BOOK REVIEWS


The partial fruits of a 1973 Notre Dame seminar on wisdom, this collection of essays explores neglected areas of study: wisdom as a form of theological reflection, cross-cultural mediation, moral formation. In "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia," James M. Robinson traces the "trajectory" of wisdom tradition in Q. Jesus is one in a chain of wisdom's emissaries; his pre-eminence in that series is owing to his role as Son of Man; in its last stage, Q identifies Jesus with wisdom itself. Mt's redaction of Q brings this Sophia Christology to fruition (e.g., Mt 11: the works by which wisdom is justified are the works of the Messiah). Q understands Jesus' passion according to the motif (found in an apocalyptic setting in 4 Ezra and Enoch) by which wisdom, rejected by those to whom she is sent, removes herself to heaven. R.'s essay is nuanced and impossible to summarize briefly.

Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, in "Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament," warns against the limitations of form-critical and religionsgeschichtlich approaches to the hymns, and suggests that in them elements of myth are used as material for theological purposes, a use she calls "reflective mythology." Starting with the theologizing of postexilic wisdom schools, one can see a trajectory of such reflective mythology. (F.'s remarks on Wittgenstein seem based on an ignoratio elenchi.)

"Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Speculation and Paul," by Birger A. Pearson, reconstructs the Hellenistic anthropology Paul is attacking in 1 Cor 1-3 and 15: man is endowed with a capacity for knowing God, the divine pneuma; the Corinthians, having realized this capacity through adherence to Jesus as Sophia and Lord of glory, and sharing in his exalted status, are already "perfect." Paul insists, rather, that this pneuma is a gift, not an innate potency, and is given and known precisely through the Cross. By their side-stepping of the Cross, the Corinthians reveal themselves to be "babes," utterly failing to understand the wisdom of God by which he has overcome the demonic powers. Paul thus turns the Corinthians' own terminology against them, and shows himself, in his adherence to the Cross, to be pneumatikos (1 Cor 2:15).

Henry A. Fischel's "The Transformation of Wisdom in the World of Midrash" is a study of "Western" or Greco-Roman influences on rabbinic literature. F. adduces fascinating parallels from Hellenistic rhetoric and literary genres (symposium, diadochic and doxographic writings, sorites), terminology ("flee," "choose," in Epicurean and Stoic
works), and thought (e.g., the picture of the sage and the understanding of wisdom). Rabbinic thought reveals appropriation of and polemic against these "Western" influences. The essay is rich but condensed and difficult.

Continuities in Philo with the tradition of biblical wisdom form the subject of Jean Laporte's essay. Besides the various notions and images L. studies (e.g., retribution, pre-existent wisdom, the Spirit of God; the tabernacle, Eden, the law, Exodus), he treats especially Philo's use of these materials and his method: reliance on allegory and the coupling of opposites or contraries.

Robert L. Wilken writes on the Sentences of Sextus and their function vis-à-vis Christians, non-Christians, and those on the way to conversion. The work is one of the first attempts to appropriate the philosophical life as a way of understanding the faith. W. adduces citations from Galen and Plutarch to explain the Sitz im Leben of works like Sextus, but it is not clear that those authors are referring to gnomological collections as such rather than maxims of the wise in general. W. follows Rufinus in mistranslating Sentence 190, "Honor the wise person as the image of the living God": "eikona theou zōnta" refers, however, to the king; the editor should have attended to the discussion of Schoedel, on p. 176, on the Hellenistic notion of the wise man as king.

William R. Schoedel makes a detailed study of the Nag Hammadi document The Teachings of Silvanus. Drawing on classical Jewish wisdom style, Hellenistic rhetoric (diatribe especially), and the Hellenistic hymn, Silvanus has affinities with the Wisdom of Solomon, and S. suggests that both works "represent diverse products of a religious and theological tradition in which these elements were blended in a variety of ways," a tradition which attests the vitality of wisdom in early Christian thought and which may well have paved the way for theologians such as Clement and Origen.

This volume will be useful to anyone concerned with "wisdom" in NT, rabbinic, and patristic studies, though its price seems excessive.

Georgetown University

J. P. M. Walsh, S.J.


In recent years increasing attention has been given to the parable form as a "vehicle of insight," and the Gospel parables have been compared to folk tales and other types of popular literature which have the same function of bringing the hearer to a new understanding of himself and of his existential situation. While this hermeneutical perspective is important, it can never replace the exegetical analysis of the texts themselves, and the appearance of C.'s careful study is a welcome addition to this
ongoing task.

C.’s principal subject matter is the parables that appear in all three Synoptic Gospels: not only the triple tradition pericopes which are in parable form but also those parables which are embedded in larger narratives. In addition, C. studies the parabolic material which Matthew has taken over from Q but which is also in Mark. In chap. 3 (“The Lucan Redaction”) C. includes a consideration of “The Waiting Servants” (Lk 12:35-38), which Luke has taken over from Mark, although Matthew has omitted it, and of three parables which occur in both Q and Mark. In his final chapter C. examines all the Marcan parables, whether they have been taken over by Matthew and/or Luke or not.

In a number of instances a comparison of the Matthean or Lucan version with Mark reveals a clear redactional Tendenz. For example, in Matthew’s interpretation of the Marcan theory of the parables (Mt 13:10-17) “he has created out of the materials of Mk. and Q a kind of double-edged beatitude in which the blessedness of the disciples (vv. 16 f.) who do understand (vv. 23, 51), is contrasted with the judgment on non-disciples, presumably the Jews (v. 12) or anyone else who does not understand (v. 19)” (p. 8). Similarly, the Lucan redaction of the Parable of the Sower and its interpretation (Lk 8:4-8, 11-15) reveals that the Evangelist “has taken what Mark organized around the themes of parables and private teaching and reorganized it around the theme of Christian preaching” (p. 72).

With such a broad topic, an exhaustive coverage of the literature would have been impossible. Nevertheless, I would have been interested to know whether C. might agree with me that Luke’s substitution of peirasmos (Lk 8:13) for thlipsis (Mk 4:17) is not simply a “de-eschatologizing” of a Marcan concept (p. 75) but rather the substitution of a negative concept for a positive one (Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke, pp. 14-15). When I read C.’s analysis of the Marcan parable chapter, I wonder whether Mk 4:34 could not be assigned at least as plausibly to the pre-Marcan parable collection (JBL 92 [1973] 64) as to the Evangelist (p. 137), whose own parable theory is best represented by Mk 4:10-11.

C. has “tried to go beyond redaction-criticism in the pure sense and repeatedly asked the question about the authenticity of the materials of the tradition” (p. xii). Not infrequently his answers raise serious questions of methodology which would certainly need to be given further consideration, although this probably would not have been possible within the limits of C.’s book. I give three examples.

1) I agree that Mk 4:10-11 “presupposes a situation in which rejection of the message [of Jesus] has already taken place, not in the mind and intention of God, but within the ongoing context of history” (p. 108). But
why is this an argument against authenticity, since C. remarks elsewhere: “It is, of course, historically certain that Jesus’ preaching brought a limited response” (p. 146)? The mere fact that “there are no parallel texts to support the theory” of hardening (p. 108) is no argument against its authenticity. Multiple attestation can confirm what is established by other criteria or in some cases even replace them, but it is not in itself a prerequisite for authenticity.

2) C. argues that in the Parable of the Sower (Mk 4:1–9) “the fate of the seed in different soils is central” (p. 144) and then goes on to suggest that the parable is probably not authentic, since “we have little evidence that Jesus was primarily concerned with the state of his hearers’ hearts” (p. 146). I doubt, first, that the amount of detail devoted in the Bildhälfte to the seeds and the different kinds of soils (vv. 4–8) has the significance for the Sachhälfte which C. attributes to it. Further, since linguistic considerations pose no objection to authenticity, would not an interpretation which is intelligible in the context of Jesus’ ministry, i.e., as a “parable of contrast,” be preferable to one which must be considered inauthentic? In any case, it is unlikely that the original meaning of a parable can be determined by purely intrinsic analysis. The meaning depends upon the situation in which the parable is supposed to have been used.

3) C. believes that the saying in Mk 7:27 “cannot be squared with Jesus’ attitude toward the poor, women, non-Jews, or any of the other things the [Syro-Phoenician] woman represents” (p. 172). Such a judgment, though possibly correct, is not subject to any external check, and one wonders whether the author may not, perhaps unconsciously, have been moved by a desire not to attribute to Jesus a statement which suggests that he was not exempt from the tribal prejudices of his nation and age. As H. Schürmann has written, “Often the positive criteria [i.e., indications of what is distinctive about Jesus] are wrongly used as criteria of inauthenticity for utterances which seem to us to be irreconcilable with those criteria” (“Die vorösterlichen Anfänge der Logienquelle,” pp. 347–48).

Such questions arise only because C. has had the courage to go beyond the relatively safe sphere of textual analysis, and I propose them not so much to criticize a valuable book as rather to suggest how full of ambiguities the “new quest for the historical Jesus” still seems to be.

General Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. Schuyler Brown, S.J.


The inspiration for this dissertation came from Käsemann while the author was at Tübingen, but it was completed at Freiburg (Breisgau) in
1973–74 with Vögtle and Deissler as advisors. It is very German in thought, method, and sources. I am startled to read a work in Johannine theology written in the 1970's which in its ample bibliography does not mention such American and English authors as Lindars, Martyn, Smalley, and D. M. Smith. (Among English commentators the older volumes of Archbishop Bernard are quoted with surprising frequency, but only under the misspelled German guise of Bernhard.) The inter-German quality of the debate is illustrated on p. 51, when L. is treating the specifically Johannine aspect of love: he starts with an article by Dibelius, jumps to Bultmann, then to Käsemann, with footnotes to Bauer and Schnackenburg. Not that L. follows his German predecessors in a slavish manner; but I fear that a ninety-percent-German discussion permits him to make absolute statements that many of us may feel unsubstantiated, e.g., his claim (p. 15) that 1 John can be ignored in this discussion, despite its markedly frequent reference to agapē, because "On the one hand this Epistle is certainly a later stage in the Johannine trajectory; and on the other hand the author of 1 John is influenced by an understanding of agapē and agapan that deviates from the understanding of love in John."

L.'s method is to present his general ideas about love in the first sixty pages, then in the rest of the book to substantiate those ideas by a detailed exegesis of the Gospel passages treating of love. L. maintains that love in John involves a subject-object reciprocal relationship. Thus "God so loved the world" in 3:16 is not typical Johannine thought (I agree), because there is no reciprocal love on the world's part. Rather, love is seen most clearly in the relationships (1) between the Father and the Son, (2) between the Son and his own, (3) among the Son's own, and (4) between the Father and the Son's own (although John does not mention that as being returned). This love produces and is reflected in unity. Thus far I would agree with his position; but L. goes farther to insist that this is a unity in word, whence the title of the book. Although he keeps stating this, I do not see that he ever proves it. He brings it in as almost an axiom at the end of his discussion of passages such as 3:35, 5:20, 10:17, and 15:9, even though these passages never mention "word" or, so far as I can see, imply it. But perhaps this is not evident to me because I am not a reader who shares the Bultmann analysis of the way in which Jesus is a revealer. I think that the light and life Jesus brings is more than a matter of word, since I do not treat as non-Johannine additions all the passages to the contrary. It may be that, having another view of Johannine theology, I have not done sufficient justice to this dissertation.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. Raymond E. Brown, S.S.
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DIE BRIEFE AN DIE PHILIPPER, AN PHILEMON, AN DIE KOLOSSER, AN DIE
EPHESER. By Josef Ernst. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg:

The first edition of RNT 7 was published in 1949 and contained the
commentary of K. Staab on 1-2 Thessalonians, the Captivity Letters,
and the Pastorals. That edition was reprinted, unchanged, in 1953, 1955,
1965. In the fifth edition of 1969 the volume was divided into two parts:
7/1 contained Staab's commentary on 1-2 Thessalonians and the
Captivity Letters; 7/2 presented the commentary of N. Brox on the
Pastorals. In what purports to be a sixth edition—it is not so labeled—
Josef Ernst now presents a greatly expanded commentary on Philippi-
ans, Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians, in an unnumbered volume
which is, nevertheless, part of RNT. The lack of a volume number will
make it a problem to refer to, a bane for both librarians and scholars.

When RNT first appeared, its volumes were thin and the commentary
on the biblical text was sparse. Subsequent editions changed that
considerably. The commentaries of J. Schmid on the Synoptics in RNT
are recognized as a real contribution to the study of these writings. But
the RNT commentaries have never been as important as those in the
critical series Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.
The latter are better compared with the German Protestant Meyerkom-
mentar, while RNT is more like Das Neue Testament deutsch.

Whereas only 135 pages were devoted to the four Captivity Letters in
the fifth edition, Ernst's commentary now fills 401 pages. For Staab, all
four letters were authentic Pauline compositions, and it was a "greater
probability" (p. 70) that they were all written toward the end of Paul's
Roman imprisonment (A.D. 61-63), with Philippians having been sent a
few months later than the rest (though Staab did toy with the possibility
that the latter may have been composed in an Ephesian imprisonment
during the winter of 55/54). In this new edition, Ernst joins the current
trend in Germany, in regarding Philippians and Philemon as undoubt-
edly authentic Pauline writings, because they presuppose a real historical
background, whereas Ephesians—and perhaps Colossians too—is
pseudonymous in view of the great authority ascribed to the imprisoned
Apostle, an ideal situation which is clearly theologically motivated.
Whereas Philippians is a writing addressed to a community (Gemeinde-
schreiben), Ephesians possesses a theological teaching that has reached a
level of development that can no longer be explained by the peculiar
condition of imprisonment or the maturity of the Apostle; everything
argues for its composition in the postapostolic period by someone who
had mastered the Pauline heritage. Colossians is rather a letter that
takes a position between Philippians and Ephesians: "it is no longer so
Pauline as the Great Letters [presumably, Galatians, 1-2 Corinthians,
Romans], but not yet as postpauline as Ephesians” (p. 8). A changed problematic has caused the author to reflect anew, on the basis of the theology of the Apostle, about the fundamental Christian faith now confronted with an erroneous teaching and to seek an answer to it, which has given Christology a new accent. The author of Ephesians used Colossians as a Vorlage, as well as other traditional material. Ernst recognizes that Philemon is an authentic Pauline letter, addressed to an individual, but it seems to be, “thematically” at least, an appendix (Nachtrag) to Colossians. But this is appearance. Whereas E. Lohse (Colossians and Philemon [Philadelphia, 1971] p. 176) considers the list of greetings in Col 4:9–17 to be a reworking of Phm 2:10–11, 23, 24 by the author to “give his own writing a greater authority” (p. 8), Ernst entertains the possibility that Colossians was written during the lifetime of Paul by a disciple who made use of that list of greetings actually as his “legitimation.” In the long run, even though Ernst admits a certain amount of relationship between Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians, he considers the most noteworthy thing about the four so-called Captivity Letters to be their divergence. They are not a closed-off group. “Captivity” is a purely formal tag given to them because of an “imprisonment” from which the author purports to be writing. For this reason Ernst has even abandoned the word in the title to his RNT commentary.

The commentary begins with a ten-page bibliography listing other commentaries and then special monographs dealing with the letters. Each commentary (Philippians, pp. 21–122; Philemon, pp. 123–39; Colossians, pp. 141–244; and Ephesians, pp. 245–405) begins with a special introduction to the letter, which treats its theology, authenticity/integrity, date and place of composition, language, and style. In general, the interpretation of the letters is balanced, in dialogue with recent exegetical trends and discussions, and coherent.

It is not possible to enter here into great detail, but I found Ernst’s treatment of Phil 2:6–11 quite satisfactory. After a verse-for-verse exegesis, he discusses the current thinking about five of the main problems of the passage: (1) its form-critical identification: he opts for a proclamatory hymn or a hymn of adoration; (2) its strophic structure: he sides basically with E. Lohmeyer (two strophes of three vss. each) against J. Jeremias and J. Gnilka; (3) its religiengeschichtlich relationship: it is not dependent on the LXX of Is 53 (J. Jeremias), nor derived from the idea of the suffering and exalted Righteous One (E. Schweizer—although this is most favored by him); it does not emply a “second Adam” motif (O. Cullmann), nor the Gnostic Urmensch-redeemer myth (E. Käsemann); while each of these may illustrate a detail or other, they scarcely explain the hymn as a whole and, consequently, Ernst seeks to explain it
solely from an early Christian faith-experience; (4) its Christology: three levels—pre-existence, kenosis, exaltation; (5) its *Sitz im Leben*: it is useless to speculate about a specific Eucharistic or baptismal background. The only aspect of the modern discussion of the passage that Ernst has omitted is the question of the kind of early Christian community out of which the hymn would have emerged: Greek-speaking or Aramaic-speaking? In this regard he might want to consult P. Grelot, "Deux notes critiques sur Philippiens 2,6–11," *Biblica* 54 (1973) 169–86—which may have appeared too late for the incorporation of it into his discussion.

In sum, this is a welcome addition to the *RNT* series, which has always tried to disseminate in a less technical way the best of critical NT scholarship. It is interesting to see a Roman Catholic commentary on this level taking the position that it has about the authenticity of Colossians and Ephesians. That issue is not a closed book, by any means. While I can see a stronger case being made for the deuter-Pauline character of Ephesians—but only recently a massive attempt was made to defend the Pauline authorship (see A. van Roon, *The Authenticity of Ephesians* [*Novum Testamentum Supplements* 39; Leiden: Brill, 1974])—I am more reluctant to relinquish Colossians from the Pauline corpus. That is too easy a way out of a real problem in Pauline theology, and commentaries such as those of Lohse and Ernst have not yet addressed themselves to it.

*Weston School of Theology*  
JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


As with all previous NT volumes of *Hermeneia*, this is taken from a German original and, indeed, from the *Meyerkommentar*, which supplied three out of four of its *Hermeneia* predecessors. In 1920 Dibelius wrote his *James* as a seventh edition to replace earlier commentaries in the series by J. Huther (1857) and by W. Beyschlag (1882)—with the latter D. said his work had "nothing in common." The current volume is based on the updated eleventh edition of 1964, further updated by the English translator. Inevitably, there are lacunae in the updating, e.g., n. 16 on p. 4 neglects a large literature on the origins of the Testaments of the Patriarchs.

Is it really worth while to translate a 1920 work? I was not so certain about a previous *Hermeneia* volume of D. on the Pastorals, but I have no doubt at all in the present instance. In every sense of the word it is a
classic. The Introduction (which constitutes one fifth of the book) is a masterful discussion of James as an example of pæreneis. D. is famous as one of the fathers of form criticism. Just what that means is never clearer than when he shows how many mistakes about James have flowed from not recognizing the peculiarities of the pæreneis genre. The letter format is superficial, and one must abandon the search for a logical development of ideas—the flow is determined much more by chain words. Pæreneis is so stereotyped that we can tell little about the historical situation of its recipients or its writing, despite many attempts to do so. Perhaps D.’s one weakness here is when he ventures out of the realm of form criticism. He is probably right in denying that James of Jerusalem is the author; James has been adopted as a patron for a theological outlook that has a certain continuity with the piety and poverty of the Jerusalem community described in Acts. But I am not convinced by D.’s argument that the epistle could not be contemporary with the historical James of Jerusalem since there is no sign of the debate over accepting the law. While the historical James may have had confrontations with Paul, it is an exaggeration to assume that a debate over the law wrecked all the early communities; and some communities dominated by Jewish Christians may never have undergone the Pauline dichotomy.

The commentary itself is comprehensive and informative. Nevertheless, at times the 1920 origins show through. D. contends that the anointing of the sick in Jas 5:13–15 is in sharp contrast to the sacrament of extreme unction, which is an anointing of the dying. That argument may have a certain pertinence to a Trinitarian understanding of the sacrament, but scarcely to the current (or to the oldest) Catholic understanding of the sacrament as an anointing of the sick. But these are small points that do not detract from the fact that this is the best commentary ever written on James.

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


Undoubtedly the best manual to date for adult catechetical instructions, The Teaching of Christ (TTOC) used as its over-all guide the General Catechetical Directory published by the Holy See in 1971 and the Basic Teachings for Catholic Religious Education published by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops in 1973 for those teaching the faith in the U.S. TTOC deliberately (and successfully) attempts to go beyond the narrow dogmatism of past catechisms, to eliminate the
excessively technical professionalism of more recent ones, and to mitigate incipient Catholic polarization by emphasizing the basic truths of the faith and their intrinsic interconnection.

If the aim of true catechesis is to make a person receptive to the Word of God, TTOC succeeds, because the whole message of the faith is itself the best sign of its own truth. TTOC proffers an integrated, balanced account of the whole message of the Catholic faith from the horizon and perspective offered by Vatican II. Through a skilful integration of quotations from Scripture, from the Fathers, from the councils, and from official Church documents, and by means of an intelligent, critical awareness of contemporary theological scholarship with its manifold positions, TTOC has reformed doctrine in a forward direction, shown the reasonableness of believing, and presented the Catholic faith, the whole Catholic faith, and nothing but the Catholic faith. Especially fine are the chapters on original sin, the Eucharist, Jesus' public life, the Resurrection, Mary, and the Trinity, although TTOC's emphatic Christocentrism has not penetrated deeply enough into the "Limbo" section. Then, too, the first chapter moves too quickly to Christ, and perhaps should have learned from the Dutch Catechism's beautiful opening section "The Mystery of Existence."

Perhaps few will read TTOC from cover to cover at any one time, but the over-all effect of such a reading is compelling and forceful. One detects a twofold movement within the TTOC's structure. On the one hand, the reader is led as a whole person to experience the mystery of God's healing and saving love in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. This movement tends to compress, to unify, and to reduce the manifold truths of the faith into the simplicity of the mystery of God's love in Christ. This more than informational movement is truly mystagogical, i.e., it leads the reader into an experience of the how of the faith, that the faith is truly God's "good news" to us. On the other hand, TTOC enucleates a comprehensive, easily usable summation of the manifold teachings of the Church. This movement unfolds the one Word of God into every facet of human life. The reader is able to find God in all things.

The social requirements of the gospel are very well explicated by TTOC. One senses therein how the kerygma ought to change individual and social ways of acting. TTOC underscores the value of a good, fully human life and the necessity to humanize the world, yet from a perspective solidly theocentric and Christocentric. The sections on building a just and good society, marriage, sexuality, and vocation are especially fine.

Finally, TTOC is clearly written and very well organized. It also offers
useful appendixes dealing with the Bible, the councils, the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, Catholic prayers, bibliography, and subject matter.

Boston College

Harvey Egan, S.J.


As the title suggests, Gadamer's concern is with truth and method, though not in the sense of presenting a method for discovering truth or validating claims to its acquisition. Rejecting the transference of the methodology of the natural sciences to the human sciences, G. set out "to discover what is common to all modes of understanding and to show that understanding is never subjective behaviour toward a given 'object', but towards its effective history—the history of its influence; in other words, understanding belongs to the being of that which is understood" (p. xix).

G. begins his exploration with "the question of truth as it emerges in the experience of art" (pp. 5-150). After an engaging examination of such humanistic concepts as Bildung (culture), sensus communis, judgment, and taste, G. confronts the subjectivization of aesthetics. If "aesthetic differentiation" (abstraction until only the "purely aesthetic" remains) must be rejected, what is the ontological explanation and hermeneutical significance of a work of art? In a surprising, though still convincing move, G. proposes "play" as the clue; for the work of art is not simply an object to be viewed, but resembles play by having "its true being in the fact that it becomes an experience changing the person experiencing it" (p. 92). After testing his concept of "aesthetic non-differentiation" (pp. 105 ff.) in the cases of tragedy, pictures, and literature, G. concludes that hermeneutics is not merely "the art of understanding texts," but would have "to be understood in so comprehensive a sense as to embrace the whole sphere of art and its complex of questions" (p. 146).

G. next turns to the question of understanding in the human sciences (pp. 153-341). A critical examination of the Enlightenment, romanticism, and historicism prompts G. to look to phenomenology to provide a universal framework for the hermeneutical problem. Against the Enlightenment's prejudice against prejudice, the "recognition that all understanding inevitably involves some prejudice gives the hermeneutical problem its real thrust" (p. 239). Against the Enlightenment's rejection of authority and tradition, the example of the "classical" is an indication that "understanding is not to be thought of so much as an action of one's subjectivity, but as the placing of oneself within a process of tradition, in which past and present are constantly fused" (p. 258). Although the interpreter "is not able to separate in advance the
productive prejudices that make understanding possible from the prejudices that hinder understanding and lead to misunderstandings” (p. 263), G. feels that “temporal distance” will let “the true meaning of the object emerge fully” (p. 265); thus, “the working out of the hermeneutical situation means the achievement of the right horizon of enquiry for the questions evoked by the encounter with tradition” (p. 269).

G. sees understanding, interpretation, and application not as different methods but as “comprising one unified process”; for example, “a religious proclamation is not there to be understood as a merely historical document, but to be taken in a way in which it exercises its saving effect” (p. 275). Further confirmation is found in the Aristotelian contrast between technical and moral knowledge (pp. 278-89) and the past-present relationship of legal hermeneutics (pp. 289-305); paradigmatically, “when a judge regards himself as entitled to supplement the original meaning of the text of a law, he is doing exactly what takes place in all other understanding” (p. 305). Analogously, the experienced person is “someone who is radically undogmatic; who, because of the many experiences he has had and the knowledge he has drawn from them, is particularly well equipped to have new experiences and to learn from them” (p. 319). Yet, if hermeneutical consciousness depends on our readiness for experience, “we cannot have experiences without asking questions” (p. 325), without “the stimulus given us by that which does not fit in with preconceived opinion” (pp. 329 f.). Hermeneutics, then, as “a conversation with the text” (p. 331), must go beyond mere reconstruction; for attaining understanding through dialogue requires a fusion of horizons, “a transformation into a communion in which we do not remain what we were” (p. 341).

Finally, G. explores “the ontological shift of hermeneutics guided by language” (pp. 345-447). Although language is the medium of experience, “the hermeneutical problem is not one of the correct mastery of language, but of the proper understanding of that which takes place through the medium of language” (pp. 346 f.). If “the spoken word interprets itself to an astonishing degree” (p. 355), it is the reader who is the arbiter of the written word’s claim to truth. Rejecting the idealization of an “original reader,” G. maintains that interpretation “means precisely to use one’s own preconceptions so that the meaning of the text can really be made to speak for us”: thus, if “interpretation must find the right language if it really wants to make the text speak,” nonetheless, no single interpretation can be considered correct “in itself” (p. 358).

After examining the emergence of the concept of language in the history of Western thought (pp. 366-87) and the process of concept formation (pp. 387-97), G. reflects on the reciprocity of language and world-experience: if every language represents a particular view of the
world, "in language the world itself presents itself" (p. 408). By implication, the hermeneutical event is properly constituted, not by language qua language, "but in the coming into language of that which has been said in the tradition: an event that is at once assimilation and interpretation" (p. 421). In effect, G.'s analysis—starting from the nature of works of art, proceeding through the question of textual interpretation, then probing the universal aspect of hermeneutics—comes full circle: "when we understand a text, what is meaningful in it charms us just as the beautiful charms us" (p. 446). Or, in another vein, if "the use of scientific methods does not suffice to guarantee truth" and if there is "no understanding that is free of all prejudices," the discipline of questioning and research must and can guarantee truth (pp. 446 f.).

G.'s thought has already gained attention in American circles since the original publication of *Wahrheit und Methode* (1960); now a wider audience can benefit from his massive erudition, perceptive analysis, and incisive critique in this translation of the second edition (1965) and later supplements (pp. 460–98) that add further aspects of his thinking, while responding to various critics. Granting that German is not the easiest language to translate and that English is not the easiest language in which to philosophize, the translation is creditably executed, though readers may be occasionally annoyed by some awkwardness in expression or even the British style, as well as by errors missed in proofreading.

A variety of disciplines should find G.'s work a source of interest and insight: philosophers, e.g., may be most attracted by the critique of German philosophy and its revaluation of classical Greek and medieval thought; literary critics and historians might profit from its aesthetic approach to interpretation; moralists presumably could find suggestions for analyzing the formation of conscience and the application of law; systematic theologians may well probe both its methodological implications and specific facets such as the exploration of the category of "experience" in theologizing about revelation.

Reading this work is a challenging, indeed "beautiful," experience; as a volume to be savored and slowly digested, it is well worth its apparently immoderate price.

*Catholic University of America*  

JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


The first and larger volume presents W.'s researches; the second volume contains footnote references, texts of the conciliar discussions
(many in the original Latin), published and unpublished source materials, an extensive bibliography, and an appendix consisting of thirteen fold-out tables. The work is not printed in the ordinary sense, but is a photocopy from typescript. It is easily legible, with very few typing errors.

The occasion for the work is provided by the discussions and controversies about the Eucharistic Real Presence and transubstantiation in this century, especially during the decades following World War II. Many, if not most, of the thousands of books and articles devoted to this subject refer to the Eucharistic doctrine of Trent. This appeal necessitates a study of Trent's history, about which there is more ignorance than knowledge, even on the part of the Dutch and Flemish theologians who were so prominent a dozen years ago. To get at the real meaning of the canons of Trent, W. applies the methods of scriptural exegesis developed and refined in our time to the documents which record the discussions and debates of the Tridentine theologians and fathers.

A correct understanding of the four canons extensively studied in the book, as well as of the entire Eucharistic teaching of Trent, requires a knowledge of their historical genesis. The four canons selected for special research do not have their origin in some theologian's favorite doctrine or in a profession of faith, but go back to definite theses put forward by leaders of the Reformation. The purpose of all the work done at the Council by the congregations of theologians, the special commissions, the general congregations, and the definitive sessions was to examine these propositions, to determine the extent of their opposition to Catholic faith, and ultimately to define the Catholic position. In a word, Trent provided responses to concrete challenges.

Accordingly, the debate that arose after World War II, whether transubstantiation involves a physical or a metaphysical change in the bread and wine, and the later fracas about transsignification and transfinalization, vainly look to Trent for support or repudiation, because Trent did not and could not provide answers to questions which had to await hundreds of years before being asked. Whether some contemporary theories are compatible with Trent is another matter; thus, W. points out that the Eucharistic conversion twice mentioned in canon 2 cannot be understood simply as a mere change in signification. The long discussions concerning this conversion, first at Bologna in 1547 and later at Trent in 1551, are too intent on basic Eucharistic realism to be satisfied with so weak a change that was actually advocated by some of the Reformers. This observation issues from an investigation of the sources, especially of those hitherto unpublished.

The same meticulous examination of the discussions among the
theologians and fathers, reported in published and unpublished documents, enables W. to clear up several matters not well understood by modern authors. For instance, the choice of Eucharistic "species" over "accidents" is not a doctrinal issue but merely favors the term that is more prevalent in tradition. More interestingly, "transubstantiation" is retained because it is equivalent to the patristic "conversion" and is sanctioned by ecclesiastical usage, especially by Lateran IV. During the 1547 meetings in Bologna, some of the Council members hoped to find "transubstantiation" in patristic writings, but were unable to do so, and in the final draft of canon 2 at Trent in 1551 regarded the word as a convenient credal term for the contemporary Church. Generally, in its overriding concern for the tradition, Trent bypasses the Middle Ages and goes back to previous councils, the Church Fathers, and Scripture. This is an important consideration because, in our disregard of what really went on at the Council, we too readily assume that Trent's mentality is simply that of medieval Scholasticism. Although the education and language of the bishops and theologians reflected their scholastic training, these men never dreamed of sanctioning scholastic teaching with conciliar authority, but persistently sought to define Catholic truth, threatened by the Reformation, by rethinking and reformulating the doctrine they searched out in tradition and the Bible. Thus the final decrees presented in canons 1–4 are the outcome of theological, not philosophical deliberations.

The exegetical, critical, and historical methodology employed has made it possible for W. to produce a book that is not only highly instructive, but serves as a wholesome reminder to all theologians not to attribute their personal preferences to doctrines that have to be interpreted in the light of their special historical genesis.

Marquette University  
Cyril Vollert, S.J.


The primary concern of this doctoral dissertation is with twentieth-century writings (up to 1966) on the subject of the Eucharistic epiclesis. It was undertaken with a view to arriving at a better understanding of the theology of the epiclesis. A summary of research on antecedents to the developed epiclesis and a cursory textual examination of more developed early forms is followed by a brief history of theological explanations of the epiclesis. This serves as background for a systematic presentation of twentieth-century writings on the theme. M. concludes with a synthesis. He suggests a new approach to the theological explanation of the
theologians and fathers, reported in published and unpublished documents, enables W. to clear up several matters not well understood by modern authors. For instance, the choice of Eucharistic "species" over "accidents" is not a doctrinal issue but merely favors the term that is more prevalent in tradition. More interestingly, "transubstantiation" is retained because it is equivalent to the patristic "conversion" and is sanctioned by ecclesiastical usage, especially by Lateran IV. During the 1547 meetings in Bologna, some of the Council members hoped to find "transubstantiation" in patristic writings, but were unable to do so, and in the final draft of canon 2 at Trent in 1551 regarded the word as a convenient credal term for the contemporary Church. Generally, in its overriding concern for the tradition, Trent bypasses the Middle Ages and goes back to previous councils, the Church Fathers, and Scripture. This is an important consideration because, in our disregard of what really went on at the Council, we too readily assume that Trent's mentality is simply that of medieval Scholasticism. Although the education and language of the bishops and theologians reflected their scholastic training, these men never dreamed of sanctioning scholastic teaching with conciliar authority, but persistently sought to define Catholic truth, threatened by the Reformation, by rethinking and reformulating the doctrine they searched out in tradition and the Bible. Thus the final decrees presented in canons 1-4 are the outcome of theological, not philosophical deliberations.

The exegetical, critical, and historical methodology employed has made it possible for W. to produce a book that is not only highly instructive, but serves as a wholesome reminder to all theologians not to attribute their personal preferences to doctrines that have to be interpreted in the light of their special historical genesis.

Marquette University Cyril Vollert, S.J.


The primary concern of this doctoral dissertation is with twentieth-century writings (up to 1966) on the subject of the Eucharistic epiclesis. It was undertaken with a view to arriving at a better understanding of the theology of the epiclesis. A summary of research on antecedents to the developed epiclesis and a cursory textual examination of more developed early forms is followed by a brief history of theological explanations of the epiclesis. This serves as background for a systematic presentation of twentieth-century writings on the theme. M. concludes with a synthesis. He suggests a new approach to the theological explanation of the
epiclesis and in the final chapter, published in this journal (TS 36 [1975] 265–84), spells out how this prayer sheds light on the various aspects involved in the realization of the Eucharist.

This thoughtful and thought-provoking work is a good contribution to recent publications which show how the epiclesis question involves one in basic issues of Christology, pneumatology, ecclesiology, and sacramental theology. It succeeds in demonstrating how the developed epiclesis mirrors the tension between the roles of God and celebrating community, lay participants and pastor, Christ and Holy Spirit.

Given the limitations of space, this review will be confined to two critical remarks. The first concerns M.'s presentation of the relation of the epiclesis to the notion of substantia sacramenti (chap. 6). Basing himself on recent literature, M. concludes that the substantia is not identical with the forma sacramenti: historical data indicates that the specific forma of some sacraments has changed while the substantia has remained fixed. He then adds that this data also indicates that the epiclesis was once, and so possibly could again be, considered to have a consecratory value along with the words of institution. The second remark concerns M.'s approach to the epiclesis question within a personalistic framework (chap. 7). Here he concludes that the whole Eucharistic prayer is consecratory, with the words of institution and the epiclesis forming the ritual expression of the full personal presence of Christ for the communicants.

In chap. 6 it would have been appropriate for M. to refer to the surprisingly uniform structure of the Eucharistic prayers of the fourth century (reflected also in the Eucharistic prayer of the Apostolic Tradition), which form the basis of all subsequent Eucharistic prayers of the great traditions of the East and West. Within this authentic whole tradition it is at least arguable that the accounts of institution are linked explicitly or implicitly with the thanksgiving prayer and refer to the historical act of Christ at the Last Supper. Linked to this account, the so-called anamnesis functions as the liturgical presentation of the gifts and so expresses the community's intention to fulfil the command of Christ "Do this in memory of me." To this is added an epiclesis which appeals for the sanctification of the gifts (the Spirit epiclesis finds its counterpart in the Supplices te of the Roman Canon) in view of the sanctification of the communicants. Within this structure it seems clear that the epiclesis has a consecratory value.

M.'s presentation in chap. 7 should have included, in my opinion, a consideration of the internal structure of the sacramental rite from the viewpoint of the science of semiology. The notion of structure (= ordered unity of multiple elements) and system (= multiplicity of elements linked structurally in a totality), as understood in systems of communi-
cation, appears to offer the best model for understanding the internal structure of sacramental rites. From this perspective some elements constitute the framework of the structure itself; others fill it out. The function of each element determines whether it belongs to the framework or periphery. While particular elements are capable of polarizing the signification normally transmitted by the whole system, they do not retain their power to transmit the whole signification when located within the totality. Thus, even if one grants that the account of institution has a consecratory value within the structure of the traditional Eucharistic prayers, when it is linked with an epiclesis it does not transmit the whole of the signification. Where an element, such as an epiclesis, pertains to the very framework of the normal celebration, and consequently transmits sacramental signification, it both “signifies and causes” \(^{(sacramenta significando causant)}\). Under what theological presuppositions could the Church limit the function of such elements to “mere signification”? Thus this approach leads to the conclusion that, where the epiclesis is found, it cannot be considered a “parasite” \(=\) without an integrating function), nor only as an “integral rite” (in the sense of “merely signifying”), but must be judged a true sacramental word.

It seems to me that this investigation could have been improved if M. had paid more attention to the liturgy itself as a true \textit{locus theologicus} and to the internal structure of sacramental rites. Nevertheless, on the whole, this book is an important contribution to the epiclesis question.

\textit{University of Notre Dame} \quad \textit{Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.}

\begin{quotation}

The series of which this book is a part is the best clue as to its value: it contains twelve research articles on varying facets of inquiry about original sin in light of the available tools in our contemporary world, and an attempt to \textit{synthesize} the results of these studies into an integrated viewpoint, exclusively through the medium of “solidarity” and “collective responsibility” of the human race. The general tone of these articles is approvingly set forth in a preface by P. Delhaye, secretary of the International Theological Commission; but what is even more interesting is that we have published for the first time (to my knowledge) the successful results of an interdisciplinary approach to a specific religious question on the part of a group of university professors. It is their hope that the intended data of Scripture and tradition will be integrated with
the findings of modern anthropology. Thus the specific religious topic of original sin is related to the viewpoints of philosophy, law, biology, and the behavioral sciences (les sciences humaines) of psychology and sociology. The authors' concern is to avoid an overemphasis on strictly historical interpretations or relativizing reductions, as one does find in some current forms of biblicism; studies in positive theology are needed, but they too frequently run the risk of meaninglessness to contemporary man. What must be sought is a metahistorical horizon which would provide and reflect the significant context of humanity today; in their opinion, the interpersonal factor as the revealer of our destiny. This approach will allow us to understand and appreciate not only the mind of man, but also what is in his heart.

Furthermore, if one is to properly understand the diverse theological theories about original sin—most of which only give partial views of a complex reality—they must be subsequently grounded in an interpretation which places the focus of individual, personal concerns within the larger context of community. The fruits of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century rationalism have produced a contemporary situation whereby there is a too narrow perspective as to what constitutes actual (sinful?) defects in man. For example, we witness today the Freudian concern for certain subconscious complexes, or the Marxist critique of primitive appropriation of goods, or the behavioral sciences’ emphases on feelings of frustration and transgressions engendered by social pressures. With such focuses of attention mankind has become divorced from a proper sociohistorical overview; hence there is a definite need to raise humanity's historical consciousness, if one is to understand the roots of evil as a reality in the world today.

Moreover, limited appraisals of evil and sin only serve to perpetuate existing myths. When each person realistically sees himself as an intersubjective and communitarian being who refuses his condition—the verification of which is found in the horizontal dimensions of his existence (war, murder, egoism, etc.)—only then will the subjective, as meaningful, and objective, as historical, religious dimensions of a person's existence begin to be appreciated. It is in the Jewish and Christian concept of fundamental culpability that there is discovered an adequate diagnosis of the situation, insofar as we find the explanation for the manifold struggles of man at all levels of his being in the world; man is seen as refusing his creaturehood and, as a result, refuses to come to grips with the God-question in his life. The Genesis narrative is only the beginning of the betrayal; the other “fall” stories (Cain and Abel, Babel, the flood) confirm the basic biblical perspective of man in revolt. The full revelation of what the evil of man in sin is reaches its zenith in Jesus
Christ, who provides us with the needed contrast in his making known the universal paternity of God and the intentions of this same God, even in the face of man's solidarity in sin.

Such a vision as I have just portrayed is admirable, and I can only agree with the over-all direction. In fact, the authors have probably given us the best available picture of original sin today. In light of specific articles, I was impressed by L. Derousseaux's analysis of OT data, and his conclusion that the unique intention of Genesis is to portray the unity and freedom of humanity, not a historical Adam. Subsequently, it is by R. Jacob's analysis of St. Paul (especially Rom 5:12-21) that one begins to better understand a definite inherited-sin tradition, but this must be balanced by the Johannine notion of "sin of the world." The study of F. Frost on the contrast between the metaphysical nature model of the Augustinian-Tridentine tradition and its literal application to a psychological personal model by Luther provides significant historical data. The same can be said of R. Vancourt's study of original sin in the rationalistic and subjectivizing tendencies of Rousseau, Kant, and Hegel.

If my summary comments are thought-provoking, they only give some indication of a thoroughly consistent book. More profoundly, one is literally forced to reconsider his traditions, in order to see how God is the ultimate focus of contrast to the problem of evil; the perfectly plausible interdisciplinary arguments shed much needed light that will annoy only those who prefer their original sin in an isolated religious context.

There are some reservations, however, in what the authors have sacrificed in their attempt at "universalizing" the ramifications of original sin. Most notably, they have failed to indicate sufficiently the difference between horizontal and vertical relationships. If they had focused on the latter, they would possibly have come to a more convincing appreciation of the universality of original sin. Horizontal relationships (with the world and other persons) do not necessarily involve an all-pervasive sense of evil; it is only when one sees the universal rejection or difficulty in establishing a relationship with God (vertical relationship) that a universal "sin" in terms of an ontological condition can realistically be posited, and thus constitute a verification possibility in terms of personal meaning. In this light Z. Alszeghy and M. Flick have done a more convincing analysis (see "Il peccato originale in prospettiva personalistica," Gregorianum 46 [1965] 705-32).

Lastly, greater attention must be given to the subjective implications of contemporary philosophy. If Kant has left us with an inevitable heritage, could not original sin be more convincingly appreciated from the viewpoint of every person's epistemic distance? Perhaps more so than at any other time in its history, humanity is cognizant of the powers at its
disposal to transform both the self and the world. But at the same moment each of us faces the individual liability of indefinitely upholding cosmic growth. Is not this the realization and thrust of what the Scriptures speak of as creaturehood and the need for creative redemption?

St. Paul Seminary, Minn.

JEROME M. DITTBERNER


"God does not control His creatures; He graciously lets them be." This is the theme of M.'s nineteenth book of religious philosophy, which attempts to bring together John's "God is love" (for M., "the most exciting statement about God" to be found anywhere) and the insights of kenotic theology. According to the latter, God empties Himself of His divinity, not only in the Incarnation but also and primarily in creation; thus creation is, in the words of Simone Weil, "on God's part an act not of self-expansion but of restraint and renunciation." M. proceeds to reject or redefine traditional attributes of God in the light of His nature as self-sacrificial love. God cannot be impassible, for suffering and risk are inseparable from authentic love; God's sovereignty must consist in His capacity for "creative anguish." For M., power and love are fundamentally incompatible: "Love is the abdication of power." To call God omnipotent, therefore, can only mean that nothing diminishes His love.

Reviewing the history of the doctrine of the Trinity, M. concludes that it was chiefly a way of making "God is love" intelligible to people whose model of divinity was too narrow to admit such a notion. If today the doctrine tends to obscure rather than clarify this basic intuition, it is "otiose" and should be scrapped. Likewise, the traditional Christian model of the redemptive process is inadequate, because it does not recognize the sacrificial nature of creation. Kenosis is not a historical oddity or accident but "the root principle of Being." Or, as C. A. Dinsmore puts it, "there was a cross in the heart of God before there was one planted on the green hill outside of Jerusalem."

M. writes simply and well, his lucid style enlivened by comically-overdrawn examples and an occasional personal anecdote. His scholarship is catholic, ranging over the whole philosophical-religious tradition of the West. Some of the most interesting pages of the book are quotations from the notebooks of Simone Weil, whose vision of the self-emptying God has great affinity with M.'s own. Enthusiasm for that kenotic vision sometimes leads M. to make rather sweeping judgments, such as "self-expansion by no means ever brings us in any way closer to God" (p.
and "all exercise of power ... in human relations is intrinsically evil" (p. 181). Most thinkers, it has been said, are right in what they affirm, wrong only in what they deny. It seems a fitting commentary on M.'s work. Its great strength is his willingness to reorient the philosophic conception of God in the light of more personal and biblical categories, even at the risk of sounding anthropomorphic. He does not even seem especially concerned to answer the difficulties to which his own vision of a "powerless" and "passible" God gives rise. The major weakness of M.'s approach, as I see it, is that it discusses and argues about religious concepts without relating them to their origin in religious experience. Even the central text, the Johannine declaration that "God is love," is treated almost as if it were a text of Plato, or some ownerless fragment of religious wisdom. It is never examined in relation to the early Christian experience of the Spirit of the risen Jesus, of God present in the love of one's fellows, though this is surely what gives the words whatever meaning and authority they have.

A more explicit use of religious phenomenology might show, I suggest, that some of the attributes M. rejects as out of harmony with the God of love have an experiential meaning quite different from the one he presupposes. The power of God as experienced in the act of worship, for instance, has little to do with power politics. Even the Trinity might turn out to be less "otiose" than he thinks. Making explicit the religious awareness which is the implicit source of M.'s own judgments might resolve some of the difficulties, while remaining faithful to the fundamental intention, of this valuable and provocative book.

University of Detroit

JUSTIN J. KELLY, S.J.
translations), the Humanist position (modification of the Latin text according to clear philological principles; in favor of vernacular), the Reformation position (utilize Humanist philological accomplishments for the grand ideal of the Volksbibel).

H.’s central concern is the Humanist position, as this is exemplified and practiced by Erasmus and More. Generous attention is given to Erasmus’ controversies and achievements, as well as to the degree of his dependence upon Lorenzo Valla. Nonetheless, More in the end holds central stage. By examining in detail More’s polemic with Tyndale, H. is able to illustrate the principles of “Humanist philology” enunciated by Valla and Erasmus. He is also able to answer the question, whether More’s criticism of Tyndale was justified by Humanist principles or was it the tendentious attack of a hunter of heretics. The question of More’s consistency with his avowed Humanist principles has often been raised and often enough answered in the negative. James Mozley’s defence of the philological soundness of Tyndale’s translation against the attacks of More has in many circles carried the day since Mozley’s biography of Tyndale was first published in 1937. The conclusion is obvious: More was inconsistent in attacking Tyndale and in not attacking his friend Erasmus, upon whom Tyndale was at least in part dependent.

Perhaps the most interesting and telling section is H.’s detailed study of More’s criticism of Tyndale. To some extent the book climaxes in that particular chapter (10). H. examines with great care three specific instances of Tyndale’s work as attacked by More: the substitution of “elder” for “priest,” of “congregation” for “church,” of “love” for “charity.” The service H. performs for us is to carry the examination back to Valla. Only then does he move to Erasmus, and thence to More. I know of no other instance where such an examination has been carried out so thoroughly and systematically. “Humanistic method” is thus pinned down and seen operative in three major figures. H.’s study should settle once for all the question of More’s “consistency” or “inconsistency” with Humanistic philology.

What is H.’s conclusion? More was consistent, and he was correct in seeing that in the critical instances Tyndale’s translation violated Humanist principles and derived from a Lutheran theological position. H.’s exposition of the Humanist principles and his demonstration of More’s consistency in this critical question seem to me to be the major achievements of this fine study. H. is not unaware of the limitations of Erasmus and More—the Humanist position—amid the turbulence of the Reformation controversies. They were distracted by their battles with the traditionalists and blind to the values of the Reformers. On the other hand, he shows that they did advocate the vernacular Bible in an
atmosphere in which it was difficult for moderate positions to find a hearing.

*University of Detroit*  

**JOHN W. O’MALLEY, S.J.**


This *Festschrift* is one of several currently being published to honor Paul Oskar Kristeller, and that fact alone should suggest the unique position he enjoys in Renaissance studies. Among the various aspects of the broad field which Kristeller’s scholarship has influenced, the relationship of Renaissance learning to ancient and medieval philosophy, with its implications for theology, is perhaps the most pertinent for readers of this journal. I shall, therefore, concentrate upon this aspect of the contributions to the *Festschrift*. The “notoriously difficult” task of reviewing *Festschriften* is rendered somewhat easier in the case of *Itinerarium Italicum* by the decision of the editors to focus on a single theme: “various forms of the dissemination of the Italian Renaissance” (p. xv). The task is also made easier by the decision to limit the number of contributions to six, each by a distinguished senior scholar, in a volume of almost five hundred pages.

To speak of the “dissemination” of the Renaissance is perforce to speak of Erasmus, the single name which most insistently recurs throughout the volume. Myron Gilmore’s “Italian Reactions to Erasmian Humanism” deals in turn with the problem of Erasmus vilified as the precursor of Luther, his impact upon the Counter Reformation, and then his relationship to the “Evangelicals and Radicals.” Underneath the overt negative reaction to Erasmus in the Counter Reformation, Gilmore indicates areas in which his influence perdured. G.’s study judiciously suggests that that influence was far stronger than is commonly thought, and he again raises the intriguing question about the relationship of Erasmus to the early Jesuits and to St. Ignatius himself. Needless to say, Joseph IJsewijn [sic] in his “The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries” also deals directly and indirectly with the problem of Erasmus as he tries to recreate the cultural milieu which somehow sparked Erasmus’ enthusiasm for the *Studia humanitatis*. What is especially distinctive about IJsewijn’s contribution is the sheer bulk of data he presents, including a valuable bibliography. His distinction between the time-honored term “Christian Humanism” and his own “humanist Christianity” is intriguing and deserves study and discussion. I feel he slips on occasion into an overly sharp contrast between the
degree northern Humanism was involved with Scholasticism and theology and the degree Italian Humanism was not (e.g., pp. 276–277), but there is validity in the point he makes.

The three contributions by Sam Dresden, Denys Hay, and Lewis W. Spitz deal with the "reception" of the Italian Renaissance in France, England, and Germany respectively. The ground these contributions cover is more familiar than that covered by IJsewijn, but this does not necessarily make the undertaking any easier. Not surprisingly, Spitz's "The Course of German Humanism" confronts the religious and theological issues at greater length than do the other two, due to the peculiar impact of the Reformation on Germany. S. insists on the vast materials which still need study. For me, a confirmation of S.'s judgment is the fact that, despite the Reformation's special concern for proclamation of the word of God from the pulpit, S. has to dismiss the question of the relationship of the new classical rhetoric to preaching in one brief paragraph (p. 419). In any case, these three contributions, like those of Gilmore and IJsewijn, are characterized by a fine comprehension of the issues involved and by comprehensiveness in trying to deal with them. The labor enjoined upon the authors suggested at least something of a Forschungsbericht (p. xvi), and the contributions can be read with profit as such. However, the mature and independent scholarship of the authors lifts these studies to a far more important level.

Though William J. Bouwsma's study is the first to appear in the book, I have reserved mention of it to the last because of the high plane of generalization on which it moves and because of the special interest it will have for many readers of this journal. "The Two Faces of Humanism: Stoicism and Augustinianism in Renaissance Thought" is an essay of provocative significance for Christian theology. Scholars familiar with the data Bouwsma analyzes will understand and appreciate the ambivalences and inconsistencies he contrasts under the terms "Stoicism" and "Augustinianism." He has exposed a problematic which throws considerable light on the Renaissance and which helps explain the antagonism between the Reformation and the Counter Reformation independently of the specific dogmas over which the battle seemingly raged.

University of Detroit

JOHN W. O'MALLEY, S.J.


The value of bibliographies for scholarly research is beyond doubt; every scholar must use them, but few have the patience to painstakingly pursue references to compile his own. K.'s bibliography, therefore, will
not only be greatly appreciated, but will certainly be put to good use. He covers a fifteen-year period and continues the work of his predecessors. A. Erichson was first in publishing his *Bibliographia Calviniana*, which ended with 1900. Then came W. Niesel and his *Calvin-Bibliographie 1905–1959*; then this reviewer followed with his “Calvin Bibliography 1960–1970” in the *Calvin Theological Journal*, and for the past few years Peter De Klerk has been publishing an annual bibliography (1972, 1973, and 1974) in the same journal, and will continue to do so. K. is familiar with his immediate predecessors and has made good use of them.

Even though K. set the years 1959–74 as his area, nevertheless, he felt the need to include items written between 1901–59 but not in Niesel’s listing. K.’s entries include works by Calvin, on Calvin and Calvinism. But it does not stop there. The reader will also find entries on contemporary Reformers, e.g., Beza, Bucer, Farel, Knox, à Lasco, etc., but Luther and Zwingli are understandably omitted. When there is a connection between Calvin and another Reformer, such an item is found under the heading “Luther and Other Reformers.”

Unfortunately, K. has not assigned numbers to his entries, his reason being to facilitate future additions (p. 14). Bibliographies should be designed to give their users the maximum of information in the least amount of time, and not to make a compiler’s task easier. The only index in the book is of authors; a subject index in such a work would not be a desideratum but a *sine qua non*. As the arrangement now stands, in order to find out if there is anything on Calvin and the antitrinitarian Blandrata, the searcher must go to the “Table of Contents” and divine under which heading Blandrata may possibly appear. Perhaps under “Opponents,” but those thirteen columns yield nothing. Back to the “Table of Contents,” perhaps under “Italy and Spain,” but the result is again negative; this time perhaps under “Eastern Europe” and again nothing. Is there anything about Blandrata in the bibliography? A subject index would have given the answer in three seconds.

In addition, there are many misspellings, but these may be printer’s errors and the result of poor proofreading. But it is somewhat irksome to find a misplaced entry: e.g., Burnotte’s article “La pensée mariale de Jean Calvin” is included under “Ethical Matters” (p. 73). One would have expected to find it with the other items on the Virgin Mary, but to find these you must look under “Roman Catholic Church.” Also, at times the data is insufficient, as in the case of Divita’s article on Calvin’s visit to Italy (p. 27); the number of the fascicle of the *Italian Quarterly* in which the article appeared should have been included, since the fascicles in a given year do not have consecutive pagination.

Though inconvenience may be encountered in the use of K.’s bibliography, he has provided an indispensable instrument for research. Those
desiring to keep abreast of current literature on Calvin should consult the annual bibliography in the *Calvin Theological Journal*.

Washington, D.C.  

JOSEPH N. TYLENDA, S.J.


Wolfgang Capito (1478–1541) studied literature and theology at Ingolstadt, Basel, and Freiburg, but first made his reputation as a leading Hebraist. From 1515 to 1520 he served as cathedral preacher and professor of theology at Basel. During these years he corresponded with Erasmus, but like many younger Humanists he found himself torn between the old reform ideas of Erasmus and the new theology of Luther. During the next three years he used his position as advisor to Archbishop Albert of Mainz to hinder legal measures against Luther. He then moved to Strasbourg, where he continued to preach, teach, and write until his death. Gradually he was overshadowed by the more energetic Martin Bucer, but Capito remained the coarchitect of the distinctive approach which made Strasbourg a center of Protestant thought and practice. In all, Capito published some thirty works, mostly occasional pieces, but including a catechism and commentaries on Habakkuk, Hosea, and Genesis. He had few original ideas: his mature theology generally follows Luther but retains echoes of Erasmus.

Although monographs have dealt with aspects of Capito’s life and work, this revision of K.’s Stanford dissertation is the first full biography in over a century. Separate chapters cover his early training and the periods at Basel and Mainz. K. divides the Strasbourg years into five topical chapters. In the first he argues against Paul Kalkoff that C.’s full conversion to Luther’s theology did not take place until 1524, when he had settled in Strasbourg and married into a leading family. K. then traces C.’s long campaign to pressure the city senate into establishing Protestantism and outlawing the Mass. Throughout, C. worked against violence and popular action and insisted on the power of the government to reform religion. Next K. treats the unsuccessful efforts of Bucer and C. to mediate differences between Luther and Zwingli and their respective followers over the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. C. had doubted the Real Presence as early as 1512; he gradually developed views parallel to Zwingli’s, but his irenic temper led him to co-operate with Bucer in searching for an ambiguous formula which all Protestants could accept. C.’s best side appears in a chapter on his relations with the radical sectarians who sought refuge in Strasbourg. He long opposed Bucer’s efforts to expel the radicals; he was not sympathetic with their ideas but
respected their integrity and worked for their conversion. In principle he was opposed to the use of force in religion and for several years supported religious toleration, but gradually he came to see the radicals as subversive of the state's control of religion, so that after 1532 he supported Bucer and expulsion. The final chapter, perhaps the best, examines C.'s work as lecturer, his ideas on education, and his exegetical method.

K. accepts the widely-held thesis that the conversion of the younger generation of Humanists was crucial to the success of the Reformation. While admitting that C. was neither a humanist nor a reformer of the first rank, K. sees in his career, which is particularly well documented, an outstanding case study of the movement from Humanism to Protestantism. The careful study of which elements in his Erasmian heritage C. retained and employed as a Protestant and which elements he had to discard or reshape provides the theme and major contribution of K.'s book.

Although there are few surprises for specialists, this study maintains the high level of scholarship expected from the series. On many points K. argues with previous writers and shows that C.'s contributions were greater than often thought. Aspects of his life previously neglected now receive their due. K. remains detached from his subject, even sharply critical on certain points: e.g., C.'s duplicity in seeking a Eucharistic agreement between Lutherans and the Swiss. The index is excellent for names but thin on subjects. There are several proofreading slips in the Latin footnotes. K. paints Erasmus as too skeptical about religious truth.

Marquette University


Every great religious upheaval stimulates eschatological speculation, and this is a side of the Protestant Reformation which has been generally neglected. Ball, an English officer in the Seventh Day Adventist Church, has traced this thread through English theological writings beginning at the time of Henry VIII but concentrating primarily on the high period of Puritan theology in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Taking up where earlier scholars such as Perez Zagorin and J. F. Wilson left off, Ball shows that millenarianism was by no means confined to well-known and rather bizarre manifestations such as the Fifth Monarchy Men, but to an extent was present in practically all Christian thought. He observes that the notion which has played so large a role in contemporary theology—that the kingdom is both present and yet to
come—would have been perfectly comprehensible to seventeenth-century minds.

In fact, eschatological expectations held by Anglican worthies on the one hand and rabid sectarians on the other shared more than they differed, based as both were on a combination of biblical literalism and personal reactions to the unsettling events of the time. (The overthrow of Charles I naturally stimulated eschatological speculation.) B. concludes that "eschatological expectation belonged more to orthodoxy than it did to heterodoxy." The more "moderate" millenarians simply refused to speculate too closely on the time and circumstances of the Second Coming (while thinking it to be near), whereas the most radical regarded themselves as agents of its hastening.

B. has confined himself largely to treatises and sermons, and his reiteration of eschatological themes becomes after a time rather tedious and dry, with the smell of the dissertation about it. There is not much offered in the way of social context to help understand how millenarian thought functioned and why it was popular. And although he makes use of several of the works of Christopher Hill, he does not use Hill's very interesting and highly relevant *The World Turned Upside Down*. Nonetheless, this is a competent, useful, and illuminating study of a subject that will have to be given its proper due in all future histories of the English Reformation.

*St. Louis University*  
JAMES HITCHCOCK


With the publication of this long-awaited ninth volume of the *Actes et documents du Saint Siège relatifs à la seconde guerre mondiale*, the Vatican offers for the first time documentary evidence bearing directly upon the charge that Pius XII must be held coresponsible for the Holocaust because of silence and inaction. The Nazis' systematic mass slaughter of the Jews did not begin until mid-1942 and was carried out in such secrecy that as late as August 1943 neither the Holy See nor the American government could confirm the persistent rumors of mass executions in gas chambers (cf. p. 274, n. 2). The postwar indictment of the Pope reached a climax in 1963 with the German play *The Deputy*. Its author, Rolf Hochhuth, deserves credit for compelling Vatican publication of the documents in this series decades before they could otherwise have been expected. The charges against Pius XII continue to be advanced, with variations, in a seemingly unending stream of publications up to the present.
In the United States especially it is widely assumed that the Pope's guilt has been established. Anti-Catholicism is still respectable in sections of the academic establishment in this country which are, by contrast, extremely sensitive to the slightest suggestion of anti-Semitism. And there is in the American mentality a deep-rooted strain (call it Puritanism, a lack of the tragic sense, or what you will) which insists on identifying heroes and villains in every situation, and refuses to acknowledge the possibility of tragedies so vast as to leave in their train only victims, all touched in some degree by a common guilt.

As in previous volumes of this series, we are given a selection only from the vast and apparently disorganized archives (the editors note that a number of important documents could not be found). An indication that evidence unfavorable to the Holy See has not been omitted is given by the inclusion of the prescient and outspoken letter from the Prefect of Pontifical Ceremonies to the Cardinal Secretary of State (no. 184). Anticipating by a full two decades elements of the postwar indictment of Pius XII, the writer pleads urgently that the Pope should go beyond diplomatic protests and letters to bishops and speak "two strong words" against atrocities of all kinds, warning of the "rising tide of hostility" because of the Pope's public silence and seeming inaction. If any response was made to this plea, there is no indication of it here.

To the urgent requests for practical assistance for Jews and others which poured into the Vatican from all over the world, a single reply was reiterated: the Holy See "has done, is doing, and will do everything possible" to aid the victims of war. Though these assurances can have given but small satisfaction to their often desperate recipients, there is ample evidence here that they were justified. Most of the documents record the Vatican's widespread and unremitting efforts to assist wartime sufferers of all kinds: prisoners of war (of all nations), hostages and others condemned to death, and Jews.

An absolute prerequisite for the success of these measures of practical help was precisely the public silence which distressed the Church's friends at the time and since, and which has formed the basis for postwar charges that Pius XII was indifferent to the fate of Jews and others. The Vatican was not alone in appreciating this grim necessity for silence. The papal representative in Switzerland reported that the International Red Cross in Geneva had also rejected all demands for a public protest, on the grounds that it would do no good and would be a grave disservice to the very people it was designed to help (cf. p. 133).

The impression conveyed by these documents is often that of harassed amateurs struggling desperately, with pitifully inadequate resources in personnel and money, against cruelly impossible odds. In fact, however, the number of victims who were aided, including those saved from death,
was remarkably high. That this did not go unappreciated at the time is shown by the many expressions of gratitude to the Pope from Jewish groups all over the world for his efforts to aid European Jewry amid the cataclysm. The Vatican's efforts to save Jews had the largest measure of success in the Nazi satellite states of eastern Europe, where appeals could be made either to Catholic government officials (including the President of Slovakia, Dr. Josef Tiso, himself a Catholic priest) or to the overwhelmingly Catholic faith of their people. With the Nazis themselves, on the other hand, there was no chance of success at all.

One searches in vain, however, for a wartime papal pronouncement as explicit and clear as the pastoral letter of the Dutch bishops of July 25, 1942, protesting against the Nazi deportation of Jews from that country which had started the month before. Pius XII sincerely believed that he had made such a protest, but neither at the time nor since were others able to perceive in the Pope's words, which he himself described as "brief, but well understood," the force with which they were invested in his own mind. (See the Pope's well-known letter of April 30, 1943 to Bishop von Preysing of Berlin, the fullest statement by the Pope of the reasons for his self-imposed wartime reserve, in B. Schneider, Die Briefe Pius XII. an die deutschen Bischöfe 1939–1944 [Mainz, 1966] no. 104.)

Any attempt to assess the probable result of a ringing public denunciation of wartime crimes by the Pope must take into account the known result of the July 1942 protest of the Dutch hierarchy referred to above. Far from checking the persecution, the bishops' letter intensified it. The Nazis responded by canceling the immunity previously given, at the request of the Church authorities, to Catholic Jews, who were immediately sent to join the other victims in Auschwitz (cf. p. 288, N. 3). Much of the postwar indictment of Pius XII is based upon the assumption that a papal protest would have succeeded where that of the Dutch bishops so disastrously failed. There is no evidence to support this assumption, however, and most of the evidence there is clearly subverts it.

After six months of research in the Jewish Holocaust archives at Yad Vashem, Jerusalem, Prof. Pinchas E. Lapide of the Hebrew University there estimated in his book The Last Three Popes and the Jews (1967), which is by no means uncritical of the papacy, that the secret Vatican diplomacy of which this volume contains abundant evidence had saved 860,000 Jews from death. He reports further that, at the time, the leaders of world Jewry were virtually unanimous in supporting the Pope's policy of public reserve, lest he jeopardize all hope of saving those who could still be rescued. In a statement to this reviewer, with permission for citation, at the International Conference on the Holocaust at Ham-
burg in June 1975, Prof. Lapide expressed his belief that "if the leaders of other churches had done what Pius XII did, several hundred thousand more Jews might have survived the war."

In the face of six million dead, not even the Church's most ardent apologist would wish to claim that enough was done. This volume shows clearly, however, that to claim that nothing was done, or that efforts to help the victims of war were feeble or perfunctory, is a grave falsification of history.

St. Louis University

JOHN JAY HUGHES


This book is an investigation of the Christian approach to ethics in the first four centuries A.D. It is written with certain key elements of twentieth-century ethics in mind: (a) the new seriousness in ethical studies today; (b) the wider recognition of the complexity and diversity of ethical problems; (c) the importance of pattern, myth, and picture in giving coherence and vitality to ethical directions; (d) the rejection of Christian claims to intelligibility. The author's aim is to reassess early Christian ethics in the hope of making a contribution to current discussion of ethical problems. O. first explores the particular features of Platonic, Aristotelian, and Stoic concepts which influenced Christian thinkers in the early centuries: virtue, natural order, reason, freedom, the individual, education, and final goal. He acknowledges Israel's crucial contribution to ethical thought: the recognition of a personal God and of the law which prescribes duties to one's God and to one's neighbor as to a brother. O. borrows his method from the third trait of contemporary ethics, in the conviction that "important moral values are visions, inspirations or powers which are to be explored rather than analyzed" (p. 3). His study is a search for the "patterns or pictures which persist through the first centuries of Christianity and which have two continuing characteristics: a respect for the contingent and an awareness of perfection" (p. 5). In the NT and in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, Basil of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, and Augustine, O. discovers four significant "patterns" and a tension between ideals and performance.

The four main patterns are righteousness (or justice), discipleship, faith, and love. While they are ethical discourses, the NT writings provide "perspectives, patterns and priorities" (in ethics as well as in doctrine) which form the Christian mind and equip it for the task of examining current ethical issues. Following the interpretation of Käse-
mann, O. outlines the four patterns and shows how the NT warns against distortion by legalism or by enthusiasm.

Righteousness is the power by which God forgives, vindicates, and saves mankind. The archetypes of righteousness are men such as Noah, Abraham, and especially Jesus, who follow the path or way of justice without swerving to right or left, and who use an honest balance in giving each man his due. Righteousness can be distorted if it hardens into a system of laws. Discipleship means following Christ. It does not mean slavish imitation, but intimate communion with Christ. It means the effort to express in new and changing situations the spirit, attitudes, and teaching of Jesus. The followers of Jesus are obedient soldiers, athletes who strain to cross the finish line, and the flock who follow at the heels of the shepherd. Discipleship suffers distortion from undirected asceticism or from triumphalism. Faith is acceptance of Christ as Lord, dependence on the word of God, and life lived under grace. The man of faith is a released slave who enjoys new freedom as son of God, yet who remains a pilgrim on the way or an athlete striving against the pressures of competition. Men of faith are gifted with active charismata which spread the power of Christ, liberating the world from the cosmic and cultural forces which enslave the world. Faith is distorted when a series of propositions replaces the living person of Christ or when freedom dissolves in license.

Each pattern carries with it at least one problem. Righteousness raises the question of natural law; discipleship, the problem of imitation and the Jesus of history; faith, the legitimacy of non-Christian ethics in a Christian ethic; love, the problem of situation ethics. O. points out the ways in which the study of the ethics of the Fathers can illuminate modern problems.

Despite their different historical settings and their strong personal idiosyncracies, there is a surprising continuity in the thought of Clement, Basil, Chrysostom, and Augustine—enough, O. concludes after a close reading of their writings, to warrant speaking of Christian morality as an identifiable phenomenon. How do these Fathers develop each of the NT "patterns"? They stress order and natural law more than the Pauline mystery of the righteousness of God. They insist on the dominating role of discipleship, the exacting demands of which are coupled with an intensely personal communion with Christ. They are prone to link faith with knowledge at the same time that they underscore man's dependence on the mercy of God. For them, "faith is absolute freedom and absolute dependence" (p. 215). Finally, they view love as the crown of the Christian life. Love grows more communal as it becomes more mystical in its fervent commitment to Christ.

O. indicates that each of the patterns had points where it was a threat
to authentic Christian living, but that each had “built-in correctives” (p. 218). Ultimately, the four patterns were based (as they must be) on a theology of hope and a theology of the cross.

All in all, O.’s work is impressive—a significant contribution to the history of ethical thought and, one hopes, to the ongoing discussion of current ethical issues.

*Lancaster Theological Seminary, Pa.*

**William J. Walsh, S.J.**


Since the publication of his *Law of Christ*, Häring has been viewed as a precedent-setting Roman Catholic theologian who ventures into uncharted and inviolable areas to make prophetic statements and incisive ethical analyses about major ethical questions. His latest book is in the same genre. Here H. approaches the current bioethical debate about the deliberate intervention into the biological and psychological processes of man with all his skill as a theological ethicist and his sensitivity as a human being.

H. addresses his book “not only [to] moralists, members of the medical profession and scientists.... [but also to] all people committed to education in the Church and in the secular world, all legislators, and all mature persons who want to participate in the process of making decisions and arousing consciences about these fundamental questions that lie ahead of us and are already to be faced.” One of the fundamental questions H. discusses underlies all attempts to influence the direction of human existence and is dramatically evident in the biomedical procedures currently followed and those being contemplated: manipulation. H. is very concerned that his readers become sensitized to the ethics of manipulation, i.e., the search for specific norms which will preserve and foster only that type of manipulation which leads to “acceptable or beneficial planned change of nature” and which will prevent the violation of the “inner core” of the human person by subjecting him to “spurious or insidious influences in the use of his freedom and his search for final meaning.”

The book has five sections. The introductory chapter is devoted to showing the relevancy of the problem to the technological world of today as well as providing an etymological definition and an ethical analysis of the word “manipulation.” H. shows the ambivalence and the ambiguity in the use and understanding of the word. He distinguishes various types of manipulation, e.g., “therapeutic,” “conscious and unconscious manipulation.” He also very briefly indicates (p. 11) the complexity of ethical evaluation and outlines his ethical methodology. Chap. 1 is a
description of “the various areas and forms of manipulation outside the medical and biological fields, [especially] those that can interfere with people’s free and full development and total health.” Here manipulation in education, public opinion, advertising, economy, authority, environment, ideology, polling, etc. is discussed. Chap. 2 is concerned with discovering the “criteria for discerning and evaluating the meaning of manipulation.” In this major ethical portion three topics are discussed at length: (1) objective criteria: what is man meant to be and to become? Here H. analyzes the humanness of human nature, personhood vs. object, the one-dimensional man, conditions of freedom and its growth, awareness of sin, the static and dynamic view of human nature, futurology and eschatology, man’s stewardship over nature, the value and limits of a teleological approach to ethical evaluation, and theological and teleological intentionality. (2) The discriminating person. (3) Who controls the manipulator? Chap. 3 studies “manipulation in the field of medicine, especially the medicine of the future.” H. applies the ethical criteria developed in the previous chapters to four issues: (1) current medical practice, (2) behavior modification, (3) brain research, (4) genetics. In each of the above areas H. touches almost every pertinent ethical aspect of almost every biomedical procedure, current and projected. The concluding chapter summarizes H.’s religious-ethical position on manipulation and reflects the prophetic and ground-breaking aspects of this book.

The book is meticulously researched, with a plethora of quotations from contemporary authors. It is extremely helpful in focusing the reader’s attention on the ethical question of manipulation and provides a real service by analyzing the concept of manipulation. It is also a balanced book, i.e., H.’s analysis always attempts to discern the good and evil aspects of the question. However, it has some shortcomings which reflect the still fluid state of bioethics as a discipline and the ground-breaking aspects of H.’s book. At times H. takes a moralistic tone by condemning certain practices: e.g., “I reject the mechanistic vision of behaviour management; yet I believe thoroughly in the need for behaviour therapy as one of humanity’s greatest tasks” (p.122). H. discusses a vast number of topics and thus does not give more than a superficial treatment of some. The presentation of the scientific data reflects H.’s professional strengths and limitations. The ethical questions are brought out very well, but the technical procedures are not clearly presented. Finally, the most important observation is that H.’s attempt to identify the normatively human and apply this to the question of manipulation is less than satisfactory. As James Gustafson remarked, it is easier to identify what is not normatively human than it is to identify what is normatively human. H. has begun the arduous process of
identifying the normatively human in the question of manipulation. Although his principles are not totally satisfactory at this time, he has once again broken the ground and given the challenge to ethicists to pursue the question until the normative can be positively identified and man can wisely utilize the developing knowledge and technique of biomedical intervention into man’s existence.

John Carroll University, Cleveland

GEORGE A. KANOTI


In the past few years the author of this major study on the Byzantine liturgy has already published several learned articles connected particularly with the Offertory and its role in the theology and practice of the Eucharistic prayer. The book under review is a synthetic work divided into two almost equal parts: (1) “The Entrance of the Mysteries” (pp. 3–275), (2) “The Accessus ad Altare” (pp. 279–425). It also includes an Appendix with the Greek original of the Byzantine “Offertory” and rich information on the manuscript tradition of Chrysostom’s liturgy, as well as a bibliography and an index.

The first part reaches the conclusion (p. 273) that, in the Byzantine liturgy until the seventh century, “there was no [Offertory] prayer at all,” and therefore nothing of what is presently being symbolized by the “Great Entrance,” the “Cherubic hymn,” or the proskomidê at the beginning of the liturgy: bread and wine were brought by the deacons to the celebrant, who then, after the Creed, proceeded immediately with the real “offering,” i.e. the anaphora itself.

The second part describes the gradual development, throughout the Middle Ages, of the preanaphoral rites, which replaced the primitive, simple prayer on the accessus ad altare, identical or similar to the present prayer of the proskomidê at the beginning of the liturgy.

Developing the method of his teacher and mentor J. Mateos, S.J., Taft finally makes some suggestions for “modest changes” in the presently accepted order of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom. The goal and limits of the intended changes consist in restoring the rites “to what they always intended to be” (p. 428).

We shall not discuss here concrete problems of liturgical reform, which, as T. himself recognizes, involve “pastoral” considerations as well as the knowledge of the historical past. We shall only suggest that all liturgical changes involve also a real appreciation for the place occupied by the liturgy in the actual life of the Church: it is easier to reform the
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Liturgy when it is seen as an external "rite" only, than when it is lived by the congregation as the very expression of its faith. The latter situation is still very much a reality among Orthodox Christians; it makes liturgical reform difficult in practice, if not in theory, but, in a sense, even more imperative.

Actually, T.'s book is anything but another manifesto in favor of "updating" the liturgy: it is a scholarly historical investigation making full use of the evidence, as preserved in the ancient manuscripts, beginning with the oldest (the famous Barberini 336, 8th c.), in the patristic commentaries, beginning with that of Maximus the Confessor (7th c.), and with an abundance of other literary sources. Secondary literature is also profusely quoted, including the very valuable results of Russian prerevolutionary scholarship in the field of Byzantine liturgy. Following the recent pioneering works of J. Mateos, R. Bornaert, F. Van de Paverd, Th. Mathews, and others—which, in the last decade, have tremendously increased our knowledge of the Byzantine liturgy, as well as of its interpretation by contemporaries—T.'s work will remain an indispensable basis for any further research on the subject.

One can only hope that those who are responsible for the preservation of the Byzantine liturgical tradition as a living vehicle of Church tradition—particularly in the Orthodox Church—will be guided by the evidence of such books as Taft's, as an antidote against frozen conservatism, against irrational romanticism of "Eastern mysticism," as well as against the irresponsible and lightheaded improvisations, which have recently done so much harm to meaningful worship among Western Christians.

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

**JOHN MEYENDORFF**


This book is important. It consists of papers delivered at a symposium sponsored by the Murphy Center for Liturgical Research at the University of Notre Dame. An introductory essay by Aidan Kavanagh points out that the current questions about the age of confirmation, the catechesis of children, the age for first confession, and other issues are tactical rather than strategic questions. At stake today are profounder questions about what it means to be a disciple of Christ, what the Church as a community of disciples is, and how to initiate people into that community.

In a series of papers, Reginald Fuller, Robert Grant, Nathan Mitchell,
Leonel Mitchell, and Daniel Stevick record and learn from the history of Christian initiation from NT times to the present. By competent scholars, these papers are well done. They embrace both the Roman Catholic and Protestant traditions; more about the Orthodox tradition would have been valuable. Kavanagh then describes the new *Ordo initiationis christianorum adultorum* and its implications. Ralph Kiefer spells out the challenges which this new rite presents for the renewal of the Church and Christian life. Finally, Robert Hovda draws from all the papers practical implications for the future.

The thrust of these papers is that Christians are made, not born. The Church has adapted its process of introducing people into its life according to the needs of various times and places. Baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist are not identical with Christian initiation but are sacraments of that initiation. Christian initiation is a much more extensive phenomenon than the sacraments, and these make sense only in the total process of "making a Christian." That process involves a catechumenate, which is not religious education, an informing of the mind, but rather experience which is transformative of a person. Such an initiation calls for a church which is a concrete community of believers, distinct from the culture around them, sharing a common life and common faith. These conceptions are not the speculations of liturgists but the content and implications of the new Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults.

The importance of this book is not that it provides liturgical specialists with new information or insights, but that it enables specialists in other fields of theology and the educated public at large to see where liturgical experts have arrived as a result of decades of research and more than a decade of reform of rites and attempts to renew the spirit of liturgical worship. Liturgical scholars are beyond ferreting out how Christians worshiped in the past and how we came to be where we are today. They are beyond revising rites, even beyond the spirit which should animate worship. They are concerned about the bases of the sacraments and other rites, i.e., about the Church and Christian life, what these are and must be according to the gospel.

The book is important also because it makes the claim that the new Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults contains a vision of the Church and Christian life as they should be. That rite is therefore normative for the activities of Church and Christian. Such a claim should attract the attention of many people besides liturgists and sacramental theologians. It is significant for ecclesiologists, catechists, religious educators, ecumenists, charismatics, pastors, anyone involved in the life and mission of the Church.
The most challenging paper in the collection is Kiefer's "Christian Initiation: The State of the Question." K. draws out the implications of the new rite for the Church and Christians in our American experience. He claims the revised rite "represents a radical change of sacramental symbols and priorities...a departure in pastoral priorities and perspectives, a departure so radical that it has been unparalleled since the middle ages and well before" (pp. 138-39). One may take issue with K.'s assessment of what has been, is, and needs to be; but his essay makes it clear that liturgical reform and renewal have brought us to deep questions which must be faced.

K. looks to what needs to be done, and so does Robert Hovda in the final essay, "Hope for the Future: A Summary." But I laid down the book with a big question: How do we get from where we are to where this book says we should be? How do we move Christians and the Church in the direction of the vision sketched in these pages? The enormity of the gap to be closed makes me wonder if our liturgical methodology is too visionary, too little grounded in the facts of life such as the sociologist would provide. Perhaps the realities of worship, Christian life, and Church appear pretty shabby alongside visions we have of what they could be; but perhaps there is a depth, solidity, and beauty in them, besides the reality they are, which we fail to appreciate because so absorbed in our visions.

Aquinas Institute of Theology, Dubuque

CHRISTOPHER KIESLING, O.P.


There is a growing body of publication surrounding the Catholic charismatic renewal. A great deal of it fails to transcend the level of personal witness or of journalistic reporting. But with the increased involvement of professional theologians in what is, after all, a movement of popular piety, serious attempts are beginning to be made to address the speculative issues which the movement raises. For the charismatic renewal has in many places "growed like Topsey," without the benefit of adequate theological or pastoral leadership. There are in charismatic communities manifest signs of life and of grace; but individuals in the movement have on occasion had an influence which far exceeded their competence.

Perspectives on Charismatic Renewal is a welcome addition to the growing body of literature which seeks to bring serious theological
reflection to bear on charismatic forms of piety. It promises to be the first of a series of such volumes. It focuses largely on historical antecedents to the most recent revival of charismatic forms of prayer. Carroll Stuhlmueller provides a brief but lucid discussion of ecstatic and classical prophecy in ancient Israel. Anton-Hermann Croust discusses the sociocultural forces in Greco-Roman society which would have fostered openness to charismatic forms of prayer in the Gentile Church. Jean Laporte offers a rich culling of patristic insights into the charismatic action of the Holy Spirit. Louis Bouyer reflects on a select number of impulses in the development of Christian devotion which, he argues, could be legitimately called "charismatic": martyrdom, early monasticism, medieval mysticism, Quietism, and Jansenism. Many of those in the renewal may be uneasy at being included in such a list, although Bouyer’s chief point is to legitimize charismatic forms of piety which submit to ecclesial discernment and pastoral regulation. Edward O’Connor attempts a comparative study of charismatic prayer and mystical experience. James Kritzeck suggests a parallel between the place of charismatic piety within Christian faith and the place occupied by Sufism in the piety of Islam. The book concludes with an updated bibliography on charismatic renewal originally published in O’Connor’s The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church.

While all the essays are of good theological quality and invite serious theological reflection, not all will be equally helpful to those who are trying to give enlightened pastoral guidance to the charismatic renewal. The most pastorally helpful efforts in the present collection will, I believe, be those of Stuhlmueller, Laporte, and O’Connor.

No one can doubt that theological scholarship has the capacity to cast important light on the meaning of charismatic prayer and its place in authentic Christian faith. But theology will be likely to succeed in that enterprise to the extent that it approaches the experience of charismatic prayer from within. While this collection of essays is correct to cite historical parallels and precedents which cast light on the present charismatic impulse in the Church, it skirts discussion of the concrete historical antecedents of today’s charismatic piety in revivalism, classical Pentecostalism, and American Catholicism. It also eschews specific negative criticisms of the present movement, perhaps in the hope of wooing religious intellectuals from irrational attitudes of suspicion and hostility or from stereotyped images of contemporary charismatics. Both omissions seem to me regrettable. Most theologians are willing to concede the place and importance of charismatic impulses in the Church, though many are more willing to concede them in theory than in practice. What troubles contemporary reflective Christians, sometimes legitimately, are signs of fundamentalistic and authoritarian tendencies
in the present movement; for while such tendencies are not universal, they are common enough to be unsettling and to feed the anticharismatic prejudices of authoritarian or rationalistic Catholics. The fundamentalistic tendencies in the present movement would seem to have their roots in Protestant Pentecostalism; the authoritarian tendencies, in a residue of pre-Vatican II Catholicism. Sexism seems to be the common cultural bias of charismatic and noncharismatic alike.

_Perspectives_ is, then, an important and welcome theological contribution to serious scholarly reflection on the Catholic charismatic renewal. It embodies a serious effort to transcend banal and stereotyped thinking about charismatic forms of prayer. It deserves to be widely read and discussed and should encourage theologians to take their pastoral responsibilities to a major movement in the Church more seriously. Its generally high quality augurs well for the series it initiates. One would hope, however, that subsequent volumes in the series will attempt to focus scholarly attention on a critical reassessment of manifest inadequacies in present forms of charismatic piety. Such critical evaluation should arise from within the movement, at least ideally; for it is sympathetic critique that will finally establish the charismatic renewal on sound doctrinal and pastoral foundations.

Finally, after seven years of involvement with prayer communities in New Orleans and in the Bay area, I may perhaps be allowed a mild fraternal protest at being characterized in the bibliography as a scholar who has not sustained personal involvement in the renewal. If the attempt to theologize about the renewal comes to be taken automatically as a sign of noninvolvement, we are in a bad way indeed.

_Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley_  
DONALD GELPI, S.J.


The author draws on his pastoral experience more heavily than on his academic background. He represents ably an ecclesial and political tradition within the American Catholic Church. The strengths of both the book and position reside in the simplicity of faith in the gospel message and the support which the community of faith has brought and can bring to the aid of the poor and the alleviation of their condition.

K. recounts briefly the contributions which the American Church has made to social justice through its ecclesiastical and lay leadership in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He argues that these contributions have been based upon the doctrines set forth in the social encyclicals. In his view, these documents together with the gospel remain a valid foundation for the Catholic position in the future. They discourage the
Catholic from seeking "false social gods" in Marxism, liberalism, unionism, or any other movements. They encourage the Catholic to seek first the kingdom of God, with the conviction that necessary realistic social and personal change must flow from this seeking. They encourage the laity to act on its own within its own acquired positions in the secular structure. Further, they respect the fundamental personal dignity of the poor. In theory, the social encyclicals hold in creative tension the transcendent destiny of man and his earthly quest for dignity and justice. K. shows that this tension has been creative in the lives and movements of Christians in the recent past.

The fundamental weakness of the book is that it is uneven in its style, fluctuating between the personal and the scholarly. K. falls into the perennial trap of the polemicist by criticizing broadly outlined positions he disagrees with, while offering no detailed analysis nor even identifying those who hold such positions. In recounting the contributions of the American Catholic Church to the social justice movement, he correctly lavishes praise on significant individuals. The question still remains whether the current disagreements on ethical and political issues within the Church are due simply to failure of nerve, lack of obedience, and other changes that have occurred within the Church, or whether they are not due to a greater extent to changes in the larger society itself.

Perhaps the major weakness of the book is this failure to distinguish adequately among his own personal convictions, scholarly analysis, and popular recounting of the history of the Catholic social movements. Consequently, one is left with the impression of valuable insights inadequately developed, solid proposals not sufficiently substantiated—in short, a book intended to be a consolation and a challenge but not quite succeeding in either intent. Nevertheless, it is my opinion that the book is worth the reading of the serious theologian concerned with political and social ethics, as well as the professional chancery official and social activist. K. himself is met in this book, and we are certainly in the presence of a man with a fine mind, a wealth of experience, and a dedication to the Catholic tradition. The meeting with such a person is bound to be beneficial.

Belmont Abbey College

Jerome R. Dollard, O.S.B.


When a theologian the stature of Baum absents himself from his ordinary professional duties for two years in order to return to school, others ought to at least notice what enticed him, especially when the material he studied was nontheological. What he did was immerse
himself in the two-century-old discipline of sociology. He recognized that theology always possessed an interdisciplinary side, but only philosophy was chosen as the kindred discipline. B. argues here quite convincingly that today the dialogue partner ought to be sociology. The product of his lengthy sabbatical is *Religion and Alienation*. Its subtitle is significant: *A Theological Reading of Sociology*. B. consciously wears the hat of a theologian, but he would hold that the garb is his ticket into a pervasive reading about human society, because there is to be found matter for theological discussion. Remember B.’s Blondelian conversion in his *Man Becoming*. In *Religion and Alienation* he exposes analysis of seminal sociologists the likes of Weber, Durkheim, Toennies, Marx, Manheim, et al. so as to draw them into dialogue with major movements in contemporary theology, particularly over the issue of an adequate hermeneutic for grasping and expressing authentic Christianity today. What results is an almost passionate appeal for a revision of sensitivity, both of theologians and churches. B. argues that there exists a pervasive dialectical relationship between consciousness and society, a mutual interpenetration which shapes both. Unless this dialectic is acknowledged and understood, theological reasoning will be myopic and the Church’s expression will be overly individualistic, perhaps even narcissistic.

B.’s weaving of theology and sociology is very welcome. Most theologians acknowledge a societal influence on their work. All who are not blind will admit to societal impact on the churches. But nowhere has this interrelation been more thoroughly studied or carefully described than in B.’s book. I sense this to be B.’s most passionate work. He stands on the prophetic side of Weber’s analysis of religion and with Richard Niebuhr’s description of religion as a transformer of culture. He accepts the general thrust of liberation theology in Latin America, while arguing for a needed modification when applied to North America and Europe. His criticism of liberation theology is not to lessen its importance; rather he considers it so important that theologians must determine the exact shape of the dehumanizing and alienating forces in each society so that an agenda to deal with specifics can be established. Here his discussion of a need to redefine the contours of sin is appropriate and telling.

B.’s reading of the sociologists is selective. His choices might be described as classical in that he focuses on the major theorists of sociology, particularly those who have explicitly discussed religion. His range is fittingly European and American. From Alexis de Tocqueville, through Weber, Durkheim, Marx, Toennies, and Manheim, to Bellah, Berger, Greeley, and Parsons, his presentations are nuanced, concentrated, and ordered. Of particular value is the manner in which he interrelates by development and contrast the significance of the sociological contribution to theology. He might have also considered contribu-
tions from social psychologists. He acknowledges Freud's impact on the theology/sociology dialogue, but he would further profit from an acquaintance with the thought of the likes of G. H. Mead and Karen Horney. Of special note is B.'s conclusion that many of the classical sociological critiques of religion observe only one side of religion's complexity. Some theorists choose to cite only the alienating forces of religion, while failing to consider the liberating side which all major religions possess. B. also adds that some churches have made similar reductions.

B. directs his study to major areas of theology. Ultimately, he is calling for a wholesale revision of theology. But within that general demand he focuses on specific areas where the theology/sociology dialogue is most useful. He treats the issue of secularization, theories of evolution and revolution, the role of symbol in understanding, and the role of the imagination in theology. He spices his study with critical comments on how psychoanalysis and a privatized eschatology have established alienating tendencies in contemporary religion. B. will forcefully criticize sociologists when he judges that they have overstepped their methodological competencies, but he is equally critical of theologians and churches when they failed to sense the societal ramifications of their teachings.

St. Meinrad School of Theology, Ind. 

DAVID MICHAEL THOMAS


This is really two rather different books. The first is a clear, detailed, thoughtful presentation of the development of just-war doctrine from its medieval formulation through its transformation and secularization in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The second, which provides the framework for the first, is a confused, though occasionally suggestive argument about the ideological character of just-war doctrine. The result is a valuable historical study set in a puzzling systematic framework.

J.'s historical study argues for several important conclusions. First, the sources for medieval just-war doctrine are secular as well as sacred. The secular sources are particularly important for the norms limiting the conduct of war (jus in bello). Second, the holy-war doctrine found in seventeenth-century English writers, mainly but not exclusively in the Puritan tradition, which allowed the justice of wars undertaken for the sake of true religion, was a development of just-war doctrine. It should not, as Roland Bainton maintains in his Christian Attitudes toward War and Peace (1960), be regarded as a form of crusade or unlimited religious war. Third, as a consequence, the development of just-war doctrine in the early modern period should be seen as divided on the issue of whether
religion can be a just cause of war, with Victoria, Suarez, and some English divines answering in the negative because of their more secular understanding of natural law. Fourth, the secular development of just-war doctrine by Grotius, Locke, and Vattel shows an increasing tendency to leave questions about the justice of declaring war (**jus ad bellum**) to the sovereign, while at the same time imposing stricter limitations on the conduct of war itself (**jus in bello**).

J. is able to support these conclusions by a subtle and judicious reading of the texts, especially those of the less familiar English writers. There are, however, two errors that should be mentioned, as well as one general interpretative problem. First, J. speaks of “removing” just-war doctrine from natural law (p. 151), when he almost certainly means “deriving.” Second, he claims that the Catholic just-war doctrine “is generally interpreted today to mean that the Church must declare a war unjust in order for Catholics to refuse to serve in it” (p. 183). This claim is not given any documentary support and is simply false. The interpretative problem has to do with J.’s use of the notion of secularization. It is not clear whether secularization for J. is a characteristic of certain kinds of arguments and claims or whether it is a long-range social development that can be appealed to in explaining and assessing particular arguments and claims.

A similar vagueness affects one of the central notions of the framework of J.’s exposition: the notion of ideology. His initial definition (p. 12) is so vague that it is hard to see how there can be nonideological beliefs, even though the argument of the Epilogue requires that there be a significant contrast between ideological and nonideological limitations of war. The notion of ideology has notorious pitfalls, and J.’s failure to subject it to careful analysis causes it to be of little real help in the over-all argument of his book.

Woodstock Theological Center, D.C.  
JOHN LANGAN, S.J.

**SHORTER NOTICES**

**Honor Thy Father and Mother:**


This is the first volume in the series **Library of Jewish Law and Ethics**, to be published by Ktav. Norman Lamm is the general editor. The purpose of the series is to examine more profoundly various aspects of the Halakhah, or “the Jewish way,” and to make them known to the non-Hebrew-speaking public. The present volume does that with regard to the Fifth Commandment (according to the Jewish reckoning.) Countless Talmudic and post-Talmudic sources are quoted to show the great variety of interpretations possible in respect to responsibility to parents. The six chapters take up the significance of responsibility,
its scope, the support of parents, conflicts in responsibility, parental initiative and filial response, and fathers and teachers.

B., professor at the University of the Negev, Beersheba, seeks to find the intensity of the command in all aspects of Israel’s life and in the whole context of the Talmud’s teaching. The many intricacies of the problems involved are revealed as the different and differing sources are quoted one after the other. In many cases there is simply no agreement. Does responsibility to a teacher take precedence over that to a father? Is a woman required to live with her mother-in-law solely because of her husband’s responsibility? What must a son do for a “wicked father”? Rather than any clear-cut conclusions, one gets a sense of the general direction taken by the sources. The myriad distinctions made are all animated by a deep respect for parents, so that one could well agree with B.’s statement that “Kibbud av ve’aim, the honoring of father and mother, is an enduring element of the Jewish ethos” (p. xi). It is not an easy book to read (there are close to seventy pages of footnotes) and there is a certain amount of repetition in it. But it does provide a survey, from a limited perspective, of the whole of Jewish literature and of the halakhic mentality from ancient times to the modern age. A list of post-Talmudic authorities cited is given, together with indexes of sources and subjects/persons.

Eugene H. Maly


Put simply, B.’s thesis is that the fourth Gospel has as its principal aim a polemic against the Book of Esther, which, he affirms, had become not only part of the Torah (in its wide sense) but at the time of the writing of the fourth Gospel an important and popular addition to it because it takes up the Exodus theme but brings it down to a more recent, and therefore more readily appreciable, period. Rabbi Akiba’s role in all of this is in his having secured the canonicity of Esther and in his adherence to its philosophy as marked by his acceptance of Bar Cochba and the disastrous second Roman War.

To support his thesis, B. relies heavily on two suppositions that are not likely to find much favor with Johannine scholars. The first is that the unnamed feast in Jn 5:1 is Purim. The main argument is that the reference to “four months” in 4:35 places Jesus in Samaria at the time of the Samaritan Zimmuth Pesah, which was sixty days before Passover, and that “if we take the chapters in the order in which they occur, the unnamed feast of Jn 5:1 is before the Passover” and therefore probably Purim, which “had the same purpose as the Zimmuth Pesah had for the Samaritans” (pp. 114, 134). A second argument is that there are six feasts or banquets in Esther and six in John. This parallel, he says, “is not accidental, but is deliberately intended to indicate the similarity and show the contrast” (p. 159, and see chap. 7). The parallels which B. finds between the two books are anything but evident, and although he is quite right in insisting that “the Fourth Gospel wanted to disengage the universalistic religious teaching in the Old Testament and Judaism from the nationalistic and to develop the universalistic” (p. 155) and in observing that “if ‘the Jews’ had heeded the Fourth Gospel there would not have been the disastrous revolt suppressed by Hadrian” (p. 154), it is quite another thing to maintain that what “John”
has done "is to produce a Christianized Megillath Esther which is superimposed on top of the Christianized Passover Haggadah pattern" (p. 279).  

J. Edgar Bruns


The publication of H. E. Tödt's dissertation on the Son of Man (1959) was a turning point in the modern study of Q. E. describes the developments of the past fifteen years, highlighting the contributions of Tödt, Robinson (1964), Lührmann (1969), and Hoffmann (1972). He then presents his own analysis of the Q material in order to produce a book that will be "both a new interpretation of the Q source and a text useful in college and seminary classrooms."

E. places the Q community in Northern Palestine or Syria during the forties. He sees in its theology an early response to Jesus that was later suppressed in favor of the orthodox doctrine (Q differs especially with Paul on the doctrine of salvific death). Q material was incorporated by Matthew and Luke and accommodated to their theologies, but it emerged with stronger features in the Gospel of Thomas.

In successive chapters E. isolates the themes he finds central to Q's theology—eschatology, prophecy, and wisdom—and then demonstrates their interaction in forty-eight pericopes. He restricts his search for the thought of Q to the texts where Matthew and Luke agree exactly without dependence on Mark ("precise Q"). The synthesis of themes is creative and enlightening. The Q community awaits the imminent return of Jesus as Son of Man but has ethical admonitions for the time of delay; it recognizes the value of both prophetic utterance and wisdom saying; and it expects persecution for witnessing to Jesus. Though E. admits there are strange bedfellows in this material, he seems overly anxious to deny the importance of layers in the tradition.

Advantages for classroom use of this book are its concise explanations of terms and issues in the early sections, and the printing of the texts under study in parallel columns throughout.


I liked this book. It does honor to the Monograph Series. Since Bultmann, it has become common among scriptural scholars to think that soma in Paul very often means the whole person directly. That had, especially in Bultmann, destructive effects on the theology of death and resurrection for Christ and Christians. G. had doubts about this; so he did this detailed and careful study of soma in classical Greek, the LXX, extra-Pauline literature of the NT, intertestamental Judaic literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as in the Pauline letters. In all this literature he found no convincing case for soma in Bultmann's holistic sense. It always means directly the physical body, which may however indirectly represent the whole person but is never identified with it. Man is in Paul, as in all the other literature investigated, a duality of parts (body and soul-spirit) which is not a monad but does form a unity. These parts are distinct and separable. But the separation in death is unnatural and unwanted; the body and the soul are destined for reunion and resurrection, according to Paul. Needless to say, these conclusions reinforce the traditional interpretation for the theology of the resurrection of
Christ and of Christians. G. has made a strong case against the holistic sense. Scholars must for a long time consult this study. G. has proved himself a keen observer for analyzing texts and contexts, a clear thinker and writer.

G. had to treat of Paul's concept of the Church as the body of Christ. Here, too, he insists that body is the physical reality but used in a metaphorical sense of the Church. It is not clear to me whether he stops there. Actually, it is necessary to go beyond that and realize that this metaphorical term covers a mystical reality, the union of all believers in Christ as Head through the grace of the Spirit. And so, it seems, we must say that in this usage body has also a mystical meaning.

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


Bruns is convinced that a Gnostic understanding of Jesus existed very early in Christianity (possibly even in Jesus' own thinking) and probably manifested itself in writings following an outline similar to that of the canonical Gospels. He accordingly devotes the central section of this short work to a reconstruction of what he considers a plausible version of such a Gnostic "Gospel." Drawing upon both the canonical Gospels (some passages of which he maintains can be meaningfully understood only from a Gnostic perspective) and a wide variety of more or less Gnostic literature from the early Christian centuries, he interweaves verses from all into a continuous narrative running from the birth and baptism to the resurrection and ascension of Jesus.

In a brief Introduction, B. sketches the Gnostic world view and argues that many modern thinkers share a similarly pessimistic outlook on the nature and fate of the material world. Such moderns, he concludes, will be interested to know that the orthodox view presented in the canonical Gospels of material creation as good and meaningfully oriented was not the only (possibly not even the earliest or the closest to Jesus' own thinking) view prevalent in early Christianity. In a final section of Notes, B. briefly discusses each of the documents from which he has drawn snippets for his reconstructed "Gospel." In this section he shows an admirable awareness of many of the nuances and complexities in contemporary research on these documents.

Many (I for one) will agree that growing attention must be paid to the important role played by Gnostic patterns of thought in the complex history of early Christianity. For this very reason, many among them will be puzzled (possibly even angered) by what they will consider the simplistic methodology chosen by B. both for presenting his Gnostic exegesis of passages from the canonical Gospels and for rather indiscriminately interweaving passages of significantly different provenance into his reconstruction. Imagination is called for in historical research, but it must remain faithful to the rich diversity of the sources—even or especially in a book intended for a wider audience than that of specialists.

Donald J. Murphy, S.J.


M. considers it a matter of urgency that Roman Catholic theologians attempt a broad, synthetic vision of the Christian mystery. It is his hope that the present work will help respond, if only through pointers and indicators, to the basic desire of all
those "who have been baptized in the blood of the Lamb": to recapitulate all revealed truths in the pierced heart of the crucified Christ. M. recognizes the need for a nuclear truth around which all other truths can assume their rightful place, and he believes that he has found it in the Eucharistic heart of the Lamb of God (pp. 296 f.).

For anyone who is involved in the study of Christology, M.'s Preface to the English edition of his treatise exposes the ambitions and the problems of such a study. In twenty-seven theses we meet M.'s principal convictions and discover a curious blend of classical Christology, language proper to the Sacred Heart devotional movement, and an array of contemporary Catholic and Protestant theologians, both well-known and obscure. It is sufficient here to quote but two statements from the Preface to indicate the difficulties contemporary students of exegesis and systematic Christology will face when reading this book: "In order that, already in His public life, He may be the infallibly exact and true revealer of the Father's secrets, the pre-paschal Christ possesses, in His human intelligence, not only an experimental knowledge of the world but also an infused and prophetic knowledge of the distant and future events, and above all else the vision, in the face of His Father, of all the secrets of human hearts and of the divine will in the course of universal history" (p. xv). Furthermore: "so too His Resurrection . . . is the glorious and mysterious reanimation of His saving corpse by His created, holy, immortal soul. . . ."

In short, perspectives such as these make it very difficult for this reviewer to recommend this book to anyone who is concerned with advancing Christological reflection in terms that contemporary men and women will find challenging and illuminating.

Brian O. McDermott, S.J.


In a previous book, Pentecostalism (1971), Gelpi left conspicuously ambiguous the phrase "charismatic experience." Now he undertakes to clarify this notion in the context of the communal experience of free-giftedness, of radical decision to put on the mind of Jesus, and of the explicit public expression of covenant commitment in acts of worship. G.'s "experiential problematic" and "genetic method" emerge from Whiteheadian foundations. Lonergan (Method in Theology) proposed a threefold process of conversion (intellectual, religious, and moral), to which G. demonstrates the need to add recognition of the affective dimension. His focus is the process of redemption coming to expression in the community of those who are open to pneumatic transformation. This distinguishes him from Rahner, whose anchor is the Incarnation, and whose notion of conversion would recognize a religious dimension as ontologically embedded in all human acts (moral, intellectual, affective).

Reflection on the sacraments leads G. to a series of affirmations such as (1) that infant baptism is a sound practice, (2) that charismatic and Eucharistic worship are not antagonistic but mutually necessary complements, and (3) that apostolic ministry is a Spirit-gift which is not coterminous with either the gift of celibacy or the fact of maleness. These systematically derived observations have obvious ecumenical as well as intramural Roman Catholic importance.

Clear and direct prose marks this work as an improvement over the cumbersome style of Discerning the Spirit (1970). Consistent use of "inclusive" language also helps make it a uniquely welcome theological statement. G.
challenges both those who uncritically embrace pentecostal rhetoric and those who dismiss the charismatic renewal as unimportant or unnecessary. The variety of ecclesial dimensions to which G. speaks, and the broad base of scholarship on which he builds, destine Charism and Sacrament to be among the most important theological works of 1976. It is the most affirmative and challenging scholarly contribution yet to emerge from the Catholic charismatic renewal.

Robert Roger Lebel, S.J.


The ecclesiology war for the hearts and minds of seminarians continues. This latest entry could be regarded as an effort to counteract the effects of Kūng and other rather adventurous works in this field. But Kūng’s The Church is not easily outclassed, and G. does not present his work as a mere antidote to Kūng anyway. Still, Kūng bases his ecclesiology on an essentially biblical, even strictly Corinthian, model and has been accused of neglecting the whole history of Christian reflection on the Church since then, except where certain historical crises serve his polemic interests. On the other hand, G. does not explicitly develop a systematic ecclesiology but rehearses the various theologies of the Church from the NT down to Kūng himself. While G. avoids direct advocacy, his traditional Roman Catholic viewpoint is discreetly evident everywhere.

The book’s defects, however, lie in its virtues. You name it, G. talks about it: caesaropapism. Bede, Alexander of Hales, Agostino Trionfo, John Wesley, Febronianism, John Perrone, and so on. If you did not know the NT was written in Greek or what a Father of the Church is, G. tells you. In short, very much a textbook, even a mini-encyclopedia, and with so many topics covered in such short span that inevitably many get caricatures rather than balanced treatments. The surprising thing is that G. manages to do so much so well. His treatment of Orthodox ecclesiology and that of the Protestant Reformers is quite neatly handled. There is a good summary of nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments. The careful reader can see that G. is perfectly aware of contested areas of considerable importance in ecumenical perspectives today, e.g., how Jesus is founder of the Church, the role of Peter and the growth of the papacy, the origin of the episcopacy; but G. shields his reader from feeling the acute difficulty of such problems. Then there is the danger of forgetting the forest for the trees. Points of lesser moment get about equal space with big themes, to such an extent that it is difficult to imagine the book being read with profit outside the context of a classroom where a teacher can underline key issues and tie the whole panorama together.

G. will not eliminate any of the present standards of ecclesiology, but he fills a glaring gap in available texts for students by providing this comprehensive, clear, orthodox summary of the history of the subject.

Francis W. Nichols


G., a systematic theologian, and Lohfink, a NT exegete, collaborate to address central questions in Christian eschatology, particularly the Parousia and the fate of the individual at death. In the opening essay, G. provides a useful, succinct sketch of theological
thought on eschatology in the twentieth century, using the parameters of individual and collective senses, human history and divine history, the present and the end times. American readers will find his treatment of black theology somewhat inadequate; but beyond that, the essay is a good summary of the principal positions of major authors.

L. follows with an essay on Christian expectation of the Parousia. After setting out NT data, he examines the thoroughgoing, existentialist, and neo-orthodox positions on the meaning of the Parousia. Then he presents his own approach, a revision of the futurist neo-orthodox model in terms of the medieval notion of the aevum. He calls the aevum "transfigured time." His approach suggests interesting possibilities for further development. Among the questions to be taken up in this regard would be what a collective arrival of the Parousia means (since we enter transfigured time individually with death).

G. continues with two essays. The first traces the history of the dialectic between beliefs in the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul in Christian tradition. He tries to mediate the dialectic in light of recent (particularly Protestant) theology. The second essay is a heavily negative critique of the final-option approach to a theology of death as put forth by Boros, Rahner, Troisfontaines, and others.

The authors conclude with two meditations, illustrating pastoral communication of their theological approaches. This work presents a number of creative insights into eschatological problems which, because of the careful dialogue with other positions, promise genuine theological development. The collaboration of a theologian and an exegete is likewise a hopeful sign.

Robert Schreiter


While Bonaventure's work is frequently described as symbolic theology, L. prefers not to use that term, since its meaning is often restricted by particular philosophical or theological styles. Hence, rather than attempting to force the thought of a medieval author into the Procrustean bed of a contemporary structure, L. prefers to allow the many levels and the fuller richness of the meaning of sign to emerge as they show themselves in the writings of Bonaventure. Corresponding to the peculiarity of B.'s style, L. presents his material in the context of B.'s theology of saving-history in such a way that the whole of creation and history appears as a revelation bearing the structure of a sign which, by reason of exemplarity, becomes the medium of the presence of God to man. This view of the world is grounded in B.'s Trinitarian expressionism and exemplarism. Flowing from the Trinity, the created cosmos is the external sign of the inner self-expression of God.

Not only are the general structures of the world seen from the perspective of sign, but the historical order of grace is seen in a similar light, both orders converging in the figure of Christ, who, by reason of the hypostatic union, appears as the supreme sign. Corresponding to the historical structure of B.'s theology, all signs must be led to an eschatological reduction, anticipated in the mystical experience, in which man transcends the sign to the truth itself which is made present in the sign.

Many themes of Bonaventurian theology familiar in other contexts are here given new light when viewed
explicitly from the perspective of sign. L. has presented a richly documented historical study, but he leaves almost untouched the further question as to whether such a vision of the world has any significance for man in the twentieth century.

Zachary Hayes, O.F.M.


The assumption of M.'s book is that diversity in the Church is a good and legitimate goal. Any proposal for Church reunion must embrace unity-in-diversity and diversity-in-unity. He eschews the organic model of Church unity and prefers to work with the more personalist category of the people of God. His suggestion is that Church unity today might be structured after the pattern of the Uniat churches, a pattern which allows communion with Rome as well as a measure of autonomy. The only realistic approach to healing past divisions, M. believes, is unity with Rome without absorption.

M. consistently employs two principles throughout his twelve chapters. First, he works with the distinction first suggested by Paul Tillich between the Catholic substance and the Protestant principle. In a series of chapters entitled Quaestiones disputatae, M. applies this principle to such diverse questions as ministry, Eucharist, marriage, Mariology, and authority. A second principle is the substitution of personalist categories for the more traditional impersonal ones such as transubstantiation and vinculum conjugale.

An example of how M. works can be found in his treatment of the Eucharist. Much of the controversy in regard to the Eucharist is linked to the doctrine of transubstantiation. The Catholic substance underlying this doctrine is faith's affirmation of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist. The Protestant principle, however, criticizes the late-medieval doctrine of transubstantiation for its semimagical approach and its exclusive preoccupation with the consecrated elements. M.'s more personalist categories would seek to do justice both to the Catholic substance and the Protestant principle by locating the Eucharistic species within the broader context of the Eucharistic community.

From a Roman Catholic point of view, one can only be impressed by M.'s effort to find the Catholic substance in such controversial questions as the Immaculate Conception and the papacy. The Roman Catholic could also live comfortably, I believe, with M.'s Uniat model.

In general, then, this is a solid effort in ecumenical theology by an Anglican whose theological tradition is clearly Catholic. The one limitation is that space prevents him from giving more than the general outline of his approach to reunion and a sketch of how he would begin to deal with the classical controversies between Protestants and Catholics. I hope M. will write at greater length on these topics.

John J. O'Donnell, S.J.


M.'s concern is not with moral theology but with a theology of morality; he seeks "a theological understanding of morality through an exploration of the moral dimension of human experience in the light of the theologian's belief in Jesus Christ." The book's ten chapters are divided into two sections; the first four chapters form an organic unity dealing with fundamental issues such as the relationship between morality and Christian theology, the meaning and structure of moral experience, the
person as moral subject, and the role of Christ in morality. The remaining six chapters are more loosely related: the Church as a learning community, vocation, sexuality and celibacy, nationalism, and violence.

For M. one’s very situation mediates unconditionally a sense of “ought” by means of which a person is called to such actions as to break out of the self; other-centered action is moral behavior, while self-centered action is immoral. In response to the inherent “moral call” of the human situation, the individual undergoes a threelfold process of development: other-recognition and self-identification, other-respect and self-acceptance, other-response and self-development. From the perspectives both of human and Christian understanding, M. sees reality as displaying “a gift-embodying-call structure where the gift is at the same time qualified by an element of threat-provoking-fear.” Because gift triumphs finally over threat in the risen Christ, the Christian ethic is eucharistic and celebrative; it is lived in gratitude and rejoicing.

In treating violence and the just-war theory, M. is most provocative. No matter how indirectly people are the object of violent activity, violence “finally counts as damage because of how it affects people.” M.’s assessment of the just-war theory is that it is not genuinely Christian in its foundation, nor has it had much practical significance in regulating war, the established form of violence.

Vincent J. Genovesi, S.J.


The title is meant to suggest a “more positive attitude to marriages between Christians of different denominations” (p. x). Such an attitude is surely needed, but it is not clear what the middle ground is, if any, between simple tolerance and outright advocacy of such marriages; the latter is certainly not urged. The “challenge” in the subtitle is not only for ecumenical theoreticians but also for those whose love has compelled them to marry despite religious differences fraught with practical ramifications.

This edited work contains the papers presented at the International Consultation on Mixed Marriages, hosted by the Irish School of Ecumenics (of which M. Hurley is the director) in Dublin, Sept. 2-6, 1974. The sixteen contributors include ten Roman Catholics, two Anglicans, two Lutherans, one Methodist, and one Presbyterian. Part 4, on pastoral approaches, statistically the situation in Britain, France, Switzerland, Germany, and Australia—in all, a good overview.

One of the more incisive contributions is by Anglican theologian G. R. Dunstan, who highlights the dynamic nature of marriage (the “emerging unity” therein) and argues effectively that family unity must not be shattered by church disunity. Very concretely, e.g., the decision regarding the religious upbringing of the children must be the couple’s own. Noting existing resentment to the Roman Catholic practice of granting annulments, according to which remarriage is “offered as marriage for the first time,” he cautions that we deceive ourselves, but the world is not deceived, when we offer ecclesiastical provisions as ordinances ordained by God. In so many words, the other contributors echo and theologically substantiate these same views.

The world in general and the family in particular can well do without religious in-fighting—an expression which should itself be contradictory. Any professional effort, such as this Consultation, designed to make the God of
love and peace more manifest can only be welcomed.

*Dennis J. Doherty*


These are complementary volumes, the first designed for the pastoral counselor, the second for a woman counselee with a “problem pregnancy.” Part 1 of the first book reprints the second book in its entirety; Part 2 contains seventy additional pages of resources for the counselor, including three theological statements from Lutheran sources, fourteen excerpts representing a fair cross section of proabortion and antiabortion viewpoints, and a listing of biblical quotations thought relevant to the abortion question.

W.’s goal is (and, he suggests, the goal of all counselors should be) to prevent a woman from rushing into a decision she will later be unable to live with and to help her evaluate her feelings objectively before deciding among the three options: abortion, going to term and keeping the child, or putting the child up for adoption. Writing with sensitivity and in a readable style, W. succeeds in unraveling many aspects of the terribly complex abortion issue. He does so in a nondirective way that may not please all readers, least of all the anxious woman who is looking for someone to assume responsibility for her decision. For those who oppose all abortions, W. provides insights into why some women choose abortion; for those who generally favor abortions, he provides some sobering thoughts on the ramifications of the decision for abortion.

Legal, safe, and accessible abortion is providing more and more women today with an option unthinkable only a few years ago. The churches, whatever their official stand on abortion, must be ready to counsel women in this crisis situation. W. has recognized the problem and taken a first step to meet the need.

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


D.’s book is both a reflection on our ethical resources for dealing with the crisis of criminal justice in America and an argument for specific proposals. The crisis is manifest in our much higher levels of crime and considerably severer levels of punishment, when we are compared with other developed nations. D. attributes both to a violent, aggressive, and vindictive tradition in America, which he calls America B and which he finds operative in American capitalism. To redress the situation, he calls on the humane and benevolent ethical consensus of America A, which he takes to be ground common to the Jewish, Christian, and secular traditions. The valuable part of his book is his explicitation of the content of this consensus as it bears on norms for criminal justice. On the basis of this ethical consensus, he rejects retributivism and argues for social defense and restoration as the purpose of the criminal-justice system. Somewhat surprisingly for a theologian, D. avoids any consideration of crime in relation to tragedy or to sin; and his approach to the problem of crime is marked by the reformist optimism of liberal Protestantism. The proposals he advances are sensible and would do much to humanize the American system of criminal justice.

*John Langan, S.J.*

Rejecting the popular notion that religious, especially mystical, phenomena are ultimately mysterious, St. insists upon a rational, theoretical, and experimental approach to the study of mysticism. He contends: “Among the religions of mankind, the western monotheistic religions are alone in putting severe restrictions on the acquisition of knowledge.” On the other hand, “If we approach Buddhist thought on its own terms, there appears to be little justification, if any, to speak of ‘Buddhist irrationalism.’”

Part 2, “How Not to Study Mysticism,” criticizes as “unsatisfactory,” “insufficient,” and “often wrong” the “dogmatic approach” of Zaehner and Panikkar; the philological and historical approaches of Ruben, Lindquist, Conze, and Massignon; the phenomenological and sociological approaches, especially of Otto and Eliade; and various physiological and psychological approaches.

Part 3, “How to Study Mysticism,” advises the student of mysticism to become a mystic in order to study it from within. St. insists that mysticism is something which affects the human mind and should, therefore, be studied by the “right kind of psychologist.” He uncritically asserts that religious and moral “paraphernalia” are often “meaningless,” “worthless,” and “irrelevant.”

St.’s sheer ignorance, misinterpretations, and facile generalizations about Western theistic religions and mysticism are unacceptable. Almost amusing, after his critique of so many reputable scholars, is his seemingly wholehearted acceptance of Cas-taneda. To suggest that one become a mystic in order to study it from within is analogous to suggesting that one fall in love in order to study it. St. never says what mysticism is, but allows himself to be guided by “some intuitive notion of what mysticism is like.” His warmed-over psychological projection theory too easily allows for a most questionable religion-as-superstructure theory and forces a working hypothesis that theistic mysticism is ultimately illusory.

Harvey Egan, S.J.


A good book. If one is looking for a book of light, pious meditations on the Eucharist in one’s life, it will be a disappointment. If one fails to heed L.’s suggestion to read the material gradually as one would a series of meditations, one might be troubled by a certain sense of repetition and lack of organic flow from chapter to chapter. If, however, one is in search of rich fare for reflection on the Eucharistic mysteries, this book will provide that with depth and clarity.

There are some minor weaknesses. For instance, L.’s statement that “Christ is really present and not merely in a symbolic way” (p. 148) needs qualification in the light of modern studies on the history of symbols. Occasionally one encounters an awkward choice of words such as “the preparation of the oblates” (p. 72) or “a better intelligence of the Eucharist” (p. 77). There are also occasional typographical errors.

The rewards for the serious reader, however, far outweigh such incidents. At one point L. characterizes his approach as “pre-scholastic,” i.e., “a traditional biblical perspective” (p. 41). Nevertheless, he shows himself at home not only with a basically biblical
approach to such realities as bread, wine, body (chaps. 1-4), but also when dealing with doctrinal issues (chaps. 5-8) and liturgical texts and contexts (chaps. 9-11). He is balanced throughout but especially in his treatment of the "problem of the two loves"—that of God and neighbor—and the tension between secular and sacral as well as between personal and liturgical prayer (chaps. 12, 13, 14).

Happily, the book contains a chapter (18) on the Holy Spirit and the Eucharist—a topic too often neglected in books and reflections on the Eucharist. L.'s work also has the merit of broadening the horizon of the Eucharist to include the whole universe, e.g., chaps. 10 and 39. To round out the picture, he offers a series of reflections on Christ (chap. 24-27) which underline the Christological dimension of liturgical prayer.

Although L. usually presents what the Eucharist is in itself and allows the reader to draw the consequences for his or her life, in the last chapter he sketches what he sees to be the implications of what has gone before. He does so with a sureness that indicates both balance and understanding of today's theological trends. The reader looking for solid food for thought, and willing to work at applying the implications of doctrine to life, should find this book a very helpful springboard to "living the Eucharistic mystery."

John H. McKenna, C.M.


In his Preface, N. states that "an education which does not prepare youth to confront and endure failure is seriously deficient." The book attempts to remedy that deficiency by offering reflections on alternatives to the current theology of hope and the American way of success. Most of the essays appeared previously in article form and are brought together here under the rubric of "failure." In general, the only criticism that can be leveled against the book is that somewhat disparate material is too neatly packaged as a theology of failure. Chapter titles such as "Jesus Fails," "Life Fails," "History Fails," etc., are too facile.

N.'s main point, however, is valid. Faced with the inevitability of death and the general collapse one sees all around, one might well conclude that failure rather than success is our way to the Father. The method of exposition ranges from deep personal reflection on the kinds of failure man faces to very competent and generous tracings of relevant themes through the OT and NT.

An appendix on "Aspects of Failure from Contemporary Drama" is unfortunately misnamed. The plays discussed might be "modern" but are by no stretch of the imagination "contemporary." The Death of a Salesman, e.g., is now a generation old.

Philip C. Rule, S.J.


If it is to understand the world situation with its polarization of "center" and "periphery," theology must search out its roots in history. This task is especially urgent for dependent cultures. D. locates Latin American history and theology within a broad panorama of world history. Compensating for a lacuna in most universal histories, he devotes attention to American Indian cultures. He briefly but penetratingly summarizes the Indo-European, Semitic, and Christian contributions to civilization. The excellent survey is marred only by the built-in by-product of brevity: overgeneralization.
Using history as "collective psycho-analysis," D. sketches the Latin American Church. The history is both informative and edifying. Much emphasis is given to the frustrated attempts at adaptation to local Indian cultures. Independence and liberalism eventually paved the way for the decline of Catholicism as a cultural and socio-political power. Nevertheless, the Christendom mentality remained until the Medellín Conference. Medellín symbolizes "something akin to a New Pentecost." Just as the colonial period had its greats, Las Casas and Santo Toribio de Mogrovejo, the Medellín liberation era has its prophets and martyrs, Larrain, Helder Cámara, Mendez Arceo, Torres, and Gallegos. D.'s historical interpretation of liberation theology provides balance and new insights. He looks realistically at the problem of violence, the role of the priest, and the formation of "basic communities." Although he employs a dialectical approach and advocates socialism, he criticizes a naive option for Marxism and simplistic thinking which claims that all solutions lie with the masses. This critical historical analysis should gain much credibility for liberation theology in North America and Europe.

The study is followed by an Appendix on Latin American peoples in the United States, a chronology of the Latin American Church, and a bibliography.

John P. Hogan


During the last year there have been numerous articles which have criticized the theology of liberation. This time a voice from the Third World, in fact, a colleague of Gustavo Gutierrez at the Pontifical Theology Faculty of Lima, offers what he feels are legitimate questions for such a theology. G. believes that a theology of liberation will be able to offer what is useful for theology only when it takes objections seriously and when it enters into dialogue.

G. begins his investigation by a careful study of the various citations used in the acclaimed Theology of Liberation. He has employed a very careful exegesis of the texts used and has some interesting conclusions. These conclusions, I think, are already suspected by those who have studied Gustavo Gutierrez' work. G. first notes that a number of citations are employed in an imprecise manner. Two categories are singled out: (1) those which are only partial or not taken in their full sense—especially cited are Chenu and Congar; (2) those which are employed in a contrary sense, most notably the works of Juan Alfaro (pp. 26 ff.), whom he feels Gutierrez has misinterpreted.

After this section of critical investigation, the major part of the book is spent in analyzing some of the terms employed by liberation theology. G. contends that these terms are never clearly or accurately defined. "Esperamos en vano una definición precisa de la que para el autor significa praxis histórica" (p. 56). The abundance of texts used as support makes this reader wonder if each will stand the test of critical exegesis.

The last section takes Gutierrez to task for diluting the science of theology by lack of clarity and failure to clarify objectives. G. feels that Gutierrez has not limited himself nor has he set sufficient guidelines for a true theology. What will emerge will be nothing more than a new form of Gnosticism (p.135). The outcome of such a procedure as is suggested in the work of Gutierrez will lead only to the evaporation of the science of theology.

G.'s work has merit because he has faithfully studied the original theology of his colleague and has painfully
searched out each citation. He does this from his own framework as a professor in Peru and as one who is part of the reality we call Third World. The work as a whole offers a number of challenges to Gustavo Gutierrez which this writer hopes will be studied and possibly answered by him.

*Calvin Alderson, O.Carm.*


It seems doubtful that the future of American religion depends on either the Hartford Appeal for Theological Affirmation of January 1975 or this collection of essays in explanation and clarification of the Appeal. Yet the Hartford statement is important for American religion in that it seeks to identify the sources of religious malaise in the West. This collection of essays by eight signers of the Appeal (in addition to B. and N.: Lindbeck, Dulles, Forell, Peter, Mouw, Schmemann) is an effort to carry the discussion beyond the initial responses and misconceptions and to focus it on the basic issues that prompted Hartford and still require attention. The essayists place the Appeal in its sociocultural and historical contexts and examine its confessional implications; nearly every writer also offers his own statement of what Hartford was really about.

Despite differences, there is a remarkable degree of agreement as to Hartford's intention: the Appeal is a call for defense of the very possibility of doing theology at all (herein lies its uniqueness); it is a declaration of the normative significance of Jesus Christ for Christian identity and for human life; it is a repudiation of “culture religion” of every sort, cutting against both right and left, liberal and conservative, and any other false dichotomy; it is an assertion of the “Protestant principle” (no longer exclusively Protestant) that no period of human history is final and no human institution is the kingdom of God. Hartford is also, of course, about the meaningfulness of “transcendence,” though the word is a red flag for many and perhaps best left aside. The “themes” repudiated by Hartford are so much a part of the fabric of our culture that the injunction to “go and sin no more” would apply equally well to the signers as to their audience. Put briefly, Hartford is the 1970’s version of H. R. Niebuhr’s “Christ and culture” question.

As with most collections, the essays vary in depth and usefulness. Perhaps because they contain much that one would expect from the authors, the editors' essays are the least interesting. Lindbeck's analysis of Hartford as an event to be located within a “paradigm shift” in theology (cf. Kuhn on scientific revolutions) is particularly rewarding; Schmemann's insight that the conditions which called forth the Hartford Appeal—a crisis in the understanding of culture and a breakdown of the transcendence-immanence antinomy—are precisely those that lie at the root of the conflict between Eastern and Western Christianity and are responsible for the failure of ecumenical dialogue with Orthodoxy is also suggestive. Other essays are less striking. Like the Appeal, the book is of value only as it points beyond itself and provokes those who would be Christians to examine their loyalties (and presuppositions) and order their loves.

*Francine Cardman*


This short but well-written book is
an overview of dominant themes in the issue of religious liberty and Church-state relations as they developed during the course of American history. Rather than focus on specific incidents and factual narration, M. focuses on themes and styles as they emerge from the practice of religion in America.

After an initial setting of the context by a discussion of Anglicanism, the New England experiment, and the Quaker experience in Pennsylvania, M. moves into a discussion of the impact of the Revolution on religious freedom and the consequent disestablishment of churches in Virginia and New England. This is followed by a discussion of the First Amendment to the Constitution and a setting of the stage for a discussion of the American way of faith. The last two chapters deal with specific problems such as the arrival of Jews in America, problems of church property and civil law, problems from conflicts between Catholics and Protestants, the rise of Mormonism, and slavery and the Civil War. A chapter on issues that touch our contemporary experience centers around nationalism, pluralism, and secularization. M. shows how these issues, emerging in such areas as Darwinism, anti-Semitism, the black experience, and freedom of conscience, have helped change the understanding of religious freedom in America.

The book provides a good thematic introduction to the problem of religious liberty in the American experience. It provides a meaningful context for understanding major problems and also a starting point from which to pursue further investigations. M. has also included a fine annotated bibliography useful for further study.

Thomas A. Shannon


Fox argues that the most appropriate structure for understanding the significance of religious language, and in particular for apprehending the significance of Christian discourse, is the "logical form of the personal." He contends that, properly speaking, the object of religious discourse is neither God, nor man and his world, but the relationship that exists between them. But as he sees it, theology and philosophy "have never developed an adequate language of relationship," because the operative conceptual models have been unable to do justice both to the "all-inclusiveness of God’s Being" and to the "reality of otherness" between God and the world.

Taking his cue from John Macmurray's personalist philosophy, Fox argues that the fundamental structure of personal reality is "contrapletal." It consists of poles which "stand over against each other (contra), yet need each other for a statement of the complete truth." This contrapletal character of personal reality provides the basis for a description of the logical structure from which can be developed an adequate language of relationship, which in turn provides an appropriate structure for interpreting the significance of religious discourse. This thesis is illustrated by chapters which explore the contrapletal character of some fundamental structures involved in God-talk (e.g., being/becoming, unity/plurality, eternity/time, faith/doubt), in the Christian’s affirmation that Jesus is the Christ, and in a comparison of Christian, Vedantic, and Buddhist visions of reality.

The direction this book suggests merits consideration as a promising contribution to the discussion of religious language, but the development of its argument, which attempts to present a thesis "intelligible to the amateur as well as the professional theologian," is not as convincing as it could be, and I suspect that its fundamental
insight is being forced to carry more weight than it can shoulder.

Robert Masson


This massive bibliography is divided into two parts. The first is a series of reviews of more than sixty of the major works in the field of sociology of religion, including the "precursors" of the discipline; the "classical authors" from Durkheim and Weber to Bergson (a choice reflecting a broader understanding of the sociology of religion than prevails in this country); systematic works such as those of Wach, Yinger, Berger, and Luckmann; more specialized studies including Parsons, Carrier, Levi-Strauss, Dumezil, Glock, and Stark; reviews of some theologically oriented works, such as O'Dea's The Catholic Crisis, Berger's A Rumor of Angels, and Schillebeeckx' The Understanding of Faith: Interpretation and Criticism. These brief articles serve as a general introduction to the sociology of religion.

The second part, the "Bibliographic Repertoire," consists of 16,291 numbered entries from nine languages, inclusive through 1973, and divided into nine major headings with numerous subcategories. The major divisions are: The Sociology of Religion, Definitions and Theories of Religion, The Religious Phenomenon: The Religions, Elements of Religious Experience, Structure of Religious Society, Religion and Society, Religion and Social Subsystems, Religion and Social Differentiation, and Sociology and Theology. Finally, there is a series of very helpful indices: of book reviews, of periodicals, and of authors.

An undertaking of this size and complexity always involves difficulties in selection and classification. The borders of many fields overlap and no categories can be rigidly maintained. The organizers of this volume have opted for comprehensiveness rather than selectivity, and this is helpful but at times also jarring—when one finds Gadamer's Wahrheit und Methode lumped together with brief articles from the Clergy Review and the Journal of Philosophy of 1913. Such completeness, however, does not detract from the value of this bibliographic tool to anyone working in these disciplines.

T. Howland Sanks, S.J.
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