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The three articles in the March 1979 issue deal with serious contemporary issues: papal jurisdiction, foundational theology, and a process theology of the Church. The annual "Moral Notes" are complemented by the results of the Lutheran–Roman Catholic dialogue on infallibility.

The Jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome shows how Vatican II, while repeating the language of Vatican I, sets the bishop of Rome's jurisdiction over the whole Church within a vision of the communion of the churches and episcopal collegiality, and so provides a key to understanding the nature of that power. The article is of crucial importance for ecumenical progress. J. M. R. TILLARD, O.P., with a licentiate in theology from the Saulchoir and a doctorate in philosophy from the Angelicum, is professor of sacramental theology and religious life at the Dominican College of Philosophy and Theology in Ottawa, and a vigorous participant in the Anglican–Roman Catholic dialogue. His most recent book is entitled There are Charisms and Charisms.

Integrative Theology: A Polanyian Proposal for Theological Foundations explores the contributions which Michael Polanyi's theory of personal knowledge might make to current discussion on theology as a genuine discipline. Its primary contention is that several systematic elements in Polanyi's thought have implications for elaborating the formal procedures of theological inquiry. JOHN V. APCZYNSKI, Ph.D. from McGill University in Montreal (1972), is associate professor in the Department of Theology at St. Bonaventure University. His areas of special competence are philosophy of religion and fundamental theology, with emphasis on theories of knowledge and methodology. Two years ago he published Doers of the Word: Toward a Foundational Theology Based on the Thought of Michael Polanyi.

A Process Theology of Interdependence suggests possible strategies for the development of a process theology of the Church based on fellowship through love. It proposes that, instead of addressing the doctrine of the Church in terms of individual and community, we should focus on love as a categorical primitive. DEAN R. FOWLER, Ph.D. from Claremont School of Theology in California, is assistant professor of theology at Marquette University, with special competence in the philosophy of religion and theology, process theology, and interdisciplinary studies in science and religion. Some of his articles have appeared in Process Studies and Zygon; he is preparing a volume of readings from the history of science and religion.

Notes on Moral Theology: 1978 surveys the pertinent literature in three areas: (1) conscience and conflict; (2) Humanae vitae and the magisterium; (3) problems in bioethics. Each area has profited much over the years from the contributions of RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J., the Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Institute.
of Ethics at Georgetown University and a research associate within the Woodstock Theological Center. Among the factors that consistently mark his surveys are, I suggest, a continuing familiarity with European and Protestant ethicians and moralists, fair presentations of approaches and opinions that run counter to his own, reasoned dialogue, and a humility born of the conviction that within a pilgrim Church he is a pilgrim theologian.

**Teaching Authority and Infallibility in the Church** calls for some background information. It is the result of five years of research by the members of the Lutheran–Roman Catholic Dialogue, ten plenary sessions (two each year), a number of drafting meetings for each of the three Statements. It is generally admitted on both sides that infallibility proved to be the most complex and elusive of all the issues discussed since 1965; it demanded the greatest nuancing; it was often frustrating. If infallibility is not the central problem for ecumenical convergence, it has been theologically and emotionally the most divisive. The document (really three documents: Common Statement, Roman Catholic Reflections, Lutheran Reflections) is the most extensive and detailed report on infallibility in all the ecumenical dialogues thus far. It cannot but be foundational for all other groups who will discuss this problem; it is for this reason that we have agreed to the publication of the report in *TS*, its first publication in full anywhere. It is a historic document.

In this connection, the June issue will carry a follow-up to the Lutheran–RC report on infallibility. John T. Ford, C.S.C., of the Catholic University of America, will survey some of the most important publications on infallibility within recent years: e.g., the Castelli colloquium, Küng, Tierney, Bantle, Pottmeyer, Hasler, Chirico, and many another.

Twenty-eight books are reviewed fully in the present issue, and twenty-seven others more briefly, each by a scholar expert in the area under discussion. One of our tasks through the years has been to build up ceaselessly a corps of competent and courteous reviewers; I think we have succeeded. Here a warm word of gratitude is due to Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J., who is our book review department while functioning as managing editor.

_Walter J. Burghardt, S.J._
_Editor_
Mircea Eliade's macroscopic work is now being examined microscopically to see (1) if he invented the religious phenomena he describes so broadly, or (2) found it waiting to be brought to generalized speech, or (3) created a way of colloquy, through his own religious experience, with religious experience not his own. Eliade has not said explicitly which process he has used, so any student of his must raise the questions of methodology from outside, so it seems. It is clear that Eliade has gathered a broad evidence from religious cultures into archetypal patterns, calling them creations of the religious spirit and hence revelations of a dimension of human consciousness. It is clear that Eliade urges the modern West to know this religious consciousness so that the West will recognize it is in human continuity with a vast spiritual history. What truth process can possibly be involved in such an amassing of evidence into archetype, archetype into symbolic ontology, ontology into therapy for desacralized imaginations?

Guilford Dudley argues that Eliade's gathering of the evidence presents the great problem—a problem which also confronts every student of religion. As Eliade himself agrees early in Patterns in Comparative Religion, evidence is often fragmentary to the point of disabling the interpreter. D. says that all of Eliade risks falling off the wall because of the critique of his methods raised by those who want clear cause-and-effect relationship between a religious phenomenon and its elucidation. These critics accept particulars only or traceable influences from smaller religious structures to greater; they do not accept Eliade's larger sense, whereby some religious expression means more than itself or than its intent in a culture because of a certain fulness the archetype provides it willy-nilly. D. reads Eliade as though he were a formed Platonist discovering that the archaic religious consciousness is Platonizing, that religious consciousness is Platonizing broadly speaking, and that archetypal religion is truly the only defense against meaninglessness.

There must, D. urges, be a modern way of saving the values of Eliade's nonscientific, nonhistorical interpretation of religion. It is a powerful
influence Eliade has had on those who want to understand religion, especially since he has avoided some of the classical mistakes of the great interpreters of the last hundred years. Dudley suggests another model of scientific inquiry than that used by the cause/effect religionists: the model of the fruitful hypothesis, not a deduction from an a priori sort of approach but an evidence/insight/comparison process, something similar to Piercean pragmatism. This different model of what it is to know the truth in the tenuous area of religious experience in the history of religions will introduce the proper amount of scepticism into the knowledge Eliade proposes, and the proper amount of fruitful meeting with alien religious material.

I think there are some serious misreadings D. has made of Eliade’s writings, some poor surmisals about his basic starting point, and too much weight given to Eliade’s fairly jejune comments on his own methodology. The argument from Cosmos and History is not the either/or choice between archetypal religion, the Platonic ontology and its meaningfulness, and historicism, the meaningless dot-dot-dot factuality of profane and modern civilization. The argument is to show that the archaic religious mind’s way of handling the terror of history is through the invention of repeated patterns of transcendence. So Eliade’s starting point is the cosmic Christianity of the Rumanian peasant, not the lore of ancient India. Modern consciousness in its historicist phase decreates the patterns of transcendence. The tertium quid Eliade suggests as his own way out of the dilemma is a consciousness that accepts a liberty from its God to create newer and newer visions of transcendence. The switch is from a God who reveals the forms to be obeyed, or from a non-God who lets humans swing slowly in the wind, to a God who urges humans to do the creating of meaning within the terror of history itself. (Cf. Eliade, No Souvenirs [New York, 1977] 86; entry of January 6, 1960, for a further explicitation of this point.) Eliade’s personal opinion forms a very small part of Cosmos and History, which is mainly devoted to explaining archetypal versus historicist appreciations of reality, not to espousing the archetypal.

I wish D. had entertained the notion that Eliade’s “Platonism” is not philosophical but iconic, that the experience of icon antedated by much Eliade’s experience either of the Renaissance or of Indian thought, and that archetype, for Eliade, is more like a collection of icons of similar themes about which one makes comparative generalities than it is like an awakening to supratemporal, suprahistorical essences. And I wish D. knew Eliade’s Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses (see below). I wish he had entertained David Rasmussen’s article “Mircea Eliade: Structural Hermeneutics and Philosophy,” Philosophy Today 12 (1968) 138-46. I wish he had consulted Gilbert Durand, Les structures anthro-
polologiques de l'imaginaire (Paris, 1964); perhaps also Arthur Koestler, The Act of Creation; maybe even Ray Hart's Imagination and Unfinished Man. Symbolic understanding works in its own way. It is a different kind of abstraction than ontological abstraction.

Douglas Allen takes the same Eliade as Dudley, but does a different sort of orthopedics on Eliade's methodology. How is the whole result of Eliade's work salvageable either by (1) calling out in the open what is implicitly acceptable in the man's procedures or by (2) what is able to be infused into the same procedures to give them a ring of defensibility? A. accepts Eliade's critiques of the history of religions over the past hundred years. He presents very shrewdly and accurately Eliade's tools of interpretation, the dialectic of the sacred/profane, and the structure of symbolic understanding. The former requires the copresence of different modes of reality, not an annihilation of one by the other. And symbolic understanding appears as a power of integration, a unique mode of knowing, and not some sort of adjunct to true knowing. A. then brings out and attempts to explain Eliade's insights as based on historical knowledge captured through a descriptive phenomenology, though the archetypes that result from Eliade's generalizations do seem to transcend history and time, seem to form a transconsciousness which is like Whitehead's primordial ideas. Next comes an evaluation of Eliade's move from descriptive phenomenology to other levels of assertion, ontological statements not apparently warranted by Eliade's description of religious phenomena. A. indicates that symbols do move in several zones of meaning, and their motion is towards fuller and fuller integrations of these zones. There is a continuum, therefore, between a religious manifestation on its simplest level of appearance and that same particular form in its state of fullest integration, mistletoe to tree. A phenomenologist of religion like Eliade can describe phenomenologically not only a horizontal level of meaning but also a vertical set of levels. A. sees procedures that are justifiable going on all at once in Eliade's work, and they do warrant being criticized, often severely, as uncalled-for impositions of Eliade on his study material. But Eliade does study wholes, and these wholes do call for a companionate range of understanding in the interpreter, one that will lead him or her to propositions stretching from historical detail through phenomenological integration into evaluative and ontological areas. A. tries to provide a philosophical foundation which is explicit for Eliade's work, and his effort is convincing.

I think A. should have paid greater attention to the ways of esthetic perception. It is unquestionably sound in a philosopher to require philosophical coherence in any work that tries for comprehensive historical and religious meaning. But suppose Eliade were using an imaginative, poetic approach to the imaginative, poetic materials of religion. By poetic
I mean the invention of means for understanding that are symbolic and attempt to be beautiful and true at one and the same time, as in the tradition of the icon, of art in general. The problem about truth gotten in such an approach remains as acute as it does in any other approach, but, as in the case of poetry, the truth is not that of photography or of testimony, nor that of fact entailing fact, but one of indirect relationship, as the truth of a symbol is indirect. It is like the invention of a mirror on the end of a stick in order to see around some corner. The truth process of symbol is forced on the human mind; understanding of symbol is forced on the same mind; and it may well be that imaginative constructs of a very integrating sort are required in order to grasp their counterparts which are asking for interpretation. It may be, then, that Eliade has come up with an esthetic explanation of an esthetic body of material, that an esthetic is a description of history in its own way, a phenomenology of history in its own way, an ontology in its own way. I may not detract, however, from the quality of A.'s study; it is the truest one of Eliade I have seen.

Neither Dudley nor Allen seems to know Eliade's *Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses*, the first of a three-volume work Eliade intends as a close to his career. In fact, this work is his career. These are the notes he used for teaching in Bucharest, Paris, and Chicago over a long span of time. In the notes, E. shows that he is a one-man Editions Pleiade historian of religions who seeks to know the central doctrines of each religious manifestation as close to the chronology of their appearances as possible. Volume 1 covers the material from the Stone Age to the Eleusinian mysteries. I think E. establishes himself as a historian in this volume and renders somewhat invalid the critique that he is not minded toward history. The quality of his historical understanding is another question. A historian of religions must depend on wide reading of studies whose quality he often cannot validate personally, so he will show the strengths and weaknesses of the scholarly field. Perhaps one may judge that such a generalist ought not to exist. E. is a generalist, an accurate one in my judgment, although his work does not have the depth of the single studies done in Pleiade's *Histoire des religions* by single experts on various subject matters. But E. does supply something special, the integrating consciousness able to see analogues between contemporary religious cultures, thin ones (verbal analogies) and thick ones (like visions). He is able to see differences in such way that the varying religious beliefs seem authentic in themselves, not in comparison. It is true, what E. predicts, there is a fascination to reading an account of religious beliefs and ideas in sequence; similarities and differences appear that make religious consciousness seem to be an adventure as extraordinary as bodily survival. There is an annotated bibliography at the end of
the work which can take any reader deeper into the various topics treated.

Specialists will have trouble floating on top of the material in E.'s volume, but I do think they will recognize the scope of this one-man work and may even be brought to recognize that a generalist's knowledge can affect profoundly particular studies. The radical problem about E.'s conclusions arises from this generalist approach and the integrating consciousness he has developed. The imaginative means at the core of this consciousness, this way of understanding *homo religiosus*, is not so much in evidence in this volume. What is in evidence is the first stage of a generalist's approach, a historical organization *cum* interpretation of a broad sweep of material. The other works of E. spiral upwards from this base, as Allen has described, descriptive phenomenology, qualitative comparison, ontological judgment about the human way of being whole, though not about the contents of that wholeness from culture to culture. I wish this volume had appeared a long time ago. I would not have felt so acutely the need to read such works as the Pleiade *Histoire* or to do field studies of religions I could reach, Teotihuacan, Tenochtitlan, post-conquest Mexico, in order to test out Eliade. A great deal of E.'s intellectual probity stands forth in this lifetime's work.

Albert C. Moore's *Iconography of Religions* stands in a very illuminating relationship to the books evaluated above. Iconography is the best exemplification of Eliade's dialectic of the sacred/profane and of his views on symbolism. I am convinced that the experience of icon in Rumanian spirituality is the ultimate motivation in Eliade's way of understanding Oriental and archaic religious expression. M. sets out very well the conditions of iconic meaning as those conditions are both historical and canonical, a material structure of beauty which creates presences: someone, something absent is brought into the presence of a believer without the medium ever substituting for those it makes present to one another. And yet an iconic structure is something in itself and must remain itself if its mediating work is to continue. M. then traces religious iconography up the same historical ladder used by Eliade in *Histoire*, although he goes much farther in the time development without fattening his book. There are drawings to illustrate every analysis M. makes, an extremely helpful procedure. And the analyses themselves are clear. I would suggest this book strongly to those who wish to teach an illustrated course on Eliade. My own method has been to build up a set of color slides of each major iconographic system, mainly because slides capture the richness and beauty of iconographic expression whereas black-and-white drawings simply do not. But there are enough color illustrations in other works than M.'s which could supply the needed esthetic perception. Each of the sections of M.'s work could be deepened by reference to interpretative images of Eliade. I am not diminishing the
worth of what M. has done; the book provides fine reading on its own, particularly in its summary of views on icon, and its organization of interpretation into iconic, aniconic religious systems. But these virtues do not really make the book stand out. There are marvelously illustrated volumes on each of the topics he treats. So I think the primary value of *Iconography of Religions* lies in its suitability as a course text. It is a work in itself, but it is also complementary to the work of Eliade and to the deeper studies, theological or esthetic, which treat individual topics such as the icon or the development of Buddhist art.

The nub of the problem about Eliade can be summed up in his own words from his journal *No Souvenirs* (Harper & Row, 1977), an entry from his visit to Mexico in 1965, p. 245: “Second Round Table seminar. There is also the anthropology professor, Jiménez Moreno, a specialist on Central America. He says some interesting things, but always stays on the descriptive and empirical level. Every time I tried to go further into interpretation and asked him what meaning all these religious facts could have, Moreno would agree with me, would seem delighted, but wouldn't continue the hermeneutics on that level. He would always go back to the ‘documents,’ to the ‘sources.’”

*Boston College*

**Francis P. Sullivan, S.J.**


If biblical scholars are going to cope with the rising tide of comparative material from the ancient Near East, books like this will be constantly in demand. The first in a series entitled *Grundrisse zum Alten Testament*, it involves the co-operation of five established scholars in Near Eastern studies, Prof. Beyerlin of the University of Münster having assumed editorial responsibility for the final presentation. The collaborators are H. Brunner (Egypt), H. Schmökel (Mesopotamia), C. Kühne (Hittite), K.-H. Bernhardt (Ugarit), and E. Lipiński (North Semitic texts of the first millennium).

Those who have, for the past twenty-five years, used the steadily expanding collection of J. B. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, will recognize in this more modest volume a supplementary effort. Yet, some of the texts published here have been available only after Pritchard's latest edition (1969), and the updated descriptions of a text's provenience, condition, and previous scholarly treatment will prove extremely useful to the reader. The editor has packed an immense amount of valuable information into the presentation of the texts; the fifteen illustrations are clear and illuminating, most of
them due to the artistic skill of Frau Gorys. The plates could have been omitted with little loss to the reader; they are just too murky and Tablet IV of the Creation Epic has been printed upside down. Printing errors are rare and John Bowden’s translation is crisp and idiomatic, qualities we have now come to take for granted in his work.

In the introduction to the Egyptian texts a difficulty is pinpointed which, with proper adjustments, could apply to almost any religious text from the ancient Near East. “Even stronger than the fear that notable parallels to Old Testament conceptions have been passed over is the fear that by taking these passages out of context, the religion of ancient Egypt may have been distorted, and that the fragments presented may be incomprehensible or even misleading” (2). Exactly put, for we must insist that the religious world of the Egyptian, Mesopotamian, Hittite, etc. was an autonomous system of delicately interrelated meanings each one of which was intelligible only within the context of the given religious system. Should we not view the OT in a similar light?

Undoubtedly, there are parallels between biblical Lamentations over the fall of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. and the Sumerian “Lamentation over the Destruction of Ur.” But Schmökel duly observes (116) that the destruction of Ur has little or no relation to human guilt and its expiation. As T. Jacobsen, commenting elsewhere on the Sumerian lament, has put it, “In reality, then, justice—that is to say, human justice—quails before the absolute authority of the unanimous will of the gods; they are not to be challenged” (The Treasures of Darkness 91). Similarly, in the Ugaritic texts of Keret and Daniel a common theme is the promise of a son, echoed in the patriarchal traditions of the OT. But if the word of God in Israel is able to grant offspring, as El had for Keret and Daniel, it is immeasurably more a word which sets in motion the history of a people who in faith consistently affirm a saving purpose in their unfolding and often tragic story.

Despite the hazards of publishing, for comparative purposes, a selection of religious texts—and fragmentarily at that—from the ancient Near East, the effort has been worth the risk. Admiration and praise are due the patience and persistence with which B. has carried out so demanding a task. In one sense a work like this puts some limits to the discontinuities between the OT and the religious literature of surrounding cultures, all the while leaving intact the profound originality of the biblical record.

University of San Francisco  
FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.

Now that image and symbol are being appreciated for their real worth by the scholarly community, it is appropriate that we look once again at the imagery of the Bible, set within the richly documented symbolic world of the ancient Near East. But has not all this been done in J. B. Pritchard's *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*? To some extent yes, but apart from the fact that Pritchard does not deal with the theory or significance of the iconographic approach in the ancient world, he leaves it pretty much up to the reader to make the linkage between the OT and the illustrations offered. Where K. has gone beyond this work and others such as B. Mazar's great five-volume *Views of the Biblical World* is in the effort to concentrate on one important biblical book, the Psalms, confronting the iconographic material of the ancient world by exploring the "identical, similar, or even diametrically opposed apprehensions of the same phenomenon (e.g., of the heavens, of death, of the king) in ancient Israel and its environs" (13).

It is a salutary, often even corrective, experience for the student of the OT to turn from his preoccupations with the text, admittedly essential, and to come to terms with another dimension of the material, its imagery and the suppositions which underlie it. As K. points out, the image of the Pharaoh smiting his enemies goes beyond a specific historical experience; it symbolically represents Egyptian kingship as the defender of the nation against all enemies. So it is with countless other symbols whose evocative power far outstrips their literal, objective meaning. So powerful is the associative capacity of the ancient Near East that the image normally moves from the historical and concrete to what touches the universal and eternal world order. Claude Lévi-Strauss, the leader of anthropological structuralism, speaking of the deep structures which are hidden beneath the surface structures, reminds us that "what appears at the level of the consciousness does not consist of the really important phenomena, which can only be reached at a hidden level."

This deeper understanding of ancient iconography may undercut an objection which could be raised against K.'s methodology. He has drawn his imagery from a vast area (Egypt predominantly) and his canvas stretches over three millennia, offering Bronze Age material to illustrate Iron Age texts etc. In other words, the method is thoroughly synchronic. But K. is not trying to show the dependence of individual Psalm verses on given works of art. He sets the literary document into a cultural context which defies chronological limits. It should be added, of course, that K. is perfectly aware of Israel's power creatively to transform an ancient symbol in terms of a Yahwist faith which touched every facet of her existence.

The book is undoubtedly a major contribution to our understanding
of the visual imagery in the Psalms and other portions of the OT. There are defects, to be sure; it would be just as well to forget the volcano imagery (218) when dealing with Yahweh and the event at Sinai. An opportunity has been missed in illustrations 292 and 294, where K. might have pointed out that the "golden calf" of Exodus is really the young bull which served as a pedestal on which the invisible Yahweh stood. In the fascinating section on the encounter with the holy, it must be said again that there is no such verb as shh, "to prostrate." This relatively frequent verb is now known to be a hishtaphel form of the verb hwy.

Biblical students can only be grateful for this rich compilation of material, which will help them to relate vision to word, image to text. To the artistic skill of Mrs. Keel we owe almost a half of the 524 excellent line drawings. The book is almost faultlessly printed and has a substantial bibliography, a catalogue of the illustrations, and an index of biblical references. In the last analysis, K. has caught the bond of human aspiration, sorrow, joy, and achievement which unites us and our forebears of centuries past. By juxtaposing image and text, this link has been plastically represented in the art of Western Asia and Egypt which unfolds before us in this extremely valuable synthesis.

University of San Francisco

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


First published in Hebrew in 1964, this is a translation and revision for English readers of Heinemann's comprehensive study of prayer among the Jews during the last centuries of the Second Temple and the first centuries of the Common Era. The title is somewhat misleading. It is not a study of prayer in the Talmud, but of the formation of prayer during the period prior to the codification of the Talmud, i.e., prayer in the age of the Tannaim and the Amoraim, as the Hebrew title indicates. H., who died several years ago, was one of a generation of outstanding Jewish scholars who were as much at home in Greek and Latin sources as they were in the Hebrew and Aramaic texts. In this extraordinary book, a work of meticulous scholarship, H., writing in his mature years, offers a comprehensive interpretation of Jewish prayer during the formative years from the destruction of the Second Temple to the formation of the Talmud in the fifth century.

In comparison to other aspects of religious history, i.e., the history of religious ideas, critical appraisal of literary texts, and the growth of institutions, the study of prayer, of liturgy, and of worship in general is still in an embryonic stage. In Jewish history the foundational studies of prayer and worship were published several generations ago; e.g., Elbo-
gen's *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung* first appeared in 1913. Since that time new sources have been discovered, e.g., the materials from the Cairo Geniza, and new methods developed, but no one has attempted to deal comprehensively with the topic. This H. does in masterful fashion, but the most provocative aspect of this book is his insistence that the best method for studying prayer texts is a thoroughgoing form-critical method.

Using form criticism, H. argues that the scholarly search for the original text of a prayer or form of a liturgy (a pursuit Christian scholars as well as Jewish scholars have followed) is unproductive. Prayers belong to oral tradition and it is neither possible nor desirable to try to establish the single text from which later prayers developed. "It seems to us," writes H., "more correct to assume the opposite: that at first many different forms of the same basic prayer grew up in a somewhat haphazard fashion, and that only afterwards, gradually in the course of time, did the Rabbis impose their legal norms on this vast body of material."

With this principle in mind, H. does not attempt a history of Jewish prayer in the Tannaitic and Amoraic periods but an analysis of the different forms of prayer, their *Sitz im Leben*, and their distinctive characteristics. On the basis of a form-critical analysis, he is able to distinguish between prayers which have their place in the synagogue, e.g., statutory prayers, those that are unique to the Beth Midrash, and those that are private and personal forms of prayer. In each case there are distinctive forms of address, key qualifiers of God, fixed endings which occur regularly.

Although the primary accomplishment of the book is the analysis of forms of prayer, the material is put in a broad historical context. During the time of the Temple, prayer was secondary to the primary activity of sacrifice; the people were onlookers. But in the last years of the Temple and the period after its destruction, forms of fixed communal prayer emerged which were not dependent on anything other than the people who prayed. Prayer was self-sufficient, not an accompaniment to another action. Accustomed as we are to such prayer, it is well to be reminded what a revolutionary achievement it was and how much Christianity depends on Judaism for this form of prayer. The new fixed prayers had as aim to provide men and women with a stimulus to turn their thoughts to God, to remove them from the mundane and routine and elevate their thoughts to the divine.

For the Christian reader, H.'s discussion of the prayers of Jesus is particularly provocative. Many have argued for the uniqueness of the prayers of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels. F. Heiler, e.g., called the prayer "thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven" the "highest moment in the history of prayer," and others have stressed the uniqueness of the
epithet "Abba." H., however, produces extensive evidence to show that
the prayers of Jesus are distinctive—not that they are without parallels,
but that they belong to a specific genre, private nonstatutory prayer.
They exhibit all the characteristics of Jewish private prayer. They are
intimate, brief, simple, without formal address or style, in the vernacular
(Aramaic), prayers that one can pray for oneself rather than ones which
are recited by someone else. What is intriguing about H.'s argument is
that such prayers are often directed against the prayer of the synagogue,
i.e., against fixed prayer. Jesus offers, then, an example of simple prayer
in accord with a tradition of private popular prayer.

It will take years for Christian scholarship to digest and understand
H.'s splendid book, but those who spend time with it will be immensely
rewarded.

University of Notre Dame

ROBERT L. WILKEN

CHRIStOLOGY BEYOND DOGMA: MATTHEW’S CHRIST IN PROCESS HER­
MENEUTIC. By Russell Pregeant. Philadelphia: Fortress; Missoula, Mont.:

The author, assistant professor of religion and philosophy at Curry
College, attempts to apply a "process hermeneutic" to Matthew's Gospel.
Based on Whitehead's view of language, such a hermeneutic accepts
religious language—in this case, the Gospel of Matthew—as "incomplete
and fragmentary," yet as also revealing a "fundamental disposition to­
ward reality itself." In other words, in and through the imprecise and
analogous nature of religious language are "lures" which lead the inter­
preter in the direction of metaphysical claims which transcend the
discursive level of the text itself.

P. applies this interpretive framework to Matthew's Gospel in order to
probe a fundamental question: whether a "fully existential interpretation
of New Testament Christology is possible." The advantage of White­
head's philosophy of language over the program of Bultmann in this
regard is that a process hermeneutic is not content with "translating"
biblical categories into existential ones, but seeks to discover an existen­
tial vision of reality within the intentions of the text itself.

P.'s analysis of Mt 5:17–20 and its context indicates that Torah is
fundamental and enduring for Matthew, even as it is radicalized and
interpreted by Jesus. Torah anterior to "grace" reveals a universal
standard by which the authenticity of human existence may be judged.
Even an emphatically Christological text such as 11:25–30 contains leads
for a vision of reality that transcends confessional boundaries. Jesus is
ultimately subordinate to and revelatory of a God whose relationship to
humanity is the basis of reality. The judgment parable of 13:36–43 and
the vivid scene of 25:31-46 confirm these universal lures embedded in Matthew's text. Fidelity to the law of love (equivalent to authentic human existence) is a standard by which all are judged, even those outside the confines of the confessing Christian community.

P. concludes his study by confronting these universal dimensions of the Gospel with its apparent soteriological affirmations. As P. clearly recognizes, if it can be shown that Matthew considers Jesus' death to have unique saving significance, as truly effecting a "cosmic shift" in reality itself, then the universal, existential implications of his vision are blunted or even eliminated. P. studies 1:21, 20:28, and 26:28, and concludes that an atonement or vicarious-satisfaction interpretation of Jesus' death is, at best, peripheral to the Evangelist's theology. Thus, P. affirms, a study of Matthew in the light of a process hermeneutic leads to what he terms a "catalytic christology," a Christ who is ultimately a symbol of a deeper view of reality that, on the one hand, points to authentic human existence defined by love and, on the other, to a universal understanding of the God who grounds such existence.

P.'s work is thought-provoking and refreshing, and his interpretation of several passages in Matthew does isolate enticing universal implications. But there are some important elements of Matthew's Christological portrait which P. does not treat, such as the miracle material (essential Christological elements of the Gospel) and the Christological titles. And his chapter on Matthew's soteriology limps. While Matthew may not delineate a classical atonement or substitutionary interpretation of Jesus' death, he surely affirms that Jesus' death is a turning point in salvation history (cf. 27:51-53, a text not treated by P.) and that the death-resurrection of Jesus rescues those trapped in death. And these affirmations are predicated on the Evangelist's conviction that the identity and mission of Jesus are absolutely unique. An existential interpretation of Matthew and other New Testament Christologies may be possible, but such interpretations will not be adequate until the "confessional" dimensions of the text are fully confronted.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago


Meaning in Texts is another contribution to the fast-growing literature of biblical structuralism. M.'s principal intention is to demonstrate that there is a fundamental relationship between structuralism and hermeneutics which can be seen by tracing the development of the two fields from the work of Wilhelm Dilthey. M. interprets the term "structuralism" in a broad sense; it is not simply the kind of structuralism that rests
methodologically on the principles of Saussure and Lévi-Strauss. It includes, e.g., the findings of scholars in the field of narratology, or the structural study of narrative, who see their work as based on Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenological theory of perception. On the other hand, not all types of structuralism can be related to hermeneutics. Hence M. maintains that the structuralism with which he is dealing is concerned “explicitly with the nature of the creator of meaning (author and reader) and implicitly about questions of meaning and knowledge; it is the structuralism of ‘narratologists’ who are discovering the logical and human constraints of narrative or the way that the human as human creates narrative in order to understand and be understood” (x).

The book is divided into three parts. The first is devoted to meaning and language in hermeneutics, and covers the relevant areas in the thinking of Dilthey, Heidegger, Gadamer, Bultmann, and the leaders of the New Hermeneutic movement. M. is lucid in his analysis of Diltheyan poetics and in his treatment of Heidegger’s contribution to hermeneutics in relation to that of Dilthey. The reader will also find some interesting pages on Gadamer and Bultmann that contain occasional provocative statements: e.g., “Gadamer seems not to combine effectively the ontological participation of belonging of the interpreter with the critical methodological attitude of the interpreter” (58). A useful review of the positions of Fuchs and Ebeling in relation to developing hermeneutics illuminates their positions on a number of matters of interpretation, though M. is certainly justified in maintaining that the extent of Fuchs’s dependence on Heidegger is debatable. He pays Fuchs a graceful but unprovable compliment when he writes: “In Fuchs’s treatment of translation and preaching it becomes clearer in what way Fuchs’s hermeneutics will transcend Bultmann’s existential interpretation” (77 f.).

The second part deals mainly with structuralism. The contributions of Saussure, the Russian formalists, Roman Jakobson, the Prague School (especially the rarely discussed Mukarovsky), Lévi-Strauss, Roland Barthes, A. J. Greimas, and numerous other scholars in the field are reviewed, on the whole sympathetically. In chapter 6, M. examines the relationship between structuralism and hermeneutics in the context of Ricoeur’s thinking and concludes by presenting a view of man’s developing mental structure which is informed by the writings of both Dilthey and Piaget.

The third part covers structures and meanings in NT narrative. M. here proposes a structural method of analysis and applies it to Lk 5:1–11, the story of the call of Simon Peter. His statement of the method is necessarily partial and tentative. The basic premise on which his analysis proceeds is that “the program of the structural study of narrative may be taken as a view of the process by which meaning and meaning-effect are
created in and from narrative by author and reader” (276). Some structuralists will undoubtedly argue the validity of this premise: it is not entirely clear (can a program be a view?); furthermore, it is questionable whether the structuralist should be primarily concerned with the meaning of a text. It could be maintained that his principal function is the analysis of the structures of a particular text, and that the clarification of the meaning inherent in the text falls in the province of exegetical interpretation rather than structural analysis. However, M.’s analysis of Lk 5:1–11 is hardly a “pure” structuralist analysis and should not be judged as such: it is as much an exercise in narrative hermeneutics.

The special singularity of Meaning in Texts lies in the importance that its author attaches to the theories of Dilthey in the development of both hermeneutics and structuralism. I do not doubt Dilthey’s considerable influence in the field of hermeneutics, but I wonder whether M. has overestimated his significance in relation to the development of structuralism. In the works of Scholes, Culler, Via, Hawkes, Polzin, Jameson, Detweiler, Calloud, Patte, and most other exponents of structuralism, references to Dilthey are generally brief, if they occur at all. However, M.’s book is worth careful study, not least for the very comprehensive notes which appear at the end of each chapter.

Harvard University

David Greenwood


Although presented as a textbook, this work is an original and creative contribution to fundamental theology. It is ecumenical insofar as K. accepts many characteristically Lutheran theses regarding the word of God, proclamation, and faith. But K. is thoroughly Catholic in his confidence in the rational demonstrability of the existence of God and in his unquestioning appeal to the Catholic dogmatic tradition. He takes pains to square his positions with conciliar teaching throughout the centuries. Bringing together these Lutheran and Catholic tendencies, K. achieves a brilliant synthesis, broadly comprehensive, internally coherent, and ecumenically promising. A totally lucid thinker, he sets forth his ideas with clarity, order, and precision. Having had the courage to present a pure position, he must be prepared for challenges from many sides. Anticipating the objections, he replies to many of them in advance.

Characteristic of this work is a sharp distinction between the natural order, which is open to rational investigation, and the supernatural, which is accessible to faith alone. The word of God, K. maintains, presupposes that God Himself becomes the subject of real relation. This can occur only because God as triune communicates Himself through the Logos and the Holy Spirit. Revelation, as a participation in the Trinitarian
processions, is totally unknowable outside of faith. Not even the antecedent possibility can be shown to reason. Yet K. rejects fideism, for he contends that the claims of faith, once proposed, cannot responsibly be set aside.

In the tradition of word theology, K. holds that faith comes only from hearing the proclamation of God's word (cf. Rom 10:14). The word of God, properly speaking, is not law but gospel—that is to say, the good news that God communicates Himself to us in the Son and the Holy Spirit. In Christianity the content of revelation and the event of its proclamation coincide. This is not true, K. argues, for non-Christian religions, including Judaism, which consequently are not bearers of the word of God, at least until their message is reinterpreted in the light of Christianity.

On the ground that the credibility of Christianity can only be believed, K. rejects the evidential value of all miracles, except insofar as the event of proclamation and its acceptance in faith are themselves miraculous. K. strains to show that the miracles and prophecies so emphasized by Vatican I can be interpreted as qualities of Christian proclamation rather than as signs external to this. Further, K. denies that Jesus was empowered to work physical miracles. The resurrection of Jesus, in his view, is not a historical event demonstrable outside of faith.

K.'s synthesis has many attractive features. Very impressive in my view is his linking of revelation with the Trinitarian processions—a connection already suggested by Rahner and Mühlen, but more systematically developed by K. As for the positions I find unconvincing, they are so ably argued that I disagree only with reluctance.

The Achilles' heel of the system is the difficulty of accounting for the original emergence of the message to be proclaimed. K. says that the word of God originates with Jesus, but he does not successfully explain how Jesus was enabled to proclaim the Father's unbounded love for him. If Jesus learned this through hearing the testimony of others, how did they learn it?

Many contemporary theologians, in opposition to K., would say that the word of God is not the original form of faith but that the word itself is a crystallization of something first intimated, at least obscurely, in a graced experience. If K. were to admit some kind of prepredicamental faith, he might have to allow for a greater interpenetration between faith and reason than he now does. But he could do better justice to the prophetic experience, to the salvific importance of non-Christian religions, and to the nonverbal components in revelation.

Debatable though some of his positions are, K. is to be commended for the thoroughness and consistency with which he has thought through the system which he here proposes.

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

Professor of religion at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., Ketcham has written several books, including Federico Fellini: The Search for a New Mythology. In A Theology of Encounter he draws on the "new ontology" indebted to Husserl, Heidegger, and Buber to propose a theology designed to overcome "the metaphysical dualism that has plagued Christian thought for such a long time—the futile effort to combine Greek monism (with its absolutes) with Hebraic monotheism (with its God who acts)" (40). The work is interspersed with digressions on topics ranging from race relations to nuclear weapons.

Analyzing modern thought on religion, K. classifies authors into three categories. A group exemplified solely by Barth is comprised of "those who, via St. Thomas or ecclesiastical tradition, remain with or return to the orthodox affirmation" (5); these, "as Neo-Thomists or Anglicans or catechetical Lutherans or Calvinists, believe that any major change in the Christian proclamation or articles of faith is heresy" (5). An even more disparate second group, represented by Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Troeltsch, Feuerbach, Bonhoeffer, Altizer, and others, seeks to reinterpret Christian theology in the light of the philosophical insights of Hume, Kant, and Hegel. A third set of theologians, "related more by the nature of their rejection of classical tradition than anything else" (5), consists of those inspired by either Marx or Kierkegaard. It is with the second strain of this third group that K. associates himself.

To develop his basic category of encounter, K. adds the transitional stages of Me-You and (I)Me-You(Thou) to Buber's familiar I-Thou and I-It. God, the Eminent Thou, is never known by the mind but only through encounter and experience, in a self-validating feeling of absolute dependence. A consideration of time and history stresses a distinction between clock time (the present) and identity time (now). The now moment enjoys priority over past and future, and the meaningfulness of events lies in our interpretations of them, not in the events themselves.

Reason and revelation are also redefined. "Reason," a corporate interpersonal activity, is distinguished from "thinking," mental activity performed by oneself, and from "consciousness," the nonpurposeful activity of the brain. Revelation is self-disclosure of any sort, part of the natural expression of being. Divine self-disclosure, neither knowledge nor fact, is "the sense of the presence of God addressing us in terms of our self-conscious awareness" (146). Though an exclusively now event, revelation may include attribution of religious meaning to past occurrences. Related more immediately to reason than to thinking, it has nothing to do with consciousness.
Application of these ideas to Christ and the Church concludes the book. Freed at last from the distortions of Hellenistic metaphysics, Jesus can be seen as one in whom God addresses me. "In the Christ-event, Jesus'-life-and-Resurrection-as-witnessed-to-by-the-disciples, I am addressed by the presence of God in terms of my self-consciousness and, because of Jesus’ humanity, in terms of my identity and life-style" (146). Although Jesus is neither God nor the perfect man (K. adduces an alleged feeling of guilt because of the slaughter of the innocents as evidence of Jesus’ complicity in social evil), the traditional Christological titles can rightly be applied to him, since he mediates God to us. The Church is the community "of those whose identities have been effected and affected through their encounter with God in the Christ-event" (153); achievement of its sorely-needed reform is contingent on its willingness to forget the divisive issues of the past and focus its attention on God’s present revelation.

This is a simplistic book on issues worthy of serious treatment. Apart from some pages on Ebeling and Rahner, K. barely mentions recent work on Christology. No reference is made to the writings of Alois Grillmeier and James Barr, which undermine several of K.’s unexamined presuppositions. His own views, frequently unsubstantiated assertions, are often vulnerable to the charge of subjectivism. There may well be need for a new Christology, but K. has not contributed to its construction.

St. John’s Seminary, Brighton, Mass.  

JOHN P. GALVIN


This is indeed an exciting book. Amid the increasing number of recent books on Christology, it is an important contribution. The book has two major sources. First would be S.’s studies in Europe and hence the heavy reliance on European biblical scholarship and systematic theology. Here S. writes along the lines of Moltmann, Pannenberg, Kasper, and Käsemann, and with reliance upon their writings. The second source would be S.’s experience and audience in Latin America. Written in the milieu of liberation theology, here is where the book becomes exciting and novel.

S.’s basic hermeneutical principles closely relate theory and practice, orthodoxy and orthopraxis. This does not remain abstract but is concretely focused and exemplified in the study of Jesus. S. maintains that we cannot know Jesus unless we follow him and his way. This becomes a theme of the book; it is in reality the consequence of taking a historical approach in the study of Jesus. While many theologians take this approach, it seems to me that S. shows its fullest implications. The shape
and pattern of the historical Jesus' involvement in history becomes the pattern of our own struggle and involvement with our history. All elements of the history of Jesus point towards this concrete mission of Christians today, not to contemplate Jesus, but to put into practice his way.

While I take this insistence on the practical as the test of a Christology as perhaps the most powerful insight of S., there are other strong points. This emphasis on the concrete and practical makes the question of implicit vs. explicit Christian faith—the question of anonymous Christianity—a very secondary issue. Jesus can never become an abstract universal; he always remains a concrete person. There is, therefore, a long chapter on the faith of Jesus, perhaps the best treatment in English on this increasingly important area of Christology. Finally, his appendix on the Christ of the Ignatian Exercises begins the difficult process of unifying a Christology, a view of spirituality, and a strong concern for social justice.

In a more critical turn, I would indicate several points that call for further clarification or expansion. Little is said of the significant area of the parables of Jesus. The work of North American theologians such as Perrin, Crossan, TeSelle, and Via provides valuable input for discussions of the faith and world view of Jesus as found in his parables. S. insists on beginning with the Jesus of history. While in basic agreement with this, I would add, as Kasper does, that in reality there is a double starting point, the Jesus of history and, always along with that, one's present, operative, living faith in Jesus Christ. In several places S. points to a structural similarity between Palestine in the time of Jesus and Latin America today, based upon deep-rooted social sinfulness and a yearning for liberation. This similarity calls for further nuance and grounding. In his powerful presentation of the suffering and death of Jesus, S. relies considerably on Moltmann. But he does not seem aware of some of the difficulties in Moltmann's position of "God against God." At one point God is supremely present on the cross; in the next the cross seems to be the absence of God, since He abandons His Son. Is this a supreme paradox or perhaps poetical rather than rigorous reflection? In several places S. speaks of Jesus "bringing about the kingdom." Here more nuance seems needed on the relationship of Christ and the Christian to the establishment of, witnessing to, or pointing to the kingdom.

S. speaks of Jesus as the way to the Father, but then explains that he reveals not the Father but the Son. He is not the sacrament of the Father. While it is true that we must follow Jesus as the way, more than contemplate the Father as the end, as S. insists, there is also need for the revelation through the Son that God is Love. Thus I feel he insists too sharply on Jesus only as the revelation of the Son. In a few other
instances I would say that S. exaggerates his own position in order to disagree with an opposing position. His cautions against cult rather than concrete discipleship, and against Christianity as a religion rather than faith, become too sharp and critical, even though one can agree with their basic thrust or direction. Incidentally, since S. does have reservations about cultic worship, I hope that he will expand on his interpretation of and function of the Eucharist in the light of a liberation-Christology perspective.

One suggestion for reading this book: begin with chapter 11, "Theses for a Historical Christology." S. summarizes the entire book in the form of theses and brief explanations. This enables the reader to catch an overview of the method, direction, and content of the entire book before settling down to read it from cover to cover.

The Preface to the Spanish Edition (xi) refers to the "inoperativeness" of traditional Christologies. S.'s book is an excellent way to push the Christian towards a more operative Christology, one that makes a difference in conduct and life style. To borrow a phrase from Schubert Ogden, the point of S.'s Christology is not that one know or study about Jesus, not that one contemplate his life, but that one take up the challenge as Jesus did. The emphasis upon the historical Jesus turns out to be not a look at the past but a commitment, modeled upon Jesus, to our own time and history; for, as S. insists, the only way we know and contact Jesus truly is through following his way.

We are once again indebted to Orbis Books for bringing to the English-speaking world this important contribution to contemporary Christological thinking and action.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago       J. PETER SCHINELLER, S.J.


This is an excellent study of the first Christian solutions to the problems of writing history. The centerpiece of the volume is a four-chapter study of Eusebius of Caesarea. It is preceded by a setting of the pagan background, the principles according to which the earlier Greek and Latin historians had structured their narratives. Following the study of Eusebius are a chapter devoted to Socrates Scholasticus and a single chapter on the other three historians. The final chapter deals with the Christian ideal of the emperor.

The study finds its unity in two themes: the role of fortune or fate in human affairs and the position of the Roman Empire in the history of salvation. It proceeds by a constant and fruitful comparison of these
Greek Christian writers with their pagan and Jewish counterparts and with Augustine. Their influence upon subsequent Byzantine and Latin political ideals and structures is also indicated.

C. is at his best in demonstrating the social context and implications of the Origenist cosmology and anthropology which Eusebius espoused. The extreme body-soul dualism protected the human spirit from a deterministic influence of historical events, and its autonomy guaranteed a true initiative within the human realm. Still, human decisions have a limited role in shaping the world because of the conjuncture of independent chains of decisions and events which often produce unanticipated consequences. Divine providence works on this higher level to control and direct history through human choices and actions which are free in themselves. C. points out the additions and omissions which betray the functioning of these twin assertions of human freedom and divine direction in Eusebius' narrating of events. One of the most significant of these is the conjuncture of the founding of the Roman Empire and the incarnation of the Logos. The Roman peace set the context for the founding of the Church, to which God providentially joined it in Constantine. C. shows that Eusebius' own experience of the horrors of civil war and his progressive view of salvation history contributed to his estimation of the function of Constantine.

The tension within the work of Eusebius and his successors is between the Platonic, individualistic eschatology and the Jewish, communal apocalyptic vision which insists upon the objective significance of historical process. They did not accept a synthesis of the two such as Augustine worked out, one in which the significance of historical events lies in their promoting the salvation of individuals.

The subsequent chapters detail the successive modifications of Eusebius' solutions by the later historians. Socrates drew more heavily on a sort of cosmic sympathy which links the religious, civil, and natural spheres in peace and disturbance. He also exploited the pagan concept of the privileged occasion in which an individual decision might have far-reaching consequences. Both Theodoret and Evagrius were more willing to assign a role to fortune; they located the characteristically Christian element in the response to it.

The final chapter shows the assimilation of the salvific role of the ruler as a model for his subjects. The ascetic soldier-monk replaced the philosopher because of the emphasis on his magnificence in raising the minds of his people to higher things.

Perhaps the most significant function of this study lies in its establishing the connection between a view of social and political structures on the one hand and of the relation between grace and freedom on the other. The troubles of the Western Empire, which so deeply affected Augustine,
did not seem to concern the Greek historians. Their optimism about a perfect society and close relation between church and state endured until the Islamic conquest. It is reflected in their views of history and anthropology.

The editor of this series is to be congratulated on his selection of this study to inaugurate English-language publication in Théologie historique.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago J. Patout Burns, S.J.


Although the question of ordination of women in the Roman Catholic Church cannot finally be resolved by appeal to historical fact alone, the clarity needed to reach a resolution depends as much on accurate perceptions about the Church's past as it does on accurate perceptions about the present situation and future needs of the Church. The Ministry of Women in the Early Church provides the historical base that has been lacking in so much of the current discussion; an informed theological position is really not possible without it.

Itself a model of clarity and scholarship, G.'s work establishes conclusively what can and cannot be said about the historical role of women in the Church's ministry from the first to the sixth century. Proceeding chronologically and collecting nearly every relevant piece of evidence—from the NT, the Fathers, manuals of church discipline, conciliar legislation, papal decretals, as well as the secular legislation of Theodosius and Justinian—G. subjects the historical data to rigorous analysis. He criticizes the work of earlier historians and theologians, while carefully delineating the conclusions that can be drawn from the evidence of the tradition. Clarification of the distinction between widows and deaconesses, roles long misinterpreted by historians, is an important result of G.'s work. His conclusion is straightforward: the only ministry exercised by women in the early Church was the diaconate; although their ministry was much more restricted than that of the male deacons, deaconesses were nevertheless "ordained" by a "laying on of hands" (cheirotonein) and numbered among the clergy. But history offers no conclusive answers to the present-day debate over ordination to the priesthood.

Unfortunately, Women and Priesthood: Future Directions, a collaborative effort by the faculty of the Catholic Theological Union at Chicago, does not do much to advance the discussion, despite its good intentions.
With the exception of a lone layman and a sister, all the essays are written by clerics. Throughout, the editing leaves much to be desired: a reference to "gorilla warfare" (p. 155) is only one example of general sloppiness.

Despite these negative observations, a number of interesting points in the essays deserve notice. Among these is Stuhlmueller's analysis of the historical process by which Israel adapted the institutions of pagan religious and cultural leadership to its own needs and eventually came to regard the process of adaptation as the work of God. Ralph Keifer makes the much-neglected point that the priest represents Christ the Head only in conjunction with representing the Church. Carolyn Osiek underlines the importance of distinguishing both the literary and social context in which the Fathers made negative statements about women's ministry and the content of such forbidden ministries. Sebastian MacDonald's questioning of the data base from which negative conclusions about women's ministry are reached today is helpful in bringing social-science perspectives to bear on the discussion. For the most part, the remaining essays are competent enough but unexciting and unlikely to move persons on either side of the debate.

Wesley Theological Seminary, D.C.


In view of preparations underway among the Orthodox for their Pan-Orthodox Synod and for official theological dialogue with the Church of Rome, this study of the "azyme controversy" between East and West, one of the issues behind the mutual excommunications of 1054, is quite timely. Now professor of religious studies at Rutgers University, S. prepared this doctoral dissertation at the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto. He explains that, although both East and West believed that bread used at the divine liturgy became the true body of Christ, the West used unleavened matzos (azyma) in their wish to employ the same kind of bread that Jesus would have used at the Last Supper, a Jewish Passover Seder, whereas the East, influenced by St. John's Passion chronology and by St. Paul's symbolism, required a loaf of leavened bread (artos), since Jesus had designated artos, not azyma, as his body. In the Byzantine tradition a loaf of bread enriched by leaven and salt was seen as a more fitting symbol of life than the "lifeless" matzos.

S. argues convincingly that the split between East and West culminating in 1054 was due in part to divergent liturgical traditions and differing
theological interpretations of the origins of the Eucharist and the appropriate relationship of Christianity to Judaism which the attitudes toward azyme bread typified. All this was more than a “kitchen quarrel over the correct recipe for sacramental bread” (170). Rather, it illustrated the shocking mutual ignorance of East and West churchmen about independent liturgical traditions. Rome’s Cardinal Humbert was quite unprepared to recognize that the Eastern churches could possess any authentic tradition that was inimical to the teaching of Rome. Friction between Rome and Constantinople was exacerbated by a common lack of historical perspective about ecclesiastical developments outside their own cultural sphere. Both the East’s and the West’s common presupposition of a universally uniform liturgical tradition would hamper the need to give some practical expression to unity amid cultural diversity.

One of the major conclusions of this study is that the often-repeated contention of many historians right into the twentieth century that Cerularios deliberately and artificially raised the azyme issue in order to thwart reconciliation between Byzantium and the papacy is plainly contradicted by historical documents. Particularly useful here is S.’s analysis of contemporary eleventh-century treatises for and against the azyma, such as the letter of Patriarch Peter of Antioch to the Archbishop of Venice Dominic of Grado, or the letter of Leo of Ochrida to John of Trani. S. wryly comments that the major participants in the azyme controversy were “not prodigious intellects or seminal thinkers.” To give one illustration, Cardinal Humbert was so ill informed in criticizing Constantinople that he blamed its patriarch for mischievously “dropping” the Filioque from the Creed.

Throughout this monograph S. uses Latinized orthography for Greek names. Has not the time come for non-Orthodox writers to follow the usage of Orthodox theologians who write in English and who prefer transcriptions such as Cerularios, Photios, etc.? After all, Catholics and Protestants in recent years have come to agree on the orthography of biblical names.

This well-balanced reassessment of the azyme controversy and its roots in isolated, independent traditions is a valuable contribution to East-West rapprochement today.

Concordia University, Montreal

MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.


Schurhammer is to Xavier as James Boswell was to Samuel Johnson, and even more so. For six decades the German Jesuit diligently concen-
trated his great talents to researches that led to this biography; his numerous other publications, including the best edition of Xavier's letters, are related to the same theme. Few biographers have been such sticklers for accuracy; for ferreting out original sources, edited and unedited; and for letting sources speak objectively for themselves. Despite repeated pressures, and despite the practice common to modern biographers and especially to hagiographers, he refused to indulge in psychological interpretations. Readers must be content, therefore, with the absence of this subjective approach, appealing as it may be, from this great work, the most detailed life of a saint ever published. Readers are also advised to note that, as the subtitle states, this is both a life and a times of Xavier, with the latter element monopolizing most of the text. What S. set out to portray was not only the person and labors of Xavier but also the world in which he moved, in Europe and Asia; and so there is a great deal of geographical, historical, and even technical information, as well as numerous substantial biographical sketches of the persons involved in the Saint's career. The more than 4,600 footnotes (many of them substantial essays), which occupy more than one third of the 605 pages of text, along with the 24 pages of bibliography (limited to the most important works consulted), leave no doubt that this is a learned tome. Yet, the vast and varied information is presented in very orderly, clear, and readable fashion.

Unlike Volume 1, which covered the thirty-five years of Xavier's life spent in Europe, Volume 2 restricts its attention to the fifty-three months between the departure from Europe to the departure for Indonesia. S. is fond of tracking the lengthy journeys of the Apostle of the Indies. Thus the description (1-132) of the sea voyage from Lisbon to Goa (April 1541–May 1543) makes us intimate with the India fleet; the officers, crew, passengers, and cargo of the Santiago; daily life aboard the galleon; and contemporary seafaring methods and perils. Along the way the stop at Mozambique (August 1541–February 1542) supplies the occasion for a protracted account (51-102) of this Portuguese colony and its history. Book 2 (133-279) recounts the stay at Goa (May–September 1543). There is a chapter (201-67) on Xavier's apostolate there, while the rest of this section presents an unrivaled view of the capital of Portugal's enormous Asiatic possessions. In Volume 1 an important subsidiary value was the best and fullest account in English of the founding of the Society of Jesus (of which Xavier was a founding father); in this volume a similar value can be attributed to the authoritative delineation of Portugal's Asiatic empire. This account would have been improved if the section on the royal patronage (padroado), had been lengthened to more than the two allotted pages, since it is fundamental to an understanding of church-state mission relations. Books 3 and 4 (285-605) center on the visit
(September 1542–August 1545) to the coastal regions northeast and northwest of Cape Comorin at the southern tip of India. They reveal the Parava and Marava peoples, among whom Xavier labored with great success. In the chapter on São Thomé (557–605), the scene of the missionary's efforts from April to August 1545, there is a twenty-eight page section on the tomb of the Apostle St. Thomas, who may have evangelized that region long before the sixteenth century.

Amid all the background material the central figure is not lost to view, as some critics have complained. All reliable data are utilized, including many of Xavier's letters (translated in extenso) and a surprisingly large amount of testimony from eyewitnesses. These highlight clearly Xavier's daily manner of life, his methods of work, his saintly and winning character, and the deservedly high esteem in which he was held by all, Christians and non-Christians.

Seven maps enhance the work's value, as do six appendices (606–703) and a thorough index (729–59). The Roman printers deserve kudos for excellent typography with very few misprints. So does the Gulbenkian Foundation for its generous grant to this project. Still more does Fr. Costelloe warrant praise for his excellent translation. I hope he will place us further in his debt by completing the translation of the two remaining volumes.

Campion Center, Weston, Mass. John F. Broderick, S.J.


This dissertation leads the reader carefully through the Luther corpus and international Luther research, attempting to answer the question "What is the relationship between wrath and love in Luther's concept of God?" B. uses two "stipulatory definitions" to sort out the complex and seemingly contradictory lines of Luther's thought: (1) notitia—implying "a general theoretical knowledge or an unspecified conception"; and (2) usus—implying "a knowledge which is applied and specified pro me" (usually applied to the notion of "law" by Luther). With the help of these two definitions, B. leads the reader through the pertinent exegetical and tractarian materials (especially the lectures on Romans and "The Bondage of the Will") under the headings "natural theology," "omnipotence," and the relationship between "justification" and "predestination." Luther's relationship to the Late Middle Ages receives particular attention, but yields only the well-known conclusion that Luther rejected a "natural theology when it is adapted and subordinated to sinful man's own needs and desires" (47).
B.'s conclusions are well based and clearly presented: (1) Luther used the late-medieval theory of predetermination as a basic notitia about God as the omnipotent creator. (2) Justification is an effect of predetermination rather than the consequence of predestination. (3) Predestination on the notitia level (theoretical reasoning) leads either to the false security of the "left wing" enthusiasts (Schwärmerei) or to the insecurity of those who constantly doubt and try to overcome uncertainty with work righteousness. (4) God's unconditional promise of love in the gospel creates faith as "a 'charismatic' experience of certainty" which can live with the most difficult contradictions in the concept of God (on the usus level—existential experience). "In the certainty and uncertainty of the idea of election, we have a clear equivalent to the simul justus et peccator of the doctrine of justification" (188–89).

There is a wealth of material in this book, since B. follows the classic norms for doctoral dissertations: the constant testing of the interpretation of primary sources in the light of past and present research. Although there are no revolutionary findings, the focus on the idea of retribution in Luther's concept of God (as His "alien work") provides a useful wedge against the popular Swedish judgment (advanced by Anders Nygren in Agape and Eros, 1939) that Luther radically broke with a medieval eros theology by teaching that God is only agape—a "Copernican revolution" in Western theology. B. clearly shows, once again, that Luther's doctrine of divine wrath is rooted in late-medieval theology and does not contradict the article of justification; for faith in God's unconditional promise without meritorious works can live with the notion that God is free to save or damn mankind in the end.

Experts on late-medieval theology (especially on Occam and Biel) will not always agree with B., who is not totally clear on what Luther meant by "natural theology" (47). But the question of Luther's indebtedness to late-medieval theology is very complex and loaded with hermeneutical freight, as the recent controversy between Leif Grane and Heiko A. Oberman demonstrates (Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte, 1977, pp. 56 ff. and 302 ff.). B. summarizes positions very well and presents a useful approach to a topic which became Luther's original Anfechtung and has plagued many a Christian mind before and after Luther.

Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg  Eric W. Gritsch

This book concerns the *via media* pursued by the Church of England during the first half of the sixteenth century. It thus concerns the concept of adiaphora, which identifies as vital to an understanding of that middle way and of the English Reformation as a whole. The title *The Indifferent Mean* comes from the Protestant humanist Thomas Starkey, who considered it to be a course running "between the extremes of 'blind superstition' and 'arrogant blindness'" (158). As such, it referred to those who insisted on a legalistic adherence to traditional rites and ceremonies as essential to salvation and to those at the opposite extreme who neglected or repudiated them. The English Reformers, steering the middle course, agreed with Christian humanists and Continental Reformers who protested against the "intolerable burden" of ceremonies in the medieval Church and especially against any suggestion that rites and ceremonies in themselves were necessary to salvation. By means of the concept of adiaphora, which Verkamp treats with considerable care, they strove for the quantitative and qualitative reduction of such matters of indifference. This was the negative which led the Reformers to look to Scripture and the early Church for guidance in separating the essential from the indifferent. There were, of course, differences of opinion. Over against those who sought to prohibit all that is not commanded by Scripture, the "mainline" English Reformers insisted that things indifferent are neither good nor bad. John Frith is cited effectively in this regard on doctrine—an area into which the concept of adiaphora was constantly intruded (102–3). This indifference being taken seriously, the inner attitude of Christians was seen to be all important. Did the faithful regard adiaphora as things truly indifferent? If so, then they must be permitted, although at no time did they believe that license was given to practice adiaphora freely, on the basis of personal whims. The Christian must consider the weak, the general welfare, and the need for edification, and political unity. Adiaphoristic liberty is spiritual, a matter of conscience. The Reformers allowed in various ways and to various degrees that those in civil authority might legislate concerning adiaphora to ensure peace and tranquility.

The book, although modest in bulk, is heavy in content, well documented from printed primary sources, and possesses a helpful index and a bibliography divided into the customary categories, from sources to dissertations. Its chief strength lies in its treatment of a major idea, recognized as such by students of the English Reformation. I am concerned, however, that V. has limited his field, neglecting contemporary Roman Catholic reform activity, especially of the Christian humanist variety. I also regret his stopping short at 1554. This is of particular concern, since Verkamp knows that to treat the concept of adiaphora it
is necessary to deal with the Puritans, who do not emerge in identifiable form until the Elizabethan era. It is inconceivable to me that anyone should write on the subject of this book without taking into account the Admonitions Controversy and Richard Hooker's Lawes. V. admits that there is more to the story than he gives here. That more is not just a matter of "future development" (173); it is essential to the task he undertakes.

JOHN E. BOOTY


This book depicts "the english recusants as a highly articulate and diversified group of churchmen and authors who, in the unfavourable circumstances of exile or of the penal legislation in England, produced an imposing literature of theological controversy. They polemicized extensively against anglicans and protestants, and, no less bitterly, among themselves. But they also did better than polemicize. They attempted to deal responsibly with some of the major problems inherited from the later middle ages and the sixteenth century" (246). The main topic of the book is, in fact, a study of the views of seventeenth-century recusants on Scripture and tradition as sources of faith.

Tavard has previously published a similar study for the sixteenth century under the title Holy Writ or Holy Church, wherein he concentrated on the views of Catholic writers who responded to the Protestant declaration that Scripture alone was the sufficient basis of the faith of Christians. Whereas in the early Middle Ages Scripture and tradition were felt to be in "fundamental harmony . . . taken as a norm of faith and doctrine" (1), the later Middle Ages saw challenges to this opinion; and these were fortified by the development both of the textual study of the Bible and of church history and by the Protestant emphasis on the Bible alone. T. then proceeded to "a study of the humanists, of Luther and of Calvin, [which] introduced the heart of my study, namely, the theology of the catholic polemicists" (3). It is this study, continued into the seventeenth century, which is the substance of the new book. In the meantime, however, he published in 1969 a book entitled La tradition au XVIIe siècle en France et en Angleterre.

The thought of the writers, however, that leisurely progress before the reader's gaze, is, at least to a historian, almost too amply illustrated. Nevertheless, many notable passages are quoted. Dr. Henry Holden, writing in Charles II's reign, has a forward-looking approach: "all words are either equivocal of themselves or at least may be variously and
diversely taken by a multitude of auditors. Whence it is that in all discourse and verbal communication there does generally arise much ambiguity and diversity of intelligence” (193).

In 1675 Abraham Woodhead was adumbrating a theory of the development of doctrine: “all points of faith are not delivered and transferred to posterity by the forementioned tradition in their express and explicit terms; but some have only descended in their principles: the necessary deductions from which are by this infallible church extracted and vindicated from age to age against those dangerous errors that may happen to assault them” (216).

T. recommends that his recusant writers be further studied “in at least two other areas, the spiritual life and sacramental theology” (246). Even so, what he has written shows their importance not only in the theological writing of their time but also as a means to the better understanding of their Anglican contemporaries.

The Dutch publisher has produced a handsome volume, though at a high price (about $30). Only one misprint has been noted (p. 229). There is an index of names and one of topics.

*Georgetown University*  
**Eric McDermott**


Williams’ new study deserves ranking with Redeker’s more biographical study and Richard Niebuhr’s Christological study as a standard introduction to S.’s thought. Although this study focuses on the doctrine of God, it can readily serve as a general introduction to the entire Glaubenslehre and S.’s more mature thought.

W. persuasively argues that a reappraisal of S. is needed, particularly in view of Barth’s influential critique. First, W. argues that S. gives the language of Kantian idealism a new meaning; for S. both disagrees with Kant’s dualism between theoretical and practical reason and his resulting noncognitive view of theological knowledge. Feeling “is the original, pretheoretical consciousness of reality” (4), while knowing and doing are simply its further determinations. This consciousness is always a consciousness-with-the-world and grounded in God. The charge of S.’s reduction of religion to anthropology overlooks all of this, as well as S.’s dependence upon the Platonic tradition in theology, in which “it belongs to the divine being and perfection to relate itself to and disclose itself in the world” (5).

Secondly, W. finds that S. has employed a sophisticated phenomenological attitude and method in the Glaubenslehre, although he has
avoided the dogmatisms of phenomenological philosophy. Thus the first half of the *Glaubenslehre*, in which we encounter the general analysis of the correlation between God and the world constitutive of the religious consciousness, functions as an eidetic reduction. But—and this is what interpretations overlook which accuse S. of a natural theology—the second half removes the brackets surrounding the “indeterminate and abstract” description of religious consciousness to show how it is concretely modified by the Christian fact of redemption.

This introduces us to the heart of W.’s work, a careful analysis of the divine attributes as disclosed in the generic religious consciousness (chap. 3) and as historically modified by the Christian fact (chaps. 4, 5, 6). W. cogently proposes that S. offers an alternative to both classical theology and process theology. Against those interpreters who think that S. inconsistently views God as absolute and unrelated to the world on the one hand, and yet related to it in redemption on the other, W. thinks it “is quite possible to read S. as saying . . . divine love is the immutable element of God, his motive in creation and redemption. This remains constant. . . . [O]mnipotence is the mutable element of God, which changes in its exercise relative to the stages of creation” (183). Finally, this reinterpretation is strengthened by W.’s proposal that S. approaches Cusanus’ view of God as a coincidence of opposites: absolute inwardness and absolute vitality, separated and related to the world (chap. 2). This Platonic background is particularly new in Schleiermacher interpretation.

W.’s analysis is neither exaggerated nor repetitious of other studies. He does not maintain that S. fully explicates his God doctrine as offering a new understanding of divine immutability, but only tends in that direction. Further, W. treats us to a careful exegesis of the more important Schleiermacher texts and never sinks into unsubstantiated speculation. The book would have been enhanced by more contextual information. Similarly, the references to Aquinas need amplification in the light of contemporary Thomistic studies. S.’s coincidence of transcendence and immanence is very close to Aquinas. Aquinas also shares the Platonic strain. Finally, however, one might ask why S. has not remained dominant for contemporary theologians. Is Barth’s caricature the only reason? Perhaps we should complement Williams’ positive analysis of S. with Gilkey’s negative critique in *Naming the Whirlwind*.

*Carroll College, Montana*  
WILLIAM M. THOMPSON

The outstanding contributions of Adolf von Harnack (1851–1930) as church historian and chronicler of ecclesiastical institutions are now widely appreciated across confessional lines. His published works, numbering over 1,500 pieces plus many posthumous studies, are often irreplaceable. His direct influence on several generations of theologians, including Barth, Bultmann, and Bonhoeffer, has been duly noted. Even the details of his life have been interestingly recorded in his daughter's biography of this most influential German Protestant church historian of the nineteenth and early-twentieth century. What has eluded us up to now, and is finally corrected by Neufeld's monograph, is a solid evaluation of his theological, especially ecclesiological, outlook.

For this task N.'s credentials are impressive. He has studied at the Jesuit theologate at Lyon-Fourvière, did doctoral studies under H. Bouillard and Y. Congar at the Institut catholique de Paris, worked several years as Assistent to Karl Rahner, re-editing Volume 11 of the Schriften (historical studies on penance) and publishing the Rahner-Register, an analytic index to the original volumes of Theological Investigations. Recently he has begun to lecture at the Gregorian University.

N. shows that, despite Harnack's vocation as church historian, he was not interested simply in the Church's past but in its present vocation. Various conflicts that he had with church leaders and disappointments about the modern Church inevitably colored his judgments and set his agenda. But the Berlin historian was anxious to understand the nature of the Church throughout the centuries spanning the age of Domitian (1 Clement) to the post-Reformation period.

N. divides the present work into three sections. Part 1 analyzes H.'s multivolumed Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, which is seen as a criticism of the Church as developed from its origins. While this growth is seen not exactly as a Krankheitsprozess, still, in responsible service to the present, H. exposed faulty emphases. N. argues that H. was not opposed to the emergence of Christian "dogmas" but only to a sterile repetition of dogmatic formulations. Part 2 is devoted to H.'s two further central publications, Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums (1902) and Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung (1910). N. proves his point, that they should be viewed not simply as sources of information about long-gone historical periods but as an invitation to conversion by the present-day local churches.

Part 3 is composed of several essays in which H. is brought into dialogue with the Church of the seventies, especially on matters relating to Christology, sacraments, and the understanding of the relationship of Church to world. The point is made throughout that H. believed that the Church could realize its vocation not in its present embodiment within the German Lutheran Church, far less in the traditional Roman Catholic
Church of his time. Rather, the Church possessed a vocation to constitute a new entity, a *tertium genus ecclesiae*, to use the term of this book's subtitle.

In light of the shoddy way that H. was often treated in older Catholic theological manuals, where he ranked usually among the *adversarii*, this Jesuit author has performed an appropriate work of reconciliation and reparation by giving us a thoughtful and perceptive study of his major writings, works that are seen to have sprung from a deeply pastoral concern for the shape of the Church to come.

*Concordia University, Montreal*  
MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.


In 1967 SPCK published S.'s *The First Lambeth Conference, 1867*. With that work S. established himself as a church historian whose command of sources and knowledge of tensions and movements within the Anglican communion in the nineteenth century nearly put him on a par with Owen Chadwick of Cambridge. Walter Hobhouse, Sidney Dark, Bernard Heywood, William Curtis, Dewi Morgan, and in 1977 Keller-Huschemerger had previously attempted to provide a connected narrative of the decennial Lambeth Conferences. S.'s current volume supersedes them all, but does still more. He has written a major work in the history of the modern Church. The reputation he earned with his first volume will be enhanced by the present work. His command of archival material, some of it scattered over five continents, is admirable, but more remarkable still is the power of synthesis he brings to his subject. Though each of the ten Lambeth Conferences is dealt with in depth, S. places these meetings of the Anglican episcopate within the history of the world-wide Anglican communion during the century of its greatest expansion. With care and clarity he traces the evolution of the diverse structural forms that the Anglican communion has developed during the last hundred years, which have seen this family of twenty-four Christian churches become the fastest-growing form of organized Christianity in the Third World.

The first three chapters summarize S.'s previous book. Chapter 4 sketches the background of the Conference of 1878, and the fifth chapter treats the debate at the 1878 Conference on the question of the best mode of maintaining union among the various churches of the Anglican communion, the major theme of S.'s work. Successive chapters deal with Edward White Benson and the Conference of 1888, and Frederick Temple and that of 1897. Chapter 8 narrates the story of Randall Davidson's visit to the General Convention of the Episcopal Church at Boston in 1904,
the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908, and the Fifth Lambeth Conference. The next chapter treats the most famous of the Lambeth Conferences, that of 1920, which issued the landmark ecumenical document *The Lambeth Appeal*. The tenth chapter skilfully relates the ecumenically complex Conference of 1930, and chapter 11 details the work of Lambeth '48. The twelfth chapter tells the story of the 1954 Anglican Congress at Minneapolis and the Conference of 1958, which produced the memorable report *The Family in Contemporary Society*, written by Bishop Stephen Bayne of the Episcopal Church. The last three chapters study the preparations for Lambeth '68, the Conference itself, and the decade following the Conference, which witnessed the emergence of the Anglican Consultative Council.

Though S. has obviously made every effort to write this major work from the viewpoint of the world-wide Anglican communion, some readers may justifiably complain that the preponderance of material from the Church of England has gone counter to the express intention of his title. Moreover, S.'s current book originated in two lecture series that he gave at Oxford in the early seventies. His audience was deeply interested in the concerns of the Church of England, and his lecture style, tailored to that audience used to wit and asides, may account for the uneasiness which some scholars will feel when perusing this volume. There are some inaccuracies, especially in the last chapter. The professor of theology at Southampton is Howard Root, not Harold Root. Geoffrey Sambell, the Archbishop of Perth, was never a member of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. There are the inevitable misprints, with one glaring mistake on p. 274.

*Loyola Marymount University*  
**Herbert J. Ryan, S.J.**  
*Los Angeles*


The motive behind the present study was a desire to examine the prospects for ecumenical ethics. With this in mind, Gustafson, although he devotes the first chapter to historical divergences in Catholic and Protestant ethical thinking, concentrates largely on recent developments in both traditions. In the historical discussion he highlights four areas of difference in the two traditions. The first has to do with the role of the Church in ethics. While the Protestant churches may have had certain moral traditions, there is nothing in the Protestant churches to parallel the magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church. Also, the development of moral theology in the Roman Catholic Church has been closely related
to church practice in the administration of the sacrament of penance. There has been no such relationship in the Protestant churches. G. finds divergences also in both the concept of sin and the concept of the purpose of law. The final area of difference is in the attitude toward Scripture. The Protestant attitude, epitomized in the expression *Sola scriptura*, puts much more of a normative burden on Scripture than Catholic moral theology has, at least over the past four centuries.

These differences account for certain strengths and weaknesses in the Catholic and Protestant approaches to ethics today. Traditional Catholic moral theology follows an ordered approach and provides clear responses based on rather well-defined philosophical and theological principles. Its weakness is that it is too rigid and too closed. Protestant theological ethics has a looseness and an openness that appeals to the modern mind. Its weakness is that it is too loose and its criteria for determining right and wrong too elusive. G. feels that these two traditions have a great deal to learn from each other, and finds them moving in each other's direction.

The Protestant ethical tradition finds current historicism and existentialism most congenial philosophies. But G. calls attention to the fact that many Protestant ethicians, to avoid the subjectivism and relativism to which these approaches can lead, have been searching for more stable bases for their ethics and ethical solutions. Catholic moral theologians, on the other hand, are trying to soften their norms by applying a touch of historicism and personalism. So fast has been the movement in this area that some of the source material regarding Catholic theologians may already be a little dated.

On the theological level, G. finds Catholic moral theologians making more use of scriptural sources, both to found their natural-law approach and to give moral conduct a Christian intentionalization. He also finds convergences in developments in other areas of theology, e.g., Rahner's theology of grace.

In summary, G. sees Protestant and Catholic moral theologians abandoning two extreme perspectives of the past: an occasionalist view of ethics and a static moral order. Convergence, however, is easier to come by in limited and special areas. More fundamental convergence will have to await the development of a consensus in basic outlook.

Those interested in the possibilities of ecumenical ethics will find this book extremely helpful in sorting out the various strands of the Catholic and Protestant traditions and in discerning the trend. As might be expected, G. is better acquainted with the Protestant than the Catholic tradition, but he shows a remarkable grasp of the latter. Even after reading the book, however, the present reviewer wonders whether recent Protestant openness, compared to a Catholic stance, may be due in some
sense to the absence of a tradition as well as to a different tradition. As G. himself notes, since the Reformation until comparatively recent times there has been little Protestant activity in special moral theology or, as it is sometimes called, casuistry. Protestants in general accepted and lived by the same traditional norms by which Catholics lived. While G. calls attention to the lack of theological development on this level, it is not precisely under this formality.

*Loyola University of Chicago*  
*JOHN R. CONNERY, S.J.*


Hannah Arendt once wrote that in an age which had turned its back on the pursuit of rational truth, truth-telling would no longer be a compelling virtue. She overlooked the case where telling the truth is itself the one absolute. Ironically, we live in an age where people at once despair of truth and at the same time make a fetish of telling every truth. Among our contemporaries there is a kind of puritanism over truthtelling, even to the point of indelicacy. Bok, it would seem, shares in this Zeitgeist. Indeed, she may be the most articulate exponent of the morality of outspokenness yet to appear in print.

Bok's position on truthtelling is exacting. She rejects the absolutism of Kant and Augustine, but the exceptions she herself would make are few and exceedingly fine. She examines excuses for white lies told to save face, noble lies told in the national interest, lies used to cover up for colleagues, tales told to quiet children, and evasions made to dying patients, and she finds nearly all the justifications customarily given for them wanting. She opposes mental reservation, is critical of the practice of denying people the truth on the ground that they do not properly have a right to know, and terms honor among professional colleagues vestigial "tribalism." She argues—correctly, it seems to me—that we should resort to deception in justified cases in the same way that we fall back on the use of force. By that analogy, for deception to be permissible, the harm to be avoided must be grave and all alternatives must have been exhausted.

The prohibition against lying, of course, rests on the corrosive effect of deception on interpersonal trust and sociability. B. advances her rigorist position with two key arguments based on that premise. First, what seems reasonable from the point of view of the liar is seldom such from the point of view of the person duped (reciprocity). Secondly, liars vastly underestimate the consequences of their actions (taint of judgment and harm). Repeatedly B. cites these reasons or some variation of them as
overriding factors, ruling out of order alleged grounds for misleading others.

On the whole, B. shows too great reluctance to grant the best possible case to the deceiver. One should not look in books on applied ethics for defenses of morally objectionable practices, but one should expect that cases of conflict of principle will be probed with sensitivity for clashing values. B. lacks the sense for hard cases which serve to nuance basic principles. There is a paucity of them to be found in *Lying*. Unfortunately, B. even lets one case to which she shows some sympathetic understanding, namely, F.D.R.’s intrigues leading to American involvement in World War II, slip by virtually unexamined. Furthermore, while she is uncompromising about truthtelling, B. has made her peace with some morally questionable practices. Lying, to judge from her arguments, is more to be avoided than divorce or suicide. Those who have a different assessment of the evil of suicide, e.g., might have a different reading, too, of whether to withhold a lethal prognosis from a patient with self-destructive tendencies. The avoidance of hard cases and the downgrading of conflicting values are the most serious flaw in what is basically a well-conceived book.

Some reviewers have suggested that B. is a contributor, along with people like John Rawls, Michael Walzer, and Roberto Unger, to a renaissance of moral philosophy at Harvard. But, despite her Harvard connections, *Lying* is not on a par with works like *A Theory of Justice* or *Justice and Unjust Wars*. For one thing, B.’s style of ethical reasoning eschews philosophical speculation, claiming it has been a source of confusion and rationalization in moral decision-making. Secondly, she lacks the rich intuitions about how various values fit together in our ethos that one finds in Unger’s *Knowledge and Politics*. Lastly, she also lacks the careful casuistry found in Walzer’s *Just and Unjust Wars*. One wonders what a book on lying from Walzer’s pen would look like. Nonetheless, the moral B. wants to drive home is an important one. We can do better in our private and public lives in promoting truthtelling and discouraging deceit. This is especially true of professional groups. It is a simple message, but one which is not readily heard. Reading this book will be important if only because by sheer accumulation of examples B. shows how manifold are the occasions for deception in our lives and how variegated the excuses we offer in self-justification.

*Woodstock Theological Center, D.C.*   **Drew Christiansen, S.J.**


Because the most profound encounters of world religions occur on the
level of mystical experience and because of the ongoing Western dialogue with the great Eastern religions, Johnston maintains that Western theology must be rethought in the light of mystical experience. Mysticism, for J., is not only the root of all religious experience but also a radically human experience found in all cultures at all times. Although J. highly esteems the founders of the world's great religions, he underscores the central role of Jesus the mystic and his Trinitarian mysticism and correctly rejects undifferentiated unity as mysticism's supreme moment.

Defining mysticism as a loving knowledge, a being in love without restriction, a way of looking at the world with the eyes of love and compassion, J. explicates mysticism as the response to a call addressed to all. In an age prone to the unusual and the bizarre, J.'s focus upon mysticism's hiddenness and ordinariness is most welcome. For J., solidarity with the poor can be mysticism. Enlightenment, be it in the desert or in the cities, promotes authentic social action.

The book's best section argues that mysticism must be the heart of authentic theology. J. perceptively notes that the normative theology of Scripture and the theology of the Fathers flowed from mystical experience. Ideally, therefore, Christian theologians should be mystics, or at least willing to reflect upon the data supplied by the mystics, with an eye towards Lonergan's treatment of conversion in *Method in Theology*. J.'s remarks should give pause to those many theologians who relegate the mystics to the realm of "spirituality" and "piety," or whose theology does not flow directly from their own living faith but only indirectly from reflection upon an academic tradition which presumes faith.

Skillfully utilizing Lonergan's transcendental precepts (Be attentive, Be intelligent, Be reasonable, Be responsible, Be in love), J. distinguishes genuine mysticism from meditative technique, philosophical inquiry, and morality, admitting, however, that mysticism may be the root of these at times. J.'s short but useful exposition of the history of the word "mysticism", his explanation of the mystical journey via the famous Chinese ox pictures (he adds his own final one: the wise man being assassinated), his emphasis on the mystical dimensions of the Bible, his treatment of creative nonaction, his striking parallelling of Oriental nothingness and Christian kenosis, his description of discernment as mysticism in action—these are excellent. I could only marvel at his blending of the Gospels, Jung, Carl Rogers, John of the Cross, Freud, Teresa of Avila, Ignatius of Loyola, Mother Teresa, Gandhi, the *Cloud of Unknowing*, the *Gita*, Taoistic statements, Zen examples, etc.

I must admit, however, that I do not see what significant role salvation history, especially the bodily resurrection of Jesus, plays in J.'s analysis of Christian mysticism. Is there not a significant difference between Jesus' historical death and bodily resurrection and the Bodhisattvas'
ideal compassion and the Buddha’s enlightenment? Along with Rahner and others, I would also tend to view mysticism more broadly as a special kind of “return to self” not necessarily linked with unrestricted love. Is it theologically accurate to speak of Jesus’ loving relationship with his Father reaching a “final stage of purification” (51)?

Nevertheless, this is one of the most important and interesting books I have read in recent years. J. possesses the rare gift of articulating very difficult theological ideas with simplicity, precision, nuance, urbanity, ecumenical gentleness, common sense, and ultraclear prose.

Boston College

Harvey D. Egan, S.J.


Readers of The Human Condition and Arendt’s earlier essays and studies in political philosophy have long awaited her statement on intellectual theory, her final reflexions on “contemplation” to complete those on “action.” Her recent death at sixty-nine unfortunately cut short her projected third volume on Judging (on which there is a brief appendix in Book 2), but the volumes on Thinking and Willing offer a welcome and remarkable intellectual challenge to a world that has often forgotten, even when it knew, how and why it once thought and willed.

The Life of the Mind, moreover, is also properly a “theological study,” a particularly valuable lesson for Christian scholars tempted to neglect their classical Greek, Roman, and medieval origins for their own and modern thought in favor of social and political action. In this sense A.’s emphasis on the nature and genius of particularly Roman and American Revolutionary thought, especially Cicero among the former, John Adams among the latter (cf. also her On Revolution), is most refreshing. Suddenly, too, it becomes clear that evidently esoteric scholastic theses on volition and intellection, even those on the common sense and the phantasm, may be far more significant than any mere theology of revolution. Indeed, for A., the latter is quite unintelligible without the former.

Thus it is sobering, yet exciting, to follow A. as she works, thinks her way through Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Augustine, Aquinas, and, most interestingly, Duns Scotus, whom we thought to have put to rest long ago, then on to Descartes, Rousseau, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, and Heidegger. Aside from Gilson, modern Catholic reflection on willing, thinking, and judging from Suarez to Lonergan seems closed to her mostly Kantian mind. And it is a pity she did not know Charles N. R. McCoy’s The Structure of Political Thought, which illuminates much of what she left unclear, particularly in the area of intellection. Yet, A.’s erudition from philosophy to philology, from theology to poetry, is vast, perceptive, inspiring.
So, if there are lacunae, this often has roots in A.’s own theories. Practically, she never did seem to know Aquinas’ theory that truth was in the judgment—hence her preference for Scotus and her difficulty with beatitude. This is why too, I suspect, she remained more an action, i.e., a political, philosopher than a theoretical one. She knew Augustine’s De trinitate but not Aquinas’ verbum. In fact, A. may be said to have appreciated and understood the importance of Augustine more than any other recent writer. It is not by accident that she ended the volume on willing with Augustine and The City of God, that she considered him the greatest of the Roman thinkers. On the other hand, to come across this statement, the opposite of which is the essence of Aquinas, seems merely unscholarly, though it probably fits in with her own action theory: “That there could be an activity that has its end in itself and therefore can be understood outside the means-end category never enters Thomas’ consideration” (Vol. 2, 123). That Aquinas did hold such a thing was once almost the very first thing one learned about him, his esse and his pure act.

What Christianity was to A.—its intellectual and political meaning—has always been a problem. Theology almost seemed to be a way to illuminate the kinds of mental activities rather than achieving some objective reality. She was, however, one of the few modern political philosophers to sense the central importance of the Resurrection and its impact on the history of thought, particularly political thought. She had no hesitation in making the will a Christian discovery, with Paul and Augustine. Her partiality to Augustine and Scotus was understandable in the light of her stress on newness and particularity as valid categories of reality, categories that also followed from the dogmas of creation and the Resurrection. The various reflections on the ontological and theological status of various collectivities in The Life of the Mind are of first-rate importance.

Furthermore, A. was ultimately concerned with saving politics from thought, or at least with distinguishing, as Aristotle did, practical and speculative reason. She wanted to know what men could be expected to do and make in their public lives. But to do this, again loyal to Aristotle’s instinct in The Metaphysics, she had to know about thought and the internal activities of the human mind. The Life of the Mind thus stands to The Human Condition as Aristotle’s Metaphysics to his Politics, though perhaps without Aristotle’s priority of the former to the latter. Indeed, I would argue that A.’s analysis of Christianity explains her preference of action to contemplation, why her Life of the Mind tends to end up in the mind, whereas for an Aquinas it ends in a beatitude that the mind did not itself produce.

In any case, that aberrations in politics ultimately stem from aberrations in thought, that therefore there is a way to think and to think
properly, A. leaves no doubt. The Life of the Mind makes the trivium and the quadrivium, the *summae* and the *Ratio studiorum* seem alive again, unsuspected treasures that ought not to be given up. This is a study to be welcomed indeed by anyone seriously interested in thinking and willing, in judging and acting. The Life of the Mind is, if nothing else, a testimony (a word she loved) to the very vigor of the life of the human mind. Hannah Arendt's last efforts are not to be neglected.

*Georgetown University*  

**JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.**


The appearance of J.'s 1974-75 and 1975-76 Gifford Lectures is the publishing event of the year for those interested in the history of science and the relations between science and natural theology. He asks the most important question in the history of science: Of all the many cultures that the human race has developed so far, why in only one has science taken root and flourished? He answers quite simply and directly. In only one, the Judeo-Christian culture of Western Europe and its descendants, has there been active the trust in the existence of an objectively present, rationally ordered world which can and should be investigated as man's privilege and responsibility because such is the will of God, who stands behind that universe as its intelligent and beneficent creator.

J.'s book is a massively documented, exhaustively researched study of the history of science and philosophy, to show that science only thrives when such a philosophic position is operative in the minds of the creative scientists of the age in question. He works through twice twenty centuries of history and devotes the whole of the second half of his volume to our own century in proof of his position. It is indeed an unusual experience to have a first-rate historian of science hold so unabashedly a theistic interpretation of the progress of science. The book is tough reading, but it is inconceivable that anyone interested in religion and our age would not attempt to master this truly staggering display of scientific and historical scholarship.

This is not to deny that J.'s book will be greeted with howls of dissent from all sides. J., a Benedictine priest-scholar of Hungarian birth, is rapidly becoming an outstanding, if not the outstanding, figure in the field of the history of science. He is, however, the most opinionated, cantankerous, and argumentative thinker since Eric Temple Bell stopped writing in the history of mathematics. Sometimes, as J. relentlessly drives home his critical perspective, one feels like saying: "Don't shout so loud; I cannot hear you."

For instance, J. wants to hold that only scientists who espouse a
position close to moderate realism are capable of creative science. To support this position, he considers Albert Einstein and Max Planck as the greatest physicists of the twentieth century. This choice is defensible, but it becomes quite awkward for J.'s thesis when one realizes that Einstein only consciously moved away from a devotion to Ernst Mach, a philosophic heretic for J., after his creative phase in science had ended. In his later, nonproductive years Einstein approached close to philosophic purity for J., but he did no work that has proved of significance in that period. Planck is a great name, but after his discovery of the law of black body radiation in 1900 he was more of a psychologically important father figure in physics than a creative scientist.

This leaves the case of the person most theoretical physicists would rate high above Planck as a separate question: Niels Bohr. Bohr was productive from the teens of this century, when he developed the theory of the hydrogen atom, through the twenties when he directed the creation of the new quantum mechanics by Heisenberg, Born, Dirac, and others, into the thirties and forties when he was present at the origin of nuclear theory (the liquid drop model, the compound nucleus model). His major scientific productivity covers more than thirty years, considerably beyond that of Einstein, although his work was not as varied. But Bohr is associated directly with the Copenhagen interpretation of quantum mechanics, which is not in the simple moderate-realism picture J. embraces. So Bohr is an enemy. He is even implicitly accused by J. of arrogance, the man whose most famous statement is “Every sentence I say must be understood, not as an affirmation, but as a question.”

One wonders if a more gentle approach might have allowed J. to salvage valuable insights from Bohr, his principle of complementarity, and his whole Copenhagen scheme. For instance, moderate realism accepts the analogy of being. Assertions about God and finite entities are simultaneously possible only because of it. Could it be that the world of the physically very small is also so radically different from the world of the very large that, just as being is said only analogously of God and creature, so it would be said only analogously of the very small and the very large. At least, it might be worth working with such possibilities before clobbering mercilessly the hero of the vast majority of contemporary theoretical physicists.

From what has been said it is clear that J. almost visibly gags in admitting that Darwin is of any scientific importance. Must we fight that battle again? J. does not even mention the work of Abbot Gregor Mendel in genetics or the shift in significance of natural selection in Neo-Darwinism. One wonders now and then in reading J. if Pope John XXIII did not have a good point when he gave the advice to look at what is valuable in
a thinker's work and not to judge totally by the philosophic or theological position from which he speaks.

So J. has penned a book which invites refutation and clarification if anyone can master the scholarship to try it. At the same time, he has restated the case for contemporary moderate realism with a forcefulness and success that has not been in evidence since the great days of Gilson and Maritain.

*Loyola College, Baltimore*

FRANK R. HAIG, S.J.

**"The best book yet on the extraordinary changes in Dutch Catholicism in the years during and after the Second Vatican Council."**

—ANDREW M. GREELEY

**"A brilliant sociological analysis of what is perhaps the most dramatic transformation in the history of modern Catholicism."**

—ROBERT N. BELLAH

**The Evolution of Dutch Catholicism**
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Ellwood's two new books attempt to provide a much-needed introductory text and accompanying reader to the study of religion. In his text he covers the problem of defining religion, some aspects of the history of religion from early times to the present, the psychological and sociological dimensions of religion, and its symbolic, ritual, and doctrinal elements. Finally, he examines the current religious scene with the intention of pointing to future religious trends. His selection of readings, relating to all the above areas, provides plenty of material for discussion.

Despite E.'s promising endeavor, his treatment of the whole religious scene is far from satisfactory. Two points, one methodological, the other factual, deserve mention. First, E. states clearly that the concern of his book is "essentially with description and understanding" (ix). But his assumptions are bound to influence both his descriptive accounts and the interpretative analysis he gives of the religious data he selects. He admits that he has philosophical and methodological preferences and then seems to assume that this admission exonerates him from a serious attempt to achieve some measure of balance and objectivity so necessary in an introductory text. It would have been more beneficial if the students were exposed to different theories and methods, even if E. clearly opted for one specific approach.

Second, E. has swallowed the popular brand of sociobiology hook, line, and sinker, and then applied it to religion. The result is utter confusion, which is the hallmark of chapter 2. It is hard to fathom how reference to Konrad Lorenz' duck Martina is conducive to unraveling the intricacies of religious beliefs and rituals. E. wrongly assumes that sociobiology is the universally accepted theory in anthropology. The knowledgeable reader may smile sympathetically at his gratuitous assumptions and lack of expertise in cultural anthropology, but the initiate, for whom the book is mainly intended, is more likely to be misled in his attempt to understand religious beliefs and practices.

John Saliba, S.J.


In this era of ecumenical dialog, Sloyan's book comes as a most valuable contribution toward increased understanding between Jews and Christians. With the skill of a scholar he traces, biblically and historically, the evolution of the Church from a body in full continuity with Judaism to a force more or less opposed through the ages to most things Jewish.

S. properly prepares the reader for the central inquiry, "Is Christ the end of the law?" by discussing the Jewish outlook during 150 B.C. to A.D. 100, where the Mosaic law came to be central for most Jews, but not for Jews who followed Jesus. Then, in light of his comprehensive exploration of the Synoptics, Paul, John, and some of the catholic epistles, he argues that whatever else may be said of the view that in Christianity the law was completely superseded by love, it is not a view that is true to the NT data. His coherent and biblically substantiated arguments against any continuation of the opposition between law and grace, creation and redemption, grace and nature, not only provide a full response to the most
basic question facing Jews and Christians in their dialog—the relationship of the law and grace through Christ’s resurrection—but also outline a Christian anthropology in agreement with the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures.

In his concluding chapter, S. performs splendidly the hermeneutical task of showing what “Implications for Contemporary Faith” fidelity to true Hebrew-Christian tradition should have. He asks that Christians in community call upon the Spirit to help them select, interpret well, and be true to those affirmations of graced nature and covenant law which are essential to their “oldest tradition”—a challenge which he has imposed upon himself and carried off admirably.

The format of S.’s book adds to its great worth, with substantial evaluative summaries at the end of each chapter, and helpful Scripture and subject/author indexes.

M. Sharon Burns, R.S.M.


Vermes has collaborated with his wife Pamela to produce this up-to-date general survey of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the educated public, with special reference to the needs of university students. The work is of top quality.

In eight chapters, V. (1) recounts the discovery of the documents and fragments in the Judean desert, (2) affirms their authenticity and establishes them firmly in the intertestamental period, (3) describes the content of the substantial nonbiblical works in the Qumran library, giving reference to edition(s), English translation (his own), and especially pertinent literature, (4) depicts the life and institutions of the Sect, (5) identifies it as Essene, (6) traces its history, (7) outlines its principal ideas and ideals, and (8) gives the important insights gained from these documents for biblical study. Each chapter (except the third, where the literature is interwoven) is followed by a specific, and often annotated, bibliography of works “meant primarily for those wishing to specialize in religious and oriental studies, theology and ancient history.”

As V. notes, “the enigma of the Dead Sea Sect is by no means definitely solved. After all this time we are still not certain that we have interpreted the whole evidence correctly or collated it properly.” He might have added that we have not even seen all of the evidence yet, due to delayed publication (the Hebrew edition of the Temple scroll mentioned on pp. 23–24, however, has now appeared). And further study may modify various positions V. has reported. Not everyone would agree with all of his positions now. But as a statement of the present status and consensus of Qumran studies, this book is hard to beat. Perhaps a future edition might add a page explaining the sigla for the documents. 1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, 1QH, 4QNahum, 4Q179, CD, 4QShir-Shab, etc. are not immediately intelligible even to the educated public and university student. Nevertheless, this book deserves the highest recommendation for accomplishing its objective.

Neil J. McEleney, C.S.P.


A reference work, composed of documents (encyclicals, conciliar statements, pastoral letters, discourses, etc.) arranged in chronological order, usually from the time of Leo XIII to 1976, on six major subjects. The complete text is usually given, but at times an excerpt suffices; each volume has an introduction and a subject index.

The volume Bible Interpretation (ed. James J. Megivern) deals with (sixty-two) documents that touch on the use of the Bible in the Christian
Church, e.g., from the Muratorian Fragment (ca. 170 A.D.) to a document of the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education on the Theological Formation of Future Priests (Feb. 1976). The great encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XII on biblical studies are here, as well as the various instructions and decisions of the Pontifical Biblical Commission. Christ Our Lord (ed. Amanda G. Watlington) contains more than its title indicates. Besides the obvious statements on the Mystical Body, Sacred Heart, and Christ the King, the volume also has an encyclical on the Holy Spirit, two on the Eucharist, and Vatican II's Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation and its Dogmatic Constitution on the Church. In all, there are thirty-one selections. The various facets of the liturgical movement are treated in Worship and Liturgy (ed. James J. Megivern). The fifty-two selections treat Holy Communion, the Eucharistic fast, Communion under both kinds, Church music, the permanent diaconate, the Roman Missal and Breviary. Clergy and Laity (ed. Odile M. Liebhard) gathers together twenty-eight statements dealing with Catholic Action, the lay apostolate, the Church's contemporary mission, the role of deacons, and holiness in the priestly life. Four documents of Vatican II on bishops, priests, and laity are included. The question of Christian marriage is taken up in Love and Sexuality (ed. Odile M. Liebhard). The forty-two selections offer a variety of statements on virginity, celibacy, and birth control. Social Justice (ed. Vincent P. Minelli) begins with Pope John's Mater et magistra (1961). One would expect to find the encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI on labor, but the Introduction (xiii) informs us that since Pope John's encyclical conveyed a new spirit, the decision was made to begin with him. Included among the nineteen selections are Pope John's Pacem in terris and Pope Paul's Populorum progresio and Humanae vitae.

Inasmuch as this is the first time so many official statements have been so conveniently gathered together in so uniform a manner, this series should find a place in all church-related libraries.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


In an introductory chapter, P. explains the need to rethink the traditional concept of sin. "Traditional concept," it soon becomes clear, means "popular misunderstanding"—though in fairness it should be admitted that some older theological works reinforced this popular misunderstanding. This leads to a consideration of sin in biblical thought. This consideration is brief and solid, but gives no new insights into the fruit of scriptural research. Next, since P. wishes to explore the biblical understanding of sin through the use of process modes of thought, he expresses briefly, selectively, and popularly pertinent aspects of process thought with some accompanying existential analysis. This then enables him to deal with sin under three aspects: as a particular kind of evil in a universe in process of development, as a situation or state in which human choices are made, and as wrongful human acts or decisions. Finally, there is a brief survey of how God, who is Cosmic Love, acts to overcome human wrong. This deals in particular with redemption by Christ, justification by faith, and sanctification by love.

The basic reinterpretation of the traditional concept, or the correction of the popular misunderstanding of sin, really takes place in presenting sin in biblical thought. The subsequent exposition shows it is possible to discuss and understand at least much of the
biblical thought on sin through process modes of thought. It is not clear that this analysis adds any new light or is superior to some other theological approaches; but for those who find process theology illuminating, this study of sin may be very helpful.

John H. Wright, S.J.


In the past, too often, general statements were made that the majority of theologians hold that Mary had a debt to contract original sin, without a careful and complete investigation. The present detailed historical survey is therefore quite welcome. The study is often no more than a catalogue of authors. Yet, Carol gives an adequate and objective analysis of the views of the principals on both sides of the controversy in every period. His research covers the beginnings of the problem in the twelfth century till the opening of the seventeenth century; through the theological debates of Toledo, Alcalá, and Seville; through the golden age of the seventeenth century; through a period of decline in the eighteenth century; through the century of the Immaculate Conception; through the period of resurgence in the present twentieth century. There is a “conclusion” in which the results of the survey are summarized.

That the Franciscans, the defenders of the Immaculate Conception, should generally have held to no debt was to be expected. However, especially in the golden age, this view had respected defenders in all the great religious orders and congregations and in the secular clergy.

One strong reason why some held back, and still hold back, is their inability to see how Mary could have been redeemed by Christ if she had no debt. That was the classic objection to the Immaculate Conception itself. The answer was simple: through Christ’s redemptive merits Mary was exempt from contracting the sin. The answer would seem to be as simple in regard to the debt: through Christ’s redemptive merits Mary was exempt even from the debt of contracting the sin. C. promises another book on this point.

A secondary fruit of this study is the unearthing of many defenders of the absolute primacy of Christ, which they used to argue against a debt. C.’s book will be an indispensable tool for further study in the problem of Mary’s debt to sin.

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


Implicitly or explicitly, the authors sustain the idea of the teaching Church or magisterium expressed in Lumen gentium 25. They study the teaching Church from the perspective of Scripture, Church history, and magisterial
statements. They examine its response to certain theological and philosophical currents of the present day. This reviewer finds himself in general agreement with the views expressed in these papers. While others hold a different point of view about the teaching Church, they will find this volume a substantial contribution to the continuing debate.

Edward J. Grätsch


In effect, all the contributors accept what might be called the classical understanding of the magisterium as expressed in Lumen gentium 25. The contributors stress the role of the magisterium in the life of the Church and examine its implications for the faithful, educators, and theologians. This reviewer agrees with the substance of their remarks. Possibly, though, the symposium could have devoted greater attention to historical considerations. Often those who disagree with the magisterium on current issues point to certain instances in the past when the magisterium seemed to have reversed itself. Is it not possible, they ask, that the magisterium will reverse itself again? A fuller discussion of the historical context of magisterial statements might have been helpful.

Edward J. Grätsch


A common phenomenon on the current North American scene is that of theologians and others passing judgment on liberation theology while furnishing no evidence that they have read it in any depth. Such a procedure appears designed to provide a kind of Olympian objectivity, especially when their judgment is negative. B. is a happy exception to this trend, and his latest book manifests solid research in the available English sources as well as many in Spanish. He also includes a valuable ten-page annotated bibliography.

The book may be divided into three main parts. The first chapter is a helpful survey of official documents of both Catholic and Protestant churches, which reveals a gradual integration in recent years of "liberation themes," if not a liberation theology. The next three chapters are devoted to an analysis of the liberation approach and its "new key" biblical hermeneutic, along with a response to the various criticisms recently leveled against liberation theology. I was most impressed by his second chapter, with its very clear exposition of the liberation methodology, and the fourth, where he provides brief but pointed responses to eight avenues of critique. The final two chapters are concerned with the repercussions of all this on North America, especially with regard to the Christian churches, where he is, as usual, solidly ecumenical. A key ecclesiological con-
cept here, familiar from B.'s earlier writings, is that of an "Abrahamic minority," and he utilizes well the important book of Maria Augusta Neale, A Socio-Theology of Letting Go (New York, 1977).

I would recommend this book highly as an introductory text for seminarians and college students as well as for general readers. B.'s style is very readable, although (perhaps because of a tin ear) I found the extended musical metaphor contrived and obtrusive. The last two chapters are the least satisfying, clearly because so little work has been done on a North American liberation theology; thus one finishes the book looking forward with great interest to B.'s future contributions in this important area.

Alfred T. Henelly, S.J.


My first introduction to the Bible was through a children's book called Bible Stories. That was a sound beginning: What is the Bible if not a book of stories all telling of God's mysterious covenant with man? In the Bible even a name will tell a story. When Jesus came upon the scene, he spoke in parables and then himself became parable, as Crossan shows in The Dark Interval, one of several recent books on the theology of story.

Navone is a welcome voice in this expanding discourse. He has made himself heard in Everyman's Odyssey and Communicating Christ, and now, more cogently, in Towards a Theology of Story. He explores the act of story-telling itself, reflecting on its power to organize and unify experience and to mediate mystery. He gives special attention to the travel story as an expression of religious experience. In Film Odyssey, a book I wrote with John R. May, we spoke of two levels of journey, one literal, the other spiritual, in order to uncover the theological dimensions of film. N. applies that distinction to the biblical travel stories of God; they too have an outer and inner component. The outer journey serves as metaphor for the inner journey of spirit, where the meaning of the story is to be found. Christ's journey from Galilee to Jerusalem becomes a visible sign of his movement to the Father. In the same way, our movement through time and space bespeaks an inner journey that begins and ends in Christ.

One of N.'s best chapters is the last, in which he boldly faces the fact that there are no travel stories of God without darkness, terror, and dread. Terror, he says, tells us as nothing else can that we cannot save ourselves. But the story of Christ's death and resurrection reveals to us "that the darkness is habitable"; God inhabits it. A good book that advances an important theological development.

Ernest Ferlita, S.J.


Bromiley is among those who place historical theology in the category of theology rather than history. B. has an eight-page Introduction filled with rich reflections on the subject, making one wish for more. His book is an introduction to Christian theologians, intended for students and others interested in learning more about how the Church and its theologians have carried on God's word through the centuries. B. has selected his theologians on the basis of the impact each had in his own time or in succeeding centuries. Since it is impossible in such a work to summarize a theologian's total output, B. has contented himself with a summary of each theologian's major work. He honestly admits that if the book were written by an Orthodox or Roman Catholic, it would have taken a different course; since B. is a Protestant, more than half of the book deals with that tradition.
There are three parts. The first treats the patristic period, advancing from the Apostolic Fathers to John Damascus. Augustine is so important that he is under three headings, “early ecumenists,” “theologians of the Trinity,” and finally a chapter of his own. The medieval and Reformation period begins with Radbertus of Corbie, passing through Anselm and his Proslogion and Cur Deus homo, with a quick glance at Abelard and Peter Lombard, finally resting a while with Aquinas. B. gives a clear summary of the Summa theologiae, and is honest in his evaluation when he concludes that Thomas’ teaching needs to be carefully reconsidered. “It is not apparent that he subsumes theology under philosophy. Nor is it apparent that he makes philosophy the source, basis, or even the starting point of faith. Nor does he seem at all to pursue an essentially rationalistic or apologetical theology” (200). I would like to have had Bonaventure, Scotus, and Ockham included before rushing on to the Reformation, which is amply covered. Not only are the Reformers of the first order represented, but there are also Melanchthon, Bullinger, Hубmaier, Menno Simons, and Ridley. The final part is devoted to modern theology and is totally given to a study of Protestant theologians, e.g., Wollebius, Lessing, Herder, Schleiermacher, Harnack, Barth, and Thielicke.

Within the confines that B. has set for himself and within his own tradition, this is an admirable introduction to historical theology and appears to be a ready-made textbook capable of enticing the student to read the theologians themselves.

Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.


The striking and unique quality of William of Saint-Thierry’s theology
with its incorporation of insights from Eastern sources is the subject of D.'s study. D. brings together here positions advanced in his previous writings but with a precision and conviction that come after many years of research. D. sees W. as an innovator who did not limit himself to the Augustinianism of his time and was able to move beyond established patterns of thought because of his contact with the East. From the writings of John Scotus Eriegena, Gregory of Nyssa, Claudianus Mamertus, and Plotinus D. draws textual parallels to sections of W.'s treatises and in this way seeks to demonstrate Eastern influences on W.'s thought.

According to D., W. came in touch with the theoria of the Christian East through Eriegena's writings and translations. W. rarely mentioned any Eastern Father and never mentioned Eriegena as a source of his inspiration. This failure, D. has consistently maintained, was due to the suspicion with which W.'s contemporaries regarded Eastern sources. The De imagine of Gregory of Nyssa is shown by D. to have been formative of W.'s theocentric anthropology. Throughout, D. gives a fine sense of the gradual evolution of W.'s thought. Especially interesting and illuminating are D.'s sections on Claudianus Mamertus, "the Augustine of the twelfth century," and Plotinus. D. sees the originality of W.'s theology as rooted in part in the philosophy of Plotinus.

D. maintains that W. was never a blind follower of any of his sources but used them boldly to further his own thinking. The question of the precise way in which W. came into contact with some of these Eastern sources remains unresolved, but D.'s presentation of their impact on W. is persuasive.

Raymond Studzinski, O.S.B.


The question whether religion and a religious cast of mind stifle scientific development can be approached by studying the thought of the early pioneers of the scientific revolution of the seventeenth century. Although the scientific ferment was widespread within Christendom in those days, a good case can be made for saying that England, with Bacon, Boyle, and Newton, was central. This is the position K. takes as he treats the understanding of the concept of creation in these and other thinkers.

His book is, on the one hand, an inquiry into the history of theology studying the concept of creation and, on the other, a work within the history of science as it examines the intellectual forces behind the beginnings of modern chemistry and physics. K. is particularly impressed by the impact of voluntarism on early modern scientists. Classical Thomism considers creation as a work of divine intelligence, divine ideas finding realizations in the contingent world. Such an approach, pushed to its limits, means that the pattern of the physical world can be deduced by a purely intellectual effort. In contrast, perhaps the most significant contribution of Boyle to modern science is his devising of the lowly laboratory report. For Boyle, as for Newton, creation is an exercise of God's will imposing an almost legal type of order from without. What nature is, therefore, can only be found by a careful study of individual experimental questions.

K. concentrates his study on the rich productivity of Robert Boyle and the influences that shaped his thought and work. It must be admitted that K.'s writing is not always clear and he makes little effort to situate his subjects in the history of their age, and so his presentation is somewhat disembodied. He has a hold on an important idea, however, which he employs skilfully to show how modern science got started when and where it did.

Frank R. Haig, S.J.

The evangelical resurgence of the last decade and the election of Jimmy Carter in 1976 seem to have turned scholars' attention toward filling an old gap in American religious historiography. Last year saw the publication of Donald Mathews' Religion in the Old South; it is followed now by H.'s The Gentlemen Theologians. Whereas Mathews had so emphasized the influence of social mobility upon the evangelical sects as to preclude any significant interest in their theology, H. argues that the social mobility of the South's urban clergy channeled their thought along the lines of a "rational orthodoxy."

H. has identified a hundred urban clergymen who occupied pulpits and professorships of influence throughout the ante-bellum South. These articulate clergymen enjoyed a degree of economic security unknown to the average Southern preacher and sought to embody the genteel values of piety and learning, of professional dignity and urbane polish. Eclipsing the South's scattered theological liberals by 1830, orthodox clergymen of the Catholic, Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, and Wesleyan traditions drew upon English and Continental formulations for a reasoned defense of revelation. If there was any major intellectual source for the development of rational orthodoxy among the Southern Protestant clergymen, H. finds it in the British moral philosophy of Samuel Clarke and Richard Price and the Scottish common-sense philosophy of Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart. Although divided by their denominational traditions over sacramental issues, the orthodox clergymen were nevertheless united in the attempt to vindicate God's justice in a rational universe. In that effort, H. concludes, lay the roots of both the New South's fundamentalism and its religious liberalism.

H.'s book is an important one, which ought to be read by students of American intellectual and religious history, as well as specialists in Southern studies. He has done a thorough job of research and written a fine book. Some of his interpretations will be subject to challenge. His characterization of Jefferson's religious thought, e.g., would be modified somewhat if Garry Wills is correct in stressing the influence of the Scottish philosophers on the Sage of Monticello. Nevertheless, The Gentlemen Theologians opens up discussion of an important subject which cuts across several fields of interest.

Ralph E. Luker


Y., an expert in the application of the principles of phenomenology to the study of comparative religion, offers an excellent appraisal of Newman's position in relation to twentieth-century theological issues. Most strikingly, he critiques Newman's detailed ideas on how Roman Catholicism fulfils the highest religious aspirations of man. He shows that Newman's limited understanding of the total, world-wide wealth of religious experience leaves his position necessarily incomplete yet tellingly informative. The most provocative part of Y.'s work is his analysis of Newman's treatment of Liberalism, Newman's perception of it as a religion, essentially destructive of basic Christianity and, indeed, of man's human religious potential.

Using principles of phenomenology as applied to the comparative study of religions allows Y. to isolate two crucial lines of Newman's thought on Roman Catholicism: its character as a fulfillment model perfecting the highest aspirations of human religiosity, and its character as an authority model, stressing the major function of authority in enabling religion to satisfy man's quest
for the sacred. It is through this process of “model analysis” that Y. works out a detailed synthesis of Newman’s treatment of Liberalism as a religion in its own right and Newman’s indictment of Liberal religion as essentially irreligious.

This is a careful, well-documented, intriguing book. It should have been much longer, if only to make a stronger case for phenomenology as a proper method for the study of comparative religion. Some nontheologians may be annoyed by a seemingly excessive use of jargon; some may be annoyed that phenomenology is used at all (one recalls Maritain’s critical commentary in The Peasant of the Garonne). But anyone who knows Newman will find the book valuable and highly rewarding.

Richard W. Clancey


With urbanity and great sympathy, C. has reconstructed the story of the Vatican Archives and especially the difficult struggle in the nineteenth century to get them “opened.” The story is fascinating in itself, but it is also entwined with the story of larger events in the period—the French Revolution, the First Vatican Council, the fall of the Papal State. Napoleon, Garibaldi, Döllinger, Lord Acton, and others all play a part in it. More important, it reveals with marvelous lucidity the antihistorical bias of Catholic thought and the depths of official fear of what historians might reveal. The pontificate of Alexander VI was forbidden to historians, and Pastor’s volume on him, when finally published, was viewed in some circles as betrayal. The acts of the Council of Trent in the Archives were withheld from the bishops at the First Vatican Council.

This is a book that the professional historian can read with profit, that the professional theologian should read for instruction, and that the interested layman can read for pleasure. Transitions are occasionally abrupt, and there are some repetitions. But these are minor defects in a book that is a rare combination of erudition, broad vision, good sense, and good fun.

John W. O’Malley


Vols. 5 and 6, composed of autobiographical material, complete this splendid selection drawn from the twenty-volume Danish edition of Kierkegaard’s incidental writings. Vol. 7 provides a complete index. Needless to say, these volumes are rich in details that can be pressed into service for anyone’s favorite view of their author. No summary of K.’s musings is possible. Often enough, though, K. is preoccupied with self, obsessively balancing the feeling of being “an unhappy individuality” with the conviction of being “gifted with the extraordinary.” But given the long story of human suffering, neurotic or otherwise, K.’s unhappiness was not extraordinary; only his ability to write about it was extraordinary. Each reader, however, will have to decide whether this suffering, once written about, was transformed or even redeemed.

Denis J. M. Bradley


D. is an Argentine historian now liv-
ing in Mexico. He has gathered together a series of lectures given to different groups in Latin America during the early seventies. "Ethics" is said to be the unifying theme of the work, but it contains a potpourri of demonology, Christology, ecclesiology, and many glittering generalities from philosophy. The major ethical concept D. employs is that of "totalization," which appears to be equivalent to idolatry (a far better term, in my opinion) and which he fiercely combats throughout the book. His Christology and ecclesiology are consequently based on prophecy, which resists and denounces the myriad temptations to totalization.

An important contribution of D. is that he analyzes oppression not only in economic systems but also in interpersonal relations, especially in the family. As in his other books, he attacks sexual and pedagogical domination and is thus one of the few Latin American authors who take women's liberation seriously. It is gratifying to see a Latin American exercise "ideological suspicion" of the machismo for which his continent is notorious. However, his attempt at a "liberation Mariology" is too sketchy to be of much help.

The major weakness of the book lies in D.'s decision to retain the "oral style" of the original lectures. This results in a content that is verbose, repetitive, and very loosely organized. After a while, one begins to wince at each succeeding denunciation of the demon of totalization. D. is a trained historian and, in my opinion, it is the retrieval of Latin American history (including the history of theology) that constitutes, and should continue to constitute, his most valuable contribution to Latin American thought. Other authors have shown more competence in disciplined ethical reflection (e.g., José Míguez Bonino, *Ama y haz lo que quieres: Hacia una ética del hombre nuevo*, 1972). Unfortunately, D.'s book may lend some substance to the charge that Latin American theology is not theology but rhetoric.

*Alfred T. Hennelly, S.J.*


This book is part of the American Association for the Advancement of Science Selected Symposia Series. It includes essays by H. Tristram Englehardt, Jr., Eric J. Cassell, E. Mansell Pattison, Thomas C. Schelling, Alasdair MacIntyre, Philippa Foot, William F. May, and Leslie S. Rothenberg, and an introductory essay by Ernan McMullin. Foot's essay is reprinted from *Philosophy & Public Affairs*. The Symposia Series was begun in 1977 to provide broader dissemination of some of the more important material discussed at the annual meetings of AAAS. This goal is laudable; asking $13.50 for this book is not, especially since the papers are not typeset but reproductions from the camera copy of the typed manuscripts of the authors.

The volume is not unuseful. It illustrates, albeit briefly, how discussions of death and our moral dominion over the dying process evoke foundational methodological questions. Several of the essays enter into issues such as the concept of personhood, the nature of rights, the impact of culture on moral judgment, the instructive role of feelings in moral choice, and the notion of personal autonomy.

The volume also shows the cautious but broadening support in ethics of positive acts of mercy death. Foot notes that "voluntary active euthanasia ... [is] sometimes compatible with both justice and charity." And May allows that under "very limited conditions, active euthanasia may be allowable tc, but never obligatory upon, the professional." The book concludes with a noteworthy "modest proposal" by Leslie Rothenberg for a program of "continuing judicial education" in co-oper-
atation with the National Conference of State Trial Judges and the Appellate Judges' Conference of the American Bar Association. The proposal faces the fact that whether it is ideal or not, judges will continue to be asked to make influential moral judgments in this area. Thus an ongoing, patterned educative and consultative program involving "lawyers, physicians, ethicists, theologians and other relevant professionals" seems socially indicated.

Daniel C. Maguire


This fine book presents a "personal view" of celibacy, prayer, and friendship. A very competent theologian, K. is involved here in an effort "to describe celibacy from the inside.... It is not the product of methodical scholarly research but of years of making sense out of my own life and helping others to make sense out of theirs." This is a little too modest. The book, especially in its introduction and early chapters, is indeed notably basic, almost prosaic. But if it is read through, with sympathy and care, it amounts to a great deal more, and it asks for a great deal more, than the "how to" manual its subtitle may suggest. Each of its terms—celibacy, prayer, friendship—initially receives a clear, almost pedestrian treatment, which is ultimately extended to a depth that is profoundly rewarding, challenging, and costly. And while it is a treatment obviously rooted, as K. suggests, in personal experience and in the pastoral guidance of others, it also shows a fine grasp of the tradition and of current literature on the issues at hand. Further, the three terms of the experience being explored are related to and integrated with one another.

The chapters on prayer have real beauty and acumen, but I believe the book's main contribution lies in chaps. 7-10, an extended treatment of human celibate love which is at once bold, honest, mature, and utterly faithful to the integrity of the celibate vocation. It is a fine example of being practical about ideals and of seriously affirming both religious and human values in the full, unsentimental light of their limitations and costs. A final chapter briefly but creatively relates human celibate love to the material poverty most celibates are called upon to practice as well as to poverty of spirit.

Personally, I am not sure I would commend this book to persons who are not celibate but who are actively wondering if they are called to this way of loving. While such persons clearly need to be well informed, this treatment could be daunting, telling them, all too clearly, perhaps somewhat more than they may need or want to know. Like a good but advanced reflection on marriage, it may better await a little experience. Perhaps not. In any event, for those in the process of actually testing such a call—novices and seminarians—as well as for those, of any age, already committed to this way of friendship with God and other men and women, K. has done very good service.

Joseph P. Whelan, S.J.


A well-balanced, informative book on a controversial subject. It covers the Spirit's gifts in the OT and NT; the Giver, i.e., the Holy Spirit; renewal and service through these gifts, the gift of the cross; responsibility for the charismata; "Charismata and Charismatics." It is fully documented and has a Scripture index but no bibliography. The book is designed for those who possess these gifts but do not feel drawn to community life. K. believes all Christians are charismatic. He points out
that only one OT passage connects the gifts with the Messiah. It is the community, Israel, that receives the gifts. No one, save Elisha, claimed God's presence in the OT. The NT does not expect Christians to live in constant euphoria. The gifts most frequently connected with rejoicing are usually horizontal, in this world. The gifts should not be developed at the expense of other people's welfare or for personal aggrandizement. Further, the gifts are received, not possessed. Possession of the gifts approximates pagan religious practices. The Holy Spirit works gently, not with coercion, and one must see the release of the Spirit as the only vehicle to the plenitude of gifts. Through a gift one receives a new relationship to the giver. K.'s chapter on the cross as a gift is excellent as a complement to the "resurrection" theology of many Pentecostals. The Spirit may heighten moral conflict (133). Koenig warns against anti-intellectualism, messianic complexes and making experiences normative, fundamentalism, oppression of women, and the expectation of an imminent parousia. The book ends with nine recommendations for Pentecostals.

J. Massyngberde Ford


Modern scholarship on world religions and attempts by Vatican II to initiate a dialogue between Roman Catholicism and non-Christian religions are gradually changing the attitudes of many Catholic theologians. B.'s study is a case in point. The first part of his book narrates how he changed his view of Islam over the years. He unashamedly admits that he started with the traditional Christian stand on Islam, which often saw it as a pseudoreligious movement instigated by Satan, but he finally came around to seeing it as a religion having a definite place in God's economy of salvation.

B.'s aim is to reinterpret the Qur'an in the light of Christian revelation. He takes the approach that the same kind of exegesis which Scripture scholars apply to the Bible should be applied also to the Qur'an. He assumes that there is a hidden meaning in the holy book of Islam, a sensus plenior of the text, and that this can be discovered by taking Christian doctrine as the starting point. B.'s theological position is that Islam was a preparatory introduction to Christianity specifically adapted to the Arabs. This general approach to non-Christian religions is not new, though its application to Islam might well be.

B. brings a fresh, interesting, less prejudicial, and noncondemnatory attitude to Islam, a position which contributes to dialogue. But there is an implicit tendency to deny that Islam is a religion in its own right and to ignore any original elements which both Muhammad and the Qur'an might have introduced. Besides, real differences and serious disagreements between Christianity and Islam are either not mentioned or downgraded. This might defeat the very purpose of B.'s book, namely, to further dialogue and understanding between the two religions.

John A. Saliba, S.J.


M. first traces the evolution of humanism through the centuries, an evolution that slowly develops an ideological bias favoring man's autonomy until it issues in obvious atheism. God becomes increasingly marginal and dispensable and the universe becomes homeocentric as it becomes less and less theocentric. As one reads this volume, one slowly comes to realize with a new sharpness what one has long known: many of the new theories in theology
are actually of ancient vintage. They are new and exciting often enough only to those who have paid scant attention to the history of ideas. "If, with slight variations, the main propositions and supporting arguments are always the same, one does well to conclude that the historical period has nothing to do with the issue and that the will to absolutize man is a permanent project" (134). M. asks why, if current humanism is patently atheistic, so many Christians flock to its flag in their interpretations of doctrine, morality, the psychology of faith, the ecclesial magisterium. He notes that many theologians preoccupied with change do not in their reinterpretations "look very attentively at the filiation of their dicta" (47). Much of what we read today has long ago been suggested by Joachim, Eckhart, Nicholas of Cusa, Pico, William of Ockham, and others.

The book is marred by a few exaggerated positions such as approving the celebration of "traditional Masses" and the grouping of Hans Küng and Karl Rahner in a common condemnation. Yet M. shows impressively the provenance of contemporary relativism, existentialism, homocentricism, and process theology. Angry labeling will not answer his charges. A detailed, clear critique is answered only by a detailed, clear response.

*Thomas Dubay, S.M.*


W.'s announced intention to explicate and clarify the specialized architectural and theological language found in English-cathedral guidebooks is well intended. In fact, he appears to have competently met and superseded this challenge. The dictionary format and pleasant line-drawings highlight its use as a reference tool. It appears that W. has attempted to do too much in too short a space. Each term is defined on several levels: etymology, history, theology, symbology, and architectural development. In several cases the explanations are insufficient or incomplete. It is unfortunate that W. has depended so heavily on Anna Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art* for his iconographic and art-historical insights. Though a solid and classic work, Jameson's volumes were written in 1865, and more recent scholarship would have proved beneficial to W.'s task.

Acknowledgment of the Anglican heritage of these cathedrals is without question, but a deeper understanding of the Roman Catholic tradition and influence on symbolism and theological self-interpretation would have added clarity and historical consciousness. Any influence of the Orthodox tradition (theological or otherwise) appears to be minimalized to the point of omission. This is an injustice: a special value for both scholar and tourist could have been found in an analysis of the historical grounding and ecumenical possibilities of many of the symbols and images of English cathedrals.

In point of fact, one of the most valuable arguments in W.'s book is his position on the dialectical nature of symbolism. The perplexing and paradoxical structure of these symbols not only presences the realities they represent but also their opposites which live within. Thus, the ring or circle symbolizes eternity while expressing limitation. W. has provided us with a good resource book whose weaknesses can be overcome. The fascination of this type of work and study will always remain our desire to retrieve and reveal the richness of our Christian heritage. For such an understanding, W.'s book is an insightful guide.

*Diane Apostolos Cappadona*

This workbook is intended as an initial step in gathering bibliographical information concerning the official dialogues (international, regional, and national) presently in progress among the various Christian churches. It lists fifty-two such dialogues; under each it gives pertinent information about the various meetings held, and offers a bibliography of books, articles, and reviews treating that particular dialogue. E.g., under “Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission” we learn that there have been nine meetings between 1970 and 1977; we have the date and place of the meeting and the subject matter treated. When a joint statement was issued, it is properly noted. It also identifies the co-chairmen of the dialogue and gives the address of the secretary.

P. sees this as an update of Ehrenstrom and Gassmann, Confessions in Dialogue, (W.C.C., 1975); it has a cutoff date, Dec. 1977. To all interested in ecumenism who have suffered bewilderment and frustration in trying to distinguish one dialogue from the other—behold the key. For a long time the need for such a workbook has been recognized, but it took Rome’s Centro pro Unione (Via S. Maria dell’Anima 30, 00186 Rome, Italy), under the direction of the Friars of the Atonement, to answer that need.
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