BOOK REVIEWS


Lonergan's latest publication comes to us while the theological public is still attempting to absorb the fuller impacts of Method in Theology (New York, 1972). But I consider this fortunate, since this brief book does much to clarify the important new thrusts of the later L., particularly with regard to some indications of practical theological pedagogy, rather than a general, though absolutely essential, hermeneutic on method. This direction toward the more concrete becomes clear in L.'s responses to questions ranging from mysticism to process philosophy, among others.

The book is the result of three lectures given in 1972 at the inauguration of the St. Michael's Lectures at Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. After a brief introductory statement on the meaning of the terms "philosophy of God" and "systematic" (the apparent genuine quantum indicator of authenticity for any theologian worthy of the name), L. presents us with three insightful chapters: "Philosophy of God," "The Functional Specialty, Systematics," and "The Relationship between Philosophy of God and the Functional Specialty, Systematics." There is also a detailed index of some six pages.

The dominant theme is L.'s attempt (quite successful, in this reviewer's opinion) to end once and for all the unnatural split between philosophy and theology in their respective intending toward the Ultimate. Though they must remain necessarily distinct (perhaps due more to historical conditioning and development rather than, though importantly, because of material and formal object), nevertheless they should be studied as a unified whole. The dust jacket of this English edition refers to the common origin of both in religious experience; this, however, is only the tip of the iceberg. I believe that the text would show that L. aims at greater composition from the total dynamic unity of the intending subject as experiencing, understanding, judging, and deciding—in brief, the total dynamic of intellectual, moral, and religious activity.

In the first chapter, dealing with the philosophy of God, the point is well taken that "the human mind is ever the same, but the techniques it employs develop over time" (p. 1). This is amply illustrated from the viewpoint of history: enrichment of language as a shift from ordinary and literary language to technical language (Aristotle), the dangers in system as a permanent achievement (Aquinas' apparent lack of concern with necessary first principles), the static quality of inherited tradition as witnessed in fourteenth-century theologians (the Franciscan school), and
the fundamental indeterminism covered over by statistical regularities (modern science). L.'s own solution is to be found in his transcendental method (the "postsystematic differentiation of consciousness," p. 8). He also alludes to the specific property of religious differentiation of consciousness, unrestricted being-in-love, and makes important strides in distinguishing consciousness and knowing in the religious sphere. His final comments indicate some of the difficulties with the purely objective proof for the existence of God as found in chapter 19 of Insight.

His second chapter, "The Functional Specialty, Systematics," provides us with L.'s own commentary on the significance of chapters 5 and 13 of Method in Theology. The basic concern is how "the Christian religion ever allowed itself to be involved in systematic thinking" (p. 23). The answer is, of course, and can only be a gradual, historical one based upon Christianity's attempt to reflect back its original meaning. This has not always been easy, nor has it always been for the ultimate good of religion; differences of "mirroring" must be allowed for in the NT itself, the apologists, the Alexandrians, the scholastics' question-answer technique, etc.; but as L. notes so well, "the larger the scale of operations, the graver became a fresh problem" (p. 28). In brief, the problem, which even has roots reaching into the contemporary scene, was that of contradiction, a difficulty which totally engrossed the successors of Aquinas and which culminated in Melchior Cano's De locis theologicis. It is L.'s contention that "it is only on the basis of a full understanding and a complete acceptance of the developments in the contemporary notions of science, philosophy, and scholarship, that my account of the functional specialty, systematics, can be understood, let alone accepted" and that ultimately the "philosophy of God be taught by theologians in a department of theology" (p. 32). And in order to accomplish this task, the basic discipline is not a metaphysics of the Gilsonian type, but cognitional theory which will lead to a derived metaphysics. My own reaction to this type of thinking is that L. refuses to entrench himself by opposing modernity, but that it must be accepted and lived for what it truly is. The simple footpath as trod by Kant is to be expanded into a proper superhighway.

The final chapter, treating the philosophy of God and systematics in their relationship, distinguishes fundamentally between a static and dynamic viewpoint, the latter characterized by logic and the former by method. The function of logic is to clearly, coherently, and rigorously indicate deficiencies of current achievement, but "the function of method is to spell out for each discipline the implications of the transcendental precepts, Be attentive, Be intelligent, Be reasonable, Be responsible" (p. 48). This too often overlooked distinction is most
important when it comes to the construction of a system: allow system to be governed by a current (or classical) logic and one ends up in a static viewpoint; inject method and one's theology "is conceived as a reflection on the significance and value of a religion within a culture" (p. 50). Discovery and progress become viable possibilities while reflecting an original meaning.

More could be added regarding specific content, but once again L.'s concern for and use of method is piercingly apparent. He rigorously lays open the historical roots of a genuine difficulty and points to possibilities of broader horizon for greater accomplishment.

My own impression is that this book's value is not so much seminal; rather, it provides us a living commentary of the author himself. Perhaps the reader might now be able to approach the age-old question of how one joins together the God of reason and the Jesus of faith. In the classical approach this was reduced to a "leap of faith"; L. has given us an approach which bridges the gap.

I would add that this book could be profitably employed as an introductory text to L. the philosopher and theologian—a dimension which I believe is lacking in P. McShane's *Introducing the Thought of Bernard Lonergan* (London, 1973). For the contemporary student of theology this is a book of promise, not only in the sense of direction but also of actualized hope. Insight is in sight.

St. Paul Seminary, Minn. 

Jerome M. Dittberner


In recent years there has been considerable interest in renewing the role of the imagination in the enterprise of theological reflection. L. has been a formative figure in this effort, writing with a vision and voice distinctively his own, leading many persons along with his keen insights and independence of judgment. *Images of Faith*, while it resumes some motifs which have previously occupied him, turns toward an insight which has not been sufficiently developed in the discussions of theology and literature. L. proposes that we explore the internal relations between faith (theology) and imagination (literature), that we revision faith, not as something external to the life of the imagination, but as a mode of imagination itself.

This thesis of the book is immensely suggestive: "Faith is a life of the imagination; it is particularly a life of the ironic imagination, and if there is going to be a continuing collaboration between theology and literature it must be collaboration between imagination and imagination" (p. viii).
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In developing this thesis the book explores two primary issues: "What are our images of faith?" and "How does faith imagine or experience the world?" (pp. 3, 5). With a format similar to Pascal's *Pensées*, the book is as much a propaedeutic to a process of reimagining as a product of L.'s thinking; it aims more to convert the reader's sensibility than to correct his logic.

L. moves against several tendencies in the traditional theological discussions of faith. He imagines faith, not as an isolated theological virtue which leaps beyond the evidence, but "as the most primary, the most elemental force in human nature" (p. 9). Somewhat reminiscent of Erik Erikson's basic trust, L. sees faith as everywhere present in belief, promise, and fidelity, internally energizing and shaping relationships, the political order, and all forms of knowledge. And, in another important emphasis, he imagines faith, not as occurring in the purity of a vertical encounter with God, but as always embodied in the horizontal and historical life of individual and social man. "Belief in God has a body, and that body is the belief men have in each other..." (p. 57).

L.'s is an imagination of continuity; hence he wishes to establish connection among all forms of faith. The distinguishing feature of the Hebraic-Christian mode of faith, however, lies in the ironic imagination. The irony of Christ is a "distinctive paradigm or patterning of facts, a re-composing in which a fact (e.g., 'having nothing') is seen within the creative presence of a contrary ('and possessing all things')" (p. 14). The imagination of the Christian moves through the concrete detail of finite, historical reality, but it always sees with the double vision of Christic irony.

In developing these emphases, L. is in dialogue with a large number of topics and persons: e.g., Greek drama, the theology of hope, revolutionary activism, Freud, Dostoyevski, Marx, Auerbach, Cervantes, Dionysus. He is especially penetrating with literary subjects, less helpful with political topics. He attempts to expand faith into a heuristic category with political import; and while this project has merit, this book does not provide adequate development of theoretical issues.

*Images of Faith* represents not so much a contribution to theology-and-literature studies as a prologue to method in theology. L. is convinced that a proper assessment of Christian faith as a life of the imagination would dispel many of the intellectualistic problems which occupy the dichotomizing sensibility of modern theology. While I am not so sanguine as he about that possibility, his general effort to instate imagination into a proper role in theologizing is important. For instance, his reimagining of faith prompts "the question whether or not the traditional and sacrosanct idea of God that has been given to us by a long line of Christian philosophers working within the vocabulary of Aristotle is not
itself part of the problem of the overly rational images of faith” (p. 150). A recovery of the imagination may assist theology to envision other modes of theological language which resonate more deeply with present experience. Theology, while it involves the formulation of the consequences of a set of beliefs, may also become “a set of images of faith and a life of the imagination” (p. ix). This brief text, however, does not develop the consequences of this methodological suggestion, though it does provide clues for that task.

L. asks a great deal of his readers in this book. The tendency toward compression sometimes obscures the focus of the thought. The reader would be assisted by a more systematic address to notions as central to the discussions as irony and the imagination. The text, moreover, does not provide sufficient means by which to discriminate the imaginings of “good faith” from the imagining of “bad faith.” Irony is L.’s category of discrimination; yet, as he admits, there are many types of irony, perhaps many ways of construing Christic irony.

These difficulties, while they inhibit, do not remove the salutary thrust of the central motifs of the text; for the function of Lynch’s format is to ask that the reader himself become an active imaginer. The value to the book depends upon the imagination of the reader to fill in the gaps and carry on the project that the author has sketched in this series of meditations. That project, if my reading is correct, involves a fundamental, at times radical, revisioning of some of the central concerns of the theological tradition.

Le Moyne College

Ted L. Estess


As De H. aptly observes in his concluding chapter, all of Rahner’s theology is in a certain sense a prophetic theology, deeply rooted in the issues of its time, constantly responding to calls for guidance on every side, revealing in ever new ways where light and where darkness may be found in the emerging future of man. Rahner has, of course, written no major treatise on prophecy, nor is he a student of comparative religion; but many of his key essays have proven seminal for the recent recovery of the Catholic Church’s understanding of itself as a prophetic community, and since the Council he has continued to insist on the Church’s vocation to be a voice of reform for our world in transformation.

De H. examines Rahner’s contribution in a sympathetic and balanced way, leaning more towards exposition than critical interpretation. Though the article he uses most extensively in his introductory chapter is
an early one ("Priestly Existence," 1942), he proceeds in general synthetically, without special attention to chronological development. Thus we have both a general introduction to R.'s thought and also a survey of his reflections on the prophetic.

Of the book's two unequal parts, the first and longer one gives a "descriptive analysis" of R.'s approaches to prophecy, while the second discusses some of the systematic principles implied in Part 1. Beginning with an analysis of prophecy as a category of religious phenomenology, De H. sees R. presenting it most basically as "the place of a revelation of God, and thus of a new relation between God and man, established by God himself" (p. 5). André Neher saw prophecy in fact as "the forge for all revealed experience," and in his chapter on OT prophecy De H. indeed comes close to identifying it altogether with revelation. The OT is understood as containing the NT "in the mode of prophecy," fulfilled in Jesus as the prophet par excellence in whom the active, saving presence of God arrives in irreversible, personal union with His Word. (Here, as elsewhere in the book, De H.'s OT theology is largely dependent on Gerhard von Rad; it would have been instructive for him to pursue the comparison between von Rad and Rahner on the relation between the OT and the NT.)

De H. continues his exposition by highlighting the prophetic dimension in the development of the history of salvation, in Jesus as "the prospective entelechy of all history," in the Church which is founded as a community of faith through union with Jesus, and finally in the unfolding ministry of the Church through the centuries. With clarity and proportion De H. reviews major Rahnerian themes in Christology, pneumatology, and ecclesiology. He emphasizes Vatican II's view of the Church as the sacrament of the world's salvation, and some of his most effective pages present the Church as a continual creation of the Spirit whose true life and mission can never be realized in totalitarian forms. De H. teaches at the National University of Zaire in Kinshasa, and I hope that he will continue to write with fresh insight on the interplay of institutional and charismatic elements in the Church. But what he has to say here is already a valuable summary of R.'s generally more formal and heuristic reflections on the subject.

The concluding chapters discuss the philosophical and theological principles behind R.'s understanding of prophecy. Though somewhat weakly organized and repetitive, these chapters do provide a survey of R.'s thought on the function of philosophy within theology today. "The original intuition which undergirds all Karl Rahner's work is that revelation and the reflection on it which we call theology themselves give rise, as a condition for the possibility of theology, to a philosophy as an independent fundamental science, as an understanding therefore of man
by himself and beginning with himself" (pp. 195-96). What I wish De H. had analyzed more critically from a systematic perspective is the internal structure of the experience and expression of prophecy. For though he repeatedly refers to R.'s notion of symbolic mediation, the idea is less developed than the book's main theme warrants. Finally, and especially in view of De H.'s fine pages on the death and resurrection of Christ (pp. 73-84), I would add that it seems to me one-sided to characterize R.'s method in theology simply as transcendental anthroplogy (p. 271). Complementary to the anthropology within his method of transcendence there is also a principle of conversion, of trusting surrender to the Lord of life whose mysterious purposes for us are always greater than we can ever imagine. This must be recalled again and again in a world almost completely inebriated with its own secularization. It is, after all, under the cross of Christ that we struggle towards the transformation of our world. De Haes has joined Rahner as his master in forcefully reminding us for whom we speak when announcing such a hope.

Weston College School of Theology


In the Foreword Jürgen Moltmann writes: "The question about the origins of the theology of hope is something of a paradox in that it is a historical question, not an eschatological one" (p. ix). And yet, as Moltmann notes, "Even hope has its memories, for hope too is rooted in the past" (p. ix). In Moltmann's opinion, a book such as this is therefore of critical significance; for in setting forth the origins of the theology of hope, Meeks is also setting forth its basic motives, motives which dare not be forgotten because they are not yet realized even through the theology of hope itself. Meeks's purpose, then, is to explain the roots of the theology of hope, specifically the theology of Moltmann, and at the same time to give a lucid exposition of that theology, concluding with some critical reflections about the future of Moltmann's theology.

Meeks locates the context of Moltmann's theology historically in the crisis of postwar Germany and the need to create new forms of social, economic, and political justice. The intellectual context is the entire post-Enlightenment period with its dualism between the subjective and the objective. Moltmann's theological task is to heal the breach between these two poles of reality. His method is a dialectical one which seeks the reconciliation of the subjective and objective through the mediation of God's future.

In the first chapter, Meeks examines the principal forerunners of
Moltmann's thought. He finds that Barth and Bloch provided him with the conceptual framework for the renewal of theology and with the dialectical method. Meeks believes that Moltmann's vision of theology as eschatology is derived largely from his teachers Otto Weber, Hans Joachim Iwand, and Ernst Wolf. Weber put Moltmann in contact with Reformation eschatology and also with Dutch apostolate theology, especially that of J. C. Hoekendijk. Here he came to regard the Church radically as mission and found in embryo form the basic structure of the theology of hope: promise → commission → mission. Christianity is basically concerned with orthopraxis, i.e., with the transformation of the world in anticipation of and preparation for God's ultimate transformation of all things in the eschaton.

Through Iwand's influence, Moltmann came to focus on the centrality of the cross and resurrection. God is related to reality by his contradiction of the nihil, the power of death to which all reality is subjected. This contradiction is revealed in the eschatological event of the resurrection. Wolf taught Moltmann to relate an eschatological view of the Church to social ethics and directed him to the position that all theology must be ordered to serve Christianity's reconciling practice in the world.

In his second chapter, Meeks deals with the question of revelation, the mode of God's being and knowledge of God. The major influences upon Moltmann are seen to be Barth, Bloch, and von Rad. Moltmann is critical of Barth's account of revelation; for he believes that in the last analysis Barth falls back into the ontological argument, i.e., God's revelation is His essence. Moltmann, on the contrary, sees the basic structure of revelation as promise. Under the influence of von Rad, Moltmann believes that revelation can be understood only in relation to the real events of history. Hence revelation is the demonstration of God's faithfulness to His promise which has been made known in the resurrection and will be fulfilled in the eschaton. In the meantime, all knowledge of God remains hoping knowledge.

In the third chapter, Meeks discusses Moltmann's views of history and Christology. Moltmann's Christology is developed strictly within the eschatological perspective of the resurrection. The resurrection as the eschatological event of God creates history in the contradiction which it reveals between what is promised and the present reality. Since 1966, Moltmann has also developed a Christological eschatology whose locus is the cross of Christ. The God who raised Jesus from the dead also suffered with him and so identified Himself with every creature who is subjected to unrighteousness and death.

Within this perspective Meeks examines the political side of Moltmann's theology (chap. 4). The theology of hope is ultimately ordered to
praxis. The resurrection reveals the Christian mission to search for the possibilities of changing history. As Moltmann has said, "The concrete practice of Christian mission will depend on the integration of hope in the eschatological future and love which suffers the present contradictions and stands in solidarity with the oppressed" (p. 145).

Meeks concludes that Moltmann's major theological contribution has been to develop a dialectic of reconciliation which brings together the subjective and the objective, the theoretical and the practical. His only criticism is in the area of ecclesiology. Meeks fears that Moltmann has too exclusively reduced the Church to mission and contends that the Church is a community of hope as well as a mission of hope. Being with others must not be overlooked in favor of being for others. Meek would like Moltmann to explore further his recent thinking on the Church as the sacrament of hope.

Meeks has done us a service in giving us a scholarly account of the origins of Moltmann's theology as well as a lucid explanation of his theological position and of his development as a theologian. The work is clearly more expository than critical or constructive, and Meeks admits that the reader will often detect the dissertation lying behind his revised work. Nevertheless, this is a useful book for anyone interested in the roots of the theology of hope, as well as for the reader looking for a concise and clear statement of the thrust of Moltmann's theology.

Washington, D.C. 


The author, professor of systematic theology at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, sets out to correct the ancient interpretation of the Lord's Supper which presents it as an eating and drinking of Jesus. In his opinion, the NT evidence points only to an eating and drinking with Jesus. In the body of the book the three chapters answer these questions: Why, what, and how may men eat and drink with Jesus? God commands such eating and drinking as a proclamation that Jesus is the Bread and Giver of Life. The eating and drinking may include all things which are shared as an appeal to the reconciliation accomplished by Christ. This sharing is to take place in gratitude, love, and hope. Appendix 1 takes up the theme "Whether Jesus is eaten in the Lord's Supper." A response to this question was already given in chap. 2, where it is affirmed that Jesus is not eaten in the Lord's Supper. This appendix provides a more detailed and technical response.

C.'s concern to stress the ethical dimensions of the Eucharist is certainly to be applauded and is in line with many modern studies of
traditional theologians who recognize the necessity of continually bringing this aspect to the foreground. One can also find the same preoccupation in the patristic commentaries on 1 Cor 10:17 (e.g., Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Cyril of Alexandria, Augustine). This latter fact seems to have escaped C.'s notice.

Nevertheless, the book on the whole provides the opportunity to restate the Eucharistic theology of Huldreich Zwingli and to reject a Zwinglian conception of the traditional Eucharistic theology of the East and West. In the measure that Zwingli's conception of traditional Eucharistic theology is defective, it follows that this work does not really enter into dialogue with or challenge traditional belief.

In the long Appendix 1, which deals with the sacramental conception of the Eucharist, C. shows a tendency to select scholarly works which support his thesis (e.g., H. Lietzmann), and his interpretation of NT data and early sources such as the Didache and the writings of Justin Martyr leaves much to be desired. His unqualified assertion that the unique cause of the sacramental conception of the Eucharist lies in the influence of Greek mystery religions hardly warrants discussion, especially since he fails to bring into the discussion much of the relevant modern literature on the subject.

In Appendix 2, "The Case of the 'Ugly Broad Ditch,' and the Leuenberg Agreement of 1973," the theological principle which underlies the whole presentation is clearly stated. Here it is affirmed that Jesus Christ is not present through the Holy Spirit in preaching, baptism, and the Lord's Supper, since this would contradict the NT message about the unique mediation of Christ. In effect, C. feels constrained to choose between mediation of Christ and mediation of the Church in word and sacrament. He is too much influenced by the earlier K. Barth and assumes that "the accursed et" of Catholic theology (as Barth called it) represents a position which advocates two distinct and independent mediations. The subject of mediation of the Church still needs further amplification, but enough has been written on this theme in recent years to warrant a more penetrating discussion from a systematic theologian.

C.'s narrow view of mediation of the Church leads him to affirm a concept of sacrament (p. 9) and sacramentalism (p. 149) which is not a fair presentation of traditional Christian thinking. In a word, he does not come to grips with the real issues of mediation of the Church by word and sacrament as presented by orthodox Christian theology, especially as articulated in the more modern contributions.

While C. speaks often of faith, he does not work out in any depth the implications of the obedience of the faith, the exercise of the faith in word and sacrament. He does not deal, e.g., with the implications of the
self-understanding of the apostle Paul, who considers that he preaches the word of God if he witnesses to his faith. It seems clear from the NT that the exercise of the faith of the Church is the inner-worldly way by which the risen Lord remains personally present and effectively present in the Church and the world. To be sure, C. is correct when he emphasizes that the presence of the risen Lord as sharing source of the faith in his eschatological presence is fundamental to Christian life. But does not the personal presence of the Kyrios to the Church and world take place through the exercise of the faith of the Church and in different ways which correspond to the anthropological-personal content of the various expressions of the faith of the Church (e.g., in preaching and liturgical celebrations)?

This book fills a need in so far as it sheds light on the ethical demands of the Eucharist. It also offers a challenge, not to the traditional Christian understanding of the Eucharist, but rather to orthodox Christian theologians to work out in a systematic way the various modes of Christ’s presence in the Church and to show how they are ordered to one another.

Weston College School of Theology

Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.


Desiring to cast some historical-theological light on the current fluidity of attitudes regarding "intercommunion," "open communion," and "intercelebration" in the different Christian communities, H. surveys Christian attitudes and practice on the relationship between Eucharistic communion and Church unity from the NT to the end of the great theological flowering in the first half of the third century. With helpful detail H. describes the primitive Church’s attempt to Christianize the system of “excommunication” it inherited from Judaism, and its not always successful struggle to free itself of the inconsistent or non-Christian aspects of the discipline it was developing.

Historically, three major phases are uncovered: (1) the biblical-theological phase, in which the practice suggested in the Gospels is fleshed out by the pastoral concerns of Paul and the doctrinal concerns of the pastoral and catholic epistles; (2) the early patristic phase, in which the Apostolic Fathers and apologists remain, for the most part, within the parameters of the NT; (3) the first great flowering of patristic theology, when Irenaeus of Lyons, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian in North Africa, Hippolytus of Rome, Origen of Alexandria and Caesarea, and finally Cyprian of Carthage, to name the most prominent, are forced to
venture into new land in their attempt to adapt the Good News to the new theological, ecclesial, and political situations brought about by the Church's continuing theological and institutional maturation. This culminated in the Church's attempt to come to terms with the consequences of the Decian persecution. It was also in this phase that the Church became solidified in the theological views and pastoral praxis which have prevailed to the present day: Eucharistic communion, as both sign and expression of Christian unity, is to be refused to all who do not share that unity fully. It is also out of this context that H. draws some potentially relevant parallels and suggestions for current Church attitudes regarding the relationship between Eucharistic intercommunion and unity among the churches. We sincerely hope that the systematic ramifications of this question, precisely from the much-needed perspective provided by this study, will be further developed in future works.

Methodologically, H. has had to work as exegete, historian, and systematician. The fact that, under any one of these aspects, the work leaves something to be desired is more an admission of the vastness and complexity of the subject than a criticism of the author; for we are indeed indebted to H. for a much-needed and competently presented work. Ideally, however, the Judaic background should be sketched in much greater detail. The treatment of the biblical and patristic material is disappointingly thin. In a work of this nature, an extensive knowledge and control of the primary literature and judicious use of the secondary literature is essential. But some of the major NT commentaries and monographs related to this theme are not mentioned. In the patristic material, H. is too uncritical in his acceptance of information and judgments contained in the handbooks of patrology and Church history, but which have since been corrected in the secondary literature, or which the careful scholar, on reading the primary text, would have corrected himself. Examples of this are an overly uncritical acceptance of Eusebius as a source of historical information and an acceptance of the imprecise patrology-handbook identification of the logikē thysia with Justin's theology of the Eucharist. Also, since this reviewer does not feel that scholarship has yet to come to terms with J. Grotz's Die Entwicklung des Bussstufenwesens... (Freiburg, 1955), it was disappointing to find H. giving the nod, without much supporting comment, to K. Rahner's side of the debate. It is also disappointing that M. Fahey's Cyprian and the Bible (Tübingen, 1971) was apparently published too late to be of use in this study.

Finally, on the level of higher method (hermeneutics), this reviewer is not wholly satisfied that H. has allowed the texts, especially the earlier ones, to speak for themselves out of their own context rather than out of
H.'s modern, systematic context. But this weakness (if it is indeed one) does not prevent him from effectively depicting the fact and significance of Cyprian's dramatic change of position, following the instructions of the Roman church, from an almost absolute rigorism to a fairly generous policy of reaccepting repentant apostates into full (i.e., Eucharistic) communion. Since this change tended to make a shambles of Cyprian's ecclesiology, it represents one of the earliest, and certainly one of the more striking, instances in Church history when the pastoral principle took precedence over theological conviction.

Boston College

ROBERT J. DALY, S.J.


The opening words give us to understand that this is all we can hope for of the promised history down to Alexander of which I was privileged to review the first massive instalment in TS 33 (1972) 748-50. An author index to that volume, as I there urged, is here included. Otherwise we find practically a "special introduction" to a single book of the Bible, a mostly literary analysis in comparison with its far-ranging predecessor. Though the preface is signed by Père R. Tournay as director of the École Biblique, he seems to credit the decipherment and minimal completion of the manuscript to F. Langlemet.

"The Twelve-Tribe System" is the theme of the first half, largely a dialogue with the classic treatise of Martin Noth. Rejection of his amphictyony had already been published by de Vaux in Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971) 415–36. He makes clear (here p. 25) that so Greekish a term would not be a priori inept for describing a Semitic usage, though he furnishes parallels from a more East Semitic background (p. 55) which he rightly considers more intriguing. But we are still pained that p. 25 ignores the fact that six rather than twelve was the number of Israel's two amphictyonies for Noth. The definition and spirit of our Greek term is inescapably fulfilled by Israel's autonomous tribes grouped around a central sanctuary. It is irrelevant whether the site of the sanctuary shifts, or whether the proximate outrage calling the mutual-defense pact into play is itself of religious character (pace p. 36).

Fascinating nevertheless is de Vaux's own bold effort on p. 62 to reconstruct what historical reality lies behind "the twelve tribes," an expression surprisingly found only three times in the whole Hebrew Bible: Ex 28:21, 39:14, and (alone with "of Israel" added) 24:4. Asher, Naphtali, and Gad were clans of nomads settled in Canaan around 1900 B.C. They never went down into Egypt, nor did Dan, a latecomer in the tribal system. These are all peripheral and thus fittingly described as
descended from Jacob’s concubines. Zebulon and Issachar also never went down into Egypt, but their proximity to the Shechem plundered by Simeon and Levi (Gn 34:25) earns Leah-status for them. Father of the Rachel tribes was originally an “Israel” distinct from Jacob. The Josephids, with whom Benjamin is linked, were undoubtedly in Egypt; but there are also hints of some Leah groups like Reuben and Simeon there. What is most noticeable in this assured and plausible analysis is its indifference to Judah, recognized to be largely Ken(izz)ite. The first unity was of Ten tribes, without Judah(-Simeon); thus Noth’s double amphictyony is granted some status on p. 64, chiefly by the concession that uniting of North and South was a temporary convenience, hardly anterior to Saul.

The main further originality of this work lies in its proofs that the proper Judges were the “minor” ones, to whom is assigned with Noth a fixed lifetime office. The charismatic heroes whose “executing of God’s judgments” constitutes the main interest of the biblical book (with no provable relation to the context or sequence in which they occur, p. 87) furnish valuable but obscure data on how the biblical people really originated.

Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome

Robert North, S.J.


This book is intended not for scholars but for nonprofessionals equipped with a basic knowledge of the Synoptic Gospels. What it provides is a more detailed study of Matthew according to the method of “composition-criticism.” By this the author means a method that gives greater emphasis to the study of Matthew in terms of Matthew, i.e., to the Gospel as a complete literary whole, than to the horizontal comparison with the parallel Synoptic traditions. I am very sympathetic to his emphasis on the over-all composition.

One’s reaction to this study, however, will depend to a large extent on whether E.’s presuppositions can be accepted. He explains them in the first part of the book, entitled “Rabbinic Matthew” (pp. 3–25). I agree with his opinion that the Evangelist was a converted Jewish rabbi, that the audience was largely Jewish Christian, that the Gospel was written as a reaction to the Judaism of Jamnia, and that the Evangelist’s sources were Mark, Q, and M. But I have some serious reservations about his description of “Matthew’s Methodology” (pp. 8–25).

E. accepts the “five-book” structure of Matthew. He stresses the alternation between narrative and discourse, focusing attention not only on the five major discourses but also on the discourse of John the Baptist
(3:8–12) and the final commission to the disciples (28:16–20). The result is a sevenfold structure, with the different parts balanced in a neat chiastic arrangement. I do not find this structural analysis convincing. The alternation of narrative and discourse is one of the criteria that must be considered, but others include geographical and temporal movement, the flow of the narrative, dominant themes, summary statements, formulae, etc. All this evidence must be taken into consideration. I especially fail to see how the words of John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees (3:8–12) can be singled out as a structural indicator and balanced with the commission Jesus gives to his eleven disciples (28:16–20).

E. goes on to develop his chiastic arrangement by showing that the five major discourses (cc. 5–7, 10, 13, 18, 23–25) are Matthean compositions, deliberately balanced in length and in subject matter. They all depart from a saying or event in Mark. The narrative sections serve the discourses to such an extent that they display the same literary characteristics, the same themes, and the same attitudes as the discourses. Their main function is to prepare the way for the discourses.

There can be no doubt that Matthew intended to highlight the five major discourses. They contain the nucleus of Jesus' positive teaching. But it seems exaggerated to reduce the narratives to such a secondary role in the over-all composition. As I have indicated elsewhere (CBQ 33 [1971] 365–88), the composition of Mt 8:1–9:34 is more integral to the Evangelist's initial portrayal of Jesus as “teaching in their synagogues and preaching the gospel of the kingdom and healing every disease and every infirmity among the people” (4:23) than it is to the following instructions to the disciples (10:1–42).

E. claims that Matthew presents his Gospel in a series of concentric circles, i.e., he returns “at regular intervals to the same fundamental themes under different forms, from different aspects, and with additional light on matters of detail” (p. 19). The image is that of ripples moving out from an object dropped in water. The themes come together in the final commission (28:16–20). So E. names ten themes from this passage and proceeds to indicate where they are found in the five major discourses. It is not easy to establish controllable criteria for such thematic connections. So some of them are not all that convincing. How, e.g., do the sayings in Mt 10:27, 18:3, and 24:45–51 express the theme “the authority of Jesus” (p. 80)? I also question whether Matthew selected and arranged his material to create such a concentric-circle presentation. Such an explanation ignores once again the importance of the narrative sections, in which the major themes are also articulated and which give the Gospel a linear, dramatic movement more comparable to a symphony or a tapestry than to a series of concentric circles.
E. entitles the second part of his book "Meticulous Matthew" (pp. 27-98). In it he studies the Gospel section by section, following the presuppositions and literary techniques he has identified as Matthean. For each section he names such characteristics as numerical arrangements, OT citations, the use of inclusion-conclusion, the development of concentric-circle themes, chiastic arrangements, the use of Mark's Gospel as a departure point, etc. He then goes on to discuss how each part functions in relation to other sections of the Gospel. In spite of my disagreements with his analysis of the over-all composition and his division of the text, I find E.'s discussion of the purpose and function of a particular section filled with many helpful insights.

True to his presupposition about Matthew's concentric-circle presentation, E. uses Mt 28:18-20 as a guide to his discussion of "Theological Matthew" (pp. 99-155). His discussion of Christology is limited to the titles Messiah, Son of God, and Son of Man. For each he presents the background, its use by Matthew, and the reasons why the Evangelist used it. The treatment of Matthew's ecclesiology is organized around the Jews' rejection of Jesus, Jesus' rejection of pseudo Israel, the Church as the true Israel, and the leaders of the true Israel. A special section is devoted to the primacy of Peter, and another to the apostle's work in the world. In many ways this is the most satisfying part of the book. E.'s presentation is well suited to his intended audience. He seems, however, to impose later dogmatic categories on the Gospel evidence when he discusses the ontic connotations of the title Son of God (pp. 110-11) and the primacy of Peter and his successors in the Church (pp. 125-34).

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago

William G. Thompson, S.J.


"In response to a world out of joint, the gospel narrates an elaborate explanation" (p. 144). With these words K. concludes his analysis of Mark's Gospel. If the analysis is correct, it is indeed an elaborate explanation. I will state K.'s thesis as simply as possible. The Gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. Its purpose was to bring a new orientation of time and place to the Christian survivors of that devastating experience. It does this by returning to the beginning, to the life and ministry of Jesus in Galilee, and by showing that the kingdom has arrived in that Galilean ministry. It is only by returning now to Galilee, relegating Jerusalem and its form of Christianity to the past, that the Christians will experience the parousia of the Lord. The Christians "will not reach the New Jerusalem unless they make the journey over again from the beginning to its tragic ending in the old city.
of Jerusalem. Then, but only then, if they begin at the beginning, will it
dawn on them that the end of Jerusalem was but the beginning of the
period preceding the End” (p. 147). It was this situation and this concern
to cope with the situation that gave rise to the Gospel genre as
represented in Mark’s composition.

K. provides a painstaking analysis of the various sections of the Gospel
to support his thesis. The message of Jesus as summarized by Mark
(1:15) announces the realization of the kingdom and the call to repent of
the old tradition represented by the Jewish-Christian way of life. “The
mystery speech (4:1–34) is born out of the Markan experience of a
present not holding what the Kingdom promised to bring” (p. 41). But
present suffering is normal and will be replaced by liberation. In the
section 4:35–8:21 there is postulated a Jewish-Christian church, tracing
itself back to Jesus through his family, with Peter at its head, which is
seen by Mark as much an opponent of the kingdom as the “Jewish power
structure” (p. 64). Mark’s decided preference for Galilee, already noted
by Marxsen, must also be seen as linked to his opposition to a Jerusalem
Christianity. Peter’s confession (8:29) is false and is replaced by the
suffering, rising Son of Man. The disciples, like Peter, continually
misunderstand and will eventually perish like the Jerusalem church. In
the precise center of the Gospel, giving meaning to the whole, is the
transfiguration which is the “experience of an imminent parousia hope”
(p. 85). Jesus’ exploits in Jerusalem (11:1–25) announce the collapse of
that brand of Christianity. Similarly, the eschatological discourse
(13:1–37) announces the destruction of Jerusalem as the place of
messianic and eschatological hope. The parousia faith of the false
Christian prophets has come to an end. Finally, the crisis had come
because the kingdom had been expected at a false time and in a false
place. “According to Mark, more than forty years ago Galilee had been
designated by Jesus to be the center of life” (p. 139). It is the new place
and now, after the collapse of Jerusalem and all it stood for, is the new
time when the kingdom will be ushered in.

It is a fascinating thesis ingeniously argued in well-written form. But it
is far too elaborate. One has the impression while reading that the
conclusions are often dictated more by the hypothesis than by the
evidence. My copy of the book is studded with question marks. These are
a few. Is it true that the Baptist’s death, placed between the disciples’
departure and return, suggests that “As the death of the forerunner
coincided with the apostolic commission, so will the death of Jesus
himself give birth to this new, apostolic community in Galilee” (p. 54)?
In the walking on the waters (6:45–52), does Mark intend to present
Jesus, not as a wonderworker “but as the unifier who calmed the storm in
order to secure the passage to the Gentiles” (p. 58)? Is sexual parallelism intended in Jesus showing concern for a man in the east (5:1–20) and two women in the west (5:21–43), and later for two women (7:24–30) and a man (7:32–37), in order to emphasize the theme of ethnic unity (p. 61)? These are baldly put and do not reflect all the evidence adduced by K., but they do reflect my reaction after reading the evidence. It is not the analysis of the individual pieces that is so troubling as the attempt to make them fit into the larger thesis. Finally, if this “elaborate explanation” really was intended by Mark, who, could he hope, would have been able to grasp it? There is an excellent bibliography and indexes of authors and Scripture references.

Mt. St. Mary’s of the West, Norwood, Ohio  EUGENE H. MALY


With a foreword by D. Mollat of the Gregorian University and a preface thanking I. de la Potterie of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, this work seems to be a Roman dissertation somewhat rewritten for a broader audience. The audience change is suggested by the rather simple introductory material interspersed throughout, e.g., information on how the historical books of the OT were composed and on the limitations of patristic exegesis.

The first hundred pages attempt to prove the unity of John’s Prologue against the majority opinion of modern commentators. Discovering Johannine style and vocabulary throughout, P. concludes that the whole Prologue is Johannine. Unfortunately, his argumentation envisages too few alternative possibilities; for, even if granted, it excludes only (a) a non-Johannine poem glossed by a Johannine writer and (b) a Johannine poem glossed by a non-Johannine redactor. It does not face the possibility of a Johannine school of writers, employing much the same vocabulary and style. When on p. 41 P. speaks of “the writings [plural] of the fourth Evangelist,” he ignores the likelihood that the epistles are by a different Johannine writer than the author of most of the Gospel, and that the Gospel itself may be composite, with large additions by a Johannine redactor. If one takes the data P. gives, e.g., that the Logos of the Prologue never appears in the Gospel as a title or description of Jesus, and that skênoun, plêrês, and charis of v. 14 and plërôma of v. 16 do not recur in John, one may well ask whether there are not enough significant differences to suggest that, although it is a Johannine writing, the Prologue may have been composed by another writer in the school, different from the main author of the Gospel. And concluding from the very obvious difference of poetic style in vv. 1–5 (with frequent “staircase
parallelism” where the main term in the latter part of one line is taken up at the beginning of the next line) and vv. 6–8 (where this feature does not occur at all), one has stylistic support for the thesis that the sudden introduction of John the Baptist is an insertion by a Johannine writer other than the poet who composed the body of the Prologue. P. does not satisfactorily meet these real difficulties against unity.

P. does discuss the format and structure of the Prologue as an argument for unity, but he relies on the intricate structural theory of chiasm and concentric circles so characteristic of the “Roman school” of Johannine exegesis, influenced by de la Potterie. (I cannot even try here to explain to the reader the complicated graph and analysis on pp. 97–99.) One would have to debate P.’s structural arguments point by point. For instance, he finds a major inclusion between 1:1 (ho logos en pros ton theon) and 1:18 (monogenês huīos ho ōn eis ton kolpon tou patros), where I can see some theological similarity but no similarity of word or structure. Yet he neglects what is to me a more obvious and basic parallelism between 1:1 (theos en ho logos) and 1:14 (ho logos sarx egeneto), a parallelism which would raise a question of whether 1:14 (and not 1:18) is an ending matching the beginning in 1:1, and thus challenge the unity of the Prologue. I have studied de la Potterie’s own writings, as well as other dissertations coming out of Rome, which follow this elaborate structural approach, and I remain completely unconvinced. (I stress “elaborate” because there are obvious simple chiasms in John.) It gives me some encouragement that such analysis does not seem to be gaining many followers elsewhere and that it has been challenged in detail (L. J. Topel, “A Note on the Methodology of Structural Analysis in Jn 2,23–3,21,” CBQ 33 [1971] 211–20).

P.’s attempt (unsuccessful, in my opinion) to establish the unity and structure of the Prologue is important for his thesis. He maintains that 1:14a (“The Word became flesh”) is not the climax of the Prologue, as Bultmann would maintain; and neither is 1:14c (“And we have seen his glory”), as Käsemann has argued. Rather it is 1:17(-18), to the exposition of which the main part of the book is dedicated. Leaving aside that point, one can still use P.’s work to test whether 1:17 fits into Johannine theology, as contrasted with Bultmann’s thesis that it reflects a “Pauline” view of law and grace. P. does a competent job of showing that 1:17 exemplifies a general Johannine theology of revelation, so that while the law is a true gift of God and genuine revelation, it is outranked by Jesus, who is the supreme gift and a revelation himself. P. demonstrates that the main similes for the law appearing in the early Jewish literature and Qumran are applied by John to Jesus. The stress on revelation fits the incarnation theme of the Prologue, since the incarnation of the Logos is in Johannine thought an indispensable condition for
the perfect and total revelation of God. (Pace P., the harmony of 1:17 with the theology of the rest of the Prologue does not require unity of authorship, if one posits a Johannine redactor with the same theological outlook as the author.) P. argues well that the charis kai alêtheia of 1:17 reflect the OT combination ḫesed we'emet, but I am less certain of his attempt to give alêtheia the meaning of revealed truth that it has elsewhere in John (notice the title of the book). This is the only example of these combined nouns and the only clear example of the ḫesed we'emet background, a fact which has caused many to give it almost a pure OT meaning of "fidelity, endurance," as distinct from the common Gospel usage; but that is another argument against unity of authorship.

P. writes clearly, has done much Johannine and general biblical research, and knows the literature. He tends to rely far more heavily on Johannine research in French than on Johannine research in German, thus losing a bit of the "cutting edge" of Johannine questions. Occasionally he lapses into uncritical language, e.g., on p. 120 (cf. p. 291), when he has John penetrating the "Trinitarian" life—unless he wishes to propose that John already thought of the Trinity. His work is useful, but it needs tightening and could have profited as a dissertation by challenges from another school of thought.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. Raymond E. Brown, S.S.
Woodstock College, N.Y.C.


As a reworked doctoral dissertation, written under C. K. Barrett, Durham University, 1969, this book aims to use "the results from a detailed study of Luke's treatment of the Gentile theme to assess modern approaches to the interrelated problems of the theology and historical reliability of Luke-Acts" (p. xi). This bare, one-sentence statement of his purpose in the Preface is the sole indication given by W. of the problem to which he addresses himself in the book. It lacks an introduction or an initial positing of the problem which might clarify what he is about. Instead, he plunges in medias res and discusses Jesus and the Gentiles (chap. 1), the Gentiles in Luke's Gospel (2), Lucan eschatology (3), the early chapters of Acts (4), Stephen and the Hellenists (5), Paul's conversion (6), Cornelius and the apostolic council (7), Paul's speech on the Areopagus (8), and Jewish and Gentile missions (9). The final chapter, a summary and conclusions, relates the detailed study of the Gentile theme to the problem of Lucan theology and historical reliability.
In each chapter W. surveys the NT evidence concerning the Gentiles and enters into debate with major modern interpreters of it. Many of his insights are well founded. His coverage of secondary literature is quite adequate and his criticisms usually telling.

W. concludes from his study that Jesus did not envisage “a historical Gentile mission,” because, since he believed that the Parousia was imminent, his “eschatological expectations logically disallowed it” (p. 28). Jesus, however, “maintained a positive hope for the Gentiles,” that the influx of them would “be effected only by an apocalyptic act of God and not by a historical Gentile mission” (p. 152). But by the time Mark wrote, a significant change had taken place: the Gentile mission became a historical process to be completed before the end-time (cf. Mk 10:45, 14:24, 12:1-9). Now Luke in his Gospel went further and severed the eschatological connection implicit in the Marcan view. In 14:16–24 and 24:47 Luke linked the Gentile mission to the Spirit and to the fulfilment of prophecy; the mission has thus become an integral part of God’s plan, and this prepares for his narrative in Acts.


In Acts 1–2 (especially in the commission [1:6–8], Ascension [1:9–11], election of Matthias [1:15–16], and Pentecost [2:1–2]) W. finds traces of the early community’s conviction about the Gentiles which is similar to Jesus’ own apocalyptic view of them. Indeed, this accounts for its slowness, even reluctance, to initiate the mission. Moreover, the Stephen episode, linked to a rift in the Jewish-Christian Jerusalem community (Acts 6), was not the beginning of the Gentile mission, since it contains no hint of a turning to the Gentiles (p. 135), but rather marked the Church’s movement away from the Jews. And the immediate sequel to Stephen’s death was persecution, with the ensuing missionary work among Gentiles being initially haphazard, as scattered Hellenists preached at first to Jews and Samaritans (cf. 8:4,14,25; 9:2).

Paul’s conversion, however, and call to be an apostle to the Gentiles were first strategically recounted by Luke, as the narrative of the Gentile mission really began. Luke recounted Paul’s conversion three times over (chaps. 9, 22, 26), just as he recounted that of Cornelius twice (chaps. 10, 11), to emphasize the importance of these episodes; for the account of Cornelius’ conversion and that of the so-called apostolic council serve to authorize the Gentile mission explicitly in Luke’s narrative. “Ch. 15
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forms a watershed in ... Acts” (p. 192); for Jerusalem ceases thereafter
to dominate the scene, and Paul and his Gentile mission take over. The
mission is clearly related to the Spirit’s guidance of the early Church
(10:44–45; 11:15; 15:8,28), and Paul’s speech on the Areopagus (17:22–31)
stresses the Lucan view that the Gentiles’ pre-Christian religiosity was
their “first stage on the way to salvation” (p. 218). Finally, W. analyzes
various Lucan programmatic statements in Acts (2:39; 3:25–26;
13:46–48; 15:14–17; 18:6) and the conclusion (28:26–28), which reveal the
relation of missions to the Jews to those to the Gentiles.

On the basis of this detailed study of the Gentile passages in
and a historian. Essentially he insists that “the description of Luke’s
approach to the Gentiles as ‘theological’ is misleading, for the most
striking characteristic of Luke-Acts is precisely the lack of any consistent
theology of the Gentiles” (p. 239). Though there are several themes
related to the Gentiles in the Lucan writings, they do not constitute a
consistent theology. A comparison of Luke and Paul in this matter shows
that “whereas Paul has a theology of the Gentiles, Luke has not” (p.
252). Scholars tend to agree that Luke is a theologian, but W. comes to
precisely the opposite conclusion: “We have found that the one thing
Luke is not, is a theologian” (p. 255). On the contrary, he defends Luke’s
“historical reliability” on several scores, admitting that though Luke has
mistaken things or wrongly attributed ideas or sayings to Jesus or the
early community, he “wanted to write history,” history with a message
for his contemporaries. “He was interested primarily in practical and not
in ‘theological’ problems” (p. 267).

In a detailed study such as this there are naturally many minor points
in which one would not agree with the author (e.g., his discussion of the
Hellenists might have benefited from the views of C. F. D. Moule,
Expository Times 70 [1958–59] 100–101, which he cites). But the detail of
the discussion at times is overwhelming, distracting, and revelatory of its
dissertation origin. The weakest chapter in the book is the first, on Jesus
and the Gentiles, wherein his methodology is not disclosed and some­
what naive assertions are made about the authenticity of sayings
attributed to Jesus. But the real problem in the book is met in chap. 10,
wherein W. sought to test the relationship between Luke the historian
and Luke the theologian on the basis of his detailed study of Gentile
was trying to uncover what W. means by “theology.” “The word
‘theology’ is used here as the most convenient way of distinguishing this
section [entitled “The Theology of the Gentiles”] from the next, which is
concerned chiefly with the historical question. As will become apparent,
the description of Luke’s approach to the Gentiles as ‘theological’ is misleading, for the most striking characteristic of Luke-Acts is precisely the lack of any consistent theology of the Gentiles” (p. 239). If, however, one analyzes the first sentence in this quotation, “theology” means only “nonhistory.” So to deny that there is a consistent theology in Luke-Acts is to affirm that there is no nonhistory (at least as far as the Gentiles are concerned). In fact, W. tends at times to equate “theology” with Tendenz, being partly influenced by the German scholars with whom he has been in dialogue. Perhaps in this sense he is at times correct. But is that the only meaning for a NT writer’s “theology”? To deny, as W. does, that Luke is a theologian is untenable. He means it, of course, in his own sense; and in this he shares the malaise that surrounds a certain form of Lucan study today. It has little room for a positive understanding of the “theology” that Luke does have. The result is that this book is not the last word on Luke’s treatment of the Gentiles.

Finally, a word should be said about W.’s writing. Apart from a host of solecisms in English style, he has the frustrating habit of naming a NT passage (e.g., Mt 8:11 on p. 3), without quoting it in full or telling the reader what its content is, and diving immediately into a detailed discussion of it. He thus forces the reader to stop, pull out his NT text, and find out what he is talking about. This is all too frequent, and unpardonable.

Weston College School of Theology

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Every NT interpreter who has wrestled with Romans undoubtedly dreams of the day when he will produce a thorough commentary on that difficult, yet all-important Christian writing. Käsemann, who has recently retired from university teaching at Tübingen, has crowned his lengthy exegetical career with this significant commentary on Paul’s greatest heritage to the Christian Church. Of it Käsemann says: “No literary document has been for me more important” (Preface, p. iii).

As might be expected, K.’s commentary is different from others. Though it appears in the now-famous HNT series, it is not only not a revision of the succinct, yet highly-esteemed commentary on Romans by Hans Lietzmann, which it replaces in the series, but it is almost twice the size of the latter and departs from it radically in conception and interpretation. The series is well known for its commentaries on NT writings from a history-of-religions viewpoint; its concise notes are usually replete with references to interesting parallels to the words, phrases, ideas, and theology of NT writers. Though K. does utilize some
new comparative material (e.g., from Qumran literature), his commentary is more discursive and debates not only Paul's meaning but recent interpretations of it. The result: it is much more like the commentary of O. Michel in the Meyerkommentar series. K.'s commentary is also different from other commentaries in that its introductory section consists solely of a two-page outline of Romans and a seven-and-a-half-page bibliography (a one-page list of commentaries consulted and an alphabetical list of important secondary literature in books and periodicals). Thus, K. devotes no introductory space to questions of authorship, date or place of composition, the occasion and purpose of Romans, its audience, a synthesis of its theology, or text-critical problems. Such preliminary questions seem to be of little importance to him, and he admits that his emphasis falls on “what Paul meant theologically” (p. iii). Obviously, a few of these questions come in for some discussion in the course of the commentary, which follows the outline provided, and for each section provides a fresh translation (in boldface), special bibliography on the matter of the section (in fine print), and an extensive discussion of the passage. There are no footnotes, but brief references to scholarly debates (set in parentheses within the text) reveal that K. has coped with much of the vast literature on Romans. Again, K.'s commentary is different from others in that it has no indexes whatever.

There are many excellent points of view expressed in this commentary. I was very happy to see the way K. divides up the letter, making 1:16-17 its theme and making its major breaks at 3:20, 4:25, 8:39; 11:36, and 15:13 (with 16:1-27 as an appendix). He thus comes out firmly for the close connection of chap. 5 with chap. 8 and regards 3:21-26 as the main thesis of the letter (explaining, in effect, the theme of 1:16-17). I was also glad to see his verdict about the appendix (chap. 16), that it is Pauline (p. 390), that it should be regarded as separate from Romans itself (p. 399), and that with the “greatest probability” it was originally destined for Ephesus. It is also good to see his support for the interpretation of paresis (3:25) as “pardon” (Erlass), nothing more than a synonym of aphasis.

But there are places where K. has slanted Paul’s meaning in one direction, when his translation (and his commentary) should have left the matter as vague as Paul’s text. Thus, with Luther, K. introduces “allein” into his translation of 3:28: “(allein) durch Glauben” (p. 94). This is, of course, a good NT phrase; but ironically enough, it is found in the Epistle of Straw (Jas 2:24). To introduce that into Romans is at least questionable, given the relation of these two letters and the historical controversy that has surrounded them. Similarly, in 5:13 Paul writes: “But sin is not counted where there is no law” (ouk ellogueitai); but K. translates: “Doch wird Sünde ohne vorhandenes Gesetz nicht (besond-
ers) verbucht.” The adverb “especially” in the parentheses is unwarranted; it mollifies the Pauline statement. And I fail to find the justification for it in K.’s comments on the text.

There are obviously many points in a commentary like this that will please and displease the critical reader, and it may be wise to concentrate further remarks on some of the bigger issues in it. One of these is the interpretation that K. gives of dikaiosynē theou, “the righteousness of God.” He had treated the notion earlier in an article which is part of his *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia, 1969) pp. 168–82. It is given a more exegetical treatment in his comments on 1:16–17 (the theme). K. rightly insists on its forensic and relational aspect, rejects its interpretation as vindictive justice (*Strafgerechtigkeit*, p. 22), and goes so far as to say that it denotes not primarily God’s bounty but His power. K. equates dikaiosynē theou with dynamis and with doxa. In a sense he is right; for he is trying to express Paul’s idea of God’s righteousness in a way that seems favorable to the Pauline text and also free of the historical controversy that has surrounded it since the Reformation. Rightly, he sees that God’s righteousness cannot be so explained by His bounty that the legal connotation is neglected. To equate His righteousness with His power has interesting connotations, but it also brings with it some problems; for if God’s righteousness = His power = His glory, what then are we to conclude when Paul says that “Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father” (Rom 6:4), or that he “lives by the power of God” (2 Cor 13:4)? I cannot imagine Paul admitting that Jesus’ resurrection was a manifestation of God’s righteousness. In this discussion, one wonders in what capacity K. writes. The equation mentioned above is not the result of exegesis; it is the systematic theologian who is at work. True, in God His righteousness, power, and glory are all one (from a systematic point of view); but are they such in Pauline usage? I find little difficulty in the equation of power and glory; but to equate righteousness with them and pretend that that is Paul’s meaning is another matter. But there is another aspect of this interpretation which is seen in K.’s translation of 5:19. Paul says: “As by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by one man’s obedience many will be made righteous” (RSV)—in both parts of the verse Paul uses the passive of kathistanai. K. translates, however: “Denn wie durch den Ungehorsam des einen Menschen die Vielen zu Sündern gemacht wurden, werden erst recht die Vielen durch des Einen Gehorsam als Gerechte dargestellt werden” (p. 130). K. explains (p. 148) that kathistanai means “to make someone something.” And one would think that God’s righteousness = power were really at work. But then why the two different translations of the same verb in 5:19a and b? Why not “als
It seems that K. has not thought through fully enough the implications of his ideas on the righteousness of God.

Implied in the foregoing criticism is a more basic one that confronts the reader of this commentary. For all its thorough discussion of the problems in the Pauline text, for all its precious insights into many individual passages, it inevitably raises the question of K.'s own purpose in this commentary. He has renounced the discussion of introductory problems, departed from the history-of-religions approach that characterized the series previously, and fails to state in his preface the perspective that he has adopted. Though he discusses the opinions of many commentators, who would share with him the emphasis that should be put on "what Paul meant theologically," the end result is that he writes much more as a systematic theologian than as an interpreter of Paul. Or rather, he comments on Paul's text of Romans with the concern of a systematician. Not that this is something bad; it is not. But it ought to be made clear what the perspective is in the approach to Romans.

K.'s prose is never easy to understand, and this commentary is no exception to that. At times his sentences are unclear and they are not helped by the lengthy references to secondary literature in parentheses in the middle of them. Is there any reason why paragraphs have to run at times for two pages or more? These are perhaps reactions of an Anglo-Saxon to German technical prose; but they are mentioned in the hope that future writings will consider these problems for sweet clarity's sake.

K.'s writings have always been controversial, and this commentary will not prove to be an exception. With it all, it remains a remarkable synthesis of K.'s understanding of Romans; whether one agrees with him or not, one cannot disregard him or his interpretation of Paul.


With this volume, B. completes his contributions to the Harper series of NT commentaries, a series that has included his commentaries on Rom and on 1 Cor. Readers of his previous works will find in the present book the same meticulous scholarship and clarity of exposition that have consistently characterized B.'s writings. In format, the book follows that of the previous commentaries in providing an extended and quite adequate introduction to the background of the epistle, the circumstances of its composition, its literary characteristics, and its theology. The author's original translation is found in boldface type at the
beginning of each section, with the verse-by-verse commentary following.

It is principally in the Introduction, in his discussion of the unity of the epistle, that B. makes his most distinctive contribution to the interpretation of 2 Cor. While generally giving ample attention to contrary views, B. rejects the theories that would see the epistle as we now have it as a composite of parts of several Pauline letters. His arguments are quite convincing for seeing no radical break in thought after 2:13, but rather a quite typical example of Pauline theological digression. But B. is on less safe ground when he also regards 6:14–7:1 as integral to the original letter rather than a later interpolation. He fails to explain why Paul, even as a digression, would insert the thought of these verses precisely in this place, where it so obviously interrupts the train of thought that, even in Paul's choice of words, continues from 6:13 to 7:2. Nor does he take sufficiently into account the arguments that have connected the passage, in thought, vocabulary, and style, to the Qumran writings. True, B. does refer the reader to articles he has previously published on these questions, but at least a summary of his arguments might have strengthened his position in this commentary, and would certainly have made it clearer to his readers. Similarly, while B. makes a good case for seeing chap. 8, on the collection, as being integral to 2 Cor, he is less convincing in arguing that chap. 9 is a natural continuation of 8. The differences between the chapters, in the opinion of this reviewer, continue to be unresolved.

Only in regard to chaps. 10–13 does B. admit the composite nature of the epistle. And even in this much-discussed question, B.'s solution is distinctive. He concedes that these chapters were originally part of a distinct letter but, unlike the majority of commentators who hold this view, he does not see the chapters as part of the "severe letter" referred to in 7:8. Rather, he considers them part of a letter that Paul wrote to Corinth after he had received Titus' report in Macedonia and had sent the letter that was composed of 2 Cor 1–9. As B. reconstructs the events, Titus gave an overly optimistic report on the fundamental state of the Corinthian church, and this occasioned Paul's favorable response in the early chapters of the present epistle. But soon afterwards the troubles in the church flared up again, and even more dangerously than before, as Paul's enemies, the "false apostles" of 11:13, gained the upper hand. Chaps. 10–13 were then written by Paul from Macedonia to deal with this situation. This effort, and Paul's subsequent visit to Corinth, were presumably successful, though nothing in Paul's writings assures us of this.

This reconstruction is ingenious, but it goes too far beyond the available evidence to be acceptable. Apart from explaining why, in the
present form of the epistle, 10–13 were placed after 1–9 (they were written later), B.'s interpretation is almost completely subjective. There is surely no objective evidence that Titus misjudged the situation in Corinth (p. 21). And it is only speculation to suppose that the difficulties in Corinth immediately after the writing of 1 Cor were really not as serious as has been assumed, and that Paul's hastening on from Troas to meet Titus was occasioned not so much by his concern for the situation in the Corinthian church as by his anxiety for the collection money that Titus was bringing through bandit-ridden territory (p. 20). Even more subjective must be any attempt to reconstruct what Paul said to Titus or Titus to Paul at their meeting (pp. 20–21). It is really no clarification of the muddled events in Corinth to provide us with yet another episode in the history of that troubled church, especially when there is no objective evidence that the episode ever took place, and yet another letter of Paul to deal with this supposed episode.

These criticisms should not be allowed to detract from the over-all excellence of B.'s work. His analysis of “Theology at Corinth” (pp. 36–50), though brief, is masterly. The same must be said of his analysis of Paul's relationship to the church in Jerusalem, and of the nature, status, and aims of trouble-making, quasi-Judaizing opponents of Paul in Corinth. His account of the importance of the collection for the Jerusalem Christians in Paul's thought and strategy is succinct and lucid.

B.'s translation of the epistle is invariably quite good. It is clear and highly readable, an achievement that is all the more impressive in view of B.'s avowed purpose of staying as close to the Greek idiom as English allows. Difficulties in the text, and nuances that cannot be reflected in the translation, are amply discussed in the commentary. B. is very careful to clarify both grammatical and vocabulary usages, establishing his points by his own incisive argumentation and by reference to a quite broad spectrum of modern authors. His discussion is eminently fair to opposing views.

This is also true of the commentary itself. B. makes extensive use of all the major writings on 2 Cor, including the pertinent periodical literature, in interpreting the thought of the epistle. B.'s own interpretations, of course, are pressed with generally impressive argumentation, but other views are given a fair hearing, so that the book is really something of a brief compendium of current thought on the epistle. This is not to say that B.'s positions are equally strong throughout. He takes no position, e.g., on the difficult "thorn in my flesh" (12:7) beyond a rejection of most of the interpretations that have been made of it, and the suggestion that it may refer to a speech defect Paul had. But in the vast majority of cases
the commentary is marked by the scholarship and balanced judgment that will be familiar to readers of B.'s previous commentaries. Very much to be commended is B.'s care to go beyond the technical aspects of exegesis and to show the continuing relevance of Paul's thought in Christian life. This makes the book quite as useful to the general reader as to the scholar.

All in all, this work must be counted as the best commentary on 2 Cor now available in English.

Immaculate Conception Monastery
Jamaica, N.Y.


This excellent volume, a dissertation at the Institut catholique of Paris, is designed for advanced students, who are prepared to follow the author as he grapples with original texts. One would be well advised to have the Greek text of the Apostolic Fathers close at hand, in order fully to evaluate and appreciate v. E.'s careful exegesis of these difficult texts. Such a work needs no justification, since previous studies of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Apostolic Fathers have been superficial and too "dogmatic," paying little heed to the context in which the pertinent ideas appear. As regards methodology, v. E. has innovated and has tried, following K. Rahner's lead, to determine the place of eschatological statements in the present Christian existence of each writer.

Accordingly, the book consists of an analytical study of the Didache, Barnabas, 1 and 2 Clement, Hermas, Ignatius of Antioch, Polycarp, and Papias (chaps. 1–6), followed by a systematic summary of the results of this analysis, and an attempt to situate the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers between the NT and the great apologies for the resurrection of the later second and third centuries (chap. 7). Without reservation it can be affirmed that the author has succeeded completely in his undertaking. The context of resurrection theology in each document is isolated, and the author's original meaning clarified. The Didache, e.g., makes eschatology a part of catechesis in the manner of the NT Epistle to the Hebrews. Barnabas connects Jesus' terrestrial life and death with resurrection, as do subsequent liturgies. Curiously, 2 Clement offers a more complex theology than has hitherto been recognized: by linking the Incarnation and the resurrection, it inspired later writers (Irenaeus, Tertullian), and for all time anticipates any attempt to reduce the resurrection to the realm of faith alone (e.g., Bultmann). 1 Clement is a witness to the dominant subapostolic problem concerning the resurrection: an emerging doubt about all the eschatological promises, especially
the Parousia. (There could be some discussion as regards v. E.'s interpretation of 1 Clem. 24, 2, where ἐν κατὰ καιρόν ἀναστασίν seems to mean resurrection "at a particular time" rather than "repeated," as he thinks on pp. 51 and 55.) The eschatological concerns of Ignatius were determined by his own impending death; for him, the center of eschatological hope is displaced from the Parousia of the Lord to the moment of martyrdom, in which he shares the fate of the Lord. (The eis auton of Trall. inscr. would seem to refer to God and not Christ on p. 122.) Thus Ignatius' recoil from traditional apocalyptic should not be attributed to the influence of Hellenism.

The volume excels in its adherence to scholarly hermeneutical principles rather than philosophical presuppositions, and for this reason alone should be on the reading list of every student of the NT. Numerous faulty interpretations of earlier critics are corrected, and the need to read early Christian literature from the point of view of the ancient author rather than that of the modern commentator is demonstrated. There is an excellent bibliography, to which may be added "Eschatology in the Apostolic Fathers," by F. F. Bruce, in The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the V. Rev. Georges V. Florovsky (Rome, 1973). The only aspect in which v. E. could be faulted is that he does not make sufficient reference to the Jewish background. This would clarify some points which appear to plague him throughout, i.e., the connection between resurrection and judgment, resurrection of the just alone vs. universal resurrection, millenarianism. A reading of the relevant chapters in Emil Schürer's or G. F. Moore's works on Judaism would thus be a good propaedeutic to this from now on invaluable essay.

Boston College

MARGARET SCHATKIN


This work, prefaced in a laudatory fashion by the late Cardinal Daniélou, reflects much of the interests of M.'s two mentors, O. Cullmann and H.-I. Marrou. The comprehensive topic treated is how early Christians viewed the "world" (kosmos) during the first two centuries prior to A.D. 202, when the first official, widespread persecutions broke out under the orchestration of the Roman authorities. Eleven chapters are here clustered about three generic topics: revealed world, historical world, and renewed world. M. attempts to explore the many senses in which the world was understood and appreciated: world as the spatial, physical reality, the temporary duration or "age" (aiōn), the sphere of humanity and the stage of history, even the society of sharing persons. We are reminded that Christians initially lacked cosmological
speculation, that the world was not viewed in itself as an object of religious interest. We are shown how Christians drew upon diverse, even contradictory representations of the world from the contemporary environment. The *kosmos* for Christians manifested teachings about God. The world’s finality was linked to redemption in Christ, but Christians did not think they had to destroy the contingent, the existing cultural, social, or political framework. They simply added a new dimension, we are told, which was inspired by regeneration and resurrection in the Holy Spirit. Christians were, according to the old adage, “in the world” without being “of the world.”

M. recognizes that what he discusses has already been covered in greater detail by other scholars. He justifies his work as attempting to provide a “tentative *dé synthèse*” (p. ix). The range of topics is very broad. Chap. 1 reviews Greek, Jewish, and Gnostic attitudes toward the *kosmos* and contrasts them to the Christian view of the world created in time and mediated by the Logos. Chap. 2 provides an uncritical summary of the notion of *Heilsgeschichte* which offers no new material from what is already available through the writings of Cullmann and Schnackenburg. This section on the “Present Age” (pp. 49–92) has a *déjà vu* quality to it and is perhaps the least successful of the chapters. M. notes the return to Jewish apocalyptic eschatology by Judeo-Christians (e.g., Ps.-Barnabas) in such deviations as the attempt to calculate the data of the world’s end. Chap. 3, on “Satan’s Empire and Christ’s Kingdom,” has some useful material on demonology and angelology in the early Christian period. Other chapters touch upon questions such as the Christian attitude toward millenarianism, the *Pax Romana*, participation in social functions such as the baths and theatres, the authority of Caesar, *paideia* and the gospel, Christian ethical norms and Stoic thought, the Church as *patria*. The final chapter touches briefly on attitudes toward martyrs and toward participation in the military.

Despite the book’s laudable ambition and interesting goal, I must regretfully register my judgment that this volume does not succeed in its objective. My basic critique would be that the study attempts more than can be handled in such a short work. So many topics are treated, charisms, slavery, the baths, education, apocalypticism, Gnosticism, but often only a very superficial and oversimplified summary is offered. Some crucial interpretations are worked out only by appeal to an article from Kittel’s *TDNT* or an already outdated monograph. M. is simply not on top of the bibliographical data which is a presupposition for such synthetic ambitions. A few examples: the chapter on the authority of Caesar, where much more needs to be said since the reactions to Brandon’s thesis about Jesus’ relationship with the Zealot causes; the
treatment on paideia, which does little more than repeat Jaeger’s earlier position; the section on the persecutions, which, though drawing from Frend, gives only a pale summary, not the fuller treatment of the causes, economic, racial, or other, for the local pogroms prior to the general persecutions of the Christians.

Daniélou praised M. for his use of Judeo-Christian writings, but a closer look at the finished product shows that only the most fleeting use of this literature is cited. Also lacking is a more detailed treatment of “world” as understood in early Christian liturgies, especially baptismal ones. An interesting topic, too, which M. might have included is the notion, found later in Cyprian but reflecting an earlier Stoic idea, that the world was growing old, suffering from a sort of “energy crisis.”

M.’s goal is creative and interesting. Perhaps in a later work he will bring greater sensitivity to his complex task. As he has a good grasp of pagan classical literature and a deep interest in the problematic of the specificity of the Christian experience of the world, so he clearly has the abilities to rework this material with greater precision and with more nuancing.

Weston College School of Theology

Michael A. Fahey, S.J.


Vatican II’s Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy directed that those teaching the mystery of Christ and the history of salvation to theological students should bring out the connection between their subjects and the liturgy. So far, one has not observed that much of this is being done. Yet Fr. Lukken has made the attempt in his work, which started as a Gregorian University thesis of 1967, begun under the direction of Fr. Herman Schmidt. It is now done into English (from the Dutch) by Mrs. M. Foran of Mountmellick, Eire, and brought up to date with bibliography as far as 1971. The work is thoroughly indexed and there is a pleasing innovation whereby the Greek texts cited are given in an appendix, thus securing that they can be given in Greek type without undue cost.

The plan of the work is a survey of material in the Leonine, Gelasian, and Gregorian Sacramentaries under the fairly obvious headings of the sin as originans and originatum, the dominion of Satan, the wound of nature, and the recirculatio of first Adam and second. For each of these L. supplies matter from Scripture and the Fathers before he tackles his liturgical texts, a proceeding which suits well enough a thesis which has to be defended but which is otiose for the reader who has Lyonnet De
peccato originali and similar works at hand. The base of the enquiry is too narrow, confined as it is to the three main Sacramentaries. In spite of Chavasse, there is much in the Old Gelasian which can hardly be Roman, while the Stowe Missal in its baptismal service has other elements combined with prayers that reappear in Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries, thus suggesting that it has been in receipt of Roman material. One would expect this from its use of the Canon dominicus papae Gelasi.

It is true that L. has looked outside his own plan from time to time, using some material from the Rotulius of Ravenna, but one really needs a preliminary study defining what exactly was the Roman baptismal service, if the title of the work is to be justified. If the aim had been simply to illustrate the development of the doctrine of original sin from the Western liturgies, one would have to take into account the expressive phrase from the Irish palimpsest Sacramentary: “Corporis comminu-tione diaboli principatum; conscriptae mortis chirographum Sanguinis effusione deletum; et per unius Salvatoris mortem vitam nobis omnibus venisse credentibus.”

L. is on his guard against accepting the Procrustean theories of Gross, who would make Augustine the author of the doctrine of original sin, but he does not make use of some early material on this point which could have helped him greatly. Melito in his homily on the Pasch set out a clear image of the sin as originatum when he wrote: “On every soul sin had placed her footprint, and on whomsoever that print was placed, they had to die” (line 398). This image was taken up by Hippolytus (in his genuine works) when he said, commenting on Prv 30:19 about the way of a serpent on a rock: “Just as a serpent is not able to leave its trace upon a rock, even so the devil was unable to find sin upon the body of Christ, for Christ says: The prince of this world cometh and in Me he will find nothing.” L.’s hesitations about what one has the right to expect from the Greek Fathers in the way of a developed doctrine might have been eased if he had paid more attention to the sources and less to their modern exponents. In the light of the evidence from Melito and Hippolytus, it is strange to find L. saying (p. 266): “The Greek tradition speaks rather of hereditary death than of hereditary sin.” Nor is confidence restored by the remark that Origen, when he said that infant baptism was an apostolic tradition, “merely means that he views it as a practice adopted in his time as a tradition” (p. 195, n. 161).

The Exultet declared that Christ paid Adam’s debt not to the devil but to the eternal Father, thus avoiding a theory of the rights of the devil. When a Gelasian collect says that we are weighed down under the yoke of sin ex debito, one should be more careful than L. shows himself to be in taking this as asserting that the yoke is “rightfully owed to Satan” (p.
208). The phrase *ex debito* does not specify to whom the debt is owed, and it is mere presumption to say that this must be the devil. L. makes play with the ideas of Artur Lang about the connection between Gelasian collects and the sermons of Leo the Great, but there are reserves to be noticed about that piece of work, as I had occasion to observe when it came out (cf. *JTS* 9 [1958] 382). In the nuptial blessing of the Leonine and Gelasian there is a prayer that Satan may have no hold over the bride, and he is described as "subsecivus ille auctor praevaricationis," which presents a problem of translation. L. plunges boldly with the version "the author of all transgression, who is excluded." This he derives from Vagaggini, who told him that the word means "excommunicated." But does it? The word comes from the *agrimensores*, who, when they found they could not impose a rectangular grid upon an area of land owing to natural features such as rivers or coastline, were in the habit of calling the leftover pieces of land *subseciva*. The metaphorical use of the word as applied to the devil requires some thought. The Leonine uses the word again (416) to describe our own wanton power of doing harm ("facultas subtrahatur subseciva laedendi"), and one could therefore argue that in the nuptial context the devil is being characterized as the *wanton* instigator of deceit; his aims do not fit into any pattern of coherence, any more than the odd bits of land into the surveyor's grid. That the metaphor was soon lost appears from what the Gregorian Sacramentary made of the phrase, for it read the words "ex hac subsecivus" as "ex actibus suis," removing the metaphor wholly. But there was no idea of describing the devil as excommunicate. Had he ever been a member of the Church?

The contribution of the liturgy to the development of doctrine has been enormous. One has only to compare the number of times the nuptial blessing as found in the Leonine and subsequent Sacramentarles must have been used for centuries with the text of a sermon by some Father of the Church which was heard spoken once and then lingered perhaps in a single manuscript in a monastic library. L.'s enterprise is praiseworthy, but its execution leaves much to be desired. The translation is generally clear, but there are lapses, as over the term "middle voice" in Greek grammar, which is here rendered several times (p. 118) as "medium." The term "antonomasia" (p. 35) has been shortened to "antomasia" with no apparent reason.

London

J. H. CREHAN, S.J.

*The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion.* Edited by Charles Trinkaus with Heiko A. Oberman. *Studies in*
This work is the published by-product of an unusual conference on late medieval and Renaissance religion held at the University of Michigan in April 1972. The conference's serious attempt to treat specifically the religion of the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance marks it as an unusual venture; its interdisciplinary representation makes it even more remarkable. Six academic disciplines were represented by the fifty-seven participants, and of these approximately sixty percent were historians with only three philosophers and one religion scholar. No one was listed as a theologian. Despite these limitations, the group shared "a sense of the need for a new unity or a new synthesis of the religious experience of the period" and was committed to "a revisionist frame of mind which wished to challenge the older interpretations, indeed to find them to be somewhat dogmatic responses to sectarian and culturally conditioned outlooks of previous generations of scholars" (Editor's Foreword, p. x). While not all of the major papers quite fulfil this description, the volume overall and the conference which gave it birth signal a turning point in the historical treatment of medieval/Renaissance religion.

Fourteen major papers appear under the headings "Theologies of the Late Middle Ages," "Lay Piety and the Cult of Youth," and "Humanism and the Arts." Most of the papers are followed by one or more critical and penetrating responses which invariably supply significant additional information. Among the contributions are Heiko Oberman on the shape of late medieval thought, William J. Courtenay on nominalism, Stephen Ozment, "Mysticism, Nominalism and Dissent," Thomas N. Tentler, "The Summa for Confessors as an Instrument of Social Control," Marvin B. Becker on lay piety in early Renaissance Florence, Gerald Strauss on Reformation pedagogy, and John W. O'Malley, "Preaching for the Popes." The longest and perhaps most important contribution is Richard C. Trexler's "Ritual in Florence: Adolescence and Salvation in the Renaissance." There are also papers on art, music, Italian humanism, Erasmus, and popular religion. Other well-known participants represented in this volume include Paul O. Kristeller, F. Edward Cranz, Leonard E. Boyle, William J. Bouwsma, Donald Weinstein, Lewis W. Spitz, Myron P. Gilmore, Eugene F. Rice, Jr. and, of course, the editor himself. A list so impressive assures both a broad dissemination and a serious consideration of the conference's results.

One of the major new directions in evidence in this collection of papers is the attention being given to the study of youth movements and pedagogy. The seminal work of Philippe Ariès, Centuries of Childhood: A Social History of Family Life (New York, 1962), was acknowledged by
more than a few participants. Trexler's lengthy study of Florentine youth movements and family life is a model of enlightened but careful historiography. His utilization of anthropological categories as well as concepts from the sociology and comparative study of religion enabled him to achieve both depth and comprehensiveness and gave his paper a realistic ring so rarely found when historians deal with religion. By contrast, Courtenay did not really succeed in drawing a convincing picture of the relationship between nominalism and religion, largely because he confuses religion with theology. His own "nominalistic" struggles with nominalism are indeed impressive and thorough but lack that contact and concern with life which alone authenticates and legitimizes the historical enterprise. So many historians of ideas do an admirable job of delineating the convolutions and variations in a given intellectual strain but fail to come seriously to grips with questions about significance. Historiography completes this essential task only when it succeeds in representing the element of creativity—human response to the challenges of life and event. History is the story of innovation, of human ingenuity in dealing with the resources of tradition and experience, and the telling of that story is itself a creative and imaginative undertaking.

Unfortunately, several of the historians represented in this volume are still struggling with the ghosts of Jacob Burckhardt and Ludwig Pastor. John O'Malley's defensive piece on preaching at the papal court is an example of meticulous scholarship which succeeds in convincing us that the Renaissance popes listened to sermons that were both doctrinal and orthodox but alas, deadly dull. One has reason to believe that in their historical context many of these sermons were quite exciting as creative and imaginative responses to current issues. It is the historian's craft to discover and to illustrate the precisely creative moment, but his selection of data is itself a response to current cultural circumstances. Unless we are mistaken, the Burckhardtian view of the Renaissance has long since "died the death of a thousand qualifications." In choosing his data as weapons against dead theories, O'Malley misperceives his own times and to that extent fails to do justice to the preachers he discusses and helps convince us that history is a study of the dead.

Both the convocation and the composition of the Michigan conference indicate that present cultural circumstances are calling for a re-evaluation of the religious dimension of medieval/Renaissance life. Progress in religious studies over the past several years is finally being appreciated by historians who are coming to understand that the history of an ecclesiastical institution is not synonymous with the religious history of a people. Kristeller is disturbed by "the recent tendency to consider all
intellectual concerns as belonging to either science or religion” (p. 367). His long-standing and vehement struggle to limit the application of the term “humanist” to members of a specific literary/scholarly group is well known and his arguments appreciated. Yet historians of religion recognize, and Kristeller admits, that humanism was a movement, not merely a profession. It was a movement with social, political, and economic concerns, implications, and presuppositions. Because some members of this movement articulated theological and moral views consistent with their more fundamental common convictions about the worth of classical studies and rhetoric, and because intellectual and moral reform lay at the heart of the movement, historians who treat humanism as a religious phenomenon, that is, in a comprehensive fashion as a cultural or subcultural system, seem to do more justice to the humanity of those who made up that movement. Historians who, with Kristeller, continue to regard religion as a mere institutional affiliation or as a cultural compartment alongside art, philosophy, science, and scholarship will never succeed in understanding or explaining either the Late Middle Ages or the Renaissance. Happily, this volume shows encouraging signs of new directions.

La Salle College, Philadelphia

JAMES E. BIECHLER


Let us first sketch the context in the available modern scholarship on Luther's Christology. A significant reference point is Gustaf Aulén’s claim, in Christus Victor (E.T., 1931), that Luther revived the biblical and patristic motif of Christ's victorious struggle against the enslaving powers of sin, Satan, and death. Paul Althaus' standard work, The Theology of Martin Luther (E.T., 1966), underscored how Christ is for Luther the utterly reliable revelation of God's heart and mind in relation to ourselves. Althaus contended against Aulén that Luther made significant use of the classical Western theme of satisfaction in interpreting Christ’s work. The fundamental fact is that Christ endured the full measure of God’s wrath against sin; because of this, one can speak of the defeat of the powers. Yves Congar's part in the Bacht-Grillmeier Chalcedon Festschrift of 1954 was a seminal study of Luther's Christology (E.T. in Dialogue between Christians, 1966). Here the mystery of Christ is the downward irruption of God's love into our sinful world. Redemption, for Luther, is so much God's work that the humanity of Christ is marginalized as a contributing cause, being little more than the site or locus of God's effective demonstration of His will to save. Congar’s
reading of Luther has been taken up approvingly by W. Pannenberg in *Jesus: God and man* (E.T., 1968) as the “Christology of exclusive divine efficacy” (*Alleinwirksamkeit Gottes*). Most recently, Ian Siggins made an impressive demonstration (*Martin Luther’s Doctrine of Christ*, 1970) that Luther should be seen as a master of the preached Christology that takes priority and control over doctrine. Siggins was generally unimpressed with Luther’s forays into technical Christology, but on the kerygmatic side was able to chart the increasing ascendancy of Johannine motifs (“He who sees me sees the Father”) over Pauline themes of reversal and paradox.

A unique aspect of the work of Marc Lienhard here reviewed is structural: he moves with Luther through eight discernible career-stages, taking full account of the successive influences and opponents affecting Luther and of the respective literary genera Luther employed. In contrast to Siggins’ “mosaic of themes,” Lienhard hopes to penetrate to the controlling logic of Luther’s Christological thought. He has conceived his work well and carries on what is for the most part an informed and intelligent dialogue with the ancient tradition and with modern scholarship. On balance, he has given us a satisfying and useful exposition of Luther’s Christology. I would single out six principal points made in Lienhard’s study and then add three critical questions.

First, Luther broke with two concerns of medieval Christological piety: compassionate meditation and moralizing insistence on imitation of Christ. Luther repeatedly underscored that Christ is, above all else, the saving sacrament (both sign and cause) of salvation to be grasped trustingly by *fides Christi*, that is, the living union by which Christ who took on my sins now conveys to me his own invincible righteousness as my consolation and firm support. The saving relationship, the *pro me*, takes priority over all else.

Second, Luther’s bent to paradox is so deep-seated that he never puts aside the theme of God’s hiddenness in revelation. At the cross, faith confronts God’s love, wisdom, and power, all *sub contraria specie*. In this life the struggle of faith is one of continual relearning of how the truths of 1 Cor 1:18–31 apply to the person and work of Christ. Incidentally, Lienhard knows well that in Luther’s *De servo arbitrio* what is hidden is God’s inscrutable will not to save some, something quite different from God’s paradoxical hiddenness in the revelation of Christ.

Third, as we would expect, Luther’s account of the redemption does not see Jesus positing an all-sufficient meritorious act. Instead, he dissipates the Father’s wrath against sin by his submission to its killing force, which is then broken as it slams against the invincible divine life and righteousness of Christ.
Fourth, Luther went well beyond any predecessor in depicting the pains of the Passion in the spiritual realm of Christ’s consciousness. Here the wrath of God, with its cursing power, invaded so forcefully as to make him experience utter abandonment, the supreme anguish of sinful humanity.

Fifth, the redemption is the work of God’s incredible condescension by which He entered into solidarity with sinful men and maintained this to the moment of death on the cross. It is crucial for our faith that this is God’s deed, for as a work of mere man it would not have broken God’s wrath and would never resolve the anguish of conscience we endure because of sin. Luther’s controversy with Zwingli over the Eucharistic presence of Christ led to excessive accentuation of the divine nature and to some carelessness regarding the “unmixed” of Chalcedon’s teaching.

Sixth, Luther did become better informed about the dogmatic tradition of the early Church during the 1530’s. In Christology, the teaching of Ephesus on the unity of person in Christ was of greatest importance. He spoke with some frequency of the communication of idioms, to underscore the truth that God died for us and that Christ, in his humanity too, can be present anywhere. Not surprisingly, Luther was reticent about Chalcedon and uncomprehending of Eutyches’ teaching.

In a critical dialogue with Lienhard, I would first point to some significant omissions. He failed to note Luther’s use in 1517 and 1518 of a three-part scheme to organize the purposes of Christ’s work as satisfaction, suffragium, and sacrifice of praise (WABR 12, 7; WA 1, 588). He also passed over Luther’s ingenious application of sacramental concepts in Thesis 27 of the Heidelberg Disputation: Christ’s is the opus operans and under his influence our fulfilment of God’s commands is the opus operatum, which, however, is pleasing to God in virtue of Christ’s opus operantis (WA 1, 364; also 1, 309). Lienhard is also strangely silent about Luther’s explanation of the relation between Christ and his mother. The Catholic reviewer misses a reference to Luther’s warm exposition of the Magnificat as the prayer of his prototype of submission to the free grace of God.

I would also register my dissatisfaction over those sections (pp. 174, 299, 335) where Lienhard turns from problems and contradictory tendencies in Luther’s thought with the weak defense that Luther’s conceptuality was not adequate for expressing his profound insight into the relation of the two natures. Luther may have had these profound insights, but they remain his private possession quite beyond the historian’s reach if in fact he was unable to express them. We must also reckon with the possibility of confusion and blind spots, especially in a man who on other occasions showed remarkable talent in forging a
conceptuality for conveying religious experience and insights into the gospel.

Finally, I am not convinced by Lienhard’s repeated rebuttals against Congar on the role of the humanity of Christ. A probe of passages of Luther’s 1531 commentary on Galatians showed that many of the references to Christ’s willingness and free acceptance refer to his coming and entry into solidarity with sinful men. There is little or no reference to graced human willingness at the center of the victory over wrath and sin. Theologically, Luther does marginalize the free commitment and dedication by which Christ implants in our humanity an act of love and homage toward the Father with which sinful men can become associated in conversion and in the sacraments. Christ is primarily a passive victim at the critical historical moment. I would suggest that Luther went to excess in projecting on to Christ his own experience of being assailed by temptation and then (e.g., on Gal 3:13) magnified this by unchecked use of superlatives in depicting the rush of noxious forces against the God-man.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago

JARED WICKS, S.J.


If ever the course of a man’s life was determined by the publication of a single work, then surely the individual would be David Friedrich Strauss and the work in question, his celebrated Life of Jesus. Prior to that time, S. was first a student of theology and then a tutor in the Protestant seminary at Tübingen. With the publication of the Life of Jesus in 1835, however, S. suddenly became a celebrity. His “mythical” interpretation of the Gospel narratives aroused intense opposition among both conservatives and liberals in German theological circles. The conservatives were alarmed by S.’s critique of the historical authenticity of the Gospels; the liberals (or rationalists) were irked by S.’s scorn for their own naturalistic explanation of the supernatural and miraculous in the NT. No one, it seems, had a kind word for S.’s own hypothesis, namely, that most of the Gospel stories were an unconscious mythologizing by the early Christian communities to make Christ appear as the Messiah whom they genuinely believed him to be. S. thus became a “lone wolf” in German academic circles; and with the publication of the Streitschriften in 1837, a stinging rejoinder to his critics, both liberal and conservative, his fate was sealed. He remained an isolated figure to the end of his life, secretly admired by many but openly supported by precious few.

H. has performed a real service in composing this first English-language biography of S. Two earlier biographies, both in German, were
never translated into English. Furthermore, both are in need of updating, in virtue of new source material now in circulation. In his own work, H. tries to give an account both of the man and of his theology. Accordingly, he fills the twenty-four chapters of the book, now with biographical detail (S.'s boyhood and schooling, his unhappy marriage, short-lived involvement in local German politics, etc.), now with strictly theological material (analyses of the Life of Jesus and S.'s other works in theology, excerpts from S.'s correspondence with colleagues, notably Ferdinand Christian Baur, on various theological issues). The analyses of S.'s various works are brief, sometimes almost too brief; but in the concluding chapters H. takes up two broader questions: the legitimacy of S.'s "mythical" interpretation of Scripture, and his enduring place in the history of nineteenth-century theology. The singular advantage of H.'s method is, of course, that the book is easily readable and that it provides an insight into S.'s character quite apart from his writings.

H. obviously admires S. for refusing to compromise on his principles, even though it cost him so dearly in terms of friendship and support. At the same time, H. points out again and again that S.'s "presuppositionless" analysis of Scripture actually contained a number of key presuppositions: that there is no transcendent personal God, hence that Jesus was in no sense divine, and finally that anything miraculous attributed to Jesus in the Gospels had to be, therefore, the result of an unconscious mythologizing by the primitive Christian communities. S., concludes H., is thus a touchstone for the basic credibility of Christianity. "For given his presuppositions, then his essential conclusions follow clearly and logically. Either one must say yes to his solution or provide new and better answers to the problems which he so lucidly exhibited. For this reason theology cannot pass him by" (p. 284).

Marquette University

JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, S.J.


This volume is a remarkable achievement. Tupper has managed to bring within two covers a detailed and comprehensive summary and assessment of the work of one of the most prominent of the younger generation of German Protestant theologians. Dividing his study into three sections (Prolegomena, Pannenberg's Theological Program, and Problems and Prospects), T. indicates the path the young Pannenberg took as a student and searcher before he locates the Munich theologian's writings in the context of modern German Protestant theology, principally the word-of-God theology which has dominated the scene in recent times. In contrast to this regnant theology, Pannenberg is very much a
post-Enlightenment thinker, aware of the unsettled character of man's future, the provisional status of all theological statements, aware as well that authority as a merely extrinsic norm cannot command assent and that appeal to tradition lacks convincing power unless that tradition is tested by historical research into the facts and events standing behind it.

T. begins his analysis of Pannenberg's theology with a study of the latter's programmatic essay *Revelation as History*, which first appeared in 1961, moving from there to a consideration of P.'s understanding of the relationship between history and revelation, Christology, the doctrine of God, and the notion of God's kingdom. T.'s work is a reliable introduction, even though it does not profess to be complete. Missing in his treatment are, e.g., any attention to P.'s dense Thesen zur Theologie der Kirche as well as the role of Hegel's philosophy in the development of his thought. Yet the strength of T.'s book lies in its ability to demonstrate the remarkable systematic power and originality of this still rather young theologian, his respect for and knowledge of tradition, and his concern to develop a theological synthesis which will command respect, if not agreement, from thinking people beyond the realm of the religiously committed. For P., talk about God involves necessarily talk about the totality of things, for God is the "power over all," so that a "ghetto theology" in the sense of a study exclusively nourished by special religious experiences is ruled out at the start.

This means that Pannenberg will not only dialogue with exegetes regarding the historical reliability of the Resurrection accounts in the NT, but will discuss with a physicist the relation of the faithful God of Christianity to the physical world as interpreted by quantum mechanics. Moreover, he will participate as the only theologian in a symposium of humanists discussing the meaning of myth, and dialogue with the great philosophers to assess the role of analogy in philosophy and theology and the meaning of the human person.

Time and again T. shows himself to be a very sympathetic critic of Pannenberg. In reporting the criticisms of fellow theologians (which, incidentally, is a very useful aspect of the book), the author generally sides with P. Yet this does not prevent him from raising some fundamental questions of his own. One of the principal problem areas in P.'s theological program as T. sees it is the German theologian's understanding of evil and the role of the cross. Undeniably, there is a real tension between P.'s universal-historical perspective and the classical understanding of the world as broken and sinful, and one can ask whether P. has been sufficiently alive to the dark side of human history. Another unsettled question and one which is fundamental to his Christology and theology of history is the use systematic theologians can make of apocalyptic. As Klaus Koch has convincingly demonstrated in
The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, there is no consensus among scholars regarding the attitude to history at work in the apocalyptic texts, so that P.'s correlation of apocalyptic with a Hegelian sense of universal history is less than firm. P.'s understanding of apocalyptic rests on the research of several scholars whose work is severely criticized by their peers. Much more form-critical analysis of the texts is required before systematic theology will be able to make use of apocalyptic in a secure fashion.

T.'s book closes with a postscript by Pannenberg himself in which he shows his appreciation for T.'s achievement as well as his critical observations.

Weston College School of Theology  
BRIAN O. MCDERMOTT, S.J.


Editor Marty tells a story in the Foreword that is at once explanatory and challenging. He once sat next to a Roman Catholic graduate student during a lecture which covered much of the WASP ground here walked by C. The student remarked: "This is a very interesting lecture—about what to me is a foreign country." Amen. Not because I have not studied American religious thought. Not because Edwards, Emerson, William James are unknown to me. But Amen because, as M. points out, I come of a heritage that "could put together a world and live a thoughtful life without much awareness of this tradition," and because C. has in any case handled the tradition in a novel way, which will move not a few Protestants into the seats next to me.

This is no catalog of the great Protestant ships. Still less is it a tracing of the thought that has flowed through manifold American denominational lines. Creeds get no shrift here. For C., churches and their theology have precious little to do with religious thought, "the reasoned, the cogent, and the evocative consideration of ways in which the human spirit of Americans seriously and strenuously relates itself to nature, to society, and to deity." By the time William James has made his contribution, American religious thought is "fully distinct from theology," and that is the way C. likes it. The tradition is consciously and deliberately characterized in an elitist vein. No acceptance of majority views inhibits this approach: "This book shows how a lineage of thinkers tried to divert American spirituality from its natural spillover into moralism by translating the religious impulse into being at home in the universe." As C. sees it, the really important American religious thinkers (Edwards, Emerson, and James are central) used religion to make the universe man's hospitable abode; they turned religious ethics
into religious esthetics. They “typically adjusted their ideas of deity to religious experience, and not vice versa.” Not for them was it to collapse “the significance of the human spirit’s earnest exercises into something other than religiousness itself.” Not into psychology, morality, metaphysics, theology, doctrine, liturgy, social or ecclesiastical institutions. The subject of the book is the “essayists who shaped the American spirit,” and decidedly not the “clergymen who built the American denominations.”

Those ground rules laid down in the opening pages, C. delves deeply and deftly into the thought of Jonathan Edwards, who on the occasion of the first truly American national event, the Great Awakening, enunciated with a new spiritual sense that the truly virtuous man enjoys God and God’s world—the hospitable universe. The saint is distinguished from the moral hero. Beauty rather than morality is the object of the religious sense. The theme is carried through the thought of Emerson and James. For Edwards, “the last major American religious thinker who fully espoused an orthodox Christian world-view in all he thought and did,” each saint’s life should be let be “a work of God’s artistry.” For Emerson, man and God are at home in nature; the individual is his own sculptor. James’s religiousness is radically humanistic, its chief concerns “the social form of humanity and mankind’s social reforms.” The reality of God is contingent on man’s belief and actions.

Has C.’s thesis seized the field? It all seems to depend on the perspective from which one writes history. In the intervals between his three eponymous figures, he admits American lapses into moralism and ethics and emotional pietism and muscular religion. In 1916 the General of the Jesuit Order, urging his sons to surpass the already fabled success of American Protestant foreign missionaries, wrote of “the character of the American people, so eager and energetic to begin and carry out great undertakings.” Is it really true that this spirit of Horatio Alger and of Russell H. Conwell’s Acres of Diamonds (it is still being published) has been of such little substantive influence in the development of American religious thought? If C. is right, if the esthetic spirituality he finds in his three eponymous essayists has indeed won the day in shaping American religious thought, then a mighty stereotype has been demolished. C. is a perceptive thinker himself, sure in his view, unafraid to set it down, and graceful in expression. Somehow one is left with the vague uneasiness that there are other pleaders to be heard from, that the story has not been fully told. But future historians of American religion will neglect C.’s insights at their peril. One parochial example: In American Catholic historiography, a current revisionist approach suggests reconsideration and affirmation of the fin-de-siecle Americanists. They do not fare well
in C.'s book. For him, Ireland, Gibbons, and Keane tried "to fit Catholicism into the live-and-let-live pluralism of the American denominations." They "sang the current songs of the middle-class denominations: progress, social reform and shared religious traditions. The typical refrain of such songs ran, 'Thy Kingdom come, in America, now.'" With that they are dismissed. In C.'s book it all happened in the interlude between Emerson and James; the Americanists were not in what he has delimited as the ultimately triumphant flow, however much they may have seemed in the mainstream.

At the very least, this is a finely chiseled and challenging book. It needs pondering, discussion, argument. It provides new perspective and should lead to new understandings and new reflections by those who seek to elaborate that elusive something, an American theology. The story C. tells is very different from the story generally told. It is a remarkable attempt to limn what has been distinctively American. Where pursuit of his themes will lead—that will be interesting to see.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago

JAMES HENNESEY, S.J.


With the melting-pot thesis about American history showing serious cracks and with monolithic images of church out of style, historians increasingly turn their attention to positive evaluations of previously slighted elements in the diversity that has been American pluralism, civil and religious. These are not seen as absences of perfection but as contributory to it. G. tackles this head on. His book about dissenters from presumed consensus in American religion begins with a description of dissent, "irritating, unnerving, pig-headed, noisy, and brash . . . often wrong," but endemic to "a society that is virile and creative as opposed to one that is sterile and decadent." Then, in rapid, sympathetic, and lively prose, he studies "the schismatics: sinners against love," "the heretics: sinners against faith," "the misfits: sinners against society." Baptists breaking with Congregationalism, James O'Kelly's Republican Methodist Church, the Cumberland Presbyterians, Reformed Episcopalians, Negro Baptists—all are part of the story. There are the tiny schisms which happen when divided Christians attempt ecumenical merger.

Heretics there have been aplenty, from the Enlightened philosopher-kings whose bicentennial we celebrate these days down through transcendentalists, naturalists, Christian Scientists, humanists, and skeptics. Among the "misfits"—those who permit "no vote ever to be unanimous, no assent ever to be complete"—G. catalogs Native Americans, their
ghost-dance religion and peyote cult, various groups that were objects of colonial persecution, Jews, Mormons, black nationalists, Orientals, millennialists, Anabaptists, and Christian Marxists, as well as the apocalyptic prophets of doom who flourish in the extreme right wing of Protestantism. He finishes with a commentary on sociological and psychological dissent as it exists in America today, disenchanted with loneliness, alienation, and competition, seeking mystery, community, and joy.

There are several references to events in American Roman Catholic history: the Polish National Church is listed under schism (but G. misses the even larger schism in American Roman Catholicism occasioned by harsh Irish reception of Ruthenian Catholics); the treatment of Mexican-American Catholics is noted under the heading "Misfits," as are the Catholic Worker movement and contemporary peace activists. That is only a sampling. It points up once again the inadequacy of the American Catholic historiography on which G. had to draw. Where, one wonders, would he have categorized turn-of-the-century socialist priest Thomas McGrady ("The fathers of the church were, as a rule, socialists"), who found Rerum novarum so inadequate; anarchist priest Thomas Hagerty, whose concern in the early 1900's for exploited Mexican-American railroad workers led him eventually to suspension from the ministry and a founding role in the IWW; the "Miners' Angel," Mary Harris Jones, with her turn-of-the-century brand of liberation theology? And what does the prominent role of so many born Catholics in the organization of the Communist Party in the United States have to say to themes of consent and dissent among the People of God who are the Church? Or the fact that so many born Catholic literary figures rested uneasily with the Church of their baptism, victims of the gap between the milieu of American Catholicism and the world in which they moved? What about varying reincarnations of the "American" theme in Catholic history, from eighteenth-century cisalpines down to present-day efforts to express belief and shape structure in terms understandable and understood in the distinctive culture, with its distinctive needs, which has developed in the United States?

G. successfully resurrects the terms "schismatic," "heretic," and "misfit," and uses them in a way which emphasizes shared responsibility for cleavages in the Body of Christ. He does it well. Once the perspective is accepted, history is seen through a prism wholly different from the one traditionally used. His methodology is immensely suggestive for further research. It breaks through carefully cultivated myth and helps us understand who we are.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago

JAMES HENNESSEY, S.J.
WOMAN AND COSMOS: THE FEMININE IN THE THOUGHT OF PIERRE
TEILHARD DE CHARDIN. By Catherine R. O'Connor. Englewood Cliffs,

This is not the first study to be devoted to the theme of the feminine in
T.'s thought. André Devaux surveyed the material in brief compass in
Teilhard and Womanhood (Paulist, 1968), while Henri de Lubac
provided a more detailed assessment in The Eternal Feminine (Harper
and Row, 1971). O'C.'s volume, originally a doctoral dissertation at
Fordham University, is, however, the first thoroughgoing piece of
research on the subject by a woman. It is also the most exhaustive
attempt to date to demonstrate the significance of the feminine
throughout the whole warp and woof of T.'s evolutionary world view.

The category of the feminine illumines T.'s own religious experience
and hence his unusual cosmic perception of the world. He himself
described Le feminin as "the spirit of Union." For T., the world cannot
be understood atomistically but only organically. The whole sweep of
evolution is intelligible only as a creative process of increasing unifica­
tion. Fragmentation is thus the great enemy and those who seek to know
the world by taking it apart through analysis violate (in a quite
masculine way) its inner nature. A feminine mode of perception sees the
world synthetically—all things cohere and hold together from a Christic
center. The feminine is also closely tied into T.'s emphasis on love as the
energy of evolutionary unification. In fact, he generally equates the two.
By means of a very useful comparison of T.'s thought with Jung's
reflections on the feminine, it is shown that in actuality the feminine is
only one modality of love (incorporating the poles of containment and
relatedness) "and does not embrace the whole range of love operating in
the cosmos." The Jungian delineation of the developmental stages of the
growth of the self also serves to throw considerable light on T.'s own
psychological evolution, as O'C. convincingly demonstrates. The femi­
nine is quite clearly articulated in T.'s approach to matter as a materia
matrix, which gives birth to spirit at appropriate levels of complexifica­
tion, and in his understanding of the earth as Demeter, the goddess of
fertility. The mythological associations of mother earth are transposed
by T. into his theology of the Virgin-Mother Mary as archetype of the ma­
ter ecclesia. What is presently in process of gestation within the womb of
the mother, of course, is ultimately the Body of Christ, an organic reality
that is simultaneously personal, collective, and cosmic. Moreover, "by
combining the theme of Mother-Earth with that of the body-person of
Jesus Christ, T. could give full expression to his mystical aspirations to
become one with the cosmos without fear of pantheism." Not surpris-
ingly, these cosmological and theological emphases receive final definition in T.'s spirituality of marriage and religious life, in which the feminine is perceived as a force of increasingly intense spiritualization.

We know that personally T. was greatly influenced by a succession of relationships with women. Many of his letters were written to women. He argued that the true spirit of celibacy was not best served by the separation of the sexes, but rather by their mutual interaction. He apparently found contact with women to be both energizing and spiritualizing. He remained suspicious, however, of sexual relationships and had a perhaps too acute awareness of their ambiguities. In spite of his appreciation for the role played by individual, flesh-and-blood women in his life, T.'s treatment of the feminine throughout his writings is almost wholly symbolic in character. Although this symbolic development is very rich and poetically suggestive, it is nonetheless somewhat disappointing in relation to the present concern over greater freedom of opportunity for women in contemporary society. Not only does T. contribute very little directly toward the forging of new images of woman relevant to the existing ferment, but indirectly he appears to lend support to the much criticized feminine mystique by the largely idealizing trend of his considerations. We are not surprised to learn that Mary Daly, e.g., includes T. among her not highly prized "pedestal peddlers." It is possible to argue, of course, that these are our problems and not T.'s, and that it is illegitimate to seek answers in writers of another generation to questions which have only recently become meaningful to us. One of the chief merits of this study is that it has chosen to face this issue head on rather than to ignore it on the plea of anachronism.

O'C. situates T. squarely within the Eternal Feminine tradition, a tradition in which "the Feminine is looked upon as a symbol of ideal or universal love, or grace, drawing mankind to God." Dante's *Divine Comedy* and Goethe's *Faust* have given the notion classical literary expression. Today this tradition has become questionable to us, and O'C. is clearly critical of some of the more dubious aspects of T.'s participation in this approach to the feminine at the same time that she seeks to present as balanced a view as possible of T.'s understanding of woman within his over-all anthropology. In the end she is forced to conclude that "the real importance of woman in Teilhard's anthropology is not that he offers new insights into her being and role in life, but rather that the place he gives to her in his system is a key to a fuller appreciation of his thought as a whole. Woman stands before man as symbol of the world, not only in the sense that total union and ultimate personality will be
achieved only at the consummation of the universe but also that she stands before him as a sign that in this final union with God the cosmic body of Christ will be preserved in its full integrity, in fact will be constituted in its integrity.”

In short, this is a most valuable contribution to Teilhard studies, carefully researched, judiciously organized, and clearly written. It will probably be felt, however, to offer little of utility to those outside the Teilhardian circle who are searching for new and viable models of the liberated woman.

Manhattan College

DONALD P. GRAY


Carman’s book is the culmination of many years of research in the writings and traditions of the Śrī Vaśīpāva theologians and philosophers of South India, for whom Rāmānuja’s teachings are normative. Though many Westerners know little of R., within the Indian tradition he ranks in importance with an Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, or Ignatius Loyola, in being at once a creative synthetic theologian, a devoted worshiper and priest, and the nuclear element in the consolidation and perpetuation of an enduring religious community.

R.’s unique contribution to the Indian religious tradition is his perception of the unity of the Absolute, signified by brahman, with the creator and lord of the cosmos, signified by īśvara, in the Supreme Personality of God. R.’s system, called Viśiṣṭādvaita, makes possible a theological status for the īśvara of the devotional tradition in a fashion analogous to the method of the Fathers of the Church who identified the Yahweh of the Jews with the Absolute of the Greek philosophers, linking rationality and the religious impulse in a creative synthesis. R. faced a problem similar to that of the Fathers in that he had to reconcile the Absolute of the Vedanta tradition with the devotional worship of the Pāñcharātra Āgamas and the hymns of the Alvar saints. The “One only without a second” of the Vedas seemed to have little relevance to a social structure in which the religious, ethical, and moral system assumes a plurality of selves engaged in real struggles for spiritual progress with an ultimate culmination in loving communion with the Supreme Self. While all orthodox interpreters of the Vedic revelation agreed that there is “One only without a second,” the Ultimate Reality which is utterly beyond any limitation, others than R. went on to teach that it is utterly unknowable and that all appearance of modification and individuation must be conditioned by human error and therefore ultimately illusory.
R. saw that this view of God as the absolute beyond human experience is not only potentially destructive of the social fabric based in a mythic structure of persons, values, duties, and rewards, but that it is deadening to the devotional personal communion of the devotee for whom his Lord cannot be an error of perception. Rāmānuja and Augustine would agree that the service of the Lord is the freedom of the individual to find himself within a structure which is ultimately real because based in the nature of Reality itself, the loving will of the Supreme Person, the Lord of the universe and of all that is and is not.

Carman, Director of the Center for the Study of World Religions at Harvard University, has two concerns in his book. The first is suggested by the fact that the present work is a considerable expansion of his 1962 dissertation at Yale, in which his primary goal is to find a methodological key by which to comprehend Rāmānuja's notion of God, and then to give a critical exposition in terms relevant to Western theologians and philosophers. In this, C. succeeds beyond any expectation aroused by previous attempts. He has selected two terms applicable to the divine nature, paratva (supremacy) and saulabhya (accessibility), as his key by which to analyze the defining attributes of God's essential nature. The metaphysical priority of God's nature as He exists in Himself, without reference to any other entity, that is infinite, joyous self-consciousness, eternally real and immaculate, is indicated by His supremacy. God's accessibility indicates those other aspects of His being which it "is not legitimate to try to separate . . . or put on a lower level of reality" (p. 255) but which stress His real relationship to all beings. "The distinction between God's supremacy and His accessibility is one that a Christian can appreciate emotionally as well as intellectually . . . that God, who is so great and so far removed from the imperfections of temporal existence, should nevertheless descend and condescend and commune with such imperfect creatures" (p. 256).

The subtitle indicates C.'s second aim. He suggests that the study of polarity within the divine nature would be significant for many religious communities other than that of the Śrī Vaisnava. The presence of this tension or paradox, while it is "an intellectual problem or a point of rational inconsistency for the theologian, is crucial for the worshipper's awe and adoration" (p. 254). He believes that many theistic systems share this polarity of stress between God's accessibility and His supremacy, and may thus find such an approach fruitful for an understanding of "the relation of the knowledge of God as creator to the knowledge of God as saviour" (p. 264).

Chap. 19, "Questions at the Limits of Phenomenological Understanding," poses the problems raised by this study in terms of Catholic and Reformation theology in a tantalizing way which should suggest to other
scholars some fruitful avenues of thought and research. Chap. 18, "The Divine Consort Śrī: The Problem of the Unity of the Divine Nature," raises the timely topic of the divine motherhood of God and should be of interest to students of Mariology as well as to those who are concerned with the almost exclusively masculine imagery of the Christian-Semitic traditions.

R.'s life, writings, teachings, and place in history get an exhaustive, but not exhausting, treatment in chaps. 2, 3, 16, and 17. These chapters alone would comprise a useful book, as they contain the latest and most comprehensive view available to a critical scholar informed by the traditional sources. The bibliography is a thorough and almost complete guide to materials on R. These chapters reveal that C.'s eight years in India have made him the master of two worlds which, in him, are not mutually exclusive, the world of critical scholarship and the traditional world of the Śrī Vaiṣṇava devotee of the Lord.

This book is the most complete analysis and exposition to date of the meaning of R.'s teachings within the Indian tradition, as well as for the Christian theologian. It is also the best available entree into the Hindu religious and philosophical thought world for the Western scholar or theologian who wishes to begin the study of the Indian traditions without the limitations of previous generations of students who were not fortunate to have the mastery of the necessary languages and the anthropological, historical, and critical resources at their disposal. A book like this would not have been possible even one generation ago. C. establishes a new standard of achievement in the field of Rāmānuja studies, yet he modestly and accurately credits his success to the collaboration of a score of other scholars who assisted him at several levels. These other scholars include a number of Indian traditional masters, which, in itself, reveals the new situation in which the Christian critical scholar-theologian can and does collaborate with the Hindu traditional believer in arriving at a new level of understanding of their respective heritages. The clarity of the language and the beauty of the book as an example of the printer's art set off C.'s ideas to make the reading of this scholarly work a fascinating experience.

Manhattan College

Davis Herron


During the past decade Heribert Mühlen of the seminary faculty at Paderborn has emerged as one of the leading Catholic ecumenical ecclesiologists. The present work, although not of the same massive
dimensions as some of M.'s previous publications, resembles them in historical erudition, contemporary relevance, and synthetic profundity. Partly made up of previously published essays, this book has a certain unity insofar as it deals throughout with considerations pertinent to the "genuinely universal council" proposed by the Uppsala Assembly of 1968 and by the Louvain Faith and Order meeting of 1971 as a body that might "once more speak for all Christians and lead the way into the future."

M. maintains that the Church, as a mystery of grace, contains within itself the hidden presence of the Holy Spirit as a unitive agency. A council of union would express the latent conciliarity characteristic of the Church as such, and is therefore a genuine possibility. Such a council is, moreover, necessary; for the ecumenical movement cannot achieve its objective by other means such as interfaith activities, pulpit and altar fellowship, federal councils, and structural mergers ("organic union"). Models of councils leading to union are provided by the Council of Jerusalem, as described in Acts 15, and, to some extent, by the Council of Florence (1439).

The way to unity, as M. understands it, involves three steps: self-discovery, mutual openness, and critical receptivity. The first step, self-discovery, involves a recognition, achieved through dialogue, by each tradition of its own special gifts as constituting its own potential contribution to a united Church. The second step, openness, means a readiness, achieved through convergence, to recognize the gifts of the others. The third step, receptivity, implies a corporate acceptance of the spiritual experiences of the other churches. The spiritual heritage of another church, M. acknowledges, cannot be accepted without critical assessment and reflection on the nonnegotiable patrimony of one's own church.

As a specialist in Trinitarian theology, M. blames a kind of unrecognized unitarianism (a survival of pre-Christian monotheism) for having erected the greatest obstacles to ecumenical progress. This narrow God-concept, he holds, gives rise to a one-sided emphasis either on confessional formulas—the Protestant deviation—or on ecclesiastical office—the Catholic deviation. A proper appreciation of the Trinity as a mystery of interpersonal communion, according to M., points a way beyond these barriers to a solution that respects the integrity of the traditions concerned and the variety of their spiritual gifts.

The universal council of the future must evidently lead to unity in the truth, but this goal makes it necessary to inquire into the meaning of truth. M. argues that truth is personal commitment to reality in its full dimensions; truth, therefore, stands in contrast to all forms of narrowness and exclusivity. In other words, truth is by its nature ecumenical.
In the final chapter M. maintains that in the present dialogue the Roman Catholic Church must cherish its own traditions concerning the priestly and papal offices as being its own special contributions to the coming community of churches. He deplores certain recent consensus statements (notably the 1973 memorandum of the German university ecumenical institutes) for having taken an unduly casual and functional view of the priestly ministry. On the other hand, he applauds the recent Roman Catholic/Pentecostal conversations as a model of mutual openness without self-deprecation. The charismatic renewal, he maintains, offers good hope for future ecumenical advances.

Introduced by Cardinal Jaeger of Paderborn, the book closes with an afterword by Cardinal Suenens of Louvain. It also contains, in an opening chapter, some biblical reflections on unity by Lukas Vischer.

Notwithstanding M.'s rather abstract, tortuous, aprioristic, and idiosyncratic approach, this book provides an interesting and thoroughly coherent alternative to the more pragmatic, impetuous, and positivistic style of ecumenism still prevalent in World Council circles. Conservative and intellectually scrupulous on many points, M. is refreshingly original and progressive when there is question of giving greater scope to what he acknowledges as the leading of the Holy Spirit. This book sets forth a style of ecumenism that might appeal to conservative evangelicals, to Orthodox, and to traditionally-minded Catholics who have thus far shied away from interchurch involvements.

Catholic University of America 

AVERY DULLES, S.J.

SHORTER NOTICES


It is not absolutely necessary to read this book, although it is highly recommended to anyone interested in pneumatology, prayer, Christology, and spirituality. Which is to say that further work in those areas will probably emerge with due regard for this original, creative, and sensitive work. Which is to say a great deal. H. is not the first to remind us that "the mystery of the Trinity and of Jesus must be approached pneumatologically, i.e., traced to the Holy Spirit." But the book is not merely a reminder of the direction Christology and spirituality will take; it also manifests the process and the dynamic of that theology.

The volume is small and impressively solid. There are no meanderings, no wasted digressions. It is lucid, decisive, insightful, and at every turn rooted in human experience. The chapters indicate the interests and questions that invite our reflection: "Jesus of Nazareth and the Spirit of God," "From Following Jesus to Being Led by the Spirit of Jesus," "The Personality of the Holy Spirit," "Contemporary Spiritualities and the Spirit," and "Who Is Duped, Who
Spirit-Led?" Such is the scope of the book, marking the direction for future theologizing if it is to be meaningful to believers and not simply an exercise in cerebral machinations. It is a book of unusual power and strength. It is wise, never compromising, never condescending, and it is gifted with H.'s uncommon consciousness of the sacredness of words. Lastly, the book makes me forget there was ever an opposition between spirituality and theology, or the experiential and academic facets of theology, because *The Conspiracy of God* unites those paradoxical but noncontradictory terms. That fact alone qualifies it as a rare work indeed.

*Doris K. Donnelly*


In the course of the past half century no one has made more solid contributions to the ecumenical dialogue between East and West than has Georges Florovsky. His serious scholarship, distinctive approach, and personal charm have enabled this dialogue to proceed on a high level. He has brought needed Eastern correctives to Western theology, particularly to what we now call ecclesiology.

After a preface by J. I. McCord and an introduction by Jaroslav Pelikan, the book presents twenty-four scholarly articles and concludes with a bibliography of F.'s writings, notes on contributors, and indices. As in any Festschrift, the articles vary in quality and interest; most treat of scriptural and patristic questions. On Scripture there are contributions by R. Renehan, D. Neiman, and J. Crehan. Other articles include: C. Richardson on the *Gospel of Thomas*, F. Bruce on eschatology in the Apostolic Fathers, K. Froehlich on Montanism and Gnosis, G. Lampe on the *lapsi*, H. Crouzel on a letter of Origen, P. Harkins on Chrysostom's postbaptismal instructions, M. Schatkin on his homily on the Protopaschites (including a translation which is an unfortunately clear example of how not to translate Greek), E. Fortin on the early conflict between faith and reason, J. Daniélou on Gregory of Nyssa, R. Arbesmann on Augustine, W. Frend on Severus of Antioch, J. Pelikan on authority in Maximus the Confessor, G. Tavard on Bonaventure, S. Prete on ancient Latin hagiography, L. Jones and M. ó Coingeallaig on liturgical linguistics (incomprehensible to the average reader), P. Bilaniuk on *theōsis*, T. Špidlík on Russian spirituality, V. Bill on Chekhov, H. Chadwick on Anglican views of ecumenical councils, Y. Congar on the *hierarchia veritatum*, P. Chamberas on F.'s ecclesiology.

*George T. Dennis, S.J.*


Y. intends his work to be "descriptive and analytical rather than expositional" (p. 19) as he surveys the evidence proposed for the priority of Gnosticism to NT Christianity. Acknowledging his debt to C. Colpe (*Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, 1961), he criticizes the views of W. Bousset ("Gnosticism is first of all a pre-Christian movement") and of R. Reitzenstein, who claimed to find evidence, especially in Mandaean sources, for a pre-Christian "gnostic redeemer myth." Y. traces the transmission of these views from R. Bultmann, who adopted and synthesized them,
through contemporary NT scholarship. On the basis of more recent research in Mandeian sources, including his own (Gnostic Ethics and Mandeian Origins, 1970), he criticizes especially what he calls the "'circular' appeal for support with respect to pre-Christian gnosticism" between NT scholars and Mandeian scholars (pp. 174 f).

Y. proceeds to examine alleged evidence for pre-Christian Gnosticism from eight different types of source material: NT exegesis, patristic, Hermetic, Iranian, Syriac, Coptic, Mandeian, and Jewish evidence. While he clearly indicates the convictions to which his own research have led him, he furnishes the bibliographical data necessary for the reader who intends to undertake an independent evaluation of the material. Finally, he offers a methodological critique of the theories that argue for the existence of pre-Christian Gnosticism: often, e.g., proponents of these theories have based their research on late sources, have inferred the existence of Gnostic systems from the occurrence of certain terms, or have assumed that what is non-Christian must be pre-Christian. He concludes that "the imposing scholarly edifice of Reitzenstein's and Bultmann's pre-Christian gnosticism is little more than an elaborate, multistoried, many-roomed house of cards, whose foundations have been shaken, some of whose structures need buttressing, and others have collapsed, leaving a mass of debris with but a few solid timbers fit for use in reconstruction" (pp. 184–85).

Most impressive is Y.'s dissection of complex traditional arguments, as he traces the evidence and analyzes the assumptions that lie behind the contradictory statements of various scholars. At times, however, his thesis seems so programmatic that the reader suspects he has not delineated the relative weight of the different types of evidence clearly enough. (Could the collapse of a "house of cards" leave so much—and such substantial—debris, to use his own metaphor?) Yet Y., with Colpe, has cleared the way for revaluation of the basic issue, the relation of Gnosticism and NT Christianity. Whoever takes up this issue should find in his book an incisive account of the history of scholarship and a challenge to rethink critically one's own approach to the sources.

Elaine H. Pagels

BIBLIOTHECA HIERONYMIANA MANUSCRIPTA: LA TRADITION MANUSCRITE DES OEUVRES DE SAINT JÉRÔME 4-A and 4-B


These volumes complete L.'s monumental repertory of the manuscript tradition relating to St. Jerome: his own works (Vols. 1–2); spurious works (Vol. 3); lives of Jerome, prayers, meditations, and panegyrics directed to or concerning him (Vol. 3). 4-A contains a list of works and excerpts not yet identified, a list of artistic representations of the Saint in the manuscripts (with 20 plates to illustrate these), and the addenda and corrigenda for all four volumes. 4-B contains very complete indexes: authors, titles, mss, provenances, initia et explicits, concordances with other large collections and repertories, and a general table of contents for the four volumes.

M. J. O'Connell


A disproportionate amount of Byzantine theological writing was devoted to polemics, to refuting heresies within the Christian framework and false creeds without. The polemical method was essentially simple: what-
ever did not correspond to the Orthodox standard was erroneous and to be rejected. A doctrine was not judged on its own merits; if it differed from the Orthodox, it was false. Islam differed from Christianity, therefore it was a false religion. Very early, certain specific differences came to be stressed and were repeated over and over again in Byzantine anti-Moslem polemics. These themes K identifies and discusses in detail. The period covered, the eighth to the thirteenth centuries, is a unified one; for from the time of John of Damascus, the polemicists, Nicetas of Byzantium, Euthymius Zigabenos, Nicetas Choniates, Bartholomew of Edessa, and others, made almost no innovations in method or content. After that period the influence of Western writers such as Aquinas and Ricoldo da Monte Croce is apparent.

The Christians first directed their attack against the person of Mohammed by demonstrating that he must be a false prophet because he does not conform to the prophetic models of the OT and NT. They seemed to enjoy elaborating on the life of Mohammed, taking their material from legendary and highly unflattering sources. The second major theme of the polemicists lay in showing that the Koran was a false scripture. Finally, they concentrated on proving the error and worthlessness of the religious teachings and practices of Islam. These three themes are thoroughly and competently analyzed. If nothing else, K. shows us Byzantine theology at its worst and has spared us the task of reading those repetitious and boring texts which remind one of children debating whether "My dad can lick your dad." Whatever one may think of the subject matter, this is a well-done, methodical, informative book. K. leaves the more interesting question of the Moslem objections to Christianity and the resulting Christian apologetic to a subsequent work.

George T. Dennis, S.J.


In the tenth century a German nun, Hrotsvitha of Gandersheim (ca. 935-ca. 1000), composed in Latin eight legends in hexameters (based on the apocryphal gospels and the lives of the saints), six dramas (in imitation of Terence, whose works she wished to replace), and two epical histories (important for the Ottonian period of German history). Although her works were not unknown in the Middle Ages, attention was first drawn to them as a whole by Conrad Celtes, who discovered them in a manuscript in the monastery of St. Emmeran near Regensburg in 1493. Hrotsvitha gained an immediate celebrity among such important German humanists as Johannes Trithemius and Willibald Pirckheimer. Their praise of her work reflects the situation of humanism in the social changes which were taking place in Germany in the period just before Luther. The epigrams composed in her honor in the Rhenish Societas litteraria meeting in Nürnberg about 1500 see her as a manifestation of the German spirit, a continuer of the classical tradition, and above all as a woman who had excelled in poetry. Celtes himself concluded the preface to his edition of her works (Nürnberg, 1501, with etchings by Dürer) with a discussion of the famous women of antiquity and his own time.

In the nineteenth century Hrotsvitha's works were often published and several partial translations were made. This complete translation is based on the translator's own critical edition of Hrotsvithae opera (Paderborn, 1970). It is meant to make the poet's work more accessible in our own time and should enable theologically interested
readers to gain an insight not only into the literary level of a well-educated tenth-century nun, but also into the themes which interested pre-Reformation Germany. An introduction concerns the cultural milieu in which the poems were written, and an appendix studies the liturgical formulae in Hrotsvitha's poetry.

C. H. Lohr


The first five booklets, all edited by Antonio Piolanti, in a new series under his general editorship. Each volume contains, in addition to a critical text, a short introduction on the author and his work generally and on the present text in some detail. The aim of the series: "to provide short but significant texts in which students may find the elements of new syntheses and discern the historical development of theological thought on themes of contemporary interest" (no. 1, p. 6); or "to provide students of theology and Church history with short texts, hitherto unpublished or now difficult to find, which may help to a better understanding of a doctrinal question, a personage, or a historical period" (no. 2, p. 5). A list of the authors and texts now published will show what P. has generally in mind and what he regards specifically as themes of contemporary interest: (1) Bartolomeo Carranza, O.P. (d. 1576), De mysticis nuptiis Verbi divini cum ecclesia et animabus justorum (1970; 55 pp.), a synthesis of the various aspects of the Incarnation as union with man: with Christ's individual human nature, with the Church militant and the Church triumphant, and with the individual human soul. (2) Agostino Favaroni da Roma, O.S.A. (d. 1543), De sacramento unitatis Christi et Ecclesiae sive de Christo integro (1971; 79 pp.): the text is concerned not with the Eucharist but with the mystical union of Christ and the faithful; Favaroni had a brilliant career as scholar and bishop, but four propositions from his work were condemned at the Council of Basel in 1435; the teachings condemned are brought to life for later readers in the present text. (3) Guglielmo Amidani da Cremona, O.S.A. (d. 1356), De primatu Petri et de origine potestatis episcorporum (1971; 54 pp.): the text consists of three questions from a longer Reprobatio sex errorum which was occasioned by the Defensor pacis of Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun. (4) Domenico de' Domenichi (d. 1478), Oratio in laudem beatissimae Catherinae de Senis (1972; 40 pp.): a discourse of May 2, 1463, at S. Maria sopra Minerva, for the first celebration of the Saint's feast day after her canonization. (5) Girolamo Ghetti da Roma, O.S.A. (d. 1635), Le lacrime di Maria per i suoi figli adotti (1973; 42 pp.): three discourses from the third part of a much longer Cetera Davidica accordata in sette ragionamenti in lode della Gran Madre di Dio con il devoto cantico "Salve Regina": Part 3 relates to the third part of the Salve Regina, "ad te clamamus... in hac lacrimarum valle."

I found somewhat intriguing the fact that the first four writers were bishops, the fifth a general of the Augustinians; that three were Augustinians; that the first was Spanish, the other four Italian. Do these statistics say something about the theological scene in the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries? Do they reflect simply the editor-in-chief's own predilections? In any event, the next five texts promised range far more widely in authorship, period, and subject matter, being less directly concerned with the nature of the Church and its authority. The texts thus far published clearly will help future students to a better knowl-
edge of “a personage or an historical period”; whether they will also help to “new syntheses” is more doubtful.

M. J. O'Connell


The first of these volumes, Ercole Brocchieri’s Mons. Andrea Cappellazzi, tomista lombardo (93 pp.), deals with an obscure figure whose name will be known only to the historian of Thomism and possibly to the historian of the nineteenth-century Church in Italy. Cappellazzi was one of the many workers who preceded and paved the way for Agostino Gemelli and the Thomist school of the University of Turin. B.’s monograph deals with C. as philosopher, theologian, apologist, sociologist, and priest, and ends with a full bibliography (pp. 82–89) of C.’s writings.

Vol. 3 of the Biblioteca, Antonio Piolanti’s Pio IX e la rinascita del Tomismo (106 pp.), is a reprint of a lengthy essay that appeared earlier this year in San Tommaso: Fonti e reflexi del suo pensiero, which was the first of four volumes in another series (Studi tomistici) edited by the indefatigable Piolanti for the Pontifical Roman Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas (cf. TS 35 [1974] 589). The essay describes Pius IX’s own training as a Thomist; what Pius has to say about St. Thomas in his writings as Pope; and the various activities of the Pope in relation to St. Thomas (proclaiming the value of the scholastic and specifically the Thomist method; fostering the Thomist revival in the religious orders; promoting centers for Thomism and Thomistic academies; the celebration of the sixth centenary of Thomas’ death [1874], and the proclamation of St. Thomas as patron of all Catholic schools).

M. J. O'Connell


Teilhard is not an easy writer to understand. This is especially the case with his masterwork, The Phenomenon of Man. The large blocks of science pose a special problem for the non-scientific reader. Furthermore, since the work is now thirty-five years old, the scientific material requires considerable updating. This primer, unlike other introductions to T., lays heavy emphasis on present-day scientific knowledge as a key to understanding the background of T.’s religious vision, which is treated here somewhat more sketchily. In the process, it communicates a fine sense of the sweep of evolutionary history leading up to the appearance of man and the creation of the noosphere. It thus helps the reader to appreciate the mystery of the universe in somewhat the same way T. himself did.

The book also differs from other introductions in that it proceeds at a more elementary level. K., by her own admission, is not a scholar, scientist, theologian, or professional writer. The research standing behind the book involved a lengthy labor of self-education born of an intense interest in the Teilhardian vision. The book grew up out of courses offered to high-school students and adults in a religious-education program in the local Episcopal church in Greenwich, Connecticut. Consequently, it is basically aimed at an intelligent but uninitiated adult audience. Anyone already having made T.’s acquaintance through his writings will probably not find too much additional enlightenment here except in the scientific chapters. However, anyone who is approaching the same kind of audience envisioned by K. might well want to consider this as a helpful point of entry into T.’s world view. An unusually serviceable bibilog-
raphy, compiled by Romano Almagno, has also been included and contains a listing of all of T.'s own writings together with a comprehensive compilation of all the books in English on his thought. It is encouraging to see a lay, nontechnical assault made on the forbidding Teilhardian fortress. It is regrettable that the publisher has not as yet made the result available in an inexpensive paperback edition more accessible to the audience for which it is intended.

Donald P. Gray


Merton's long-time secretary has compiled under one cover twelve essays, four poems, and a eulogy, all written after M.'s death and previously published in a variety of small and not readily accessible journals. Several of the essays have been considerably expanded since their original appearance. The vast variety of persons who have read M.'s works over the years but have never had an opportunity to know and appreciate him personally should get a deeper insight into his interior life from this attractively edited volume.

The essays of greatest interest are the six written by his fellow monks of Gethsemani who lived many years with him, including his abbot of twenty years. These essays, particularly, bring out many details not previously known about the interior aspects of M.'s quest for God. All the essays are well written, restrained in the obvious affection which their authors held for M. Though the other authors did not live with M., most share a common monastic background, knew his writings thoroughly, had met him personally, and knew him through mutual correspondence, some of which is cited here for the first time. All the essays are easy reading for those interested in deepening their knowledge of the inner spirit of this great man of God. Among the themes considered are M. as a human being in search of God, his evolution as a monk in quest of deeper solitude for prayerful awareness of God's presence, and as a modern writer committed to broadly ecumenical concerns in an era of changing structural forms.

This compilation includes a four-page bibliography of M.'s books, translations, and major pamphlets arranged in chronological order from 1944-73, as well as a short *curriculum vitae*. Eleven apposite woodcuts by monk-artist Lavrans Nielsen of Gethsemani further enhance the book, as does a color portrait of Merton in a contemplative mood by his personal friend Victor Hammer of Lexington. This book is a must for libraries, religious houses, Merton scholars, and those general readers interested in the roots of his thought, which is having an ever-deepening influence on modern religious understanding of our human condition.

Frederic J. Kelly, S.J.


This bibliography fulfills a long-standing need in Merton scholarship. A prolific and compulsive writer, M. frequently published his articles, book reviews, forewords, prefaches, and introductions in a variety of “little” magazines, obscure, inaccessible journals, and foreign-language publications. Many of these contain seminal ideas and are essential in tracing the development of his thought, especially his writings on contemporary social and religious problems. Ms. Breit, circula-
tion librarian at Bellarmine College, Louisville, Ky., site of the Thomas Merton Study Center, has compiled a total of 1801 items in this bibliography of primary and secondary sources, covering the period 1957-73. It ably supplements Frank Dell’Isola’s *Thomas Merton: A Bibliography* (1956). Of particular interest to some would be the listing of 246 Merton writings translated into 16 foreign languages. These items in themselves give some indication of the international influence that M.'s work has to this day. The Foreword by Brother Patrick Hart includes a short sketch of M.'s life and a briefly annotated survey of his major books, arranged according to the various periods in the development of his thought. A forty-seven-page index completes this indispensable tool for Merton scholars and the general reader interested in the thematic study of M.'s thought and its relevance to the contemporary world.

*Frederic J. Kelly, S.J.*


The present bishop of Erfurt is here honored on his sixty-fifth birthday by the staff of his seminary and others in a volume which announces as its central theme the unity-in-multiplicity of the Church. A few of the essays are directly concerned with the theme: Jungmann on the bishop as mirrored in the legal language of the late Roman Empire; Müller on the bishop and his presbytery; Ernst on the magisterium and moral theology; Löbmann on the structure and discipline of the Church in the post-Vatican II period (a brief review of structure and discipline from the beginning to the present, with an attempt at a forecast). The other essays include two on Erfurt’s history, two on Scripture, two on liturgy, and five on various other topics; in all these the relation to the book’s major theme is indirect. Of particular contemporary interest are H. Schürmann’s essay (pp. 156-69) on what exegesis can say of the virginal conception of Jesus, and L. Ulbricht’s on the diaspora Church of past and future (pp. 221-41).

*M. J. O’Connell*


C. allows images to do their work—images capturing the half shape of our day-to-day lives and images offered by a more comprehensive tradition. And he does his own work expertly by showing how such images can help articulate one another and in the process illuminate our lives. The chapter headings are topical: Analogies, Priesthood (an especially good one), Computers, Souls, Superman . . . , yet their treatment approaches the systematic, as we are offered cumulative assistance in learning how to read a world replete with images, yet so seldom construed as revelatory. C.’s fertility gleams from his tradition, and in doing so he shows how theological intelligence can be made to be fruitful. He can do this because he has a canny feeling for the way theological notions operate, and a winsome way of putting them to work to show how fertile traditional images can be. His feeling for theological notions stems from a respect for diverse uses of language, especially analogical ones. He recognizes how analogical expressions are endemic to religious discourse—not as a way of bootstrapping to the divine, but by way of calling our attention to the reaches latent in certain key notions ingredient in our lives. By showing how easily theological misunderstandings develop from overlooking
which sense of an expression is focal in the context, C. displays that skill known as theology. Along the way he manages to locate a half-dozen doctrines in their appropriate niche of human ignorance. A deft essay betraying philosophical-linguistic acumen.

David Burrell, C.S.C.


Theologians may go to the movies occasionally but they do not usually make them the object of theological reflection. Indeed, it is not the tradition in the English-speaking world to approach film with the philosophical and theological seriousness of French critics such as A. Ayfre and H. Agel. S., however, does take film seriously and, though he is not a professional theologian, his systematic study of the expression of the transcendent in the work of three directors is an important contribution to the theology of culture. S. examines the films of Ozu of Japan, Bresson of France, and Dreyer of Denmark and argues that, despite their geographical and cultural disparity, they are united in their effort to express the transcendent in film and that to do this each has carried forward the austere style of sacred art, whether Buddhist, Byzantine, or Gothic. The translation of this austerity to the screen results in a style marked, he maintains, by three characteristics: (1) a meticulous attention to the everyday, (2) a disquieting gap between the prosaicness of the everyday and an inexplicable sense of the more-than-this, (3) a final stasis in which the physical and spiritual, while still in tension, are united in their expression of the transcendent.

This book is likely to be damned from all sides. Film critics will be baffled by its whole intent and question the sturdiness of S.’s methodology. Theologians will find both his notion of the transcendent and his static conception of revelation open to challenge. The book’s chief value, however, is in the incentive it might give others to pursue similar research. S. makes us realize that films can be art and not just entertainment and that they deserve serious theological reflection.

Kenneth C. Russell
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