an appearance of greater impartiality. Our volume was edited by Dr. Greenslade, but the editor of this one, Prof. Lampe, had the *Patristic Greek Lexicon* under his care, and this reason alone would account for the long delay. It has not been unfruitful, for all that. The chapter on early Christian book production (by T. C. Skeat of the British Museum) has been able to benefit by knowledge of the Yale papyrus of Genesis and the work done on it by C. H. Roberts in 1966. This papyrus, dated between 80 and 100, is a Christian product, and it has the same system of abbreviation for the sacred names that has been found in all Christian papyri. Roberts has argued that this system points to a central control of book production for church use. Skeat agrees with him and is willing to put the start of it as early as 70. If that is accepted, there will have to be some revision in an upward direction of datings for Gospel production. It could hardly be supposed that a church which bothered about uniformity in copying the sacred names was careless about allowing enlarged versions of Gospels to go into circulation.

One of the essays is by the late Fr. Sutcliffe, S.J., on Jerome; it gives the mature thought of a veteran *OT* scholar on a man whom he venerated as a hero. A parallel sketch of Erasmus by Père Bouyer closes the volume. There are fourteen dozen plates, clearly reproduced and fully annotated, while there is a chapter on medieval Bible illustration by Prof. Francis Wormald. Miss Beryl Smalley deals once more with the Bible in the medieval schools. A section on the Wycliffite versions (by H. Hargreaves of Aberdeen) gives the fullest account of recent work on this topic, making clear that the Wycliffite intention was to set up a new and all-sufficient authority in opposition to the Church. Hargreaves points out that Archbishop Arundel (who had Wycliffe condemned) was able nonetheless to praise Anne of Bohemia (in the funeral oration he preached on her in 1394) for having and using an English version of the four Gospels which he had himself licensed. The activity of Nicholas of Hereford and John Purvey is as fully dealt with as possible, and the patient survey of many manuscript sources makes this study of the Wycliffites very valuable.
The late C. S. C. Williams of Merton College has the chapter on texts and canon before Jerome. On the texts he has a good survey of the field, but on the canon his work might have been brought up to date to include some consideration of what has been done in the years since his premature death. He puts out an interesting suggestion that it was the coming into notice of the Acts of the Apostles after 70 which led to the desire for a collected corpus of Pauline letters. One might connect with this desire also the somewhat extensive revision of the text of Acts which we know through codex Bezae. That must have happened at some date near the end of the first century. The forthcoming New English Bible version of the Old Testament (promised for March 1970) may make this companion to the Bible more needed than ever, as one can anticipate a renewal of scholarly interest in the transmission of the Bible and the making of versions.

London

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.


Burtchaell's book is a detailed and informative survey of much Catholic thinking about biblical inspiration during the past 150 years. He contends that the first hundred years (1810–1910) were theologically very fruitful, but that most of the progress was dissipated at the condemnation of Modernism, so that even today Catholic thought about the Bible is far less vigorous and interesting than it was at the turn of the century. B.'s sympathies in the debate on biblical inspiration are clearly with the "creative" thinkers whose work met with official disapproval early in this century, and he makes no effort to present an assessment of the "other side" in the discussion. Though the presentations are generally clear, B.'s style occasionally becomes anecdotal.

Five of the book's seven chapters are devoted to the period 1810–1910. Chap. 1 deals with the Tübingen School, whose members generally regarded Scripture as a homogeneous part of tradition, all of which conveys Christ's same revelation and is guaranteed by His same Spirit. Since grace is understood as aiding nature, biblical inspiration is thought to stimulate the human faculties supernaturally to intuit and transmit religious truths otherwise unavailable to men. Salvation history, in which God acts before men's eyes gradually to reveal His nature and our condition, finds its earliest, most primitive, and basic expression in Scripture. This then serves as the subject of the
Church’s constant meditation as its faith seeks ever-new avenues of development.

Chap. 2 deals with theories that found eventual rejection during this hundred-year period, and groups them under the following three positions: (1) that inspiration merely means preservation from error; (2) that a book is Scripture only because of a later guarantee of freedom from error on the part of God or of the Church; (3) that only certain portions of Scripture were inspired.

Chap. 3 treats various forms of content inspiration, according to which the ideas in Scripture are inspired and come from God, while the words can come from men and need not be inspired. While originally launched as a creative attempt to explain the human dimensions of biblical literature and to explore inerrancy, by 1884 the content-inspiration theory was, according to B., simply a conservative means of defending inerrancy.

In chap. 4 verbal inspiration is discussed: not the ancient view that every word in Scripture came primarily from God, but the view given impetus by Lagrange that God teaches whatever the human author teaches, because His inspiration illumines the human faculty of judging. After tracing various changes in Lagrange’s position over the years, B. returns to a discussion of those who followed him in refusing to separate ideas or content from the words in which they found expression.

Chap. 5 groups together various late-nineteenth-century attempts to dissociate inspiration from inerrancy, so as to investigate the former without a polemically defensive prejudgment that inspiration must exclude every form of error.

Chap. 6 begins its survey of the last half century with a bleak summary of the lifelessness that stretched from the condemnation of Modernism to the early 1940’s. Benoit was the first to return to the nature of inspiration. A summary of his work is followed by synopses of various other scholars’ subsequent efforts. In recent years the interest of scholarly examination has shifted from inspiration and its connection with inerrancy to revelation, understood as personal self-disclosure, as vital intercommunion between God and man. Within this new perspective the Bible is both the response to revelation and the cause of further revelation, but it is neither absolute nor exhaustive in its presentation. Hence the question now arises as to just what privilege it can be said to hold.

In chap. 7 B. essays a brief critique of the vast and varied data through which he has guided the reader. The scholarly debate about
inspiration is really only one facet of the larger debate about the manner in which individual human events are jointly caused by both God and man. B. finds the following three important weaknesses in evidence throughout the period surveyed: an uncritical defense of official authority, an obsession with inerrancy, and a crude theology of divine-human collaboration. The charism of inspiration should be understood as aiding men to produce writings which, taken together, "can serve the Church with an undeviating, or inerrant, reflection of how the faith grew from nothing to Christ" (p. 304). For B., this understanding has all too often been lacking in the writers surveyed.

As a contribution to our understanding of the theological problem of biblical inspiration, B.'s book is useful and welcome, even though it is far from the last word on the material treated. We might note in particular that his presentation of Rahner is inadequate and that he forces an opposition between Rahner and McCarthy (p. 251) which appears unfounded. Even if all his analyses would not meet universal acceptance, B. has managed to control a great deal of material and has successfully reduced it all to readable prose. We only regret the very negative and unconstructive tone of much of the book. It is unfortunate that B.'s painstaking study did not let him show more respect for either his subject or the people whose views he presents.

Woodstock College

KEVIN G. O'CONNELL, S.J.

A HISTORY OF OLD TESTAMENT PRIESTHOOD. By Aelred Cody, O.S.B.

Rigorous historical method characterizes this study of OT priesthood up to the beginning of the Hellenistic period. Cody follows the approach of Wellhausen's disciples, W. R. Smith and A. Bertholet (cf. Encyclopaedia biblica 3, 2770-76, 3837-47), but he avoids their one-sided attention to Arab-nomad parallels by keeping in mind also the comparative-religions evidence from Mesopotamia and Canaan. Archeology, documentary criticism, and especially the traditio-historical method (cf. esp. A. H. J. Gunneweg, Leviten und Priester [Göttingen, 1965]) are judiciously used. Those not familiar with the traditio-historical method are well advised to become so, for it provides the key method in the historian's attempt to neutralize the decidedly tendentious cast of mind with which so much of the OT, especially concerning the priesthood, was written.

C. is involved basically in a search for answers to the seemingly innocuous questions: what is a priest in the OT, what is a Levite, what is an Aaronide? The book thus centers on the centuries-long tension
between the (apparently quite popular) religious ideal that priests should be Levites, and the hard reality that the great Jerusalem sanctuary (which eventually became the sole sanctuary) was in the exclusive control of a Zadokite priesthood not at all eager to share it with anyone. Almost all of the OT witness to the history of the priesthood comes to us through authors and redactors who took a more or less partial view of one side or other of this question. In getting to the real history contained in or behind the texts, we often do not get beyond probabilities. But these very probabilities are facts which can only with peril be ignored by anyone wishing to say anything reliable about the historical background of the Christian religion and its sacral institutions. That C. has made this material available to the nonspecialist, as well as presented the latest advances for the specialist, is the great service of his book.

Some of the more notable conclusions of the book follow. Moses and Aaron in all probability were not priests, at least not in the later sense of the word. There is even some doubt about the existence of an established priesthood in presettlement days. The sacrificial function of the early priests was perhaps quite subordinate to that of oracular divination; this developed later into the function of torah interpretation and application. The term Levite remained primarily a tribal designation (not synonymous with priest) until after the exile, when it became the term, without tribal significance, for a minor cultic functionary. The Levite-Zadokite tension was not resolved until the post-exilic restoration. At that time the Zadokites finally had admitted the principle of a Levite priesthood, but they also managed for themselves a tactical victory. They started calling themselves “the Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok” (e.g., Ez 44:15), supporting their claim to this title by genealogical manipulations which made them Aaronides (“Aaron’s sons the priests,” Lv 1:5; 2:2; 3:5,8, etc.); but most important, they were forced to admit only a relatively small number of Levites to the exercise of the full priesthood with themselves. Subsequently, the term “levite” (now written with a small “I”) was never used to describe priests, but only the minor cultic functionaries, nor was it any longer in first instance a tribal designation.

The book is provided with a valuable bibliography and extensive indexes. But since the work has considerable reference value, the systematic inclusion after each major section of summaries distinguishing clearly between possible, probable, and sure conclusions would have been welcome. Modifications in the evaluation of some texts would doubtless have been made, had R. Rendtorff’s recently published

The author's answer to this question is a sharp No, beginning promptly with his first sentence: "The doctrine of original sin is not found in any of the writings of the Old Testament." The purpose of the book is to improve catechesis by confronting it with this deficiency of scriptural data.

After an initial brief chapter skirmishing with Karl Rahner on monogenism, the book falls into four parts. First H. considers the treatment of original sin by dogmatic theologians (centering on a pre-Vatican II edition of Michael Schmaus's Dogmatik and some articles of Leo Scheffczyk, J. Feiner, and J. Auer) and in handbooks of catechetics used in this country (Baltimore; Priory Press Series; Bible, Life, and Worship Series, etc.). With the exception of the Dutch Catechism and the On Our Way Series, Vatican II edition, he understandably finds the rest deficient. The tone of this section is harsh and sarcastic.

Second, he examines the OT evidence for both original sin and the traditional "preternatural gifts," in the P and J accounts of creation and in J's account of Paradise and the Fall. What H. has to say about the OT is a good summary of conclusions generally accepted by Scripture scholars.

Third, he analyzes the scriptural passage most significant for the idea of original sin, Rom 5:12-21. His treatment of this is slightly more controversial. Some scholars would not agree that in this text "no idea of a biological unity with Adam can be found," seeing some evidence for it in v. 12 and confirmation in 1 Cor 15:21-22. Nor would they agree that "death" is simply another word for sin in this passage: H.'s argument ("If we were to understand death here as physical death, the Adam-Christ antithesis would lose its point, because Christ did not remove physical death from the world") fails, because it is precisely Paul's claim that the final achievement of Christ is to remove physical death from the world. Again, the usual translation of kates-thesasan in v. 19 would be "they were constituted," "put into the category of" sinners, rather than "they became sinners," which H. insists on in order to emphasize the role of the individual.

If H. had confined himself to the scriptural question, however, he could only be complimented for a fine piece of scholarship; but he
goes on to a swift conclusion about the way original sin should be understood theologically. This raises a fundamental question of theological method. After his review of the scriptural data, he passes on to a short (four-page) treatment of the canons of Trent, based chiefly on the researches of Vanneste regarding the historical circumstances of the canons' origin. His main concern with Trent seems to be, not to evaluate it as an expression of historical Christian tradition, but to show that it does not stand in the way of his interpretation of Scripture. Because of the derivation of the first two canons from the Councils of Orange and Carthage, he considers that Trent's treatment of original sin was primarily directed against the Pelagians rather than the Reformers. He overlooks the question, why the Council believed it necessary to treat the topic, and he does not consider the possibility that the weight of the Council's intention might fall on canons 4 and 5, which represent an attempt to de-emphasize original sin against the Reformers' heavy stress on it. He then goes on to make the astonishing statement that "the Council certainly does not want to say more than the Bible says." His general argument even requires us to accept this for all councils. He gives no evidence to support this, except a generalized quotation from Scheffczyk, whom he had previously held up as an example of poor theology, in connection with the temporary character of doctrinal formulations. Obviously there is an important sense in which any council must want to say more than the Bible says; otherwise there could never be any reason for holding a council at all.

In a final summary H. presents his theological conclusions. The "inheritance" of Adam's sin means that "sin, after its entrance into the world, so spread that consequently all men are born into a sinful world and in this sinful world become themselves sinners." "No man enters the world a sinner." However, neither is man born as child of God or a member of Christ. Membership in the Church through baptism bestows these gifts.

The problem of the book is presented not by the author's scriptural work, which is excellent, but by his idea of theological method. Briefly stated, the position underlying his work is that the norm for what a Christian should hold by faith is decided by the scientific exegesis of Scripture. The Bible is not to be interpreted in the light of dogma, but dogma is to be interpreted in the light of the Bible (p. 74). Further, biblical exegesis is to be the only source for theology: increased scientific or historical knowledge should not influence the theologian in his interpretation of traditional teachings (p. 85). H. seems unaware that Scripture itself needs to be interpreted or that he himself is interpreting it. At the beginning of his treatment of Scripture he makes a
claim that would bring a heated response from many non-Catholic Scripture scholars, when he says that the Bible’s message about man’s salvation “is, in the final analysis, a unified whole.” To an unbiased onlooker, he is here doing what he accuses others—rightly, no doubt—of doing: reading his own presuppositions into the text. Would H. himself be prepared to accept the findings of scholarly exegesis as the sole basis for what a Christian should believe about Christology, the Church, or the salvific character of human history?

The full reality of a religious tradition is not given in its scriptures alone. The historical reality which we call Christianity is a movement of long duration. Its faith has been objectified and crystallized in a number of ways at different times, initially in Scripture, subsequently in creeds, conciliar definitions, etc. The problem of interpreting the tradition is not solved simply by opting for one of these elements rather than the others. The same hermeneutical difficulty applies to all of them. It is just as much a blind alley to interpret dogma solely in the light of Scripture—even where there is some consensus about its exegesis, let alone where there is not—as it is to interpret Scripture solely in the light of dogma. Both Scripture and dogma need to be interpreted.

Because of the particular state of exegesis on this one topic, it so happens that the conclusions H. reaches are also theologically very desirable. But the application of his method to most other fields of theology would render them even more chaotic than they are already.

For a work of scholarship, the book is not well produced. The final section, dealing with Trent, is mistakenly included under the previous section heading, “The Adam-Christ Parallel in Paul.” The transliteration of Greek quotations is inconsistent and frequently erroneous. The crucial Vulgate text “et ita in omnes homines mors pertransiit” is given as “et ita omnes homines mors transiit” (p. 96). The list of abbreviations omits all diacritical marks.

Despite these reservations, the book should achieve its purpose of putting an end once and for all to the unjustifiable emphasis on original sin which has characterized so much Christian religious instruction.

Temple University

Patrick Burke


This work would more properly be called An Outline of the Theologies of the New Testament; for it is not an attempt at a synthesis
of all NT teaching but sketches of salient points found in the kerygma of the primitive communities, the Synoptics, Paul (Rom, 1 and 2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Th, Phm), post-Pauline writings (the Pastorals, Col, Eph, 1 and 2 Pt, Jas, 1 and 2 Clement, Didache), and John. Undoubtedly the most important part—and the longest—is that treating Paul (pp. 155–286).

The distinguished author is quite knowledgeable. It is his knowledge which at times makes his task almost impossible; for once he assumes for the sake of argument an extreme view regarding the influence of the community on the formation of the tradition, he cannot logically use this material for determining the teaching of Jesus or Jesus’ view of Himself; yet to some extent he does precisely this. Thus, in his interesting discussion of Mt 16:18–19 and 18:17–18 (pp. 32 f.) he argues that it is not certain whether Jesus considered Himself the Messiah, but that if He did He would not have founded a community, and if He did not He would not have founded a community. Certainly, if we cannot know whether Jesus considered Himself the Messiah—something which I am not prepared to admit—we cannot know what His concept of Messiah and His functions were, and thus cannot argue from it.

Another weakness of the book is the contradiction which marks it at times. Thus, he says that Matthew “does away with casuistic observance” (p. 124), while earlier (p. 117) regarding Mt 5:31–32 he states that Matthew made the saying about marriage into a “casuistic rule.” An example of an apparent contradiction is the way in which he treats John’s argument concerning the resurrection; for he says “there is also no future judgment and no future resurrection” (p. 356) and then a few lines later he states “Of course, John knows the expectation of the parousia (and indeed of the resurrection and the judgment)” (p. 357). This is disconcerting. Again, is it not denying Paul’s own practice to state “The wrath of God is not to be played with, even pastorally. Preaching has to offer unconditional salvation, which is there in the cross”? Paul certainly uses the theme of the wrath of God in Romans in what is in effect preaching in written form. Further, C. considers 1 Jn 4:2 as “the first beginnings of the extension of dogma by the positive development of the confession of faith and a critical defence against false doctrine” (p. 302). I wonder how he could not make the same statement about the pre-Pauline confession in 1 Cor 15:3–5.

These observations (others could be made) show why this work is a disappointment. It is valuable for its exegetical insights and for portions of its systematization. Yet it gives the impression that C. did
not really think his positions through, that he presents us with a collection of lectures written in isolation from one another.

Saint Charles Seminary, Phila.                        JOHN J. O’ROURKE


It is a pleasure to read a book so perceptive and literate as Mrs. Ruether’s monograph on the foremost stylist of the Cappadocians. Her purpose was, first, to set forth the characteristics of Gregory’s rhetoric, but, second, to show the implicit tensions which marked the cultured Christian philosopher within a reactionary environment. But R. does not stop at style, neatly analyzed as it is against the late sophistic background. With copious citations in English, she delves into Gregory’s religious ideals and into the stormy life and struggles of this haunted figure with patient and loving care. Gregory was a man of deep feelings and sensitivity; perhaps no other Father has spoken so warmly of his family and friends.

In Gregory, R. sees “renewed the traditional conflict between philosophy and rhetoric. . . . The answer of the Christian ‘philosopher’ to the problem of rhetoric and literary culture in general was strikingly similar to that of Plato” (p. 174). By this she means the absorption of literature into a new value system, purged of indecency and subordinate to the ideals of a higher life. But here one note rings false: it is the suggestion (ibid.) that the Platonic heritage as assimilated by Gregory leads to censorship and the spirit of the Inquisition. But the Basilian theory of eclecticism in literary studies, which Gregory followed, was nothing less than an adaptation of Plutarch’s “theory of the bee” (How the Young Man Should Study Poetry 11, Moralia 30 D), a point of view quite common in the ancient world and hardly to be laid solely at Plato’s door. It is well, too, to bear in mind that the attitude of the Greek Fathers towards pagan literature was somewhat different from that of the Latin. Augustine and Jerome, e.g., drew inspiration from Cicero, Horace, and Vergil, whereas the Greek Fathers were still repelled by the excesses of the Asianic orators, the gross mythology of the Alexandrian poets, and the obscenities of the contemporary mime. The different attitudes are a function of the different sorts of literature they had before them. Apart from these reservations, however, R.’s analysis is both pleasing and profound.

The work involved much translation from the Benedictine text (of A. B. Caillau, as reprinted in Migne; not the “Migne version,” as on p. 171, n. 1), and R.’s versions are usually accurate, though occasion-
ally somewhat free; other fresh translations are from an unpublished manuscript of Denis Meehan, O.S.B. The book, I assume, went to press too early to use Paul Gallay's new critical edition of Gregory's letters (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1964); and, to mention one minor correction, I had always thought that what Daedalus built at Cnossos in Crete was a "dancing ground" in *Iliad* 18.591 and not a statuary group (cf. her note, p. 99). All students of the Cappadocians will find fresh material and insights in this handsomely printed volume from the Clarendon Press.

*Fordham University*  

**HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.**  


This brief study is very satisfying and well worth reading. After a brief but clear introduction establishing the historical context, the book is divided almost equally between the two men considered, John Cassian and Cesarius of Arles, each section opening with a brief biography. The men are well chosen, for they characterize the two great influences which formed the monastic mind and spirit in the West. Cassian, the "pilgrim of the absolute," pursued his search in Palestine, the Egyptian deserts, and Asia Minor, finally bringing to Europe the monastic wisdom of the East, establishing monasteries for men and women at Marseilles. Cesarius, the bishop, exemplifies the influence on the formation of Western morality through the entrance of monks into the episcopal college and the local ecclesial community.

Cassian readily identified monasticism with the evangelical or apostolic life and in turn with perfection. For him monasticism took its origins in the primitive Church and it alone remained faithful to all the gospel precepts. The cenobitic life patterned on the early Church could blossom into the anchoritic under the impulse of a greater love of contemplation, but for Cassian neither was integrally contemplative, both were open to the care of souls, teaching, almsgiving, etc. This identification of monastic life readily led to a certain disdain for nonmonks, for those who remain in the world and marry, for the world in general and for marriage; it led to a reaching for the angelic life, to renouncing created goods, the past and the present to reach towards the future. Cassian has a well-developed if exaggerated theology of chastity and a carefully worked-out theology of sin, mortal and venial, featuring eight capital sins. He presents a very exalted ideal of Christian morality which knows no distinction between precept and counsel. It is the monopoly of monks. All others must live under the yoke of the
old law rather than under the reign of charity, which is supreme for the monk. But an absolute rigorism is avoided by the great emphasis placed on the virtue of discretion, which is obtained through humility and looks to the living tradition as a norm for action. On the negative side, C. points out that Cassian’s teaching on obedience could be misunderstood, his theology on lying was too broad (for C. at least), and in the realm of dogma he fostered Semi-Pelagian thinking.

Cesarius’ bonds with monasticism were close: at an early age he was a monk at Lérins, as a priest he reformed a monastery, as a bishop he founded and wrote a rule for a monastery of nuns over which his sister presided. He lived a poor and common life with his clergy. While he brought about the definitive check of Semi-Pelagianism at the Council of Orange (529), in the field of morals he fully imbibed the teaching of John Cassian through the school of Lérins. He urged the laity to live as much like monks as possible. His teaching on chastity and marriage is excessively rigid, showing an Augustinian influence. Riches were meant only to redeem sin by almsgiving. All had an obligation to live a monastic type of life during Lent. In his view as in Cassian’s, for those not pursuing perfection (living the monastic life) the Old Testament retained the force of law. He also has a similar and well-developed theology of sin. He seems to be the first to have imposed on Christians a workless Sabbath.

C., then, rightly sees Cesarius carrying on a tradition in morals set forth by Cassian, though not exclusively depending on him, which dominated the Gallican Church during the period of change from the end of the Empire to the opening of the Middle Ages—a lofty moral which presented an ideal of perfection more properly monastic and little realizable in the life of the ordinary Christian in the world. The extent of its impact on succeeding centuries is not developed.

The utility of the book is enhanced by the presentation. C. summarizes each chapter in a lucid paragraph, summarizes each section, and gives a clear summary conclusion. In addition, there are tables and a good bibliography.

St. Joseph’s Abbey
Spencer, Mass.

M. BASIL PENNINGTON, O.C.S.O.


This work deserves the epithet “magistral” for several reasons. It has historical breadth, ranging not only through a hundred or more twelfth-
Book reviews, but back into their sources and forward to their successors, the great Scholastics, especially Thomas and Bonaventure. It has a fundamentally important and fruitful theme: the image and likeness of God in man; this theme has been studied, during the last three decades, in numerous monographs on individual Fathers and in less numerous ones on medieval writers, but it here receives for the first time such extensive analytic and synthetic discussion for a key period of Western theological thought. It has immense doctrinal scope, and this is what will probably first strike the reader: all the major areas of theology are opened up as the effort is here made to elaborate the Christian anthropology of the twelfth century. After a preliminary survey of the historical development of the image-likeness idea beginning with Plato, Javelet divides his material according to the ordo disciplinae and moves from the Trinity through creation and sin to the Incarnation and the restoration of the image-likeness in knowledge and love.

The work shows, further, a genuine mastery of a vast material. The reader becomes aware, amid the manifold variations of vocabulary and viewpoint, of a basic unity of spirit and thrust among the twelfth-century writers, but also of a fruitful divergence-in-unity, as different approaches (e.g., to the Trinity) bring to light a wealth of scripturally based and theologically developed insights into an inexhaustible subject. And there is a final mark of the magistral work: J.'s book will be a mine of suggestions for other students to take up in the study of this monastic theological culture.

The book is in two volumes, the first being text, the second notes. The two volumes contain, in addition, a number of items which add to their value as a general aid for the period: in Vol. 1 there are a brief "Tableau des écoles au XIIe siècle" (pp. xv-xviii) and some pages of "Distinctiones dictionum theologicarum" (pp. xix-xxiii) which orient the reader among the basic terms and distinctions which recur in the text; in Vol. 2, besides the usual indexes of authors and Greek words, there are two short indexes of patristic and philosophical influences on the twelfth century and of notable (Latin) terms, and one long and precious index of "ideas" (pp. 341-76). The notes consist of texts referred to in Vol. 1 and of related texts, along with comments to situate them within a writer's work or in relation to other writers. Of the secondary literature listed in 2, xvii-xxx, little explicit use is made: of modern writers cited (in the notes), a number are those who deal in the patristic background; of writers dealing directly with the twelfth century, even fewer are cited or referred to (Chenu's Théologie de la douzième siècle, e.g., is quoted or referred to only three times in the notes, and then either to modify or to disagree with what he says). I mention this matter...
of secondary literature, not as a limitation, but as an indication that, aided undoubtedly over the years by the efforts of other scholars, J. is nonetheless primarily giving us here the results of his own long years of devoted meditation.

J.'s essays on the twelfth century go back many years. Of those listed on 2, xxiv, two are notable: *Psychologie des auteurs spirituels du XIIe siècle* (Strasbourg, 1959; reprinted from the *Revue des sciences religieuses* 33 [1959]; concentrates on Bernard and William of St. Thierry, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor) and "Intelligence et amour chez les auteurs spirituels du XIIe siècle," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique* 37 (1961) 273–90, 429–50. They are here completed by a genuine *magnum opus*.

*Fordham University*

**MATTHEW J. O'CONNELL**


Wicks sets himself a twofold goal. First, he attempts to reach an ecumenical, nonpolemic understanding of the young Luther by taking up a thesis central to the Lortz school of Luther studies. According to this thesis, Luther is to be more appropriately situated and appreciated within the context of spirituality than in that of systematic theology. Second, W. seeks to grasp the events of 1517–18 by showing the role which the young Luther's spirituality played in them. In executing this project, he manifests great familiarity with Luther's early writings as well as professional acquaintance with scholarship in the area.

Several difficulties nevertheless emerge from his treatment. The Lortz thesis has yet to be definitively established; hence its value as a working hypothesis remains subject to verification and cannot be presumed from the outset. W. also takes over an anachronistic perspective from the Lortz school. While he continues to characterize the Reformation negatively as "a heretical and divisive movement" (p. 199), other Catholic Luther studies have progressed beyond this viewpoint. The most regrettable deficiency in this work lies, however, in its methodology. W. states that his approach to grasping the young Luther's spirituality will remain expository. The value of any understanding of a text thus considered in isolation is obviously questionable. Within the context of W.'s total project, the inadequacy of this method is reinforced. Despite his intent to remain with Luther on the expository level, he indulges in categorical statements concerning influences upon Luther's development. Again, although simple exposition requires no thesis, the same section of the book is also intended to elaborate the
initia Lutheri towards clarifying Luther's thought on indulgences in 1517. For this purpose a thesis is demanded, and W. supplies one when he situates Luther in a Catholic, Augustinian-Bernardine tradition. Such a claim cannot, however, appeal to the clarity of self-evidence, and would require far more thorough substantiation than that afforded by W. Lastly, the specific treatment of Luther's thought on indulgences itself indicates the inadequacy of this methodology. The five chapters preceding this topic were to provide the background. W.'s procedure at this point indicates, however, that the previous material was only tenuously related to his central topic. In the sixth chapter he begins again, reviewing the years 1513-17 for Luther's references to indulgences and thus introducing new, necessary background material.

What emerges, then, is as follows. The first major part of the book (chaps. 1-5) presents a thorough study of the young Luther which, appropriate to its methodology, presents no thesis. In order to make the transition to the second part, however, a particular thesis and a theory of development are assumed rather than proved. The second part contains the strength of the book in dealing with the penitential literature of 1517. Because, however, the same method is operative and the material is treated in isolation from its total context, no new handling of it is forthcoming.

Various specific points deserve mention. The second chapter sets out to glean Luther's view of the "concrete situation of the Christian man" (p. 16) from the marginal notes of 1509-10. In light of W.'s stated adherence to the Lortz thesis, it is puzzling that he concentrates on relating Luther's view to the nominalist tradition rather than to late medieval spirituality. Furthermore, it must be noted even within this perspective that nominalism presents a less than united front, and conclusions resulting from a complete study of primary sources rather than on references to Iserloh and Grane would find more ready acceptance. The third chapter finds a major problem with Luther in the asacramental character of his theology without elaborating the criteria according to which this judgment is made. The fifth chapter relates Luther to German mysticism without troubling to make an independent evaluation; rather, it apparently depends on Luther's own testimony on this score.

Throughout W.'s work a type of systematic, internal critique of Luther is operative. This becomes fully manifest in the concluding evaluation. Here Luther's dualism of just and unjust, his dichotomy of present and future, as well as his so-called asacramentalism, are explicitly attributed to a fundamental Neoplatonism. The norms governing this judgment remain unelaborated, and it would appear that at
this point W. misunderstands Luther. The work of Ebeling and Preus would be instructive. W.’s difficulty reveals itself in his critique of Luther’s thought concerning the certitudo salutis as presented in the Lectures on Hebrews. Luther’s dualism is not ontological, as W. would have it, but characterizes the individual in his response to the Word. Hence certitude of salvation cannot involve the attainment of a static, perduring security, but rather constitutes a dynamic element in the ongoing life of faith.

Wicks’ book, then, is hampered by both methodological and theoretical deficiencies which severely restrict the value of its contribution to contemporary Luther scholarship.

Marquette University

Kenneth Hagen


There is an almost predictable form that most book reviews take. One begins by saying a few nice though very general things about the book; then one gets to the heart of the review—a spirited, perhaps at times even nasty, description of all the book’s faults, followed by a few oracular hints about how the book should have been written; finally, a few favorable platitudes to convince the reader that, after all, the book is still good enough for the likes of him.

It is because this review falls into precisely this pattern, and because I want to make clear that the praise is meant and is not simply the result of stylistic habit, that I call attention to this structure. This thousand-page book is a first-rate analysis of the theologies of Aquinas and Luther. Its first third is the best “brief” exposition of Aquinas’ theology that I know of. Moreover, we have not merely a juxtaposition of two excellent descriptions of different systems; we have also a skillful probing back and forth to determine how these systems relate to each other. Pesch raises Roman Catholic Luther scholarship to a new level.

P. is careful to define what he is attempting to do. His basic concern is to ply Aquinas with Luther’s questions: he attempts to manifest to those who would stand with Luther to what extent and in what ways Aquinas affirms what Luther affirms and denies what he denies. Though he sometimes reverses the procedure, in his view it is more appropriate for those who stand with Luther fully to develop this other perspective.

Thus the focus of the book is Luther’s, not Thomas’, understanding of justification. P.’s general evaluation: (1) in the main the two say the same things on those points of greatest concern to Luther; (2) the two
differ most significantly in the general structure of their theologizing, Aquinas developing a "sapiential," Luther an "existential," theology; (3) the differences are not such as to warrant the division of the Church. P. argues at length for each of these contentions, and I am in the main convinced by his argument. Still, I have some doubts about each.

Re the first assertion, we may consider P.'s analysis of the Lutheran *simul iustus et peccator*. (It will be recalled that Calvin identified this as the principal point at issue between the Reformers and "the sounder [i.e., the Augustinian, anti-Pelagian] Schoolmen" [Inst. 3, 14, 11].) P. begins by registering the at least verbal contradiction between Luther and Thomas. Luther insists that the Christian living under grace continues to be quite literally a sinner; Aquinas speaks only of a *fomes peccati* remaining after the reception of grace. It is an inclination to sin, and a constant threat, but is not itself culpable; to use Trent's phrase, "(non) veram et propriam peccati rationem habet" (DS 1515).

P. then develops a brief statement of Thomas' doctrine of justification, with a strong and quite legitimate emphasis on the *solo Deo, sola gratia* thrust, then writes: "The changed will, newly subjected to God, is dealt with personally by the forgiving God in the *qualitas*-interpretation of the will as well. Whatever change there is depends on this personal act of God. But just this was the principal result of Luther's teaching on justification: God forgives sin and begins to "ride" the will, to do his work in it. It is in this perspective that the *simul* is introduced. Then there must be a place for it in Thomas as well...: If God withdraws his personal activity on and in man's will, all change ceases. If man remains with only his freedom, he is left with only his sin. Only with regard to God's action is man just; with regard to himself he is a sinner... The only thing that Thomas cannot accomplish is to turn this into a dialectical statement about the whole man, i.e., to identify the self as Luther does, with both dialectical relationships. We have seen that Thomas' nature-ontology does not allow this. But the difference thus has to do with the philosophical apparatus rather than the reality being interpreted" (pp. 531-32).

P. may be correct that it is Aquinas' *Naturontologie* that keeps him from joining Luther at this point; but, as a matter of fact, he does fail to join Luther here, and one cannot confine the difference by a distinction between *das philosophische Interpretament* and *die interpretierte Sache*. It is crucial for Luther that the Christian, looking into himself as he is here and now, recognize himself as a sinner deserving condemnation. P.'s claim that for Thomas too it is true of the Christian that "with regard to himself he is a sinner" is misleading here. Were it not for the grace of God the Christian would be a sinner, but the *sich*
selbst at which the Christian is looking is the transformed sinner, the ex-sinner. Thomas’ man under grace, insofar as he perceives himself correctly, finds actually present fomitem, non veram et propriam pec­cati rationem. My difficulty here carries over into the second part of P.’s thesis; for it may well be that within a “sapiential” theology the difference indicated here is negligible, but for an “existential” theology it may be central.

By a sapiential theology P. means one that attempts, on the basis of God’s self-revelation in Christ, to construct a vision of God, man, and the universe that will approximate as closely as possible God’s own knowledge of Himself and of His creation. By existential theology he means theology that attempts to remain where man is vis-à-vis God and to articulate the structures within which man lives before God. He argues that though each kind of theology will have critical words to say to the other, nonetheless both are necessary to the Church; indeed every actual theology is something of a mixture of the two.

Thus far it is difficult not to concur. However, I do not think this distinction solves as many problems as P. supposes.

First, it is possible for a sapiential theology to existentialize itself in a variety of ways. P. states that it was Luther (Chenu adiuvante) who taught him to read Aquinas. This is an excellent way to read Aquinas. It helps to make clear the Augustinianism of Thomas’ views of sin, grace, and justification. But, to make use of the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, both could look to a theology like Aquinas’ for justification of their life style. The Pharisee, after all, thanked God that he was not, etc.; he too, presumably, could endorse a sola gratia formula. Luther was less concerned with the Augustinian-Pelagian issue in the classical sense than with the Pharisee-publican issue. This is not to accuse Thomas of pharisaism, but only to suggest that a theology which, like Thomas’, is clearly Augustinian is not invariably existentialized in an antipharisaical way. Viewed from Luther’s perspective, such a theology is more seriously ambiguous than it appears when viewed exclusively in sapiential terms.

Moreover, there are elements in Aquinas’ theology that are not merely neutral but have a tendency away from a publican and toward a phari­saical lifestyle. This can be seen in the highly paradoxical character of the explanations which P. gives of certain Thomistic expressions. Con­sider merit and the conceptualization of grace as a quality of the soul. “Thomas’ teaching on merit is to express the inner teleology of grace toward its development into the eternal, unbroken fellowship with God . . . . In a paradoxical formula, it is to assert that what God began in justification He also sees through to completion. The reality of merit
is only the prolongation of the reality of justification toward and into
eternity. The doctrine of merit is thus the prolongation of the doctrine
of justification, and thus speaks of the extent of God’s doing and not
about the value of man’s work” (pp. 781–82).

Because I think Pesch altogether correct here, I can hardly disagree
with him when he goes on: “Must Luther contradict this view of
Thomas”? We think not. ... Without using the word ‘merit,’ Luther
teaches all this too: reward without our having a claim on it, justifica­
tion without merit, perseverance as grace, assured completion of the
work which God has begun, Christ alone as the basis of grace, prayer
as man’s unique means of salvation before God” (p. 786). But it is
not unimportant to ask whether the theologian has such Humpty
Dumpty powers over the meanings of words, whether “merit”
can be defined in such a surprising way. A half century ago R. Seeberg
made the very interesting comment: “Thus Thomas has retained the
vocabulary of merita de congruo, but so conceives of them as the prod­
uct of grace that it is difficult to maintain their meritorious character”
(History of Dogma 3/4, 481). What is of interest here is that Seeberg
writes as though there were some kind of antecedently given meaning
of the word “merit.”

I would not take the position that there is a kind of meritum in se
to which Thomas should have turned in his definition of merit; but I
would suggest that certain restrictions are imposed upon the theologian
by the force of common usage, restrictions he ignores at his peril. It may
well be that a theologically indefensible meaning of “merit” has a quite
tenacious hold in popular usage, and that to save it by giving it a new
and quite surprising definition may simply provide a justification for
what really ought to be eliminated. I take it for granted that Aquinas
is always aware of his redefinition whenever he speaks of merit, but
surely it is not without significance that P. has to complain that
Thomas’ conception of merit has often been interpreted crassly by sym­
pathetic Roman Catholic scholars and even some Neo-Thomists. If
scholars so often miss the point, one may reasonably wonder whether
Aquinas’ theology could have provided an effective antidote to the
works-righteousness mentality which it was Luther’s prime purpose to
eliminate.

A similar question arises when we consider Aquinas’ analysis of grace
as a quality of the soul. Pesch writes: “With reference to God it asserts:
God always loves creatively. When man is met by the creative love of
God, in which God gives Himself as a gift, this must attain the very
roots of his being in such a way that it is a reality already antecedent
to any response of man. . . . Concerning man, the qualitas-theory . . .
asserts that the act of giving oneself to God, of trust, faith, obedience, love, acts which man attempts and which he may possibly bring forth effortlessly, joyfully, spontaneously succeed... indeed truly reach God only because God’s eternal love has already gone before these acts and the man producing them, and is at work at the root of his being” (pp. 634-35).

Once again, Pesch has admirably succeeded in articulating what Aquinas wants to say. But built into the kind of ontology which Thomas uses here are limitations which make it difficult to analyze interpersonal transactions in a satisfactory way. This ontology tends to suggest that the process of growth in the Christian life is a progressive accumulation of an accidental modification by a substance. Though at the outset Aquinas states that the primary sense of *gratia* is the *favor Dei*, and that *qualitas animae* is but a secondary and derived sense, he subsequently talks almost entirely about this secondary sense, since this lends itself most readily to the kind of analysis for which Aquinas is prepared. Thus the actual execution of the treatise on grace tends to obscure certain of Aquinas’ deepest intentions.

With both these doctrines I have stressed tendencies and the ways in which a theology is likely to be interpreted. This may seem an irresponsibly vague kind of criticism. However, if one wishes to define the relationship between Aquinas and Luther, it is essential to assess their theologies not simply as theoretical systems accessible only to the elite. One must attempt to determine the ecclesial or community dimension, to ask how a given theology relates to where the Church is and where it is going at a given time. P.’s alternatives, sapiential and existential, useful as they are, are both individualistic. But successful theologies function socially to reinforce or inhibit the tendencies of an age, even to inaugurate or eliminate them. Luther’s conception of theology is, in this sense at least, more ecclesial than Aquinas’. If it is existential, it is existential in a first-person-plural as well as in a first-person-singular sense. The pulpit and the everyday life of the community are part of the theologian’s responsibility more significantly for Luther than for Aquinas. Pesch studies Aquinas and Luther as elite theologians, and does a superlative job of that; but this is, contrary to Pesch’s avowed intention, to pose the questions in Thomas’ way rather than in Luther’s.

The last part of P.’s thesis (the differences that do exist between Aquinas and Luther on justification are not such as to warrant a division of the Church) is a very difficult matter; it is yet another mark of his book that he addresses the problem so thoughtfully. The difficulty has to do with establishing criteria by which one judges different theologies to be in some basic sense the same.
It is in prayer and worship that P. locates the base from which a judgment concerning agreement or disagreement between theological systems is to be made. It is in, and on the basis of, the experienced "contact with the thou of revelation and faith" (pp. 915-16) that one (or a community) is in a position to judge. The judgment is made intuitively, per connaturalitatem. It cannot involve the comparison of a third system with the systems of Aquinas and Luther. I have no suggestions that would take us beyond where P. leaves us, yet I think that, with his appeal to intuition, he leaves us far short of a generally satisfactory solution. It is to his credit that he does not pretend that his solution solves all problems and entirely escapes arbitrariness.

I know of no earlier study of Luther by a Roman Catholic that can stand comparison with Pesch's work.

University of Iowa

JAMES F. McCUE


Mr. Ridley has written what is likely to be the standard work of reference on John Knox for some time to come. He has gone to great pains to assemble his material, and he deploys it skillfully. It is a massive undertaking, in the face of very considerable hazards. In the sixteenth-century Scottish scene of high intrigue and devious personalities, one needs, more than a sense of history, a nose for the whiff of actuality. In the absence of so much contemporary evidence, one has to reconstruct as best one may what was in fact a very tangled web of politics and religion. Nor was it a period of sober chronicling, but of bitter Christian invective and unscrupulous pamphlet warfare. And too often Knox is his own historian.

We have here such facts as can be established, not always with the greatest certainty, about its central figure. One curious item illustrates our dependence on the flotsam and jetsam of this particular era of history. By a curious twist of history we have some evidence (at second or third or later hand) of Knox's ordination to the priesthood on Easter Eve, April 15, 1536. A note to this effect turned up among the papers seized from a Scottish Jesuit over seventy years after the event, and unnoticed in Edinburgh for nearly three and a half centuries.

How much still awaits discovery? How far does Knox's self-history need correcting? Can we sift fact from legend in that legend-riddled era of the Scottish Reformation? How much of the catastrophic destruction of Scotland's artistic and literary heritage was due, not to the armies
of England of a previous generation, but to the fury released by the preaching of Knox?

If the materials for a fully documented history of Knox are lacking, the materials for a biography are slighter. R.'s history is less convincing as a biography. This is not the fault of his workmanship, but of his material, too arguable for a fully rounded study of the man. The character of Knox seems too complex, and his evolution too shadowy, for a wholly satisfying interpretation to emerge.

He remains a many-sided, paradoxical figure, with no simple key to so diverse a character. He is a religious phenomenon. R. makes an interesting contrast between him and Calvin. "Calvin was more cool and subtle, Knox more passionate and direct. Knox is not as deep as Calvin, but he drives home the point to its brutal conclusion with a fearlessness and ruthlessness from which even Calvin flinched. . . . After reading their books, we can understand why Calvin devoted himself to organizing a society which regulated the life of the individual, whereas Knox's life-work was the overthrow of a government and a Church" (p. 292).

Knox's contribution to history does not lie directly in the field of politics: it was the state intriguers who made the running here. But the religious settlement of Scotland is his legacy to history. As R. sums it up: "the overthrow of Catholicism in Scotland was due much more to Elizabeth and Cecil than to either Knox or Lord James [Stewart]; but it was because of Knox that the Church of Rome was replaced by Calvinism and not by Anglicanism" (p. 528). Knox is the explanation of why the Church of Scotland is Presbyterian and not Anglican. But, apart from the influence of the Order of Geneva, Knox had little else to do with the future history of the Church of Scotland. Indeed, as R. points out, it is difficult "to imagine Knox as a member of this Church in any of the four centuries during which it has acclaimed him as the Great Reformer" (p. 526).

In the political sphere, however, he does seem to exercise a considerable indirect influence, on ideas if not on events. The ideas are not the subtleties of Calvin but the crudities of power. The chain reaction of modern revolutionary democracy has been traced (how justly?) to Knox. "Knox is one of the most ruthless and successful revolutionary leaders in history" (p. 527). The logic of his "blast of the trumpet" against the "regiment" or rule of women (and of Catholic princes) contains the seeds of revolutionary doctrine. The seeds are ultimately the seeds of self-destruction. This pioneer of democracy was essentially an intolerant man, and his ideal of freedom (for the godly) turns sour in the hands of the ungodly.
R.'s concluding chapter is an excellent summary of the paradox that is John Knox.

Edinburgh

James Quinn, S.J.


When a distinguished French theologian was asked whether in his country Calvinists were ever converted to the Catholic faith and whether he had ever instructed such converts, he gave a firm negative to both questions, yet he had written a learned work on the theology of conversion. One wonders, on reading this book, whether Père Malevez has had the same negative experience. He sets out the usual apparatus of speculative and practical judgments of credibility (the credibile est and credendum est of the manuals) as preambles to the act of faith and then makes play with the idea that by some reciprocal causality or concomitance these judgments are given to the mind along with the very act of faith; the mind perceives, while making the act of faith, that it is both possible and right (thus on p. 56). One wonders how this schematism would deal with the case of the non-Catholic Englishwoman who in 1939, when her Catholic husband went to the war, underwent a course of instruction in the Catholic faith in order to be able to keep the promise she had made to bring up their son as a Catholic. At the end of the course she became a Catholic herself, but her act of faith when it was made must have been long preceded by the judgment of credibility. In another case an Englishman was educated in a Catholic school in South America and went through a full course of Catholic apologetics, but always with the impression that while it was a coherent system it was not for him. Years later he came back to England, enlisted, and in the heat of battle suddenly came to the conviction that he must be a Catholic. However admirable M.'s abstract speculations, one could have wished for a pennyworth of bread with the unconscionable quantities of sack.

The essays in the book have all save one been published before in the pages of the Nouvelle revue théologique, though in an irregular fashion (I in 1960, III in 1968, IV in 1967, V in 1966, and VI in 1964). The new essay, which is the longest, is a close study of de Broglie's restatement of the Rousselot position after it was badly mangled by the book of J. de Wolf (La justification de la foi chez s. Thomas, 1946). M. takes the line that de Broglie and his opponents are really talking about the same things, if only they would realize this. One cannot say that his account is very convincing. In particular, the idea that though the spec-
ulative judgment of credibility could be made by natural reason unaided, it is always in fact aided by grace, and that from the first instant of the dawn of reason grace is present (p. 69), does not commend itself to all men; one would welcome a list of cases where this presence could be seen. The natural desire of the beatific vision is another part of de Broglie's system and it marks him off from a great number of theologians who hold nothing of the kind.

One essay is devoted to the problem of Hb 12:2, where Christ is described as “author and finisher of faith.” This has been taken by von Balthasar and others as requiring some exercise of faith by Christ. M. wants to interpret the *fides Christi* as a fiduciary abandonment to the Father, and he appeals to Hb 2:13 with the comment on the passage by St. Thomas (though this is really Reginald of Piperno, taking notes at the lectures of St. Thomas). These notes stress that Christ did not have hope (for His eternal salvation), any more than faith, though He did have a trust that the Father would give Him aid in the diminution He was to suffer at the Passion. From his position M. is able usefully to traverse the views of Rahner about the knowledge of Christ, but he adds to the *minoratio* in the consciousness of Christ an ontological parallel, calling Capreolus in aid with his theory of the divine act of existence for the human nature of Christ. It will thus be seen that, while the book is strong on the side of speculative theology, its lack of contact with the actualities of men seeking faith, finding it, and even refusing it, renders it less useful as a contribution to the theology of faith.

*London*  
J. H. Crehan, S.J.


Dewart engages in a wholesale criticism of almost every branch of what he calls “Thomism” and attempts to erect surer philosophical foundations for a rational approach to belief in God. His starting point is the nonintelligibility of being and the meaning-creating capacity of mind or human consciousness. For him, being, like Mount Everest, is there. It is simply given to empirical consciousness. It is a brute fact having no intrinsic meaning. Consciousness is the starting point of the possibility of the differentiation of subject and object, since it constitutes the subject as subject. In consciousness there emerges a differentiation of the self from the self and from objects apart from the self. It is this self-differentiation that at once creates the self and creates the meanings that the self puts upon the facts because they are understood.
D. turns from a consideration of being and the self-relation of consciousness to being to a consideration of reality. Reality is that which transcends consciousness, that which is other than the self. Reality and being are not identical concepts. "The essential characteristic of reality is its aptitude for being related.... Reality is whatever the self can have real relations towards. Being, on the other hand, is the object of thought: it is that which is empirically given" (p. 399). Concrete beings are real to us not because they are beings but because they are related to us. Hence there conceivably could be a reality (that which is related to us) that would not be a being (that which is given in empirical experience).

God is this reality that is not a being. God is found when a man whose life is an affirmation of the meaningfulness of existence realizes that no meaning is to be found in being and that therefore there must be a reality beyond being that accounts for that meaningfulness. It is in the depths of religious experience that one discovers this direction toward meaning that is the foundation of the intellectual apprehension of God.

Although I appreciate D.'s efforts to rethink vast areas of philosophy, I do not believe he succeeds too well. The nonintelligibility of being is a starting point that flies in the face of empirical evidence. D. is right in rejecting the notion that each being has a fixed essence that constitutes its total intelligibility. He is wrong in assuming that the alternative to this view is the nonintelligibility of being. I would say that the real alternative more in line with the facts is the changing and almost unlimited intelligibility of the whole universe. The world is a whole tissue of relationships that constitute its intelligibility. Differences in persons and cultures occur largely because there are different appropriations of intelligibility in different sequences.

Other shortcomings characterize the book. D.'s notion of the process of knowledge is quite simplistic. It never gets beyond the first stages of the problem. How and why do errors occur? In what way does knowledge unite one to reality? In what manner is true knowledge self-unifying and a false grasp of reality self-destructive? How can men overcome their incapacity to find truth? What is the difference between common-sense knowledge and scientific knowledge? These and a host of other questions are never really treated. Further, D. has the habit, which will undoubtedly annoy many, of calling the views of those who do not agree with him (usually Thomists) "fantastic," "incredible," "preposterous," etc. What is worse, he makes a number of historical judgments that can hardly be substantiated. For example, no historian of created grace would see in D.'s account of the origin of this doctrine
anything but a caricature of what really happened, the reading back into the past of a degenerate subsequent popular deformation.

In short, I do not believe D. has effectively sketched out a way to rebuild the foundations of belief. When these foundations are said to include the nonintelligibility of being, the building constructed on them is likely to be incoherent and unintelligible. And when the mind is said to be creative of the meaning of being, it will be no great step to decide, as Cornelio Fabro suggests that the course of modern history of philosophy teaches, that it is also creative of the meaning of that reality Dewart calls “God.” This is the inevitable road to atheism.

St. Patrick’s Seminary
Menlo Park, Calif.


The subtitle presents this book as a study of two aspects of the theological awakening in France. The title evokes the interrelated equations of ecclesiology on which the study is focused. The period covered goes from the 1930’s to shortly before the pontificate of John XXIII. Four persons dominate the book, Yves Congar, Marie-Dominique Chenu, Henri de Lubac, and Jean Daniélou, although many others are mentioned and quoted.

The book is divided into four parts. First, a historical sketch of the origin and background of modern French theology tells the story of the theological debates from the Modernist crisis to the controversy over what Garrigou-Lagrange called “the new theology.” This section is, in my opinion, the best of the volume. It adequately describes Modernism, the “new apologetics” of Blondel and Rousselot, and the controversies around them. It carefully analyzes three key works, by Chenu (Une école de théologie), Congar (Chrétiens désunis), and de Lubac (Catholicisme). It gives a fair overview of the impact of World War II on French theologians. And its description of the debates of the late 1940’s, up to and including the publication of Humani generis, is both objective and sensitive.

Part 2 is devoted to the “mystery” of the Church or, according to a dialectic which recurs often in the book, to the “interior” aspect of the Church, held in tension with the “exterior” aspect, studied in the third part under the title “Church and World.” The interiority of the Church is successively centered on two themes. That of “mystery,”
in the period under survey, is rich with Christological, liturgical, and spiritual implications. That of "catholicity" comes next: this one mark of the Church attracted French theologians more than any other mark. In it the others were somehow absorbed; and it provided a key to the Church's missionary tasks, to her eschatological dimension, and to her historical continuity.

The problem of "Church and World" gives first place to the dialectics of incarnation and eschatology. The author starts from the contrasts that he finds between two anthropologies. Maritain, followed by the "Thomists," gave nature its full due as a self-contained order, whereas de Lubac declared nature radically incomplete. To these diverging principles F. traces back the origins of a great debate, where one side "optimistically" stressed the incarnation of the supernatural in the structures of this world, while the other, mistrusting both nature and society, "pessimistically" emphasized the expectation of the Parousia.

Part 4 asks a series of questions formulated from F.'s Protestant standpoint. It is followed by two excursuses (on de Lubac's Sur les chemins de Dieu, and on Congar's understanding of Protestantism) and by a bibliography.

As may be suspected from my summary of the third section, F. does not escape a certain artificiality. He is obviously fond of categories and enumerations, finding, e.g., five conceptions of incarnation (pp. 195-99) and three of eschatology (pp. 211-32) in postwar French theology. He opposes the "optimism" of Teilhard (in spite of Teilhard's repeated warnings that the failure of evolution is a distinct possibility) to the "pessimism" of de Lubac and Daniélou (thus taking no account of de Lubac's recent writings on Teilhard), or the "incarnationism" of the Dominicans to the "eschatologism" of the Jesuits. In his characterization, Teilhard and Chenu are extremists, whereas de Lubac and Congar remain moderates, Congar systematically trying to mediate between opposite tendencies. Daniélou is a hidden conservative; but the analysis of his contribution is retroactively tainted by a long criticism of his L'Oraison: Problème politique (1965).

I would not cavil about these flaws. The volume of material was enormous. And it was infinitely difficult to digest from the situation of a person who did not experience those years, who looks at his topic from Germany, and who happens to be a Protestant. However, several major omissions in both the historical survey and the systematic analysis should be pointed out. No allusion of any kind is made to the important sacramental reflection which started with de la Taille's Mysterium fidei and continued through World War II with the works,
among others, of Masure. Yet the aspect of the Church as mystery cannot be grasped without a corresponding insight into the mystery of the sacraments, and specifically of the Eucharist. Perhaps it is because this reflection was never in question and sailed peacefully through the rough waters of 1950 that it does not appear in F.’s vision. Yet it had a great formative influence through the years under survey. Likewise, no mention is made of the studies of the Catholic mystics that were largely inspired by Bruno de Jésus-Marie and his *Études carmélitaines*. Again, this contribution played no small part in what F. sees as the “eschatology” of some of the theologians of the period.

It is difficult, if not impossible, in the limits of this sort of book, to do justice to all authors. I would have given more importance to Louis Bouyer. And several men would have deserved at least to be listed in the extensive bibliography at the end of the book, even if they did not take a prominent part in the controversies: e.g., Gustave Bardy, Fulbert Cayré, Martin Jugie.

On the whole, this book makes worth-while reading. But it is to be used with caution on account of its lacunae and its occasional over-systematization.

_Pennsylvania State University_  
GEORGE H. TAVARD


This work is significant less for its doctrinal content than for its method. It is the first major effort by a Roman Catholic systematician to construct a Christology on the base of a serious and contemporary exegesis and biblical theology. “Bâtir une christologie dans laquelle la recherche scripturaire positive soit un des éléments essentiels, et non plus la preuve extérieure de thèses préparées à l’avance” (p. 10)—such is the endeavor of this fine work.

Père Duquoc divides his essay into three parts, two of which appear in this first volume. In the first part he studies first the mysteries of the life of Jesus. One welcomes here a sophisticated response to the call of Karl Rahner and others for a contemporary recapturing of the theology of the mysteries of the life of Christ, cultivated by Aquinas and Suarez but mostly abandoned in more recent Christology. Scripture scholars will have to judge whether D.’s handling of the Gospel material satisfies the exigencies of their trade. For the systematic theologian, the very fact that D. is making the effort is good news.

After seeking the theological import of the infancy accounts, D.
does the same for major aspects and events of the public life: the baptism and temptation of Jesus, His preaching and miracles, His transfiguration. He then investigates the attitudes of Jesus disclosed in these events. This could appear a naive enterprise, but D. shows a refined awareness of the impossibility of a biography or personality sketch of Jesus. He chooses to align himself with those \textit{NT} scholars who are more optimistic than Bultmann regarding the possibility of access to the Jesus of history. But, once again, it is Christological reflection, not exegesis or biblical theology in the strict sense, which is the major thrust and contribution of this work.

In the long second part of his essay, D. takes as basis some of the \textit{NT} titles of Christ and seeks to integrate them with some of the major themes and problems of Christological tradition. Thus, the title of Christ as prophet leads into a discussion of His human knowledge and its limitations. Christ as servant suggests a treatment of His sinlessness and freedom from concupiscence. The title of Son of God is the occasion for reviewing the classic patristic Christologies as well as recent controversy over the human consciousness of Christ. The lengthiest and most original reflection, on the grace of headship, takes off from the titles of Son of Man and high priest.

If the enterprise sometimes appears to yield to artificial construction and mere juxtaposition, this is excusable in a pioneering effort. There are enough moments of creative reflection to offer promise of a new way in systematic Christology, now opened up by D.'s work. Nor are his efforts without sensitivity to the pastoral aspects of Christology. He shows himself attentive to and, to some degree, sympathetic with the "death of God" currents in American theology.

When the second volume, dealing with the paschal mystery (presumably covering the Passion and Resurrection narratives) appears, it will be interesting to see whether the rich promise of this first volume has been realized. In any case, D.'s work should invite all systematic Christologists to similar reflective essays constructed in the light of the recent renaissance and revolution in biblical studies.

\textit{Woodstock College} \\
\textit{Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.}


This little volume of theological essays contains something for everyone. The penetrating essays on "True Freedom" provide rich material for those of metaphysical inclination, although some of them are too
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If the enterprise sometimes appears to yield to artificial construction and mere juxtaposition, this is excusable in a pioneering effort. There are enough moments of creative reflection to offer promise of a new way in systematic Christology, now opened up by D.'s work. Nor are his efforts without sensitivity to the pastoral aspects of Christology. He shows himself attentive to and, to some degree, sympathetic with the "death of God" currents in American theology.

When the second volume, dealing with the paschal mystery (presumably covering the Passion and Resurrection narratives) appears, it will be interesting to see whether the rich promise of this first volume has been realized. In any case, D.'s work should invite all systematic Christologists to similar reflective essays constructed in the light of the recent renaissance and revolution in biblical studies.

Woodstock College

THOMAS E. CLARKE, S.J.


This little volume of theological essays contains something for everyone. The penetrating essays on "True Freedom" provide rich material for those of metaphysical inclination, although some of them are too
brief to stand on their own. Many of the questions and objections which can be raised against these short essays, however, have been handled in depth in other works by Rahner. The core of freedom, for R., rests in the fact that a man must freely decide about himself with respect to the loving Mystery which confronts him. “In its origin, freedom is freedom of saying Yes or No to God, and thus freedom of the subject to itself” (p. 209). The horizon of man’s transcendental subjectivity, then, is not only the condition of possibility for freedom, but is also freedom’s prime “object.” The paradox of human freedom is underlined in the ultimate absurdity which occurs when human freedom denies its own horizon. In the actual denial, the horizon of man’s transcendental subjectivity is called upon as the condition of possibility for the denial. What is denied is actually the grounding for the denial. Any no, therefore, also contains within it a deeper yes. A further intensification springs from the fact that God as Grace is present to man in his freedom not only as horizon but also as absolute immediacy. Since freedom alone provides for the total integration of human existence, it is a demand and a requirement. Freedom is the very capacity for the eternal, so that through freedom man really becomes good or evil throughout his being—for eternity. Man is his freedom, and becomes his decisions for eternity. Love of neighbor plays a special role in the unity-in-difference between man’s basic, holistic decision and free individual acts, for “the act of neighbourly love is the only categorial and original act in which man reaches the whole categorially given reality and thus experiences God directly, transcendentally and through grace” (p. 218).

Those who approach theology more intuitively will enjoy the beautiful mystagogical and evocative meditations on “The Little Word ‘God.’” These profound, quasi-poetic meditations could easily be the best part of the book. R. attempts here to set us into our own deepest mystery by evoking the ultimate experience of the radical meaning of our being. A psychiatrist attempts to help a patient explicate his own experiences through the data provided by the patient’s verbal and non-verbal posture. If successful, the patient is given a higher intellectual-visceral viewpoint from which he can know, acknowledge, and accept what he has already “known” all along. In much the same way does mystagogical theology attempt to awaken what is slumbering in every man, so that he can savor his fundamental experiences from a qualitatively higher, freeing, and creative viewpoint. Mystagogy structures, explicates, and thematizes the experiential life of faith and prayer. Since it is the science of conversion, faith, and prayer, it ought to lead from these and back into these. This is not done to dissolve theology
into a fuzzy mysticism, but to meet the demands for a real praying theology, a theology that flows out of and back into Mystery.

The essays on "Responsibility in the Post-Conciliar Church" and "Commitment to the Church and Personal Freedom" highlight R.'s skill as a pastoral theologian, as one who can apply his deep metaphysical speculations with a keen pastoral sense to concrete issues facing the Church today. One finds in these essays a balanced approach to such problems as ecumenism, democracy in the Church, medical ethics, changes in the Church, liturgy, etc.

The translation is adequate, although one should note that the book has been "adapted" as well as translated. The adaptation, however, is quite minor.

Münster

Harvey Egan, S.J.


"Thomas Merton is dead." The news was electrifying. If this little book would have been precious in itself under any circumstances, in the course of such an event it has become a priceless heritage. It is the last book M. put together, being sent to the publisher when he was already en route to the Orient. Based on an essay he wrote for his brother monks in 1964–65 and worked up into book form in the summer of 1968 as a special favor to one of them, in it M. reveals himself—the Christian, the monk, the man of prayer before God—as in no other of his writings.

M. tells us that this is "a practical non-academic study of monastic prayer"; nevertheless he feels sure that it "should be of interest to all Christians, since every Christian is bound to be in some sense a man of prayer" (Introduction). However, the scope of the book is actually much broader. M. sums it up well when he speaks of it as "deepening one's existential grasp of his call to life in Christ as it progressively reveals itself" (p. 30). The pages do discuss prayer, not some special restricted techniques, but rather its very nature. Therefore it is true that what is said here is applicable "to the prayer of any Christian," though perhaps with a little less emphasis on the intensity of certain trials proper to life in solitude. With deft strokes M. sketches the development of prayer attitudes through the centuries. His is a unique ability to distil the essence of the teaching of each of the great writers he introduces in relation to the topic, to complement and contrast them. He discloses the pseudo problem of action and liturgy versus contemplation and
brings to the reconciliation of complementarity the positive and negative, meditation and asceticism, culture and "the dark nights." Mixed in there is a good bit of wise and practical advice for all the different stages of prayer—for beginners as well as for the proficient—from an experienced director who has had his own experience as well as shared the experience of others. He knows the pitfalls and clearly points them out, and he stresses the gift quality of contemplation.

Undoubtedly the most valuable part of this book are the chapters where M. turns his attention to the great problem of our times: existential dread—the sense of loss, of boredom, of forsakenness and loneliness experienced by so many today with such poignancy. His great love for his fellow monks led M. to speak with great frankness and simplicity of the struggle, of the "dread" that he himself experienced and that every man must experience if he is to confront his own humanity and that of this world at the deepest and most central point where the void seems to open into black despair. Having lived it personally and seen it, too, from the more perceptive vantage point of one standing apart, he clearly discerns its nature, causes, meaning, and ultimate solution. He confronts this possibility of despair, he rejects it, he opts for hope by the pure and humble supplication of prayer. His, as of a man on the threshold of eternity, is essentially a message of hope.

For those monks and nuns and others seeking to identify the role of monasticism today vis-à-vis the modern world, M. gives a clear and unambiguous answer. This prayer of hope, witnessing to an ultimate faith and love, is the creative and healing work of the monk accomplished in silence, in nakedness of spirit, in emptiness, in humility. It is a participation in the saving death and resurrection of Christ. Every Christian may, if he so desires, enter into communion with the silence of the praying and meditating Church, which is the Church of the desert. This is the invitation which M. extends here to every Christian.

This is a small book that is incredibly full and rich. If one really wants to know Merton, it is a must. If one realizes in himself the desire to live a deep life of prayer and finds himself struggling with all the existential currents of our times, it is probably one of the best things in print to help him. If one wants to know the meaning of monasticism today, especially that variety that is spoken of as being "integrially contemplative," here he will find the nearest thing to an adequate answer.

St. Joseph's Abbey
Spencer, Mass.

M. Basil Pennington, O.C.S.O.
LEXIKON DER CHRISTLICHEN MORAL. By Karl Hörmann. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1969. 1392 cols. + xxv pp. DM 78.—

Claiming to be the first German-language dictionary of moral theology, the Lexikon presents the latest teaching of Viennese moral-theology professor Karl Hörmann on most questions of possible interest in morality today. Its alphabetical arrangement of only 250 entries may hardly seem adequate; however, an alphabetical index at the end lists many other subjects with a reference to where they are treated. For example, one might look in vain in the body of the Lexikon for something on calumny (Verleumdung) or detraction (Ehabschneidung), but a quick glance at the index of subjects (Sachregister) will show the reader that he can find them both treated under the heading of honor (Ehre).

In his foreword H. states his purpose: to give the latest data for forming one's conscience or a reasonable theological opinion, by presenting the teaching of Vatican II and of recent popes, with additional arguments from the Old and New Testaments and from the latest writings of theologians, mostly since 1960. Further, he often presents natural-law arguments under the form of how the matter supports or betrays the image of God in which man is created. Still further indications are given as to how a sin works against the agent's own perfection of personality and against the love of God and of neighbor. He does not claim to give solutions to all questions, but rather to furnish the data for a reasonable theological judgment. In this he succeeds very well on important questions where there can be and is a difference of opinion among Catholic theologians. The bibliography on all such subjects is quite extensive in several languages, including English.

For a reader with a moderate facility in German, the Lexikon is easy reading. The style is simple. Latin equivalents of technical terms are a help to anyone brought up on traditional Catholic terminology. Abbreviations are plentiful but are either obvious or explained in an introductory page. There are ample cross references.

When H. presents his own opinions, and sometimes even in the manner of presenting his data, he would be placed by this reviewer in the category of an updated, somewhat liberal traditionalist or somewhat conservative situationist. His direct treatment of situational ethics shows that he rejects the extreme of some modern Catholic moralists of denying all moral absolutes other than the love of God. Nevertheless he appeals occasionally to individual situations for possible exceptions to what has been traditionally considered a moral absolute. This he seems to do in treating contraception. Nevertheless he holds to the tra-
ditional line of outlawing all direct abortion and all deliberate, formal lying. On this last-mentioned subject, he seems to have updated his previous opinion on lying in admitting that a lie in the strict sense can only occur when there is formal speech or full appearance of communication.

This volume is a worth-while addition to a theological library, if for no other reason than its copious bibliographical listings of modern periodical literature. It can be further recommended as a good and fair treatment of current questions in moral theology.

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley

JOSEPH J. FARRAHER, S.J.


These two volumes represent the labors of three priests who wished to help other priests reflect on some basic themes in moral theology. Originally the chapters appeared in the journal Collectanea Mechliniensia during the academic year 1964–65, but unlike most collections of journal articles there is no overlapping; on the contrary, it appears as if the authors outlined their over-all plan well ahead of time and worked in close collaboration. As a result these two volumes of fundamental theology illustrate haute vulgarisation at its best.

Since one of the fundamental questions of moral theology is how man lives the life of God in Christ, this work wishes to study man in his moral development from three fundamental points of view: how personal values relate to the commandments; the relationship, the foundation, and the meaning of conscience and authority; finally, the moral development of man throughout his life. The elaboration of this plan runs as follows. In Vol. 1 there is an introductory discussion of Christian morality and the modern world, a description of morality in terms of dynamics, a study of general moral values and their relation to concrete norms of activity, and an attempt at theological reflection to tie in the earlier discussion with the specific demands of Christian revelation. Vol. 2 takes up the question of conscience and its formation, the development of a moral sense through life, and a discussion of morality and particular arts. The books end with a rather beautiful essay by D’Hoogh entitled “Notes marginales sur l’amour et la charité.”

The above, in general, is the main thrust of the book but says nothing about it with respect to content. First, a few favorable words. One cannot but be impressed by the effort that these theologians have made to use the insights of other disciplines in order to more adequately deal
with their subject. They are obviously influenced by the personalism that has done so much to render moral theology more credible in our day. Thus, in his discussion of natural law, D'Hoogh does not appeal to any abstraction in which to found natural law; he appeals to the very structure of the human person: "Natural law is the totality of demands that the unique and inalienable dignity of the human person imposes on the liberty of man" (1, 108). When the discussion is less philosophical and more theological, the major influences (if footnotes are a fair indicator) seem to be Schillebeeckx, Fuchs, Janssens, Dondeyne, and Häring. Nor do the authors appear reluctant to stray even further afield to illuminate their ideas. Thus, Anciaux has a very suggestive essay on the question of collegiality and responsibility that makes abundant use of the theoreticians of group dynamics, leadership theory, and the problems of organization. I found this particular essay quite good and thoughtful.

Now, a negative word or two. While reading these two volumes I was also reading Rollo May's new work Love and Will (New York: Norton, 1969). The amazing thing about May's book is its ability to take rather complex theories and issues and render them usable in a life situation. You can tell people (or counsel them, if you will) things gleaned from May's book that make sense existentially for them. The volumes under review—and, proh dolor, much of moral theology, even the best of it—often fail to do this. These essays, intended for priests for their pastoral formation, simply move too academically in language and conception. The fundamental questions of conscience, law, obedience, subjectivity, are burning issues today for many people, especially the young; they are not merely philosophical problems or theological tangles. I do not want to sound anti-intellectual, but the academic air hangs a bit heavily over these essays meant for pastoral renewal.

In summary: these two volumes represent a fine summary of Catholic thinking on fundamental issues of moral theology from the perspective of personalism and the Christocentric approach to moral theology pioneered by Gillemac, Häring, and others. What they lack in pastoral passion is compensated for in the steadiness of the scholarship; the volumes should be read with this in mind.

Florida State University

Lawrence Cunningham


In 1800 there were not more than 50 cities of 100,000 inhabitants; at present there are over 900. Today ⅓ of mankind lives in urban concent-
trations (5,000 or more inhabitants); by the century's end it will be \( \frac{3}{5} \).
In one generation the urban population reached in 7,000 years of civilized history will be quadrupled from 1 billion to 4 billion. Such a mutation during our own time ought to have its impact on theology. Is it not strange, then, that we find so little theological work on the city? As Comblin points out, what is often announced as a "theology of the city" treats of "urban society" in the abstract (Cox, Greinacher) rather than of the concrete reality of the city: human beings related in their bodies, homes, factories, roads. It is to this concrete reality that C. directs himself.

The book is long, dense, labyrinthine, and at times repetitious. A preliminary chapter sets out the main themes. There follows a lengthy chapter on the principles of theological method, which C. borrows from Grelot (Sens chrétien d'Ancien Testament): the "divine pedagogy," the "dialectic of the divine economy," and "typology." These he relates to the traditional three "laws," pagan, Mosaic, and Christian, at the same time extending Grelot's categories beyond the Scriptures to include prebiblical and extrabiblical realities.

"Histoire théologique de la ville" is an application of this method to the city (e.g., Babylon, the pagan city, is the affirmation, Israel is the negation, of the myth and idolatry of the pagan city, and the New Jerusalem will be the definitive overcoming of the dialectic—which remains to an extent in the Church). This whole chapter is rich and incapable of summary here. "La cité de Dieu" treats of the eschatological city, particularly under the rubric of reconciliation. "La ville des hommes" is a consideration of some aspects of the human reality of the city. Here naturally C. relies heavily on his sources, notably Lewis Mumford, G. Bardet, and LeCorbusier. From the latter he borrows the notion of the human body as the starting point for reflection on the relationships between men in cities. With many urbanists C. sees the medieval city as a kind of high point followed by a decline, particularly with the rise of the absolutist state, which arrogates politics to itself and thus ignores the "art of building the city." He urges the replacement of abstract ideologies of power with the concrete task: the construction of a truly human city.

Some will flip immediately to chap. 5, "L'Eglise et la ville," for C.'s ideas on the pastoral consequences of urbanization. His historical and theological critique of the parish is devastating. For C., the local church is not the parish nor even the Eucharistic community, but the paroikia in such-and-such-a-city and which exists to serve it. What delimits the local church is not an ecclesiastical determination but the human reality
of the city. As a consequence, the local church is not built around the person of the bishop but is related to the whole city, served by the presbyterium, centered in the bishop. C. quite disagrees with recent simplifications of Church history into a primitive "pure" period, followed by a fifteen-century Constantinian interval and the emerging "religionless" diasporism. In the urban society of antiquity the Church lived the eschatological destiny of the city in its local communities. In the medieval city the Church worked through the whole fabric of life. The dechristianization of society C. situates in the tacit agreement on the part of the churches to limit themselves to the "supernatural" (and by definition nonpolitical), which left the field open to the absolutisms of baroque society. Today we are called to make a new creative response to the city. In a final chapter C. proposes some reflections on secularization and on the city as a way to the sacred and to God.

No short review can communicate the richness of this book; for C. is often most illuminating and most provocative in digressions, e.g., his suggestion that the course of theology might have been altered had Aquinas discovered Aristotle's Politics early in his career. His use of history enriches the background of practically every question, and he often relativizes apparent absolutes both old and recent, e.g., the facile use of the polarity Volkskirche-Gemeinderkirche. He is particularly virulent against naive theologies of secularization, elaborated prematurely and without doing the sociological homework. Our much-touted homo technicus is submitted to rigorous interrogation and found to be a myth. C.'s experience in Latin America as well as Europe enables him to make some interesting commentaries on the crisis of urbanization in the Third World. (What about urbanization in Marxist countries?) This reviewer would like to have seen his ethical commentary, which is spread throughout all sections of the book, developed into a more systematic ethic of urbanization.

Although he offers some principles of method, C.'s approach does not seem to be methodological in the same sense as is the work of men anchored in a metatheology such as transcendental method. His background is Scripture, but he tends to root his treatment in historical and sociological perspective as well.

Of late we have heard the call for a "political" theology, though some who shout loudest have yet to produce such a creature. Here we have theological work which is political—religion for those concerned about building the city.

Republic of Panama

PHILLIP E. BERRYMAN

As Auntie Mame summed it up, "Life's a feast, but the poor bastards are starving to death!" In this revised version of his Harvard Noble Lectures of 1968 (minus, unhappily, the "slides, movies, music, balloons, and dancing"), Cox endorses Mame's verdict. The industrialized West suffers from festive malnutrition. Profitable asceticism is not enough. Cox does not repudiate The Secular City's updated manifesto for the Puritan ethic; the present work should be read as the Catholic and soulful supplement to the godly reconstructionism of the earlier work.

Cox retrieves the medieval Feast of Fools for his title, thereby symbolizing his ecumenical intent to reclaim baggage hastily and unwisely cast overboard during the shipwreck of the sixteenth century. He devotes his attention to meditation, mysticism, prayer, and ritual, the recreative "works" of festival and fantasy which he deems essential to the survival and vitality of our harried, overachieving Western spirits. Though the institutional Church takes its usual licks at his hands, he draws heavily on Catholic authors: Hugo Rahner, Josef Pieper, Romano Guardini, William Lynch. (Protestant literature on homo ludens is admittedly scarce. He does not explore Orthodox iconology.) The mystic and communal experiments of our alienated youth, Cox realizes, have ample precedent in Christian monasticism. At the same time, they testify to a growing revulsion with the making, self-making, consuming, self-consuming, ideal man, whose relaxation and recreation consist of mere diversion.

There is no question but that Cox has his finger on important raw nerves within our hurried lives; few will dissent from his thesis that the atrophy of festive and imaginative powers has left us one-dimensional and out of touch with our own deeps, and that this impoverishment is related to our sense of God's absence. The up-tight will not see God. Unfortunately, the publisher does not supply a do-it-yourself Corita kit to bolster Cox's random aperçus. If extended theological reflection has a part to play in awakening us from spiritual anesthesia, Cox does not do a very effective job in furnishing it. Theologically, the essays on "A Theology of Juxtaposition" and "Christ the Harlequin" are the richest in suggestion. But Cox fails to settle down and develop his own suggestions. This reader fantasied that he was being chauffeured at great speed through a foreign city, while Cox, the official guide, pointed out various historic monuments (many of which I'd heard of)
that one ought to view at close hand if only there were time. "It's Tues­
day, it must be Belgium!"

To those seeking conceptual clarification and depth probes that will
help them find a way past mere frivolity to genuine celebration, the
etuas will exasperate, virtually bibliographical rather than elucidatory.
Cox tells us what we need, announces a program of "juxtaposition"
which he claims will explode that impervious shell that conceals us
from ourselves and our God, but why no convincing sample of the
technique? He talks about a jester's maieutic, capable of "questioning
the self-evident," able to lead us out of the slough we're in (one thinks,
perhaps, of Kierkegaard or Erasmus), yet Cox himself plays observer,
summarizer, prophet, but jester hardly at all. Hence these essays are
essentially prologue; I hope Cox will someday soon cash in on their
promise.

Southern Methodist University

D. S. Toolan, S.J.

A Christian-Communist Dialogue. By Roger Garaudy and Quentin

This dialogue between the French Communist Roger Garaudy and
Fordham professor Quentin Lauer, S.J., is one of the most successful
attempts to establish contact between Christians and Communists.
Aside from the competence of the participants, its success is mainly due
to the formula itself: a genuine dialogue rather than the usual indi­
vidually prepared series of position papers. As a result, the readers ob­
tain a good idea of where Communism and Christianity stand in rela­
tion to each other, not just how they compare. Of course, dialogues
wander around peripatetically. This one is no exception. Problems dis­
­cussed in the beginning reappear at the end, repetitions abound, and
the division in topics seems to be somewhat of an afterthought. Only in
one aspect is there a rectilinear evolution: the tone develops straight
from the conciliatory to the acerbic, culminating in Garaudy's emo­
tional invective on American policy (representative of Christianity?)
and Lauer's severe indictment of the Berlin wall and the Russian inter­
vention in Hungary. Yet the aggressiveness results from a commendable
refusal to water down one's position for ecumenical purposes.

Debates inevitably induce in the audience a desire to hand out a
prize. I would give two. In the dialogue part Lauer is unquestionably
the better man. The concise, cutting remarks and rejoinders of the
Jesuit are simply more "dialectical" than the monological expositions
of the dialectician Garaudy. G.'s drawback is that he does not answer
the questions. (Of course, L. gave him a chance to get away with this by asking too many at once.) He rather speaks apropos of the questions or, when a particularly thorny problem has been uncovered, he says the Christians have a similar one. L., on the other hand, never turns down a question: he seems to feel confident that his quick wit is not matched by G.'s didacticism. Yet in his own ponderous way G. deserves our praise for his systematic exposition of ideas, especially in his reinterpretation of practice and history in Marxist thought.

The dialoguers are more concerned with honest confrontation than with agreement. Differences are not covered up but systematically searched out, nuances are given their full weight, the central purpose is constantly kept in view. That purpose is to allow the two positions to face each other in order to learn from each other and perhaps, after due correction of their positions, to discover a higher area of agreement. Most successful in this respect is probably the first part, on the opposition between Christianity and Communist humanism. L. asks: Is it inevitable that as a humanism Marxism must look upon religion as a dehumanizing, "alienating" force? Marx rules out the possibility of a religious faith continuing to exist in the mature Communist society. Yet G. hedges on this point. He rejects all state atheism as conflicting with the spirit of Marx and ascribes the tensions of Communist regimes with the churches to their connections with counterrevolutionary forces. He also appreciates that Christians regard another alienation, inherent in human nature itself, as more fundamental than the socioeconomic alienation which the revolution must eliminate. Yet he remains vague on the crucial question of whether religion itself must still be regarded as an alienation by the contemporary Marxist. For him, the task of Communism will not be finished until it has integrated the aspirations of the believer. But, as L. interprets him, this will occur only after these aspirations have ceased to be religious and become purely immanent strivings. Transcendence then is reduced to "the alienated expression of culture's going beyond nature." Simultaneously with this acceptance of Christian aspirations G. sees new possibilities for agreement in Barth's theory of radical discontinuity of God and man; for such a theory fully protects the creative activity of man and makes faith into a partner in the fight against religious alienation. Unfortunately, G.'s embrace of both theories at once leads to the paradox which L. is quick to point out, that on the one hand Christianity is expected to become a theology of earthly values in which all transcendence disappears, and on the other hand faith must radically transcend these same values.
While the first part of the dialogue took place mainly on the Christian side, the section on morality and history moves over to Communist territory. The main issue here is the validity of the practice norm. L.'s problem is that if historical practice becomes the norm of what is good, the real is identified with the ideal in the worst real-political tradition and one historical appearance becomes as good as another. G. rejects this interpretation as too simplistic. What characterizes the Marxist practice, according to him, is not that certain things are being done, but that they are done as the result of a choice based upon a general conception of human life and history. This conception is not speculative, in the sense that it sets no a priori or God-given standards of value. It is nevertheless an ideal criterion insofar as the ideal is itself an integral moment of the real development of history. "From the theoretical point of view the ideal, at each moment of history, is the rigorous determination of a human possible based on a contradiction present in the real; from the practical point of view the ideal is the demand that this possible be actualized" (p. 105). Thus socialism is neither a moral demand nor the automatic outcome of the present reality, but a method capable of overcoming capitalism's contradiction. As such, it is an ideal born out of actual history. Nazism, on the contrary, did not resolve the existing social contradictions but rather aggravated them. It therefore is not ideal, although it appeared in human history—as a reversion to the past.

Yet, L. questions again, how can we distinguish an authentic choice from an inauthentic one before its realization? What enables the Communist to consider certain events in accordance with history and others not? Is it not a universal criterion inspired by an a priori view of human nature? The problem becomes particularly acute when the decision must be left to one political party. On what basis can the individual adopt its view of history? Moreover, if the revolution as understood by this party is the only right course of action, how are "deviations" such as what is now called Stalinism possible? How can any previous decision of the party be declared to be wrong when the party was the only criterion for the reading of history as well as for the decisions to guide it? Finally, if the party makes true "choices," what happens to the so-called "scientific" (and inevitable) character of historical development which G. upholds with his fellow Communists? This last question brings up an old antinomy in Marx's dialectic which G.'s humanist interpretation has not succeeded in eliminating from it. Under L.'s persistent questioning he defines as scientific what the experience of the working classes reveals about the contradictions in the present social-economic
situation and about the real options to solve these contradictions. But situations may be interpreted in many ways by a number of workers. Who decides which are the historically enlightened workers? Why is the party's interpretation, although usually based upon very few "workers," the only valid one? Why are the less violent and less restrictive solutions which more workers advocate historically "inauthentic"? G.'s answer is that the Communist solution has proven successful. This is unquestionably true, but what does it teach us about right and wrong as long as alternatives have not been tried or have been brutally eliminated? The entire argument then seems to rest upon the latius hos: since capitalism in the past has not been satisfactory, Communism must be true. The simplicity of this reasoning appears nowhere more clearly than when two honest and intelligent opponents freely discuss it.

*Georgetown University*

**LOUIS DUPRÉ**


To one who has the task of teaching a survey course on Roman Catholicism on the college level, the first of many frustrations arises in the search for a suitable textbook. The protean nature of postconciliar Catholic thought has driven many to the use of a variety of paperbacks, but there is always the lingering desire for a handy volume that could serve as a general introduction to Catholicism. Using *The New Catechism* is one solution, but my experience has shown that, despite its inestimable value as catechesis, *The New Catechism* still tends to appear to students (especially to non-Catholics) as idealized and hortatory, with a corresponding lack of focus on the actual Catholic experience; it is, in short, catechesis and not phenomenology. Theo Westow has recently published *Introducing Contemporary Catholicism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1968), but W.'s book is more an extended contemporary commentary on the main thrusts of Vatican II, with little attention to either actual Catholic practice or the historical antecedents of contemporary Catholicism.

It is because of this lacuna in survey books on the Catholic Church that John McKenzie's volume is so welcome. In his introduction McK. carefully delineates the scope and limitation of the book: "My effort is to describe Roman Catholicism as it exists at the time of this writing, with as much attention as possible given to the processes by which it became what it is" (p. xii). Organizing his book around four major divisions (structure, worship, beliefs, works), he attempts to both de-
scribe these facets of Catholicism and, at the same time, indicate how they are distinctively Roman Catholic.

It is a tribute to McK.'s disciplined prose that he is able to include so much information in a relatively short book without getting bogged down in trivia. To cite one example, in his discussion of the Eucharist one can find not only an exposition of scriptural and doctrinal formulations, but concise explanations of speculative attempts to come to grips with the Eucharist that range from the classical position of Maurice de la Taille on the Mass as "mystical mactation" to a summary of the transubstantiation/transignification debate over the nature of sacramental change.

Yet one should not get the impression that this book is just a well-written compendium of Catholic belief and practice. Those familiar with McK.'s writings would be surprised (and probably disappointed) if he remained the dispassionate chronicler. He can criticize, and throughout the book he does. Faithful to his intention of presenting the phenomenon of Catholicism as it actually exists today, he does not hesitate to indicate the manifestations of what Hans Küng has called the "unnature" of the Church: ossified structures, essentialistic thinking, the gap between the imperatives of the gospel and the actual reality of ecclesiastical practice.

One final note. McK.'s section on "The Works of the Church," a wide-ranging discussion on the canonization of saints, schools, charitable institutions, the missions, the parish, preaching, etc., is an extremely good chapter if only to give a "feel" for the Catholic experience. In fact, if I were to fault the book, it would be in that McK. did not expand this section and try to draw out more clearly the Catholic experience, the sense or "feel" of being a Catholic. It may have been outside the scope of his book, but it is a much-neglected area of writing, and McK. has at least shown that it may be a viable approach to understanding Catholicism. I suppose what I am asking for is a study of Catholicism similar to Van der Leeuw's *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*. In this day of the Church's "identity crisis" it would be an interesting book to read.

In summary: this is an extremely readable and reliable guide to contemporary Catholicism that would well serve both the individual reader and the college class. I can pay it no higher tribute than to adopt it for my students, and that I intend to do.

*Florida State University*  
LAWRENCE CUNNINGHAM
THE BIBLE READER: AN INTERFAITH INTERPRETATION. Prepared by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., Arthur Gilbert, Rolfe LANIER HUNT, and J. CARTER SWAIM. New York: Bruce, 1969. $7.95; $3.95 paper. This splendid ecumenical project, while by no means the complete Bible, offers its readers a generously broad selection of those biblical passages which, in the judgment of the editors, have for centuries been the strength, inspiration, and comfort of millions. “What portions of the Bible best contribute to an understanding of our history, our literature, our culture?... What passages of our Bible would acquaint the Christian with Jewish practices at Rosh Hashanah, or Passover, in the synagogue and at home? What portions of Scripture would help the Jew know what Christians affirm at Christmas or Easter?” These are some of the questions the volume attempts to answer. The answers are given largely in long citations from the Scriptures, preceded and followed by editorial explanations of the context in which the chosen passages occur in the original and of the significance both Jews and Christians of varying religious backgrounds have discovered in them.

Broadly speaking, the biblical quotations are given in the Revised Standard version. This has, however, been paralleled on occasion by other English versions, notably that of the Jewish Publication Society’s 1917 English translation of the Bible and its more recent 1962 version of the Torah. (One of the six very helpful appendixes is an excellent brief study of “The Bible in English Translation.”) It would be difficult to quarrel with the editorial choices of the scriptural passages given at length and discussed from the several points of view represented by the editors. The explanations are calculated to bring new knowledge and understanding of the Bible itself and of contemporary as well as traditional Jewish and Christian approaches to the religious meaning and value of the sections chosen. How much Jew and Christian together share from the scriptural story of God’s love for the universe and mankind which He brought into being, how deeply the divine plan for the salvation of all His children has influenced the world of our ancestors and the world of today—all this can hardly fail to emerge with new urgency from the careful study of this work.

John F. Sweeney, S.J.

A RIGID SCRUTINY: CRITICAL ESSAYS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By Ivan ENGnell. Edited and translated by John T. Willis with Helmer Ringgren. NASHVILLE: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 1969. Pp. xiv + 303. $10.00. E., who died in 1964, was a gifted, influential Swedish biblical scholar. His spirited espousal of the “traditio-historical” method of OT research has left him a controversial figure among scriptural scholars. This book offers an English version of thirteen essays contributed by him to the Swedish Bible Encyclopedia in 1962. In their present form they sum up for English readers the essentials of the cause he so strongly defended. The first article exposes the essential idea of the traditio-historical methodology, contrasting it with the widely accepted literary-historical approach to OT study. The “history of tradition” method is described as “an analytical method which demands a thoroughly unprejudiced reconsideration of all aspects” of the OT. Its special stress is on the oral tradition which, the theory emphasizes, lies behind all the written texts. Research which confines itself to the literary-historical analysis of the texts as writ-
ten literature is foredoomed to failure precisely because it neglects the all-important oral tradition.

The remaining essays carry this basic principle into practice. After introductory considerations on "The Science of Religion" and "Old Testament Religion," the essays analyze the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the Prophets and Propheticism, the New Year Festivals, the Exodus, the Wilderness Wandering, the Messiah, the Son of Man, and the Figurative Language of the OT. From these articles it soon becomes clear that E.'s conception of the history-of-tradition method embraces much more than the special place and importance it gives to the oral tradition embodied in written texts. It demands, in addition, careful attention to the mythical and cultic traditions and their influence on the final literary form of the OT documents, as well as a comparative study of pertinent materials from similar literature of Israel's neighbors. It is obvious that this English-language version of E.'s writings will be of special interest to the biblical scholar. And only the serious student of the biblical sciences will be able to offer a final judgment on the validity of E.'s position. The translation is clear and flows smoothly.

John F. Sweeney, S.J.

THE WAY IN THE WILDERNESS: EXODUS, WILDERNESS AND MOSES THEMES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW. By Augustine Stock, O.S.B. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1969. Pp. xii + 156. $4.75. There is a standing need to mediate the conclusions of technical biblical scholarship to the non-specialist, and to bring together observations of various scholars which bear on a single topic. Drawing on the biblical research of the late fifties, S. draws together what has been written concerning the influence of specific OT motifs on parts of the NT, primarily on the Gospels. The first of three parts points out the influence of Exodus motifs in such places as the Matthean infancy narrative, the Synoptic treatment of the temptation of Jesus, as well as in the Transfiguration and Institution narratives. In the second, and best, part S. shows how the events of the wilderness wanderings influence the Synoptic Gospels, and attempts a bit of redaction criticism by indicating Mt's and Lk's modification of the Markan use of wilderness motifs. The wilderness theme was also used "to illustrate the general eschatological outlook of the New Testament" (p. 99). The early Church, like Israel in the desert, looked back upon an event of great deliverance, but had not yet reached the fulfillment of God's promise. The third part treats the influence of the figure of Moses in Jn.

A basic obscurity permeates the work. Since S. never distinguished clearly between Exodus, wilderness, and Moses motifs in the OT, his use of them in the NT as discrete themes becomes confused. E.g., the temptation of Jesus is treated as an Exodus motif, when in reality it is a wilderness motif. Though published in 1969, there is little awareness of any research done after 1962, and virtually no use of Continental scholarship. Though S. is very acute in detecting OT motifs in the NT, he is not very critical in his approach to the NT and shows little knowledge of form criticism or tradition history. In his work the NT emerges as a one-dimensional mosaic of OT motifs. Despite these reservations, the work should prove very helpful for one unaware of the pervasive influence of the OT on the NT. The general reader of the NT will find his understanding of many passages enriched by S.'s evocative suggestions.

John R. Donahue, S.J.

THE OPEN HEAVEN: THE REVELATION OF GOD IN THE JOHANNINE SAYINGS OF JESUS. By W. H. Cadman. Edited by
A posthumous work on John (yet another!) left in an unfinished state that required considerable editing by a former pupil. (The reader is not told where Cadman taught or when he died—facts that may be common knowledge in Great Britain but which should have been included for the sake of the provinces.) Caird deliberately does not choose to identify his editorial work, but assures us that in his labor of love he has tried not to alter Cadman’s ideas, even where he did not agree with them. It was not entirely clear to Caird whether Cadman intended to write a commentary on John or a book about the themes of the Gospel. What we have received is a statement of a principal thesis and a brief commentary on Jn 1–17 written to sustain the thesis. The thesis is that while the Logos existed with the Father from all eternity, the coming of the Logos into human flesh constituted Jesus the Son of God. Thus the Son of God, unlike the Logos, was not preincarnate. The Son of Man is yet another title to express the union of Jesus’ manhood with the Father. When the Spirit descended upon Jesus, He entered into the knowledge of His own heavenly origin and of God’s purpose in sending Him. The ascent of the Son of Man into heaven (3:13) is a way of describing the fact that Jesus came to know and to identify Himself with God’s will. His work of revelation was not concerned with the disclosure of preincarnate knowledge but dealt with the implications of His Sonship for men: He is to share it with those who believe.

By way of brief evaluation, the reviewer would judge that while this work will be of particular value to Cadman’s friends and pupils, it does not constitute a major contribution to Johannine studies, perhaps because of the circumstances under which it appears. While there are individual observations of merit, the thesis of the book is tenable only if one does not study the fourth Gospel in light of a literary criticism that detects layers of thought. For instance, the constant references to the Logos will seem exaggerated to scholars who think that the Prologue (where the sole references to the Logos appear) is an appended hymn not written by the author of the Gospel.

Raymond E. Brown, S.S.

JEWISH CHRISTIANITY: FACTIONAL DISPUTES IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By Hans-Joachim Schoeps. Translated by Douglas R. A. Hare. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969. Pp. xi + 163. $3.50. This volume and its German original (Das Judenchristentum, 1964) are a distillation of the research in Schoeps’s Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (Tübingen, 1949). S. has included in this shorter work, along with a convenient index to biblical and other ancient texts, an index of subjects treated, a glossary of terms, a convenient but extensive selected bibliography. For all its admittedly controversial points (e.g., the opposition of the Ebionites to Gnostic views), this book will give the reader perhaps the best possible available reconstruction of one of the offshoots of Jewish Christianity. Nevertheless, when S. holds that the Ebionites are a “legitimate development” of the Christian community, the reviewer’s criticism (especially in a theological journal) must focus on the criteria for judging legitimacy. Insofar as the historian of religions (and such is all S. professes to be) notes a phenomenological continuation of the community in this sect, he may perhaps term it a “legitimate development”—at least to the extent to which the historian of religions is able to recover the total set of faith
characteristics that marked the original community. Even so, he would do better to call this imperfectly discernible daughter community a de facto development of a particular set of characteristics. On the other hand, legitimacy can be understood from the theological standpoint by which one who "defines" the gospel sees it as the eschatological (final, definitive, enduring) personal communication of God to men in the unique person of His Son, this man Jesus Christ, who formed an eschatological community to continue to communicate His personal message to men. The Ebionites passed out of existence. They failed to continue to communicate the gospel—if, indeed, they ever really recognized Jesus as God's Son. On the score of their failure to continue the eschatological communication, even by the minimal standards of their failure to endure, they have proved themselves theologially to have been an illegitimate development.

Charles H. Giblin, S.J.

The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainies and Uncertainties. By Samuel Sandmel. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1969. Pp. 241. $6.00. An expanded version of three lectures given at the Dubuque Theological Seminary in 1967. Four chapters take up these topics: the significance of the first century, Palestinian Judaisms (note plural), Hellenistic Judaism, and Christianity. Extensive notes follow each chapter. The first traces the complex religious history of the Mediterranean world, with emphasis on the Jewish world, a necessary background for the understanding of Christianity. The second chapter concentrates on the varying forms that Judaism manifested in that century. The third chapter is written largely in the context of Philo's writings, an area in which S. is very much at home. The final chapter presents a Jewish view of the rise of Christianity, with attention given to the various NT writings. The book is noted for clarity of style, control of extensive literature, corrections to certain Christian interpretations of Rabbinism and Pharisaism, and general scholarly caution. Some reservations must be expressed. At times S.'s caution is extreme (he has shown this same caution in other writings). Scholarship, in areas where there are lacunae in our knowledge, must proceed by way of hypotheses. There can be dangers in refusing to construct them as well as in treating them as more than hypotheses. The possibly second-century dating of canonical Mark (p. 210, n. 29) is difficult to accept (admittedly S. does not treat this ex professo here). Also, the frequent designation of writings, including the Gospels, as midrash tends to deprive the word of any real meaning.

Eugene H. Maly

Die apologetische Methode bei Klemens von Alexandrien: Apologetik als Entfaltung der Theologie. By Johannes Bernard. Erfurter theologische Studien 21. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1968. Pp. xxi + 402. B. has chosen "apology" as a main-spring with which to unfold Clement's whole theology. Ethics, mysticism, or social teaching would have provided a similar starting point (p. 196), but today apologetics is of special significance as the meeting ground of world and faith, philosophy and theology. As a dialogue between Christianity and its alien environment, Clement's work can be related to the aggiornamento (p. 200). Rather than compose a compendium of Clement's apologetic tactics, B. seeks to "represent the apologetic method of Clement as the unfolding of a theology, which responds to its
environment, while it seeks to justify a Christian conviction of faith" (p. 1). In distinction from earlier writers, Clement's goal was to achieve the salvation of all he met, not only to defend Christianity and prove monotheism. Thus he advanced from the defensive apologetic of the earlier apologists and deepened the theological content of their arguments. Against the assertion of mere faith (Tertullian), Clement advocates a seeking (zêtësis) which may be lead to true knowledge (gnōsis).

B.'s study is divided into two parts: (Clement's) apologetic method against pagans and against heretical Gnostics. Though his aim in both cases was the same—the transmission of the saving knowledge and ultimately conversion—his methodology was necessarily different. To pagans he offered "synthesis" with no idea of syncretism. And he also accepted pagan philosophy as leading to Christ. Earlier, Aristides had utilized philosophical vocabulary for Christian concepts, and Justin had introduced philosophical concepts into Christianity; but Clement made an advance in the total openness with which he accepted philosophy. This B. calls his "method of contact," by which he tried to make biblical sayings comprehensible to the Greeks. With the Gnostics, on the other hand, Clement could not begin to harmonize. Facing their misuse of the Bible, he withdrew into the sanctuary of the Church and demanded exegesis based on Christian principles. He did not attempt to erect a counterpart to the developed Gnostic theologies, but was content to expose a few sects. He understood Gnosticism as a dissonant element within the harmony of theology. B.'s worthwhile study is in substantial agreement with the chapter (11) on apology in C. Mondesert's Clément d'Alexandrie (1944).

Margaret A. Schatkin

DAS MODERNE KATHOLISCHE LUTHER-BILD. By Werner Beyna. Essen: Luderus, 1969. Pp. 242. DM 26. With this seventh volume of the ecumenical series Koinonia, B. supplies a critical survey of German Catholic evaluations of Luther from the late nineteenth century down through 1967. Church historians and theologians receive most attention, but we also hear about Luther's image in school books, some popular periodicals, and occasional passages in the papal encyclicals of the era. B.'s great theme is the astounding revision of Catholic attitudes toward Luther. This has been related before, but not in so detailed a manner. B. shows that reform-minded Catholics had planted seeds of revision even before the jarring explosions of 1904 (Denifle) and 1911 (Grisar). Through the 1920's B. finds a series of discreet critics of Denifle and Grisar—along with much uncritical repetition of their theses. B. is good in calling attention to those who rank with Lortz as the pioneers of a new understanding of Luther's piety and theological protest: Adolph Herte, Konrad Algermissen, Robert Grosche (founder of the periodical Catholica), and Johannes Hessen.

However, B. had the bad fortune to write his book at the very time in which Luther's life and theology were under even more intense scrutiny by Catholic scholars. B. lists some of these more recent works, both in his last chapter and in his 25-page bibliography, but he did not have sufficient perspective to delineate clearly the new lines of approach. B. carries on a running argument with Catholic critics of Luther, and does not seem ready to admit that some of their points may be justly made. Where he goes beyond straight exposition to argue with Catholic evaluations of Luther, we feel the need of some indication of how contemporary Protestant scholars were then handling the same material. Were they not often caught up in blatant hero worship? Did they not frequently
stress elements in Luther's thought most opposed to the Catholic Church of their day? Were they not also very often polemical in speaking of Catholic doctrine, worship, and piety? One suspects that the earlier Catholic critics of Luther—even in the 1930's—were much more men of their times than B. adverts to in his survey.

Jared Wicks, S.J.

CALVINISM AND THE AMYRAUT HERESY: PROTESTANT SCHOLASTICISM AND HUMANISM IN SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE. By Brian G. Armstrong. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1969. Pp. xx + 330. $12.50. Amyraldianism is a chapter in the history of French Calvinism and it is expertly delineated by Dr. Armstrong of Georgia State College. The study of Amyraldianism is the study of tensions: tensions between humanism and scholasticism, between the practico-ethical and the philosophico-speculative, between the thought of Calvin and that of Calvinism. Modern research has shown that the Reformation had not forsaken scholasticism; even before Calvin's death its elements were found in Peter Martyr Vermigli and Theodore Beza. By the seventeenth century Protestant scholasticism was in power, and in reaction the theologians of Saumur, e.g., John Cameron and Moise Amyraut (1586-1664), dedicated themselves to its purification. Amyraut constructed his theology on the foundations laid by his teacher, Cameron, and insisted on faithfulness to the teaching of Calvin. Since Amyraut's opinions on predestination and related topics were in open conflict with the understanding of the same by orthodox scholastic Calvinists, e.g., du Moulin, he was brought to trial and acquitted.

This is a work in historical theology. A. begins by setting the theological background for Amyraut's coming on the scene at Saumur, adds a brief biography and a calm account of his trial. A.'s readers will be grateful for this background material, but they will find especially valuable his study of Amyraut's theology, particularly on predestination. A. concludes that Amyraut's position was consistent with the emphases of Calvin. Seventeenth-century Calvinism had so separated itself from Calvin that he was only rarely quoted in the theological writings of the time. The book as two appendices as important as the text and is enriched by an extensive bibliography. A. is to be commended, not only for offering us a much-needed scholarly work on Amyraut, but also for his masterful method in summing up Amyraldian research and continuing where Moltmann left off in his doctoral dissertation. The publisher is also to be commended for adding another title to its growing list of monographs on Calvin and Calvinism.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.

PATTERNS OF REFORMATION. By Gordon Rupp. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969. Pp. xxi + 427. $9.50. The primary figures of the Reformation have all had their lives and works as subjects of studies in English, but not so the equally courageous secondary Reformers. R. offers studies of four such men: Oecolampadius, Karlstadt, Müntzer, and Vadianus. With a historian's accuracy R. has so blended biography and doctrine that he has achieved a book scholarly in its details and fascinating in its narrative. Each of these Reformers had a distinct pattern in his reform activities. Vadianus, who receives the briefest treatment and is the only layman in the group, contributed to the reform of St. Gall precisely as a layman. Oecolampadius is the student who turned divine, gained a hearing in Basle, and became its leading Reformer because of his scholarship in patristics. Karlstadt's pattern seems to have been
unique in the sixteenth century, and it surely brought about his break with Luther. R. sees Karlstadt as a puritan, advocating a reform which anticipated the seventeenth-century Puritanism of England. Müntzer is the rebel, an intriguing individual of whom it is said that he had more originality than all the other radicals put together. The reader will meet four divergent patterns; yet he will discover the underlying coherence which led these men towards the goals of the Reformation.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.

**Thomas More et la Bible: La place des livres saints dans son apologétique et sa spiritualité.** By Germain Marc'hadour. Paris: Vrin, 1969. Pp. xviii + 586. The first full-length study of the Bible's role in the life and writings of St. Thomas More and a useful addition to the literature on More. M. provides a biography of More, relating both the man and his country to the Continental intellectual and spiritual movements. M. treats More's use of the Bible in his humanism, his polemical writings, and his own spiritual life. Nor are the theological questions of the day overlooked; M. investigates More's hermeneutic and his (favorable) views on vernacular translations. The picture emerges of a brilliant and saintly man who shared the humanistic desire to return to the Greek and Hebrew sources, who appreciated the medieval exegesis of multiple senses, who utilized the Scriptures in argument and polemic, but who always saw the Scriptures primarily as a guide for the spiritual life and was anxious that the holy books be made available, via vernacular translations, for the spiritual lives of others. The book is well documented, especially with references to and quotes from primary sources; it also includes a large bibliography in which the entries are listed chronologically, from 1477 to the present, and a helpful index of scriptural passages cited in the text.

Joseph F. Kelly

**The Church as Enemy: Anticlericalism in Nineteenth Century French Literature.** By Joseph N. Moody. Washington: Corpus, 1968. Pp. viii + 305. $10.00. M., while acknowledging the very remote origins of French anticlericalism and its powerful role in the Revolution of 1789, finds it generating a special mythic stereotype of the Catholic Church in the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth. This process was both a symptom and a cause of the crystallization of a mentalité collective reflected in many areas of French life. Particularly instrumental and indicative was the image of the Church embodied in many of the novels of the time, from Stendhal (1783-1842) through Anatole France (1844-1924). Political and social events energize this literary anticlericalism as presented by M.: the resistance of the Church to the Revolution, its apparent sponsorship of the Bourbon Restoration, ultramontanism (seen as betraying not only the nation but the French Church itself), the venality of the Third Empire (partly symbolized by Napoleon III's acceptance of Lourdes), and, above all, the Dreyfus affair, in which the Church (according to these critics) joined hands with the bourgeois and the army in the cause of injustice.

M. does not fail to note in all this much emotional irrationality joined to notably shrewd diagnoses. Even the two ralliements were treated ipso facto as conspiracies rather than as adaptations to the modern world. Priests and clerics, and sometimes unsavory types of dévots, are used by this array of novelists as carriers of
the mythic image; through them the Church is blamed for almost everything wrong with France, from alcoholism to a lack of sanitation. In trying to account for this sort of syndrome in a whole group of extremely gifted writers, who were also humane men and intellectuals (not "meaner minds pursuing ideologies of frustration"), M. suggests that they were social optimists, deeply pained by the intransigence of circumstances and by the infuriatingly slow pace of change, and venting their wrath on the Church as mythic enemy (not totally without reason); in their version, the Church enslaved men's minds, violated their natures (especially by celibacy), and, through political and social totalitarianism, 'shocked all generous French initiatives towards improvement of human welfare.  

Marie Louise Martinez, R.S.C.J.  

The Modern Schism: Three Paths to the Secular. By Martin E. Marty. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 191. $5.95. A genuinely fresh approach to the problem of secularization. M. argues that in the middle decades of the nineteenth century (1830-70) the Western Church divided into mutually opposing parties: one group devoted itself to religious and ecclesiastical concerns, the other was increasingly preoccupied with the secular. He calls this phenomenon "the modern schism": "modern" because it occurred during that period when the Western nations went "over the hump of transition" towards a new ethos of industrial enterprise, urbanization, and nationalism, accompanied by various programs and creeds which helped constitute the modern world, such as liberalism, evolutionism, socialism, and historicism; a "schism" insofar as this new secularization did not cause the disappearance of religion so much as its relocation. M. establishes that the secular has been approached and appropriated in vastly different ways in different segments of Western culture and that these ways have shaped our understanding throughout the present century. There have, in fact, been three separate paths to the secular: (1) utter, or maximal, secularity; (2) mere secularity; (3) controlled secularity. M. devotes a chapter to each.  

The strongest attack against traditional Christianity came in Western Europe behind such proclamations as "God is dead!" The Christian legacy was written off as bad faith, enslavement, and falsehood. Although by the end of these crucial middle decades God, Church, and Christian culture had not been suppressed completely, each survived only in carefully sequestered corners, dealing with rigidly segregated aspects of life. German theology initiated the most ambitious attempt anywhere to bridge the developing schism between traditional Christianity and the new secular culture, but the effort essentially failed. On the one hand, the period was the most creative since the Protestant Reformation; on the other, the tradition of modern unbelief and atheism did emerge and Christians were powerless to thwart it.  

In England the schism happened gradually and quietly without doctrinal or ideological fanfare and controversy. The Industrial Revolution had radically altered the social, economic, and political texture of the country. People had become tired, thoughtless, and distracted; old parochial forms had lost their functions and old appeals had lost their drama. Religion offered little and seemed superfluous. The response of ecclesiastical leadership to the new social problems was halting at best, narrowly conservative at worst. Whole classes of people, laborers and intellectuals alike, found God
and the churches irrelevant to their everyday, mundane pursuits. And so religion receded as a seriously influential force in British life.

In the U.S. the path to secularity was controlled and manipulated. In the new social contract, religion was confined to the personal, familial, and leisureed sectors of life, while the public and political dimensions were to become autonomous or to pass under the control of other kinds of tutelage. This accepted new contract, M. insists, was a novelty in Western culture, even though it has come to be regarded as normative by many contemporary Christians in America, especially those of a conservative persuasion. Ironically, institutional religion not only survived but greatly expanded; however, it no longer provided the integrating principles for social, political, economic, and cultural life.

The story of "the modern schism" has not been told before, even though there is an abundance of literature on its various components (M. provides a 32-page bibliographical essay at the end of the book). The modern schism has been overlooked, M. suggests, because it is often seen mistakenly as a mere consequence or aftereffect of the Enlightenment. Ironically, institutional religion not only survived but greatly expanded; however, it no longer provided the integrating principles for social, political, economic, and cultural life.

The story of "the modern schism" has not been told before, even though there is an abundance of literature on its various components (M. provides a 32-page bibliographical essay at the end of the book). The modern schism has been overlooked, M. suggests, because it is often seen mistakenly as a mere consequence or aftereffect of the Enlightenment. M.'s thesis challenges this assumption. This is an imaginative work, clearly argued and carefully documented. It is M. at his best.

Richard P. McBrien


However, we soon become aware that this study is a "transformation" also in another sense: it simplifies K.'s ideas. The philosophical background indispensable for a full grasp of his thought is almost entirely missing. This is painfully evident in the introductory discussion of the "self." But even the central concept of imitation lacks historical perspective. How did K. reach this idea? Why is it so important to his thinking? These questions remain largely unanswered. Historical perspective is not the only thing missing; with the dialogue has disappeared the dialectic of his thought. D. has carefully read the texts, classified and analyzed them. But the dialectical movement out of which these texts emerge is no longer visible. K.'s thought is too much presented as a loosely connected number of views on disparate topics, a method not altogether surprising in a thesis made under a mentor who in the preface compares K.'s "explanations" to the language games of Wittgenstein. My most basic objection, however, is that the evolution of K.'s thought from "hidden inwardness" to outward imitation is not reflected here. This evolution, which appears clearly in the diaries, is essential for understanding the movement of his thinking. Because of these reservations I would call the study more a promise than an achievement. Yet, the clarity of D.'s thinking, his familiarity with K.'s work, and his engaging style make me feel sure that some day he will deliver an excellent work.

Louis Dupré

De initio potestatis primatialis Romani pontificis. By Jesus Hortal Sanchez, S.J. Analecta Gregoriana
Canon 219 of the Code states: "The Roman Pontiff, legitimately elected, acquires supreme power of jurisdiction, iure divino, from the moment he accepts the election." The author of this doctoral dissertation attempts to reconcile this statement with the teaching of Lumen gentium 21 that "episcopal consecration, together with the office of sanctifying, also confers the offices of teaching and governing" and with its prefatory note asserting that "in consecration is given an ontological participation in sacred functions." There seems to be a contradiction between the Code and Vatican II if one accepts canon 219 as true in the absolute sense, i.e., as applying not merely to our present-day situation, in which the elected pope is already a bishop, but also to the situation prevailing during the first nine centuries of the Church's history, during which time elected popes received the fulness of the priesthood only after their election. (To date, this has been the common understanding of this canon.) Gregory the Great (590-604) is cited as the first clear example of a pope allegedly exercising primatial authority while not yet a bishop, and Clement V (1305-14) is the earliest source cited for canon 219. Tracing the history of the matter between these two papacies, S. proves conclusively that popes who had not yet received the fulness of the priesthood did not consider themselves to have, and did not have in fact, full primatial authority. This historical study should prove of considerable importance in the further study the recent Synod directed to be made regarding the relationship between primacy and collegiality. The role of the individual bishop with respect to the universal Church becomes clearer if, in fact, in his episcopal ordination he acquires some ontological participation in that function which the pope exercises over the whole Church.

Maurice B. Walsh, S.J.

The Modernist Crisis: Von Hügel. By John J. Heaney, S.J. Washington: Corpus, 1968. Pp. 304. $8.50. Concentrating on von Hügel's theological relationships with Loisy, Blondel, Tyrrell, and the Roman magisterium, H. shows that while von Hügel was a co-ordinator of Modernism insofar as it can be said to have existed as a planned international movement, he rejected many of its characteristic positions, such as agnosticism and immanence. In the name of the autonomy of scientific history, he protested against the condemnation of Loisy, and, under the influence of Protestant biblical scholarship, he openly questioned many traditional Catholic views with reference to matters such as the Virgin Birth, the human consciousness of Jesus, Jesus' expectations of an early parousia, and the historicity of the empty tomb. Without denying the infallibility of the magisterium in dogma, von Hügel warned against excessive institutionalization in the Church and sought to safeguard the mystical element in religion. Since he wrestled with problems that are still with us, it is helpful to have this carefully researched study. H. is sympathetic but moderately critical. The presentation lacks clarity of outline and is overloaded with detail, but it contains many exact and interesting points of information about an outstanding lay theologian who can still be studied with profit.

Avery Dulles, S.J.

The Church in the Theology of Karl Barth. By Colm O'Grady, M.S.C. Washington: Corpus, 1968. Pp. x + 366. $10.00. O'G.'s aim here is the faithful exposition of
Barth’s ecclesiology. This volume is to be followed by a second one in which he will present his reflections as a Roman Catholic upon Barth’s ecclesiology. It contains no surprises. The general lines of Barth’s ecclesiology are well known. All aspects of Barth’s thought are intimately related and interdependent. If one seeks to understand his doctrine on the Church, he must consider it in relation to his doctrine on election, Jesus Christ, and justification. O’G. does just this. According to Barth, Jesus Christ is both electing God and the elected man. Included in the election of Jesus Christ is the election of a community which has two forms, Israel and the Church. The Church is the community of those who have been reconciled to God through Christ, a community which proclaims this reconciliation to others. The Church is an event, that is, an assembly which comes into existence in response to a call, in a definite place, its members united by a common interest. The Church is both visible and invisible; it is the body of Christ; it is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. Although Barth’s influence has waned somewhat in recent years, it is still considerable. O’G.’s volume has provided theologians with a highly competent study of his ecclesiology.

Edward J. Gratch

Evolution: The Theory of Teilhard de Chardin. By Bernard Delfgaauw. Translated by Hubert Hoskins. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 124. $4.00. Introductions and guides to the thought of Teilhard have multiplied prodigiously during the past decade. D.’s book belongs to this genre, but offers something richer. The technical phase of Teilhard’s evolutionary theory is no more than a starting point. Philosophical, religious, and theological aspects are the main concern. The truth is that Teilhard’s religious thinking is inseparable from his world view. The whole universe is in process of development, and man is inextricably enmeshed in it. This fact has tremendous meaning for every person’s life and relationship to the world, to his fellow men, and to God. In the first chapter an attempt is made to sum up the most salient features of the synthesis itself in a series of eight advancing propositions; the attempt turns out to be an achievement. Evolution of mankind toward unity is clearly presented; it is a unity that in the final instance can be attained only through love of a person, Jesus Christ, the Omega Point, who makes all mankind one by drawing all men to Himself. Christians have the duty of promoting this unification; their activity is never profane, for their involvement in the work of the world is collaboration with God in creation and with Christ in redemption. The third and last chapter, which comes to grips with some perennial problems, is not an account of Teilhard’s thinking but an elaboration and extension of it from the viewpoint of philosophy. In endeavoring to clarify the continuity of evolution from the nonliving to the living and from animal to man, D. ends up with the assertion that man is not composed of body and soul but is simply spiritual matter, without explaining what that might mean. Teilhard himself cannot be charged with such a statement.

Cyril Vottiert, S.J.

Priests for Tomorrow. By Ruud J. Bunnik. Translated by Frances Wilms. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969. Pp. xiii + 224. The book has three sections: the elements of the present crisis, the theology of the ministry, the ministry of the future. Part 3 will attract the sensationalists; hopefully their quack ing will not deter concerned priests
from meditating on Part 2. B.'s demythologizing and declericalizing of the ministry might seem a denigration of treasured, if unexamined, clichés about the priesthood. The initial shock is soon allayed by the prevailing tone of reverence and honesty in his treatment of a sublime calling. Offered as an outline of the theology of the ministry, Part 2 necessarily disappoints sometimes, but it always whets the urge for further exploration because of its many fine insights, theological, historical, sociological, into the real significance of the ministry within the community of the Church. Of great interest were the sketches on apostolic succession, the indelibility of the sacrament of orders in the light of temporary ministry, the spirituality of the priest, the value of privately offered Mass, the relation of the ministerial to the common priesthood of the faithful. B.'s discussion of the ministry as functional is particularly balanced and careful: he is able to demythologize the priesthood without reducing ministry totally to function. He stresses that the true source of the sublimity of the ministry lies in the priest's representing authentically the Lord in the community, not in his performing certain rites. Apart from some irritants (e.g., between p. 98 and p. 126, it is not clear whether sacred power and jurisdiction are different; the apodictic statement on p. 148 that "absolutely and permanently binding monastic vows cannot exist"), B.'s theologizing among the debris of Vatican II excites us with bright visions of hope for the future of our ministry.

Vincent M. Burns, S.J.

LIFE FOR A WANDERER. By Andrew M. Greeley. Garden City: Doubleday, 1969. Pp. 168. $4.95. G. frankly sets forth his intention in writing this book when he says that it is a series of reflections on what Christian life seems to him to mean in the contemporary world, and suggestions how traditional concepts of Christian spirituality might be interpreted. There is nothing particularly new in it for those who have been keeping up with contemporary writing, but its presentation is forceful and challenging, inviting and almost demanding a personal response. The chapters range through the virtues: faith, love (bringing out the valuable insight of the importance of self-love), hope, temperance, justice, fortitude, and prudence; they go on to treat the counsels: poverty, chastity, obedience (used in an analogical sense as "the virtue which inclines us to coordinate"—giving some quite good dialogical principles); they end with prayer (disappointingly lacking in depth) and resurrection (perhaps the best chapter). The brief conclusion is also quite good. One likes the joy and optimism that comes through throughout. In a candid footnote G. tells us that "most of what is written in this book is based on self-analysis" (p. 98), and it is this personal touch which probably saves the book from tedium.

For some this is not the thing for spiritual reading; it brushes or sidestrips too many controversial issues to leave them any peace. But for one in the existential swim of things it can occasion fruitful reflection and valuable insight. I note the hesitation on pp. 19–20 to state simply that Christ is God. G. was aware of this and adds an assuring footnote, one of fifteen in the book. Yet in more places than one he seems to implicitly admit that for the man for whom "to live means Christ" this book doesn't have it; it settles down too much in the merely human ethic.

M. Basil Pennington, O.C.S.O.

JESUS REDISCOVERED. By Malcolm Muggeridge. Garden City: Doubleday,
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

1969. Pp. 219. $5.95. M., best known in this country as a highly cantankerous, decidedly opinionated, yet engaging guest on TV talk shows and monthly book reviewer for Esquire, has had a long journalistic career in Great Britain that embraces reporting for the Manchester Guardian, editing Punch, and writing for the B.B.C. In this potpourri of columns, articles, transcripts of interviews, and old television scripts we are treated to his views on religion and a description of how he got it. To state the matter boldly: M. has no time for avant-garde clerics, the new morality, socially-with-it theologians, most churches, and the youth cult of today (Harvey Cox, as one might suspect, does not like the book; cf. Saturday Review of Literature, Aug. 30, 1969, pp. 23 ff.), while he admires the stark faith, cultural criticism, and general irascibility of Tolstoy, Pascal, and Kierkegaard, the immobility of Pope Paul, and Pilgrim's Progress. It would be easy to dismiss the book as an outpouring of spleen from a somewhat bitter old man. But that does not tell the whole tale. Jesus Rediscovered is also an example of religious writing that I thought was dead with the passing of Chesterton and Belloc: a tenacious but highly polemic faith that stands squarely against the current love affair that religion in the West is having with modern culture. With people he does not like—and their name is legion—M. has an instinct for the throat. In the chapters on the life of Jesus he writes not only with grace but a certain tenderness. In the sections that are more reportorial (a visit to Lourdes, a stay with the Trappists) one sees his fine journalistic eye. Many will take a dim view of M.'s general view of religion; others will be put off by the repetitious and fragmented nature of this random collection of occasional pieces; but few, I suspect, will escape being intrigued by a man who approaches his dotage with such a vigorous disdain for growing old gracefully.

Lawrence Cunningham

CATHOLICISM U.S.A. By George H. Tavard. Translated by Theodore DuBois. New York: Newman, 1969. Pp. 130. $4.95. The view of the "outsider" is usually accepted as closer to objective reality than that of members of the family. It may, however, suffer from a lack of that insight which is frequently beyond the grasp of anyone other than the native-born. Both of these characteristics mark this study of American Catholicism by the well-known theologian and ecumenist who has lived in the U.S. for something like the past fifteen years. The book, originally published in French in 1966, aims "to help...the Catholic European to have better regard for his neighbor beyond the Atlantic, so little known and so poorly understood, and who himself seems to do so much to be disapproved of by a world that he does not sufficiently know." The seven chapters discuss three principal points chosen as peculiarly characteristic of the Catholic Church in North America. The story, briefly told of the foundation and growth of the Church in the U.S. provides the background against which we see the European Catholic immigrant bring to the new land many of the externals of the Church as he had known it in Europe. This brought into being a Church structure in many ways opposed to the pluralistic religious situation already existing in America. Add to this the special North American sociological phenomenon, which T. thinks of as "a kind of humanism which has not found a place in traditional theology," which may be called by some materialism or secularism, or even a latent kind of Marxism, but which has
brought about a reaction by American Catholics entirely peculiar to this country. The American is defined not so much by what he is as by what he produces; this is a secularism in which a man's religion plays no well-defined role. In this atmosphere the American Catholic Church has tended to build up in its own defense a number of secular-style organizations (whose inner commitment to essential Catholicism is not always clearly noted, even by T.).

All this leads to the author's third point: that the genius of American Catholicism lies precisely in its successful preservation and profession of Catholic principles, doctrinal and moral, within a convinced acceptance of the special realities of American society and the "American way of life." The book ends on an optimistic note. It does not, of course, take into account the very recent appearance of confusion and uncertainty so apparent in all our communications media today as besetting the American Catholicism which T. has tried to analyze and understand. But his basic optimism will be shared by many who, with him, see much that is prophetic of a deeper and more profoundly religious growth of that Church in America which has only too often appeared to European Catholics to have already succumbed to the "well-known materialistic society" which is the United States of America.

John F. Sweeney, S.J.

VIOLENCE: REFLECTIONS FROM A CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE. By Jacques Ellul. Translated by Cecelia Gaul Kings. New York: Seabury, 1969. Pp. 179. $4.95. A deeply disturbing book, important for theologians and all who are interested in social change. E.'s thesis is simply stated: violence of any kind, be it the violence of war, the legitimized violence of the state, the extralegal violence of the revolutionary, or the hidden violence of the capitalist or the propagandist, belongs to the order of necessity. It has exactly the same character and necessity in the social-political realm as the law of gravity in the physical. But to say that what is natural is good or what is necessary is therefore legitimate is anti-Christian thinking par excellence; for what Christ does for us above all is make us free, and the Christian task is precisely to act against necessity. The book is deeply disturbing because E.'s critical gaze falls with decisive penetration on pacifist and revolutionary, realist and idealist alike. No one escapes his criticism as he argues for a Christian realism and radicalism that is uncompromising and intransigent. As usual in E.'s work, Violence is marked by clarity of thought and expression, and a solid grasp of the historical, sociological, and theological principles at stake. His analysis of the five laws of violence in the third chapter is masterful. He faces squarely the objections to his position that are raised on every side. Whether his answers to them are always as incisive and accurate as his criticisms will take the further thought and exploration that this essay richly merits. E.'s contribution in this slight book goes beyond mere reflections on violence; it contains in germ a theological basis for a badly-needed Christian social ethic. The translator has done her work with grace and accuracy.

James P. Hanigan, S.J.

HOLY LAUGHTER: ESSAYS ON RELIGION IN THE COMIC PERSPECTIVE. Edited by M. Conrad Hyers. New York: Seabury, 1969. Pp. vii + 284. $6.95. This book can be described either as essays on literature and humor from a theological viewpoint or, in the words of the subtitle, as "essays on religion
in the comic perspective.” In either case H. has given us a collection of learned and valuable studies. Most essays are reprints, and some classics are included: William F. Lynch, S.J., on the finitude and humanity of comedy; Nathan A. Scott, Jr., on comedy and faith; Reinhold Niebuhr on humor and faith; and (charmingly and graciously) Hugo Rahner, S.J., on eutrpelia. There are two studies on the clown, an essay on the humor of Christ (which tends to wander off the subject), two fresh and interesting studies on Zen humor and on the OT roots of Jewish humor, and two philosophical analyses by Barry Ulanov and Peter Berger. The editor offers two original essays, one which provides examples of humor in religion (but apologizes too much for his book combining religion and humor), the other which interestingly argues that the sacred needs the comic and vice versa; otherwise, H. maintains, a necessary dialectic is missing, with the sacred becoming too serious and the comic too chaotic. Chad Walsh contributes a light closing essay.

This book, like all collections, requires mental agility in dealing with changing points of view and different presuppositions; some writers are metaphysicians and some phenomenologists, some follow Bergson, while others, with Lynch, stress pleasant, Falstaffian humor. It is good, though, to have these essays collected together, and the book is valuable for its insights (Lynch, Scott, Hyers) and its delight (Rahner, R. H. Blyth on Zen, and Israel Knox on Jewish humor).

Joseph J. Feeney, S.J.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT OF CANDIDATES FOR A RELIGIOUS ORDER.** By Charles A. Weisgerber, S.J. Chicago: Loyola Univ. Press, 1969. Pp. xiii + 191. $3.20. A compact, succinct report on a psychological evaluation program in effect in the Midwest since 1960. The reporting is primarily statistical and in general technical, consequently not very illuminating to the general reader. W. is cautious and guarded in drawing conclusions—not unreasonable in view of the relatively disappointing results that the report is able to show. He finally concludes in a general way that it seems that psychological screening is better than no screening at all, but that it is not very striking. He feels that far too many poor risks are still slipping through the screening procedure. The title is somewhat misleading, since the volume really deals with psychological testing of candidates. W. admits that interview data might have some relevance to the assessment procedures, but glosses over interview procedures. In any kind of interview situation calling for clinical judgement, how and by whom the interviewing is done are extremely important variables. This seems a decidedly weak aspect of the evaluation program as well as its reporting. It is encouraging, however, to have a report of testing procedures in such a difficult and valuable area. This book will undoubtedly be of great value to those concerned with setting up testing procedures for evaluating candidates for religious orders and in evaluating the efficacy of such programs.

W. W. Meissner, S.J.
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