BOOK REVIEWS


Although I cannot find it so indicated in the English edition, this is only Part 1 of a study of the theology of the NT, as made clear in the German which has been published simultaneously. Undoubtedly Jeremías, recently retired from his chair at Göttingen, held since 1935, hopes to gather together and to cap the work of a lifetime of really unique scholarship. Please God, he will finish his projected Theology, but the one volume is already a remarkable effort. What fascinates in J.’s long list of previous publications is the consistency of the dominating theme. Whether he is concerned with Golgotha, or Jerusalem in NT times, or the expression Abba, or Jesus’ parables and eucharistic words, J. is employing his unique knowledge of the Aramaic language and of the customs of Jesus’ times in a consuming passion to know what really happened in those two or three extraordinary years in Galilee and Jerusalem. And here he gathers into one book the results of this incredibly detailed research about the ipsissima verba et facta Jesu. It is done readably and concisely; and if one can buy only one of J.’s books, this one would best catch the span of his interests.

J. spells out his criteria at the beginning, especially the principle that the authentic words of Jesus should be retrovertible into Aramaic, along with the techniques for recognizing the peculiar characteristics of Jesus’ Aramaic speech. Then he goes through Jesus’ life from baptism to resurrection applying the criteria. Although such facta as exorcisms are considered, the substance of the treatment involves the verba, which are analyzed as to what they tell us about Jesus and his claims. What emerges is a consistent and intelligible picture of Jesus, and certainly a fuller one than the majority of critical scholars think they can paint from the evidence. Jesus spoke with unique authority because God had made Himself known to Jesus as the Father. Drawing from reflection on Dn 7, Jesus used the expression “Son of Man” in the third person, not to refer to another salvific figure who would come, but to describe his own future royal glory. Correspondingly, he interpreted his present status, particularly his suffering and death, through reflection on the Servant passage in Is 53. His eucharistic words show that he had a sense of what his death would mean for others in terms of representative atonement. The hostility of the Jewish authorities against him was centered on his being a prophet—a false prophet, in their eyes, of the type whom Moses had commanded to be put to death (Dt 18:20). Yet he conquered death, for
his disciples experienced him as risen—an experience that meant for them the dawn of the eschaton, the beginning of the great resurrection of all the just.

The scholars who disagree with the "conservative" character of J.'s conclusions are not always willing to battle it out with him in the field in which he is facile princeps, namely, in what we know about the linguistic and historical conditions of the times. I suspect that this book will not radically alter the situation; and so it would probably be a waste of space for me to debate here the merits of individual observations. But what calls for comment is that J. should write such a book not under the rubric of a life of Jesus but under that of NT theology. He has reconstructed the proclamation of Jesus during his ministry; and even were that reconstruction 100% accurate, it would not represent the theology of a single NT book or author. Perhaps I see more of a hermeneutic problem than J. intended, but my uneasiness reflects previous difficulty that I had in evaluating his book on the parables. In that research he was restless until he could uncover what a parable may have meant on the lips of Jesus. Naturally we all want to know that, but I would not attribute to the parable on the lips of Jesus the unique theological importance that J. seems to attribute to it. I could almost be paradoxical and claim that, so long as there is a continuity from the ministry of Jesus to the message of the Evangelists, what the parable means for the Evangelist(s) and the community addressed by the Gospel(s) is more important for us than what it meant when Jesus spoke it in Galilee. We live in a situation more analogous to that of the Evangelists' churches than to that of the Galilean preaching ministry. The ipsissima verba et facta Jesu, to the extent that we can detect them, will always deserve our special reverence; but in His wisdom and through His Spirit, what God has given us as the permanent legacy of the NT is not a collection of these ipsissima verba et facta but the Jesus-tradition adapted and rethought to meet later problems. This proclamation of Jesus (objective genitive) in the Church constitutes NT theology, in which the proclamation of Jesus (possessive genitive) is not the first volume but a prolegomenon.

Union Theological Seminary
and Woodstock College, N.Y.C.

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


This book is, on the whole, rather disappointing. It contains six essays written independently by Robinson and Koester (three apiece). Four of the six are revised reprints of previously published articles. They
appear here, along with a good introductory essay by R. and a weak concluding one by K., as separate chapters in a single volume. In the words of the book's opening sentence: "they are so intimately interwoven in theme and approach that their arrangement as chapters in a single volume is their appropriate format." Fortunately the judgments expressed in the rest of the book improve over this.

R.'s introductory chapter, "The Dismantling and Reassembling of the Categories of New Testament Scholarship," is stimulating. He describes what he sees to be a crisis of categories in NT scholarship that arises out of the experienced inadequacy of the basic categories presently employed for assembling the data of research. Static categories such as Jewish, Greek, or Gnostic "background" or "environment" or "context" must be reconceptualized in terms of the movements, the "trajectories," in which a whole culture is caught up and in terms of the "trajectories" of specific religious traditions within the wider cultural stream of movement. The book's title is intended to suggest the need to replace "perhaps the most embracing and foundational category of all: the traditional static, substantival, essence/accidence-oriented metaphysics which gave our inherited categories their most basic form" with a "dynamic, historic, existence/process-oriented new metaphysics, in terms of which a whole table of restructured categories may be envisaged."

The high promise of this opening chapter is followed by articles that, though individually good except for the last, in effect plot less the trajectories of early Christianity than the trajectories of R.'s and K.'s scholarly work that led them during the past seven years to their present common trajectory point of appreciating the present inadequacy of previously helpful categories. But the present need of discovering tomorrow's useful categories is not fulfilled by getting out yesterday's articles.


Chap. 6, however, is an excellent essay not previously published, "The Structure and Criteria of Early Christian Beliefs." K. examines the relationship between the historical event of Jesus of Nazareth and culturally conditioned expressions of faith. For examination, K. presents four different types of expressions of faith: Jesus as Lord of the Future,
Jesus as Divine Man, Jesus as Wisdom’s Envoy and as Wisdom, and Jesus Raised from the Dead. In each instance K. considers briefly four aspects of such symbols: the religious context providing the language of faith for the formulation of the symbol; the event—Jesus of Nazareth in a particular tradition of His teaching, work, life, and death to which the symbol is specifically related; the credal formulation (or hymn or narrative) that is most typical of the belief; and the sociological implication of the belief upon the understanding of church and society.

This rewarding article is followed by an updated version of a paper entitled “The Johannine Trajectory” that R. first delivered at an organizational meeting of the SBL Gospels Seminar in 1968, in response to a request that R. present a report identifying an important growing edge of Gospel research for the purpose of suggesting a point of departure for the Seminar. This essay consequently illumines the trajectory of recent Johannine research more than it illumines the Johannine trajectory of early Christianity.

K.’s concluding chapter, “The Intention and Scope of Trajectories,” is particularly dissatisfying. In his effort to point up the need to replace static categories with dynamic trajectories in order to properly understand early Christianity, he overstates his case. “It should become a general rule that the literature of the first three centuries must be treated as one inseparable unit.” This is a call for a rule containing within itself a monolithic leveling of differences that results in a more static depiction of early Christianity than do such static divisions as “New Testament Introduction” and “Patrology.” Only two pages later K. himself speaks of the cultural dissimilarity of the North African churches from the Christian churches of Asia Minor and Rome. Does he suggest that we view literature from these “Latin-speaking Christian communities with only a few Hellenistic features, and without any traces of Jewish-Christian past” as an inseparable unit with the rest of the literature of the whole first three centuries? Does not emphasizing the differences shed more light on this specific trajectory of early Christianity and thus more light on the larger Christian trajectory within the wider cultural stream of movement?

What started with promise of being a good book did not become one, since most of the chapters subsequent to the first remain to be written.

Georgetown University

EDWARD GLYNN, S.J.


Those of us who still use the two-source theory as a working hypoth-
esis for the study of the Gospels have long had an uncomfortable feeling that Streeter's attempt to explain the agreements of Mt-Lk against Mk from the external evidence covered only a fraction of those agreements. Yet, while the attempts of Farmer et al. to revive the Griesbach hypothesis were understandable, Marcan priority has still served us as the best available explanation for the majority of the triple tradition. Schramm's work will be welcomed by all who have shared this discomfort. It is a thorough analysis of all the Mk-material in Lk. Assuming Marcan priority, S. successfully uses three criteria to establish a special Lucan tradition: (1) Mt-Lk agreements against Mk inexplicable from textual variation, including omissions; (2) Semitisms in Lk's departures from Mk; (3) non-Lucan style and word-usage in Lk's departures from Mk. Sometimes the Thomas Evangelium can also be adduced for the existence of a non-Mk version. S. distinguishes clearly between all passages meeting these criteria and genuine Lucan redaction. The latter he is concerned to limit, not to deny.

The following Mk-pericopes in Lk show evidence of the use of a Nebenquelle: the healing of the leper (Lk 5:12–16); the paralytic (5:17–26); the question of fasting (5:33–39); the call of the Twelve (6:12–16) and the summary of healings (17–19) as the preface to the great sermon; the sower (8:4–8, 10, i.e., without the allegorical interpretation but with the section on the purpose of the parables); the storm at sea (8:22–25); the mission of the Twelve (9:1–6); the feeding of the five thousand (9:10–17); the three Passion predictions (9:22, 43b–45; 18:31–34); the Transfiguration (9:28–36); the epileptic boy (9:37–43a); the triumphal entry (19:28–38); the vineyard (20:1a, 9–19); the Sadducees' question (19:27–40); and considerable parts of the Synoptic apocalypse (21:5–36).

If Lk has indeed supplemented his Mk-material with a Nebenquelle, the consequences are far-reaching. S. directs his results particularly against Conzelmann and other works on the Lucan redaction. Dominated as that work has been by the most rigid application of the Marcan hypothesis, much of what it has postulated as Lucan redaction is in fact derived from the Nebenquelle. If S. is right (and I believe he is), the recent redactional work on Luke will require extensive revision. Less emphasized by S., but of equal importance, is the significance of his results for the earlier history of the Synoptic tradition. All of the pericopes listed above will now have double attestation. Many have at least a pre-Hellenistic origin, even if they are not authentic to Jesus. Finally, S. should have rendered unnecessary any further flirtation with the Griesbach hypothesis.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C.  REGINALD H. FULLER

The author, the Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne, has published several monographs and many articles on John (see his Studies in the Fourth Gospel [Grand Rapids, 1969]), so that this long commentary is the result of many years of study. He has read extensively in the literature that is available in English (but his footnotes refer seldom to untranslated German and French material on John) and he is unfailingly fair and courteous to those writers from whom he differs. Naturally, the commentaries he is using are cited more frequently when he agrees with them than when he disagrees, and the uninformed reader might get the impression that Morris moves with the mainstream of British exegesis on John—and perhaps against the flow of Continental exegesis. However, Hoskyns and Barrett, to whom he acknowledges his debt, would be considerably to his left. And in the English-speaking world today few scholars would agree with M.'s contention that John the Apostle is the actual author of the Gospel.

This is a commentary that might well be read by specialists, for it contains much information. There are occasional slips of fact, e.g., when he states (p. 155) that in the Synoptists there is no indication when the name “Peter” was bestowed on Simon; but these are understandable in a commentary of this size. For my own work on the fourth Gospel I read widely, but from going through M. I have added many details to my notes. The basic difficulty, then, is not about M.'s knowledge; it is about his interpretation. I cannot recommend this book to the general reader, whom I think it would mislead on how to evaluate the facts of Johannine research and how to view the historical Jesus and the theologizing of the early Church. This is not simply a liberal's judgment on a conservative, for I do not consider myself a liberal; it is a judgment that M. does not accept and hence does not employ a historico-critical approach to the fourth Gospel. By way of parallel I would say that he has produced the type of learned but incredible biblical commentary that flourished in Roman Catholicism before the scriptural reforms of Pius XII.

M.'s exegesis supposes that the scenes in John happened almost exactly as described, and that Jesus spoke most of the words attributed to him—an approach that is not at all the same as maintaining, as I do most emphatically, that an ancient tradition of Jesus' words and deeds underlies the fourth Gospel. Let me give some examples of M.'s approach. Although the Baptist had the role of Elijah (Matthew/Mark), he denied that he was literally Elijah (John). Why did he not explain himself more carefully in making this denial? Because he was not in the
mood for long discourses about himself (p. 135, n. 17). The disciples really did give Jesus all those titles in chap. 1 within three days of their first meeting him! Philip called Jesus "son of Joseph," but that is not a denial of the Virgin Birth. Why? Because "it is unlikely that the Virgin Birth would have been already communicated to such a new disciple as Philip" (p. 165). There were two cleansings of the Temple, one at the beginning of the ministry (John), one at the end of the ministry (Synoptists). When Jesus referred to the destruction of the Temple and its being raised up, he was consciously predicting his death and resurrection. There is no need for me to go on, save to regret sincerely that I have to pass so negative a judgment on the work of such a learned and courteous author.

Union Theological Seminary and Woodstock College, N.Y.C

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


This commentary on four letters ascribed to Paul follows the format and approach of the Pelican Gospel Commentaries. It provides extensive historical and critical information while highlighting the religious meaning of the text. Although Houlden recognizes that "the fact that [these four letters] were, supposedly at least, written in prison is not among the more significant features of any of them" (pp. 23-24), he has given us a useful introduction to Paul's thought and to the critical problems involved in the study of his letters.

H. takes a balanced approach to an understanding of Paul's thought. He weighs carefully its various sources and the influences to which Paul was subject. In particular, he realizes the pervasive mixture of Jewish and Hellenistic cultures in Paul's world and thus avoids putting Paul's ideas into one or other pigeonhole of cultural associations. He avoids making Paul seem to speak in idioms congenial to the modern Christian, acknowledges "the difficulty caused by the gulf between Paul's world and ours" (p. 15), and honestly faces the reflection "that such alien ideas generated in a culture so different from our own can have little to say to us" (p. 25). But he sees in Paul "a profound analyst of man's permanent questions and a proclaimer of the good news which he sees as their answer" (p. 26). He emphasizes that in "trying to understand him, we need to begin by taking him as a whole, on his own terms" (p. 188).

The commentary on the individual letters is generally stimulating. It never becomes a mere catalogue of exegetical positions but always re-
fects his personal understanding. Some of his interpretations depart sharply from the prevailing consensus, e.g., that Colossians was written at an early date (p. 140), or that Onesimus in Philemon was not a runaway slave but that Paul’s delicacy in the letter is simply because he wishes to retain Onesimus’ services longer (p. 226). Other interpretations receive wider support, e.g., that Ephesians was written by a disciple of Paul perhaps thirty years after his death, though H. ultimately rejects “by far the most influential, thoroughgoing, and attractive” Goodspeed-Knox hypothesis that the author was none other than the good ex-slave Onesimus, now become bishop of Ephesus and responsible for collecting Paul’s letters (pp. 250–52). In other matters he exercises an enviable caution, as in his discussion of the date and place of composition of Philippians (pp. 42–44) and in his sparse use of Acts as a point of reference for the life and work of Paul, recognizing in Acts at best a source secondary to Paul’s letters and therefore where there are discrepant accounts, “if anybody is to be ‘fitted in’ it is surely Acts not Paul” (p. 35). He is sensitive to contexts both in individual letters, e.g., for the ethical interpretation of the Christological hymn of Philippians 2:6–11, and in Paul’s letters as a whole, with abundant cross references.

In the textual notes H. shows a sense for Greek style, but he lacks firsthand acquaintance with letters found in roughly contemporary papyri (errōsō not chairein = “farewell”) and specialized knowledge of the Greek Koine (participles, especially articular, have no time value), as occasionally also sufficient realization of the Semitic background for some Greek terms (apostolos).

*Fordham University*  
F. T. GIGNAC, S.J.


In 1967 the Cambridge Press completed its NT series of commentaries based upon the NEB. Geared to the needs of a wide reading public and forgoing technical detail without sacrificing quality, these volumes enjoyed a success which made a venture into the OT area inevitable. The first volume listed above is one of three books which will serve as a general introduction to the entire OT series. The other two are The Making of the OT and Understanding the OT. All three aim at providing a solid archeological, historical, and theological background for the OT. They are meant to undergird the individual commentaries, but all three may be studied quite independently of the series.
Prof. Jones of Leeds, already well known for a similar volume in the NT series, has assembled and commented on photographs, maps, and charts which bring to life—to say nothing of new understanding—the record set down in the OT. A particularly commendable feature is the close synchronization between text and picture or map. J. knows that it is not enough to provide the picture; it must be interpreted, often in detail, and he does it extremely well. The material is arranged, for the most part, in chronological order, each major period of Israelite history furnishing the backdrop for the illustrations. Shorter sections provide illustrative material for various aspects of the OT. The reader gets the feel of a written record inserted in a living tradition. J. is an excellent guide in archeological matters, pointing up the values and limitations of the science, and lucidly describing the methods of excavating a Palestinian tell. His observations on the stables discovered at Megiddo, the finds at Ezion-geber, and the architecture of the Temple are typical of his balanced presentation of the current state of our knowledge. There is neither sensationalism nor extrapolation; the vast contribution of archeologist and artist is simply put at the service of the biblical text.

Prof. Ackroyd of the University of London briefly situates the First Book of Samuel within the Deuteronomic history and describes its purpose as a work of both history and theology. The commentary follows, section by section. It should be noted that, for the reader's convenience, short passages of the text and the editor's commentary are so interspersed that the whole book can be read consecutively from beginning to end. The Book is composed of exceedingly complex traditions; A.'s handling of the kingship traditions may be taken as typical. He notes that the attitudes towards this institution are not only different but irreconcilable and it is no solution to try and harmonize them into one consistent account. "Such an institution was seen to be both good and evil. It therefore could be explained in terms of divine action, but also in terms of human aspirations and human disobedience" (p. 93). Needless to say, a commentary based on a given translation limits the exegete's virtuosity, even granted that here and there he may take issue with the translation. A. might have noted the evidence from Qumran 4, which, in 1 S 1:22, makes it likely that Samuel's status as a Nazarite is explicitly affirmed (cf. the NAB translation).

Prof. McKeating of the University of Nottingham has undertaken the introduction and commentary on three Minor Prophets. The introductions are well done, though I believe that M.'s opinion on Amos' prophecies of hope is needlessly complicated (pp. 69-70). I see no compelling reason for doubting that Amos, like other prophets, was convinced that, beyond judgment, God planned a new beginning for His
people, and that this testimony to Yahweh’s fidelity belonged to the original edition of his oracles. As for Moab’s alleged crime of burning the bones of the king of Edom (Amos 2:1, NEB), he might have mentioned Albright’s attractive suggestion: “because he burns the bones of a human sacrifice to a demon.”

M. wisely warns the reader that the text of Hosea is badly preserved, though it might be more accurate to say poorly understood. As for the perennial question of Hosea’s marriage to Gomer, he believes that we have to do with a piece of enacted prophecy. Looking at the matter from Gomer’s viewpoint provokes the wry reflection: “It is doubtless idle to speculate what it felt like to be married to someone as intense as a Hebrew prophet, or how a girl of spirit might have reacted to the thought of being married off as a bit of somebody else’s prophetic symbolism” (p. 78). M. sees the text of Micah as expanding in the course of several centuries. Along with authentic oracles he would find substantial additions from later editors, the collection reaching its present form sometime after the Babylonian exile. He treats briefly but adequately, here and in Hosea, the lawsuit form as protesting a breach of covenant.

All three volumes contain suggestions for further reading and have both subject and Scripture indexes. The OT series is off to a good start.

Woodstock College, N.Y.C.  Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.


Balthasar’s volume on the theology of the Old Covenant is surely an important book. Although it can be read by itself as an independent study, it is conceived as an organic part of a much more imposing and ambitious whole: B.’s “theological aesthetic,” Herrlichkeit, of which several volumes have already appeared. Understandably, then, one does this volume full justice only when one reads it as part of the larger systematic undertaking. In a brief review it is impossible to give an impression of the breadth of B.’s thought, let alone the characteristic brilliance of his language; the best we can do is sketch the book’s basic intent.

First, it is meant to be a theology of the Old Covenant, not simply of the Old Testament. The theological dimension in which it seeks to move is the whole history of Israel, communicated to us by the pages of the OT and including the biblical text as a decisive moment in its development, but larger and more complex than the OT by itself. Second, it is meant to be a theology of the Old Covenant. For von Balthasar this means two things:
1) B. has not attempted to write a philosophy or an anthropology of the Old Covenant, even if a theology naturally implies philosophical and anthropological statements. He himself recently described the alternatives confronting any interpreter of the Bible: “Granted, the Bible constantly presents us with two poles of action: God and man. But it does not draw a neutral ellipse around them both, as if they were basically one field, one plane. In the final analysis there is only a choice, an either-or decision: Is God giving us His opinion of man here, or man his opinion of God? Is biblical ‘theology’ primarily theos legōn or theos legomenos? This very question makes it obvious, all of a sudden, that there is no such thing as ‘neutral’ exegesis; that any exegesis, precisely when it tries to be scientific, is forced to make a fundamental decision between belief and unbelief; that this decision determines magnetically where the textual iron-filings will arrange themselves—around the pole God or the pole man. On the important questions (and they reach down into the most innocent-looking side issues) one cannot build himself a sphere of ‘scientific neutrality’ free of ‘subjective value-criteria’; rather, the scientific integrity of exegesis demands a prior decision of its purpose—in what direction one plans to ‘open up’ the text” (“Die Vielheit der biblischen Theologie und der Geist der Einheit in der Kirche,” in Einfaltungen [Munich, 1969] pp. 69–74, at 73).

In this volume of Herrlichkeit, B. is decidedly offering a theological exegesis of the OT and of the history of Israel to which it bears witness (whereas Ernst Bloch, e.g., undertakes a consistently man-centered interpretation of the OT in his Atheismus im Christentum [Frankfurt, 1968]; here at least, Bloch’s philosophy and Balthasar’s theology are diametrically opposed). In a long introduction the author attempts to describe the many conditions that must be fulfilled to make such a theology of the Old Covenant possible.

2) As a theology, the work goes beyond the limits of a purely historico-critical treatment of the OT. This does not mean that B. underestimates the value of contemporary historico-critical work; on the contrary, he recognizes that the correct interpretation of the biblical text is the presupposition for theological statements about it, and he attempts to handle all exegetical questions with scrupulous accuracy. He takes it as his starting point, in fact, “that the historico-critical method has destroyed the old form of the argumentum ex prophetia, which saw words of the Old Covenant directly referring to Christ (such as Isaiah’s oracle of the ‘virgin who will bear a son’)” (p. 371). But precisely this change in exegetical attitude “has opened the field to something much more important and sublime: the prophetic character of the whole of Israel’s history” (ibid.). In B.’s theology, the Christian meaning of the Old Covenant does not simply “arise” when a Christian looks back on the text of the OT and the history it relates (cf. the rélecture model so dear
to exegetical text-analysts); rather, the history of Israel already carries this Christian meaning "objectively" in itself, even if it is only visible to "eyes of faith." This Christian meaning, in B.'s terms, is the dialectic movement within Israel's history among a complex set of theses and antitheses, all straining forward towards a final synthesis; and the synthesis, Jesus Christ, is not simply the result of the dialectic, the movement's built-in goal (which would be Hegelianism), but the solution to the riddle that God Himself, in His grace, has given. Between Israel's questioning history and the fulfilment of that history there remains a qualitative leap.

Within this very deliberately constructed framework, B. arranges the enormous mass of his material in three large chapters: (1) God's Glory and Man (A. Glory [= Herrlichkeit], B. Image, C. Grace and Covenant); (2) The Ladder of Obedience (A. The Broken Covenant, B. The Obedience of the Prophets). (3) The Long Twilight (A. Theologia Gloriae, B. Today without Glory, C. Argumentum ex Prophetia). All of this, taken together with the fulfilment which Jesus Christ Himself is, comprises the "arrangement" (Gestalt) that God Himself makes in man's history as His own Self-expression, and that the eyes of faith have, as their task, to discover.

University of Freiburg

WERNER LÖSER, S.J.


One trying to understand the present state of American Christian ethics could profit from reading The Ethical Demand. Although the lively debate in this country concerning practical issues such as abortion, war, genetic control, etc., has drawn attention away from rock-bottom theological questions of ethics, it is well known that the underlying thrust of much of today's ethical thinking can be traced back to the radical theology which began to appear on the Continent at the close of World War I. Not so well known is the intervening evolution—in particular, how the paths opened by Barth, Bultmann, Brunner, Tillich, et al. in the field of foundational ethics were explored in a more thorough and systematic fashion by the following generation, notably in book-length syntheses written in Danish or German by theologians such as N. H. Søe, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Helmut Thielicke, Hendrik van Oyen, and Knud E. Løgstrup.

One foundational question engaging the younger theologians, like the older, concerned the Christianness of Christian ethics. They wanted not
so much to distinguish the ethics of Christians from those of non-Christians, as to distinguish in the ethical life of the Christian what would be genuinely Christian and what merely human. The enterprise necessarily involved them in both an interpretation of Christianness and a description and delimitation of humanness. L. centers his inquiry on humanness: what the proclamation of Jesus says about human existence "apart from Christ." What is it in a man's existence to which the divine initiative is offering an answer? Following Friedrich Gogarten, L. premises that man's relationship to his neighbor is the human dimension to which God is replying and in which He would fashion man's relationship to Him. Rather than study the proclamation of Jesus in itself, L. lets it direct him to consider interpersonal human experience as it presents itself in its own terms. The greater part of the book is a moral phenomenology, with few references to Christian revelation or tradition.

What L. sees as the "fundamental ethical phenomenon" is that, whether or not they want to, men are always trusting each other. Human life is such that a man inevitably and continually puts himself in the power of another, entertaining certain expectations of him. Out of this trust arises "the ethical demand," the demand that the one trusted respond to the trust by loving and caring for the other. Most of L.'s phenomenology is devoted to tracing out the ethical demand and the ways in which men meet it. (Gerhard Ebeling, writing shortly after the publication of L.'s book, noted that he himself had independently worked out a similar phenomenology of "the evidence of the ethical" for theology.)

By declared methodology, L. refuses to fit his analyses together into a system or coherent pattern. Nevertheless, he does indicate in general how these analyses of ethical experience are confirmed (and some perhaps first disclosed) by the proclamation of Jesus. Although men recognize in various ways the ethical demand, it can have no objective empirical grounding, precisely because it is a demand. Moreover, as a demand of radical, all-inclusive, totally selfless love, it could be validly made only by the creator of life. Jesus proclaims that this is what God has done in giving man life and all he has. Through "life's demand we hear God's word to us. And, incidentally, I believe that in this discussion I have only been expressing in modern-day language what Luther spoke of as God's word to us apart from Christ."

Furthermore, human experience shows how man's selfishness makes him thoroughly incapable of fulfilling the ethical demand. The cause is his refusal to recognize his life as a gift and to surrender to it, his obstinacy in considering himself sovereign and acting as if it were up to him
to take care of himself. In response, Jesus proclaims God's new word and work in Him, Jesus Christ, namely, God's unexpected forgiving of man guilty of transgressing His demand. It is to be noted that the forgiveness presupposes the validity of the demand and therefore confirms it and its radicality and "excludes every concession to our perverse nature that might involve a moderation of the demand for love." It thereby gives a new motive for observing the radicality of the demand: "any limitation of love's demand designed to leave reasonable room for one's own demands upon life is equivalent to a refusal of God's forgiveness."

The theological foundational work carried out in the 40's and 50's by L. and others forms a central part of the evolution of twentieth-century Christian ethics. An understanding of this work is essential to understanding the present situation. Moreover, a reconsideration of this work would reopen fundamental questions of ethics and revitalize sources generative of ethical insight. This might be important as signs accumulate that American Christian ethics has been living dangerously long off its capital.

Brown University

JOHN GILES MILHAVEN


Since Kant, religious philosophy and theology have been plagued by an antecedent doubt: is religious knowledge possible? The case against speculatively valid religious knowledge was argued by Kant with consummate skill. But Kant's own position, as Gill shows in this book, rested on a very questionable division of human knowledge between the factual (equated with the cognitive) and the valuational (or non-cognitive). This dichotomy stands at the source of the split between empirical or rational philosophies on the one hand and existential philosophies on the other—a point that G. illustrates from the early Wittgenstein, Hans Reichenbach, and Paul Edwards (representing logical empiricism) and from Heidegger, Ortega y Gasset, and Sartre (representing existentialism). Because of the dualism behind both these streams, the contemporary philosopher finds himself pressured to choose between two equally unacceptable alternatives. Either he embraces rationality and rejects value or he accepts value and denies rationality.

In the historical section that forms the first part of this study, G. strives to situate all post-Kantian philosophy and theology in relationship to the Kantian dichotomies. This leads him rather far afield, into discussions of Hegel, Schleiermacher, and Feuerbach which add little to his thesis. Also, he strains to find Kantian dichotomies in theologians
who are too complex to be reduced to either of the alternatives G. recognizes. Thus, Barth is rather curiously put into the positivist-cognitive column and opposed to Tillich, who is classified as a non-cognitive existentialist. An equally good case could have been made for saying that Barth was an existentialist and Tillich an ontologist-intellectualist. While G. is right in calling attention to the dichotomous tendencies of these and other theologians, his pigeonholing is rather dissatisfying.

In a second and more successful section, G. sets forth the basis for his own solution. Following the later Wittgenstein and J. L. Austin, he shows that meaning and language cannot be adequately understood in terms of either objectivist representationalism or subjectivist expressionism. Relying on Polanyi, he maintains that our knowledge of objects inevitably includes a tacit and personal element of which we are only subsidiarily aware. The positivist ideal of a wholly explicit and objectified knowledge is a mirage. Once the true place of the tacit component is recognized, one is in a better position to appreciate the cognitive aspect of valuational insights, which undergird and penetrate all human knowledge. In the moral and religious sphere, where the un-explicit and the valuational elements predominate, one should not seek to impose standards of truth and verification appropriate for the physical or mathematical realm, where the tacit ingredient is reduced to a minimum. Drawing on the work of Max Black and I. T. Ramsey, G. calls attention to the use of disclosure models and metaphors in personal and religious knowledge. In these and other areas, G. maintains, truth is not a mere correspondence between propositions and external data; it contains an "operational" element and is validated by the assistance it offers us in coping with the life situations in which we find ourselves.

From these general considerations about moral and religious knowledge, G. passes on to a very helpful discussion of revelation. In accordance with his contextual-functional approach to knowledge, he views revelation as the disclosure of a higher level of meaning through an interpretation of events known by our experience in the world. Building on the insights of John Hick and I. T. Ramsey, G. steers a middle course between the Scylla of traditional orthodoxy, which looks upon revelation as factual information handed down from a higher world, and the Charybdis of theological existentialism, which regards revelation as meaning divorced from historical fact. On G.'s view, which I find generally satisfying, Christian revelation is essentially mediated by the events concerning Jesus of Nazareth but is by no means reducible to sheer facticity. Since valuational elements are intrinsic to revelation itself, Christianity cannot be tested by purely objective criteria. Par-
ticipation in the religious way of life is demanded of anyone who would wish to assess the force and value of the Christian claims.

G. is one of a growing body of philosophical theologians who refuse to choose between a dehumanizing objectivism and an irresponsible cult of subjectivity. His book should greatly help to re-establish communication between Anglo-American linguistic philosophy and Continental European personalistic phenomenology, and to break down the barriers between philosophers and theologians. An ecumenist in spirit, G. makes good use of Catholic authors such as Henri Bouillard and Michael Novak. But he could have enriched this work still further had he drawn on Newman, Blondel, Maréchal, Rahner, and Baum, all of whom have deeply considered the same questions as those which this book investigates with balance, competence, and disarming modesty.

Woodstock College, N.Y.C.

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


This rather large and closely printed volume contains twenty-two theological articles composed since 1962, all but three of them previously published. Although several of Kasper's important articles, for reasons not explained, do not reappear here, this collection gives evidence of an astounding productivity, especially when one considers that K. has published four other important books in the same period.

The book is divided into five parts, each containing two to five articles. Part 1 contains two articles on the roots of modern historical theology in the Catholic Tübingen School and in the philosophy of Schelling. Part 2 includes five essays on the contemporary situation of faith. The next five papers, constituting Part 3, focus on the proclamation of faith, and the following five (Part 4) deal with pastoral questions, such as the Church's missionary activity, the role of preaching and sacraments, and the theology of penance and matrimony. The last four articles (Part 5) have to do with structures and offices in the Church.

A central thesis of this work is that the contemporary crisis of faith is only superficially a crisis of authority. More fundamentally, it results from a shift of world views. The stratified hierarchical type of thinking prevalent in earlier centuries has given way to a form of historical and critical thinking introduced by the Enlightenment. After being systematically excluded from Catholicism by the authoritarian and reactionary leadership of the nineteenth century, modern historical thinking was accepted in principle by Vatican Council II. As spokes-
man for this newer style of thought, K. espouses the view that "within an evolutionary and historical world history has become the most encompassing horizon of theological inquiry and understanding" (p. 5). Even if this is an exaggeration, one can agree with K. that in the modern situation the appeal to authority that was characteristic of Catholicism before Vatican II is no longer convincing. The roles of pope, bishop, and priest have radically changed, and this sudden shift has given rise to strong polarizations within the Church.

Drawing upon the tradition of dialectical thinking that stems from nineteenth-century idealism, K. finds a path through the dichotomies and polarizations that presently plague the Church. In tackling dilemmas such as those of Scripture vs. tradition, exegesis vs. dogmatic theology, authority vs. insight, theory vs. practice, office vs. charism, and papacy vs. episcopacy, K. shows that neither member of each dyad should be unilaterally subordinated to the other; the priorities and dependences are mutual. In fact, K. seems to be saying, the first member of each dyad already contains something of its own counterpart as an inner dimension of itself. K.'s dialectical approach is theoretically and pastorally satisfying, and would be of great value to the Church if it could be more generally understood and accepted.

As in some of his other published works, so in these articles K. handles very expertly the relationship between dogma and history. He shows that dogma must unceasingly be reinterpreted in such a way as to lead the Church into a living communion with Christ and thus to facilitate the mission of the Church in the contemporary world. The truth of faith, for K., is a dynamic reality, leading to a more intense life of faith, hope, and charity. A faith that shackled one to the past and inhibited the Church in its service to mankind could not be authentically Christian.

Without being as yet a very original thinker, K. is a highly competent and persuasive exponent of pastoral and theological renewal. In every essay of this collection he shows himself well in control of the historical sources and the current literature. He gathers up many of the best fruits of contemporary German speculation and brings together authors as diverse among themselves as Rahner and Balthasar, Küng and Metz, Barth and Bonhoeffer. Although he occasionally states his disagreements with other authors, K. is never polemical. His clear, modest, and balanced style of presentation evokes confidence and respect.

It must be said, however, that this volume suffers from the faults characteristic of collections of this type. There are numerous repetitions. For example, Kant's call to the enlightened man to have the courage to rely on his own understanding is quoted at least three times. The essays might have been advantageously edited for the collection,
so as to eliminate overlapping and provide cross references. Most of the articles deal with subjects so vast that they would require an entire book to do justice to the problems. Some of the chapters are, in fact, virtual condensations of books K. has already published. Others, such as those on the sacraments and on office in the Church, may hopefully be viewed as sketches of books yet to come from the pen of this distinguished young theologian.

Woodstock College, N.Y.C.  
AVERY DULLES, S.J.


With Wolfhart Pannenberg's *Jesus, God and Man*, this volume represents the most important translation of a Continental Christology in recent years. Gogarten, who died in 1967, shortly after finishing the work, was, with Barth and Brunner, a member of the troika which broke with liberal Protestantism at the end of World War I. After World War II, however, it was the dual theme of history and secularity which engaged his concern, and he is, with Bonhoeffer, the most prominent name associated with the theology of secularization which came into its own in the 1960's.

The present work is not intended as a comprehensive Christology, but rather deals with how the basic questions of an honest Christology are to be placed. The main areas of concern are these: (1) The Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. Here G. is in dialogue with Bultmann and such disciples and opponents as Fuchs, Ebeling, and Althaus. (2) The unity of God and man in Jesus Christ, or the Christological question in its most basic traditional sense. Consistent with his antimetaphysical stance, G. eschews the two-nature approach of Chalcedon and, following Luther's lead but going far beyond him, seeks to make the humanity of Jesus the starting point; for it is as this man that Jesus is Son of God. (3) An understanding of Christian faith in terms of historical existence and secularity. (4) The Lutheran *sola fide* in its Christological expression, with Jesus Himself as the model of a faith that allows God to act in man and man himself to act in the world. (5) The foundations for a Christological ethic, with particular attention to the identification of Jesus with the outcasts of His milieu, His availability as neighbor for all men, and His freedom as responsible son to shape the world rationally.

These five aspects are interwoven by G. with consummate skill, though with a certain amount of tedious repetition, into a powerful and attractive Christological synthesis. The genre of this Christology makes it difficult to criticize it from the viewpoint of classical Christology.
In a sense, the choice of an existentialist mode of discourse has removed the very possibility of dialogue between Gogarten and those who espouse a theology of Incarnation. Unlike Pannenberg, G. presupposes rather than argues to a rejection of the two-nature model. Perhaps the focus of dialogue might be the question of whether one can be faithful to the more developed Christologies of the NT within the limitations of an existentialist Christology.

Nor is it only the absence of serious attention to the few but significant NT assertions of pre-existence which is striking in this volume. The resurrection of Jesus goes literally unmentioned. Can the basic questions of honest Christology really be raised adequately without even a mention of this central NT teaching? Here, perhaps, is where the Lutheran sola fide and theologia crucis have germinated a sola cruce. The contrast with Pannenberg is immense, of course, even though the latter finds much that is valuable in G., especially his accent on filial responsibility and his effort to find the divinity within the humanity.

A final aspect where a Roman Catholic theologian might express reserves concerns G.'s denial of salvific significance to man's action in the world, together with his attribution to God alone of true action. This combination of the Alleinwirksamkeit Gottes and the radical secularization of worldly action would appear to purchase the transcendence of God and of Christian faith at the price of a dichotomy at least as questionable as the two-nature Christological model.

When all this is said, it remains that G.'s work challenges the Roman Catholic theologian to seek a more integral Christology, especially one that is better related to the moral and social life of man.

Woodstock College, N.Y.C. Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.


The present revival of interest in Troeltsch's theology and sociology is a sign that his concerns were very close to our own. For T., the Reformation and the subsequent division of the churches was of less importance for the contemporary problems of Christianity than the Enlightenment and the development of historical consciousness. According to him, the Protestant and Catholic Churches, in order to remain faithful to the gospel, had to detach themselves from certain positions defended as absolutes in the past and reinterpret the meaning of the gospel for a new historical situation. By comparison with the need for reinterpretation, the differences between the ecclesiastical confessions were secondary.
It is characteristic that T. found words of praise for Loisy’s little book *L’Evangile et l’église*, composed as reply to Harnack’s *The Essence of Christianity* and advocating a developmental understanding of the Christian gospel. Loisy’s book, as is well remembered, was placed on the Index. T. realized that some French theologians, such as Labéthônnière, were working out an approach to religion similar to his own.

In the Protestant churches the genius of Karl Barth and his vehement rejection of “liberalism” slowed down theological interest in T.’s work. Similarly, on a more legal and less spiritual plane, the anti-Modernist campaign in the Catholic Church prevented theologians from dealing with the problems raised at the turn of the century. This may well be the reason why today American Catholics eagerly await the translation of Blondel’s writings and Protestants desire to have the extensive work of T. available in their own tongue.

The present volume is a lecture given in 1901 and expanded as a small book, in which T. deals with the topics that preoccupied him all his life: the role of Christianity in world history, the historical and therefore the nonabsolute character of all truth, and the refutation of any kind of skeptical relativism. The volume touches upon many issues that remain unsolved in the contemporary theological discussion.

A summary of T.’s basic argument is contained in another lecture of his, given twenty years later and published in a slim volume entitled (in English) *Christian Thought: Its History and Application*. In it T. renders an account of how his mind has changed since 1901. However, his book of 1901, here under review, is much richer than the summary can possibly indicate.

There are two ways, T. shows, of understanding the absolute character of the gospel. According to the first, the Church’s traditional apologetics, divine truth is present in Jesus Christ alone: apart from Him is only human truth with its inevitable ambiguity. According to a second way, the so-called apologetics of immanence, the gospel is absolute in the sense that it brings to completion and perfect self-consciousness the divine truth present in the lives of all men, especially in the great religions and wisdom traditions. At the time of T.’s writing, this apologetics of immanence was found mainly in Protestant theologians following the inspiration of Hegel. For them, Christianity was the absolute religion. Since then, the apologetics of immanence has become widely accepted in the Catholic Church through the influence of Blondel and Karl Rahner.

Yet T. rejects both of these approaches. He tries to show that neither the one nor the other does justice to critical history. What he attempts
to do is to develop an understanding of the supreme uniqueness of Christianity based simply on the critical study of history and the values generated by human experience. T.'s position, in some form or other, is still defended by some theologians today. Later in his life, however, T. became more deeply convinced of the pluralism of religions and values in history. The absoluteness of Christianity referred to nothing but the total and unreserved commitment to it on the part of the believer and the believing community.

The availability of T.'s book in English will stimulate theological research on the plurality of religion and the historical conditionedness of all truth. The translator has rendered T.'s complex and often turgid German into readable English. In particular, he has translated some of the static and abstract-sounding words into dynamic and concrete English terms. While the translator has moved away from a literal rendering, he has succeeded in expressing the vitalist and dynamic understanding of history that was, despite the abstract vocabulary, proper to Troeltsch.

*Toronto*

**Gregory Baum**


No one could dispute the timeliness of a theological study on unbelief. Atheism of one sort or another surrounds the modern believer on all sides. Usually it also resides in his own heart. To be sure, unbelief is not a new phenomenon: with the coming of a new culture, the old religion has traditionally suffered a severe crisis. But today the choice is no longer between the old faith or a new one. The issue is whether there should be any faith at all. A theological treatment of this problem seems appropriate enough, since the atheism that has become so much a part of his culture must also be fitted in religious man’s world view. Guidance is needed to accommodate this particularly resistant item. Fr. Reid deserves our praise for having attempted to provide it.

Nor could one claim that R. came ill prepared to his task. Long a student of atheism, consultor to the Vatican Secretariat for Nonbelievers, he is thoroughly acquainted with the “documents” and has worked himself through an impressive amount of books and articles related to his subject. Yet, one wonders why he did not probe the sources of contemporary atheism (specifically those of the end of the seventeenth and of the eighteenth century) more deeply? Such important names as Bayle, Lessing, and Diderot are missing. R.’s efforts to cover the entire contemporary (often second-rate) literature has shortened his perspective and impaired his critical sense. At no point
does the ever-growing cloud of negative witnesses which he so threaten­
ingly displays before our eyes compel him to re-examine the traditional
expressions of theism. Too much space is used up for proving somewhat
redundantly that Scripture and Church reject atheism. Does it really
shed much light upon the atheist’s position (or the believer’s, for that
matter) to know that he is declared a heretic by the magisterium? The
survey concludes with the surprising remark: “By the end of the reign
of Pius XII the world was sufficiently aware that Catholics disapproved,
officially and without reservation, of every contemporary form of
atheism” (p. 50).

Neither do I feel, in spite of R.’s exemplary fairness and profound
respect, that the unbeliever always receives his due. First one might
quarrel with his description of all unbelief as “an option, a fundamental
decision” rather than “a plainly evident or compelling necessity for
reason” (p. 10). The most representative form of unbelief today, as he
points out at a later stage, is one that does not feel the need for inves­
tigating beliefs which are thought to possess little evidence in support.
He himself includes from the beginning nonbelief which lacks the posi­
tive rejection of disbelief. Of course, since even the refusal to take seri­
ously what one considers to be a prima-facie absurdity may be called a
“decision,” a criticism in this matter may be reduced to semantics.
What I would definitely have liked to see, however, is a more sustained
analysis of the unbeliever’s attitude. Instead of analyzing, R. often pre­
fers to catalogue. Distinctions abound, but they accomplish little in clari­
fying the issues. Thus, under the heading “Counterparts of Unbelief,”
we find a heterogeneous mixture of various religions of nature (all as­
sembled under the title “paganism”) and various philosophical attitudes
(such as pantheism and deism) which as such have no relation to living
religion. Totemism, referred to as one of the most widespread forms of
polytheistic paganism, may according to some modern anthropologists
be no religion at all. It certainly seems out of place in a section which
covers also Voltaire and Locke. I was reminded of the strange bedfel­
lovers that used to be lumped together at the beginning of every scho­
lastic thesis under the head adversarii. There are plenty of distinctions
in this work, but their quantity does not fully compensate for the lack of
a more orderly investigation.

My reservations about such a treatment do not impair my respect for
the perceptive insights contained in R.’s work. Thus his memorable
characterization of modern unbelief: “Unbelief is supported not by a
string of syllogisms, the terms and propositions of which can be exposed
to logical and real critique, but by a style and a way of life that is chosen
and maintained because it is found humanly rewarding, while the alter-
natives of religious belief are found seriously wanting" (p. 112). Enlightening also are the discussions of doubt within faith (pp. 122–25) and of the abusive equation of faith with ideology, or with a metaphysical or moral world view (pp. 128–30). The views offered here and in a number of other passages make us regret all the more that R. has not given us a more structured, systematic discussion of a subject with which he is so well acquainted.

R. strikes me in this book as a man in a hurry, gifted with a good mind but anxious to get on with the practical business of the dialogue with unbelievers. In the final section, where he gives directives for conducting such a dialogue, he proves to be a skilful, experienced guide whose advice should be heeded by anyone involved in discussions between believers and unbelievers.

Georgetown University

LOUIS DUPRÉ


In this compact volume Mrs. Storoni Mazzolani outlines the development of the civitas (città, city) concept in Roman history and thought. In a sense, the title is not accurate, since she places at least equal emphasis on the actual history of the empire in relation to the city of Rome. In defense of her method, the historical account serves to illustrate the emergence and function of the "idea of the city" in its concrete setting. Indeed, her forte appears to be the description of political ideology in relation to historical events, and the most engrossing chapters in her book are, I think, those (7–9) dealing with the early empire and the mind of Augustus.

S. "does not claim to give an exhaustive or systematic account of all the existing literature" (p. 11) but bases most of her insights on the original sources, literary, numismatic, archeological. She also makes use of modern scholarship, but her procedure is generally to let the ancient writers speak for themselves.

S.'s thesis is that "for thinking men in those days, history began when the unformed mass of humanity was converted into a social organization—when the City came into the world. The City is identified with the State, and also with the home of the national gods" (p. 11). Further, "the Roman metropolis, the City of all mankind, emerged as the archetype of civilized and orderly society" (p. 13). After a brief reference to the Greek polis, she turns to Rome, and indicates the two forces exist-
ing within the city, which determined the peculiar nature of the future development: exclusivity and expansionism, conservatism and cosmopolitanism. The conflict in the City is between a small number of aristocratic families, whose will is law, and the threatened mingling of the classes; between a belief in Roman racial superiority and universal brotherhood; between the religion of the Capitol and foreign cults; between the democratic custom and an Eastern theocracy—in short, the difference between Rome conceived as a city-state or as the City of Justice for all humanity.

If the ideal of exclusivity originated with conservative Romans themselves, the cosmopolitan theory was a contribution of the East, inspired first of all by the career of Alexander the Great. Acclimated in the West by Polybius and Poseidonius, this ideal was assimilated by the young Octavian into the traditional, republican ideals of the City. Realizing that to lead the world he must first win pre-eminence in the City, he was able to “reduce the Empire, that historically burdensome, geographically crushing fact of life, to the scale of the City” (p. 130). Already in Cicero’s time, the pun of the words urbis/orbis (city/world) had been coined.

S. traces the universalist idea of the City in writings of the early Christian centuries, and finds its apex in the sophistic orations of the second century. For example, Aelius Aristides in his speech To Rome writes: “Rome is to the whole world what an ordinary city is to its suburbs and surrounding countryside.” In the imperial crisis of the third century the idea of the City suffers. Commodian thus contrasts the earthly city, which boasted eternity, with the true heavenly city: “luget in aeternum quae se iactabat aeterna.” The philosophers’ idea of the perfect city becomes separated from the City, as the correspondence between St. Augustine and Nectarius, a pagan, in the year 409 demonstrates. In a reply to the Saint, Nectarius recognizes the existence of three cities (Ep. 103): “I accept with all my heart your exhortation to me to keep my eyes fixed on the heavenly fatherland. I thought, to tell the truth, that you did not mean to refer to the City that is encircled by a wall of stone, nor yet to the City common to all mankind (and equivalent to the world we live in) of which the philosophers tell us; but rather to that City inhabited by God and the souls of the elect, towards which all laws, in their varying ways and with varying scope, continually tend....”

Nevertheless, despite the weakening of faith in Rome as the City of Justice, the sack of Rome in A.D. 410 was interpreted by Christian writers as a symbol of the end of the world. “The brightest light of all lands is put out; the head of the Roman Empire is cut off. To speak
more correctly, the whole world perished in one City,” writes St. Jerome in Bethlehem (preface to his commentary to Ezekiel).

Finally, S. sees Augustine's *City of God* written not as a mere apology but in the light of Roman ideology of the City, and thus brings another, necessary, and valid perspective to interpreting his masterwork. That it is impossible to neglect the *civitas* concept, as it evolved in Roman thought and was transformed in early Christian theology, has been made clear in this admirable survey. Further implications of her book may also be present for our own era of urban civilization and cosmopolitanism.


The “Nicodemites” were those who were interiorly converted to the Reformation but had concealed their inward beliefs and outwardly continued to participate in the ceremonies and life of the Roman Church. The phenomenon of Nicodemism in the sixteenth century had been studied by D. Cantimori in his *Eretici italiani del Cinquecento* (Florence, 1939), but he limited his treatment to the second half of the century, i.e., to Calvin’s several anti-Nicodemite letter-treatises (1537-44) and subsequent events, and to the Italian scene alone. New research and the discovery of new documents have invited a new study. Prof. Ginzburg significantly adds to Cantimori’s work by examining the period prior to the one he investigated and by extending the study to Europe. G.’s volume is basically historical, a search for the origins of an idea, and in this case the beginnings of the doctrine which considers religious simulation and dissimulation licit.

Otto Brunfels of Strasbourg (1488-1534) is revealed as the father of Nicodemism. G. examines Brunfels’ life and writings to learn why and when he came to adopt his Nicodemite opinion. B. was a Lutheran sympathizer who agreed with the principles which led to the Peasants’ Revolt but could not condone the Revolt itself. He believed that all power came from God, and to oppose one in power was to oppose God; furthermore, God permitted tyrants to rule in order to punish men for their sins. The gospel teaches the cross and not revolution! What, then, is the Christian to do? B. concluded that the Christian was to dissemble. He first hinted at this opinion in his *Annotationes*, but gave it its clearest expression in his *Pandectarum veteris et novi Testamenti, libri XII* (Strasbourg, 1527) under the heading “Inter incredulos et pertinaces dissimulare possimus et fingere, praesertim si non sit spes:
quia Deus ponderat cor," where he offered a few citations from Scripture as the source of his opinion. All externals are indifferent; only the interior disposition counts; to act thus is in accord with the freedom of the Christian.

B.'s *Pandects* had a wide reading public: twenty-one editions and/or reprints up to 1576. G. narrates how the theory of the liceity of religious dissimulation got a foothold in Europe: in France, through the activity of Lefèvre d'Étапles and Gérard Roussel; in Germany, through the work of Sebastian Franck; in Italy, through the humanist Lisia Fileno, alias Camillo Renato. When Calvin wrote his first two anti-Nicodemite letters in 1537, he was encouraging his readers in France to come out openly for the gospel and to give public declaration of their inward faith. It was not until his *Excuse à Messieurs les Nicodémites* of 1544 that the disciples of Brunfels began to be known by the sobriquet. Though referred to as Nicodemites, neither Brunfels, the originator, nor Lefèvre, Roussel, Franck, or Capito, the propagators, ever appealed to Nicodemus as an example or possible patron of their religious stance.

G.'s volume treats many historical facets of Nicodemism together with its widespread growth through Europe. In the history of religious thought, the Nicodemism of the sixteenth century is surely a small item, but G.'s book helps to fill in the picture of the Reformation and brings much understanding and clarification to Calvin's anti-Nicodemite treatises. If Brunfels happens to be mentioned in today's encyclopedias, it is invariably because of his contribution to botany—he wrote the first herbal; Ginzburg has now well demonstrated that Brunfels merits a place in the history of religious thought.

**Rome**

JOSEPH N. TYLEND, S.J.


Jacobus Arminius, born Jacob Harmenszoon (1559–1609), has had up to now but two biographers: C. Brandt (1725, in Latin; English version, 1854) and J. H. Maronier (1905, in Dutch). Dr. Bangs's volume, then, is the first written in English, and is most welcome; furthermore, it is a needed addition to a balanced view of the Reformation. B. brings the scholarship of a historical theologian to his subject. As historian, he vividly delineates Dutch life in the cities of Amsterdam and Leiden where Arminius spent controversial years, depicts the politico-religious tensions between the Dutch and the Spanish, and describes the country's growing interest in commerce in the East Indian trade. As theologian, he endeavors to give an unbiased presentation of doctrinal
positions and an honest evaluation of the proponents themselves; this he achieves, always sensitive to the conflicts between Catholics and Reformed, between "high" and "mild" Calvinists. As scholar, he re-examines the data passed down from author to author and questions the legends, favorable and unfavorable, in order to find the true Arminius.

B.'s volume has three parts: A's student days, his pastorate in Amsterdam, and his academic career at the University of Leiden. In the first part, B. seeks to uncover the influences acting upon the youthful student which would direct him towards his reform position. At Leiden, A. studied under "mild" as well as "rigid" interpreters of Reformed theology, but more importantly, it was there he espoused the logic and ideas of Ramus, so enthusiastically that later in Geneva a public defense of Ramus would bring about his temporary leave-of-absence from the Academy. He went from Leiden to Geneva, was a student of Beza, and was lectured not in the Master, but given the Bezan brand of Calvinism, now usually termed "high," i.e., supralapsarianism with all its involvements. Though he sat under Beza, A. did not embrace the rigid predestinarianism offered there, so that when he arrived in Amsterdam as pastor (1588) it could well be said that A. was not a Calvinist. The rejection of Bezan Calvinism was not the rejection of Calvin.

The ministers of Amsterdam were five in number: four were "mild" but the fifth, Plancius, was "rigid," and it was he who initiated, fostered, and prolonged the attacks against A. In his second part, B. details A.'s pastoral life and the strife that arose because A.'s interpretation of Romans 7 was said not to agree with Calvin and Beza, and departed from the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism. What did A. preach? Unfortunately, his sermons are not extant, and during his fifteen years as pastor he published nothing; nevertheless, approximately 45% of his published works were written while in Amsterdam and from these B. gives A.'s interpretation of Romans 7 and 9 (chaps. 13 and 14) and scrutinizes his Examination of Perkins' Pamphlet (chap. 15), one of A.'s major writings on predestination.

The third part tells how A., though a controversial pastor, was nevertheless invited to be professor of theology at the University of Leiden and lectured there (1603-9) until his death. A. had previously been circumspect in his pulpit preaching, but now in the lecture hall he would be candid and full-voiced. Now the battle began; the role of Plancius was being played by Gomarus—an unrelenting battle, or was it persecution? The controversy on predestination could no longer be contained within the university's walls; it had its voices in the pulpits, was fought in the city streets, even divided houses. The entire nation
was about to be split on the matter of predestination. When A. concluded his year as Rector Magnificus of the university (1606), his final oration was an earnest plea for toleration, since the hurt of the hour was the religious dissension in the Reformed Church, and a request for a national synod to study and decide the question.

In the two final chapters B. tersely brings out the essence of A.'s teaching. (1) On the church: A. follows the broad lines of the Reformed. (2) Original sin: it is more in privation than in depravation. (3) Free will and grace: the will is in bondage to sin and needs salvation from outside, but it can co-operate with grace, and it may resist grace when offered because grace is not a force but the person of the Holy Spirit. (4) Justification: this is by imputation, i.e., the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us, and faith is imputed to us for righteousness (not that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us for righteousness). (5) Assurance: believers may have present assurance of present salvation, but not present assurance of final salvation. (6) Perseverance: impossible for believers, as long as they remain believers, to decline from salvation. (7) A. never denied the doctrine of predestination, but he always sought a constructive statement of it. His final statement on the matter is in his Declaration of Sentiments (1608), where he defines the doctrine in four divine decrees (logical not chronological order): (a) The election of Christ: the Son is appointed Mediator, Redeemer, Saviour, to nullify sin and grant salvation by his power. (b) The election of the Church: God determined to receive in favor those who repent and believe, and the same persevering, to effect their salvation in Christ, and leave the unrepentant and unbelieving in sin and to damn them as strangers to Christ. (c) The appointment of means: God determined to administer the necessary and sufficient powerful means of repentance and faith. The preaching of the gospel is a serious call: and if God is to be both merciful and just, the reprobate must not be denied access to sufficient powerful means to repentance and faith. (d) The election of individuals: the decree to save certain particular persons and to damn others rests on the foreknowledge of God, by which He has known from eternity which persons should believe and persevere, and which should not believe and persevere.

The story of Arminius does not end with his death; in an epilogue B. gives a broad outline of later events. In 1610, forty-four ministers, following A.'s opinions, signed a "Remonstrance" and it is in this document that we find the famed five points of Arminianism. The adherents to this document came to be known as the Remonstrant Church, while the followers of Gomarus were known as Contra-Remonstrants. The national synod so earnestly begged for by A. was finally held at Dort.
(1618–19) nine years after his death. The Remonstrants were never seated as delegates at this national synod, but were summoned to appear before it for condemnation.

B.’s book, ecumenical in spirit, is a significant contribution to Reformation studies and invaluable for the Dutch Reformation.

Rome

JOSEPH N. TYLENDA, S.J.


Although efforts to integrate the writings of Kierkegaard by showing his works as delineating the various structures and behavior of human consciousness have previously been made, it is doubtful that the scholarship and speculative ability that Shmueli displays in this provocative book have ever been so well combined.

The first chapter, on consciousness in general, seems quite crucial. Though it is difficult at times to discern when S. is stating his own position and when that of Kierkegaard, it is clear that he sees K. as presenting a view of consciousness capable of being explicated by contemporary phenomenological insights. What S. does is effect is take the famous and difficult definition of the self given in The Sickness unto Death, explain it in more concrete terms, and set it up as a model to understand in the subsequent chapters the three stages of human existence (chaps. 2–5), the alienation of consciousness (6), indirect communication and truth (7–9), and the historicity and temporality of consciousness (10).

S.’s consideration of esthetic existence in the second chapter is a good example of his treatment of a particular consciousness. His own Gestaltist description of estheticism as a tension between consciousness as background and a particular phenomenon is combined with the more Kierkegaardian description of it as a multitude of possibilities unaware of the finite. The result is that the reader, thanks to S.’s ample substantiating evidence, has a clear idea of the nature of this type of consciousness both in itself and in the Kierkegaardian framework. The third chapter deals in a similar manner with ethical consciousness. Religious consciousness is then discussed. Ever attentive to the definition of the self in The Sickness unto Death, S. differentiates religiousness from the previous two types by noting that in this consciousness not only the immanent factors involved in man as a synthesis are expressed, but also the relation of those factors to that which is transcendent. An excellent description is given of the humorous con-
sciousness and its capacity in K.’s view to detour one from religious consciousness which, in Christian love, is determined by the “other.” This emphasis on the intentionality and alterity of the religious consciousness is important, though one wishes that some attention had been paid to the plausible tension in K.’s view between love of God and love of neighbor.

Various forms of alienated consciousness are dealt with in the sixth chapter. Particularly helpful are the portrayals of the demoniacal type in terms of its immersion in the immanent categories of the self with no real contact with its beloved and of the objective mentality which is seen as a being of habit, not a living synthesis.

In the next three chapters indirect communication is revealed as a means for a consciousness to overcome alienation and to relate to another. The inadequacies of direct communication are considered, as irony and humor are presented as forms of indirect communication which spur the learner to new and unheard-of possibilities manifested by God. At this point S. delineates the category of existential communication as the Christian form of indirect communication, and in the process exhibits a fine cognizance of its unique qualities. I have difficulty, however, with S.’s claim that by “truth is subjectivity” K. means “truth is intersubjectivity.” There is no doubt about the interpersonal dimension of K.’s position, but is this phrase not chiefly used in opposition to “truth is objectivity” to remind an individual that there is a truth for him alone, a truth which, of course, involves a relation to another person?

In the ninth chapter S. focuses on K.’s contention that the self is a synthesis of the temporal and the eternal. The one-sidedness of esthetic consciousness is explained, but the chief merit of the chapter lies in the argument revealing how the teaching of the eternal in the fulness of time makes possible the emergence of a new, eternally youthful consciousness. This last chapter cannot but cause one to speculate that for S. the Incarnation is central to K.’s thought and that in the face of it one can imagine him as happy.

Le Moyne College, Syracuse  
CHARLES J. KELLY


In Modes of Thought Whitehead characterizes William James as one of the “four great thinkers, whose services to civilized thought rest largely upon their achievements in philosophical assemblage.” He contends that “the essence of his greatness was his marvellous sensi-
tivity to the ideas of the present. . . . He systematized; but above all he assembled. His intellectual life was one protest against the dismissal of experience in the interest of system” (Capricorn edition, 1958, pp. 3–4). In *Science and the Modern World* Whitehead goes beyond these words of respect to give a more direct indication of the affinity between his and James’s thought. An in-depth exploration of the philosophical grounds for that affinity constitutes the theme of Prof. Eisendrath’s text. E. concentrates mainly upon a systematic analysis and interpretation of the writings of both philosophers. In my view, the text has a twofold importance: (1) it fills a serious gap in the scholarly commentary upon American philosophy, and (2) E.’s interpretation of the ideas of James and Whitehead is both faithful and extraordinarily perceptive.

E. reveals at the outset the focal point for his study. “The philosophy of William James and Alfred North Whitehead is an attempt to answer the old Platonic question: how do ideas work in the world? . . . In answering this question, James and Whitehead force a major reinterpretation of Western thought” (p. ix). To understand this reinterpretation, it becomes necessary to situate James’s and Whitehead’s response in the context of what E. calls “the unifying moment.” This term is described thus: “The James-Whitehead philosophy comes closest to that point where real things are making themselves up out of the materials of their own existence. It is an attempt to analyze this unifying moment, both as a subjective fact for the thing itself and as the introduction of a new objective fact in causal history of the world” (p. xi). The central philosophical issue in the text is thus the analysis of present experience, for that is the moment at which ideas become effective.

E. begins with an examination of the effort of both philosophers to overcome the dualism inherent in the modern schools of rationalism and empiricism. Both agree upon the need for a more fundamental perspective: “the unity of experience as feeling” (p. 42). This perspective then becomes the basis for the analysis of such concepts as time, causality, self, and purpose. For example, in E.’s discussion of the notion of purpose, he points out that, for James and Whitehead, ideas act as final causes in the process of experience. He then links this position to the fundamental perspective by stating that “both ultimately hold that anything real in the universe is an experienced fact. Accordingly, final causes must be felt” (p. 103).

In addition, E. stresses as an essential part of this perspective James’s and Whitehead’s insistence upon the centrality of the individual. He sums it up in the following passage: “For both James and Whitehead, the process of existence is the working out of what James calls a ‘perspective-interest.’ For Whitehead, it is ‘concrescence.’ It is the way in which the many influences of the world, including the
prior self, are integrated into a particularly located, single individual” (p. 98). Perhaps the strongest affirmation of this insistence is seen in E.’s consideration of such complex aspects of experience as human society, morality, and religion. Here he exercises special care to develop these themes in light of the fact that “the individual is always the final reality with which James and Whitehead deal” (p. 191).

I realize that my concentration upon the matter of philosophical perspective does not do full justice either to E.’s lucid and far-ranging commentary on or to my enthusiasm for the ideas of James and Whitehead. In my estimation, the strength of the text grows out of E.’s sympathetic understanding of the common framework within which both operate and his appreciation of the real differences that arise within that framework. Too often, classical American philosophy is reduced to pragmatism and dismissed as a short-lived episode in the history of thought. A careful reading of this text supports E.’s assertion that James and Whitehead represent “a line of thought which is alive to contemporary evidence and which speaks meaningfully of the universe” (p. xiii).

Le Moyne College, Syracuse

THOMAS V. CURLEY


At first glance this slim volume by the well-known Jesuit of Tokyo’s Sophia University may appear to be merely a popular, once-over-lightly treatment of Zen for Western Christians who want to dabble in an Eastern type of meditation. But its simplicity is deceptive. Despite an apparent looseness of structure and a decidedly informal tone, it will prove invaluable even for those who feel no urge toward the meditative life. The more one studies it, the more one sees it as the distillation of years of educational, pastoral, and mystical experience. There is nothing amateurish about the central message of this work. It breathes a spirit of authority that comes of a complete at-home-ness with its subject matter on the part of the author.

In eleven short chapters (and an appendix about posture in meditation), Fr. Johnston writes engagingly about how Zen and Christianity have “met” in his thought, and shares many of the “practical conclusions” he has reached—especially concerning how the life of a practicing Christian can be deepened through familiarity with Zen methods of mind control. Though in an earlier work he expressed doubt about whether a “Christian Zen” could exist, he now feels he was mistaken. Numerous Zen teachers differentiate between Zen Buddhism and Zen itself. The term “Zen” actually refers to objectless meditation and can
therefore be used in conjunction with any of the great religions. The first several chapters recount, in an almost conversational style, J.'s own experiments with Zen meditation in a Zen temple in Japan, and the early attempts at dialogue between Christians and Zen Buddhists.

For J., the key thing in Zen is detachment—not simply from physical objects and cravings but from all the "images and ideas and conceptualizations that are so dear to Western man." The means employed in Zen to attain this end, he points out, closely resemble the contemplative practices advocated for qualified contemplative religious by St. John of the Cross. But, as he goes on to point out, this is only one side of the picture, for Zen is not essentially negative. Detachment is cultivated so that "something else may shine forth," namely, the Buddha nature, which is present in the deepest recesses of the human person. Though he is careful not to equate this Buddha nature with the indwelling Christ, J. believes that Zen practice cannot fail to intensify meditative life within the Church. It is his conviction, in fact, that it is the vocation of Japanese Christians to renew this aspect of Christian living.

In two central chapters J. deals directly with "Christian Zen," telling of his experiments in teaching Zen meditation to Western Christian students (he has also encouraged Japanese Christian students to meditate in this way) and discussing perceptively the relationship of Zen to Christian mysticism. He foresees the possibility that large numbers of Christians who have lost interest in the old devotional practices of the Church may be able to take up in their place the "simple contemplation" that is accessible to anyone with good will. If Christian Zen is to be Christian, however, it must remain Christocentric and continue to build on Scripture. Here he parts company, it seems to me, with the Zen masters, who state that one of the first principles of Zen is "transmission outside the scriptures." But perhaps even modern Zen teachers would agree that in applying Zen methods in religions other than Buddhism original approaches may not be out of place.

What J. asks Christians to remember is that words and concepts and images of Christ are not Christ. One has to rid oneself of these if one wants the "high contemplative union with Christ" that is, for him, the real thing. The living and risen Christ is the unknowable Christ, "co-extensive with the universe and buried in the hollow recesses of the human heart." He is careful to add that the cosmic Christ is precisely the Jesus who shed His blood. He has no desire to be identified with those who want to cut the link between the cosmic Christ and the historical Christ. As a starting point in the quest for the living Christ, he suggests use of the traditional means of Scripture reading and prayer, but then adds his own practical conclusions about the use of Zen
methods. He also devotes a few pages to the obstacles to progress in meditation.

Perhaps the most significant portion of the book, in addition to the chapters on Christian Zen, is the concluding chapter on "Enlightenment." Here J. makes helpful clarifications. He lists three kinds of satori, or enlightenment, available to Christians. First there is the basic human enlightenment found in all cultures, which consists in an experience of the unity of all things and the loss of self. (I take it that he alludes here to an experience involving no permanent transformation of character, but simply a sort of temporary insight into the nature of existence.) Second is the specifically Judeo-Christian enlightenment such as Paul or Moses had, which is for the few and has little or nothing to do with the Zen approach. There is no methodology, J. states, that can lead to such experience. Third is the central experience of conversion, metanoia. This change of heart is not necessarily the same as the Zen experience of satori, but the methodology of Zen, if adopted by a Christian, may well lead to a sudden conversion. Without such an experience, which is not—like the second type—far beyond the ordinary psychological powers of men, the Christian's faith is weak and superficial. J. links up the change of heart experienced in true conversion with the "baptism of the Spirit" experienced by the Catholic Pentecostals. As Buddhism centers around enlightenment, he concludes, Christianity centers around conversion.

If I could take issue with anything in the book, it would be that J.'s unwillingness to commit himself about the relationship between satori and metanoia might seem to a non-Christian a holdover from the old "imperialistic" approach to other religions. His own reply would be that Zen Buddhists want complete honesty in the dialogue and welcome such frankness. But this is an insignificant flaw, if indeed it is a flaw, in a work that is a little jewel—one I recommend as the best introduction I know to Zen and to Zen practice as Christians can apply it.

Gordonsville, Va.  

JOHN MOFFITT


Père de Margerie's book on the reflections of Reinhold Niebuhr is a thorough, competent analysis. Originally a doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University under the distinguished Dutch theologian Jan Witte, S.J., it reflects the exhaustive, well-organized, meticulous kind of work expected in all serious scholarship aimed at a just and profound appreciation of a contribution to human knowledge.
The book keeps clearly separate its presentation of Niebuhr’s own thought and M.’s critical evaluations. M. writes from a basic Catholic orthodox position. His analysis of N.’s strengths and weaknesses is reduced to divergences in theological premises. Further, M. has surveyed the various Catholic and Protestant critical judgments of the Niebuhrian corpus. His emphasis is not so much on N.’s political theory as on his theology in so far as it explains his political positions.

N.’s death last year makes this book especially timely. In a way, at a moment in history when political enthusiasms of a variety of utopian sorts seem so prevalent, we shall miss a Niebuhr who was not afraid to remind us bluntly of the darker side of man’s nature, of his pride and his sin. Indeed, it is precisely the political context of such theological doctrines that seems most in need of his voice.

The relation between Augustine and Niebuhr is, as M. notes, very real. And when we speak of Augustine, we speak both of man’s maddening blindesses and his call to the City of God, not only on an individual basis but also in some sense on a collective one. N. has the distinction of being one of the few theologians able to convince American political leaders that their actions did contain theological depths in their very context, though this is not itself a solution to political problems.

The precise problem of the world community—its relation to existing political structures, to the Church, to eschatology—is one that above all others reveals the closeness of theology and politics. M., with considerable justice, finds that N.’s real perplexity over the possibility of a true world community is rooted in his often ambiguous positions with regard to Christ, everlasting life, the resurrection. This seems often a strange place to discover analytic problems about temporal affairs. Yet Christian political theory poses this as its essential contribution—a freeing of politics from the necessity to divinize itself together with a concrete meaning given to the affairs of worldly history. The abidingness of ignorance and sin cannot be avoided politically. This is what N. has vividly learned from Augustine and passes on to our generation.

Yet N. did believe in a world community. This is what Jesus Christ stood for as a project in this world of sinful men—its “possible impossibility” granting the passions and sins that do abound. However problematic may have been N.’s grasp of Christian eschatology and Christology, he recognized their this-worldly consequences, that an invitation to share a divine order of justice and love is what we are called to in Christ. This makes a finite world community possible.

M. is often tempted too much to Catholic theologizing of the type “had the author only understood Trent-Aquinas-Paul-all-would-be-well.” There is a place for critical comparison, but the dosage should
be mild. In any case, M. preserves his sympathy for and grasp of N.'s essential Christianity in his view of worldly politics. It is well to add that we are in great need of this type of pure scholarship in our understanding of fellow Christians and worldly problems.

University of San Francisco

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.


This is a competent, scholarly book that gives evidence of painstaking readings and thorough editorial preparation. Turner, professor of political science at the University of Connecticut, finds Catholicism by and large an effective force for determining political development in Latin America, principally in a liberal direction of late, despite its many reactionary members and those who could not care less. He examines one school of thought after another, from the revolutionaries to the retrograde, and presents their views fairly. He keeps his promise "not to become the intellectual prisoner of any faction in the contemporary Church controversies," yet one soon senses that at heart he is with the reformists, not the revolutionaries. His final pages are a cogent plea for more U.S. government and popular support for Catholic progressives in Latin America.

Several flaws appear in this fine work. The volume is dated 1971, yet it smacks rather of 1967 or 1968 in that its somewhat timeless analysis fails to convey the speed-up that is occurring in Latin America's political life: things are coming to a rapid boil there. Incredibly too, it makes no mention of the historic Medellín Conference of 1968, where a determined group of progressive bishops got their social and political as well as pastoral views ratified by their peers, even by the Pope, as norms for the Church's future direction. Nor does he mention the rapid rise of that new theological category "liberation," which turns up on almost every page of the Medellin Conclusions and has now spread from Latin America to Catholics in the rest of the underdeveloped world. (In the reference library where I work, the file on liberation is far fatter than that on Christian democracy, which T. seems to look on as enlightened Catholicism's obvious political development.)

T. has read widely in all areas on his field, yet he neither quotes nor alludes to either Hector Borrat, one of the most trenchant and original Catholic lay thinkers of that Continent in 1971, or P. Gustavo Gutiérrez, the acknowledged theoretician of and spokesman for liberation.

For all these minor deficiencies, T.'s study will be a permanent con-
tribution to the history of Catholicism's role in shaping society politically in Latin America.

Washington, D.C.  

EUGENE K. CULHANE, S.J.


These two volumes by Fr. Igartua consist of three main parts: a methodological investigation of the ecumenical hope in the Church, its basis in the NT, and theological problems concerning that hope in the Church today. I. ends with an epilogue on his methodology and the importance of his conclusions. There follows an appendix of texts in which the Church's ecumenical hope can be found (in the Fathers, doctors, and exegetes of the Church) and two further series of texts: those dealing directly or indirectly with the theme "one flock and one shepherd," and those pointing explicitly or implicitly to this ecumenical hope.

The study opens with an analysis of the ecumenical hope as found in the documents of Vatican II and the Praeclara of Leo XIII (1894); for here are two instances in which the ecumenical hope is manifested, a clear light which illumines the Church's future. I. defines ecumenical hope as "the hope manifested by the Church concerning the future of the world's religious unity in faith." He studies the problem of Christian unity in universality (the unity of Christians and particularly union with the Oriental Church) and the universal unity of the world in Christian faith. He is not concerned with the unity of faith within the Church itself; for this has existed since its foundation, by the promise given her by Christ (Mt 16:18). In support of his thesis—that the Church hopes for a unity in universality—he makes a deep and thorough study of two types of texts: those dealing in a general way with the Church's ecumenical hope (her magisterium) and those which make reference to "one flock and one shepherd." He claims that this ecumenical hope is manifested in the texts of the magisterium in three ways (which provide him with his methodology): texts which express a prayer or desire (interpretative); formal expressions (sperare, exspectare, fidere); explicit and implicit affirmations or assertions of this hope (i.e., the certitude that such a union will take place).

For I., there exists hope for an extraordinary renewal in the Church (the first step towards a full community) in Benedict XV, Pius IX, and Pius XII, and a hope for the unity of all Christian churches. This has also been expressed in Vatican II. There is also a hope for the Christian renewal of civil society, especially in Benedict XIV, Leo XIII, Pius XII,
and *Gaudium et spes*, and a hope for religious unity of the world in the Christian faith. A study of Jn 10:16, as used by the magisterium starting with Clement VIII (1300), and an investigation of the NT basis for the ecumenical hope, precede a series of conclusions, all pointing to the existence, operation, and viability of this hope and full unity.

The second part is a detailed study of the NT basis for the ecumenical hope of the Church. I. gives an anthology of passages, from the primitive Church to the present, in which the Johannine text (10:16) occurs or is referred to, studies the understanding and use of this text by the magisterium, and provides various exegeses of the text. He examines the various elements contained in the text: fold, shepherd, time, unity. He also makes use of Christ's ecumenical prayers in the Gospels (Jn 17:21-23 and Mt 6:10) as used by the magisterium and offers an educated exegesis.

The last part, theological problems in the ecumenical hope of the Church, defines the virtue of hope, distinguishes it from faith and charity, and presents arguments from the NT and the magisterium to affirm the ecumenical hope.

The two volumes represent an excellent historical study of the Church's ecumenical hope. It is historical theology splendidly done, and may well form the basis for a systematic theology of ecumenical hope.

*Collegio Bellarmino, Rome*  
José A. F. Borges, S.J.


For some years, the Department of the Ministry of the National Council of Churches under the leadership of John Biersdorf has been a source of creative reflection about contemporary issues in ministry. The two volumes under review here are products of the research and reflection that are characteristic of the Department. *Ministry in the Seventies* consists for the most part of papers and reports presented at departmental meetings. They come to us with the flavor of immediacy, statements of how the authors presently view the issues, but without pretense of any systematic analysis. I suspect that we shall have to rely, in times of such rapid change, on thoughtful men who are willing to run the risk of telling it as they now see it, without any attempt to legitimize their hunches and insights with the traditional paraphernalia of academic scholarship. We must, so to speak, reflect and talk on the run.

The issues in *Ministry* are solid, thoughtful, useful to us as we reflect
on the emerging of ministry for the present decade. The article by Leon Watts is a gem of thoughtful analysis as he lays out the reality of the Black church. He writes out of some years as a community organizer and churchman. The result is a perceptive challenge to the Black churches, with particular stress on the elements which must come to the fore in theological education for Black church leaders. His focus is the Black church, but his wisdom is urgent for all seminary development.

There is not space to comment on the other articles, save the excellent discussion by Edgar Mills on continuing education. Director of the Ministry Studies Board, Mills is the ablest researcher writing today about the problems of the clergyman. His research is from the heart as well as the head: he cares about the church and its ministry, but is unwilling to let us engage in deceptions. As in all his writing, this article is provocative and stimulating.

Clergy in Action Training is a research report on the effectiveness of three major training programs, heavily funded for the purpose of retraining clergy for effective urban ministry. In my judgment, the book will be of use primarily to specialists in the field of research and to those directly responsible for evaluating programs in continuing education. Somehow, for the money invested by the Urban Training Center in Chicago, Clergy Intern Program in Cleveland, and MUST in New York, the results seem trivial. Perhaps the research tools developed are first-rate, but the programs being measured simply do not justify the application of such heavy artillery. Or it may be that the research attempts to develop a common tool for three utterly diverse and incommensurate programs. If there is a generally useful section, it is the last chapter, “Summary and Implications.” There is good material here, but I kept feeling that the authors had wisdom and experience enough to write this chapter before they did this research.

New York Theological Seminary

GEORGE W. WEBBER

SHORTER NOTICES


An unusually important book which should be read by a wide circle of theologians and churchmen. It is a revised form of M.’s Cambridge dissertation written with Moule. One sees the careful exegesis which underlines the work. Equally important, one sees what I should like to term the dually contextual character of all good exegesis. M., of Makerere University College, Uganda, is properly intent on hearing the NT against its own background, rather than hearing merely
the credal formulations of the Africa Inland Mission; but precisely in this process he knows quite well that there must be an indigenous African hearing of the NT which is not simply an importation, whether from Grand Rapids or Cambridge. Although the methodological implications of this stance are not fully worked out—one wonders whether that would be likely in a dissertation written in a scientific manner for any of our western Ph.D. programs—part of the groundwork is laid. One hopes that M. will proceed in ways which may even challenge his Western counterparts to wake up to the dually contextual character of biblical interpretation. Meanwhile, along with E. B. Idowu, he is providing key elements of an indigenous and thoroughly biblical theologia Africana.

J. Louis Martyn


What F. earlier did so felicitously for Christology in general (The Foundations of New Testament Christology, New York, 1965) he here succeeds in doing, with equally good effect, for the Resurrection narratives specifically. He re-examines these narratives, employing as tools tradition-historical criticism and redaction criticism. He begins by showing that the Easter tradition in its earliest recoverable form was framed in the manner of a report. In subsequent stages of development, he argues, the community and the Evangelists reshaped the tradition so as to make it verbalize their understandings of the event. F. confronts with candor the inconsistencies exhibited by the respective narratives. He believes that to discover the motivations which prompted the several fashionings of these narratives will, if not reconcile the discrepancies, at least give the reasons for them. He feels, too, that this study should shed light on the “artless indifference” of the NT writers which allowed such discordant accounts to stand side by side. His arguments are compelling. Surely the rubric for reading F.’s books must be: he who endures to the end will be saved. This is not to imply any deficiency in the earlier sections, but just to say that it is in the concluding chapters that F. is at his very best. It is at the end that he draws out the conclusions of his studies and makes helpful applications both to the faith experience of the Christian and to the ministry of preaching. If only for these paragraphs, F.’s book is well worth the reading.

James C. Turro


Devoted to the letter sigma alone, the volume contains many important articles, such as those on sabbaton, Saddoukaios, Samareia, sarx, sêmeion,
Sina, Siôn, skênè, skotos, sophia, sózó, sóma, and a series of entries involving the important preposition syn (and its compounds). One can only continue to marvel at the tour de force by which the pagination of the English volume follows that of the German original, or is only off by roughly a page at most throughout. However, the authorship of articles by more recent interpreters often brings with it a mode of interpretation with which one did not always have to cope in the past. For instance, the uncritical hermeneutical jargon of E. Fuchs on sêmeron in Lk 4:21: “He who would hear Scripture must ‘to-day’ see Jesus, so that in encounter with Him there is definitive division and decision concerning salvation or perdition” (p. 274). One cannot fault Bromiley here (though his rendering of “summarisch” by “comprehensively” might be questioned), for the jargon is in the German. The article by G. Fohrer and E. Lohse on “Sion” includes Jerusalem as well. The forty-six pages devoted to it are in general excellent, but the place of this city in the Luke-Acts complex could have been better presented and more nuanced. Part of the difficulty here lies in the separate Gospel and Acts treatment of the Jerusalem theme; this would merit a more complexive discussion. Picayune remarks could be made on a number of points, but that is only to be expected in a collaborative work involving so many authors. It is important to emphasize the value of this translated volume, and of the whole set, for anyone serious about the study of the NT and its theology. It is not just a lexicon; for though it has elaborate word-studies, philological and historical, it never neglects to sum up the theological nuances of the words under discussion. This is what makes Kittel-Friedrich a gold mine of information for the student of the NT.

*Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.*
picture of a rich and sophisticated Canaanite culture which dominated the Syro-Palestinian area for over two thousand years.

Unfortunately, it is all too common in books of this kind to have strange texts printed upside down. The great Isaiah Scroll (1QIs) and a Lachish Letter have not escaped this fate. That and a somewhat liberal (over twenty) sprinkling of typographical errors should be corrected in the next printing. The intrinsic value of this handsomely produced book and the modest price make this one of the best buys on the biblical market.

Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.


These two slender volumes, eventually to be joined by a third on tradition criticism, are excellent introductions to major types of OT research. The expositions are clear and concise. The present-day interrelatedness of these originally separate disciplines is rightly stressed. Each book first puts its subject into historical perspective and outlines the methodology involved. After presenting several examples of literary criticism, H. concentrates on the Pentateuch. Gn 1-5 and 6-9 are used to illustrate the procedures of literary criticism in detail, and then two final chapters, "The Yahwist and the Promise" and "The Priestly Writer and the Covenant," are devoted to careful interpretation of the results. T. chooses to exemplify form criticism at work both in narrative materials and in prophetic literature. His treatment is dependent upon Gunkel's programmatic work and updates it.

An epilogue calls attention to other applications of the form-critical method.

These two books are examples of a happy interplay between careful scholarly preparation and controlled popular exposition. The history of scholarship is judiciously alluded to, but the reader is not swamped by yet another tedious summary of all that has gone before. The importance of detailed work is made clear, but the expositions are not encumbered by needless data. The intended audience is the college student or the mythical "educated layman," but the graduate student in biblical studies or theology should also find these books useful for review and for new insights. Most valuable is the constant attempt to find some meaning for theological understanding in methodologies that have all too often been pursued in isolation. Habel and Tucker show that literary and form criticism are not simply relics from the history of biblical scholarship. They must be used in new ways by students and scholars today.

Kevin G. O'Connell, S.J.


This small, expensive, scholarly book—which presumes a professional command of Semitic languages, at least of Hebrew—sets out to investigate Is 40:13-14 in its relationship to chaps. 40-55, the Book of Consolation (vv. 13-14 are a fragmentary poem, separate even from 40:12), in their philological details and literary style (vocabulary of politics, not of sapiential background), and most of
all in their relation to the image of a heavenly council for Yahweh. This image within Is 40:13–14, “though related to an [early] Israelite belief in the existence of an assembly of divine beings [and counsellors] over whom Yahweh presided like an earthly king,” is actually derived from the Babylonian myth of the creator gods Marduk and Ea. Deutero-Isaiah then argues, according to W., the superiority of Yahweh over these gods as world creator. The book offers many valuable insights: an important clarification about the heavenly court of Yahweh and the form of pre-exilic monotheism as well as many fine observations on such difficult texts as Ps 82, Dt 32:8, Jb 15:7–8 and 28:27.

Personally, I find the main link too weak to pull the weight of W.’s conclusions. He rests his case almost solely on poetic structure, in order to separate 40:13–14 not only from the rest of 40:12–31 but even from v. 12, overlooking the many logical connections linking 40:13–14 not only with v. 12 and vv. 15–31 but also with the whole series of poems on First and Last, where Deutero-Isaiah is arguing Yahweh’s exclusive right to divinity. W., furthermore, presumes that the exilic prophet is primarily discussing kingship and first creation; actually he calls Yahweh King only four times and never in a context of creation. I have written against this presupposition and need not repeat my reasons here why salvation and not creation is the major theme of Deutero-Isaiah (Creative Redemption in Deutero-Isaiah, Rome, 1970; earlier in CBQ 29 [1967] 495–511). In fact, my principal grievance against this book lies in the way in which words or ideas are investigated far more fully elsewhere in the Bible than in Is 40–55. Even the presence of the heavenly council in 40:1–8 is mentioned only in the final conclusions of the book.

Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P.
passage of the New Covenant (31:31-34) "entirely [to] the work of the Deuteronomists" (p. 138). Further elucidation must be given to this and other difficult passages, e.g., "prophet to the nations" (1:5) and the problem of the salvation of the nations in Deuteronomy, the relationship to Deutero-Isaiah, "the seventy years" in 25:11 and 29:10, and the interdependence of the Hebrew text behind the Septuagint and the longer Massoretic text. I look forward to further research from N. Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P.


In the first century B.C. a Jewish scholar whose deep commitment to his own religion was coupled with a thorough formation in Hellenistic Greek culture composed the Book of Wisdom for a group of Jewish students similarly trained in the Hellenistic culture which dominated their native Alexandria. Wisdom provides a classic example of how a convinced believer may adapt his vision of the faith to the challenges of a new cultural situation while remaining in dynamic continuity with the permanent values of his spiritual patrimony. R. has analysed the extent and depth of Hellenistic influence on Wisdom in a study of the highest quality. It is likely that we have here the definitive work on this particular problem.

There are five chapters, the first of which examines the extent and specific areas of Hellenism upon Wisdom. His careful, detailed survey of the vocabulary and style discloses an author trained in Greek rhetoric and subject to extensive Hellenistic influence. The second and longest chapter investigates the depth of the influence, concluding that Wisdom represents a personally elaborated synthesis comprising traditional belief and the new learning which flourished in Alexandria. R. pinpoints the areas of deepest influence, among them Epicurean speculation on immortality, the Isis cult, and the material found in the Hellenistic treatises on the kingly ideal. The third chapter studies the smaller genres of Wisdom, then the larger literary form of which they are parts. This comprehensive genre is the protreptic or didactic exhortation, a literary form popular in both Greek and Latin classics. The fourth chapter defends the unity of authorship and describes the addressees. A final chapter tells how and why the Sage went about his work, emphasizing the positive consequences of Hellenistic influence upon his appeal to fellow Jews. A classified bibliography and indices will greatly assist the reader. This study is too valuable not to correct, in a future printing, over twenty-five typographical errors.

Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.


F.'s study breaks some new ground in the study of Clement and shows that he is, on certain issues at least, closer to the mainstream of Christian thought than scholars have often thought. In this compact monograph F. attempts to locate the context for C.'s discussion of the problem of evil and to set forth the main outlines of his thought on the matter. F.'s thesis is that "Clement of Alexandria's speculation on the problem of evil is in a large measure dictated by his anti-gnostic polemic" (p. 91). According to F., Clement argued, against the backdrop of Gnostic views which made God responsible for evil and man helplessly determined by an
eternal destiny, that man is free and responsible for his decisions and acts and that the world is essentially good because it was created by God. Evil, however, though not God's work, serves His purpose to chastise and educate man and to make a place for the redemptive work of Christ.

Despite the systematic, intelligent presentation, I am dissatisfied, if not with F.'s specific conclusions, at least with the context of the discussion. He has no sympathy whatsoever for Gnosticism, seems oblivious to the recent studies of Gnosticism. And so, what he presents as C.'s opponents are really the opponents as C. conceived them, not as historians might construct them today. In Floyd's picture, there is no subtlety and it becomes a simple matter to set C. off from Gnostic views. Gnostics rejected monotheism, they did not believe in a loving God, they were fatalistic and deterministic, they "read into the texts their own presuppositions, rather than letting the texts speak for themselves." C., on the other hand, "interprets the Scriptures by the Scriptures." Further, F. does not do justice to the wider cultural and intellectual milieu for C.'s thought on evil. Though he is aware of this horizon, and knows that philosophers, e.g., wrote treatises on "Whence evil," the intellectual currents of the Greco-Roman world contribute little to his assessment of C. I felt that F. was reading C. in light of later Christian discussions of evil.

A useful book for its careful discussion of many important texts in Clement, but on the basis of these texts a different kind of interpretation seems possible.

Robert L. Wilken

L'IMPERO E L'IMPERATORE CRISTIANO IN EUSEBIO DI CESAREA: LA PRIMA TEOLOGIA POLITICA DEL CRISTIANESIMO.


Mainly as a result of the lively discussions on the authorship, literary genre, and credibility of the De vita Constantini, historians have shown increased interest in the political theology of Eusebius of Caesarea. While in the past this has often been written off as the unbridled flattery of a court bishop, F. believes that, despite the lack of systematic treatment, Eusebius' writings contain a very consistent political theology which is definitely more than a mere justification and glorification of Constantine's regime. The Introduction, dealing with F.'s selection and treatment of sources, is essential for a correct assessment of his analysis. The De laudibus Constantini he sees as Eusebius' portrait of an ideal Christian emperor, while the De vita Constantini describes the same ideal as incarnated in Constantine's life and deeds. Part 1 expounds the dogmatic foundations of Eusebius' theories culminating in the key notion of the empire as the terrestrial image (eikón) of the celestial reign of God the Father, and of the emperor as the imitation (mimésis) of the Logos-Christ and King.

Part 2 shows in detail how these theological premises are actuated in the Eusebian conceptions of the Roman Christian empire and emperor. Among the more striking consequences F. mentions: the empire as unique, universal, and Christian by necessity; identification of the Christian empire with the reign of Christ and the pilgrim Church; the emperor as vicar of the Logos-Christ and therefore head of the Church. The Conclusion is actually a brief survey of the sources from which Eusebius drew the elements of his imperial ideology: Christian (Scripture, Origen) and non-Christian (Plato, Dion Chrysostomus, Philo, etc.). Appendix 1 analyzes the
salient points of Eusebius' ecclesiology; Appendix 2 discusses the meaning of the famous sentence in *De vita Constantini* 4, 26.

F.'s richly documented synthesis should be a valuable help to all historians interested in the origins of the political theology which dominated Byzantine history and later influenced the theoreticians of the new Roman Christian empire at the court of Charlemagne, the "new Constantine."

*Victor C. De Clercq, C.I.C.M.*

**LA PATROLOGÍA TOLEDANO-VISIGODA.**


The thirteenth centenary of the death of St. Ildefonsus of Toledo (d. 667) provided the theologians of Spain with the occasion of honoring him as one of the leading personalities of the ancient Visigothic Church. The fruit of this anniversary, celebrated in Toledo, Sept. 25 to 29, 1967, is this valuable contribution to Spanish patristics. The whole work, eighteen articles, is largely devoted to themes inspired by the history and theology of Visigothic Spain: e.g., "The Problem of the Jews in the Visigothic Fathers," by Ramón Hernández, O.P.; "Some Aspects of Penance in the Visigothic-Mozarabic Church," by Gonzalo Martínez Díez, S.J.; "Theological Evaluation of the Spanish Liturgical Literature," by José A. de Aldama, S.J. The heart of the volume is the eight studies specifically concerned with the Visigothic Church of Toledo: with the historical figure of Eugene of Toledo (Fray Justo Pérez de Urbel), with the eschatological doctrine of Julian of Toledo (Cándido Pozo, S.J.), and with the scholarship of Ildefonsus (Julio Campos et al.). While not all the studies are of equal value, the work as a whole renders a useful and informative service to students of the *Geistesgeschichte* of Visigothic Spain.

*Robert E. McNally, S.J.*

**MARTIN LUTHER UND DER PAPST.**


This short yet detailed study traces the development of Luther's position on the papacy from his earliest writings to his death, concentrating on the period 1517-1520 when Luther's views changed most radically. Before posting the ninety-five theses, the future reformer was an ardent papalist, as related in the *Tischreden* and proved by his sermons. The theses themselves show him as a concerned Catholic, accepting papal authority, though not in the extreme form advocated by Prierias. Luther continued to make papalist statements during his first period of notoriety, but the interview with Cajetan and the Leipzig debate forced him into defensive opposition. His initial replies were ill conceived, such as the appeal to a council, although he was not a true conciliarist. After he had had time to formulate his theory of Scripture as the supreme authority, he turned forever from the papacy. His first attacks on the pope were *ad hominem* and still contained papalist sentiments. By 1520 Luther had moved to the theoretical and denied the divine origin of papal authority; B. feels this sealed the break with Rome. Once in opposition, Luther characteristically pursued his course to the full, claiming the pope was at best just a man, at worst Antichrist. The offensive went beyond reason; Hadrian VI's public confession of the Church's guilt was a murderer's trick, and the earnest reformer Paul III, the Pope of Trent, was the destroyer of Christianity. B. cites other scholars who find lingering traces of papalism in some of Luther's later works, but
argues that an occasional sentence cannot compensate for volumes of scurrilous attacks. Although the book is hard on Luther, B.'s intent is ecumenical. He feels Luther's savage polemic has distorted the Protestant view of the papacy and he hopes to right this wrong. It is "a pleasant sign that ever more Protestant theologians" (p. 99) are re-examining Luther's position.

Joseph F. Kelly


Through the portraits of twenty reformers, S. has encapsulated the atmosphere, anguish, and aims of the early years of the Reformation, and feels that all these men can only be understood when seen against the background of Luther's life and thought. He divides his chosen group into four categories or traditions, and within each he offers five representatives: Late-Medieval Catholic (Geiler von Kaysersberg, Staupitz, Contarini, Lefèvre d'Etaples, Pole), Lutheran (Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Osiander, Amsdorf, Brenz), Reformed (Bucer, Bullinger, John Hooper, Vermigli, Beza), Radical (Carlstadt, Schwenckfeld, Hubmaier, Denck, and Marpeck). In each portrait S. first outlines the subject's life, then offers a brief summary of his particular teaching; where applicable, he compares him with Luther and cites what he has especially contributed to or emphasized in his own particular tradition. Among the Catholic reformers, Geiler is hailed as being the first to recover the importance of preaching in the life of the Church, and Staupitz for his influence on Luther, particularly in leading him to embrace a more Augustinian view of grace and predestination. Cardinal Contarini is included for his middle-of-the-road view of "double justification" at Trent, Lefèvre for his exegetical work and his manner of interpreting Scripture, and Cardinal Pole, who somehow does not exactly fit the role of a reformer.

Of the twenty reformers, some were original and innovative in their thought—and S. is acute in pinpointing this contribution—while others were the "doers" who put the reformed thought into practice. Within each given tradition, the men conserved that tradition's original insight (they may have modified it, but they did not reject it), they built upon it, and in so doing they pushed the Reformation forward. Though these men are said to be "in the wings," each had his day on the Reformation stage; some have remained there (e.g., Melanchthon, Beza, Bullinger) and some have retreated into the shadows of the wings (e.g., Bugenhagen, Hubmaier). An excellent introduction to an over-all view of the Reformation, especially valuable in highlighting the plurality of theologies encompassed under the single name "Reformation."

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


Feeling the absence of a theological understanding of the Church, M. turned to Calvin for guidance, and through his study he became aware that the doctrine of the Church was at the center of C.'s thought. The unifying principle is no longer the "doctrine of God and His predestinating will" nor "the revelation of God in Jesus Christ," but "the absolute correlation of the Spirit and the Word" (p. 4); i.e., the inseparability of the Spirit and the Son is the criterion of all theological statements. Though the Spirit ordinarily works through the expressions of the Word (ordinationes Dei), He is not bound to them. When the work of
the Spirit is correlated with the manifestation of the Word, then order appears. Hence the Church (order) can only be understood dialectically, as referring simultaneously to the Word and to the Spirit. M. substantiates this inseparability of Spirit and Word through his several chapters; e.g., both conspire in the creation of the natural order and in establishing the integrity of man; both act together in the restoring of man after the Fall, i.e., in saving the world, in which restoration the Church was created. The covenant offered to Abraham and fulfilled in Christ was also through the inseparable activity of Spirit and Word. The marks of the Church require the Spirit for the pure preaching (and hearing) of the Word, as well as for the right administration (and receiving) of the sacraments. Furthermore, M. feels that his unifying concept, rather than Dowey’s *duplex cognitio Domini*, underlies the final organization of the *Institutes* (p. 193).

M. has heavily documented his study with abundant quotations from the *Institutes*, but especially from the commentaries, where he feels one meets Calvin’s direct and positive teaching. He has at times altered the translations of others where he feels the original requires it, but his rendering (p. 120) of Calvin’s *non faciat inane aut inefficax* (cf. *Comm. Tit. 3, 5*) as “not to make the sign unmeaning and efficacious” seems to say the opposite of what Calvin said, and what M. intends to say.

*Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.*


A readable and insightful account of the schism which split American Presbyterianism from 1837 to 1869. M. traces the “New School” from its origins in Jonathan Edwards through Nathaniel William Taylor’s “New Haven theology” to Albert Barnes and evangelical preachers such as Lyman Beecher, with a careful analysis of the doctrines of the imputation of original sin, predestination, and co-operation with saving grace. The Old School objected to the New School’s evangelical interpretation of these doctrines, its support of the Presbyterian-Congregationalist Plan of Union of 1801 and other interdenominational activity, and its program for social reform, and excised the New School in 1837. M. destroys the myth that the schism focused on the issue of abolition which the New School skirted out of deference to its southern adherents until the 1850’s. He then narrates how the New School, in an effort to prove its Presbyterian orthodoxy, became denominationally conscious and therefore less interested in interdenominational co-operation, and how it gradually approached the Old School in doctrinal formulation, especially through the work of Henry B. Smith. He is very balanced in his evaluation of both the New and Old Schools as seen through the writings of their leading figures, and in an excellent conclusion he traces evangelicalism to the present and compares and contrasts the New School with twentieth-century fundamentalism. The book is worth reading not only as a study of an important aspect of American Christianity but also as an illustration of the effects of schism on a group which tried to remain orthodox.

*Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J.*


This valuable research tool provides
a page and line correlation between the two most recently published Danish editions of Kierkegaard's *Samlede Vaerker* and the most widely available English, French, and German translations. The third Danish edition is regarded as the basic reference point. One can discover, e.g., that p. 63 of this edition of *Either/Or*, Vol. 1, extends from p. 54, line 20 to p. 55, line 26 in the second Danish edition, from p. 63, line 3 to p. 64, line 7 in a standard English translation, and so on for the French and German translations. The bibliographical listing of the scattered English and French translations of K.'s works is in itself quite helpful.

*Charles J. Kelly*


V.'s work is already familiar to students of Modernism and he has aptly chosen the title of his present book—a series of vignettes portraying the personality and thought of the many disparate figures who were known as or were accused of being Modernists. He does at times have a latitudinarian bias, e.g., his assertion that the Church should have retained Loisy (pp. 54–55), to whom two out of eight chapters are devoted, but his general approach is balanced. He considers Modernism as a broad movement and therefore includes figures ranging from M. Hébert and J. Turmel to Blondel, Mgr. Mignet, and von Hügel (Tyrrell appears only indirectly, partly because V. feels that he is already better known in the English-speaking world than A. L. Lilley, who is treated at some length). The chapter "Lesser Lights and Fellow Travellers" contains interesting biographical details and an incisive analysis of the thought of minor figures and of sympathizers. Another chapter is on Edmund Bishop, an English layman and "an unrecognised modernist"; yet V. ignores Ernesto Buonaiuti. He concludes with a chapter on the Sillon, which he sees as a social manifestation of modernism—a fine example of the necessity of seeing Modernism in a wide context.

V.'s book is well written in a conversational style; yet it is scholarly throughout. It is not nor does it pretend to be a complete history of Modernism. Its intention is far more modest and it offers to the reader V.'s personal reflections on several aspects and personalities of Modernism.

*Gerald P. Fogarty, S.J.*


According to the dust jacket, "a radical book. It reaches to the roots and to the ultimate source. G. embarks on an autobiographical journey to explore the meaning and nature of religion, the role of the church in the world today, and, particularly, the relation of Western Christianity to Hinduism and Buddhism." But the book itself is a disappointment. Interesting questions and suggestions surface momentarily, only to be swept along in the onrush of information and stories. Apparent gravity of intent is matched by neither the tone nor careful reflection.

Amid the miscellany of anecdotes, historical forays, transcribed conversations, provocative suggestions and questions, there runs a basic line of argumentation. G. contends that Christianity emerged as a religion of crisis, and that since its immediate eschatological expectations failed to materialize it has had to incorporate within itself life-views which worked out more adequately the elements needed for a more present-focused
Religious existence. In the present situation of emerging world community, Christianity could well profit from the spiritual wisdom and attitudes of the noneschatological and nonexclusivist religions of the East, especially Hinduism and Buddhism. He stresses that this coalescence of traditions will be effected more profitably at the level of personal spiritual experience than in the realm of theological speculation and ecclesiastical politics. The ideal product of such a fusion would be the ultimate (teleological) "end of religion": a radical and enlightened openness to the gracious unveiling of Being, a loving responsiveness to the gift of Existence. Nowhere, however, does G. carefully correlate the various affinities he finds between Eastern religions and Christianity, nor is the needed balance that these religions would provide Christianity more than generally indicated. There is a need for theological work that takes seriously the fact that the mystery in which human life is immersed has come to expression variously but authentically, in different cultures, but this book does more to point up than to meet that need.

J. V. Loudon

Understanding Church Growth.
A rather heavy volume in pages, rather light in theological concepts. Confessional in tone, it is a kind of profession of faith. Unfortunately, I must disagree with M. on almost everything, especially the definition of mission, which he couples with missionary activity as a "vast and purposeful finding," concerned with the actual number of souls gained. When you contrast "search theology" with the "theology of harvest," the outcome is cloudy and misleading.

The book has five sections: Basic Considerations; Discerning the Outlines (a justification of the numerical approach to Church growth); Causes of Church Growth; Sociological Foundations; Specific Kinds of Church Growth. I have always been ecumenical in theological outlook, but even with the enlarged horizon of ecumenical theology, it is beyond my comprehension how becoming a Christian can be identified with becoming a Protestant—or even more narrowly, an Evangelical. M. shows no appreciation for the theological content of one denomination in comparison with another, nor any theological valuation of non-Christian religions. This latter point is particularly unfortunate at this juncture of history, when every effort is being made to place Christian theology and the role of the Church within the greater context of religious experience in the whole of mankind. If one continues to look at Church growth exclusively as saving souls and at theology as feeding the people with the one formula allowed, one can hardly speak of an understanding of Church growth today. In a diaspora situation, numbers reveal nothing at all.

Sabbas J. Kilian, O.F.M.

Vers une nouvelle christologie.
This work of popularization by the well-known Belgian Jesuit presents, first, a clear, fair, and negative appraisal of the Christological speculations of A. Hulsbosch, E. Schillebeeckx, and P. Schoonenberg, whose essays in Tijdschrift voor Theologie in 1966 created something of a sensation. Readers of TS will recall the lengthy analysis made by Robert North (TS 30 [1969] 27-60) and the review of Schoonenberg's subsequent book, also dealt with by G. (TS 31 [1970] 351-54), which has now appeared in English as
The Christ. G. goes on in the rest of his volume to insist that, within the two-nature model of Chalcedon, a dynamic Christology is possible. His most interesting point concerns the sense in which novelty is possible in God. The treatment is more descriptive than analytic, but the essay should be enlightening for the general reader.

Thomas E. Clarke, S.J.


In The Broken Center (1966) S. observed: “What one feels to be formative in much representative literature of our period is the profound need for a deep restoration of confidence in the stoutness, reliability, and essential healthiness of the things of the earth.” As if answering his own analysis, he suggests in The Wild Prayer of Longing that such a restoration may currently be taking place. In the first of three essays, largely through a discussion of Eric Auerbach’s notion of figurative imagination, he provides a historical context for understanding the religious crisis of our age. Through the process of “defiguralization” of man’s understanding of nature and history, life in the world has been rendered void of radical significance. Drawing primarily from Heidegger, he argues in the second essay, “The Sacramental Vision,” for the continued viability of a sacramental principle, which means in the period post mortem dei “that nothing may be a sacrament unless everything is. at bottom, sacramental, and that ours may be considered to be a sacramental universe because, in its every aspect and dimension, it...appears to be for man rather than against him.”

The final essay, a discussion of the poetry of Theodore Roethke, gives a literary example of how the sacramental vision may now be imaginatively appropriated “without resort to supernatualist figuralism.”

Those acquainted with S.’s writings will find little new, with two exceptions: (1) he appears to alter his perspective from correlation of specifically Christian theology and literature to a broader study of religion and literature—as indicated, in part, with the subtitle; (2) the attention granted the later work of Heidegger exceeds that provided in S.’s previous works. This is a book written with the sometimes bothersome breadth of scholarly allusions now characteristic of S., a book which offers a capsule of many motifs disparately stated in his earlier works, and a book which properly recognizes the current renewal of meditative dwelling with the things of this world.

Ted L. Estess


This modest volume of six articles is published to honor Prof. Josef Hasenhuss of Würzburg on his seventieth birthday. The main themes are God, faith, Church, and mankind. The contributions, by and large, are of no more than average quality.

In his essay on atheism as a problem of theology, Biser sees Goethe, Dostoyewski, and Nietzsche as representing three types of atheism. Goethean atheism is anxiety in face of an absolute God; Dostoyewskian atheism comes from care for the suffering of the world, Nietzschean atheism from man’s concern for his own self-fulfillment. Biser sees these three “scandals” as serious problems for theology and their solution in a theology not merely oriented to but grounded in the...
Word, leaving pure speculation behind. Hubertus Mynarek’s essay on the changing developments in Marxist criticism of religion argues that the kind of absolute hope and love which recent Marxist critique exalts (Garraudy, Bloch) cannot be consistently maintained without the eternal unconditioned being we call God. Heinrich Döring’s article on current Protestant and Catholic rethinking of the possibility of knowing God concludes that the growing similarity of their approach has its philosophical basis above all in the system of Kant, which forces us critically to find a new “contact point” in the approach to God. This is in many ways the book’s most interesting article. Heinrich Petri’s article on the recent idea of dogma sees the task of theology in the use of dogmas and other Church teachings as instruments in the process by which the Church grows in self-awareness of her faith. Paul-Werner Scheele’s article on the unity of the Church and the unity of mankind sees the Church as that part of humanity which has a special responsibility for the whole of humanity. The last essay, by Wacker, is mainly a documented explanation of what “no salvation outside the Church” means for the Second Vatican Council. The volume concludes with a seventeen-page bibliography of Hasenfuss’ writings.

Daniel J. O’Hanlon, S.J.

The historical understanding of reality out of which this historical scholarship arose has also penetrated deeply into Christian reflection, making terms like historicity, dynamism, evolution, development, and process altogether commonplace in theological literature today. The essays gathered together here consistently reflect the impact of this historical revolution in their efforts to articulate the place of “the dynamic in Christian thought.” They are all of a uniformly high quality of scholarship, although they differ somewhat in length, breadth, and depth of treatment. Originally presented as papers at Villanova University in 1968, they represent the initial offering of a projected five-volume series commemorating the 125th anniversary of the University.

Of the ten contributions only two are made by Protestant writers: Krister Stendahl, who explores the present plight and future role of biblical theology, and Jaroslav Pelikan, who sets out in great detail the process of de-Judaization and consequent Hellenization which transformed the shape of the early Church. Two pieces, by Bernard Häring and John Noonan, explore the dynamic, developmental dimension of Catholic moral theology. The emergence of a Catholic process theology is clearly demonstrated in Eugene Fontinell’s pragmatic reconstruction of the doctrine of God and Eulalio Baltazar’s reappraisal of the traditional understanding of the immediate creation of the soul. Two of our most sophisticated exegetes, Eugene Maly and John L. McKenzie, offer their reflections on the OT roots of secularization and the renewal of the institutional Church respectively. Avery Dulles on the subject of revelation and Walter Burghardt on the topic of Jewish-Christian relations round out the collection.

Because of the three-year lag between presentation and publication,
these papers do not today reveal any refreshingly new overtures for the future, especially for anyone familiar with the writing of these important scholars over the past decade. Nonetheless, they do provide a very impressive balance sheet on our recent theological past as well as an unusually rich feast of theological reading.

Donald P. Gray


Sufficiently disparate to preclude a book-length development, these essays share a common concern and perspective. M. is working toward a theology and spirituality which unifies the Christian vision and the deepest aspirations of modern man. In this aim M. proves faithful to his Teilhardian heritage, and these essays appear to represent his transition from exposition of Teilhard to implementation of his program. For the three sets of essays treat, in turn, future directions for theology and spirituality, particular present issues, and central aspects of T.'s thought.

In the initial set of essays, the first discusses the changes in mood and modes which must characterize future theological work and complements Lonergan's more technical and ambitious restructuring of the method of theology. The second indicates how prayer can be freshly understood within the dimensions of human time and especially with reference to the future. The third is a fine account of the futurist option as it has recently emerged in the theologies of Pannen- berg, Moltmann, Metz, and Schillebeeckx, and affords a balanced assessment of its dangers and promise. The second triad includes (1) a proposal regarding the nature and function of theology courses in Catholic universities which makes a valuable distinc-

tion between "theology" and "religion" courses and argues for their integration into a program of diverse options; (2) a reasonable but undaring essay on the role of women and the feminine generally in the Church; (3) an account of contemporary dimensions of validity in Ignatian spirituality. The final threesome presents a treatment of Teilhard's views on the relation between evolution and God and on the spiritual economy of Christian existence, and a response to challenges to T.'s thought from phenomenology, personalism, and Marxism.

Three strong impressions: T.'s most durable influence on theology will be in spirituality; imagination, disciplined by science and tradition, has a vital role to play in theology's elaboration of a viable vision of Christian existence; we should look forward with enthusiasm to future work from M.

J. V. Loudon


It is no secret among educators that a new kind of consumer, "audio-visual man," has emerged to challenge their effectiveness and ingenuity in communication. Marshall McLuhan has already documented the arrival of this new species that is attuned to images and sound rather than to print. B. has undertaken the task of guiding religious educators through the mine field of audio-visual communication, an area dotted with both pitfalls and promise. On the whole, he succeeds rather well. He acts as author and editor, writing half of the book himself and drawing for the other half on the expertise of men of acknowledged competence in the field of media. One of the most fruitful of the book's ideas is that appealing to the senses is more than a mere gimmick, an unfortunate but
necessary accommodation at a time when book learning has become problematic even for the literate. B. is persuasive in pointing out that the great moments of Judeo-Christian revelation have occurred not through print but through the kind of total experience which media try to reproduce. Hence audio-visual language is a medium which should be eminently adaptable to catechesis, if educators can overcome the print-oriented bias of their own origins and respect a language that has its own rules. For those who want to try, this book is a good beginning, offering an effective blend of how-to and what-for. The illustrations are excellent, and an object lesson in the book’s key idea, that print is by no means the only or the most effective way to impart the message of Christ.

James J. DiGiacomo, S.J.


The first volume of a projected series The Gospel Encounters History, carrying on the thought and spirit of earlier volumes by Lutheran scholars on Vatican II subjects. (Funding is by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bavaria—an example to be recommended highly to other churches for scholarly ecumenical work.) The seven contributors, all connected with the Lutheran Foundation for Ecumenical Research located in Strasbourg, explain their project in the Introduction: to examine the great ecumenical themes of our day, seeing the challenge from the world as an opportunity for the churches to discern their mission better in terms of the gospel. The call to re-formation now comes from revolution, secularization, modernity. The Church’s response must be service to the secular world in Christ’s name.

The chapters are: “Theology in Dialog,” by V.; “Ecumenical Endeavour and its Quest for Motivation,” by Harding Meyer; “The Plurality of New Testament Theologies and the Unity of the Gospel as an Ecumenical Problem,” by Leonhard Goppelt; “Roman Catholic and Lutheran Relationships,” by Warren Quanbeck; “Church, Unity and History,” by Gunther Gassmann; “Secular Ecumenism: One Church—One World,” by Michael Rogness. The book is densely packed, already a bit out of date, but with considerable value. The historical sections make clear the unfortunate “real distinction” between Faith and Order, and Life and Work, and the gradual overcoming of that dilemma. The biblical sections seem too understandable to be completely in touch with the latest scholarship, but then again the writers may well have achieved an enviable charism of intelligibility; they surely have done so in their theological sections.

The last two chapters are likely the most usable for most readers. Gassmann speaks of a “third ecumenical movement” toward the humanum in a world of God’s redeeming work found in addressing the problems of the secular world: racism, poverty, war, unfreedom in many places. He asks what structure can effectively initiate the necessary dialog, but sees no present answer. Rogness gives Roman Catholics like Rahner, Schillebeeckx, and Teilhard primary credit for moving toward a new ecumenism of the world as the arena of God’s activity, and urges Lutherans to catch up quickly. He sees the mission of the Church as “service to the secular world” (p. 189) and asks the churches to take the risk of attacking the roots of injustice in the political and social spheres, as well as to do the works of mercy for persons in need.

David J. Bowman, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES


These fascicles, "Ibañez-Indulgences," continue the patient historical studies we have long appreciated in DS. The article "Image and Likeness" traces its subject through Scripture, the patristic age (highlighting Tertullian, Hilary, Augustine—the Greek Fathers were covered in earlier fascicles), the 11-13th centuries (especially Bonaventure and Thomas), the later mystical writers, down through Vatican Council II and contemporary theology. Scheffczyk notes the current tendency to view image ontologically as the capacity to respond to God's word (la responsorialité), so that it is on this basis alone that the image of God can be considered as permanent. The natural image and the supernatural image are thus viewed as two phases in the one history of man and his completion in Christ, the Word and Image of the Father. S. points out that it is a contemplative attitude toward the world, not a technical, utilitarian one, that is the primary source of a deep appreciation of things as vestiges of God. In his article on imperfection, Zomparelli approaches the disputed question of moral imperfection and sin by declining to solve it in legal terms of precept-counsel or obligation-nonobligation. Seeing Christian morality more as a response to the dynamism of God's call in love and grace, he holds a moral imperfection to be a venial sin because the person in determined circumstances who refuses to return love neglects a determined request addressed to him by God in love. The article "Illusions" by Derville is a helpful supplement to the current abundant literature on discernment. Other articles of interest deal with illumination, images, imitation of Christ, immortality, indifference, and indulgences.

Thomas Dubay, S.M.


The role and objectives of Catholic universities is one of the most challenging issues now confronting churchmen and educators. All the major questions are asked, and provocative and cogent responses are proposed, in this important and useful book. The need for both autonomy from the institutional Church and academic freedom is effectively argued. The centrality of theology and of Christian inspiration is vigorously advanced. Allowance is made for institutions which have a juridical bond to Church authorities, in one form or another, and those which do not. The authors are all from North America and Europe and definitely support the concept of the autonomous Catholic university free of juridical ties to the hierarchy.

A sophisticated rationale for the necessity of a univerity which "must therefore comprise a faculty of theology" is developed by Edward Schillebeeckx, O.P. Another Dominican, Norbert A. Luyten of the University of Fribourg, provides a spirited critique of those in academia who claim that a modern Catholic university is a contradiction in itself. Reflection on the current American experience in modernizing Catholic universities is thoughtfully presented by the presidents of St. Louis, Notre Dame, and Fordham. University trustees, administrators, heads of theology faculties, bishops and their educational advisors, and all persons confronted with the difficult task of restructuring the relationships between religion, theology, the Church, the magisterium, and the university community will find
this book indispensable. Missing is any evaluation of the problem from the lay constituencies of the university other than one essay in which John Cogley of the Center for Democratic Institutions states: "I do not believe the Catholic university as such has any future.”

Philip H. Des Marais


Each of these books represents only one instance of the continuing effort of each of the authors to face up to today’s crisis in the Church and to say something helpful about it. In 1968 Max Delespessse, Director of Le Centre Communautaire International in Paris, brought out *Cette communauté qu’on appelle église*, which, for all its brevity, has proved in the event to be the basic expression of the purpose and the methodology of the CCI common to both its various monographs and its periodical (*Courrier communautaire international*): the promotion of the community ideal through observations of a psychological or sociological sort which (by North American standards at least) only occasionally transcend the banal. In the present monograph, D. has collected in more or less orderly fashion some further observations, his own and others’, prompted by the programmatic synthesis of 1968. However serious the present situation of the Church may be—and there are those who argue that it is very serious indeed—there is value in having one’s attention redirected now and again to the obvious in the situation. D. here continues to provide that modest and useful service, and he does so most admirably.

*La voix de Dieu* is the second volume of a trilogy whose over-all purpose is “to rediscover the religious life”: *L’Exigence de Dieu* appeared in 1969; *La rénovation dans l’Esprit* has been announced. Here Régamey assesses with extended detail such chief issues in the renewal of religious orders as were implied in *Perfectae caritatis* and *Lumen gentium* (6) of Vatican II and in his own initial volume, which was in strict and unquestioning dependence on Council doctrine (quite as is this one). He begins with a lengthy warning that God’s voice reaches man no otherwise than distorted by the human. With that caveat riding shotgun, he then inspects the changed ways these days of looking at the world, at the Church, at oneself, and judges none of it requires a radical change in (or the disappearance of) religious life. What is required is a *metanoia*, a “change of outlook” (the etymology is R.’s own) in religious concomformable to what *Lumen gentium* has to say about Christians (all, by baptism, are called to perfection) and what Yves Congar has to say about religious (relatedness to God constitutes their very existence and hence encompasses their conduct wholly). With this disjointed yardstick—half Council, half Congar—R. takes the measure of present problems and future prospects of the religious life. Against all the probabilities, he makes a number of excellent observations in the course of doing so.

Matura’s *Célibat et communauté* (1968) was a most respectable study of the religious life from a biblical perspective. Largely systematic, it richly deserved a complement—equally knowledgeable, sagacious, and sure—
of a more practical cast. Such, preeminently, is *La Vie religieuse au tournant*. Its ambit is wide; its matter, everywhere pertinent and to the point; its history, solid, and (miracle of miracles) its sociology too; and common sense, big as a lighthouse, towers out of every page. One question, however: Why for M., as for so many others who talk or write about the religious life these days, does "community" in its purest form always mean the meaty presence of a number of people under the same roof? The answer, "theological myopia," simply won’t do any longer, because M. obviously has a mind’s eye that is in tiptop condition. Whatever the answer to that one, this splendid book is the answer for the concerned in the Church today, lay, cleric, and religious alike.

*Elmer O’Brien, S.J.*
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