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Presenting This Issue

Our first issue of 1982 features three articles that approach significant theological issues from three different perspectives—historical, philosophical, and hermeneutical—followed by the annual “Notes on Moral Theology,” a short piece on process theology, and the usual reviews of half a hundred recent volumes.

Corporate Reunion: A Nineteenth-Century Dilemma examines the progress of the ideal of corporate reunion of the Church of England with that of Rome, ranging from a consideration of plans advocated by Jacobean divines to that of the reasons underlying papal rejection of Anglican claims in 1865. It assesses the part played by Ambrose Phillipps and John Rouse Bloxam in fostering the branch theory as a basis for eventual reunion. V. ALAN MCCLELLAND, Ph.D. from Sheffield University, U.K., is professor of educational studies at the University of Hull. The areas of his special competence are Victorian church history, nineteenth-century social and educational history, and religious education. He has published books on Cardinal Manning: His Public Life and Influence 1865–92 (1962) and English Roman Catholics and Higher Education 1830–1903 (1973). A work nearing completion is a study of Manning’s Anglican life.

Experience and Interpretation: A Philosophical Reflection on Schillebeeckx’ Jesus and Christ analyzes the Dutch theologian’s massive Christological work from a philosopher’s perspective, with special stress on his use of the notion of interpretation. LOUIS DUPRÉ, with a doctorate in philosophy from Louvain, is the T. Laurason Riggs Professor in the Philosophy of Religion at Yale. He has done significant research in the intellectual history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially on Hegel, Marx, and Kierkegaard, on each of whom he has written a monograph. He is completing a book on Marx and the critique of culture.

The Paschal Imagination: Objectivity and Subjectivity in New Testament Interpretation is an effort to expose and analyze the major problem of contemporary exegetical methodology as an unrecognized historical positivism, and to describe the shape and conditions of possibility of a more adequate theory of biblical hermeneutics which would take proper account of the theological, philosophical, and literary dimensions of the task. SANDRA M. SCHNEIDERS, I.H.M., with a doctorate in theology from Rome’s Gregorian University, is associate professor of NT and Christian spirituality at Berkeley’s Jesuit School of Theology and Graduate Theological Union. Her particular interests lie in the NT, biblical spirituality and hermeneutics, and the theology of ministry and of religious life. Recent articles have appeared in Horizons and the CBQ. She is at work on a full-length treatise on NT hermeneutics.

Notes on Moral Theology: 1981 focuses on three general themes: (1)
methodology in moral theology; (2) the encyclical *Laborer exercens* and social morality; (3) pastoral problems (sterilization, hunger strikes, nuclear disarmament, divorce and remarriage). RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J., Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University, continues his methodical, judicious, provocative analysis of recent literature at home and abroad. Recent and long-time readers will be pleased to learn that the earlier "Notes" are now available, fully indexed, in a single volume, *Notes on Moral Theology 1965 through 1980* (University Press of America, 1980; $24.50; $15 paper).

**Does Process Theology Rest on a Mistake?** is a deliberately provocative essay probing the contention that process thought offers a more adequate conceptuality for theology; it assays the claim in the light of a longer and more comprehensive tradition. DAVID B. BURRELL, C.S.C., Ph.D. from Yale, is professor of philosophy and theology at the University of Notre Dame. His particular interest lies in philosophical theology, with special attention to the role language plays in clarifying basic positions; see his *Aquinas: God and Action* (1980). He is currently doing a comparative study of the notion of God in medieval thought (Jewish, Christian, Islamic), with particular regard to the relations between Aquinas and Maimonides.

Those who have missed our earlier announcements may be interested, even delighted, to learn that the first *TS* index, comprising Vols. 1-40 (1940–79), is now ready. Prices (payment in advance): $15 in US, $16 foreign. Kindly address orders to Theological Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057. It might be wise to check with your favorite librarian to see whether the library has ordered the index.

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


T. develops his dialogue between NT interpretation and philosophical hermeneutics by an in-depth exposition of four significant representatives of the latter: Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein. In this exposition the oft-mentioned incompatibility of the "German" philosophical tradition of Heidegger and the "English" (359) philosophical tradition of Wittgenstein is rejected in favor of an approach which seeks a fruitful comparison and interaction between the two (33). It should be noted, however, that in the final analysis T.'s sympathies lie with the later writings of Wittgenstein—which he uses to critique Heidegger (38)—and with the central hermeneutical insights of Gadamer (304). Indeed, the title Two Horizons is adapted from Gadamer's metaphor of the "fusion of horizons" between the interpreter and the text (xix).

After a brief section dealing with introductory questions, T. devotes a second section to some of the broad issues in NT hermeneutics: history, theology, and language. The essential problem posed for hermeneutics by history is historical distance. This problem arises not so much in terms of dealing with past ideas that we now see were mistaken, but more fundamentally in terms of how we enter imaginatively into the world of thought and feeling of a past tradition that we consider significant or authoritative (52). When hermeneutics is confronted by theology, the problem is to defend the legitimacy and necessity of hermeneutics against theological arguments that question the compatibility of the work of the Holy Spirit and human reflection (88–101). In the confrontation of hermeneutics and language, the problem centers on the significance of the linguistic nature of texts for attempts at "translation."

The third and largest section is devoted to the exposition of the four representatives. All the expositions are balanced in both appreciation and critique. In particular, the presentation on Bultmann is one of the most balanced critiques known to this reviewer. Singled out as Bultmann's most significant problem is not his use of philosophical categories etc., but his acceptance of a radical dualism from Marburg neo-Kantianism and Lutheran anthropology which forecloses in advance certain possibilities of interpretation (210, 284). The section on Gadamer represents one of the best condensations of Truth and Method presently available. Throughout, attention is centered on the positive use Gadamer asserts for preunderstanding and the role tradition plays in interpretation (cf. 304, 307). T. regards the section on Wittgenstein as his most distinctive
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work (xx) and I am inclined to agree. Rather than interpreting Wittgenstein's "language games" as a fideistic defense of the claim of religious language to its own realm, T. works in a manner more faithful to Wittgenstein's own intentions, analyzing several classes of statements in the NT on the basis of their usage.

This volume admirably fills a desperate need of the English-speaking world for a sympathetic, thorough, yet critical survey of the German hermeneutical tradition and its relation to linguistic philosophy. It will serve as a trustworthy introduction to this discussion for exegetes, theologians, and even philosophers.

Emory University

RANDY L. MADDOX


In this extraordinarily learned and rich commentary, Prof. Fitzmyer, an internationally renowned NT scholar, devotes 283 pages to Introduction. Some highlights are: Luke-Acts is to be dated ca. A.D. 80–85; its author is Luke, "the Syrian from Antioch, who had been a sometime collaborator of the Apostle Paul" (51); Luke's audience is "one that is predominantly Gentile Christian" (59).

The format of the commentary proper is: Comment, followed by Notes, and Bibliography. Two general points should be made about the commentary: (1) there is constant reference to all 52 chapters that Luke wrote; (2) there is primary concern about Luke's presentation of Jesus (Stage 3 of the Gospel tradition), and not about the historical Jesus of Nazareth (Stage 1). Fitzmyer's procedure in the Comment is threefold. First, he discusses sources and Lucan redaction and/or composition. When Synoptic relationships are involved, he follows a modified form of the Two-Source theory. Second, he gives an explanation of the literary form of the passage. Finally, he gives the meaning of the passage, discussing the author's theological interest and purpose.

The Notes are superb. They are not only replete with philological and stylistic information, but also contain much helpful information on general biblical and Lucan themes, e.g., on miracles (542–43) and parables (600). The Bibliography is well-nigh exhaustive, in many languages.

The contributions of this commentary to Lucan studies are many and stellar. Space allows me to name but two. One of F.'s most incisive sections (3–34) deals with theses about Luke-Acts, e.g., Luke-Acts is an example of "Early Catholicism." In a bombshell sentence which will shake many a Continental NT department, he writes: "The current study of the Lucan writings is more dominated by theses about Luke-Acts than
by a detailed analysis of these writings" (6). His section "A Sketch of Lucan Theology" (143–270) gathers together significant insights from multiple sources and is unparalleled in any current book on Luke-Acts.

I have one, minor criticism. In a number of places F. deals with the question whether Luke has made the kerygmatic character of the Gospel subservient to a theology of history (11–14, 145–62, 171–92). He answers no, but I do not believe that he has resolved the issue satisfactorily. For example, his section on "The Lucan Kerygma" (145–62) stands in some tension with his section on "The Lucan Historical Perspective" (171–92). It does not seem accurate to say that "the kerygma exists in Luke along with the historical perspective" (175). The historical perspective is subservient to Luke’s purpose of compiling an orderly narrative "account of the events that have come to fulfilment among us" (Luke 1:1). This kerygmatic narrative of how God has fulfilled and will continue to fulfil His promises is a proclamation of faith. Or, as Fitzmyer puts it, "It is difficult to imagine that Luke’s purpose did not include an accosting of reader Theophilus and an eliciting from him of an act of Christian faith" (152).

In brief, this commentary is an accomplishment of the first order. It will be a benchmark in Lucan studies for decades to come. We await with eagerness and gratitude the publication of the second volume.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago  ROBERT J. KARRIS, O.F.M.


This collection contains eighteen articles pertinent to Revelation and ten on other apocalyptic sections of the NT. Among the better-known contributors are G. Beasley-Murray, O. Böcher, J. Coppens, M. de Jonge, L. Hartman, F. Neirynck, R. Pesch, P. Prigent, and M. Wilcox. No short review can do justice to the wealth of these contributions from the 1979 Journées bibliques of Louvain, a yearly colloquium that has now emerged as an international meeting of major importance. Acknowledging that this is an essential volume for those interested in apocalyptic, let me concentrate on a few contributions that struck me.

There is a useful survey by Y. Janssens of Gnostic apocalypses from the Nag Hammadi corpus, and a study by P.-M. Bogaert of two Jewish apocalypses. Likely to be challenged by many is the latter’s contention that Revelation betrays knowledge of 2 Baruch, while 4 Ezra has been affected by Revelation. A short note by A. S. Geyser on the twelve tribes of Israel in the eschatological outlook of the NT is original and interesting. Neirynck continues his debate with Pesch over whether there is a pre-
Marcan apocalypse underlying Mk 13. While not denying the flight of the Christians to Pella in the 60's (as some have unwisely done), Neiryck judges our knowledge of it too fragile to use as a context for the putative pre-Marcan account.

In 1963 A. Feuillet surveyed the issues involved in interpreting the Book of Revelation (transl. in 1965 as The Apocalypse). Using Feuillet's title, "L'Apocalypse johannique: Etat de la question," U. Vanni extends that survey over the next fifteen years. From his notes one can reconstruct a bibliography, but it is a shame that this collection did not enlarge (in both directions) and print his Revelation bibliography (1970-75) published in Rivista biblica 24 (1976) 277-301. The structure of Revelation is a perennial problem, and teachers should note the outline by Lambrecht (85-86), which is persuasive in tracing linear development and recapitulation. While partially in agreement with the principles of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (CBQ 39 [1977] 344-66), Lambrecht may be easier to follow.

Let me devote major attention to Schüssler Fiorenza's article here, which deals with Revelation and early Christian prophecy, for it illustrates her strengths and weaknesses. In the past decade, through her dissertation on priesthood in Revelation and a series of articles, she has made original and essential contributions, so that her awaited volume in Hermeneia may be the most important commentary on Revelation in the latter part of this century, supplying the need in English for a detailed and balanced work. Nevertheless, her views, often shaped by dialectic, need more nuance. Despite the "rigor and clarity" of her dissertation, which stressed the eschatological aspect of the priesthood of the saints in Revelation, Vanni (34), along with other reviewers, has rightly asked whether one does justice (especially to Rev 1:5 and 5:10 with their sense of accomplishment) by making the priesthood purely eschatological. It is praiseworthy that Vanni raises the question without ceding to the implausible thesis of Feuillet, who would introduce the ministerial priesthood into the question; Vanni suggests "une certaine précompréhension" on Feuillet's part.

Here Schüssler Fiorenza accepts seriously the self-designation of Revelation as a prophecy, combating those whose highly subjective views of NT prophecy do not have room for Revelation (sometimes assigning it to OT-style prophecy). Drawing upon this insight, she continues her campaign to remove the work from the Johannine School (Jn, 1-2-3 Jn) into closer relationship to the Pauline sphere (NTS [1977] 402-38). Previously she called into question many of the resemblances between Revelation and John; but in this collection Böcher effectively stresses them, supplying a useful table of similarities (295-301). Now S. F. points out that there
is little of the prophetic in the Johannine writings, while features of Paul's vocation have analogues to the call of OT prophets. I would simply observe that Paul, who clearly knows what the prophetic charism is (1 Cor 12-14), never designates himself as a prophet but always as an apostle—a distinct charism. One would have to argue for S. F.'s position from a later understanding of Paul as a prophet (perhaps Acts 13:1 and the blurring in Eph 2:20). Her claim that Rev 1:4-6 and 22:21 resemble the salutation and conclusion of Pauline letters also needs more nuance: as Vanni (33) has pointed out, 1:4-6 may echo common baptismal motifs; and what are clearly designated as written missives to churches in Revelation (the seven "letters" of chaps. 2-3) bear little structural resemblances to the Pauline letters. As I pointed out in my *Community of the Beloved Disciple*, a city like Ephesus in the 90's would have had house churches influenced by different traditions (Pauline, Johannine, "apostolic" [my designation for what we find in Mark read through Matthew and Luke], and more conservative Jewish Christian). Schüssler Fiorenza is right in moving Revelation away from an exclusive nexus to the Johannine School (a nexus I made without nuance in my early writing on John), but I think she loses the advantage of this perception by seeking to move Revelation too close to the Pauline writings and heritage. Has the prophet of Revelation, who may not have felt himself confined to any single (house) church or tradition, acquired language and thought from various Christian traditions (Paul, John, Mark 13) and addressed himself to all the Christians in a particular area? It would be another reason for not concerning himself with the presbyters of the individual churches.

I deliberately drew out the discussion of Schüssler Fiorenza's contribution because it interlocks with many other articles in this important volume and because it indicates just how important Revelation is in the reconstruction of early Christian existence. The book may be the happy hunting ground of eccentrics and fundamentalists, but it still deserves prime scholarly attention.

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


Many instructors have long felt the need for a single textbook which would introduce students to some of the critical areas of discussion fundamental theology has staked out. The issues of revelation, tradition, and inspiration have been so widely debated and their data drawn from such divergent specialties as OT studies, contemporary ecumenism, recent theories of hermeneutics, modern philosophy, language analysis, and systematic theology. O'Collins offers such an introductory work, one
which in an easy and available style presents some of the major themes and problems which cluster around that discipline. The book proposes as its task "a coherent and substantial study in Christian fundamental theology," and it takes as the foundation for this study "the human experience of the divine self-communication." Granted such a purpose and such a principle, the exposition moves from an initial examination of the nature of human experience to an analysis of the three classic themes in fundamental theology: revelation, tradition, and inspiration. Each of these is explored for its meaning, for the range of questions which it properly entails, and for an approach with which a response to these problems can be realistically formulated. At the conclusion of the study O. evaluates his own work for its limitations and its positive emphases.

This internal criticism, whether in the modesty with which a proposition is advanced or in the subsequent appraisal of the strength of an argument, is one of the most refreshing aspects of this work. It will draw students into the same critical process: examining distinctions and schematizations for their adequacy, the citation of a massive array of theologians and philosophers for their accuracy, the argumentation and its evidence for critical precision and coherence. Each chapter invites this kind of engagement as the clarity of the writing and the insistent outline of each unit make unmistakably present the anatomy of argument which is used to formulate positions and to give them substance.

My own reservations center on the adequacy of the examination of human experience to support so extensive a structure. A couple of examples: O. stresses that "immediacy is an obvious aspect of any experience. . . . Whether our role appears more active or more passive in a given experience, in either case we directly encounter some object or person" (33). There is certainly an immediacy which is characteristic of experience which distinguishes it from report, but it is critically important to note that this is almost always a mediated immediacy. To fail to notice or establish this mediation within the nature of experience renders it difficult to sustain such proposition as "Christians now experience God's self-communication reaching them through preaching, sacraments and other ritual actions which interpret and re-enact those past events. The mediation of revelation and grace by means of the sacramental life, the Scriptures, . . . " (71). Again, the section dealing with transcendental experience needs a phenomenological treatment rather than an outline under ten headings if it is to function as the foundation of the discussions of transcendental revelation. Here O. fails to distinguish between the movement of the human subject towards the absolute horizon of being, meaning, truth—the natural self-transcendence towards mystery—and transcendental revelation in which this mystery is no longer a receding
horizon but moves towards the subject in the mode of defining closeness. Almost every chapter will raise such questions and objections, but it is important to note that this is inescapably part of the very enterprise which O. has set himself: it is a work of exposition, not of inquiry, and one which does not pretend to offer a comprehensive fundamental theology. O. brings to the three topics that he does treat a wide acquaintance with contemporary theologians and with biblical criticism. His insistence that fundamental theology be grounded in experience is a good one, and the judgments he forms on a vast number of issues are uniformly balanced and clearly argued. To do justice to this work, each of these judgments would have to be analyzed and evaluated—clearly beyond the limitation of a review.

In general, a welcome book and one which will be widely used as college teachers introduce their students to the issues of revelation, tradition, and inspiration.

*Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley*  
**MICHAEL J. BUCKLEY, S.J.**


In the middle of the eighteenth century, the French Benedictine Pierre Sabatier (1682–1742) published, in three large volumes, his collection of the remains of the Old Latin Bible. ("Old Latin" is used to mean any Latin text that differs from the Vulgate. The assumption that there was a single pre-Vulgate Latin version has been abandoned, as has the search—based on an enigmatic remark of Augustine's in *De doctrina christiana* 2, 15, 22—for a *Vetus Itala.* Sabatier's achievement was awesome and remains useful. But the need for a "new Sabatier" grew, and the Bavarian pastor Josef Denk (d. 1927) began work on it. Upon his death the project came to the Archabbey of Beuron, where in 1945 the Benedictine Bonifatius Fischer set out to continue Denk's work. In 1951 the *Vetus Latina* Institute was founded at Beuron.

The Beuron *Vetus Latina* aims to publish in a critical edition all Old Latin biblical texts, whether found in biblical manuscripts or in quotations. The project is extraordinarily difficult. The Vulgate gained acceptance only slowly and Old Latin texts persist at least through the Carolingian reform. Practically, each book of the Latin Bible has its own distinct history. Moreover, the Beuron editors are not trying to reconstruct a single original or archetype (as editors of the Greek NT are), but rather to present in a historical panorama the text of the Latin Bible, in all its variations, from Tertullian to the Carolingian age. To illustrate the work involved: F. remarks that Phil 2:6–7 is cited 1200 times in Latin in this period.

In 1949 Fischer published a volume which had two parts: a list of 400
manuscripts containing some part of the Bible in Old Latin versions, and a list of the abbreviations of the names and works of Latin ecclesiastical writers to be used in footnotes to identify quotations. The latter list was republished by Fischer in a second edition in 1963 and supplemented with loose-leaf pages until 1970. *Kirchenschriftsteller* is the third, revised and expanded edition, by a new editor.

Calling this volume a list of abbreviations in no way does justice to it. It is an authoritative guide to the whole corpus of Christian Latin from the earliest extant documents to A.D. 800. Documents are listed alphabetically by author, and for each document the best available edition is named. When possible, the date of composition is given, or at least an indication of sources and later use, to supply *termini a quo* and *ad quem*. This is all relatively simple for well-known works such as Augustine's *De trinitate*, but enormously complex, e.g., for the 550 or so extant sermons of Augustine, which are treated one by one, or the numerous writings attributed by modern scholars to Pelagius and his followers.

The work has a special relationship to two other reference works: the *Clavis patrum latinorum* edited by E. Dekkers (2nd ed., Steenbruge, 1961), and the *Clavis patrum graecorum* 2-4 edited by M. Geerard (Turnhout, 1974-80). F.'s work is more exhaustive than Dekkers', since it includes Latin writings up to the year 800, and all ancient Latin translations of Greek Christian writings. (Moreover, Fischer had omitted from his two editions the few Latin documents which supposedly contained no biblical quotations, but F. dropped this distinction and includes everything from the Latin *Clavis*.) On the other hand, Dekkers and Geerard supply much more information than F. has space for. But the works are easy to co-ordinate, since F. always gives the *Clavis* number for each document and has a 200-page supplement which enables the user of either *Clavis* easily to find a Latin document in *Kirchenschriftsteller* (and thus, e.g., to be informed about more recent editions).

*Kirchenschriftsteller* is not immediately easy to use, although the annotations (in German) are in clear sentences and unabbreviated. But, especially in combination with the Latin and Greek *Clavis*, this volume is an extraordinarily useful instrument for patrologists and medievalists. F. has added significantly to Fischer's work (a glance at Chromatius of Aquileia or "Concilia oecumenica" makes this clear), so that the second edition is truly obsolete. This reference work should be readily available in every theological library.

*Marquette University*  

**JOSEPH T. LIENHARD, S.J.**

In an admirable introductory survey, Countryman informs us that for the last 150 years there has been considerable interest in the social consciousness of the early Christian Fathers. It was spurred by the “collision between capitalism and communism.” Frederick Engels, Lujo Brentano, Karl Kautsky, and the socialist leaders of the 1848 revolution all claimed that the early Christians were the forerunners of modern socialism, “the spiritual ancestors of Marxism.” Christian writers, in turn, both Catholic and Protestant, took up the challenge of the socialists and rejected their claims. Much of the ensuing discussion was polemical or pious or theological.

In the first stages of the debate, the more scholarly writers concentrated on early Christian theory of wealth, while ignoring its practice. After World War II, however, there was a revival of scholarly interest which focused on the general social life of early Christians. Who were they? What precisely was their social status, the social milieu in which they lived? In other words, how did the Christian theory of wealth work itself out in practice?

C. wishes to understand the ancient Church on its own terms. He attempts to see how the words and theories of early Christian writers reflect the concerns of their age and culture. Only when these concerns are grasped, he maintains, can modern commentators see the relevance of early Christian writings to economic controversies today. And so, after the introductory survey, C. examines the theory of wealth in the early Church by taking as measuring rod Clement of Alexandria’s sustained discussion of the rich and their wealth. But, C. asks, is Clement’s thought truly representative of early Christianity? He checks this out by a detailed comparison between Clement’s work and other ancient Christian writings on wealth and almsgiving. He finds substantial concurrence.

Next C. examines the practice of early Christians. What precisely was the role of the rich in the Christian Church of the first three centuries? How did they behave? And how was their behavior viewed by their fellow Christians? His conclusion: the early Church saw wealth as a clear danger to the rich, insofar as they run the risk of an “unhealthy attachment” to their material possessions. On the other hand, the rich are a clear danger to the Church, for their benefactions to the poor make them rivals of the clergy for leadership.

Finally, C. tests his results by exploring the works of Cyprian of Carthage, who has left us “much the broadest... picture of the interaction of ideas and social realities in the ancient Church.” Here he finds a body of thought which is consonant with the earlier tradition and which sums it up. Thus Cyprian recommends detachment, simplicity of life, and almsgiving. Further, he sees the rich as absolutely necessary for the
Church's welfare program, but marginal in the Church's life and tending to insubordination.

All in all, an excellent study. One caution, however. Repeatedly in the book, C. states that early Christian writers advocated the belief that the rich could "purchase" their way into heaven by almsgiving and claims that such a belief is a "crude and potent statement of the doctrine of salvation by works" and a harbinger of "much medieval trouble." Perhaps. But the same charge could be leveled against Jesus' own teaching on almsgiving, were it divorced from the NT theology of atonement. To focus on almsgiving and neglect its place in the full doctrine of early Christian Fathers on redemption is to pay insufficient attention to the emphasis which they placed on almsgiving as an expression of one's heartfelt gratitude to Christ the Savior and of one's passionate concern for his/her impoverished brothers and sisters in the Church.

_Baltimore, Md._

WILLIAM J. WALSH, S.J.


Alan Kreider, of the London Mennonite Center, has devoted five years to the lofty avocation of translating (on the basis of Oliver Coburn's earlier version) this richly documented patristic study by the French Reformed pastor Jean-Michel Hornus. For H. himself, who published the original version in 1960 and revised it in the succeeding decade, the work stands as a fitting monument to a life of scholarship. The simple ratio of the text to the endnotes bespeaks the seriousness of the study: 75 pages of notes for a text of just over 200 pages.

The work traces the evolution of Christian attitudes to war in sometimes tedious detail. Yet, fortunately, the outlines of the forest remain visible. H. argues that the ambiguity of the early Christian attitudes towards the moral legitimacy of state-employed violence represented different philosophical perspectives of the various commentators. Tertullian represented the positive appreciation of the utility of imperial organization, while Hippolytus in the _Apostolic Tradition_ reveals the unworldly face of the Church, damning Christian involvement in the execution of justice or the maintenance of security.

Such ambiguity in Christian responses to the exigencies of political life is judiciously placed in the context of the small Christian community's life within the empire, which provided for Church members' mundane needs in those times when it was not actively persecuting the Church. As they gradually grew in number, and inexorably in responsibility, within
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

the empire, such evasion of personal choice between anarchy and order became insupportable. At this point the Church chose involvement in political life even at the cost of assuming moral responsibility for decisions of life and death.

This evolution, whose detailed progress is much clearer because of H.'s careful scholarship, is repugnant to the author. He reveals his own views quite candidly in both the opening and closing pages (e.g., 16, 226). Earlier, for H., is better; the primitive Church is purer. Another prejudice surfaces in his claim that the Church's accommodation to the usages of conventional politics was due to its prior fateful choice of a two-tiered morality which reserved the practice of perfection to the monastic clergy and tolerated lesser ideals in the rest of the Church (185–89). Reasonable readers may well take offense at such polemical analysis.

The volume, containing a superb table of patristic sources and ample bibliography, strangely lacks an index.

Georgetown University
FRANCIS X. WINTERS, S.J.


The most famous concept which Irenaeus has bequeathed to Christian theology is probably that of recapitulation, which figures in this book, although B.'s main interest centers on several related issues: human liberty, God's grace, and their relationship.

The opening chapter sets Irenaeus and his work in their historical context and shows how theories on salvation, liberty, and grace developed from contemporary attempts to explain the tragic condition of human life. B. then analyzes the Valentinian Gnostic answer to this problem, as described and refuted by Irenaeus in his Adversus haereses. He argues that Irenaeus was both well informed and objective on this topic, and concludes that Gnosticism, at least in this form, was an innovation developed within second-century Christianity as a response to the aforementioned problems of human tragedy, despite the influence on it from Oriental religion and philosophy, Judaism, Greek philosophy (Platonism and Stoicism in particular), and Johannine and Pauline ideas.

B. then discusses Gnostic anthropology and the problem of liberty in that context. He finds the key to Gnostic teaching in its division of humans into three groups: pneumatics (true Gnostics, few in number, who will be saved because of what they are, not what they do); earthly people (the mass of humans, condemned on the same principle according to which the pneumatics are saved); psychics (members of the orthodox
Church, whose fate is not fixed by nature and therefore depends on whether or not they choose to follow Gnostic teaching). Only the psychics have freedom of choice, but this power is, for the Gnostics, a clear sign of imperfection. This anthropology is based on a radical dualism which says that matter is evil and that salvation consists in an escape from this world to a pleroma, which is the domicile of a totally transcendent supreme being who has no relationship whatsoever with this imperfect world. Salvation comes through knowledge, not faith, and thus human liberty, as a response to grace offered by a loving God through an incarnate savior, has no meaning.

Irenaeus develops his theology in response to such a system, but, according to B., it is a statement which is at the root of later patristic thought, both Eastern and Western (253). To counter what he saw as a major threat to Christian life, Irenaeus explained a doctrine which he had received from Scripture and the tradition of the Church; its cosmology depends on the immanent activity of a transcendent but loving God. This world and humanity are therefore good; freedom is not a sign of imperfection but a means of developing human possibilities and of achieving human perfection, which consists in union with God. God's grace, offered through Christ, does not negate that freedom or fix the destiny of an individual human; instead, it liberates humans from the power of sin and death and makes true human freedom possible. These are a few of the themes developed by B., and they indicate the richness of Irenaeus' thought.

One could argue that B. is too optimistic about the depth and objectivity of Irenaeus' knowledge of Gnosticism, just as many would disagree with his conclusions about the origins of Gnosticism as a movement; he does refer to the Nag Hammadi material, but draws mainly from documents in the Valentinian tradition, which support his arguments. B.'s scope is therefore limited, but his positions seem defensible within the boundaries he has drawn. While his work can serve as a useful guide to Irenaeus' understanding of Gnosticism, its major contribution lies in his analysis of Irenaeus' personal theology.

_Fordham University_  
GERARD H. ETLINGER, S.J.


These two monographs present from different perspectives important
currents in the fourth century. Winslow, in his revision of a 1966 doctoral dissertation, attempts a systematic study of the theology of Gregory of Nazianzus. He finds the concept of theósis to be “the primary interpretative tool” for that theology, a concept that Gregory employs more frequently and more consistently than any of his predecessors. Theósis within the economy of salvation designates “a process having its initial roots in the purposes of creation, a purpose recreated in the incarnate life and death of Christ, perfected in the economy of the Holy Spirit, appropriated individually in baptism, as well as in ascetic and philanthropic imitation, and finally realized in the future life.” In this one sentence W. sums up the central chapters (3–7) of his work. He sees theósis as a metaphor having six dimensions: (1) spatial (anabasis), (2) visual (illumination), (3) epistemological (theōría), (4) ethical (mimēsis), (5) corporate (henōsis), (6) social (koinōnia). For all six, theósis is the one “shorthand” metaphor in Gregory’s theological language.

W. forcefully stresses that Gregory’s doctrine of the Trinity is rooted in soteriology. The predominance of soteriological concerns in his theology testifies to his anthropological concern. This study strives to articulate the unifying aspects of Gregory’s theology. The lines it takes are valid, even already studied before. The unity delineated, while real, is, in the opinion of this reviewer, something of a simplification of Gregory’s mentality and needs the counterbalance of a broader perspective, one that encompasses as well the Hellenistic background of his thought. At least a sketch in this direction can be found in D. Tsame’s 1969 monograph The Dialectical Character of the Teaching of St. Gregory the Theologian (a work not listed in W.’s bibliography), which explored five dialectical problems: change and permanency, estrangement and security, retirement and mission, faith and knowledge, fall and theosis of man.

The absence of an index is regrettable. Paroikia (169) should be translated as “sojourn” and not as “journey.”

Kopecek’s two-volume history of Neo-Arianism has as its goal the “clarification of the history of Aetius and Eunomius and their brand of Arianism.” Chap. 1 presents a chronological sketch of the Arian debate in its inception. Chap. 2 picks up with the early career of Aetius. Vol. 1 ends with chap. 4, which brings us to the Syntagmation of Aetius and the eve of the Synod of Constantinople in 359/60, i.e., to the turning point in the history of the movement. Vol. 2 traces the career of Eunomius following the eclipse of Aetius and the transformation of Neo-Arianism from a party to a sect and its final decline and disappearance in the reign of Theodosius. Particularly intriguing are the social and personal aspects stressed by Kopecek. George of Cappadocia, Aetius, and Eunomius are all characterized as “aggressively ambitious” and all are socially linked as self-made men coming from the fringes of fourth-century society. (A
striking contrast with their Cappadocian opponents, e.g., Gregory of Nazianzus, the bishop's son, by automatically receiving the best possible education available at Athens, had much less formal training in theology than the struggling Aetius, who had to rely on a charitable acceptance by a bishop for free theological studies.) The historical approach to this golden age of theology sadly underlines the fact that the "most powerful bishops of the eastern church were less interested in theological advance than in ecclesiastical politics." Despite their aggressive ambition rooted in the poverty of their origins, both Aetius and Eunomius emerge as men also sincerely dedicated to an intellectual position. An irony of history is that both the champions of Neo-Arianism and Gregory of Nazianzus, the defender of orthodoxy, ultimately fell victim in their careers to the machinations of their more politically-minded colleagues. As a movement in theology, Neo-Arianism falls under the criticism already lodged against it by Gregory of being reductionist, reducing faith and the life of faith to the narrowness of "propositional doctrine as the sole way to salvation" (p. 499). Concerned as he was with "right doctrine," Gregory never did that, stressing as he did that even the best theology is only a poor approximation of the divine incomprehensibility and providing a theology even for extrasacramental salvation (cf. Winslow 37-40). Behind the doctrinal differences lies also the Aristotelian syllogistic approach almost instinctively embraced by Aetius to become the foundation of the movement, and the Platonic approach equally instinctively embraced by the Cappadocians.

Norfolk, Va.  

John T. Cummings


One theme that links these three books is that Roger was Bishop of Worcester during the conflict of Thomas Becket of Canterbury with King Henry II; Winchelsey was Archbishop of Canterbury and had difficulties with Kings Edward I and II as well as with certain former royal clerks including Walter Reynolds, who served successively as Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of Canterbury, the latter in fact as Winchelsey's successor. Reynolds' dealings with the crown are the major concern of
the third study. All three books show the enduring strength of the crown in relation to the bishops regardless of the century and a half that separated Roger from Reynolds.

To be a friend of Becket and a cousin of Henry II was a difficult burden, but Roger bore it well, as this study shows. Our limited sources restrict any personal view of the man. He was the first from his circle to begin an ecclesiastical career by attending a university, but we do not even know if he spoke English or if he ever preached. He acted as judge-delegate for Pope Alexander III on many occasions, but did he ever study law? These are but a few of the questions that remain open even after the obviously wide-ranging research that went into this work.

Cheney considers Roger under a series of headings: the Becket affair; the bishop in his diocese; the judge-delegate; the bishop and the law; his later years (1172–79). Under the first topic, Roger is shown to have been caught between conflicting loyalties and promises of obedience. He became the Bishop of Worcester in the same year as the Council of Clarendon, which precipitated the crisis in the English Church. Part of the fascination of this famous dispute is the ambiguity that surrounds the actions of so many of the participants, not least Roger and the pope. Alexander III was not so sure of his own position that he could intervene decisively; even if he did, he still required someone on the spot in England who would be bold or foolhardy and loyal enough to carry out his most peremptory commands. In the whole affair Roger at least had the courage to endure exile in support of his convictions, but all through the dealings and disputes of Henry and Roger there was the fact that they were cousins and friends from childhood and thus each would only go so far against the other and so no ultimate break ever occurred.

The next chapters deal with Roger’s episcopal duties and show the concerns of that era. But even here the evidence tells us not so much about the normal as the abnormal, the aberrations and evils with which he dealt. In addition, there survives a treatise written at his order by a learned monk which confronts the theological difficulties occasioned by the development of indulgences. Roger also had to decide what to do with judicial duels and their participants in regard to confession and burial. He requested and obtained a papal letter, Inter cetera, giving directives on clerical marriage and on the inheritance of benefices. Questions of advowson, exempt churches, and the rights and powers of the king came to him for settlement. Despite his interests and achievements, we have no record of any visitation or synod conducted by Roger. Yet he was part of the movement by which the new legal system came to northern Europe and to England in particular. This system depended upon the selection and quality of the judges involved, and so Roger was heavily burdened especially with cases of prominent people. His ability, virtues, and con-
nections made him an obvious choice. C. makes it clear that the local bishops and judges, in petitioning the curia for directives and decisions, strongly influenced the formulation of papal policy. It is no accident that so much from Alexander III survived in English sources.

As with a good part of his life, Roger's death is surrounded by unknowns. He died near Tours from some epidemic and so did not live to attend the council at the Lateran to which he had been headed. He was only fifty at death and his life had been full. He had lent the support of an able and aristocratic bishop to the reform movement of his day and so pushed it towards success, as this fine study demonstrates.

The book on Winchelsey also demonstrates the difficult life of a bishop caught between conflicting forces. Winchelsey was Archbishop of Canterbury when England was having problems with Edward I and II; this situation was compounded for the bishop by a papal vacancy and then the character of the three popes who followed: Celestine V, Boniface VIII, and Clement V. As a tenant-in-chief of the king, Winchelsey was caught up in the disputes of the nobility with the king; as a churchman, his stance for the liberty of the Church did not always receive support from other prelates or even from the popes. As a result, he would suffer outlawry, suspension, and excommunication. Ironically, he was succeeded as archbishop by the man whom he saw as representing what he opposed, Walter Reynolds. The sources record conflicting views of W.'s life and rule depending on the party of their authors. This study presents a fair and judicious evaluation of the man and his career; it also tells about the problems he faced and why there were difficulties.

Winchelsey was a learned man concerned with scholarship. He looked for these qualities in ecclesiastical candidates. He was committed to what he saw as the defense of clerical liberties, and so he achieved a posthumous reputation for sanctity among circles that opposed his successor's policy of granting more power over the Church to the king; but there was no unanimity among churchmen on these questions. The English hierarchy was a disparate group: some were university trained, some not; some were monks, most not; there were former royal clerks among their ranks, but even this distinction cannot be pushed too far, although the contrast between Winchelsey and men such as Langton and Reynolds is quite clear.

The key to W.'s problems with both kings and popes was the taxation question. The issue did not allow an easy solution, for Edward I stressed the necessity and obligation of all to support him in defense of the realm at a critical time (war with France and Scotland). W. stressed the point that consent of the clergy was needed for any tax to be imposed on them. In the midst of all this there was the papal decree Clericis laicos, which prohibited such taxation without papal approval. The king's hand on the
clergy was pretty harsh and caused much suffering for those who stood with Winchelsey. For a time W. was down but then he won the support of the nobles who opposed the king on other grounds. His stance for the principle of consent was undermined by the papal policy of conciliation with the king. Moreover, papal policy stressed its permission for taxation of clergy, while the English Church defended the consent of those being taxed, and so there was a real difference between these two positions. When a Gascon pope (Clement V) was elected, W. soon found himself abandoned and fighting a lone battle, which he lost. In the decades that followed, papal taxes which the clergy in England could not refuse became royal subsidies. W.'s other key issues, nonresidence and pluralism, were also lost when papal exemptions were freely granted to royal clerks.

One can ask: Was Winchelsey a failure in that as a conservative he did not exercise any constructive influence over the kings and on his death both pope and king joined together to appoint a more malleable successor? But for W., the critical question always remained how far he could go, where he should draw the line in adapting, in compromising his vision and his duty as he saw it. This excellent study shows us one man faced with these choices and what they entailed.

The title of the third study is indicative, for Wright concentrates on the relationship of crown and church in the period 1305-34 rather than on the person of Reynolds. To be sure, his major source is R.'s Register, but the concern is more with the actions of the Archbishop than with the man himself. The study centers on three topics: papal provisions, safeguarding the royal prerogative, and conflict and co-operation within the realm. The power of the king is shown in that, although the pope was blamed for imposing papal tenths on the realm, the king was able to hold onto 92% of the money collected in this manner. Starting from this demonstration of royal power, W. shows that in the matter of provisions England was hardly a hapless victim of foreign rapacity and exploitation, as was the view of some earlier writers. Between 1305-34, about 850 provisions were made; most vacancies went to English clerks and at the behest of English bishops. Few went to aliens and most of those that did went to royal clerks. In fact, there was a common point of view of both pope and king, who saw benefices as a way of paying their own servants, and so both were rivals of the English episcopate, which tried and to some degree succeeded in maintaining control of patronage. Reynolds is portrayed as a leader of the bishops in this cause.

The English kings were successful in defending their prerogatives in this period and did so by skilful manipulation of their contacts at the curia in Avignon, by using the benefices and the promotion system to solicit or reward favors. The crown knew well the value of a well-placed cardinal. In addition, certain privileges were claimed by England in regard
to the papal courts. W. shows that while it began with an appeal to a special privilege, the crown and the realm in time converted this from an appeal to privilege to the right of ancient custom that they could not be called to answer in court outside of England. In England there was not the anticlericalism found in the French royal court, since often the future church leaders came from the king's clerks. In addition, within England the crown could block action in a case by a writ which prohibited the case from ecclesiastical courts, but it could also work hand in glove with church leaders by writs of consultation or by getting the Church to condemn its enemies. In these circumstances it is perhaps understandable that the leaders of the English Church often showed concern only about their own local rights and had little care for wider or theoretical issues.

W. finally presents his view of Reynolds in these events. R. remains a shadowy figure, criticized by many for his apparent policy of working with the ruling power whoever that might be. His critics also charged him with simony and illiteracy, but these are rejected, although he was clearly not the intellectual type his predecessor had been. He had risen in life as a successful royal clerk and had served the king well. As archbishop, he worked as a mediator and a force for stability and accommodation. He had made a clear and clean break with the policies and personality of Winchelsey and gained the confidence of both king and pope, which Winchelsey had not done. In his life and actions he steered a careful course and was if anything overly hesitant before any controversial act. Indecision in a bishop in such troubled times for both the monarchy in England and the papacy in Avignon is perhaps understandable, but one sentence by W. seems to offer a harsher judgement: "Reynolds was not a man to risk alienation of the crown if he could help it" (270). Unlike the two bishops considered in the other studies, Reynolds seems never to have pushed this question very far as to his respective duties towards the crown and the Church. The book closes with a number of useful appendices which can be consulted in filling out the picture of Reynolds's life and actions; especially useful are the detailed itinerary from 1313 to 1327 and the extensive bibliography.

In all, the medieval English Church has been well served by these three studies, which show the futility of attempting a stereotype of the medieval bishop. And yet the problems bishops faced were indeed perennial. The crown grew in strength and knew how to make use of the very machinery of church government for its own ends. The importance of the personality and leanings of the individual bishop is made clear and they were determinative, but also the personality and propensities of the reigning pontiff shaped the responses of their fellow bishops. It was lonely and unrewarding for a bishop to take a firm stance on the liberty of the Church as he saw this, and then to have the pope reverse his own policies
for political reasons or because of the insecurity of his position and so leave the bishop high and dry, or even worse join together with the king in a joint attack on the bishop, as Winchelsey experienced.

The three men discussed come down in history as more or less controversial in that in varying degrees they tried to balance conflicting loyalties. Roger was criticized by royal sources as disloyal and by supporters of the Becket cause as too hesitant, and so, although he suffered exile, his image was not completely a shining one. Winchelsey took a firm, perhaps even an unyielding, position on ecclesiastical liberty when this term was shifting meaning, but also when such a stance could and did become mixed in with other political movements, and so he suffered in his lifetime and in his memory. Reynolds bent over backwards to accommodate; he reversed the policies he had inherited and so alienated the party of church liberty as they saw it, but he did win some victories for this cause. His picture too was not free of rancor or condemnation. In such circumstances how could a medieval English bishop win? Perhaps it was impossible, but at least with these studies we have a good picture of how difficult their task was and how lonely their position of power always remained.

State University College
Fredonia, N.Y.

Thomas E. Morrissey


Aside from Luther himself, Melanchthon is the most interesting and influential theologian during Lutheranism’s formative period. Ever since his own day intense debate has arisen over the degree to which Melanchthon adheres to or departs from the theology of Luther and the Lutheran confessional documents not only on justification and good works but also in his Eucharistics, his use of philosophy in theological method, and other areas. M. explores the content and development of Melanchthon’s teaching on good works from his first extensive treatment in his answer to the Catholic Confutatio of the Augsburg Confession down to the last edition of his Loci communes in 1559. M. takes up chronologically each of Melanchthon’s writings that develop the doctrine of good works and tries to show its evolution against the dual background of his theological development and of the controversies within early Lutheranism. Melanchthon’s treatment was influenced by his dealings with the Catholics at the Colloquy of Regensburg and other contacts, as well as the attacks on him by Flacius Illyricus and by the atmosphere of the Osiandrian controversy. As is well known, Luther was far more indulgent toward
innovations by Melanchthon than by his other disciples. M. also shows that nontheological factors such as astrology (Melanchthon felt that the stars indicated an impending crisis) influenced his theology.

A short review cannot trace all the steps in that development. Melanchthon argued that good works are necessary for the Christian life. Justified believers will necessarily do good works, which are a sine qua non of salvation, but these works do not cause the remission of sin and do not merit salvation, although they may merit other rewards from God. Righteousness is imputed to man because of Christ, who alone merits salvation and causes the remission of sin. Men receive righteousness from outside themselves. Indeed, personal religious experience of our terrified conscience before God testifies to us that our works have no value and cannot appease God's wrath. Increasingly the later editions of his Loci communes employ formal theses and syllogisms to support Melanchthon's doctrine of good works.

M.'s book is an unchanged photo reproduction of his dissertation typescript together with a new preface and an index. Despite careful organization and clear, serene writing, the book, like most dissertations, makes for dull reading. No previous work deals with the topic in such detail, and it is surely good to see how and why Melanchthon's thought developed. Still, I feel that M. would have done better service if in addition to tracing Melanchthon's development he had faced more squarely Melanchthon's contemporary critics and modern scholarship. Only in his introduction and conclusion, and there mainly in passing, does M. deal with other Melanchthon scholars. Sometimes M. overstates Melanchthon's importance: "Lutheranism itself has taken its form from Melanchthon rather than from Luther." "Melanchthon's teachings . . . [are] perhaps more influential than Luther's . . ." The bibliography includes works up to 1978. The price is too high for a photo reprint of a typescript.

Marquette University

JOHN PATRICK DONELLY, S.J.


In this valuable little book the world's foremost Galileo scholar politely offers an invaluable message to that vast public of otherwise informed and discerning readers and writers who have long been effectively conditioned by institutionalized sentiment to accept uncritically either one or the other of two standardized interpretations of Galileo. In one portrait Galileo is glamorized as the intuitive hero of iconoclastic science who, even in advance of convincing evidence, instinctively challenged be-nighted tradition. In the other, Galileo is caricatured as an irresponsible troublemaker who compromised the case for serious science by needlessly
baiting the police powers of a society then under siege insofar as any Catholic revision of the literal sense of sun and earth and star texts in the Bible would automatically legitimize the Protestant principle of private interpretation of even Eucharistic and other critical ecclesiastical passages.

Drake successfully argues that both of these pictures are fakes and each fatally incompatible with the complete historical record; for when all the evidence is accepted without selective omissions for irrelevant reasons, Galileo emerges as a zealot indeed, not for Copernican astronomy as most mistakenly imagine, but rather, as too few now realize, for the future of his beloved Catholic Church and for the permanent immunization of all religious faith against any scientific disclosure of whatever kind. Galileo thus risked everything in his solo crusade to prevent his Church from adopting either side of any controverted scientific question and suppressing its rival as a matter of faith. If his Church were to suppress anything, Galileo pleaded, it should forbid the interpolation of scriptural authority into any scientific debates about matters of fact that could only be satisfactorily settled by experience and reason combined.

To the end Galileo’s own conscience was clean and clear both as Catholic and as scientist. On one occasion he wrote, almost in despair over his traumatic repudiation by the Church he loved, that at times he felt like burning all his work in science. But the same Galileo never so much as thought of turning his back on his faith. The Church turned its back on Galileo, and still suffers not a little for having done so. How did it all happen? Drake persuasively suggests, as Galileo also did, that bureaucratic administrators of a pilgrim church succumbed to the pressure of their theologian advisors (periti), who were themselves beguiled by the comfortable blandishments of a handmaiden (ancilla) philosophy of common sense, readily absorbed by passive indoctrination and perpetuated without genuine intellectual effort of any kind. It is a sobering thought for all aspirants to theological reflection who allow their philosophical competence to petrify.

I find the book sound, solid, scholarly but not pedantic, innovatively sensitive to heretofore neglected texts, and professionally sincere. Other amateur Galileo students may join me in gently chiding the author for permitting an avowed hypothesis (67) to become over the short space of five pages a determinative fact (72), or for understating in his favor the full import of denunziata in Bellarmine’s affidavit (67). But these two and some few other technical blemishes do not in any way lessen the massive impact of these few deft pages by one past master about another. This is the only biography in which I feel that Galileo would recognize his full self rather than the partial papier-mâché images into which others
have cruelly metamorphosed him for polemical purposes. The index is usable, the reading list choice and generous, and the absence of typos a welcome bonus.

_Canisius College, Buffalo_  
JOSEPH T. CLARK, S.J.


What Newman was to the English-speaking world of the nineteenth century, Ignaz von Döllinger was to the German: church historian and ecclesiastical apologist, theological littérature and political figure, whose followers were as faithful as his opponents were unforgiving. Similarly, in parallel to the renewed interest in Newman's theological thought, in recent years growing attention has been given to Döllinger's theology (cf. _TS_ 40 [1979] 296; 42 [1981] 151–53).

D.'s scholarly life can be divided into three almost equal parts. The first—from the time of his doctoral dissertation on the Eucharist in the early Church and his appointment as professor of church history at Munich (1826) to the Congress of Frankfurt, which he attended as a Bavarian representative (1848–49)—was characterized by both his theological emphasis on the apostolicity of the early Church and his caustic polemics against the Protestant failure to preserve the requisite apostolicity. The second period—from mid-century to the promulgation of _Pastor aeternus_ by Vatican I (1870)—was marked by a growing insistence on the necessity and freedom of historical investigation in theology and by a corresponding disenchantment with papal political claims defending the pope's temporal power and with ultramontane ecclesiological exaggerations that aggrandized papal prerogatives at the expense of the apostolicity of the episcopate. The third phase—from his excommunication (1871) by Archbishop Gregor von Scherr (who had sided with the opposition at Vatican I) to his death (1890) when he received the last rites from Johann Friedrich, an Old Catholic priest and D.'s later biographer—was highlighted by his persistent animosity towards Roman Catholicism, his ambivalent involvement in the Old Catholic movement, and his precocious ecumenical insights and initiatives.

These three stages in D.'s academic career have received unequal attention. The first part has failed to retain much attraction because the polemical tone of his writings is no longer congenial and his historical scholarship has been superseded. The second part has long been the center of interest, since his objections to the proposed definitions of papal jurisdictional primacy and infallibility were not only the most vitriolic voiced by any Roman Catholic, but also apparently the most valid.
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These three stages in D.’s academic career have received unequal attention. The first part has failed to retain much attraction because the polemical tone of his writings is no longer congenial and his historical scholarship has been superseded. The second part has long been the center of interest, since his objections to the proposed definitions of papal jurisdictional primacy and infallibility were not only the most vitriolic voiced by any Roman Catholic, but also apparently the most valid
defended by any church historian. The third phase has received little more than cursory consideration outside Old Catholic circles; thus Neu- ner's investigation fills in details of a portrait that was previously sketchy.

D.'s rejection of Pastor aeternus was counteracted by his archbishop's demand for submission; when D. declined, he was speedily excommuni- cated. Perhaps the scenario was enacted too hastily; there is reason to speculate that D., if given more time, might have eventually accepted the Vatican decrees. In any case, D. was excommunicated before the last of the German anti-infallibilist bishops (Hefele of Rottenburg) had submit­ ted. Moreover, D. felt that the way his excommunication was publicized was needlessly humiliating—a feeling that frustrated subsequent over­ tures to obtain his reconciliation. Though observing the penalties im­ posed, he considered his excommunication unjust and so more injurious to the salvation of the excommunicator than to the detriment of the excommunicated.

Whatever its spiritual effects, D.'s excommunication occasioned his election as rector magnificus of the University of Munich and his appoint­ ment to the presidency of the Royal Bavarian Academy of Science. With such manifestations of support, it seems surprising that D. did not attract a larger following to the Old Catholic movement. The explanation seems to lie in his theologically based style of leadership, which was more issue­ oriented than process-directed. Thus, though D. believed that many had accepted the Vatican decrees only externally, he did not try to lead others away from Roman Catholicism; rather, his initial protest was operative within Catholicism. Correspondingly, D. saw the Old Catholics as mem­ bers of the Church "in need" of its sacramental life, so that dissenting priests were entitled to celebrate Mass, administer baptism, witness marriages, conduct funerals, etc., whenever the Roman clergy refused to provide these spiritual services. If such a view is theologically justifiable, it was practically untenable, so that the Old Catholic movement, in a departure from D.'s original intentions, soon became a separate ecclesi­ astical body.

D. seems to have had misgivings about the Old Catholic congresses, where he felt doctrinal issues were settled by majority vote instead of theological deliberation. In contrast, he was definitely in his element at the Church Union conferences at Bonn in 1874 and 1875. These meetings, organized and moderated by D., brought together Anglican, Orthodox, and Old Catholic theologians for the purpose of formulating a doctrinal consensus that could serve as the basis for church confederation. The participants achieved a surprising amount of agreement, not only in regard to the acceptance of the ancient creeds but even in such volatile areas as mutual recognition of ordination and intercommunion. The actual results, however, were minimal; ecclesiastical authorities were
upset by opposition from one disgruntled participant (Overbeck) and D. realized that the time was not ripe for further dialogue. Moreover, D.'s basic principle—*unitas in necessariis, libertas in dubiis*—was deficient: in accepting the teachings of the early Church as necessary for unity, one cannot simply discard later doctrinal developments as nonessential and negotiable.

Neuner's book, though partially dependent on Finsterhölzl's *Die Kirche in der Theologie Ignaz von Döllingers bis zum ersten Vatikanum* (1975), is valuable for its treatment of D.'s life and thought in relation to contemporary ecumenical endeavors. On the one hand, N.'s analysis of selected writings highlights an otherwise neglected facet of D.'s theology; on the other hand, the thematization of D.'s historically based thought seems to lack organic unity—a flaw that may have been more Döllinger's deficiency than Neuner's responsibility.

*Catholic University of America*  
JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


This book is primarily a collection of sixty-eight letters from Tyrrell to Ward. Only Tyrrell's letters are presented because no letters from Ward to Tyrrell survive; Tyrrell destroyed most letters written to him. Also contained in the book as appendices are: (a) a previously unpublished article by Tyrrell entitled “Who Are the Reactionaries?”; (b) “The Church and Liberal Catholicism: A Joint Pastoral Letter,” published in 1901 by the Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of the Province of Westminster “to sound a note of warning and to set forth at some length certain doctrines that may be needed for the guidance of the faithful” (133); (c) two letters relating to “Semper eadem,” a critical review by Tyrrell of a book of collected essays by Ward; (d) several letters from Tyrrell to Mrs. Wilfrid Ward; and (e) five letters from Tyrrell to Maria Longworth Storer, the wife of an American diplomat.

The sixty-eight letters from Tyrrell to Ward are the main reason for this book's importance. The correspondence, though one-sided, is a study not only of the growth and deterioration of the friendship between Tyrrell and Ward, but also a study of the liberal Catholicism of the late nineteenth century and the Modernist crisis of the early twentieth. That these two men could have been friends at all is somewhat puzzling. Tyrrell, the Jesuit priest and writer, was condemned as a Modernist and excommunicated from the Roman Catholic Church. Ward, also a writer, was a very successful biographer of Nicholas Wiseman, the first archbishop of Westminster after the Roman Catholic hierarchy was restored.
in England in 1850, and also of John Henry Cardinal Newman. Both Tyrrell and Ward could claim Newman as their mentor, although each would come to see his mentor in a different light as time passed. Ironically, the Tyrrell-Ward correspondence begins and ends with discussions of Newman’s thought. The point of difference which eventually led to the demise of their relationship was a difference in interpretation of Newman’s ideas. Ward argued for moderation—a *via media*—in meeting the religious problems of the day; he hoped that Newman’s work could be a basis for an effective apologetic for those times. Tyrrell, on the other hand, came to see Newman as inadequate to meet the contemporary problems or answer the sophisticated questions being posed at the time. Interestingly, Tyrrell wrote that Newman had been condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi*, an opinion which Ward may have privately held.

Tyrrell’s style is typically provocative, humorous, scathing, and towards Ward, increasingly exasperated as the correspondence continues. Ward always remains sanguine about the Church; Tyrrell grows increasingly pessimistic. As the exchange comes to an end, one can only feel sadness when, by Letter 68, the friendship lies in ashes.

The book is carefully edited. The notes after each letter are very helpful; they set the context which illuminates the letters as well as the turbulent historical period in which they were written. One minor error is found in Letter 14, which probably should be dated 1900 rather than 1908. The editor makes certain that the reader becomes acquainted with the personalities mentioned by Tyrrell; her brief identifications take care of this. As a result of the thorough introduction and notes throughout, this collection will serve as good background material for students of the Modernist crisis and the personalities caught up in it. It is unfortunate that some prospective readers may be discouraged by the price.

*Durham, N.C.*

FRANCIS M. O’CONNOR, S.J.


King has fastened on a central thread of Teilhard’s thought; the proof of that emerges from the way his main contention both compels and enables him to confront and weave together virtually every aspect of the Teilhardian “system”: matter and its relation to spirit, the dynamism of life and the evolving nature of human truth, person and the All, spiritual growth and diminishment, and many others as well. Plundering not only the published works in their entirety but also retreat journals and unpublished notes, K. shows cogently that Teilhard’s mysticism was a mysticism of “knowing” rather than of “unknowing,” but also (quite so cogently?) that his notion of knowing on all its levels was penetrated with
the mystical dynamism into which all human knowing is ineluctably drawn.

The amazing compression K. achieves in presenting his case (he writes a brisk but liquid prose) only underlines the comprehensiveness of this compact book—compact, but of rare importance. K.’s instinct was sure: dwell with enough “baffling” texts from a superior mind and surprises inevitably come in squadrons; Teilhard has more and deeper things to say than our sometimes pedestrian expectations would assume.

Among those surprises, two stand out: first, the “reversal” of Teilhard’s original attitude toward matter as the unifying cosmic milieu, a reversal that brings him to regard form and spirit as the decisive unifier; this leads into the second surprise, the strongly idealist cast of the man’s mature thinking: the entire material universe is lured and driven to become idea. Does enmattered spirit, then, ultimately shear off into pure disembodied spirit? K. deals candidly with this profound ambiguity: it may dramatize the revenge won by a Platonism from which Teilhard so often professed himself disaffected.

This book, then, gives us much to think about, as well as a fresh set of angles from which that thinking may fruitfully be done. But it makes it more evident than ever that understanding Teilhard means understanding a difficult and important thinker; it takes hard work, of the kind that K. has admirably done. No negligible service of this work is K.’s litany of warnings on how often English translators of Teilhard clearly failed to understand his French.

K.’s work does leave us, though, with some questions: the strongly synthetic cast of his enterprise may have led him to blur important articulations and distinctions in Teilhard’s own acknowledgment of the “degrees of knowledge.” Specifically, K.’s repeated allusion to Teilhard’s lyrical description of (clearly, scientific) “hypothesis” and its workings might encourage the hasty conclusion that the scientist must consent to be a mystic even if malgré lui. That conclusion would eviscerate the man’s explicit claim that, in a number of his works at least, he was operating on the “scientific” (better, purely “phenomenal”) plane of knowledge. That plane he was convinced (as Pierre Duhem had inspired him to think) is, and should resolutely remain, autonomous and independent of all theological, metaphysical, and in this case mystical commitments. That Teilhard came to see knowing in its entire compass as necessarily changing the object known, closer inspection may show that that proposal too calls for crucial qualifications.

A book as valuable as this would more usefully have come with an index, or even several. Some few printing errors mar its overall excellence. But no serious student of Teilhard, or thinker grappling with the vital
questions that preoccupied him, will fail to profit from this lively, and masterfully conducted, voyage of discovery.

Robert J. O'Connell, S.J.


These excellently conceived and clear lectures given at Gonzaga University, Spokane, in 1979 outline the programmatic character of Lonergan's life's work. Crowe in his lucid style has provided the generally educated reader with a protreptic for understanding the study of Lonergan as well as a sharply etched picture of how Lonergan has accomplished his own task.

The first lecture helpfully locates Lonergan in a tradition of intellectual analysis rooted in Aristotle and Francis Bacon. In light of both, C. argues that L. has not so much provided a series of content-oriented studies, but the organon for the integration of such disciplines. This organon is an intellectual instrument for recovering the past of our culture and for reforming our future achievements. As a means of investigation, L.'s organon installs a fundamental method of the incarnate subject at the base of a cultural edifice which may require some hundreds of years to complete. In the course of C.'s exposition, he offers some of the intellectual genesis of L.'s own work, "filling in the gaps" as only he can. The combination of L.'s intellectual history and the history of ideas is particularly fruitful for those who would prefer to set L. aside with labels such as "transcendental Thomist," "subjectivist metaphysician," or whatever. L.'s enterprise requires the commitment to a long view of the history of ideas, a faith in the worthwhile character of thinking itself. So if Aristotle's organon is abstract and only concretized in the medicine, physics, and metaphysics of specific works, and Bacon's Novum organum remains an implement of reason to control nature, L.'s fundamental method accounts for human cognitive operations which ground both the data of sense and consciousness, thus ordering the foundations of social being.

The second lecture focuses upon interiority and the problems inherent in appropriating one's own incarnate subjectivity; for if the goal is a new society, the means is an instrument called insight into one's own insights. To clarify L.'s own tightly knit prose, C. offers a useful application of L.'s functional specialties to his own work. So C. points out the data which will be encompassed by research into L., the kinds of interpretation which will best serve to understand L.'s texts; the historical studies (such as his own first lecture) which will situate L. within wider cultural history; the dialectics which allow existential appropriation of L. and the responsibility for being intellectual, moral, and religious persons. On the way, C.
answers major objections which have risen in recent years: the question of the unrevisability of the operations of intelligence, the private character of the intellectual experiment and its application to intersubjectivity, and the occasionally too-worshipful attitudes of L.'s disciples.

The final lecture schematically describes some of the items in a cultural agenda which will require attention in the adoption of L.'s instrumental organon; for the creation of a new philosophy, theology, and human science will be the work of collaborative disciplines. So there will be some restructuring of the past, the discovery of new data previously unattended to, the reordering of some research, and the revision of interpretations. Doctrines and the Scriptures become data to be understood and later to be reformulated for new ears and eyes. The existential commitment of theologians and their communities of discourse will be essential, requiring a transposition of neutral observers to engaged participants in the praxis of social order and disorder. There will be a confessional and prayerful element to this new theology which cannot be ignored. C. suggests concretely that some space like a "center of learning" will emerge as the societal matrix for such cognitive, existential religious encounters among theologians, with a return to public discourse and communications as essential. Different cultures will require different systems of discourse and the Church will constitute itself in these cultural indigenizations.

This well-wrought invitation to study L., or rather to enact the articulations for oneself of L.'s positions, does not of course answer all the problems it raises. Are there "neutral observers" (26), disinterested researchers and interpreters, in any discipline? Is the public world of language and its traditions precisely where the conversation of intersubjective interiorities occurs (68)? Is not the linguistic community of common sense (whether secular or religious) the (at least methodological) matrix for our personal achievements of interiority and therefore space for common agreement (69)? And even if one should agree that theology is more than an eleventh-twelfth century phase than in the thirteenth (90–91), are there more viable institutional expressions of intellectual, moral, and religious conversion than theological centers based upon the model of a retreat house (95)? Not that the theology of prayerful, committed, confessional thinkers may not begin there; but are there not creative public postures which theologians may take to be responsible for their own religious traditions and where the thoughtful of whatever cultural expression may take responsibility for the religious dimension of all experience? If Lonergan contributes to these dialogues, as Crowe and this reviewer believe, then the enterprise should be furthered in all the ways Crowe suggests.

St. Meinrad School of Theology

Stephen Happel

Tradition, as much as friendship, involves relationship and reciprocity. It is a gift to the living, who are by definition in a state of process and of growth. Tradition, properly understood, is not a narrowing inhibition but an invitation to growth within a tested perspective. In this volume we see a theologian, traditional in this noblest sense, at work. McCormick is a distinctly Catholic moral philosopher and theologian in a way that brings him naturally into dialogue with other traditions while he self-consciously drinks from the wellsprings of his own. He is not a traditionalist in the sense of those magisteriological positivists who disfigure ecclesiastical offices and statements by endowing them with oracular status. He is basically more conservative than his critics from the radical Catholic right. He seeks to conserve those achievements of the Catholic past that permit growth in fruitful continuity with the roots of the res catholica and that build links with the achievements that God has wrought in other traditions. Growth involves reaching, ramifying, filtering, retaining, rejecting, and surviving frequent failures. M.'s epistemology allows for this law of growth and so the distinguished "Notes on Moral Theology," so well served also in the recent past by Robert H. Springer, have flourished under his pen.

All of these "Notes" have been previously published in TS over the past sixteen years. Still, their republication in one volume makes good sense. Now the "Notes" for these years are indexed and packaged in a single volume. Searchers in ethics will turn to the "Notes" more readily given this convenience.

Having read all of these pages at least once before, I undertook this review in some dread of tedium. Some tedium there was, since not all of our quibbles are eternally exciting. More importantly, there grew in me an increased respect for this genre of writing and for M.'s specific achievement. In the brevity allowed me here, let me suggest some of the strengths of the institution that the "Notes" have become. Then I will respond to M.'s invitation that we theologians become "more critical of one another—in a courteous and disciplined way" (667) by offering gentle suggestions for improvement.

First, the "Notes" illustrate the unnaturalness of the division between theological and philosophical ethics and point toward the common ground of both disciplines. With some notable exceptions, philosophical ethicists take no account of theologically tainted ethics. This divorce proceeds from two elementary misconceptions: that "theological ethics," immersed as it is in faith and religious confessional concerns, does not speak to ethical theory or history, and secondly, that philosophical ethics operates
without affective biases or specifically theological loyalties. With all manageable courtesy it must be said that the innocence manifested by most philosophical ethicists of what theological ethicists are up to is appalling. The “Notes” are antidotal. In this regard they follow the Catholic tradition which has always stressed the compatibility of reason and religious experience.

Regarding ethical theory, this volume is heavy with it. Isolated philosophers would do well to sample it on issues such as the relationship of science to moral value, of premoral to moral value, of means to ends, and of consequential analysis to norms; the adequacy of the teleology/deontology dichotomy, the nature of reason, the role of affect in moral judgment, the disguised presence of faith options in supposedly neutral moral inquiry, the privatizing of moral imagination and the problem of moral communication. And more.

Pretensions to religious or theological neutrality are as dangerous as they are naïve. The basic questions to which theology addresses itself are unavoidable. They rise naturally in the shaping of a world view. There is not neutrality here. The only question is whether the positions one assumes are implicit and untested, or up front and under scrutiny. M. is regularly committed to asking the foundational questions that underlie the collision of arguments and principles. He could do more of it, as could we all, both philosophers and theologians. Such questioning could only ease the unnatural separateness of these two disciplines.

Of course, the main business of the “Notes” is to do a judicious analytical survey of the literature, show the state of the question, and react critically to it. This is obviously a tricky business. M. at his best is without peer in doing it. One example of M. at his best is in his treatment of *in vitro* fertilization with embryo transfer (787-800). In these pages M. leads us through some forty articles culled from the religious, legal, and scientific literature in North America and Europe. He inserts tough evaluative comments throughout, deals with all sides of the question, categorizes the main concerns of the debate, and then discusses the relationship of potential moral judgments to public policy. He concludes noting the likelihood that on this debated issue, as in the hot debate on abortion, scientific, religious, and moral matters are all contending. If anyone from any discipline wanted to enter the *in vitro* fertilization debate, it would be difficult to find a better statement of the question with suggested bibliographical follow-through than is found in these thirteen pages. Specialization in aspects of the case could follow, but one would then specialize out of a sense of the broader cultural picture that M. gives of this debate with few and deft strokes.

The “Notes,” of course, do not just reveal the strengths of the Catholic history and tradition; they also reveal the weaknesses. They reflect some
of the unproductive fixations that beset that tradition. They treat more of zygotes than of migrant workers, more of contraception than of sexism and racism, more of ecclesiastical teaching authority than of the growing possibility of nuclear holocaust. (M. is not creating but only refracting these Catholic preoccupations. And it is an encouraging augury that the last entry in the volume finally gets to "Nuclear Energy and Nuclear Arms.")

In spite of all of this, there is hope throughout the "Notes" because there is progress. An uncritical and passive acceptance of hierarchical teaching has been and for some still is a serious Catholic problem. M. describes the problem as a "paternalistic attitude toward teaching where the teacher possesses the truth and the taught are dispensed from personal reflection and assimilation, and are asked simply to accept. . . . If you belong to the club, you keep the rules of the club" (295). In the 1978 "Notes" M. can agree with Walter Burghardt's assertion that all teaching must be tested by the Word of God. "In so doing," says Burghardt, "we are not setting ourselves above Pope or bishop; we are collaborating with them in a joint effort to understand what God says to us and what God wants of us. The paradox, a humbling paradox, is that at times our very loyalty demands that we dissent" (quoted at 745). "To disagree with Burghardt here," says M., "is to be faithless to the theological task and to disappoint the Church" (ibid.). This shows distinct progress from M.'s earlier, more gingerly approach to magisterial teaching (see 19–20). Most Catholics have matured in this regard with much help from the Second Vatican Council. Some have not and remain a pastoral care. But the preoccupation of Catholics and the "Notes" with such problems has not been without fruit.

It should be insisted upon again that the "Notes" have not been totally fixated on private morality and Catholic ecclesiastical concerns. From M.'s first piece in 1965 there is concern with public morality. He also draws solid evangelical messages from "liberation theology" and argues that "the Church does indeed have a proper mission in the social, political, and economic areas" (616). From the beginning, too, M. has been in broad ecumenical dialogue. The "Notes" in his hands have never indulged in a sectarian Catholicism, though they have given special care to Catholic problems.

In brief and in praise: as early as 1965, M. pointed to "the inadequacy of our questions" in sexual ethics due to "their profound masculinity" (48). One is struck on rereading all of the "Notes" how often M. calls for courtesy in theological debate. He practices what he preaches, while showing that courtesy is not incompatible with congenial sharp licks; see, e.g., his characterizations of the work of Bernard Häring (340), Paul Ramsey (690), and Gustave Ermecke (690). Finally, and incidentally, it
is mischievously refreshing to note M.'s immunity to the Rawlsmania that has consumed so many; I find but one reference to Rawls in the 853 pages.

By way of constructive criticism, when the "Notes" nod, it is in the selection of either issues or authors to report on. M. himself calls for "a healthy shift in the focus of our moral concern" (472). He quotes Pope Paul on the sociopolitical responsibility of Christians: "These are questions that because of their urgency, extent, and complexity must, in the years to come, take first place among the preoccupations of Christians..." (ibid.). He quotes, too, the Synod address of Archbishop J. A. Plourde saying that the Church's "moral teaching must at all costs stop giving privileged treatment to private ethics, wherein sin is seen primarily as a private matter, rarely as association, consciously or not, with the forces of oppression, alienation and physical violence" (quoted at 464).

These "Notes" are, in the main, the work of a white man writing about other white men's writings. The concerns of blacks are given insufficient attention. Affirmative action, which was being debated in moral terms in the legal literature throughout the whole time of the composition of these notes, merits not a single entry. Given the magisterial importance of the "Notes," the selection and weighting of issues has significant scholarly impact. Issues such as racism, sexism, the use and abuse of corporate power, including such things as advocacy advertising, ecology, the nuclear threat, militarism, and underdevelopment, should, to borrow the words of Pope Paul, "take first place among the preoccupations of Christians." And of the "Notes."

The selection of authors must be a painful problem for M. He struggles well to move broadly. Still, while almost every breath of Bruno Schüller is noted, Rosemary Radford Ruether, who writes prolifically on issues of major import to ethicists, is quoted once in sixteen years, on the topic of sex. That may serve as a caution against the clubbism that inevitably taints even the best of our enterprises. The number of Jesuits cited is disproportionate, and this esprit de corps goes counter to the very universalism M. has brought to the "Notes."

But enough. The "Notes" have become in M.'s hands an institution. Few persons do anything as well as M. does this work. We are all in his debt.

Marquette University

Daniel C. Maguire

This last volume of three deals *ex professo* with social ethics seen from the unique perspective that Christians are called to be "light to the world," coresponsible in creative liberty and fidelity for the redemptive healing of the world. The volume is divided into two parts joined rather awkwardly under the rubric of "healing."

Part 1 ("Bioethics") comprises three chapters on such issues as abortion, sterilization, transmission of life, health and healing, death and dying, professional ethics, experimentation. The section is very uneven, not well organized, repetitive, and sometimes hasty. There are some admirable attempts to move moral theology forward, the most important of which is H.'s effort to situate moral analysis in the Christian meaning of health, e.g., and death as personal realities. Thus, he finds the problem of sterilization not well solved by the direct/indirect distinction, and seeks the "moral meaning of sterilization" holistically in concrete personal relationships rather than in abstract analysis of acts and organs. Again, he accepts abortion in the classic extreme case (saving one life rather than letting two die) because "the whole of the action gives meaning to its parts." Nor would he condemn the (apparent) suicide of the political protester. While the conclusions are progressive, the theoretical justification for them leaves much to be desired.

The six chapters of Part 2 ("Healing of Public Life") are pervaded with a macroscopic view of the moral malaise of modern man. The magnitude of ethical problems relative to ecology (chap. 5), culture (6), economics (7), politics (8), and war (9) cannot be solved by recourse to the immediate duties of individuals, but only by conversion of societal attitudes towards property, power, energy, wealth, success, and the like through a personal renewal of attitude in depth that is prior to and necessary for the structural changes demanded by justice, charity, and peace. There is rewarding reading in chap. 4 on theology and authentic secularity, in chap. 6 on the relation of culture and ethics, in chap. 7 on the economy of the Beatitudes, and in chap. 9 in his discussion of the proper meaning of the just-war theory, the possibilities for disarmament, and especially his theology of peace. In chap. 5, I felt that he never really came to grips with the meat of the issues involved in the ethics of ecology. And chap. 8 was particularly disappointing in its derivative, undigested, and unclear presentation of the meaning of political ethics with his "politics of the gospel... an obliging but never fully realized ideal which... liberates believers..." (336).

On the whole, the book gives the impression that H. tried to cover too much material in too little space. If one reads the volume as a series of disparate lectures gathered in one place for convenience, the repetitiveness and lack of systematic organization is less grating. As a manual for those seeking a general treatment of germane issues, the book is adequate,
especially since it has a fine index and references that are quite up to date.

*Fairfield University*  
VINCENT M. BURNS, S.J.


K.'s thesis is fascinating, provoking, and somewhat frightening. In view of psychological evidence, K. questions the abstractions of much moral thinking, be it dogmatic rationalism or morality of intention. The ancient consideration of the role of the passions re-emerges here as psychology reveals to what extent human freedom is inhibited in moral choice.

After K. has sketched the complementarity of psychology and moral theology and grounded his choice of Lonergan's methodology, his third chapter exposes the thesis' psychological foundations. Many surveys agree that ca. 20% of the population reveal serious psychiatric symptoms, "60% show some degree of immaturity or incomplete development affecting the range of their freedom, and 20% may be considered relatively free of [such] psychological liabilities" (44). L. Kohlberg demonstrated how very few attain the higher stages of principled thought—and his tests were administrated to relaxed subjects not affected by cases considered. How do people react when personally confronted by a moral dilemma? The research of L. Rulla *et al.* about entering and leaving religious vocation yields at least a provisional answer. Though almost all explicated their commitment in terms of high ideals, very many abandoned their chosen vocation—and this abandonment corresponded to previously discovered levels of psychological integration. Unconscious needs deeply influence moral commitment. How many of Kohlberg's subjects, reasoning on higher levels, would react consistently in existential crises?

Against this somber background, chap. 4 studies how emotions and the unconscious influence the level of experience by forming basic attitudes and permeate the levels of understanding, critical reflection-judgment, and decision. A profound fallibility affects the individual's decisions. The fifth chapter examines the convergence of moral theology and psychology. Both are concerned with ordering a world of desires (potentially infinite) and a world of limits. Since every decision involves renunciation and death is final, man must confront frustration. E. Becker analyzed social evil as arising from the fundamental tension between real and ideal; in the attempt to overcome meaninglessness, man constructs immortality symbols: culture, technology, wealth, ideologies. The finite is absolutized, and this idolatry leads often to disaster for those not worshiping at the same shrine. Correcting Becker and following Lonergan, K. argues for
religious conversion to allow man to accept limits with gratitude instead of resentment. A final section compares sin with psychological limitations and proposes a sober view of freedom. Freedom is effectively limited prior to conscious choice, yet its range can be increased by the actuation of antecedent willingness to grow (essential freedom). This properly understood "fundamental option" prevents equating one's own spontaneity or habits with responsible action.

The sixth chapter draws conclusions about the interrelation and distinction of moral theology and psychology. Moreover, it underlines the need to maintain firm moral principles and concrete, objective prescriptions while admitting "compromise," i.e., appreciating man as a sinful creature to whom God's pardon is offered as a means of overcoming personal and social sin. Finally, K. argues to the need of public, pedagogical authority in moral questions to prevent unconscious, uncriticizable group tyranny. Religious authority is best suited for this role, since it is self-relativizing, invokes the strongest motives, and joins hope to challenge. A final chapter reconsiders methodology.

This clear, lively challenge to moral thinkers should not be overlooked. One might question, however, K.'s juxtaposition of Kohlberg's conceptualistic measurements with Lonergan's more dynamic ontology. To what extent does the intellectual articulation of moral values define real progress in virtue? Might not uneducated people be living a deeper level of self-sacrifice in following Church authority than professors of ethics at prestigious universities?

*Fordham University*  

**JOHN M. McDERMOTT, S.J.**


In December 1979 the International Congress on Mission (IMC) was held in Manila to discuss the Catholic Church in Asia. Nearly 250 delegates representing episcopal conferences, episcopal commissions, mission-sending communities, and mission-funding agencies gathered for five days to discuss the work of missions and evangelization in Asia. The conference was unique for several reasons. It was the first IMC to deal with Asia. The concerns of the conference dealt mainly with the Asian scene and the participants were representatives of the Asian churches whose views were drawn from personal pastoral experience. The conference also marked the beginning of a new age for the Church of Asia. The gathering was not a plea for more personnel or funds. Instead, the Christian community in Asia was reflecting on its own role to be an active
participant in the work of evangelization not only to the people of Asia but to the world at large. The Asian Church had come of age and the IMC in Manila was a public notice of that fact.

The reports of the conference noted some past mistakes of the Christian community in the work of evangelization. It also recognized in a very clear manner the present situation of the Church in Asia and set forth the general outline for its future work. The past mistakes noted were those common to missionary work in many other regions. The Church of the West was transplanted to Asia without proper regard for the culture or the religious tradition of the native people. Past missionary work was too often a monologue rather than a dialogue. The gospel was preached but not always witnessed. The Church was frequently out of touch with the people and their real needs. The IMC took account of the present-day situation of the Church in Asia. The region has 54% of the world’s population, over 2 billion people, 75% of whom are under 25 years of age. Asia is the home of many ancient religious traditions which have penetrated the culture of the people. The majority of the people are poor and experience all the problems associated with poverty: hunger, lack of human rights and the opportunity to better one’s condition. The Christian community in this section of the world is very insignificant. It accounts for only 2½% of the population and the majority of the Catholics are located in two geographical areas. Taking into account past mistakes and the present situation, the IMC set forth several resolutions for the future course of the Asian Church.

Nine workshops at the IMC discussed the following topics: theology of mission, dialogue with other religions, basic Christian communities, development, inculturation, ministry, education, spirituality, and media. The position papers indicate the mentality of the Asian Church and make for worthwhile reading. The consensus statements noted that the starting point for any mission theology is always the present contextual situation. The Christian community must enter a dialogue with the other religions of the Asian area. Bringing the gospel to a new area is not merely a work of translating religious texts into the new language. What is needed is re-embodiment of gospel values and attitudes into new cultural forms. The people must receive the word of God and make it a principle of their life, values, and aspirations. The Christian community must be involved with the poor and their needs. The Church must work for liberation of oppression and for the development of a better human situation. Human concerns must be given a greater priority than institutional concerns. Education is not just to obtain a better economic life but to realize one’s responsibility for all the people. The media has an important role to play in the work of evangelization in Asia due to the limited Christian presence.

The volume contains the blueprints and ambitions for the Asian
Church. It is not a work to be read once, then set aside. It is a manual to which one must return often for guidance and direction. The tasks facing the Church in Asia are monumental and challenging. Anyone associated with the work of evangelization in Asia will find the reports and papers refreshing, enlightening, and extremely encouraging.

*Uniondale, N.Y.*

MATTHEW H. KELLEHER, M.M.


Schall has gathered together a number of previously published and forthcoming articles which, with one exception, he wrote over the past six years. The theme of the articles is important and timely: the proper relation between Christianity and politics. S.'s basic thesis is that certain contemporary misinterpretations of Christian teaching lead to false, immoderate expectations from politics. A corollary thesis is that Christianity properly understood can have a very beneficial effect on the political order. As this is a collection of S.'s articles, it is not surprising to find lacking a progressively deeper development of the basic thesis.

S.'s fundamental argument is that some Christians have redefined evangelization as a purely worldly enterprise. Baconian "relief of man's estate" replaces fidelity to the whole gospel. S. points out that Christianity is identified with revolutionary movements of an economic and political nature. Christian spirituality becomes attentiveness to the movements of history. Evil becomes a corporate thing, social sin, and the solution to political and social problems lies in finding the appropriate institutions and structures. Personal sin and the conversion of individuals are downplayed or neglected.

One of the main contributing causes to the truncation of Christian faith and Christian social thought in Catholic circles is inadequate study of philosophy, especially political philosophy, in both Catholic seminaries and universities. S. argues that there is a direct relation between the decline of philosophy and the rise of ideology. It is philosophical ignorance which makes sincere Christians susceptible of confusing their faith with Marxism, socialism, or liberalism. "There is no more serious issue in Christianity today than that of preserving an authentic spirituality free from its subordination to historical ideologies... It is the study of political philosophy, including ancient and medieval writers, which enables the student to step back from the fashionable opinions on both the right and the left and look at perennial political issues with a fresh perspective."

In several articles S. draws attention to the work of Leo Strauss, "one of the very greatest political philosophers of this century" but mostly
unknown in Christian circles. He implies that the work of Strauss could be of great benefit to Christian scholars and theologians, especially by shedding light on the relation between faith and reason, and Christianity and politics. In my opinion, no man has done as much as Strauss to revive the serious study of political philosophy and to provide valuable introductions to the writings of the major political philosophers. Schall is one of the few Christian thinkers calling attention to the profundity of Strauss’s work; however, he is less fortunate in clearly explaining aspects of Strauss’s thought; his remarks are fragmentary and bound to seem inadequate and confusing even to readers familiar with that thought.

Schall has a good sense of the problems which have emerged from relating Christianity to politics. However, one could desire a more systematic, deeper analysis of the important subjects he discusses.

University of Scranton

J. Brian Benestad


This is a collection of essays by four women, Valerie Saiving, Marjorie Suchocki, Penelope Washbourn, and Jean Lambert, and one man, John Cobb. All are persuaded that Whitehead’s philosophy in particular (especially his systematic metaphysics) and recent feminist thought are significant and that each stands to gain from a dialogue of mutual criticism and corroboration. All the essays are exploratory and preliminary in tone. What one finds here is neither a programmatic manifesto nor even the expression of a unified point of view. Nonetheless, some basic themes do emerge.

All the contributors agree that Whitehead’s philosophical anthropology, with its basis in a phenomenological account of human existence, is a resource that feminists may critically appropriate with profit. Cobb and Washbourn in particular argue that his explicitly revisionary treatment of the so-called mind-body problem, according to which all forms of psychophysical dualism are rejected in favor of psychicalistic monism, permits one to address feminist concerns about both distinctively female experience and its relation to the self-transcendent character of human experience as such. Saiving suggests that Whitehead’s understanding of the issues of individuality and relatedness intimates a model for envisioning the fundamentally androgyrous structure of human life, which, when actualized, comprises authentic existence seen from a sexual perspective.

Questions of praxis and of ethics are taken up as well and are considered in a specifically theological context. Suchocki maintains not only that feminist action and strategy aim to actualize values of openness and
mutuality which are central to process thought and grounded in its doctrine of God, but also that process thinkers need the help of oppressed groups such as feminists to understand what such actualization might mean in the concrete contemporary situation. Lambert turns to Whitehead for new ways of thinking about the ethics of pregnancy and abortion. She finds that he helps one think about the respective values of human life, individual freedom, and human community in their interrelation in ways that focus both the inescapable tragedy inherent in creaturely decision and the need for divine redemption in light of this.

What is one to make of this incipient dialogue? Most important, I think, is that it has occurred at all; for the recognition that one needs some more or less systematic and general conceptuality in which to express and defend one's point of view represents a certain stage in the development of feminist thought. These feminists, at least, have chosen to reject private ideology in favor of thoroughly public argumentation. That they have chosen Whitehead's particular version of "process thought" to do so is perhaps less significant in the long run, as is what will strike many readers as their too facile rejection of more traditional philosophical outlooks. On the one hand, not all the contributors have clearly grasped the basic philosophical issues Whitehead meant to address, and, in any case, only careful analysis can advance discussion of these issues in a significant way. On the other hand, the constructive course for proponents of the *philosophia perennis* to take is to ask how their own ways of thinking address the concerns of feminists in a positive way. This sort of response will both broaden and deepen a conversation that one can hope this little book may have served to begin.

*University of Notre Dame*  
PHILIP E. DEVENISH

**SHORTER NOTICES**


This is not one but several dictionaries—a single-volume compendium of Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, Judaism, Taoism, etc. The editors have limited it to living religions, i.e., those in practice in the present day. This limitation thus excludes the religions of the ancient past, as those of the Sumerians, Egyptians, Greeks, and pre-Christian Europe.

Each of these living religions has its own introductory article describing its origin, development, and growth, and a statement of its major beliefs. If the religion is not identified with a definite region, but has enjoyed a world-wide spread and has taken on distinct characteristics because of that growth, there are additional entries to incorporate these data: e.g., besides the article on Islam, there are entries on "Islam in
SHORTER NOTICES

America,” “Islam in China,” “Islam in South Asia,” and “Islam in Southeast Asia.” Where there are distinct denominations within a religion (e.g., Christianity), these are included, e.g., Roman Catholicism, Anglicanism, Methodism, etc., with the terminology that is associated with these denominations, e.g., rosary or Book of Common Prayer. The volume abounds in liturgical and theological words, and if a word (e.g., resurrection, confirmation) is found in more than one religion, it is explained from each religion’s viewpoint. Too, there are entries for the important personages connected with these religions as well as the cities (Rome, Canterbury, Mecca) associated with them.

The entries were written by some 160 contributors writing, for the most part, within their own tradition. There are numerous cross references within the articles and at times a bibliographical entry or two at its end. Besides the illustrations found within the text, a special section of eight colored maps locates the important cities, shrines, and regions referred to in the articles.

This volume is certainly not intended to replace the New Catholic Encyclopedia, the Encyclopedia of Judaism, or any such reference set. But for the parish library, the pastor’s desk, or the student interested in comparative religion, whose budgets keep them from purchasing such multivolume sets, the Abingdon Dictionary of Living Religions perfectly meets their needs.

JOSEPH N. TYLENDA, S.J.
Georgetown University


This is both a basic and a unique tool for biblical students and, I would add, their professors. As far as I can judge, no previous publication in any language has assembled so much valuable bibliographical information in such clear, accurate, and concise form. Here is service to scholarship at its selfless best. F. is already well known for carefully researched publications and meticulous work habits, and I am sure that the successive editorships of two prestigious biblical journals have sharpened the skills needed in work like this. The twenty-four chapters cover almost every imaginable heading in biblical scholarship (OT and NT). Random samples would be Bibliographies, Periodicals, Lexica, Concordances, Commentaries, Biblical Theology, History, NT Apocrypha, Hermeneutics, etc. Under many of the headings we find titles common to both OT and NT; there follow entries specifically related to each testament.

Enumeration of titles is never enough, either for beginners or the more advanced. Evaluation is essential and it has been provided here in several ways. Important titles have been asterisked, the most important receiving two asterisks. F. then gives, in all but a few cases, a description of the listed work and a brief judgment of its value. I doubt that there will be many dissents here. In addition, most of the entries are further supplied with references to reviews of the book in important journals. Thus we have further evaluations of the work in question. The rather rare blurred printing (nos. 180, 191–93) is not the fault of the author; instead, I would call attention to the almost flawlessness of printing of a genre notoriously vulnerable to typographical errors. This densely packed volume, in which even the most seasoned scholar can learn much, is a very appropriate memorial to G. S. Glanzman, S.J., his coauthor in the first and far more modest edition of the book.

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.
Gonzaga University, Spokane

JESUS WALKING ON THE SEA: MEANING AND GOSPEL FUNCTIONS OF
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES


This dissertation follows the style and method common to the series. Redaction criticism is practiced by following through the structure and setting of a pericope in each Gospel. This method contrasts with the German tradition embodied in the Herder Kommentar series (e.g., the volume on Mark by R. Pesch), which begins by reconstructing the tradition behind the Gospel text. It also makes for tedious and repetitious reading. Several of H.'s objections to German redaction criticism lose their force when one recognizes that he has not taken seriously the tradition history on which those results are based. Consequently, he is led to deny Schnackenburg’s observation that the ego eimi proclamation in the Johannine version has the force of a divine epiphany and to overemphasize the disciples’ desire to take Jesus into the boat.

Works in this series also characteristically deny any influence of Hellenistic culture on the biblical tradition. Consequently, the many noncanonical and pagan stories of divine rescue at sea are considered insignificant to understanding the Gospel narrative. Of course, the strength of this exegetical tradition is its single-minded devotion to uncovering the OT roots of Gospel material. H. catalogues all of the OT imagery in which Yahweh rescues His faithful from the waters. He goes on to show that the Qumran hymns combine the language of rescue at sea—the distress of the righteous and the Teacher as founding rock of the eschatological community. This analysis makes a major contribution to our understanding of the Matthean version of the story, which follows Jesus’ walking on the sea with a story about Peter’s attempt. H. suggests that the story is at the midpoint of a progressive revelation of Jesus’ identity, which begins with the stilling of the storm (Mt 8:23-27) and concludes with Peter’s confession (Mt 16:13-20), at which point he is established as the rock. H.’s work on Matthew is the most extensive and the best part of the book. His use of OT and Qumran material calls for re-evaluation of some of the usual conclusions about discipleship in Matthew.

PHEME PERKINS
Boston College


In the opening chapter M. formulates two goals: first, he proposes to offer “a model for Pauline theology . . . as comprehensive as possible” (2); second, he attempts to prove that the concept of reconciliation is “an interpretative key to Paul’s theology” in the sense that it is “the ‘chief theme’ or ‘centre’ of his missionary and pastoral thought and practice” (5).

M. states that, having avoided the temptation to “turn aside to comment on the present relevance of reconciliation” to pastoral concern, he has produced “the clarification of a single principle that runs through Paul’s teaching” (5). Yet he does not limit himself to Paul, but includes Ephesians, which he recognizes as a non-Pauline document. He even adds a chapter that seeks to “establish lines of connection between the Jesus of the Gospel tradition and the apostle to the nations” (6).

For an account of what M. has actually produced, the summary in his short preface is more accurate: “an exegetical enquiry at some depth into the literary form, background, meaning and application—what is called today ‘the horizon’—of a few key passages.” These passages are 2 Cor 5:18-21, Col 1:15-20, Rom 5:1-11, and Eph 2:12-19. These analyses are preceded by three chapters on the background of Paul
and his message and on the way he has been interpreted. M. also treats classical Pauline themes like sin, law, and justification by faith. He has a chapter on the human predicament "to focus on Paul's background against which he erected his teaching on reconciliation" (48).

The final result is a well-indexed book that surveys previous studies on a few Pauline texts. It is written out of a deep love and admiration for Paul, but it is not a new model for doing Pauline theology. M. falls short of proving his thesis that reconciliation "is an overarching term that ... describes a new relationship with God" (139).

JAMES M. REESE, O.S.F.S.
St. John's University, N.Y.


This is a continuation of the series (cf. TS 40 [1979] 210-11) which McGrath Publishing Co. has produced to make available major papal, curial, and episcopal documents. The present volume contains the major addresses and homilies of John Paul II in his Mexican, Polish, Irish, United States, and Turkish visits, as well as the encyclical Redemptor hominis, his messages to bishops and priests of April 9, 1979, the Apostolic Constitution on Ecclesiastical Faculties (Sapientia christiana), and the 1980 message for world peace. Also found are several hard-to-come-by documents from the Holy See, e.g., the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith's statements on Jacques Pohier's When I Say God, on the American book Human Sexuality, and on Hans Küng. We likewise have the message of the Latin American bishops at Puebla, the Synod's preparatory statement on the family, the Congregation on Catholic Education's instruction on the liturgical formation in seminaries, and finally the United States bishops' pastoral on racism.

It is possible for the diligent and persistent to find each of these documents in L'Osservatore Romano, The Pope Speaks, Origins, the Daughters of St. Paul Editions, or elsewhere; nevertheless, it is nice and valuable to have them in this handy form. The astonishing productivity of John Paul II is remarkable and here we find only the major documents. A very useful series, easy to use; the index of references is itself worth the cost.

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.
Georgetown University


Church teachings and doctrines, according to H., are always to be placed in the "context of the living faith community." As the community grows in its understanding of these teachings and doctrines, and as the community reformulates them, uncertainties and doubts may surface amongst the faithful. H. writes her book for "people who worry when they have questions about their faith, or when they begin to realize that the old explanations, which were good enough before, no longer seem to offer coherent meaning."

In a very concise way H. discusses basic Church teachings in the context of a pilgrim, searching, hopeful Church. She begins by discussing a compassionate God in the self-revelation of Jesus. She states that the Church has always seen itself as a people made in the image of God, but also a sinful people, in need of redemption. Jesus' life, death, and resurrection brought about this liberation from sin. The Spirit of Jesus is alive in the institution of the Church, calling us into community (communio) with one another, and calling us into communion with God—in this life and the next. Thus "the Christian faith begins and ends with God."

H.'s book is simple and easy reading, within the framework and spirit of Vat-
ican II, comprehensive, offering historical, biblical, and theological perspectives. She effectively discusses the major teachings and doctrines of the Church. Most of all, it is a reassuring book, which could be well used in an adult-education setting.

RICHARD A. BOYD
Crookston, Minn.


A prophet speaks with power and his words tend to shock his hearers. It is certainly debatable whether Metz is indeed a prophet, but no one reading this short collection of his recent addresses will doubt his capacity to challenge, even shock, his hearers. This little book seems to be as good a way as any to get to the heart of M.'s political theology. He describes quite clearly his understanding of the messianic challenge of the Christian faith to what he calls "bourgeois religion"—essentially the accommodated, acculturated Christianity of the churches of our experience.

M.'s basic thesis throughout these talks is that we are living in, or will soon be living in, a postbourgeois (or middle-class) world. The Christian churches must take seriously the radical character of the Sermon on the Mount and change themselves and society through a radical conversion of hearts. Solidarity of all human beings must replace religious and economic individualism; some type of communitarian socialism must replace competitive capitalism, but without destroying the dignity and freedom of individuals—all individuals.

The basic-community churches of the Third World countries in Latin America are for M. an inspiration, if not an adequate model, for what he would wish to see in the transformed First World. This would lead, he believes, to the rejection of such categories as "developed" vs. "undeveloped" nations and would help bring about a fellowship among all peoples that would involve religious, social, and economic values. The upshot of all this would be a viable instrumentality for bringing about world peace.

M.'s challenge is formidable, since it attacks quite directly the rigorism and elitism of the institutional element of the churches (especially the Catholic Church). No doubt there will be, as there already have been, many responses. But neither is there any doubt that the "theology of liberation" has a formidable champion in Johann Baptist Metz.

WALTER C. McCauley, S.J.
Ignatius House, Atlanta


H. describes his "modest" purpose as offering an alternate view of nature to that currently reigning in empiricist scientific circles. His objective is to redefine and replace religious experience within that cosmographic whole. Too many theologies neglect the physical universe in their self-descriptions, thus needlessly privatizing religious language. H.'s strategy is to break down the dualism of "private" subjective and "real" objective facts, as though value, beauty, aim, or direction were simply not real, because subjective. In a chapter containing an active notion of perception, modeled by process epistemology and metaphysics, H. sees as pivotal the interpenetration of subject and object in the apprehension of reality. Indeed, reality is this ongoing emergent interaction of subject and object. In a fashion similar to Rahner's notion of transcendental and categorical, prereflexive and reflexive, H. distinguishes primary from secondary perception and
believes teleology (if it is to be recovered as an attribute of nature) must necessarily appear in primary perception. Our perceptive subjectivity is a "blossoming forth" (34) of world process in its interactions. Ever higher integrations are required to explain and enact the lower manifolds of existents, thus giving evidence of emergence. Faith is a "confident receptivity to and active appropriation of new possibilities of emergent order" (62). This describes a loose teleology, a value-laden process which is "not strictly directional in its advance through time" (68). This purposefulness of nature is an aesthetic category with its appropriate criteria of harmony, pleasure, and variety. This experience of cosmic purpose may belong to a manifold higher than our own in which we must have faith. Religion names in a mythic, symbolic fashion the faith in an ultimate emergent developer of our process. In the final chapters H. confronts the issues of perishing, death, and failure with a divine reality who promotes the adventure of the universe. This divine one operates not by coercion but persuasion; this God is in helpless love with a cosmos He would convert, but only can convert when it co-operates.

As an introductory text to a complex topic in process theodicy, H.'s work serves well. That a reintegration of non-human reality into philosophy and theology is a necessity should no longer be an arguable problem from both an existential and theoretic point of view. That work beyond the romantic reinterpretations of the Naturphilosophen, the phenomenological courses of Merleau-Ponty, or even the residually idealist positions of Whitehead/Hartshorne or Rahner is required is also the case. As a text which argues sufficiently for purpose, this analysis may not serve; as an inventive, analytic argument for the purpose, it achieves clearly and admirably its objectives.

STEPHEN HAPPEL
St. Meinrad School of Theology


B.'s study persuasively concludes that Hilary's Commentary on Matthew reflects a distinctively Latin perspective. The point is made partly by a careful study of Hilary's early career and of the Western reaction to Arianism in the 350's. Written before his exile in 356 and his involvement in the center of the Arian controversy, Hilary's commentary does attack Arian views, particularly those of Ursacius and Valens; but it neither mentions opponents by name nor treats Arianism as an urgent concern. Polemical passages in the commentary are deftly located in a careful account of Western involvement in the Arian controversy.

The major task of the book, however, is to argue that the Trinitarian, Christological, and soteriological views of the commentary are Latin in character. This conclusion depends upon denying that before 356 Hilary had any direct knowledge of Eastern writers such as Origen and Athanasius, and upon arguing that his theology continues a Latin tradition found primarily in Tertullian and Novatian. For example, Hilary's insistence upon the "community of the Father's substance" must be understood in relation to Latin predecessors and not as a reflection of the Nicene homoousion. As well, equating the divine substance with "spirit" must be seen as peculiarly Latin.

The chief contribution of the study is to supply a firm point of departure for the examination of larger questions—definition of a Latin theological tradition in the fourth century and the possible contribution of such a tradition to the "old Nicene" theology. The limited focus of the book means that the reader must find his way through detailed treatments of evidence and complicated arguments with the secondary literature. But it is a focus re-
required by the state of the question, and one can hope that B. will use it as a basis for further work.

Rowan A. Greer
Yale Divinity School


Until the Iranian revolution in 1979, Shii Islam had never received the academic attention it deserved. Dominated by Arabists and Sunni Muslims, Islamic scholarship often relegated Shiism to the status of a deviation from “normative” Sunni Islam. There are few scholarly works (the writings of S. H. Nasr and H. Corbin and Tabataba’i’s Shi’ite Islam are notable exceptions) which have described Shiism from within, as a comprehensive expression and tradition of Islamic faith. The lack of careful historical studies on specific aspects of Shii belief has been even more pronounced. Thus Sachedina’s book is a welcome addition to a neglected field of scholarship.

S. treats a central and distinguishing characteristic of Shiism—the concept of the Mahdi. According to Shii belief, the Mahdi—the twelfth and last of the Imams—has been in concealment since the year 940, waiting for the proper moment to return and establish a reign of justice and true belief throughout the world. S. compiles information from early Shii sources to show the emergence of the concept of the Mahdi in Shii circles and the historical events which motivated and determined that development. The book is thus a fascinating study of the function of theology in explaining and justifying religious history.

The technical drawback of the book is that common to published dissertations. The text reads as dry as dust, and S. fails to distinguish important points from a smothering mass of detail. His historical analysis is unimaginative, and his detached stance does disservice to the subject. The reader receives the impression that Shii belief is merely a post-factum accommodation to political disappointment. Only an explicit faith-vision of this tale of palace intrigue as sacred history can show its timeless significance. Finally, despite the title, the work’s historical scope is quite limited, treating only Shii writings to the eleventh century. From this book one would never know that anything of importance had been written on the Mahdi since that time, and thus some basic questions are not addressed. What changes in Shii attitudes towards the messianic savior occurred during the Safavid period, when the persecuted faith became the established state religion of Iran? Have twentieth-century Shii thinkers made no new contributions to the concept? Nevertheless, the work is successful as an organized chronicle of the appearance and growth of the messianic concept among Shii during the 9–11 centuries and will open the way, we hope, for broader and deeper studies.

Thomas Michel, S.J.
Vatican City


This work from a scholar in English literature will be welcomed by students of seventeenth-century Puritanism. We have come a long way from the epoch-making work of Millar toward a broader, more balanced assessment of the Puritan mind. K. makes an important contribution to this process of interpretation, which has seen the narrow burrowing of the intellectual historians give place to the interdisciplinary approach of recent decades. K. is interested in the Puritan imagination and examines the prose works of five seventeenth-century writers in order to de-
termine the influence of biblical imagery upon their patterns of thought. He selects Sibbes, Baxter, Winstanley, Milton, and Bunyan precisely because they represent the "strength and diversity of Puritan prose." Many may wish to argue with so broad a definition of Puritanism as adopted by K.; yet the juxtaposition of their different genres, their approaches to reform, to spirituality, to the Bible, all serve to illuminate the nature of Puritanism in ways that a more circumscribed analysis may never achieve.

The opening chapter traces the development of two attitudes toward the Bible in England, one derived from Erasmus, the other from Luther. The former treated Scripture as a source of knowledge for the direction of the spiritual life, the latter as a medium by which the Spirit subdued and transformed the reader. Through Cranmer and Tyndale respectively, K. sees these two traditions shaped in England, with the Puritans identifying most clearly with Tyndale's emphasis on the experience of the Word. Given the volume and range of the material, K. does a masterly job of selection and description in his study of these five Puritans. The reader will derive much profit from his delightfully written tour of Sibbes's preaching, Baxter and the meditative tradition, Winstanley's crude yet effective use of biblical imagery, Milton's shifting concept of truth, and Bunyan's genius for concrete imagery. Because K. majors on description, however, there is a serious lack of both analysis and a clearly developed thesis in the body of his study. These shortcomings, plus a deliberate choice to avoid the important question of hermeneutics, restrict the value of K.'s otherwise fine study.

IAN McPHEE
Hamilton, Ontario


The remarkable life and thought of the Russian philosopher and theologian Bulgakov (1871-1944) is little known in the English-speaking world. Successively an apostate seminarian, a Marxist philosopher of first caliber, then—after a spectacular conversion together with a group of eminent Russian intellectuals—an Orthodox priest, expelled from his country by Lenin, to finally becoming dean of an Orthodox seminary in Paris, Bulgakov has left a voluminous literary inheritance, often admired today by Russians rediscoversing religion.

S.'s doctoral dissertation approaches Bulgakov from the particular angle of his views of the "visible" Church—admittedly a weak point in B.'s thought. Indeed, B. returned to Christianity by reading German idealistic philosophy of the nineteenth century and by becoming a disciple of the Russian philosopher Vladimir Soloviev (d. 1900). Together with Soloviev and Florensky, he became the major spokesman of the so-called sophiological school, which saw in the concept of divine Wisdom (sophia) the divine ground of all reality. A philosophical approach so close to Platonic (and German) idealism provided very little help in understanding the concrete, historical, and visible aspects of the Church. Nevertheless, Bulgakov, a dedicated and articulate priest and churchman, was constantly concerned with the sacramental and practical issues of church life (and with ecumenism). Often raising the right issues, he stumbled in his solutions, because his philosophical presuppositions tended to transfer all reality to the realm of the "invisible." S. honestly and critically reviews his intellectual, spiritual, and emotional wanderings. However, one can wonder whether accepted Ro-
man Catholic criteria of today can really and fairly be applied to a system of thought so utterly idealistic and philosophical. Can one expect to find sound approaches to issues of the “visible” Church in Origen, in Tillich, in Teilhard de Chardin? Their strong points, as Bulgakov’s, lie elsewhere.

JOHN MEYENDORFF
St. Vladimir’s Seminary, N.Y.


A contemporary Protestant American theologian, Meland comes out of the process tradition of James, Bergson, and Whitehead and epitomizes the best in the school of empirical realism. His value lies especially in his insights regarding epistemology, methodology, and cultural theology.

In Meland’s view, reality is organically structured and is experienced, though not necessarily rationally conceived or understood, as such. This means that in an experience a person is conscious not only of the sensible qualities of an object but also its real relations, dimensions (specifically the religious), and the context in which all these exist. The human mind is oriented to absorb these elements of reality and, depending on what it has drawn from culture as regards language, mindset, and interest, experientially recognizes these as such. This power of the mind is described as “appreciative awareness.” This view of knowledge has profound ramifications for life, especially for personal faith. It means that at times the mind can be aware of the dimension of ultimacy in an experience, discover demands imposed by relations (especially towards community), and realize the cultural orientation of a particular act.

Meland explores too how culture, cult, and tradition affect a person’s faith. He is especially illuminative in the way he delineates how Christology discloses the structure existing in reality. He also evolves a methodology to insure recognition of the elements structurally and contextually operative in one’s experience.

The present work is a dissertation exposing how faith and appreciative awareness are related and interact in Meland’s major trilogy. It is valuable for propagating his insights. It is not, however, easy reading. The matter is complex, and the language, though vivid and consistent, frequently becomes technical and esoteric. In brief, it is rewarding but requires a reader to dive deep and stay under for extended periods.

FREDERICK G. MCLEOD, S.J.
Saint Louis University


Kull, an American Jesuit now living in the Philippines, studies Rahner’s understanding of revelation against the background of his theological anthropology. The extensive secondary literature on R. is not taken into consideration. A brief introduction assesses Rahner’s efforts to address issues raised by the anthropocentric turn of modern European thought as an example of successful theological inculturation. Thorough discussion of Hearers of the Word elucidates the philosophical foundations of R.’s thought as reflected in his analysis of the conditions for the possibility of human reception of salvific revelation. Chapters on transcendent and categorical revelation pursue the development of R.’s views in subsequent writings, with stress on the universal offer of grace and the mediation of grace and revelation in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. The
book concludes with insightful and balanced reflections on the relevance of R.'s theology for the Church in the Philippines. While warning against uncritical importation of European thought, K. finds value in R.'s anthropocentric thrust, creative confrontation of the needs of a particular cultural situation, and emphasis on God's universal salvific will.

K.'s work can be recommended as a reliable exposition of Rahner's views on revelation on the basis of careful recourse to the original German texts. (A serious error in the cited English translation of an important passage on the resurrection [p. 178, n. 102] did, however, escape notice.) Particularly valuable is the section on Hearsers of the Word, which alerts the reader to the deficiencies of the published English version and to the changes introduced in the second edition by J. B. Metz. The discussion of transcendental revelation is also useful, despite some obscure passages on its relationship to human consciousness. Less successful is the chapter on categorical revelation, due both to the restriction of the treatment to its Christological aspects and to the incomplete presentation of R.'s Christology. Apart from an omission in the table of contents and consistent misspelling of Herbert Vorgrimler's name, the book is well printed, with the copious footnotes conveniently located at the bottom of each page.

JOHN P. GALVIN
St. John's Seminary, Boston


One wonders whether the publication of Lady Anscombe's remarkable papers by the University of Minnesota Press does not portend that today Catholics professing religious and philosophical orthodoxy in the great tradition of faith and reason need to discover a public or non-Catholic press to have their works see the light of day and be taken seriously. On the other hand, that incisive, brilliant philosophical reflection by A., the Cambridge professor of philosophy who does not hesitate to argue the theoretical wrongness of contraception in public, not to mention the errors of the whole modern English system of academic ethics, seems worthy of careful attention.

These essays, mostly on ethics but likewise discussing political authority, transubstantiation, and faith, written over a period of four decades, have a surprising consistency and useful pedagogical repetitiveness. From her negative judgment on the morality of World War II in 1939, to her rejection of pacifism, to her justification of civil coercion in the state, and finally to her protest against giving Harry Truman an honorary doctorate at Oxford in 1956 on account of the Bomb, A. has been wrestling with, in many fashions, the protection of the life of the innocent and the absolute reasons for it. This is likewise a consistent element in her remarkable defense of the Catholic Church's position on contraception and abortion, as well as an insight into the nature of the ethics that these positions entail. She has learned that faith is itself a stimulus to philosophic reflection about the truth of things.

This is a lively book; A. is the best of both worlds. She does not hesitate to give us the awful gyrations of linguistic philosophy, with its endless combinations of p's, q's, z's, and n's, all designed in her deft hand to establish the most basic truths about intentions or promises. In her touchingly beautiful essay "On Transubstantiation," in which she tells us how to teach small children (of whom she has had a number) about what happens at Mass, she recounts the true story of a little boy who, having been told what his mother received in
Communion, prostrated himself when she returned to the pew.

The importance of this book would be hard to overestimate, especially for the Christian who might think the philosophic defense of what the faith teaches is either impossible or irrelevant. The front line of religion as well as of humanity is not in the slums nor in the armies, as we are so often taught, but in the minds of those who presume to think. The recovery of sanity is never dull. Lady Anscombe knows that obscure controversies ultimately determine whether we can protect human life in its innocence and dignity.

JAMES V. SCHALL, S.J.
Georgetown University


A book more commendable in its ambitions than in the details of its argument. The ambitions are most clearly stated at the end, where B. writes of his concern “to present a version of the natural law tradition that is open to historical change and development and is yet true to the central insights of an outstanding spokesman of that tradition, Thomas Aquinas” (136). B.’s search for a historicized form of natural law leads him to adopt a reading of Aquinas which emphasizes the cognitive limitations of practical reason and which finds in Thomas a proto-Humean. Consider the following argument which B. presents as an exegesis of Aquinas’ position: “If God is man’s happiness, and if God is not known by us, then our happiness is not known by us. Rather, happiness is a state of affairs that we cannot imagine or describe, and because we cannot imagine or describe it, we cannot see how to make any connection between it and our present state of affairs. If all actions are moral or immoral according to whether or not they lead us toward or away from our last end, we cannot naturally know which, if any, actions are directed to our last end” (117). Any reader familiar with the text of Aquinas can recognize echoes of some of his views here, but would be surprised, I believe, by the conclusion, which can only be reached by ignoring the ways in which Aquinas qualifies particular statements in the course of integrating them into his philosophical-theological synthesis. It may be that Aquinas’ qualifications introduce tensions or inconsistencies into his system; but these have to be shown in detail, not simply ridden over in an effort to portray him as a precursor of contemporary conceptual relativism in the manner of Kuhn and Wilfred Sellars.

B. has a certain acquaintance with analytic philosophy, but he refuses to use this material in a disciplined way. Thus he lumps together the very different senses of intuition in G. E. Moore and John Rawls (11) and links intuition and affectivity (106) in a way which would surprise students of twentieth-century British moral philosophy. He also confuses “counterfactuals” and counterinstances (125). But, as if to show the impartiality of his carelessness, B. is willing to speak of the “virtues” of synderesis and intellectus principiorum in Aquinas (101) and to observe that “good” and “happiness” are synonyms for him (112). He also ascribes to Aquinas the view that “the counsels of the wise are needed” if we are to make any nonautologous judgments that killing is wrong (91, 94).

B., however, has some of the virtues of his defects. He is willing to be venturesome and to work hard to establish connections between Aquinas and contemporary philosophy. His essay has some value as a presentation of certain natural-law themes for those who object to conducting moral argument in terms of human nature and its goals and requirements but who wish to make some use of Aquinas. One thing
that B. does illustrate is the significant overlap of concerns and methods between Aquinas and analytic philosophy and the possibility of developing elements of his position in ways that are much more flexible and interesting than manual scholasticism.

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


L., professor of Christian education at Princeton Theological Seminary, has subtitled his work “Understanding Convictional Experiences.” The book is an attempt to ground authentic spiritual experience in transformational, Christocentric, multidimensional, and reality-expanding categories. He situates these categories within the context of the dynamics of human development and is careful to avoid reductionistic tendencies. The work seems thoughtfully and coherently argued so as to clarify the vast difference between neurotic self-absorption and authentic transforming experience in Christ.

Convictional experience so engages personality that there appears a convergence of three elements: “the Convictor, the convicted person, and the endurance through time of the convictional relationship between them” (6). The effort to sort through the dynamics of such an experience is L.’s concern throughout. He identifies four interacting dimensions of authentic convictional experience: the lived world, which is recomposed through transforming knowledge; the self; the void, which a number of authors characterize as limit or boundary experience; the holy. These four dimensions of experience constitute the environment of conflict, negation, and the deeper penetration of insight or intuition in transforming the person’s hold on reality. The transformational/convicting event is rooted in the power of Jesus Christ through his Spirit to enable redemptive action in personal and communal life.

Convictional knowing is patterned on an analysis of the intuitive and the tacit present in scientific, esthetic, and therapeutic knowing. L.’s reflections dispel any confidence in a narrow objectivism or positivism. In fact, he prepares a careful grounding for convictional experience.

L.’s final chapter offers guidelines which reflect both theological and psychological perspectives. They are meant to aid a discerning process in convictional events. He offers numerous examples from pastoral experience which highlight his guidelines and the transformational model outlined in the book. This work deserves the serious attention of those whose work or ministry is centered in articulating the significance of religious experience.

JOHN F. RUSSELL, O.CARM.
Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, N.J.


Anyone who has taught a course on the revised liturgical year has lamented the fact that beyond periodical literature no book is available in English that might be recommended to undergird classroom lectures. A. Allan McArthur’s The Evolution of the Christian Year (Seabury, 1953), a standard text, has been out of print for decades. Furthermore, it antedates the 1969 liturgical calendar reform.

Pueblo has done the English-speaking world a service in making available in translation A.’s 1979 Das Kirchenjahr mitfeiern. Its aim is to explain the structure, theology, and spirituality of the liturgical year against the back-
ground of its historical development. The treatment of the spirituality is uneven, limited to select days. However, this dimension can be filled out by the use of other works, e.g., *The Liturgical Year* by Adrian Nocent (Collegeville, 1979), translated by Matthew J. O'Connell from the French original.

In ten chapters A. moves through the concept of time, cosmic and Jewish, to a treatment of Sunday (chap. 4), the temporal and sanctoral cycles (chaps. 5–8). The paschal mystery, that “Easter act of salvation” (20), remains central throughout A.’s study. Chap. 2, “Sunday as the Original Celebration of the Paschal Mystery,” needs careful study by those who use the Sunday liturgy to champion themes and causes, divesting the dominical Eucharist of its central purpose: the celebration of the “Easter act of salvation.” A brief treatment of the liturgy of the hours (chap. 9) as related to the celebration of the liturgical year is timely as parishes begin to implement the revised Office. A final excursus (chap. 10, “The Problem of a Perpetual Calendar”) addresses a concern that goes beyond the Christian churches and calls for ongoing study and dialogue: the adoption of a new world calendar.

As a translation, *The Liturgical Year* reflects a reliance on German sources with little reference to existing English literature. The translator, however, worked carefully to provide current English texts of presidential prayers wherever used to illustrate seasonal tonality. The book is recommended for its intended audience: persons outside the scholarly world.

THOMAS A. KROSNICKI, S.V.D.
Washington, D.C.


The argument of W.’s “foundational inquiry” for grounding and reconceiving ordained Christian ministry has a simple structure: if we want to understand Christian ministry, we need to know what it is to be a Christian minister. A Christian minister is a Christian, and a Christian is a person who has experienced conversion to a new vision of what is real and important in life through participation in the consciousness-transforming event of revelation. One should, therefore, revise the agenda for ministry as the Christian minister’s prophetic interpretation of the motivating experience of conversion and as his or her priestly facilitation of such experience for others.

W. argues that the minister can appropriate and revalorize the treasury of traditional Christian symbolism by means of an autobiographical recovery of the depth dimension of life that the story of one’s own conversion discloses. This issues in a method of pastoral care he calls “interpretive analysis,” whereby ministers help others find horizons of greater meaning through the guided retelling of their own personal stories. “We are different at the end of telling a story” (59). Lest the theory remain merely abstract, he provides three case studies to illustrate how this method of narrative reintegration actually functions.

W. recognizes the limitations of his proposal, which is directed primarily at the quest for meaning in the personal lives of individuals. Still, it is difficult to tell how far his method of interpretive analysis depends on a specialist’s level of competence in understanding symbols and in assessing their psychological significance for the person in question. In the event, he stresses autobiography as a vehicle for self-understanding in a helpful way, and he argues eloquently that Christians are responsible to the larger culture to provide a witness to the depth and meaning of life that they express symbolically in speaking of God.

PHILIP E. DEVENISH
University of Notre Dame

Pastoral ministry to the aged is today's no. 1 parish need. Unfortunately, while many church people, including pastors, have been laboring for years on behalf of the elderly, until recently there has been scarcely any informed theological writing to aid their ministries or to introduce new coworkers to the special needs of the aged. The first books to appear some years ago were either heavy-handed, like Seward Hiltner's anthology Toward a Theology of Aging, with theologians clumsily applying their wooden ideas to a field of which they had little firsthand knowledge; or, like Nouwen and Gaffney's Aging, they were largely inspirational works with little theological substance. Several years ago philosopher Stuart Spicker and others edited a fine volume on the humanities and aging, under the title Aging and the Aged, which contained among its articles a few with religious interest. In the last year or so, some solid theological writing on aging has finally begun to appear, and Ministry with the Aging is among the best of the new crop.

The theologians who have written for this volume have done their homework. Their contributions are meaty. John LaPorte's survey of "The Elderly in the Life and Thought of the Early Church" is an especially juicy morsel. His treatment of the role of widows in the early Church and of the spirituality of the elderly is rich in insights for contemporary ministry. Martin Heinecken's "Basic Affirmations" show his Lutheran commitments, with emphasis on sin and the agape/eros tension, but they also issue a strong call to social justice on behalf of the elderly. Urban Holmes also lashes the sharp blade of social criticism in exposing the impoverishment of the aged which comes from America's flaccid ritual life. John Bennett's review of ethical issues is better balanced than most, but too general to be much help, except for a summary of views on euthanasia. Other articles consider family relations of the elderly, death and dying, adult education, and lay ministry with older people.

DREW CHRISTIANSEN, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology Berkeley


This volume begins with a historical overview of the main developments in religious life through the centuries. Then, with the aid of a sociological model, it traces out the typical life cycle of individual congregations: foundation, expansion, stabilization, breakdown, and critical periods. These analyses are aimed at informing present action and aiding future planning. The authors recognize that recent changes in religious life "more often than not produced failures and confusion," with concomitant conflicts of group against group and a loss of communal identity (98–99). Yet they are optimistic in seeing a regrounding and reintegration as possible, if congregations give themselves to what they call "technologies of foolishness" and "action planning and the art of rationality" (114–60).

The book is free neither of trendy jargon nor of occasional bias. We are told, e.g., that the gospel needs to be disentangled from "the institutional maze", which prevents its being heard (169), but there is no balancing observation touching on the towering evangelical accomplishments effected by the institution through the centuries: establishment of world missions, parishes, dioceses, schools, hospitals. The program offered for the revitalizing of religious life may be helpful to a degree, but it rests too heavily on merely human techniques. Chaps. 4–6 express insufficient awareness that the deepest,
richest, and most radical changes in religious life through the ages have been effected not by committees and planned processes but by saintly men and women. The Holy Spirit gives perfect wisdom, says Scripture, not by techniques but through conversion, obedience, humility (Rom 12:2; Lk 10:16, 21). In the authors' view, an experimenting congregation is now probing in the darkness, a darkness which "is a time of exploring without insight" (102). This darkness image suggests that much of the detailed teaching of Vatican II, Paul VI, and John Paul II on the nature and future of religious life may be irrelevant. Likewise, it seems to imply that the New Testament has little light to cast on future practicalities in living celibacy, poverty, authority, freedom, obedience, prayer, community, and apostolate. The messages of theology and history are clear, but unfortunately some of them are missing in this book.

THOMAS DUBAY, S.M.
Marist Center, D.C.


The Cloud of Unknowing, edited and introduced by James Walsh, S.J., and prefaced by Simon Tugwell, O.P., is a fourteenth-century, anonymously written, mystical classic of utmost importance for a contemporary mystical spirituality. Because knowledge cannot fully comprehend God, all created things must be placed in a "cloud of forgetting" for a "cloud of unknowing" to arise between the contemplative and God. Naked, mystical love alone can pierce that cloud. The Cloud maintains a creative tension between apophatic contemplation and a human love of Jesus Christ. Very important are its teachings on the special signs for a contemplative vocation and on pseudo contemplation.

Hadewijch: The Complete Works, translated and introduced by Mother Columba Hart, O.S.B., and prefaced by Paul Mommaers, S.J., is "the most important exponent of love mysticism and one of the loftiest figures in the Western mystical tradition." A thirteenth-century ecstatic-visionary mystic of literary genius, psychological acumen, and intellectual depth, she taught her young Beguines that a life stripped of all experience could be mystical. Her main question is: What does concrete life mean for one wholly united to God? She emphasized turning in to the Trinity and Christ's humanity and outward in service, especially to the sick.

Philo of Alexandria: The Contemplative Life, The Giants, and Selections, translated and introduced by David Winston and prefaced by John Dillon, is an anthology of the most representative mystical philosophy of the great synthesizer of Jewish tradition and Platonic thought. Although he emphasized the "sober intoxication," rational emotions, tranquility, and stability which flowed from mystical states, he also noted its frenzied aspects. Knowledge of one's own nothingness and complete attachment to God lead to man's goal: knowledge and vision of God.

Native Mesoamerican Spirituality: Ancient Myths, Discourses, Stories, Doctrines, Hymns, Poems from Aztec, Yucatec, Quiche-Maya and Other Sacred Traditions, edited with a foreword, introduced, and notes by Miguel Leon-Portilla and prefaced by Fernando Horcasitas, is a volume of skillfully chosen and translated pre-Columbian spiritual texts. Anonymous priests, poets, sages, etc., between 950-1521 A.D. in Mexico and adjacent Central America, wrote in languages of sensuous attraction about the mysteries of life and death. This extraordinary wisdom frequently stood in sharp contrast to the official mystical militarism based on human sacrifice and ceremonial warfare.

HARVEY D. EGAN, S.J.
Boston College

THE WHOLE TRUTH ABOUT MAN:

A collection of inspiring addresses given by Pope John Paul II to university students, faculties, and administrators. The Pope delivered these addresses in Rome and in other cities and places to which he traveled on his recent journeys. The addresses reflect the Pope’s own experience as a university student and professor of philosophy.

The Pope urges students to seek the full truth about themselves and man, a truth that must include the truth about God. A university that does not pursue theological, metaphysical, and moral truth is not really a university at all. The level of a student’s or professor’s religious knowledge should not be inferior to the level of his academic knowledge. The Pope points out that the pursuit of religious truth is not an easy one. He agrees with certain students in Paris that belief and morality are difficult; but he goes on to say that this is the nature of anything worth living for. He thinks that there should be Catholic universities, and he suggests that they can and should be more than they are.

Of particular interest to this reviewer were the Pope’s remarks about the philosophy and theology of Thomas Aquinas. He quotes with approval the words of Leo XIII: “Human reason soared to the loftiest heights on the wings of Thomas and can scarcely rise any higher, while faith can expect no further or more reliable assistance than such as it has already received from Thomas.” The Pope adds: “The philosophy of St. Thomas deserves to be attentively studied and accepted with conviction by the youth of our day by reason of its spirit of openness and of universalism, characteristics which are hard to find in many trends of contemporary thought.”

EDWARD J. GRAT Sch
Cincinnati, Ohio


Brown has constructed a very fine essay in process theology on the theme of freedom, written the way process theology ought to be written. Lest that put off some readers, let me stress the final qualification. This is not the enthusiastic recommendation of Whitehead’s or Hartshorne’s esoteric categories. Their conceptualities remain very much in the background, used only when needed. Some very specifically theological, quite nonphilosophical topics are addressed, such as original sin, pride, sensuality, salvation, resurrection, and the nature of Jesus as the Christ, always systematically related to the theme of freedom. As such, it cannot help but be constructive, going beyond any philosophical foundations.

Chaps. 2 and 4, on the structure of freedom and its denial in sin, are nicely balanced. Freedom is analyzed as requiring two polar elements: context and creativity. Without a supporting context of physical and psychic well-being, institutional support, etc., the exercise of freedom is hampered, but it is also hampered if the individual refuses to engage himself creatively. The denial of freedom in sin reflects this polarity: on the one hand, the denial of context is the denial of the limits appropriate to being human, the effort to be like God, without restrictions, which is pride; while the denial of creativity is sensuality, the willingness to live on the surface of things, accepting the given, “losing a feel for the difference between ‘what is’ and ‘what might be’” (72). “Sensuality” is too often reduced to its sexual aspect; B.’s systematic argument is a powerful plea for the notion’s reinstatement.

John Cobb’s preface, situating B.’s essay in the context of Vatican II and liberation theology, may lead some to anticipate in B.’s essay a full-scale syn-
thesis of process and liberation theology. Since there is no necessary antithesis between them, this could conceivably be achieved, but their basic concerns are different. Liberation theology stays very much in the foreground, while process theology penetrates the wider context in the background. The chief function process theology can provide for liberation thought is a solid theoretical foundation, and this Brown explicitly undertakes to do in the final chapter, overcoming some of the conflicts indicated in the writings of, e.g., Alves and Gutiérrez.

The essay is tightly written, compressing a wealth of reflection. There is not a wasted word. This makes for rewarding, albeit somewhat difficult reading.

LEWIS S. FORD
Old Dominion Univ., Norfolk


Art and meaning is the undefinable and inescapable paradox that Küng claims to discuss in this brief excursus from his usual fare. Divided into six short chapters, conclusion, and poetic appendix, the book is a disappointment. Written in the style reminiscent of a parish talk, K.'s text is deceptively simple while appearing to sound profound. His knowledge of "modern" European art is superficial and his consideration of contemporary American art is almost tragiuc. His mixture of sweeping generalizations with insufficient examples is irritating; and this irritation eventually leads to angry frustration for the reader. The tragedy here is that there actually are some interesting ideas brought forth in this text. The value of the volume may be its signal as an awakening among theologians that art has meaning and value beyond artistic categories; and perhaps, that theology occurs in less traditional modes than treatises and doctrinal statements.

The central problem with K.'s interpretation of "art and meaning" is that his definition of art is not merely elusive but nonexistent. Although claiming to proceed from the "reality of art" (leaving the debate as to a definition of art to art historians and critics), K. proceeds to prove his limited understanding of art's nature and to proclaim a nostalgia for an art which is "open to religion"—a euphemism for the time when art served religion. Clearly, art has always been open to religion; whether art has always been open to the Church or vice versa is another matter entirely. However, consider that K.'s intended subject of discourse is not religion but the Church.

K. raises some pertinent issues as to the role of the artist as a communicator of meaning and value, and also the symbolic consciousness of art, but his text is too short to be anything less than superficial. The importance of K.'s text is that a major theologian is raising these concerns and may make others cognizant of the fact that theology and theological concerns go on in the "real world." To paraphrase K., perhaps the heretical question is: Is not theology too important to be left to theologians?

DIANE APOSTOLOS-CAPPADONA
George Washington Univ., D.C.

BOOKS RECEIVED

SCRIPTURAL STUDIES


Theological Anthropology. Ed. J. P.


HISTORICAL


MORAL, LAW, LITURGY


PASTORAL AND ASCETICAL


**PHILOSOPHY**


**SPECIAL QUESTIONS**


