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BOOK REVIEWS


This magisterial work is a translation of the second, revised edition of the Heidelberg professor's contribution to the Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament, of which he is presently editor. The Hermeneia Series has already established extremely high standards in the NT volumes which have appeared; this work, first of the Hermeneia OT commentaries, carries on the tradition of first rate critical and historical scholarship. I would call attention to the strong emphasis placed upon the theology of the Hosean material, not only in the exegetical treatment but also in a section entitled "Aim," which accompanies each literary unit. This "Aim" pulls together the dominant theme or basic thrust of the passage and consistently relates it to the NT and to the needs of the modern Christian reader. Such attention to religious values, without in the least diluting the rigorously scientific character of the work, is a welcome change from earlier commentaries which were apt to sacrifice the theological dimension to philological and historical considerations. This commentary makes heavy demands upon the reader but he need not be a specialist in the field to grasp the theological significance of Hosea's message, which W. has expounded with rare skill and clarity.

Maximum usability seems to have been the norm in constructing this commentary. A list of selected titles bearing on Hosea is followed by a short Introduction, which describes the period of Hosea's proclamation, the prophet himself, his language, his theology, and the transmission of the Hosean material. What is here written in brief is filled out later, the Introduction actually giving us W.'s conclusions on the main problems which are treated in detail in the commentary. The book is broken up into twenty sections, each of which is arranged under the headings of form, setting, interpretation, and aim. A short bibliography appears at the head of each section. Twelve excursuses deal with pertinent material which would not easily fit into the commentary.

One of the book's great merits is the effort to come to terms with the redactional history of Hosea. W. sees the book as comprising three main tradition complexes (chaps. 1-3, 4-11, 12-14) which were substantially set down in writing during the prophet's lifetime but then entered a redactional process covering a period of almost two centuries. Admittedly, it is not always easy to separate authentically Hosean material from redactional supplements, but W.'s commentary gives one a sense of the vitality of the prophetic tradition as it moves through history and is influenced by that history.
From a form-critical viewpoint, W. notes the influence of wisdom literature upon Hosea's language, especially in the exuberant use of similes from Yahweh and Israel. More importantly, W. has detected the extensive influence of legal language on most of Hosea's oracles. The situation in life would be disputation between two parties who bring their case before the elders at the city gate. While W. does not neglect the influence of covenant (Sinai) ideology on the prophetic speech, I think that even more could be said on the theme of covenant violation as central to the thought and expression of Hosea. More use might have been made of studies by Mendenhall, McCarthy, Hillers, Baltzer, and others. For example, "Knowledge of God" (4:1; 6:6) and related phrases are characteristic of the prophetic proclamation. The expression may well refer to intimate knowledge of God's revealed law, as W. observes. But comparative studies have shown that the phrase has strong covenant overtones, inasmuch as "knowledge" of another often suggests the recognition of that person's authority. In other words, the phrase is at home in the context of the suzerain-vassal relationship.

W. is not alone in underlining the strong influence of Hosea on Deuteronomy in both language and theology. Whole complexes of thought which are characteristic of Deuteronomic parenesis find their counterpart in Hosea's oracles. W. even calls the contemporary tradents of the Hosean tradition "forerunners of the Deuteronomic movement" (p. xxxi). And yet the differences should not be overlooked. Hosea speaks of Yahweh's love for Israel, but there is no mention of Israel's love for Yahweh, either as a fact or as an ideal. Hosea pictures Yahweh's love for Israel under the figures of the husband's love for wife or father's for son. The father-son relationship is present in Deuteronomy, but not in the context of a love which is demanded; and the husband-wife analogy is missing. Influence on Deuteronomic thinking, therefore, should not be questioned, but it must be stated with caution.

One might sum up this superb achievement by saying that the elements are all here for an in-depth study of Hosea. Bibliographies, historical references, abundant textual notes with special attention paid to the Septuagint, independent translation, and generous indices make this an indispensable volume for the scholar whose disagreement on this or that point will not diminish his gratitude for what must now rank as the leading commentary on Hosea in the English language.

Boston College

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE FIRST CENTURY: HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY, POLITICAL HISTORY, SOCIAL, CULTURAL AND RELIGIOUS LIFE AND INSTITUTIONS. Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 1, Volume 1. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern in co-operation with D.

This is the first stout volume in an ambitious, projected series of ten volumes that “is designed as a historical work on the relationship of Judaism and Christianity” (p. ix). Two volumes are planned for each of five sections in this series of Compendia: (1) The Jewish People in the First Century; (2) Oral and Literary Tradition in Judaism and Early Christianity; (3) Social and Religious History of Judaism and Early Christianity; (4) Comparative Study of Jewish and Early Christian Thought; and (5) The History of Jewish-Christian Relations from the Third Century to Modern Times. The project grew out of a committee meeting (September 1964), called to produce “a general handbook on the interrelation between Judaism and Christianity in the first two centuries” (p. v). But the project has obviously grown in scope and perspective beyond what is implied in the (grammatically questionable—cf. IGR on p. xviii for the way a classicist would have phrased it) Latin title of the series relating it ad Novum Testamentum. How Section 5 fits into that is unclear.

The preface of this volume frankly sets forth the irenic concern of the editors of the series (M. de Jonge and S. Safrai), to “bring together scholars of Early Christianity and Rabbinic studies and others in related fields” to examine the many sources available in both Christian and Jewish tradition to produce “a series which could form a bridge between Jewish and Christian theology” (p. vi). Supported by many renowned individuals and Jewish or Christian groups, in particular by the Prins Bernhard Fonds of Amsterdam, the series is obviously off to a good start in its quest for “a deeper insight into Torah and Gospel.” Both the Dutch publisher, Van Gorcum of Assen, and the associated American publisher, Fortress of Philadelphia, are to be congratulated on their courage to undertake a project of this scope in a joint endeavor.

The subtitle of Vol. 1 indicates the breadth of its coverage. Its ten chapters are devoted to such topics as the following: (1) Sources: Hebrew and Aramaic (composed by S. Safrai), Greek and Latin Literary Sources (M. Stern), New Testament (M. de Jonge), Papyri (M. Stern), Archaeological Sources (M. Avi-Yonah); (2) Historical Geography of Palestine (M. Avi-Yonah); (3) Jewish Diaspora (M. Stern); (4) Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel (S. Safrai); (5) The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty (M. Stern); (6) The Province of Judaea (M. Stern); (7) Jewish Self-Government (S. Safrai); (8) Legal Status of Jewish Communities in the Diaspora (S. Appelbaum); (9) Organization of Jewish Communities in the Diaspora (S. Appelbaum); (10) Private Law: Jewish (Z. W. Falk), Hellenistic (H. J. Wolff). As one can see from
this line-up, most of the scholars who have contributed to this first volume are Jewish. The contributions of Safrai and Stern were originally written in Hebrew and have been translated. The stylistic revision of the articles, however, does not measure up to the general good quality of the contents. Too many misprints, mispointed Hebrew words, and English solecisms have slipped through.

The Introduction explains that “the authors and editors have attempted to consider all the sources and researches and have striven to present as faithful and complete a representation as possible” (p. xiii). Yet one wonders just what idea of “sources and researches” the editors are operating with, since neither Qumran nor Targumic literature figures among the “sources” of chap. 1; they are apparently to be treated later in Section 2 (Oral and Literary Traditions). But a glance at the Hebrew and Aramaic sources in chap. 1 treats of Mishnah, Baraita and Tosephta, Talmud, and Midrashim. Consequently, it is not clear why certain materials are included here and not others. It is to be hoped that the rationale behind the ordering of the material in the volumes will eventually be made clear. One has the impression that the project grew somewhat like Topsy and has not even yet been fully integrated.

The individual contributions in the various chapters represent up-to-date treatments of the topics. Normally they are succinctly written and accurate. Since the volumes are intended for use by “pastors, priests, rabbis, teachers and other non-specialists” (p. ix), the contributions will undoubtedly be found adequate. But the topical range of the contributions is wide and the treatment is recognizably limited. What is there is good, but the scholar will normally have to go elsewhere for detailed treatments (e.g., only two pages are devoted to the census of Quirinius). I found the most interesting chapters to be those on Historical Geography, and Herod and the Herodian Dynasty.

Unfortunately, the first chapter is the one that is the most problematic. Whereas one can only laud the emphasis to be placed in this series on the “relations in history, literature and thought” between the two bodies of documents to be studied, Jewish and Christian, over against former treatments that were often one-sided or that used the one body or other only incidentally, yet there are problems. In a volume that purports to treat the *Jewish People in the First Century*, the critical reader is puzzled by the first real page of text when told that the Hebrew and Aramaic “sources” for this topic come “from the period of the Second Temple until the end of the Talmudic period” (p. 1). Now “the end of the Talmudic period” by any conservative estimate is ca. A.D. 450. Or again, it is puzzling to read that the “group of writings, which is our direct concern in these pages, consists of the various collections known by the
comprehensive designation of Talmudic literature" (ibid.), when it is admitted that "the date of their first compilation as written works can hardly be earlier than the third century C.E." (ibid.). Yet not one word is offered here to substantiate the claim that "the matter embodied in them had been taking shape in the era of the Second Temple (before C.E. 70), and was transmitted orally from scholar to disciple with such additions and reformulations and adaptations as each age demanded" (ibid.). Pp. 4-5 are devoted, indeed, to "the problem of dating," but they never come close to confronting the real problem in this literature: How does one sort out from the "additions and reformulations and adaptations as each age demanded" that which "had been taking shape in the era of the Second Temple (before C.E. 70)?" It is well known that this literature cites the sayings of rabbis prior to R. Judah the Prince (ca. A.D. 200), the compiler of the Mishnah, which forms the core of the Talmuds—and of some rabbis even from the first century. But how does one guarantee that what the Talmuds or Mishnah put on the lips of R. So-and-So was actually said by him? In Christian circles we have gradually achieved some success in getting some Christians to realize that merely because NT writers put words on the lips of Jesus of Nazareth, that does not necessarily mean that he actually uttered them. And the Christian Gospels are not so far removed from the period of the Palestinian Jew, Jesus of Nazareth (somewhere between 4 B.C. and A.D. 33 roughly), as that implied by "before C.E. 70" and "the third century C.E." How do we bring about a critical reading of the rabbinic literature dating from A.D. 200-450 that is going to be free of some of the naive extrapolation that is the undercurrent in chap. 1 of this volume? Another reviewer of this volume has noted that "the Israeli historians whose works comprise almost the whole volume tend to take 'historical' details found in the NT more seriously than many Christian interpreters of the NT" (D. J. Harrington, JBL 93 [1974] 609). The quotation marks about the word "historical" save the statement, but that tendency is rooted in their own less critical stance about the purported historical details of the first century "before C.E. 70" recorded in rabbinic literature. Fortunately, the deficiency noted characterizes the first chapter of this volume and is not true of the genuinely solid contributions to be found in most of the other chapters of the book. With this one general caution, I can only recommend the volume most highly and wish the series a continued success.

Weston College School of Theology

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


This work is an outgrowth of the Speaker's Lectures Professor Goulder
delivered in 1969–71 at Trinity College, Oxford. G.’s thesis is simple: Mt expands Mk by midrash, has no other written source, and depends very little on oral sources. Further, Mt is a lectionary, a cycle of lessons which follow the Jewish festal lectionary.

In Part 1 (“The Matthean Manner”) G. discusses midrashic method as having a broadly twofold purpose: to edify and to reconcile the “old” with the “new.” With this explained, there are chapters on Matthew’s poetry, Matthean imagery, non-Marcan traditions, Mt and Paul, etc. Part 2 (“The Matthean Year”) explains the Matthean cycle of lessons, with chapters on the New Israel (Mt 1–4), Pentecost (5–7), the works of the Messiah rejected (8–9:12), the new year (10–11), Tabernacles (13–16:12), Hanukkah (16:13–19), going up to Passover (20–23), Passover (24–28). The depth of G.’s work is obvious; the expertise in Greek we have seen so often in British scholarship is impressive; there is a wealth of valuable information and a broad sweep through OT and rabbinic parallels to Mt in style, imagery, and language; the book is serious and well worth working through.

Still, I find very serious problems with G.’s conclusions; a few examples can illustrate my reservations. In his treatment of Mt 5:31–32 (pp. 290–91), G. notes the Matthean insertion of μη επι πορνεία. That “insertion” (if it is one) occurs only in 19:9, not 5:32, where the phrase is parektos logou porneias, which G. had rightly located at 5:32 on p. 18. He obfuscates treatment of these difficult exceptive phrases when he says parektos is non-Matthean (p. 291). It is Matthean—it is there and that makes it Matthean, if only by adoption. Further, to calmly declare that porneia “has nothing to do with the Levitical laws of affinity” (p. 291) will raise many eyebrows. This remains a heavily contested issue and G. treats it as settled.

G. maintains that Mt is a reworking of Mk much more than an “edited compendium of traditions, as has been commonly supposed” (p. 6). Supposed by whom? Not by Schweizer, Bonnard, Grundmann, Cope, Thompson, or dozens of others who have resisted in the strongest ways any effort to view Mt simply as a scissors-and-paste editor. G.’s opponents, as he describes them, are hardly in vogue in the 70’s.

It is somewhat astounding that in a 1974 work there is no reference to the works of Gaboury, Léon-Dufour, and others who must be reckoned with before we simply see a reworking of Mk. These men have raised significant new questions in recent years concerning the Synoptic problem; they should be faced if one is to make his own case plausible. Part of the scholar’s task is to enter into debate with opposing positions and then demonstrate the merits of his thesis over against others.

G.’s description of midrash is so broad as to include almost anything outside the Mishnah. Assuming G.’s presuppositions about midrashic
activity in Mt, I would agree but be left wondering what I had really affirmed. Some consultation with A. Wright's work on midrash could have refined G. 's midrashic thesis considerably.

In finding Mt a lectionary, G. notes rightly that in some mss. there are divisions (kephalaia) which lend themselves to lectional usage. The question, however, is not whether the community of Codex Alexandrinus in the fifth century used Mt as a lectionary (they probably did) but: did Mt intend this? To argue from textual divisions three or four centuries removed from the autograph is tenuous. It appears to retroject an ordered, structured fifth-century community's liturgical life into the first century. I believe G. is correct in finding Mt to be a Christian scribe, but the structured community G. seems to see in Mt has yet to be established. To suggest (p. 9) that Mt is a bishop in a Syrian community is interesting but totally unfounded.

The wealth of information is enriching but one is left with the impression that G. took an imaginative thesis and set out to prove it, not to check it and challenge it. With most other Composition critics, I think most of our questions about Mt are answered in Mt, not in Mk or Paul or elsewhere. Synoptic comparison is essential, but to allow this to lead us into terms like "Mt replaces Mk's..." presumes too much and lays a weak foundation on which to build. If Mt used Mk, as is commonly held, did he have our edition of Mk? Did Mt and his community understand and interpret Mk as Mk intended or the Marcan community understood it?

Marquette University

J. ALEX SHERLOCK


Lane's commentary, written for a series with a professed Evangelical perspective and directed at both scholars and pastors, represents the most detailed and comprehensive work on Mark's Gospel in English since the commentary of Vincent Taylor. One purpose of the work, as L. states, is to incorporate "this vast reservoir of critical opinion [on the Gospel] and to make the best material accessible to the man who is not a specialist" (p. xi). The work contains a thirty-eight-page Introduction, detailed exegesis of each verse, ample bibliography and indices of authors, topics, and scriptural citations. The exegesis is done on the basis of the King James Version, which represents a serious defect, since much space is devoted to updating the translation.

In treating the introductory problems to Mark (date, destination, and authorship), L. blends a modification of new insights with traditional
positions. Mark is the John Mark of Acts 12:25 (cf. 1 Pt 5:13) but is viewed as a charismatic teacher who creates a new form “gospel” which is a witness document made up of Petrine recollections of authentic sayings and deeds of Jesus. This work is written for Roman Christians suffering under Nero’s persecution and embodies a theological perspective where the reader has a faith encounter with Jesus, the Messiah and Son of God, through the medium of history (p. 53). In restating traditional opinions, L. brings a wealth of evidence and clear argumentation which should evoke serious consideration of his positions.

In the commentary itself L. stresses primarily historical criticism and exhibits masterful control over OT background to Mark and possible rabbinic parallels, and shows a wide knowledge of the Greco-Roman world. He shows fine ability to shed new light on aspects of the Gospel such as the wilderness motif which is behind Mk 1:1–14 (p. 39–62) and Mk 6:30–44 (p. 223–232), the discussion on fasting (Mk 2:18–22), the Sabbath controversy (Mk 2:27–28), and the cry of dereliction (Mk 15:34). His treatment of problem verses such as 14:7 and 14:41 is perceptive and enlightening.

Despite the weight of scholarship and careful exegesis, certain of L.’s positions are at variance with contemporary Marcan studies. While using redaction criticism, L. sees Mark’s activity as limited to the collection and structuring of authentic words and deeds of Jesus. In effect, he does redaction criticism without using the insights of form criticism that the early Church not only handed on but modified the Jesus tradition. For example, despite the virtual consensus that Mk 4:13–20 (the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower) stems from the early Church, L. holds that it is Jesus’ own interpretation. He argues that Jesus could have taught in allegory. While this may be true, L. never comes to terms with the linguistic and historical evidence that the interpretation is a later addition. In his discussion of Mk 13, L. holds that the discourse is an integral discourse representing a prophetic discourse of the historical Jesus. Yet, in his own discussion of the individual sections of the discourse, he sees allusions to the events of the Jewish wars and the destruction of the Temple which would suggest that the discourse was redacted at a time later than L. himself proposes for the composition of the Gospel.

While L. sees Christology as the center of Mark, the Christology represents a reporting of the explicit consciousness of Jesus that he was Messiah and Son of God. He uses expressions like “The demon is fully aware of Jesus’ divine origin and dignity” (p. 183) and “For a brief moment the veil of his humanity was lifted” (p. 318, in commenting on the Transfiguration). There is danger here of interpreting NT Christolog-
ical titles and the developing Christology of the NT through the lens of Nicaea and Chalcedon.

Because L. so frequently alludes to rabbinic material, the reader should exercise caution in viewing all this material as background to the NT. In his exposition of the Sanhedrin trial (14:53–65) L. writes: "There is evidence that contemporary Judaism also conceived of the Messiah as sitting at God's right hand and coming in the clouds of heaven. The Sanhedrin would understand Jesus' words as an unqualified claim to messianic dignity" (p. 537). As proof for this he cites the midrash on Ps 2:7 and Ps 18. Examination of the midrash cited indicates that not only is it post-Christian but it may actually represent a Jewish response to Christian use of the Psalms as found in Mk 14:62.

Despite these reservations, L.'s work remains a significant contribution to Marcan studies. A short review can neither do justice to the many positive qualities of the work nor enter into critical discussion of the problematic points. Though written from a "conservative" posture toward the methods of contemporary NT research, the work cannot be ignored by scholars of any posture. The pastoral implications scattered throughout the work show that, like the Gospels themselves, the work is written from faith for faith.

Vanderbilt Divinity School

JOHN R. DONAHUE, S.J.


This is an uneven work, excellent in the specific area of the author's expertise (e.g., Greek style) but quite inadequate in many points of Johannine scholarship. The inadequacies are obvious in the first two pages. Quite rightly, F. tells us that in John the personage of the divine Logos tends to efface the human characteristics of Jesus, but he sees no difficulty in postulating that an eyewitness of the career of Jesus wrote this Gospel. F. assures us with confidence that he wrote this book with the commentaries of Lagrange and Bultmann always at hand, but he shows little knowledge of other Johannine criticism. On p. 12, n. 3, he can assert: "All the critics are in accord in recognizing that one must put chapter 6 before chapter 5." In reconstructing the style of Johannine poetry, F. has no real difficulty in following Bultmann's incredible rearrangement in the sequence 9:4–5; 8:12; 12:44–50; 8:21–29; 12:35–36; it is almost as if Moody Smith had never written a masterful critique of Bultmann's Discourse Source. Particularly mind-boggling is the argumentation on p. 22 that the question of whether 6:51–58 belongs to the original Bread of Life Discourse depends ultimately on whether one
believes Jesus is the Son of God: if he was, he certainly knew his own destiny and that he would institute the Eucharist. In my judgment, that is both bad literary criticism and questionable Christology.

But such faults are minor and do not seriously detract from the main contribution of the book. Drawing on his knowledge of Greek poetry, Septuagintal, Hellenistic, and classic, F. arranges the Johannine discourses in lines and strophes, carefully analyzing their features. The poetic format that emerges is not as rigid as Bultmann's canon for the Redenquelle (strophes of four verses formed of two parallel distichs). It is a reasonable blend of variant styles based on both formal grammatical features and on the sense of the lines. It would thus differ considerably from the almost purely structural reconstructions of Johannine poetry popular among Catholic scholars who have studied in Rome under I. de la Potterie. The detail of F.'s stylistic analysis is a major step in placing on a scientific level the versification of Johannine discourse—a versification on which I insisted in my own commentary on John but without such minute analysis.

Since both Jesus and John the Baptist speak the same way in the fourth Gospel (cf. 3:31-36), the Evangelist has rewritten the tradition in his own style. Indeed, F. has applied some of his stylistic study to the Synoptic tradition and reached the conclusion that each Evangelist imposed his own style on the words of Jesus.

Other good points of the book include an eloquently simple analysis of the Johannine message and a comparison between John and the Corpus Hermeticum. The Johannine message is that the glory of God has been revealed in Jesus, so that to recognize the glory of one is to recognize the glory of the other. This is done through belief called forth by words and deeds of Jesus and above all evoked by his passion, in which he returns to his Father. The first half of the Gospel is arranged in a pattern of reactions to Jesus: belief, disbelief, and division, provoked by his words and deeds. As for the Corpus Hermeticum which F. coedited, there is little relationship between its thought and that of John. Here F.'s reputation as a Hermetic scholar of thirty-years standing is pitted against Bultmann's Gnostic approach to John, for F. holds up the Corpus as a provable example of second-century Gnosticism opposed to Bultmann's hypothetical reconstructions. He writes almost brutally in reference to the latter: "Ce sont là inventions aussi peu scientifiques que possible et, en un sens, moralement malhonnêtes" (p. 134). Unfortunately, he gives no real discussion of the bearing of the Chenoboskion works on the proto-Gnosticism question.

A flawed book that is still important for Johannine specialists.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.
Woodstock College, N.Y.C.

Towards the end of his book F. quotes with approval the late T. W. Manson: “The Church is built on the fact and not on a theory. The theories that we meet in the New Testament and in later doctrines are attempts to explain the fact. The fact is not an invention to suit the theories. That is why, while in different books of the New Testament we have different lines of explanation, they are at one in the fact that they set out to explain.” The fact, of course, is that “Jesus of Nazareth, dead and risen, [is] the savior of all mankind.” F.’s dissertation, presented to the Pontifical Biblical Commission in 1970, is an admirable confirmation of Manson’s words as far as the Gospel of John is concerned and as specified in his subtitle. Meticulously and carefully done, this is an almost entirely satisfying production in every way. Without sacrificing scholarship, F. has succeeded in the enviable and correspondingly rare performance of writing a doctoral dissertation that is also extremely readable and should speak to an audience wider than the one professionally devoted to Johannine studies.

Without denying the light that is shed on Jn by comparative religious studies, F. adopts the sensible premise that the Gospel should first be allowed to speak for itself. He rejects Bultmann’s totally existentialist interpretation, which excludes all salvific meaning from the cross, but he also recognizes that the primitive kerygma which interpreted the cross in terms of expiation, vicarious satisfaction, or sacrifice is not part of Jn’s theology. An important element in his methodology is to highlight the redactional character of the Gospel, so that secondary elements can be seen properly as such.

He begins with the presentation of the central theme of Jn’s theology: Jesus is the revelation of God. In this context the cross is the visible sign of the exaltation and glorification of the Son of Man in the presence of God. The Good Shepherd giving his life for his sheep in chap. 10 is not an expiatory figure but one manifesting devotion. Jesus’ sanctification of himself in 17:19 signifies his fidelity to the Father’s word and thus his revelation of God to man: the revelation of a whole life which is only culminated in the cross.

In this light F. analyses the Passion story in Jn: it represents Jesus’ triumph, by which he is exalted as the source of life. His death is a passover because it is a passing to the Father, but Jesus is not the paschal victim. The Resurrection story, once such non-Johannine elements as sensible verification and the Lucan and Pauline theme of the Spirit and forgiveness of sins have been removed, is a mission appearance
fulfilling the Gospel's expectation concerning eternal life. I would like to have seen this hypothesis argued a little less hurriedly.

Faith in Jn is a dynamic personal act by which the believer attaches himself to Jesus. F. perhaps questionably argues that the pisteuein eis formula (which is not peculiarly Johannine) is derived from the ha'amín b of the OT, even though he notes that it was not transmitted by the LXX. Also, he has not perhaps given sufficient attention to the possibility that Jn not only regards faith based on miracles to be inadequate but that he actively polemizes against such a faith. Eternal life in Jn is communion with God and Christ made possible by faith. F. resists the temptation to excise all future eschatology from Jn (eternal life is shared more fully after death), but he does regard as additions those texts which speak of a last day of resurrection. On the sacraments he steers a path between the extremes of Cullmann and Bultmann: there is a sacramental interest in Jn, but it is entirely subordinated to faith in the word of God revealed in Jesus.

F.'s treatment of sin in Jn is provocative. It is of such complexity that forgiveness is not the issue but rather an eternal life which banishes it and creates sinlessness. Accordingly 20:23 is rejected as non-Johannine. Jn 1:29 partly represents the Servant of the Lord (though not by the mis-translation theory) but not in an expiatory sense. In a comparison of Jn with 1 Jn (skipping over the literary question) F. finds the two writings to be in basic agreement even on eschatology and hilasmos.

F. concludes with a suggestion of the pastoral relevance of this interpretation of Jn as more attuned to the modern world than others have been. I agree with the suggestion, and for that reason would have welcomed more attention to Jn 12:24.

*DePaul University*  
*BRUCE VAWTER, C.M.*


This second volume of Pelikan’s monumental history of Christian thought (five volumes are planned) begins with a quotation from Harnack: “The history of dogma in the Greek church came to an end in the seventh century and any revival of that history is difficult to imagine.” Another quotation, from Gibbon, follows: during ten centuries of Eastern Christian history “not a single discovery was made to exalt the dignity or promote the happiness of mankind.” *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom* is an attempt to counterbalance Harnack’s and Gibbon’s evaluation. Not only is this attempt successful, but it represents as well—together with the first volume on *The Emergence of the Catholic*
Tradition, where a strong emphasis was also placed upon doctrinal developments in the East—the first "history of dogma" published in any Western language which does real justice to Eastern Christianity. P. does not hide his personal affinities with "the spirit of Eastern Christendom," but he is also right when he describes his work as "a history for Western readers in a Western context" (p. 7), and one can only hope that Western readers will give appropriate attention to his work.

Vol. 2 is divided into six chapters, devoted respectively to the theological methodology which prevailed in Eastern Christendom (with appropriate and extensive references to Maximus the Confessor), to Christological issues, to the veneration of icons and the liturgy, to the conflict between East and West, to polemics with non-Christian religions and philosophical systems (Judaism, dualism, Islam, and Hellenism), and to "the last flowering of Byzantine Orthodoxy," which includes monastic mystical theology and, according to P., continues with the struggle for Eastern identity in the various Orthodox confessions of the seventeenth century. Numerous references to primary sources—Greek, Syriac, Slavic, and others—and a very rich bibliography, which includes Russian authors, contribute to the exceptional comprehensiveness of the book.

P.'s main emphasis is on Byzantine Orthodoxy, but chap. 2 includes also a detailed discussion of the Nestorian and Monophysite Christological positions, appropriately reminding the reader that the first major and lasting schism in Christendom occurred not in the eleventh century but during the Eastern Christological controversies which followed Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). The impact of these Christological debates was so great that the medieval Byzantines continued to understand newly-emerging theological issues within the same Christological frame of reference, even in the later period. Thus, fundamental issues concerning the nature of salvation were defined Christologically, and the appropriate synodal decisions, because of their central importance, were enshrined in the Synodicon of Orthodoxy. A reference to these debates and also to hymnography, one of the most revealing sources of theology for Byzantium, would have confirmed P.'s basic points that "the antithesis between divine grace and human freedom, which dogged Western theology for many centuries, did not present a problem in that form for Eastern Christian thought" (p. 12) and that "the divergences between the Eastern and Augustinian definitions of Christianity were expressed in connection with this doctrine of deification" (p. 260).

It is with great expectation that one will now await the publication of the next three volumes. Vol. 5, Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture
since 1700, will include appropriate treatment of modern Orthodox theology, particularly in Russia, considered as "heir apparent" of Byzantium (pp 295-98). When completed, the work is likely to serve as a major resource for an authentic reintegration of Christian tradition as a whole.

St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

JOHN MEYENDORFF


For some years there has been need for a general account of the Celtic churches to replace Louis Gougaud's Christianity in Celtic Lands, long out of print and now outdated. This new volume can be called an adequate successor to Gougaud's, and although it is intended for a general readership, it will be of some value to scholars as well.

The term "Celtic churches" can be applied to those churches among the Celtic peoples, and their study can begin with the Epistle to the Galatians and can certainly include the work of Irenaeus of Lyons, who preached in Celtic. However, the term is usually limited to the churches which developed in the British Isles and their Continental offshoots in Brittany and Spanish Brigantia. This more restricted understanding, accepted by M., usually has an important corollary: the Celtic churches developed an almost native Christianity which adopted many Celtic cultural and social practices and which in many ways was independent of the larger Western church, especially the see of Rome. It happened almost inevitably; Christianity grew up in a warm, urban, classical environment and was transplanted into a cool, rural, barbarian environment. A highly organized church was both unnecessary and impossible, and individuals rather than institutions dominated religious life. But, as M. makes clear, the Celts were always part of the universal Church and accepted, however unwillingly, its authority even on the most controversial issues, such as the date of Easter. Contrary to another recent work (cf. TS 34 [1973] 321-23), this makes no attempt to turn the Celts into proto-Protestants.

The book proceeds chronologically and geographically, surveying the rise and development of Christianity in Britain, Ireland, Wales, and Brittany, with special attention given to Irish Christianity. It concentrates on M.'s two favorite topics: the monastic saints and the uniqueness of the ecclesiastical organization. The presentation is always clear, readable, and, for the size of the book, remarkably informative. The scope and depth of Celtic Christianity are seen in the moderate approach to pagan culture and customs, the development of distinctive art forms,
the missionary accomplishments of the *peregrini pro amore Christi*, the Continent-wide conflicts with the Roman order, and the remarkable durability of Celtic traits. M.'s approach is objective, except for his fondness for Celtic individualism, and he usually avoids taking sides in the many scholarly disputes bedeviling the Irish side of these studies.

An added value (at least to this reviewer) is M.'s long experience in this area. He began his work in 1912 and has witnessed and shaped the development of Celtic Christian studies since then. He has a superb knowledge of older editions and secondary works which are still of great value, and in some places he draws upon his personal recollections of past scholars. This is a knowledge which will not again be available.

The main drawback is, ironically, M.'s reliance on older editions which are not as valuable as the modern ones. For the *Catalogus sanctorum Hiberniae* he uses the text of A. Haddan and W. Stubbs rather than that of Paul Grosjean. The same is true for the canons of the Second Synod of Saint Patrick; M. uses Haddan and Stubbs instead of Ludwig Bieler. There are also occasional errors which defy easy explanation. The figure who called Saint Patrick to Ireland is twice listed as Victorinus, despite the fact that the critical edition of Bieler, which M. cites, clearly says Victoricus. There is an attribution of a sermon to Saint Gall with no mention that its authenticity is an open question at best. Finally, one must wonder at the absence of the names Bernhard Bischoff and Jocelyn Hillgarth from the bibliography.

But these reservations are not major obstacles for the book's intended general audience, and this should remain a standard introduction to Celtic Christianity for some years.

*John Carroll University*

**JOSEPH F. KELLY**


This modest volume, a *Habilitationsschrift* submitted to the theology faculty of Göttingen University, contains a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the charismatic structure of the Eastern Church and its corresponding understanding of St. Paul during the fourth and early fifth centuries. The influence of Hans von Campenhausen upon the work is such that it could almost be viewed as a sequel to the latter's *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, which explores the tension between institutional and charismatic offices in the ante-Nicene Church. The subject matter with which R. deals is
inherently difficult, since it is scattered among the voluminous writings of the four churchmen studied: Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyr, and Cyril of Alexandria. Unfortunately for the non-German reader, R. has chosen to express himself in elegant periodic sentences, which make the original Greek texts he is discussing seem simple by comparison. The book, however, repays the careful reading it demands, and much time will probably elapse before anyone can improve upon its conclusions.

R. calls his work "unmodern," in view of the flight from history that marks the Church and theology today. A reading of his essay, which is characterized by historical empathy, intellectual humility, and scholarly discipline, suggests that such "antiquarianism" has much to offer in raising the consciousness of the Church by presenting an accurate image of her Catholic past which she may reflect upon with profit.

R.'s stated purpose is to determine how the Pauline conception of the Church, as the body of Christ formed of charismatic members, was taken up in the ancient Church. In general, previous works on this subject concerned themselves with charism in the sensational, supernatural sense, e.g., B. B. Warfield, *Counterfeit Miracles* (1918), to be added to R.'s excellent bibliography. He chose to study the golden age of the Fathers, since the period up to Origen had been covered by M. Lauterburg (1898). Chrysostom was selected as one of the few Fathers whose works survive almost entirely and permit the concept of charism to be studied in its manifold usages. To place C.'s thought in perspective, a comparison is then made with important contemporary theologians of Syria (Theodore, Theodoret) and Egypt (Cyril).

R.'s main concern is Chrysostom (+407), who usually defies the academician because of his extensive writings and their unsystematic, poetic character. Probably for this reason a basic confusion occurs in the otherwise distinguished chapter on C.'s understanding of charism. R. initially assumes that C. and the early Church, in contrast to St. Paul, misunderstood charismata as "miraculous" (p. 35); but then he goes on to show that C. did indeed differentiate "wonders" from other charismata (pp. 38 f., n. 21). Finally, on p. 53 he begins to expound the saint's "other" (Pauline) view on grace gifts. The distinction between the two types of charismata, which is fundamental to Chrysostom's interpretation of the matter, is disparagingly compared to Pauline thought and at last discounted by R. on p. 54. But this is the only point at which he does not appear as the total master of his material.

The basic posture of the various Fathers towards charismata is well delineated. Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia agree in distinguishing the physically perceptible charismata of the apostolic Church
(glossolaly, gift of healing, miracles), which were eventually extinguished, from the charismata of the present-day Church, which are invisible to those outside the community of faith (forgiveness of sins in baptism, justification, atonement, sanctification). On p. 55 R. understands Chrysostom as saying that the charismata of the contemporary Church are visible in the common goods of the community (teaching, pastors, mysteries), but the meaning seems rather to be that even these goods are visible only to believers and depend upon faith, i.e., trust in the truth of the heard Word with no reference to human reasonings (logismoi) or any other assurances. According to Chrysostom and Theodore, the foremost apostolic charisma was the gift of tongues, which was given to aid the first missionary endeavors of the apostles in foreign lands. Both Fathers offer the same explanation for the disappearance of the perceptible charismata (= signs and wonders of the Gospels and Acts). These were intended to function as the necessary complement and confirmation of the apostolic mission preaching—necessary because the apostles, ordinary, ignorant individuals, could not have conquered the world without the help of miracles. Pagans at the outset would not have been converted by means of a spiritual grace alone. At the same time, C. emphasizes the shortcomings of such wonders, whose function was only "to astonish and to disturb" and could not provide the basis for faith, which was created by preaching and teaching. Subsequent to the apostles God withdrew the grace, which had permitted the energy of the Spirit to be felt externally. By so doing He has honored rather than belittled the later Church, which must believe in invisible realities without any external sign. Thus for C. the miraculous grace gifts disappeared in order that the essence of faith would appear more clearly.

Whereas Chrysostom and Theodore both attest to the disappearance of the perceptible charismata, they differ in their conception of the charismata in the present-day Church. The former comes near to the intention of Paul, when he emphasizes the ministerial character of church office, and attempts to organize monasticism in this framework also. Indeed, one of the most intriguing aspects of R.'s essay is the revelation of the almost incredible profundity of C.'s ecclesiology, based largely upon the NT and influenced only superficially by the hierarchic imperial Church of the time and the excesses of Syrian monasticism. It is not surprising that Theodore has a much more limited concept; for him, nothing rivals the priesthood in its concretizing of grace.

In distinction to both these writers, Theodoret of Cyr believed in the continuation of the miraculous grace gifts in the monasticism of his day. Monasticism itself he viewed as charismatic, insofar as it presupposed a special grace to undertake the arduous life of "philosophy." In addition,
many of the eremites were gifted with the apostolic charismata of healing and prophecy, for which they had fitted themselves through their ascetic labors. The monks actually functioned as an independent, charismatic clergy, but nonetheless willingly deferred to the bishops and presbyters. While the latter derived their authority from ordination, which set them apart for the specific purpose of governing the community, the former received an individual grace that related primarily to their own person and only secondarily to the service of the community. The relationship between the two types of clergy in T. prefigures that between bishop and starets in medieval and czarist Russia.

R. admits that he is least satisfied with his analysis of Cyril of Alexandria. Two conflicting traditions commingle in his thought: Origen's belief in the supremacy of the charismatic office of teacher, and the later development of patriarchal politics, in which C. unduly emphasizes his own power. He seems not to have resolved the tension between these two forces. He speaks almost scholastically about the Pauline charismata being present in his church, while he insists that all the grace gifts are incarnated in the bishop's office.

In more ways than space permits to be enumerated here, Ritter's work is trustworthy and informative, and will be read by all interested in the Eastern Church of the fourth century as well as the contemporary charismatic movement.

Boston College

MARGARET SCHATKIN


This volume is the result of several years of research into the early medieval sources that bear on the development of religious lay movements, with special attention to those that speak of Francis of Assisi and his order. The key concept examined is that of "evangelical perfection," and L. shows the origin, changes, and development of this idea as it shaped the life and thought of the Friars Minor prior to the election of St. Bonaventure as minister general of the new order in 1257.

L. was awarded the doctorate from the University of Munich for this research. His study may have some of the disadvantages of a dissertation, but his constant use of summaries makes the work readable and informative even for one not trained in the ways of a scholar. For the trained reader—theologian, historian, or spiritual guide—L.'s study fills an important need. His contribution is original and sheds much light on the spiritual lay movements of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. In addition, L. surveys the literature and incorporates it into his own
research; thus he introduces the reader both to early medieval literature and to the fruits of modern scholarship, especially that of Germany.

The book is divided into three sections. The first section, a short forty-five pages, is important for its summary of the pre-Franciscan movements that began with the Gregorian reform, and L. indicates how the literature of that time spoke of the "apostolic life" as the guiding principle of religious reform. With the arrival of the Waldensians and the Humiliati, this changed into the principles of the "evangelical life."

The second section and the major portion is L.'s examination of the writings of St. Francis, showing that "the rule and life of the Friars Minor is to observe the holy Gospel of Our Lord Jesus Christ." From Francis' writings L. moves on to investigate the little-known letter of Brother Elias in which he announced to the Friars the death of Francis. Elias' letter puts Francis in a biblical perspective, as the antitype of many biblical personages, and gives to Francis a salvific mission. The Friars form a sign of the new people of God. This early witness of Elias shows a spirituality pre-eminently biblical. With this as foundation, L. goes on to show that the integral element of evangelical perfection is poverty, as it is especially clear in Francis' Sacrum commercium, his dialogue with Lady Poverty. L. also studies the legends (legendae, i.e., written to be read publicly, not legend in the modern sense) of Francis by Thomas of Celano, Julian of Speyer and the three companions, also the writings of St. Clare, early liturgical texts, papal statements, chronicles, and even sources that arose independently of the Franciscan experience.

In the third section L. systematically integrates the elements he found in the sources and builds an adequate vision of what is meant by "evangelical perfection." He shows that this is a very rich concept filled with the experience that the early Friars understood as the radical way of the gospel life, i.e., to follow and to mold oneself into the "footprints" of Jesus Christ. Gospel perfection must have its focus on Jesus, who chose poverty as the way to the Father.

This excellent, thorough study will serve as a source book for years to come; I hope it will be translated into English. With our desire today for renewal in religious and ecclesial life, there is much we can learn from the early Friars who were closest to Francis. L.'s careful study of the sources provides us with much help to solidly construct a renewal of the Christian life characterized as evangelical perfection.

St. Louis, Mo.  WAYNE HELLMANN, O.F.M.Conv.

ORDO: UNTERSUCHUNG EINES GRUNDGEDANKENS IN DER THEOLOGIE BONAVENTURAS. By A. J. Wayne Hellmann, O.F.M.Conv. Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Institutes zur Erforschung der mittelalterlichen

The recent year-long celebration of the seventh centenary of the deaths of Aquinas and Bonaventure has occasioned programs and publications on medieval thought of high caliber, among which we may include the present book. Completed in 1973 and published in 1974 during the centenary year, this study is a doctoral dissertation written by an American friar under the direction of W. Dettloff. Coming at this point in the history of Bonaventurian thought, the work benefits richly from the studies which have preceded it and develops numerous well-established findings in a new context.

Those familiar with the Bonaventurian literature will clearly recognize the problem of finding an adequate point of entrance into his thought. It seems that the proper point of entrance must be through B.'s theology rather than through his philosophy. H. has rightly chosen to enter B.'s world through theology; specifically, his choice falls on the concept of order. Thus he has taken up a problem pointed out by both Guardini and Ratzinger and has produced an extensive investigation of the concept in such a way as to uncover the inner structure and interrelationship of the major theological doctrines found in B.'s work.

H. begins with an analysis of the essential elements of the concept of order, which arises from the existence of multiplicity, since the multiple gives rise to the question of unity. The search for a fuller understanding of the first principle leads into the realm of order, which is to be conceived in both vertical and horizontal terms and includes always a beginning, a center, and an end. Here one begins to see the metaphysical insights that lie behind B.'s predilection for the symbol of the circle and the number three.

The main portion of the book consists of three sections, the first of which elaborates the doctrine of the Trinity, that perfect order in which is found the basis of all other order. The search for the first principle, which begins in the world of multiplicity, leads from the vertical order of the created hierarchy to the first principle, which is the divine essence. But the fuller understanding of the first principle leads further into the horizontal order of the trinitarian persons. Trinitarian and Christological dimensions come together in an extensive analysis of the notion of primitas, so central to B.'s thought. H. moves to a consideration of the order of the created world, which finds its highest realization in the mystery of man. The human potency to share in the divine order, which is the highest potency of the created order, is brought to actuation in the Incarnation, where the uncreated center of the divine order enters into personal union with the created center of the created order, thereby securing the proper order of the world.
The inner order of the Trinity, which is seen as the basis for the created order and for man, is understood further as the basis for the mystery of the Church, which represents the third dimension of H.'s presentation. It is in the communal existence of the Church that man achieves a share in the divine community of persons and their relation one to another. Thus man enters into the proper relation to other persons, both created and uncreated, from which flows the experience of that unity and peace which is the characteristic of the divine order.

The final section attempts to bring together all these dimensions of order within the one order of charity; for, in the final analysis, there is but one order, in which primitas is identical with caritas. The mystery of the first is identical with the order of love. The mystery of the world consists in the fact that divine love evokes an order of love in the world, which leads to the deepest union of creation and Creator, in which personal distinction is not lost but is most sharply defined. The whole of the mystery is symbolically expressed in the cross of Christ, in which the intersection of the vertical and the horizontal point to the very center of all order, the mystery of divine love embodied in creation in the person of Christ.

Readers looking for a treatment of the historical sources and influences that shaped B.'s vision will be disappointed; for H. has expressly restricted himself to the study of B.'s own work. On the other hand, the book is an uncluttered presentation, the strength of which lies in its directness and clarity of style. Perhaps more than any other book now available, this study makes clear the metaphysical background of many Bonaventurian symbols. It is a welcome, well-researched addition to the growing number of studies which reflect a significant shift from the earlier interest in the relation between the philosophies of B. and Thomas to a serious study of the inner structure of B.'s own world of thought.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

ZACHARY HAYES, O.F.M.


It is a historical commonplace that by the beginning of the fourteenth century papal censures such as excommunication and interdict were rapidly losing their force. The reasons generally asserted for the declining effectiveness of such censures are their excessive misuse and the increasing power of the secular state. In his most recent work, T. maintains that, at least with regard to Florence, our accepted belief concerning the lessening impact of papal censures must be modified.
To illustrate his thesis, T. has chosen the papal interdict imposed on Florence from March 1376 to July 1378. Ever since 1352 the Avignon papacy had endeavored to restore its authority in the papal states in preparation for its eventual return to Rome. The realization of this plan was entrusted to the skilful though at times brutal leadership of Cardinal Egidio Albornoz. Florence, though traditionally Guelph in sympathy, feared that the successful consolidation of papal power would threaten her independence. The city, therefore, sought to protect itself against what it regarded as an inevitable territorial and political encroachment by papal forces. Florence signed a treaty with its archenemy to the north, the Visconti, secured the services of John Hawkwood, and incited many towns within the papal states to rebellion. In reaction, Gregory XI placed the city under interdict on Feb. 11, 1376.

T. approaches his study of the papal interdict against Florence by concentrating upon its economic and religious consequences. Since economic strictures were an integral part of the interdict, Florentine citizens throughout Latin Christendom were declared outlaws, their goods ordered seized, trade with them forbidden, and they became subject to imprisonment or expulsion. Given the extensive number of Florentine merchants and bankers throughout Europe, the city was economically vulnerable. In a most interesting analysis of the economic consequences of the interdict upon Florentine citizens throughout European countries, T. clearly demonstrates that, while most ruling houses of Europe supported the Florentines either because of financial dependence upon them or in defense of the principle of national sovereignty, lower levels of society frequently used the papal strictures as a pretext for confiscating Florentine goods and monies. Trade with Florence declined considerably and this decline was especially manifest in the wool and cloth industries. The unrest in these industries was, indeed, one of the factors contributing to the famous Ciompi Revolt of 1378. While admitting the many ways in which Florentine ingenuity flaunted the economic sanctions of the interdict, T. rightly concludes that the interdict did have serious economic consequences for Florence.

Equally serious was the impact of the interdict upon Florentine religious life. Papal policy counted heavily on the religious unrest that the cessation of normal religious practices would have on the city. The Signoria, in turn, feared the alternate forms of religious expression that the citizenry would adopt as a result of being denied their traditional devotional practices. As T. shows, political order in Florence was closely allied with religious stability. In the eyes of the Signoria, the intensified religious activities of the confraternities as well as the increased processions of the Flagellants provided excellent occasions for political
intrigue and revolution. Contrary to the thesis of Becker and Rodolico, T. does not regard the fears of the Signoria as justified. He sees such movements almost exclusively as religious phenomena. If the anger of the Florentines was directed towards any institution, it was not towards their government but towards the Church and its wealth.

While T. vividly describes the religious malaise occasioned by the interdict, his over-all treatment of Florentine religious life did engender a certain reserve in this reviewer. Although it is certainly not my intent to defend the aberrations of late medieval piety or its, at times, superficiality, one does come away from T.’s work with the impression that religion in Florence was primarily a matter of mere ritualism. Undoubtedly this impression is engendered by the nature of the sources utilized by T. as well as by his methodology, which is more that of a religious sociologist than of a historian of spirituality. These remarks are not intended to depreciate the work of the former but to emphasize the need for a combination of both methodologies if we are to get a full grasp of Florentine piety. The study of spirituality alone gives us but a pale reflection of the intense and manifold religious activity that characterized Florence, yet if it is lacking one can easily miss the deeper strains of Florentine religious devotion. Florentine piety, indeed, still remains one of the least explored aspects of that city’s history, and T. himself has done much valuable research in this area.

These reservations should not minimize the fact that T. successfully shows that the interdict seriously affected Florentine religious life. Florence’s traditional acknowledgement of papal authority produced in its citizens a serious crisis of conscience and resulted in intense anxiety and guilt. Thus on the religious as well as the economic level the papal interdict had profound consequences. At least with regard to Florence, then, the traditional belief regarding the ineffectiveness of papal interdicts in the Late Middle Ages must be considerably qualified. Moreover, in establishing his thesis, T. has given us a fascinating case history of how a papal interdict in the Middle Ages affected not only the leaders of a state but the daily lives of its citizens as well.

*Fordham University*  
Louis B. Pascoe, S.J.


Though the title seems to indicate a treatise on Calvin’s theology of the spiritual life, this is not the case. The book is much more fundamental. Prof. Richard’s intention is to demonstrate the originality of C.’s spirituality as the expression of his religious epistemology. To accom-
plish this, R. situates the reformer's spiritual teaching in the context of those of the sixteenth century, and while he searches out the antecedents of C.'s teaching, he seeks to do justice to its originality at the same time. R.'s thesis is that the originality of C.'s spirituality is attributable to his epistemology and to the basic structure of his theory of the knowledge of God (pp. 8–9).

It has been common in Calvin studies to acknowledge the influence of the *Devotio moderna* on the reformer and to view C.'s spirituality as an outgrowth of the same. R. does not follow that well-trodden path. In his first chapter he introduces the reader to the history and basic characteristics of the *Devotio moderna*. In the second he summarizes the spiritualities of the sixteenth century, treating Gerson, Petrarch, Erasmus, and Lefèvre d'Étaples, and finds that the spirituality of the *Devotio moderna* and that of the sixteenth-century humanists were different: the former sought the dissociation of theology and the spiritual life, the latter sought their integration.

Given this difference, R. proceeds (chap. 3) to offer a concise but excellent study of the words *devotio* and *pietas*. The former is defined as the total consecration to, or man's fundamental disposition toward, God. R. examines the word's history from the early Fathers through the Middle Ages, including the *Devotio moderna*, and notes that the word always kept its basic meaning. However, in later medieval times the meaning shifts from subject to object, so that it is no longer the dedication of an individual, but an individual's prayers and acts of religion now become devotions. Because of this new meaning, C. rejects its use and prefers another word, *pietas*; this likewise indicates the right attitude of man towards God, but unlike *devotio* its meaning never changed.

When R. deals with the genesis, dynamics, and content of C.'s spirituality (chap. 4), he gets to the question of the influence of the *Devotio moderna* on the reformer. C. entered the College of Montaigue in 1523, an institution imbued with the spirit of the *Devotio moderna* since 1483, the year that Standonck became its principal. R. admits that C.'s spirituality shows a marked resemblance to the vocabulary used by the *Devotio moderna*, but his investigation also shows that this resemblance diminishes when one compares C.'s ideas to those of Groote or Kempis. For some points of contact, R. offers the transcendence of God and His absolute sovereignty, elements found in C.'s concepts of election, holiness, and God's glory, all of which demand man's total consecration to God expressed in service and worship. As for differences, (a) the primacy of worship so characteristic to C. was not so strongly defended by the *Devotio moderna*; (b) the latter sought some return for one's
efforts in the spiritual life, while C. maintained that sanctification is wholly God's; (c) granted that inwardness is found in both, nevertheless, C. insisted on an inwardness also in worship and piety; (d) though both speak of a *contemptus mundi*, C. sees spirituality as a summons to involvement in a world in need of reform; (e) while the *Devotio moderna* was a type of monastic spirituality, C.'s is certainly not. The conclusion: C.'s spirituality differs radically from that espoused by the *Devotio moderna*.

And the source of this new spirituality? It lies in C.'s new understanding of the nature of the knowledge of God. To this epistemological question C. gives the answer of an intuitive knowledge of God in His Word and through His Spirit. The Word supplies the objective factors for the knowledge of God, while the Spirit supplies the subjective factor. True knowledge is communicated through a conjoined divine action—objective and subjective: theological knowledge is rooted in the Word of God, but it is the Spirit who illuminates the soul to perceive the truth revealed in the Scriptures. Such an understanding of the nature of the knowledge of God brings inwardness, individualism, and personalism, as it does in the *Devotio moderna*, but it escapes the pitfalls of pure subjectivism. R. can then conclude his study: C.'s spirituality differs radically from the *Devotio moderna* on three essential points: (a) it was a spirituality of service within the world; (b) it was accompanied by a new religious epistemology; (c) it asserted the inner unity of Christian life and theology (p. 174).

Since R.'s monograph offers a challenge to the tradition, it merits close study and evaluation. His argumentation is most convincing and it remains for others to confirm his findings.

*Washington, D.C.*

JOSPEH N. TYLEND, S.J.


This book demolishes the commonly held notion that the Puritans were fiercely opposed to all forms of sacramentalism. So thoroughly does H. document his thesis that we are provided with yet another instance of a theological cliché turning out to be more myth than reality. The book corrects and informs, however, not by negative argument but by skilfully outlining the baptismal and Eucharistic doctrine of the Puritans and their Reformed forebears, and, by locating the development of this doctrine in its historical (i.e., political-cultural-pastoral) context, letting it speak for itself. A clear path is marked for the benefit of those who do
not themselves have the resources to make their way unaided through the intertwining complexities of post-Reformation sacramental theology.

"The Continental Background" (chap. 1) surveys the baptismal and Eucharistic doctrine of the great European Reformers. The sacramental emphasis of the mature Luther is contrasted with the extreme subjectivism of the early Zwingli. But we are also shown how some of Zwingli’s successors, attuned to the positive implications of his later doctrine, could work out agreements with the Calvinists (cf. the 1549 *Consensus Tigurinus*) which moved away from the low sacramental doctrine of the early Zwingli. It became common among the early Puritans, who were heavily but selectively dependent on Continental Reformed theology (cf. chap. 2), to speak of the sacraments as “seals of the covenant of grace.” But they disagreed on whether the sacraments actually sealed or only testified to the faith and covenant membership of the baptized. A major part of Puritan religious history centers on the “Baptismal Debate in England” (chap. 3), in which the Puritans had to defend sacramental efficacy, as they understood it from Reformed orthodoxy, against the Baptists and also, after 1652, the Quakers. A second major part of this history centered on the requirements for admission to the Lord’s Supper (chap. 4). There were two contrasting assumptions: (1) that the Eucharist was instituted to confirm faith, and hence was accessible only to the faithful; (2) that it was really a converting ordinance, and hence also intended for the unregenerate. A further basic point of division was the place of material things in sacraments and worship.

The New England Puritans shared in these ambivalences of their English brothers (chap. 5). They felt constrained to defend the sacraments against Baptists and radically desacramentalizing laymen, while they themselves continued unintentionally to deprecate the sacraments by the intensity of their covenantal ecclesiology. The Eucharist was given only to the spiritually elite. The Synod of 1662 confirmed this Eucharistic exclusivism, but also assured the right of baptism to the children of professing Christians. This “Half-Way Covenant” was increasingly accepted by most Puritans, who by their baptismal piety gradually took up a more open attitude to the relationship between corporeal symbols and spiritual grace (chap. 6). This led, in the decades following Cotton Mather’s 1690 publication of *Companion for Communicants*, to a veritable “Sacramental Renaissance” (chap. 7). There was a great flourishing of sacramental works both of a devotional and homiletic as well as of a polemical and theological nature. Much of this centered around Cotton and Increase Mather’s opposition to Solomon Stoddard’s “open admission” policy. But gradually the Mathers mellowed to such an extent that, by the advent of the Great Awakening, the Lord’s Supper was no longer
restricted to a spiritual aristocracy. Thus, despite continued ambivalence, “a notable Reformed sacramentalism, assuming varied forms and provoking intense debate, could and did emerge within the Puritan tradition during the seventeenth century” (p. 225).

H. skillfully traces this neglected aspect of Puritan religious history, artfully orchestrating the intertwining and conflicting influences on the doctrine whose development he is describing. Particularly helpful, and of great significance for comparison with other religious traditions, is the repeated attention brought to bear on the way in which pressing practical and pastoral concerns contributed to an increasing resistance among Puritans to their own antisacramental impulse as the seventeenth century progressed into the eighteenth. The author has succeeded in making his subject come alive, and the value and usefulness of the work as a whole is enhanced by an excellent printing job, a valuable bibliographical essay, and a helpful index.

Boston College

Robert J. Daly, S.J.


Most commentators situate Nietzsche primarily in terms of his relation to the philosophical tradition. Considered this way, he would not be of major importance to the Christian theologian. His atheism could be explained as a philosophical aberration the believer can easily avoid. V.’s thesis is that N. can be better understood if his work is seen not as philosophy in the traditional sense but as a genealogical critique of Christianity. If there is merit in his approach, and I think there is, then a fresh interpretation of N. is opened up and, more importantly for the theologian, his work can no longer be considered on the periphery of the theological enterprise but as a critique of Christianity so radical it demands respect in any subsequent theology that hopes to achieve credibility.

Genealogical analysis is a relatively new kind of philosophical thinking. Ricoeur calls it reductive hermeneutics. It does not move on the level of content. It does not challenge the doctrines, expose the contradictions, or attack the claims of the movement it studies. In place of examining what a person believes, it attempts to discover why and how he has come to believe the way he does. It assumes there are hidden attitudes and self-serving interests playing a powerful role in determining our beliefs and attempts to trace these beliefs back to the prerational will that motivated them. In many ways it is a forerunner of Freud’s psychoanalytical approach and reverberates today in such work as Habermas’ emphasis on the role of human interest in knowledge and Ricoeur’s own hermeneutics of the will, symbol, and language.
A genealogy of Christianity will concern itself with the particular will to believe that could account for the theory and practice of Christianity. The will called Christian by N. is characterized by him as the need to gather everything under a unique principle of explanation that gives a clear and distinct final meaning and value to the whole. It is an attitude craving a system of assurance, of guaranteed truth, and the final triumph of good. It is the will to eliminate the irrational and deny the inevitable perspectival nature of man's truth and values by erecting a transcendent or transcendentalist realm unencumbered by the limitations of existential finitude.

As V. carefully exposes N.'s critique, it becomes clear that this kind of will is found not only in explicit Christianity. It had beginnings in the "pre-existent Christianity" of the Hebrew and Greek cultures and exists as "latent Christianity" in the long history of Western metaphysics. N. also finds it in the secular thought of his own age, especially in the "new faith" of Strauss, the morality of Schopenhauer, the political ideologies of socialism (with its utopianism), democracy (with its egalitarianism), and anarchy (with its motivation of resentment).

Western man does not even notice these latent forms of the Christian will to believe, so conditioned is his consciousness. Only the genealogical critique, "the analysis of the structures of the will in relation to its history," can get back to the source of the deformity. This analysis reveals that the root of the problem is what N. calls the ascetic ideal. The ascetic, unable to affirm the healthy and powerful instincts of creativity and sexuality, denies the value of them. In addition, he is too weak to face the suffering, death, ambiguity, anxiety, irrationality, and all the other existential limitations of being human, so he believes in a transcendent illusion, a world of eternal rest and happiness that he would really like to exist. He is thus the source of the deformity in Western thinking. Greek metaphysics, especially since Socrates, is only a sophisticated rationalization of this prior will to believe in a transcendent realm. The ascetic ideal, personified and preached by the priest, is the original manifestation of the weak will, Western philosophy its theoretical articulation, the Christian Church its cultural incarnation, modern secular thought, beginning with Hegel, its latent residue. And, since the whole projection is an illusion, if it is not exposed, Western culture, propelled by its empty metaphysical presuppositions, cannot but collapse in the bankruptcy of nihilism.

V.'s interpretation of N. as genealogist of Christianity rather than philosopher in the traditional sense, though unorthodox, merits serious consideration. He is not alone in his view. Ricoeur's 1968 Bampton Lectures at Columbia, "Religion, Atheism, and Faith" (a reference inexplicably omitted from V.'s bibliography in spite of their French publication).
tion in 1969 and V.'s expression of gratitude to Ricoeur at the front of his book), had suggested just such an interpretation. Although it was not worked out in detail, he did speak of the work of both N. and Freud as a reductive hermeneutics that is philological (consciousness is a palimpsest to be deciphered) and genealogical (the origin of the distortions is located at the prerational level, N.'s will and Freud's libido).

For the Christian believer, a radical genealogical analysis raises questions about the possibility that hidden fears and anxieties might account for why he believes the way he does. The discomforting thing about a genealogical critique is that it does not attack the content of the belief or the reasons alleged to justify the reasonableness of the commitment. It does not operate on the level of content and reason at all. Hence it cannot be refuted by presenting contrary reasons. In fact, any reasons advanced to disprove its thesis, besides missing the whole point of this kind of critique, becomes counterproductive in that the genealogical critic can interpret them as additional indications of the weak will at work rationalizing the position it cannot help but believe in. The knot pulls tighter the more one attempts to loosen it. All that can be done, and this is what V. and Ricoeur try to do, is meet the critique on its own terms.

N.'s genealogical analysis is also pertinent to some contemporary ways of doing theology. The God of process theology, for example, whose primordial nature is the source of originative order and initial purpose, and whose consequent nature is the guarantor of an ultimate triumph of good, is still open to N.'s critique. The fact that Whitehead ignored N. as well as Freud should not lull the growing number of process theologians laboring to develop a viable theology for contemporary culture into thinking process theology can hope to establish its credibility without coming to terms with their analyses.

Neither can theologies rooted in transcendental method avoid facing this challenge. Their theory of a normative pattern of operations by a human mind that is ever the same with its invariant structures, procedures, and operations has located in cognitional theory an a priori “fixed base” that claims to justify a metaphysics and notion of God very similar to those of the classical tradition. It is precisely this kind of metaphysical thinking that is challenged by the genealogical critique.

Perhaps the concepts of God elaborated in process theology or in a systematics based on transcendental method can withstand the genealogical critique. This will not be known, however, until this critique is taken seriously and confronted by these movements. On the other hand, perhaps Heidegger and Ricoeur are right in thinking N. has definitively closed off one way of doing theology, the way of ontotheology, that is, the kind of theology that begins or ends with metaphysics of first cause, of
necessary being, of a prime mover who is absolute goodness and the origin of values, a moral God who would be the foundation of ethics, a providential God who would be the ultimate source of protection and consolation (cf. Heidegger's *Identity and Difference*, *Phänomenologie und Theologie*, and Ricoeur's "Religion, Atheism, and Faith"). If this is so, then a new direction of theological thought, grateful for the genealogical critique, must be developed.

It is, I think, V.'s raising again the radical and metatheological question first posed by N. that constitutes the chief importance of his book. I hope V., a Jesuit priest now teaching at the Institut Catholique, will continue to remind us that contemporary Christian theologies, if they are to be credible, must either show how the genealogical critique of their positions can be neutralized or develop new theological approaches to escape its radical criticism.

*Emmanuel College, Boston*  
RAYMOND J. DEVETTERE


In the ongoing discussion about the crisis of theological method, some researchers have been shifting away from a predominantly epistemological approach toward a metacritical one based upon considerations from the philosophy of the sciences. This move is conditioned by the malaise of metaphysics, by the successes of the sciences at organizing wide areas of human knowledge, as well as by the dialogue between theology and the sciences within the universities. In the publication of this work on metacritical theory and theology, P. has taken a lead position among German researchers on this topic (other notables including Sauter, Schupp, and Grabner-Heider).

P. begins by noting that, at least since the Middle Ages, theology has claimed the right to be considered scientific, i.e., that theology organizes religious knowledge and that via this organization it achieves varying degrees of certainty about things religious. The collapse of traditional metaphysics and the rise of autonomous sciences have called this right into question. P. sees the problem as twofold: on the one hand, theology's claim to scientific autonomy vis-à-vis the sciences; on the other hand, the location of the unity of theology within the multiplicity of its methods, which range from exegesis to those of pastoral theology. P. articulates the first problem in terms of theology's relation to the other disciplines within the university; the second, in terms of metacritical considerations in the organization of a science.

The book itself falls into two parts. In Part I, P. provides a wide-ranging study of metacritical theory in the natural and social sciences and
the humanities. The principal concerns of metacritical theory are how data are established and organized within a discipline, how theories and hypotheses are formed, and finally how theories and hypotheses are proven, disproven, and developed. P. shows himself well informed in this field. While most at home with discussions emerging from German universities, he commands a broad understanding of Anglo-American work as well. Part 1 considers logical positivism, Popper’s falsification theory, the critical rationalism of Hans Albert, the social-critical theory of the Frankfurt school, the emergence of the Geisteswissenschaften under Dilthey, the development of Continental hermeneutics, and British philosophy of language. P. concentrates on those areas of metacritical theory that have addressed themselves to the problem of theology, thus leaving such important discussions as Church and Hempel’s confirmability theory, and Bertalanffy and Laszlo’s general systems theory out of the picture.

Part 2 is devoted to theology’s self-understanding as science, and its inner organization based upon this understanding. P. provides an excellent survey of theology’s various self-understandings since the Late Middle Ages, particularly in view of the notion of the theological encyclopedia. He then confronts this self-understanding with contemporary metacritical theories. In an important section he develops his own notion of theology as “the science of God.” Theology should seek its unity not in its method but in its object, God. More precisely, the object of theology is “the indirect self-manifestation of the divine reality within the anticipative experiences of reality’s totality of meaning, to which the faith traditions of the historical religions refer” (p. 330). P.’s notion of theology comes close to the “science of Christianity” that prevailed among the religionsgeschichtlich school of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. An important difference, however, is that within the realm of P.’s scientific theology Christianity cannot claim an absolute position among the historical religions; its claims must be submitted to the same canons of science as are those of the other historical religions. Finally, P. works out an approach to the inner organization of theology and its various methods (systematics, exegesis, Church history, etc.) based upon his notion of science.

P.’s book is indeed breath-taking in its scholarship, showing a remarkable command of the literature of metacritical theory and of theology as a discipline. It is essential reading for anyone interested in the metacritical foundations for theology as a science, and is highly recommended to anyone interested in the question of metacritical theory and theology, in hermeneutics, the philosophy of religious language, the theology of religions and theology’s role within the study of religions, and
the role of religious studies within the university. The weaknesses of the book are not so much P.'s as those of much of the metacritical literature he relies upon: namely, to what extent can metacritical theories indeed speak for those sciences they purport to represent? Radnitzky (Contemporary Schools of Metascience [Göteborg, 1968]) gives a searching critique of this question that would have enriched P.'s own presentation. Also, P.'s research interest needs further exploration. He seems to locate the question as one of theology's position within the university and does not adequately discuss theology in reference to its own praxis situation, which leads one to wonder to what extent academic respectability rather than the organization of theological knowledge is the overriding concern. Nevertheless, P.'s book remains an important contribution to the discussion of method and theology.

*Catholic Theological Union, Chicago*  
ROBERT J. SCHREITER


K. retraces ground originally covered in the '30's, when positivism was in its early heyday, and in the '50's, when a number of apologists (R. B. Braithwaite, T. R. Miles, Peter Munz) offered nontheistic or noncognitivist reinterpretations of Christianity in response to positivist attacks. K.'s reason for doing this lies in his belief that the positivist position presents a challenge which Christian thinkers have not fully responded to and which requires further examination. In his first chapter he lays out in commendably clear fashion the main lines of the positivist critique of Christian theism. The three basic claims of the positivist argument are: "1) theological sentences are characteristically used to make putative assertions; 2) these putative assertions are neither verifiable nor falsifiable; 3) consequently, theological sentences are uninformative . . . meaningless, unintelligible" (p. 38). K. then examines the nontheistic Christian responses to this critique, on which he makes a number of useful detailed comments but which he rightly regards as obviously incompatible with traditional Christianity.

In the following chapter he reviews the positivists' search for a satisfactory formulation of the testability criterion of factual significance and settles on David Rynin's formulation, which requires either verification or falsification to establish factual significance. K. then attempts to show that this criterion, when suitably extended, can allow factual significance to statements about other minds and about "unobservables" in science. In his fourth chapter he considers various efforts by I. M. Crombie, Basil Mitchell, John Hick, and John Wilson to show that theological sentences are testable. This chapter represents K.'s most original and most solid
contribution to the discussion; its most valuable parts are his criticism of John Wilson's claim that theological sentences are verifiable by religious experience and his examination of Hick's notion of eschatological verification. K. shows convincingly that Hick's notion of God's transcendence effectively rules out any conclusive verification of theistic claims, even under eschatological conditions. In an unusually candid and probing final chapter, K. considers the main difficulties bearing on his over-all argument; the final two sections of this chapter provide an admirable illustration of the way in which consideration of the positivist challenge requires theologians to rethink such fundamental religious notions as faith and the transcendence of God.

K. provides a clear and careful introduction to a very important debate about the meaning of theistic claims. The book is both philosophically sophisticated, which one would expect in a work that was originally a dissertation in the Harvard philosophy department, and sensitive to the complexities of the theological tradition, which one would not expect. But it is open to criticism on several scores. First, K. does not explicitly consider the difficulties arising for positivism from the questionable status of the verifiability criterion itself. He seems content to recommend its adoption as a means for capturing our intuitions about factual significance; but this recommendation is bound to seem question-begging to those with contrary intuitions. Second, the underlying strategy of K.'s work is to question the meaningfulness of the claim that God exists by making the same demands on that claim which one would make on an empirical hypothesis, which describes or predicts certain states of affairs in the world. But the existence of God may be a fact about the world without having the definite logical ties to states of affairs within the world that we require for empirical hypotheses. Third, K. establishes the meaningfulness of statements about other minds by in effect turning them into first-person reports which are to be privately verified. This move requires an extension of the notions of verification and observation to the private realm, which is at variance with the initial positivist program; and it will not do for some kinds of statements about other minds, e.g., statements about motives. This issue is likely to be important for future discussion because of Plantinga's arguments for a kind of parity between our knowledge of God and our knowledge of other minds. Fourth, the notion of divine transcendence that K. works with and that he tries to establish as normative for the Christian tradition is so extreme that it seems to rule out the possibility of true statements about God, quite independently of positivist criticism. Despite these reservations, the book stands as a serious and careful treatment of a central problem in the philosophy of religion.

University of Michigan

JOHN P. LANGAN, S.J.

Through his classes in dogmatic theology at the Gregorian in the late fifties and early sixties, through his writings on the uses of Verbum in Aquinas and then his masterwork Insight, and through patient hours of seminar work and dissertation direction, Lonergan taught many of us how to appropriate a classical tradition in a critical (even existential) fashion. Since that process of appropriation involved acquiring reflective and critical skills, his teaching has to be understood and his influence appreciated in all the ways mentioned. To wit: one cannot give someone Insight to read and expect him or her to learn what we learned from the many and varied paces he put us through.

T.’s book reaches back to the Gregorian lecture notes to try to reconstruct that explicitly dogmatic context of L.’s thought, and out to his subsequent topical lectures given hither and yon to offer yet further purchase on Insight. All this might help, but I fear it will not, since one element is lacking and the lack of it distorts the entire dynamic—and understanding, Insight avows, lies in appropriating the proper dynamic. That element, of course, is L. as actor. He is very much present in T.’s text, but as object rather than actor. Paragraph after paragraph begins with his name, and we are even told that he “still considers his [chapter XIX] proof valid” (p. 166). To which one of his students, faithful to the skills of critical inquiry he had learned from Lonergan, could appropriately respond: so what?

Do not misunderstand me. This is a good book and it will help many to try to reconstruct the living context to which I have alluded. But it remains a book, where Insight (properly appropriated) can be a cumulative series of exercises leading one on to understanding what it is to understand as he executed it. T. describes accurately and clearly the shift which Insight would help one execute—from classical to critical awareness—and focuses manfully on the affirmation of God. Furthermore, his chapter on “The Position on Being” is a remarkable example of philosophical exposition. Yet withal, the book ends up as a piece of exposition, at crucial places resolving in L.’s opinions rather than carrying one on to that act of understanding which might spell self-appropriation.

As an expository work, one ought not expect much advance on the critical issues surrounding chap. 19 of Insight: L.’s proof for the reality of God. Yet T. sets the issues up clearly enough to suggest what is at stake: can “chapter 19 [be] the inevitable culmination of the cognitional, epistemological, metaphysical and ethical considerations of Insight” (p. 123) when L. himself has acknowledged that the dialectical process carried out in that chapter would better be included “as a distinct moment within systematic theology” (p. 120), where “it is impossible for
a writer who has not himself undergone religious conversion to reflect authentically and accurately upon religious conversion” (p. 58)? In short, if such a conversion is required for executing the reflection upon it that is systematic theology, and if the quality of reasoning that characterizes chap. 19 would be more appropriately located within systematic theology, how can the conclusions drawn there be the inevitable result of the self-appropriation process that is Insight, unless religious conversion be inevitable?

There is a sense, of course, in which a generically religious (or Socratic) realization of the limits of human understanding within an unrelenting quest to understand can be said to be the outcome of continuously honest inquiring. But that sense is itself inevitably persuasive, not a matter of argument, as Tyrrell’s persuasive rhetoric testifies: “if one intelligently, critically and wholeheartedly commits oneself to the positions ...” (p. 121), or “radical fidelity to the positions requires the affirmation of the existence of God” (p. 128). That sort of bullying is hardly argument. Furthermore, there is no doubt “that the ultimate explanation of the possibility of our knowing [would be] the unrestricted act of understanding that is God” (p. 171). What remains in doubt, however, is whether Insight is an example of the sort of transcendental analysis which reaches down for “ultimate conditions of the possibility” (p. 170) of knowing, or whether it intends and does proceed from cognitional fact. If so, then “the fact [of an unrestricted act of understanding cannot] prove the possibility” (p. 173) when that fact is not a cognitional fact for us. Lest I be accused of parti pris, Jon Nilson has advanced this controversy in the Thomist 37 (1973) 366-77, and Tyrrell has succeeded in laying the alternatives out to view.

Univ. of Notre Dame

David Burrell, C.S.C.


Two preliminary items merit note: this Festschrift directs well-deserved honors to Hopper, formerly dean of the graduate school at Drew University and now professor of religion at Syracuse University. All the contributors (with the exception of Joseph Campbell, who wrote the Introduction) were educated in the 1950’s and 1960’s at Drew in the ambience created, in large part, through H.’s efforts. Secondly, the book reflects a significant development in publication by professional societies. I hope we will see more volumes of this type from professional societies, as the commercial publishing world continues to retrench.
Although the essays range in format from formal scholarly pieces to a collection of aphoristic fragments, there is considerable unity among the components of the book. Several of the essayists turn to common sources, the most important being Heidegger, Jung, Nietzsche, Rilke, and Owen Barfield. Also, moving through the text is a firm judgment that the categories which have informed traditional Western theological reflection are now exhausted. As James Hollis states the matter, “The words we used to describe our world have sickened unto death” (pp. 30-31). Similarly, Carl Ridd speaks of “the death knell of the Western literalist imagination and the birth cries of a new one” (p. 142).


Reflecting H.'s ground-breaking work in the field of religion-and-literature studies, considerable weight is given to poetry as the territory from which contemporary persons might discern resonances of the “wordless word.” The essayists bestow on the poet several functions: to enter into the open space and hear the voice of being, to mediate the dark messages of the unconscious, to be a therapist in the quest for individuation, to release the winds of spirit.

There is a certain obliquity, even obscurity, about the rhetoric of several of the essayists, perhaps because in giving voice to the new the writers wish to avoid repetition of the old. Or perhaps it is because persons who listen seriously to poets often run the risk of using private language, particularly if those persons are intent on charting the paths of their own interiority. Yet the volume rewards attention, largely because of the attempt the essayists make to move into new terrains of thought, to mint a fresh vocabulary for speaking the human mysteries, and (in Gerhart Hauptmann’s phrase) to echo “the resonance of the primal word.”

Le Moyne College, Syracuse 
TED L. ESTESS


T. is professor of Church History and theology at the Divinity School of
Vanderbilt University. His previous work includes *Augustine the Theologian* (1970). The present study is “an essay in advocacy, arguing against the Christocentrist position that became popular in the theological world in recent years and in favor of another” (p. ix). It is clear, scholarly, and at least as persuasive as problematic.

The Christocentrists whom T. opposes (but otherwise admires) include Blondel, Teilhard, Barth, and Karl Rahner. Behind these moderns, as archetype, lurks the “Scotist” view that “the incarnation is center and aim of all God’s activity toward the world” (p. xi). Though such Christocentrism may be valid “forward” (after the Incarnation), T. finds it untenable “backward” (regarding history prior to Jesus). He argues that another tradition, verifiable as the consensus of patristic, Scholastic, and modern (nineteenth-century German) ages, makes Jesus less central or nonpareil epistemologically, anthropologically, and ontologically.

The argument develops in three stages: (1) the emergence of the question in the first centuries of faith; (2) the archetype Christology of nineteenth-century German idealism; (3) the contemporary evolutionary understanding of the world. Though principally historical, stages 1 and 2 also assemble elements for speculative construction. Stage 3 builds these elements into a case that contemporary evolutionary philosophies join past theological history in resisting a Christocentrist explanation of the God-world relation.

In the first centuries of faith, three basic assumptions contrasted with recent Christocentrism. First, Jesus’ significance was held to lie chiefly in his fulfilment of humanity’s original destiny. Second, it was unquestionable that the divine Logos can be present and knowable before and apart from the Incarnation or any historical revelation. Third, the Incarnation, like all of salvation’s history, is part of God’s purpose only because of His foreknowledge of human sin.

In the NT, Jesus is related to other humans centrally as “the new man”—the Pauline “Second Adam,” the Gospels’ “Son of Man”—exhibiting for the first time humanity as it was intended to be but for sin. The Greek Fathers saw the Logos as “the principle by which God is related to the world, both as the formative influence in creation and providence, and as the source of whatever rationality and wisdom man attains” (p. 32). Fathers, Schoolmen, and Reformers agreed that God’s purpose in the Incarnation was a solution for human sin.

Nineteenth-century German theology agreed on an “‘archetype Christology,’ the view that Jesus is in some way the manifestation or actualization of the archetypal ideal for all humanity” (p. 48). Kant’s Christology stressed mankind’s failure to live up to Jesus’ idealization of the God-
man relation, and its consequent need of salvation. Schleiermacher tried "to give an account of the Christian consciousness as a specific feeling of dependence upon Jesus of Nazareth as the unique actualization of the ideal and denied the possibility of ever going beyond this direct dependence upon Jesus" (ibid.). Hegel's concerns were reconciliation with God and participation in divine life, which he saw as possible independently of the historical Jesus. Generally, the nineteenth century was embarrassed by the concrete particularity of Jesus. On epistemological grounds, German idealists fled from any historical or ontological Christocentrism.

Today, recent Christocentrism "at least nullifies the element of contingency and risk by introducing the incarnation as a guarantee of the success of the human enterprise from the beginning . . ." (p. 128). The traditional theologians denied this because of their commitment to a biblical, dramatic view of free interaction between God and human beings. Recent evolutionary thinkers "look for God's influence in the persistence and growth of order" (p. 132). However, "if we take seriously the converging indications that God's purposes are not fully determined from eternity but grow in precision as he knows the actual course of events and adapts his will accordingly, then he will not expect to find everything focused upon Christ . . ." (p. 163). This is T.'s concluding position.

In final judgment, I find Christ in Context rather learned, clear, and persuasive. Yet this judgment needs a few qualifiers. First, T. neglects historical countervalents to soteriology like the Johannine revelation-center of the Word-made-flesh and the Greek patristic theme of divinization. Second, some expectable authors are missing: Lyonnet on Romans, Lonergan on emergent probability and contingent predication about God. Third, T.'s not unmeasured regard for nineteenth-century theology is higher than critical realists' or religious contemplatives' would be, and his style sometimes dangles nineteenth-century-wise. Fourth, the historian in T. makes his Christological focus "functional," to the avoidance of issues of Jesus' personal ontology. It seems that this avoidance, more than intrinsic merit, is why he rejects Christocentric symmetry like Rahner's. But Rahner and Colossians fight back: "in him everything in heaven and on earth was created . . . and all things hold together in him" (1:16-17, NEB). For their high Christology, Jesus is this "him."

Pennsylvania State University

JOHN CARMODY


This is a collection of eleven articles, ten of them previously published
(since 1968), by one of Germany's most promising younger Catholic theologians. The first seven articles deal with fundamental theology (hermeneutics and the formulation of faith), the remaining four with sacramental theology (intercommunion, baptism, and Christian marriage).

In two essays on secularization, L. points out that man "come of age" still has to grapple with questions concerning ultimate value and insists that the imperatives of faith, hope, and charity have lost none of their urgency in our time. In two essays on hermeneutics, he then argues for an exegesis that stands within a religious tradition, while at the same time seeking to confront the contemporary mentality. Then in three articles on short formulas of faith (*Kurzformeln des christlichen Glaubens*) L., with some dependence on Rahner, states the case for expressing the core of Christian faith in new ways that resonate with the consciousness of modern man. He cautions, however, that concentration should not lead to any diminution of the content of faith.

In the final section, L. takes up first the question of infant baptism. Acknowledging that the ancient doctrine of sacramentally "infused grace" needs some updating, he maintains that there are still good reasons for baptizing infants who are born into a believing Christian household. Modern studies in social psychology, he believes, have served to bring out more clearly the social dimension of the sacrament. In an essay on intercommunion, L. then points out that it is always theologically questionable to practice Eucharistic hospitality with a group of whose genuine ecclesial character we are not confident. He thinks, however, that for various reasons it would be possible for the Church to tolerate regular intercommunion in the case of persons involved in confessionally mixed marriages.

The two final essays, which deal with the problem of divorced and remarried Catholics, will probably attract more interest than any others in this collection. In the first of these, previously published in English in the *International Catholic Review* (1972) and in *Communio* (1974), he concedes that in spite of Jesus' absolute precept of indissolubility it is sometimes necessary to make pastoral exceptions tolerating second marriages. He contends, however, that the Church should not admit any system of general legal dispensations, for this would undermine the permanence of marriage. In the second of these articles, taking up a point already suggested in the first, L. warns against allowing individual priests or couples to work out pastoral arrangements without regard to the general discipline of the Church. The Catholic Church, he maintains, has an ecumenical vocation to give concrete and credible testimony to "unconditional and irrevocable fidelity in marriage."
In all these essays L. shows himself a prudent and serious scholar. In his footnotes he gives abundant references to the current theological literature, especially but not exclusively in German. For some of the chapters written several years ago he has added, for this edition, an appendix with listings of more recent literature in several languages. In each chapter L. takes pains to set the problem under discussion within the contemporary intellectual and social context. Before broaching any solutions, he carefully sorts out the various aspects of each question, including those to which he does not plan to address himself. Like his master, Rahner, he shows a fondness for enumerating problems that have thus far, in his estimation, been insufficiently studied in Catholic theology. Because of these many preliminaries, L. rarely devotes much space in these articles to his own personal input. He is content to make small advances that seem to him to do justice to all aspects of the question. Judging from this book, one might characterize L. as a highly capable and industrious theological scholar, aware of new questions and open to new solutions, but inclined to favor well-established Catholic positions unless there are peremptory reasons for change. While other theologians may be more bold and creative, L. is notable for his catholic and ecclesial sense. He works reflectively within a clearly defined tradition and a highly structured community of faith.

_Catholic University of America_  
_Avery Dulles, S.J._


This book (a translation of the 1972 German original) is Rahner's advice to the 1971 German Synod in building the Catholic Church of tomorrow. Divided into three parts, it offers an examination of the shape of the Church today, some suggestions for immediate changes, and a vision of the Church in the "rather more distant future."

The Church is presently in a process of transition. Many persons try to live according to the dictates of the Church they remember, but the Church no longer enjoys the total cultural support it once did. With less secular support for the Catholic Church, Catholic faith itself must be less secular. A person no longer simply "inherits" faith from the environment. A personally meaningful decision of faith must be made—with a certain amount of dissociation from many popular feelings and opinions in the environment.

Catholic faith is becoming more difficult, includes fewer people, and demands more authenticity. This authentic faith involves two dangers which R. identifies as ghetto-like separation from the world and polari-
zation within the Church. The Church of tomorrow must be concerned not to withdraw into a "cozy traditionalism" but to get a hearing from the "neopagan" world. And, with the predicted theological diversity among Catholics, the temptation will be for Catholics to assign labels ("progressive," "conservative," etc.) to people and listen only to the "group" to which they themselves belong. Such narrow-minded polarization (which R. feels is already afoot) is the opposite of the openness and discussion which the Church must encourage within itself.

With an admirable evenhandedness, R. asks that in the time of transition the Spirit be allowed to work, that change not be feared in itself, and that nonessential aspects of the past be abandoned by the hierarchy. More particularly, the hierarchy must be less managerial, the laity allowed more influence, and the way opened to married and female clergy. In morality the Church must teach decision-making rather than simply laws, must risk taking explicit political stands, and must seek to work out a new and meaningful spirituality.

The more distant future puts demands upon the here and now. It requires the Church to become more democratic and to show more concern for political and economic justice throughout the world. R. also continues the theme of diversity and discussion in the Church—diversity within limits and without polarization. This theme is tied to R.'s desire for ecumenism. Now is the time for institutional reunion. There is adequate unity of basic beliefs between Catholics and some Protestant Churches. And if an appropriate amount of autonomy is allowed to all reunited Churches, the role of the pope in providing unity and defending the basic substance of Christian faith would be acceptable to all.

The layperson who might have had difficulty previously in understanding R.'s theological writings will find this book surprisingly readable. Some short sections do deal with peculiarly German church problems, and even Quinn's good translation does not eliminate some needless complexity in Rahnerian sentences and paragraphs. But R. does not use much of his technical theological terminology in this book of advice to the Church. The content is neither particularly profound nor novel, but it is refreshing to read this scholar's qualified and studied arguments in favor of changes that have been proposed—sometimes too glibly—by others. This book provides an exceptional opportunity to examine a practical dimension of a great theologian's thinking.

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Ronald Burke


Charles Swezy has collected and introduced fourteen recent articles of
G. Three appeared originally in the late 60's, the rest in 1970–72. G. is the most potent mediator in contemporary Christian ethics in the U.S. He has written 6 books, over 125 articles, and over 85 book reviews over the last twenty years. In much of this writing, as in practically all the present book, G. does with remarkable success what is perhaps the most needed and promising thing to be done now in Christian ethics: promoting communication where polemic, mutual misunderstanding, or mutual ignoring has prevailed. G. goes back and forth between Catholics and Protestants, liberals and conservatives, activists and academicians, scientists and moralists, worshipers and theologians. That often the differing or distant parties are merely two sides of the same individual Christian does not make his task easier. His response to every position is "Yes, but ...." Man may well be psychologically determined more than he generally recognizes, but that does not keep him from having an all-important freedom and responsibility. Scripture should deeply inform the moral judgments of the Christian community, but it cannot by itself determine what they ought to be. The Christian ethicist has to live in the tension of being involved but disinterested.

G. compels new thinking and often new understanding in part by the sharp questions he forces on a given position, in part by the boldness, lucidity, and persuasive reasonableness of the syntheses he offers. The latter are not simple collages. The ideal he proposes of theologian-participant draws heavily on the two current and conflicting ideals of theologian-prophet and theologian-preserver, but goes beyond them. G. suggests that the Catholic traditional understanding of the moral life as grounded in man's orientation towards his end complements valuably the Lutheran understanding, centered on man's interior trust and love, precisely because the Catholic perspective encourages the sense of direction actually experienced by the Christian in his spiritual life. This suggestion, I suggest, is a creative and careful interpretation of both traditions, of Christian spiritual life, and of everyday Christian experience. The systematic issues G. tackles usually have evident practical bearing: on evaluating the Cambodian invasion of 1970, on the appeals of seminarians to the "visceral," on the question of a physician attending a dying patient, etc.

To G. I must say, "Yes, but ...." The mediator himself seems to me guilty of the capital sin he persistently denounces: neglecting pertinent viewpoints on a given question. The question I refer to is: How does the human moral agent come to sound judgments on what ought to be valued in human life and how much should each be valued? The question, therefore, concerns not judgments of fact but value judgments, judgments affirming "the normatively human." The question concerns the Christian not as Christian believer but as human moral agent like other
men. (The question how the Christian as believer comes to value judgments is dealt with extensively in some of G.'s most personal and illuminating pages.)

G. affirms the importance of this question. He shows respect for certain affirmative answers to it, e.g., that the moral agent may justifiably claim a certain "sensibility" or "sensitivity" to human values, a certain "intuition" or "insight" into values, a certain "apprehension" or "awareness" or "knowing" of the normative. But, although each of these terms can have different meanings in different contexts or in different systems of thought, G. does not define them nor explain how they differ (if they do). Despite the importance he accords in principle to these sources of value judgments, I found no place where he states what he believes is the validity and scope of any one of them. He certainly carries out no critical inquiry to determine this validity and scope.

To this question, what the normatively human is, G. refuses the answer "Jim, if you don't know, I can't tell you." Taken as a single, all-sufficient answer (which is the way G. takes it), it has to be rejected. But that normative human values cannot be told except to those who have a fundamental, if obscure knowledge of them is held by a redoubtable multitude from Socrates, Aristotle, Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas down to contemporary black theologians, women liberationists, married people refusing the teaching of Roman Catholic authority, and perhaps G. And if it be true, then it raises questions that have to be answered before one can determine the valid scope and limits of rational reflection, educated discourse, ethical argument, public debate and mediation, etc.

Brown University

JOHN GILES MILHAVEN


Matters so awesome, critical, and fragile as life and death are here met with appropriate reverence, compassion, and supportive humor and urbanity. Read for content rather than method, the volume's focal thesis, amid wider contexts about killing and ethical choice in general, is that as a last alternative the process of death may sometimes be assisted passively, and more rarely, positively. Not so shocking in the context of war, self-defense, or abortion, when it is applied elsewhere, a declaration of such independence ironically offends the "human sense of profanation." Ending the lives of self or others for reasons like unbearable suffering seems unthinkable. It would open an inevitable trajectory to the killing of humans thought to be weak or "useless" and to suicide by those who weakly think themselves useless. But his anxiety about crumbling moral
principles, grounded in historical analogues and in metaphors of wedges and cracked dikes, is logically confronted with the observation that the reality of a senile or infantile human consciousness, let alone one which autonomously chooses to prolong its life, is qualitatively different from a life whose suffering is unbearably painful. This new exception to principles which prescribe reverence for life and proscribe its extinction need not generate further loopholes or waning reverence, any more than heroic self-sacrifice for others or a just self-defense should have led on to additional killing which was abusive. Noticeably, for support of this logic, flawless in itself, M. has turned to a historical order reflective of the ideal more than the real. Such reasoning naturally presumes that if the law should allow death by choice, it would include a legal apparatus sufficiently strong and intricate to protect society from those whose judgment is not as masterful and dike-respecting as M.'s. At any rate, extending the scenario into unevasive questions and (a real treat) answers, M. peers into a spiraling nebula of cases with consummate clarity. As values which compete with the prolongation of life begin to be outweighed, and as alternatives to death begin to multiply, exceptions fade nebulously away. If M.'s thesis is incorrect, the powerful onslaught of his logic merits confrontation en masse. If right, it should not escape the review or attention of journals and schools of medicine, law, or religion, given the considerable chasm between M.'s judgments and medical, legal, and religious facts of life.

Important for its content, M.'s treatise is equally and perhaps more significant as a paradigm for clarity in ethical methodology, both in (1) procedure and (2) exposure of presuppositions. What M. serves up as a full course, in an attractive and animated style, may be only sampled in the following hors d'oeuvres. (1) Procedure concerns data and analysis of consequences and alternatives. Those who pursue the issues may emulate M.'s sensitive selection and holistic collating of medical and legal data by extending it into interrelated dimensions of sociology, psychology, comparative religions, etc. The more variegated the phenomenological field, the more will it evoke realistic and creative appraisals. Subsequent diagnosis of conflicting values or consequences entails the uncharted art of induction, but it guides itself around the perils of instrumentalism and antivalue attitudes. Death by choice, e.g., must be prolife (a paradox meriting further contemplation). (2) Presuppositions. While their rationale would comprise the project of other volumes, M.'s less mediate assumptions are divulged with uncommon generosity. Epistemologically a cognitivist, M. orchestrates several sources of moral knowledge into a concerted judgment. Cautious with argument by analogy, the individual is to base decisions on a composite of value feeling (Gemüt) and individual and group experience. But as regards that source of judgment
called the natural order (law) of things, a physicalist picture must be re­
placed with the notion of a reality-based yet creative human analysis 
of relationships—an alternate meaning for natural law reputable in the 
tradition of Aquinas and Roman Catholic thinking. This epistemology 
coheres with M.’s other ontological and religious premises, two to be re­
peated here. First, as a Christian world view confirms, it is an autono­
mous human intelligence which is to discern right and wrong. Not meant 
to await intervening revelations from God or natural processes, it is no 
pretender to the throne of divine judgment. Correlatively, decisions are 
not prefabricated by general principles, any more than they are validated 
by consequences offensive to primal value experiences. It is at the 
grounds of this position (“the mediating position”) that metaethicians of 
M.’s tradition may fruitfully dialogue with challenges uncovered by ana­
lytical ethicists who end-run that tradition.

Similarly, the religio-ethical world view about autonomy will hopefully 
elicit another conversation from M.’s heritage with “primitive” and 
Asian cultures. There, for various reasons, like suffering which is physi­
cally or socially rooted, elective death has been cautiously but perva­
sively justified. Compared with the culturally limited imperative against 
death by choice which reigned in Christendom from Augustine to More 
and Hume, variable cross-cultural attitudes and religious assumptions 
about life and its deliberate termination may background M.’s argument 
with the instructive contrast of wider vistas.
The book begins with a chapter, summarized from anthropological sources, describing the life of the Blackfoot tribe before the white man had perceptibly influenced it. The point here seems to be that, whatever weaknesses there were, this culture was integral and able to sustain a strong and independent people. Their religion worked for the good of the whole tribe. There follows a description of Catholic and Protestant missionary attitudes over against the Blackfoot religion, which generally saw the new religion as another species of “medicine” by which to obtain supernatural power, especially in warfare. H. holds that Christianity made no strong impregnation into Blackfoot society until that society was nearly destroyed by the course of nineteenth-century history and especially by disease and starvation.

While all Christian missionaries to the Blackfeet showed similar cultural presuppositions, Catholics and Protestants operated on differing theologies and world views, and showed different results, none of them terribly impressive by their effect on the Indians. H. has a certain admiration for the early Jesuits, seeing them as talented, dedicated, and stubborn men, from De Smet to the present. Characterizing their apostolic work has been the threefold thrust of (1) sacramentalism, with belief in the predominantly religious role of the pastor, (2) strong opposition to traditional tribal culture, which they have seen as “the kingdom of Satan,” and (3) a deep fatherly closeness to and involvement with the Indians. Protestant missionaries can also be conveniently described in a threefold way as (1) concerned with a more personalistic ministry as contrasted with sacramental roles, (2) an interest in philanthropy and (3) a tendency to identify with white society to the exclusion of interest in the Indians.

With extensive documentation and a small bit of field work as support, H. compiles informative and readable chapters on the stormy history of early Jesuit and later diocesan missions to the Blackfeet, as well as chapters (somewhat more bland reading because of the more nuts-and-bolts nature of their concern with survival) on later Protestant missions. H. (who does not tell us his own persuasion) seems to hold that, while the Catholic missions were able to affect the Blackfeet more profoundly, based on a fervent spiritual dualism and a rigid sense of priestly identity, the Protestants were able to offer greater help in the philanthropic and social order, even though their religious impact may have been less dramatic.

In summary, a useful “case study” with important implications for any future approach to missiology. The distinguishing categories used are perhaps somewhat too neat, if not for Blackfoot history, then certainly for any wider application to North American Indian missions. This is true especially of the various philanthropic works of Catholic missions
and the cultural involvement of some Protestant missions, at least by the twentieth century. However, H. himself would be the first to caution his readers that he is dealing with only one segment of church mission activity.

Rockhurst College

CARL F. STARKLOFF, S.J.

SHORTER NOTICES


In several ways this atlas is unique. There have been atlases of Judaism and of Christianity, but never before has there been one which includes both of these as well as the other religions of the world. By means of ninety-three illustrations and sixty-five maps in twenty chapters, thirteen scholars introduce the reader to the origins, beliefs, migrations, expansion, and distribution of the major religions of the world, past and present. The atlas is divided into three parts. The first, "Religions of the Past" (chaps. 1-7), studies the Ancient Near East, Greece and Rome, Eskimo Shamanism, and Amerindian religions. The second, "Ethnic Religions of the Present" (chaps. 8-15), deals with the religions of Africa, Hinduism, Jainism, Sikhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Zoroastrianism, and Judaism. The final section (chaps. 16-20) is entitled "Universal Religions of the Present" and includes Therevāda and Mahāyāna Buddhism, Christianity, and Islam.

Wherever possible, the essays were written by believers in the faiths under discussion and include bibliographies for further study. The maps are especially easy to read and are as up to date as possible, e.g., map 28: "Jews in the United States c. 1970," or map 65: "Pilgrim Traffic to Mecca in the late 1960's." An appendix includes two valuable chronologies, one for the religions of the past (14 pp.) and the second for those of the present (24 pp.). The publisher is to be commended on presenting such a handsome and exceptional atlas at so reasonable a price.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


Associate editors A. and W. see this book as a "pioneering venture into unchartered territory" (p. 8). Because literary analyses of the Bible are virtually nonexistent (p. 8), this first of five projected volumes is welcome. The seventeen essays by nine contributors (three each from Jewish, Catholic, Protestant traditions) grew out of five summer institutes (1970-74) funded by Lilly Endowment, Inc., held at Indiana University by the Department of Religious Studies for over three hundred secondary and college teachers to assist them in developing or improving courses using the Bible in literature classes.

Chaps. 1 and 2 deal respectively with the relation between rabbinic method and literary analyses and some fallacies in the study of literary criticism. Twelve essays treat books or themes in the OT, and the last three chapters center on Mt, Mk, and Ap. You are almost sure to find your favorite story or character treated in delightful and
scholarly fashion: Ruth, Jonah, Moses, Job, Joseph, Eden. The evenness of the essays in style and quality is due, no doubt, to the fact that nine are from the pen of the general editor, who is professor of English and comparative literature and chairman of the Department of English at Indiana University.

This book probably deserves two reviews: by an expert in literary analyses and by one steeped in biblical scholarship. The present reviewer straddles the fence between the two disciplines without being an expert in either. Perhaps this underlies the assessment of the text as a valuable aid to both teachers of the literature of the Bible and of the Bible qua Bible, and rewarding reading for anyone interested in such material.

M. Alma Woodard, R.S.M.


This interesting introduction to NT textual criticism has a unique feature: it guides the student through twenty-four reproductions at near or actual size of important NT mss. arranged in sequences so that the student learns textual criticism by doing it.

An introductory part on ancient writing materials and practices provides much useful information about biblical mss., including divisions into sections, prologues and colophons, stichometry, colometry, and Euthaliana. The second part gives a brief history of editions of the Greek NT but fails to mention the important editions of Vogels, Merk, Bover, and Kilpatrick. The third part is the heart of the book. Here the student personally encounters NT mss. arranged in sequences. In the first sequence, the student reads Jn 18:31-33, 37-38 in P46 (Bodmer II, ca. A.D. 200), and P56 (Colt, 7th cent.). In the second sequence, Jn 6:8-12,17-22 is presented in P46, P75 (Bodmer XV, ca. A.D. 200), and P26 (Pacific School of Religion Papyrus 2 = POxy. 1596, prob. 3rd cent.). In the final sequence, the Prologue of John, with variations in punctuation and wording that are of theological significance, is read in three series of witnesses: the Proto-Alexandrian witnesses represented by P46, P75, and Codex Vaticanus; the Western witnesses represented by Codex Sinaiticus (Western for Jn 1-8), Codex Bezae, and the Freer codex (W); and the Koine/Byzantine witnesses represented by Codex Alexandrinus, the minuscules 666 and 1345, and various versions and Fathers. Finally, there is a brief fourth part summarizing the method of textual criticism advocated in the book, basically to begin with the earliest mss., discern what is happening in the copying of each document, and build up from there an understanding of the history of the ms. tradition (p. 182).

The proverbial proof of the pudding is the best recommendation for a book of this nature: I gave it to a student, who enjoyed it and learned much about NT textual criticism from it.

Francis T. Gignac, S.J.


The NT writers lived and wrote in the particular cultural, religious, political world of their day. The more we know about that world, the more complete can our understanding of the relevant passages of the NT be. C. makes a valuable contribution to this by studying the divine cult offered to the rulers of the ancient world, especially to the Roman emperors, and how that
may be reflected in certain titles and expressions of the NT. As a prelude, C. treats of the divine honors given to rulers in the Hellenistic world, in the Roman Republic, and in the early Roman Empire. Among the more important aspects of the imperial cult were titles (e.g., Lord, Savior, Son of God, which might have been among the "blasphemous" titles given to the first Beast of Ap); the legends of Nero redivivus; the ministers, especially the pagan priests, used to promote the cult (as symbols of the second Beast); the terms "ascension" and "epiphany," by which the emperors were honored, and which might have some resonance in NT usage.

C. reveals a vast knowledge of the matters covered and the literature. His conclusions, placed throughout at pertinent spots, are cautious. One would, I think, have appreciated a succinct statement of the results of the study relative to the NT at the end. On p. 114 someone slipped in ascribing the Magi story to Luke.

_Dominic J. Unger, O.F.M.Cap._


This book studies Paul's use of "paradox," defined by the author as "an apparent or real logical opposition of words, statements, or propositions which point the way to an inherent meaning deeper than is directly articulated" (p. 11). Paradox has a significant place in biblical literature, particularly in the NT, where the sayings of Jesus are often marked by this device. Paul himself, K. contends, became a frequent user of paradox because he was deeply influenced by the teaching of Jesus (Paul would have had access to the sayings of Jesus by his contact with the early disciples in Jerusalem and Damascus) and because the paradox was an apt means for expressing the complexity and richness of his own religious experience. Five paradoxical themes in Paul are studied: sovereignty and freedom, law and grace, living through dying, strength through weakness, foolishness and wisdom. K. concludes that these and other paradoxical themes enabled Paul to interrelate the various levels of meaning which come from the Christian's experience of God in Christ. Such paradoxes are resolved by moving to deeper levels of understanding and by ethical and moral decision.

K.'s study approaches Paul from a relatively novel angle and offers some sensible insights into Pauline theology. However, the book's format and style never let the reader forget its origin as a dissertation for a doctoral degree in philosophy. K. constantly refers to "this dissertation"; the Greek words are handwritten in the text (and sometimes border on illegibility); the style is dry and pedantic; the argumentation often seems undigested and is based on long strings of quotations from secondary authors. The reader's task would have been much more rewarding if K.'s study had made the necessary metamorphosis from a dissertation to a book.

_Donald Senior, C.P._


Though they deal with the theme of resurrection, these chapters are not an "essai" (p. 7) but a collection of essays. The opening and closing chapters have more in common than the similarity of their elliptic titles. They are exhortations; consequently they suffer that genre's penchant for generalizations that say at once too much and too little: "A mystery of death and resurrection runs through the ecclesial organism from its birth to its eternity" (p.
“If the U.S. is the land most rotten by money, it is also the land where ‘religious appetite’ marks most, if not too much, the image of society” (p. 154).

Chap. 2 examines the triple account of Paul’s conversion in Acts, then turns to the famous passage in 1 Cor 15:1-18 and especially to “he appeared also to me,” in order to enquire into the nature of the “vision.” Nevertheless, granted the qualification of that “vision” as a vision “of faith” and “kerygmatic,” the question of the visibility of ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς remains unanswered. But a more urgent question has to be asked: Was Paul’s conversion Christological, as K. maintains in speaking of the perception croyante of the Lord Jesus? Or was it perhaps soteriological, a complete reversal of how a “Pharisee of the Pharisees” understood salvation?

After a brief discussion of Paul’s own references to the incident on the road to Damascus, chap. 3 takes up the function of the risen Lord in the euangelion of Paul, “l’acte herméneutique par excellence” (p. 90). It is within this discussion, the most interesting in the book, that the opacity of the headings of the opening and closing chapters is dispelled by the comments on Rom 8:2 and 11 (p. 99). Chap. 4 deals with the “truth,” “the simple truth,” “the reality of the facts” recorded about Jesus (p. 113). The Gospel accounts of the Resurrection appearances are briefly treated and are then followed by a series of affirmations about our faith in “the physical and personal resurrection” of Jesus (p. 128). If Jesus’ mystery is, as K. maintains, a mystère intact, one may well wonder why it requires such fragmentation into its component parts. Is it simply a roundabout way of reminding the readers that the “realism” of our faith in the Resurrection is neither artistic nor political nor philosophical but évangelique (p. 146)? This “realism,” K. concludes, is a historical realism that refers to a réalité certaine of history as well as a spiritual realism that refers to the spiritual experience of the present. “The realism of faith is of a spiritual order” (p. 146). This, of course, begs the question altogether.

Stanley B. Marrow, S.J.


The career of Harry Sawyerr is closely bound up with the development of Fourah Bay College, where he has served in roles from tutor to vice chancellor over the past forty years. During this time, Fourah Bay has grown from a little missionary school to a college affiliated first with Durham University and then with the newly established University of Sierra Leone. And S. has emerged as one of the first Africans of modern times to achieve international prominence in theology. This Festschrift is inscribed to him on his sixty-fifth birthday by colleagues and friends.

There are two distinct stresses in the volume. Over half of the eighteen essays treat themes that S. himself has pursued, the confrontation of African culture and Christianity, and the development of a Theologia Africana. A series of exegetical studies reflects his career as professor of NT. The editors themselves express this divergence of themes in two of the better essays in the collection. Glasswell studies the first verse of Mark, concluding that the Evangelist includes the whole of Jesus’ activity and preaching in “the beginning” of the Gospel preached by the contemporary Church. Fasholé-Luke shows that African ancestor worship,
repudiated wholesale by early Western missionaries, can be related to the doctrine of the communion of saints.

Space is too short to evaluate each of the articles, but I can at least cite three I found worthy of special mention: C. F. D. Moule’s “Interpreting Paul by Paul,” H. E. W. Turner’s “Justification by Faith in Modern Theology,” and Max Warren’s “The Missionary Expansion of Ecclesia Anglicana.” The book contains a brief biography of S. and a list of his published writings.

_Jerome Kodell, O.S.B._


This recent work by a professor of theology at the University of Moncton is a welcome effort to introduce some of the thought of Augustine to modern readers. A. does not propose to present an exhaustive treatment of Augustine’s Christology. He chooses rather to use the commentary on the First Epistle of John and _De magistro_, to present a general overview of Augustine’s vision of man and the world in the eyes of Christian faith. For the most part, A. allows Augustine to speak for himself, but he frequently adds his own comments and interpretations. The book is presented as a pastoral reflection based upon the theological reflection of Augustine himself. The themes that are covered go far beyond what the title may suggest. A. follows the general order of Augustine in his commentary on John and so treats Christ as the Word of God, the Master, the Revealer, and then continues his reflections on the Holy Spirit and the Church.

Since A. presented his objective as offering a theological and pastoral reflection on some of the themes of Augustine that might have relevance today, he seems to have accomplished his task well. The audience for such a work will no doubt be limited. Such is the nature of works based on the Fathers, even those that purport to be pastorally oriented.

_John F. O’Grady_


In this translation of the 1959 French edition, the professor of Church history at St. Vladimir’s Seminary has provided a masterful introduction to Eastern spirituality centered on Gregory Palamas (1296–1359), monk and archbishop. M. traces the traditional roots of his thought in primitive monasticism; in Macarius of Egypt, who espoused a biblical anthropology against the Neoplatonic intellectualism of Evagrius of Pontus; in John Climacus, who encouraged invocation of the name Jesus leading to consciousness of his presence as luminous as that on Mount Tabor; in the metaphysics of Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus the Confessor, who sought, by distinguishing between God’s essence and energies, to show how the Unknowable makes Himself known; in Symeon the New Theologian, who through personal experience stressed God’s essential transcendence and the fact of revelation and grace which result in face-to-face vision; in Nicephorus the Hesychast, who spread the Jesus prayer coupled with controlled breathing that culminated in consciousness of the whole man’s deification.

Moving beyond the designedly static Orthodox theology, Palamas gathered these threads into a synthesis which was officially endorsed by the Church. M. emphasizes Palamas’ importance in defending man’s total deification within an Incarnational and sacramental theology against Neoplatonic disembodiment and the nominalistic hu-
manism of his adversary, the Calabrian monk Barlaam. He ends by showing Palamite influence throughout the Orthodox world and the relevance to contemporary man of his existentialist spirituality based on the techniques of unceasing prayer revealing the divine presence in the whole man defied through the sacraments. The translation is in clear, vigorous English; the illustrations numerous and pertinent, though occasionally muddy; a paragraph is repeated on pp. 132-33.

Leo Donald Davis, S.J.


P.'s book is easily divided into two distinct parts. Part 1 focuses on finding God in all things, contemplation in action, or the natural interaction between the “prayer of quiet” (too loose a use of this term) and the “prayer of action.” Although P. rather easily assumes that today's temptation is for contemplation without action instead of the manifest thirst for action without contemplation, he does emphasize that life brings forth prayer and prayer brings forth life, because prayer and life are as necessary to each other as soul and body. In fact, prayer for P. is the “breathing of the soul” and “vertical living” which transforms all of one's life and the world. P. also stresses that “the action of love united to God is perfect action,” which happens only when one is “not looking for oneself but looking for and finding God” in all things. Because the rhythm of Christ's life of prayer and action corresponds to life, death, and resurrection at their deepest level and illuminates every person's life of prayer and action, this may be the link between the two parts of the book.

Part 2 underscores the oneness of prayer and action by centering upon the Gospels' view of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. P. presents a pleasant, sober, insightful, and spiritually nourishing summary of the four Gospels. By a blending of exact but nontechnical exegesis with the insight born of prayer, Part 2 makes for excellent spiritual reading, especially the section on John's Gospel.

Harvey D. Egan, S.J.


In a world where technology and mass media have pulled people out of their moorings not only to face the whole world but to look even beyond our planet to outer space, reflective individuals are seeking a means of offsetting these centrifugal forces fragmenting their lives. The search today is turning inward, to inner space. Silent Music is an overview and an analysis of that search. After having written two books illustrating the possibility of dialogue between Eastern and Western practitioners of meditation, J. now attempts to show why and how dialogue is possible today between scientists and mystics.

He succeeds in accomplishing this aim, but in-depth treatment of any one area must be sacrificed to handling the great variety of traditional meditative experiences and modern experiments in altered states of consciousness. This approach, plus J.'s popular style, might irritate the scholar, who would insist on more scientific rigor. However, it is J.'s intent to merely “summarize aspects of recent scientific research with a view to discussing their implications for religious meditation.” In that sense he is a “popularizer,” but he performs his task with responsible caution. For instance, he emphasizes
the difference between experimentation which measures and induces altered states, and the “ecstatic love affair” in which the beloved is “the mountains, the solitary wooded valleys, strange islands . . . silent music” (St. John of the Cross). Without the dimension of love and trust, meditation runs the risk of mechanical manipulation. Hence, science needs the complementarity of religion if it is to be really human in its research in the area of meditation.

J.’s concluding contention is that the three-cornered dialogue already underway within Christianity-Buddhism-and-science can open new vistas of universal unification. At the center of this movement he puts the meditator-mystic, because he loves—and it is this energy of love that will bring about the harmony of “silent music” in a dissonant world.

M. Sharon Burns, R.S.M.


When a Korean friend of mine, philosopher, became a Catholic Christian, he had enough sense to concentrate his energies on the epic poetry of this tradition he wished to call his own. The result was a young man’s book on the Divine Commedia: The Fragile Leaves of the Sibyl, by Thomas Swing (Westminster, Md., 1962). It lays bare in an ingenious way the interlacing of symbolic structure in Dante: a tour de force in a domain cluttered by footnotes. L.’s book is of another sort, but equally free of pedantry. Hers is rather the fruit of a lifetime questing and given over to hearing others’ dreams and stories, listening to them with a healing ear. She finds in Dante’s journey an ordered set of indicators for our own individual ordeals, and offers us a reading which turns out to be a vade mecum of the inner life.

Using the text as Dante explicitly intended it to be used, L. shows how canto after canto turns on images that speak to a person in search of her self, questing after his God. Her commentary issues in an exercise in the grammar of symbols, showing us how Dante is busy teaching us how to use the language of images, if we would but allow ourselves to make the motions with him. Hers is a study in imagination as a guide into the realms of spirit, as she shows how Dante’s master poem means to discipline our sensibilities, attuning them to a transforming process.

Poetry directs images susceptible of many senses, much as a therapist learns how to help a person seeking to understand her dreams discover the point the given images have to make to her. Here is the art which allows L.’s commentary to offer insight into what Dante is about, as well as to help us to profit from his careful work. Her work is best located in the domain of theology of the inner or spiritual life, as its mode is reflective. What sets it off and above most works of that sort is her capacity for moving with images and letting us glimpse what they may say to us. What gives it body, of course, is the poem whose lineaments it traces: the epic of the Catholic Christian tradition.

David B. Burrell, C.S.C.


1972 was the fourth centenary of the death of John Knox, an event that passed with very little notice. The only biography of the Scottish Reformer to call the centenary to mind is the present one, appearing two years after the event. Reid is both a history professor
and a Presbyterian minister, and thus he brings knowledge and commitment to this biography. He notes that opinions of Knox have varied through the centuries: there are those who see no good in him, as well as "those who could see in him no fault whatsoever" (p. 285). R., however, sees himself as belonging to that category of biographer "who sees him as a man who sought to accomplish a certain purpose, and who attained considerable success, yet who at the same time had all the weaknesses, failings and foibles of every man..." (p. 286). Though R. prefers to see himself as an objective biographer, I would place him in the category that admits that Knox did have his weaknesses and prejudices, but still sees "in him no fault whatsoever." When modern authors take Knox to task for acting according to his prejudices or being intolerant, R. is right there with his brush to repaint the Knoxian portrait in the style of a nineteenth-century biographer. The modern author he most often seeks to correct is Jasper Ridley (e.g., pp. 160, 170, 184, 243, 247, 251), whose John Knox (Oxford Univ. Press, 1968, and reviewed in TS 31 [1970] 197-99) was and still remains the best modern biography of the Scottish Reformer. 

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


Readers who appreciated P.'s A Dynamic Psychology of Religion will find his thought extended and sharpened in this sequel. P. provides chapter-length discussions of key elements in religion: mystery, options, providence, fantasy, and reality, while portraying the dynamic complexity of belief and unbelief in each context. He augments his study by a careful reading of Schleiermacher, Otto, James, Erikson, Marcel, and Freud, with an acknowledged bias to Freud's general theory of religion. He eschews, however, any abstract formulation of the issue of belief and unbelief by incorporating insights from his own clinical practice. This is done judiciously and contributes a realism to his study.

P. contends that personal history is the foundation of all religion. He characterizes the normal condition of each believer or unbeliever as mixed in intensity. In fact, both are judged radically different only when poor judgment is made. Persons who intensively believe or reject religious belief are so similar in structural arrangement, P. argues, that their antithesis is more those who are lukewarm in either category. One is reminded of Rollo May's insistence on indifference rather than hate as the opposite of love.

P.'s style is quite suggestive as he raises many questions that theologians are unaccustomed to deal with. No one will pigeonhole believers and unbelievers if they accept P.'s analysis. Another benefit is his description of the immense varieties of unbelief which, he argues, will correspond to the plethora present in belief. The point is perhaps obvious, but the insight arises only after the issue is discussed. Inquirers into the psychology of religion will profit, as well as those who deal in a pastoral context with the enfleshed, personal reality of belief or unbelief where textbook categories are felt to be deficient. P. will be criticized by some for reductionism and by others for his satisfaction over the passing of certain illusions, e.g., the belief in a God-man who wandered on earth. On the whole, however, P.'s work is substantial and convincing as an analysis of the contemporary problem of religious belief, its acceptance or rejection.

David Michael Thomas

IS FAITH OBSOLETE? By Robert McAfee Brown. Philadelphia: West-
At the beginning of his study of faith, B. acknowledges the fact that hope and love are in far better repute theologically and that for many faith is held to be important but not possible, or possible but not important. The thrust of his book, then, is to show the possibility and relevance of faith in all dimensions of human living.

Two dimensions in particular are stressed: faith as the creative appropriation of the past and faith as the dynamic interrelationship of content and commitment. B. is particularly sensitive to the relationship between thought and action, knowledge and will. His conviction is that faith is only proved true in the doing. This insight is developed forcefully in the last two chapters, which I found particularly stimulating.

Chap. 4 deals with the problem of faith and doubt. Especially illuminating is B.'s treatment of the relationship between faith in a loving God and the dark aspects of human life, such as innocent suffering. According to B., faith and experience must be understood dialectically. One sheds light on the other. Thus, e.g., the dilemma between an all-powerful and an all-loving God is redefined through the realization that "divine power turns out not to be something static, harsh, remote, but something that can only be understood as working through love" (p. 102). "And that, in turn, means that we must see the suffering that goes on about us not as the place where God is absent, but as the place where he is present, where he may in fact be most fully present, involved in it, participating in it, wrestling with it and unwilling to let it remain as it is, seeking along with us to bring some good out of it" (p. 104). B. concludes that "where faith is at issue, the payoff is whether or not it leads to our being 'poured into life.'" The truth of faith is tested through involvement, which in turn leads to a redefinition of faith, and so the process continues, evolving dialectically.

Although this study is brief, it is rich. B. has drawn from a wealth of Protestant and Catholic authors as well as from personalist philosophy and literature to support his argument that faith is basic to life. The style is straightforward, the exposition lucid, so that the book is accessible not only to other theologians but to the wider community of faith as well.

John J. O'Donnell, S.J.

Table Talk with the Recent God.

This volume includes, besides forty-seven of the author's poems, five "poetic liturgies" prefaced by an essay on the relationship between poetic and liturgical creativity. S. states that the discovery of a set of images expressive of a given culture or time is or can be the basis for poetry which mediates a religious relationship. Accordingly, many of these poems seek to re-create the experience of encounter with the living God in images of city and highway, of tall copper-glass skyscrapers, "irked horns in traffic," and the flashing blue lights of patrol cars. Not all of the imagery is so urban and automotive: hawks and olive trees, songs and skies and green water also enter into the sacrament of the encounter. But it is unmistakably a meeting in our world, "in the Eucharist of this time," that these poems and liturgies mediate.

With the exception of the Mass without Scriptures, really "a poem in the form of the Mass," the liturgies mainly follow existing models at least in the canons, coming to rest, as S. notes, "in archaic forms" in the words of consecration. Even these transform in some measure the tradition they embody, rendering the scriptural for-
mulas with unusual simplicity and rhythmic grace. The other elements of the celebration are treated more adventurously in the attempt to evoke through language a Eucharistic experience “dramatic in every conceivable way.” The poems, though difficult, are unmistakably authentic, and bear out the contention of a recent anthologist that “poetry of merit is being written faster than we can read it.” One hopes, nevertheless, that S. will get a wide reading among those who share his sense of “the stringent need for emotional honesty, which is cognitive honesty.” The essay in the middle of the book contains brilliant insights on the nature of poetry, and the designs and illustrations of Gloria Ortiz are perfect frames for the poems themselves.

Justin J. Kelly, S.J.


Sacraments are signs of God’s activity and the believer’s graced involvement in the mysteries of salvation. That dual movement, situated within an ecclesial context, has not always been obvious in the theory and practice of the sacrament of penance. Such is the thesis advanced in this book, submitted as a dissertation at the University of Würzburg in 1973. S. narrows his study by focusing on the neglected and revealing theological systems of Pittroff, Giftschütz, Schwarzel, and Lauber. He maintains that the pastoral approach of these Enlightenment theologians is preoccupied with the individual’s role in the sacrament of penance, emphasizing the penitent’s preparation for efficacious reception of the sacrament, and concentrating on the indispensable requirement of the proper repentant dispositions.

This approach, of course, has some merit, but S. holds, and rightly so, that when the emphasis becomes one-sided and neglects the Christological and ecclesial dimensions of the sacrament, we are dealing with a severely impoverished theology of penance. After all, the aim of the sacrament of penance is the liberating encounter with the Father and the gift of a new life in Christ; it is severely deficient to regard it only as the occasion for moral improvement and human effort in overcoming sin.

S.’s exposition of the Jansenist proclivity towards rigorous regulations and severity in penance is especially relevant. Certainly, it is helpful in explaining the interest of Pittroff, Giftschütz, and Schwarzel in the sacrament of penance as a time of acquiring moral virtue, and Lauber’s view of confession as a lengthy period lasting over a month, during which time the penitent confronted sin and after which time he received absolution. S. is also sensitive to what contemporary theology and practice of penance has inherited from these Enlightenment leaders of penance theology. In suggesting how some of these excessive positions began, S. is also helpful in proposing a clear and sound series of counterbalances.

Doris K. Donnelly


Papers presented at a symposium in Atlanta in 1973. The papers of Sam Keen, Richard Zaner, and John Fenton all suggest the dominant theme, that the human body has not figured in theological reflection either as a source of insight or as content for its conclusions. If theology is to encompass all human life, the body, it is argued, must be taken more seriously. At best, traditional theology expressed benign
neglect of the body; at worst, the body was considered an enemy. Most papers suggest that the use of a phenomenological method best serves the theologian in the attempt at articulating a full human theology as it concerns corporeal existence. Little is suggested by way of definitive conclusion. The authors quite adequately describe the shortsightedness of the past reflection while suggesting some future directions—and some are quite imaginative. Tom Driver, as is his custom, puts together an unforgettable essay as he provides a mythical theologian’s reflection on his own body while bathing in a tub. He reminds theologians to be fully aware of themselves, their hangups and bias, because it will affect their work.

Those engaged in the delicate theological inquiry of the theological encounter with the life sciences, theology and ecology, or theology and human sexuality, will do well to consult these papers. The life of the human body has widely interested the social and physical sciences. It is obvious that theology should enter this field equipped with more than worn-out Hellenistic categories of thought.

David Michael Thomas


S. suggests a union of Roman Catholic law ethics with Protestant love ethics to formulate more adequate principles for the clarification of contemporary moral issues. Among many insights, most helpful is the reason for engaging in the process of synthesis of two different systems: “the primary way in which this process can be used is not to establish moral justification, but to achieve moral clarification. If there is anything new in our proposed synthesis between the ethical traditions of Rome and Geneva, it is only the affirmation that the primary purpose of Christian ethics and morals is clarification, description, and action. The problem of whether a Christian action is justified, righteous, morally valid, or ethically superior to a previous condition is the province of theology and faith....”

S. also provides a carefully nuanced analysis of American policy concerning the morality of the threat to use our nuclear arsenal. While he sees the necessity of radical modification of our political system, he is at a loss, like most of us, how this can be accomplished. In the realm of personal ethics, S. elucidates his axiom that “the problem of sex is not a sexual problem” but one of interpersonal relationships; e.g., caring love, the need to curb exploitation and egoism, are not adequate. At this point there is needed some kind of magisterial teaching showing the relationship between the sexual fulfilment of the individual and the values of marriage as institution.

Rightly, S. claims that the how of applying principles to realistic situations is very complex and controversial among ethicists. Consistently, he shies away from the enunciation of clear and binding norms for the guidance of the theologically unlettered laity. For such absolutism he faults Roman magisterial teaching. Thus the cleavage between Rome and Geneva remains in the sexual sphere. Given, however, the prevalence of sexual rationalization, it would seem that an authoritative norm, subject to qualification and development, is more helpful for the general body of the laity.

I hope, however, that the dialogue between the two major divisions of ethical thought within Christianity will continue in an atmosphere of serious scholarship and respect for differences. Since S. shows so many areas of agreement, and ways in which Rome
and Geneva can enrich each other, he has advanced dialogue and updated the state of the question in ecumenical ethics.

John F. Harvey, O.S.F.S.


An ecumenical response to some of the major political and ethical issues of the day. B. works with three major documents: Populorum progressio (1967), the report of the Conference on World Cooperation for Development (1968), and the report of the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Uppsala (1968). There is no detailed analysis and comparison of these documents. Such a comparison would have been helpful, for there are points of divergence between the Roman magisterium and the World Council. B. does skillfully blend the documents to illustrate the Church’s parallel theological development in four major areas: man’s vocation and the destiny of society, the alienation of humanity and its restoration, the role of a continuously renewed Church in this process, and the necessary, though temporary, character of politics. His interpretation demonstrates the fruitfulness of pursuing an ecumenical approach to these and other issues of major importance.

The book has the strengths and weaknesses of the documents on which it depends so heavily. It is at its best in the analysis of man’s alienation and what is required for the restoration of humanity. Its weakest point is the exposition of policies and programs necessary to transcend nationalism, racism, economic and political self-interest. B. acknowledges that the documents under examination represent “official positions” and are far from representing the common Christian conscience. He makes it evident that the development of a Christian conscience within the Church can only take place through dialogue among the Churches. It is also clear, as Dom Helder Camara notes in his Preface, that for the time being, the Church does not need new statements on social issues. It does need ecumenical conferences to develop in practical terms the establishment of justice and peace.

Jerome R. Dollard


A difficult book to review adequately in a few words. C. persuasively argues for Christian involvement in public affairs and vigorously flails the sins of capitalism. His solution is socialism, not state socialism on the Russian model but “classless” socialism on the Chinese model. The book, appropriately subtitled a political theology, interprets and analyzes political-economic systems in relation to what C. calls Christian eschatology. Rightly criticizing attempts to identify Christianity with capitalism, C. proceeds to canonize a highly idealized socialism. His indictment of capitalism, though telling, is one-sided, and his explanation of the socialist Brave New World in a single chapter of twenty-five pages is hardly adequate. C. dislikes the bureaucratic socialism of the Soviet Union and finds the People’s Republic of China more to his taste. But what of the roles of army and party in “classless” China? C.’s vision of socialism remains exactly that.

Richard J. Regan, S.J.


J. has two purposes: an ethical eval-
ulation of various themes in black theology and a suggestion for an ethical formulation necessary for building new relations between blacks and whites. The former takes the approach of critiquing appeals to violence made by some black theologians, especially Cone, and faulting these authors' lack of a constructive strategy or program for social change. The latter suggests that the state of being ex-master and ex-slave creates different ethical imperatives for each group. This ethical posture rejects violence both as a social strategy and as a viable ethical principle. Instead, J. proposes love and non-violence both as a way of life and as a meaningful and constructive social strategy. In this he follows the thought of King but also relates this to Moltmann's theology of hope, thereby ensuring that love will be active.

While J. provides some worthwhile commentary on the role of the black church, an interesting critique of Cone, and a fair analysis of the meaning and role of violence and revolution, many of these discussions are not brought to a clear conclusion. Different ethical principles and concepts are proposed but they are not fully analyzed or resolved. At times J. seems to equate ethics with social-strategy decisions; this usage is neither clarified nor justified, although it remains problematic.

Although at times interesting, the book leaves much to be desired in terms of conceptual clarity and rigor, thorough analysis of issues presented, and a justification for the ethical options he selects. A helpful bibliography is included.

Thomas A. Shannon


When G.'s book first appeared in its Dutch version in 1973, it met with generally unfavorable reviews in the Dutch press. The book is a grave disappointment both for what it is not and what it is. It is not the insider's book which G., more than any other Dutch Catholic, could have written out of his eight-year experience as chairman of the Pastoral Institute for the Netherlands Church Province. G. was the principal architect and manager of the Dutch national Pastoral Council. As it is, G.'s allusions to this experience are anecdotal and tend to be grating. The book was hastily conceived as a shallow hodge-podge of simplistic theoretical positions, historical allusions, ad hoc citations of documentation from the Pastoral Council, and personal bias. It is neither a coherent history of the critical years under study nor a very illuminating interpretation of the events of those years within Dutch Catholicism.

In the central part of the book, G. invokes a naive typology of progress and regress in the Church based on the articulation of the exercise of authority with scholarly study and the publicity media that does little either to explain the explosive structural changes in Dutch Catholicism or illumine the topic of church innovation. Although the book abounds in sociological jargon, it is not properly a sociological study, since no theory is ever really tested and no coherent method is followed. The translation is often faulty, suggesting the original Dutch. The book, despite its grave defects and superficial treatment, is nonetheless the only full-length treatment of church change in the Netherlands from a sociological perspective so far to appear in English. It is a pity that G.'s treatment rarely raises the discussion of this experiment in church innovation beyond the level of popular journalism.

John A. Coleman, S.J.

The basic thesis of this stimulating and well-documented study is that the "space to be human" is "a basic right" and that the whole economic, marketing, industrial, political, and social structure of our society is increasingly encroaching on this space, and thus on a basic human right (pp. 11-13). R., associate professor of religion and society at Temple University, carefully illustrates with specific, documented examples where and how this encroachment occurs. In particular, he argues that two complementary pressures "threaten to unravel our heritage of freedom ... (1) the invasion of personal privacy for the sake of commercial or political advantage and (2) the privatizing of effective public power in the hands of a highly benefited minority" (p. 114). The attack on privacy affects us not only as individuals but also as social persons. For the purpose of effective administration and efficient management, the world of personal reserve and privacy is deprivatized, made publicly available, and leased to the managerial elite. At the same time and for the same reason, the public world is transformed into a realm of private management under the sole control of an elite minority. "This reversal of public and private worlds reflects a loss of confidence at the spiritual level" (p. 13) and tends to destroy personal self-esteem, social dignity, communal loyalty, and individual integrity. For this reason, what may seem a matter of politics and business is also and primarily a matter of the spirit; for the attack on privacy affects the quality of the allegiance which man can give, within the mundane order, to the transcendent destiny which is his both individually and socially. R.'s concluding chapter contains a number of specific, valuable suggestions for making statutory laws more responsive to the needs of man's spiritual being.

John J. Mawhinney, S.J.
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