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Presenting This Issue

Our March issue is predominantly historical and moral in content; but the history as well as the morality is theologically significant.

Vision and Praxis in American Theology, a contribution to America’s bicentennial, argues that only three deceased American Catholic theologians are still worth reading for more than historical interest, and extracts from each “essential mediating concepts between eschatology and political praxis for a developed liberation theology”: Orestes Brownson (providence), John A. Ryan (ethical theory of justice applied to the moral order), John Courtney Murray (pluralism in social authority in the doctrine of state and society). JOHN A. COLEMAN, S.J., Ph.D. in sociology (University of California, Berkeley, 1973), is assistant professor of sociology of religion and social ethics at the Jesuit School of Theology and the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley. His long-range research interests are the sociology of comparative cross-national Catholicism and the history of social Catholicism; he is presently working on a manuscript on Catholic lay movements in the U.S., France, and Chile; his Evolution of Dutch Catholicism will appear in the fall.

Episcopal Elections in Cyprian researches the famous Bishop of Carthage on (1) the elective process in general; (2) the specific roles played by clergy, laity, and bishops; (3) secondary issues involving suffragium and the nominating method. It presents in valuable detail the theory and practice of one workable process which admittedly is historically conditioned, with a view to avoiding “the twin dangers of exaggerated idealism and biased immobilism.” PATRICK GRANFIELD, Ph.D. from Sant’ Anselmo and S.T.D. from the Catholic University of America, is associate professor of systematic theology at C.U., with special competence in ecclesiology. An area of particular interest to him is coresponsibility in the Church. His Ecclesial Cybernetics was published in 1973 (cf. TS 35 [1974] 195-97).

Melito, the Jewish Community at Sardis, and the Sacrifice of Isaac examines three highly interesting fragments from the second-century apologist on the famous Gn 22 pericope, in the light of the Jewish and Christian situation in Sardis at the time Melito was bishop and the Jewish interpretation of the sacrifice in the early centuries of the Common Era. The research is important in view of the Christological exegesis that became classical within Christianity. ROBERT L. WILKEN, Ph.D. from Chicago (1963), is associate professor of the history of Christianity within Notre Dame’s department of theology. Last year he edited and contributed to Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity. This year he is on leave writing a book on Chrysostom and the Jews of Antioch, and studying the Talmud.
Notes on Moral Theology: April–September 1975 studies in some detail three areas of concern where the literature has been especially heavy: (1) behavioral moral norms: their meaning and limit; (2) care for the dying and euthanasia; (3) human rights and the mission of the Church. Richard A. McCormick, S.J., the Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Center for Bioethics at Georgetown University, is also research associate at the Woodstock Theological Center in Washington, D.C. His bulletins are not only valuable as surveys of the field; for over a decade they have been a force in the renewal of contemporary moral theology.

New Dimensions of Responsible Parenthood undertakes, on the basis of recent medical research, a new reflection on the ethical implications of a number of problems related to the rhythm method, e.g., a disproportionate waste of zygotes, even a disproportionate frequency of spontaneous abortions. The distinguished moralist Bernard Häring, with a doctorate in theology from Tübingen, teaches moral theology at the Academia Alfonsiana in Rome. Recently he was a visiting research scholar at the Kennedy Center for Bioethics in Washington, D.C. His most recent book (1976) is Ethics of Manipulation: Issues in Medicine, Behavior Control, and Genetics.

Our consistently extensive book section continues to be a valued feature of TS's service to the theological community. This issue presents detailed reviews of twenty-five recent books, shorter notices of twenty-six more—all by scholars who we believe are uncommonly competent in the areas in question.

If present planning and research continue to mature, we hope to present in December a theme issue on “The Church in the Modern World,” prepared by scholars at the Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.
Editor
BOOK REVIEWS


This is an extremely compact book, rich in information, balanced in its judgments, and superbly translated. Prof. Herrmann of Bochum owes much to Martin Noth and perhaps even more to Noth's great teacher, Albrecht Alt, to whose memory the book is dedicated. H. had the privilege of serving as Alt's assistant during the last years of the master's life. Still, H. is his own man and writes with independent critical judgment. This history falls somewhere between Noth's history of Israel and that of John Bright. It is well known that Noth assigned greater importance to the traditio-historical approach than to archeology's contribution, whereas Bright, representative of the Albright school, gave a more positive evaluation of the archeological evidence. Noth has been criticized for an unwarranted skepticism toward the authenticity of the early Israelite historical tradition; Bright has been accused of overplaying the archeological card and overlooking the complex redactional history of the literary sources. H. strives for a middle course, though my own impression is that German scholarship has had the preponderant influence on our author. While the bibliography at the end of the book has been thoroughly adapted to the needs of American-British readers, no such overhauling was done in the footnotes, where one runs into glaring omissions of significant non-German articles in the scholarly journals.

A brief introduction concisely sets the stage for the unfolding of Israel's history and concludes with an observation worth recalling: "Israel's territory and its potential as a world power were necessarily limited. Its fate was bound up in a network of unavoidable dependent relationships. However, what took place almost in a corner of the world and its history was to have far more influence on world history than might ever have been suspected" (p. 22).

The first of H.'s tripartite division of the history is entitled "The Birth of the People of Israel" and it extends from the patriarchal period to the end of the era of the Judges. The author's contention that the Aramean movement in the second half of the second millennium B.C. provides the wider context for the patriarchs flies in the face of the widely held position that the patriarchs cannot be separated from the Amorite invasions of the Middle Bronze Age, so brilliantly illuminated by archeological discoveries of the past forty years. While it is true that Alt's brilliant essay "The God of the Fathers" contributed substantially to our
understanding of patriarchal religion, the fact is that this essay has been supplemented by other studies, notably F. M. Cross's "Yahweh and the God of the Patriarchs," unmentioned by H. though it appeared more than a decade before his book. On the relationship of Moses to the historical accounts preserved in the Pentateuch, H. breaks sharply with Noth, whose classic History of Pentateuchal Traditions diminished the historical role of Moses in the Late Bronze Age. H. sees no obstacle to giving Moses a part in all the five themes of the Exodus and wilderness tradition, as they emerged from Noth's analysis. Incidentally, a map of the Exodus would have helped the reader in this section.

Part 2, dealing with the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, demonstrates H.'s gift for condensing a wealth of material in a limited space without sacrificing clarity. There is an excellent observation on what is common in the two conflicting traditions of kingship (p. 136). In each instance Yahweh chooses the person as king; absolute monarchy was ruled out from the start, for kingship ultimately belonged to Yahweh. In dealing with the covenant made with David, H. very sensibly takes issue with Kutsch's position that berith means essentially "obligation" instead of a "treaty" or "covenant." On the other hand, I find it very hard to accept his view that Elijah's confrontation with Ahab over Naboth's vineyard is a secondary element in the narrative (p. 212).

The last and shortest part, "Israel in the Hands of the Great Powers," rapidly summarizes the period of Babylonian exile, the Persian hegemony, and the emergence of the Greeks, coming to a close with Alexander of Macedon. The problem here, of course, is the dearth of sources. For example, we have practically no sources from Syria and Palestine to give us information on the transition from Babylonian to Persian rule in these territories. And there is little or nothing in the OT itself to tell us about conditions in Judah and Jerusalem from the time of Ezra-Nehemiah (5th century B.C.) to Antiochus IV (175-164 B.C.). One item of evidence overlooked by H. are the fourth-century legal papyri from Daliyeh. In exequmination it should be added that we have up to now only preliminary reports on this new material, though a first volume of the final report is in press. This book is heartily recommended to students who already have some initiation into the problems of Israelite history. H.'s serious, scholarly, and somewhat creative synthesis of the evidence is a welcome supplement to the efforts of Noth and Bright.

Boston College

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


In the first complete revision of Einleitung in das Neue Testament
(1973) since the twelfth edition (1963), not only has the text been revised but also the most significant scholarly literature that appeared between 1963 and 1971 has been incorporated. So little now remains of the work of P. Feine and J. Behm that Kümmel is identified as the sole author. In fact, this could have been done already in the twelfth edition. The object of NT introduction is defined as "the historical questions of the origin and collecting of the NT writings, and of the textual tradition of both the writings and the collection" (p. 28). The general plan of the book is unchanged: the formation of the NT writings (narrative books, letters, the apocalyptic book), the formation of the NT canon, and the history and criticism of the NT text. The positions adopted are the same "middle of the road" views expressed in the twelfth edition. On many matters recent discussion has led to the introduction of new paragraphs or the revision of earlier ones, but daring hypotheses are rejected with terms like "inconceivable," "wrongly contested," or "untenable." For an accurate assessment of K. as one who always works for consensus within critical scholarship, see R. Morgan's "Great Interpreters—VI: W. G. Kümmel (b. 1905)," Scripture Bulletin 5 (1974) 28–29. Measures have been taken to make the book more readable. References to bibliography and sources in the course of the discussion have been usually removed from the text and placed in footnotes. Some of the older bibliographic material has been omitted, and the listing of authors and bibliography on individual questions has been arranged more clearly. The abbreviations have been adapted (where possible) to those of the third edition of Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. In this English version Kee has modified the text at a few points for the non-German audience and noted the existence of English translations. His clear and straightforward rendering of the new edition means that A. J. Mattill, Jr.'s 1966 translation of the fourteenth edition is obsolete.

As a sober, reliable, and comprehensive guide, this introduction is rivaled only by J. Schmid's revision of A. Wikenhauser's Einleitung in das Neue Testament (1973). Its major concerns (content, literary character, purpose, authorship, place and date of composition) reflect a narrow and traditional concept of NT introduction—one that some scholars now find to be inadequate. While we can be only grateful that such a vast amount of information has been digested and placed at our disposal, the "assured results" on most issues seem meager in proportion to the efforts expended in arriving at them. This book's limited focus and extraordinary detail mean that it will serve primarily as a reference work, not as a basic text for classroom use. As a main text, students need something simpler but wider in scope, such as H. Conzelmann–A. Lindemann's Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament (1975), which treats exegetical method, the world of the NT, the NT books, the work and
teaching of Jesus, and the history of the early Church within a single volume. An English version of that book would also be very useful.

Weston School of Theology

DANIEL J. HARRINGTON, S.J.


One reason why church people are apt to regard contemporary NT scholarship with some suspicion is because different exegetes come to such different conclusions. This would seem to indicate that NT exegesis is not the exact science it sometimes claims to be. F. suggests that the reason for this diversity is to be found in the very different historical picture (Geschichtsbild) that is presupposed by different exegetical methodologies, more particularly with respect to the influence of the individual and the community in the formation of the Gospels.

The most dominant methodology employed today is undoubtedly redaction criticism, which attempts to explain the Gospels as the expression of the varied theologies of the Evangelists. Their individual contribution is stressed to the point that it has even been suggested that to apply the same designation "gospel" to the first four books of the NT is to engage in illegitimate "leveling."

F. undertakes a comparison with another major corpus within NT, the Pauline epistles, and concludes that the differences between the two groups of writings, particularly with respect to their relationship to the OT and to Judaism, far outweigh the differences existing between the four Gospels. Consequently, it is legitimate to treat the first four books of the NT as belonging to the same literary genre.

The exaggerated emphasis on the individuality of the Evangelist, as represented in the radical approach of W. Marxsen, has a conservative parallel in O. Cullmann’s emphasis on the individuality of Jesus, as the basis for NT Christianity in all its essential features.

Confidence in the possibility of determining the contribution of the historical Jesus to the formation of the Gospel tradition was rudely shaken by form criticism, and one of the principal practitioners of this discipline, R. Bultmann, arrived at a very different picture of the Gospels as the product of Hellenistic syncretism.

Bultmann’s concentration on the contribution of the community finds a parallel in the work of G. Schille, who sees the Gospels as the end result of an "ecumenical" process at work within primitive Christianity which united three different movements, each of which originally had its own geographical center, its own preferred Christological title, its own interpretation of the Christ-event, and its own cultic act. Schille’s
approach suffers from the fatal flaw of taking as its starting point a hypothetical reconstruction of earliest Christianity rather than the texts which have actually come down to us.

F. illustrates how these four different views of the historical situation of early Christianity are the presupposition for four different methodologies which, in turn, have led to four different interpretations of the Marcan prologue and its relation to Christian baptism. For Cullmann, Jesus’ baptism points to his death on the cross (cf. Lk 12:50), from which Christian baptism derives all its efficacy. Bultmann sees John’s baptism for the forgiveness of sins as the origin of Christian baptism, to which were added three other elements: the pronouncing of the Lord’s name (cf. Mt 28:19), the bestowal of the Spirit, and a relationship to the death and resurrection of Jesus, who was venerated as a cultic deity. W. Marxsen finds the significance of the Marcan prologue in the key concepts “Galilee” and “gospel.” Mk 1:1 qualifies the entire work as “good news.” The risen Lord is made present in the preaching of the community, which has gathered together in Galilee. G. Schille, finally, sees as the Sitz im Leben for the story of Jesus’ baptism the first stage in his postulated “ecumenical” development, i.e., the union of the Christian Baptist group located around the Jordan with the North Galileans, whose main interest was in the earthly Jesus.

F.’s study of these four authors is careful and provocative, and it should stimulate all NT scholars to re-examine their own presuppositions. Unfortunately, his own attempt to determine the form of the gospel (Formbestimmung des Evangeliums) is somewhat disappointing. In particular, his description of the evolution of the pre-Synoptic tradition contains a disconcerting number of direct citations from K. L. Schmidt, Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte (1923). After such penetrating criticism of the limitations of other authors, one would have hoped for a more personal and updated positive contribution.

Moreover, although the Marcan prologue serves very well to exemplify the methodologies which F. criticizes, it offers too narrow a textual basis for the model for the formation of the Gospel tradition which he himself proposes. His own Geschichtsbild for this pericope seems problematical, since he sees the “baptisms” of Pharisaic Judaism as the background for the baptism of John. Furthermore, his own reconstruction of the successive stages which led to the present form of Mk 1:1–11 is quite as hypothetical as any of the reconstructions which he criticizes.

Nevertheless, this book makes an important contribution in pointing out the limitations of redaction criticism and in insisting that the Gospels be interpreted as growing out of the historical situation of the different Christian communities, which utilized the Jesus-tradition in
coping with the existential problems (Lebensbewältigung) which resulted from their Christian confession.

General Theological Seminary, N.Y.

SCHUYLER BROWN, S.J.


Vanderlip's book is in the tradition of such well-known works as W. F. Howard's Christianity according to St. John, E. K. Lee's The Religious Thought of St. John, J. Crehan's The Theology of St. John, and A. M. Hunter's According to John. It has the advantage of contemporaneity, incorporating the findings and conclusions of leading Johannine scholars over the past decade. Apart from that, it deserves high praise for clarity, comprehensiveness, and an admirable balance. Catholic readers will be pleased to note how much account V. takes of our best scholarship.

Chaps. 3–5 are perhaps the best. 3 and 4 deal with Johannine Christology. V. makes the important point that whereas the Son of Man in the Synoptics is an apocalyptic judge, in Jn "the understanding of Jesus as judge is moved from the future to the present," and though he does not emphasize the difference between the titles Son of Man and Son of God, he correctly sees that "the former puts an emphasis upon the descent and ascent of the pre-existent Son of Man," whereas the latter "puts special stress on the person of the Son and on his unique relationship with the Father." This is what this reviewer has characterized as John's twofold Christology, vertical and horizontal, in The Art and Thought of John. V. is willing to concede that the "I am" sayings with a predicate have "probably been influenced by 'the soteriological style of discourse found in Eastern Hellenism.' " He is open as well, in a later chapter, to the recognition that Jn's terminology bears a close resemblance to Gnosticism, though he finds no Gnostic convictions in the Gospel's theology. His remarks on pp. 144–47, however, where he compares Johannine dualism with that of Qumran on the one hand and that of the Gnostics on the other, seem not to bear the weight of the conclusion he arrives at; for he points out all the differences between Qumran's dualism and Jn's, yet ends by thinking it closer to the fourth Gospel's than that of the Gnostics. The Gnostic belief in a radical physical dualism is indeed not to be found in Jn, but, as V. says himself, in Jn "A person is either from above or from below. Either he has the Spirit of Truth or he does not. A person is loyal to one of the two realms which are in conflict. This stands in contrast to the Dead Sea Scrolls which envision two spirits in every man, the spirit of good and the spirit of evil." It should be added that in this respect Jn not only diverges from the Qumranites but comes as close as possible to the Gnostics.
Chap. 5, "The Children of God," is a valuable analysis of Jn's ecclesiology. V. successfully shows that there is a concept of Church in Jn, something often denied. He is less successful, however, when he attempts to define Jn's attitude toward ecclesiastical structure, allowing too much ground to Käsemann and Schweizer. An approved ministry is clearly behind the words of Jesus in Jn 10:1-14, as Lagrange pointed out years ago, and Feuillet has recently made out a good case for seeing it in Jn 17 as well.

V. has some very good things to say about the Spirit and the Paraclete in this Gospel also. Writing in the vein of R. E. Brown, he notes that one function of the Paraclete doctrine "is to give a defense for the validity of the deeper insights and understanding which the Fourth Gospel gives. . . . He sees the promise of Jesus being fulfilled (at least in part) in his own work." Turning to contemporary enthusiasm with the Spirit, he soberly notes that Jn "makes no reference to special charismatic gifts or special manifestations such as speaking in tongues. Some in our day argue that such things are the Spirit's primary work."

This is a book which I intend to recommend enthusiastically to my students, and I hope others will follow me in this.

Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans


English-language readers can be grateful to M. for providing a kind of encyclopedia of recent European research on Mary in NT scholarship. His comprehensive bibliography is a valuable listing of materials available through 1970. Among more recent publications he cites only the articles of J. Fitzmyer and R. E. Brown on the virginal conception of Jesus, but without incorporating their thinking into his text. He conceives his work as high-level popularization addressed to nonspecialists "who wonder how a Roman Catholic can accept the modern methods of biblical criticism and still retain full confidence in the teaching of his Church, and in its devotional practices, concerning the Blessed Virgin" (p. xiii). More scholarly data are found in thirteen Detached Notes placed before the three indexes.

M. divides his subject into three parts: (1) "Mother of the Saviour (Lk 1–2)," which is 153 pages of theological exegesis; (2) "Virgin and Mother (The Virginity of Mary in the New Testament)," a 193-page investigation stressing historical matters, including theories on the brothers of Jesus; (3) "Mother of the Word Incarnate (Mary in the Theology of John)," an 84-page survey that includes theories about the Woman Clothed in the Sun of Apocalypse. Throughout, his aim is to show how
critical scholarship on these texts can illumine the significance of the mystery of Christ. For example, he writes: "The virginal conception is placed among the Church's basic dogmas not because it says something about Mary, or about the value of virginity, but because it is an assertion that the birth on earth of Jesus Christ the Redeemer is due exclusively to the direct intervention of God" (p. 332).

M. undertook this study because he sensed "a genuine need for a fairly serious treatment of some New Testament problem of major importance, to show what happens in practice when modern critical methods are adopted and applied by a Roman Catholic who is not prepared to throw overboard the traditional teaching of his Church" (p. xl). He justifies his approach in an introduction that focuses attention on the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption, because "acceptance of these two doctrines constitutes a complex roadblock on the path to Christian unity" (p. xxv). It is impossible to trace his plan for overcoming that roadblock, but—to put it briefly—he attempts to prove that these defined dogmas, as well as such doctrines as the perpetual virginity of Mary, are "necessarily implied" in Scripture (p. xxvii). Unfortunately, he argues along narrow conceptual lines that ignore the rich complexity of religious language and the existential dimensions of mystery.

To cite one example of the shortcomings of M.'s approach: he justifiably refuses to find a vow of virginity implied in Lk 1:34, but then goes on to interpret the verse as "a formal and deliberate assertion by the evangelist after the event of Mary's perpetual virginity" (p. 194). The methodological flaw in that statement is that Luke here was not writing in assertive language. The verse is part of a complex religious dramatization to present the dignity and destiny of Jesus. Luke chose that particular genre to say, among other things, that the mystery of Jesus as an event for us and for our salvation cannot be adequately communicated in conceptual assertions. In addition, Luke reminds readers that Mary's response to her role in the mystery was to keep turning her experience around within her in faith, without fully understanding how God's will was unfolding. As a woman of faith, she had to let the mystery penetrate and reveal itself gradually, not as an object outside, but as a transforming grace in her life.

M., then, has composed only the prologue to a biblical theology of Mary in the NT. What is still urgently needed is a study of how the mystery of Jesus, of which she was part even in her body, became available to the apostolic Church as a saving truth. "Religious significance" is a constitutive dimension that cannot be treated separately
after the mystery, as is done on pp. 330–47; rather, it is at the heart of the revelation itself.

St. John's University, N.Y.  

JAMES M. REESE, O.S.F.S.


In these days of theological ferment, not many works on the Trinity are appearing. That is why M.'s book should be welcome, for it gives a solid modern representation of traditional Trinitarian doctrine in somewhat unusual fashion. Its main concern, of course, is the Trinity of divine Persons, yet it is the Holy Spirit who receives special emphasis throughout. Its stance is strongly conservative, yet it takes some cognizance of more liberal views. Its main thrust is doctrinal, yet it also touches on cult and devotion. It is strongly Roman Catholic in its orientation, yet it makes some overtures to ecumenism.

In its analytic part it first offers a strong presentation of the biblical, patristic, and conciliar development of the Trinitarian dogma, and a sound study of the divine Persons in their properties, distinctions, and processions, in their circuminsession and appropriations. Then it glances at Luther's pneumatology and at modern Protestant and Catholic pentecostalism, and sketches rather thoroughly the Trinitarian doctrine of Vatican II and of Paul VI. Surprisingly, in his discussion of appropriations, M. does not mention the fact that many theologians maintain that a merely appropriational position does not harmonize sufficiently with the language of Scripture and the Fathers.

In its synthetic part it exposes the "false systematisations" of Eckhart, Ruysbroeck, Hegel, Feuerbach, Spiritism, and Günther, and studies the three imperfect analogies that M. finds in the human family, the Church, and the human soul. But it is hard to see how M. can be so enamoured of the "familial image" of the Trinity when this image has such a tenuous biblical foundation and has been so bluntly rejected by both Augustine and Aquinas. Finally, the synthetic part turns to the missions of the Word and of the Holy Spirit, which are the link of the Father to the world, and it concludes with a study of the Trinitarian redemption of the world in and by the Eucharist.

The strengths of the book lie chiefly in the areas of Trinitarian doctrinal development and pneumatology. It would be hard to find anywhere today a better and clearer brief presentation of the pneumatology of the NT, Augustine, Luther, and Vatican II. The third strength lies in the created analogies of the Trinity, which seem to fascinate M. and which he opens up with a wealth of insights and vistas that should appeal
to contemporary Christian men and women. The fourth is his attractive study of Eucharistic Trinitarianism, an important area too often downgraded or bypassed altogether.

M.'s book has weaknesses too. Again and again he takes up the question of the "ecumenicity" of the great medieval Trinitarian councils, Lateran IV, Lyons II, Florence, and then fails to state his own position clearly. Often he inclines to eisegesis rather than exegesis. Too often he omits matters that are very important today. In the area of Trinity and creation, he makes no mention of process theology, no mention of R. C. Neville's view of creation theory as a model for interpreting the Trinity, no mention of Teilhard de Chardin's view that creation is an image of the life of the Trinity. Even more surprising, he makes no mention of Schoonenberg's "becoming Trinity," a God who became "diune" at the Incarnation and "triune" at Pentecost, a view (if it really is his) that has been strongly criticized by some, strongly favored by others.

But all in all, this is an attractive book, and if it were translated into English it could prove to be a satisfactory textbook for contemporary seminarians.

Jesuit Retreat House, Barrington, Ill. 

E. J. Fortman, S.J.


Among the many contemporary theories about original sin, V.'s unique contribution is that he reduces it to the universal need of mankind for redemption/salvation by Christ. In this way he contends that there is a certain "inevitable absence" in all persons (adults and infants); this definitely places him outside the classical tradition (privation, concupiscence) and contrasts well his positive tone with the negative emphases (the nature of sin) of other authors today. Thus the significance of the historical "Adam" is minimalized (leaving room for the scientific conclusions of polygenism) and the genuine message of revelation becomes apparent: original sin is to be seen as a need for fulfilment at every individual's religious level of existence. This conclusion is reached only after careful and lengthy analyses of the major texts and controversies in the evolution of the dogma: Gn 2–3, Rom 5:12–21, the Augustinian-Pelagian conflict with the resulting decree of Carthage (418), and Trent's reaffirmation, in light of the Reformation, of the thousand-year magisterial tradition.

Some observations, however, are in order. Granted that V. presents us with a more positive approach to our religious needs, and that we are not overburdened with Luther's *peccatum manens*, does he adequately explain what is the "sin" in original sin? He acknowledges that original
sin can only be rightly understood in a general context of sin, but I have failed to find an explanatory definition anywhere in his text; his explanation is limited to the historical details of the term “original.” In this light he fails to do justice to the considerations of other contemporary theologians: e.g., Schoonenberg’s “power of sin in situation,” Alszeghy-Flick’s “dynamic incapacity for good,” Hulsbosch’s “evolutionary solidarity of all men in evil,” etc.

In a more profound sense, there are two reasons why V.’s theory must be considered incomplete. First, he limits his investigation to a gathering and interpretation of historical data (probably the best available in English), but he fails to treat adequately the field of speculative theology, where philosophy and psychology are playing an ever-increasing role today. Furthermore, even at the historical level, V. probably distinguishes, along with Augustine, too sharply between the human person ante lapsum and post lapsum (cf. his delineation of concupiscence as a consequence of original sin). Does this do justice to the available certainties of scientific evolution? Could not the historical results be more properly appreciated if they were put into a “model” perspective (cf. G. Daly, “Theological Models in the Doctrine of Original Sin,” Heythrop Journal 13 [1972] 121-42)?

Secondly, more attention must be paid to the philosophical structures of individual authors, whether ancient or modern. This does not mean a return to purely metaphysical speculation, but an authentic introspective consideration of every individual’s problem of epistemic distance: thus man’s fallenness would consist in his refusal to advance toward the goal for which he was created. The history of knowledge itself would be sufficient proof of the universality of such a model. In this light much research needs to be done about the possibility of degrees of original sin.

It is fortunate that we have available at last in English one of the complete studies on original sin from European theologians; the majority are still unavailable. There is also a valuable 24-page introduction by R. Gleason which situates V. in the contemporary scene with the many questions of the last several decades on original sin.

St. Paul Seminary, Minn. 

Jerome M. Dittberner


Theologians of the twentieth century have allotted much time and energy to study of the Eucharist in all of its aspects, historical, scriptural, liturgical, and dogmatic. Since World War II, discussion has often led to
heated controversy, especially on the Eucharistic presence of Christ. For the past four or five years a relative calm has followed the previous turbulence. The moment seems to have come for a serene, serious, thorough investigation of the many efforts that have been devoted to the elucidation of Eucharistic theology in our time.

Such an investigation has been undertaken by Sayes, who came to his task well equipped, particularly since he knows the most important languages in which hundreds of contributions have appeared. In addition to his native Spanish and familiarity with Latin, he has a good command of Italian, French, German, English, and Dutch.

His method is largely analytical, in the sense that, although he groups together theologians who shared common interests in the various movements that have succeeded one another, he studies each author in detail, with careful documentation. This analytical method is complemented by recapitulations at the end of each section, in which he provides a synthesis of the ideas and proposals characteristic of each trend, and adds his own judicious critiques. The order followed is roughly chronological, with considerable overlapping, for theologians do not band together decade by decade.

The first great crisis, that was to lead to many disputes reaching down to the very foundations of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, was the challenge to hylomorphism issued by modern developments in physics. Some theologians held that theology has nothing to do with the physical sciences, others endeavored to adapt scientific discoveries to the traditional teaching on substance and accidents. The debate about the concept of substance in the doctrine of transubstantiation, conducted between F. Selvaggi and C. Colombo, began shortly after World War II, with each side drawing staunch adherents; it flourished for a few years and then lapsed. As early as 1939, Y. de Montcheuil introduced a new perspective that was to have unsuspected consequences: the idea that reality consists in the religious relation of things to God. F. Leenhardt argued that the basic reality of things was their religious being, and J. de Baciocchi held that it was their ordination to Christ. What changes in the bread and wine of the Eucharist is the religious meaning assigned to them by God.

Another group, including B. Welte, J. Möller, and S. Trooster, contended that reality should be understood not as religious entity but in the perspective of existential phenomenology, according to which material reality consists in its relationship to man. As applied to the Eucharist, Christ takes the signs of bread and wine and confers on them a new signification, his self-donation to the Church; he changes the nature of bread and wine into the symbol of his self-giving to men.
During the past decade, the personal presence of Christ was the watchword of a Eucharistic theology dominated by scholars from the Netherlands, particularly E. Schillebeeckx, P. Schoonenberg, and L. Smits. Christ changes the signification and finality of the bread and wine to symbolize and thus to convey the personal gift of himself. The ensuing polemic about transignification and transfinalization is well known. Later attempts to cast light on the Eucharistic presence of Christ by relating it to the paschal mystery and the Parousia attracted less attention.

After the long historical account he gives of these and other tendencies, S. sets forth the teaching of the Church during the pontificates of Pius XII and Paul VI. The latter especially, in addresses, letters, the Encyclical Mysterium fidei, and the Credo of the People of God, insists on the traditional doctrine, clearly defined at Trent, that the substance of bread and wine is really and truly changed into the body and blood of Christ, and that the term “substance” does not imply adherence to any particular philosophy but precedes the advent of Aristotelianism and belongs to the patrimony of the Church. He admits transignification and transfinalization, but only as a result of the absolute and objective change of the basic reality of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, that is, transubstantiation.

S. concludes with a lengthy theological and philosophical evaluation of Eucharistic speculations in our century. He praises the many valuable contributions that have stressed the communal, sacramental, symbolical, personalist, and other aspects of the Eucharist. But he asks many searching questions and finds that most of the recent proposals fail to do justice to the Eucharistic teaching of Scripture, tradition, and the magisterium. The book is a splendid example of thorough research, reflection, and theological sanity. It deserves to be translated and to reach as wide a public as possible.

Marquette University

CYRIL VOLLETT, S.J.


When Moltmann's Theology of Hope appeared in 1964, a number of its critics objected that it was too oblivious of the cross. In The Crucified God, however, M. insists that a theology of the cross has always been the guiding light of his theological thought; and he presents here a brilliant treatise convincingly establishing the link between the Crucifixion, human freedom, and hope.

The criterion of what can be called Christian, M. insists, is always the
crucified Christ; and the self-identity of the Church and its theology can be authentically established only on the basis of an association with the Godforsaken of the world, whose exemplar is the crucified Christ. Every conceivable theme of Christian theology must be anchored in the mystery of the cross. The doctrine of the Trinity, e.g., must be seen as arising out of the spontaneous attempts by the early Christian community to associate the inner life of God with the accursed man who was crucified.

The cross of Jesus, M. insists, must always be the foundation on which the Christian image of God is based. But M. is especially sensitive to the observations of psychology and sociology that it is only rarely the case that the God of Christians is in fact the crucified God. He soberly observes with Whitehead that the image of God in Christian history was very early shaped along the lines of Caesar's imperial, coercive power rather than by the suffering love manifest on the cross. M.'s is probably the most thorough, intelligent, and powerful attempt in recent years to draw the Church's and theologians' attention back to the spectre of the cross as the milieu in which to discuss the nature of God's being.

The question with which such speculation must begin is: "How can God himself be in one who has been forsaken by God?" (p. 190). In this connection M. highlights the utter forsakenness which historians see in the event of crucifixion, the mode of execution reserved for the most accursed in Jesus' time. An awareness of the opprobrium associated with crucifixion is necessary to appreciate how much Jesus experienced his death as the "rejection by the very God whom he dared to call 'My Father.'" The theological implications of the crucifixion lie not so much in its exemplification of the martyr-like death of a deeply religious man as in its setting forth the rejection of God by God. "In the passion of the Son the Father himself suffers the pains of abandonment" (p. 192). The Good News of human hope and liberation is all contained in this proclamation.

M. notes that Christian theology, and perhaps especially ecclesiology, have yet to appropriate this kernel of Christian faith in which the identity of God is seen as inseparable from that of the Godforsaken of the earth. The Church has all too readily acceded to the illusory, projected image of a God of imperial power as a way of buffering itself against any liberating association with the poor and oppressed. The identity crisis through which Christian churches are passing today can be meaningfully resolved only through a return to a radical theology of the cross. The churches will find themselves to the extent that they find themselves representing the rejected of men; the theological basis for this ecclesiological turn (return) is a renewed faith in the God who finds His own identity among the outcast.
BOOK REVIEWS

In the final two chapters of this magnificent work, M. develops the theme of human liberation in terms of psychology and politics. In a compelling dialogue with Freud he attempts to show how freedom from the vicious circle of the Oedipus complex and neurotic obsession is implied in the *pathos* of God. “The Unknown Father of Jesus Christ has nothing to do with those idols of the father which lead to the Oedipus complex. The crucified Christ makes earthly fathers and earthly sons alike sons of God and brings them in community to the freedom which lies beyond the Oedipus complex” (p. 307).

Finally, M. develops a political hermeneutics of the theme of the crucified God in terms of human suffering in society. Again, the key to liberation from the vicious circles of poverty, racial alienation, environmental abuse, and meaningless existence is a recognition that “the glory of God does not shine on the crowns of the mighty, but on the face of the crucified Christ” (p. 327).

It would be hard to exaggerate the significance of this book. Although it is not revolutionary, it is a powerful, inspiring synthesis of Christian reflection on the cross and an exciting interpretation of the theology of the cross in terms of contemporary problems of human life.

*Georgetown University*

JOHN F. HAUGHT


In brief compass O’Collins here gives a readable and informative treatment of many knotty problems connected with the notion of dogma in Roman Catholic theology. After an introductory sketch of the history of the term, he sets forth the principal objections against dogma as formulated by liberal Protestants, rationalists, Marxians, and others. In reply to some of these criticisms, O’C. then explains how dogmas can function in a healthy way as guides and incentives to genuinely Christian living. To prevent exaggerated dogmatism, he points out that dogmas are subordinate to Scripture, that they are historically conditioned, and that by their very nature they fall immeasurably short of encompassing the mysteries of which they speak. On the basis of these reservations, O’C. finds it possible to show how dogma is not of itself incompatible with human freedom, with the canons of rationality, or with the inevitable shifts in thought-forms and linguistic usage.

In his next section O’C. takes up the problem of interpreting dogmas, providing some interesting illustrations of how the dogma of the Assumption of Mary has been understood by thinkers as diverse as François Mauriac, C. C. Martindale, C. G. Jung, and Karl Rahner. In a final chapter he attempts to show that the term “dogma” should not be
applied to doctrinal decisions prior to the nineteenth century. He then concludes that, since dogma does not have a past, it does not have a future either. Dogmas, he declares, are not necessary or helpful for defending the true faith or separating heretics from the true fold. “For the future one can only hope that the Church as a whole will agree to dispense with dogma” (p. 99).

If the term “dogma” must continue to be understood as defined in the Neo-Scholastic manuals of 1870–1950, O’C.’s conclusions would seem to be correct. It is my opinion, however, that this definition is unwarrantably narrow. Quite independently of Neo-Scholastic usage, the term “dogma” has played a major role in Western theology, especially since the seventeenth century. Regrettably O’C., in his brief review of this history, overlooks the different understandings of dogma that might be found, e.g., in the Anglican tradition (with indebtedness to Vincent of Lerins), in the Catholic Modernists (such as Laberthonnière and others), in Karl Barth, and in some twentieth-century Lutherans, such as Ernst Kinder, Bernard Lohse, Heinrich Vogel, Regin Prenter, and George Lindbeck.

In contrast to O’C., I believe that the term “dogma,” like many other key theological terms, should not be allowed to become a casualty of the decadent theology of the Roman School between the two Vatican Councils. There is no reason why this school should be authorized to impose on the whole world its own definition of terms. As an alternative, I have suggested in *The Survival of Dogma* (end of chap. 10) that dogma might better be understood as expressing “what some relatively large body of Christians see together, and find the strength to affirm in unison, by the light of their common faith.”

My difference with O’C. is chiefly on a point of terminology. If he wishes to speak of “formulations of faith” where I speak of “dogmas,” I have no major quarrel with him. We are at one in maintaining that the prevalent understanding of dogma in the Catholic seminaries of the recent past has ceased to be viable.

On many points one might wish that O’C. had written at greater length. His remarks to the effect that formulas of faith were not imposed on Christians in NT times fail to reflect the complexity of the NT evidence, especially in the Johannine epistles and the Pastorals. He seems to vacillate as to whether the status of dogma should be accorded to documents such as *Unam sanctam*. His discussion of the hermeneutical problem, which makes excellent use of English philosophers in the linguistic analytic tradition, might have been profitably enriched by reference to Continental authors such as Gadamer and Schillebeeckx. While O’C. devotes considerable space to liberal Protestant objections against dogma—which he does not fully share—he is overconcise in
setting forth his own case against dogma. He does not sufficiently explain, to my mind, how the "formulations of faith," which he favors, differ from dogmas, which he repudiates, and how they escape the weaknesses he finds in dogmas.

These limitations, however, are chiefly due to the brevity of the book. O'C. is to be commended for having produced a forthright, lucid, and interesting probe into a sensitive and strategically important theological area.

*Catholic University of America*  
*AVERY DULLES, S.J.*


"Beyond" and "new theism" raise questions that never seem fully answered. "Beyond" implies that the author intended the work as a trajectory aimed at implanting classical theism on the philosophical and theological territory of post-Enlightenment times. By "new theism," G. means a philosophical-theological tradition stressing the relation between "God and creation" (pp. 3-4, 246), in contrast to classical theism, which aims at making a case for the separation between them. Serious readers must decide whether this work succeeds in using either term properly or persuasively. In general, I consider these terms vague and inaccurate philosophical historiography. Is it simply possible to advance "beyond" a tradition or to remodel an intricate "classical" scheme to fit the contours of new philosophical views or methods? Is "the new theism" definable? In what sense can "theism" be applied to as diverse a congregation as Buber, Barth, Bonhoeffer, Karl Rahner, Sölle, or Tillich? What is theistic about religious claims that God is ineffable, absent, or dead? Can a cosmological argument, no matter how phrased or reconstructed, bear on such states of theological affairs?

The program in this study is not so much to "get beyond" a tradition starting with the early nineteenth century as it is to replant Thomist questions and conclusions in a modern context. Despite his demurrers (p. 12), he works clearly in the Thomist tradition. It is a confident and ambitious work done with preciseness, marbled by style that is frequently acerbic, and often reliant on claims of contemporary philosophers not always set in a context helpful to the reader. G. apparently assumes that this book serves as a prospectus for discussion among well-prepared Catholics, non-Catholics, theists, and atheists alike.

The initial chapter affirms the native inseparability of faith and reason by reciting naive observations by children dramatizing their awareness of God's existence. Nature, animate and inanimate, requires the child to
consider the question of God and His reality. Interestingly, Tillich, particularly in Vol. 1 of his *Systematic Theology*, follows a similar route to a serious conclusion: that the proofs of God's existence are more cogently put as existential questions than theoretical proofs. G. presses his argument into rougher terrain in the next five sections: that there is an uncaused entity; that the philosophical arguments opposing this claim are false; that the meaning of God-talk depends on the reasoning used to affirm His existence; that there are particularly difficult questions that threaten religious belief; that specific essential Christian doctrines are credible in an organic relation to the preceding sections. This is a formidable and complicated project; a thorough review is neither possible nor necessary.

Close to being an agenda for broad discussion which is the nature of the philosophy of religion, G.'s book contends that fideism, mysticism, supernaturalism, and pragmatism will not aid in reaching sure conclusions. Therefore, philosophers such as Anselm, James, and Kierkegaard and theologians such as Bultmann and Barth are criticized and summarily rejected, no doubt to the dismay of many who are informed by these traditions.

The most difficult and closely-woven section (Part 2) deals with G.'s conception of the uncaused entity. Nonformal reasoning is prior to faith. This is familiar philosophical ground. What is distinctive about G.'s treatment of it is his use of notational and formalistic devices borrowed from modern analytic philosophy; e.g., he approves and develops Wittgenstein's claim that religious language games are played on different levels (p. 6). However, after more than one reading, it is not clear that G. improves on the argument's traditional form. E.g., there may be some significance in substituting "obtains" for "happens" or "occurs," but it does not alter the ambiguity of the argument and its concept of contingency. Likewise, it fails to remove the problem of the argument's unconvincing religious significance as frequently dealt with in theological commentary. G. admits that arguments "closer to moral and emotional need always have more existential force," but insists that the argument for the uncaused entity is thoroughly defensible by the methods he has adopted.

A lengthy survey of technical and discursive alternatives to this position comprises Parts 3 and 4. Here Hume's and Kant's views on the relation of the what and the that of anything to an extraempirical principle, as well as Hegel's view that man can understand a pervading Spirit as a whole, are examined in relatively precise detail. Historians of philosophy, particularly of Hegel, should debate the interpretations proposed in this analysis. The section (Part 5) on "existential objections" is more effective and articulate. A cluster of perennially bothersome
problems related to freedom and divine causality, theodicy, and the meaning of human dignity in relation to divine sovereignty comprise the issues that “touch the existential nerve.”

Perhaps the book should have concluded at this point. Rather, the text continues in Part 6, as though an addendum, to analyze “the Meaningfulness of Christian Beliefs.” Sixty pages considering miracles, the nature of the human person, the doctrine of revelation, and the necessity of doctrine itself yield little that is unambiguous or consequential to the preceding sections. The concept of miracle, e.g., could be debated by contrasting G.’s view of miracles as “signals from the creator” with the concepts of such “new theists” as Schleiermacher or Tillich. On the doctrine of revelation, it would be striking to compare a view of revelation as the disclosure of theological truths with an existentialist understanding of revelation as experience or event as in “new theists” such as Buber or Bultmann.

If a lengthy work such as this is to avoid the elitism that makes dialogue and interchange of criticism impossible, students of philosophy of religion should insist that the philosophical and theological enterprises be marked by openness, sensitivity, and searching. Inquiry, in these days, is more appropriate than explanation. Bernard Lonergan’s “Aquinas Today” (Journal of Religion 55, no. 2 [April 1975]) helpfully summarizes the point: “If we bear in mind that Aquinas was a teacher, we must also remember that he taught in the medieval period, when theology became a speciality. Then first there arose a collaborative, ongoing, cumulative process of reflection and formulation that topically ordered and explanatorily developed the Christian tradition as a whole. Its inspiration was the search of faith for understanding, and in this effort Anselm of Canterbury was the pioneer. In contrast, its implementation was a spontaneous growth. The traditional combination of lectio and quaestio, of reading that learned from the past and of questioning that assimilated what is read, gave rise to a two-pronged advance.... The juxtaposition and commonly the fusion of these two developments had the double effect of bringing tradition to life by the questioning and of making questioning significant by basing it on traditional materials.”

University of Maine at Orono  

RALPH HJELM


Up to p. 60 of this book I was genuinely impressed with S.’s efforts to delineate the problems and directions needed in order to validate belief in the existence of God. His concern is strictly philosophical, and although his scope has wide implications, he appears to be directing his
principal thrust at Anglo-Saxon schools of rigid empirical and linguistic convictions. Quite refreshingly and convincingly, S. indicates a desire for a renewed metaphysics after the "demolition job" represented by such authors as Flew, Hepburn, et al.; i.e., there is still an evident need to know nonempirical reality—a fact that became apparent to S. after his reading of Owen's *The Christian Knowledge of God*. This aspect can no longer be neglected, since there is a real urgency to satisfy contemporary man's search for religion on a rational basis. The purpose of this book is to provide a practical refutation of the varied misdirections on the existing scene.

Since, however, the old- or hard-argument metaphysics (represented by such figures as Owen and Mascall) can be logically compelling but psychologically unsatisfying, a new or soft argument is needed, particularly in light of Barthian and Wittgensteinian fideism (p. 1) and Heidegger's underdeveloped existentialism (pp. 2-6). In brief, can experience without inference (argument) provide a rational basis for belief in God? Existence itself calls for explanation.

Chap. 4 ("A 'Soft' Cosmological Approach") contains the crux of S.'s inference: since the explanation sought for a CEB (the "cosmos-explaining-being" of Ninian Smart) is nonnatural, what is there in human experience that can provide a model? "In a sense there is an aspect of every person's experience which is totally dependent on his subjective activity . . . the process of experiencing is a process of interpretation and reinterpretation. And what are these? Surely a creative going beyond the immediate evidence" (p. 54). But there will then appear a limiting factor in the human self, and this in turn will give rise to S.'s primary argument: "a means of interpreting a putative cosmological relationship of dependence" (p. 56). Rational man must be able to experience his capacity to arouse a sense of ontological shock which points to a lack of ontological self-sufficiency (the wonder that there is and continues to be a world at all). Contingency is the key to the inference.

Furthermore, there is in this introspective model a concept of continual creating and re-creating (shades of Whitehead) which must logically lead to a source or ground beyond the self (cf. such questions as "why does the world exist?"). Ultimately, man is faced with an abduction (the term is C. S. Pierce's) of an analogous nature between the human personality and the CEB whose explanation arises out of a principle of sufficient reason, given man's basically trustworthy drive for transcendent intelligibility (p. 78).

Now I have no difficulty with this approach as I have perhaps too succinctly paraphrased it, but there are some real problems as to how far it is taken; for this reason I am uneasy about what S. says after p. 60. He
rightly posits the foundational aspect of human questioning, and he rightly does away with the contemporary fallacy that one can depend exclusively on religious experience for belief in God. In this sense I can see that he is definitely on the footpath of authenticity, but because of the traffic it should be expanded into a superhighway. Given the fact that any rational inquirer is influenced by his cultural milieu—in this case positivistic criteria and the temptations of process thought—there is a real danger that S.'s CEB will remain at worst a product of pure subjectivity, or at best a "soft" God who enjoys only a numinous existence. This becomes especially apparent in his remarks about a "temporal deity" (pp. 112 ff.); just because man must consider God temporally, and even because God acts in time, I fail to see the conclusion that God must also be temporal. The further question must be posed about God's own dynamic and personal objectivity. Perhaps this points out too strongly the limitations of a purely philosophical approach, but it should indicate the need for a clearly distinctive sublation between intelligence and a religious level of conscious existence. The lack of such a distinction becomes apparent when S. philosophically attempts to understand the supreme religious figure in Christianity, Jesus Christ, with only dubious results (pp. 86-93).

The core of S.'s problem is that his ontological argument suffers from an underdeveloped epistemological base. He rightly recognizes the role of intelligence, but fails to do justice to the distinctness of judgment: "It [judgment] is simply a matter of taking issues in turn (and deciding when their turn is)" (p. 143). He further analyzes rules of relevance and norms of judgment, but they are all lacking in historical perspective. My problem is that this sounds like a random turn toward a too facile intuitionism; more correctly, judgment is concerned with the sufficiency of facts ascertained, and especially the values connected with them. I find this type of perspective particularly disheartening when S. reduces his philosophical and religious certainty to such comments as "relative indeterminacy is a healthy sign" (p. 123). Granted that we are always faced with a gap between our certainty and Total Knowledge, is this all we can say in light of our many centuries of existing with God? Man must not turn his back on Mystery, or simply be content with a horizontal existence, but he must continually reach up toward It.

I find this last thought reinforced in S.'s postscript, where he states that it really does not make too much difference whether one comes to know God or not: "After all, according to Christianity itself, at least as I understand it, we shall in the end be judged, not according to how much knowledge we have acquired in matters of specifically religious truth, but according to how much we have loved" (p. 175). True, but to divorce
knowledge and truth from love in the human subject is more a sentiment than a reason; at best, it is poor cognitional theory and selective fundamentalism regarding the Christian Scriptures.

St. Paul Seminary, Minn.  

Jerome M. Dittberner


I suggest that the clearest expression of the basic problématique of C.'s book is found on p. 182: whether or not there exist a religious function and a religious activity which, though exercised within the scope of global history (for there exists no other history), are specific and irreducible realities inherent to the texture of salvation history. If the answer is yes, full human liberation (or salvation) is not exclusively historical but also eschatological, and consequently the latter dimension of salvation must be dealt with. C. intends to do precisely that.

As Christians, we are promised Christian hope, which goes beyond the realization of human hopes (p. 169). Be it understood, however, that nothing should be taken away from the exigencies of human hopes, such as the triumph of justice over injustice, the elimination of hunger, of all sickness, of death itself (p. 155), not only on an individual level, but also on the social and political levels (p. 175). There is, nevertheless, a "beyondness" to human hopes, which reveals itself in a twofold way: first, as a gift which "the eye has not seen, nor the ear heard" (1 Cor 2:9): the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the dead, the vision of God, a divinization, a "surpassing" of human finitude; secondly, as an evaluating principle with regard to our terrestrial endeavors which, in bringing about justice and liberation, always remain tendential and provisional. Furthermore, the salvation of Jesus Christ (a yet and a not yet) radicalizes (goes to the roots of) the goals of liberation, for liberators are themselves submitted to particular forms of slavery. They must often side up with Beelzebub in order to free people from Beelzebub. God's freedom alone, as a gift, leads not anew into slavery those whom it has set free (p. 170). Thus C. accepts a certain kind of dualism, not one that establishes a separation between the sacred and the profane, but one that points to a distinction of levels as well as to the specific reality of a religious dimension. As a man rooted in tradition, he concludes his book by vigorously stating: "Always (one must take into account) the Chalcedonian statute: without separation, without confusion" (p. 195).

Un peuple messianique contains two parts. The first deals with the Church as the sacrament of salvation. This is seen through an analysis of some of the Vatican I and II documents, Scripture and patristic writings,
the ancient Church and modern theology. The model of messianic people is then used to explain how the Church in its entirety is called to be the sacrament of salvation for the world. As such, the Church reveals to the world its final meaning.

Part 2 deals with the themes of salvation and liberation as seen through the eyes of both OT and NT witnesses. C. then makes a profound study of Jesus as Saviour. A chapter follows on the meaning of human liberation today. A last chapter approaches human liberation within the context of Christ's mission and salvation. The latter appears as the book's most controversial chapter. C. makes a distinction between the roles of the hierarchy and the laity with regard to each one's involvement in the realization of human liberation: in this respect, the hierarchy witnesses to that aspect of the Church considered as distinct from the temporal society in which and for which it exists; the laity, to the Church considered as messianic people involved with the world in the construction of the world itself in view of the kingdom of God. The hierarchy, through its prophetic teaching, raises the awareness of the laity (who in turn must inform the hierarchy) concerning issues dealing with human liberation. This teaching must then be translated into social and political militancy through the action of the laity.

C.'s praxis—the Church and its tradition—is very real; it is a reality he has received faithfully and lived to the utmost. For this reason the book is to be highly recommended for theology professors and students; for it is a terribly new and prophetic book insofar as one is assured of finding there, concisely and clearly put together (with abundant documentation, as always in C.'s works), what a man of authentic tradition has to say to us today about the Church of Christ which is meant to be the sacrament of humanity's full liberation.

_Chestnut Hill, Mass._

_RICHARD J. BEAUCHESNE, O.M.I._


This monograph attempts to detail Clement of Alexandria's doctrine of purification by fire after death, as a part of his general understanding of resurrection. It is successful in demonstrating that Clement's notion of "purgatory" is ontological rather than moral, and based upon the cosmological physics of Heraclitus and the Stoics.

Clement's teaching on resurrection as a continuous process is explained well. Against the common opinion that C. volatilized the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh, S. shows that he used the Stoic concept of substantial spirit (_pneuma_) to explain the spiritual body (_sōma_) of the
resurrection. In this connection we learn how C. conceives of a realized eschatology. Resurrection takes place in stages, beginning with baptism, and gradually transforms a person fully into spirit-substance. The Eucharist helps to change the flesh of man into a spiritual flesh.

Less satisfying is the section on postmortal purification, which is also conceived by Clement as a facet of the transformation of man into substantial spirit. When a mature (gnostic) Christian dies, he passes into a world near to God, but not of the same essence, that can be characterized as spirit (pneuma), the divine fluid, and fire (pur), its chief component. If the dying person is not totally substantial spirit, but carries within himself materialistic parts (hylē) coming from the passions (pathē), the integration into the upper spirit world becomes a process, which eliminates the discrepancy in essence. Death is extended beyond the mere biological event, until its real goal is realized: restoration of the complete consubstantiality of the being-to-be-saved with the spirit of the divine world.

The book is difficult reading, because it contains complex analyses of many problematic ancient texts which are never actually quoted themselves. Moreover, one may question the basic methodology, which involves using Clement's Gnostic anthology Excerpta ex Theodoto as a main source. Despite all S.'s protestations, one cannot be sure if the ideas under discussion belong to the Valentinian Gnostic Theodotus or to Clement. Also, he points out repeatedly that C. aimed to be a biblical philosopher and to elucidate pagan philosophy on the basis of the Bible, and not to set up pagan thought as a rival to Scripture. Yet the idea of cosmic purification by fire, as S. concedes, is drawn largely from philosophy and alien to the Bible. Thus we are forced to conclude that, if such a doctrine was developed by C., he is violating his own hermeneutical principle of the supremacy of Scripture.

On the positive side, Clement's procedure is pertinent to modern Scripture scholarship: the content of Scripture is not to be demythologized away, but the relevant teachings of philosophy are to be used to flesh out the statements of Scripture, even if we then run the risk of two concurrent revelations.
patriarchate" of the Byzantine Empire and of the contemporary Orthodox Church, is quite abundant and much of it is of a very high quality. It is the first time, however, that the study of the subject by an Orthodox author is published in a Western language. One should note also that the book is written by an author personally and responsibly involved in the issues he raises, being one of the eldest and most influential titular metropolitans of the patriarchate and the chairman of the Synod's committee for interecclesiastical relations. His goal is to interpret the historical and canonical data, so that it may be useful for the present and the future. Those familiar with the present situation of the Orthodox Church know very well that the role of the patriarchate of Constantinople, precariously surviving in the now Turkish city of Istanbul, is a burning and sometimes controversial issue among the Orthodox themselves. On the other hand, the question of primacy in the Church stands at the very center of the present ecclesiological debates in Roman Catholicism. Those Roman Catholics who either challenge or, on the contrary, defend the Roman primacy, as it is defined by Vatican I and Vatican II, may profit from learning more about the history of the "new Rome" on the Bosphorus, which rejected the claims of its elder sister-church on the Tiber, but in fact acted for centuries as the center of Eastern Orthodox Christendom.

As indicated in the title, the learned study of the Metropolitan of Sardis involves historical and ecclesiological issues. M. describes the rise and growth of the Church of Constantinople in the new capital of the Roman Empire; he analyzes at length the canonical legislation of the Councils of Constantinople (381) and Chalcedon (451) where its prerogatives were defined; he also discusses in detail the manner in which Constantinople's authority and primacy were exercised during the Byzantine period (i.e., until 1453), under the Ottoman khalifate, and finally in modern times. He fully recognizes the purely historical and canonical basis of Constantinople's primacy, as distinct from the doctrinal, scriptural, and therefore dogmatic arguments which are used to justify the primacy of Rome (and which the Orthodox reject). Most of the historical material gathered in the book is a form of apology for Constantinople's primacy and is interspaced with polemics against those Orthodox canonists who tend to reduce its role and its importance. While the polemics are always academically respectful in tone, this constantly apologetic character of the argument makes it somehow less convincing, at least on certain issues. For instance, if the position of Constantinople, as a supreme court of appeals, competent to judge disciplinary cases coming both from inside and from outside the territory of the patriarchate, is convincingly established on the basis of canons 9 and 17 of Chalcedon (pp. 169–253), it is doubtful that the informed reader will
follow the author in his interpretation of the famous sentence of canon 28 of Chalcedon ("the bishops of the aforementioned dioceses [of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace], who are among the barbarians, are also ordained by . . . Constantinople"), as formally giving the ecumenical patriarchate jurisdiction over all mission lands (pp. 264-83). Similarly, it is quite difficult to follow M. in his interpretation of many examples of Constantinopolitan interventions in the affairs of other local churches, as always fully consistent with the meaning of the primacy as he defines it.

Actually, the real importance of the book lies not in its historical arguments (of which some are controversial) but in its strong affirmation of the most authentic contemporary Orthodox consensus in ecclesiology: "Each local church, united in its bishop . . . is the full Church, identified with the total Body of Christ" (p. 48). Consequently, the ministry of regional or universal primates—including that of Constantinople—is a diakonia of unity among the churches, never a dogmatically-held power over them.

Another major and highly significant feature of the book is M.'s insistent condemnation of phyletism, i.e., the organization of the Church along ethnic lines in the same territory, as the true heresy in contemporary Orthodoxy (pp. 377-87). Anyone familiar with some sad realities in this respect will read these pages with great relief and with the hope that M.'s warnings will be taken seriously by all, including Constantinople itself, whose leadership is badly needed precisely in this area of Orthodox church life.

*Fordham University*  
*St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary*


This study attempts and succeeds in an almost impossible literary/historical enterprise: tracing the history of the Franciscan Order in early-thirteenth-century Italy to its establishment and development in England up to 1350; sketching carefully the main features of Franciscan spirituality; and finally delineating carefully and illustrating generously the extraordinary influence the Franciscans had on the development of Middle English lyric poetry up to 1350. The work's conclusion, "The Middle English lyric is, essentially, a Franciscan song," is clearly established.

J. first considers the standard theories concerning the development of Middle English lyric poetry. He argues that early Middle English poetry was not heavily indebted to its French or Provençal predecessors nor does it resemble the short poems of Chaucer or Machaut; it is largely the
result of the preaching methodology and distinctive spirituality of thirteenth-century Franciscans.

J. then, in the body of the work, shows that Franciscan preaching style developed from a number of popular religious movements in the twelfth century. From these it derived many of its themes and particularly its use of contemporary lyric poetry as a major part of its preaching technique. St. Francis even used popular melodies for spiritual lyrics as part of his preaching. St. Francis called his preachers *joculatores Dei*.

The Franciscan poetic tradition, from its origins in Italian lyric poetry to its flowering in the Medieval English lyric, emphasizes particularly man's meditative response to the Passion, to nature as God's work, to the evil of sin and grandeur of virtue. The reflective-emotive vigor of much medieval English verse in no small way draws its force from Franciscan homiletic verse. Much of this poetry included scriptural paraphrase and reflection. J. is very detailed in establishing the strong intellectual character of Franciscan spirituality. He discusses the extensive theological and classical holdings of thirteenth-century friaries. Such intellectual vigor not only kept Franciscan lyricism orthodox but also aesthetically rich.

The great strength of this work lies in its careful documentation. J. richly illustrates and deftly explicates extant specimens of Franciscan lyrics. He also examines major Franciscan preaching manuals such as *Liber exemplorum*, *Speculum laicorum*, and the *Fasciculus morum*. J. treats the *Fasciculus morum* in great detail because it includes so many popular preaching lyrics. Some of the most interesting examples J. discusses are lyrics which have Christ speaking from the cross, lyrics dealing with the fickleness of fortune, and lyrics versifying Scripture and the Ten Commandments.

Because of its extensive documentation and the adroit skill of its explications, this work would be particularly useful to the student of Franciscan and medieval spirituality and to the student of English lyric poetry. The historical material is succinct. The careful relating of historical fact to the development of lyric themes is especially rewarding.

Many readers will be possibly surprised to find so much clear evidence for the high character of Franciscan intellectualism and artistry in the context of popular preaching. It is often naively assumed that good Middle English lyrics were mainly the work of courtly poets. J.'s many examples show that splendid poetry can develop even in "vulgar" contexts. Much of the lyric poetry was accompanied by popular melodies. Indeed, often the friar preacher would use poetry and song to hold a large congregation preached to outside. But even in their contexts the poetry generally was of good quality.

This work has a wide range of academic appeal because of the careful
annotation and even translation of many Latin, Italian, and Middle English lyrics and sermon manuals. Even undergraduates whose linguistic abilities may not be strong will find the work readily understandable. A special virtue of this work is its careful documentation. There are some sixty-eight pages of notes. Many of the notes have detailed explanations, further examples, and multiple references to manuscripts and related studies. Much of the poetry in this work is published for the first time.

The work does not give much emphasis to metrics nor to the place Franciscan homiletic verse has in the development of Middle English poetry from its Old English origins. Actually these would be lengthy projects in themselves. But the work amply fulfills its promise. It clearly demonstrates that fully 85–90% of Middle English verse prior to the Black Death is Franciscan poetry. This is a major fact splendidly handled.

John Carroll University, Cleveland

RICHARD W. CLANCHEY


For almost a decade, in an unpublished dissertation and in at least three major articles, D. has developed and refined the thesis he here presents with great care. For most historians of the Franciscan Order, it is a foregone conclusion that the history of the Order in the late thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries is one of the gradual modification and eventual distortion of the intention of St. Francis. Such assessments generally single out one particular element—usually poverty—as that which constitutes the essence of the original Franciscan movement; and from that limited perspective all that follows is seen as loss and decline. For D., the mission theology of the early Franciscans provides a more adequate key for dealing with the early history of the Order; for it gives expression to the fundamental values of the Order without limiting our view arbitrarily. A basic change of values would unavoidably find a reflection at the level of mission theology.

To a greater extent than was possible for earlier scholars, D. takes account of the growing body of information on the Joachimite phenomenon in the development of medieval thought. This, together with the medieval notion of the societas christiana and some remnants of the Augustinian theology of history, provides a number of basic clues for understanding various forms of medieval mission theology, one of which is that of the Franciscans. The thesis developed by D. affirms that there is a remarkable continuity in the mission theology of the Order from St. Francis up to the fifteenth century at least. Arguing from continuity at that level, D. argues to a basic continuity between the original intention
of St. Francis and the Order as it had developed in the period under study.

The key to this argument is the type of eschatology peculiar to the early Franciscan movement. In contrast with the eschatology of Joachimism, which is essentially a doctrine of linear evolution, that of the Franciscans is characterized by D. as renovationist. In essence, this eschatology is one that sees the life of Francis and the early friars as the re-enactment of the life style of the early Church. When this is combined with the Augustinian understanding of history, it becomes clear how the conviction could arise that God had called forth this renewal of the primitive Christian life style in the last age so as to prepare mankind for the final apocalyptic events in which history would come to an end. The Franciscan understanding of mission, then, focuses most sharply on the missionary power of the living example of men whose lives are truly an interior and an exterior imitation of Christ, and whose purpose is to prepare themselves and others for the glorious return of Christ.

This understanding, D. argues, began to take shape already in the life and writings of Francis and finds its full expression in the theology of Bonaventure. The Franciscan concept of mission, thus conceived, must be distinguished from the approach of intellectual conversion through apologetics and philosophical theology such as was characteristic of the early Dominicans, and from the apocalyptic expectations of Joachimism, which were later fused with the Franciscan ideas in the work of Olivi. While both these alternate approaches to mission would eventually have a significant impact on the Order, yet the influence was never of such a sort as to destroy the peculiar Franciscan approach to mission during the period considered in this study.

By placing the early history of the Franciscan Order in a fuller historical context than is normally found, D. succeeds in presenting a thesis that calls into question some of the most common assumptions about the nature of the Order. In a well-documented work, and in a style that is both warm and persuasive, he presents an alternate version of that early history which makes it possible to achieve greater clarity concerning some fundamental problems in a way that deserves the serious attention of other scholars.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

ZACHARY HAYES, O.F.M.


John Jay Hughes, in reviewing Pottmeyer’s Der Glaube vor dem
Anspruch der Wissenschaft (1968), a study of Vatican I's Constitution on Faith, characterized him “very much a man to watch for the future” (TS 32 [1971] 334). This previous prediction of promise is amply verified in the present publication, which was P.'s Habilitationsschrift at Münster.

A rationale for this study is furnished by the intriguing fact that, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, papal infallibility was at most a matter of theological opinion and, as such, sometimes rejected. How, then, can one explain the subsequent rapid and widespread acceptance that made its dogmatic proclamation possible, though debatable, a few decades later at Vatican I? In P.'s response, papal infallibility is seen as emerging from a politically conscious ecclesiology that was pragmatically and theoretically concerned about the dual goal of maintaining the independence of the Church and of fostering its intramural unity in the face of attempted incursions by civil authorities and the attacks of rival ideologies.

Thematically, P.'s study undertakes an analysis of the Ultramontane motives and arguments supporting infallibility as they developed within nineteenth-century ecclesiology prior to, but not including, Vatican I. As “Ultramontane” here broadly denotes “supporters of the papal primacy of infallibility and jurisdiction” (p. 16), authors of quite different viewpoints are included. Geographically, the authors studied are restricted to France, Germany, Austria, and Italy.

As stage-setting for Ultramontane ecclesiological development, the initial chapter (pp. 21–60) helpfully surveys the nineteenth-century political scene: in postrevolutionary France, the Gallican marriage of Throne and Altar needed to be replaced by a new ecclesiological analogy; the result was a gradual turning towards Rome, though in various degrees and for various motives. In Germany and Austria, where Ultramontanism as a movement for Church autonomy also looked to Rome for assistance, a different context was furnished by the struggles with Febronianism and Josephinism. In Italy, defense of and devotion to the papacy emerged in face of attacks on the papal temporal power, which became personified as an essential concomitant of the Church's spiritual authority.

While rightly stressing the importance of the encyclicals of Gregory XVI and Pius IX in promoting the papacy as the ultimate bulwark against the onslaught of a host of evils, P.'s view of the definition of the Immaculate Conception as the precedent for the definition of infallibility (pp. 54–55) fails to give sufficient weight to the collegial role of the bishops in 1854 (cf. J. Hennesey, TS 25 [1964] 409–19): if 1854 was a precedent, why was there such opposition at Vatican I? In addition,
while granting that theologians have tended to overlook the political factors operative behind Vatican I's definition, P.'s contention that infallibility for Pius IX "as for the majority of the bishops was not in the first place a theological question, but a life-or-death issue (Lebensfrage) for the church in a situation of apocalyptic dimension" (p. 60) seems to overplay the political aspect of infallibility.

The major portion of P.'s study is devoted to a detailed exposition of Ultramontane views of papal infallibility as they developed in French theology (pp. 61–114), German canonical studies (pp. 115–81) and theology (pp. 182–278), and the ecclesiology of the “Roman School” (pp. 279–345). In these four chapters, P. displays considerable familiarity with a large number of primary sources and critical acumen in his analysis and evaluation of their theological/canonical positions. These chapters defy succinct summary; a few samples may convey some indication of the value and achievement of P.'s presentation.

The treatment of Joseph de Maistre (pp. 61–73) goes beyond a conventional summary of the monarchical analogy of Du pape (1819) that parallels infallibility in the spiritual order with sovereignty in civil society. P. emphasizes that Maistre's argument, based on political utility and efficiency, construes infallibility essentially as legal decision-making without recourse rather than specification of doctrinal truth. Maistre's political analogy, which prescinded from Scripture and tradition, exercised considerable influence during the following half-century. If Maistre's monarchical absolutism is patently less acceptable today, the facile alignment of infallibility with sovereignty still plagues too much of the contemporary discussion.

A quite different approach was taken by Johann Adam Möhler, who as a canonist at the beginning of his professorial career (cf. pp. 134–42) envisioned the Church as the image of Christ: if love could constitute the inner cohesive force among the early Christians, the eventual need for external mediation led Möhler, unlike Maistre, to a collegial view of Church leadership. Möhler's subsequent ecclesiology (pp. 222–36), first expressed in Die Einheit der Kirche (1825), envisioned the Church as a community whose spiritual life must be visibly constituted under a primate, "the personal reflection of the whole Church's unity" (p. 225). If Möhler's concern in his later writings about the Church's external dimensions prompted an ecclesiological communicatio idiomatum that in the hands of less discerning ecclesiologists was employed to identify the pope with Christ, still his warning against the danger of absolutizing specific historical forms of the primatial office remains germane.

Firsthand experience of the Revolution of 1848 and exile during the Roman Republic served as the background for Roman theologians like
Carlo Passaglia (pp. 298-329), who subsequently insisted that authority is essential for Christianity. From his earlier societas-ecclesiology, which grounded the Church's firmness in faith on Peter (Lk 22), Passaglia's De ecclesia (1853-56) shifted to an incarnational ecclesiology in which infallibility as an aspect of Christ's abiding presence in the Church is specifically entrusted to the successors of Peter. After 1861, when he fled Rome due to the hostility toward his compromising attitude regarding the future of the Papal States, Passaglia again revised his view of the Church: a constitutional monarchy in which pope and bishops co-operate collegially. While some of Passaglia's views anticipated Vatican II, the full implications of his ecclesiological shifts for the doctrine of infallibility remain to be developed.

The preceding samples can only hint at some of the complexity and diversity in Ultramontane ecclesiology as found in the writings of Félicité Lamennais, Prosper Guéranger, Ferdinand Walter, George Phillips, Matthias Scheeben, Giovanni Perrone, Clemens Schrader, and many others. Cumulatively, P.'s masterly exposition furnishes the background necessary for a more perceptive understanding of the infallibility debate at Vatican I and the diversity in postconciliar interpretations of Pastor aeternus.

P.'s concluding assessment (pp. 346-428) helpfully recapitulates the principal facets of Ultramontane teaching on infallibility (scil., its political and ecclesiological framework, its utilization of tradition, the unresolved problem of the relationship of ordo and jurisdictio with magisterium, the adoption of the contemporary view of sovereignty) and incisively evaluates their respective strengths and deficiencies. If the arguments supporting infallibility were the best weapons at hand in counterattacking the threats to the Church's freedom and unity, their once apparently irrefutable logic can no longer be critically sustained. Yet these deficiencies do not lead P. to a sensationalistic repudiation of infallibility. Rather, he cogently suggests a number of exits from the impasse of nineteenth-century categories within which much of the current infallibility debate has floundered. For example, the ghost of Maistre still creates confusion through an implicit identification of infallibility with sovereignty; and the customary presentation of infallibility within a monarchical ecclesiology (variantly absolutist or constitutional) has left unexplored the roles that infallibility might receive in other ecclesiological models.

In sum, P. has not only made a valuable contribution to the history of theology; in addition, the present infallibility debate would benefit immensely if P.'s excellent study were made mandatory reading for all participants.

Catholic University of America

JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.

Phenomenological description is a perilous art. If it sticks too close to the literal rendering of phenomena, it risks banality and easily invites a shrug of "So what?" If it construes its subject matter with a complex method and a panoply of technical terms, it tends to become self-defeating, further shrouding the "things themselves" it aims to disclose. For the most part, B. strikes the right balance, neither elaborating the obvious nor burying the subtle in a pyramid of distinctions.

B.'s aim, necessarily exceeding his grasp, is a phenomenological description of the human situation. Scarcely a novel quest, but his approach is fresh: he wants to sketch generically the actual, concrete reality of man's existing as embodied spirit, bodymind. His enterprise is thus an incarnational version of what Heidegger sought to do in the delineation of his gnostic existentials and what Kant strove to achieve in the transcendental deduction of his rationalistic categories. As closer to the shape and feel of lived experience, his account is even less finished than Heidegger's but much more accessible. More suggestive than definitive, it promotes a way of regarding man, a sensitivity to his radical physicality, as opposed to offering a categorical summation of his essence.

B.'s sympathies lie with the philosophy of life and the romantic tradition of hermeneutics. In interpreting the generic text of human behavior, he seeks to understand it from the inside as well as the outside, to evoke the subjective, bodily experience that shapes the worlds of meaning in which we dwell. The body is the lived prism that refracts the perceived world. From this perspective, B. proceeds to consider in lush detail the co-ordinates, raw components, and interpersonal context of human living. First, the dimensions of embodied existence: the many facets of the radical spaciality and temporality of existence, the ways we concretely orient and master space and time. Second, the media of expression and communication: the protean potentiality for receiving and giving meaning that is invested in the work, the hand, the face and gaze. Third, social modes of behavior: the exemplary way in which visiting and sharing a meal bring out the meanings of human time and space, the complex interplay of expression, and the mysterious power of facial presence. In a virtuoso display of acute observation, B. highlights scores of ways in which these different dimensions of embodied existence define how we encounter the world and regard ourselves.

The cumulative effect of the book—which, like a series of Arbus photographs or Alain aphorisms, defies ready summary—is to heighten consciousness of what it actually means to say we are embodied spirits. It makes an auspicious basis for an incarnational theology, its avowed
but indirect purpose. It provides, I suspect, an elaborate and supple substructure for the concrete theology of the Incarnation ventured in its companion volume *The Humanity of God*; for it offers a much richer and nuanced anthropology than underpins most Christology.

It is a leisurely essay, saying as much by suggestion and implication as by assertion. It is a book to be mulled over, lived with, browsed in. It yields its vision gradually, less in flashes of insight than in the increments by which a fresh horizon opens up. Still, B.'s is not a flawless performance. He succumbs at times to the natural tendency to regard as universal what is merely cultural or accidental. More importantly, he neglects almost totally the realms of sex and death, which, after a century of psychoanalysis, seem indispensable to tracing acts of human meaning to their springs.

Despite the translator’s care and inventiveness, the book’s original language likely suits it better. The French seem especially adept at achieving phenomenological description that does not clunk with literalism or sail out of sight in flights of philosophical fancy, perhaps because their language allows simple words and phrases to carry their own distinct weight with unmuddled authority. Such forceful simplicity suffers translation less gracefully than technical complexity or fact-filled reportage.

Still, this translation is most welcome. It makes available to a wider audience one of those rare works that can enhance one’s grasp of the actual ways human existence works.

*New York, N.Y.*  

**John V. Loudon**


G. is a Dominican priest, professor of systematic theology at the Aquinas Institute, who has had the benefit of training in pastoral counseling at the Menninger Foundation. His work suggests that he has been successful in integrating the various strands of his training experience; the result is a book which many religious, priests, and even lay people will find a useful summary of more contemporary views on integrating sexuality and spirituality.

G. says nothing startling and new. If one approaches this work with the persuasion that to be human is also to be sexual, that to be fully human and fully sexual one does not need to be fully genital, and if one can feel comfortable in putting together humanity and sexuality on the one side with spirituality on the other, he will have little difficulty in assimilating most of what G. has to say.

One problem, however, is that the approach throughout tends to be
somewhat superficial. G. stays on the level of general principles, tends to merely touch the bases and not get very much into the nitty-gritty. Thus he steers a careful course between Scylla and Charybdis. On the one side, he steers clear of questioning the inherent value of celibacy in the Church’s life. The value of celibacy or virginity is merely asserted on more or less scriptural grounds. The question is not examined in any meaningful degree. Having thus avoided Scylla, G. is cautious about coming too close to Charybdis. Again he more or less takes it for granted that the celibate life in a religious context is an adequate expression of human sexuality. I, for one, totally agree with that proposition and would be willing to defend it. But the question is problematic and cannot simply be glossed over or taken for granted.

At a number of points I would want to take issue with positions espoused; I will focus on two. The first is somewhat incidental; the second is of greater moment. First, I find myself puzzled by G.’s treatment of Freud and psychoanalysis. The Freud reflected here is very old and very dead. At best, it is the early Freud of the prestructural days, when he was most preoccupied with the development of a libido theory and the correlative economic-energie problems. Even here, however, any understanding of Freud’s approach which tries to divorce it from the meaningful context of human relationships and their inherent values does a gross disservice to even Freud Junior. If the statements offered in a number of places are a caricature of even this early Freud, they are all the more a distortion of contemporary psychoanalytic thinking. In fact, there is very little expressed anywhere in this book— with some exceptions I shall point to in a moment—that is not quite consistent with a basic psychoanalytic orientation.

The second point has much greater moment and significance: G.’s treatment of homosexuality. I find myself at considerable odds with the basic tenor of his account. In saying this, I am quite aware that I am articulating a minority position quite in opposition to the official stand of the American Psychiatric Association. The change in diagnostic nomenclature, which reclassifies homosexuality from a perversion to a variation in sexual orientation, as though putting it on equal footing with heterosexuality, is a travesty of the scientific process. It represents the result of a politicization of a scientific body, and culminates in a process by which scientific categories are determined by a vote. But this outlook only reflects the confusion and both emotional and political contamination that is so characteristic of this whole question.

My basic objection to G.’s formulations, as it must also be to the official APA posture, is that it ignores some of the basic facts about homosexuality, specifically the genetic and dynamic aspects of the homosexual personality organization. It should be obvious that such a
statement is neither a political position nor a condemnation of homosexuals. It is an expression of an understanding of certain developmental deficits and patterns of organization that are inherent to the homosexual orientation. Psychiatry would be in sad shape indeed if the United Front for the Defense of Schizophrenia got on the bandwagon to tear down the diagnostic category of schizophrenia. Similarly, if Alcoholics Anonymous went political and decided to do away with the diagnosis of alcoholism, we would be in a similar fix.

On the other hand, no one in his right mind suggests that a diagnosis of hysterical personality or obsessive-compulsive neurosis either is a condemnation of a patient or implies that the individual is not perfectly capable of taking his place in society as an honest and upright citizen. Even further, it is widely accepted that pathological traits may not only be nondisruptive in the social sphere but can be positive and dynamic forces in the elaboration of the social process. One can make a very good case that a good many political and religious leaders have in fact been schizophrenic—but their illness has been elaborated within a sociocultural context that allows them to channel it in ways which are not only assimilable by the society but may in fact be creative and productive. This does not change the diagnostic fact or the implications of the diagnosis that these individuals suffer from certain underlying genetic and structural deficits in the organization of their personalities. With these caveats and qualifications, I can best leave the reader to judge for himself.

Harvard Medical School

W. W. MEISSNER, S.J.


Missionary adaptation is always a difficult task for the person who brings the Good News to the people of a foreign culture. It is the message of the gospel and not the culture of the bearer that is to be given to the people being evangelized. The missionary encountering a new culture should not condemn the cultural practices of the people unless such customs are evil in themselves. It is within the pastoral context of evangelizing the natives of the Sub-Saharan African area that H. asks that the question of polygamous marriage be re-examined. A veteran of eighteen years missionary work in Africa, H. combines pastoral experience and scholarly research in his treatment of this topic.

Polygamy is defined as a form of marriage where one has several lawful spouses at the same time. Such marriages are not only lawful but also very common in many parts of Africa. Although statistics differ as to
whether the practice of polygamy is on the rise or decline, H. maintains that polygamy will be present in Africa for many more generations. The pastoral problem associated with polygamy is that under the present Roman Catholic regulations the polygamous spouse cannot enter the Church unless he agrees to live with only one spouse in a monogamous form of marriage. This means divorcing the other wives and sending them apart from the family structure. In the African culture the children remain with the father. H.'s thesis is that this demand is a greater evil than permitting the person to remain in his polygamous marriage. Such marriage is very much an accepted part of African culture and fulfils many necessary socioeconomic functions and goals. Thus some concession should be granted to permit the polygamous party to enter the Church without changing his marriage status.

H. is not alone in advocating a new pastoral approach to polygamy. A similar view is shared by the noted moralist Bernard Häring. In his argument for polygamy, Hillman faces a very difficult task, in that the teaching of the Church has been continually opposed to polygamy. However, he strives to show that the Church's condemnation is not as evident as one might think. He argues that the monogamous form of marriage which the Church advocates was more a development of culture than of Christian morality.

The weakest part of H.'s thesis occurs when he tries to show that polygamy is not in conflict with the teaching of the NT. He states that Jesus was aware of polygamy, yet did not condemn it as he condemned other evils such as adultery, divorce, and fornication. He also implies that some polygamists may have been accepted into the Church without divorcing their spouses. Unfortunately, H. offers little documentation for such conclusions. He does not accept the notion that the “one flesh” teaching of Paul (Eph 5:22-33) excluded polygamy. His interpretation of Scripture certainly reflects a minority viewpoint.

Reviewing the teachings of theologians concerning polygamy, H. notes that polygamy is not considered an evil in itself. There are times and conditions which would permit the practice. One can share with him his pastoral concern for the people involved in polygamous marriages who desire to enter the Church but are not permitted to do so under present regulations. The question of how to deal with such people will probably become more controversial as the local churches in the post-Vatican II period demand more incorporation of their own culture with the practices of their religion. It remains to be seen whether the leaders of the local church will advocate some form of concession for polygamous marriage. At present, it appears that they avoid confronting the issue. There are many other unanswered questions. Will the local governments aid or curtail the polygamous form of marriage in future years? Will such
forces as education, woman's liberation, and population control work against the advantages of polygamous marriages? Could not a dispensa-
tion be granted for the people of the Sub-Saharan area for polygamy on
the ground that such people have not yet reached a stage of cultural
development where they can be required to live a monogamous form of
marriage? The pastoral problem raised by H. is real and urgent. Much
research should be done. The skill and knowledge of moralists, sociolo-
gists, and anthropologists must be added to this discussion. H. admits
that his work is not the final word on the subject. His book raises many
questions; I hope it will be the cause of further debate, study, and
research on a very important pastoral subject.

Bronx, N.Y.

MATTHEW H. KELLEHER, M.M.

PERSON AND COMMUNITY: A PHILOSOPHICAL EXPLORATION. Edited by
$9.00.

This collection of nine essays by faculty of Fordham University and
Loyola College (Baltimore) shares a concern for a renewed understanding
of man in light of his constantly changing environment and his
interpersonal relationships. Beginning with the acknowledged fact that
changing conditions and interpersonal relationships are so dominant in
man’s existence that no understanding of man is adequate which does
not take them into account, the authors pursue their common problem in
a variety of ways. The individual essays spring from the authors’
differing backgrounds and interests and range widely through the
thought of Kant, Freud, Dewey, Whitehead, Rahner, Lonergan, and
others.

The lead essay by Quentin Lauer, S.J., was, for this reviewer, the most
interesting. It traces in broad strokes some of the social changes which
have inevitably forced changes in man’s way of thinking about himself.
Without denying the possibility of universal truths, L. suggests that it is
necessary to take into account political, social, and historical reality, to
see man concretely as “person” rather than abstractly as “nature.” With
varying degrees of success, the succeeding essays attempt to enlarge upon
this point of departure. Perhaps the most general criticism of the
collection is that it seldom lives up to the promise of the lead essay, and
precisely because in so many cases the authors lapse into the overly
abstract type of philosophizing criticized by Lauer. Thus, in Aldo Tassi’s
“Communitas and Polis,” the love-dominated personal community and
the justice-dominated political society tend to be overly distinct from
each other because of a failure to understand man as essentially
interpersonal prior to either community or political society as Tassi
defines them. Man is not first a person who then comes together with other persons in order to achieve a “taken-for-granted” character for his origin as other than nature. The reality is just the reverse. Seen in this light, the discussion of man as person or nature (or even as person and nature) is short-circuited, since it is recognized as secondary rather than primary and essential.

The collection also suffers from an obstacle common to such projects: a certain diffuseness of purpose and a lack of coherence among the individual essays as to style, level of difficulty, and envisaged audience. Several of the essays (“The Metaphysics of Peace,” “Person and Community in Karl Rahner,” “A Whiteheadian Critique”) are heavy with footnotes and appear aimed at an audience of scholars already learned in philosophy and theology. Others (“Philosophy and Social Change,” “Interpersonal Dialogue: Key to Realism,” “Person, Community, and Moral Commitment”) seem aimed at a broader readership, relying on a less academic presentation.

Perhaps the book’s greatest value is the proof it offers of the difficulties present in any attempt to rethink what man is. If the above-mentioned essay of Tassi is too traditional in its definitions and logic, the essay of John Donnelly (“The Metaphysics of Peace”) suffers from a logical structure too insufficiently developed to carry the reader from a sociological understanding of peace to a theological one. Feldstein’s essay on the implications of Freud’s thought is on thin ice when it attempts to make Freud imply what, admittedly, Freud would have roundly denied. And Gerald McCool’s essay on Karl Rahner, while it raises some thoroughly interesting and perceptive questions about R.’s thought, fails to develop alternatives. This is not to say that the essays are weak; it rather is evidence of how difficult it is to move beyond what has already been thought, even when that thought is felt to be unsatisfying.

State College, Pa.  

G. Michael McCrossin


Who is Bohdan Chudoba? I wish I knew. Nothing outside this book or within prejudices the reader with biographical details. Like some Melchizedek, he simply appears—strange, curmudgeonly, no priest of peace. From his acknowledgments, references, and style, I conjecture that he is a polyglot international, for whom English is not the mother tongue. His vigorous Christian faith is likely from Slavic Orthodoxy, and his intellectual discipline is perhaps the history of ideas, with heavy stress on the classics.
What does Bohdan Chudoba have to say? Again, you embarrass me. Most mildly put, he is not the clearest of expositors. In broad gauge, he is moved to fire a pox on contemporary science and theology alike, insofar as they consider history to be an advancing stream or speak of "progress." More narrowly, at the outset he intends a study of basic Christian concepts of time, mythological language, the creative act, the unity of the human person, and evil. The motivation for this study is a conviction that the original wording of the Christian message has been neglected. As well, its meaning has been misinterpreted in recent times, because of false philosophical presuppositions, rationalism, new pseudo-mythical ideologies, etc. When these false horizons met a distorted Christianity, full of unoriginal doctrines (the postponed second coming of Christ, the immortality of the soul, hereditary sin, or even the task of reorganizing mankind), the air was filled with ignorant rejection. Quite creditably, C. would like to help set matters back where they should be.

His help takes the form of seven spiraling, though not progressive essays entitled "The Old and the New Myths," "Time as History's Background," "Time and the Unity of the Person," "Of Hope and Anguish," "Man in the Exploding Time," "The Death of History?" and "Of Light and Hell." These essays are rather discursive, but a few theses seem apparent. First, C. is high on ancient myths, low on modern "scientific" theories. In genuine mythopoeia, one has language fresh from experience, close to God and a neighborly cosmos. In modern rationalism, one frequently has pseudomyths—false tales pretending to be beyond mythopoeia. "The evolutionists seem to have believed in a mysterious and extremely mythical person at times called Variation, then Survival and then again Selection. But this person actually operated by 'random' and 'accidental,' i.e., not so meaningful, means. Without Aristotle and Aquinas this dainty trick would hardly have been possible" (p. 18).

As the quotation suggests, C. has a second, antischolastic thesis. Unfortunately, some of his deliverances cast doubt on its basis. For example, "Vain scholastic treatises have certainly condemned men to be mere robots when they described a concept as a mere sum of a certain number of perceptions" (p. 59). What draws C.'s spleen in scholasticism is its supposed denigration of "life." He has no patience for a theory that makes God "transcendent," or is abstractive. Scholastics have no lack of fellow blackguards, however. Teilhard, Thomas Merton, the Dutch bishops, Toynbee, Paul VI (Octogesima adveniens)—all miss the Christian mark. By their talk of progress, or advance toward human "equity," they would secularize the holy. Most of C.'s heroes—Simone Weil, Unamuno, the patres—presumably "place the value of the moment
above that of the arrow of passing time" (p. 187). With C., there is little both-and, so Teilhard et al. are left open-mouthed at their goathood.

What I have not suggested so far, however, is the wealth of reading this book manifests. From Carlos Castaneda to Russian psychologists, with grammatical references to Arabic, Hopi, Bantu, Pahlevi, C.'s table groans and groans. He is interested in everything; his notes are a mine of stimulation. Further, he has a serious case. Peripherally, it is that many modern conceptions are uncritical—shibboleths against a caricature faith and antiquity. Substantially, it is that modernity flees right order under a God of the now. I think much of this is true: "modernity" is often derailed from healthy cultural order; much "history" is a fugue from the one thing necessary. The problem with C.'s case, however, is its confusion. Ironically, his style is very modern, almost stream-of-consciousness. In it, form is so submerged by materials that I, at least, could find no conceptual toehold. Alternatively put, I find C. remaining completely on the level of conceptual description or reference. There is no sociohistorical discussion of where "time" or "progress" come from, no explanatory correlation of these and the book's other capital notions into a constructive layout. What the book aspires to be is a theology of history. It fails its aspiration because it has no immanent base, no theological taxis. Just as historical sensitivity would make many of C.'s blackguards more intelligible, so method—the logos classically differentiated from mythos—would discipline his flailings into an impressive, useful theological conservatism. As is, he will lie on my shelves as a curio.


The recent interest in black theology and black religion in America has spawned a concomitant interest in reappraising the roots of black religion in America. This volume, a revision of S.'s doctoral dissertation at the University of Delaware, analyzes the white church missionary endeavors to the slaves on plantations from 1787-1865, and the parallel rise of the indigenous black churches in that period. In contrast to scholars such as James Cone and Henry Mitchell (who emphasize the liberation themes and African components of the black religious experience in America), S. finds the clue to Negro Christianity from 1787 to 1865 in the Evangelical Movement in America. It was the vision of Christian Evangelicals, who looked at the black community as a
potentially rich "harvest," which pioneered in bringing the gospel to the slave community. S. demonstrates that, although the symbols and expressions of white Christianity did occasionally receive new meanings within the black community, on the whole those symbols meant for blacks just what they meant for whites. Their meaning, in other words, was not always politically militant or liberating, but usually was taken as conveying a belief system about God, the world, human life, and life after death.

Methodologically, S. describes the role and intent of the white Evangelical leaders in the mission to the slaves, and then describes the rise of black leadership and black churches (the Bethelites and the Zionites). The difference in viewpoints between white and black leaders is neatly juxtaposed to sharpen the contrasts between the two communities. S. pays special attention to the contribution of Bishop Morris Brown, Bishop Christopher Rush, Bishop Daniel A. Payne, and the Rev. William P. Quinn in the rise of indigenous black churches. On the whole, the volume reflects a positive assessment of the role of the black church in the formation of black identity and dignity in America.

Within the contemporary stream of studies in black religion, this volume makes an important clarification concerning the rise of black churches, the white mission to slaves, and the role of key leaders in the black movement. It is a corrective against any who would reread black history in the light of contemporary ideology. S. carefully sets the events of black religious history into the broader historical context of the period (the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the Dred Scott Decision of 1857, John Brown’s raid on Harper’s Ferry in 1859) and points out that the formation of black churches in America was related to the attempts of black leaders to establish churches that would meet “the whole needs, physical and spiritual,” of black people (p. 168).

This book has numerous strengths. It is well researched (nearly one half of its pages are notes, bibliography, statistical tables, and biographical sketches of leaders of the black church) and it has an interesting selection of pictures of black leaders, historic churches, and even black institutions of the period. Negatively, it reads like a doctoral dissertation and is priced beyond normal commercial value. It is, nevertheless, a sound and helpful work and can be read with profit by all persons interested in American religious history and/or the roots of black religion in America.

*Florida State University*  
John J. Carey

This volume is a collection of essays which, with one exception, were delivered at the 1974 College Theology Society Convention. The thirteen essays are organized around four themes: liberation and Christian theology, liberation theology and freedom, the question of violence, and a critique of liberation theology. Although each article is carefully restricted to its theme, there is enough overlapping of issues so that the reader can become actively engaged in a comparative analysis of the different ideas. The book is a good introduction to liberation theology and the articles are well written and informative, and raise a number of critical issues. The editor suggests the articles represent the "mature reflection" of the authors. In general they do, although a number of them are quite superficial and are exhortative rather than critical. A common element of many of the early articles is the necessity of doing theology within a sociopolitical context. Unfortunately, this theme and its praxis disappear from many of the later articles, which are examples of privatized theology. While this is due mainly to the nature of the composition of the book, it does reveal how easy it is to fall into old habits of theologizing.

Fiorenza's article provides an excellent introduction to the volume and the first section. Through his analysis of several authors, he gives a well-presented statement of the basic themes of both political theology and liberation theology which sets forth the major themes of each and indicates similarities and differences as well as strengths and weaknesses. His analysis of the cultural situation out of which both theologies arise is most useful. Bellefontain's essay on Israelite law is a good and interesting presentation of how the development of Israelite laws on the Sabbath, festivals, property, and poverty were instruments in fighting the oppressive structures in the states in which Israel found itself living. This short but well-written essay exemplifies how religion, expressed in a legal framework, helped provide a basis for social change.

The second section, on freedom, begins with an analysis of hope and freedom within the black community by Cone. These concepts are analyzed and presented through an examination of spirituals and sermons. Cone has some interesting definitions and strategies in the essay, which is a good example of blending "popular theology" expressed in the spirituals with solid academic analysis. The article on grace by Shaull was disappointing to me because of its tone of hopelessness. This very autobiographical essay seems to suggest Shaull has abandoned hope in change and looks only to the creation of liberated zones in which some sort of life may be led—presumably until the decay of society. The emphasis seems to be only on the results of the short run—but sometimes the results of the long term must be evaluated by both Shaull and liberation theology.
The third section is on violence, a critical problem within liberation theology. Casey's article is a welcomed analysis of James Douglass' view of nonviolence from a variety of perspectives. Through this dialogue Casey sets forth his own position in contrast to Douglass. This is a strong, well-written essay, with conclusions worth thinking about. Biallas' article on the psychological origins of violence is basically a comparison of Jung and May and how some of their ideas may relate to an understanding and critique of liberation theology. Some of Biallas' criticism of these authors may be unfair, because they do not intend to answer the questions he asks of them.

The final section is a critique of liberation theology from a variety of viewpoints. Gaffney's article on Ellul is very interesting, not only for its excellent analysis of Ellul, but also for the normative ethical questions it raises. Although one may not care for Ellul's theology, his question can be avoided only if one wishes to be totally uncritical. Reilly's article on G. Wingren is a presentation of how one theologian worked out a position on liberation theology. The article is somewhat interesting and does present a strong critique of liberation theology.

Several of the articles raise good questions about liberation theology and present valuable contributions to its evaluation. As such, the book does help the reader begin to formulate some orientation to the strengths and weaknesses of such a theology. It contains a few excellent articles, some generally interesting ones, and a few whose absence would greatly enhance the book.

Worcester Polytechnic Institute

THOMAS A. SHANNON

SHORTER NOTICES


In this his last book, B. examines the role of art and ritual in religion. Scholars have usually studied the religions of mankind by examining their sacred writings, but B. chooses to examine these religions in their art and ritual, the activities of man prior to his learning how to write. In this sense, art and ritual are the earliest evidences of man's belief, but B. would like to understand primary as "first in importance"—iconography makes a more immediate and effective impact than does the written word. By means of 511 illustrations, B. takes us from the Paleolithic Era to recent times. By studying and interpreting that earliest period, he concludes that all religious belief is connected with three basic concerns of human life: death, birth, and food supply. These "three basic themes . . . provide the guidelines for our interpretation of all subsequent religious iconography and ritual practice" (p. 356). With this in mind, B. passes through the ages, always inter-
preting. Most frequently he depends on the religion of ancient Egypt; he only touches those of the East and Near East. He especially enjoys to bring “Catholic Christianity” into the discussion, but his knowledge of Catholic belief is so faulty that he can only misinterpret and misrepresent it.

Some random examples: (1) The fact that Christians believe in the kingship of Christ, B. sees as originating in a medieval society in which the pope had temporal power (p. 390). B. somehow forgets the wording of the inscription that was placed on Christ’s cross. (2) B. sees the sacraments as magical acts. To be sure, he is careful not to express this opinion clearly; rather than give offense, he couches it in words ambiguous and unclear. His understanding, therefore, of *ex opere operato* is definitely defective (pp. 10, 24–25). (3) That B. erroneously asserts that the making of the sign of the cross over the baptized in baptism is an “essential constituent of valid baptism” (p. 24) is in keeping with his magical interpretation of the sacraments. (4) To honor an icon, or to carry icons or statues in procession, is to treat the object as the god himself (p. 51). (5) When B. wants to give the Catholic teaching on images, he quotes Harnack, strange as it may seem (p. 57, n. 50). (6) B. often speaks about the Mass, and he seems taken by its rich ritual. He interprets the act of elevating the consecrated elements as “the offering of Christ’s vicarious sacrifice, for the sins of mankind, to the Father” (p. 23). B. is familiar with Jungmann’s *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, for he makes use of it on that very same page. While Jungmann puts the origin of the elevation of the elements in the congregation’s desire to see the host, B. departs from this accepted interpretation and chooses his own esoteric but erroneous excogitation. (7) B. views Christianity as a religion that evolved through man’s initiative, not a religion rooted in revelation. He brings the same prejudices to this book as he had done in his previously published works on Christ and Christianity (cf. *TS* 30 [1969] 498–500).

The illustrations (all black and white) are good, and some are quite hard to come by, e.g., fig. 38, the rare medieval attempt at representing the Trinity by three heads growing from a single body.

*Joseph N. Tylenda, S. J.*


The thirteenth volume of B.’s *Studies in Dogmatics* is now available in an English translation. This is an abridged edition of a two-volume original first published in 1966 and 1967 by this prolific exponent of Reform theology. The present work is one third the size of the original, much of B.’s extensive states of the question being sacrificed to focus on his own exposition. Its intent is to confront the crisis of certainty caused by modern biblical criticism. The Church, B. warns, should not slip into a “scriptural docetism” which would emphasize the divine element in Scripture to the detriment of the human. There are many ways of failing to treat Scripture reverently, and a lifeless orthodoxy can be as toxic as a hostile scepticism.

This moderate apologetic tone characterizes B.’s discussion of the theological issues inherent in biblical interpretation. Most of the classical questions regarding the authority of Scripture are brought forward: canonicity, interpretation, inerrancy, role of biblical criticism, etc. Chaps. 5 and 6 are the heart of the book. Here B. expounds his notion of inspiration, or, in his preferred terminology, the “God-breathed” nature of Scripture. Although B. is sceptical about the success of any theory of inspiration, he
concludes that an “organic” theory (i.e., one which gives proper credit to the human process in the formation of Scripture) is preferable to any “mechanical” theory in which the biblical writer would have a passive and minimal role.

B.’s method of dealing with these and other theological issues regarding Scripture is not to develop a coherent systematic approach, but to clarify a faith confession and then to point out the advantages and limitations of various theological explanations. Though useful in B.’s own church context, this approach can be tedious at times. In reading B.’s discussion of inspiration, e.g., one might like to see more epistemological sophistication and a firmer confrontation with the relation of Scripture to the Church. Ultimately, B.’s approach to theology is “pastoral,” in the sense that his dominating concern is to legitimize for his readers the task of theology. The result is a confessional statement on the divine origin of Scripture coupled with an apologetic for reverent theological reflection.

Donald Senior, C.P.


Studies in Johannine literature, particularly books and articles on the fourth Gospel, have been tumbling off the presses in a flood since the forties. Even the specialist can hardly keep his head above this rising water, and the general reader is not sure where he may safely wet his feet. P. has come to the rescue of both in this brief synthesis and assessment of progress to date in the study of the Gospel and the first Letter.

The focus of the volume is the theology of the Gospel. A discussion of Johannine symbolism introduces the central section, which relates everything in the Gospel to the theme of revelation: Jesus as the Word, the Glory of the Father, the Christ, the Spirit-giver; our response to this revelation in faith, knowledge, witness, and love. Several commentators are mentioned with regard to individual questions, but P.’s main dialogues are with Bultmann and Dodd.

P. deals with the perennial question of the relationship of the Gospel to the first Letter without descending to dates. He assumes common authorship for the two books, but parts company with the majority of commentators, who consider them to be written against a common background and in confrontation with similar problems. The Gospel belongs to a first movement of Johannine thought best understood against a Jewish background. It combats Jewish legalism and asserts the divine sonship of Jesus and his primacy in salvation history. The first Lettercombats a mystical interpretation of Jesus divorced from history. This began to emerge in Hellenistic circles, to some extent as a result of the teaching reflected in the fourth Gospel.

Though discussion of questions like these has more than average interest, the book is intended “primarily for students and for the serious reader,” so references are limited to a select bibliography and an index.

Jerome Kodell, O.S.B.


Because the atmosphere in which the NT was written is to a great extent the product of the period between the Testaments, S.’s purpose is to treat briefly the Jewish literature which had its origin in Palestine and in the Diaspora during that time. Before doing so, he treats the historical and political and then the religious background of that period.

The treatment is not intended to be
exhaustive. S. gives an overview which at the same time indicates the complexity of certain issues. The over-all presentation offers a good deal of reliable and useful information put forth in a readable fashion for approaching this area for the first time. Occasionally one encounters slips or statements that could be misleading. Thus, John is mistakenly mentioned as the victim of Herod's killing in Acts 12 (p. 50); John the Baptist is said to have been put to death by John the tetrarch (p. 169). S. does not really indicate that Mt 2:16 may not be meant to supply historical information about Herod (p. 47). It seems confusing to say that the Saducees accept the oral law, while rejecting the tradition of the Pharisees (p. 57). Should one speak of Jesus and his apostles following the "canon" of the OT (p. 93)? Josephus' account of the imprisonment and death of John the Baptist may not be so easily reconciled as a "supplement" to Mark's account of the matter (p. 169).

An index of subjects would have added to the book's usefulness, though the material presented is neatly broken down. Each chapter has a select bibliography of works mostly in English, and so is helpful to a wide group of readers.

Salvatore Tassone, S.J.


Is the category "sacrifice" outmoded for today's Christian? This book, a literate popularization of doctoral research, treats this issue directly and from several points of view. Part 1 discusses sacrifice in early Christianity against the background of the OT and adjacent religious cultures. First, a general type-analysis of sacrifice is given—communion sacrifices, gift sacrifices, sin offerings—according to which Hebrew and pagan rituals are considered; this schema, assumed as a given, serves as a constant explanatory pattern (pp. 61-63, 80-82, 111-22). Ancient sacrificial practice is seen to have undergone a process of critical refinement, so that within both Jewish and pagan traditions a gradual spiritualization of sacrifice emerges with the accent upon personal integrity, inner conversion, and virtuous living. The early Church's rejection of all literal sacrifice and its development of a wholly spiritual cult continue this spiritualizing tendency but derive their central focus from Christian experience of Jesus and his sacrificial death. In the discussion of the sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' death, very little contemporary biblical criticism is employed. Y. passes quickly from OT background (Jewish martyrs, Is 53, Day of Atonement) and individual NT texts (1 Cor 5:7-8; Jn 19:31) to concentrate upon the Epistle to the Hebrews and selected (no basis given) quotations from the Fathers, especially from Origen and Chrysostom.

In Part 2, Y. presents the consequences of her research for theology and Christian life today. Two major topics are confronted: atonement theory and the contemporary meaningfulness of sacrificial language. Proposing "a subtler understanding of sacrifice as an act not only offered to God but an act performed by God himself" (p. 95), Y. sketches her own theory of atonement. Although it includes objective as well as subjective aspects of redemption, it fails to incorporate in a decisive way the humanity of Jesus (hence its neglect of vicariousness). To demonstrate the viability of sacrifice as a religious category today, Y. resorts to psychological analysis (C. Jung), to cultural and literary experience, and to the use of poetic symbolism as fundamental religious discourse.

Some real assets of this study are its clear and provocative style, its store of patristic and pagan religious citations, and its brave effort to translate for
modern Christians the abiding significance of sacrifice (always against the background of human experience in general). Largely successful in her over-all endeavor, Y. does lapse into occasional groundless generalizations and uncritical assumptions. A reader may even object that too many basic questions are raised without resolution. But is that also part of Y.'s plan?  

Gabriel Scarfia, O.F.M.


The question this book sets out to answer "is whether and to what degree an Occidental of the modern day may look to the New Testament for any guidance or clues for behavior." In six exegetical and interpretive chapters S. examines the ethical teachings of Jesus, the Synoptics and Acts, Paul, the later epistles in the Pauline tradition, Johannine literature, and the remaining books of the NT. The tone for each of these chapters is set from the start, where S. espouses Albert Schweitzer's thesis that the teachings of Jesus are inextricably intertwined with an imminent eschatology proven false by history. The abandonment of such an eschatology leads to a sense of responsibility for oneself and for human history. Consequently, such biblical symbols as the Good Samaritan and the Sermon on the Mount, because they do not speak to the complexities of corporate life, can provide neither specific ethical norms nor even a general attitudinal orientation toward action. This theme reappears in S.'s analysis of the Apocalypse, which is viewed as a retreat from the ethical task of living in the world. Ironically, early Christianity's attempt to incorporate some of the prevailing ethical wisdom of its time (e.g., in the Haus tafelein and the Pastorals) is seen as a capitulation and a loss of the radical heart of the primitive ethos.

S.'s slim hope that the NT can provide some help for ethics is staked on the Pauline formulation of the meaning of agape as the present, incipient realization of the hoped-for eschatological existence through grace. Again ironically, he also looks to the letter of James as a legitimation for a nontheological ethic of humane response to basic human needs.

The questions raised in this book are serious, and the analysis of individual texts brings out the ethical and theological pluralism of the NT. Its rather sweeping and negative conclusions, however, are shaped as much by a set of beliefs about what a modern Occidental can and cannot believe as they are by the textual analysis. There is a way in which the mythic structure of an imminent eschatology and a lively belief in the resurrection and the continuing presence of Jesus can converge to produce a very different kind of reading of the NT ethical texts.

David Hollenbach, S.J.


The essays of this memorial volume in honor of the well-known scholar David Stanley cover a variety of fields: two in the OT, three in the NT, one in patristics, three in systematic theology. Six of the nine authors are from Regis College. One could wish that a broader representation of scholars had been chosen, since S. is so well known, especially in the English-speaking world.

Brian Peckham gives his view of the redactional composition of Dt 9:1-10:11. Fidelis Buck presents a kind of history of the function of prayer in the OT. Aloysius Ambrosic has a very
readable and interesting study of Mark's dictum that Jesus presented new teaching with power (Mk 1:27). J. T. Forestell offers a careful study of the Paraclete in John's Gospel, whom he rightly identifies with the Spirit. Joseph Plevnik, in the longest article, studies the parousia of 1 Th 4:13-18 in the light of the resurrection. John Egan discusses the meaning of the Logos in Gregory of Nazianzus' writings against the background of Greek, Jewish, and patristic antecedents. Frederick E. Crowe writes about the power of the Scriptures—some good observations, but I found the treatment inadequate. Tibor Horvath writes on the need of having the correct preunderstanding for the theology of sacrifice, which is really Christ's resurrection, not an a priori concept of sacrifice. The treatment is not adequate to the subject. Jean-Marc Laporte insists that God is revealed as truly generous, and that this "mystery of God's abundance" should not be fenced in by man, as it has been at times. The volume ends with a short curriculum vitae of S. and a bibliography of his published works.

Dominic J. Unger, O.F.M.Cap.


Access to the early liturgical documents is often limited. For this reason D. has provided a great service by compiling major selections from the early manuscripts. Unlike other such works, there are included prayers, ordinations, references to the Divine Office, as well as the expected accounts of baptism and Eucharist. In one volume there appears most of the richness of the first four centuries of Christian worship.

Since this kind of work can be so useful, it is unfortunate that this second edition does not include the substantial liturgical research that has occurred in the twelve years since the first edition. Ligier and others make it imperative to include the Quiddus, Birkat ha-Mazon, Seder, and the Semeneh Essreh as sources of early Christian worship. Furthermore, any contemporary account should use Vööbus' work on the Didache, Botte's newer edition of the Apostolic Tradition, Metzger's analysis of the Eucharist in the Apostolic Constitutions, and Mateos' research on the Divine Office. D.'s section on Addai and Mari is uselessly dated by the new manuscript that Macomber published in 1967. My article on this subject shows that this prayer has a different structure than formerly believed. The introductions to the prayers would be more useful if they would establish the prayers in their liturgical school and evaluate the extent to which these prayers were part of the mainstream of Christian worship.

Since there is nothing similar to D.'s work in English, it continues to be useful. It is unfortunate, however, that this second edition is not in tune with recent research. Many will have to use it because it is the only available one of its kind. Used with caution, it will serve a good purpose.

Emmanuel J. Cutrone


Students of early Church literature are familiar with the role that Paulinus of Nola played in persuading, through his letters, his fellow intellectuals to give up earthly goods and follow Christ. It is, therefore, a natural sequence to observe that the collection of poems here translated serves to illuminate more fully the genius of this
member of the Roman elite toward the fulfilment of that mission. Rather than reiterate the knowledgeable statements already written about this volume of such impeccable scholarship, I would like to address myself to other aspects of Paulinus' works which the translation has revealed.

W.'s introduction contains a wealth of material which serves not only the smaller number of Church history readers, but also those who have an interest in the growth of Western philosophies as emerging from Judaic classical streams. E.g., in describing three genre poems, W. states: "it is especially clear how Paulinus is attempting to build a Christian superstructure on the classical foundation, with the implicit purpose of contrasting differing ethos of the two cultures in their attitudes towards significant occasions in the course of human life" (p. 13). The importance of these poems is, then, far-reaching and worthy of a wider spectrum of readers. The references to early Jewish customs, to the primitive life style of the Basques (still referred to in twelfth-century literature), to Roman superiority in civil life, and the classical allusions being replaced by Christian deities, to name only several, greatly enrich the fabric of history. Even the picture one might have of Julian of Eclanum, the man who gave Augustine such a bad time, could be altered in reading Paulinus' celebration poem.

Secondly, the strikingly beautiful and plentiful figures which W. has retained can be mentioned here as a manifestation of a truly remarkable feat of translation. The metaphors leap from every page, and Paulinus reveals himself as an astute rhetorician in his use of arguments from contraries, circumstances, similarities, and authority, and by analogy. Moreover, he is not loathe to pass up a snide remark to an adversary if it suits his purpose.

This is not only a fine book for its primary readers but it is, in its way, an intellectually exciting one, abounding with historical and literary insights into that challenging period which served as the bridge between the Roman classical world and the medieval age to come, and which would repeat and renew the rhetorical techniques perfected in this age of transition. While it may be, as Walsh states, that Paulinus was of lesser intellectual stature than Augustine and Ambrose, I believe that he does him an injustice, because his purpose was not to define dogma but to convince. In that respect, Paulinus is, in my judgment, a most worthy equal.

Ruth M. Gover
philosophie au XIIIe siècle (1966), provide a new view of the evolution of medieval philosophy, especially in its relation to Christian doctrine, and have revealed the profundity of the metaphysical speculation which underlies the naive scientific views of the thirteenth century.

The first volume contains a complete bibliography of the author's 241 publications, a list of 78 doctoral dissertations directed, and some 30 articles or conferences providing a history of the study of medieval philosophy, a program for future research, a consideration of the relation of medieval studies to the rebirth of Thomism and other medieval philosophies, monographical and synthetic views of Latin Aristotelianism and Averroism. The second volume contains about 350 book reviews published by the author in the course of his career. Arranged under the headings, bibliographical aids, editions and translations, monographs, synthetic works, and Festschriften, this volume offers a panoramic view of the literature dedicated to medieval thought in the past fifty years and thus forms with the former volume a valuable introduction to the study of medieval philosophy. It is the great merit of the author to have directed the attention of scholars to the role played by Aristotelianism in the formation of medieval philosophy. His own work has naturally concentrated on Thomas Aquinas and the thirteenth century. The study of the later forms of Aristotelianism which appeared from the fourteenth to the sixteenth century remains the task of future generations, but the foundations for this study have firmly been laid by scholars like Van Steenberghen. It is a pleasure to express our congratulations and gratitude.

C. H. Lohr


Throughout the length and breadth of Europe there is an enormous number of gargoyles and grotesque representations in medieval churches and buildings which have never been properly studied or classified. The authors of this book define a grotesque object as one representing something abnormal or normally impossible, and they include in this category giants, centaurs, devouring beasts, severed heads, hagodays, figures of fertility, etc. S. and R. have made a beginning of the enormous task of searching out and photographing grotesques and proposing a system of classification for them.

Rejecting the theory that these grotesques are meaningless decorations of purely functional features, they claim that no matter what other cultural influences may have played a part in the grotesque iconography, earlier pagan beliefs must certainly be given due consideration. Since there is no documentation for this (due to a conspiracy of silence, according to the authors) they depend on the objects themselves, and R., who is a leading authority on Celtic studies, brings all her background and learning to establish that there is a predominant influence of pagan Celtic survivals. Although the authors do not take sufficiently into consideration the more immediate medieval traditions of the horrors of Last Judgment scenes with Satan devouring Judas, of the exotic beasts of the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelations and the numerous popular bestiaries, they do establish a strong pagan Celtic influence on grotesques, especially against the background of the Church's continuing struggle to sanctify pagan survivals. To my knowledge, this is the only work on the subject in English to appear in recent years, and it is especially valua-
ble for the inclusion of many original photographs of grotesques from all over Europe taken by S., an internationally known photographer, and for the classification of various types of grotesques.

Henry J. Bertels, S.J.

约翰·威克里夫作为法律改革者。比尔·法尔。利登：布利尔，1974。PP. x + 187. 48 glds.

标题有些误导，因为它主要是关于W.的努力来阐述一个理论，即英国国王可能干预来改革教会。只有偶然性涉及计划来改革普通法律本身。

对于W.，如对许多其他改革者一样，真正的教会是无形的，并且不能用与它们的等级和机构结构相等的任何方式来度量。所有的明显的教阶制社区被收集和吸收到单一的大教会。然而，有不一致的是，他也承认每个国家教会的准自治性，这在英格兰与王国本身是同义的。因此，国王在英格兰治理教会中起着主要作用，并且特别在改革它以恢复教会到原始的简单性，W.赋予了神学家一个重要的教会职位，并且他们成为国王的最亲密的顾问。

教会的世俗财产，和牧师的干预这些财产，很快成为W.的攻击的核心，这反过来导致他深入普通法律的茂密荒野，因为普通法律偏向于保护财产权。W.巧妙地解释了法律的技术性，以便论证教会应对其所管理的教会的高利益负责。在后来的世纪里，这一原则将对英国教会和政治生活有重大影响，但，由于与他的名人的叛乱和罗拉代的关系，W.没有得到信誉。

詹姆斯F.希奇科克

路德教百科全书。编辑由Erwin L. Lueker。圣路易斯：康科迪亚，1975。PP. xiv + 845. $24.95。

这本新版本是一个绝对的修订和扩展版本的1954年版本，它涉及文章的重新组织，列出新文章，更新参考文献，和许多新文章。百科全书的目的是客观地呈现（简明扼要）事实和立场，新版本成功地实现了它的目的。以前文章有些偏见，编辑指出（p. vi）；以前的不敏感的评论现在被放在一边，存诚和未预设的叙述（例如，比较关于贝尔拉明，拉丁，地狱，马尔多纳图斯，隐士，誓言）。

整个强调是在路德教的教导，历史，和生活，是一个优秀的教义编目，关于路德教，同时它也包括其他基督教社区和非基督教宗教。文章不是对一个主题的详尽研究，也不是打算去，但它们的成功主要在于它们的简明和客观性。这本百科全书现在是一个手头和可靠的参考指南在教会历史，圣经解释，教义，历史人物，和神学和礼仪语言。

约瑟夫N.特莱登，S.J.

雅克-保罗·米涅：回到父老的教会。由A. G.哈曼。巴黎：波伊奇斯，1975。PP. 184. 30 fr.

混乱标志着欧洲的天主教知识分子在19世纪的头三分之一，就在Migne，一个教区牧师，来自一个偏远的国家教区，——
tempted to spark a theological revival in Paris. First he launched a religious journal (L'Univers religieux, later L'Univers) and then, in 1836, embarked on one of the most ambitious and successful publishing ventures in modern times. His dream was to provide an all-inclusive but inexpensive library of Christian writings for the use of the clergy and the well-educated laity of the French-speaking world. His plans called for two thousand volumes devoted to complete courses in apologetics, Scripture, and theology, as well as collections of sermons, theological encyclopedias, and a history of the Church. By instinct Migne soon turned to the treasures of the past; hence his most celebrated accomplishment was the publication of 382 volumes of the Latin and Greek Fathers, with the assistance of the Benedictine scholar J. B. Pitra. To execute this gigantic task, M. ran imaginative fund-raising campaigns, founded his own publishing house equipped with the latest steam-powered presses, and mobilized a staff of three hundred people. In a period of thirty years, over a thousand titles were issued. In February 1868, however, a tragic fire brought the whole enterprise to a halt.

H. describes the sorry effects of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era on the intellectual life of the French Church, outlines M.'s often turbulent career as parish priest, journalist, and publisher, and sketches the character of a man of extraordinary vitality, vision, and business acumen who has rightly been called "one of the most useful priests" in the nineteenth-century Church. H. also gives a summary of earlier attempts to collect the writings of the Fathers, then concentrates in more detail on the genesis and production of the two famous Patrologies, and reports the chilly reception they received in the scholarly world of the day. H. points out that the subsequent history of theology abundantly demonstrates that M.'s foray into the past was not an eccentric exercise in archeology but a highly productive return to the sources. H.'s account is spirited, informative, and critical. It honors a fascinating man, one hundred years after his death in 1875, with the recognition that was largely denied him in his lifetime.

William J. Walsh, S.J.


The bibliography first appeared in 1971 on the occasion of L.'s seventy-fifth birthday; now that he is approaching his eightieth, it has been revised and significantly enlarged. The bibliography covers fifty active years of one of France's greatest theologians and indefatigable authors. In producing this volume, the compilers have arranged the material in a variety of ways. They not only list L.'s writings in chronological order, which number 322 different items, but they also separately list the thirty-four books he authored and the eighteen he edited. Of special interest are the charts indicating the genesis and development of L.'s most famous books, Catholicisme and Surnaturel. In addition, there is a listing of L.'s works that have been translated (sixteen different languages). In this revised edition the compilers have added a catalogue of books and articles about L. or in dialogue with him. The value of such a bibliography is self-evident; no theologian can ignore it, no library can be without it.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


Following brief, useful introductions on the life of St. S. and on the nature
and sources of his extensive writings, P. offers an ample, topically arranged anthology of this seventeenth-century French mystic and charismatic. A Carmelite lay brother, blind from childhood, St. S. has been called the Ruysbroeck of France and the John of the Cross of the reform of Carmel in that country. His writings offer convincing evidence both of a powerful, original religious experience and of an impressive knowledge of Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, and the mainstream mystical tradition. His literary roots lie mainly in the Flemish and Rhenish schools, though his central teaching on aspiration contains major nonderivative elements. While he is known to have been familiar with the writings of his fellow Carmelites Teresa and John, he appears to have reached his spiritual maturity and outlook before this contact was made. Diffuse and of minimal literary interest, St. S. is nevertheless valuable and useful for the searching description and advice he offers on classical questions about prayer, contemplation, and the love of God. St. S.'s context is his own: monastic and seventeenth century. But however very greatly re-contextualized, the issues themselves remain, both for those who, today also, are led into the depths of God and for those who direct their prayer.

*Joseph P. Whelan, S.J.*


Interpersonal commitments are fragile indeed in our time and call for the kind of treatment H. gives them. His study reflects author's and reader's involvement in commitments, and he approaches his subject from the social sciences and philosophy but primarily from Christian theology and our shared experience of personal growth. He investigates aspects of commitment such as choice, promise, and freedom; and he raises the question whether uncommitted people are freer than others. He analyzes our conscious commitment and the deeper intentionality and horizon that is its context. A shift of horizons found, e.g., in falling in love leads to being in love only through commitment, while being in love depends upon mutual indwelling. He argues that a permanent commitment is the best way for one to grow personally and to get beyond oneself, and that love is the only justification for a total and irrevocable disposition of one's life. He reflects upon the roots of our ambiguity about permanence, and shows that the proper context for understanding its value must be the acceptance of a communion among men rather than an individualistic philosophy of freedom. It is in the context of communion that he deals with some specific questions about withdrawal from permanent commitment in marriage or in religious life.

In the second part, H. draws on the resources of Scripture for the light that the Christian mystery casts on commitment. The commitment of the Father to Jesus and of Jesus to the Father, the teaching of Jesus, and examples of commitment and lack of it in the NT help us to get to deeper dimensions of this mystery in human life. Finally, H. examines the question of fidelity. And he does so once more in the context of communion, for fidelity occurs in this context and is measured by the communion present.

This book constitutes a real service in the midst of the present confusion about permanent commitments.

*John Farrelly, O.S.B.*

Written by a theologian well informed about current developments in Christian thought and movements, this book does not have much theological content. We have a very long sermon which admonishes us to be less concerned about the survival of the Church as part of the establishment. Christ's gospel is meant to be working as yeast or as salt to vitalize the true fibers of God's creative goodness. Nicodemus came in the night to seek counsel with the Lord; Jesus was prepared to become involved in the concerns of his visitor in the dark. Frustrations and evil plague us in multifarious ways, and the Church is to become a center where true responses can be formed and a course of action can be initiated. Rahner's Church as diaspora represents H.'s basic contention: the Church is more relevant in East Berlin than in the old cultured neighborhoods of North America. In East Germany the Church is outside the establishment and can function as a catalyst.

H.'s negative evaluation of present technological and industrial developments is rather superficial. He simply repeats what other prophets of doom have voiced in their readings of statistics regarding the abuse of energy resources and the pollution of life's quality. No significant alternatives are presented, no good word is said in defense of technology and its relevancy for the survival of the billions who inhabit our planet. Simply, this well-written admonition promotes an attitude which favors personal care for the quality of life; the author does not offer a vision or theology according to which his concerns receive perspectives.

William P. Frost


The aim of this dissertation is to see what relation, if any, may be said to exist between incomplete truth on the one hand, and error or deception on the other. More precisely, its purpose is to ascertain whether our knowledge of reality can ever be false as a whole while yet containing nothing but the truth; and if so, under what conditions. The dissertation is also a study of how and why a truth that is incomplete can turn into or lead into an error—my own error, if the incomplete truth leads me astray, and another's error, if I use the incomplete truth to mislead him so that the resultant error is his and not mine.

This amounts to saying that "some errors are incomplete truths" but not "all errors are incomplete truths" (e.g., 7 times 8 = 78 is not even partly correct). F. does not claim that "incomplete truth is error and error is (only) incomplete truth" in any universal sense. He remarks that propositions such as these have been defended, and have also been refuted, and because sharply opposing positions have been taken, no one has seriously tried to investigate whether, or why, or under what conditions an incomplete or partial truth can at least sometimes turn into an error or lead to one.

After two chapters of a survey of what philosophers and standard Scholastic authors have had to say about error and incomplete truth, F. offers a brief historical picture of deception as incomplete truth together with another chapter concerning the positions of contemporary moralists on the same question. His conclusion is that moralists have made little express mention of what F. calls deception-via-the-truth apart from their doctrine on mental reservation, which they do not consider a method of deceiving others at all. Mental reservation, for F., is a refined technique with very precise rules for hopefully leading an unwary hearer into an erroneous judgment. Its proponents consider that this is neither lying (because what is said is,
in itself, not false) nor deception (be­
cause, far from purposively deceiving
the hearer, one simply and reluctantly
allows him to deceive himself). F.
rightly considers that there are good
reasons for regarding the incomplete
truth as a false version if and when it
distorts in any substantial manner the
picture of the whole, and for consider­
ing this resultant incomplete truth as
morally equivalent to a lie.

Very little of originality is found in
F.'s two chapters on the logical, psy­
chological, and metaphysical founda­
tions of error, deception, and incom­
plete truth.

**Thomas A. Wassmer, S.J.**

**THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THEOLOGY TO MEDICAL ETHICS.** By James M. Gustaf­
son. Milwaukee: Marquette Univ.
Theology Department, 1975. Pp. v +
109. $3.50.

This publication of the 1975 Père
Marquette Theology Lecture continues
the high standard of earlier publica­
tions. G. brings to bear on a vital
contemporary issue his usual clarity of
thought and expression, without either
overstating or minimizing theology's
role in medical ethics. He develops his
theme by first discussing the meaning
of theology and of the work of the
theologian, specifically the meaning of
theological ethical reflection. He then
reflects upon three theological themes
with reference to their contribution to
(a) a theological moral point of view,
(b) certain relevant moral attitudes
toward human life, and (c) a basic
intentionality that informs action.

Two of the three themes are about
God, viz., God intends the well-being
of His creation, and God is both the
ordering power that preserves and sus­
tains the well-being of the creation and
the power that creates new possibilities
for well-being in the events of nature
and history. The third theme deals
with the human response, viz., hu­
mans are finite, sinful agents whose

actions have a large measure of power
to determine whether or not the well-
being of creation desired by God is
achieved.

In reflecting on, and attempting to
balance, the three theological themes,
G. strives for a less unitary approach to
medical-ethics problems than he be­
lieves has characterized past ap­
proaches, including Catholic thinking.
It is when he deals with the necessary
openness to the future so as to discover
humanity's well-being that G.'s
thought becomes the most controver­
sial. He suggests tentatively: “there
must be an openness to the possibility
of extending, or even altering, tradi­
tional moral principles and re-ordering
traditional human values” (p. 54).

G.'s ideas are seminal ones, coura­
geously and forthrightly proposed.
They deserve an equally courageous
and forthright response from other
theological ethicists of all traditions.

**James J. Doyle, C.S.C.**

**THEOLOGY IN RED, WHITE, AND
BLACK.** By Benjamin A. Reist.
$7.50.

Inspired by Du Bois's assumption
that the problem of this century is
racial, R. proves to be a staunch oppo­
nent of the idolatry of the melting pot.
He outlines the fourfold dynamics of a
theology of theologies, which alone
"can function in the multilogical world
of ethnic pluralism." First, mutual
intelligibility introduces an element of
disciplined openness to the various
racial interpretations. Second, mutual
interdependence overcomes the paten­
ralistic sufficiency of certain theologi­
cal traditions and promises some recip­
rocral creativity. Third, the compo­
nents of a genuine pluralism have
varying rates of relatability, with
none dominating the exchange.
Fourth, mutual openness to change
guarantees the respect of each tradi­
tion.
On the basis of Troeltsch’s recognition of the cultural conditioning of all religions, H. examines, bext de Vincent. Harding's rejection of integration and Vine Deloria’s resumption of his tribal heritage. He presents Barth's equation of the basic form of humanity with “being in encounter” that takes place gladly, Martin Luther King’s understanding of nonviolence, and James Cone's aggressive polemics, to reveal that one must listen not to conquer but to relate. After a survey of the Red Religion of the Land in the writings of Neihardt, Waters, Brown, and Eastman, R. calls upon Tillich to delineate the various forms of the experience of the Holy. Finally, he examines the contributions of Gaylord Wilmore’s Black Religion and Black Radicalism. Deloria’s God Is Red, and Frederick Herzog’s Liberation Theology to illustrate the mutual openness to change of a theology in black, red, and white. Since the “kingdom of God is a mosaic,” the recognition, affirmation, and positive contributions of each racial religious tradition are essential to the completion of the spectrum. This masterful synthesis marks a watershed in the history of American theology.

Jean-Jacques D’Aoust


It is not some extrinsic call to relevance so much as the nature of the discipline itself that drives theologians to try out new idioms. Most of us, of course, remain securely tied to the interpretative essay, quite unsure of ourselves in any other genre. Yet we continue on, I suspect, somehow aware of the essay’s inadequacy to the theological task. In Buddha and Jesus, D. treats to a dialogue between them. We already know the power of dialogue to elicit the reader’s active participation, but we also recognize how few are the masters.

A philosopher of religion herself, whose dissertation tried to disengage the faces of Socrates in Heraklemon’s pseudonymous works, D. offers us conversations as astute as they are engaging. Her choice of the dialogue form for confronting diverse religious traditions moves one conscious step beyond Niiian Smart’s quite useful introductory work World Religions: A Dialogue. D. deliberately fashions an interior dialogue—between the figures of Buddha and of Jesus vying for her own understanding and allegiance. By this move she not only displays hermeneutical sophistication but also makes contact with the personal queries of many a Christian today. Furthermore, she explicitly takes her stand with the Christian tradition, using the dialogue to bring many forgotten facets to light.

The conversations do not shrink from the hard points of difference, and an initial methodological dialogue of Jesus with Simon offers a useful non-exclusive formulation of the uniqueness of God’s revelation in Jesus. The dialogues focus on Christianity and Judaism as ways, and move subtly from confrontation to complementarity. In that sense the entire book offers an exercise in that dialectical reasoning endemic to theology. Though interior, the conversations are not private; hence, while sometimes wordy, they do succeed in their explicit aim: “a model for one way of carrying on the spiritual journey in our times—a journey marked by a quest for individuation on the one hand and for world community on the other” (p. 7). It is seldom that a work succeeds in showing what it says, yet many a hermeneutical essay tells us that theology must do just that.

David B. Burrell, C.S.C.


The four writers whose work is ex-
examined in this theological-literary study are called “prophetic” by K. because each has “a coherent and compelling view of the human condition” and has also “obtained a large and influential following” (p. 3). No one would deny that all of them meet the latter criterion, but many would be quick to point out the internal inconsistencies to be found in the writings of each. Such an observation would, according to K., be determined by a habit of “linear thinking,” a habit which the aforementioned authors have overcome. Each has been able to maintain within his thinking a “simultaneity of opposites” which somehow transcends the principle of noncontradiction. K. appears to have coined the foregoing phrase in order to describe the obvious contradictions to be found within the tradition of contemporary literature which she is considering here. As a description, however, “simultaneity of opposites” does little to bring to light anything that has not heretofore been said about these four authors. At best, K. seems to be interpreting their work in terms of a camouflaged Hegelian dialectic. She denies this, but offers no persuasive arguments to the contrary.

K. is quite informative in providing biographical and historical background concerning the authors and works in question. Her analysis of the latter, which is mainly the fiction, is adequate but hardly original. Sometimes her attempts at harmonization lead her astray. Sartre, e.g., is really in the tradition of Hegel despite his denials, although the same could not be said of Dostoevsky, Camus, or Faulkner. K. links him with the others, however, in this respect. The concept of the “simultaneity of opposites” somehow reconciles all contradictions. This concept thus serves as the starting point for a theological homily on the subject of hope in the midst of the contemporary darkness of alienation and totalitarianism. Suitable applications to recent historical events are included. Unfortunately, the result is more edifying than illuminating. In her final chapter, K. makes some interesting moves in the direction of a “story” theology and of a Jungian treatment of the feminine. These are not followed up, however, and remain merely suggestive.

John F. Martin, S.J.


The keynote of this short treatment of Camus’s career and thought is sympathy. W. shows a definite sympathy for the values of C.’s works and work. He also shows that C.’s lifelong dialogue with Christianity was not hostile or bitter, but rather sympathetic with many Christian values and regretful for what he considered its errors and historical mistakes. W. examines carefully the chief elements in C.’s thought—absurdity, lucidity, innocence, plagues, revolt, human solidarity, and his “invincible faith and hope born of the enduring characteristics and values of the human condition in the world.”

C. developed explicitly many counterparts and substitutes for Christian doctrines and values. For faith he substituted lucidity, for Christ he substituted all the victims of oppression, etc. These parallels are clearly stated and carefully examined, providing an enlightened challenge for any reader, Christian or agnostic. Another value of this book is that it shows some of the blind spots C. had in his view of Christianity; e.g., he equates God’s omnipotence with determinism. W. could also have pointed out that C. misunderstood the Judeo-Christian theology of divine retribution. Fr. Paneloux, the Jesuit preacher in The
Plague, gives not the Judeo-Christian idea of God's punishments for sin but rather C.'s misinterpretation of it.

This book would be an excellent addition to any course on Camus or existentialism, or any course which compares Christian and agnostic humanism. The style is clear, the references are abundant, and W. does not hesitate to present his own well-balanced opinions.

Joseph M. Moffitt, S.J.


The focus of this book is intentionally limited to the Roman Catholic perspective on Church-government relations. S.'s examination of the historical data reveals dominant and subordinate themes within the Catholic tradition of this question. The dominant position has been a bias toward the presumption of obedience to the state on the part of the Church and the individual. The subordinate position emphasizes the right and duty of the Christian to dissent from immoral and unjust commands or laws. S.'s theory of selective obedience does not attempt to resolve the tensions of Church-state relations; rather it calls for the careful examination of a law or policy directive before deciding whether or not to obey. S.'s explication and critique of recent teachings of the magisterium regarding obedience to the state is thorough and concise. This tradition and the writings of contemporary Catholic moral theologians have given new emphasis to the primacy of the kingdom and the role of the individual conscience in the making of moral-political decisions and provide the foundation of S.'s position.

The limitations of the book, though self-imposed, are severe. The two most outstanding are the failure to acknowledge the contributions of Protestant thought in this area and the treatment of only certain "contractualist" political theorists of the state. His treatment does permit him to integrate the more traditional Catholic organic theory of state with one strain of the social-contract theories. Since, however, he is concerned primarily with the American scene, further development and challenges to his position would have emerged through an examination of Protestant thought and those political theorists who are in the Hobbsian tradition.

S.'s contribution to the field of political ethics is the demonstration that the principle of selective obedience is well founded in the Catholic tradition in theory and practice. The application of this principle will remain a difficult endeavor.

Jerome Dollard, O.S.B.
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