BOOK REVIEWS


This large quarto volume is the first presentation to the public of a substantial part of the unique manuscript named in the title. When A. Díez Macho announced to the scholarly world in 1956 that a complete copy of the Jerusalem Targum to the Pentateuch, otherwise known only in bits and pieces, existed in the small Neofiti collection held by the Vatican Library, it gave a notable impulse to the study of the whole related literature of early vernacular (Aramaic) translations of the OT. In their turn, NT studies also have been influenced by the prospect of a deeper insight into the synagogue interpretation of the OT text in the days of our Lord: previous data were re-examined, a number of scholars opted for this field of study, and the present partial publication has been eagerly awaited. Something of this ferment shows in D.'s long introduction, which brings the story of scholarly discussion down to 1967. Central matters of concern, which will not be fully resolved until the four remaining sections (Ex through Dt) of this work are published, have been the age of the targum here contained and its relation to the cluster of complete and fragmentary targums already known.

The manuscript was prepared for Giles of Viterbo in 1504. It has its share of identifiable scribal errors; and there are corrections between the lines and in the text itself, besides marginal readings. D. is satisfied that despite its late date and the rather slipshod transcription, the targum itself is all of a piece and has undergone no recensional treatment since antiquity. A slender internal clue as to the age of the targum is in the text of Gn 14:14, where "as far as Dan" comes out "as far as Qysrywn"—Caesarea Philippi, so named in 3/2 B.C. D. sees the work as originating in the period of composition of the NT books (p. 95*). Since the origins and adventures of the better-known targums (Onqelos, pseudo-Jonathan) are not clearly understood and are mooted questions even today, it is unlikely that all serious students of this present text will arrive without difficulty at D.'s conclusion. Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that we have here a relatively independent witness to Palestinian exegesis of great antiquity. That by and large it antedates the official Targum Onqelos and retains material which was excluded from or rewritten by the latter seems a reasonable expectation.

That the manuscript was prepared for a Christian patron may account
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for its astounding first verse: "From the beginning by wisdom the Son of
the Lord (and) completed the heavens and the earth." This depends on
an omission and on the identity in written form of the Aramaic for "the
son" with that for "created"—besides which, the word "and" (a single
letter) has been expunged from the text. The primitive reading is re­
stored for us by the editor, no doubt rightly, as "In the beginning by
wisdom the word of the Lord created and completed the heavens and the
earth." Let us hope that none of the three scribes who indited the subse­
quent 447 folios of the manuscript anywhere else achieved as much,
whether by way of audacity or of confusion.

The text, with an apparatus for its interlinear and marginal readings,
and with D.'s Spanish translation on the facing pages, runs from p. 2 to
p. 347; there follow the translations indicated in the title. Since Frs. le
Déaut and McNamara are deeply engaged in targum research, their col­
laboration could have a value that goes beyond merely transposing the
rendering into another European language; le Déaut says he has re­
viewed his rendering throughout vis-à-vis the Aramaic. The manner in
which the readings in the apparatus key in to the Aramaic text is some­
times nearly as hard to follow in print as would be the case for the mar­
ginal notations in the manuscript itself. For this especially, the alterna­
tive translations may shed some light.

One can only wish all concerned with this project the strength and
courage to complete the very important task according to the standard
they have set for themselves with this first part.

Catholic University of America       Patrick W. Skehan

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY IN CRISIS. By Brevard S. Childs. Philadelphia:

It is hardly news that biblical scholars worry about the current decline
of serious interest in scriptural studies among seminarians and lay
people. We look back to happier days. After the Second World War theo­
logical studies among Protestants and Catholics took on renewed vitality,
thanks to an extraordinary revival of interest in the Word of God. This
was true in both Europe and America, with the former often enough pro­
viding the catalyst for the latter. Theology here, however, reflected a
unique American experience, a part of which is traced in this book.
American Protestantism had been bogged down in the Fundamentalist-
Modernist controversy; something like this was going on in the Modern­
ist crisis among Roman Catholics. The American resurgence of biblical
studies, which Childs, professor of OT at Yale, calls the "biblical the-
ology movement," broke out of this impasse with a fresh and challenging approach to both Bible and theology.

In Part 1, "Remembering the Past," C. joins to his description of the movement a summary of the consensus reached, allowance being made for their differences. These elements would include a strong insistence on a theological dimension in biblical studies, emphasis on the unity of \( OT \) and \( NT \), the concept of revelation through history, the recognition of a distinctive biblical mentality, and the fundamental contrast between the Bible and its Ancient Near Eastern milieu. After a chapter dealing with unresolved problems, C. looks at the present, where he sees a "collapse of the movement as a dominant and cohesive force in American theology" (p. 61) brought on by forces within and outside of the movement.

Part 2, "Seeking a Future," aims at rehabilitating the biblical-theology movement by establishing a context for the theological interpretation of the Bible. This he finds in the canon of the Christian Church. What C. wants is interpretation of the Scriptures "in relation to their function within the community of faith that treasured them" (p. 99). This is certainly not new, but perhaps it is a useful reminder that the interpreter must expound the Bible as normative for the Christian. The descriptive task is necessary but not enough, much less the presentation of the biblical witness as a nosegay of edifying illustrations. Priest or minister, using the Bible within the context of a normative tradition, strives to discern out of his hearing of the Word God's will in the concerns of contemporary life.

Part 3, "Testing the Method," examines three biblical passages, Ps 8, Ex 2, and Prv 7, according to principles suggested in the preceding chapters. Finally, C. looks at the biblical concept of God as witnessed in the \( OT \) and later in the Church of the \( NT \). Some \( OT \) texts preserve a continuity between the God of Israel and the God of Christians; others are points of departure for the development of a \( NT \) Christology. In any case, Christ of the \( NT \) is simply incomprehensible apart from an understanding of that God who entered into covenant with Israel. Like others who move the interpretation of the \( OT \) in a clearly Christological direction, C. has happily rent the iron curtain separating not only \( OT \) from \( NT \) but the past from our present, what it meant from what it means. The effort here is modest and tentative. It will be a long time before we can speak of a full-fledged biblical interpretation which takes the Christian canon seriously.

The book is provocative and clearly written. One gets the impression sometimes that the assessment of biblical theology as now practiced is too negative. Where find more lively and stimulating reflections than in the works of Eichrodt, von Rad, Wright, and others? Of course, the differ-
ences in methods and results are sharp; but you will find as much vigor and excitement in few academic disciplines. Lastly, the phrase “biblical theology” is something of a puzzle. It is easy to name those who have produced important theologies of the OT or NT—both from Christian standpoints. But who has attempted a biblical theology combining OT and NT? If there is a “crisis,” it is in one or the other, and it should be so identified. The comprehensive (OT and NT) biblical theology has yet to be written.

Weston School of Theology

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


The origin of this volume was a series of three lectures delivered in 1964 in Liverpool Cathedral and again, in modified form, to the Faculties of Theology of Cardiff and Swansea by the Professor of New Testament Studies at King’s College, London. The delayed appearance of these lectures in printed form is explained by the author’s wish to incorporate the considerable literature on the resurrection which appeared during the intervening period.

The first chapter, “The Idea of the Resurrection,” begins with a sketch of the second-century controversy concerning this central Christian teaching. An adequate conceptual background for this teaching is to be found neither in the OT, where there is but one text which clearly refers to the resurrection (Dn 12:2) nor in the previous history of the resurrection vocabulary used in the NT, especially egeirō and anistanaí. Moreover, though after the destruction of the Temple and the victory of Pharisaism, the resurrection of the dead became a fixed tenet of Judaism, it is not clear to what extent it was doctrina communis at the time when the NT books were being written. The lack of a clear belief in the resurrection in the Qumran documents is especially significant in this connection.

Even in the Synoptic Gospels, written though they are in the light of the Easter faith, Jesus is represented as saying remarkably little about the resurrection. Particular attention is therefore focused on the actual resurrection of Jesus, and the complex history of this resurrection tradition is handled in a second chapter. It is a peculiar fact that the earliest element in this tradition, the pre-Pauline kerygma contained in 1 Cor 15, is not picked up by the later stages of the tradition. Nowhere in the Gospel resurrection appearances do we find, e.g., an account of the appearance to Cephas (simply the bare affirmation in Lk 24:34) or of the
one to James. Perhaps Paul’s list of witnesses was found too jejune to be utilized by a later generation which was interested in a more “realistic” presentation.

The resurrection stories of the individual Evangelists are handled separately. In each case the concluding chapters of the Gospels are shown to reflect the theology of the respective writers. Though incorporating a good deal of recent scholarly opinion, this second chapter betrays a certain lack of clarity and unnecessary diffuseness, with occasional repetitions of points already made (cf., e.g., pp. 113–14 with p. 101). This section of the book also reveals a considerable dependence on Willi Marxsen’s *Die Auferstehung Jesu von Nazareth*, including the latter’s assertion (p. 76) that Luke (24:24) contradicts Matthew and John in denying that any women had seen Jesus at the tomb (p. 104, n. 106). An examination of the text reveals that the subject of the affirmation “but Him [Jesus] they did not see” is not “the women” but “some of our people,” i.e., some of the disciples. The very fact that this assertion does not correspond precisely to the mention of a visit to the tomb by Peter alone (Lk 24:12) cautions us against accepting too readily the common view, shared by the author (p. 97), that this verse is a Johannine interpolation.

The third chapter, “The Resurrection Faith,” points out that the resurrection was variously understood in the *NT* tradition. In a rudimentary form, it was viewed simply as God’s reaction to the death of Jesus, while the positive significance of the divine intervention comes out in the interpretation of the resurrection as establishing the messiahship and lordship of Jesus (Acts 2:36). As to the relationship between “resurrection” and “elevation,” E. does not take the simplistic course of preferring one conception to the other as being more primitive. Although the two images can scarcely reflect two distinct events (p. 141), they do contain varied nuances, the exaltation suggesting extrication from this world, while the resurrection looks not only forward but backward (cf. the empty-tomb tradition), i.e., to the earthly ministry of Jesus, which is recovered “as the raw material of the eschatological future” (p. 142). In the earliest theological elaboration of the resurrection faith (Paul), the resurrection appears not only as a moment in a fixed eschatological schema (p. 155) but also as an empirical and experiential datum in the life of the redeemed Christian. It is this latter line of thinking which E. regards as more significant for resurrection faith today, since “the parousia expectation presupposed that the world and history were of a certain kind,” and this expectation “has now irretrievably collapsed, along with the view of the world and history which goes with it” (p. 165, n. 34). E. rightly affirms more than once that the problem for the Christian
today concerning the resurrection is not whether to believe but what to believe; but in trying to determine what is of permanent value in the resurrection faith as expressed in the NT, opinions are bound to differ. Certainly, E. is correct in his assertion that our acceptance of the resurrection need not commit us to the anthropology presupposed by the NT tradition (p. 168).

An appendix, "The Resurrection: Theology and History," deals critically with various attempts to relate the unique resurrection experience of the first witnesses to "history," however understood. While some of E.'s criticisms of Künneth, Hooke, Barth, R. Niebuhr, and Pannenberg may be in order, the problem of the relationship of the resurrection to history is an unavoidable one, and one wonders whether the author's own inclination to treat the resurrection as pure theology really does justice to the hermeneutical problem.

The reviewer wonders whether the future middle form on p. 157, line 17, for which he could find no basis in the textual variants to 1 Cor 15:51, may have been erroneously substituted for the future passive. Also, one might have hoped that in such an up-to-date consideration of the resurrection a more up-to-date English version would have been used. An archaism such as "to us-ward who believe" in the translation of Eph 1:19 (p. 136) is particularly jarring.

Woodstock College, N.Y. Schuyler Brown, S.J.


The present volume is a revision of Prof. Wolfson's 1955 study of the philosophical background of various patristic doctrines (theories of faith, allegorism, Christology, and Trinitarian theology) with several concluding chapters on Gnosticism and early heresies. (Cf. Daniélou's review of the first edition: TS 9 [1949] 578-89.) At the end of the original preface there are listed over seventy-five instances of changes made in the second edition (1964) and the present revision: these are mainly corrections of minor slips, some variants in footnote references, and in a few cases a sharpening of the English text. Thus the fundamental thesis of the book remains the same, though W.'s results are perhaps more interesting now in the light of the theological developments over the intervening decades. His attempt to uncover the philosophical models which underlay the Nicaean Trinitarian solution and the Chalcedonian synthesis anticipated much more recent theological speculation, e.g., the approach to Christology that we find in P. Schoonenberg, S.J., in some of his latest articles.
W.'s method, which derives from his studies in the philosophical eclecticism of the late Hellenistic period in his classic monograph *Philo* (1947), yields interesting results. He feels that Origen adapted the Aristotelian categories of genus and species for the framework of divine substance (*ousia*) and person (*hypostasis*). And of the five types of union which he has discovered in philosophers of the early Christian period, he is convinced that the primary patristic model for the hypostatic union was (in his terms) the "union of predominance," the union which Aristotle mentions in *De generatione* and elsewhere in connection with the bond between bronze and tin, fire and wood, wine and water (p. 385). It should be recalled once again that W. has a valuable discussion of circuminces-sion (pp. 418–28), set against the background of Stoic and Philonian doctrine, supplementing G. L. Prestige's treatment in *God in Patristic Thought* (1936). W.'s bold suggestion that the Holy Spirit in Pauline doctrine is to be identified with the pre-existent Logos (pp. 161–67) goes far beyond the obscurity and lack of development in Paul's Trinitarian doctrine as admitted, e.g., by J. Fitzmyer, S.J., in his account in the *Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Newark, 1969) pp. 810–14. The confusion, which is well known in Hermas and Arnobius, on the relationship between the Spirit and the Logos is extended by W. to Ignatius of Antioch, 1 and 2 Clement, and Barnabas.

Despite the inevitable disagreements it will arouse, it must be confessed that the new Wolfson edition is a volume written with the author's usual care and attention to detail, with a wealth of supportive evidence, and every patristic scholar will profit from the author's sharp discussions and the broad background which he has brought to his task.

*Fordham University*  
**HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J.**


The relationship between Cluniac monks and the leaders of the eleventh-century Gregorian reform movement has long been a subject of scholarly controversy. In recent years, and especially among disciples of Gerd Tellenbach, the view has prevailed that the Cluniacs were primarily interested in monastic reform and only tangentially participated in the wider reform activities of the eleventh century. The role of Cluny in the pontificate of Gregory VII has been seen as a *via media*, a third force in the contest over lay investiture and proprietorship of churches, freedom of ecclesiastical elections, and the full exercise of papal claims.

In this work Cowdrey marshals evidence to show that the objectives of Cluny were indeed akin to those of the Gregorian papacy and that in the work of Church reform the Cluniacs, and especially their head, Abbot
Hugh (1049–1109), actively collaborated. To prove his point, he reviews the early history of Cluny, and he traces its success as a monastic reform center not so much to its famous foundation charter as to the conjunction of favorable developments at Cluny in the course of the tenth and the early eleventh century. The consolidation of Cluny's claims for temporal freedom, its success in obtaining exemption from the bishop of Mâcon, and the strengthening of its ties with the papacy laid the foundation for the compatibility of papal and Cluniac interests in mid and late eleventh century.

Two precursors of the Gregorian reform movement, Popes Benedict VIII and John XIX, were particularly active in buttressing Cluny's claims to immunity and exemption. In the period between John XIX's death (1032) and Clement II's accession (1046) Cluny had occasion to experience how fragile its position became when the papacy was weak. Thus Cluny came to identify its interests with those of the papacy. The reform popes, on the other hand, had in Cluny a living sign of their own blueprint for the Church. Cluny "was cultivated by the popes and eulogized by them as the quintessence of what the reformers were striving after" (p. 63).

Cluniac spirituality reached fullest elaboration in the eleventh century, and it fulfilled contemporary aspirations at a time when Carolingian penitential practices had begun to lose favor. It had been the practice to reconcile sinners to the Church only after proportionate satisfaction for their sins had been given. In the eleventh century, however, the practice of granting absolution and then assigning a penance was becoming the rule. This shift caused individuals' attention to focus on the desirability of reducing, by means of charitable foundations and endowment of Masses, temporal punishment for their sins. "It is the secret of the spectacular success of the Cluniacs under Abbot Hugh that they knew, better than any other part of the monastic order, how to meet these needs" (p. 127). In hundreds of contemporary grants to Cluny reference was made to remission of sins.

The Gregorian rallying cry was *libertas ecclesiae*, the freedom of ecclesiastical institutions from temporal coercion, exploitation, or supervision, and their concerted action for God's service under papal direction. The Cluniacs, according to C., had little reason to shun reform objectives and, in fact, readily fitted the pattern of Gregorian expectations. Although he grants that Cluniac houses had a varied experience which sometimes resembled in little that of the motherhouse, C. cites papal and Cluniac collaboration under Gregory VII, Urban II, and Paschal II, not only in France, but also in Germany (where Cluniac influence was exercised indirectly through Hirsau), Spain, and Italy.
The main weakness of C.'s thesis of close affinity between Cluniacs and Gregorian reformers is its shrinking of the boldest Gregorian claims, such as Gregory VII's contentions for suzerainty over the Iberian peninsula, and its minimizing of cases of conflict between Cluniacs and reformers. A useful ally Cluny no doubt was, for it had the prestige and the resources that commanded attention at a time when the reformers were sorely beset by their adversaries. But under Abbot Hugh Cluny hardly experienced what Tellenbach has called "the Gregorian revolution." Bypassed by the new mainstream of Church life in the twelfth century, the proud Burgundian motherhouse had to yield pride of place to the Cistercians, the true monastic heirs of the Gregorians.

Woodstock College  

FERNANDO PICÓ, S.J.


Many of the theses of Thomas Aquinas which formed the center of controversy in the latter part of the thirteenth century may be regarded as a step in the emancipation of philosophy from authoritarian control. As such, they were attacked by conservative theologians, particularly among the seculars and the Franciscans, the representatives on the one hand of the old feudal mentality and on the other of opposition to the rising centralization of power in the Roman papacy. The official condemnations of 1270 and 1277, the Correctorium fratri Thomae of William de la Mare, O.F.M. (ca. 1282), a letter of John Pecham, O.F.M. (1284), and the development of a new form of Augustinianism, represented particularly by the secular master Henry of Ghent, are the main stages in the criticism. The Dominican Order responded to these challenges. The institutional condemnations were answered by decrees (1278, 1279, 1286) calling for fidelity to Aquinas' teaching, the doctrinal attacks by Correctives of the Correctives (John of Paris, "Circa" [1282-84]; Richard Clapwell, "Quare" [after 1286]; anon., "Quaestione" [ca. 1290]; Rambert of Bologna, Apologeticum veritatis [before 1300]; Robert of Colletorto, "Sciendum" [ca. 1310]).

The controversy was carried on both in Paris and in Oxford, but in England a new speculative assault came with the teachings of Robert Cowton, O.F.M., and Duns Scotus. This is the context for the work of Thomas Sutton, O.P. (1250/60 Sutton [Cambridge]—after 1315, Oxford). Even as a fellow of Merton College, he seems to have been attracted to the Thomistic teaching. He attacked Augustinian and Franciscan theses in Contra pluralitatem formarum and De productione formae substan-
tialis (1274–84). After his entry into the Order about 1282, Sutton as magister artium at Oxford (1285–87) defended in his Quodlibeta 1–2 Aquinas’ doctrine against Henry of Ghent and Aegidius Romanus. To this period also belong possibly his Aristotle commentaries (Praed., 6 Pr., Prior., CMund., 6 Metaph.) and his continuations of Aquinas’ commentaries on Perih. and GCorr. By 1290 (1292/93) he was baccalaureus theologiae at Oxford, and about 1294 doctor there. During his regency he composed a work on the Sentences (1313–15), Books 1–3 against Cowton, and Book 4 against Scotus, in addition to Quaestiones contra Quodlibet Duns Scoti and Quodlibeta 3–4, which are also directed against Scotus. The Quodlibeta (1, 21 qq.; 2, 18 qq.; 3, 22 qq.; 4, 24 qq.), which are here edited in full for the first time, are responses to particular criticisms of Aquinas’ doctrine, only one opinion being represented in each question. Sutton defends the controversial theses of Aquinas on the unicity of substantial form, the pure potentiality of prime matter, quantity as principle of individuation, the spirituality of separate substances, the real distinction of essence and existence, the distinction of the soul and its faculties, the passivity of the human intellect, etc. The edition of these texts is a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the early Thomistic school. It is hoped that the editors will continue with their projected publication of the other works of Sutton.

Raimundus-Lullus-Institut

der Universität Freiburg i. Br.


Eventually the ecumenical movement will have to face constructively and at intellectual depth the hard theological questions that divide the traditions. Some mark of this approaching maturity is the appearance in English of this 1957 study from the University of Lund on the fundamentals of St. Thomas’ theology. Persson attempts first a consideration of the material content of Aquinas’ theological corpus: revelation, God, Trinity, creation, grace, and Christology. Here his reading of St. Thomas (the translation makes use of the new Blackfriars version of the Summa theologiae) is searching and insightful, and is done in the light of the Thomistic revival originating with Maritain, Gilson, and the French Dominicans and Jesuits of the thirties and forties; the more contemporary interpretation represented by the transcendental Thomism of Rahner, Lonergan, et al. is not pursued. P. succeeds in exorcising certain ghosts by clearly showing that Thomas did not, e.g., give priority to the Creed over Scripture (p. 59), nor acknowledge the pope as foundation of
the Church rather than the teaching of the prophets and apostles (p. 62),
or nor extend the authority of the magisterium beyond a potestas interpretandi (p. 63).

In so vast a project from one not nurtured in the tradition it is not surprising to find some imprecisions: e.g., that of limiting the explanation of the invisible missions to categories of causality and neglecting those of presence, i.e., viewing them in terms of God’s production of created grace rather than of man’s intentionality (pp. 180 f.); that God’s effecting of actual grace is not distinct from His general activity in the world (this from Bouillard; pp. 188-89); that the Third Person of the Trinity is God’s act of love rather than the immanent term of such activity (p. 146); and that Christ did not bear our guilt of sin before God (p. 288). Such misconceptions, however, are the exception; generally speaking, P.’s grasp of the material content of Thomas’ thought is accurate. What is missing is a feeling for the intellectual spirit that animates the whole of Thomistic theology and constitutes its hermeneutical key.

This comes to light in P.’s central problematic: a search for the formal principle governing the relationship between revelation and reason. What is sacra doctrina as a doctrine “secundum revelationem”? His interpretation is that Thomas’ sacra doctrina is in fact an introduction of revelation into a prior metaphysical scheme: “Revelatio supponit rationem” (p. 256). But if revelation be in any sense an initiative of God’s towards man, is it not necessary to allow some point of insertion within man as the one to whom the Word is addressed? P. appears to conceive of revelation as something autonomous that either does not occur within human consciousness or else appropriates it in ways other than human. Thus he interprets sacra doctrina as a deliverance of the Word over to the power of autonomous reason, whereas Thomas only means to say that, as human occurrence, the revelational event is itself indigenously cognitive. The illuminative principle in the First Question of the Summa theologiae is that sacred doctrine in its source, i.e., in God Himself, is not only something sacred but is also doctrine; it is God’s “holy teaching” of men. Also, two points in Thomas’ teaching that P. fails to note need to be remarked here: the primacy he gives to the volitional element over the noetic in faith (“In fide principalitatem habet voluntas” (C. gent. 3, 40), and the nonsalvific character of faith as long as it remains mere cognitive response (even one motivated by the will’s activity).

This is far from saying that any philosophical system is “true” in a final sense or adequate to revelation. That is another question—though if man is to search out the full meaning of his religious encounter with God, some interpretative principles are indispensable. Bultmann admits as much, and even the work of Barth is in fact evidence of it. What the
present situation of theology calls for is not an abandonment of extrabiblical categories of thought, but a fresh encounter between them in their antiquity and their newness and the biblical experience itself. In a way, P. has done just this; and it is this that makes his contribution to present theological endeavor a serious and considerable one.

*Dominican House of Studies, D.C.*  
*William J. Hill, O.P.*


The tension between philosophical theology and biblical revelation will probably always attend the effort to relate them. This present work of the late Ronald Gregor Smith of the University of Glasgow gives that tension the positive value out of which theological progress is formed. A noted theologian in the tradition of the Church of Scotland, he was an agile metaphysician, but his contribution here is the edifying reality of a man confronting his own experience as linear with or seemingly tangential to doctrinal consistency. These chapters were prepared to be delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary and published as the Warfield Lectures for 1969. Careful and sensitive editing by his colleagues makes available to us now the penultimate excellence of his thought and reflection.

S. purposefully adopts the prosaic title *The Doctrine of God* and offers six chapters of exciting writing. Setting the problem in the words of St. Anselm, "I am not trying, O Lord, to penetrate thy loftiness, for I cannot begin to match my understanding with it, but I desire in some measure to understand thy truth, which my heart believes and loves....I believe in order to understand" (p. 19), he affirms the need of tradition, as if one could define tradition as consistent desire. Remarking the limitations of much current theological writing, he perceptively assigns the reasons for them: lack of tradition and a failure of wit. In a passage that should be celebrated S. writes: "How can they be described as lacking in seriousness? I mean that they lack the context of the tradition out of which their essays come. And because this is so, they also lack the final mark of true seriousness: the ability to be witty, the touch of light-heartedness, the relaxation which is only possible within the sure and clear ambit of a long and arduously elaborated tradition" (p. 21). Ultimate concern, like love, can never be morbid, nor can it be rootless.

Possibly S.’s definition of faith, despite his evident intention, is too angular and eager for snug insertion into the arch of doctrine. Indeed, no experiential purchase on faith is possible apart from eschatological confrontation, that is to say, apart from the confrontation with death, *Tod und Verklärung*. Faith might be partly and provisionally defined as the
invitation to experience, to a mystical knowledge wherein the magic of
textual power to evoke presence. To hold faith sterile in the mind is to reject it. The eternal and the his-
toric must be counterpointed so that there is no longer any hollow be-
tween the Word and the Person. The texture of revelation is an invita-
tion not to notional assent, except as prelude, but to indwelling and eu-
charistie union. In this there is a kind of dying, for abnegation is en-
demic to faith; there is joy in the shroud.

God need not catch up with our modernity, for our relevance may at
length be triviality (p. 80). Fashionable faith runs the wrong risk; gen-
uine faith involves the threat or risk of annihilation before the stronger
Being of God; the redemption of the sinless is their Rilkean transforma-
tion, authentic, mystical experience. What is irrelevant today is a do-
mesticated faith of notional assent, a testament vulgarized to the dead-
ening terminus of good works, when charity, to the unconscious grief of
many, becomes or is mistaken to be its own reward. The kerygma is he-
raldic, rampant with symbols which bend our words and categories to
that angle of humility which lets the sun shine in. As John Fowles writes,
"Language is like shot silk; so much depends upon how you hold it." The
last privacy for the religious man is in the connotation of his personal
experience, his mute knowledge that God's Beauty is His Truth.

S. does seem to want to make belief measurable to the community;
given the right formula, we may all safely believe. A community of only a
general, univocal faith seems a desperate goal indeed; a deadening,
closed unity, which excludes the newness and vitality of individual ex-
perience, insures only the fact that it will sink where it thought it stood.
Finding new forms and categories, if they intend no more than earlier
styles, that is, the unwholesome effort to marinate belief in a new, gelati-
nous transparency, a hollandaise catechetic, seems to consolidate the
view that the theological enterprise of these times is becoming besodden
with acedia and curiositas, not far from that disappointed melancholy
which has always crowned the temples of disappointed prophets and yet
healthy messiahs.

The Christian dialectic is not simply between faith and nonfaith. It is
between faith and vision. Or we have, as we do, visions without faith, the
walls of our existence stippled and psychedelic, murals with the illusion
of depth, ours the chaplinesque effort to eat these stones. An uneasy en-
tente between faith and doctrine makes the freezing of faith and the
denigration of doctrine a perennial hazard. We must indeed move
deeper into the mystery, toward the virtualities implicit in the faith,
or risk calcifying our creeds. Tradition may be read as an enabling norm
which prevents the dreary residue of past mistakes from appearing as
verdant newness (p. 34). As the written spoken word becomes the Word speaking, numinous communications become resplendent in their promise and respectful of the shabby fragility of the creature. S. seems to press for an experience of faith; he seems to assume correctly the view of St. Thomas that this “Claritas quaedam occupans et dirigens” is a person present and not an epistemological condition; it involves both *alêtheia* and *doxa*, vested in the Body of Christ. S. writes well: “The other activity which is required of us is precisely that which led to Barth’s comment: it is the need for more passion” (p. 53).

S. delivers a yeasty lesson, rising to that mellowness which warms one’s own wintry, credal thoughts. His position, and apparently that of many of his colleagues in Glasgow and Edinburgh, is well and wisely stated for the future of ecumenical theology: “Today we may even note an odd and rather confusing tendency on the part of certain Catholic writers to take up the claim ‘sola scriptura’ at the same time as some Protestant theologians are writing it off as obsolete. . . . There can be no doubt about the hopefulness of this dissolution of frontiers, so far as future ecumenical conversation is concerned. But our hopes cannot be fulfilled merely by a change of positions” (p. 36).

A difficult and most valuable book. To S., ecumenism is not the sabled coincidence of theological opinion; it is a sinewy dialectic open to and waiting for the Spirit. One senses that here was a man worth a lance. May he rest in peace.

*Boston College*  

**WILLIAM J. BURKE, S.J.**

**THE GOD OF EVIL: AN ARGUMENT FROM THE EXISTENCE OF THE DEVIL.**  

Like a fireside conversation, warmed by sherry and friendship, S.’s thought reveals suspicions and misgivings held close to the vest in the halls of academic respectability, crackles with insight, grows wearisome in the unrefined, monotonous return to those too long restrained suspicions, stirs with outrageously one-sided formulations, and astounds with a precise statement of what this evening ramble has meant. S.’s project is daring. Since the existence of evil is the single greatest motive for atheism, he proposes to take the devil by the tail by eliciting an argument for God’s existence which begins by taking evil into its very understanding of God. Some of his discussion, e.g., evaluation of Kant or the death-of-God theologians, is methodological in content. It discloses the unreasonableness of the demand for perfect certainty (Kant), measures the lifespan of ideas (death of “God”), and thereby makes way for a plurality of probable ideas of God and for a metaphysics without necessity. Two in-
triguing chapters, "The Existential God" and "Atheism and the Theologians," point up the atheistic tendencies in Kierkegaard's rationalist God and in Tillich's mysticism. The concept of God with which S. concludes is that of a God who has the sustained power to withstand and control nonbeing, but not to the point of eliminating evil. Nonbeing as possibility and as the exclusivity of incompatible orders are factors even in God's nature. This God has much in common with Whitehead's. He is the arbiter of the type of order existent in the cosmos.

There is a serious gap in S.'s advancement of the priority of nonbeing over being. Out of the nature of his project, he accepts contingency as the dominant note of both human and divine existence. This shift from necessity and its epistemological companion certitude to contingency and probability may be warranted on many grounds. But to establish contingency in this new status without investigating what possible meaning necessity might now have is to avoid the root issue of much unreflected and reflective atheism and theism. Further, this same drive for necessity and certitude is the lifeblood of rationalism, theistic or atheistic, and rationalism is the real culprit in modern secularism as well as traditional Christianity. It is in his inability or reluctance to tackle an articulation of the meaning of necessity and its associated principles, with an option for the opposite pole exclusively, that S.'s own latent rationalism becomes clear. Nonetheless, he makes a contribution of some weight in opening a new area for theological and philosophical reflection. The years to come will see many publications along the lines he has first sketched here. For those who have no patience with fireside philosophy, S. has provided a summation of his positive views in chap. 12.

Woodstock College

ANDREW CHRISTIANSEN, S.J.


What is the job of theology these days? Does it in any way still follow the example of Paul and attempt to re-present Christ and His importance for the world from within a faith commitment? In more subjective terms, should today's theologian still proclaim his faith as he seeks to understand it, or is his work now a secular and "unbiased" attempt to make a judgment on the rational acceptability of gaining personal faith? Since the time of David Hume, theology has tended toward the latter possibility. History has generally accepted Hume's statement of secular ground rules for the sciences and his "modern" vision of reality (p. 131). Hence much of today's theology operates in response to a rather naive dualism which sees reality as either physical or spiritual (p. 70), seeks
anxiously for empirical references for its claims, and composedly main­tains an “unbiased” detachment from full Christian faith (p. 120).

John B. Cobb, Jr., wishes to argue by way of effective example to a different understanding of what Christian theology can and should be. The “personal style” (p. 11) in which his book appears allows it to become quite clear that it is written by a man of faith. C. is also a man quite sharply aware of the particular and general challenges to theology and faith posed by the secularism of our age. (The challenges range from faith’s “tenuous foothold in contemporary experience” to the sometimes disabling question “So what?”) Yet, presuming (and revealing) his own faith, C. works to understand it in terms of the secular rules, experiences, and vision. However, his confidence in his faith allows him to ask ultimate questions regarding its content and allows him to come to a sometimes surprising understanding of what he believes. Further, his confident faith allows him to ask and reflect upon the deeper demands and implications of the “modern” ground rules, rather than accepting these rules quickly and unknowingly as demanding exactly what they say (p. 134).

The result of C.’s “new” theology is a clearheaded apologetic (though it often demands careful reading) and a prolegomenon for a systematic theology. Of course, the book comes out of the American school of “process theology” (Whitehead, Hartshorne, Ogden), but it rings so harmoniously with themes of Karl Rahner’s that it seems less pervasively “revolutionary” than that school sometimes assumes itself to be. But revolutionary or not (the school proposes that its vision of God maintains all fundamental Christian doctrines, though it sees them in a “postmodern” way), this work of theology deals with the primary task of a theology—a doctrine of God—and speaks in a language and style which is prophetic in its attention to the horizons and searchings of the audience to which it speaks.

Just as important as its cultural attunement, this work of theology is concerned that its God not be only a philosophical-political accretion or a psychological projection of “Creator-Lord of History-Lawgiver-Judge” (pp. 23, 37). Rather, this God must be one with the God of Jesus Christ, revealed in the NT (pp. 10, 33). Human wish-fulfilment must not force us to see a “power God” hidden beneath the humanity of Christ. “We can only go forward in a way that somehow corresponds for our time to the meaning of his [Christ’s] life and message for the men of his time. My proposal is that we can do this best by attending to what I am hereafter designating as the call forward” (p. 45). That which Christ seems to hear, live, and announce is a God of invitation, evocation, or “call forward” in time.
The attraction of C.'s style of theology and his doctrine of God is that it suggests a harmony between faith and philosophical honesty, between a God of creation and human responsibility, and between a heuristic interpretation of Scripture and reflections on human experience. Sometimes C.'s reasoned advances from experience to God become rather murky (pp. 57–58), but the book never claims to be “rigorous” (p. 66). And the book revives a too-long-dormant kind of theology in proposing one man's biblically based vision of the harmony of God and world.

Yale University


Writing from his own recent experience and association with young religious, O'Meara communicates a sense of urgency for and a hope in a reform of religious life that goes beyond the patchwork renewal of the past five years. The urgency is expressed in pleading terms to recognize that the times are uncommonly critical for society and the Church. “As long as we cling to the hope that a radical crisis is not at hand we will be content merely to revise past structures. . . . What is necessary for belief in religious life is belief in crisis, and in the power of the Spirit and the future of man to transcend it creatively” (p. 31).

Secularization, social change, new desires for community, political involvement, and other developments in our culture have to have an effect on religious communities. Otherwise they run the danger of looking too much to past answers and not facing new possibilities. Religious groups, O'Meara insists, must look to their past to exorcise from it a formation that has left religious helpless before change, or reluctant to support revolutionaries who work for more responsible answers to questions of peace, poverty, alienation in communities or in society at large. They must also see to it that individuals are freed from complete subordination to the community and that all members be led to accept pluralism as a fact of religious life. These directions lead to a future that is unsure and risky, but confidence in God and Christian hope lie right here in these days of change (pp. 21, 35, 72).

The experience of being American should also have an influence on the theology and spirituality of American religious. O'Meara would hope for an interpretation of life, grace, and service that is more pragmatic and dynamic, and for a description of holiness in terms of action and function rather than of being and state.

One central idea is woven through every chapter and becomes increasingly convincing: there is tremendous hope for religious life if it under-
takes a reform that is truly radical, i.e., takes the revolutionary spirit of
the gospel seriously, is not fearful to match institution and traditions
against it, and makes a critical and applied assessment of what is hap­
pening in the world. This radical action is positive: it is part of the mes­
sonian of the Testaments. It is realistic: it makes men face the present
after years of success and mistakes. It is necessary: if there is no response
to today's demands, what right does religious life have to a future?

O'Meara must be commended for some truly excellent passages, brief
but incisive, on community life, the three vows, the need and dangers of
pluralism, and the relationship between authority and leadership in
present-day communities. One could say that he overshoots his mark
when he implies that a more radical reform at the very beginning would
have avoided the unhappy phenomena of polarizations, losses, and un­
necessary risks. On the last few pages he balances what is close to an
overoptimistic picture of radical reform by admitting that openness to
individuality, freedom, and current needs is not utopia. What sometimes
seems like a purely political approach to religious life he clarifies by une­
quivocally stating that nothing can supplant faith, which is necessary to
begin and to sustain the radical reform.

O'Meara ends by urging religious to think, lest they never be liberated
from an institutionalism which they neither desired nor planned but into
which years of routine may have lulled them. The book itself is a pow­
nerful prod to just that kind of thinking.

Weston College

Raymond P. Bertrand, S.J.

The Future Present: The Phenomenon of Christian Worship. By

Progress made in one discipline often provides confrontation with and
additional insights into another area. The study of Christian worship,
embracing as it does the questioning of so many elements related to
other fields, would seem to provide an apt locale for interdisciplinary
dialogue. In this work Dean Micks uses the phenomenon of Christian
worship as the focus for just such an overdue interchange. The result is a
fresh approach to the otherwise dead question, what is worship? The in­
vestigation comes alive because M. is not sparing in the number of other
fields to which she turns. The initial springboard is provided by the his­
torians of religion, but good use is also made of recent advances in the
communication arts, psychology, sociology, philosophy, and religion.
Such prominent behavioral scientists as Steiner, McLuhan, Cage, and
Merleau-Ponty fall easily within the pattern of this book. M. seeks to
integrate worship concepts long a part of the Christian experience with
other concepts more recently elaborated by these other disciplines. She does not, however, weaken the investigation by a simple attempt to relate or superficially examine the two, but remains at all times significantly critical of both old and new, as well as aware of the unique forces which make Christian worship what it is. An effective control is maintained over the entire study by submitting all judgments, especially those resulting from contemporary dialogue with other areas, to evaluation in the light of Scripture and Christian history. Still, a great deal is accomplished by viewing Christian worship in the context of the total religious experience of mankind. It is more than a legitimate approach; given the concern of the moment for *homo religiosus*, it is an essential one.

The necessary point of departure comes from the historian of religion Mircea Eliade. M. begins by taking exception to his generalization that the worship experience is tied only to the past. Christian worship maintains a necessary continuity with the past, but at the same time it is both present- and future-oriented. The rest of the work moves progressively out of this correction of Eliade’s thesis, isolating the present- and future-oriented elements of Christian worship for further examination in the light of contemporary data from many fields.

In the first part the focus is on the future. The origins of Christian worship are expertly grounded in the event of the Resurrection. It is this fact, M. notes, which contradicts Eliade’s thesis and creates the eschatological tension unique to Christianity. This tension continues to be expressed for the Christian in the liturgical calendar, in the audial and visual dynamism of liturgical services, in the expectant silences of the worship service, and above all in pentecostal openness to the Spirit. The whole is bound together by an excellent survey of the new theologians of hope and what their thought contributes to liturgical understanding. This is a propitious addition to the rest in that it grounds much of the previous speculation on a solid theological foundation.

The latter half examines the liturgy as an enactment of hope in the present. At this point M. addresses herself to those facets of the Christian worship experience which speak to the already of Christ’s presence in the liturgy, to those elements which touch man immediately, such as the visual, audial, and tactile. Man’s use of and reaction to time and space is an important adjunct to this phase of the study.

A study of Christian worship, when approached phenomenologically, dialogues well with many other disciplines. This M. has demonstrated expertly in this work, an indicator of the direction worship and liturgical studies will be taking in the future.

*College of St. Thomas, Minn.*

Brendan Rosendall, O.F.M.Conv.

This is a collection of essays by a number of theologians who met with others in Northern Spain two years ago to study possibilities for a contemporary presentation of a theology of priesthood. The collection develops some methodological orientations for such a theology. The essays are in five major areas and end with an ample bibliography.

The first three essays are primarily historical. Manuel Guerra studies ministerial priesthood in the *NT* and early Christianity: terminology, hierarchical ministry, functions and charism, priesthood of the faithful, women in the ministry. The essay offers nothing not available elsewhere, e.g., in Colson. Ignacio Oñatibia analyzes the Fathers of the Church, with stress on the problems and development of ministerial priesthood. Nicolás López Martínez deals with the Middle Ages and Scholasticism.

Much more interesting is the following major section. The first essay, by Juan Esquerda Bifet, presents present-day reflections and problems dealing with the point of departure for a theology of priesthood. He dismisses some of these attempts as inadequate and presents what he sees as a more fruitful and valid approach. Beginning from the concept of priesthood or starting with priesthood in the *OT* are deemed inadequate, though they give valuable material. A conceptual approach impoverishes the data of revelation; to start with *OT* priesthood, important as this is for the *NT* priesthood, is not to give due emphasis to the newness of the priesthood of Christ and consequently of the Church. The approach which begins with bishop-priest in order to bring us to priest-presbyter risks reducing the priesthood or ministry simply to bishops. A study of present-day mentality in order to “define” the role and function of the priest today, though significant, seems to limit the Christian priesthood to a sociological fact, in some way minimizes the fact that Christian priesthood is based on God’s revelation in Christ.

For the author, a more adequate and valid starting point is Christ the priest present and acting in the Church (world) today. Any theology of priesthood must consider Christ in His totality and then present the “priestly” character of His life and person; for if Christ’s presence in the Church is the kernel of our faith (primitive kerygma), then we cannot but start with the priestly dimension of His presence in order to build on it an adequate theology of priesthood faithful to the data of revelation. Such a study demands consideration of the Church as sign and must try to see the role that various facets of the People of God (ministers, bishops, deacons, laymen, women, etc.) play in it.

The fifth essay, by Carlos Escartin, considers the priestly crisis today. It is more a personal crisis than a crisis in structures. Add to the tend-
ency towards demythologization and secularization the lack of an adequate theology of priesthood. The effort to respond to demands for a more satisfying pastoral approach often eliminates or disregards the vertical aspect of the priestly mystery. The "mystery" is reduced to a sociological datum and the aspect of "mission received from Christ" is not even considered. This lack of perspective creates confusion and insecurity on a personal level, which in turn permeates the life of priests in general. There is great need for a biblical, dynamic theology.

The sixth essay, by Juan Esquerda Bifet, is rather a commentary on Pope Paul's address to priests on June 30, 1968 (AAS 60 [1968] 466-70). He analyzes its theological aspects as well as the problematics it presents for theology today. He then enumerates various aspects of the priest today which would have to be considered in fashioning a theology: sacred, apostolic, mystical-ascetical, and ecclesial dimensions.

The last fifty-eight pages offer an excellent extensive bibliography. Juan Esquerda Bifet includes in it books and articles touching on priesthood in general, priesthood of Christ, priesthood of the faithful, ministerial priesthood, sacrament of orders, episcopacy and presbyterate, diaconate, spirituality, vocation, and pastoral orientations.

The collection offers a valuable historical and methodological approach. Perhaps the most interesting sections are those on various points of departure for a theology of priesthood, and the bibliography at the end. In the preface Capmany points out that this is to be the first in a series of publications; we look forward to the rest.

Collegio Bellarmino, Rome

José A. F. Borges, S.J.


The volume at hand is not a point-by-point commentary on Vatican II's Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity. For such a commentary, the English-speaking reader already has available the excellent study by Ferdinand Klostermann in the third volume of Herbert Vorgrimler's Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967 ff.). Like the Klostermann piece, however, the present work does contain an extensive historical investigation of the evolution of the text itself, beginning in the fall of 1960 with the meetings of the preparatory commission and ending in November of 1965 with the official, papal promulgation of the decree. It is still vexing to be reminded that at no point in this complex history was a layman ever a member of any of the drafting commissions, even if it is repeatedly stressed that laymen were frequently consulted. The Latin text with a French translation on facing pages is also included.
The essays which constitute the body of the book serve to provide broad commentary, contextual perspective, and critical assessment. Mlle. Rosemary Goldie presents a panoramic overview of the Catholic apostolate in its remarkable variety across the world. Yves Congar offers a very judicious analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the Decree itself. Hans-Reudi Weber explores the OT material for perspectives on the appropriate secularity of the lay presence. In the process he also manages a perceptive aside on the thought of Bonhoeffer. A largely NT study by Gotthold Hasenhüttl underlines the importance and import of the teaching on charisms, a notion which comes into play in other essays as well. In a thoroughgoing, no-holds-barred critique of a document which he considers to be of merely second-line importance, Jan Grootaers raps the clericalism and paternalism all too evident in the Decree. Mme. M.-J. Beccaria discusses the place (or lack of it) of women in a male-dominated Church, while Pierre Toulat looks into some of the concrete factors conditioning meaningful lay apostolate. Finally, in a characteristically provocative piece, Hans Küng opens up the issue of lay participation in the decision-making procedures of the Church, a question completely ignored by the Decree. Happily, at many points these essays seek to go beyond theoretical considerations to suggest their practical implications for the shaping of a renewed Church.

Several motifs tend to recur throughout the volume. It seems a matter of common agreement, e.g., that this text represents not only a partial view of the Council's teaching on the laity but also a somewhat inferior form of it. *Lumen gentium* and *Gaudium et spes* both supplement and indeed in some areas transcend the positions of *Apostolicam actuositatem*. The integration of the Council documents, as we are all aware, was far from complete. In line with this observation, we hear it said in several places that the Decree is now *dépassé*, indeed *loin de nous*, in that it represents an earlier, incomplete, and now largely abandoned understanding of the place of the laity in the Church. This emphasis is surely connected with the repeated insistence that the Church in its self-understanding and in its life-style has yet to be satisfactorily declericalized, decentralized, and demasculinized. While the essayists do attempt to create a positive definition of the lay status (Grootaers is most helpful here), they recognize (Toulat and Grootaers in particular) that the present flux in the understanding of the priesthood and the religious life makes any rigidly definitive statements at this stage uncomfortably hazardous.

Jan Grootaers makes the observation that the very fact of the existence of such a decree devoted wholly to the laity is, in the last analysis, of greater significance than the inadequacies of the text itself. One can only
concur with this judgment and further hope that this initial opening is but a sign of some as yet unguessed future. This volume is a very candid appraisal of this initial opening and a serious searching for that unguessed future.

*Manhattan College*  
Donald P. Gray


Written by an ordained minister of the United Church of Christ who is professor of theology at a Presbyterian seminary, this latest in a series of books he has authored in pastoral theology is a survey and evaluation of efforts at reform and renewal in various phases of church life. Concerned primarily with the mainline Protestant churches, the book makes constant reference to parallel developments in Catholic life and depends rather heavily on current Catholic theology.

Though apparently stimulated to write by the work of Hans Küng, B. is only peripherally and casually concerned with church structures and with questions such as participation in decision-making, criteria for the exercise of authority, and appropriate processes for the formulation of doctrine. The two chapters more directly concerned with these areas, chap. 6 on church discipline and chap. 8 on new forms of church, provide a helpful balance to Catholic writing in their concern over situations where there is too little control to hold the enterprise together. Basically, however, this is a book about reform and renewal in the personal and communal spirituality of Christians, focused on the local parish community.

The first five chapters (preaching, liturgy, baptism, Eucharist, and evangelical confession) are thoughtful and interesting, and closely parallel the movements, practical problems, and theoretical developments in Catholicism. Despite extraordinarily wide reading in contemporary Catholic sources ranging from Karl Rahner and Piet Schoonenberg to James Kavanaugh and the *N.C.R.*, B. gives the impression of not being adequately oriented within Catholic theology to draw valid comparisons and of being sometimes misinformed on traditional Catholic theology (e.g., pp. 32 and 45 on the Eucharist, p. 36 on baptism).

In the latter half, chapters of special interest are those on new forms of church life and on the charismatic gifts; they offer a careful theological evaluation of current trends. Considerably less satisfying are those on healing and evangelism, which are based on rather sketchy acquaintance with the social sciences. The chapter on spiritual disciplines is rather simple and direct in upholding traditional practices of Christian asceticism and commends itself by its flawlessly unambiguous stance.
The concluding chapters, on social relevance and Christian unity, are sober and take note of the really difficult issues. In relation to social issues, B.’s analysis is indebted to Karl Barth and the confessing church of the Nazi era, though it seems somehow a betrayal of this tradition when the book sets aside the truly agonizing issue of the present, that of Vietnam, as one too factually complex for the churches to take a stand.

An interesting and rather fundamental conflict of views runs through the book. B.’s expectations of the churches and of Christians are shaped by a conscious and rigorous loyalty to the thought of Martin Luther and seem to have been profoundly influenced by Bonhoeffer, but apparently without taking into account the evolution in the thinking of both. There is a certain ambivalence as to the Church’s responsibility in worldly matters and as to the connection between salvation by faith and the way one conducts oneself in the shaping of human affairs. On the one hand, B. condemns dualism as a presently persisting error in the churches. On the other hand, he holds out for a certain exclusive “churchiness” of church activity and draws a distinction between sacred and profane that does not seem to be properly biblical. He leaves the reader in doubt as to the practical coherence of his position.

All this notwithstanding, the book is well worth the modest investment of money and time for Catholic readers who have been getting an overdose of secularization in their pastoral theology for some time.

*Georgetown University* 

**Monika Hellwig**


A statement that appears toward the end of this volume (p. 245) perhaps best summarizes its contents: “The fact that it is easier to point out the deficiencies in the older approaches without being able to elaborate any systematic newer methodology remains symptomatic of the problems facing Christian ethical reflection today.” C. acknowledges in the Preface that these essays—on penance, natural law, sexuality, genetics, social ethics, and methodology in moral theology—“make no pretense of forming a systematic study, but rather illustrate the content questions and methodological problems in contemporary moral theology.” But it is precisely because a systematic study is needed that, in my judgment, any volume of essays on contemporary issues is bound to lack, as does C.’s latest, a certain depth. Any such volume will too readily appear to be something of a (theological) grab bag in terms of both the issues considered and the opinions and studies of the authors adduced.

However, C.’s emphasis on historical consciousness, cultural condition-
ing, the validity of experience, and hence an evolving understanding of crucial issues is positive and much needed. The bibliography which he provides is, as usual, extensive, timely, and excellent.

There are, unfortunately, serious flaws in this work, which is simply a compilation of essays all but one of which have appeared earlier. Accordingly, the volume suffers from entirely too much repetition—and this despite the fact that C. has taken the time to cross-reference the matter presented. Further, the approach at times reads more like a retreat conference than a theological analysis.

More substantively and in particular, certain assertions which C. makes are hard to reconcile. For example, “If sin is the opposite of love [hence, presumably, mortal sin], then there is quite a bit of sin in our lives” (p. 8), and “sin is alive and well in the twentieth century” (p. 9); at the same time, though, mortal sin is repeatedly said to be a rare occurrence (pp. 16, 21, 23, 75). I think it preferable to assert that it is difficult to commit mortal sin, not that its commission is rare. Moreover, granted that sin has for too long been regarded in terms of the external act, contrary to C. (pp. 17 f., 21) I think it demonstrable that there are indeed certain criteria by which the existence of mortal sin can be established. C. suggests (pp. 20 f., 175) that it would be helpful to speak of the external act apart from the intentionality of the person in terms of right or wrong. But this terminological distinction, in reality self-evident, is hardly helpful, since popular Christian parlance readily identifies “wrong” with “sinful.” Moreover, it does not add anything to the traditional terminology of formal and material or subjective and objective; indeed, apart from the intention of the agent one cannot even speak of a human act.

Or take the following statements: “The whole purpose of the sacramental rite of penance is the forgiveness of sin which is just the opposite of the judicial processes which take place in our courts” (p. 48); “One must distinguish between the judicial aspect which belongs to the heart of the sacrament and the particular judicial aspects which might be more prevalent at a particular time in its historical development” (p. 49; cf. pp. 58, 60). Again, “Homosexual acts for such a person [one incurably homosexual], provided there is no harm to other persons, might be the only way in which some degree of humanity and stability can be achieved” (p. 177); referring then to a false dualism which underlies many arguments in favor of premarital sex, C. asks: “How often does one hear the argument: as long as both parties agree, there is nothing wrong with it” (p. 179). Is this not the same as the reason which C. tolerates in the case of homosexuality, namely, “provided there is no harm to other persons”?
Further, certain statements are not readily intelligible. Attempting to nuance our understanding of the relationship between nature and grace, C. says: “The two are neither opposed nor identical; but they exist side by side. Grace adds something to nature without in any way destroying it. A simplistic view of the supernatural sees it as something added to the natural. But the natural retains its own finality and integrity as the substratum to which the supernatural is added” (p. 99). “In the last few years the renewal in moral theology has stressed the primacy of love and service of neighbor and not sexuality as the hallmark of Christian life” (p. 159). “Note well that the axiom denying parvity of matter in the sixth commandment does not mean that every sin against the sixth commandment constitutes a mortal sin. Sexual actuation or pleasure within marriage and indirect sexual actuation outside marriage are not grave matter” (p. 166). “However, to deny the value and importance of the psychological distorts the meaning of human sexuality. For example, psychology reminds us that masturbation is not a very important matter in the life of some people such as the developing adolescent” (p. 168).

Other statements are simply unacceptable. “The older theologians can be excused because man has become aware of the psychological only within the last century” (p. 168). Unacceptable, too, is C.’s apparent approval of the application of the term “complete sexual actuation” to both masturbation and conjugal intercourse; unwittingly he thereby accepts the same physical understanding of human sexuality which he is rejecting.

The force of other statements is not in evidence. “Masturbation may mean many different things depending on the person placing the action” (p. 169). Any action may—including fornication, adultery, sodomy, etc. “This wrongness [viz., of masturbation] is not always grave; in fact, most times it is not. In the developing adolescent individual acts of masturbation are definitely not that important at all provided the individual is trying to develop his personality and enter into healthy relationships with others and the world around him” (p. 176). Certain questions arise here: Is this wrongness light and therefore always at least venially sinful? What exactly is the relationship between masturbatory activity and personality development? I am disputing not C.’s thesis but his argumentation; from a casuistic standpoint this essay on sexuality is quite vulnerable and of all the essays is the weakest.

Finally, some comparisons are curious. There is the “side by side” coexistence of grace and nature, the latter the “substratum” to which the supernatural is added (p. 99, as above). “All must admit the negative and even unhuman approach to sexuality which existed in the past both
in Catholic theory and practice, but fortunately a much more positive approach is beginning to prevail" (p. 172).

One is left with the over-all impression that despite the attractive and generally well-argued contemporary approach, and although C. at times does state his convictions which are opposed to traditional views, there is nonetheless a pervasive ambivalence in his approach. For these reasons and because the essays are available in various journals, I think the price of this book is a bit high. The essays, however, do provide a stimulus for further exploration in these and other matters.

Marquette University

DENNIS J. DOHERTY


Situation ethics is here presented in a new form, that of the dialogue, in an edited transcript of spoken conversations. All three participants are fluent, gracious, and charming conversationalists. But shortly after the beginning the possibility of disaster looms. The two main speakers just cannot be brought to disagree. Their harmonized voices turn every incipient discord into concord. The moderator, whose business presumably was to referee a fair fight between battling dialecticians, has more and more to step in to part their loving clinches. He has to heave a few punches himself in both directions to produce even the semblance of a contest. Socratic form is not adaptable to this kind of situation. We have a two-headed Socrates saying the same thing out of both mouths. A one-mouthed Socrates was formidable enough in his day; the two-headed one here is overpowering, despite May's desperate objections.

Without the advantages of a dialogue, the book is left with the disadvantages. The conversations tend to wander. Though kept somewhat within the range of one topic in each chapter, they are certainly not systematic. No point is pushed through to its conclusion; each blithely dances off into other speculations. One who has read a fair amount of situation ethics can here find the subject illumined by various flickering and occasionally brilliant lights, but one unfamiliar with the field would not find this book a good introduction.

One interesting point is Fletcher's four kinds of principles: (1) the formal: always do the good; (2) the substantive: to do the good is to act lovingly; (3) the normative: generally wise propositions on how loving concern is ordinarily expressed; (4) the prescriptive: definite laws about definite kinds of acts. The last is a null class: there are no prescriptive
principles of loving conduct. Wassmer is concerned to accentuate his denial of any intrinsically evil acts. This question seems to be largely semantic and Wassmer offers no reason why his semantic system must be preferred to the one embedded in the language. He makes no reference to Eric D’Arcy’s fine work on this topic.

The book ends with an exhortation toward the desacralization of morality. One can see that ethics, if it ever was sacralized, never should have been. But morality also pertains to moral theology, and to desacralize that seems, at least to this reviewer, to attempt to have a non-Christian Christianity. Popes and bishops are admonished to refrain from enunciating prescriptive principles of morality. Presumably they, like the aging St. John, should say nothing but “Love! Love! Love!”—certainly one of the best things to say, but, having said it, what else do they do? On the whole, this reviewer found the book interesting in manner and disappointing in content.

University of Santa Clara

Austin Fagothey, S.J.


La pillule d’or has lost its gilt. The Food and Drug Administration requires druggists dispensing it to insert a warning that the user of oral contraceptives should ask her doctor for a folder on “side effects.” The folder says in part that one user in two thousand will be hospitalized each year with “a serious blood clotting disorder.” This is the same “pill” that was said only to “put the ovaries to rest” in Dr. Rock’s The Time Has Come.

The authors of these three books indict the oral contraceptives (OCs). Their views aired in senatorial subcommittee hearings caused the FDA to order the warning insert and the folder. They do not present a balanced view, but mention sources where “the other side” can be found. They advocate that OCs be withdrawn from the market. If, they say, these drugs were submitted as new drugs today, they would not be approved by the FDA for release. When released, only their efficacy had been investigated. As their withdrawal seems impossible, the authors want the dangers present now and possible in the future disclosed to the users—what might be called informed consent.
S. writes on medical topics for the *Ladies' Home Journal*; her book is leveled at that readership. She compiled it from articles in medical journals and from interviews with doctors, patients, and families involved with OCs. It vividly details some of the disastrous and distressing effects OCs can have. It is lurid but reasonably accurate. A chapter on alternate methods has the erroneous suggestion that the temperature method (my special interest) is thrown off by colds.

M. criticizes the OCs more thoughtfully. He is a reporter for the *Washington Post*, specializing in the drug industry and its control by government. He documents the charges that OCs cause thromboembolic diseases and that the likelihood of their causing cancer has never been tested. He recites all the other adverse effects that have ever been discovered. Of course, all drugs have them, but the book should be read by anyone inclined to suggest to a woman "Why don't you try the pill?" M.'s knowledge of drugs and their evaluation is rare for a popular writer. I found only one blooper: he explains "polyploid" as if it were "polyloid." His pungent turns amuse or infuriate, depending on how one stands on OCs. He enfilades their proponents, biased and unscientific in their zeal for birth control, the manufacturers evading reports of clots in their sales enthusiasm, the FDA without adequate funds or legal strength and partial to the industry, and popular magazines stampeding women into doctors' offices to demand magic.

W. is both a physician and a lawyer. As attorney for plaintiffs in suits for disabilities and fatalities due to clot complications from OCs, he had access to the files of the manufacturer. He recounts how the manufacturer called a conference of experts in 1962 to determine if OCs caused thrombosis (clotting within blood vessels). W. later found in the files case records which could have influenced their judgment but were not shown to the experts. The proceedings mailed to all doctors concluded: nothing proven against the OCs. We had to wait for British figures about increased risk of thrombosis with OCs before the FDA sent out a warning letter.

W. shows how the responsibility for the patient's safety, which should rest with the prescribing doctor, is shuffled around from the doctor to the manufacturer, to the FDA, and to the patient herself. He says that research which should have been done years ago is only now being talked about. Vital statistics should have been analyzed. To recognize those women who would be prone to clotting complications before they develop, those who have been affected should be studied. This unique book should be read by anyone interested in OCs.

The authors disclaim a religious ground for their position against OCs. I do not, and I am further biased by a special interest in periodic conti-
nence by the temperature (T) method. These books have special signifi-
cance for Catholics, attracted to OCs among the first by reassurances
that their use would be approved in time by the pope.

It was just as Catholics were learning that temperature charts are an
essential guide to effective periodic continence that the OCs were
launched on a flood of publicity. Debaters contrasted the failures of
"rhythm" with the 100% effectiveness claimed for the OCs. A Catholic
psychiatrist showed that "rhythm" caused emotional disorders. Now we
know that depression and loss of libido are frequent complications of
OCs. W. even thinks suicides in women have increased with their dis-
semination. Any system of birth control has its drawbacks and its drop-
outs.

With the magic gone from the OCs, the T method seems less of a de-
privation and even has positive advantages. If the effort in promoting OCs
had been used to teach Catholics the T method, thousands more would
today be content with it. The 25% said to be "too irregular for rhythm"
(and the T method does not require regularity) are matched by 25% of
new users of OCs who drop out before a year for many reasons.

The T method was called impractical for doctors to teach, but the laity
are teaching it to one another. Now we know that OCs require contin-
uous supervision and examinations by physicians for safety. A unique
advantage of the T method is that couples can gradually taper off, as
they require less efficacy. OCs must be taken faithfully or not at all.

Advocates of OCs, in offsetting their bad features, claim they are 100%
effective. One cannot evaluate a method of birth control on efficacy
alone; its acceptability and safety must be considered. The T method is
practically as effective as the OCs (cf. Bartzen, Roetzler), but it must be
correctly applied and its discomforts, as with OCs, accepted. OCs are
highly effective because the majority of patients get an overdose to con-
trol the variability of the rest. The early formula contained ten times the
present dose, reduced (to make it more acceptable and have fewer drop-
outs) to the level where a missed pill may mean a pregnancy.

These books are needed to balance the extravagances of the OC propo-
nents, one of whom says (Look, June 30, 1970): "the FDA's advisory
committee found no evidence that the use of oral contraceptives in-
creased the risk of breast cancer." How could they? It will take ten or
twenty years to learn the cancer-provoking powers of OCs, and one in
twelve women gets it at some time in her life. Routine examinations do
not prevent cancer of the breast, and in young women even the earliest
possible discovery may not lead to a cure in every case. The authors feel
that women have a right to know that the risks are unmeasured, but
cannot be ignored as were those with thrombosis.

New York, N.Y.  
Edward F. Keefe, M.D.

A genuine understanding of Bonhoeffer's life, vision, and thought will necessarily involve an acquaintance with the writing of Eberhard Bethge. Such necessity is dictated by the fact that he was one of Bonhoeffer's most intimate friends and colleagues and that two thirds of the famous letters and papers from prison have Bethge as their correspondent. Also, Bethge's writings on Bonhoeffer, especially the Alden-Tuthill Lectures published in the *Chicago Theological Seminary Register* (February, 1961), shed significant light on the context, development, and challenge of Bonhoeffer's life and thought. Now that Bethge's authentic biography of Bonhoeffer has been translated, the fulness of Bethge's light becomes overwhelming. Such a book had been a desire for the past decade and now it surely is a necessity for both scholar and admirer of the prophet of our world come of age. A reading of this lengthy biography forcefully presents to all an interesting moment wherein to confront the real Bonhoeffer as a man of courage and vision.

Along with his intention of writing a biography of Bonhoeffer, Bethge's central preoccupation is to point out the profound continuity which permeates the Lutheran pastor's seemingly disjunctive thought and vision. By giving proportionate attention to both the earlier instances of Bonhoeffer's writing as well as to his more widely read works, Bethge achieves his purpose. Unlike John Phillips' recent thesis about the conflicting Christologies found in the later Bonhoeffer, Bethge makes it imperative not only to view Bonhoeffer's thought in the context of his early writings but thereby to "ascertain an intrinsic consistency and continuity in Bonhoeffer's theological development." Bethge views such development as being an evolution or expansion rather than a series of conflicting stances. Thus he concludes that Bonhoeffer evolved from an academic theologian to a Christian and thence to a "contemporary." This type of evolution made demands on his vision and thought pattern, but the central interrogative which undergirds this evolution is always Bonhoeffer's famous question: who is Christ for us today?

This biography brings into focus much of the necessary context from which we can derive an understanding of Bonhoeffer's relationship, disagreement, and indebtedness to Barth. One of the most informative sections of the work is Part 2. Herein we find a detailed analysis of the facts, conflicts, and events which caused Bonhoeffer's passionate involvement in the ecclesial and ecumenical happenings of the mid and late thirties. The significance of the Synods of Barmen and Dahlem for the Church and for Bonhoeffer himself is accented, so that a dimension of
Bonhoeffer's personality and thought is highlighted which often remains hidden in the rush to marshal texts from his widely-read *Ethics* and *Letters and Papers from Prison*. Bethge also clarifies, as far as is possible, what Bonhoeffer intended by such terms as "nonreligious interpretation of biblical concepts," "world come of age," and "religionless Christianity." By elaborating on the "arcane discipline" and Bonhoeffer's basic *theologia crucis*, Bethge is able to point to a sought-for relationship between Bonhoeffer's *Cost of Discipleship* and the later fragmentary *Ethics*. Bethge also finds a proportionate relation between ecclesiology and Christology in Bonhoeffer's theology, especially when it is viewed as developmental or evolving.

Such lengthy biography naturally prohibits detailed review, but the general impact felt after reading it is that of contacting the person, vision, and thought of Bonhoeffer through the eyes of his closest friend. The work is drenched with Bethge's love, admiration, and intimacy. His access to personal letters and family documents that are unpublished, as well as his involvement in Bonhoeffer's life, combine to give us an experience of the person beneath the feverish activity and thought in which Bonhoeffer was engaged throughout his adult life. Bethge writes in the preface to this translation: "my approach to my subject is not that of a scholar approaching it from the outside. I am involved. I must try to use this weakness as my strength." It is precisely Bethge's involvement and weakness that make his biography of Bonhoeffer a longed-for dream come true, a desire become a necessity, a gift for which we are all indebted.

*University of Chicago*  

CHARLES M. HEGARTY, S.J.


In this remarkable book Fr. Lynch dramatizes the critical encounter of religious man with the secular project. He presents, along the lines of a Greek drama, the following hypothesis: suppose religious man adopts all the humanity of the secular project which, on the face of it, seems to be its own antithesis. What happens? Plenty.

We have seen some of L.'s plot and characters before. His first work, *An Approach to the Metaphysics of Plato through the Parmenides* (1959), provided him with both a philosophical theory of and a deep respect for "the laborious sense in which contrary predicates are composable." *The Image Industries* (1959) was the first application of this theory to contemporary culture. While criticizing the counterfeit success of what he called
the magnificent imagination of the media, L. warned moral theology against being tricked into an unnecessary conflict with art. He insisted that the apparent contraries, art and morality, are in fact composable by reason of their common grounding in the truly human. *Christ and Apollo* (1960) focused on the literary imagination. Aesthetics that is not immersed in all the rhythms of human life becomes gnostic dreams. On the other hand, L. suggested that in the biblical revelation God is precisely imaging forth a concrete humanity which would challenge any literary talent. We will note in his present work a shift of emphasis away from one theme of *Christ and Apollo*: its concern for the formally Christian imagination. In *The Integrating Mind* (1962) L. warned against a too facile alienation of the intellectual from society; the intellectual's temptation, he said, is to “elevate the tragic incident of his isolation into a metaphysical value.” *Images of Hope* (1965) pushed further into the individual psyche to show how false or premature antinomies in the quest for truth and value can be tragic for man's mental health. In numerous articles over the past decade L. has applied his reconciling imagination to other polarities as well, where he thinks that they threaten education, art, film, politics, faith, and culture.

In a good Greek drama it is less important that we already know the plot and characters than that we experience them again dramatically. Thus, in the present work L. is again searching for mutual belonging and organism between polarities. This time it is religious man, man in all his devotion to and dependence upon God, who seems to be at stake. Can this religious man be both this-worldly and other-worldly? What would be so terrible if he dropped his formally religious imagery? What are the counterfeit images of that secular man he hopes to become? Can we hope to be secular if we are religious, or will our secularity be guilt-ridden? Is Christ becoming as isolated from the human as Apollo ever was?

These are dramatic questions. So in a prologue, three acts, and an epilogue, L. asks his reader to put himself in the shoes of Prometheus, that hero of the secular project. By the end of Act 1 we will have tried our hand at accepting all the unconditionality, autonomy, and emerging self-identity that secular man is famous for. We will also have learned to distinguish between an authentic secularity and a childishly wilful one, which L. calls Prometheusism. Yet religious man should not take heart too quickly because of this distinction. In Act 2 religious man is forced to contemplate all the implications of choosing the secular project. He is asked to embrace the hypothesis, now more strikingly expressed, that man is the forger of his own destiny. And at this prospect religious man, now become man, suffers. He suffers with the intensity of an Orestes,
who sees the futility of an old way of living which is endless and fruitless, but cannot see light coming from some new direction. L. comments that religious man's dilemma would be less intense if he realized that his new mode of acting in freedom is not to be conceived of as rampant and limitless choice but is rather to be a human, historical, step-by-step freedom. At this point, religious man is still unsure, so in Act 3 he must set out on a search for innocence, during which he purges himself from the guilt, terror, inhumanity, fantasy, and aggression that are usually present in the secular project.

If we may give away the ending, L. finds that it was not religious man who was at stake all along; it was secular man in his Promethean quest for autonomy, unconditionality, and identity. For three acts L. has bravely tried to describe the secular as it is. It is with supreme irony that he concludes the third act: "Some people have even told me I was writing about the sacred. That would not be a problem for me so long as I would have convinced a good number of people that I had been talking legitimately about the secular." In his epilogue L. spells out more analytically why it is that sacred and secular not only do not conflict, but also why the secular need not be so hung-up about the sacred. In this part of the book L. might seem to be taking back some of the unconditionality that he previously gave to the secular, and some will fault him for this. No matter. L.'s message is directed to religious man, and L. himself never abandons a believing stance. He "tries literally to imagine things with God." He is telling religious man not to be afraid of the secular. He is warning religious man that he will never get over his guilt about living in a secular world unless he dramatically lets himself in for the hypothesis that the secular project is alright. Cleansed of his self-pity and of his fear, religious man can then turn his energies to the service of the secular, resourcing himself for this task with fresh and imaginative interpretations of the Word of God.

A crown for L. for a great show.

St. Peter's College, N.J. George McCauley, S.J.


"In the past," Fr. Padovano says, "we may have diminished the impact of Christology by limiting this study to questions concerning the nature and redemptive mission of Christ. A more effective approach would explore, in addition to this, the Christological import of Creation and Revelation" (p. vi). A richer theology is to be found in searching the realities of a particular people, to see if the gospel message of salvation
complements their aspirations and in what special way. The purpose of
the present volume is to present data of American culture as evidence for
this openness to salvation. While sources from direct social commentators
and philosophers are analysed, literary figures claim the greatest atten-
tion.
Not surprisingly, literary figures of the twentieth century provide rich
material for P.'s purpose. Faulkner's *Fable* and Hemingway's *Old Man
and the Sea* especially carry a Christological reference in their sym-
bolism. In others, as with philosophers, the frustrations and incomplete-
ess of their message reveal the need for salvation. P. is adequate and
writing at his best in most of the instances he takes from novels and
plays. It is significant that he omits Saroyan, O'Neill, Anderson, and
others so prominent in American literary culture. These are not con-
cerned with turning outward to salvation, but inward in reaction against
naturalism. The adjustment in such patterns of contemporary thought
would not have the ensuing frustration and even despair of O'Neill's cry
for salvation. Stubborn pursuit of the human in an agnostic and material
condition without expectation of attainment has become axiomatic with
the kind of happiness many Americans settle for.
Half the book moves in the vein established by certain literary figures.
"Salvation Themes in Modern Philosophy" and "The Religious Phe-
nomenon" expressed in world religions are sketched in the same spirit in
the earlier portion. This is followed by "The American Experiment,"
which uses comment on de Tocqueville, Dewey, Riesman, and a few
others to give a profile of the American character. The whole first half is
less satisfactory. There is no suggestion of the wide range of studies in
social and intellectual history, and the many problems they raise for the
author's profile. Since World War II, moreover, scholars of American civ-
ilization have moved from dominant concern with literary history and
philosophy to detailed examination of explicitly religious culture, exem-
plified in H. Richard Niebuhr's *The Kingdom of God in America*. While
there is scholarship in P.'s development, it is not in this area; and by
explicitly excluding the sociological dimension of the term "culture" as
he uses it, he significantly limits the nature of his book and its scholarly
contribution.
Perhaps these same strictures could have been made of Jean Danié-
lou's *Salvation of the Nations*, published long before Vatican II and
carrying a spirit not dissimilar to P.'s interpretation; for it seems im-
portant to look at this book as a post-Vatican II believer's observation on
and response to American culture, as a primary source for future histo-
rians. One thinks of Josiah Strong's *My Country* and a book that came
from his contemporary Americanizer John Ireland; and even of Fulton J.
Sheen as an immediate predecessor among those who sought to reconcile
the gospel message with the destiny of the country. Much is told of the
evolution of Catholic culture in the 1960's in P.'s comment. Where Sheen
would say that a philosophical adversary carried the logic of his aberra­
tions to its natural conclusion in suicide. P.'s analysis reflects the concili­
atory mood of Vatican II's bridge to the world of agnosticism. Ireland's
pious generalizations about American virtues stand in contrast to P.'s
penetration of the inner conflicts in the culture manifestations which he
considers.

It is assuring that publication of a work by one deeply involved pastor­
ally as well as professorially in American life is still possible. Where the
academe would in some cases dismiss the scheme of this book as gran­
diose and not comprehensive, the case happily is that the reader can look
forward to a second volume. The promise of P.'s forthcoming scriptural
and dogmatic adaptation of Christology to the American scene presented
here is a challenge to others than himself. In an age of revival in poetry of
all kinds and quality, it is heartening that sacred studies have a place. In
this sense P. manifests American culture and the quest for Christ by a
segment of the People of God and of America.

The John Carroll Papers

Washington, D.C.

The Ecumenical Advance: A History of the Ecumenical Movement

This is an invaluable ten-dollar book, a volume every serious religious
library should have, every serious ecumenist. It is a sequel to the 1954
Rouse-Neill A History of the Ecumenical Movement 1517–1948, by a
man admirably equipped by nature, grace, and experience to handle the
material. He knows the movement.

The first and perhaps the only significant negative criticism I have is
drawn from the title: a history of the "ecumenical movement." Henri
D'Espine meets my objection by writing in the Introduction: "Here it
should be emphasized that the ecumenical movement must not be re­
garded as identical with the World Council of Churches, nor has the
latter ever claimed to be its only expression." True, and laudable. The
difficulty is that the book then looks and reads as if the two are identi­
ified for all practical purposes—or are so interdependent as to allow little
room for nonconciliar ecumenism to go a more spontaneous way. Check
the chapter on "Signs of Radicalism in the Ecumenical Movement,"
where throughout the capable report on a variety of independent events a
recurring reference appears to conciliar events and publications. The impression is given that we conciliarists remain pretty much in the thick of all things ecumenical. Would that we did—but we do not.

Of positive judgments there are at least fifteen, since the book has that many chapters by as many competent writers. Some examples: Visser ‘t Hooft on general ecumenical development since 1948; Hans-Ruedi Weber on regional developments; Fey on confessional families; Newbigin on mission to six continents; Abrecht on social thought; Nolde on international affairs; Vischer on Roman Catholic ecumenism; Blake on Uppsala and afterwards. To omit the other seven is truly a sin, but not of malice, only of privation of space. Each writes about thirty pages of densely packed information, history, and evaluation of a subject on which he is extremely well informed and well affected. And there is more. Ans J. van der Bent contributes a selective bibliography for each chapter except the last. The entries are almost all available in English. A general index follows, as well as an index of authors in the bibliography.

Readers of TS will be especially enriched by Meredith Handspicker’s chapter on Faith and Order. WCC studies have concerned many of the topics that our American bilateral theological discussions have taken up: the nature of Church unity, ecclesiology, worship, tradition and traditions. H. points out the methodological change agreed on at Lund in 1952. “Rather than to compare positions, people from all Churches were asked to study together the relationship between God and his Church” (p. 151). This is the true ecumenical method, the one which theologians are more and more adopting. On the difficult subject of ministry, which now occupies a number of American bilateral conversations, H. is candid: “One can only speculate on the reasons why such a central question of church order has received such scant attention and evoked little support from churchmen. It is at least possible that part of the ‘hidden agenda’ in discussions concerning order is the institutional identity of church bodies, and, for that matter, the self-identity of churchmen and ministers as well. The very fact that for many Churches order provides the main thread of continuity, at least in their own self-understanding, means that reaction to change in this order will be strong. ‘Organizational inertia’ mounts to a well-nigh immovable force where organizational identity is in question. Continued probing of what had been termed ‘non-theological factors’ may be necessary in conjunction with study of the specifically theological aspects of order.”

But the book is optimistic in its overview of Roman Catholic participation in the ecumenical movement. Chap. 12, on this subject, seems to me the best short summary available. Lukas Vischer has a feel for the Church and the churches, a sensitivity to currents of influence, and,
above all, the experience of all four sessions of Vatican II. He is critical and fair-minded, hopeful and realistic. He nicely shows the continuity in attitude between Pope John and Pope Paul, herein seeing more clearly than some Roman Catholics. Somewhat surprisingly, in treating Paul's opening address at the second session, he omits mention of that psychological milestone: the asking and extending forgiveness for ecumenical sins of the past. For the rest, though, his exegesis of the Decree on Ecumenism seems quite insightful, and his judgment (happily correct) is "that with the promulgation of the Decree the Roman Catholic Church had explicitly and irrevocably committed itself to the ecumenical movement" (p. 338).

Both Vischer and Blake mention the question of Roman Catholic "membership" in WCC. Fr. Roberto Tucci's major address brought the matter to the fore at Uppsala. The appointment of nine Roman Catholic theologians to the Faith and Order Commission (including the editor of TS) has brought an official dimension to the relationship. The Joint Working Group of WCC and the Vatican is now working through the planning and consulting process, with no major obstacles looming so far.

"Doctrine divides; service unites" was for a long time a shibboleth among churchmen. No longer. Christ unites, in doctrine and service, inextricably interconnected. Truly an "ecumenical advance" has occurred.

National Council of Churches, N.Y. 
David J. Bowman, S.J.


Though written primarily for Jews, this book contains nothing that should be obscure to an educated Christian reader. It is concerned with problems of modernization and secularity within religious tradition in ways immediately applicable to the Christian churches. Neusner writes from a historian's extensive and detailed knowledge of his own tradition, but the book is more than a summary of historical findings. It is creative projection of future possibilities by one who hopes much and cares passionately for the continuation of the living tradition of Judaism.

Taking his stand within Conservative Judaism, N. sets out his thesis: "the meaning and challenge of secularity for both Judaism and Christianity... may be best met... through the formation of havurot or fellowships of serious and faithful Jews, and through the reformation of the larger Jewish community... I am more optimistic that the fellowships will prove meaningful to many Jews than that such a community reformation is possible" (p. vi).
Basing his analysis on Wilfred Cantwell Smith's theory of religions, N. discerns two characteristic and constitutive features of Judaism: (1) the belief in a promise that some day things will be better in this world—which calls forth the commitment to bring about that betterment for all; (2) an inevitable process of secularization from within the tradition itself. He sees these features expressed in three aspects of the tradition: messianism, social ethics, and ritual or religion in the narrow sense of the word.

Up to the eighteenth century, these aspects are scarcely distinguishable. The corporate, segregated, collective style of Judaism integrated all aspects of life into an organic culture, until gradually Hassidism from within and the Enlightenment from without caused fragmentation and a crisis of Jewish identity. From that point on, N. suggests, the messianic and ethical aspects tend to be carried in secular movements and ideologies with a passion for social justice and the liberation of the poor which is in the best tradition of the biblical prophets but uses no religious language. At the same time, the religious element, in the ritual sense, became highly problematic and a source of division among Jews rather than their bond of unity. Such a bond was provided instead by a "community of fate" in modern human experiences that Jews could share in common, such as the holocaust and the State of Israel. N. quotes Heschel's dictum that Jews may be messengers who have forgotten their message, but that they have never forgotten that they had a message. In this context, secularization is seen as a recall to the central thrust of the tradition, and an important part of the response which N. still considers missing is a Jewish theology of Christianity. His summary of existing attempts at this is relevant and helpful (pp. 68–81).

The latter half of the book is devoted to practical proposals for a renewal of synagogues, that they may become genuine hauurot or fellowships. Many of his suggestions are closely akin to current Christian projections such as Rahner's Christian of the Future. Fellowships should not result from membership drives but from the inner needs of the individuals to create them; they should involve a radical and active commitment of all members; they should be serious communities of prayer and study of the tradition; at the same time, they should be drawn together by objectives outside themselves, works of social justice and compassion that have the messianic thrust. In his discussion of the quest for a contemporary ethic of Jewish fellowship one finds noteworthy parallels with Moltmann and Pannenberg. In the final section N. reflects on the dynamic polarity between the State of Israel and the dispersion in the living tradition.
Although the book consists of essays published in periodicals over the last five years, it offers a reasonably unified presentation.

Georgetown University  
MONIKA HELMWIG

SHORTER NOTICES


M. argues that (1) the first Gospel was written in 42 A.D. as a letter to convey a farewell message from the apostles justifying their departure to the Gentiles and urging the Judean church to stand firm, and (2) Luke wrote to show the agreement between Christ's teaching and the theology of Romans and Paul's earlier letters. As spokesman for the other apostles, Matthew composed the first Gospel in Hebrew; later it was faithfully translated into Greek. The second Gospel (by Peter's disciple Mark) records instructions given by Peter in Jerusalem between 30 and 42. During those years the Twelve had worked as a team in Jerusalem. "The distribution of doctrinal material among them, we ought to assume, was settled by all of them together in conference" (pp. 108 f.). A western version of Mark, incorporating additional notes for Gentiles, appeared after 60. Luke, briefed by Paul, began his Gospel and Acts in 57, and completed the Gospel before leaving with Paul for Rome, where he finished Acts.

These views are argued badly. M. knows that many scholars agree that Mark was a source for Matthew and Luke, but nowhere mentions Q. In M.'s view, Matthew employed Peter's catechesis, which Mark later recorded, while Luke drew on both Matthew (for discourse material) and Mark. M. seems unaware of the work of Conzelmann and others on Redaktionsgeschichte. He presumes that Acts 1–12 accurately recounts Peter's preaching in Jerusalem and that 1 Peter mirrors his preaching during later (Roman) years. In writing Romans, Paul is alleged to assume that readers will be familiar with his Galatian and Corinthian letters. Bultmannian exegesis would be astonished to learn that the third Gospel is "dominated by the doctrine of Romans." Real differences between Luke and Paul over eschatology, ecclesiology, apostleship, justification, and other major doctrines go unrecognized. Again M. seems to know nothing of the relevant literature.

Gerald O'Collins, S.J.


As its title suggests, this book is meant to introduce the nonspecialist to one current theological approach to NT interpretation. After an initial chapter on the hermeneutical problem as the possibility of Christian faith and theology in the modern world, the book is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the background of the new hermeneutic: two chapters on the earlier and later Heidegger, one on Bultmann's use of Heideggerian concepts, and one on the role that language plays in man's relationship to the world. In the second part various aspects of the new hermeneutic are discussed—primarily as exemplified in
Fuchs and Ebeling. Two chapters treat their presuppositions on the nature of man and language, and on the nature of faith. Further chapters present the new hermeneutic's approach to the biblical text and the figure of Jesus that emerges from this approach; a final chapter contains A.'s reflections on the movement and his brief criticisms.

Throughout the book the intent is to provide a clear and accurate presentation of the material, with a minimum of critical evaluation. The various descriptions meet this aim, given the complex nature of the philosophical positions being summarized. A.'s major criticisms are that the new hermeneutic arbitrarily chooses one of the various views of faith reflected in the NT as the only valid view, not only for men today, but even for the early Christians, and that this procedure either denies the historicality of human existence, a key element in the new hermeneutic's philosophical foundations, by asserting the persistent validity of a single concept of faith, or else ignores that historicality by projecting today's concept back into the time of the early Church. The book is useful as an introduction, but more extensive critical evaluation throughout would have made it far more valuable for the students who are its probable audience.

Kevin G. O'Connell, S.J.


For most Christians the figure of Francis of Assisi remains shrouded in legend. Unlike Bernard of Clairvaux or Ignatius Loyola, he did not leave a sizable corpus of writings and correspondence. Francis is best known through multiple stories that circulated after his death through Western Europe and quickly became popular iconographical subjects. This volume contains an early collection of these stories, written down some twenty years after Francis' death at the behest of the Minister General of the Order by three of Francis' last companions. The Scripta are important because they underlie Thomas of Celano's Second Life, one of the most widely used sources of early Franciscan history. They bring us a step closer to the living man. Long considered lost, the Scripta were recovered at the end of the last century and the beginning of the current one in several fourteenth-century manuscripts.

What the companions evoke in their thematically interlocked stories is Francis' personal warmth, the transparency of his joy, the serenity he brought to the ordeals of his health, and his impatience for the steadfast service of God in poverty, simplicity, and prayerfulness. They underscore how radically he veered from the social and political goals which the contemporary hierarchical Church and Italian town elite pursued. The volume also contains Brother Leo's Life of Blessed Giles, one of Francis' first associates. Following the format of the Oxford Medieval Texts, an English translation faces the edited texts.

Fernando Picó, S.J.


The 1969 Proceedings gathers together views on what the theologian, especially the college theologian, should be doing today. Some of the proposals are too general, if not in-
flated (Greeley); others are simplistic (O'Connor); others (Fortin, Vanderhaar, Kelly, Shaw) suggest that theology will succeed only where the theologian is an active participant in contemporary peace, ecumenical, and student movements. Westerhoff is best on the view that "where, how, and why you think is what you think." In a pluralist spirit, he allows that the library- and lecture-oriented theologian is a necessary check and balance on the more activist theologian. There are two good, if not very revolutionary, articles on the mutual teaching roles of theologians and bishops (Dulles, B. Cooke). Kelley stresses the important theme of theology's identity. The theologian's claim to academic freedom will be responsible only if he identifies what he wants freedom to do, only if he says what he means by theology. Some contributors (Burns, Going, Green, Brady) seem to say that the measure of theology's identity should be what gets through to turned-off students and average adults. That would be revolutionary, but it also might lead to shallowness. Rubencamp is more cautious; the theology he ends up with is a study of the religious phenomenon which avoids indoctrination to any given tradition, which allows people to feel free to question, yet which is not blind to the fact that some faith-commitment in the theologian is inevitable. Balducelli's phenomenological approach to religion is less sophisticated on this last point. There are faith-assumptions at work even in the supposedly open theological questions one chooses to ask. Sometimes it seems easier to join a revolution than to bring these faith-assumptions to light intelligibly and confidently.

George McCauley, S.J.


The Future of Theology is really about theology's past. Beginning with the restoration of Thomism under Leo XIII, A. traces more than a century of debate over what role theology should have in the modern Church. The protagonists of this debate are numerous: Neo-Thomism and its critics, Modernists, Blondel, Chenu, charismatic theology (Stolz, Casel, Mersch), kerygmatic theology, Labourdette and Garrigou-Lagrange attacking the new theology of postwar France, Humani generis, other theologians who prepare the way for Vatican II. A.'s treatment is clear, well documented, and dramatic. The extensive bibliography is very helpful. His final section, on the implications of his historical survey for future theological curricula, is not up to the rest of the book. Such suggestions for theological education are quickly dated and depend too much on local needs and circumstances. At any rate, the debate which A. describes so well was hard fought. The question of theology's place in the Church and in the world was often entangled with the more fundamental question of what the Church itself should be doing in the world. Here it was never clear whether and to what extent theologians, or anyone else for that matter, could speak for "the Church." It still is not clear. This is perhaps why much of A.'s history is being repeated in similar, if less heroic, forms today.

George McCauley, S.J.


The Scottish editor and dogmatician J. K. S. Reid, well known for his previous work in the area of fundamental theology, here turns his attention to the history of apologetics. In the first half he deals with the NT (chap. 1) and the patristic period (chaps. 2–5). In the last hundred pages he surveys the Middle Ages (chap. 6) and modern
times (chaps. 7–10). In the final chapter he gives an enlightening account of modern secular theology and exposes the limitations of an apologetic that would sacrifice the transcendence of God to the alleged demands of relevance. While R. is generally accurate in his reporting, his selection of materials seems rather arbitrary. In his account of the patristic period he omits Eusebius of Caesarea and Theodoret of Cyrrhus. In the medieval period he focuses almost exclusively on the proofs for the existence of God and overlooks the great apologies against the Jews and Moslems by scholars such as Raymond Martini. He overlooks eminent Renaissance apologists such as Savonarola and Vives. From the seventeenth century on he becomes so engaged with British authors that he omits to mention the great apologists of France (Pascal, Bossuet, Abbadie, Chateaubriand), Holland (Grotius), Germany (Sack and Luthardt), Italy (Alphonsus Liguori), and Spain (Balmes). In treating nineteenth-century England R. gives many pages to the Darwinists but says nothing of Newman. Notwithstanding these omissions, the book deserves to be commended as an interesting, well-written, compact survey. It is no doubt especially directed to English-speaking Protestant readers.

Avery Dulles, S.J.


Just as Fr. Boros’ God Is with Us came upon the scene in the midst of the “God Is Dead” controversy, so now his Living in Hope comes to us as an argument against the darkness and despair that seem to plague modern minds and hearts, even in Christian circles. For B., the basic “hope” of human existence takes shape in the Christian conception of man as expectation of heaven, the most intensely meaningful focus of humanity’s most vital longing. Consequently, Christians feel a certain solidarity with all hope, even purely human. The unsurpassable pitch of ultimate fulfilment is magnificently expressed by St. Paul in a basic principle of the Christian interpretation of life: “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love Him.” So it is this ray of hope alive in the heart of the Christian, even amid the failure and distress and suffering of life, that is a sign of the eternal destiny of the world, the movement of life towards God. The hope of creation has found eternal reality in Him: heaven.

These short chapters, rather “sentences” or “meditations” on hope than a technical theological exposition, manage to achieve the depth and freshness we have come to expect from this “existential theologian.” Perhaps the appeal of B.’s work is that his approach to Christ and His mysteries has the conviction of a lived experience. Those who may feel that the last word has already been said on Christian hope should pick up B. again. One can hardly think of a better book for lectio divina.

Richard Weber


The relationship of human values and Christian values, and the larger question of the unity between the natural and the supernatural, have important implications for Christian identity in general and for religious education in particular. Marcel van Caster confronts these problems in a way that will not satisfy all catechetical theoreticians but makes a valuable contribution to serious research. He admits that in former times religious education erred by separating human and Christian values, but he warns
against an overreaction that would confuse the two. "Does the fact of loving our fellow men already mean that we love God? Is every form of goodness achieved on the human plane already implicitly Christian?" He maintains that neither separation nor confusion but rather a dynamic unity must be preserved, whereby human values become parables and mediations of Christian values. He tries to forestall the inevitable accusations of devaluing the natural by supporting a serious and effective communication of human values and by contributing thereto an in-depth analysis of such basic themes as work, freedom, love, and sexuality. The chapter on love is particularly impressive. But he insists that genuinely Christian education must help the subject to transcend the purely human and open himself up to the divine. In the same vein, he asserts that the task of the Church as institution is directly concerned only with the religious values of the kingdom of God. Human values are only its indirect concern insofar as they dispose us to welcome the gift of God. A difficult book, consisting of involved analysis and abstract expression unrelieved by concrete examples. A less recondite style would have made more useful for religious educators a study that is crucial in scope and sometimes profound in its insights.

James J. DiGiacomo, S.J.


"Context" in this case means the entire revolution in sexual morality. More than 1400 entries in this volume cover such diverse topics as adolescence, popular attitudes, moral absolutes, sterilization, and the efficacy of the pill. Entries are listed by author and title in a single alphabetical arrangement. A subject index and a resource index for tracing materials by publisher and journal make this an effective research tool.
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