BOOK REVIEWS


This is a superlative effort and at least an extraordinary achievement. C. has done two things. He has written what will almost certainly be the standard graduate-school Introduction for many years to come. More than that, he has had the courage to approach the matter of Introduction and indeed of OT study from a totally different perspective. His perspective is the work of canonical criticism. By this last term C. means the notion, as found, e.g., in the works of J. A. Sanders, that the history of the canon should be reinterpreted "as an ongoing hermeneutical process extending throughout Israel's entire history." In C.'s own writing on the subject, he has expressed his general agreement with Sanders' basic thrust, i.e., that canonization should be seen as a process extending through all of Israel's history and affecting the shaping of the literature itself. C. and Sanders differ when they define the historical and theological forces which evoked the formation of the canon (57-58). But the canon remains "open" (58) and C. is ever concerned with the writings "as a whole" (142).

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this book is the precision with which C. has used the general thesis in treating of individual books. He has successfully resisted the temptation to find that every book of the OT can only be understood in light of the work done in canonical criticism. Wherever appropriate in discussing the individual books, he treats his thesis in detail. Occasionally in such treatments the major thesis does not have much to offer and he moves on. A couple of brief examples must suffice to illustrate the former. C. notes that it is a commonplace for OT Introductions to state that the Song of Songs entered the canon only because it had been allegorized, but "in the light of its canonical shaping, this statement appears highly questionable" (578). An excellent place to begin studying the "canonical shape" of the book is a serious look at the superscription, "the most excellent song of Solomon." The superscription alone places the work in the genre of the Wisdom literature. And the Song and the rest of the Wisdom literature find a common ground in wide use of erotic vocabulary. There is no doubt that both Jewish and Christian traditions succeeded shortly in allegorizing the major concerns of the Song. But there is no evidence in the biblical material itself that the canonized text had already been shaped in this direction. Rather, if the Song is read in the canonical context, it becomes clear that its innermost meaning (even in a Wisdom context) is a probing of the mystery of human love within the creative order. In
reading Leviticus canonically, we see that historical rationales for much legislation have been drained of any theological significance and replaced with a concern for the sole response of obedience (186).

C. has done almost all the things that one would look for in an Introduction. The bibliography is exhaustive. The book is equipped with a comprehensive (seventeen pages) index of authors—but no Scripture index. Pedagogically, however, the most noteworthy feature of the book is its preoccupation with canonical criticism. Presumably, C. did not bring in this uniting theme simply for pedagogical reasons. Serendipitously, however, it makes a great contribution. It answers the student question, “To what purpose the effort of the Introduction and its drudgery?” (cf. 15). Beyond that, it gives the beginner a place on which to stand in reading the Old Testament in a serious, scholarly manner. It is difficult not to predict a long, useful, and happy life for this remarkable work.

Marquette University

JOHN F. X. SHEEHAN, S.J.


Twenty-five years separate the first edition of this book (1955), which went through eleven printings, and the enlarged (by a hundred pages) second edition—henceforth designated I and II. In explaining the need for changes and additions, B. characterizes I as a “juvenile work,” but really it was a significant contribution to Johannine scholarship. In both I and II, B.’s strengths include a lucidity of thought and expression, a precision in dealing with the text, and freedom from an exaggerated philosophical Tendenz that has marred some German commentaries. B.’s words on an individual passage can be read with profit no matter what approach one has to the Johannine writings.

B. refused the burden of the overall survey of what has been written on John since I, and that means that II deals only with some of the larger issues which have arisen in the interval. With characteristic honesty he states in the Preface to II, “This Commentary, even in its new state, will seem to many to be old-fashioned”; and, in fact, B. has changed his main views to a surprisingly small degree. Let me exemplify this from the Introduction, which has gone from 118 to 143 pages. A high percentage of the paragraphs in II are preserved word for word from I, with only an additional sentence added, usually toward the end. In the average section a new paragraph has been added, again more often at the end. To take a crucial issue like the “Sources” of John (I, 14–18; II, 15–21), we find in II a new introductory paragraph mentioning surveys of this question by
Moody Smith and Kysar which speak of an "emerging consensus," to which B.'s I was an exception, and II continues to be an exception. Six possible sources are listed: (1) Synoptic Gospels—virtually no change between the views and wording of I and II: John probably drew on Mark, possibly on Luke; (2) material akin to the Synoptic tradition—no change: a possibility, but Mark is the main source; (3) signs source—all new in II, which characterizes the source as unprovable; (4) discourse source—expanded in II, in terms of Bultmann: also unprovable; (5) Judean source—no change: unprovable, with a warning not to overvalue Johannine knowledge of topography; (6) Passion narrative—new sentence in II: still rejected, for John drew upon Mark. B.'s treatment of the possibility of rearrangement of passages in John is unchanged (still rejected), but the section in II on redaction possibilities has been enlarged (still rejected—alas, Barrett treats in detail only Bultmann's view of a redactor, and so in my judgment he is rejecting the most indefensible form of the theory). The new treatment in II of Qumran literature is very cautionary. B. continues his view (which I find curious) that the Johannine theology presupposes the Pauline, but adds a statement (II, 59) that "John is the first and greatest of the reinterpreters" of Paul (curiouser and curiouser).

A very interesting change relates to Johannine sacramentalism: instead of "Yet it is true that there is more sacramental teaching in John than in the other gospels" (I, 69, italics mine), we find "Yet it has been held that . . . " (II, 82) with a discussion of whether in fact this is true. In I's treatment of 19:34 it was difficult to doubt sacramental references; now the allusion is uncertain. I for one would approve the greater caution of the elder Barrett but then wonder why he sees nothing to change in the confident statements of I about the Johannine awareness of the Church (other than the fact that "church" is lower case in II). A whole section has been added to the "Theology of the Gospel" section insisting that despite its high Christology John is basically theocentric (and here I think he tips the scales too far). The dating of John is more precise in II than in I (ca. A.D. 100), but Barrett is firm: "The Fourth Gospel in fact adds little to our knowledge of the historical Jesus" (II, 98).

I admire Barrett's courage in doing a serious revision. One gains from II the valuable insights of the more mature scholar who knows how to resist as well as how to accept. But sometimes a revision loses the bravado of an earlier work. On one point, at least, I preferred the younger Barrett, who dared (I, 114) to call the fourth Evangelist "Perhaps the greatest theologian in all the history of the Church," over the elder Barrett, who carefully modifies (II, 134): "Perhaps, after Paul, the greatest theologian in all the history of the Church."

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

This is the first NT Hermeneia volume that is not a translation from the German. True, the author is German-born; but years of teaching at Claremont and now at Chicago have shaped him so that his interests and command of literature clearly mark the work as done on this side of the Atlantic, where comprehensive commentaries are becoming a characteristic of provocative biblical scholarship. Indeed, B. stops to defend the commentary as a medium where original thinking can be done, since the carefully explained text of Scripture enables the reader to see what the issues really were and can provoke reflection on the issues of today. The commentary, says B., “is a dialogue between the author and the commentator about the subject matter itself”; and an effective commentary invites the reader to participate, making it a three-way dialogue. B. has given us one of the top five biblical commentaries composed in English in the decade of the 1970’s, all the more important when one considers the very short list of large-scale English commentaries on Galatians: Lightfoot (1865), Burton (ICC, 1920), and lesser works by Duncan in 1934 and Bligh in 1969.

B.'s special strengths include his knowledge of the Greco-Roman literature and of the second-century Christian controversies centered on Paul, accompanied by his interest in early Christian sociology. His literal translation is helpful (although I am not convinced of the utility of the constant comparison to standard English translations), and his detailed outline shows a careful attention to the importance of the letter format. Overall, his views are balanced. I liked particularly that he does not needlessly press silence to the point of contradiction, a frequent fault in comparing Paul and Acts. (For example, B. does not think that Paul's attitude toward Titus in Gal 2:3 is irreconcilable with Paul's attitude toward Timothy in Acts 16:3, or that Paul's going up to Jerusalem according to a revelation in Gal 2:2 is incompatible with the sending of Paul to Jerusalem by the Antioch Christians in Acts 15:3). He insists on not exaggerating the tendency to interpret Galatians through the other Pauline letters, and so the revelation of Jesus Christ in Paul in Gal 1:12, 16 is an internal experience partially corresponding to the external experience described in 1 Cor 9:1 and 15:8. Nevertheless, in strange departure from his principle, he reconstructs the opponents' thought in Galatia through 2 Cor 6:14—7:1, which he regards as anti-Pauline!

Extreme conservatives may be offended by B.'s (correct) observation that Paul's statement in Gal 4:4 about God's sending (forth: exapostellein) His Son born (ginesthai, sometimes wrongly rendered as "become" or "formed") of a woman does not establish pre-existence or refer to virginal
conception. A few Catholics may be surprised by his consistent (and again correct) rejection of Schlier's interpretation of Gal 2 whereby Paul went to Jerusalem because he recognized himself to be subject to higher human authority (of the older apostles, including Peter). However, despite the agreement I have indicated, I admit that I found curiously flat and uninvolved his treatment of Gal 1–2, which is so crucial in our understanding of apostleship and authority in early Christianity. B. knew the work Peter in the New Testament but seemingly chose not to discuss the treatment of Galatians therein, which in my (biased) judgment offers better possibilities than the ones he mentions, e.g., that Paul feared that he might have run in vain (Gal 2:2) because the Jerusalem rejection of his gospel would break the koinonia which Paul had tried to preserve between the Gentile churches and the churches in Judea.

If the reader wants one commentary on each major biblical book, this is the one to put on the shelf for Galatians. Yet, it is encouraging that J. L. Martyn is doing Galatians in the Anchor Bible; for when there are two really competent modern commentaries on the same book, the three-way dialogue mentioned above really becomes exciting.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. Raymond E. Brown, S.S.


This study, the revision of a doctoral thesis presented at the Institut Catholique de Paris, examines the image of the resurrected Jesus seated at God's right hand, an image which Père Gourgues finds one of the earliest used to express the apostolic Church's primitive belief. G. gathers and analyzes the first Christological rereadings of Ps 110:1 to see what they tell us of the resurrected Jesus, his being, life, activities, and functions. Each NT usage of Ps 110:1 is examined for its role and importance in its context, for its meaning and thematic application, and to establish its most primitive form and subsequent mutations.

By way of preliminary to his detailed study of texts, G. first notes that while the NT furnishes no indication of the original Sitz im Leben of Ps 110:1, it does share the OT's (and antiquity's) positive assessment of the "right hand" and "right side." G. then examines NT texts in the generally accepted chronological sequence of their redaction, beginning with pertinent texts of the Pauline corpus. Rom 8:34 contains no explicit reference to Ps 110:1 but does tell us that Jesus intercedes now for us at God's right hand, a position of privilege. Elements of this verse are anterior to the redaction of Romans. In Col 3:1, Christ's place at the Father's right hand, confirmed in glory, is used to motivate the Christian's conduct. G. is
inclined to see in this text a reference to a baptismal formula. Eph 1:20, as its context makes clear, puts emphasis on what Christ has for himself. Being at God's right hand in heaven, Christ dominates all. The believer, seeing what God has done for Jesus, has hope. Eph 1:20-23 does not reproduce a determined, pre-existent formula, but combines and integrates primitive elements of diverse provenience.

Outside the Pauline corpus, 1 Pet 3:18-22 evokes for the believer the paschal experience of Jesus, which culminates in Jesus' sitting at God's right hand (3:22). Recalling this fact becomes an appeal to the Christian to persevere in hope. 1 Pet 3:22 cites an earlier formula relating to a baptismal context.

Hebrews, of all NT writings, makes most use of Ps 110. Heb 1:3-4 stresses the superiority of God's Son over the angels. Heb 1:13 reintegrates the many thoughts of verses 5-12, summarizing the Son's superiority over the angels by a new citation of Ps 110:1. Heb 1:3 echoes ancient hymnic material. Heb 8:1 again places Jesus at God's right hand to intercede for us. More, this intercession is the essential function of Jesus' heavenly ministry. Heb 10:12 shows that his sacrifice made this possible. Heb 12:2's use of Ps 110 is basically parenetic. Seeing Jesus at God's right hand should inspire Christians to emulate Christ's actions.

Mk 12:36 and its parallels teach us that the Messiah, while David's descendant, is greater than David. But this text does not speak of Jesus himself. Jesus' challenge to the scribes in Mk 12:35b, 37a reproduces his authentic words. In Mk 14:62 and its parallels, Jesus evokes the Daniestic Son of Man to say that the Messiah's sharing in God's power will be more than terrestrial. It will be a sharing of the risen Christ in the divine prerogative.


G. then traces much of the development that took place between the two texts at chronological extremes. 1 Cor 15:25-28, one of the earliest usages of Ps 110:1, emphasizes Christ's Lordship. Mk 16:19 shows the definitive end of Jesus' terrestrial presence but shows also that his continual presence on earth through a new missionary activity is made possible by his new place in heaven.

In closing chapters G. synthesizes his research. He notes the development and variations in use of Ps 110:1 through diverse contexts. He also notes that the symbol of Jesus' sitting at God's right has much to tell us
even yet of Jesus' perfect and permanent communion with God and about
his identity and functions. Difficult as it is for us to grasp this symbol
meaningfully today, we must try.

This book is at times tedious—what thesis is not?—and occasionally
its assertions could use more argument and/or hard evidence. But G.
provides the reader with a thoroughly critical and important treatment
of Ps 110:1's usage in the NT. And for that important benefit G.'s work
can be recommended.

Saint Paul's College, Washington, D.C. NEIL J. MCELNEY, C.S.P.

JESUS: THE MAN AND THE MYTH. By James P. Mackey. New York:

M. has constructed his new work on Christology very carefully in order
to display his proposed solutions to some chronic Christological problems
and to offer an overall method for the understanding, one might even say
the demythologizing, of Christian statements about Jesus.

He tackles the problem of what to do with the word "myth" by co-
opting it for theology as a positive term, "a symbol or series of symbols
developed in the form of a story" (78) which can express depth and
universality of significance as well as abstract thought can. To the
systematic doubt which has been advocated more than it has been
exemplified by questers for the historical Jesus he opposes the thesis that
myth can furnish quite satisfactory knowledge of a historical figure. The
resurrection of Jesus is the first comprehensive myth of Jesus' death,
expressing the disciples' experience of Spirit, life, and power deriving
from Jesus; it is a mistake, according to M., to take the Resurrection as
a premise, proof, or moment of disclosure for the disciples' faith. Finally,
the experience of the Spirit, of the kingdom of God, of faith may be
described as "a lived conviction that all life and existence comes to us as
cherished gift from the hands of God our Father, a persuasion of grace
persuading us to be gracious, a sense of the richness of life motivating us
to enrich life for all, and allowing us to hope, out of the depth of our
conviction and the intensity of our commitment, that life will triumph
over the harbingers of death, and finally triumph over the last enemy,
death itself" (191)—though only the living, not the description, can
enable us to catch this contagious experience of Jesus' own faith.

The construction of the book is clear and didactically helpful. A first
chapter shows in unusually clear fashion how the difficulties encountered
at each stage in the history of life-of-Jesus research sprang from ideology
and not from the science of history itself or the principles and methods
of the various forms of criticism (50). A chapter on the death of Jesus
recounts first the historically recoverable details, then the myths which
grew up around it as believers tried to express its deepest significance for
them. Chief of these myths is the story of resurrection, primarily a way of speaking about the disciples' experience of the Spirit as described above; this experience alone leads them to assert that Jesus personally has achieved a destiny beyond that which was witnessed in his death and that we too may hope for a further destiny of some equally unknown sort.

The fourth chapter describes the kingdom experience itself as exemplified in Jesus' parables, prayer, and ministry of miracle and meal; the kingdom of God is Jesus' own myth of the world as experienced as cherished gift of God. Anyone with "a smattering of Greek" (163) would realize that where the NT speaks of "faith in Jesus" the Greek generally can be rendered "as easily, and even more literally" by the "faith of Jesus." It is that faith which Christians catch from Jesus. Paul, though he scarcely mentions Jesus' preaching and ministry, manifests in his own life that same lived conviction which marked Jesus and credits Jesus with enabling him to live in that way. For M., Paul replaces the kingdom myth with his own ways of evoking the same reality, and the titles assigned to Jesus throughout the NT, derived from various cultural milieus, are all likewise chosen to present Jesus as the one who has this deepest significance for us, namely, that he enables us to live as he did.

The sixth chapter sees this process of the evolution of the Jesus myth through to the definitions of the early councils. Necessary as the latter were, they had the negative effect of leading people to play down the humanity of Jesus. Yet the true Christian faith continues, for "the same faith of Jesus is the center of his historical and historic identity, and he is therefore present in our world . . . and the spirit which Jesus breathed into a dying world is still present in books and buildings, in lectures and rituals, and above all in patterns of living and in people; still pointing to the invitation issued in every existing thing and event, and inviting us to respond" (261).

One out of many points of detail: M. rashly assumes that the Arians, not their opponents, are the heirs of the earlier subordinationist tradition.

Whether M.'s resolutely immanent Christology, in which Jesus saves us by his contagious faith and in no other way, does full justice to the Christian myth is open to serious question. I was looking this year for a new Christology textbook, but this is not it.

College of St. Thomas, St. Paul

MICHAEL SLUSSER


This book is the second of a three-volume work by Congar on the Holy Spirit. The first volume was reviewed in TS 41 (1980) 201-2. The present volume treats the animating activity of the Spirit in the Church (Part 1),
in individual believers (Part 2), and in the "charismatic renewal" (Part 3).

The Church is the fruit of two missions, that of the Son and that of the Holy Spirit. Some of his own earlier formulations of the action of the Spirit in the Church, C. acknowledges, have been criticized as expressing a "dualism distinguishing between institution coming from Christ and free interventions coming from the Spirit" (23). Here C. stresses that the action of the Spirit is not "reducible to a simple actualization of the structures of the covenant instituted by Christ on earth" (24), but is also the source of newness in history. There is no disunity here, however, since this newness has as its goal the work of Christ and the building of his body. The Spirit is principle of the unity, catholicity, apostolicity, and holiness of the Church. In C.'s rich treatment of these themes, he emphasizes that the Spirit serves as principle of unity by bringing together many personal subjects and local churches in a way that preserves their diversity and their nature as personal subjects. This awareness was not reflected sufficiently in the pre-Vatican modern Church, characterized by an "overestimation of the role of authority and by a juridical tendency prompt to reduce order to an imposed rule and unity to uniformity" (27).

In the seven chapters of the second part, C. dwells on such themes as the Holy Spirit's relation to the believer and transformation of him or her into Christ, the presence of the Spirit in Christian prayer and in the Christian's battle against the flesh, the gifts and fruits of the Spirit. He notes that while St. Paul characterized the condition of the Christian by an "already, not yet," he understood that of the Jews as manifesting the "not yet" and that of the Gnostics influential in the Corinthian Church as presuming the "already," for the latter considered themselves free of the limitations of the present time (157). In the third part, C. discusses at length the great benefits that the "charismatic renewal" (a name he does not favor) brings to the Church in our age. However, he also raises questions in reference to specific aspects of this movement.

While the whole of the book is eminently worthwhile and interesting, perhaps the last part will evoke the greatest interest and discussion. I would raise a question particularly with reference to C.'s view that if one poses a reciprocity in the Trinity that involves a plurality of consciousnesses, one is coming close to tritheism (290). This view is similar to that of Karl Rahner on this subject, but there are a growing number of contemporary Catholic theologians who think that a plurality of consciousnesses in the Trinity is called for by the scriptural message and that this plurality, like that of Trinitarian relations, is consistent with the oneness of the divine Being.

De Sales Hall School of Theology
Hyattsville, Md.

JOHN FARRELLY, O.S.B.
In their ongoing attempt at self-understanding and dialogue with others in the Christian family, Roman Catholics are still searching to articulate more accurately their basic convictions on the Petrine ministry and more specifically its relationship to the modern papacy. Catholics are striving to understand what Vatican I stated authoritatively about the pope's primacy and his possible exercise of infallibility. Especially since the hundredth anniversary of Vatican I in the academic year 1969–70, numerous books and articles have studied the Sitz im Leben of the Vatican I constitution on the papacy Pastor aeternus. M.'s book is witness to the fact that Catholic theologians and historians have not yet achieved their task of trying to interpret the constitution against the background of speeches, emendations, and relationes found in the acta. Such work is obviously crucial for ecumenism.

Here M.'s investigation is inspired by a special concern for more fruitful dialogue with Orthodox and Anglicans. He chooses a highly restrictive question: What was the force of the word episcopalis as applied to the pope's role in chapter 3 of Pastor aeternus? M.'s question is whether the pope was seen there as exercising his worldwide ministry either (a) as the bishop of the universal Church or (b) as the first among the bishops who acts as a primate. It can be documented that the view that the pope is bishop over the universal Church corresponds to the theological opinion of the nineteenth-century Roman School represented at the Council by such men as P. Cossa, F. Hettinger, C. Schrader, and G. Perrone. M. aims to prove that the Council did not adopt that opinion of the Roman School and refused to state explicitly that the pope is a universal bishop over the entire Church.

This volume is a model of careful and close analysis. The four chapters treat the intention of the various consultors of Vatican I, the discussion on the Council floor of the first schema De Romano Pontifice, the historical roots of the papal title "catholicae ecclesiae episcopus," and the relationship of papal primacy and the episcopal college.

M. finds special significance for contemporary doctrine in the fact that Lumen gentium avoided describing the pope's jurisdiction in the terms ordinaria, immediata, episcopalis (even though the terms were in the Vatican II first draft De ecclesia). Instead, Vatican II described the pope as "totius ecclesiae visible caput, totius ecclesiae pastor, supremus omnium christifidelium pastor et doctor" etc., avoiding the questionable terminology of the pope's universal episcopal power. Vatican II's view is closer to that of Maximos IV, who described the pope as exercising "diaconie primatiale."

M.'s book will need a companion volume that studies chapter 4 of
Pastor aeternus and indeed many other works before a comprehensive synthesis is achieved. Meanwhile he has set a standard for careful and painstaking analysis of the primary sources.

Concordia University, Montreal

MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.


This volume of twenty essays, written from 1975–78, underscores once again that the seventy-six-year-old German Jesuit Karl Rahner is still one of the world's most creative and prolific Catholic theologians. These essays, moreover, were organized to form a unity with a soon-to-be-published Volume 14, subtitled "Church and Spirituality."

This volume centers on the true unity and genuine historicity of dogma. R. thereby transposes traditional dogmas into today's pluralistic horizon of understanding. This is possible and necessary, because all dogmas contain not only what is really meant (which R. states cannot be derived in a "chemically pure" form) but also an "amalgam" of outdated concepts, modes of representation, prejudices, etc., which are understood together with the authentic in the dogma but are not necessarily binding and may prove false. For example, R. contends that it is not necessary to defend monogenism to uphold the binding doctrine on original sin. Moreover, when seen in the light of the global unity of faith, many areas of theology are far less clear than traditionally presupposed. Applying this to such themes as the development of dogma, the history of theology, disputed ecumenical issues, moral argumentation, prayer, the magisterium, death, mystical theology, law, justification, angelology, etc. gives this volume a tighter underlying unity than previous Rahner volumes.

Recent disputes between the magisterium and theologians make R.'s first section of essays especially cogent. Asking how one deals with authentic magisterial pronouncements which may be wrong, R. applies the rules of biblical hermeneutics to both dogma and various pronouncements of the magisterium. He pleads for genuine and open dialogue between theologians and the magisterium. He insists upon theology's critical function and sees the need for magisterial pronouncements to be qualified with contemporary theological notes still to be worked out. He cautions against applying the concept "teaching office" to theologians, as if they somehow formed a second magisterium. He also upholds the right of the magisterium to speak and to stop endless dialogue. Yet, instead of being the watchdog of individual dogmas, R. sees the magisterium's contemporary function in terms of prophetically defending and explicating the heart of Christianity.

The essay on transcendental experience is one of the finest essays I
have ever read on mystical theology. It clarifies the essence of Christian mysticism, defends a graced non-Christian mysticism, and explicated an acceptable meaning of "natural" mysticism. The reflections centered on poor argumentation in moral theology, the mystery of the Triune God in the dialogue with Islam, an "ascent Mariology," and dying with Christian "style" are truly profound. It was impressive to see Rahner genuinely stymied by the difficult question as to how an offense against any creature may be an offense against the infinite God. Most daring are his articles on Mary's virginity and the angels. R. stresses Mary's whole body-soul existence being totally involved in salvation history's climax in the Christ-event, but maintains that what Mary's total integrity means biologically is still unclear. He argues, too, for the cosmic function of angels, their having a specific relationship to matter and a "region" of operation, and their being principles of higher biological, cultural, historical, and social order, if they exist—a point R. insists cannot be definitively rejected or accepted theologically.

The essays on dialogue with God, ecumenical issues, faith as courage, and the experience of the Holy Spirit have already been published in English. Some repetition of matter in other Rahner works is found here.

Boston College

Harvey D. Egan, S.J.


Why did the Arian conflict rage most fiercely after the Council of Nicaea? Why did Athanasius not still the controversy with a reference to the infallibility of an ecumenical council? These questions initiated S.'s quest, the tracing of the ancient Church's developing consciousness of the authority of an ecumenical council. His book assembles, reworks, and orders the series of articles appearing in *Theologie und Philosophie* 1970–76, to which are added introduction, conclusion, comprehensive bibliography, indices, and two and a half new chapters. Yves Congar found the articles to be "of exemplary erudition and precision," and the additions only assure indispensability for further research on ecclesiastical councils.

The first third of the work focuses on authors who rendered significant contributions to the theology of the councils. Athanasius, Augustine, and Leo the Great developed their understandings in disputes about Christological and sacramental heresies. Vincent of Lérins, influenced by monastic spirituality, and Theodore Abu Qurra (+820/25) elaborated positions directly concerned with the authority of an ecumenical council and the formal characteristic by which it could be recognized. From Athanasius' growing awareness of the council as *paradosis*, tradition in
of bishops, a court of bishops, a pontifical synod, and the assemblies of national churches.

In his careful, nuanced scrutiny of theologies and their interrelations S. manifests an amazing control of wide-ranging sources. While indicating great diversity in the Church's historical understandings of a council, S. also emphasizes the Church's continuous persuasion that "councils have passed on unabridged and inerrantly the mystery of Christian faith" (512). Hans Küng had cited S.'s earlier articles for support in the Infallibility debate; without naming Küng explicitly, S. distances himself clearly from that interpretation (514-16).

W. Brandmüller wisely published S.'s magnificent study as the initial volume of the new series Konziliengeschichte, which should eventually comprise twenty-five volumes. S. has hewn a path to guide future research. Though some conclusions may later be questioned, the present work cannot be neglected. There is still need for a full study on the reception of a council, and one might have desired a more comprehensive conclusion summarizing the essential of an ecumenical council. Otherwise one regrets only the price.

Fordham University

JOHN M. McDERMOTT, S.J.


In the fifth century three major apologies were written in defense of Christianity to paganism: Augustine's De civitate Dei contra paganos; Theodoret of Cyrus' Graecarum affectionum curatio; and Cyril of Alexandria's Contra Julianum. Augustine's work has been studied extensively and continuously, and Pierre Canivet wrote a large monograph on Theodoret's apology, but Cyril's Contra Julianum has been surprisingly neglected. This is particularly unfortunate because the book was written in response to Julian the Apostate, the most important critic of Christianity since Porphyry, and because it preserves many citations from Greek authors, e.g., Porphyry, Plato, the Hermetic corpus, Alexander of Aphrodisias, et al. Further, the Contra Julianum, unique among Cyril's works, which are exegetical or dogmatic, offers a different perspective on a man who is known almost wholly for his role in the Christological controversies. A good monograph on CJ has long been needed but, sad to say, this dissertation by Malley does not do the job. It is not that the book is without use; for M. has carefully read CJ, in itself no mean accomplishment; the difficulty is that he does not understand Julian's attack on
Christianity, nor the spiritual and intellectual milieu which prompted Cyril's apology and shaped the character of his response. Furthermore, CJ is read without reference to any of Cyril's other writings, leaving the distinct impression that this work had no relation to the theological and intellectual concerns which dominated Cyril's life.

This last failing is particularly disappointing because M. realizes that the purpose of Contra Galilaeos was (as Libanius acknowledged in his funeral oration over Julian, Oration 18, 178) to prove that Jesus was not fully God but a divinized man. Would it not be in order to ask whether Cyril's interpretation of Christ in the controversy with Nestorius, or in his early writings against the Arians, is related to the arguments against Julian? Cyril's argument against Nestorius that Christ is not an ordinary man (cf. Contra Nestorium 3, 2) is paralleled in CJ where Cyril says that Christ, in contrast to the heroes of Greece and Rome, overcame death, for which reason he is named the "first born of the dead" (972c).

The book is divided into two major sections, the first an analysis of Julian's criticism of Christianity, the second a discussion of the major arguments of CJ. M. has read widely in Julian's other writings, i.e., his epistles and orations, and he provides many parallels of language and ideas between these works and the fragments of CJ. Yet he ignores the more important secondary literature on Julian's anti-Christian program, including the relation between Julian and the Jews, a major part of the argument of the Contra Galilaeos; nor does he see how Julian's work stands in the tradition of pagan criticism of Christianity going back to Porphyry and Celsus. Hence he misses the point of Julian's criticism (Contra Galilaeos 327a-b) that the apostles deviated from the teaching of Jesus. M. takes this to mean that the later Church deviated from the apostles, but what Julian says, following the lead of Porphyry, is that the apostles, contrary to the teaching of Jesus, made Jesus into a God, thereby departing from Jesus' teaching that the one high God alone should be worshiped. Such criticism was current in pagan circles in the late fourth century, as can be seen from Augustine's De consensu evangeliistarum 1 and the City of God 19, 23.

Lest these comments be unduly negative, it should be said that M.'s work is valuable simply because it is a study of CJ and because he does give a detailed summary of a difficult and as yet untranslated text. He also offers some useful comments on Cyril's view of the wise man (sophos), an interesting and unnoticed aspect of the Christian response to pagan criticism in the later Empire. Malley's work has the value of offering students an entree into a little-known side of Cyril of Alexandria and of Christian intellectual life of the fifth century.

University of Notre Dame

ROBERT L. WILKEN

In this study Gill shows that the basic disagreement between the papacy and the Eastern Churches throughout the High Middle Ages was well expressed through two images: Innocent III liked to refer to the relationship of mother and daughter as the paradigm, while the Greek Church continued to speak of sister churches. Later papalism would mix two images and speak of the return of the prodigal daughter churches. This difference of vision is revealed over and again: e.g., the popes only too often saw the question of church union in juridical terms in which the key issue was one of obedience. The "return" of the Greeks to union was just another part of the whole medieval program of papal centralism in this view. On a number of occasions this program led the popes into unfortunate alliances with ambitious Latin princes and into disastrous decisions on policy.

In 1198 the Greek and Latin Churches were already divided, but only a few years into the new century the tragic actions of the so-called Fourth Crusade marked the nadir in their relations. Innocent's connection with and attitude towards the tragic diversion of Latin forces away from the Holy Land, their intervention in the domestic politics of Constantinople, and then the seizure and sacking of the city is an unsettled question, but regardless one can understand the later Greek suspicions of anything that emanated from Latin and papalist circles. The subsequent struggle on the one hand to get rid of the Latin Empire and on the other to support it were constant reminders of the gap that existed.

Only too often, to make matters worse, it appeared to Eastern eyes and to some scholars today that the leaders of the Western Church were more concerned with church property than with matters of prior importance: faith, doctrine, and correct practice. When the popes did deal with such issues, they often, as in the case of Gregory IX, exasperated the Greeks. By simply ignoring the legitimate differences of customs and practices, Gregory IX declared Greek baptism invalid and wanted to accept only the Western traditions on confirmation. This appeared to vindicate Greek suspicions. Again the Romanists, to be on the safe side, wished to do everything in the Roman way and so unity came to imply uniformity. The use of the new mendicant orders, the policy of Latinization, the ignorance about the Greek world and situation were countered by an obstinate and not unreasonable hostility on the other side and by an unwillingness to make concessions, but also by the habit of the Greeks promising union in order to get military help for political ends. Intolerance was not a privileged attitude restricted to one side; the Latins did not really understand the Greek view or their customs or the exact role of the emperor in the Greek Church, while the Latin use of crusades was
not familiar to the Greeks. Pope Gregory X and a few others tried conciliation, compromise, and discussion, but this was rare and more like voices crying in the wilderness. More commonly, papal religious policies were dependent upon the political ambitions of princes who were supporters of the pope, e.g., Charles of Anjou. The councils that attempted union were an odd bunch. Gill shows that at Lyons II the lower ranks of the clergy were made to agree to a papal tax and then sent home while the Council went on, and the aftermath of this Council in 1274 with intransigence and extremism on the Latin side and instability and shiftiness on the Greek side led to further alienation.

At the end of the period studied, hopes for union would be renewed with the Council of Constance and the first steps towards contacts that had been broken for the forty years in which the Great Western Schism had occupied all the efforts and attention of the Latins, but then came the unfortunate battle between the Council of Basel and the popes, especially Eugenius IV. The period covered in this book was a tragic one for interecclesial relations. It was marked by a catalogue of failures, insensitivities, duplicity, arrogance, and tragedy. Unfortunately, the picture did not become much better in the next five and a half centuries. Gill has given one more segment of the long and sad story of the failure of Christians to love one another. At times the story because of its complexity becomes slow and the cast of characters very long, but it is a story whose effect has lasted to today and so it is one that needs to be told. Gill has done this well and his book reveals the need that Pope John Paul II has so recently dramatized for positive steps toward reconciliation and a confession of guilt.

*State University College, Fredonia, N.Y.*  THOMAS E. MORRISSEY


This excellent study, written by the well-known medievalist with expertise in canon law, is a welcome contribution to the study of papal legal thought as reflected in the expansion policies in the Christianization of pagan countries. The present study is the result of a dozen years of study on the canonists' writings from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. The purpose has been to test the accuracy of Mattingly's statement about the debt of the sixteenth-century Spanish critics of the conquest to the medieval legal tradition. It should be made clear that Mattingly set the starting point of such research too early.

The material content of the problem is framed in seven chapters: (1) Christian relations with infidels: the theory; (2) Innocent IV: the theorist as practitioner; (3) the successors of Innocent IV; (4) the popes at Avignon
and the world beyond Christendom; (5) the end of the Mongol mission; (6) the lawyers reconsider the rights of infidels; (7) the Spanish experi­ence. The starting point is the pontificate of Innocent IV (1243–54), who as canonist brought together several strands of legal thought relating to infidels in the first attempt to consider the relations that could exist between Christians and infidels.

As pope, he initiated the Mongol mission, the first attempt to deal with the Mongol threat to Eastern Europe on a diplomatic level, as well as to convert the Mongols to Christianity. The result was the blending of legal theory and papal practice in a single career. For three centuries following Innocent IV’s death, his thinking influenced the thought of those who wrestled with the problems when Europeans moved out from Europe itself and encountered people of various levels of culture and civilization. M. shows that the three hundred years from Innocent IV to Bartholomew de las Casas proved a coherent period in the development of European attitudes toward non-Europeans. This period stands between the era in which the crusades, based on the theory of the just war, dominated European relations with non-Europeans and the era of modern interna­tional law, which is concerned with both war and peace among the nations. By grounding the right to possess property and lordship on the natural law common to all, Innocent IV provided a theoretical basis for securing the rights of infidels in the face of European expansion, while he was also clearly working within the tradition of the just war in the defense of Europe from invading infidels.

Important questions needed to be answered: How did Christian Euro­peans view their infidel neighbors during the Middle Ages, and in what legal framework did they place these perceptions? M. has succeeded in showing that the medieval canonistic tradition had indeed a great effect upon the development of modern international law, despite the fact that the fundamental difference between medieval and modern approaches was that the former was an ecclesiastical one. Furthermore, M. deals ably with some difficulties arising from medieval thought on the dominium, which was rooted in the long tradition of conflict between the spiritual and temporal powers within Europe. It might have been still more helpful if he had made more use of some leading Byzantinists on the relationship between sacerdotium and imperium, e.g., Francis Dvornik, Early Chris­tian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background (Washington, D.C., 1966).

The increasing role of secular rulers in overseas expansion paralleled the general increase of royal power at the time. The assertiveness of the thirteenth-century popes toward secular rulers was a reflection of the king’s weakness as much as of the pope’s strength. Gradually the medieval motives for expansion, expressed in religious terms, gave way to secular
expansion, and as a result actual practice of conquest had gone beyond the canonistic legal framework.

In the sixteenth century, transition of this change paved the way for Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) to write his De jure belli ac pacis, the foundation of all modern thinking on international law and relations. Grotius set the issue of international law and relations in a broader perspective than had Innocent IV and other canonists, but there are clear links between the two schools of thought.

This is a well-written, richly annotated work, with a well-selected bibliography, an appendix on medieval attitudes and modern racism, and a good index. I recommend it warmly to scholars and students, historians, canonists, and theologians, even to the general public.

*Chestnut Hill College, Philadelphia*

LUDVIK NEMEC

*Universities, Academics and the Great Schism.* By R. N. Swan­

There are a number of reasons why universities and academics were important and outspoken in the era of the Great Schism. Obviously, a good part of the theologically and legally educated class in the Church were at the universities, and so it is no surprise that people turned to them for advice and assistance. But there was also the more mundane matter that the divisions in the Church meant a cutback in the patronage available to the faculty and graduates. One could hardly expect them to keep quiet about this. What is surprising is that it took so long for a book like the present one to be written; a good overview of the role of the universities and individual masters was clearly needed and Swanson has provided this.

Partly because so much material has survived from its records, but also because of its own fame and the eminence of its masters, S. devoted a large part of this study to the University of Paris. A listing of the prominent masters of that age in part justifies such a choice, e.g., Langenstein, Gelnhausen, d’Ailly, and Gerson. His reference to the “de­
cadent Italian universities” (17) is less easy to justify. To be sure, no Italian university became famous for its philosophy and theology in the way that Paris or Oxford did. Theology faculties came late to Italy, as D. Hay has recently shown. But the late fourteenth century was hardly decadent for the Italian legal faculties, as any list of the important canonists and legists of that era would reveal. From 1378 on, these Italians provided the arguments and writings to defend mostly the Romanist claims, but it was also from these circles that the earliest and a continuous call emanated for a council to settle the crisis. Unfortunately,
it took several decades before the obstacles to this means of solution were overcome.

In what other ways could the schism be ended? In 1381 d’Ailly proposed the alternatives: (1) the way of force, not favored by the academic community but only too often resorted to by various princes and by the competing papal claimants; (2) the method of resignation, but this option was moribund since it opposed the French royal policy at that time and (3) at that time the possibility of a council seemed too remote to be taken seriously at Paris. It would require the development of conciliarism, i.e., a rethinking and a redefinition of the power structure of the Church, before Constance was able to end the schism. Still, the conciliarists in their own way were very conservative, for unlike Wyclif or Ockham they could not conceive of any good coming out of the existence of more than one pope. But if action were to be taken, on what grounds could subordinates act against their superior, the pope? Here is where various suggestions began to be made; *quod omnes tangit* and *epieikeia* made their appearance. As the 1380–90’s passed, things were quieter, but it was the calm before the storm. In this period royal interference at Paris led to migration of some students and masters; new universities grew up. Then the proposal that the French Church subtract its obedience led the debate to a new level and stimulated more writing, but for the time no further advances were made.

Soon after 1400 the momentum had shifted. The key writings, actions, and controversies now were within the Roman obedience and it would be from these circles, from the Italian academics chiefly, that the solution would come. B. Cossa (the later Pope John XXIII) stimulated ideas and writings from Ancharano, Sancto Geminiano, and Zabarella; Johannes de Imola, de Butrio, and Baldus de Ubaldis were active. After Pisa failed to bring a final settlement, Constance brought together prelates and princes, canonists and theologians of all Europe to resolve the crisis. The universities would never again have the influence they had exercised in the previous decades, but it would be their graduates who at Constance led the way to union. The universities and their masters in the subsequent period became more and more subject to local authority, their independence was restricted, and their international character was more limited. For all too many masters that was not their chief concern and they were now far more interested in the job market, i.e., benefices and provisions, now that things were back to normal. This “normalcy” would lead to the Reformation.

A number of points I might question. For example, S. seems to put the Councils of Pisa, Peniscola, and Cividale in 1409 all on the same level; he interprets Pisa as acting to replace popes who had ceased *ipso facto* to be pope and that therefore Pisa was not acting in a judicial manner. At times
he attempts to impose the schema of Walter Ullmann, an ascending system of authority vs. a descending system, upon some very recalcitrant material. All in all, however, this is a valuable study of an important topic. S.'s references to the source material and literature are quite full for those wishing to do further investigation.

State University College, Fredonia, N.Y.  Thomas E. Morrissey


In the world of science, scholarship, or art it is only the exceptional figure that continues doing significant work into his old age, and the Catalan philosopher Ramon Llull (1232–1315) is surely an exception even within these exceptions. The works edited in this volume are the works of a man well over 75. He did not cease writing until his death at 82 or 83. Much of the earlier part of his immense production has been available in the numerous editions published since the fifteenth century. But because the greater part of the later works, though known to such figures as Nicholas von Cues and Pico della Mirandola, have been accessible only in manuscript, the editors of Llull's Opera omnia latina (the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut of the University of Freiburg i. Br.) have concentrated on these later works. Vols. 1–2 (1959–60) contain the 50 works written in Sicily and Tunis during the last two and a half years of Llull's life (1313–15). Vols. 3–4 (1961–63) contain the Liber de praedicatione of 1304. Vols. 5–8 contain 30 works Llull wrote during his fourth and last stay in Paris (Nov. 1309–Oct. 1311). Vol. 5 (1967) contains an important introduction by the editor of the present volume concerning the University of Paris at that time, Llull's role in it and at the court of Philip the Fair, descriptions of the MSS, and an edition of the works written in 1309. Vol. 7 (1975) contains the 10 works written in the first half of 1311. Vol. 8, due to appear shortly, will contain the 5 works written between July and September of 1311, along with the famous Vita coaetanea. Vol. 6, here under review, fills the intervening gap with the 12 works written in 1310. Of these works, only four have been published in a modern edition, two have not been edited since the mid-eighteenth century, and six have never been printed at all.

One is particularly grateful for this superb edition, since these two Paris years have been the subject of discussion and controversy ever since Renan in his Averroès et l'averroïsme of 1852 described Llull as the hero of the anti-Averroist crusade. For it was indeed during this period that Llull wrote all the anti-Averroist works which make him such an important figure in the history of the University of Paris. Here one can
see Llull addressing himself over and over to the Parisian philosophical
radicalism of his time, trying to redo its bases or to refute specific
doctrines, providing an anti-Averroist methodology, defending the divine
omnipotence and his own conception of the divine activity *ad intra* and
*ad extra*, presenting each of the fallacies catalogued by Aristotle as the
source of a particular Averroist error, and offering a *Metaphysica nova*
and a *Liber novus physicorum*. The *Liber reprobationis aliquorum
errorum Averrois*, which attacks the Averroists most directly and specific­
ally, should be read in conjunction with Riedlinger's important article
"Ramon Lull und Averroes" in *Scientia Augustiniana: Festschrift
Zumkeller* (Würzburg, 1975) 184–99. The *Supplicatio Raimundi vener-
abilibus et sublimis sacratissimae theologiae professoribus ac baccalear-
iis studii Parisiensis* is a "humble and ardent" plea for confirmation or
correction of his arguments for the Trinity and Incarnation. Here we find
once again Llull the missionary, struggling against what must have
seemed to him like a fifth column undermining the core of his methods
at Paris, the very center of Christian intellectual life and political power.

In this otherwise splendid (if expensive) edition, I found only a few
minor misprints and one omission. On p. 15, l. 194, it seems to me *unum*
should be *verum*; on p. 77, n. to l. 477 should read *ROL V, 477–479*; and
on p. 122 the P at the bottom of the stemma should be lower case. In the
bibliography for the *Liber novus physicorum* (p. 62) there is no mention
41–66.

Puigpunyent, Mallorca

ANTHONY BONNER

**THE LETTERS AND DIARIES OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN 2: TUTOR OF**
**ORIEL, JANUARY 1827 TO DECEMBER 1831; 3: NEW BEARINGS, JANUARY**
**1832 TO JUNE 1833. Ed. Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall, S.J. Oxford:**
**Clarendon, 1979. Pp. xix + 416; xix + 344. $53.00; $49.95.**

The years 1827–33 with which these volumes of letters are concerned
were important ones in Newman's development and can in a sense be
viewed as preparatory for the leadership he would assume in the Oxford
Movement from 1833 onwards. Newman in these years was becoming
more prophetically conscious that the Church of England would have to
be reformed if it were to meet the challenge of secularism, or what he
termed "liberalism" in religion. Moreover, and this perhaps of greater
importance, he was becoming aware of his own principles and views.
Unlike Keble and Froude, with whom he had a natural affinity of principle
and outlook, Newman, when he had a clear view of a matter, "was
accustomed" (as he later wrote referring to himself in the third person)
“to formulate it, and was apt to be what Isaac Williams considered irreverent and rude in the nakedness of his analysis and unmetered and even impatient in enforcing it.”

Such a character almost inevitably becomes involved in controversy. And so we follow Newman successfully campaigning on clearly defined principles to keep Robert Peel from being re-elected to Parliament as representative of Oxford University in opposition to Edward Hawkins, whom Newman had supported rather than Keble for the position of provost at Oriel. So also we see Newman and two of his fellow tutors, again on clearly defined principles, engaged in controversy with Hawkins about the modifications they introduced into the tutorial system at Oriel to which Hawkins as provost objected. Since neither side would compromise, Hawkins exercised his power of withholding pupils from the tutors, virtually dismissing them from their posts. The editors of these volumes with commendable objectivity have included with Newman’s letters those of Hawkins and Copleston, whom Hawkins consulted as his predecessor. These letters give the reader the opportunity to study the dialectic of the controversy and to make his own judgment. Nevertheless, in the perspective of the Oxford Movement, as Newman later wrote, “humanly speaking, that movement never would have been, had he not been deprived of his Tutorship, or had Keble, not Hawkins, been Provost.”

By the time the reader follows Newman in the second of these volumes on his trip to the Mediterranean with the Froudes, he perceives Newman’s acute concern about the state of the Church, as well as Newman’s awareness of his own strong principles and views. This awareness was perhaps sharpened by his contact with the Catholic Church in Italy, towards which his emotions, like many a Protestant visitor to Rome in the last century, oscillated between attraction and aversion. The letters written on this journey, most of which were published in Anne Mozley’s Letters and Correspondence, though not always completely, still make interesting reading in their full text. When Newman returned to England, he was ready to take up the leadership of the Oxford Movement.

There is, of course, much more in these volumes than has so far been mentioned: the death of Newman’s sister Mary, his breakdown while examining in the schools, his assistance to his mother and sisters, his verse compositions including “Lead, Kindly Light,” his illness in Sicily, and perhaps one of the longest and strangest letters Newman ever wrote, addressed to his brother Charles, as to why he refuses to enter into further controversy with him on religion.

As far as the editing is concerned, one recognizes the painstaking preparation of these letters. In a few instances one would have welcomed an annotation. The proofreading seems to have been hasty; in one
instance, e.g., the footnote does not correspond with the number in the text. Finally, the page references in the index especially under "Newman" are by no means complete.

Vincent Ferrer Blehl, S.J.


One might almost say that the reason Darwin in 1859 published his masterpiece The Origin of the Species was to throw the theologians out of science. One might equally say that, to an extent he himself found a bit uncomfortable, he succeeded.

G. studies Darwin's career as an example of a change from one way of thinking and doing science to another. The theme G. fastens on to study this refocussing of scientific method is the concept of special creation, a crucial point in the heated and sometimes personal battles between science and religion in Victorian England.

And yet, the battles perhaps need never have happened. Already in the thirteenth century Aquinas had partially seen that the natural order is perfect. That is, God's creative action was not defective, as if there would be need from time to time of a direct intervention to keep the system in order or to urge it forward to the next level of development. A naive reading of Genesis, nonetheless, led religious people to believe that, whatever the case in the inorganic world, life was different. The realm of the living was held to be to some extent outside scientific observation and explanation and subject to almost capricious divine action.

The situation has parallels to the problems in cosmology. Aristotle taught—and the point seemed reasonable enough to simple-minded inspection—that the physics of the moon and beyond was different from the physics of earth. It would take Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, and Newton to dispel this notion. In the process, religion would take a bruising drubbing because of the mental rigidity of its spokesmen, as Pope John Paul II has recently acknowledged.

So, with ill grace, the theologians left the stars to the astronomers. Darwin's point, G. documents, was that they had better also leave life to the biologists. Just once, on June 30, 1860, the Anglican Church sent its champion, Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford and soon to be the moving spirit behind the beginnings of the Revised Standard Version, to throw his body against the onrushing evolutionary juggernaut. The resulting debacle, as Thomas Henry Huxley chewed up and spat out the overly facile preacher, reduced the Anglican establishment to eternal silence on the issue. The Roman Catholic communion was less docile.

Darwin's attack on special creation and his advocacy of descent with
modification as its replacement was, G. shows, a long time under construc-
tion. Darwin began as a nominally believing Anglican, even willing for a
time to study for the ministry. He moved to the stance of a non-Christian
theist and ended in an uncertain agnosticism.

Special creation finds its strongest nonbiblical support in the apparent
fixity of species and the seemingly obvious evidences of design. The child
of a hippopotamus is a hippopotamus, and the eye is better adapted to
the job of seeing than any man-designed microscope. Unfortunately for
the special-creationist point of view, Darwin had other data to consider.
For instance, the Galápagos Islands. During the voyage of the *Beagle* in
1831-36, Darwin noticed that many varieties of living beings on the set of
islands were closely related but had drifted apart in some characteristics.
Descent from a common ancestry but with modification was an obvious
explanation. To imagine that God specially created strongly related
species on each island in such a way as deceitfully to mimic descent with
modification was, Darwin felt, unworthy of the Deity. His reading in 1838
of the *Essay on the Principle of Population* by Thomas Malthus clarified
for him the mechanism of modification, natural selection.

Now Darwin's arms were at hand. Paleontology and his own experience
with South American flora and fauna demolished the immutability of
species. Natural selection explained the evidences of design. Even more
important than such scientific data, which were at the time still debatable,
was the methodological point. Special creation was a scientific dead-end,
giving rise to no new experiments. What G. labels Darwin's positivistic
approach of evolutionary natural selection might inspire, and has in-
spired, a wealth of further development.

The ensuing battle was again tough on religion. The existence of design
in living nature and hence of a special divine intervention and so of a
melding of science and theology was so overpoweringly evident. It was,
however, evident perhaps only in the sense that it is so deceptively easy
to misinterpret the rising and setting of the sun in a geocentric fashion.

Darwin's attack on special creation, G. writes, even had a theological
component at one point in his career. Special creation made God directly
responsible for the "clumsy, wasteful, blundering, low, and basically cruel
work of nature," as when the ichneumon fly lays its eggs in the body of
a living caterpillar so that its young may have fresh meat available to
feed on. Natural selection, the early Darwin asserted, moved such horrors
over to the area theologians attribute to God's permissive will. God then
became no more the guilty cause of such brutalities than He is of human
sin.

To the end, however, Darwin puzzled, as any great scientist must, over
the fact that the world is intelligible, that science is possible at all. That
mystery, at the heart of any valid natural theology, would not vanish
from his mind. In the last year of his life the Duke of Argyll, no friend of
his work, asked him if the obvious evidences of intelligence in the
biological world did not impress him. “Well,” Darwin answered, “that
often comes over me with overwhelming force; but at other times it seems
to go away.”

Dimly Darwin was approaching the sticking point in natural theology.
What proximate mechanism explains the origination of the magnificent
variety that is at hand in our universe is not the important point in
natural theology, central as it must be in natural science. For example,
the means adequate to produce the multiplicity of living forms on our
planet might well be natural selection or some other device. The impor­tant
concern in natural theology is that the variety exists and that, as Sir
Isaac Newton insisted in the conclusion to the Principia long ago, blind
causes do not provide the ultimate intelligibility for such wealth and
diversity. G. alludes to this point but it is not clear what significance it
has for him.

There is one final note of irony in the sequel. As the positivistic impulse
stemming from Darwin’s work swept all triumphantly before it, it became,
G. notes, its own rigid orthodoxy, demanding, for instance, that the old-
fashioned amateur parson-naturalist be driven out of science. It was,
however, just such an old-fashioned parson-naturalist working in the
monastery garden in Brunn who was at that very moment plugging one
of the holes in Darwin’s theory by discovering the science of genetics—

G.’s analysis of Darwin’s thought is careful, abundantly documented,
fascinatingly painstaking, and leaves the natural theologian in particular
with plenty of homework to do.

Loyola College, Baltimore

FRANK R. HAIG, S.J.

IL MAGISTERO DI ALBINO LUCIANI. Edited by Alfredo Cattabiani.

The intense activity of the present Pope has not diminished interest in
the shortest pontificate of modern times, that of his predecessor Albino
Luciani. The figure of that smiling meteor, as Cardinal Confalonieri
eulogized him, continues to captivate our imagination. Certain questions
will remain important for church historians (“Who was he?”), others for
futurologists (“What would his pontificate have been like?”). Illustris­
simi, the collection of his letters to real and fictional characters, gave us
some insight into the breadth of his cultural and literary background,
revealing, in the words of Cardinal Hume’s preface to the work, “a man
rooted in the Gospel . . . with his eyes twinkling as he calmly surveyed
the contemporary, tempestuous, troubled world, smiling at its absurdities,
regretting its evil, rejoicing in its good.” Although the present anthology of Luciani’s discourses and short essays, dating from 1973 to the vigil of his election as pope, gives us a more realistic picture of his personality, it still leaves his smile intact.

Briefly but perceptively introduced by F. S. Pancheri, who knew Luciani personally, the material is thematically arranged: Christian living, models of Christian life, the Church, and contemporary problems. These themes alone prove that as patriarch of Venice, appointed in 1969 and named cardinal in 1973, he was a man of the Church who lived its life intensely and sought to bring others to incarnate it. He was always dedicated to what he called in one of his papal discourses the “great discipline” of the Church.

For Luciani, the re-creating energy of the kingdom of God is operative in the communion of the Church to such an extent that the Christian more than anyone else must contribute to human progress and development. Since Christian service to the world inevitably leads to holiness and joy, he took delight in reminding his people that a sad saint is a bad saint, and agreed with a Spanish friend who suggested that a certain holy but disagreeable sister could very well be called “Suor Dolores de Panza” (Sister Sorrows of the Stomach). His own veneration for true models of Christian life (Francis de Sales, Francis of Assisi, Bonaventure, Leon Dehon) was sincere. They were the ones who taught him that although a Christian is buried once, he dies twice—once to sin and once physically—and the first death is more important than the second. One would like to recommend these pages to those who have given up referring to the saints in their catechetical instructions.

The first selections of the third part should have been set in a different order—Pentecost, Church, and Pope, rather than Pope, Church, Pentecost. Luciani thoroughly agreed with Vatican II that the Church is a communion, the bishops a college, and the pope a servant. His other concerns were priestly holiness, freedom and authority (“a bit of purgatory”), vocations, seminary formation, and the Church’s evangelizing and catechetical mission. Although his genial observations on each of these topics could be profitably examined, that of vocations must be singled out. Luciani did not ignore the need of good publicity for creating interest in the ministerial priesthood and proved it with his own smile: “A smile is not good advertising only for toothpaste but also for vocations, especially if it reveals the deep and serene happiness of a priest” (247). He fondly recalled an incident from his own formation which involved the seminary faculty, the local pastor, and even the little old woman in the village. During one of his vacations his pastor asked him to write an article for the parish bulletin. When he had submitted his “masterpiece,” the priest criticized it and required radical changes: “shorten the sen-
sentences, eliminate the ‘isms,’ and keep in mind that it is going to be read by the little old woman who lives on the hill, the one whose hands tremble and whose glasses keep slipping down her nose” (254).

His own study convinced him that good theology cannot destroy devotion. He encouraged the seminarians of Venice: “You will hear objections to the serious study of theology. Some will remind you of Dante’s complaint: ‘Paris has killed Assisi.’ . . . But keeping in mind that Dante himself was a great theologian, the person who wants to can very well reconcile Paris and Assisi, science and holiness. Indeed, people can be brought to Assisi through Paris. . . . This is understandable: the true theologian not only speaks about God but also to God” (257).

Luciani examined some of the most serious issues (women’s rights, the education of the young, abortion, Marxism, terrorism, etc.) with the same good sense. The ordination of women was a question which required further study but could not detract from other more urgent problems. He viewed the defense of religious freedom in Italy in strict connection with the renewal of the concordat. He agreed with Lacordaire’s dictum: “We do not demand privileges but freedom.” On the other hand, he observed that many Italians treated the question as if it were a matter of eating an artichoke, ready to remove one leaf after another until nothing remained. He found the needed corrective in Augustine’s works: “Yes, God wants to fill paradise with free men but not with donkeys” (419).

Reminding newsmen of the famous incident in the life of one of his favorite writers, Mark Twain, Luciani chided them for not being ready to report the truth. When Twain’s newspaper falsely reported the death of an individual, he refused to retract; but forced to do so, the man’s name reappeared under “Recent Births.”

Not all of Luciani’s important discourses are found in this anthology, but even this selection permits the reader to share his optimism. No matter how difficult the doctrinal, moral, or social questions, the charm with which he handled them whets one’s appetite for more. Not only his smile but his intellectual gifts made him, in the best sense of the word, an excellent apologist. If Chesterton is right that man is more himself and more human the deeper his personal joy, then Luciani was the most human of recent popes. An incident from the life of Don Bosco, reported by Albino Luciani, is symbolic of his own humble and short service to the Church: “Don Bosco invited Fransoni, the Archbishop of Torino, to visit his boys . . . Fransoni accepted, but when he climbed the improvised stage with his miter on his head the miter struck the beams of the ceiling. Removing the miter and turning to Don Bosco, the Archbishop explained: ‘I understand now. To these boys I must speak without a miter.’ ‘Without a miter’ meant with simplicity, affability, and clarity” (300).

Seraphicum, Rome

BERNARD J. PRZEWOZNY, O.F.M.Conv.

With three of his projected eight volumes still to appear, Piepkorn's posthumously published magnum opus has already been hailed by the Christian Century as one of the ten best religious books of the 1970's. The author was introduced to readers of this journal in reviews of his first two volumes (TS 39 [1978] 360–62; 40 [1979] 375–77). The two volumes under review here are bound as one, but with separate title pages and pagination, Martin Marty's sprightly Foreword to the series being printed twice over. Like their predecessors, these volumes are marred by a quantity of misprints difficult to excuse in a standard reference work.

These volumes are useful on two levels. First, they provide information about the beliefs, structure, membership, and headquarters of an enormous number of religious bodies in North America, based on data supplied by the groups themselves. This work is almost entirely P.'s own, the fruit of years of painstaking investigation. Where necessary, the information has been brought up to date by P.'s posthumous collaborators. It is they who are responsible in these two volumes for the second level of usefulness: the analytical sections which attempt to bring some order into the bewildering kaleidoscope of denominations and sects by identifying their common roots, shared beliefs, and the mutual rivalries and protests by which many of these bodies define themselves.

The Holiness and Pentecostal groups surveyed in Vol. 3 have common roots in Methodism, with which they share the concern for sanctification. In this they are closer to Catholicism than are Lutherans, with their frequently one-sided concentration on justification. To Catholic eyes many of these groups appear bizarre. Yet the spiritual dynamic which produced them is similar to that which in Catholicism gave birth first to monasticism and then to the successive reforms of its classical types (e.g., Benedictines–Cistercians–Trappists). We observe a frequently recurring pattern. A charismatic leader deplores the mediocrity of conventional church life and gathers a band of fervent followers. Their dynamic faith and practice cause something akin to a spiritual explosion. A new body is formed which in time becomes the victim of its own success. The resulting decline of original fervor calls forth yet another charismatic reformer, and the process is repeated.

The Fundamentalist groups surveyed in Vol. 4 arise from a desire which burns in numerous Catholic breasts: the yearning for clear and simple answers. Both Protestantism and Catholicism in their classical forms are hostile to this demand. Clear and simple answers are precisely what Job's comforters had, and what Job lacks—even at the magnificent
conclusion of that great book. Such answers were often sought from Jesus, and as seldom supplied. In Catholicism both the Church’s magisterium and its great theologians have always stubbornly defended the complexity of religious truth.

The reaction to this complexity has spawned groups like the Quakers, who emphasize the Inner Light given to every believer to find his own answers; and on the extreme fringe where belief shades into agnosticism, Unitarians and Universalists, who today mostly bypass belief in God in favor of commitment to the infinite perfectibility of man.

Both volumes illustrate a classical principle of Catholic Church historiography: that every heresy lives from the elements of truth which it contains. This principle needs to be supplemented, however, by another: that spiritual vigor is directly related to missionary dynamism. This explains the continuing vigor of groups whose measure of true belief, judged by Catholic criteria, is slender. Moribund spiritual communities, by contrast, almost invariably trace their decline to their abandonment of evangelism for concentration on their own internal problems. There is an important lesson here for Catholics in an age in which the Church in many countries is preoccupied with its own structures, while elsewhere (especially in the Third World) the missionary dynamic is excitingly alive.

St. Louis University

JOHN JAY HUGHES


The visit of Pope John Paul II to Constantinople in late-November 1979 to assist at the Divine Liturgy celebrated by Patriarch Demetrios I expressed dramatically the increasingly cordial relations between the See of Rome and the Orthodox Churches. This visit was one of a series of mutual exchanges since Vatican II that regularly take place in Rome (for the feast of Sts. Peter and Paul) and in Constantinople (on St. Andrew’s Day) and which led to the establishment of an official joint theological commission to work toward achieving full communion between Byzantium and Rome.

K.’s highly informative book arrives at an auspicious moment. It offers theologians and nonspecialists a brief history of Orthodox–Roman Catholic relations especially since 1965 and assesses the doctrinal convergences and divergences. Although compact, his compendium includes many judicious comments about issues that have too long been treated polemically or one-sidedly. The text is organized into four chapters: the history of Orthodox–Roman Catholic relations; the theological consultation in
the U.S.A.; the international dialogue; and Roman Catholic responses to certain theological concerns of Orthodoxy. K. provides two long appendices. The first contains for the first time in any printed form all seven consensus statements of the North American consultation concerning Eucharist, mixed marriages, respect for life, church, pastoral office of bishops and presbyters, the principle of "economy," marriage. A second appendix includes a sample of formal addresses exchanged between Rome and Constantinople since the publication of the *Tomos Agapis*. The speeches date from 1977, and for the most recent exchanges in 1978 and 1979 one must consult periodical literature.

The history of the U.S. consultation, of which K. was the Catholic executive secretary until 1978, clarifies some historical details. He states that the first meeting took place on September 5, 1965 in Worcester, Mass., a fact that will require one to correct the widely consulted list in N. Ehrenstrom and G. Gassmann, *Confessions in Dialogue: A Survey of Bilateral Conversations among the World Confessional Families 1959-1974* (3rd rev. ed.; Geneva: WCC, 1975) 117-20 (Ehrenstrom's first meeting is actually number two, and so on).

Personally, I am somewhat unhappy about K.'s choice of the word "schism" to describe the separation of the Ancient Oriental Churches and the Orthodox Churches from Roman Catholicism, whatever the historical precedent for that term. Why not isolation, estrangement, shunning, neglect? *Unitatis redintegratio* of Vatican II speaks of "the removal of the wall (paries)" dividing Eastern and Western Churches (no. 18). Especially in the case of Ancient Orientals, one could question whether K.'s remark that "they drifted into schism" (7) is felicitous, since it could be shown that some of them did not consciously reject the Council of Chalcedon but simply did not know of its existence.

K., who has shown himself to be one of America's leading sacramentologists, has some illuminating remarks about the defects in ecclesiology in both East and West through a faulty Eucharistic ecclesiology or a papal ecclesiology, neither of which can serve our churches today (47-49). In treating of apophatic theology, the *Filioque*, the Petrine office, and various doctrinal issues, he shows cases where one is dealing with developments which from divergent perspectives make valuable contributions to the theological enterprise.

Several printing errors can be noted. The unofficial representative of Athenagoras at Vatican II was Fr. Scrima, not Schira (40); the text of the consensus statement on "Economy" should read "the divine purpose or prothesis" (87, l.2). Reference to the December 1978 session as the "last meeting" (17) is equivocal, since it means the most recent consultation at the time of writing and since then two other sessions (March 15-16 and November 2-3, 1979) have occurred. Finally, however sparse books and
articles may be in this field, it is regrettable that there is not at least one page of recommended readings.

This book should be required reading for all professors and students of contemporary theology. The dedication of the volume to Iakovos, Greek Orthodox Archbishop of the Americas, is most apposite in the light of his unstinting devotion to mending the torn seam of East and West.

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

**THE CHURCH AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY STATE.** By José Comblin.  

Comblin is perhaps the most widely read and quoted analyst of national-security doctrine in Latin America. This book will not only disseminate his ideas in the U.S. but also precipitate considerable debate. Furthermore, his arguments reflect opinions about the U.S. that increasingly are held abroad, particularly among church people. A critical thesis of Comblin’s work is that: “[A]fter World War II, a new ... political system and ideology came out of the United States and spread all over the continent, chiefly under the armed forces. This is the national security system, proselytized primarily by the Pentagon, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and other American organizations. Its principles are: integration of the whole nation into the national security system and the policy of the United States; total war against communism; collaboration with American-controlled business corporations; establishment of dictatorship; and placing of absolute power in the hands of the military. Supported by the United States, especially after the Rockefeller report was issued in 1967, the national security system has come to dominate most Latin American nations and is likely to conquer the rest very soon” (54). This position is presented by one who frankly states that as a Belgian his attitude towards the U.S. had originally been molded by a vision of America as a paladin of democracy and the liberator of his country in 1918 and again in 1944. In a remarkably revealing Introduction, C. indicates that his views have also been influenced by his training at Louvain and eighteen years of living and working in Brazil, Chile, and Ecuador. The reality of widespread poverty and exploitation in Latin America and the role of the U.S. in reinforcing the status quo ultimately led him to regard this country as the prime imperial power of the twentieth century. C. analyzes the development of unequal relations between Latin America and the U.S. in the context of the mission of the Catholic Church.

His discussion in chapter 7 of the biblical sources for liberty and liberation aptly demonstrates his strengths, particularly in the exploration of the relationship of evangelization and freedom and their inherent
opposition to national-security doctrine. His formulations are provoking and relevant, especially in view of the emphasis on the evangelizing role of the Church at the Latin American bishops’ conference in Puebla. The clarity of some of C.’s perceptions is, however, undercut by weaknesses in his socioeconomic and political analysis, which tends to be simplistic and at times contrary to the facts. This is especially true in his dealing with the phenomenon of underdevelopment, where he largely ignores internal economic factors, his projection of the Peruvian military regime that came to power in 1968 as more progressive than it ever was, and his description of national-security doctrine as a total U.S. import. While C. recognizes the influence of Hegel, Nietszce, and other European currents on Latin American authoritarianism, he does not recognize the critical role of European military missions and the writings of French officers of the Algerian period, as do other critics of national-security doctrine such as Augusto Varas, Nelson Minello, and Genaro Arriagada. C.’s arguments lead one to suspect that he is looking more for a culprit than for an explanation.

In addition, by denying national-security doctrine any conceptual sophistication, C. tends to discount it instead of dealing with its substance in order to better combat it. By ascribing the proliferation of national-security states primarily to the U.S. and secondarily to the Catholic bourgeoisie and some women’s groups of a religious orientation in Latin America, C. is misrepresenting its evolution and underestimating its appeal.

The book’s principal weaknesses are revealed most clearly in the attempt to blend a political theory based on partial understanding of socioeconomic data with a prophetic theology. Chronic overstatements to the effect that “The state is now, as always, a monster in which all the irrational forces of the human being meet” (95) and “Modern society leaves men and women devoid of ethics, norms and values” (212) do not contribute to the very necessary task of convincing the reader of the dangers, not just for Latin America, of national-security doctrine. Nor is C.’s tendency to totally subordinate developments in Latin America to a U.S. master plan, for it fails to accord Latin Americans the capacity to opt for good or evil, albeit within the context of international interdependence. Such arguments deny hope and fly in the face of C.’s pleas for a prophetic church. The struggle against injustice in Latin America has most often been effective when the complex reality has been well understood and accurately presented.

This book is, nevertheless, an important one, for it reveals the depth of feeling generated in Latin America by the spread of repression and authoritarianism. It is a gutsy and partisan book that can increase our understanding of the reality of anti-Americanism in Latin America and,
I hope, stimulate more North Americans to participate in the struggle against authoritarianism and exploitation whenever it exists.

Woodstock Theological Center, D.C. MARGARET E. CRAHAN


The Final Document (FD) of the Third General Conference of the Latin American Episcopate (CELAM III) at Puebla, Mexico (Jan. 27–Feb. 13, 1979), is now available in English. Drury’s expert translation of the 173-page FD is the heart of this Orbis edition, which also contains the opening address of John Paul II to the Conference as well as three other pertinent papal homilies delivered during his Mexican pastoral visit. The editors aid our textual and contextual interpretation of the FD by surrounding it with seven valuable commentaries by experts on the Latin American Church. Puebla and Beyond is a substantial contribution to the understanding of the total Puebla event.

The first CELAM Conference at Rio de Janeiro in 1955 was organizational. CELAM II at Medellin, Colombia (1968), confronted the problems of “The Present-Day Transformation of Latin America in the Light of the Second Vatican Council.” The 249 members of that Conference, in the course of ten working days, produced sixteen rather disparate pastoral documents, only three of which had a lasting impact on the Latin American Church.

The sociopolitical context of Latin America had changed considerably by the time CELAM III addressed the problems of “The Evangelization at Present and in the Future of Latin America.” So the Puebla process was much broader in its scope than Medellin, in its more thorough preparation and regional consultations, sociopolitical and cultural situational analysis, its more realistic confrontation of the pastoral problems of evangelization in relation to Marxism, capitalism, the national-security military states, transnational corporations, and the exploitation of the poor and margined dependent peoples in the twenty-two regional conferences represented. The theory and practice of more careful pastoral planning and greater inculturation of the evangelical message of integral liberation through Christ is more specifically analyzed. The Church has issued a ringing challenge to itself to implement its renewed “preferential option for the poor” and its increased concern for the youth of these burgeoning countries that represent more than a third of the Roman Catholics of the world.

The FD is the work of the Latin Americans themselves, though they had considerable Roman guidance and help. Under the tripartite presi-
dency of three cardinals, Sebastiano Baggio (Rome), Brazilian Aloisio Lorscheider, and Mexican Ernesto Corripio Ahumada, and the day-by-day guidance of the elected five-member Coordinating Committee, the 350 delegates, divided into twenty-one working commissions, attempted to produce in seventeen days a comprehensive, unified single document that would provide pastoral guidelines for the revitalized regional churches in the 1980's. In that truly formidable task the Puebla process was relatively successful, as a close study of this pastoral FD will attest.

The working commissions followed the conciliar procedure of "see-judge-act" in their compilation of the five-part FD, substantially the same technique of situational analysis, theological reflection, and pastoral planning of praxis used by Latin American liberation theologians. Part 1 presents a pastoral overview of the Latin American sociopolitical and cultural reality. God's saving plan for Latin America is analyzed in Part 2, the most heavily doctrinal part of the FD. The latter three parts propose guidelines and specific techniques of pastoral action to promote the communion and participation of all in an effort to achieve the desired Christian integral liberation of humanity through the implementation of this unified single document.

The seven interpretive essays, averaging twenty pages in length, will aid this process of implementation. All are excellent in their contextual analysis, each providing valuable information especially about the influence of Pope John Paul II on the Puebla process. Penny Lernoux supplies the historical overview of Latin American evangelization and the growth of the CELAM organization. Moises Sandoval analyzes the forces at work within the Conference itself. Virgilio Elizondo comments on the papal opening address to the episcopal delegates and its impact. Panamanian Archbishop Marcos McGrath gives an insider's reflections on the daily workings of the Conference as a member of the Coordinating Commission. The significance of the Puebla process is the theme of the three final commentaries: for Latin America by Jon Sobrino, S.J.; for North American Catholics by Joseph Gremillion; for the Protestants of North America by Robert McAfee Brown. All seven commentators express their own particular analytic insight of both the positive contributions of the FD and its oversights, weaknesses, and omissions, but two are of special importance: McGrath's because of his long personal involvement in the whole Puebla process, and Sobrino's because of his theological analysis of the thematic connections and pastoral experience of the Latin American Church in the period between Medellín and Puebla and within the Conference itself. His study highlights the core of the FD as integral Christian liberation and suggests the proper principle of interpretation, namely, that the document be read from the viewpoint of the Church's commitment to the "preferential option for the poor."
A long-range appreciation of the developing ecclesiology of the various regional churches of Latin America and their efforts at greater inculturation of the message of Christ the Liberator will be deepened by a thoughtful re-reading of Karl Rahner's essay "Towards a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II" (TS 40 [1979] 716–27) in the light of this FD of Puebla.

The influence of Latin American theological and ecclesiological developments on the whole Church seems certain to increase in the 1980's. Puebla and Beyond, with its thorough twenty-page index, merits thoughtful reflection by all who are interested in the specific contribution of the total Puebla process.

Canisius College, Buffalo

Frederic J. Kelly, S.J.


For over half a century, a growing number of Christian writers has chosen not simply to criticize but also to learn from psychotherapeutic practice and theory. What some of them learned marked their versions of Christian morality and spirituality. One thinks of Tillich, Reinhold Niebuhr, Oraison, Thielicke, Pohier, Meissner, Lynch, Driver, Tyrrell, Browning, among others. To my knowledge, however, no Christian writer, locating a point where religion, morality, and psychotherapy intersect, spun out steadily and systematically a relatively comprehensive description of human life as constituted by these three dimensions. At least, no one did so with enough intellectual care and lucidity that the synthesis could be widely accepted as a framework for further Christian discussion. E. has done so, I believe, with this book and his Faith, Authenticity and Morality (University of Toronto, 1980). If Hegel is right that "the truth is the whole," then E.'s synthesis could channel into the open much of the contemporary search for a spirituality germane to the experience of our times.

The strong lines of E.'s picture of human life are his eight attitude-virtues and their corresponding attitude-vice. The virtues are basic trust, humility, self-acceptance, responsibility, self-commitment, friendliness ("readiness and willingness to enter intimate 'I-Thou' relations of love . . . ") , concern, and contemplation. E. acknowledges his debt to Erikson, while this reader was struck by numerous parallels to the "Pars secunda" of the Summa of Aquinas. But E. revises the Eriksonian virtues and ties them less to stages of life. Moreover, E.'s eight virtues, unlike Erikson's, are religious as well as therapeutic and moral. This makes them also different from Thomas' virtues. Whereas some of Thomas'
main virtues are theological and infused, and others are moral and natural, all of E.'s eight are theological and moral, natural and infused. Each of E.'s virtues, in its own way, focuses directly on God as well as on human life. Each virtue is a natural development of human capacities, because it is an openness to and a presence of the divine. E.'s synthesis is an innovation for both Catholic and Protestant traditions. Yet it broadly continues them, and as far as novelty goes, articulates, extends, and integrates much that is stirring presently within these traditions.

Many readers will undoubtedly be engaged by particular pages that let light in on hitherto dim spaces of their experience. This reader prized E.'s account: of trust as foundation of all the virtues; of the void as a necessary experience for growth; of divine cosmic energies flowing through the individual, constituting him or her as a person; of the human bent to idolize people and things; of the human bent to hide from oneself and of the personal fulfilment that comes through making the hidden conscious; of the trustworthiness of one's most fundamental, all-inclusive passions, of the essential implications of bodiliness.

This book is austerely intellectual in unremitting analysis and synthesis. It makes for strenuous reading. Yet many pages will move the reader or capture the imagination. An accomplished analytic philosopher is exercising his craft to an end few philosophers dare: simply to describe experience he has personally had or shared. E.'s own experience includes that of pastoral ministry, of participation in a therapeutic community, and of political involvement. But he sees it, above all, as the experience of himself and others simply as religious, moral human beings struggling to live and love more fully and thus fulfil themselves as God wants. The book is an unbroken invitation to each reader "to test my proposal by reflecting on . . . his or her own experience."

Brown University

J. Giles Milhaven


This important work offers an interpretation of religious behavior from the standpoint of the psychological and social sciences. R.'s work with the Grubb Institute of Behavioural Studies in London led him to observe that people, religious and otherwise, are engaged in an ongoing "process" of alternating (oscillating) between two types of experience, the one an experience of creative capacity and activity in the world, the other an experience of need, attachment, dependence. He characterizes these two modes in a variety of ways (intra-dependence vs. extra-dependence, work-activity vs. symbol-activity) and instances them both for individuals
(chap. 2) and for groups and institutions (chap. 3). The oscillation process is crucial, since our very capacity for work in the world hinges on how successfully we have internalized persons and/or objects for which we have (literally) dependable images. By "movement" R. means the interpretations people have built up to articulate the process they find themselves in. Process varies from person to person; in institutions with many members it must be synchronized. The shared interpretation of behavior is what contains the diversity and lends some coherence to the movement.

R.'s thesis is that religion provides a setting for one of the modes of the oscillation process: it allows people to regress (creatively) to a dependent state in such wise that they can then return to life in the world with renewed resources. Central to his thesis is that, while all people in fact are struggling with process, religion, through its ritual and symbols, deals with process on behalf of society at large; it is a sign to nonreligious people that resources for life in the world are not sheer fantasy. In fact, R. calls religion functional when it performs this wider service to society, and considers it disfunctional when it fails to do so, turning in on its own rituals and intramural activities.

In a stretching, provocative chapter (4), R. applies the foregoing analysis to Christian churches, assigning more detailed stages to the oscillation process, illustrating function or disfunction at each stage and indicating how the Christian movement interprets all this. He elaborates on function-disfunction in terms of folk religion and secularism (chap. 5) and, in his most theological chapter (6), he expands on his ideas about the Christian movement. The implications of his theory for the local Christian church (chap. 7) and for its leadership structure (8 and 9) merit special attention. If a theory is to be judged by the number of situations it helps explain, these last three chapters are impressive.

R.'s work is tightly argued without ever becoming dense, and it is endlessly rewarding. It could speak volumes to liturgists, pastors, sacramental theologians, and ecumenists. In turn, several questions could be put to it. First, does its insistence that religion provides a setting for (only?) one mode of the oscillation process, the dependent mode, lead to a one-sided view of Christian symbols? The issue is at base a Christological one. What was the relation of dependence to work in Jesus' own experience? Has that relation been preserved in Christian symbol and sacrament, given all the forces at work in institutions like the Church? R. proposes that religious symbols not only give people the opportunity to depend but also transforms them so that they can work in the world. But if this transformation is to be more than an arbitrary development, should not Christian symbols present us with some vision and embodiment of work in the world? One view, at least, of Christian sacraments sees them
as places where Christians do such work and thereby present the non-Christian world with a dependable image of its own tasks. This view sees work going on not only in the world but in the Church, through its very symbolism and sacrament. In the final analysis, even in Christ we have to get our dependable images from one another. Christ's work in us is, to be sure, dependent work, but we may have less leisure to explore the dimensions of that dependence than R. gives us to believe. Second, depending on how the previous issue is resolved, would the role of the priest have to be revised? Would ordination have to be seen more as giving the priest authority to call Christians to do the work inscribed in their symbols and sacraments?

A minor point: the diagrams on p. 201 seem to be reversed.

*Fordham University*  
George McCauley, S.J.


Confronted with the myriad definitions of "religion" and theories of religion, S. seeks to map the debates about religion using "neutral" terms. His anticontextualist stance not only presumes that reaching "objective truth" about religious matters is possible, but also claims that such a stance is necessary for any debates about religion even to occur.

S. constructs one axis for his map by presenting five types of theories of religion, with representatives speaking for each type: ceremonial (Plato, Cicero), moral (Rousseau, Kant), mystical (Plotinus, Sankara), revealed (Philo, Augustine, al-Ghazali), and secular (Comte, Feuerbach). Conceptual disagreements concerning both objects and actions of religions are also discussed. Revealed religion is claimed immune from "conceptual" criticism, "i.e., from the charge of having misconstrued or betrayed the very concept of religion" (69), although it, as other types, can be criticized "existentially" by denying or rejecting an element essential to the type, e.g., a revealing God. His analysis of the types of religion leads S. to claim that the essence of all religion is reverence for transcendent goodness.

The second axis of his map is a typology of the debated issues about religion in general. Does religion have to do with the ultimate or not (Kierkegaard, Plato, Cicero, Tillich, etc.)? Does religion integrate or fracture the self and society (Durkheim, Comte, Plotinus, Aquinas, Feuerbach, Marx, etc.)? Is religion based more in the will or in the intellect (Kierkegaard, Freud, James, Pascal, Randall, Aquinas, Teilhard, etc.)? Is religion ultimately diverse or one (Tindal, Stace, Barth, Comte, Berkeley, Sirdar Ikbal, Hegel, Troeltsch, Toynbee, Radhakrishnan)?

While one could quibble with S. over his exclusions (little mention of
analytical philosophical approaches) or his analysis (too facile distinctions among religion, magic, and superstition that make most "ceremonial" religion appear no religion at all), or the adequacy of his types (how do Chinese and Native American religions fit?), his typologies of theories and issues are useful and his treatments of representative authors are clear and balanced. Unlike some maps that oversimplify the picture of the terrain or ignore huge regions of debate, this map could be used as a guide to help beginning students to find their way about the historical debates over religion.

Nevertheless, a verdict of "not shown" must be rendered for S.'s more general claim to have found a property, reverence for transcendent goodness, which characterizes all religion. This formula "represents the collective response of the authors to the question 'What is religion?' in that it identifies what is common to their five religious proposals" (98). Yet the formula is so ambiguous that it is hard to imagine his authors allowing that it constitutes what each understands religion to be. Can all the actions central to all religions be called "reverence"? Would "moral" or "mystical" religionists recognize "secular" reverence as any sort of reverence at all? Can all of the objects of religion be subsumed under "transcendent goodness" without evacuating those terms of any significance? S. needs to shed his map-maker role and display his own place on the map in much greater detail if he wants to make persuasive his own idea of religion.

St. Michael's College, Vermont


B. encourages a particular theological method in response to the challenges posed to all religious traditions by modernity. He analyzes the source, character, and object of these challenges; he divides possible defenses into three general "types," evaluating each; finally, he encourages a "confrontation" between Western and Eastern views of God.

As he did ten years ago in his most recent effort in theology and belief (Rumor of Angels, 1969), B. the sociologist first relativizes the source of challenges to religion, modernity itself. Modern consciousness cannot be presumed the pinnacle of humanity's intellectual evolution. It is but another historical era, doubtlessly containing itself deplorable blindnesses as well as advantageous awarenesses. The challenge modernity poses to religious traditions is not simply secularity but the mixed blessing/curse of choice (haeresis). Modern social structures are plural rather than singular, offering choices in almost everything one does, including travel,
sexual relationships, child rearing, and religious beliefs. The plethora of new options renders everything, including religion, uncertain. The proper response, B. argues, is subjectivity: to examine the interior of oneself, personal experience, and "dredge up" whatever certainty one can find.

One dimension of a person's interior is religious experience. Almost everyone has had some glimpse or intuition of the experience best articulated by certain "religious virtuosi." These most experienced ones have had a whole other realm of reality revealed, a sacred and supernatural "Other" that puts everything into a more cohesive and meaningful framework. This sort of religious experience is found at the foundations of the world's religious traditions. Yet the traditions cannot do justice to the experience, never adequately articulating and preserving it in any human words. Nor do the traditions encourage repetition of the experience. They tend rather to "domesticate" it into rules, rituals, and later-day reflections. Hence the once revelatory authority of the experience is surrendered to human words and decisions, historical institutions.

How might a theology best appreciate a religious tradition in the face of modern challenges? By retrieving the religious experience at its foundation, B. claims. He divides recent (Protestant) theologies (those which have faced modernity most directly) into three distinct "types" and argues that the last is best. First are neo-orthodox theologies, exemplified by Barth, which embrace unabashedly a tradition despite modernity's challenge. He calls these theologies "deductive" and finds them to include basic inconsistencies. Second are theologies of demythologization, exemplified in efforts by Bultmann and others to translate traditional claims into new philosophies, psychologies, political positions, etc. He terms these "reductive" and criticizes them as secular and self-defeating. Finally, there is a middle path, classical liberal theology, instanced in Schleiermacher's method. Such theology attempts to retain tradition's importance by focusing on religious experiences, past and present, and correlating these experiences to a tradition's claims. This theology is "inductive" and the only consistent way to speak reasonably of the transcendent or supernatural.

The book is valuable, filled with interesting historical insights and with persuasive points from sociology and theology. Despite inclusion of unnecessary foreign phrases (tant pis, wie es wirklich gewesen ist, faute de mieux, prise de conscience) and irksomely recurring linking phrases ("Put differently," "In other words," "That is"), the book is exceptionally well written and extremely readable. One line is left out of a quotation from R. C. Zaehner and another duplicated in its place (180), but this slight oversight will be corrected in all but early copies of the book and is corrected in the May 1980 paperback (Anchor).

The only real disappointment is the concluding chapter. It is quite
good in and of itself, for it offers a valuable contrast between Western and Eastern concepts of God, calling for a confrontation between the two. But the reader may find this rather extraneous to B.'s argument and might have hoped for the outline or beginnings of B.'s own "liberal" theology. That would be necessary to provide some concrete sign that such an effort, based on personal religious experience, could hope to legitimate whole religious traditions, with their many dimensions of dogma, ritual, ethics, society, and institution. Perhaps the author-sociologist awaits the theologian to take up his call. But this very valuable descriptive and analytic exercise prompts the wish we need only await a future publication from B. himself.

University of Nebraska at Omaha

Ronald Burke

SHORTER NOTICES


M. writes with a verve and penetration that makes biblical theologizing surprisingly accessible and attractive. Never one to shirk combat or shy away from problems, he presents twenty-three compact essays on as many biblical issues. The essay format, M.'s penchant for the pithy turn of phrase, and his frequent cynicism mean that some discussions remain relatively superficial—more entertainments than scholarly analyses, but entertainments that also open up new directions for further reflection and that pose vexing questions often overlooked in more modest discussions. Thus, the opening essay vigorously reviews conceptual and practical problems besetting traditional Christian beliefs in biblical inspiration and inerrancy, and suggests that there is not as yet (and may never be) any meaningful way of identifying God as the Bible's author, even if we feel bound by the language that makes such an affirmation. Toward the end of the essay he draws a direct parallel between biblical and papal infallibility, and remarks that neither quality is really supported by experience. Some readers may object to strongly negative assessments of such as David and Solomon, but the "illusions" M. attacks do need re-examination. While he works at undermining many that color our reading of the OT, he leaves open the basic questions about "how we are to view the unity of the Old Testament" and "what it means to call the Bible 'the word of God'" (263). He closes with the suggestion that the Bible is probably better understood as a record of human response to God's presence and activity, a response in which "God is revealed, sometimes better, sometimes not so well" (264). Although the biblical record is written and closed, the divine activity, the human response, and the revelation of God in the two together still continue.

Kevin G. O'Connell, S.J.


The postexilic period in Judah was not the best of times. True, exiled Ju-
deans had returned from Babylon, but the glowing promises of the prophets, centered upon the dynasty of David and the city of Jerusalem, remained largely unfulfilled. How did the Jewish community cope with disillusionment, the unsettling gap between expectation and reality? C., lecturer in OT at the University of Glasgow, has confronted this problem in a cross-disciplinary study which opens up new levels of discourse in our interpretation of prophetic oracles. In a book whose importance cannot be questioned, C. has proposed fresh and challenging solutions to the way in which later generations faced up to the disillusionment of failed predictions. He borrows one of the tools of social psychology, the theory of cognitive dissonance, first propounded in Leon Festinger's *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance* (1957). For those unfamiliar with the terminology, the theory essentially is concerned with the conflicts arising from the coexistence of inconsistent or dissonant beliefs or apperceptions and the attempts to neutralize or reduce these conflicts.

C. is quite aware that a modern psychological theory cannot be simply transferred to a society which is now beyond any acceptable controls of scientific investigation, not to mention that the problem of unfulfilled prophecy in the OT touches a transcendental message accepted in the community as the word of Yahweh. C. realizes that Judah's faith in the divine word must have militated against any belief that predictions had not been fulfilled. There must be another way, and there was—reinterpretation of prophetic oracles. Examining in some detail the Isaiah and Haggai-Zechariah traditions, he has illuminated the hermeneutic process by which the later community reduced the stresses inherent in the nonfulfilment of earlier predictions. Beyond its value to students of the prophetic literature, I recommend to NT scholars his brief observations on the reinterpreted messianic hope whereby the Christian community understood the life and teaching of Jesus as prophecy fulfilled and themselves as participants in the eschaton.

Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.


M. describes a two-pronged motivation for this book: he conceived it as a response to J. D. Kingsbury's recent work on Matthew and to the *Human Sexuality* report submitted to the Catholic Theological Society of America. In the first instance, he challenges Kingsbury's thesis that Son of God is the central title in Matthew's Christology; in the second, he wants a better method of interpreting NT teaching on sexual morality than was used in *Human Sexuality."

M. opens with a description of modern Gospel interpretation, noting the individuality of the Evangelists and the ins and outs of the Synoptic problem. On the production of Matthew, M. leans to a Gentile author writing probably in Syrian Antioch about 90 A.D. Matthew's redactional work is described as a "remodeling" of the Gospel form to carry a particular emphasis on the active presence of Christ in the Church. The central part of the book is a "Mini-commentary on the Gospel of Matthew." M. takes the reader through the Gospel section by section, "alert for those statements on Christology and ecclesiology which have an impact on the moral life of the disciple" (45). By doing this, he means to establish the equal significance of the title Son of Man with Son of God, and to prove five theses about Matthew's approach to Christian morality which, in summary, state that the Church is entrusted with the mission of communicating Jesus' way of living and his moral teaching. A final section takes a closer look at the antitheses of Mt 5:21-48 as a concrete
statement on morality in the teaching of Christ. M. makes a helpful division of the antitheses into three that radicalize the Mosaic Law without annuling it, and three that actually annul the Law.

M. writes well and has focused a wealth of insight from recent study on Matthew. There is nothing to fault with his treatment of the material or the way he draws his conclusions. But it does appear that the fusing of two formats has frustrated each of them. M.'s dialogue with Kingsbury is distracting for the general reader, who would appreciate more expansion in the area of NT morality; and the introductory material is redundant for a Scripture scholar. The mini-commentary is good but may be hidden by the surrounding argument from those who need it; it is encouraging to know that M. is currently preparing a more complete commentary.

Jerome Kodell, O.S.B.


The noted Belgian Benedictine of Maredsous died in 1976 at age 65; this book, which contains an unpublished essay from the 1940's (first part of subtitle) and his 1976 preaching on the Prologue, is a memorial to his life and accomplishments. He founded the periodical Bible et vie chrétienne, which ran from 1953 to 1972, and a collection of books under the same name, which published Bouyer, Cerf, Winandy, etc. (I could not help reflecting that a translation in the nouvelle série of that collection is J. A. T. Robinson, Can We Trust the New Testament?, which may say a good deal about where some of French-speaking scholarship is going.) C.'s most famous book was La lecture chrétienne de la Bible (1950); it saw seven editions and translation into a half-dozen languages. The title catches the movement for spiritual reading of the Bible which C. animated and so well embodied. Without his work and that of his Francophonic colleagues Vatican II would have been something quite different.

As I read this book of Johannine meditations preceded in each instance by prayers and suggested Bible readings, I was nostalgically reminded of seminary spiritual reading, which created a love for the Bible and presumably still could today. But critical sensitivity sharpened by the 1960's and 1970's will leave some readers puzzled. For instance, the introductory essay comes to a climax by describing the attitude of the Johannine Jesus in his passion with the quotation “Not my will but yours” centered in italics—a quotation from Lk 22:42 that the fourth Evangelist seems to have avoided in the garden scene since it is not clear that the Johannine Jesus had a will independent of the Father with whom he was one! C. meditates on Jn 1:14 by stressing that the Evangelist does not speak of the glory of God's first-born but of His "only-begotten" and his "unique Son." The fact that he uses two translations shows he is aware of the problem, but a modern reader who knows that monogenēs does not mean "only-begotten" will wonder whether he is being asked to meditate on John or on Jerome (unigenitus). More of this would be carping; for those who can read it in the spirit in which it is written, it opens a world of reflection that is too seldom entered today.

Raymond E. Brown, S.S.


The second part of a translation, revision, and adaptation, in collaboration with the original author, of Z.'s Analysis philologica Novi Testamenti graeci (3rd ed.; Rome, 1966); this short notice
is meant to supplement my more extensive review of Vol. 1 in TS 36 (1975) 160–61. This second volume was completed by G. after Z.’s death in 1975, with some assistance from several members of the faculty of the Biblicum whose help she acknowledges graciously in the Preface.

The book can be used profitably by students ranging from those at the elementary level of biblical Greek to the very advanced, who will be more concerned with differences between Koine and Attic Greek and especially with problems of bilingual interference from Hebrew and Aramaic. For the convenience of the reader, the introductory material, including the explanation of signs and abbreviations, a highly useful glossary of grammatical terms, and a vocabulary of words occurring over sixty times in the NT, is reprinted in Vol. 2, as well as the appendix of verb paradigms in Hellenistic forms. Since most users may be presumed to have both pocket-sized volumes at hand, this added convenience might be considered a luxury if it added substantially to the printing cost. The analysis of forms is flawless, and the printing nearly so. Easy reference is afforded by verse numbers in the margins.

As indicated in the review of Vol. 1, this Analysis has cross references to Z.’s Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples (English ed. adapted from the 4th Latin ed. by Joseph Smith; Rome, 1963). Beginner and advanced student alike stand to profit immensely from Z.’s incisive interpretations of Greek grammar and Semitic interference. G. is to be thanked for making Z.’s word-by-word Latin analysis of the Greek NT, which has been very popular for a quarter of a century, available in English, adapted to the specific needs of English speakers, and enriched by her own grammatical insights.

Francis T. Gignac, S.J.


This book, after a survey of biblical versions and translations, has separate chapters on the biblical criticism of nine Englishmen, John Colet, William Tyndale, Thomas Cranmer, Richard Hooker, John Wilkins, John Bunyan, Richard Baxter, John Owen, and Samuel Fisher, and on that of the Dutchman Hugo Grotius and the Frenchman Richard Simon. The object is not to discover any link between these writers but to exhibit their views on critical topics.

Though these thinkers represent widely differing views, they do in fact have one similarity in so far as they diverge greatly from medieval interpretations of Scripture. Catholic, Anglican, Separatist, Presbyterian, and Quaker approaches to the use of the Bible are represented, though the major difference between them was that between fundamentalism and liberalism. The Congregationalist “Owen declares every jot and tittle, every word and syllable to have been divinely dictated, and written with merely passive concurrence without forethought or recognition on the part of the penmen. The errors which were kept out of the originals by this scrupulous celestial supervision were prevented from corrupting later copies by the providence of God” (95). In contrast to that bibliolatry, Richard Simon, the Catholic priest, “sets the basis for all subsequent Old Testament criticism...in his rejection of Moses as the author of the Pentateuch...and disclaims the right of the Bible to speak with authority on certain matters, particularly in the realm of [natural] philosophy” (11).

The book is offset-printed with heavy paper covers and includes a bibliography and an index.

Eric McDermott, S.J.

THE CATHOLIC TRADITION: SACRED SCRIPTURE 1–2; THE SAVIOUR 1–2; THE CHURCH 1–2; MASS AND THE SACRAMENTS 1–2; SPIRITUALITY 1–2; PER-
Christian community always saw itself as having a share in the political and social aspects of the world; the twenty-eight authors trace the growth of the Church’s social teaching from the early ecclesial communities to the more complicated one of the twentieth century. Among the selections we have Augustine on *The City of God* and More’s *Utopia*, the famous social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, with powerful excerpts from Dorothy Day, John LaFarge, John Courtney Murray, and Gustavo Gutiérrez.

No parish library should be without *The Catholic Tradition*. To someone with a budding interest in theology these volumes are an introductory “mini” course; to the advanced student they can be an excellent review; to active priests in the parish the modern selections can easily serve as material for continuing their theological education.

*Joseph N. Tylenda, S.J.*


Treats the question of the tension existing between past and present doctrines about grace. The problem with the classical treatises on grace, argues B., is that they no longer mediate the experience of grace in a manner intelligible to the twentieth-century believer. Moreover, B. emphasizes, the past human experience and cultural context upon which the theology of grace was elaborated are different from ours. After thus posing the problem, B. analyzes the possibility of experiencing grace today in a world characterized by historical and scientific consciousness. He discusses in particular the situation of social dependence and ideological manipulation existing in Latin America and concludes that “any situation is capable of introducing us to the experience of grace” (89). According to B., divine grace is not different from the “gratuitousness that occurs in our own lives” (105). In light of this analysis, B. then interprets the traditional categories of the theology of grace, attempting to show the underlying continuity of divergent experiences and understandings of the presence of God and His love in the world.

That attempt, though welcome, seems to this reviewer at times too ambitious; in consequence, some ideas appear elaborated insufficiently or too swiftly (cf. 157–59). Nevertheless, B.’s book is a contribution to liberation theology as well as to the theology of grace proper; the author has addressed effectively the question of continuity and discontinuity in the history of the Catholic doctrine on grace, and this in a readable fashion. This translation of the original, first published in Brazil in 1976, is also commendable; the translator, however, should have been consistent in giving the references to available English translations of the books appearing in the bibliography.

*Carlos A. Garcia-Allen*


Bearing in mind that Catholic belief about the devotion to the Blessed Mother is a stumbling block to Christian unity, M. sets out to examine what the Bible says about her. He maintains that the servanthood of Mary in God’s salvific plan is a constant biblical theme. He interprets the Annunciation as a prophetic calling comparable to that of some OT prophets. And analyzing the way OT heroes were extolled and celebrated, he affirms that the Visitation story indicates that devotional practices towards Mary must have existed from apostolic times. Then, taking up the marriage feast at Cana, he interprets Jesus’ retort to Mary’s request as a rhetorical question acknowledging his consent to perform the miracle. More-
over, the incident attests to the intercessory role of the mother of Jesus in the life of Christians. Finally, M. discusses those NT passages which seem to exclude any mediator role to Mary. Once again, by studying parallel texts from the OT and by referring to the mediator roles of Abraham, David, and Paul, he admits that the NT ascribes to Mary a "factual mediation" rather than a juridical and official one, making her a channel through which God's graces flow to others on account of the merit of Christ.

M.'s interpretation of the texts seems at times strained and the comparative method he uses is debatable. Yet, by searching for the roots of Mariology in the Bible, he has demonstrated that the place of Mary in Christian belief and devotion can be a fruitful area of ecumenical dialogue.

John A. Saliba, S.J.


An important set of texts to have in English dress, if only because the discourses in question "have occasioned subsequent charges of anti-Semitism which make Chrysostom a contributing cause to every argument and weapon used against the Jews in every pogrom for the last sixteen hundred years" (ix). Harkins, with an impressive background in the classics and patristics through long years at Xavier University in Cincinnati, has already demonstrated his competence in Chrysostomica and felicitous translation: his version of, and commentary on, Chrysostom's Baptismal Instructions in ACW 31 (1963) was a model of its kind. Now, besides a highly readable English (on Montfaucon's text reprinted in PG 48), he provides what has all too frequently been lacking in FC volumes: a lengthy introduction offering detailed data on the background of the discourses, and an extensive commentary which is at once a justification of the translation and a liberal education.

Since it is H.'s conviction that the traditional translation ("Against the Jews") of the discourses' title (Kata Ioudaion) misrepresents them (the discourses "clearly show that Chrysostom's primary targets were members of his own congregation who continued to observe the Jewish feasts and fasts") (xi), his introduction understandably focuses largely on the Judaizing movement among Christians in late-fourth-century Antioch. The story is fascinating, but Chrysostom's reaction is painful to read. Neither the circumscribed setting of the discourses, i.e., sermons to Christians in a church, nor the Judaizing tendencies among Christians lessen their defamatory character or excuses their anti-Semitism. Still, this is part of our unchristian history and it is to H.'s credit that he undertook the project and has faced and fulfilled it with such honesty and frankness.

A few minor criticisms. Chrysostom may well have been born in 347 (xxi), but R. E. Carter's chronological study in Traditio 18 (1962) 357-64, placing his birth in 349, should have been cited. The Chrysostom bibliographies in Quasten's Patrology 3 (1960) cited by H. (xxi) should be updated by reference to the Spanish version (2nd ed., 1973). The biblical scholar Fitzmyer is consistently misspelled Fitzmeyer; the general index should change Devreese to Devreesse and Quain's first initial from F. to E. The extensive use of the Jerome Biblical Commentary (1968), A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (1953) and its successor A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture (1969), J. L. McKenzie's Dictionary of the Bible (1965), and the Encyclopaedia Judaica (1972) provides so much pertinent biblical information that it might seem ungracious to sug-
gest that at times more specialized and/or more recent commentaries should have been utilized. A splendid production.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.


The key to understanding O.'s ecclesiology for the author of this short but useful work is to see how O. linked the structures and the faith of the Church. Ryan shows that O. was not a radical secularist like Marsilius but neither was he really that close in thought to the later Reformers. O. was unique and so R. indicates where he sees this singularity; i.e., in two short chapters he presents O.'s disengagement of the Church from its structures and his cumulative-distributive treatment of the Church. In the first part O. somehow had to relativize the Avignon papacy. Here is the key to the whole question, for O. started with the conviction that this papacy was guilty of heresy and all the later ratiocination had to be brought into line with this premise. This marks a major departure of O. from the medieval canonistic tradition, which often agreed with much that O. was to assert. For the canonists began with the possibility that a pope could become a heretic and so drew their conclusions on how to limit papal authority and on how to understand its position vis-à-vis the Church as a whole. O. started from the subjective certainty that his pope was a heretic and drew a whole ecclesiology from this.

When Ryan deals with the second premise of O., the going becomes very murky indeed. In O.'s theory the prayer and promise of Christ are directed towards an object—the faith of the Church which will not disappear or fail. Therefore it is not the Church in its offices or structures, nor in its officers, but all the believers, some of the believers, or even a single believer which could be the bearer of this treasure and recipient of the promise. This juggling act of O. results in the possibility that the faith of the Church could be the faith of each believing member or of all the members. How is one to choose? This is the nub of any critique of O.'s ecclesiology.

This study is challenging to read but not convincing at all points and so I have some reservations and questions. At times Ryan presents an idea as new in O. which appears to me to be a commonplace among medieval canonists. His treatment of O.'s teaching on what makes a definition true (was O. a positivist?), the relation of office to the Church, and his treatment of conciliarism raise questions. He puzzles me in his presentation of the fusion of mysticum corpus and persona ficta in medieval ecclesiological thought. Where would the line of O.'s thought lead which moved the occasional emergency situation of the canonists into the normal state of affairs? What was for O. the relation of truths necessary for salvation, the Church, and Scripture? On p. 43 the second translation seems to be based on a misunderstanding of what the Latin text says and so is misleading.

Thomas E. Morrissey


This is in many ways an unfortunate book. A good study and re-evaluation of Mark Eugenicus would be very much desired. The plethora of recent studies on the conciliar era (Constance–Basel–Ferrara/Florence) has opened many of our earlier assumptions to serious questioning; e.g., J. Stieber's recent book on
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Eugenius IV, Basel, and the German princes shows that the Latins at Florence really represented but a small fraction of the Latin Church in whose name they sought unity with the Greeks. The present study, despite its title, is less a re-evaluation than a polemic. There is in it little of the impartiality and balance that one expects in a re-evaluation. One finds a repetition of a tired and tiring theme: Mark E. and the good Greeks vs. the bad Latins and some corrupt Greeks; Mark is sick from the attitude of the Latins; Bessarion and Isidore of Kiev were self-seeking; Bessarion was jealous, as were all of Mark's opponents; Patriarch Joseph II was corrupted by hope of gifts. The one-sidedness of the study is difficult to take; e.g., Mark's brother John is noted as a bitter opponent of union and therefore he gave an objective view of what happened at Florence.

At the same time T. does reaffirm the place of Mark in the Orthodox tradition and stresses the questions he raised at Florence. It was Mark who best formulated the Greek objections to the Latin doctrine of purgatory in the form it had taken at that time. His role in the Filioque controversy is also highlighted. T.'s desire to prove that Mark did not organize an antiunion movement really shows why in fact Mark was at the heart of this movement even if he did not initiate or organize it. The description of the political and economic situation in the remnant of the old Byzantine Empire on the eve of the Council reveals the sad state of affairs. Even more, it makes explicable the dedication of the antiunionists to orthodoxy as the only hope for salvation. Orthodoxy in a sense became the sublimation for the grandeur of the old empire, which had so little left to it. Every tradition and detail became sacred; but this attitude, that the Greeks alone were truly orthodox, i.e., possessed the full and pure truth, belies T.'s disclaimer that the Greeks (i.e., Mark) came to the Council without any prejudices or sense of superiority. This study merits careful reading for what it tells us about the Byzantine world of the fifteenth century and, sadly, something of the modern Greek mind. But the emphasis must be on the word "careful" and so we still await a true and objective re-evaluation of Mark Eugenicus.

Thomas E. Morrissey


This book contains the diplomatic edition of the text and facsimiles of the forty-two miniatures of a manuscript in the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York. The text is one of only two typological lives of Christ preserved in the corpus of Middle Netherlandic literature, and was intended for members of a convent. Produced in the northern Netherlands about 1450, this book of devotion provides new evidence of the range of literary and artistic activity in the circles of the Modern Devotion, which placed great emphasis upon the function of private meditation as a means of enhancing a life of piety.

In his introduction B. describes the linguistic and other peculiarities of the codex and relates it to similar medieval typological interpretations of Christ's life. M. gives a remarkable specimen of scholarship in his detailed study of the miniatures by an anonymous artist who, in his production of several Books of Hours, connects the styles of the northern and southern Low Countries. The edition of this important manuscript gives a valuable insight into the religious and artistic life of people living in a period of transition and looking for new ways of expressing their faith experience.

Paul J. Begheyn, S.J.
combed Jones's ministry as a form of social control. Charleston was something different. In the city, the races were more nearly equal in numbers: 19,000 of a population of 43,000 were slaves, and there were 3400 free black people. Churches were white-controlled, but only Roman Catholic blacks (descendants of slaves brought to the United States by refugees from Santo Domingo) normally attended services with white coreligionists. Class "leaders" among Protestant blacks carried on a ministry subordinate to white preachers.

The story is told well and with understanding. But it is stiff with the constraints, the harshness, the stifling paternalism of a system fundamentally grounded in injustice. Pastoral problems frequently revolve around reconciliation of the "property rights" of the slaveholder with natural rights of the slave such as that to marriage. There are chilling lines. Slaves whom Charles Colcock Jones himself has sold into Louisiana write: "Although we were sold for spite, I hope it is for our own good." At Emancipation, his widow is puzzled that so many former slaves are "faithless." They abandoned the Jones's three plantations in droves. A world of good intentions, and illusions, came to an end.

James Hennesey, S.J.


"One of the results of the Second Great Awakening was the impetus given to domestic and foreign missions," W. remarks, and proceeds to tell the story of "The Yale Men," a group of Congregationalist ministers—accompanied by their wives in many cases—who ventured to the Illinois frontier in the late 1820's and 1830's. Although the newly-founded Illinois College in Jacksonville became one of their primary apostolic centers, the Band engaged in a preaching and educational apostolate that took them throughout the state and into neighboring Iowa and the Wisconsin Territory. W. does not go into great detail about the life and times of each member, but discusses enough of each man's apostolate for the reader to share the missionaries' many trials: financial insolvency, death-stalking cholera, impassable roadways, swollen spring streams and rivers, proslavery forces, and the dire results of an occasional unworthy minister. But, as W. shows, God blessed their work; for they achieved notable success through the educational institutions they staffed, the libraries they opened, and the churches they founded. They were not spared, however, the "evil" of internal dissension; for they faced the breakup of the Plan of Union, a plan by which the Congregationalists and Presbyterians had agreed to co-operate under the latter's polity on the frontier. The Yale men, traditional Congregationalists, made the break; in time, however, the issue was resolved.

Although W. presents a good survey of the Band's apostolate, the reader would benefit from a more detailed treatment of secular history, especially such areas as the slavery controversy and the financial policies of the Jacksonians, so that the works and careers of the Yale men could be viewed in greater perspective. The reader would profit from a discussion of the "peopling of the frontier" theme, especially as this relates to the German and Irish migrations; for on one occasion in particular W. mentions the hostility of the frontier ministers to Catholicism without developing the proper setting for such antagonism. The text is unfortunately marred by unmanageable footnotes. Such criticism aside, W.'s work is interesting and a contribution to the ever-growing file of American religious literature. Professional historians will consult God's Frontiersmen with considerable profit.

Francis G. McManamin, S.J.

This collection of six essays on the Orthodox Church offers a rich diversity: history, theology, spirituality, ethics, and ecumenism. Three of the essays published were public addresses given at John Carroll University as part of a special course on the Orthodox Church. Five of the six writers belong to the Byzantine tradition; they write as both scholars and believers. The sixth, Joseph F. Kelly, is a Roman Catholic who surveys the influence of Eastern spirituality on Western hagiography.

Thomas Hopko's "God and Man in the Orthodox Church" succinctly presents the Orthodox theological position: the fundamental vision is that God exists and that He can be known. But this knowledge is not strictly intellectual inquiry: the Orthodox theologian, like the laity, must follow the path of faith, repentance, purity of heart, and prayer. The indivisibility of the theology, spirituality, and liturgy of the Orthodox tradition emerges as fundamental to understanding as well as existence. H.'s analysis clarifies the Orthodox position vis-à-vis the other Christian traditions.

Demetrios Constantelos has written the key essay in the collection. "The Social Ethos of the Orthodox Church" analyzes a seldom discussed issue. The ethical position of the Orthodox Church is grounded in the concept of agape. Love of God is not sufficient; one must express continuous compassion to all persons. C. clarifies this position by highlighting the integral relationship of ethos with the social aspects of soteriology and, ultimately, with Eucharistic theology.

Theodore Stephanopoulos writes on the relations between Rome and Constantinople since Vatican II. In terms of the Council documents on the nature of the Church, S. sees important developments in the Roman position. He concludes that the burden for the ecumenical dialogue rests on the Orthodox: papal paranoia and Orthodoxy's triumphalism must be overcome.

This collection represents a fine achievement in the study of Orthodox theology. It would serve as an excellent source book for courses on the Orthodox tradition. Sadly, its sexist language and lack of a female contributor raise the question of the role of women in the Orthodox community. However, its publication at this time of increased dialogue between Rome and Constantinople is especially gratifying.

Diane Apostolos Cappadona


This important, often brilliant study of post-Vatican II Catholicism could not be more timely. It is a welcome departure from similar works by George A. Kelly, Peter Hebblethwaite, and Andrew Greeley, with the saving advantage that it is forthright without harshness or any hint of special pleading. The author of Decline and Fall of Radical Catholicism (1971) and Recovery of the Sacred (1974) brings to this new study wide reading in the conciliar documents and in an amazing range of preconciliar and postconciliar literature. He documents his ten chapters fully but unobtrusively at the end of the book and provides a select bibliography. One wishes there had been space for an index.

At a time when well-known theologians are much in the news, this careful book provides some clue to how the present impasse developed. H. bluntly states at the outset that "The crisis of the Church is not primarily intellectual and probably never was. It is personal and spiritual...." Not content to argue by unsupported assertions, he quotes extensively from priests, nuns, and laymen who, in what he calls "the flight from eternity," gave up their vocations...
the evolution of a number of Christian scholars who exhibit an empathetic appreciation of non-Christian spiritualities. Significantly, many of these scholars originate from the Third World, study at major Western centers, and purposely focus their research on important cross-cultural religious problems. Much is to be expected from these multicultural theologians in the future.

N.'s adaptation of his Gregorian University dissertation is a thorough, detailed analysis of the "divinization of man" as envisioned by Sri Aurobindo, a modern Hindu synthesizer. A.'s celebrated neo-Hindu vision of God-Realization and his intertwined theory of Integral Yoga are detailed with a specifically theological interpretation. Involvement is the descent of the Divine into the phenomenal world; evolution, on the other hand, is the gradual elevating ascent of all phenomena to the Divine. Humanity discovers itself located squarely within this Divine Process. Saccidananda is the foundation of A.'s entire theology; it is the critical underpinning of whatever is. Sat is Divinity articulating itself as Cit or Light, that illumination which intelligizes and inspires Ananda, the joyful Bliss or Love which unifies "all that is" by recalling it to its Divine Source: in a single word, Saccidananda is Reality. Very significantly, A.'s new interpretation of the classic Hindu symbols finds "an important place for Man and his life in this world" (99–100), an emphasis that is not always clear in classical Hindu theology. Evolution, for A., then is but a gradual awakening to God-Realization. "Transformation implies a change of consciousness with an upward trend of being in the scale of existence" (209). "Ascending grades of consciousness are likened more and more to the image of Saccidananda" (221).

A unique strength of this book is its critical evaluation of A.'s vision. Chapter 8 analyzes the similarities and differences between this neo-Hindu and the classical Christian approach to God-Realization. Herein begin the initial stages of cross-cultural theological reflection.

Frank R. Podgorski


The author, a Catholic priest with a doctorate from Columbia in Religion and Society, claimed, at the end of this small volume, that the Catholic left played an important role in ending the Vietnam War, ending the draft and exposing abuses by the FBI. Besides, the movement influenced the American Catholic Church and carried on an experiment in nonviolent direct action. This view of Meconis is questioned by Andrew Greeley, the priest-sociologist who bluntly charges that the Catholic radicals made no difference at all, for they had no popular support nor could they gain votes nor effect any social change.

The impetus of the movement among Catholics opposed to the Vietnam War occurred in 1961 with various literary efforts, especially an article by the Trappist monk Thomas Merton in the Catholic Worker, but it took until 1965 when the draft-card burning became common and until 1967 for the destruction of military draft files in Baltimore, Milwaukee, and Catonsville to take place. By the fall of 1969 the action community numbered eighty members who had taken part in draft-board actions and hundreds of supporters. But as the number of those in prison increased, recruiting became more difficult. Also, the emergent feminism was a problem building a chasm between the men and women. The accusation that the East Coast Conspiracy was about to blow up Washington tunnels and kidnap Kissinger came at the end of 1970 and made the group quite paranoid about informers. Much of the evidence came from the letters of Philip Berrigan and Liz McAlister. A hung
jury for acquittal gave the Catholic Left a legal victory but an institutional defeat from which the antiwar group never recovered. This work is a good overview of the movement, but the authentic history still has to be written.

James J. Conlin S.J.


Two years ago, when I first read the British edition of this book by an Anglican priest, I was hoping it would be published in America. I am delighted that my hope has been fulfilled. With an introduction by Henri Nouwen, this book "brings together in an accessible form an accumulated body of wisdom and guidance from the Christian spiritual tradition" (1). All those seeking spiritual guidance will find here valuable nourishment, in an eminently readable style, from the great spiritual masters of the tradition. Especially for spiritual directors, this book provides a rich complement to Jean Laplace's trusty manual Preparing for Spiritual Direction (Franciscan Herald Press).

Four of the six chapters are surveys, not in a superficial style of parading names and one-sentence summaries, but in a study integrating many themes and authors. With an incisive and delicately balanced judgment, L. refuses to compromise the tradition as he applies it to the contemporary scene. For example, he is very clear that self-discovery, so highly valued today, must always lead to self-surrender to God.

After tracing the spiritual undercurrent of many youth movements of the 60's and 70's, and after stressing the need to respond to these spiritual desires, L. builds up, in a long second chapter, a powerful impression of the need for the value of spiritual direction as he reviews its place in the whole Christian tradition. A third chapter, on direction, counseling, and therapy, is one of the most enlightening because of his keen insight into the similarities and distinctions among these three human relationships. In a fourth chapter, on prayer, after acknowledging a contemporary loss of familiarity with the history of spirituality, he explores the wisdom of the tradition as expressed in six different spiritualities. Though fairly brief, a fifth chapter gives a good experiential treatment of the practice of prayer. A last chapter, by far the briefest but the most provocative, treats "a prophetic understanding of spiritual direction" as producing deeply Christian social critics of our culture. The book concludes with an appendix on spiritual direction and the sacrament of reconciliation.

"Soul friend," a Celtic term coined even before the advent of Christianity, refers to an intimate advisor. This book not only renders attractive the ideal of a spiritual director as soul friend but also stirs the perennial human desire for God as the friend of the soul. Only someone who wants to cut spirituality off completely from the Christian tradition will be bored with this book.

George A. Aschenbrenner, S.J.


This collection of thirteen essays on the relationship of contemplation and action will become an important source book for scholars of world religions and spirituality. The essays are representative of the colloquium "Traditional Modes of Contemplation and Action" held at the Rothko Chapel. Respected as a scholar in the field of religious studies, each participant is also actively engaged in his respective religious tradition. This combination of scholarship and faith commitment offers a unique attempt at pursuing the interreligious dialogue.
Raimundo Panikkar’s essay is excellent. He deals with the Hindu concept of karma and the Christian understanding of the person of Jesus. The symbolic and sacramental intentions that ground these two understandings are mutually disclosive: an understanding of the one offers insight into the meaning of the other. Elemire Zolla’s essay on the typological nature of the key terms—method, contemplation, action, and tradition—is instructive. His interpretation of contemplation as the feminine element within the Western religious tradition deserves careful consideration. T. M. P. Mahadevan’s essay on “Vedantic Meditation and Its Relation to Action” is perhaps the finest piece in the collection and is destined to become a classic.

The book’s weakness is the differing style and intention of the essayists. But Ibish and Marculescu have done an admirable job in editing and unifying the manuscripts. The theoretic weakness of the study, however, is the lack of definitive attention to the problem of evil—a lacuna in most studies on religious and mystical experience.

Collectively, these papers would offer the following insights: the need to understand and be rooted in a religious tradition, the primal relationship of contemplation and action, and the understanding that the spiritual path is operative in the daily journey. The future orientation of interreligious dialogue might, as Panikkar suggests, become the study of ultimate problems (man, peace, freedom, salvation, joy, life, and death) under the guidance of more than one religious tradition.

Taken individually, these essays are important documents in the study of traditional understandings of contemplation and action. Taken collectively, they represent an exciting achievement in interreligious dialogue. The essays concern themselves more with the cultural and metaphysical issues raised by this relationship than the technical and theological ones. The importance of this type of colloquium and text cannot be overstated; it offers a new model for the study of religious traditions.

Diane Apostolos Cappadona


There are far too many flaws in this work to make it a useful reference tool, be it for scholars, students, or lay persons. Some of the flaws are mechanical: e.g., in two articles there are cross references to nonexistent entries; there are more than forty typographical errors, by this reviewer’s count. Some are flaws in the consistency of format: e.g., some short entries (“Addiction,” “Education”) have long bibliographies, while many major entries have extremely brief bibliographies (“Freedom,” “Love,” “World”) or none at all (“Norm,” “Truth,” “Value,” “Virtue”). The most frustrating flaw of this kind is one which makes it almost impossible to use certain entries as a guide for further reading: more often than not, bibliographical information is not supplied for authors mentioned or even quoted in the text of the entry.

The flaw which this reviewer finds most damaging, however, is neither a mechanical one nor one of format. It is the lack of a clearly indicated editorial principle by which topics were selected for inclusion and, presumably, others were rejected. There are, e.g., no entries for evil, grace, law, poverty, responsibility, rights; these are omissions which call for explanation in a work which, according to its Prefatory Note, seeks to provide guidelines for Christians “who wish to consider or reconsider the fundamentals of ethics at the present time.” Many of the major entries were translated from German; no information is supplied, however, about whether or where they may have been originally published.
This work does not supplant John Maquarrie's *Dictionary of Christian Ethics* (1967) as a convenient, single-volume reference tool.

Philip J. Rossi, S.J.


G.'s central message deals with five types of love: self-esteem, friendship, community, ministry, and prayer; and it includes a section on divine love. While G. does have some worthwhile things to say, one is often left with a *déjà vu* feeling. More importantly, this reviewer was repeatedly annoyed by statements he cannot accept. To categorize is not necessarily to dichotomize (35), nor is recognizing one activity as superior to another to deny their interdependence (38). Jesus did not begin to “discover” as an adult his unique relationship to the Father (136–37, 216). Catholic (G. speaks of Christian) tradition has not been negative toward sexuality, nor has it had Manichean roots. The Church has been negative toward making sex an end in itself and has always condemned people who asserted that matter or sex were evil. I find superficial the statement that “there are few substitutes if any for the feeling of worth which develops within the context of sexual love, the realization that my body can be a source of pleasure to someone, that someone can value my body and enjoy it” (56).

I have problems likewise with some of G.’s theology. He writes of homosexual genital preferences among some friends with no suggestion that there may be something abnormal or sinful involved (83–84). He writes at some length about the Eucharist and love and yet does not mention the colossal love implications of its being a sacrifice (177–88), though later he rightly speaks of the passionate love shown on the Cross (207). G. explains Jn 12:1–8 merely in terms of friendship between Jesus and Mary (Martha’s sister) and does not catch the Lord’s reference to the paschal mystery and therefore to his divinity as well as his humanity (29). While the book does relate love with prayer, it only feebly suggests the vast power of earth’s greatest human love, namely, that described in St. John of the Cross’s *Spiritual Canticle* and *Living Flame of Love*, which works, surprisingly, are not included in the lengthy bibliography.

Thomas Dubay, S.M.
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