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Presenting This Issue

TS begins its forty-first year with an issue fat in quantity and quality: three articles (on clerical continence, on revelation, on the Anglican-RC dialogue), two bulletins (moral theology and ancient Christian literature), and a note (sociological concepts applied to the early Church).

Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century: Three Papal Decretals is a rigorous study of three difficult documents that are of paramount significance if we are to understand the relationship of continence to the clerical state and liturgical worship in the early Church. The arguments and conclusions are too complex to be summarized here; suffice it to say that before publication this essay received uncommonly high praise from two distinguished experts in this area. Daniel Callam, C.S.B., has his D.Phil. in theology from Oxford, is assistant professor in the School of Religious Studies at St. Thomas More College in the University of Saskatchewan, and is currently writing on the appearance of a daily Eucharist in the early Church.

The Symbolic Structure of Revelation studies the five dominant approaches to revelation: the propositional, historical, mystical, dialectical, and symbolic—with greatest stress on the last-named. It asks how in each theory revelation is mediated and what kind of truth it has. It concludes that in Christ the five aspects coalesce into a kind of unity, but insists that the first four are reconciled and held in unity through the symbolic facet. Avery Dulles, S.J., doctor in theology from the Gregorian University in Rome, is professor of systematic theology at the Catholic University of America and research associate within the Woodstock Theological Center, Washington, D.C. Author of eleven books, he is widely recognized as an expert in the area of revelation and has contributed significantly to the progress of ecumenical theology.

The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreed Statements and Their Reception is apparently the first attempt, outside the ARC International Commission, to evaluate the ways in which the texts (Windsor, Canterbury, Venice) issued so far by the Commission have been received in the churches. Such reactions are highly important if a body of opinion is to be produced on the doctrinal value of these statements and the ecumenical possibilities they open for future relations between Roman Catholics and Anglicans. George H. Tavard, S.T.D. from the Facultés catholiques de Lyon, has been professor of theology at the Methodist Theological School in Ohio since 1970. Author of numerous books, he is preparing an introduction to the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue and a study of the spirituality of Emmanuel d'Alzon, founder of the Augustinians of the Assumption, his own religious congregation.

Notes on Moral Theology: 1979 is organized around three areas of concern touched by Pope John Paul II on his visit to the U.S.: (1) the person and personal action; (2) the pastoral problem of divorce and
remarriage; (3) nuclear energy and nuclear disarmament. RICHARD A. McCORMICK, S.J., Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics (Georgetown University) and currently the Institute's director, manifests the qualities that have consistently characterized his contributions to moral theology: broad familiarity with current literature here and abroad, a rare gift for rigorous yet charitable moral discourse, and a deep personal and Christian concern for the people whose lives are likely to be affected by such discourse.

Literature of Christian Antiquity: 1975–1979 is a report on thirty-one institutions, publications, and projects which should be of interest to patristic scholars and students of early Christianity. The bulletin is based on, but frequently updates, reports presented at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, Sept. 3–8, 1979). WALTER J. BURGHARDT, S.J., formerly professor of patristic theology at Woodstock College and the Catholic University of America, is theologian-in-residence at Georgetown University, editor of TS, and research associate within the Woodstock Theological Center, Washington, D.C.

Sociological Concepts and the Early Church: A Decade of Research gathers together some of the most important books and articles of the seventies that explicitly use sociological concepts for understanding the origin and development of the Church in the NT, and while recognizing the limitations of this approach, sketches the contributions it might make to exegesis and theology. DANIEL J. HARRINGTON, S.J., associate professor of NT at Weston School of Theology in Cambridge, Mass., has his Ph.D. from Harvard (1970) in Near Eastern languages and literatures. His special competence lies in intertestamental Judaism and NT theology. General editor of New Testament Abstracts since 1972, he has published four books since 1976, among them the valuable A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (with J. Fitzmyer).

Our readers will be happy to know that a recent promotion to the priests of the U.S. garnered almost 1200 new subscribers for TS. The increase will enable us, for the time being, to continue providing 800 pages for $10—a minor miracle in our inflationary times.

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


This commentary, from its first German appearance ten years ago, constitutes a landmark in Ezekiel studies. Bringing to bear on the elucidation of the text a rich assortment of philological, literary, historical, and theological tools, Z. has unquestionably produced the most significant study of the prophet in this century. This competently translated volume gives us Part 1 of the project, dealing with events and oracles prior to the final siege and destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. The chapters make a distinctive unit, with prophecies of judgment and inevitable doom their major burden. Leaving unresolved the riddle of the “thirtieth year” in Ezek 1:1, Z. observes that it is more important to recognize that the dating scheme in the whole book is based on the first deportation of Judeans with their king, Jehoiachin, in 597 B.C. On this reckoning the call of Ezekiel falls on July 31, 593 B.C., with the latest dated oracle (29:17) coming in 571 B.C.

The survey of critical work on Ezek over the past hundred years makes very dreary reading indeed; I sense a sympathy in Z. for the more recent work of Howie and Fohrer, reacting in different ways and with new methodologies to the critical excesses of the past. Wevers and Carley could be added to those who have eschewed extreme and hypercritical solutions to the problems of Ezek, though their commentaries are far less detailed than that of Z. The strength of this book lies precisely in conveying a sense of the dynamism inherent in the process from prophetic word to prophetic book. Z. firmly rejects the thesis that the prophet himself composed the whole book; instead we must think of a “school” which presided over the redaction as well as a certain updating of the prophetic tradition. Do we ever have the actual words of the prophet? Z.’s answer is quite positive. “We can affirm with certainty that we find elements in the book of Ezekiel which are the direct deposit of oral delivery. We must therefore reckon in Ezekiel with the phenomenon of the collection of already fixed units, which were first minted in oral delivery” (68).

No commentator can evade the question of the prophet’s personality. Z. offers two useful cautions. The text on which we must base a judgment has undergone considerable redactional activity and must not be taken simply as derived from the prophet himself. Secondly, the texts describing visions and symbolic actions show a highly stylized form, making it difficult for us to recover the underlying experiences. I would add that our distance from the prophet, both chronological and cultural, should
make us very hesitant in attributing pathological phenomena to a man who undoubtedly was deeply sensitive, highly emotional, and yet strangely controlled in the presence of God.

The textual analysis attached to the independent translation does not seem to me to be altogether in line with a modern tendency to conserve and understand the Massoretic text rather than amend it. It is curious that the first century B.C. fragment from Cave 4 at Qumran (4Q Ez*), containing parts of 10:17 to 11:11 and beautifully reproduced in the end papers, has not been utilized along with other Qumran evidence in the discussion of the pertinent verses. All in all, this is a superb and indispensable contribution to our knowledge of the first half of Ezekiel's prophecy. It is a classic work on a vast scale with practically all the scientific apparatus necessary for a thorough study of this important, enigmatic figure who was made a "watchman over Israel."

Loyola University of Chicago

FREDERICK L. MORTIARY, S.J.


This new collection of Fitzmyer's articles is important not only for specialists in Aramaic but also for exegetes and theologians. Unlike the previous collection entitled Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Chapman, 1971; Missoula: Scholars, 1974), it includes only articles that directly concern the Aramaic language. Two of the twelve studies appear here for the first time, and a third is an expanded version of an essay first published in German. The remaining nine papers have been revised and expanded in varying degrees, though their basic theses are substantially unchanged.

The initial eight articles discuss some aspects of Aramaic that have special significance for NT study: the Aramaic background of the NT (1975), the languages used in Palestine in the first century A.D. (1970), the phases of Aramaic (unpublished), the contributions of Qumran Aramaic to NT study (1974), the Semitic background to the Kyrios title of Jesus (1975 in German), the NT title "Son of Man" in light of philology (unpublished), the first-century Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11 (1974), and Aramaic epistolography (1974). The last four studies deal with specific problems in earlier Aramaic texts: the syntax of kl and kl' (1957), the Padua papyri letters (1962), the letter of King Adon to the Egyptian Pharaoh (1965), and the Elephantine marriage contract designated AP 15 (1971).

Aramaic specialists will welcome the availability in a single volume of F.'s efforts at organizing the various phases in the development of Aramaic and at charting the whole field of Aramaic epistolography. The
detailed philological analyses of specific texts will be much appreciated, and the charts listing all the Palestinian Aramaic texts (99–102) and the Aramaic letters on skin or papyrus (197–200) will be particularly helpful. The discussions of the Qumran Aramaic texts scattered through several of the articles synthesize past scholarship and break new ground in imaginative but sound ways. From the perspective of Aramaic studies, this collection testifies to the author's thorough and careful scholarship in very technical and demanding areas of research.

NT scholars will find here a sophisticated and nuanced presentation of the so-called Aramaic problem with respect to Jesus' sayings in the Gospels as well as a reliable catalogue of first-century Palestinian texts in various languages. The volume also provides the most comprehensive treatment of Qumran Aramaic parallels to the NT and gives the reasons for the author's long-standing skepticism about the "early" dating of the Targums. Finally, theologians whose area of interest is Christology will profit greatly from reading some of these essays. They should pay special attention to the occurrences of the absolute mārēh ("Lord") as a divine title in 11QתgJob 24:7 and of "son of god" in 4QpsDan A 2:1 as well as to the absences of m'mr' ("word") as a buffer term for God and of "Son of Man" as a title for an apocalyptic figure. Research in NT Christology is changing rapidly (see L. W. Hurtado’s valuable survey in TS 40 [1979] 306-17), and Fitzmyer correctly insists that theologians must reckon with the philological evidence furnished by the Qumran scrolls.

Weston School of Theology, Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.
Mass.


Rabbi Frank Zimmermann, sometime professor at Dropsie University in Philadelphia, has capped a long career of the study of Aramaic with a book on the Aramaic background of the four Gospels. Its thesis is "that the Gospels as a whole were translated from the Aramaic into Greek" (5). Z. begins with the presupposition that "Jesus spoke Aramaic," as did his disciples, and that "the transmission of his sayings and the reports of his activities were in Aramaic" (ix). He finds that the "Greek gospels abound in bizarre locutions and unintelligible happenings," and his book presents "some two hundred new readings as retroversions from Aramaic that clarify many Gospel problems" (ibid.).

After a brief introduction which sets forth the problem of the Aramaic background of the Gospels, as Z. sees it, the book has eight chapters: (1) The Written Text, which is intended to show how a number of Greek mistranslations taken from all the Gospels "ascend to a written document" (25); (2) The Evidence from Matthew; (3) The Evidence from
Mark; (4) The Evidence from Luke; (5) The Evidence from John; (6) Texts and Doctrines (i.e., discussions of the Aramaic background of the Johannine logos, "lamb of God," the Matthean divorce texts, etc.); (7) Logia of Jesus and Their Aramaic Source; (8) "The World is a Bridge . . . ." Another Logion of Jesus (i.e., one of the agrapha). Appendix 1 treats of the Aramaisms in Acts, and Appendix 2 those of the Book of Revelations (sic) and its underlying document.

The book is intended to support the position adopted years ago by C. C. Torrey of Yale. It utilizes, refines, and adds to the data gathered, often in uncritical fashion, by him and by J. Wellhausen, C. F. Burney, J. A. Montgomery, and others, but it is limited to the sort of study of the Aramaic background of the Gospels which characterized that generation of scholars. A minor aim of the book is the refutation of the position of W. F. Albright, who despite all his skepticism about modern solutions to the Synoptic problem and NT form-criticism spoke out loudly and often against the Torrey thesis.

This book, however, is but another example of a work over which its author has labored for decades but which is hopelessly out of touch with all that has been going on in the last twenty-five years in the study of the Aramaic background of the Christian Gospels. For Z. to say that "in the field of Aramaic-Greek studies, only a minimal work has been done" (ix) reveals the major flaw in his study. Save for stray references to Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich's Lexicon, Blass-Debrunner-Funk's Grammar, B. M. Metzger's Textual Commentary on the Greek NT, to the NAB, NEB, and to the work of J. Jeremias on the agrapha, there is an almost total neglect of the studies of A. Dupont-Sommer, D. Flusser, J. C. Greenfield, P. Grelot, E. Kutscher, J. T. Milik, G. Vermes—to mention only a few.

The book shows practically no awareness of the contribution that has been made to the study of the Aramaic background by the discovery of Qumran Aramaic texts. Its illustrations are borrowed liberally from rabbinic literature, even from the Babylonian Talmud, the Aramaic portion of which (the Gemara) cannot be dated before A.D. 250 and may be as late as A.D. 500. The mistranslations that Z. finds behind the Greek "bizarre locutions" of the Gospels are equally bizarre. For example, who will accept his contention "that the Aramaic writer [of the Johannine prologue] had no conception of Logos" (170)? "The Prologue conveys what he thought: V.1 In the beginning was the Lamb, and the Lamb was with God, and the Lamb was God . . . ." (ibid.).

In the discussion of Lk 1:35, "the holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the son of God," Z. invokes "substratal Aramaic," which runs dhu′ ylyd qwds′, ytqry br 'lh' and which may mean rather "For he, born of holiness, shall be called a divine being . . . ." or "For he, born of God, shall be called son of God" (100-101). But no real justification is
given for this Aramaic substratum. Moreover, Z. finds that in the annunciation to Mary "the denomination of Jesus as 'the son of the Highest' is incongruous" (126). But Z. is supremely unaware of a precious Qumran fragmentary text which attributes to someone (who cannot be identified with certainty because of the broken character of the text) remarkable parallels to the Lucan phrases: "[He shall be called the son of] the [G]reat [God], and by his name shall he be named. He shall be hailed (as) the Son of God, and they shall call him Son of the Most High" (see NTS 20 [1973–74] 393). This is cited here merely as one example of what might have been done in this book but has not been done.

Since the book also abounds in mistakes in English (e.g., singular verbs with plural subjects [p. 6, l. 2], misspellings [superceded for superseded, Würtheim for Würthwein, Koster for Köster, "Der Sprache" for "Die Sprache" (nom.), etc.]), it is unfortunate that it was ever published. It certainly does not represent a modern contribution to the study of the Aramaic background of the Gospels.

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


The shorter articles cannot be viewed in detail. In general, they too are of fine quality. Noteworthy is M. Wilcox' persuasive article on the probability that with Acts and Bezan Acts we have two distinct revisions and developments of one original Lukan work. But P. G. Mueller has little textual support for his position, and B. Dehandschutter does not realize how much Luke models the Christians in Acts (especially Peter and Paul) on Jesus.

In summary, the book constitutes a major contribution to the study of Luke-Acts. Kremer, Coppen, and Neirynck deserve our appreciation. Less admirable is the German tendency to interact only with scholars who write in German (at times French). Nor should Kremer have asked the contributors to give an important place to textual study (360); not everyone is a good text-critic. There are many typographical errors and whoever proofread the English did a wretched job.

St. Louis University

R. F. O'Toole, S.J.


Like any really good professor, Raymond Brown has written a book on the Johannine community the contents of which he is able to summarize on a chart of two pages (166–67). Obviously, we would expect from the man responsible for the magnificent Anchor Bible commentary on the fourth Gospel and the numerous articles on Johannine literature which he has published in a variety of periodicals, a rather masterful, yet easily readable hypothesis as to the formation, development, and eventual breakup and dissolution of the community for which the fourth Gospel and the three letters of John were written.
B. posits two phases in the development of the community. The first phase, beginning around the mid-fifties and extending into the eighties, consisted of the absorption of, first, Jews "of relatively standard expectations," including followers of John the Baptist, who accepted Jesus as the Davidic Messiah fulfilling OT prophecies and confirming his status by his miracles. Included among this group is the individual whom we later come to know as the "beloved disciple." The second to be absorbed were Jews of an anti-Temple bias who believed in Jesus and made converts in Samaria. As B. puts it in his succinct little chart, "they understood Jesus against a Mosaic rather than a Davidic background. He had been with God, seen him, and brought down his words to people." It was this second group which was most influential in leading to the development of what we recognize as John's high Christology with its emphasis on pre-existence, its realized eschatology, and its distinctive Eucharistic theology. The second phase in the development of the community came with the writing of the Gospel, which took place around 90. It is likely that at this time the community moved from Palestine to the Diaspora to teach the Greeks, and at the same time this group found itself not only rejected but severely persecuted by the Jews. Even those Christians who did not wish to break company with Judaism rejected the high Christology of this community.

The third phase in the history of the community is to be found in the letters, which are to be dated around 100. By this time the Evangelist is dead but his Gospel has left itself open to more than one interpretation, and within the community two groups begin to form: one which realizes the necessity of insisting upon the literal truth of the Incarnation and the necessity of keeping the commandments. The other group sees in Jesus one who is so divine that he is not fully human. "Neither his life on earth nor that of the believer have salvific import." The conflict which took place during this period and of which we have, of course, only the literature of one side soon resulted in a complete dissolution of the Johannine community. Those who held to the fourth Gospel but read it in an orthodox sense realized the necessity of attaching themselves to the "Great Church." The price they had to pay for this was giving up their own belief that they had no need for authoritative official teachers inasmuch as they were guided by the Paraclete. The other group, which was in all probability the larger part of the original Johannine community, moved into Docetism, Gnosticism, and Montanism. Naturally, they took the fourth Gospel with them and, as we all know, the earliest commentary written on the fourth Gospel was by a Gnostic (Heracleon). It was for this reason, of course, that the Great Church was slow to accept the fourth Gospel and really did not embrace it until Irenaeus came to its defense at the end of the second century.
Such, in brief, is the history of the community as B. reconstructs it, and one must admit that it has tremendous plausibility behind it. It is interesting to observe that in his *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God* M. de Jonge has suggested some two years ago that the letters of John reflect the kind of schism which B. posits. It is curious that although B. cites de Jonge at several other points, he fails to do so here. Perhaps the most surprising position taken by B. is his more or less firm conviction that when the community moved out of Palestine it settled in Ephesus, and he seems to offer as a reason for this the fact that "the general geographic area can scarcely have been a 'backwater,' for the Gospel would cause us to think that in the same region there were non-Johannine churches (Jewish Christians, Apostolic Christians), as well as synagogues and some followers of John the Baptist" (98). Certainly in recent years the general trend among Johannine scholars has been to look for the locale of the Johannine community in eastern Syria, and there is no reason why Edessa would not fulfill all the requirements which B. feels necessary for the composition of the Gospel. In any case, this is a relatively minor point, since the location of the community does not greatly affect the stages of its development and dissolution as B. has described them.

Although B. makes it clear that he does not wish to make any detailed comments on the letters of John in this book—though, of course, he has to use them—since he is still working on his commentary on these letters, it is obvious that he considers their author to be someone quite other than the Evangelist. And when one reads them in the light of this history of the community, they would, of course, have to be the work of a disciple. Needless to say, all those interested in the fourth Gospel and Johannine literature will be eager to read this fascinating contribution to the ongoing study of that area of NT scholarship in which Brown stands among the most pre-eminent.

*Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans*  
J. Edgar Bruns


G.'s purpose in this study is to validate the "method of correlation" as a means available to the contemporary theologian for reconciling the traditional Christian faith with modern thought and to illustrate this by applying the method to a reflection on the first article of the Creed, viz., creation. The choice is excellent, for nothing is so basic to theology as the first article, and nothing so calculated to reveal the strengths and weaknesses of a method as its use in relation to this article.

The first section (*homo creator*) is a concise, clear, and informative
digest of those trends and ideas which since the time of Descartes have led from what G. terms an exclusively theocentric notion of creation to one that is wholly anthropocentric, viz., that affirms not only human self-sufficiency, but self-creativity and the need by definition to vindicate such in order to be free. The revolution in thought and conduct has left the older scholastic theology of an Aristotelian stamp high and dry—still quite consistent as a system and still nourished by a long tradition, but thoroughly irrelevant and incomprehensible to those outside the system. If, according to G., theologians are to do more than talk to themselves and are to meet as pastors the spiritual and existential needs of modern man, another approach is required. On the other hand, as G. notes, all is not well within the modern camp. The need to be free (and hence create) has its own correlative: the potential to annihilate so dramatically evident in the subordination of person to ideology, in economic exploitation and its tragic consequences, and in the inability of the new humanism to deal with "facts" (hence the recent reaction of structuralism).

In the second section (Deus creator) G. attempts by a judicious use of correlatives to find in the language of secular philosophy, completed with certain insights from futurology, a point of departure for a better understanding of the Christian faith in creation (as distinct and separable from the old theology of creation) which will also serve as an adequate response to the existential need of modern man for freedom and for protection from the absurd. The point of departure is neither theocentric nor anthropocentric but allocentric. In Christ Jesus we find the perfect model of partnership in creating between God and man, in which partnership each acts not for self but for other. In this mystery of total giving to another, even to death, the theologian finds a perennially valid source for restating the traditional faith in terms of a contemporary science.

G. writes well and, in terms of a "Christ mystique" and the natural penchant of the human mind for the grand synthesis, he has constructed an alluring hypothesis. But as a theological alternative to the traditional theocentric notion of creation rejected by modern systems of thought, some might find the hypothesis leaves much, if not everything, to be desired. The plausibility of a thesis is no guarantee either of its theological character or of its truth. If every exposition of creation in the traditional vein has not been equally perfect or equally capable of a final solution for the speculative problems involved, each at least had this in common: a clear and reasonable claim to affirm something true about God in Himself on His authority (on balance, the only possible way of doing so), however little this something might fit for the moment the current intellectual fashions in system-building. The claim that this modern approach requiring a divorce between faith and a fixed doctrinal content, and hence directly contrary to the patristic and scholastic theology, is in fact the
real thrust of Scripture rests on nothing more than a selective use of some very dubious modern exegesis. *Gratis asseritur, gratis negatur.*

One can, then, hardly be blamed for suspecting the worth of an exposition claiming to be theological but resting on such premises. The cursory and unsympathetic treatment given a number of the familiar propositions of the theocentric theology (could there be any other?) of creation, e.g., *productio ex nihilo,* the manner in which God acts solely for His own glory in creating, the distinction between sin and finite limitation and between moral evil and physical evil; the utter absence of any consideration of the nonmutual relation between Creator and creature, of some import, one might think, in view of G.'s proposal of an allocentric partnership between Creator and creature; the hearty approval of a Christology "from below" indistinguishable from the old adoptionism; the ready assumption that the modern philosophical stance radically refusing an unconditional obedience to divine authority in intellectual matters is at heart correct in its negative evaluation of the "old" theology of creation and of the "inability" of that theology to deal with the question of human freedom—all this results in a caricature of the Catholic tradition. Only in the context of such a caricature does G.'s hypothesis seem an alternative to, rather than a simple extension of, the essential features of modern thought.

The correct theological notion of creation is not that which fits a system but one which is true absolutely. The problem of "fitting" the cultural context comes only after the question of truth has been resolved. Unfortunately, G. does not treat the basic challenge of modern thought on creation, especially in its Hegelian version, to the older theology as a challenge to the truth rather than as a comparative study of systems. Hence the need on G.'s part to assert a divorce between revelation and Christian metaphysics. But from the standpoint of that ancient Catholic tradition with its roots in divine revelation, G.'s allocentrism stripped to its essentials is but another variation on the Hegelian theme of thesis (creator), antithesis (creature), and synthesis (incarnational partnership), covered over by a bit of traditional terminology. Either the traditional approach is true, and then there remains only the possibility of dismantling the modern synthesis to purify whatever genuine insights it might contain; or the traditional theology and the faith on which it rests is false, and then there is no need of an alternative system. By G.'s own admission, this is not a very pleasant prospect for humankind. Had G. developed his reflections on the basis of the truth of the theological tradition he rejects as irrelevant and the falsity of the systems he tries to salvage, his study might have become a very valuable contribution to theology and apologetics.

As it stands, without the Christian metaphysics of creation encased in
the traditional interpretation of revelation, the allocentric partnership between the uncreated and created in Christ becomes not the incarnation of One who without ceasing to be what He was—divine—comes to be what He was not—human, but a synthesis, an intellectual middle ground where absolute differences of nature are leveled and the unity of person is not that of the truth but simply the logical key to a coherent system. In so opting, one opts not for reality but for a self-enclosed, circular argument wherein the synthesis demands the method and the method permits the reconstruction of revelation to fit the synthesis and to justify the modern "consensus" to deify the human mind. It is really not a modern but an old drama replayed: if you disobey, you will be gods. That happy middle ground, in fact, is a mirage, and the method of correlation as a way to that mythical land an intellectual sleight of hand. However well done, the theological facsimile is simply not genuine theology, least of all true. Perhaps this is why it always ends in cruel disappointment, as it did the first time it was believed. Caveat emptor.

St. Anthony-on-Hudson

PETER D. FEHLNER, O.F.M.Conv.
Rensselaer, N.Y.


This book constitutes the first of three volumes that Congar hopes to publish on the theology of the Holy Spirit. Since theology seeks to understand what we believe and live, and revelation of the Spirit is mediated to us through interpreted experiences that are accessible through Scripture and the tradition of the Church, this first volume is a history of the most significant interpretations of the activity of the Spirit in the economy of salvation. This work is not so much an account of the spiritual experiences of Christians through the ages as a study of some major interpretations of these experiences in Christian history. The second volume will treat more thoroughly the Holy Spirit's activity in animating the Church and individual believers, and the third will present a theology of the Holy Spirit in His relations to Father and Son. C. acknowledges that the present volume may appear too difficult to some readers and too elementary to specialists, but he asserts that his gift and vocation is "that of a Christian who prays and of a theologian who reads many books and takes many notes. May we be permitted to sing our song!" (11).

The first part of the present volume treats the Spirit in Scripture. C. offers us here a good, if at times sketchy, summary of material that is familiar to theologians who deal with the question of the Holy Spirit. The second part presents interpretations of the experience of the Spirit.
in Christian history that have special significance for a pneumatology. C. is particularly interested and interesting when he presents the interpretations of those whose pneumatology is balanced (e.g., Irenaeus and Augustine) and of those whose view of the Spirit is excessively dissociated from Scripture, the Church, or the sacraments (e.g. the Montanists, Simeon the New Theologian, Joachim of Fiore and those he influenced, the sixteenth-century Reformers and some later Protestant leaders). He also gives a good, if brief, account of how Catholic ecclesiology in modern times was largely forgetful of the Holy Spirit except in His function of aiding the magisterium to be indefectible. In this volume C. is clearly preparing for his development in the second volume of a pneumatology that is balanced, that is, one that preserves "the Christological reference to the word, to sacraments, and to the ecclesial institution on the condition that in all this the place and the role of the Spirit is fully recognized and honored" (197).

C. outlines the elements of a pneumatology that are found in Vatican II. These and the call for a new Pentecost by Pope John XXIII have had a dynamic impact in the Church in recent years; they have tended to redress the imbalance of the Catholic past, and they call for a more developed pneumatology than we have at present.

While some readers may find that the brevity of some sections of this book militates against an adequate understanding of the content, an overall view of the history as C. has presented it is an essential part of a contemporary theology of the Holy Spirit. One can only admire Congar's spirit for planning a three-volume work of this character that begins to appear in the year of his seventy-fifth birthday.

De Sales Hall School of Theology
Hyattsville, Md.

JOHN FARRELLY, O.S.B.


This book, dedicated to the memory of Pius Parsch, the great Austrian liturgical leader, is a treasure house of information. E.'s purpose is to give the reader an understanding of (1) the essence of the Mass in light of Christ's institution and the Church's traditional teaching, (2) the form or shape of the Mass in light of the Scriptures and the many historical changes that form has undergone, and (3) the responsible celebration of the community Mass in light of the changing form and the living faith of a given period (cf. v-vi, xiii, 97, 156). E. sees the book as practical, not in the sense that he intends to spare the reader necessary study and reflection, but because it is geared to living the new liturgy and celebrating it as a sign of salvation and a self-expression of the Church (vi). Having
At times one finds oneself disagreeing with E.'s practical judgments, e.g., that it would be out of place to allude to the coming readings in the introduction since it is not part of the Liturgy of the Word (116; cf. 127, 130). Even here he is good in pointing out the importance of being brief. Another point of disagreement is with E.'s contention that the "altar is generally a better and more meaningful place from which to read the concluding prayer" (207). Praying this prayer from the president's chair might help illustrate visually the structure of Introduction, Liturgy of the Word, Liturgy of the Eucharist, and Concluding Rite. Also, E. occasionally slips back and forth from simplistic to more nuanced positions, e.g., in regard to the Last Supper as a Passover meal (19-20, 24) and in regard to a "consecratory epiclesis" in the Roman Canon (175-76, 181-82). The phrase "inclusive Church" used throughout is explained only on p. 50 as "a Church to which the entire population, not just committed believers, belonged." E., incidentally, contends that the change into an inclusive Church did not begin with the "Constantinian Turning Point" but had already begun in the third century (50). These weaknesses are, however, more annoying than crucial. More crucial is the absence of any real discussion of the Christological controversies which had such great impact on liturgical theory and practice.

The value of the book, however, far outweighs its weaknesses. One finds in the Introduction (esp. xvii–xviii) a fine summary of the theological principles underlying both the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy and the General Instruction. E. is, moreover, right on target when he indicates that the real liturgical renewal "by which we will interiorly appropriate the purified and improved means of expression in the sacramental life . . ." has only just begun (xxvi).

In Part 1, chap. 1, E. shows how the Eucharist is essentially both a meal and the sacrifice of Christ made present. In so doing, he gives a good account of the notion of covenant sacrifice (6–11) and of the Passover context of the Eucharist (11–21). He then suggests that the basic form of the Mass is a eucharist, i.e., a blessing or prayer of praise over elements of food intended for eating—an eating which is symbolic and sacramental (23; cf. 156). Here he presents the Jewish berakah as the root of Christian Eucharist and offers a reconstruction of the joining of the Liturgy of the Word to the Eucharistic meal (28–38). Part 1, chap. 2 traces the historical changes in the form of the Mass over the centuries.

Part 2 is a good blend of historical data, reflections on the new rubrics and the General Instruction, and pastoral applications toward a responsible celebration of liturgy today. At times E. can be constructively critical, e.g., when he asks why Christ, the intercessor and mediator, is not named in the new form of the Confiteor (118). His treatment of the
preparation of the gifts is a good instance of E.'s attempt to draw the significance of a particular rite or gesture from historical and theological data, then make pastoral applications. He shows both learning and balance here (cf., esp., 157-58). Part 2 can provide much food for homilies on the rites of the Mass—something still urgently needed.

Still other facets recommend the book. E. summarizes frequently and well (e.g., 11, 28, 37-38, 156). He provides an index, some handy charts (213-17), and a selected bibliography. In short, a fine tool for celebrating priests and all those concerned with understanding and explaining Eucharistic celebration today.

St. John's University, N.Y.  
JOHN H. MCKENNA, C.M.


Among the Victorians the term "rational dress" was applied to ladies' bloomers, because that garment had been specifically designed to permit women to ride bicycles. Rationality in this use of the term was simply the application of a suitable means to a desired end. It is a meaning which would have confused the ancients and medievals, for whom reason consisted in universal truths which were standards for the right ordering of desires. The two conceptions have so often been opposed that it is surprising to find Green opening his book by conflating them.

"Whichever is more fundamental," G. says, "I shall henceforth treat these two as equal and interchangeable expressions." Later he writes: "There is no domain where reason is forbidden to enter or where the question 'Does it maximize my satisfactions?' is not appropriate and required." The conflation of these two kinds of reason is a momentous supposition; for, if they may be equated, then morality and religion can be shown to be consistent with prudential calculation, giving us a uniform understanding of reality. If, however, they are genuinely in tension, then morality, not to mention religion, is not reducible to the maximization of satisfactions, and the project of confining them within the bounds of "reason" is untenable. The issue is nothing less than what standards of rationality we hold in practical life.

Religious reason, G. says, is the cognitive activity of comprehending "the totality of conditions that reason itself requires to make possible the understanding and control of reality." In another formulation he writes: "We can think of religion as the effort to utilize a possible but unknowable domain beyond our experience as a way of rationally harmonizing, while always retaining their integrity, those demands of our reason which must be affirmed but which, within our ordinary experience, remain contradictory."

What are these irrepressible but contradictory demands of reason?
There is, first, the tension between individual self-fulfilment and the realization of community. This tension is resolved in the Kantian "kingdom of ends," i.e., "uncoerced, universal assent to policies." The second conflict is the internal contradiction of conscience in which one and the same reason instructs us to satisfy our own desires while it also enjoins us to sacrifice those satisfactions for the sake of a communal good. Like Kant, G. proposes a resolution in the postulate of the unity of happiness and virtue. When happiness is jeopardized by moral obedience, a person acts rationally when he/she believes that "the course of moral obedience may not be imprudent at all." A third problem is the weakness of the human will. Distancing himself from Kant's almost Christian language on this point, G. finds the solution to this problem in the "belief that there possibly exists a perfect moral causal agency . . . which . . . stands as the final objective ground and arbiter of moral worth."

G. is emphatic about the postulatory character of the religious function of reason. Religious people make nonempirical statements, he argues, not because they are referring to nonempirical objects or experiences, "but rather and primarily because they must be affirmed as existing." To drive home his point, he attacks Rudolf Otto's phenomenology of religion, which locates the source of belief in certain states of awareness. Experience, G. writes, does not give rise to "the enigmatic nature of certain religious utterances. . .," as O. suggests. "Rather it is reason's own requirements that give rise to the need to affirm the existence or experience of an enigmatic object." In the second half of his book, G. proceeds to apply this rationalist interpretation of religion to the analysis of Judaism, Pauline Christianity, and the religions of India, repeatedly denying that religion offers independent norms of reason with which to judge morality or everyday prudence.

The most obvious difficulty in this argument is that G. only allows as much of moral and religious reason as will make prudential calculation coherently rational. But why must morality and religion adjust to prudence rather than the other way round? From another angle, one might ask, how does individual calculation of interest have a special claim in defining what is empirical and so rational? Utilitarian reason, as Iris Murdoch points out, is puritanical. It is single-minded and obtuse in its conception of morality. It recognizes only purposes which are like its own, clear and distinct. Social life, however, is never simple and easily analyzable. It has a density which escapes formulation. For that reason, religion and morality express themselves symbolically, a characteristic which frustrates plain-speaking utilitarians and rationalists.

Morality and religion differ from self-realization in another way too. They both involve a decentering of the self. Moral awareness begins, as Thomas Ogletree has argued, not in the unfolding of the ego but in the recognition of the other. Reason, in that case, is founded on justice, not
vice versa. Rationality, accordingly, involves an active receptivity foreign to G.'s prudent person and alien to the spirit of control latent in rationalism.

Woodstock Theological Center, D.C.   DREW CHRISTIANSEN, S.J.


Joly's thesis is that the writings commonly known as the letters of Ignatius of Antioch are forgeries produced in the late 160's by a Christian of Smyrna who also interpolated the letter of Polycarp to Philippi to substantiate his forgery (and possibly also composed the Martyrdom of Polycarp). The forger's purpose, according to J., was to reinforce the novel system of the monarchical episcopate in the province of Asia. J. knows that his is not the only recent attempt to raise and then settle fresh questions about the Ignatian corpus; he gives the reasons why he cannot agree with either R. Weijenborg or J. Rius-Camps.

J. insists that the only indispensable step of his argument is that Polycarp's letter has been interpolated, the additions being chap. 13 and the thirty words from dexamenois to kai hoti in chap. 1. Apart from those passages, we have no testimony to the letters as the work of the martyr-bishop Ignatius of Antioch before Eusebius, except in a doubtful text of Origen; all that remains is the martyr Ignatius of chap. 9, who is probably from Philippi itself and to whose name the interpolator-forger has attached his work of propaganda for the episcopate.

As for the Ignatian letters themselves, J. considers the scenario they propose very odd: there is no letter to Antioch or mention of one; Ignatius shows no charitable interest in the well-being of his companions; he does not mention Polycarp by name in the letter to the Smyrneans; and we lack parallels to his being sent to Rome as a prisoner condemned to the beasts. In the letters J. finds citations from the Doctrina Petri, the Shepherd of Hermas, and (despite the findings of Koester) the canonical Gospels. Other indices of the letters' late date are discovered in their developed Christian vocabulary, the not only unprecedented but unparalleled role attributed to the monarchical bishop, and the apparent acquaintance with Gnosticism, as well as extensive parallels with 4 Macc.

J.'s arguments vary in cogency. His assertion that Ign. Eph. 10, 1 is a citation of Hermas, Sim. VI, 2, 4, VIII, 7, 2, and VIII, 10, 2 does not deal with the fact that Hermas is writing of those for whom there is hope as contrasted with those who are lost, while Ignatius is appealing for prayer and meekness so that others, who have hope for salvation, may attain to God. Why would Ignatius quote the words of Hermas and not the thought? More perplexing is Irenaeus' failure to name the source of his quotation of Ign. Rom. 4, 1 in A.H. 5, 28, 4; J.'s ingenious explanation is
that while Irenaeus thought the passage worth quoting, he had never heard of this supposed Ignatius, hero of his own hero Polycarp. J.'s studies of Ignatius' Christian vocabulary show that most of it is unparalleled not only in the early second century but also in the time of the alleged forger.

If J. were not an established scholar, one would have to think it naive of him to demand that advocates of the traditional attribution and dating of the Ignatian letters prove that the letters were not forged. Of course it is possible they were forged, and every verisimilitude could be a sign of how clever the forger was; that possibility does not need the elaborate development J. has given it. But when it comes to evidence for the forgery, J. can offer only a possible motive and the contention that Polycarp's letter to Philippi must be interpolated, since Ignatius is called makarios in 9, 1 and hence must be dead, yet in 13, 1-2 it is implied that he is still alive. More evidence than that would be required if one wished to prove forgery. Yet perhaps J.'s modest ambition for his book will be satisfied if people remember that the external evidence for dating Ignatius' letters to the reign of Trajan is very slender and shaky, and, as Lightfoot said, if internal evidence points to a later date, "it is not the genuineness of the epistles but the veracity of the chronology which must be surrendered."

College of St. Thomas, St. Paul

Michael SluSSER


Readers familiar with R.'s fine articles will be pleased to see that he has written a book on fourth- and fifth-century monasticism. He begins with Antony and Pachomius but does not dwell long in the East—only a third of the book. He has a brief section on "Western Beginnings" and then turns to the heart of the book, three long chapters on Jerome, Martin of Tours, and John Cassian.

The story of monasticism emerges as a parallel to other movements in the Church: a few individuals informally live their own version of the Christian life, their life attracts increasing numbers of disciples, the new situation forces compromises upon the original way of life, the founders die off and become idealized but safely distant, those emulating the founders become anachronisms, a new raison d'être must be devised, the institutional Church enters the scene, and eventually what the founders wished to avoid becomes commonplace.

R. tells this familiar story but from the point of view of authority, demonstrating how the personal charisma of the founders was passed on to successors, became enshrined in sayings and eventually the written
word; how these new sources of charisma eventually overshadowed but never eliminated the older ones; how asceticism went from exterior to interior, so that ascetics would not be prevented by their life style from partaking in the larger Church; how asceticism ceased being elitist and became universal in its applicability if not in its adherence; and finally—and this is particularly well done—how the later generations of monastic leaders wrestled painfully with the problem of adapting monastic life to new situations, not just with finding means of being effective but with how to avoid betraying the earlier spirit.

What impressed this reviewer is how R. could weave so many independent elements into the central theme of authority without forcing the evidence. For example, in the earliest stages of desert life labor took precedence over learning as the mark of a true teacher (25), in Martin of Tours's day "ecclesiastical" miracles played a similar but not exclusive role (160), while Cassian stressed a "sense of being involved in a wider community" (229), a sure sign that monasticism had come a long way from the desert.

R. devotes almost a third of the book to Cassian, because he marked the end of asceticism's journey into the hierarchical Church, theoretically as well as actually. Cassian is known to the Christian world as the man who adapted Egyptian monasticism to a Western environment, and the world considers adaptors clever but hardly creative. R. demonstrates how original a thinker Cassian indeed was. He came from a tradition which stressed fidelity to the past, and burdened with this he still rethought and reshaped all of monastic life, a remarkable achievement.

R. acknowledges "The book had to remain, therefore, an essay in interpretation, rather than a narrative history" (4). One can accept his method but, in a sense, does so on his word. For example, Rufinus of Aquileia, who is treated very briefly, spoke for some important Italian ascetics, including ones who were in contact with Jerome. Rufinus does not seem to fit in with the figures discussed in detail. Did his circle not contribute anything significant to the question of authority? Perhaps not, but a fuller discussion would have been helpful.

This is in many ways a thoughtful book, and like all thoughtful books, it is thought-provoking. Students of early monasticism will find it useful and stimulating.

John Carroll University, Cleveland

Joseph F. Kelly


Haberman's reappraisal of "the two foremost philosophical theologians of the Middle Ages" (19) so stresses their cultural distance from our own age as to leave them giants of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries quite
without significance for our own century. Any prospects for rapprochement between their thought world and ours are so remote that anything approaching Gadamer's hermeneutical act, in which there can occur a fusion of the horizons of understanding, is foredoomed. What lies behind that judgment and explains its overly facile character is an unquestioned acceptance of everything characteristic of the contemporary scientific Weltanschauung. Granting a certain primacy to the contemporary worldview—we can only begin with our own situation, and we have the advantage of being able to look back and compare the two perspectives—this does not automatically guarantee that the present stance is on all sides the truer objectively. H. contends that the misadventure in medieval thinking, pursued by both Maimonides and Aquinas, lay precisely in their attempt to synthesize faith and natural science, whereas our enlightened vantage point enables us to see they have nothing whatsoever to do with one another. But this in effect turns upon allowing that religious faith is a matter of obedience and not a cognitive affair involving beliefs at all (save in a pragmatic sense). Thus he readily acknowledges that his own position is "a form of fideism" (5) and that the occurrence of faith, lacking all philosophical, psychological, and ethical underpinnings, is best understood in terms of Hare’s "blick" (105). This brings to light the root reason for the dissatisfaction with Maimonides; H. believes, with Don Issac Abravanel, that "belief in principles of faith, or a creed as such, is incompatible with the character of Judaism as a divinely given law" (79). What he means when he writes that "Religion conceived as a matter of creed is merely a way of talking, but religion conceived as the acceptance and observance of the commandments of the Law is a way of living" (80) is that the former tends to subvert the latter. He tends to view intellectual assent to the proposition "God is" as somehow displacing "the inner conviction of the heart that God loves us and cares for us" (108).

What is really at work here is a misunderstanding of how reason functions at the interior of faith in the properly theological act. H. writes, e.g., of the "devices" of Maimonides and Aquinas for reaching "conclusions already fixed in advance" (41), when what is really at issue is not logical inference at all but manifestatio fidei. Further indication of this tendency to play off reason against belief is his wry remark that what we long for is not the "metaphysical moonshine . . . of God as the very Act-of-Subsistent-Being . . . but a Friend behind phenomena" (112). But is not that longing really for a Friend whose love is identical with Being and so all-powerful (even in its kenosis) and so able to prevail over death? Considerations such as these lead H. into anti-irenic remarks about the "incredible dogmas" of Christianity (91), in which all too frequently he misunderstands the content of such beliefs—e.g., in calling transubstantiation a "miracle" (in the proper sense it is not, since it is not sensibly
observable), in stating that God is necessitated to create the world (223), or that revelation is absolutely necessary (attributed to Aquinas, p. 15).

If H.'s uneasiness is with the "contradictions" in Maimonides' thought, it is with the "verbalism" in that of Aquinas. This latter refers to the Thomistic theory of analogy—e.g., Maritain, Gilson, Klubertanz, McNerny, Mondin, Lyttkens, omitting however Bernard Montagnes—yet he himself fails to grasp, in any formal sense, the intelligibility it means to convey. Thus he can observe that to say "God loves us" is true analogically is to say it is not really true (63). This points up how difficult it is to lay hold of the spirit that animates the thought of a seminal thinker—as opposed to "knowing about" him—when one is not committed to the architectonic insights from which such thought lives. Thus H. reads Aquinas as importing Neoplatonic elements ab extra into Aristotelianism without perceiving the surmounting of the two Hellenic schools in an original synthesis through an understanding of Being as act; he thinks the teaching on human destiny is of Neoplatonic origin, whereas it is strictly biblical and Christian; he interprets the Fifth Way of Aquinas as if it were the argument from design of Hume; he misreads 1 Sentences, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3, concluding that Aquinas here makes the distinction between the divine essence and its attributes to be "not merely 'logical' but 'real.'"

The book concludes with an epilogue on Herbert Loewe's "Unorthodox Defense of Orthodoxy," and five appendices that will prove informative to those interested in modern Jewish studies, among them a revealing essay on "Kant and Judaism."

Catholic University of America

William J. Hill, O.P.


The intense debate over the relative authority of the papacy and of the general councils in the late-fourteenth and fifteenth centuries reached its culmination in the conflict between Eugenius IV and the Council of Basel. Stieber focuses attention on the manner in which the Holy Roman Empire in the persons of Emperors Albrecht II and Frederick II, the electors and other princes, bishops, theologians, and canonists reacted to it. When the conflict first erupted, the Germans adopted a neutral position, expressing dismay both at the Council's deposition of the Pope and his transfer of the Council against its will to Ferrara. By the Acceptation of Mainz in 1439, the Empire accepted the reform decrees of the Council. In the next several years the Germans, in their efforts to
mediate the dispute, urged the Pope not only to accept these reforms but also to acknowledge the supremacy of general councils. They also proposed the convocation of another council, representative of both sides, that could bring about a resolution of the conflict. In the 1440’s, however, Frederick III abandoned his earlier commitment to the principle of conciliar supremacy and the necessity to abide by the conciliar reforms, and pursued a policy favorable to the papacy. Not only did he recognize Eugenius IV as the legitimate pontiff; he also concluded the German Concordat of 1448. S. argues that this change of position can only be explained by the Emperor’s perception of the interests of his dynasty. In return for supporting the Pope, he obtained significant rights over ecclesiastical benefices in Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary. In S.’s view, the Emperor and the princes were dynasts who were quite traditional in their political and religious outlook and not state-builders in the modern sense. They were not so much moved by the abstract notion that conciliarism represented a threat to monarchy in general as they were by the concrete advantages arising from control over ecclesiastical offices.

Eugenius IV and his successors in fact gave up the age-old papal policy of defending ecclesiastical liberty against secular encroachments in order to win the support of the princes in the struggle to thwart the conciliar effort to impose constitutional restraints upon the papacy. The pattern established at this time continued to be followed even when Leo X concluded the Concordat of Bologna with Francis I of France in 1516. While the papacy ultimately triumphed over the Council and the Emperor gained benefits for himself by siding with the papacy, a powerful antipapal sentiment had been stirred up in Germany. The theologians, canonists, and university men, who S. believes were more authentic representatives of ecclesiastical opinion than the prelates, had consistently argued for the supremacy of the Council and the need for reform. They now saw the papacy as the principal obstacle to reform, and this attitude would remain firm down to the Reformation.

This is a well-documented, stimulating, and challenging study, in which S. has not hesitated to take issue with opinions and interpretations hitherto widely accepted. A major contribution to the history of the conciliar movement, it points up the need to look again at all aspects of that era without prejudice or preconception. In addition to a lengthy bibliography and index, there are eleven appendices on a variety of themes treated in the book. Perhaps most valuable are the critiques of sources and studies of the papacy and the Council of Basel.

Fordham University

Joseph F. O’Callaghan

Ferguson poses a series of important and interrelated questions about the growth of historical consciousness in Renaissance England. Both parallel and conflicting developments are studied, with frequent comparisons between medieval and Renaissance attitudes. F. does not restrict his analysis to the work of historians themselves; indeed, some of his most interesting conclusions follow from a study of the uses to which reflection on the past and awareness of contemporary change were put, particularly in religious controversy concerning such questions as the nature of the primitive Church and of ancient authority, Christian and pagan. F. is alert to tendencies which sought explanation in historical conditions as well as in the theology of history, and which looked to nonpolitical materials in an expanding consciousness that the past was composed of much more than “great deeds” and “good examples.”

The first four chapters, filled with the wealth of detail which characterizes the book, study the discrepancies between the English Renaissance theory of history and the manner in which historical study was actually pursued. Here and throughout we find analysis of a long list of writers: Ascham, Bacon, Camden, Cartwright, Coke, Colet, Cranmer, Daniel, and Hooker, to name but a few. Part 2, “The Fruits of Controversy,” contains seven chapters on the development of historical insight on questions involving the national church, the law, the language, and the course of civilization. A “Conclusion” emphasizes the diversity and ambivalence of historical consciousness in this period.

The book is a remarkable achievement and represents a real advance in the study of the slow process by which both historical method and the idea of what constitutes “history” developed in Renaissance England. This said, I have a number of reservations which touch not so much the descriptions given in the book as the manner in which some theoretical questions are posed and in which some comparisons are made. The chief of these reservations, the only one I can consider here, centers on the third chapter, “Nature and Process,” which presents a perspective that runs through the remainder of the book. F. perceives a paradox in the growing ability of many writers to take notice of social change while persisting in their belief in an unchanging natural order. Here there seems to me to be a continuing ambiguity, probably resulting from the failure to use terms like “nature,” “natural law,” and “the eternal substance of things” in a clear and consistent fashion. Sometimes F. writes as if the Renaissance men were trying to come to terms with some central philosophical problem, sometimes he merely sees them as torn between their desire for stability and a kind of medieval cosmic order and their growing perception of change. On p. 68 “nature” is defined, vaguely, as “the
principle of permanence.” The idea of a fixed natural order is subse-
quently applied, in a kind of analogous fashion, to things which are not
really commensurate: (1) to the idea of the natural law in a Thomistic
sense; (2) to the idea of a fixed hierarchy of being or cosmic order; (3) to
the idea of fixed laws of nature; (4) to the idea of fixed paradigms of the
social order, such as the metaphor of the “body politic.” From time to
time F. takes each of these senses of there being a natural order as
logically incompatible with the growing admission that the world is
characterized by change. It seems to me that not all of these senses of a
natural order are in fact incompatible with the acknowledgment of
change, and that each of them is related to the question of “change” or
of “relativity” in a different fashion. In spite of other reservations, mostly
concerned with the adequacy of some of the comparisons between me-
dieval and Renaissance thought, I repeat that this is a valuable study
which tries to come to terms with some of the most difficult questions
facing the historian of ideas.

University of Utah

GLENN W. OLSEN

COLLECTED WORKS OF ERASMUS 23: LITERARY AND EDUCATIONAL
WRITINGS 1: ANTIbarbari/parabolae; 24: LITERARY AND EDUCA-
TIONAL WRITINGS 2: De copia/de ratione studii. Edited by Craig R.
Thompson. Translated from the Latin by Margaret Mann Phillips et al.

Where the previous publications in this series were devoted to Erasmus’
correspondence, these volumes present four of his educational works.
The many, even among scholars, who lack proficiency in Latin will be
grateful for access to these influential Renaissance texts never before
published in complete and exact English translations. The Antibarbari
(1520) discusses in dialogue form the place of pagan literature in a
Christian education. A handbook of aphorisms collected mainly from
Plutarch and Pliny, the Parabolae (1514) offers pithy expressions of folk
wisdom to writers and public speakers. The De copia (1512), a manual of
Latin composition, inculcates a fulness of verbal expression and subject
matter. Finally, the De ratione studii (1512), written in letter form,
outlines curriculum and methods for teaching Greek and Latin.

The two-volume collection is edited by Craig R. Thompson, best known
for his English translation of Erasmus’ Colloquies (Chicago, 1965). His
“General Introduction” is particularly helpful when pointing out the
probable influence of Erasmus’ Latin stylistics on vernacular authors
such as Rabelais and Shakespeare. Margaret Mann Phillips, whose rep-
utation was established by her Adages of Erasmus (Cambridge, Eng.,
1964), tactfully refutes Albert Hyma’s strictures against the religious
spirit of the Antibarbari in her introduction to this work: “We will not
stop to inquire why anyone should note the absence of the mysticism of Thomas à Kempis in a book in favour of the classics” (23, 11). As cotranslator of Vols. 1–4 of The Correspondence of Erasmus (Toronto, 1974–77) and as editor of two tracts for the Erasmi opera omnia (1/1, Amsterdam, 1969), R. A. B. Mynors brings extensive experience to his work of translating the Parabolae. In a devastating footnote at the end of his introduction, Mynors pointedly criticizes the work of Jean-Claude Margolin, Latin editor of the Parabolae (0.0. 1/5, Amsterdam, 1975): “The reader should be warned not to place implicit trust in the identifications of sources in ASD, of which about a hundred are erroneous” (23, 129 n. 12). A spot check reveals that Mynors is habitually on target where Margolin goes wide of the mark.

The introductions of Betty I. Knott to the De copia and of Brian McGregor to the De ratione studii are far less controversial. Knott’s annotations witness to Erasmus’ catholic reading of the classics, not only of Cicero, Virgil, and Horace but even of Suetonius and Apuleius. McGregor’s notes helpfully give philosophical backgrounds and refer to current trends in literary criticism of the classics.

As works that focus on grammar and stylistics, methodology and philosophy of education, these four treatises are more relevant to students of literary and intellectual history than to theologians. In the Parabolae, perhaps as a result of his debates with conservative theologians, Erasmus generally makes wry comments on the profession (see, e.g., 23, 265). The De copia offers a brief paragraph on scriptural allegories (24, 635). More pervasively, the Antibarbari deals with the theologically significant question of the proper relationship between Christianity and secular culture. As a characteristically Renaissance text, the De ratione studii prefers the study of the Fathers, both Latin and Greek, to that of the scholastics. Erasmus’ modest treatise would later influence both the name and the program of the Jesuit Ratio studiorum.

At the cost of $45, these two volumes would be less valuable to the library of a theologian than other translations of Erasmus forthcoming from Toronto, e.g., his Paraphrases of the New Testament and the Ratio verae theologiae.

Catholic University of America ANNE M. O’DONNELL, S.N.D.


Seeing Luther as the potential source of an evangelical ferment for contemporary Catholicism, O. trains his reader to read Luther for the retrieval of central Christian themes. O. judges that the original Roman refusal to listen in 1518–21 was itself a sign of the low state of a church
in which the supreme pastorate had just passed from a Borgia to a della Rovere to a Medici. After the initial refusal, Catholicism was impoverished by the absence of the surging power of Christ's presence in his gospel word of grace. O. knows the dross in Luther, e.g., his insensitivity to the forces of social renewal in the name of justice and his inability to speak well on Christian growth and sanctification. Still, there is a golden center in Luther's *élan primordiale* to discourse on the consoling and freeing gospel, on self-abandonment to God in faith, on Jesus Christ (for us, with us, victorious on the cross), and on the appropriation of the perennial creed of the Church.

O.'s method is to lead us to and through three major texts (averaging twelve pages in length) which display Luther's theological themes and method far better than do the snippets used by most expositors. The advantages of the method are numerous. For one, O. is able to reject convincingly a recent attempt (R. Dalbiez, *L'Angoisse de Luther*, 1974; one thinks also of Erikson's *Young Man Luther*) to reduce Luther's theological achievement to the construction of mechanisms for overcoming pathological constrictions due to morbid anxiety over guilt. Luther's exertions, one sees in O.'s texts, were less against the demons of his own psyche than against the demonic hold of Germanic thought, especially its notion of justice by compensation through retribution, on late-medieval Western Christianity. Luther offered a Pauline-Augustinian retrieval of the gospel of grace against which the Western Church had become impermeable.

A reviewer naturally sees ways of doing such a project more adequately. O. does not tell how Luther's advocacy of the gospel quickly linked arms with forces pursuing other aims, such as Philip of Hesse's anti-Hapsburg politics and the drive of the German cities to throw off episcopal authority. In showing what Catholicism lost by excluding Luther, O. goes to excess in depicting the nonevangelical Church of the Counter Reformation. He mentions neither Trent's reform decrees, nor the catechetical and missionary ferment of the post-Tridentine generations, nor the flowering of mysticism and charity in seventeenth-century Catholicism. Much more adequate readings of the Counter Reformation are circulating in Church history today. For this reviewer, O.'s presentation of Luther's evangelical theology of the word skims the specific anchoring Luther gave to the gospel, especially 1518–20, by his accounts of absolution and the words of Eucharistic institution. One may have misgivings about Luther's new twists in sacramental doctrine, but it is to his credit that he situated the events of forgiveness and freedom squarely in the concrete life of the Church.

Still, O.'s book is a notable success as an introduction to Luther's thought. His selected texts are just right to help us encounter Luther unhindered by an existentialist or systematic-theological overlay. Second,
the "faith of Luther" to which O. leads us is sorely needed by American Catholicism in the 1980's, where poor preaching has abounded and moralistic "shoulds" resound from pulpits from which one rarely hears the freeing gospel of the Son of God's death and resurrection for our forgiveness and new life.

Gregorian University, Rome

JARED WICKS, S.J.


In faithful reflection of the breadth of George Williams' own interests, this Festschrift in his honor spans the history of Christianity from its origins until the present. The articles begin with a piece on First Thessalonians by Helmut Koester, and the final article, by Lewis W. Spitz, is entitled "Model Man, Modern Man, Reformation Man." If only to give readers some sense of the range of the book, the names of each of the twenty-four contributors to its three parts must at least be mentioned: (1) Ancient and Medieval History: Helmut Koester, James Leo Garrett, Robert M. Grant, Jaroslav Pelikan, Giles Constable, George H. Tavard, Deno J. Geanakoplos, John Meyendorff; (2) Reformation: Steven Ozment, Charles Trinkaus, David C. Steinmetz, Harold J. Grimm, Robert M. Kingdon, John E. Booty, John Tedeschi, John C. Godbey; (3) Modern: J. Samuel Preus, Lech Szczucki (the only contributor not teaching or writing in the United States), Robert T. Handy, Sydney E. Ahlstrom, Conrad Wright, William R. Hutchison, John C. Bennett, and Lewis W. Spitz. The book includes, besides, a biographical sketch of Williams' life by James Luther Adams, an introductory essay on "The Periodization of History" by Franklin H. Littell, "A Letter from Roland Bainton on Immortality," and a bibliography of W.'s publications. The very names of the contributors indicate that the volume has to be one of the most impressive Festschriften ever published to honor an American Church historian.

Limitations of space and competence force me to forgo comment on the third section of the book. Even the other two must be dealt with briefly and according to my own interests. First of all, however, a word must be said about Adams' "portrait" of Williams (1-17). This sketch is an unexpected bonus. It enables us to see the "vocation" of W. as a Church historian and the responsibility for the present that his knowledge of the past imposed upon him. W. has consistently spoken out on immediate issues. He was an early enemy of the Nazi and an early friend of the Second Vatican Council. Today his opposition to abortion on
demand puts him in the center of another controversy. I found the story inspiring. (On a lighter note—Adams does not mention that W. was the only person, to my knowledge, who predicted that Karol Cardinal Wojtyla would be elected pope after the death of John Paul I. The Pope's name appears in the Tabula Gratulatoria at the beginning of the book.)

As I suggested above, the quality of the articles invariably corresponds to the distinction of their authors. I single out only a few. Grant's "Civilization as a Preparation for Christianity in the Thought of Eusebius" combines attention to detail with the ability to rise to broader generalizations—a gift Grant has consistently manifested in his scholarship. Here he touches on a question, "progress," of interest to historians of all eras. Historical theologians will find in Pelikan's article on Guibert of Nogent interesting material on redemption, the Eucharist, and especially Mariology. Constable's "Nudus nudum Christum sequi and Parallel Formulas in the Twelfth Century" is technical and specialized, but offers helpful information on the history of medieval spirituality and on the curious outburst of enthusiasm for "poverty" in the High and Late Middle Ages. "The Byzantine Recovery of Constantinople from the Latins in 1261" by Geanakoplos illustrates how pious and traditional formulas were used to legitimate a revolution in a document never before so carefully analyzed. Booty's study of the sermon in which John Jewel confronted Elizabeth on her ecclesiastical policies shows how prophetic preaching continued to be practiced even after the Reformation was established.

Ozment addresses an immense subject in his "Humanism, Scholasticism, and the Intellectual Origins of the Reformation." He advances theses about the relationship of these three phenomena that put a lot of issues into focus. Like a few other recent scholars, he recognizes a continuity between the Reformation and some aspects of the scholastic, as well as the humanistic, tradition. In some ways Trinkaus in his careful "Luther's Hexameral Anthropology" deals in a microcosmic way with the same problems that Ozment handled more broadly. He focuses his study on Luther's stance on the "dignity of man" and the "misery of man" in the Lectures on Genesis. Drawing on his vast knowledge especially of Renaissance texts, Trinkaus shows how radically different was the framework of Luther's interpretation from that of his humanist contemporaries who also commented on Genesis.

I found Tedeschi's "Preliminary Observations on Writing a History of the Roman Inquisition" satisfying, despite its admittedly provisional character. I commend T. for his readiness now, after years of research, to make some generalizations about a major institution that has often been cursed, rarely studied. T.'s assessment of the Inquisition is, in fact, perhaps as mild as anything ever written about it except by obvious partisans. Thus the article opens up, once again, the larger question of the interpretation and historiography of the Counter Reformation. For
anybody interested in that problem, there are still immense archives and libraries that contain fascinating materials never before examined by scholars, as T. points out for the Inquisition alone. The fact that the Counter Reformation, that movement of such enormous significance for world culture, is represented in the Festschrift by this single article indicates the neglect it continues to suffer and a fresh direction that scholarship should now take.

Weston School of Theology, Mass. JOHN W. O’MALLEY


L. argues forcefully that a definitive history of “Modernism” cannot be written without first understanding a basic dichotomy in the last two hundred years of Roman Catholic history. The claim, which owes some debt to Louis Bouyer and to L.’s mentor, Alexander Dru, is that two conflicting mentalities have long divided the Catholic Church. On the one hand have been “liberal Catholics” who sought to synthesize Catholic faith with modern sciences; on the other hand have been “ultramontanes” who emphasized the unifying authority of the papacy. Unfortunately, and perhaps unnecessarily, these two parties have had a long and continuing history of strident conflict.

With impressive scrutiny, many archival documents from George Tyrrell, Friedrich von Hügel, and others are presented here to suggest the importance of this dichotomy. Tyrrell’s position was that ultramontanism was not the only possible form of Catholicism. It embraced a Neo-Scholastic philosophy which presumed to present eternal truths and hence was incompatible with modern claims of the contingency, the historical character, of truth (see Gerald McCool, Catholic Theology in the Nineteenth Century). It not only defied many things the modern intellectual world held dear; it also sought to equate Catholicism with this defiance. Tyrrell was convinced there was another form of Catholicism, one more organic, developing, and appreciative of history, the authentic Catholicism that would endure. This alternative form of Catholicism, espoused by liberals, he saw as the “historical community through whose fortunes and fluctuations and errors and experiences the truth is slowly threshed out.” It was to this form of Catholicism that Tyrrell attempted to remain faithful even after his excommunication.

Von Hügel was an exceptional Modernist because he sought to be at the same time both a liberal and an ultramontane. He somehow failed to see that in his time such a reconciliation of opposing positions in the Church was impossible. He was convinced that previously the two op-
posing positions had been one, as in the person of François Fénelon (1651–1715) and Jean Mabillon (1632–1707). Theirs was an ultramontanism which gave the pope power to oppose the anti-intellectualism of narrowly-based national churches. Later, neoultramontanism seized only part of this historical whole, divorcing scholarship from ecclesiastical loyalty and making a cliquish kind of obedience the decisive Catholic virtue. Between Fénelon and von Hügel, a welter of events (such as the Munich Congress, Pius IX’s “Munich Brief,” the Syllabus of Errors, Vatican I, and Döllinger’s excommunication) precluded the possibility of healing the divorce. The Munich Brief, for instance, made explicit and precise the papacy’s opposition to science and learning.

No less valuable than the clearer historical perspective upon Tyrrell, von Hügel, and the general Modernist controversy are five other sections of this book: (1) 120 pages of critical bibliography on nine Modernist topics; (2) a most informative catalogue of ninety manuscript collections relating to various arenas of the controversy; (3) brief excursuses into the positions of Edmund Bishop, Charlotte Lady Blennerhassett, and Joseph Sauer; (4) indications of the forms the controversy took in Germany; and (5) 16 previously unpublished documents which signal the wider context of the Modernist controversy or which reflect the intellectual development of von Hügel.

Disappointments in the book require only passing mention. It is the first volume in the Tübinger theologische Studien to appear in English, but delays on the part of Matthias-Grünewald bring this important work to print only in 1979, despite the fact that it was for all intents and purposes complete in January 1973. Hence the massive and unmatched bibliography is not entirely current. And no mention is made of various recent points of interest, such as the fact that the Vatican Archives, though still uncatalogued, were opened to study through the papacy of Leo XIII (+1903) in 1978.

Perhaps related to the delay in publication is the supposition that debate regarding the character of Alfred Loisy’s faith is closed, that journal entries of 1904 prove he was already a religious sceptic and exceptionally deserving of excommunication. In so judging Loisy, L. makes only brief and deprecating references to kinder evaluations of the man by Henri Bremond, Roger Aubert, Alec Vidler, and Larry Barmann. Of course, no reference is made to similar and more recent evaluations by Bernard Scott and Valentine Moran. Nor is mention made of repeated statements by Emile Poulat, most knowledgeable of Loisy scholars, that the character of Loisy’s faith remains simply “insaisissable.” Too cavalier in this regard, L. makes only repeated suggestion that Poulat and Barmann do not know enough German to understand fully even this French dimension of the Modernist controversy. It must be admitted that Loisy’s faith was not identical with that of Pius X, nor was it ruled by the
"orthodoxy" imposed by anti-intellectual, Neo-Scholastic, ultramontane Rome. Yet the central insight of L.'s landmark work is that the theological establishment which imposed that orthodoxy was but one of two possible kinds of Catholic theology and that its authoritarian style has been at issue in two hundred years of liberal-ultramontane dispute.

The book is distributed in North America and Great Britain through its author: Thomas Loome, Theology Department, St. Catherine's College, St. Paul, MN 55105. It is critically important for understanding and researching Modernism in the Catholic Church.

University of Nebraska at Omaha


If the American Catholic Church in the nineteenth century was largely formed by the flood tide of immigrants, its intellectual community, such as it was, drew its strength from a remarkable group of native converts. Orestes Brownson (1803-76) and Isaac Hecker (1819-88) were the two most influential converts in shaping the intellectual life of the Church in America through the pages of Brownson's Quarterly, the Catholic World, and their other writings. Their thirty-year correspondence offers a rich commentary on their odyssey from transcendentalism and radical social reform to Catholicism and its place in a democratic society.

Hecker referred to the older Brownson as his "spiritual Parent," but the mystical Hecker's role in the conversion of the more rationally oriented Brownson was also crucial. "[W]hile you supposed I was leading you to the Church," Brownson wrote several years after coming into the Church, "it was you who led me there" (148). Nonetheless, Hecker, who had no illusions about the intellectual poverty of American Catholics in the 1840's, looked to Brownson to lead the crusade that would convince American Protestants that Catholicism was the religion most congruent for a democratic people.

Brownson shared Hecker's conviction about the compatibility of democracy and Catholicism but was decidedly less optimistic than Hecker about the prospects of an early conversion of America. The foreign-mindedness of the American hierarchy and the lack of a missionary spirit among the immigrant Catholics convinced Brownson that the only Catholics who really understood the American people were the converts. So he encouraged Hecker's efforts to form a congregation dedicated to the conversion of America that led to the foundation of the Paulists in 1858. When Hecker subsequently established the Catholic World in 1865, Brownson became one of his chief contributors.

Their intellectual paths, however, were diverging. By 1868 Brownson
confessed to Hecker that he had become a convert to the encyclical *Quanta cura*, including its Syllabus of Errors, "and am almost beginning to despair of the success of the American experiment" (242). His growing concern was the impact of America upon the faith of Catholics. In the summer that the Vatican Council defined the primacy and infallibility of Pius IX, he wrote Hecker that he feared that not one American Catholic in twenty accepted the decree. "I think," he concluded, "the Church has never encountered a social & political order so hostile to her" (292).

The new champion of Pio Nono's ultramontanism was somewhat of an embarrassment to Hecker and his liberal associates at the Catholic *World*. After several of Brownson's articles were rejected, he ended his connection with the journal in 1872, as well as his correspondence with Hecker.

The documents are effectively put into context through judicious introductions and annotations. There is an adequate index of proper names. Several collateral documents are included from the period of their conversion. In this inaugural volume of the Notre Dame Studies in American Catholicism the editors have set a high standard of excellence.

*Georgetown University* 

ROBERT EMMETT CURRAN, S.J.


Historians write with greater frequency and greater zest about nonconformists. What, after all, is there to say about traditionalists who by temperament or a sense of calling or by the obligations of office "defend the faith"? It is possible that life toiling in the vineyard may win a heavenly reward; indeed, expositors of history "from the bottom up" regularly presume this about the lowly. But the conservative who achieves or just finds himself rather surprisingly in high office is likely to remain unsung. Or if singled out, very likely he will be noticed for his obduracy; his attempts to maintain the *status quo* will be treated as mean-spirited, his methods deprecated as dully bureaucratic, if not downright conspiratorial.

There has never been a biography of Corrigan, archbishop of New York in the turbulent years of late-nineteenth-century America. Jay Dolan and the Arno Press are to be congratulated for recognizing this unfortunate lacuna, and Curran for agreeing to publish the longest study yet available about this key figure in American Catholic history. I cannot help thinking it unfortunate that C. has chosen not to write the needed full-scale biography, but rather an interpretation of Corrigan's role in the already well-known controversies of the era. For one thing, the Corrigan papers, which C. was able to consult and which must be indispensable to
any biographer, have apparently disappeared again from the archives. Another bit of bad luck is that this book was written during the fevered months of Watergate; C. worries, rightly, I'm afraid, about the ways this ambiance may have affected his interpretation. I doubt that in 1979 he would not have qualified his prefatory remark that the "fear" Corrigan and his allies experienced "about the threats they saw to their authority or the well-being of the Church led them to misuse their power and corrupt the very authority they were trying to preserve. They, too, like many of the former president's subordinates, thought that the higher ends could legitimize sleazy means." The Archbishop, C. acknowledges, "unlike Nixon, was not driven from office by his excesses," but the bulk of the book clearly suggests the author's conviction that he probably should have been. As C. assiduously chronicles the events in Corrigan's episcopacy, he comes to the summary judgment that the Archbishop played an "important role" in setting "the seal of the reactionary, Roman, and authoritarian cast of American Catholicism." He adds, as if in parenthesis, that Corrigan's death "left no legacy of affection among his people." Then, returning to his main charge, he declares that the Archbishop and his fellows "in effect abandoned any attempt" to find what C. calls "an equation between Catholicity and Americanism. They had resolved this dilemma by a process of bifurcation, by a compartmentalization of the basic components of the American Catholic's identity."

Even if one is disposed to accept C.'s characterization of twentieth-century American Catholicism, the book does not establish that Corrigan can be made to carry major responsibility. Even if one accepts C.'s characterization of Corrigan as a man, and concludes that he made life very hard indeed for such independent-minded clergymen as McGlynn and Burtsell, and perhaps too easy for the suppliant and conformist, I should have thought that the main forces shaping the nature of American Catholicism would be the pretty steady pressures from Rome through most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries for a special kind of Catholic life, along with the intensifying difficulties in modern society—perhaps most acutely felt in the United States—for anyone seeking to serve both "Christ and culture."

Since I have written this much—in effect regretting that C. did not really try to write the book his title advertises ("and the Shaping of Conservative American Catholicism in America")—I want to recommend reading the book he did write. Ecclesiastical infighting is usually interesting to read about, and especially so when such colorful Irishmen as McQuaid and McGlynn, Corrigan and Ireland were involved, not to mention the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, who Andrew Greeley has recently revealed was popularly and respectfully called "little Jimmy" because of his archcraftiness. C. has an admirable ability to survey the
whole field; he has a nice sense for the crucial play, and the ability to describe it with precision and style. Both great intelligence and enormous amounts of hard work obviously went into the crafting of this book. The section recounting the long, free-swinging contest between Corrigan and McGlynn is especially well done. Irreverently, I was reminded of this section when recently I saw a nostalgic clip on television of the encounter of John Wayne and Victor McLaglen in "The Quiet One." But a scriptwriter has privileges which a responsible historian like Curran is denied. The fictive heroes, it is suggested, lived happily ever after; Curran shows all too clearly that neither McGlynn nor Corrigan did.

University of Virginia

ROBERT D. CROSS


That a case can be made for Christianity may come as a relief for the doubter or a surprise for the skeptic. But that it comes from Butterfield, who has written equally well on science, history, and theology, can only be a delight to those who take reason seriously because they also take faith seriously. Indeed, without faith there are even empirical causes to wonder about the security of reason itself. "It may transpire," B. wrote, "that the notion of what we call absolute truth is not unconnected with religion" (159). This is not the conclusion of a man unaware of what the actual historical alternatives to the Christian faith really are.

In gathering many of B.'s penetrating essays, McIntire has rendered a necessary and valuable service to those of us who suspect that the real problem contemporary civilization really has with Christianity is that it just might be true, that "science" may just be a product of and not an alternative to religion. For B., men do not decide their religion from their thoughts on science. "The conclusions that they draw even from the discoveries of the natural sciences depend on a more fundamental factor—namely, the posture they themselves have initially developed toward the universe" (183). Such were also the sentiments Aquinas suggested when he wondered whether even our very first acts were towards God or not, acts that revealed our first, fundamental orientation (2-2, 89, 6).

B. has been one of those Christians who have pondered Christian doctrines to see where they or their denials have in fact led down the ages. He has been uncompromising about historical fact because he has also known that the very idea of a unique historical fact was itself related to Christianity, to incarnation.

B. is a Protestant Christian. For him, the NT is more normative, the sins of later Christians more poignant, less easy to dismiss. He thus also knows Augustine, that the kingdom of God is not political. No one can
understand human nature unless he realizes that "he himself is part of the problem—he has his share in man's universal sin" (263). This means for the Christian that redemption pertains to this very sense of fact and historical record about man's universal sin.

The greatest temptation is to forget that human dignity is based, historically, on the ideas of the spirituality of the soul and the resurrection of the body. Belief in God frees us from the temptation to worship anything less, any state, any abstraction, any mere person (47).

For those who follow the flow of ideas about medicine from Hitler's Germany to our own abortion clinics and many of our ecological theories, B. is prophetic. Christianity's belief that we are meant for eternity, unique in creation, is the locus of all future conflict between Christianity and paganism (181). The most astonishing thing about B.'s reflections is their sense of authentic newness and uniqueness that revelation brings into the world. There is something to be said for creation itself, for Lambs that frolick in May, for something that is an end in itself, made only for the glory of God. It is worthwhile, then, to study a period of obscure history just for itself, because "human life always has its interest" (182).

And B. understands the danger in insisting that we might have been redeemed otherwise, in another fashion. "The slightest hint of resentment against the universe in one's heart—the slightest trace of anger at having been born in such an imperfect world, or even indignation against human beings for not being better than they are—anything of all this would always be a further cause of intellectual aberration" (266).

Something exists in the world for its own sake. He protests: "If those who think of [God] as creating human beings for the achievement of some utilitarian object would only say rather that men were created for the glory of God, they would at least be speaking, and doing their thinking, in the right universe" (146). To think and do in the right universe—ad majorem Dei gloriam—this is already the only freedom worthy of the name.

No Jesuit certainly can read B. without rediscovering his own spirit, a spirit that must, as Augustine said, as B. reiterated, still first wrestle with itself lest it fail to know what wrestling with the world is really about.

Georgetown University

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.


Beauchamp and Childress have been on the biomedical-ethics scene for a good while, and in this work their experience is telling. They accomplish what they set out to do. They have written a fine and practical work of applied ethics for a wide audience. They weave practical cases
around the four principles of autonomy, beneficence, nonmaleficence, and justice. There are two excellent appendices, one gathering all the medical codes, the other a collection of twenty-nine well-drawn cases. The fine integration of the cases into the text could be the real genius of the work.

My only real dissent concerns a certain philosophical inconsistency which I detect running throughout. The authors divide the ethical world into two basic categories, the deontologic and the utilitarian. I fear the categories are too broad. There is a current temptation in ethical circles to stretch the utility category backwards and forwards. One tries to show how the deontologist is subtly a utilitarian and at the same time how the utilitarian is not really too utilitarian. So also B. and C. try so hard to hem in the meaning of utilitarianism that they almost seem to want the term no longer to mean what it commonly means.

In this regard it is not surprising to read their confession that one author is a deontologist, the other a utilitarian (40). While they may have healed their differences at the level of practical conclusion, there is a certain remaining ethical schizophrenia in the mindset. Both positions may frequently lead to similar conclusions, but the roads to the conclusions are never really united; they remain at best merely juxtaposed.

The old tracts on the criterion of the good (De bono) may yet offer a way out, in that many did not include the category of teleology within utility as the authors do. Because teleology becomes for the authors synonymous with utility, they never quite come to what teleology as a separate category can offer, namely, a more basic exploration of the meaning and purpose of human activity in itself. For example, they speak well of why we must respect others and others must respect us. In this sense autonomy functions well as a sociolegal category. But they do not speak so clearly about the moral meaning of autonomy and why, e.g., suicide is not a good human action or why a woman ought not to donate her heart while living (232). They say that they do not wish to do a metaethics. Yet there is no way to avoid the problem; there is no neutral ground.

The authors use Ross's category of prima-facie duty but do not quite get to discerning why one exception can override the prima-facie duty and another cannot. They allude to the problem of ordering goods (35) but never quite get to a systematic analysis of the issue—and this despite an excellent reporting of the Catholic discussion of double effect in its contemporary nuancing on proportion. The principle of utility, I fear, ends up being pulled out almost as a deus ex machina whenever common sense dictates the need for an exception to other principles.

The point is that the authors do have common sense, eminently so. They are very careful at the level of practice to circumscribe utility
considerations. There is a healthy conservative instinct at work. But their lack of a more articulate philosophy of human dignity and relationality leaves room for potential mischief. Someone later will come along and use their category of utility without their common sense and without their feel for individual rights.

I believe it is especially in their treatment of issues surrounding the dying or the "refusal of treatment" that they miss a more coherent theory. Their conclusions are sound but their decision to handle the discussion under the rubric of suicide ends up, I fear, obscuring more than it clarifies.

There is a notable absence of any _ex professo_ entering of abortion discussion. I would have reservations regarding their apparent sympathy for the 1973 Court decision and personally would have appreciated seeing their characteristic skillfulness in applying the principle of autonomy to the child in the womb. Perhaps they wisely knew that entering such a polemic would submerge their gifted capacity for working out their principles in other areas. One has to respect that decision as well as their ecumenical sensitivity.

If there was ever an area that is easier to criticize than to construct, it is in bioethics. Conflicting values are at work. It is human to live; it is human to die. The human is autonomous, yet in community. B. and C. deserve credit for a careful and practical work. Despite my concern over a weakness in their theoretic underpinnings, the book is written with a gift for careful articulation, with a dialectical sense, with a respect for the ambiguities of the human lot, with a sensitivity toward the fragility of individual rights especially of the poor, with a respectful ecumenical tone. It deserves a wide reception at graduate and undergraduate levels.

_St. Charles Seminary, Phila._

Francis X. Meehan


This volume, related in many ways to G.'s previous book on abortion, examines the problems surrounding euthanasia from a jurisprudential and ethical point of view. The purpose of the thirteen chapters is to build a two-pronged argument against euthanasia. The first prong examines liberty and justice from a constitutional and political viewpoint and argues that these fundamental values cannot be used to justify euthanasia. Model statutes and amendments to the Constitution show how the authors would apply these values to public policy. The second prong is a strong argument for the absolute-value-of-life position, which prohibits voluntary suicide or the intentional killing of another. Interspersed in these arguments are discussions of the definition of death, the refusal of
treatment, suicide, voluntary and nonvoluntary euthanasia, care for the incompetent, discussion of ethical theories, and the responsibility of professionals. The concluding chapter pulls together the two general underlying arguments to relate law and morality.

The opponents of the authors are secular humanism in political philosophy and utilitarianism in ethical theory. G. and B. feel that secular humanism is replacing the American political philosophy based on traditional Western religious values and even argue that secular humanism functions as belief in God does for the theist. This latter view is based on U.S. v. Seeger, which was an attempt to make room for conscientious objectors who did not base their objection on religious beliefs as the Selective Service Act demanded. This may be compounding one bad argument with another. They correctly point out that significant value and philosophical issues are at stake in education and health policy, but it does not follow that traditional Western religious values should have a privileged position in the debate or within the development of an appropriate political philosophy. The authors also argue against utilitarianism and its political analogue, cost-benefit analysis, because of its foundations in secular humanism and its reliance on the use of circumstances and proportionality to resolve cases. Their critique of utilitarianism points out several of the major flaws of the theory. Their argument that human goods/values are incommensurable is not clearly developed and does not come to terms with the experience that human goods come only in circumstances, not in the abstract, and therefore some attention must be paid to the consequences of choosing a particular good as it is manifested in these particular circumstances as opposed to choosing another manifested in other circumstances.

The penultimate chapter focuses on a moral evaluation of killing. This analysis is conducted by a rather tortuous reworking of the traditional concept of objective-versus-subjective responsibility for acts, on the basis of which the authors distinguish between killing in a strict sense (voluntary commitment to a proposal) and doing a deadly deed (death is not voluntarily attended and is not a part of the proposal). Naming these two dimensions actions and performance does not seem to advance the discussion, but allows the authors to justify some deadly deed, e.g., some acts of self-defense, some killing in war (but not the development of a strategy based on nuclear deterrents), and some abortions, e.g., tubal pregnancies, removal of a cancerous uterus, and some embryotomies. The distinction allows some actions to be reclassified so that they do not include killing in the strict sense. Euthanasia is not one of these actions and the authors argue that it is to be prohibited.

Positively, the authors review and analyze a great deal of contemporary literature, and in doing this they poke holes in many theories and
positions. They get to the heart of the matter and persistently follow through on their line of reasoning. They construct their own position as an answer to the proponents of euthanasia and as the basis for the development of a public policy with respect to euthanasia. Negatively, the book is about twice as long as it needs to be. The penultimate summary chapter could have been expanded by about a hundred pages and a clearer, more easily readable volume would have been produced. A shorter version of this volume would be more helpful than using the book selectively, as the authors suggest. As such, the book is an interesting, if wordy, contribution to the euthanasia debate.

Worcester Polytechnic Institute

THOMAS A. SHANNON


When W. became pope, there arose a widespread interest in his previous writings. It should perhaps be noted that this book was not written for a general or even a theological audience; moreover, it has not been quickly translated for commercial gain. The translation, begun years ago, was prompted by the book’s success in Poland. The text has been revised in the light of the Cardinal’s further research and publication in phenomenology.

W. indicates that Vatican II, Max Scheler, and the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition are the main sources of his thought. These sources should be understood as merely starting points for his probing anthropological investigation. There is, in fact, almost no discussion in this text of anything religious. Scheler’s thought is frequently ignored in favor of more traditional positions. And the scholastic tradition is transformed by a personalistic phenomenology.

The basic argument of the book is that the essence of being human can best be illumined through an extensive analysis of voluntary action. Action is the distinguishing feature of spirit. Passivity, or all that happens either in or to human beings, pertains to their psychosomatic centers—the realm of nature. Although W. devotes little space to purely intellectual activity, he begins with an analysis of consciousness. More traditional, cosmological approaches, he thinks, often neglect the personalization or subjectification of action that occurs through consciousness. For the most part, he focuses on freedom, whose primary act is self-determination and whose principal object is the subject’s self-fulfilment. Moral decisions, which in later essays he calls the “drama of the will,” are creative encounters with the truth of values presented through emotions. This aspect of truthfulness saves the basic argument from what would otherwise be a heavy voluntarism.
The central dialectic of human existence involves the dynamisms of self-transcendence and integration. Traditional anthropologies have portrayed human life too statically. The human spirit moves beyond all determinisms, and at the same time it must integrate into itself the semi-independent dynamisms of the soma and the psyche. Full chapters are devoted to the reactivity of the body and to the emotivity of the psyche. Human freedom cannot emerge without psychosomatic dynamisms, and these dynamisms become personal through freedom. Of themselves, bodily and emotional activities, apparently including love, are not spiritual acts, for what is outside the will is less than personal. The reviewer thinks that the positions of Scheler on emotions, of Merleau-Ponty on the body, and of Teilhard on passivities are more adequate.

The book's last chapter will perhaps be of most interest to theologians, especially after the Pope's speeches in Mexico and Poland. He argues that everyone has a right to self-direction and to effective dissent. He rejects ranking any limited community ahead of the entire human community. He opposes individualism and totalitarianism as well as conformism and noninvolvement, because each of these denies the complementary truths that the individual is primary and that this individual can achieve self-fulfilment only through a participatory being-and-acting-with-others.

The book in parts follows Ingarden's method of meditating on thematic words. It is well organized and develops cumulatively. It is, unfortunately, repetitious and gathers momentum only in the second half. Possibly the most exacerbating feature of the book is its turgid, often ungrammatical style. Problems also occur where W. leaves crucial terms vaguely defined and major themes more asserted than proved. On the other hand, he consistently rejects oversimplifications and tries to think everything to its foundations. Overall, throughout the text the originality, intelligence, and insight of a systematic mind is evident.

Edward Vacek, S.J.

Shorter Notices


The English translation of the theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament continues apace, now that the problems surrounding its initial appearance have been surmounted (see TS 36 [1975] 510–13; 39 [1978] 154–56). A new translator has been taken on, David E. Green, who presumably will continue with the volumes to come. Many spot-checks of the translation in this volume
reveal that it is now being done as would be expected. Vol. 3 of *TDOT* corresponds to almost four fascicles of Vol. 2 of the German original (cols. 1-501). It covers the words from *gillûlim*, "idols," to *haras*, "tear down, destroy." Among the important articles that appear in this volume are those on *gāmal*, "recompense, requite," *gepen*, "vine," *dābār*, "word, thing," *Dāwid*, "David," *dōr*, "generation," *dīn*, "judgment," *dām*, "blood," *derek*, "way," *hēkāl*, "palace, temple," and *har*, "mountain." The format of the articles continues to be the same, including a survey of cognates in other Semitic languages and in Egyptian, a succinct overview of the OT meanings, and then a detailed analysis of the specific usages in the OT and in Qumran literature (sometimes including also the rabbinic).

In general, the volume continues to make a good impression. One of the good features of this translation is the way in which it has simplified an often complicated German text, filled with space-saving abbreviations, sigla, and references. The German original uses no footnotes, but these have been introduced into the translation, and details that often obscure the understanding of the German text have rightly been consigned to them. There is, however, one slightly annoying element in the translation that could be remedied in future volumes. It concerns the mode of transcribing Hebrew words into Latin characters. Pp. xviii-xix present two systems of transcription, technical and nontechnical, and the introduction of Vol. 1 stated that the latter was going to be used. But in this volume it has not been uniformly used. By and large, in the first part of it the nontechnical system has been employed, but toward the end the technical system appears. Since the latter begins before p. 359, it cannot be the work of the new translator. There are many pages earlier where a mixture of the two systems is found. Circumflexes, macrons, etc. appear in arbitrary fashion. In future volumes some effort should be made to bring in uniformity. It is a minor detail in an otherwise invaluable work, but it is one that is distracting to an informed reader.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.


The six chapters of this volume are a revised version of the Sprunt lectures delivered by W. at Richmond's Union Theological Seminary in 1977. In a popular treatment, he gives focus and unity to many diverse OT understandings of God and our response to Him. The strength of the book comes from the ease with which W. integrates into a dynamic vision of God such disparate elements as historical narrative and psalms of praise, goodness of creation and human sin, words of judgment and promise of blessing. He thus responds to modern critical doubts that a salvation-history approach adequately expresses the concerns of biblical theology. He does not slight the importance of the historical aspect in the OT, but balances it with the role of the blessing and the word to give a fuller picture of revelation that can include Job and Psalms and other nonhistorical material comfortably. He distinguishes times of transition, such as the change from tribal rule to kingship, as moments when Israel was most acutely aware of God’s historical acts, from the long years of settled life in cult, social structure, and family bonds, which are better described by God's ongoing blessing. The last chapter finds a continuity in the NT centered on the same saving and blessing God.

W. has presented much of this material elsewhere, especially his ideas on the psalms of praise and the nature of the judgment oracle. As in all his writing, he loves structures, patterns, and contrasting types, almost to the point
of artificiality. But he is ultimately successful because he does show a way through the maze of OT traditions without becoming stuck in any. He sheds light on the wholeness of the OT experience of God while rejoicing in its many-splendored expression.

Lawrence Boadt, C.S.P.


This book presents three source-criticism studies of John's Gospel that were published separately. However, the studies were conceived originally in relation to one another. M. has rewritten the second study and affixed an appendix on the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1, 33-71. The first study asks if the Evangelist had discernible predecessors. M. feels that John's source for Jn 1:19-51 and at least five of the miracle stories (Jn 2:1-11; 4:46-54; 6:1-14; 9:1-7; 11:1-44) did in fact contain—between the Baptist's denial that he is Elijah and the Elijah-like portrait of Jesus—an explicit identification of Jesus as Elijah. The fourth Evangelist could leave Elijah-like traits strewn among the miracle stories, but he could scarcely allow the explicit identification (M. sees traces of this in Jn 1:43) and maintain the integrity of his own Christology. Further the second study investigates whether Jn may be more closely connected with Jewish Christianity than previously thought. Here the fourth-century Pseudo-Clementine literature provides M. with a discrete stratum of Jewish-Christian tradition. The parallels of this literature, with pertinent sections of Jn, suggest that the Jewish-Christian communities behind these two documents underwent similar experiences. The final study draws together the major threads of M.'s theory. The history of the Johannine community, from its origin through the period of the composition of Jn, displays at least four discrete social and theological groups: the synagogue of "the Jews"; Christian Jews within the synagogue who maintain a dual loyalty; the Johannine community itself; other Jewish Christians expelled from the synagogue with whom the Johannine community hoped eventually to be unified.

M. has a thorough knowledge of Johannine literature and, with the data available, argues ingeniously. However, at times the argument lacks force. M.'s theory proves enticing, but I for one remain unconvinced.

R. F. O'Toole, S.J.


Fundamentalism is surely on the rise in the Christian community. The multiplication of prayer and Bible groups, often with little or no direction, has contributed to a sense of naïveté among Christians with regard to the words of Jesus in particular. The result is that years of good scholarship slip further away from the masses of people who are truly interested in growing in their understanding of the Bible. M. offers a helpful book which tries to deal soberly with problems in the Gospels that should at least cause questions among all Christians but especially among those who are inclined to fundamentalism.

In his introduction M. distinguishes two approaches to the Bible: "The first is to say that the Bible is the word of God and to mean literally just that." This approach sees a descending order from the God who reveals to the inspired scribe. "The second approach...reverses the order of argument." It starts with the human author and ascends to the word of God. The fundamentalist chooses the former; M. writes his book following the latter. Half of the book is devoted to "problems" in the Gospels. Why are there discrepancies with regard to the Eucha-
ristic account in Luke, Matthew, and Mark? Why are there differences in the Our Father in Luke and Matthew? Why do the Evangelists treat the same incident and give diverse interpretations? With regard to the Epistles, S. treats authorship, textual problems, clear indications of lost epistles, etc. The treatment is fair and engaging and should cause the thoughtful reader to question even the possibility of fundamentalism.

The second half of the book has four chapters, one on each of the Gospels. Here M. gives a good summary of contemporary scholarship and in most instances recognizes the various disputed issues; a notable exception is his comment that John knew Mark (128). I found the book quite helpful in dealing with the problem of fundamentalism precisely because of M.'s ability to demonstrate the kinks in the armor. I still wonder, however, whether it will convince a fundamentalist. At least it is worth a try.

John F. O'Grady


The current volume is the fifth to appear in the Overtures to Biblical Theology, a series concerned "not only with what is seen and heard, with what the Bible said, but also with what the Bible says and the ways in which seeing and hearing are done" (xi). In this concern the series participants share the convictions of many modern exegetes. Bailey here discusses the problem of death in a fresh and suggestive way, showing how handlings of death in the Bible have definite pertinence to contemporary discussions. He admits to a vast modern literature on mortality, but criticizes it for focusing largely on the "process of dying," which he parallels with the reduction of the mystery of sexuality to technique and genitalia (xii). He aims his work not at scholars but at contemporaries who sense in the reality of mortality a problem of meaning and are interested in how fellow humans have grappled with it.

After a brief consideration of the modern situation on the human response to mortality, B. proceeds historically, first with perspectives on death among the neighbors of Israel. Next he moves to a discussion of death in the OT, with later transitions toward apocalyptic eschatology and further variances in the intertestamental period. A short treatment of Pauline, Synoptic, and Johannine viewpoints closes his biblical developments. He concludes with numerous practical observations.
for current discussions of death and dying.

The volume is well structured and clearly written, and admirably fulfils the purpose of the series. The arrangement of the book, its development, and its wide-ranging notes and bibliography lead me to look upon it as an ideal text for a seminar on death/dying, even on an undergraduate level.

John E. Huesman, S.J.


This little book expands upon and clarifies a number of questions reviewers raised about the first two volumes of S.'s projected three-volume Christology (cf. TS 36 [1975] 169-71; 39 [1978] 539-40). In the first half S. expands upon the assumptions underlying his approach, particularly on how experience is translated into theology. He responds to some of his reviewers on the role given the historical Jesus in the first volume, his use of the Q material, the central position given the experience of Jesus as eschatological prophet, the relationship of the various Christologies to the paschal Christology, and his interpretation of the Resurrection. In the final section S. presents a broader framework for his soteriology in relation to creation theology and closes with a brief discussion of the divinity of Jesus.

S.'s Christology has generally drawn praise from exegetes, with the major criticisms coming from systematic theologians. His discussions of the role of religion in society, the sources of theology, and the relation of soteriology to the person of Jesus within Christology will be helpful for theologians in understanding the assumptions guiding S.'s Christology. And for a wider audience the book gives an insight into how one major theologian conceives the theological task today within the Western, urban-industrial cultures.

Robert J. Schreiter


This book is not a Christological study, i.e., an interpretation and evaluation of the person and message of Jesus. Rather, it utilizes modern Christology and the human sciences in a creative contribution to Christian anthropology. Taking a clue from Jaspers, T. explores the way Christians have participated in and contributed to the three great transitions in the history of human consciousness (axial, rationalistic-technological, and planetary) and what has happened and can in the future happen to Christian consciousness as a result. Among the most fascinating of the study's many important contributions is T.'s correlation of Jaspers' view with that of Lawrence Kohlberg. T. explores Jaspers' general characteristics of the axial period (individuality, autonomous freedom) from the more concrete perspective of Kohlberg's understanding of moral reasoning developing into the postconventional level of principled judgment.

What is Christianity's special contribution to the world-wide phenomenon of axial consciousness? The resurrection belief/conviction, translated into the terms of human consciousness, presupposes a heightened perception of a transcendent source of personal identity, a source which was now known to transcend mutability, decay, and even death (66). Thus, according to T., Jesus' ministry and resurrection brought the Jewish process of human spiritualization (i.e., self-responsibility and freedom) to its completion and removed every barrier to its full emergence (67). T. might have been more specific about how this resurrectional consciousness relates to Kohlberg's understanding of the postconventional person (94). Does it, for example, point to, or beyond, the metaphorical religious "stage 7" which Kohlberg himself has introduced?

T.'s thesis focuses on the disciples'
resurrectional consciousness. Current Christology is also asking about the possibility of understanding Jesus' own experience of God as being unique enough to have transformed his own consciousness. T. may want to deal with this latter issue at another time.

T. demonstrates thorough study of a wide range of authors and offers appropriately cautious conclusions as he argues that Judeo-Christian consciousness is properly characterized by a more holistic self-identity than that of the rationalistic, autonomous ego, and is now struggling to achieve its own intrinsic possibilities for transcultural consciousness. While the book's creative thesis invites discussion by professional theologians, its coherent organization, clear style, and explanatory footnotes facilitate study even by college students.

Walter E. Conn


This excellent book provides the reader with the necessary tools to study the rise and development of Mariology and to explore the current theological reflections on the Virgin Mother in the Christian churches. C. first outlines recent developments in the study of the Virgin Mary; these include her place in Scripture, her relationship to the Holy Spirit and the Church, and the discussion of her role in contemporary Protestant writings. He believes that great strides have been made in the ecumenical field about Mary's place both in theology and in liturgical practice. In spite of the great hurdles still in the path of ecumenical dialogue, C. has hopes that studies on Mary in Scripture, patristic writings, and the works of the Protestant Reformers might lead to a break-through in understanding and agreement.

In Part 2, C. turns to the most common questions Protestants ask about Mary. In dialogue form with Alan Gill, the religious editor of the Sydney Morning Herald, he tries to come to grips with most of the serious reservations which Protestants have about Catholic belief in and devotion toward Mary. The last section contains a lengthy, useful bibliography (111-59). One is, however, left wondering how Catholics deal with the question of Mariology in mission lands. Have any studies been made on the place of the Mother of Jesus in the great religions? One would like to give an affirmative answer to this question, although C.'s book gives almost no evidence that the "wider ecumenism" of our days has left a mark on Mariology.

John A. Saliba, S.J.


Whatever became of such once-treasured concepts as validity and liceity, causality, matter and form? V. performs a valuable service by providing an updated sacramental theology in the wake of the liturgical renewal. In the first part, he evaluates the liturgical renewal and pastoral ministry of the sacraments, tracing the historical context through three periods: from sacramentality to sacramental rite in the early Church, the medieval concentration on the sacramental rite itself, and the more recent movement from sacramental rites to the sacramental nature of the Church. The second part examines recent developments in ecclesiology, Christology, and anthropology. The third part applies these developments to the liturgical renewal by creating a sacramental synthesis wherein the three principal "actants" in every sacramental encounter are the Church, the human person, and Christ, all of whom are involved in a process which is at the same time revelatory, actualizing, and celebrative.
On the positive side, V. deserves good marks for situating the sacraments squarely within the Church, in contrast to an all-too-frequent overly individualistic tendency. By way of improvement, V.'s Christology could be better integrated into a Trinitarian theology more inclusive of the role of the Holy Spirit; also, the liturgical tradition as a source for theology (*lex orandi lex credendi*) receives scant attention. The work is written in an intelligent, lucid style, though marred by occasional awkward translations and a disturbing sexist language.

Charles W. Gusmer


The English paperback edition of a Portuguese original which appeared in 1971. No changes have been made; texts cited rarely go beyond 1970; for the most part they end with Vatican II and the commentaries on conciliar documents which appeared soon after the Council.

The book has value as a compendium of the main ecclesial themes appearing in the documents of Vatican II. It is well organized and easy to follow. Often the main points are indicated in successively numbered topic sentences which are then illustrated and explained from the conciliar texts. Quotations from the Council are frequent; citations of texts are easy to find if one has the familiar Abbott translation at hand, because K. gives in parentheses not only the section and paragraph of the pertinent conciliar document but also the page of Abbott on which the citation appears.

The tone is objective and irenic for the most part, even though K. is deeply concerned with the impact of the conciliar teaching on his mission field of Brazil. I found his treatment of sticky issues such as *extra ecclesiam nulla salus* to be balanced and informed. Occasionally he goes beyond presenting conciliar doctrine to indicate his own views on what needs to be done. Thus, his personal reflection on why he mistrusts a synod of bishops which is purely consultative (216–17) is worth pondering. The chapters on papal primacy, episcopacy, and priesthood are excellent.

The book can be utilized as a high-level popularization for the instruction of intelligent laity and as a handy reference to Vatican II ecclesial themes. It is unfortunate that no index is furnished; however, the clear organization of the book and the inclusion of a fairly detailed table of contents permit most issues to be located easily.

Peter Chirico, S.S.


All concerned with the early Church (historians, theologians, liturgists, etc.) should read this book. Egyptologists, papyrologists, paleographers must read it. R. as a skilled professional deals with the Christian literary papyri, to present a revised picture of the Egyptian Church up to the death of Constantine, and does so in a style easily intelligible and captivating.

Chap. 1 sets out the relevance and limits of the evidence and reviews the texts. Chap. 2 deals specifically with the “Nomina sacra” and reaches the conclusion that they represent an embryonic creed of the first church and are a creation of the primitive Christian community. Modestly termed “a footnote of some theological importance,” it is rather an excursus of major theological import. Chap. 3 delineates the revised picture of the character and development of the Egyptian Church. In particular, it presents, in contrast to the picture painted by W. Bauer and R. Grant, an Egyptian Church of the second century that is not exclusively het-
erodox (i.e., Gnostic) but rather one that represents an embryonic orthodoxy related to a common core of books, an incipient canon, a core free of Docetism, conspicuous for the rarity and not the frequency of Gnostic works, and in line with the implicit theology of the "Nomina sacra." The facile equation Coptic-equals-Gnostic is branded as false for the third century, the first phase of the Coptic mission. Gnosticism is seen as only one current, one intimately associated with the spheres of personal influence of Basilides and Valentinus, a current not sharply distinguished at this period from Catholic Christianity, which from 117 A.D. onward was fostered by Roman influence and by Pantaenus' reform of the School of Alexandria. This "less sensational" picture is convincingly documented in the footnotes and appendices for the critical scrutiny of the professional papyrologist-historian and plausibly argued in the body of the text for the less technically skilled reader.

Possessed of such grace and charm in their published form, these Schweich lectures must have been a delight to hear when orally presented. Three indices enhance the utility of this carefully published work.

John T. Cummings


C., professor of history at the University of California at Berkeley, has made a rather creative contribution to the abundant literature on Origen with this study of his political theology. Origen's ideas on the nature and relations of political and religious authority and on patriotism and military service are analyzed within the overall context of his theology, and specifically of his mode(s) of interpreting Scripture.

In a meticulous, closely-reasoned construction of Origen's thought from exegetical works and Contra Celsum, C. shows how the two swords of Lk 22:35–38 illustrate some major themes of his theology: the allegorization of OT violence and its transfiguration into spiritual struggle. A spiritual sword supplants the corporeal sword, which is never to be used by Christians.

All this gives much added depth to the usual citation of Origen's explanation in Contra Celsum of how Christians do serve the emperor and the public weal by their prayers and the virtue of their lives. The Empire sometimes shows demonic qualities, when its commands contravene God's law, and then Christians will disobey, though not with physical resistance. But by and large, Origen's attitude toward the state is seen to be conciliatory, acknowledging its providential role in the spreading of the gospel.

In Origen's reading of Rom 13, influenced by Mt 22:21, the judge of this world executes the major part of God's law, the Church handling only religious matters. Church and state are distinct and parallel structures. C. promises a second book tracing the history of this view up to the twelfth century. The indexes in this work of quality scholarship include a very good general subject index.

Richard F. Costigan, S.J.


A detailed study (perhaps the first of its kind) of Basil's views on the charismatic operation of the Spirit on the leadership of the Church. An initial analysis of the concept of the Church in Basil's thought and life reveals his notion of a corporate communion of all "complete" (i.e., holy) Christians. F. then discusses the charisms of the "ecclesiastical leader" and of the "leader of the word" (in this context of what might be described as the official and the pastoral office, a number of appar-
ent oppositions are shown rather to be complementary—see below). The final chapter deals with pastoral concern for the communion of all churches; this last aspect acts as a kind of binding agent for the various aspects of Basil's thought.

F.'s study stresses the importance of Basil's homilies, letters, and ascetical writings for this question; the issue, in other words, is not purely speculative for Basil but grows out of a rich sense of Christian life. Basil sees no intrinsic opposition between the life of the ordinary Christian and the ascetical life practiced by monks; charismatic inspiration is for the whole Church, and F. develops the meaning of Church leadership in this context on both the official and pastoral level, showing both the magisterial and more directly personal functions of the leader. The realities of the Church situation are, of course, complex, and F. takes them into account by viewing them in the total context of fourth-century life: the religious aspect arising from the conflict between orthodoxy and heresy (especially the late stages of Arianism), and the political position of the Church, with special reference to developments arising from the activities of Emperors Julian and Valens. Here the official concern for orthodoxy and the pastoral solicitude for the communion of all churches take on a crucial role. Basil's view of the Church, its juridical and pastoral leadership, and the role of the Spirit in all this is therefore quite complex, and is not limited to canonical legalism, to monastic asceticism, or to a simple prophetic charisma divorced from them.

Of the appendices which complement this book, perhaps the most useful are those on the chronology of Basil's life, works, and the noteworthy historical events of his day, and the select bibliography of editions and translations of Basil and of works of Basil. This book is a fitting and needed contribution to a better understanding of Basil in the year commemorating the sixteenth centenary of his death in 379.

Gerald H. Ettlinger, S.J.


This distinguished series continues with the publication of the works of Lucifer, bishop of Cagliari in Sardinia (died 370/71). At the Synod of Milan, convoked in 355 by Emperor Constantius, Lucifer was one of only three Western bishops who refused to sign the condemnation of Athanasius and thereby accept the court's Arianism. He was exiled to the East, and there issued five short works within five years, attacking Constantius with fierce abuse and defending Athanasius and—what amounted to the same thing—the Nicene faith. His name is also connected with two schismatic movements, the Paulinian party in Antioch and the obscure Luciferians in the West. The corpus of his writings comprises his five tracts and seven letters connected with his case.

D.'s new edition is fully justified, because the previous critical edition, published in 1886 by W. v. Hartel (CSEL 14) was based on one MS. D. has used a significant second MS and changed Hartel's text in 509 places, or almost twice on every page. The very full introduction gathers the (scanty) information available for Lucifer's biography, treats the MSS, editions, Latin-ity, and biblical text, and provides a good bibliography. The indexes include a 150-page index verborum. Lucifer's writings are interesting philologically (D.'s specialty) as an example of late, vulgar Latin, and important to Church historians for the question of Western Arianism, a topic which has attracted considerable attention in recent years. D.'s edition is an excellent instrument. Instead of simply cataloguing opinions, D. might have been a little more deci-
sive in the introduction. Nevertheless, it is a pleasure to have such an opulent critical edition available.

Joseph T. Lienhard, S.J.


While not as radical in its departure from the doctrine of learned ignorance as the De apice theoricae, written by Nicholas in 1464, the De non aliud, composed in 1462, definitely marks a new and complex development in his methodology. The book is not only difficult to translate but also hard to interpret. H.'s translation and introduction reveal the challenge the translator and interpreter faces when confronted with this work.

H.'s translation, while generally reliable, tends to miss the subtlety of Nicholas' Latin. E.g., the rendering of principium as “beginning” or aenigma as “symbolism” is more misleading than incorrect; his translation of sensibilis motus as “perceptual stimulus” is too generic, however, and destroys Nicholas' distinction between rational and sensible motion in the soul. The rendering of splendores as “elucidations” loses the spirituality of the term. Besides the unevenness of the translation, there is also a kind of awkwardness to H.'s text. The excessive use of hyphenation, as e.g., “intelligible-thing-which-Omnipotence-can-necessitate-with-respect-to-the-possibility-of-being-water” tends to tire even the most patient reader.

The introduction to the translation attempts to give the reader the background necessary to interpret Nicholas’ work. But H.'s own understanding of N.’s thought is often incorrect. He fails to understand the work in its historical context or its purpose with respect to N.’s other writings. The reader, therefore, is misinformed about a number of important doctrinal points, as e.g., the problem of God being the essence of essences—where H. wrongly assumes the term “essence” to be univocal—or the erroneous claim that creatures do not resemble God. Consequently, while the reader may use the translation with some confidence, caution should be exercised with respect to the introduction.

M. L. Fuehrer


As the title indicates, B. studies representatives of three distinctive Christian religious cultures, the Reformation, the Renaissance, and Scholasticism, aiming to clarify relationships in the field of Eucharistic doctrine. He follows Zwingli through three phases of his Eucharistic thought. Zwingli's main themes become leading questions for probing the extent of Erasmus' influence on the Zurich reformer. On central points of Eucharistic doctrine, the two positions were notably different. There were important influences of Erasmus on Zwingli, but they were most intense well before the emergence of Zwingli's characteristic notion of a Eucharistic symbolism excluding Christ from the elements. B. speaks of Zwingli giving a radical twist to Erasmian themes in 1523-24, but in fact a gulf had begun to open between the two in 1519, when Zwingli started treating the NT as the exclusive source of binding church ordinances. With his first reforming actions against abusive church laws and unbiblical practices of piety, Zwingli passed over to the new religious culture of the Reformation. Erasmus' mark remained, e.g., in Zwingli's way of contrasting flesh and spirit, but the ambiance of existence and the purpose of theology had changed drastically—a fact the author slights. In this new context Zwingli rethought Eucharistic doctrine.
B. offers a competent presentation of Cajetan's creative work on the Eucharist within the parameters of scholastic purposes and principles. Special care is given to reporting Cajetan's arguments against Zwingli in 1525 and his defense of the Sacrifice of the Mass in a 1531 anti-Lutheran treatise. Looking then to Zwingli, B. concludes that in spite of some common concerns, Cajetan and Zwingli represent systems of thought which on a fundamental level are irreconcilable. One misses here a systematic attempt at mediation, such as Otto Pesch does in his studies of Luther and Aquinas. But the main desire one feels after reading this book is for a more general typology of the three mentalities that interacted with one another in the early sixteenth century.

The technical work of producing this book was at times quite careless. Corrected lines were pasted in crookedly or in the wrong place (56, 62), and the pages often juxtapose faintly printed lines with darker and more distinct passages.

Jared Wicks, S.J.


The thesis of this monograph is that "John's mystical experience and thought are best understood when we focus our attention on his Christ-motif" (23). Hence N. sets himself (chaps. 1–5) to relating various aspects of John's life, thought, and works, e.g., his submissive rebellion, his method of biblical interpretation, his doctrine of mystical union, his iconography, etc., to his Christocentrism. N. is to be commended for achieving his purpose in a balanced and evenhanded manner: he makes no attempt to force these aspects into a rigid preconceived system. On the contrary, he takes pains to stress that John's thought-experience is never fully resolved into a synthesis. In two final chapters, N. first distinguishes mystical experience from religious experience and then relates John's mysticism to universal mysticism and Catholic mysticism.

One of the most interesting sections is N.'s comparison and contrast of St. John's mystical conception and experience with St. Teresa's (114–16), in which he uses their differing attitudes toward Holy Communion as the point of comparison. There are, however, occasional weaknesses. E.g., the first two chapters ("Rebellion and Sainthood" and "Mysticism and the Bible") are based on two previously published articles that appeared in BHR (33 [1971] 63–77, and 36 [1974] 17–32, respectively). Chap. 1 would have been much stronger if N. had included the section from his earlier article on the two contrasting images of Christ of the Reformation and of the Catholic Reform and Counter Reformation, i.e., the Christus victor of Luther and the humble and suffering Christ of, among others, St. John. This material is quite relevant to the thesis he is trying to demonstrate.

There is a complete, up-to-date bibliography as well as an index of names. To the former I would only add B. M. Ahern, "The Use of Scripture in the Spiritual Theology of St. John of the Cross," CBQ 14 (1952) 6–17, and C. P. Thompson's recent book The Poet and the Mystic (1977; see TS 40 [1979] 400–401).

Joseph F. Chorpenning, O.S.F.S.


Reacting to what he considers a distortion of Aufklärung (Enlightenment) Catholicism by Catholic historians, S. sets out to examine this reform movement anew. He concentrates on the liturgical reforms of Aufklärung Catholicism and, when appropriate, compares them to the reforms of Vatican II. His hypothesis: the reforms are sub-
stantially similar. One implication of this is "a further discrediting of that powerful authoritarian mentality that dominated Roman Catholicism for many generations until Vatican II" (3). Another is that non-Catholic scholars should be more sceptical towards descriptions of the "only acceptable" Catholic positions on various issues. The Catholic Church does reverse itself on basic issues, despite claims to the contrary (3).

In his introduction S. outlines the context, including an optimistic stress on reason and freedom; the industrial and commercial revolutions which catapulted the middle class into a position of great influence and initiated the "age of the masses"; an "enlightened despotism"; the French Revolution, modern nationalism, and the antithesis to rationalism, romanticism. Against this backdrop S. delineates the liturgical reforms Aufklärung Catholicism promoted in its efforts to overcome a "mechanical ritualism" (11).

In regard to the reception of Communion, e.g., increased frequency, a flexible approach toward the age of first Communion, reception during the Mass, and Communion under both species were urged. Other areas of concern ranged from the introduction of the vernacular to the reform of preaching and Marian piety. S. concludes that in almost all areas the reforms advocated by Aufklärung Catholicism were enacted by Vatican II and postconciliar reforms. The vast majority of Aufklärung Catholics were moderate reformers.

S. then traces the demise of Aufklärung Catholicism in the face of bitter opposition. He concludes with some interesting reflections on the parallels with, and differences from, "Vatican II Catholicism" and with a caution: present reforms are likely to evaporate unless there is "a shift in the flow of power to a from-below rather than a from-above direction" (69). This book is a well-done, scholarly beginning to some-thing which S. earnestly desires, a fair, extensive treatment of Aufklärung Catholicism.

John H. McKenna, C.M.


The book is a drama of well-chosen and well-translated selections from primary sources. It brings new evidence to bear upon the controversy which surrounded Loisy and biblical criticism at the turn of the century. It provides previously unpublished letters of two friends of Loisy's, the English layman Friedrich von Hügel and the Italian priest Giovanni Genocchi. Other pertinent data from the period includes selections from Loisy's professional and autobiographical writings; a few sources from the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris and the Vatican Archives (the latter source is still sadly undeveloped, though now open—and uncatalogued—through the reign of Leo XIII); and such important varia as reviews by Harnack, letters of Cardinal Richard, and a letter to Cardinal Merry del Val.

Loisy and Genocchi are introduced with brief biographical sketches, and the development of their use of biblical criticism is traced. Genocchi (of whom T. has previously written) emerges as something of a hero. He lived in Rome and knew the Vatican; his way of criticism was not as "extreme" as Loisy's. T.'s exegesis of Genocch's letters to Loisy is masterful. The letters are models of Italian diplomacy: gently suggesting compromise and caution, they advise another path than the way of dealing with Church authority chosen by Loisy—the way which led inexorably toward intensified censorship and eventual excommunication.

The historical data is concise, intelligible, and revelatory. All parties most involved in the crisis emerge as more human: more understandable and yet
more mysterious. Personal glimpses provide interesting faces of Leo XIII, Pius X, Cardinal Richard, del Val, von Hügel, Genocchi, and Loisy himself. From what is seen, no single personality seems to merit the label of archvillain in the Modernist tragedy.

If any contest can be raised with this excellent book, it would be that the importance of Loisy’s driving concern for professional honesty is incompletely grasped. And the evidence provided on his denial of the divinity of Christ (on the basis of historical evidence) can be misleading if (1) not seen in the context of his alienation from any intimate faith community in the Church and if (2) not balanced with his “mystical” (Bremond) affirmation of the symbolic character of all dogma. His position is, in fact, comparable to that of many more recent and renowned Catholic theologians and biblical scholars who affirm that no titles could adequately express the absolute mystery and richness of Jesus the Christ.

Although the book is not judgmental, there is suggestion that Loisy was excessive in making historical study normative versus dogma. It would be more accurate and less judgmental to say that Loisy personally experienced and early articulated in Catholic circles the hard challenges put to many traditional forms of Catholic faith by historical research. The book is indispensable for the study of Loisy and contributes significantly to understanding Modernism and the history of biblical criticism in the Catholic Church.

*Ronald Burke*


Although S. has entitled this work an “enquiry,” it very quickly takes on the tone and form of an old-fashioned polemical tract. To be sure, he asserts at the outset that certain balances have to be restored in order to see the division between Eastern-Greek and Western-Latin Churches in a proper perspective. Thus he emphasizes theology and theological differences as the roots of the schism and not just language, politics, and ethnic differences; he demands as well that one’s Christology and ecclesiology be integrated. These are all well and good, and a timely reminder is hardly amiss. But as soon as S. moves beyond this point he tends to set down the differences between the patristic period and later medieval developments, between the patristic tradition, vision, and methodology and later theology, with as much and as harsh a contrast as possible. The result is a clash between a patristic (divine) way and the later (all too human) way. An example: he sees the fact that in the earlier period there was no formal ecclesiology as a strength and virtue, while the later development becomes a deviation.

As a historian, I cannot help but ask: (1) Was there a patristic theology or was there not a variety of theologies corresponding to the number of theologians? (2) Was not each of these theologies (or the patristic theology, if it existed) just as time-bound, limited, and human as the later developments which S. so excoriates, especially in the Western tradition? What makes the patristic period ahistorical and eternal when biblical scholars reveal the NT era itself as caught in a historical and time-bound view? All in all, this book disappoints because it presents a perspective that seems out of place in modern scholarly and ecumenical dialogue.

*Thomas E. Morrissey*


An impressive analysis, concise and clear, of divine command theories of ethics (DCT). It is part defense of DCT against philosophic charges of falsity or incoherence, and part constructive formulation of the basic logic of DCT.
Q. first defends the compatibility of DCT with moral autonomy by arguing, à la Kant, that unqualified obedience to divine commands does not require unqualified acceptance of the claim that a command is of divine origin. Next Q. explicates and then defends the “kernel” principles of DCT against ten prominent types of philosophic objections. Proceeding axiomatically, in chap. 3 Q. constructs a two-tiered DCT, with a basic axiology and an ancillary deontology. Interestingly, Q. accounts for not only supererogation but also the “extraordinary,” viz., that which con­jointly ought to be, and ought not to be, done. Chaps. 4 and 5 extend DCT to recent formal work in the logic of moral concepts. By employment of Chisholm’s “logic of requirement,” the problem of conflict of duties is resolved. Here Q. suggests, contra Kierkegaard, that Abraham did not operate under a “teleological suspension of the ethical”; rather, God’s command was an “inde­feasibly imposed” requirement. Chap. 5 discusses the compatibility of certain systems of deontic logic with DCT. The book concludes with an interesting dis­cussion of putative theological objections, where Q. attempts to show the coherence of God’s forgiveness of sins, how God can be just yet merciful in sparing some sinners while justly punish­ing others, and how to account for God’s own moral traits, within DCT.

Shakespeare’s Hamlet, Lewis once wrote, should be read with the eyes of a child. L.’s own greatness lay in his boyishness: his love of combat, his open devotion, the simplicity of his truths. But, as Owen Barfield has written, along with this boyishness, L. exhibited “a certain psychic or spiritual immaturity.” M. does not resolve the paradox of L.’s boyishness. Instead, he offers a sympathetic and intelligent synthesis of L.’s theological ethics, with re­strained and judicious comments on his notion of Christian maturity.

L. was at his best as a theological ethicist. The heart of his teaching was the medieval ideal of the vision of God: “fellowship with God and with all his creatures, a fellowship which is the cul­mination of a long process of sanctification.” M. presents L. in a favorable light by organizing his study around traditional theological loci: the love of God and inordinate attachments; char­ity and self-love; sanctification and pu­rification; affirmation and negation; na­ture, the unnatural, and the supernat­ural. L.’s theological vision, however, eclipsed his social thought. The subject matter of the book is social, therefore, chiefly in the sense that its medieval prototype, the communion of saints, is social.

M. does a superb job of expounding L.’s thought, and by itself his book is a useful contribution to the understudied ethics of virtue. L.’s voice was never more authentic than when he described encounters with the divine. His distinctive contribution to theological ethics is to be found in the figures he left us of the impact of grace on the human personality. M.’s presentation of the soul’s need for purification, of the insufficiency of virtue, and of the longing for transformation opens up important areas in the theological treatment of virtue.

L.’s strength was theological. His moral thinking tended to polemics and was marred by insensitivity. He tended to make snap judgments, to caricature,
and to reduce an opponent's argument *ad absurdum*. He seemed compelled to hold on to literal certainties. Though he was shrewd about the vices of some moderns, his resistance to modernity was indiscriminating. In his uncompromising traditionalism, he preferred dependence to full adult responsibility, confusing the deference of a vassal with the humility of a creature before God. Given the popular enthusiasm for L.'s writings, it is a shame M. does not give his readers better means of distinguishing L.'s mature Christian wisdom from his boyish posturings and antiquarian biases.

*Drew Christiansen, S.J.*


*Catherine of Genoa—Purgation and Purgatory, The Spiritual Dialogue*, translation and notes by Serge Hughes, prefaced by Catherine de Hueck Doherty, focuses upon spiritual purification in this and the afterlife. It also explicates the inner life of this first-rate spiritual genius, a married woman gifted with the highest contemplative experiences, a servant to the poor, and an unceasing hospital worker. Especially penetrating is her analysis of the conflict between self-love and pure love.

*Origen—An Exhortation to Martyrdom, Prayer, and Selected Works*, translated and introduced by Rowan Greer, prefaced by Hans Urs von Balthasar, presents an excellent paradigm of what can be found in the more than two thousand works of a man "as towering a figure as Augustine and Aquinas." Origen blended a creative Christian gnostic with an ecclesial sanctity and attempted to render the gospel intelligible to the educated pagans of his day. His insistence upon the link between prayer and exegesis, upon practical Christian life; his search for the spiritual sense of Scripture by employing all of the literary tools of his day; his description of the soul's struggle to return to God; his cosmic, Logos mysticism; his theory of the spiritual senses, etc.—these are classic.

*Richard of St. Victor—The Twelve Patriarchs, The Mystical Ark, Book Three of the Trinity*, translated and introduced by Grover Zinn, prefaced by Jean Chatillon, provides a key link between Pseudo Dionysius and the great mystical renaissance in medieval Europe. Richard of St. Victor ("doctor of contemplation and charity") combined creative theological investigation, disciplined contemplation, and exact biblical study in what is perhaps the first systematic work in contemplative instruction. His use of biblical persons as archetypes for interpreting contemplative experience; his sense of love and community; his Trinitarian daring; his active/contemplative schema integrating the individual/communal; his insights into the complexities of the divine call, human yearning, and procrastination; his exposition of ecstasy as introversion and ascension, etc.—all need to be assimilated by contemporary spirituality.

*Nahman of Bratslav—The Tales*, translated, introduced, and commented upon by Arnold Band, prefaced by Joseph Dan, presents thirteen enigmatic "tales" of "one of the most intriguing figures in modern literary history." Nahman considered himself to be "the Zadik" (Jewish charismatic figure, often outside the rabbinic line) of his age and the Messiah. These highly allegorical tales depend upon the elaborate theosophy of the *Zohar*, the text of cabalistic mysticism, and are studied by the Bratslav Hasidim as Scripture.

*Harvey D. Egan, S.J.*


The subtitle of R.'s book accurately
displays its content: "an introduction to monastic profession," a work written by a monk for monks. The book's evolution also reveals its specifically monastic roots: it began as Thomas Merton's mimeographed notes on the vows, was revised by Roberts in light of the changing theological climate generated by Vatican II, and was first used for monks in formation at the Cistercian monastery in Azul, Argentina. Two of the book's chapters (6 and 7) first appeared, in more expanded and technical form, in *Cistercian Studies*. Some readers will find that the intensely monastic character of the volume limits its appeal. Although R. treats topics of interest to all religious communities (chap. 3, consecrated chastity; chap. 4, poverty; chap. 5, obedience), he does so in light of a tradition consciously shaped by the Rule of Benedict. Two of the book's best chapters, moreover, deal with issues that concern monks almost exclusively: the notion of Benedictine stability (chap. 6) and methods of monastic spirituality (chap. 7). Nevertheless, readers who want to know more about contemporary understandings of Benedictine-Cistercian life will profit from R.'s discussions of poverty, stability, and "conversion of life" (conversation). Each chapter concludes with a useful bibliography.

Although persons involved in the formation of candidates for monastic life will find R.'s work profitable, the book suffers from several drawbacks. It often reads like a preconciliar manual on "the religious state," to which conciliar texts have been added almost surreptitiously. The Council is frequently cited not as a challenge to new ways of thinking and living, but as confirmation of traditional ideas about monastic custom and behavior. Finally, although R. gives credit to the Benedictine nuns of Santa Escolastica (Argentina) for "toning down the exclusively 'Cistercian' character of the text," religious women in the United States will probably be annoyed by his manifest preoccupation with communities of men.

_Nathan Mitchell, O.S.B._


This is a book on British constitutional and legal theory and practice by one of its leading jurists. It is significant as a detailed study and reflection on the relation of the court system to the precise determination of justice within and by means of law. Such an effort is doubly interesting in a period when religion and theology are often presented in the name of "justice," but with little concrete awareness of the historic and legal tradition that goes into accomplishing such a virtuous reality called, since Plato, justice.

For those of us who belong to the British tradition of law, it is helpful to see how the British themselves have used their court system in relation to Parliament—itself originally a court—for fostering the improvement of human relations. Even without our vaunted "separation of powers" and "judicial review," the British have achieved much the same things in other formulae. D. has been an advocate of a theory of law that would allow the courts to look at the real justice situations and to provide a legal remedy for any abuse. He is particularly good on the problem of the control of new forces in society—unions and public bodies—which have been too long immune from legal surveillance and control.

This book is engaging in many ways. It is a personal account of Lord Denning, present Master of the Rolls, former member of most English higher courts, of his own decisions in the areas of construction of legal documents, misuses of ministerial powers, locus standi, abuse of group powers, individual protection, negligence, and precedent. The American will have to accustom himself to English practice and institutions,
but anyone can recognize the worth of a wise reflection, not abstract but very detailed, of what it means to cause justice to exist. The majesty and discipline of the law are real, so it is well to encounter a hardheaded view of justice that is not ideological or naive. This has ever been the value of the common-law tradition.

The final Epilogue is entitled “Nothing Must Be Left Undone.” This expresses a valid legal attitude which refuses in principle to let the mechanisms of the legal structure stand in the way of a greater good, i.e., the protection of an innocent, concrete victim. It is not intended as a utopian or ideological vision. Yet, for Christians—D. writes: “We have been to the Services which mark the beginning of the legal year. Such as the judges of England have done from time immemorial. In Westminster Abbey, in Winchester Cathedral, in the Temple Church” (316)—there is a constant impression that justice comes after charity in the present order of things and not before. There will be things left undone, so that if the sufferer only has justice, he will rightly despair. The “law” has nothing to say to the sufferer of injustice about his actual suffering except to repair the damage or to prevent vengeance or repetition.

The law is indeed noble and disciplined, but as St. Thomas said in his famous treatise, we do need a “new” law, even for justice itself.

James V. Schall, S.J.


L.’s major new study of William Holman Hunt focuses on the crucial question: the relationship of religion and art in a society that has lost its communal understanding of symbol. L.’s interpretation of Hunt’s paintings are based on an analysis of his elaborate scriptural typology, which he used to solve the problems of Victorian painting and to modernize religious language. Hunt saw the artistic problems of materialism, academic conventionalism, and sentimentality as symptomatic of the declining religious situation in Victorian England. For him, art and religion went hand in hand: art visually expressing the contemporary religious spirit or lack thereof.

L.’s interpretation places Hunt in the center of the nineteenth-century discussion on imagination, symbol, subjectivity, and religious tradition. Hunt’s understanding of the relationship between signer and signified in the symbolic process is the key to his painting’s theological interpretations. He painted in order to praise God and to bring others to spiritual conversion. His triadic concentration on personal conversion, strict morality, and scriptural typology suffices to categorize him as a religious artist.

L.’s well-written account of Hunt’s paintings is a fine achievement. His basic thesis remains persuasive throughout the text. However, key questions remain unanswered: What religious tradition does Hunt represent? Why is his attempt to create a modern pictorial symbolism so misunderstood? How important is an artist’s faith experience to his art? Hunt, an enigma even among his pre-Raphaelite brethren, may prove to be a crucial figure for interpreting the nineteenth-century relationship between religion and art.

Hunt’s dramatic conversion experiences are responsible for his most important and successful paintings, e.g., “The Light of the World.” Perhaps because of the problems in clearly associating Hunt with one of the streams of Anglicanism, L. must avoid the issue of the role of religious conversion beyond generalities. A study of Hunt’s artistic vocabulary before and after these experiences might prove relevant and
meaningful to theologians. L. appears more concerned with the aesthetic and iconographic issues. Even so, he cannot help coming up against the issue of the meaning of conversion experiences.

*Diane Apostolos Cappadona*


S. is one of the more prominent Christian partners in the ongoing Buddhist-Christian dialogue in Sri Lanka. Therefore a book of his on a topic so central to the dialogue raises high hopes. And indeed, the essay is massively ambitious. S. endeavors to treat not only the title topic, which has long been the major stumbling block to Christian understanding of Buddhism (and vice versa), but such important connected problems as God vis-à-vis the Uncompounded, and karma/rebirth as well. At least half of the fourteen chapters could have, and probably should have, given rise to book-length treatments. Hence the reader experiences both tremendous intellectual/spiritual challenge and expansion, and intense aggravation at appallingly light once-overs.

S.'s central endeavor, and the lone significant accomplishment (though by itself it suffices to make the book important), is to show that the Buddhist doctrine/praxis of *anattā* ("non-self") can reinforce and respecify the true biblical notion of the nature of the human person. The human person by nature does not survive death; there is not "self" in the sense of an immortal soul or other human substance—no more for the Bible than for Buddhism. But there is *pneuma*, the not-natural but God-given and God-maintained human "spirit," which relates a person to God and to other persons. S. stresses that this *pneuma* is not a "thing" or "substance," but a "dynamic quality" (89) which is a relational "dimension" (91) of all life. The resulting synthesis of Buddhist and Christian teachings is the ideal of *anattā-pneuma* ("non-ego-centric-relationality, or egoless mutuality" [103]). Such a notion could bear great fruit for both Christians and Buddhists.

S.'s treatment of the related problems is inadequate and disappointing. But his general principle, that the teachings of other world religions offer to Christians original and sorely needed frames of reference for discussing our own theological questions, is commendably established here. The price is much too steep for the individual interested in the dialogue and in dialogue-theology. But the individual's nearest library should be petitioned to capitulation.

*James D. Redington, S.J.*
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