BOOK REVIEWS


The success of the 1961 translation of the NT in the NEB will certainly be matched by this complete translation of the Bible: the OT, the so-called Apocrypha, and the second edition (no extensive changes from 1961; mostly individual words: "paralysed man" now instead of "paralytic") of the NT. The names of three well-known British scholars are a guarantee of the high quality of the work: C. H. Dodd is the general director and responsible for the NT; G. Driver, OT director; W. D. McHardy was charged with the Apocrypha. The NEB is the fruit of a cooperative enterprise by the Protestant Churches of Britain to produce a new independent translation (not a revision). The process of translation had the following chain of command: the draft translation, the emendation by the panel of experts, further scrutiny by a literary panel, and finally, approval of a joint committee.

The goal is a translation "in the language of the present day." However, the decision to keep "thee" and "thou" in direct prayer to God seems to be a concession to the past. This reviewer has used the NT for several years with approval and pleasure, and the same reaction holds for an initial examination of the OT and the Apocrypha.

Hebrew poetry is indicated by a poetic format, although the rationale for dividing the units within the oracles of the Prophets is not clear; the varying indentations of lines remain mysterious to the reader. The poems within the historical books (songs of Moses, Deborah, etc.) are also printed as poetry, but in many instances (e.g., Bar 3:9—5:9) this does not obtain, and the entire Book of Wisdom is unfortunately printed as prose. The two-line sayings in Proverbs, although they are obviously discrete, are all printed like so many men standing in a row, but in Prv 23–24 and 30 the longer sayings are printed separately. It is interesting to note that Prv 6:22 is inserted at 5:19, a change first suggested in CBQ by P. W. Skehan and reflected in the CCD translation. There are several silent corrections, e.g., the obscure hakkol in Qoh (Ecclesiastes) 9:2 is properly read hebel and construed with 9:1. But there is no mention of this in the notes, contrary to the practice which the NEB set for itself.

The translation of Ct 8:6 is not a happy one: "for love is strong as death, passion cruel as the grave." Such a description of "passion" (and a better synonym could have been chosen here) misses the point: death and the grave (literally, Sheol) are relentless in pursuit of human beings. So also love pursues the beloved. To speak of the cruelty of passion is contrary to the parallelism and totally misleading. On the other
hand, one can point to many sharp and idiomatically rendered renderings, such as Qoh 10:5-7, "There is an evil that I have observed here under the sun, an error for which a ruler is responsible: the fool given high office, but the great and the rich in humble posts. I have seen slaves on horseback and men of high rank going on foot like slaves."

These remarks in no way detract from the value of the NEB; it is a worthy, scholarly, and attractive presentation. But like every translation of the Bible, it raises questions that, whatever be the decisions of the board of directors, can be posed kindly and constructively by critics.

*Catholic University of America*  
ROBERT E. MURPHY, O.CARM.


To approach the subject of contemporary existence in the light of the *OT* in a way which results in neither an insignificant popularization nor a detailed scholarly treatise is indeed an accomplishment. In *The Old Testament and Theology*, Wright combines personal scholarly reflection and historical theological analysis, yet the result is a small volume which should prove to be beneficial to the nonprofessional theologian and of more than passing interest to the *OT* scholar.

W. sees theology as "the effort of a man to explicate his own or someone else's tradition meaningfully in his conceptual world, so that he can understand it. To restrict theology to the proclamation of Israel's or the Christian's kerygma is too confining" (p. 62). As a scholar, he judges the greatest influence of the *OT* on modern theology to be its "form and style as a mode of revelation" (p. 68). Its unique weaving of history with confession in respect to the people of Israel is theologically necessary, for to Israel Yahweh was the Lord of history. The biblical knowledge of God can only be understood when this is appreciated.

Most Christian *OT* scholars would agree with W. that "certain varieties of Christocentricity which dissolve theology into Christology, leaving one with nothing to say about the independence of God" (p. 9), must be rejected if the *OT* is to have significance. The first chapter, "Theology and Christomonism," develops this point. Although it may be contended that W. belabors the issue, it cannot be denied that the point is well made. The second chapter, "Revelation and Theology," is one of the finest treatments of the subject from an *OT* point of view which this reviewer has seen. Presentations of various views are well documented and are in line with the work done by Wolfhart Pannenberg and Gordon Kaufman. Systematic and historical theologians, as well as seminarians, would do well to read the chapter carefully.
Chaps. 3 through 5 attempt to present some features which are basically biblical: God as Creator, Lord, and Warrior. W. sees as a central contribution of the OT the proposition that the universe is to be understood in a special political way. God is the Lord of time, event, and history, and human life is a responsible vocation under him. W.'s contention that "language takes form around particular political forms of the world which are sublimated for theological use" (p. 10) may well be challenged, but this does not detract from the basic premise, which seems quite valid.

Creation, for Israel, meant that human activity in the covenant relationship was in the created order. The point is made that the epic literature, Second Isaiah, and the royal theology in Jerusalem see creation "in terms of power and purpose" (p. 95). "Creation... identifies history's Lord and releases into time that judging and redeeming power which is to be observed again and again in human history by eyes trained to see and interpret by faith" (ibid.). W.'s treatment of the subject helps clarify the fact that the OT offers a deeper dimension to theological speculation in this area.

The discussions of God as Lord and God as Warrior deal with the Bible's version of cosmic order and government. The metaphysical background of the NT is understood as the war between the sovereign Lord and His historical enemies on earth, which perhaps can be thought of as the final destruction of Satan and his armies. W. briefly considers the problem of Christian pacifism or nonviolence. It would seem that this could have been developed more fully.

Chap. 6, "Language, Symbol, and Faith," deals with how to live with such biblical conceptions. W. rejects Bultmann's program of demythologizing, but endorses Calvin's principle of accommodation and Tillich's interpretation of the religious symbol. In chap. 7, "The Canon as Theological Problem," he tries to show the theological significance of the canon, and proposes how the problem may be handled.

An expanded form of the Sprunt Lectures (1968) at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, The Old Testament and Theology is of special interest because many of W.'s ideas and personal reflections are now made available to a wide audience. It is to be hoped that some of these ideas will be developed in later work.

Woodstock College

DONALD L. MAGNETTI, S.J.


This is an important book concisely and accurately described by its
author as an attempt "to show how the application of the fruits of Ugaritic scholarship can make a valuable contribution to the study of Israelite conceptions about Death and the Hereafter" (p. 1). The work was written under the direction of Mitchell Dahood, but it is not, as might be expected from that fact and the choice of topic, a development of Dahood’s thesis that a doctrine of resurrection runs throughout the OT. Tromp’s concerns are at once more modest and more extensive: “our theme is Death and Sheol as the Israelite eschaton; the problems of immortality, resurrection, and the like will not be discussed” (p. 3).

The book is divided into two parts, of which the first analyzes “Names and Epithets of Sheol in the Old Testament” and the second presents the “Implications and Explications” of the previous analysis. T. examines every OT allusion to death and the realm of the dead with painstaking care. His labor reveals how many more interpretations of the biblical text have been made possible by the Ras Shamra documents and how, in the light of this new knowledge, together with a more searching investigation of the MT itself, it becomes evident that the language of the OT is indeed rich in mythological allusions. Much that has been overlooked or misunderstood in the past suddenly takes on impressive significance. T. notes, e.g., that the meaning of “the enemy” in the Psalms is rather veiled, and suggests that the vagueness was not a casual one. His conclusion, after extensive textual analysis, is that death is often the intended enemy (pp. 110–19). Surely one of the two most important deductions made in this book is that there is an organic evolution of the concept of the devil from that of death (pp. 99–128); the other is T.’s conviction that “Sheol owes much to the grave” (see esp. pp. 129–40), by which he means that the notion of “grave” is anterior to that of an underworld and accounts for most, if not all, that is said of the latter. Of the exact meaning and etymology of Sheol, by the way, we must remain uncertain.

It is no criticism to say that this is a book for scholars, but it is an observation to be borne in mind by those who are only interested in its conclusions. It demands attentive reading, and T.’s approach to his subject is necessarily philological. When his conclusions are made, they carry conviction (see, e.g., his consideration and eventual rejection of one of his mentor’s proposals, pp. 80–83), but this will be lost on the nonspecialist, and unless he perseveres through pages of transliterations he may miss the conclusions as well. For the exegete, the biblical theologian, and the historian of religions the book will be, of course, an indispensable tool.

St. Michael’s College, Toronto

J. EDGAR BRUNS

This is a commentary on the four Gospel accounts of the Passion and Resurrection, arranged in parallel columns. Benoit writes well and does not get bogged down in details, so that the over-all effect of the work is coherent and attractive. The English edition, unfortunately priced beyond the range of the ordinary reader, seems to be well done; certainly the commentary has been carefully tailored to the English version (Jerusalem Bible) that is used. The choice of a more literal translation, the RSV for example, would have been better (witness the difficulties with the JB on pp. 33, 135). The abbreviations for biblical books are sometimes awkward, e.g., Si for Sirach and Jn for Jonah (p. 10), especially when elsewhere in the book Jn means John's Gospel.

B.'s reputation as an exegete needs no additional praise. This work, however, is a popularization, and the scholarly support for the theses advanced must be sought in B.'s articles, some of them thirty years old, conveniently collected in Exégèse et théologie (Paris, 1961–68). B. is pastorally concerned about the faith of the broad Catholic audience to whom the work is directed and is very cautious in matters of historicity, anticipating the objections based on inerrancy that are sure to rise in the readers' minds whenever he departs from the literal import of the Gospels. Paradoxically, while he is to the left of previous Catholic works on the subjects, e.g., J. Blinzler's The Trial of Jesus, in fact he presents us with a relatively conservative harmonization of the Gospel accounts. Perhaps I should add, for clarity, that "conservative" and "harmonization" are not pejorative terms in my vocabulary, and some of B.'s harmonization is far more reasonable than the skepticism seen in more critical works on the Passion and Resurrection.

Let us sample B.'s stance on some controverted points. Not only do Mark, Luke, and John have separate sources for the Passion, but at times Matthew may have drawn on an independent source more primitive and more Semitic than Mark (p. 39). Mark often reproduces Peter's animated style (p. 9). In certain passages the language used by Luke is so precise that it may very well be that of a doctor (pp. 18, 44). The historicity of John is taken seriously, so that it is quite likely that, awed by the majesty of Jesus in Gethsemane (Jn 18:6), the soldiers really did shrink back and fall to the ground (p. 47). The interrogations of Jesus before Annas (John) and before Herod (Luke) are historical, as are the mockeries by the Jewish police in the high priest's courtyard and by the soldiers during the Pilate trial. Historical, too, is Jesus' reference to Himself as the Son of Man, "a title which he is fond of using
at important moment [sic] in his life to indicate the nature of his mission and destiny” (p. 13; see also p. 107).

The popular nature of the work leaves many questions unanswered, and at some points this reviewer found himself a bit frustrated. How can B. give only minimal attention (e.g., note on p. 72) to the thesis that the Marcan Passion account is composite throughout, a thesis shared by such diverse scholars as Taylor, Bultmann, and Jeremias? Does one do justice to the problem of Jesus’ knowledge with statements like: “There is, however, no reason at all to reject the fact that Jesus foretold his own resurrection” (p. 101), or “Jesus knows that he is the Messiah ... a Messiah of divine rank and transcendent dignity who would surpass their usual hopes” (p. 107)? Can one accept so easily the *privilegium paschale* applied to Barabbas without wondering whether the representative of a military occupation would be likely to release a convicted, murdering revolutionary? Is B. (p. 46) logical when he would have us believe that in the Gethsemane scene of Jn 18:3,12 the Evangelist refers to Jewish and not to Roman troops when he speaks of the cohort and the tribune, even though John distinguishes this cohort from the specifically identified Jewish police? The confusion deepens when B. goes on to remark that perhaps John was not well informed about this scene, and yet on the next page B. tells us that John was an eyewitness of it and the only Evangelist to preserve accurately the memory of the roles of Peter and Malchus in the garden. Reading B.’s defense of the authenticity of Lk 22:43-44 (the sweating of Jesus as if bleeding), one would not realize that these verses are absent from P75, reflecting a late-second-century textual tradition. B. is an imposing scholar and undoubtedly would answer these queries with both subtlety and surety; but he will not be surprised if a generation of scholars whom he himself has taught to be critical want to challenge him in this way.

*St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore*  
RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


This excellent work by a scholar well known for such works as *Broken Wall, Conversation with the Bible, Was Christ’s Death a Sacrifice?* should be read by all those interested in determining why the relationship between Jews and Christians is not as it should be. Its timeliness is obvious in light of the renewed political tensions in the Near East and of the continuing passivity and misunderstanding among Christians in their posture toward Israel.
In view of the abundance of certified biblical evidence supporting the fundamental principle that Christians and Jews are brothers and their brothers' keepers, Barth attempts to present the rationale behind their unfortunate estrangement precisely within a biblical framework. Beginning with the core of the controversy, B. explores what a Jew can believe about Jesus and still remain a Jew. Despite divergent views on Jesus’ messianic role, B. insists that both Jews and Christians share a common belief in the one living God. He proceeds to consider the so-called biblical anti-Semitism which some see hidden in Paul’s writings, and concludes that the whole problem is in the diverse interpretations placed on his message by Christians and Jews. In fact, B. claims that to consider Paul anti-Semitic would be to do him a gross injustice. Finally, he outlines the relationship between Jews and the early Christian Church as seen in Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians, and shows how this message can help to resolve many of the problems resulting from the Christian interpretation of the OT, the mission to the Jews, and Christian responsibility in open or hidden anti-Semitism. While an inexcusable negligence on the part of the Church accounts in some measure for existing anti-Semitism, nevertheless Christians have failed in ascertaining Paul’s real message in Ephesians and therefore can never find justification in the story of Christ’s passion for their anti-Semitic views. Despite many possible interpretations, one fact remains central: Christians and Gentiles come to a knowledge of God’s kingship, an understanding of their share in God’s love for the world, and a comprehension of the need for obedience to God's call, only when in gratitude they learn from and with Israel who this God is, and the real meaning of nature, election, and service. In this sense, too, a proper Christian relationship to Israel becomes one criterion of the vitality and faith of the Church itself. It is obvious in this ecumenical era that the interests of all men will best be served by a recognition of past mistakes, an awareness of present responsibilities, and serious thought of the future, wherein hope and expectation converge in the unity of the Messiah, come for all men.

Barth’s work, richly annotated, and including the most recent scholarship and research, serves well to awaken the consciences of both Jew and Gentile to the need for mutual understanding. That anti-Semitism in whatever form, including its political implications, is unchristian should be amply clear. The author deserves commendation for the great service he has rendered through his well-balanced treatment of a recognizably delicate problem.

Rosemont College

Ludvik Nemec

As a competent in-depth exploration of anti-Semitism from a Christian standpoint, a survey and critique of the best works on Jewish-Christian relations, and a clear and forceful statement of the liberal Protestant position on the latter, this little book is unexcelled. I know of no book that evinces better the urgency the problem of anti-Semitism holds, or should hold, for the Christian conscience since the Holocaust and the grave implications it has for Christian theology. The book comes as a call to the Christian, and to the Christian theologian in particular, to re-examine his faith, especially where it touches on Judaism, in the searing light of the post-Auschwitzian era.

Davies sees Auschwitz and all it represents as one of the greatest watersheds of Christian history. He sees it as that catalyzing agent which reveals to us the depths of our anti-Semitism, its roots in Christian teachings, and the failure of Christian ethics. Thus does he make anti-Semitism and theological anti-Judaism, its correlate, the pivotal problems facing not only the ecumenist but all interested in Christian reform, renewal, or survival. D.'s penetrating analyses of our traditional attitudes toward the Synagogue will give the most triumphalist of Christians pause and will render the more sensitive a shattering sense of the magnitude of the task that confronts the Christian intelligence and spirit today. His view should, moreover, revolutionize the thinking of those who still accord our relations with Judaism a low rating on the ecumenical agenda.

D. is, rightly, critical of traditional Catholic and Protestant theology on Judaism, and has this to say: "...the obligation felt by such writers, especially the Catholics, to defend the deposit of sacred tradition or traditional exegesis has seriously restricted their contribution to a new understanding. Still worse, the older Catholic attitude toward revealed truth, in this context, has tragically debased the status of the love commandment, which, in greater or lesser degree, must be forcibly reconciled with a body of anti-Jewish 'true' dogma. In their own way, Protestant biblicists have been quite as guilty of the same sin, even intensifying it...Not only do liberal theologians reject the patristic image of Judaism, but, because liberal Christianity has different priorities, any conflict between the claims of 'truth' and the claims of love, such as permeates every conservative theology dealing with the subject, is not a problem. Love is the only valid dogma..." (p. 148).

Here D. is at his strongest but also at his weakest. His strictures on the disastrous traditional anti-Judaism are, after Auschwitz—and after
Vatican II for the Catholic—unchallengeable. One may question, however, what appears to be an effort to dogmatize the "liberal" position, which would have us believe that love of Jews or Judaism is impossible, not only when there are hurtful anti-Judaic dogmas, but even when a theological egalitarianism is lacking. Does not this position also "forcibly reconcile the love commandment with a body of 'true' dogma"? It is not only anti-intellectualist, moreover, but also contradicts the clear experience that "kerygmatizing Romans 9–11" need not lead to anti-Semitism, as in the cases, e.g., of St. Paul himself, Karl Barth, the Catholic "schism" theologian, and many others again. One may well find Rom 9–11 insufficient to our needs and purposes today; it is still, practically, our best hope for any large-scale conversion from traditional anti-Judaism to a full appreciation of the role of Judaism in salvation history and of Jews as kinsmen in faith. Just rediscovered, these precious chapters are hardly ready for scrapping. One misses in this otherwise comprehensive book any references to contemporary Catholic theologians of Jewish-Christian relations, such as Hruby, Schubert, Thoma, who might supply an alternative to D.'s hard line on nonkerygmatizing Rom 9–11.

D. draws no clear line that must always mark off our Jewish-Christian contradictions from our Jewish-Christian affinities. But this perhaps is another stage of the task facing theologians of the post-Auschwitzian era. Meanwhile, all stand deeply in D.'s debt for an indispensable _mise au point_ of what has thus far been done on this most important subject.

Secretariat for Catholic-Jewish Relations

Edward H. Flannery

Seton Hall University


The volume in hand was a dissertation in the Gregorian University written under the direction of Antonio Orbe, S.J. (1968) and corrected for publication by Henri Crouzel, S.J. The author's purpose is to place the transfiguration of Christ (Mt 17:1–9 and parallels) in the total context of Origen's theology, in particular his Christology. Origen's interpretation of the transfiguration of Christ is found in his _Commentary on Matthew_ 12, 36–42, where Mark and Luke are also cited, and in a number of passages in the _Contra Celsum_, which are listed on p. 16, n. 6. The book is divided into eight chapters, of which the final is a summation. These chapters are summarized in the following paragraphs.

The transfiguration of Christ is represented by Origen not as a fact in
the biography of Jesus, but as the goal of the revelation. Jesus was transfigured only before those of the disciples who were able to comprehend His glory.

In the *Commentary on Matthew* Origen refers to the man-below (*katō*) and to Jesus on the mountain above (*anō*). E. shows that these adverbs of place are expressions symbolic of the spiritual world before the Fall (above) and the sinful world of the senses which resulted from the Fall (below). The man-below is unable to understand the spiritual world above. Through the Incarnation the man-below can achieve a knowledge of God, since the Logos in a certain sense has become a man-below. For the sinful man-below, the humanity of Jesus *can be* the first halting step in recognizing the divine Logos. The faithful man-below *does* perceive the divine Logos through the human body. The sinful one sees Christ as servant, the believer sees Him as Lord.

While the incarnate Logos is the object of perception for the man-below, the man-above sees the Logos as He was *before He became flesh* in the form of God. Preaching in foolishness is made for the man-below; preaching in wisdom is for the man-above. The transfiguration is thus the revelation of the divinity of the Logos, which brings a corresponding subordination of the humanity of Jesus. After the man-below has grasped the Logos in the flesh, he can become a man-above who comprehends the Logos without flesh.

Origen was not concerned with a physical change in Jesus’ body in the transfiguration, and ignores these details in the biblical account. “The true understanding of the transfigured bodily form,” E. states, “is that [Christ] does not show Himself to those on the mountain in His bodily appearance and in His Godly nature in the same way as to those below” (p. 119). Before the Resurrection Jesus’ body was both like that of other men (e.g., able to suffer, and visible to all) and different, in that it appeared to each beholder *as He willed*. The body of the transfiguration is like that of the return, only all will see Him then and not just three. In chap. 5 the author poses the question whether the revelation of the Logos at the transfiguration negated the humanity in Jesus.

In order to solve the problem, E. analyzes the various terms for “body,” “form,” and “change of form” in Origen’s writings. This constitutes a long digression, which the author felt called upon to justify (p. 162). Most significant of these terms is *metamorphousthai*, which is used by Origen to describe the manner in which the Logos accommodates Himself to the form in which he will be comprehended by men-below, i.e., the Incarnation. It is also the word for the change that the soul and body of Jesus underwent when they mixed with the Logos.
Utilizing the material of the preceding six chapters, E. concludes that, for Origen, during the transfiguration Jesus' humanity was removed from the Logos like a veil, which He had only assumed in order to become comprehensible to men. The human is submerged in the divine, and the divine makes use of the human to express itself.

In conclusion, E. points out the weaknesses in Origen's Christology which have been revealed by a study of his interpretation of the transfiguration: the human Jesus will always be foolishness to Origen. Crucified, He was visible to all men-below; transfigured and resurrected, only to a few men-above.

E. is to be praised for a detailed and sympathetic analysis of Origen's interpretation of the transfiguration pericope in Matthew—subject matter inherently difficult and fraught with linguistic and theological problems. In effect, he has written an Origenic midrash on the pericope, utilizing mainly the Contra Celsum. His methodology is laudable in so far as he has successfully avoided using modern categories to interpret Origen's thought. Indirectly, he has shown the importance of the transfiguration in the life of Jesus, and thus his study is worthy of perusal by biblical as well as patristic scholars.

Boston College


The present volume is a milestone in patristic studies, and for its excellence of conception and execution a great debt is owed to Bernard Peebles and Claude Barlow. The former points out in his Foreword the recent trend to rescue from their undeserved obscurity the numerous and significant Iberian Fathers, such as Potamius and Epiphanius of Seville, Gregory of Elvira, Pacianus of Barcelona, and the great Isidore. In this volume Prof. Barlow of Clark University has remedied the situation for three major Iberian Fathers: Martin of Braga (d. 580), Paschasius of Dumium (fl. ca. 555), and Leander of Seville (d. 600), older brother of Isidore, and to whom Gregory the Great dedicated his Moraalia in 595. B.'s prefaces are erudite and informative; his translations are evenly inspired reproductions of the original Latin into good modern English.

For Martin of Braga B. has utilized his own critical edition of the Latin text published by the Yale University Press in 1950. Born in Pannonia and trained as a monk in Palestine, Martin came to Galicia
in northern Spain around A.D. 550 and settled at Dumium. Here he founded a monastery and, like Cassian in Gaul, modified the severity of the Eastern regulations in favor of ethical prescriptions, as appears from his translation of the Sayings of the Egyptian Fathers. Later he became Metropolitan of Dumium and nearby Braga. B. offers the first English translation of the following writings of Martin: (1) Sayings of the Egyptian Fathers; (2) three moral treatises based on Cassian: Driving away Vanity, Pride, Exhortation to Humility; (3) Anger; (4) Triple Immersion; (5) The Date of Easter. The only other translation seems to be the Portuguese version of Caetano do Amaral in 1803. B.'s version of Rules for an Honest Life is its first rendering in modern English. Finally, the translation of De correctione rusticorum is the first published translation, though an unpublished version exists in a Catholic University of America master's dissertation by Harold F. Palmer (1932). B. chose not to translate the poems of Martin with their heavy borrowings from Dracontius and Sidonius.

There exists no previous translation of Questions and Answers of the Greek Fathers by Paschasius of Dumium, who probably obtained the material from the same Greek source that Martin used subsequently. Two versions of the work have been handed down: (1) a long one, which is found in most of the manuscripts, but has never been published; and (2) a short one, which was printed by Rosweyde in his Vitae patrum (Antwerp, 1615) and reprinted in PL 73, 1025-62. The long text is probably the original, and B., by utilizing other manuscripts in addition to Rosweyde's text, has attempted to produce a translation of the version which approximates the original.

Similarly, B. has produced the first English translation of the extant works of Leander of Seville. His translation of the epistle On the Training of Nuns is based upon the edition of A. C. Vega (Escorial, 1948), supplemented by the readings from a Monte Cassino manuscript published by Madoz in 1949.

The importance of these documents is both historical and theological. Historically, they provide one source of information for the development of Christianity in Spain from the fifth through the sixth centuries. (The other source is the material associated with the councils, concerning which B. writes on p. 9: "It is regrettable that none of this exists in English, but many years of cooperative work would be required to establish reliable Greek and Latin texts before a satisfactory English translation could be made.") Theologically, these documents witness to the concerns of the early medieval church with Christian ethics, with proper understanding of the feasts and sacraments, and with the preservation of unity against the heresies of Priscillian and
Arian. "It remains then," concludes Leander of Seville, "that we should all with one accord work for one kingdom and that, both for the stability of the kingdom on earth and for the happiness of the kingdom of heaven, we should pray to God that that kingdom and nation which has glorified Christ on earth shall be glorified by Him, not only on earth, but also in heaven" (The Triumph of the Church, p. 235).

Boston College
Margaret A. Schatkin


Most specialists in sixteenth-century religious and intellectual history are aware that within the past decade, especially in Germany, Catholic Luther scholarship has taken a new turn and has evoked a serious response from Protestant scholars. Much of this scholarship stems from the so-called "Lortz school," but with important differences from the views first advanced by Lortz himself in 1939 in his Die Reformation in Deutschland. Until the publication of the present book, however, very little of this new Catholic scholarship was available in English. Fr. Wicks, therefore, has performed a great service for his English-speaking colleagues by editing these essays, whose authors are among the most important Catholics writing on Luther today: Joseph Lortz, Erwin Iserloh, Otto Pesch, Paul Hacker, Harry J. McSorley (the only American represented), and Peter Manns. Moreover, the essays in the book by and large relate to the principal area of the authors' concerns and consequently give us in a few pages their characteristic opinions and conclusions. In a brief Afterword, Warren A. Quanbeck reflects upon the contributions of these Catholic scholars from the viewpoint of a Lutheran scholar.

In his Introduction Wicks very accurately isolates the "two foci of interest" around which the essays turn: (1) the "style" of Luther's theology and (2) Luther's "vision of man under God's judgment and justifying grace" (p. viii). Lortz's essay, for instance, deals at length with the question of Luther's intellectual style and insists upon an understanding of it as a prerequisite for any proper interpretation of the Reformer. Lortz admits a development in his own understanding of Luther since 1939 (e.g., p. 7). Otto Pesch (who elsewhere has criticized certain tendencies of the Lortz school) contrasts Luther's "existential" style with Thomas' "sapiential" style. Hacker's essay uses the fact of "the predominance of pronouns of the first person singular and the corresponding possessive adjectives" (p. 86) as an entrance into what he
calls the "reflexive" nature of Luther's faith, thus moving from the first focus to the second. Iserloh discusses Luther's "Christ-mysticism" and indicates rather conclusively that there was a significant mystical element in Luther's thought. McSorley deals with the Luther-Erasmus controversy and distinguishes Luther's "biblical argument" for man's bondage to sin from his "unfortunate" (p. 115) "necessitarian argument." Manns attempts to show that Luther's teaching on good works and especially on the role of charity in the Christian life is more reconcilable with Catholic thought on these topics than is commonly believed.

In the words of Quanbeck, this volume is "an indication that Luther scholarship has attained a kind of maturity, moving away from the defensiveness of Protestant and the polemics of Roman Catholic approaches" (p. 160). The Catholic scholars in this book are concerned with trying to understand Luther, not with trying to pity, refute, or excoriate him. Hacker's final assessment of Luther's theology is more negative than that suggested by the other authors, but his judgment does not spring from any confessional necessity to prove Luther wrong. As Quanbeck points out (p. 165), what is perhaps the most encouraging conclusion to be drawn from this book is that we are in a new theological situation. Whether one agrees or disagrees with the positions advanced by the authors, one must certainly recognize that we are now equipped to discuss what is genuinely significant. Fr. Wicks is to be thanked and congratulated for so ably assembling a book which makes this conclusion possible.

University of Detroit

JOHN W. O'MALLEY, S.J.


It is gratifying to this reviewer to see an increasing number of valuable works devoted to a reappraisal of Luther's thought within an ecumenical context. Ozment's book appears to be among the most revealing and valuable of many such works, because the author examines Luther's thought with scholarly precision free of polemics. Using comparative hermeneutics to arrive at his historical and systematic conclusions, O. goes directly to the roots of Luther's thought. He contends that a historical personage must be interpreted against the background of his own historical environment and its related theological thought if
he is to be properly understood. Basically there is little new in this study with its thesis that Luther's "the spiritual man is the man who relies upon faith" generally reflects the thought of Tauler and Gerson. The study does, however, provide a new interpretation in its presentation of Luther's quest for correlation between faith and *homo spiritualis* as carrying in its wake decisive clues to his understanding of law and gospel, the formation of his doctrine about the just man and the sinner, his appreciation for historical Christology, and his gradual rejection of the Pelagian covenant theology of nominalism.

O. presents a strong argument supporting Luther's Reformation theology as originating and developing in relation to the anthropology of late medieval mystical theology, and it is in this light that he compares and analyzes the anthropology of Tauler, Gerson, and Luther. Part 1 encompasses three chapters dealing with Tauler's thought; Part 2 includes four chapters on Gerson's theology; Part 3 in four chapters is devoted to Luther's early thought (1509-16). It is well written, analytical, and logical in its presentation. O. arrives at a dual conclusion: (1) Luther's thesis, "*homo spiritualis nititur fide,*," is the very antithesis of Tauler's concern to promote the *Seelengrund* and Gerson's concern to enhance the soteriological possibilities of the *synteresis*; (2) Luther, in contrast to Tauler's and Gerson's view that man's union with God in this life is in the attainment of maximum similitude to God, understands this union to be simultaneously the full recognition of man's unlikeness and opposition to God. There is, of course, an interrelation between these two views. This puts the relationship of the sinner to God in better context but leaves some questions unanswered.

Enriched by valuable primary and secondary annotations and detailed indices, this work provides lucid insight into Luther's thought. Its demonstration of how hermeneutical reading of historical texts rarely claims exclusive interpretation places this among the masterpieces of scholarly analysis. Theologians may read it with considerable confidence, while ecumenists will find ample reason to rejoice in its new approach.

*Rosemont College*  
LUDVIK NEMEC

**THE CATHOLIC REFORMATION: SAVONAROLA TO IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. DOCUMENTS ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE MAIN FACETS OF A VITAL MOVEMENT.**  

Toward the end of the Middle Ages the Western Church stood in need of drastic reform. Sebastian Brant expressed this conviction in
1494, writing:

St. Peter's ship is swaying madly,
It may be wrecked or damaged badly,
The waves are striking 'gainst the side
And storm and trouble may betide.

John Olin, in his book of documents, is concerned with efforts to reform "St. Peter's ship" arising from within the Catholic Church. He thus writes, in a general introduction and in brief introductions to each document, about the Catholic Reformation as distinct from the Counter Reformation. The reform which confronts us in this book existed, after 1517, of necessity in relationship to the Protestant Reformation, but was basically indigenous and possessed its own history reaching back beyond Luther. It found expression in the preaching of Savonarola and John Colet, in the writings of Erasmus and Lefèvre, in the founding of the Oratory of Love, the Theatines, the Capuchins, and the Jesuits, in advice tendered by Egidio da Viterbo, Contarini, Adrian VI, Giberti, and the papal reform commission of 1536-37, and in such a reform bull as the *Supernaе dispositionis arbitrio* of 1514—all represented in documents which comprise the major portion of the book.

The introduction is an important essay in its own right. Here, relying in part upon the work of Gerhard Ladner, O. explores the meaning of reform in the sixteenth century. "Basically," he writes, "the two terms reform and reformation mean a return to an original form or archetype or ideal and imply the removal or correction of faults which have caused deformation. The object of reform is restored to its original character, its essential mode of being." Such reform, as applied to the Church, involves both institutional and personal reform, *reformatio in capite et in membris*. Both types are important and are related to each other, as the Gregorian and Franciscan reform movements were related in a complementary fashion to each other. But O. seems to stress the idea that there is a chronological and necessary priority attached to personal, individualistic reform, the *reformatio in membris* proceeding at the deepest level of experience, closest to the *NT* understanding of reform. Be that as it may, the truth as it seems is that institutional reform, in the hands of papacy and councils, failed in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The emphasis then fell upon the personal, and in the documents presented this is what is highlighted, although much is said concerning the necessity for *reformatio in capite*. Over and over again there is exhortation to renewal of commitment, purification of life, following after the example of Christ and the gospel precepts.
Not everyone will be satisfied with the selection of documents presented, but they are all important and all informative. Some are presented here for the first time in English. There is a bibliographical postscript and much helpful discussion of bibliography in footnotes to the introductions. O. hopes to compile another such volume covering the period of the Council of Trent.

*Episcopal Theological School*

*Cambridge, Mass.*


Scharlemann is professor of theology at the University of Iowa and author of *Thomas Aquinas and John Gerhard.* His present work investigates an important and central theme in Tillich's thought which has not until now received extended commentary by scholars. The theme is also one which has received increasing attention from Roman Catholic theologians in recent years. "What certainty is left for thought after men have become conscious that thinking itself is historical? . . . After men have become historically conscious, is there any objective reality that cannot be dislodged by critical thought or any religious presence that does not fade when it is doubted?" Questions such as these, according to S., express the crisis which has confronted systematic theology and philosophy since the death of Hegel.

The first chapter of S.'s book tightly and clearly summarizes the history of the problem through the nineteenth century, with special emphasis on the antithetic proposals of Hegel and Schleiermacher, and the nihilistic counterproposal of Nietzsche. Tillich received the problem in the form in which it emerged from the nineteenth century. It is S.'s thesis, argued through the remaining seven chapters of the book, that Tillich finally succeeded in resolving this problem. Tillich constructs his answer with two basic ideas, that of "correlation" and that of "paradoxical reality and presence." In expounding Tillich's answer, S. shows a thorough mastery of the texts as well as a critical perspective informed by current American and German theology. Yet he does not simply repeat Tillich. He offers his exposition in the form of what he calls a "constructive analysis," i.e., while attempting to analyze Tillich's own thought, the point of view from which this is done as well as the concepts used are somewhat different from those of Tillich himself.

"The aim of such a constructive analysis is to find an approach to another man's thought which is close enough to how he understands himself that it can interpret him fairly but at the same time is far enough
removed that it allows one to transform the material and take it into a new systematic construction.” It is in the last chapter that S. outlines the main directions in which he would attempt to develop a new systematic theology which works its way out of Tillich’s systematic theology.

I do not know whether Tillich solved the problem of historical consciousness with which he began, nor thus whether S. has successfully defended the thesis of this book. Certainly, both Tillich and S. have constructed careful and imposing theological works which deserve serious study. Unfortunately, it is the problem itself, which they set out to solve, that never seems to get sufficiently clarified by either. For instance, the problem is typically set up by S. in terms of what he calls “critical reflection” and “doubting response.” Critical reflection is defined as the “endeavor to grasp the objectivity of whatever I am dealing with in thought; I endeavor to understand what it is.” Doubting response is my “reply to the power (the subjectivity) acting upon me.” The problem is posed for reflection somewhat as follows. I desire to know the one objectively certain reality, but I can never be certain “whether my here-and-now reflection changes the reality I reflect.” “Is it or is it not an act that changes the reality? It is no great problem to answer that question—to think my act of thinking—if one ignores or is not conscious of the temporality, or historical character, of the act. But once I take into account this temporality, I am conscious that each act, each here-and-now, is new. And if each here-and-now act is a new reflection, I can never ‘catch’ it, I can never think my present act because it has already gone when I think it.” I have quoted at length in an attempt to be as fair to S. and, I think, to Tillich as one can be in a brief review. I can only say that I find all of this extraordinarily opaque. It seems to me that the reason S. cannot “catch” it is that there is really nothing there to catch at all. How does one think his act of thinking? Indeed, what is an act of thinking? I do not mean to imply that either S. or I do not think. Of course we do. But thinking, I suggest, is the sort of thing which is only rendered obscure, elusive, and hard to “catch” when it is thought of as a kind of “act” such as Tillich and S. seem to think it is. The problem then becomes all but insoluble when this alleged “act” is seen to have a “historical character.”

The same kinds of difficulties suggest themselves with regard to the problem analyzed in terms of “response.” “The one certain presence is the one which my response can never remove. But how can I tell whether my response diminishes the power of the presence or confirms it? Again, this problem is not acute if one ignores the temporality of every response. But if each here-and-now act of response is new, then I
can never ‘catch’ my present response to know what presence is eliciting it; what I ‘catch’ in my present response is always something past.” A sacral presence is some reality which is present in the world in such a way as to be qualitatively different from everything else. However, sacral presences, according to S., were dissolved by the beginning of the nineteenth century. Protestantism supposedly destroyed the sacral character of the medieval Church, and historical criticism supposedly destroyed the sacral character of the Scriptures. The conclusion is that “Anyone who either directly or by recapitulation participated in the historical development leading into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries could no longer revert to the Medieval and Protestant theological stances without loss of integrity. The disappearance of sacral realities is never a reversible process.” To this reviewer “participation in historical development” sounds very much like nineteenth- and twentieth-century mythology which can well be dispensed with unless it is given some clear determinate meaning. Surely those who still feel committed to “Medieval and Protestant theological stances” are entitled to tighter argumentation than this before having to face the threat of “loss of integrity.”

Perhaps S. can justly criticize me for attacking his central problem from a point of view foreign to Tillich and objective idealism. So much is certainly true. It is also true, as S. observes, that “critical studies have fairly well defined the extent to which Tillich is not a biblical positivist and the extent to which, measured by the narrower canons of logical positivism, he does or does not talk nonsense and confuse categories.” But one does not have to be a logical positivist (I suppose a few still exist somewhere) to object that the thought world of German idealism scarcely enjoys prima-facie plausibility, and that attempts to build a theology on it require much closer attention to basic presuppositions than Tillich, who grew up in the world of German idealism, ever sufficiently tried to provide. But I have carped on this point long enough. Surely for those who are prepared to grant Tillich the basic concessions necessary to move freely in his categorical schemes, S. has written a first-rate book and one which deserves to be studied by anyone seriously interested in Tillich.

University of Wisconsin

VINCENT M. COOKE, S.J.


The present work is in part a commentary on Dei verbum, in part a
study of contemporary German Catholic theologies of revelation, and in part an original theological construction. Since it aims to be all three of these things, it will not completely satisfy a reader who might be looking for one or another of them; but this three-pronged approach offers riches which no mere history or commentary or personal reflection could convey. Since he does not confine himself to writing a mere commentary, Waldenfels is able to show, all the better, how rich a theological understanding of revelation can emerge from the text of *Dei verbum* 2–6.

The least satisfactory part of the book—and one scarcely necessary for the remainder—is Part 1, which aims to set the historical background for Vatican II. After a brief sketch of the manual-type presentations of theology, W. here surveys, rather cursorily, certain modern developments in France, Germany, and Belgium. In this treatment he includes the Tübingen school (Drey and Möhler), Blondel, the "nouvelle théologie" (Chenu, Congar, Lubac, Daniélou), and the dialogical personalism dominant in Germany between the two World Wars. In a concluding summary, paving the way for Part 2, W. shows that the prevailing tendencies on the eve of the Council were personalistic, biblical, dynamic, historical, and Christocentric.

Part 2, the remainder of the book, follows closely the text of *Dei verbum* 2–6. In a preliminary section W. raises the question whether the biblical approach of this document was not a simple evasion of the doubts and questionings of modern man, to which attention is given in *Gaudium et spes*. He replies, in effect, that *Dei verbum* takes the position that theology must begin in faith, basing itself on the testimonies of Scripture and tradition (*fides ex auditu*). While allowing for cultural variations in the forms of thought and speech, the Council insists on the need for continuity, and refuses to make an abrupt break from the past.

The essential nature of revelation, as W. analyzes it in the light of *Dei verbum* 2, is a divine-human encounter in which God, through His initiative, effectively communicates a participation in His own divine life. This communication necessarily occurs in word and deed—two media which mutually share in each other's nature. In order for man to grasp the authentic meaning of the two-in-one of word and deed, the Holy Spirit must be present, bestowing the "eyes of faith.”

The divine-human encounter, according to W., takes place historically through a series of covenants which are treated in *Dei verbum* 3, and more extensively in 14–16. These covenants point progressively to the "concrete universal" of Jesus Christ, who, precisely because He gathers up in Himself the total meaning of history, overcomes all the particularism of the previous covenants. Following *Dei verbum* 4, W.
then shows that Christ is not only the midpoint (Cullmann) but the end (Pannenberg) of all history. W. also accepts Moltmann's view (which he finds anticipated in Pierre Charles, Lubac, and Balthasar) that Jesus in heaven will continue to have a future until the final consummation of all history.

Revelation and faith, W. maintains, are not two independent realities. Relevation becomes truly revelation when it receives the acceptance for which it calls; and the response of faith, articulated in word and deed, becomes revelation to those who witness it. Jesus in His humanity was the supreme recipient of revelation, and for that precise reason He is, for us, the supreme revealer. The life of faith, for each Christian, is a community of existence with Jesus as the Son, totally obedient to His Father. Thus Dei verbum 5 correctly accents the loving obedience inseparable from faith.

In the last section of his study the author, following out certain indications in Dei verbum 6, examines the relationship between faith and doctrine. Consistently with his personalist point of view, W. shows that doctrine is not in the first place an impersonal content but rather a testimony calling for personal response. Christian doctrine, moreover, is "salutary" truth leading to a vital communion with God. The words and concepts of creeds and dogmas are created media through which one may hope to apprehend the silent Deity who stands beyond all words.

All these points, and many others, W. sets forth in a nuanced and sometimes subtle manner that makes considerable demands on the reader's attention. He makes extensive use of living German theologians. Following Rahner, he shows that the theology of revelation cannot be formalistically constructed from outside, but that it depends on the content of revelation, namely, the mystery of the self-communication of the triune God through the grace of Jesus Christ. The theology of revelation, therefore, involves a trinitarian doctrine. W., moreover, agrees with Balthasar that revelation is fundamentally the splendor of the divine love, as it freely pours itself forth in the humanity of Jesus Christ. A thoroughly Christocentric view of revelation, W. maintains, need not involve any "Christological constriction," for it recognizes that Christ is the one in whom all creation has its consistency. A major task for theology is to evolve an existential logic that will show how the form of Christ is to be detected in the events of secular experience. Balthasar, according to W., has brilliantly sketched what such a "theological aesthetic" would involve.

W.'s study of revelation differs markedly from the many popularizations which go by similar titles. Concerned neither with apologetics nor
with catechetics nor with polemics nor with ecumenics, W. is intent on exploring, with the tools of dogmatic theology, the theological reality that goes by the name of revelation. This is a book for reflective readers who, in the light of faith, wish to ponder more deeply the immense resources to which Catholic tradition gives access.

Woodstock College

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


There are times in the life of every reviewer of theological books when he might well wish that a moratorium would spread from the issue of Vietnam to the book-publishing trade. So very few contributions to theological literature are really beyond the extremes of acceptable banality that sometimes this reviewer feels that he must call on his exhaustive adaptive reserve system to cope with the ever-increasing printed assaults on theological questions. Then one begins to wonder if the literature is of marginal importance or whether the reviewer is asking more than can be delivered in these times. Conversations with other reviewers indicate, unfortunately, that the first alternative is universal enough to deserve some small consideration.

Given this mental climate, it is a genuine pleasure to read another book of Fr. Dulles, who is among the very clearest and most competent theological writers we have. No book on revelation in any of the languages I read is as well written, as comprehensive, and as thoroughly and measuredly accurate as D.'s most recent theological contribution. Listed as Revelation Theology: A History, it is precisely that. Every page gives evidence of the long, assiduous, and devoted work that has gone into a grasp and understanding of all the theologians and philosophers included in the treatise. This is no small accomplishment when one considers the extent of the history and the subtlety, not to mention the magnitude, of the subject and of the theologians who have dedicated considerable effort to achieving some understanding of God's presence in the world.

Those searching for conclusive definitions of revelation might be disappointed; for D.'s conclusion from the historical investigation is that "our survey seems to indicate that no one understanding [of revelation] can be appropriate for all persons, times and cultures" (p. 171). This inevitable historical conclusion might be less than comforting, but it is assuredly in accord with the data that D. handles so extremely well.

The book represents first-rate thinking and writing. It would, I think, belong in the library of anyone interested in the best single
short history of the concept of revelation. It is likewise a good example of the measured phrase and value judgment.

University of Notre Dame

P. JOSEPH CAHILL, S.J.


This is both a very impressive and a very disappointing book. It is impressive for the breadth of its conception and the illuminating consistency of its actual composition. It presents a complete outline of Christian theology from a radically historical point of view. Theology is described as the study of God, who reveals Himself not in nature but in historical events, especially in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. For this reason God is grasped as trinitarian: the transcendent Creator Lord (Father), who as personal companion is active everywhere (Spirit), manifests His redeeming love especially in the paradigmatic happening of the Christ-event (Son).

Man is made in the image of God precisely as being historical, i.e., a free being who shapes himself and the course of events by his choices. Early in the history of man, the Fall (understood as the rise of moral consciousness) injected a force of selfishness and estrangement from God into this history. Remedy comes from God's loving involvement with man, injecting a counterforce of mercy and self-sacrificing love, especially through Christ. This force continues to spread and develop through the words and lives of believing Christians who reflect the openness and nonresistance of God in their love.

Thus God the Creator Lord is at work in the world and in all its events to establish eventually His kingdom: a community of men united to God and to one another in the harmony of unselfish love. That this is what is happening can be grasped through faith, in spite of the lack of any confirmatory empirical evidence.

But in the final analysis this book is very disappointing. The cause for disappointment is found most centrally in K.'s interpretation of the resurrection of Jesus. This is said to have been a series of hallucinations or even delusions, which convinced the apostles and the early Christian community that Jesus was alive in some mysterious way after His death upon the cross. This enabled them to appropriate the meaning of His unselfish love displayed upon the cross and thus to believe that God was still active in the world. K. deems this appropriation and belief alone theologically important; Jesus' own continued existence is irrelevant. But this means, of course, that God had not really taken upon Himself the suffering and alienation of man (for Jesus was
not personally divine), and the conviction of God’s deep involvement in our situation rests upon the delusion that the Father has glorified His Son. K. admits that this is not the understanding of the NT or of Christian tradition; but he sincerely thinks that modern science and culture have made the earlier position incredible.

In keeping with this, K. offers many radical reinterpretations of Christian belief—most notably, one about God and another about man. God is Trinity, not in Himself or His own inner life, but only in relation to us; for all our knowledge of God is relational, and hence we are unable to know anything about Him in Himself. And man is wholly mortal. Neither Jesus nor any other man personally survives the encounter with death. The Christian hope of eternal life is likewise a delusion, a mythical persuasion that points to an eventual terrestrial paradise, a community of love to come about at some unknowable time in the future.

K. had said that Christian faith is a challenge to believe that God’s loving power is at work in the world through Christ, even though empirical evidence may not support this. In spite of his manifest sincerity, he seems to have accepted this challenge only halfheartedly; for it is not at all clear how modern developments have made Jesus’ victory over death more difficult for us to accept than it was for the Athenians who turned away from Paul when he preached on the Areopagus.

Jesuit School of Theology

at Berkeley

JOHN H. WRIGHT, S.J.


The Logic of Self-Involvement is an unlikely title for an important theology book. Theologians should put aside their customary fear of logic and pay close attention to Dr. Evans. This is a time for examining the foundations of theology and philosophy of religion, and E. has a contribution.

E.’s aim is to give a philosophical analysis, in the style of John Austin, of the language of the Bible, especially of the concepts associated with the doctrine of divine creation. The first three chapters lay out with great clarity (and none of the donnish snobbishness that usually turns American theologians off) a scheme for classifying performatory utterances with respect to how the speaker is involved in the utterance (self-involvement). A statement, for instance, may involve a commit-
ment to future actions, may imply an attitude about something, may express such an attitude, or express a feeling. Although the basic inspiration of Evans' approach stems from Austin, he is no slavish devotee and is careful to point out his differences.

The remaining four chapters deal with the concept of divine creation as expressed in the Bible, primarily but not exclusively the OT, and with the contemporary upshot of this analysis. Creation is analyzed as a performative action, as an impressive and expressive action, and as a causal action (those are phrases from chapter titles). Lest theologians think this is all too abstract for theological purposes, some of the topics dealt with under those heads are miracle, covenant, creative word, Jesus and the divine spirit, authority, glory, holiness, revelation, the uniqueness of Christ, mystery, parables, and whether creation has a beginning in time. Regarding some of these topics, E. makes exciting points even for those who are uninterested in his specific undertaking.

E.'s undertaking is not to derive true theological doctrines from biblical texts. Rather he aims to lay out the meanings of central biblical claims. On the other hand, he does not treat the language of the Bible as a unique language game itself. It is rather part of the ordinary language of the biblical writers, concerned as they were with their religious situation. The significance of E.'s work is that he provides a new and extraordinarily disciplined way of analyzing certain theological concepts sympathetically. Although he is aware of apologetical implications of his work, his analysis is offered primarily as an examination of the biblical ground for theological doctrines. His work must be considered by anyone interested in the foundation of theology, even though it must be classed itself as philosophy of religion.

E.'s own theological predilections are rather Barthian, although he shows close acquaintance not only with biblical scholarship but also with the Continental tradition of Bultmann and Bonhoeffer as well as with English Thomism (Farrer and Mascall). Because the worth of classificatory schemes rests with whether they successfully classify their material, and E. has limited his material to biblical language, I wonder what changes might be entailed if discussions of creation from other traditions were included. For instance, would the analysis of performatory utterances adequate to the Bible be adequate to the distinction between Brahman with qualities and Brahman without qualities as this is debated by Shankara, Ramanuja, and Madhva? Would it be appropriate to the Mahayana Buddhist texts concerning the Three Bodies? Until a more catholic sampling is dealt with, it would be premature to say that E.'s book stands on its own in philosophy of religion. Rather it is a philosophical propaedeutic to Christian theology. E. himself may
subscribe to the view that philosophy is only a special way of dealing with material more normatively a part of other disciplines, for instance theology, not a discipline with conclusions of its own to establish. But at any rate, the contribution E. makes to the foundations of Christian theology bears much further examination.

Fordham University  
ROBERT C. NEVILLE


Despite the promise of its first chapters, where the writing is still brisk and clear and the focus still fairly sharp, the basic fact about this book is that it aims at reflective awareness of understanding, yet reveals serious oversights with regard to both the concept and the reality of understanding. These oversights are tightly, multiply connected, as follows.

Two key chapters out of twelve treat What-questions and Is-questions and the relation between them. "Our interest is methodological," say the authors, yet they ignore the distinction of greatest methodological moment for questions of the form "What is X?"—namely, the distinction between conceptual What-questions, requiring a definition or word meaning for their answer, and nonconceptual What-questions, calling for a description, causal explanation, or other account of the reality referred to by the term "X." Since the answers appropriate to these diverse sorts of What-questions differ so radically, so do the requisite evidence and mode of investigation. Accordingly, repeated neglect of the distinction has caused untold confusion since the start of philosophy. Similar, though less grave, is the authors' failure to note that the question "What?" (like the question "Why?") does not have a single, unambiguous sense regardless of the context in which it occurs. These oversights automatically vitiate the treatment of Is-questions. For the authors point out that an answer to the question "Is this an X?" presupposes an answer to the question "What is an X?"—and they have not specified the sort of What-knowledge presupposed. Rather, by treating only nonconceptual What-questions and the evidence required for them, then drawing the connection with Is-questions, they obscure the fact that most Is-questions presuppose the answer to only a conceptual What-question, yet require for their answer nonconceptual data similar to the data needed to answer nonconceptual What-questions.

The authors might answer that the questions referred to in these two chapters are not so much sentences as mental events, just as the answers to them are not so much verbal expressions as the judgments
they express. Such a use of the words “question” and “answer” would be typical of the way in which the book tends to dissociate terms from their ordinary meanings, a tendency connected with the oversights just mentioned. Oblivious of linguistic considerations when they discuss What-questions in general, the authors disregard them equally when they ask and answer their own What-questions: What is understanding? What is belief? What is faith? They do not see the requirements implicit in the fact that they borrowed words from the English language—“belief,” “faith,” “understanding”—to ask their questions with. Thus they refer to knowledge, understanding, belief, faith as mental acts or experiences, that is, in a way not at all typical of ordinary usage.

These objections may not seem too serious; for it is conceivable that someone should use his own variant of the English language to express valid and valuable insights. However, it is not likely that he will communicate them to those unacquainted with his personal variant of the mother tongue. Rather, since the words (“understand,” etc.) are the same in both languages but the concepts are different, it is more likely that, to the extent any communication at all takes place, it will impart false notions—for instance, the notion that what people commonly call “understanding” is an act.

I have stressed these deficiencies because they are so widespread. For the same reason many readers will not agree with my criticisms. However, they too may feel that the authors have not made a consistent enough effort to communicate with the (Catholic) “learner” for whom the book is intended. While exhorting him to reflect for himself on himself as “source of meaning” in science, art, and society, they nevertheless bombard him with rapid-fire “hints” and suggestions which are so briefly put that they could achieve their purpose of stimulation only if greater care were taken to fill in necessary background, avoid all unexplained jargon, and perceive when a thought familiar to the authors has not really been put across to the reader. As for the nonbeginner, he would do better to read Lonergan himself rather than this introduction to his thought.

Spring Hill College, Mobile

GARTH L. HALLETT, S.J.


Nels Ferré, as was to be expected, has written another first-rate book, one which he tells us is really his “lifework.” “Almost everything in this volume is new and different from my previous books; yet it seems that all my life has prepared me for this work.” This book is
really "theology" in the old Greek sense, i.e., imaginative generalizations about God and about the world in so far as it is related to God. As the subtitle indicates, it is a theology for a universal faith, i.e., it attempts to provide the broad lines of a categorical scheme which can serve as the framework for an understanding of man's various approaches to God which are instantiated in each of the historical religions. It is "Christian" in so far as the main interpretative categories, what F. calls the "categories of reality," have been suggested by the Christian religion and seem to have received some sort of privileged realization in it. Indeed, it is one of F.'s main contentions that Christian thinkers have for too long looked to alien philosophical or cultural sources for their prime metaphysical categories and have ignored or treated in a very secondary, quasi-metaphorical way those provided by the Christian faith.

F. singles out, as his three central "categories of reality," Spirit, the Personal, and Love. In the first part of this work, F. indicates what he believes to be the superior adequacy of these categories in treating problems long discussed by both "substance" and "process" philosophers. In a sense F. can be read as an attempt to provide a third alternative to these classical and neoclassical options. He is especially concerned with incorporating the insights, and yet substantially going beyond the accomplishments, of his old friends Paul Tillich and Alfred North Whitehead. Indeed, students of both Tillich and Whitehead will find it interesting to read the accounts in this volume of personal conversations which F. had with each.

This volume is called a theology for a universal faith, rather than a metaphysic, because it is F.'s conviction that man's best knowledge of ultimates can never exceed the status of a "warranted faith." "The real and only question is whether, in the light of the most critical and the most creative interpretation of experience, we can have a warranted faith to the effect that there is an ultimate nature of things and that we can know something of what this ultimate nature of things is." F. accepts the criticism of Hume and Kant that man's awareness of ultimates can never validly entail a justified knowledge-claim. Yet he is sharply critical of what he regards as the excesses of post-Kantian developments, especially the radical rejection of the classical correlation of right thinking, being (reality), and virtue. If I understand him correctly, F. seems to feel that if we substitute a demand for "warranted faith" rather than "strict knowledge," we can still maintain that right thinking will ultimately reveal to us what really is, that when we grasp what really is we will not be disappointed, and that man's good consists precisely in this attainment of awareness of what is. F. regards a philo-
sophical program conceived along these lines as an attempt at a genuinely post-Kantian metaphysic. Be that as it may, he is probably right in insisting that we have too long concentrated simply on the Kant of the first Critique.

The second part of this book contains F.'s appraisal of various Christological questions under the rubric "The Historical Word." To this reviewer it seems all too Nestorian and not appreciably different, though somewhat clearer, than Tillich's corresponding endeavors. Yet F. claims to have gotten to the "inner and deepest meaning" of what Chalcedon asserts. The last part of the book contains F.'s account of creation, the continuation of creation, and the consummation of creation.

I have been able only to indicate the most general lines of F.'s very careful work. Detailed study should be given to his suggested use of "contrapletal" logic: a logic attributed to Ramanuja and "accepting contradictions on one level or in one dimension as not contradictions on another level or in another dimension." F.'s concept of "unimunity" also deserves study, especially in connection with problems of eschatology.

University of Wisconsin

VINCENT M. COOKE, S.J.


Confronting the contemporary believer are obvious tensions which risk eroding into doubts. Though largely encountered on the level of lived religious experience, any effective dealing with them must situate itself on the level of intellectual reflection, of reasonable discourse as the critical function of faith—in a word, on the level of theology. The value of this present study (a translation of Herausgeforderter Glaube) lies in its presentation of the contemporary problematic on this plane, yet in an unpretentious and nonpedantic, nonarcane way. The literary genre is haute vulgarisation, and excellent of its kind, though nearly all of what it offers in content is already familiar to the practicing theologian. Its tone is entirely realistic, accepting rather than overthrowing the tensions, and sincerely irenic, acknowledging that such tensions offer opportunity for a needed "purification" in the articulations of faith content. Most significant of all, however, is a refusal, somewhat in the spirit of Hans Urs von Balthasar, of any easy decline into a religiously amorphous humanism which "runs the danger of making this [Christian] message optional" and wherein "prayer no longer has its proper place of value, but rather is replaced by meditation on humanity" (pp. 196-97). In this F. holds himself somewhat at a remove from the efforts of Neo-Liberal Protestantism, in spite of affording these a
sympathetic hearing, as, e.g., in his reservations on the attempt of Moltmann and Pannenberg to make hope the principle of theology (chap. 5), a project given a qualified Catholic expression by Schillebeeckx in his God the Future of Man. Such an endeavor, while cutting across the "Jesus of history-Christ of faith" controversy, merely substitutes the "God out ahead of us" for the "God above us," categories of the future and of promise for those of logos and disclosure, thereby subordinating to hope not only faith but charity as well.

A chapter entitled "Is Faith Defenseless?" offers what amounts to a new curriculum for what used to be known as "apologetics." In sharp opposition to Bultmann's insistence that man "must realise that he possesses nothing on the basis of which he could believe" (Kerygma und Mythos, cited on p. 28), F. sees faith as both admitting and demanding some grounding outside of itself: "If everything were a matter of belief, then there would be no faith at all" (p. 36). His own approach views the credibility of faith as analogous to the question of the foundations of love: faith, in short, is grounded in an act of trust and surrender to a person, but this latter in turn is further grounded in the "authority and the authenticity, and thus in the insight and the knowledge, of him who is believed" (p. 34). Critically speaking, this may satisfy for faith in general but suggests certain deeper underlying difficulties where faith in God is concerned. Seemingly the situation today is one in which the God-question, i.e., the question of the very reality of God, grounds every possible Christian faith-act. As Schubert Ogden puts it, it is "not one problem among several others, [but] the only problem there is." F.'s procedure, in a later section on atheism, focuses on the "implicit theism" in the actual good will of so many modern nonbelievers, thereby neutralizing the explicit denials of God in the realm of theory and ideas. This explains somewhat the fact that he himself rests content with the "co-affirmation of the Unconditioned" as adequate basis for the affirmation of God. But even more radically, the existence of God as a praeambulum fidei reduces itself back to the prior question concerning the very possibility of any kind of religious discourse, i.e., beyond the problem of truth to that of meaning itself. F. does not pursue matters that far, but an author cannot be taken to task for not writing a different kind of book than the one he intended.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D.C.

William J. Hill, O.P.

This second volume of *Theological Soundings*, from the years 1958-64, raises with characteristic Dutch aplomb (e.g., chap. 1: “God in Dry Dock”) the question of contemporary Christian theology, the reality of God, specifically with respect to man’s knowledge of and relationship to Him. For Schillebeeckx, man’s quest, “the search for the living God” (chap. 2—his 1958 Inaugural Address at the Catholic University of Nijmegen), is the frame of reference for a theological anthropology which conceives man as dialogue, intersubjectivity with God—for which relationship S. employs a neologism: “théologal.” Indeed, théologal intimacy is the theological definition of man’s personhood (p. 216) and the basis for faithful commitment to Christian secularity (chap. 5).

The Second Vatican Council, during whose final session the Dutch original of this collection appeared, was typical for a Catholic theological emergence from an isolation Christianity which shunned the world and was suspicious of man’s place in it. More and more there is a conviction that salvation comes to us in our daily life and the ordinary activities of the world. Revelation occurs in human history—whence the concern to integrate, within the perspectives of faith, human and “secular” structures, peace, the incipient unity of the world, the independence of developing countries, man’s inherent freedom of conscience, and the relative autonomy of human reason.

These “soundings” examine aspects of a twofold tendency which S. feels are characteristic of the current situation: in the Church, a movement toward the world; in humanity and the world, a movement toward ecclesiality, resp. (religious) community and sacral experience. (Cf. also his elaboration on this theme in the inaugural issue of *Concilium*, January, 1965.) Though one or two of these articles now seem dated —e.g., the discussion of natural law and situation ethics—they do provide the components of S.’s theological anthropology, and that not abstractly but in the context of his characteristic concern for current, concrete reality: reflection on the ideals and practice of the nontheistic Dutch Humanistic Association (chap. 3), and two lengthy essays in response to Bishop Robinson’s *Honest to God* (chap. 4, comprising nearly half the book). These articles are indispensable for an appreciation of one whose entire theological career represents a search for synthesis between tradition, the gospel and the teachings of the Church, and contemporary thought and experience.

Though several of the essays have specific points of departure, e.g., the Humanistic Association, all have a comprehensive scope and thrust which is eminently applicable within an even more “secularized” American theological and cultural climate. His primary concern is the resolution of a (false) dilemma, God or man, which pits personal human responsibility against impersonal divine mystery. This expresses a
fundamental insight and conviction of modern theology: there can be no competition between God and man, world and Church, secular reality and sacred mystery. (Protestant authors will perhaps reprove an almost naive neglect of the problem of sin here.) On the other hand, his reference to a modern "proof" for the existence of a personal God, based upon the reflexive explicitation of the experiential content and dynamics of earthly reality, seems to me to propose little more than a direction for further inquiry based on the reinterpretation of a traditional tenet within a contemporary anthropological perspective, for which the point of contact between God and man can only be found within human experience. The essential openness and contingency of human existence embraces an absolute dimension which, S. claims as theologian, objectively points to the mystery of God.

The epistemology of revelation theology—the nonconceptual intellectual dimension in our knowledge of God (cf. his Revelation and Theology 2—and a concurrent metaphysics of person predicated on the ontological structure of intersubjectivity are the core issues which give this collection its unity, and its importance as ground (not merely background) of so much of S.'s more recent hermeneutical studies. He here displays his philosophical indebtedness to the personalist existentialism of Merleau-Ponty and to the phenomenological reassessment of Aquinas by his Dominican master De Petter. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt about the originality with which S. has assimilated these traditions, and the critical ingenuity with which he employs them in the service of an ever ongoing Catholic theological tradition.


The latest book from Schoonenberg’s pen consists of two theological studies. The first is a development of the author’s 1965 inaugural address on the occasion of being named Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Nijmegen. Entitled “God or Man: A False Dilemma,” it makes use of recent publications on the theology of creation and evolution (Hulsbosch, de Haes, Karl Rahner) and on the nature-grace problem (de Lubac, S.’s own work) to make one fundamental point: “God does not compete with us, He does not alienate us, He does not dehumanize us; rather, He humanizes us through His Word become flesh. As I have written elsewhere: our divinization is our humanization” (p. 5).

The second study relates this general theological principle to the
Christological question "God and Man or God in Man?" S. begins with a discussion of the difficulties presented by the dominant model in Roman Catholic Christology, the Chalcedonian model. The questions which S. sees emerging from a study of this model are ranged in two series: those which deal with "the divine character of Jesus' humanity" (e.g.: Is Jesus in His humanity the natural or adopted Son of God? How is one to explain the unity of Jesus' actions? How can Jesus have acquired knowledge?) and those questions which bear on the ontological constitution of Jesus Christ (p. 58). This second and more important series consists of six objections to the Chalcedonian model, and it is these difficulties that he now discusses. The first objection has to do with the use of the term "nature" when speaking of a personal reality, given the current distinction between person and (objectifiable) nature. The second bears on the Chalcedonian use of "nature" with regard to God and man in Jesus Christ. While an analogical use of the word is intended, this is not developed in a theologically satisfactory way. The third objection insists that the use of the term "nature" makes it very difficult to free Christology from an essentialistic context. The fourth objection is a consequence of the problem formulated in the preceding: Jesus' place in salvation history does not find expression in this model. The fifth shortcoming of the two-natures model is that Jesus' own history, the succession of phases in His life, is not shown. Lastly, we are faced with the problem of a Jesus who is not a human person, but is person only in the divine Word, so that we are compelled to ask: Does the Chalcedonian model lead us in the end to the affirmation of a distinguished or divided Jesus Christ? The personal unity of Jesus, which was never an explicit problem for the NT writers, is put under severe strain when a modern theologian speaks of a wrestling between the divine and human in Jesus (Déodat de Basly), or when one feels compelled to say that Jesus' humanity, as a conscious center, worships the Logos (Karl Rahner). It is this imperiled unity that S. hopes to safeguard by his own Christological reflections.

S.'s positive contribution begins with a firm affirmation that Jesus is and was a full human person (p. 66). The theory according to which Jesus Christ is ontologically a person only in the second divine hypostasis is asked to yield to the hypothesis that Jesus Christ lacks nothing in the created order: if Jesus is the "unique man" (S. prefers the term "eschatological"), this is not rendered possible by a divine "element" taking the place of Jesus' person or act of existence (p. 73). Expressed succinctly, S. prefers the model of "indwelling" to that of hypostatic union. Instead of speaking of Jesus' enhypostasia in the Word, he
speaks of the Word's *enhypostasia* in Jesus the man: the Logos becomes person, it acquires its "way of subsisting" within salvation history, it becomes a personal self for whom the Father is a genuine Thou, only in the Incarnation (p. 86). Here S. appeals to the traditional Trinitarian theology, according to which the Logos within the Godhead does not have its own proper consciousness and will. An analysis of the development of Trinitarian doctrine convinces S. that the idea of a pre-existent Logos, that is, of a Logos that would exist within the Godhead even if God had not shared His life with a redeemed creation, was slow in developing, and was not necessarily the last word. Whether we must affirm that God would be triune even if He were not Creator and Redeemer, depends on our understanding of God's immutability. S. is more cautious here than previously (cf. *TS* 30 [1969] 27–60). In the present study he is content to say that we cannot decide this question, but whatever we say about a pre-existent divine person must never be such as to undo the one and human person that is Jesus. S. offers various formulations in which he tries to express the special relationship between Jesus and God. For example, he says that his theory is that of "the presence of God's Word, or of God through His Word, in Jesus Christ, and indeed in such a way that this Word enters Him completely, it becomes a historical person in Him, it becomes flesh" (p. 86). Thus S. wishes to find the transcendence of Jesus Christ with respect to other men in His humanity as related to and expressive of the Father.

In this short space we have had to concentrate on only several small sections of S.'s impressive and difficult book. The sections that treat the questions mentioned above, and those which discuss Jesus' earthly activity and His fulfilment in the Resurrection, have had to be omitted. The brief summary of S.'s positive contribution to the question of Jesus Christ's constitution will suffice to indicate where many theologians will want to push him further. Does his indwelling-model manage to express, with a precision that can satisfy the demands of systematic theology, the uniqueness of Jesus of Nazareth among men? Is the subordinationist tendency in his theory (a tendency that, to one degree or another, any Logos-theology brings with it) stronger than Catholic Christology can tolerate? Can the theologian be satisfied with S.'s "agnosticism" regarding a "pre-existent" Trinity?

These and other pressing questions will be raised when the Nijmegen theologian's book reaches a wider audience (English and German translations are in preparation, hopefully with indices). But that audience will not simply have questions. It will experience once again how seriously S. takes contemporary man's search for the credible, the ancient
Church's complex tradition, and, last because first, the Word that God once spoke to us.

University of Nijmegen

BRIAN O. MCDERMOTT, S.J.


A. Vanneste, Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Lovanium University at Kinshasa (Congo), is well known for his historical and systematic studies concerning the problems of original sin, which he published in various theological reviews during the previous decade. In the present book (The Dogma of Original Sin: Senseless Myth or Revelation of a Fundamental Structure of Human Existence?) he has summarized his studies and presented them to a larger than strictly theological audience. The book is a good example of haute vulgarisation.

Like many contemporary authors, V. places the doctrine of original sin in a Christological perspective: fundamentally, it expresses the need of all men for the one Mediator of salvation. This is the basic thesis of the book. From this viewpoint V. interprets the classical texts of Genesis and the Letter to the Romans, the statements of Carthage and Trent, and offers a solution to the various problems connected with original sin: concupiscence, death, and suffering. The book concludes with a reflection on the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and a chapter on the lot of children who die without baptism. In an appendix V. criticizes the views of various contemporary theologians in these matters: Dubarle, Grelot, Schoonenberg, Alszeghy, Flick, Rondet, and Hulsbosch.

The book's originality lies in its thesis that one can speak of sin only in a personal sense: all adults are personal sinners and hence in need of redemption. The myth of Adam and Eve merely expresses the universality of this experience, and should not be taken as revealing the source of this universality. V., therefore, holds that scientific questions of evolution, monogenism, polygenism, etc., have no relation whatever to theological doctrines. It seems doubtful, however, whether V. gives a satisfactory solution to the disturbing question, why all men are personal sinners. He merely states that on principle all could avoid sin, but in fact nobody does. Perhaps a more serious study of ancient myths and modern philosophers (e.g., Ricoeur) could bring us further in appreciating the mysterium iniquitatis which in V. somewhat evaporates.

Although V. maintains with hesitation the term "original sin" for children who are not yet able to make a personal decision, he quite
frankly admits that it does not make much sense to speak of sinfulness or innocence prior to the free act. The theologian can speak meaningfully only about man insofar as he is capable of a free relationship to God. "The child can be a sinner only to the extent that it is a human being" (p. 85). But obviously the child is not a human being in the same manner as an adult. Original sin in the infant means, then, that he would be a sinner if he were an adult and will be a sinner as soon as he becomes an adult. One wonders how such an interpretation can be reconciled with the infant's need for salvation in Christ, as it is implied in the universality of this need and probably in the practice of infant baptism. What V. has to say about the questions of concupiscence, death, and suffering is not very impressive after the profound studies which Rahner (whom V. never mentions) has published on these questions. Concupiscence means "that all men are hurt as a consequence of their sins, hurt especially in their highest and noblest capacities: their intellect and will" (p. 99).

In general, one must say that the book lacks speculative depth. Many questions appear to receive a satisfactory solution only because they do not probe below the surface. Yet for those who are not professional theologians the book clears up a number of popular misunderstandings. Its value lies in the effort it makes to relate the doctrine of original sin to the human experience of sinfulness and also in the Christological perspective in which this doctrine is placed.

*Loyola College, Baltimore*  
**BERNARD A. NACHBAHR**


Grasso is the author of the successful book *Proclaiming God's Message* (Notre Dame, 1965). He is associated with the Gregorian University, Rome. The book under review is an apologetical work which analyzes the evidence for the divine origin of the Christian message and the Catholic Church. Using the Gospels as historical documents, G. studies the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah of Israel and the Son of God. G. sees in the miracles of Jesus, especially the Resurrection, support for His claims. The Catholic Church is the projection of Jesus in space and time. The Catholic Church has inherited the mission of Jesus because He founded the Church upon Peter, who lives on in his successors, the bishops of Rome. In connection with the Church, G. develops such themes as the People of God, the Body of Christ, the papacy and episcopacy, infallibility, tradition, and Scripture.

The function of apologetics is undoubtedly legitimate. Its function is
to study the fact of revelation and the signs which disclose it. The fact of revelation provides a rational foundation for the decision of faith. There are solid reasons for accepting the claims of Christ and the Church; hence, one's commitment to Christ and the Church is a rational act in conformity with man's nature as a rational being.

The undersigned is convinced that the apologetical method employed by G. is basically sound and indispensable for apologetics. But the method is in partial eclipse, for various reasons: a lack of confidence in the Gospels (at least in some quarters) as sources of information about the historical Jesus; questions about the nature of miracles as transcendent events and signs; particular interest in the human subject to whom revelation is addressed with his needs and aspirations; ecumenical considerations; possibly even a more or less latent antipathy to rational argumentation. This review, however, is not the place to debate the significance of these reasons.

At any rate, G. has employed the apologetical method described—but with mixed success. As he employs the method, its logic is evident. He uses his knowledge of authors and literature to good effect. His style is clear and concise. On the other hand, his exegesis of Scripture is dated in certain instances. For example, he sees a correspondence between the prophecies of the OT and their fulfilment in the NT to a degree seldom recognized by modern Catholic exegetes. He has taken only passing note of the documents of Vatican II, even where these might have clarified the matters under discussion. Indeed, G.'s volume conveys the impression of having been written a decade or two before Vatican II, with a halfhearted attempt to bring it up to date by an occasional reference to the Council.

The apologetical method employed by G. has its place, but it must be rehabilitated. It can be rehabilitated by using the results of modern exegesis and the insights of Vatican II. An excellent beginning has been achieved by works in German such as Warum glauben? (Echter-Verlag) edited by Kern, Schierse, and Stachel, and Lang's Fundamentaltheologie (Hueber). G.'s volume, however, does not make the same contribution to the theological literature in English.

Mt. St. Mary's Seminary
Norwood, Ohio

Edward J. Gratsch


Crisp and declarative, Nicolas presents a commanding synthesis of biblical, patristic, dogmatic, and current reflections on divine grace. Confronting the richness of such material, the invitation to sermonize
is not easily declined; happily, homiletic hones insight and N. masters the expansive range of his material. With ample and illuminating notes, all the major metaphysical questions are traced in detail and with clarity. Wisely setting aside the dichotomy he seems to affirm (p. 18) between "information théorique" and "possession vivante," he proceeds with an enviable erudition to examine the themes of grace as a state of being and its consequent effects. While apparently slighting the profane notion of grace in parabiblical cultures and the pre-Christian salvific economy, N. develops the theme of divinization through grace and its systematic explanation. Marked insistence on grace as mystery, a prime property of the divine Life shared with us, notably enhances his treatment of the role of the Spirit in Christian life. Tinctured as it was by an earlier Montanist taint, charismatic grace is developed as an integral part of the vivacity to be expected in the life of the Church. It is of some regret that N. does not address the question of the experience of grace in the personal self and the corporate, ecclesial life. Rightly shying away from a behavioral exegesis of created grace, N. affirms and explains its Christic power and assimilative potential.

Less satisfying is the treatment of the natural capacity for supernatural elevation (pp. 380 ff.). There seems no valid reason for restricting Thomas' obediential potency to the domain of intellect and will; it is consistent with a Thomist view to affirm at least the repercussive, possibly decisive, effect of grace upon the sense faculties of man. Indeed, less warranted is the confinement of this potency to the range of the conscious mind alone; Thomas (De veritate, q. 12, a. 2, ad 1m) elaborates on the precise mode of passivity of the potency at the exact point that grace may become experience. Surely the misty peripheries of these questions are replete with thorny issues, the solution of which demands a sharper precision than allied disciplines have yet been able to offer the theologian. Still, whether one prefers the terms "conscious" and "unconscious," or Adler's "awareness" and "nonawareness," it is unwise to restrict the impact of grace to consciousness and reason; the mystery of justification confronts, purposefully, man's intuitive (instinctive), imaginative self so carefully and skilfully served by the stylistic variations of Scripture. In Reinhold Niebuhr's view, there are and must be "dramatic modes of apprehension of the Scriptures." Plato's "prophetic transport" (Phaedrus) means to be seized by a personal and personalizing power below or beyond the rational mind. Grace is both power and presence.

Perhaps the Greek theme of divinization is pressed too univocally, thereby overvaluing these two ethereal powers of man, intellect and will. The hazard of an inconsistent analogy distracts from the humanization of grace. As the late Hugo Rahner once wrote: "Man only be-
comes human in God; this constitutes his healing.” To seem to remove grace from the cloudy preconscious perimeter of human existence and experience affords only an expensive clarity. Theology must avail itself of that Greek parallel to divinization, anagnórisis; it is to this “recognition” and the modes of its realization, as actuated and deepened by the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, that theologians must address themselves.

Pacific commentary rather than disputation enhances the considerable value of this book. Still, it must be said that brevity deflects the force and suasiveness of good argument; thus, in rejecting quasi-formal causality an explicative of the Indwelling, N. does not really serve the question. For K. Rahner and (though less true but still valid) for M. de la Taille, the question is broader than ontology (pp. 439-44). The elaboration of the depth and penetration of grace requires a supple metaphysic, an open ontology; N. exhibits high competence here. It further requires a sensitized psychology through which the experiential inflections of grace may be discerned for personal as well as ecclesial edification. With this compendium offered by N., the future work has a clear and definitive starting point; it also has a depth and style that make imitation a necessity.

Boston College

William J. Burke, S.J.


This volume of texts and documents on the sixteenth-century controversies de auxiliis is the answer to a suggestion made by C. Pozo, S.J., in 1966, for the edition of the Apologia fratrum praedicatorum. This document was drawn up in 1594-95, when the controversy between Dominicans and Jesuits was transferred from Spain to Rome at the direction of the Holy See, to be continued and settled there. The famous Congregationes de auxiliis, after eighty-five sessions (1600-1606), left the question open, and both sides were allowed to hold their respective positions concerning the efficacy of grace ab intrinseco and ab extrínseco.

The edition is the work of V. Beltrán de Heredia, O.P., the Spanish Bañezian scholar and editor of Báñez’s unpublished works: his Scholastica commentaria in Primam secundae (3 vols.; Salamanca, 1942–48) and in Tertiam partem (2 vols.; Salamanca, 1951–53). The volume under review had been under preparation for a number of years. Its publication is an important contribution to the history of the controversies de auxiliis.

The editor prefaces the texts with a ninety-page historical introduc-
tion. This is meant, he says, to balance the account of the Jesuits A. Astrain and R. de Scorailles, which he considers as definitely biased in favor of Molina and Molinism—a bias which at times leads to inaccuracies. When studying his own account, a reader may well get a similar suspicion about a Dominican bias. The theological setting in which the Concordia of Molina came to be written is noteworthy. As the author shows, there was in the Society at the time a trend toward a new theology, different from traditional Thomism. He narrates in detail the history of “pre-Molinism,” with the incident of the theses of Prudencio de Montemayor, S.J., and the publication of the Concordia, which took place, he shows, not without some irregularities in securing official approval. His account of the ensuing controversies, apologies, and censures completes the history of this episode.

The substantial piece among the texts edited here is the Apologia (pp. 115–380). This was the work of seven or eight Dominican theologians and represented the official stand of the order. The present edition drew its text from two official manuscript traditions which complete one another. The Apologia refutes, one by one, eight principal assertions of Molina taken from the Concordia (Part 1), another fourteen less important assertions (Part 2), and finally reviews and refutes the arguments, including the auctoritates, proposed by the Molinists in support of their views (Part 3). The document is signed by the authors and seventeen censors. It throws a light of its own on the theological mood of the time, which delighted in controversy and argumentation.

The volume includes other unpublished texts of Báñez, such as his comments on the theses of Fr. de Montemayor and his answer to Suárez’ Defense of the Society regarding Free Will, a dialogue between Jesuits and Báñez on the efficacy of grace, etc. A number of other documents, not from the pen of Báñez but in favor of his position, complete this collection of source material.

V. Beltrán de Heredia has thus filled a gap in theological history. His work is mainly of historical interest, and is a sign that traditional historical and theological scholarship is kept up in Spain. It is typical of the contemporary temper that this Dominican “correction” of the Jesuit history of the controversy is published under the aegis of the Instituto Francisco Suárez.

St. Mary’s College, Kurseong

P. De Letter, S.J.


This book contains the text of lectures given at the Texas Methodist
Pastors' School in 1968 by E. J. Fiedler, a Catholic priest, and R. B. Garrison, a Methodist minister. Both authors describe themselves as “pastor-priests.” The lectures, written in a simple and engaging style, deal with the problem of sacramental theology and practical aspects of worship in an ecumenical perspective. In alternating chapters the authors engage in a kind of dialogue about the meaning of Christian sacraments in general, baptism, Eucharist, the other five major rites of the Christian tradition, and the preaching of the word. A final chapter treats “The Worldliness of the Sacraments.” A select bibliography and an index are added.

Given the nature of the book, it would be unfair to register a complaint about the quality of the historical perspective and the theological depth of the work, or to expect a thorough analysis of the different perspectives on the Christian faith which gave rise to the varying Reformation and Catholic views of the sacraments: the nature of the Church; the role of the humanity of Christ in the work of redemption; the relationship of matter to spirit, of human to divine. This book does not present a serious dialogue between traditional Catholic and Reformation theology of the sacraments. However, it does offer the reflections of two dedicated pastors on contemporary literature concerned with the sacraments. Both find that this literature is leading to a consensus with which they can agree. They allude to the fact that complicated theological problems exist but feel that they can be overcome.

A number of good things are said in favor of infant baptism, incarnational Christianity and its implications for sacramental practice receive satisfactory treatment, and there is a good chapter on the preaching of the word. A more complete treatment of theological problems connected with the Eucharist would have been useful, especially the theme of the Eucharist as sacrifice of Christ and the Church.

The authors communicate well their optimism and dedication to the ecumenical task and the conviction that what divides them is far less than what unites them. Perhaps this is the book’s most important contribution.

Weston College School of Theology

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.


Just a few years ago, when the first rumblings of a theology of hope
began to be heard from Europe, not a few wondered whether we had another fad arising on the academic horizon. Unlike the death-of-God phenomenon, which generated far more smoke than heat and light, the impetus furnished by the writings of Jürgen Moltmann and others has proved to be a fruitful and exciting approach to theological inquiry. The two books under review are part of a continuing stream of works that attempt to wrestle with the eschatological dimension of theology. While both works, as their titles indicate, wish to treat the same general theme, the respective approaches are quite different—the differences arising, in part at least, from the milieu and preoccupations of the authors. F. is an American theologian who writes from the cultural matrix of contemporary America, while A. is a Brazilian who approaches theology from the far more tumultuous context of the Third World and its sensitivity to class struggle, political aspiration, and constant proximity to revolution.

If F.'s work is the thinner of the two, both in size and content, that is not to say it is a book lacking in merit. F. starts with a chapter that attempts to show the future-oriented thrust of today's culture by a discussion of the “futurology” of Herman Kahn and his associates at the Hudson Institute, a lively analysis of the hope-filled vision of the late Martin Luther King, and a quick look at hope-oriented literature that includes, of all things, a short analysis of Tolkien, and a far more convincing discussion of Jean François Steiner's moving account of life in the concentration camp at Treblinka.

As a counterpoint to this cultural discussion, F. then examines in two chapters the structures of Christian hope. Accepting the “massive fact of evil” does not lead to existential despair for the Christian, because he looks forward to the “not yet,” the eschaton; the “not yet” is Christ and His kingdom; the mirror or approximation of this is the Church, which should manifest that mutuality and concern for others that will mark the arrival of Christ's kingdom and the ineffable Shalom of God. This “pull of the future” is prominent in the theological efforts of such hope-oriented theologians as Harvey Cox, Jürgen Moltmann, and Teilhard de Chardin, writers whom F. examines and criticizes in turn. The respective analyses must be, due to lack of space, somewhat superficial, and the section on Cox suffers from having been written prior to the publication of Cox's latest work, The Feast of Fools. A final chapter on “Discerning the Signs of Hope” proposes the Church as eschatological community in a sense larger than the exclusivistic groups of the radical reformation or the Catholic tradition of religious orders with the evangelical counsels as uncompromising signs of the eschaton to come.
The work of A. is not quite as easy to summarize, both because of its density and the closeness of its argument. At the risk of superficiality, I would outline the main thrust of his work in this manner. There is emerging a new consciousness in the Third World that A. calls political humanism. This new consciousness is characterized by a language that expresses both the impotent poverty of the oppressed and their unwillingness to remain in this condition. Political humanism then calls for freedom, and projects this freedom in the direction of the future, thus giving rise to hope. This projection into the future is not founded on the promise of technological salvation, but rather in a resoundingly negative critique of technologism, as Herbert Marcuse pointed out some time ago in *One-Dimensional Man*. A. then attempts to show how inadequate certain theological movements are to speak or understand the language of this humanism. Existentialism, whether of the Kierkegaardian or Bultmannian variety, will not take the world seriously enough to hope for a new tomorrow; thus hope becomes a category of pure subjectivity. Barth, both old and new, takes election very seriously, but not history; Barth, pushed to the wall, must affirm that history is in fact over, and without a seriousness about history one can never understand the aspirations of political humanism. A. finds Jürgen Moltmann’s analysis of the biblical community of faith closely related to the ideas of political humanism, but Moltmann’s idea that the Church mediates the fact of the Resurrection through its preaching and thus creates the only true history is rejected by Alves. He flatly states: “it is not true that the Church has been the midwife of the future. Moreover, it is not true that where the word is not preached there is no history. Indeed, our historical experience today is exactly the opposite” (p. 66).

As A. sees it, the theological task today in confrontation with political humanism is to create a theological language that expresses the sincere will of the community of faith to create a new tomorrow for man; the community of faith must also take the critique of political humanism seriously in its own formulation and add something real to its aspirations and program. This new language is historical, treating revelation as history; it must have a radical prophetizing impact; it must clearly indicate that the present is not final, and it refuses to point to anything in history as eternal or absolute; hence it is radically iconoclastic and imaginative (which dimension A. denies is a form of alienation from history). A. is also quick to point out, remembering the travail and pain of the Third World, that the future comes only through suffering, just as the seemingly hopeless suffering of the slave of Deutero-Isaiah was really the key to the freedom of the future. As Harvey
Cox, in his introduction to this book, so well puts it: "Hope grows out of historical experience, especially the experience of liberation that occurs where there was no evidence that it could" (p. x).

Both E. and A. have written engaging books from the point of view of the theology of hope, and I have no intention of choosing or recommending one over the other. Both have their merits and their faults. F. has contented himself with being sensitive to the signs of hope in the modern world and showing that these signs are consistent with a genuinely Christian concern and capable of being seen within the framework of a logically articulated theological position. A. has tried to show that theology can speak to an essentially hope-oriented humanism that finds little time for theology. There is much to be pondered over in his work. I was somewhat disappointed that A. found little space to discuss Teilhard de Chardin or J. B. Metz (the Teilhard omission was also noted by Cox).

A final word. What struck me about both works was the continued insistence of the authors that Christianity should take this world and its historical moment with complete seriousness, while always pointing to the "not yet"; such a stance both guarantees worldly involvement and avoids absolutizing that which is less than God. To put the matter somewhat differently, it allows for seriousness about immanence while pointing to the transcendence of the future. If this tension has not yet been adequately described by the "futurity" theologians, this should be little cause for chagrin. That they can approach the problem with vigor and insight is in itself a hope-filled sign not only for the vitality of theology but for the pastoral mission of the Church.

Florida State University Study Center

LAWRENCE CUNNINGHAM

Florence, Italy


This work, which grew out of a series of lectures delivered in 1966 at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary in St. Louis, attempts to assess what is "new" in the postconciliar theology of Roman Catholicism and how this "newness" may affect the Roman Church both internally and in its relations with the Churches of the Reformation. It is not a long work (only 118 pages of text) but it is marked by an easy and sure understanding of contemporary Catholic theological work, and an unflagging optimism about the future of the ecumenical enterprise—an optimism which, the author himself admits, may seem to some unrealistic.
L. organizes his work around the theme of Church and mission, a theme he finds both congenial to his own purposes and absolutely seminal in the documents of Vatican II. Successive chapters deal with the Church's secular mission, the liturgy, ecumenism and ecclesiastical structures, and Catholic dogma and the Word of God.

In his analysis of the various documents of Vatican II that bear on the problems of service, liturgy, ecclesiology, and ecumenism, L. is careful to point out (quite rightly) that the conciliar formulations betray a tension between the older, more Scholastic forms of theological conceptualizations and the newer theological formulations that were only emerging at the time of the Council. *Lumen gentium* is particularly illustrative of this tension: the Bellarminian vision of the hierarchical visible society over against the more horizontal view of the pilgrim Church; the office of the bishop and the local church coupled with the reaffirmation of the *potestas ordinaria* of the pope (one need only read Archbishop Felici's second *addendum* of Nov. 16, 1964, to see that there was awareness of the possible tension in the text of *Lumen gentium*), an unsolved theological dilemma which is causing not a few practical problems today, as our newspapers so abundantly illustrate. One could cite similar examples of two competing theologies from the Decree on Ecumenism, the Constitution on the Liturgy, and the Constitution on Divine Revelation.

However, it is in the dialectical nature of the documents of Vatican II that L. sees reason for optimism. The very "unfinished" quality of Vatican II, coupled with the postconciliar eagerness to push on with the theological task, makes for progress, a sensible sort of revisionism, and, hopefully, an increasing fidelity to God's Word. This possibility is a real one, L. insists, because of the virtual abandonment of a theology based on immutable and ahistorical "propositions" divorced from the context of time and culture. As L. rightly observes, "Historical studies have made Catholics as well as non-Catholics intensely aware of the time-conditioned and culture-conditioned character of all human language, even when it is used by the Church. Meaning depends on the situation, and to repeat abiding truths in the same old ways in radically new circumstances is not to preserve, but to betray them. The only way to say the same thing in a new context is to say it differently" (p. 99).

What L. has written about the Council and its aftermath is not totally optimistic. While he does hope for the best as far as future doctrinal and disciplinary development is concerned, he also recognizes that, from the viewpoint of the Reformation tradition, there are grave problems to be confronted, not the least of which is whether a revisionist understanding of the role of the magisterium and the Petrine office
on either the Catholic or Protestant side may not provoke a crisis of identity for both traditions. Yet, because men in fact are willing to talk, and talk honestly, even these obstacles may be overcome. Even the consensus of theologians, however, is not enough; for one must still account for the “grass roots” problem of the Christian people who are separated not so much by ideology as by the long-standing divisions of tradition and practice that flow from that ideology. The ecumenical hope is still a hope.

One last observation may not be out of order. While L. is concerned to examine and study Roman Catholic theology today, nonetheless he is doing it in a totally ecumenical context. He is seeking to understand what is happening in Catholic theology and why, with the desire to communicate to his own brothers. To this task he brings a great deal of study and understanding. In fact, the most attractive quality of this book for me is the grasp that the author has of Catholic theology. Along with Albert Outler, L. must rank as one of the most knowledgeable Protestant commentators on Catholic theology writing in the United States today. That in itself is a good sign and it bodes well for the future of ecumenism, whatever the theoretical and practical problems may be at the present.

Florida State University Study Center
Florence, Italy


Bring together experts in the fields of exegesis, Stoic and Platonic philosophy, ecclesiology, dogmatic and moral theology, toss in the clear thinking of a metaphysician and the realism of a natural scientist, and you have the makings of a nourishing theological salad. Make the participants representatives of Irish centers of learning such as Maynooth and University College, Dublin, and it will be properly seasoned. Such is the nature of this book, which addresses itself to the sources of Catholic moral teaching and the attitudes we ought to have vis-à-vis these sources. The eating does not belie the promise. In part this work peels away theological excrescences belonging to a particular age, thus seeking the heart of perennial theology; in part it indicates directions for development of moral. How timely in the aftermath of Humanae vitae!

No theology in the Vatican II era is honest that does not admit the shortcomings of the manuals and even of official pronouncements that may be postconciliar in time but are preconciliar in viewpoint. This book presents honest theology with courage and acumen.

It is curious, the editor notes, that the best evidence of real authority
for papal teaching lies with such documents as *Populorum progressio* and *Pacem in terris*, whereas the pronouncements that make absolute legal claims for themselves evoke dissent. This noteworthy fact initiates the authors’ search into the biblical and magisterial sources of Christian ethics, the origins of natural-law theory and a critical evaluation of some of its arguments, the idiom used in Catholic moral teaching, the way this teaching has been imposed on and received by the community, and the notable assets of the Church for the guidance of God’s people in the future. The contributors decline adequate treatment of these topics in favor of selective consideration of certain aspects.

An important thesis sustained is the difference of official Church teaching in the moral sphere as compared with the area of faith. The former scarcely if ever has been proposed infallibly, though in practice it was treated as such. Moreover, the authority of moral teaching must be the authority of the truth itself, Mackey holds, or rather of the known evidence for it. The source, then, of the known truth found in moral conclusions will usually be reason, rather than the authority of the person speaking. *Ipse dixit* authority “is here minimal, if it can be allowed at all, and it certainly cannot remain in force for long either in the entire absence of reason, or in the presence of substantial contrary reasons” (p. xii).

Another thorny issue tackled is that of the response of conscience to official, noninfallible teaching. The discussion of this question in the wake of *Humanae vitae* has not been marked by theological clarity, Mackey finds. Some episcopal statements did not make it clear whether they were acknowledging the right to dissent only in those with an erroneous conscience or admitting a dissent based on objective evidence. Worse, to say that one must act with an informed conscience but then to suggest that this means informed solely by the official teaching is a denial of the relative autonomy of conscience basic to our Catholic tradition. This use of authority renders moral teaching in the Church “absolute and irreformable. Such a suggestion would be highly irresponsible” (p. xiii). This is strong language, but in a matter so sacred as the guidance of the conscience of God’s people words are not to be minced in deference to courtesy.

The doctrine of conscience has not been significantly advanced since the Middle Ages, Enda McDonough summarizes. It stands in need of development. This, he rightly suggests, requires a conception of conscience in terms of the whole person rather than just of intellect, responding to God in Christ, interacting with the community, facing the concrete situation. Moreover, teaching proposed to the Christian conscience must recognize three levels of moral understanding: the great,
profound moral truths such as brotherhood and sonship; secondly, the application of these to the world at any given time in history; finally, the bearing on the life of the individual. The validity of the teaching, whether official or otherwise, diminishes as it moves from the first level to the next. On the last level “nobody can substitute, although many can help” (p. 125).

The biblical conclusions in the book are particularly pertinent. Seán Freyne insists that Christian ethics respect the basic scriptural distinction between apodictic law, e.g., the Decalogue, and casuistic law, e.g., prescriptions concerning the manumission of slaves, moneylending, and the like. The latter genre the Israelites borrowed from secular sources, viz., the neighboring peoples. Thus they were actually seeking the content of the will of Yahweh in human experience. Add to this that the moral teaching of the Prophets is not based on any special revealed content. Similarly, the wisdom books borrow their message from secular literature. Moving to the NT, Freyne concludes: “Jesus inherited and refined rather than innovated” as far as codified moral law is concerned (p. 19).

Even apodictic laws, for all their claim to revelation as their source, are limited, Freyne points out. The Decalogue presents merely the minimal requirements for walking in the way of the Lord. The total response of faith, to him, far exceeds the grasp of legal formulation. It is moral motivation that uniquely characterizes OT teaching and that of Jesus rather than codification of moral precepts. The will of Yahweh inscribed in the heart should be the inspiration of the Christian. Following this lead of the Holy Spirit, the Church ought to propose, not impose, her teaching.

The authors of this symposium are to be congratulated that they have not taken the negative stance of merely revealing the shortcomings of our moral teaching of the past. They make a significant contribution to our reconstruction of Christian ethics for the present. To the extent that such writing reflects the experience of the community, we can say that we are undergoing a liberation from the law roughly akin to that of the pristine Church.

Woodstock College

ROBERT H. SPRINGER, S.J.


In a time when religious life is being much questioned, religious will find help through this book in ascertaining the foundations of religious
life. Gelpi probes fundamental questions of religious life in the Scriptures, through developments in patristic and later times, and presents the best of theological thought; this is done in view of an intelligent forecast of the future of religious life. The book seeks to penetrate far beyond the sketchy presentations found in formation manuals; for much of the confusion in the mind of religious about the elements of religious life may be due to the limitations of exposure to manuals alone.

G. treats the five basic areas of poverty, chastity, obedience, community, and prayer, and in each instance goes to the core of the reality. Poverty is viewed in terms of gratuitous sharing, and the treatment seeks to shake off the influence of the Franciscan Spirituals; religious are challenged to meet existing needs of society in living through faith a life of selfless sharing with those most in need. Chastity, the vow of unrestricted love, is seen as implicitly contained in gratuitous sharing. G. focuses on the positive dynamic aspects of this vow, its ecclesial significance, and its demands of affective human involvement with particular people in need. Objections to celibate unrestricted love are realistically treated, especially in G.'s presentation of the concrete particularity of universal love. The chapter on the vow of service reflects current thinking on authority and obedience, with a new thrust. G. would describe the vow of obedience as "a promise made to God in which a baptized Christian freely dedicates himself on a permanent and public basis to cooperate in a responsible manner with the members of the eucharistic priesthood in their effort to serve the Christian community by providing responsible leadership for that community in its worship of God and in its efforts to serve men in the image of Christ." Such an approach does not require one to accept the Christian community or one's own particular religious community blindly in its present state of historical evolution; nor does one have to consider the decisions of those in authority as ideal. The ultimate commitment of the vow is to Christ's own ideal of Christian community, and this ideal must be cooperatively discerned through reflection; subordination of one's will to authority is a means to embodying this ideal.

G. points out that it is the vow of obedience that publicly gives servant status in the community; thus it would hold the primacy among the vows. The vow of unrestricted love is concerned with interiority for the first vow; but this does not give ecclesiastical status as a servant. To this reviewer the approach to the question of the primacy, however, does not seem to be considered sufficiently; for arguments could be constructed with this approach to obedience to assert the primacy of chastity.
The chapter on Christian community carries through the theme of service and realistically presents the problems facing religious community living today: tension, polarization, work, and the challenge of small community living, leadership, etc.

G. offers excellent reflections on a dimension of prayer which he calls the "prayer of involvement," because it springs from the existential commitment in faith and love to the living Christian community. Charismatic prayer, the liturgical involvement, and personal prayer are well treated.

This book deserves much attention from religious, not only because of its content, its approach, and its scriptural spirituality, but also because it provokes the reader to synthesize for himself the fundamental elements of religious life which have too frequently been seen in a disconnected way.

Stonehill College

WILLIAM F. HOGAN, C.S.C.
North Easton, Mass.


This study of the evolution of Western liturgy is compiled from study notes of the Bonn Correspondence Course for seminary students and priests in military service or in prisoner-of-war camps. It is short (152 pp.) and appends two brief studies: a résumé of the principles for Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, and the principles for Church design drawn up for the Fulda Union after World War II. A lengthy annotated bibliography (pp. 172–228) and a good index complete the volume.

K.'s outline does not pretend to be an exhaustive work. The Preface quite frankly refers a reader interested in greater detail to the works of Jungmann and Leichner. And throughout the study, especially of early and medieval materials, the reader is simply referred to the conclusions of the groundwork done by such giants as Andrieu, Baumstark, Capelle, Mohlberg, and Chavasse. The result is a very readable and comprehensive study of the development of Roman liturgy from the Jewish and Hellenistic origins to the frozen rubricism of the post-Tridentine Missale and Breviarium Romanum. The study falls into four sections: (1) the creative origins, from the ascension of Jesus until the time of Gregory the Great (590); (2) the period of Roman decline and Franco-German leadership in liturgical formulation until the dawn of the Mid-
Middle Ages (590–1073); (3) the period of the dissolution of the liturgical community until the reform of the Council of Trent (1073–1545); and (4) the period of rigid centralization and unification of worship (1545–1963). Each section begins with a general outline of the character and spirit of the period and then studies what K. sees as the principal developments. Thus, rather than presenting a cursive survey of the evolving shape of liturgy during the Middle Ages in the third period, K. treats the questions of the dissolution of the liturgical community because of the silent Canon, the shape and design of the church and the altar and the growth of the private Mass, the disappearance of the Offertory procession and the meaning of the practice of genuflection.

The purpose of K.'s study is clear enough. It is historical consciousness. Previous to the work of Vatican II (and, in many cases, after it), the conviction of many pastors has been one of a rigid rubricism, the conviction that the details of the Roman Missal and Breviary are sacrosanct and immutable. That conviction still prevails in some pastoral circles. K.'s study shows, in an eminently readable and understandable summary, how much of the opus Dei is really opus hominis and by that very fact opens the reader to the possibility of a more creative attitude toward liturgical worship. For historical consciousness, while it does not free any man from his own historical condition, does at least give a man the possibility of transcending the conditions of the present in his own understanding and of adopting an attitude of more creative responsibility for the future. One would hope that many reluctant pastors would read this study and profit from its lessons.

The survey style of K.'s study has the added advantage of giving one a manageable framework for an understanding of liturgical history. The clear division into four periods and the handling of the principal developments in those periods in such a clear presentation is easy to remember, and its lessons are almost unavoidable. K.'s work is one of great value for the student, for the active pastor, and perhaps even for the professor whose specialization does not permit the type of detailed research enjoined on the liturgical expert.

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley    JOSEPH M. POWERS, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES

APPROCHE DES PSAUMES. By Robert Martin-Achard. Cahiers théologiques 60. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1969. Pp. 107. Eight separate essays, all but one previously published between 1958 and 1968. The opening and closing essays concern Calvin’s treatment of the Psalms and Kraus’s two-volume commentary in the Biblischer Kommentar series (1960). Three other essays discuss Yahweh’s poor, prayers of the sick, and death as man’s enemy, while the remaining three concern individual Psalms (8, 22, 38). M. feels that the stereotyped prayers of the sick (whether petitions or thanksgivings) in the Psalter reveal a close connection between the community’s official temple liturgy and its sick members. Sickness and recovery of an individual are an important concern of the total worshiping community. The petitions also show that death was regarded as an actively hostile power, ever trying to snatch believers from Yahweh’s control through sickness. Sickness, pain, and evil are a direct challenge to Yahweh, and the assumption is that he can and must respond to those who call upon him. In his review of Kraus’s commentary, M. shows the progress of Psalm research by contrasting Kraus’s treatment of three Psalms (2, 6, 46) with the earlier efforts of Duhm (1899) and of Gunkel (1926). Kraus’s work is judged to be a culmination of previous scholarship, rather than a creative venture along new paths of research. In sum, a pleasant and interesting collection, though derivative rather than creative in its contents.

Kevin G. O’Connell, S.J.

THE PROPHETIC WORD OF HOSEA: A MORPHOLOGICAL STUDY. By Martin J. Buss. Beihefte ZAW 111. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1969. Pp. xiv + 142. DM 46. The book appears in a stilted, unidiomatic, sometimes ungrammatical English that often reads like translation by computer. B.’s style, to boot, is elliptic, so that one is not always entirely sure of what he is being told. But these distractions aside, the reader will find a rewarding study packed with suggestions and insights having at least a 50/50 ratio of intrinsic probability—a high average. The term “morphological” (which, despite B.’s disclaimer, seems a needless neologism for what form-critical would convey nicely) means exactly what it says: every structural form of the book of Hosea has been subjected to a meticulous examination, and the results and conclusions wander far beyond the area covered by this one book. Particularly intriguing is the hypothesis of a “levitic-deuteronomic tradition” encompassing, inter alia, Hosea, Jeremiah, and the Asaph psalms (pp. 81 ff.). Less satisfactory conclusions at least need further validation: a self-reported prophetic symbolic action is per se nonfactual (p. 53); Hosea rejected the existing cult qua talis (p. 105; I may have misunderstood the author at this point); Hosea viewed Israel’s doom as inexorable, whereas Amos did not (p. 129). The last judgment supposedly makes room for Hosea’s salvation prophecy, which, contrary to most critical opinion, envisions an eschatology that is mythological (B.’s own term). I also find his dissection of Hos 1 hardly credible. In any case, the book should be read by all students of Hosea.

Bruce Vawter, C.M.

show how the Aramaic Targums form a part of Jewish exegesis as a whole, B. first presents a general introduction as well as a survey of recent research on the major rabbinic documents. His lucid and balanced treatment serves to bring up to date H. L. Strack's Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, which was last revised in 1924. This section is of particular value because B. has made abundant use of books and articles published in modern Hebrew. The Targums are described as lying halfway between the LXX, which incorporates interpretation but remains relatively close to the Hebrew text, and works such as Jubilees and Pseudo-Philo, which retell the biblical narrative in their own words. While B.'s reserve in assessing the arguments for the early dating of the Targums is fully justified, his remarks on the Dead Sea Scrolls ("no certain conclusions can be drawn about the provenance of the material"; "Their date is not yet known") are excessively cautious. J. Heinemann's objection (Tarbiz 35 [1965] 84–94) that the early date of Targumic material can be established only by comparison with datable material from outside the Targums should have been discussed at greater length, and S. Lieberman's (Hellenism in Jewish Palestine [New York: 1962] p. 83) derivation of halakah in the sense of regula from Aramaic hlk (Ezra 4:13 passim) and Babylonian iku ("tax") might have been mentioned.

The second part of the work illustrates Jewish methods of biblical interpretation by presenting the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on selected chapters of Genesis along with selections from the Fragmentary Targum and Onkelos. Relevant material from Pseudo-Philo is presented in an appendix. Each major section of text is followed by explanatory notes. This collection of materials provides a concrete introduction to the fundamental concepts and motifs of rabbinic Judaism. Of special interest for those engaged in NT and theological studies are the rabbinic attitudes toward Enoch, Melchizedek, and Abraham, as well as those texts (e.g., on Gn 1:26; 3:22; 11:7–8; 19:24; 20:13) which B. describes as instances of anti-Trinitarian polemic.

Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.

APOSTASY AND PERSEVERANCE IN THE THEOLOGY OF LUKE. By Schuyler Brown. Analecta Biblica 36. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1969. Pp. xvi + 166. $4.50. In this doctoral dissertation presented to the Catholic Theological Faculty of the Westphalian Wilhelm University in Münster, B. first clashes head-on with the key idea of Hans Conzelmann, and then with meticulous care firmly establishes his alternate thesis. Rightly enough, he rejects Conzelmann's postulate about Die Mitte der Zeit (that central period between the Age of Israel and the Age of the Church) that it should be spared all diabolical activity. Jesus is shown by Luke pursuing the devil in 10:17; 11:14–22; 13:11–17. Further, to begin the Age of the Church with 22:3 not only separates the climactic moment of Jesus' ministry from His own "age," but it labors under the further, insurmountable difficulty (and Brown's prime effort is expended here) that "the age of the church is characterized neither by the activity of Satan... nor by peirasmos [temptation or trial; but] rather [by] the presence of the Spirit." The crucial choice of the Christian lies in faith and in his reaction of apostasy or perseverance in the face of the Christian kerygma. One of the finest sections of the book investigates the Lucan sense of "faith" and perseverance (the better translation for hypomonē—not "patience"). Faith
is the act which precedes or accompanies baptism, an exterior confession of the Christian kerygma; or it is the kerygma itself, as witnessed to by the apostles.

One would have liked to see further clarification or corroboration of several positions: (1) "no basis for attributing to [the temptation scene of Jesus in 4:1-13] an exemplary character... typical... of the pious faithful"; (2) the denial of the double influence of devil and spirit in the Lucan temptation scene; (3) the statement that the kingdom in the Eucharist account cannot be eschatological. Against 1 is the close literary link between the temptation account and the baptism episode; regarding 2, there is the interrelation of being led by the spirit (imperfect tense) and being tempted by the devil (present participle); in connection with 3, there is the fact that Luke places 22:15-18 before the words of institution, not after, as in Mark and Matthew.

Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P.

THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN: AN INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTARY. By Leon Morris. Tyndale Bible Commentaries, New Testament Series 20. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969. Pp. 263. $4.50. A useful small commentary on the Apocalypse. M., principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, combines a sensible approach to the book with exegesis which is to the point. The book, he says, was written for the persecuted churches of western Asia Minor, to explain to them the theology of power, specifically that real power rests only in Christ, not in the emperor or his associates. The date is late in Domitian's reign, about 90-95. On authorship he concludes, with E. Stauffer, that this and the four other Johannine books must be attributed to "the apostle John or to his influence."

The book, though epistolary in form and apocalyptic in imagery, fits better into the tradition of the OT prophetic books. The theologian will find the commentary useful for clear and brief exegesis and occasional applications to modern problems, but he may be disappointed that space did not allow M. to deal at length with some of the theological themes, e.g., the theology of power. The exegesis suggests that his contributions on these themes would have been useful. Despite this, M. has made his commentary what R. V. G. Tasker, the general editor, hoped each one in the series would be: "a concise, workable tool for laymen, teachers and ministers."

Eamonn O'Doherty

POTAMIOUS DE LISBONNE ET LA CONTROVERSE ARIENNE. By Antonio Montes Moreira, O.F.M. Louvain: Bibliotheque de l'Universite, 1969. Pp. xix + 349. $5.50. "Potamious de Lisbonne n'occupe assurément pas la toute première place dans la controverse arienne en Occident." One should be indulgent toward such understatements by writers of doctoral theses. Potamius' chief claim to fame is that he is the first bishop of Lisbon about whom we have any historical information. Dom A. Wilmart characterized his literary remains as "d'un mauvais goût, d'une obscurité et aussi d'une fatuité qui n'ont pas été souvent égalées." The first part of M.'s thesis, devoted to the life of Potamius, comes to the positive conclusions that Potamius was bishop of Lisbon, that he followed Nicene orthodoxy in the early part of his episcopate, and that he then went over to Arianism and signed the second formula of Sirmium in 357. Negatively, M. concludes that Potamius did not attend the Council of Arles in 353 and was not an author of the second formula of Sirmium.
For M., the rest is uncertain: date of birth, death, episcopal consecration and conversion to Arianism, whether he attended the Council of Milan in 355, and whether he returned to Nicene orthodoxy after the Council of Rimini in 359. The second part of M.’s dissertation is devoted to the writings of Potamius. The four which M. accepts as authentic are the Epistula ad Athanasium, the Epistula de substantia Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, and the two homilies De Lazaro and De martyrio Isaiae prophetae. A final chapter is devoted to the lost, dubious, and spurious writings. M.’s thesis is the most thorough study to date of Potamius, and it would be difficult to believe that it will not long remain the only full-length monograph on its subject.

Robert E. Carter, S.J.

STRUCTURA THEOLOGICA VITAE SPIRITUALIS APUD HERONYMUM NADAL S.I. (1507–1580). By Julius Héjja, S.J. Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1969. Pp. 98. One of the more important figures in the Counter Reformation and in the early history of the Society of Jesus was that of Jerónimo Nadal. He played a decisive role in the organization of the Jesuits in Spain and Portugal, introduced Loyola’s Constitutions in various lands, and was active as a mediator in affairs concerning the Empire. Although he had met Ignatius in Paris, it was only after the completion of his studies and of seven years of pastoral work in his native Mallorca that he entered the Jesuit Order in 1545. During most of his career he was engaged in administrative tasks: 1548–52 as professor and first rector of the College of Messina; 1553–55, 1561–63, 1566–68 as visitator; 1571–72 as vicar general. Much of the later part of his life (1574–77) he lived at Hall in Tirol. He died at Rome on April 3, 1580. A great part of Nadal’s literary production reflects these cares: Scholia in Constitutiones s. Ignatii (Prato, 1883), Commentarii de Instituto Societatis Jesu (Rome, 1962), four volumes of Epistolae (Madrid, 1898–1905). He was, however, also active as an exegete and spiritual writer, composing Evangelicae historiae imagines (Antwerp, 1593), Annotationes et meditationes in evangelia quae in missae sacrificiis leguntur (Antwerp, 1595), in addition to many conferences and exhortations. Although these works were of great significance in forming the Order in accordance with Ignatius’ conception of Jesuit spirituality, they received little attention until M. Nicolau’s treatment of Nadal’s spiritual works and doctrine (Madrid, 1949) and J. Conwell’s study of the prayer proper to the Society of Jesus according to Nadal (Spokane, 1957). The present work, originally presented as a dissertation in the Gregorian University, concerns less the specifically Ignatian stamp of Nadal’s spirituality than the place of his work in the general history of Christian spirituality in the sixteenth century. H., whose work is characterized by thoroughness, clarity, and elaborate documentation, brings out interesting connections with the Franciscan school, particularly the motif of ascent/descent as it is found in Bonaventure and Ramon Lull.

C. H. Lohr, S.J.

MELANCHTHON, REFORMER WITHOUT HONOR. By Michael Rogness. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969. Pp. viii + 165. For many Christians Melanchthon’s name has only recognitional value. R.’s object is to define M.’s place in the development of Lutheran theology. What he achieves is an index-card summary of M.’s views on several crucial issues of the early Reformation. The great-nephew of Johann Reuchlin, M. was a humanist turned reformer
under the impact of Luther's preaching. Ideally he should have been the mediator between the fervent German evangelists of the 1520's and the Erasmian humanists of the rest of Europe. Luther himself, as E. Harris Harbison pointed out long ago, assigned him to this role of scholar of the movement, the stabilizing force that could articulate in concise form the movement's faith. This function he performed most memorably at Augsburg in 1530. M. the systematizer, however, could not make headway without the ebullient power of Luther's thought. The latter might depurate his own shortcomings as a scholar, but it was he in the end who could see the bottom issue of a controversy and distinguish principle from rhetoric. At one point in his life M. can be isolated from the movement and his personal contribution to the development of Lutheran doctrine can be evaluated: from 1546, when Luther died, to his own death fourteen years later. The pathetic figurehead of a church that had far more energy and life than his aged mind could moderate, M. the controversialist appears as a senescent Protestant pope surrounded by disciples who know too well the limit of his powers.

Fernando Picó, S.J.

**What Is Religion?** By Paul Tillich. Edited by James Luther Adams. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 191. $5.95. Over the past twenty-five years Dr. Adams has greatly contributed to the dissemination and appreciation of the thought of Tillich. In this volume he has organized a team of collaborators to translate from the German three important essays of the young Tillich: "The Philosophy of Religion" (1925), "The Conquest of the Concept of Religion in the Philosophy of Religion" (1922), and "On the Idea of a Theology of Culture" (1919). The quality and consistency of the translation is excellent; Tillich is fortunate to have fallen into the hands of such competent translators. However, readers will not find these essays easy going. They are abstract, full of technical jargon, and written from a highly specialized German intellectual background. At the same time, the student of Tillich will discover in them the first articulation of the basic principles of the Tillichian system. A. has correctly seized upon "religion" as the unifying theme of the essays, for here Tillich elaborates his essential distinction between religion in the broad sense and in the narrow sense. In his American period Tillich relied heavily upon the notion of "ultimate concern," but in these essays he speaks of "directedness toward the Unconditioned" (Richtung auf das Unbedingte). Here he constructs a complex theory of meaning (Sinn) which underlies the search for meaning in *The Courage to Be*. Here the interrelation of religion and culture as substance and form is already well worked out at this early date in Tillich's career. Hopefully A. and his team will continue to provide us with more translations of the significant, but not always accessible, early Tillich.

Carl J. Armbruster, S.J.

**Dogma 2: God and Creation: The Foundations of Christology.** By Michael Schmaus. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969. Pp. x + 232. $3.95. In the first volume of this new series, reviewed in *TS* 30 (1969) 338-39, the bases on which Christian theology must rest were the main concern. The second volume of the six begins an exposition of the subject matter of doctrinal theology. Convinced of advantages to be found in an early presentation of the Christocentric structure of the faith, S. chooses the event of Christ as his point of departure. A study of God as One and Three is re-
served for a subsequent volume. Nevertheless, since Jesus cannot be understood apart from His relationship to His Father and the world, God the Creator is considered so far as is necessary for imparting knowledge of the incarnate Son. Thus the book treats of God and creation as a prelude to Christology. Examination of the pertinent scriptural data reveals that the sacred writers regarded creation as the inauguration of God’s activity in salvation history, which was to culminate in the coming of Christ. Therefore creation is really the inception of the Christ-event, and the man Jesus is the meaning and measure of all mankind. Man himself is the image of God in a functional sense: he is a created creator, destined to direct the earth toward higher and more perfect forms. In thus forming the earth, man forms himself. The creation of the spiritual soul is envisaged in an evolutionary perspective; ideas drawn from Aquinas, Hermann Schell, and Teilhard de Chardin enter into the attempted explanation. Contemporary theories of original sin are pondered and are mostly found wanting. Either they fail to do justice to Trent, or they have recourse to extrinsicism, or they reduce original sin to actual sin. The book closes with a realistic discussion of the angels in their relationship to salvation history.

Cyril Volland, S.J.

La dimensione trinitaria del carattere sacramentale. By Crescenzo Sepe. Rome: Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1969. Pp. 175. The Trinitarian aspect of the sacramental character has a long and evolving history. S., after commenting on the well-known Scripture texts (2 Cor 1:21-2; Eph 1:13; 4:30), traces this history from its beginnings in the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Fathers, through the theologians of the Middle Ages (with special emphasis on Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, and Thomas), up to more recent theologians, notably Scheeben and Mühlen. This evidence establishes that the character has both direct and indirect relations to the Trinity. The indirect links are founded principally on three truths: the character is a sharing in Christ’s priesthood, it structures the Church, it entails an exigency for the state of grace and the Trinitarian presence in the individual. Directly, too, the character associates us with the Trinity because its efficient and exemplary causes are the three divine Persons; also because it induces a special Trinitarian presence that conveys a sonship which, however, differs specifically from the sonship of grace. Moreover, the character supplies the ontological foundation for the diverse kinds of Christ’s presence in the Church. To the character, therefore, should be ascribed the diverse Trinitarian presences necessarily involved in these varying presences of Christ. S., though dealing mainly with the Trinitarian presence in general, does point out several connections between the character and each of the Persons. The character, too, is treated generically for the most part, but comments are made about each individual character. The methodology is sound, the bibliography ample.

Clarence McAuliffe, S.J.

Council over Pope? Towards a Provisional Ecclesiology. By Francis Oakley. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969. Pp. 190. $5.95. The metaphor for this book is the sandwich: the meat is a warmed-over summary of conciliarism between chapters on contemporary ecclesiology. Though the substance is concerned with the Great Western Schism and the conciliar movement, O. says: “the general thrust of the book . . . represents an
historian’s attempt to open up a middle way between the paths chosen by Charles Davis and Gregory Baum” (p. 9). O. sees the fundamental differences between the two men resting on their attitude towards conciliar statements: Baum, he says, insists that one must “lump conciliar statements together with the Scriptures and interpret both in accordance with the same hermeneutical principle,” whereas “Davis insists, with equal force, that one must not” (p. 175). The reader is led by this and similar passages to suspect that O.’s entire discussion of ecclesiology is simplistic, entirely taken up with structures, authority problems, and verbal formulae, rather than giving some consideration to the Church as sacrament, people of God, and body of Christ.

O.’s credentials as a historian are well established. His earlier work on the political thought of Peter d’Ailly was well accepted. His repeatedly expressed unhappiness about the insensitivity of theologians, and ecclesiologists in particular, to history is shared by this reviewer. On the other hand, historians who write on theological questions can be expected to show some feeling for theological niceties: the question of doctrinal development is more complex than O. allows; and his berating of Pope Paul’s Credo and Humanae vitae reads more like impassioned journalism than theological criticism. In short, even if theologians do not do their homework, historians should know that there are better sources for contemporary ecclesiology than the National Catholic Reporter and Commonweal.

Berard L. Marthaler, O.F.M.Conv.

DEATH: MEANING AND MORTALITY IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND CONTEMPORARY CULTURE. By Milton McC. Gatch. New York: Seabury, 1969. Pp. viii + 216. $5.95. G. gives an interesting sampling of the intellectual traditions on immortality and resurrection (and the tension between the two) from the OT to the Reformation, by means of commentaries (3–5 pages) on some twenty sources, from poets to theologians. He is a medievalist, and it is this period that he handles most reliably. This is followed by a discussion of the interpretation of such vast material, in which G. tries, in a rather vague and unconvincing way, to illuminate it by applying Auerbach’s figurative approach. These two central parts are sandwiched between discussions of contemporary views on death, which are intended as personal essays rather than strict theological argument. Though the book is meant to be a whole, it does not hang together well as such, and insofar as it concludes to much, its argument is slack. G. says that “something better is required” than a Bultmann-type interpretation which strips away the mythological world-picture only to leave a brand of one’s own twentieth-century existentialism. And yet this is pretty much what G. leaves the reader with, speaking of death using the motifs of Christian tradition “without a commitment to their content” (p. 184) but preserving their “tone” (p. 163). Thus he concludes that the problem of immortality versus resurrection is of little concern doctrinally in a modern world where the idea of an afterlife is inconceivable. But immortality and resurrection are crucial issues when conceived as modes of approach to life. So conceived, the issue becomes whether man should be more interested in his subjective existence or his social existence. “The mode of resurrection,” for example, “calls upon man to live hard and well and boldly here and now and to understand that what he does is important in the historical continuum.”

Robert J. Ochs, S.J.
The Office of Proclamation in the Theology of Karl Barth: A Study of Preaching Authority as Service to the Word of God. By Carl F. Starkloff, S.J. Ontario: Univ. of Ottawa, 1969. Pp. xi + 158. $5.50. In an address delivered at a minister's meeting in Schulpforta in July, 1922, Karl Barth stated: "It is simply a truism that there is nothing more important, more urgent... than the speaking and the hearing of the Word of God..." In the same address Barth warned of the peril inherent in preaching, viz., that men will make God's Word their own and thus usurp the prerogative of God. In this book, originally a dissertation, S. endeavors to trace and study a key concept in the theology of Barth which offsets the peril in preaching: the duty and authority of the Church is to be subservient to the Word of God, Christ Himself. Indeed, this service is the essence of the office of proclamation.

There are three chapters: the first contains a discussion of Barth's theology of the vocation and office bestowed upon the Christian community, how the community knows itself to be called, and how it responds to the divine authority. The second chapter deals with what it means to be totally subjected to the sovereign Word of God, and what this implies for proclamation. The work of the Holy Spirit in the Church comes in here. The third chapter turns to the concrete situation known as "preaching," and treats the office and authority of the preacher. The book concludes with a brief criticism of Barth's theology of proclamation and a reflection on the positive contribution made by Barth according to the thinking of some Catholic theologians.

Though it is a dissertation, the book is quite readable. Barth's theology of proclamation is treated objectively and thoroughly, indicating development from early writings to later. S.'s criticism applies Barth to our times. This work will be valuable to a Church striving to implement the emphasis of Vatican II on the ministry of the Word and to theologians serious about developing a theology of preaching. Perhaps its chief value will be exactly what Karl Barth intended his whole theology to be: a "corrective."

Joseph J. Bonadio, S.S.

Theology Today. Edited by Edward Yarnold, S.J. No. 4: The Theology of the Trinity. By Laurence Cantwell, S.J. No. 5: The Theology of Creation. By Robert Butterworth, S.J. No. 7: The Theology of History. By Osmond Lewty, O.P. No. 8: The Theology of the Church. By Peter Hebblethwaite, S.J. Notre Dame: Fides, 1969. Pp. 96 each. $.95 each. The publishers, through this series of sixteen projected short volumes, are making available to the American public a group of solidly constructed essays on many of the basic theological questions which are, or should be, of special contemporary interest. Volumes already available, in addition to those mentioned above, include studies of the theology of revelation, of faith, and of the Incarnation. While the authors seem to have had in mind as their primary audience what is sometimes called the "religiously well-educated" Christian, the professional theologian will find much that is stimulating in the nontechnical language and the freshness of viewpoint which characterize the volumes we are discussing. These virtues are perhaps especially notable in the study of the Trinity, which, while neglecting none of the important aspects of the divine revelation, maintains throughout an awareness of the religious, spiritual, and pastoral implications of this Christian mystery. And a two and a half page appendix sums up with succinct-
ness “how the doctrine is traditionally expounded in technical terms.”

Butterworth’s presentation of the Catholic theology of creation, beginning with the decree of Vatican I on the subject (which is mildly criticized as being, among other things, “very dry and philosophic” in tone) examines the way in which the creation doctrine is set forth in the OT and NT (with proper emphasis on the revelation of God as Creator gradually unfolding in the revelation of God as Saviour). This leads to a discussion of the “reasons why the Christian theology of creation has remained for many centuries strangely undeveloped.” Here the theologian will discover some valuable suggestions by the author regarding “the lines along which the full theology of creation should develop in the Church.”

The volume on the theology of history covers such subjects as the historical faith of Israel, world history and salvation history, Christ as the meaning of history, and history in its relations to eschatology. This introduces some of the problems connected with the theology of hope. The same theme recurs in the fourth booklet we are examining: the theology of the Church. The editor of the series says, in his preface to this essay, that since Vatican II “the way of studying the Church has changed out of recognition. It is at once more theological and more ‘relevant’. . . . But perhaps the greatest advance is in the recognition of the Church’s eschatological nature. It is a developing Church, a Church of hope.” This is the theme of Hebblethwaite’s admirably developed treatise on the Church as a structured unity, as the people of God among whom each man and every group has its proper place and function, concluding with a final chapter on the divinely ordained mission and goal of the Church of Christ as the sacrament of salvation, the sacrament of hope for the service of mankind. Other volumes in the series deal with evolution, ecumenism, inspiration, tradition, preaching, the Old Testament, and the Gospels and Epistles of the New Testament in the light of present-day theological developments.

John F. Sweeney, S.J.

The Shaping of Modern Christian Thought. By Warren F. Groff and Donald E. Miller. Cleveland, 1968. Pp. xii + 489. $10.00. This “sourcebook of faith and ethics,” composed with a view to filling a place in a theological curriculum, is divided into three main sections: Faith and History, Faith and Freedom, and Faith and Truth. Under each section are a number of excerpts arranged in chronological order. Among the authors represented are philosophers such as Descartes, Kant, and Heidegger, and theologians such as Schleiermacher, Troeltsch, Herrmann, Barth, Tillich, Bonhoeffer, and Bultmann. No Catholic theologians are included. The excerpts, some twenty-five in all, are woven together with thoughtful but bland introductions and commentaries. While many teachers will doubtless prefer to make their own selection of problems and authors, rather than depend on a sourcebook such as this, the present anthology may prove useful or suggestive for many courses dealing with modern Protestant thought.

Avery Dulles, S.J.

Evolutionary Philosophies and Contemporary Theology. By Eric C. Rust. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969. Pp. 256. $6.50. In his now classic study of Christianity and classical culture, Charles Norris Cochrane averred that, in effect, the Trinitarian doctrine of Nicaea affirmed that God’s being includes becoming as comple-
mentary, and hence represents a categorical rejection of Greek philosophy in this respect. If this interpretation be correct, Christian theology failed to take it seriously until Hegel. R.'s book offers a creditable inventory, from Hegel to Hartshorne, of those who have essayed to conceive God, at least in part, in temporal terms. By and large, his exposition is careful, lucid, and sufficiently detailed to avoid thinness, though on occasion I think he misreads his author's purport (e.g., on the meaning of Whitehead's "creativity"). As such, the book provides a comprehensive introduction to a line of thought which holds much promise for unraveling the conceptual antinomy and incoherence of the more speculative reaches of Christian systematics—the incoherence so much objected to by British analytic philosophy. R. regretfully makes no mention of this latter asset in assessing the contribution of process models to theology. The survey is also marred by exasperating summary caricatures and distortions peripheral to its theme, e.g., on the Cappadocian Fathers, medieval theology, and Schleiermacher. R.'s attempt to show the limitations of process models for Christian theology is less successful than his exposition—the result, I believe, of an uncritical fogginess in invoking notions such as creatio ex nihilo, the Incarnation, and personal immortality, all of which he finds normally compromised by the thinkers he treats. For the theologian who contemplates the use of process lingo, these will surely be neuralgic areas deserving the most cautious assessment, but when R. takes issue with process thinkers on these points, he does not seriously consider the arguments for or against their stands, nor is it clear that he is holding to the rough scriptural form of these doctrines or their later theological refinement. What are the un-compromisable claims that Christian faith in fact makes here? And on the basis of what appeal? R. is not candid in revealing his presuppositions in these matters.

D. S. Toolan, S.J.

Kirchenreform heute. By Alois Müller. Munich: Ars Sacra, 1968. Pp. 100. DM 12.80. For those familiar with M.'s Das Problem von Befehl und Gehorsam im Leben der Kirche (ET: Obedience in the Church [Westminster, Md., 1964]), the present volume is a further indication of how the author looks at the current state of affairs in the Church. Because he is aware of the diminishing enthusiasm for reform now in the Church, he raises the problem of the nature of reform itself in this small volume. The underlying principle of his approach is factual: the changed and changing sociocultural situation of the Church necessarily brings about important developments in the very life of the Christian community. He singles out four areas of ecclesial life where change is particularly noticeable in spite of unchangeable divine elements present: the structure of the Church, sacraments, doctrinal statements, and questions of morality. Noteworthy are his remarks about the universal priesthood of all believers as the foundation for structural reforms (p. 48) and as an element enabling the layman to participate to some extent even in inner ecclesiastical functions (p. 56). He also stresses that any Church reform depends on the reform of canon law. The purpose of legislation is to create arrangements which help bring about a better order. Consequently, laws are relative, changeable, and, by necessity, as flexible as possible. M. is convinced that detailed laws should be dropped unless they are absolutely necessary. He also favors the complete elimination of ipso facto
penalization. In reference to faith, M. stresses, in the footsteps of Bultmann, the importance of the fides qua in Catholic theology today. Belief should not be based on the fact that one holds something true, but on how one responds to the truth. It should also be added that the responding Christian will experience his deepest commitment to Christ in the Eucharistic celebration. The purpose of true reform is to make it possible for the Christian to give his best possible response to the gospel message.

Sabbas J. Kilian, O.F.M.

APPROACHES TO INTERCOMMUNION. By P. M. McDonald, O.F.M. Durban: Unity Publications, 1967. Pp. xi + 259. M.'s doctoral dissertation for the Pontifical Urbanian University is divided into two parts. The first traces the development of the movement for Eucharistic intercommunion among some of the member churches in the World Council of Churches from 1910 to 1937. The second part discusses the theological evolution of three of the four discernible viewpoints on the question of Eucharistic intercommunion by utilizing the categories (1) open, (2) doctrinal, (3) ministerial, (4) full, which M. takes from Max Thurian's now classic article “Intercommunion” in Verbum caro 56 (1963) 199–213. M. does not describe the “full” position which Thurian uses to designate the theology of the Eastern Churches on this question, since this position did not undergo change during the period which M. is investigating. The study is controlled, well written, and objective. It was composed during Vatican II and prior to the present Roman Catholic investigation of the feasibility of Roman membership in the WCC. It is to be hoped that M. will continue his study of the question of Eucharistic intercommunion in the light of the Council documents, new insights in the Roman Catholic theology of ministry and sacraments, and the considerable development in Anglican theology on this question during the last two decades. M.'s present work is recommended as an auspicious beginning of a much-needed study which would carry the history of the question up to the present time.

Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.

CODICES LITURGICI LATINI ANTQUORES. By Klaus Gamber. 2nd ed. Spicilegii Friburgensis subsidia 1. Freiburg, Swit.: Universitätsverlag, 1968. Pp. 651. 65 fr. The first edition of this invaluable aid appeared in 1963 (cf. TS 24 [1963] 724–25). The structure of the book and the main divisions are unchanged, but the book has almost doubled in size. The increase is due to the numerous new fragments which have been found (and for most of which G. thanks Prof. Bernhard Bischoff of Munich) and to the growing volume of secondary literature which G. can list under the various entries. The most noticeably expanded section is the first, formerly “Reliquiae liturgiae Africanae” (nos. 001–020; pp. 7–11), now “Documenta liturgiae occidentalis antiquissima” (nos. 001–099; pp. 26–129), with items from Africa, Gaul and Spain, Italy, and the Danubian provinces.

M. J. O'Connell

MODERN ARCHITECTURE AND CHRISTIAN CELEBRATION. By Frédéric Debuyst. Richmond: Knox, 1968. Pp. 80. $1.95. D. contends, at the beginning of this small but excellent book, that the overwhelming majority of so-called “modern” churches are essentially backward-looking, unauthentic, purely formal adaptations, not creations, a compromise between the old medieval, symbolic, and monumental concept of church build-
ing and the new vision of things, religious as well as architectural. The clarification of the problem of the modern church, he says, is a very complex procedure involving a new theology of the local community, a new sociology of religion, and a phenomenology of modern housing and communication. D. makes a significant contribution to the solution of this problem. He first defines the church as a place where the faithful come together to meet the Lord and one another in the Lord in the context of a celebration. It is, he says, a paschal meeting-room. Since celebration of the Lord's death and resurrection is the essence of our Christian existence, the Christian church must be neither a sacral monument built to express God's glory nor a simple gathering center for biblical lectures or social proceedings. Taking into consideration the fact that today genuine Christian values can only act as a leaven in our modern society through the very discreet, almost silent action of the faithful, D. claims that the celebration of the paschal mystery demands a setting of great simplicity, of calm and deep humanity, of genuine freedom, a kind of "interior classicism," reserved, subdued, yet full of spirit—austerity, nobility, warmth, certitude, and unpretentiousness combined. D. develops his approach by a brief phenomenology of celebration, or "the feast," followed by an historical survey of the place of celebration, a short phenomenology of the modern house (with illustrations), and a brief historical survey of the origin and development of the modern church (with illustrations). In the last chapter D. discusses the problem of the decoration of the church building. This is a book I would heartily recommend to all architects and artists and to all those responsible for building and renovating churches. In a few pages D. poses the proper questions to be asked about church buildings and gives some interesting and illuminating answers.

Lawrence Madden, S.J.

TOWARD A THEOLOGY OF SECULAR INSTITUTES: NON-CLERICAL SECULAR INSTITUTES IN THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. By Carol Lee Cowgill. Hyattsville, Md.: Institute of Salesian Studies, 1969. Pp. 58. $1.95. This master's thesis is singular in that it is one of the few distinctly American contributions to the field. Considering the topic of clerical institutes too broad to be included, the author attempts a theological perspective of this modern movement by answering the controversial question: are these associations religious or lay? After a discussion of the ecclesial tradition from which they arose, she seeks to show (1) they are religious in nature and therefore their members are charismatically distinct from the ordinary layman; (2) their differentiation from religious lies in their relationship to the secular order, as Vatican II expressed the field of witness for the layman. In developing the nature of these institutes as communities of eschatological faith witnessing to the Church's mission and using the means by which this witness is channeled, she compares the public corporate witness of the religious and the engagement of the laity to transform the secular order; the secular institute is the task force which combines the witness of the two.

While institutes are associations invisible within the secular order, and the Church does not ask a corporate apostolate of them, members witness in their own visible manner, as signs of joy and service dependent on total commitment, stable dedication, vibrant prayer life, strong faith, and an active spirit of sacrifice—traditional
ingredients which it is reassuring to see considered essential in today’s confusion. C.’s development of “community” is intriguing especially since women compose the bulk of secular institute members in this country. She stresses a type of corporate community, definitely not monastic but geared to a truly secular environment as an essential reflection of the Church community. She draws the conclusion that, although the secularity of the secular institute makes it look like a simple lay association, it is religious in its theological orientation.

Barbara Ottinger

Cybernetics, Society and the Church. By Mary Virginia Orna, O.S.U. Dayton: Pflaum, 1969. Pp. xiv + 177. $2.95. O.’s book examines the point where Christianity, culture, and cybernetics meet. Her thesis is that the Church’s activity as a community must adapt to the new life-patterns that evolve from the cybernetic society. In developing this thesis O., a professional chemist, analyzes the notions of science and technology, control and communication, artifacts as expressions and extensions of man, entropy and creativity and purposive achievement in society. In O.’s view, the major difficulty facing the cybernetic society and consequently the Church within that society is the isolation, identification, and fostering of a specific, qualitative difference between man and the digital computer. O. is keenly aware of the complexity of this problem and refuses to be satisfied with slogan answers which either identify the human with the logically rational or which so personalize man’s subjective qualities that his existence in a cybernetic society becomes ultimately impossible. O. does not offer answers to the problem she is analyzing; rather, she tries to approach the problem area from successive viewpoints and to let the reader see the magnitude of the problem area she is attempting to outline. A stimulating and hopeful book, crisply written and rich in its insights into the contemporary mind.

Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.

In Praise of Play. By Robert E. Neale. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 187. $5.95. N.’s thesis is briefly summarized: the sacred is the realm of new discharge of energy in harmony with a new design; the profane is the world of work where these needs are in conflict. Magic consists in giving a work response to the sacred experience. The strength of N.’s psychological perspective on play and religion is its interpretation of such basic concepts as belief, immortality, and religion itself. Belief is a magical response. The believer attempts to use the sacred for his own benefit. The religious attitude is make-believe. “Belief,” writes N., “gains ascendancy in times of crisis. The foxholes of life are filled with magicians.” In make-believe, the religious person shows complete involvement in his experience. There is “a primal recognition that something has happened ... nothing else is required” (p. 144). Truth and falsity, belief and disbelief are transcended in submission to the holy. Similarly, fear of death and concern for survival are concerns of the work-self who knows only duration. For the religious person, each moment of time is his fulfillment. Religion, in this context, is the full surrender of the work-self and the work-world in the fascination of adventure. To be religious is to play with one’s whole personality.

The weakness of N.’s presentation is methodological. His apology for an “intuitional” approach cannot justify his a priori judgments against other play theorists (Erikson, Brown, Hui-
zinga, Caillois). Such halfhearted dialectic is butchery. A playful essay on play would have more suitably been related as a "likely story." N.'s idea, that play is harmony of the need for discharge with the need for design, lacks careful explicitation. Finally, the undifferentiated identification of play with religion is open to fundamental criticism from the point of view of negative depth experiences. Tragedy, in the end, is probably a more common ground for religious self-appreciation than play. All definitions, like N.'s, which define religion in terms of peak experiences must ultimately answer the charge of dualism. In fairness to the author, however, it must be said that death is an element in mature play, as he presents it.

Andrew Christiansen, S.J.

Brain, Mind and Computer. By Stanley L. Jaki. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969. Pp. 267. $7.50. Essentially a sustained, well-informed polemic against the thesis that there is no essential difference between man and a computing machine. J.'s comprehensive knowledge of the development of scientific thought is reflected in his treatment of the historical background of the different facets of the man-machine controversy. Yet his argument is surprisingly simplistic, aimed at the lowest common denominator in differing opponents, and at times rather personal and emotional. All mechanists are effectively lumped together as supporting the theses that man is essentially an interrelated collection of molecules and that thought can be explained on mechanical grounds. J. shows that the principal contributors to computer technology, from Descartes through von Neumann, did not support these theses. Arguments to the effect that digital computers are essentially equivalent to the human brain have little significance as long as so little is known about the functioning of the human brain. Furthermore, J. argues, computers are limited by Gödel's incompleteness theorem in a way that men are not—an argument I found rather unconvincing. Towards the end J.'s basic convictions come through more clearly. The human soul is directly created by God and infused into the body, while the true nature of thought, something discovered only by reflective introspection, is essentially different from the material symbols, e.g., words, that stand for thoughts. Since machines have no souls and are radically incapable of introspection, there is no possibility that machines will ever duplicate distinctively human traits. If such an a priori approach to man can settle this question, then the factual information surveyed by the author is essentially irrelevant. Though few in this field will find J.'s polemics and ad hominem arguments to their tastes, all can profit by the wealth of factual and historical information reflected in this work.

Edward MacKinnon, S.J.

The Silence of God: Creative Response to the Films of Ingmar Bergman. By Arthur Gibson. New York: Harper & Row, 1969. Pp. 171. $5.95. Theologian Arthur Gibson, with his profound sensibility to the phenomenon and problem of modern atheism (The Faith of the Atheist), creatively responds to seven films of Ingmar Bergman, pre-eminent builder of the new Chartres that is being fashioned from images and sounds. "Man has no meaningful contact with God, says The Seventh Seal; man is loveless, says Wild Strawberries; out of his lovelessness man makes contact with dark powers, says The Magician; the darkest of these powers surge up from man's inmost heart and issue in sterile nar-
cissistic tragedy, says *Through a Glass Darkly*; man must break out of this dark circle and can do so only by some drastic affirmation of God, says *Winter Light*; this affirmation, however, must be free and involve total commitment without any immediate responsive powering, says *The Silence*; therefore, either man must affirm self-transcendence in the terrifying dimension of personal encounter or still definitively the voice of God, says *Persona*. The dynamic of each film and the entire series which forms an organic whole is the God-man duet—divine invitation eliciting human response—and the human relationships in terms of that transcendent one. The films evolve, and so do the images of God and man; and what is at first (*The Seventh Seal*) seen and heard as a silence apparently indicative of the absence of God, turns out in the end (*Persona*) to be a silence, harrowingly indicative of his presence. G.’s theo-aesthetic approach to the films is painstaking, intriguing, and edifying. Even Bergman himself will be edified (in the same way that Rohmer and Chabrol once edified Hitchcock)—which might not be a good thing; for this approach contains more insight into the theological problem of the God-man relationship than it does into Bergman’s aesthetics. Each analysis is preceded by a synopsis of the film—applause, applause.

*Joseph A. Casper, S.J.*
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