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Presenting This Issue

The first issue of TS's 44th volume contains major articles on Luther, on Matthew, and on American theology, together with the annual Moral Notes and a new look at Lamennais.

Justification and Faith in Luther's Theology, our initial contribution to the 500th anniversary of the Reformer's birth, treats his central complex of themes and convictions, i.e., how God converts the sinner from self-approval first to self-accusation and then to trusting adherence to Christ (and to union with him), whose saving work is mediated by the sacramental, promissory word as being valid pro me. Luther's significance in this area lay in unifying theology around soteriology and in overcoming the medieval divorce between theology and religious experience. JARED WICKS, S.J., Th.D. from Westphalian Wilhelm's University, Münster, is professor of fundamental and historical theology in Rome's Gregorian University, with special interest and competence in Reformation theological controversy. Two new books by Wicks will appear this year: Luther and His Legacy: An Introduction (Glazier) and Cajetan und die Anfänge der Reformation (Aschendorff). He is preparing a study of Cajetan's theological career as well as articles for the Dictionnaire de spiritualité.

Matthew on Christ and the Law argues that, for Mt, the law must not be limited to the outward act; it is summed up in the commandments to love God and neighbor wholeheartedly. In 5:17-48 Jesus does not take away from the law; rather, he brings it to its full eschatological measure of completeness. BRICE L. MARTIN, Ph.D. from McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, is currently pastor at Bedford Park Chapel in Toronto. The scholarly area of his predilection is the New Testament. He has published articles recently on the unity of the NT, on the identity of egō in Rom 7:14-25, and on Paul's understanding of Christ and the law, and is presently working on historical-critical method.

The Reasoning Heart: An American Rationale for Christian Discernment is the second of a series of articles in philosophical theology by the John Courtney Murray Group (see our Dec. 1982 issue for Donald L. Gelpi's exploration of the community called to conversion). This approach to Christian moral discernment based on the thinking of American theologians stresses the normative contribution of biblical symbols and distinctive Christian affectivity in guiding moral evaluation. WILLIAM C. SPOHN, S.J., Ph.D. from the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, is Bannan Professor of Christian Values at the University of Santa Clara for the 1982-83 academic year, after which he will return to the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley. He specializes in Scripture and ethics as well as in American theology and moral philosophy. The
Paulist Press will soon publish his *What Are They Saying about Scripture and Ethics?*, a study of aesthetics and ethics in Jonathan Edwards, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Josiah Royce, and William James.

**Notes on Moral Theology: 1982** concentrates on four areas that have generated much intriguing literature during the past year: (1) intrinsic evil, moral norms, and the magisterium; (2) moral reasoning and storytelling; (3) nuclear deterrence and nuclear war; (4) women, newborns, and the conceived. The section on nuclear morality continues *TS*'s effort (see the Sept. and Dec. 1982 issues) to engage the issues that surround and penetrate perhaps the most difficult ethical problem of this or any century. RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J., Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Institute of Ethics, Georgetown University, has fashioned these invaluable Notes for *TS* since 1965. Their publication in an 892-page volume, *Notes on Moral Theology 1965 through 1980* (University Press of America, 1981), has given us an incomparable history of moral and ethical thinking since Vatican II, as well as a fascinating portrait of a first-rate scholar's control of a vast intercontinental literature, his methodology, and the development of his ideas through two decades.

**The Condemnation of Lamennais: A New Dossier** takes up a famous case that played a prominent role in the painful effort of the Church to respond adequately to the conditions of modern European society. The case has attracted many competent historians, but they have been handicapped by the absence of full documentation. This is now available through the publication of the hitherto secret correspondence of the Church officials involved, which calls for drastic revisions in accepted judgments. JOSEPH N. MOODY, Ph.D. from Fordham and long-time beloved teacher at the Catholic University of America, is adjunct professor of history at Boston College and St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass. Over the years he has focused most of his attention on modern French history. In 1978 the Syracuse University Press published his *French Education since Napoleon*.

Two practical observations. First, copies of our *Index, Volumes 1–40: 1940–1979* are still available at $15 in the U.S., $16 Canada and foreign. Order from Theological Studies, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057. Second, I ask our subscribers to renew their subscriptions within a month after receipt of the renewal notice. The risk in late renewal is that the next issue may no longer be available. This happened with the Dec. 1982 issue—to the dismay of all concerned.

_Walter J. Burghardt, S.J._

*Editor*


Stacey, W. D. *Groundwork of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Augsburg,
184 THEOLOGICAL STUDIES


DOCTRINAL THEOLOGY


HISTORICAL


BOOKS RECEIVED


MORAL, LAW, LITURGY

Gorman, M. J. Abortion and the Early Church. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1982. Pp. 120. $3.95.

La teologia morale nella storia e nella
186 THEOLOGICAL STUDIES


PASTORAL AND ASCETICAL


Catoir, J. That Your Joy May Be Full. N.Y.: Christophers, 1982. Pp. 120. $3.50.


Daly, G., O.S.A. Asking the Father. Wilmington: Glazier, 1982. Pp. 120. $8.95; $4.95 paper.


Green, M. Evangelism Now and Then. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1982. Pp. 150. $3.05.


Moore, S. The Inner Loneliness. N.Y.: Crossroad, 1982. Pp. 120. $9.95.


PHILOSOPHY


SPECIAL QUESTIONS


A few years ago Père Bertier de Sauvigny remarked that he had kept a dossier on Félicité de Lamennais throughout his decades of teaching and writing. When it became evident that his monographs on the Restoration and his volumes on Metternich would prevent a serious study of Lamennais, he gave the dossier to a young student. That protégé must rejoice at the publication of these texts, which clear up much of the obscurity that has clouded this case for its contemporaries and all since. The competent historians on both sides of the Atlantic who have worked on the problem must be equally grateful that solid documentation has replaced inference on many key issues with which they have grappled.

Historians of nineteenth-century France can hardly ignore l'affaire Lamennais. Interpretations vary, but no one contests its importance. Recently, when Bernard Plongeron summarized his innovative research on the Revolutionary period, he saw Lamennais as the last flicker of the eighteenth-century Catholic Enlightenment, already dimmed by the Revolution and now extinguished in France “by a vengeful ultramontanism.”

His investigations of the Catholic Enlightenment had revealed that informed and believing Catholics in the eighteenth century had advanced a program that would have been of immense advantage to the Church had it been adopted. Their pleas for a simpler, more understandable liturgy—in the language, it was hoped, of the people—for the regular doctrinal instruction of the faithful, for broader popular education, and for a greater role of the laity in ecclesiastical decisions were constants in the reformers’ plans. But the theme of freedom of religion, often denoted as the core of the philosophes’ position, faced the reformers with a solid tradition enveloping doctrine and practice since the Reformation. It had been commonly accepted that credal unity was necessary for the state to preserve its integrity. The fact that religious pluralism had been partly legalized in England in 1688 and had been practiced in the Netherlands did not appeal to most rulers, although Emperor Joseph II and Victor Amadeus II of Savoy had decreed toleration in their domains and had won some support from Catholic curialists on the grounds of utility. Rulers and theologians generally would reject as too dangerous the right of each to practice and preach any doctrine of one’s choosing. The modest

---


acceptance that had been won among Catholics for the innovation hardly survived the trauma of the Revolution.

It was Lamennais's vibrant assertion of freedom of religion in the widest sense that lay at the root of his difficulties. It explains the paradox of the papal condemnation of this most vigorous ultramontanist and the most successful apologist of the Church in the new Romantic idiom. The man who lived his aphorism "No Christianity without Catholicism and no Catholicism without the pope" could not believe that the institutions that were central to his theory would turn hostile. He remained puzzled even after Mirari vos and firmly believed that he had been unjustly condemned solely because of political pressure: "I will never understand the verdict without a precise indictment presented to the accused, without investigation, debate, or defense. Such a monstrous judicial proceeding would be revolting even in Turkey." The secrecy that surrounds these investigations justifies the mystification. He might have been surprised had he been presented with this mass of testimony and opinion that had been collected in his case.

The publication of these documents has been long in preparation. One of the brothers, Louis, has been editing the Correspondance générale de Lamennais (9 vols.; Paris: A. Colin, 1971–81). The texts themselves were difficult: they are largely in Italian, often in the colloquial forms of the early nineteenth century. Permission to work on them had been given by John XXIII and his successors; but when the work was completed, the editors sought explicit approval from the Vatican. Wisely they chose to select about two hundred of the most significant, omitting the perfunctory or those which had already appeared in the Correspondance générale. As compensation, they added some hundred extracts from contemporary journals and nine essential documents from other sources.

The general conclusion that emerges is that, in the aftermath of the upheaval of 1789–1815 and with new threats arising from the Revolution of 1830, it was nearly impossible for Lamennais to receive a favorable hearing in Rome. He could not have chosen a more inauspicious moment to lead his Pilgrims of Liberty to an Italy where an inexperienced pope had already faced serious insurrections in the Papal States. As in all else in the nineteenth-century papacy, the shadow of the temporal power clouded objectivity.

The documents support a much more benign view of Gregory XVI than is commonly held. Lamennais was correct when he frequently confided to friends (Gerbert, Corr. gen. 1, #839) that the pope was woefully ignorant of the world. Lamennais's liberal views had seriously disturbed him, for he considered them subversive of all authority. But he was appreciative of the French priest's talents and his contributions to the Church, and he was anxious to retain him in the fold. Despite glaring
inadequacies, the pope was not overbearing nor inconsiderate. Lacordaire, writing to Foisset (Corr. gen. 5, #99), declared that it was his unshakable conviction that Gregory wanted to save the abbé and would never have condemned him had he not obstinately remained in Rome. Certainly the pope had received the three pilgrims graciously in the audience of March 13. Had Lamennais thanked Cardinal Pacca for his communication and left Rome in June or July 1832, declaring that he was returning to France to resume L'Avenir, the process would have died. The editor concurs in this opinion of Lacordaire and adds that it is unfair to see Gregory as an autocrat "with his finger perpetually on the trigger of condemnation" (#143).

When in 1833 it appeared that the affair had been successfully concluded, the pope wrote three briefs to express his happiness: to the archbishop of Paris, declaring himself "overwhelmed with joy" (#177); to the bishop of Rennes, Lamennais's home diocese, suggesting that both should rejoice "with the dear son of that diocese who has obediently accepted the encyclical" (#178); and to the penitent himself, praising him for his courage and his devotion to the truth (#179). All three bear the stamp of sincerity, though it must be noted that they followed the strong pressure to obtain the compliance of the priest-editor.

The entourage of the pope generally believed that the French priest was in serious error. The classic example is Luigi Lambruschini, who was nuncio in Paris when L'Avenir was first published and was an important cardinal in Rome during the controversy. He filled scores of pages with "evidence" that Lamennais was opposing Scripture, the Fathers, the councils, and the great theologians; at the end he recommended that he be given a reprimand and sent off with a blessing, despite the fact that Les paroles d'un croyant "filled him with horror."

Archbishop Hyacinthe de Quelen of Paris is often roughly handled in the secondary accounts; in the documents he appears kindly and conciliatory. Writing to the Holy See on November 10, 1831, he expresses confidence in Lamennais's sincerity; he has hesitated to give him too evident approval lest he scandalize the faithful (#10). According to the nuncio Garibaldi, the archbishop attempted to persuade Lamennais not to go to Rome, since the pope could not possibly approve the proposal that the funds owed to the French Church under the concordat be refused (#14). He was equally certain that it was a mistake to trumpet the intention to go to Rome; had the Pilgrims gone quietly, they would have been received in the same fashion. De Quelen's underlying assumption, probably correct, was that the pope did not wish to pass judgment on this issue. When the conflict appeared to have been settled on December 13, 1833, the archbishop suggested to the pope that he address Lamennais some words of paternal appreciation so that the publication of the
adhesion to the encyclical will be clearly seen as the end of the affair. He will write himself, and perhaps offer the priest a canoncy; and he will attempt a reconciliation between Lamennais and the bishop of Rennes (#169). The letter to the reconciled priest would satisfy most injured egos: it speaks of his attachment, his joy, and his hope for an early opportunity to embrace him. When de Quelen heard that the priest was about to publish *Les paroles*, he wrote again in most courtly terms, regretting that he had not had the pleasure of bidding him adieu before he left Paris. The report that has reached him may be a calumny; but in case it be true, the archbishop wishes to be armed to defend his friend’s reputation. Despite de Quelen’s Gallicanism and ideological distance from Lamennais, there can be no doubt that he was sincerely devoted to the priest’s interests.

The concern of the archbishop that some French Catholics might be scandalized was not a chimera. The documents attest to the depth of the fissure in the French Church as a consequence of the Revolution and that it surfaced in resentment to Lamennais. This hostility could find expression in an individual, as with Père Jean de L. Rozavan, S.J.—ironically the only other Breton in the cast. He first appears as one of the expert consultors assembled in Rome to advise the pope on the case. He was already convinced that Lamennais was a threat (#31) and never lost an opportunity to sway official opinion in that direction, sending news clippings and verbal rumors regularly to the Vatican.

Equally disturbed by *L’Avenir*’s vision of the role of the Church was Cardinal Paul d’Astros, Archbishop of Toulouse, who was not content with solitary protests. He orchestrated the dispatch of a report from thirteen bishops in the Midi to the pope calling for condemnation of Lamennais (#66, April 1832). From then until the meeting of the Commission for Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs in February 1833, he was the source of fourteen of the documents in this collection. From the intensity of the response it is evident that there was a reservoir of resentment in French Catholicism toward any concept associated with the Revolution; it was this fever of resentment that handicapped the work of the Church during the century and led to the disasters at its close. It is interesting to compare the moderation in the letter of Cardinal Gregorio, written at the direction of the pope, to the importunities of the Cardinal of Toulouse. To the collection of demands for censure gathered by d’Astros, the Holy See responded with “patience, prudence, charity.” It is hard to believe that the Vatican was determined to break the French priest. The Roman position remained: Lamennais cannot be treated as a heretic nor can his supporters be forced to renounce his doctrine; especially one should not humiliate those who fall into error (#124, 129).
The standard accounts of l'affaire Lamennais have placed major emphasis on the machinations of the European courts, which used every device to destroy this dangerous clerical enemy. The uprisings in the Romagna had brought Austrian troops into northern Italy to regain this most rebellious segment of the papal possessions. This military presence was an implied threat that Metternich used adroitly. A flow of messages to his Vatican ambassador, Count Lutzow (#59), and to the nuncio in Vienna (#195), or ministerial notes from the Imperial Cabinet to the Cardinal Secretary of State (#26) stress, often in unctuous phrase, the threat to government and religion posed by Lamennais. Appeals are made to other monarchs (#60, to the King of the Belgians); copies of radical journals that mention Lamennais favorably are forwarded to Rome; and, most effectively, letters among the circle of the priest's friends were intercepted by the Austrian secret police and made available to the Vatican. This concentrated effort to undermine Roman confidence in the sincerity of Lamennais was supported by similar pressure from Saint Petersburg—an influence particularly resented as the czar was engaged in a brutal repression of his Catholic subjects, consequent on the Polish rebellion of 1830. Yet it is the opinion of the editors—and this reviewer would concur—that while the conservative courts were certainly influential at the Vatican, they were not decisive in the condemnation. Gregory XVI was not politically oriented and the decision was made on what were considered religious grounds.

Lamennais had one firm supporter among the papal consultors, Gioacchino Ventura di Raulica. Even he had some doubts about the balance of the political views of L'avenir, but he argued that they must be weighed against the unquestioned contributions of the Lamennais circle. Ventura even found the journal's criticism of the severity of the papal repressions in the Romagna acceptable, since Lamennais had never lost sight of the interests of religion or the dignity of the Holy See. Because these two themes had been dominant in all his writings, the priest had been consistently attacked by the enemies of the faith. In defending true liberty with the stability of government, L'Avenir had reconciled an immense number to Rome. It had exposed the anti-Catholic nature of the new government in France. Against the dangerous Gallican policies of this regime, L'Avenir had defended the liberty of the Church and the infallibility of the pope. Its editors had come to Rome with the honorable intention of consulting the Holy See and had offered to submit fully to its decision. In contrast to the services of this French paper, there is the frightful repression of Catholics by the Russians and other enemies of Lamennais.

The final tragedy came swiftly. All sides appeared to have been satisfied
by Lamennais's unqualified acceptance. Yet the atmosphere had been poisoned by the intemperate attacks and a sensitive man had rebelled against the suggestion of the pope that he use his pen to defend _Mirari vos_. He believed that while prohibited from writing on spiritual matters, he was free as a Christian to write on the political. He seems to have intended his _Les paroles d'un croyant_ as the cry of his conscience against the oppression of the masses of mankind; or it may have been the pained expression of the anguish he had suffered. Its consequence was his condemnation by name in _Singulari nos_, July 7, 1834—one of the documents in the Appendix.

It would have been too much to expect that any of the opponents of Lamennais could have foreseen the Declaration on Religious Liberty of the Second Vatican Council; but it is curious that they did not examine "monstrous errors" similar to those of Lamennais among Catholic leaders in other countries. The Vatican may have had no report of the appearance of Bishop John England before a joint session of the United States Congress, where in full episcopal regalia he demonstrated the complete compatibility between Catholic principles and the Constitution's guarantees of full religious liberty. They might have been disturbed by his peroration that while he would reject any Congressional interference with his religion, he would equally reject any suggestion from Rome on his politics. Even while England was still in his home diocese of Cork, he had insisted that in the matter of religious liberty the United States was the model for the whole world to follow. While _Mirari vos_ was in preparation, Tocqueville was making his memorable voyage to America, noting the passionate devotion of American Catholics to the defense of liberty elsewhere; but _Democracy in America_ had not been published and its pertinent passages had not been available to the participants in this controversy. That Catholics on the two sides of the Atlantic would not have understood each other is evident from the reaction of the future bishop John Hughes. When _Mirari vos_ was brought to his attention by the nativist press, he cavalierly responded that the encyclical was opposed only to the abuses of religious liberty. He would have found the text in the appendix to this volume useful!

But if America seemed remote and unimportant, the European press covered rather fully the speeches of Daniel O'Connell. Any participant in this debate could have read the Irish statesman's flaming appeals "to the eternal right of liberty of conscience" and his call to all Catholics to "exterminate the Inquisition in Spain," "to stamp out the cruel persecution of the Protestants in France" and "every similar violation of religious liberty which contravenes every principle of justice." All these activities, the Irish liberator thundered, were "contrary to the sacred and inalienable right of humanity."
While the Belgian Catholics who were assisting in the writing of their liberal constitution when Mirari vos was being prepared lacked this crusading passion, they did endorse, and profit by, full liberty of conscience. And the pleas of exiled Polish Catholics protesting against Russian repression of their religion appeared in many European journals. All these developments, save the American, were fully reported in L'Avenir, and these documents testify to the care with which its opponents scrutinized its columns. Yet, except for a statement in the Censure of Toulouse (#66) that L'Avenir "claims credit" for the revolutions in Ireland, Belgium, and Poland and certain complaints of Belgian conservatives (#114, 115, 118), it is the threat to old regime governments that attracts the attention of the critics. That Catholics were suffering from political persecution and could benefit from religious liberty never enters their calculations!

Scholars will welcome the publication of The Condemnation of Lamennais for its clarifications of important aspects of this celebrated case. But the removal of these obscurities is not its sole contribution. It focuses again on the tragedy of a deeply religious man who committed his superior talents to the defense of his faith. He was effective enough with his contemporaries in this task to deserve the title "The Chaplain of the Romantic Movement." Certainly the prevailing Romantic mood colored some of his proposals, e.g., his suggestion to French clergymen, struggling to rebuild after the Revolution, that they should reject the payments promised by the state in order to preserve their liberty. Since the time was not propitious for such quixotic self-denial, he was an egregious failure.

Or so it appeared. But l'affaire Lamennais could be viewed as an incident—albeit a regressive one—on the Church's tortuous road toward the acceptance of religious pluralism. Thus Vidler has viewed Lamennais as one of two types who appear in the Church in time of serious change: the prophet who points to the challenge of the future and the priest whose interest is the preservation of the heritage of the past. Lamennais belongs to the prophetic tradition: he sensed that the world was in process of an awesome mutation; he saw more clearly than most the direction in which history was moving. He was specific: the bulk of mankind was coming to demand a share in political decision-making and a portion of the new wealth that the machine was beginning to provide. He argued that the Church would have to deal with the many in forming policy. If the Church were to seek support among the people of God, she would be much more secure than trusting in the volatile will of monarchs. This would not be a distortion of her history, for the seed had been planted in the Gospels and had been maturing for centuries before it could produce fruit in this springtime of peoples. This was a prophetic
vision indeed, and it met the fate of many of its antecedents in ancient Israel. But as we read the documents in this collection, we recall the words of Paul VI at the beginning of his pontificate: "the great principles of the Revolution were merely appropriated from certain Christian ideas—fraternity, liberty, equality, progress, the desire to improve the working classes. All these were Christian. . . ."

St. John's Seminary
Brighton, Mass.

JOSEPH N. MOODY
BOOK REVIEWS


This book has been put together by recasting lectures given on various occasions and to very different audiences. There is no attempt at a unifying theme, unless it be a steady quest for whatever meaning the OT might contribute to some contemporary concerns. This amounts to a treatment of about fifteen themes to which L. brings both personal involvement and a trained, inquiring mind. Our quest for unity, pluralism in theology, the distribution of power in our ministries, liberation, the people of God, growth and its limits, work and leisure, the love ethic, and prophetic charisms are among the disparate topics on which L. both comments and hopes to provoke reflection. The risks and pitfalls in such a venture from there to here are obvious to anyone familiar with the hermeneutic problem as it has been raised in modern biblical scholarship. Still, the effort is worth a try, and who will not sympathize with our author voicing impatience at the impression we give outsiders “that preambles and problems of detail prevent our ever coming to the point” (ix)? We are so good at analyzing, dissecting, restructuring, and hypothesizing that we can create our own little self-contained world, deaf to the questions and needs of a larger audience.

It is not easy either to read or to review this book. As to the former, I am aware that L. has an enviable and deserved reputation for eloquence and power when he speaks or writes in German; unfortunately, this does not come through in English. The writing is pedestrian, sometimes opaque, and in a few places simply unintelligible. I understand better why von Rad was so reluctant to have his work translated into English. The background of vast learning and genuine insight is evident to an OT scholar. One admires his profound understanding of Deuteronomy, the recognition that the historical credo of Deut 26:5-10 is a retrospect on the Hexateuch rather than its catalyst or brief summary, the interpretation of Gen 1:28 as blessing rather than command, the familial background of the theologoumenon “People of Yahweh,” the understanding of Sabbath as an openness to God which gives meaning to our own work. These and many more are precious acquisitions, but I am not at all sure that they will come through with their full impact in this translation. The reader will have no help from any indexes, and more than 25 typographical errors will stretch his patience. It is difficult to escape the impression that the book was put together in haste.

Among the better chapters is the one describing the witness of the priestly tradition (P) to a stable cosmos enriched by the loving presence
of God through the cult. L. has effectively used the ancient (no later than 1700 B.C.) Atrahasis Epic as a counterpoint to the creation story of the priestly writer. This great Mesopotamian myth opens up new possibilities for our understanding of Gen 1–9, enabling us to grasp more securely some of the major themes of the Flood story. Less successful, I think, is his treatment of Israelite monotheism as contrasted with the polytheism of Israel’s neighbors. Israel’s early and uncompromising worship of one God will seem oddly underplayed in L.’s concern “to release both polytheism and monotheism from the labels ‘error’ and ‘truth’ and to display both as two, in some sense equally valuable if epoch-centered, ways of speaking about God” (150). Finally, in comparing the love ethic of OT and NT, it might have helped his case had L. observed that the “new commandment” of the Johannine teaching reflects the vision of Jer 31:31–34 with its promise of a new covenant, a new relationship which empowers us to love others with God’s love.

University of Scranton

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


The authoritative Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch, Targum Onkelos, was last translated into English by a Wesleyan minister, John W. Etheride, and published in 1862 (see The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Pentateuch: With the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum: From the Chaldee [2 vols. reprinted in one; New York: Ktav, 1968]). It was not a good translation, and so one welcomes this new translation of Tg. Onkelos of Genesis. It is presumably to be followed by others on the rest of the books of the Pentateuch.

As the subtitle indicates, this new translation has been based on the critical edition of A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1959–73). Unfortunately, the translators did not succeed in wresting permission from Brill to reproduce Sperber’s Aramaic text. As a result, they have translated the Sperber text but faced the translation with the antiquated (scarcely critical) text of the targum published by A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos (2 vols.; Berlin: Gorzelanczyk, 1884). In most cases that I have checked, the difference between the Berliner text and the translation’s substratum is minor; the notes given at the bottom of the pages usually (but not always) call attention to the different readings of the Sperber edition. The wise student, however, will use this new translation with a copy of Sperber’s Aramaic text. But it raises a real question: Why was it necessary to include the Berliner text at all? The inclusion of it
has only increased the price of the book, and anyone who is going to consult the new translation for serious work will have to get Sperber anyway. For future volumes the Berliner text should simply be omitted; a good translation of Sperber's text with suitable notes is all that is needed.

The new translation is, in general, well done. It has been produced in modern, idiomatic English, with difficult Aramaic phrases rendered more literally in parentheses. Greater consistency, however, should have been used in translating and preparing the text. For instance, in Gen 3:5 the serpent says to Eve *thwn krbrbyn*, which is translated "you will be like angels," and a note refers to Gen 6:2, where a form of the same noun is also found, *bny rbryb*, but which is translated more literally as "the sons of the great ones." That *kēlohim* (lit. "like God," Gen 3:5) is rendered by a form of *rab*, "great," is thus obscured. Similarly, the spelling "Onkelos" is used in the book's title, but "Onqelos" occurs in the first sentence of the introduction.

The notes which accompany the text are also, in general, well written. They are sometimes explanatory, sometimes grammatical, but most often referential, giving parallels to rabbinical writings and medieval Jewish literature, which manifest the translators' wide knowledge and competence. These are a gold mine of information, but some of them could stand some improvement. Thus, the translation of Hebrew *Šâlēm*, the town from which Melchizedek came forth (Gen 14:18 [Salem, in the RSV]), is translated in the targum as *Yrwšlm*, "Jerusalem." That should certainly have been illustrated by reference to the *Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (22:13).

The first paragraph of the introduction, however, is imperfect and does not give the good impression which the rest of the book does. It reads: "The Targum Onqelos... on the Pentateuch is probably the oldest and certainly the most accurate Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Scriptures" (9). But there are three fragmentary texts of targums from Qûmran caves 4 and 11 which certainly antedate Tg. Onqelos (4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, and 11QtgJob). Certainly Leviticus and Job are to be reckoned as parts of the "Hebrew Scriptures." Later on, the translators themselves admit: "...despite the reputation of T.O. for its literal rendering of the M.T. [= Masoretic Text], there are thousands of deviations—some obvious ones, but many of a more subtle type—which cannot be imputed to accidental misinterpretation or to scribal errors" (10). Granting this, we may still admit that Tg. Onqelos, when compared with the other classic targums (Pseudo-Jonathan, Neofiti I, and Yerushalmi II), may probably be "the most accurate," but it is still more paraphrastic than the earlier Qumran targums (see my article "The Targum of Leviticus from Qumran Cave 4," *Maarav* 1 [1978] 9–10). Moreover, the argument about Greek words
in Tg. Onqelos not revealing a background in Babylonia is wholly unproven. How does one account for the greater incidence of Greek words in Syriac (East Aramaic contemporary with that of Tg. Onqelos) than in the Palestinian (Western) Aramaic of the first two Christian centuries? The reader will have to prescind from the first paragraph of the introduction.

The book should have been more carefully proofread, since the typographical errors in it are legion. By and large, however, the book makes an excellent contribution to targumic study; it will further the study of Tg. Onqelos and of Jewish theology of the patristic period.

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


Often enough pastors, teachers of religions, and other concerned lay people accuse theologians and exeges of writing only for themselves. Not only do they seem to choose esoteric topics; they write in such a way that often even the professional is left in the dust. Fitzmyer's newest book counteracts all such accusations. Not only does he write of topics that pop up in religious discussions and in homilies, but he writes in a style that people can easily understand.

The book has its origin in two earlier works: a brief summary of NT Christological problems for Chicago Studies and an updated version for the NRT. This book is a further revision of the original with an addition of four questions.

The format is question and answer, much like what appeared in the past in Sunday Roman Catholic publications under the rubric "The Question Box." F. selects his twenty questions carefully, including some ever-popular red herrings such as the virginal conception, miracles of Jesus, the brothers and sisters of the Lord, as well as more nuanced problems: How is Jesus the redeemer of the world, and what does the Resurrection mean in the NT. With set purpose F. limits his response to the NT. He does not engage in any dialogue with systematic theology or the history of dogmatics. As must be true for many of these questions, he states simply that the NT gives no complete or final answer.

The value of such a study lies in its succinct portrayal of the findings of contemporary scholarship in response to certain Christological questions. People who are curious about the actual testimony of the NT can read this book and quickly receive an accurate summary of NT scholarship. Any weakness will flow from this strength: the response is limited to the NT and the response is a summary. Often enough, however, F.
refers to other available material if the reader wishes to seek further understanding.

I can see this book used for inquiry classes which would also include the results of contemporary systematic theology in their purview. I can also envision it appearing on a required-reading list for college courses in Christology, since it will help the beginning student to deal quickly and accurately with many of the NT questions. To such individuals and groups F.'s work will be most helpful.

How I envision this work being used brings out a continual problem for contemporary scholars. Too often the exegete writes without the further collaboration of the systematic theologian, and perhaps more frequently the systematic theologian writes without the collaboration of the exegete. I would welcome the study which would not only give the NT data but would also include the history of theology and the results of contemporary theology. Then we could have a contemporary Christological catechism and not just NT answers or dogmatic answers.

Duquesne University

JOHN F. O'GRADY


To rethink and recast trinitarian theology is for many today a highly dubious and even superfluous endeavor, but it is precisely this type of skepticism which Jenson laments as a sign of contemporary theology's intellectual and religious bankruptcy. Nothing short of a fully restored trinitarian piety and theology will suffice for Jenson; his is a creative and oft incisive historical and theological analysis and reconstruction which signals good new directions in trinitarian theology. A substantial portion of his creative proposal is adumbrated by his book on Barth, God after God (Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), and readers will detect that at some points J. unexplainedly still holds on to Barth, but overall we hear more of J.'s own voice—a voice very much worth hearing.

The correlation between the name of God and the narration of God's works yields two biblical identifications of God: in the OT God is "whoever freed us from Egypt"; in the NT God is "whoever raised Jesus from the dead." The trinitarian name of God becomes the Church's name for God, as it combines both the content and logic of what J. considers God's own self-identification. (For rather unusual reasons J. insists on retaining "Father" as the address for God. In order to make the point that there is no sexuality in God, and given a choice between "Mother" and "Father," Israel, Jesus, and the Church recognized the "ontological superiority of women" and chose the term which is "more easily separable
from its function as the name of a role in our bisexual reproduction." Since God is neither our begetter nor our bearer, only the inferior, fragile male sexuality offers the proper term of address.)

J. locates the gospel's identification of God in terms of three temporal arrows: God is what happens with Jesus; God is what will come of Jesus and us together; God is the will in which all things have Jesus' love as their destiny. He sees these "trajectories" as contiguous with and the fulfilment of the Jewish experience of God (threefoldness corresponding to: Yahweh's not being on the side of established order; Yahweh's will not being identical with natural necessity; Yahweh being the promised one of Israel). It should be noted that J.'s NT analysis in this section reflects more confidence than many would have in so-called primary or primitive trinitarian "formulas" (e.g., Rom 8:11, 15:16; Eph 2:18; 2 Cor 1:21 f., and others).

One of J.'s central preoccupations is the relationship between God and time. Chapter 3 charts out in abundant historical and theological detail the meaning of the *homoousios* in terms of this very question. In J.'s opinion, to the degree that early Christianity capitulated to the Hellenic doctrine of God's timelessness, it failed. Subordinationism (mediation of the timeless God through an intermediary) and modalism (a timeless God who is above the distinctions of Father, Son, Spirit) in their various historical forms are defeated and contradicted at Nicaea. "To be God is to be related... To be God is not only to give being, it is also to receive being." The dogmatic formulation is a triumph because the temporal reference of trinitarian theology is reaffirmed.

J. draws a great deal on Cappadocian theology, especially on Gregory of Nyssa's insight that "God" is a predicate of the divine activity toward us. Thus it is deity which the Father gives, Son receives, Spirit communicates; this is J.'s lead-in to "triune identity" as his translation of *hypostasis*. His formula: "There is one event, God, of three identities." J.'s proposal is fully eschatological and thereby reverses the pattern which attributes timelessness to God. Jesus' deity is to be interpreted as a final *outcome*, and in this way as eternal; this is God's Faithfulness. Then, inner trinitarian relations are amended and multiplied so that Father and Son also derive deity from Spirit. God is triune in that God always has future in temporal unhinderedness. God's *ousia* is temporal infinity or, in the terms of J.'s revisionist metaphysics keyed on the historical reality of Jesus, the resurrection is God's *ousia*. Thus God is both event and enduring reality with a future guaranteed by historical temporal events. However, J. does not intend any of this to be construed as a "process" theism; his indebtedness to Barth (also Rahner and Jungel) discourages such a direction.
THE JESUS OF FAITH: A STUDY IN CHRISTOLOGY

By Michael L. Cook, S.J.


C. has written an intelligent and balanced contemporary Christology. Principally influenced by Schoonenberg, Pannenberg, Moltmann, and Hodgson, he is at home with both scriptural issues and systematic theologians. Faith, he tells us early, is constitutive of what it is to be human; in some form or other it is native to humanity and to history. Christian faith is a willing response to Jesus as God’s Word, so that encounter with him is indispensable. Historical knowledge is a subordinate but necessary medium to image forth this Jesus to whom Christians respond. Afraid with the New Questers that Jesus can all too easily become a timeless paradigm or a variable in a thoroughly anthropocentric theology, C. devotes the larger portion of the volume to tracing the basic development of Christology from the ministry of Jesus to Chalcedon. Norman Perrin provides C. with criteria for authentic Jesus material, and the reconstructed image of the Jesus of the ministry is the familiar one of the eschatological prophet who in word and deed anticipates the coming kingdom of God. Particularly interesting is C.’s contention that Jesus used the “day of the Son of man” (cf. Lk 17:24) as a prophetic symbol of God’s vindication of his ministry. “The distinction is thus not between Jesus and another figure known as the Son of Man, but between the present crisis... and the future resolution of that crisis in the divine activity of vindication” (71).

In treating Jesus’ death, C. employs Moltmann but with a critical and balanced eye. He locates the experience of abandonment in human sinfulness and not in a stasis within God, as does Moltmann. The narratives of the Resurrection appearances receive attention principally with regard to the connections they exhibit between the cross and Easter. The narratives appear to C. to be more a mode of theological presentation than stories to be accepted literally.

What enabled the early Church to move to an explicit Christology was Jesus’ use of the apocalyptic image of the Son of man and the apocalyptic event of resurrection as a reality affecting Jesus. In this movement soteriology continued to be the root of Christology, but the identification of Jesus with God’s saving activity will push the Church beyond functional modes of expression to the affirmation of identity-in-being. The key to this ontic affirmation is the early Church’s experience of the Spirit, “rooted in Jesus’ ministry, revealed as the power of the resurrection, experienced within the community in worship, and expressed by the community in Christological hymns” (116).

The last part considers with some care the starting points of the four above-mentioned Christologists, who represent the four dimensions of an adequate Christology: incarnation (Schoonenberg), resurrection (Pannenberg), crucifixion (Moltmann), and the historical Jesus (Hodgson).
I warmly recommend this work not as a first introduction to Christology (a book such as Dermot Lane's *The Reality of Jesus* would serve better) but as a second book in the field. Its brevity, clarity, balance, and ecumenical spirit are particularly commendable. The brevity is a liability as well, in that certain recurrent themes receive scant attention but are described as very significant: the role of worship as the basis of Christology; the function of metaphor in relation to metaphysical thinking; the connection between dogma and religious experience. A concluding chapter or epilogue and an index would also have been welcome. The book deserves a wide audience.

*Weston School of Theology, Mass.* BRIAN O. MCDERMOTT, S.J.


Any study of Jesus finds a willing audience today. Whether we deal with the pop-culture approach to Jesus or the remarkable study by Schillebeeckx, people seem eager to read and learn about Jesus. These contemporary studies differ, but almost all seem to share a movement from a Christology "from above" which characterized older Christologies to a Christology "from below." We might even call these Christologies "revisionist."

Ogden needs no introduction to the theological world. His recent work on Christology is the published version of the 1980–81 Sarum Lectures at Oxford. At the outset he makes his purpose clear: "to further the effort in our situation today toward a christology of reflection that will be fully critical in that it will ask and answer the question of the truth of the christology of witness as well as the question of its meaning" (4).

O. devotes half of his work to a critical examination of revisionist Christology, as well as some serious problematics often overlooked in the more traditional Christology based on Scripture and dogma. Readers will find points of agreement as well as disagreement. To this reviewer the value of this section is not so much the outcome as O.'s ability to pinpoint some neuralgic items for both Scripture scholars and theologians: e.g., in truth we know nothing of the historical Jesus, whatever approach we take to the Gospels; we know only how some few people viewed the historical Jesus.

O. returns frequently to his assertion that the point of Christology is a question of the ultimate meaning of human life. Christology leads to anthropology, which finally concludes in the relationship to God. He admits his dependence on Bultmann, opting for an existential-historical approach as fundamental, but goes further, calling for a "deideologizing and political interpretation" of Christology. The existential, historical,
deideologized, and political interpretation of Christology finds a resolution in Jesus as liberator. Jesus has given us liberation, "the glorious freedom of the children of God" (150), whose ultimate ground is the liberating love of God, which implies our specific political responsibility for the achievement of secular freedom.

I find it difficult to assess this work. Its lecture nature detracts, since often the ideas are presented in a format more suitable to the spoken than the written word. Each lecture is separate and builds upon the previous, causing a certain amount of repetition. O. is most accurate and helpful when he joins Christology to anthropology and then to the question of God, but he seems too critical of other "revisionist" Christologies, since he too offers a revisionist approach.

O. concludes that a Christology of liberation fulfills all of his established criteria for a contemporary Christology, but he fails to clearly establish credibility for such a liberation Christology, a fact he himself admits (165). I believe such an argument can be made, and O. is quite capable of accomplishing it, if he were to develop his understanding of liberation theology more than he does here.

I highly recommend this book. It caused me to rethink many assertions of contemporary theologians and Scripture scholars. Often I wanted to ask O. specific questions, and I am certain that O. will tantalize others as he must have done his listeners in Oxford.

_Duquesne University_  
JOHN F. O'GRADY


This is a collection of ten essays published by D. in 1977–82. They are loosely united in that all pertain to ecclesiology. D.'s work is marked throughout by forthrightness, familiarity with the literature, openness to new currents combined with a respect for tradition, courtesy to those with whom he disagrees, and a style easily comprehensible to the professional theologian and the intelligent layman.

I shall comment on the seven articles I think contribute most to our understanding. Four of the earlier pieces treat basic questions. Chapter 1 sets the stage for the book: it gives an overview of the Church through various images and models. D. now favors the model of the Church as community of disciples. Chapter 2 takes up charism and institution. After a sketch of the history of the question, D. advances eleven theses on the necessity, distinctiveness, and interdependence of these two elements. I found his points balanced and perceptive. Chapter 5 treats freedom in the Church. D. sees freedom as "the power to act out of a deliberate
choice, in view of the perceived goodness of that which is chosen” (70). He argues well that the Church should strive ceaselessly to free persons from both exterior and interior restraints against selecting the good. Civil liberties for Church members analogous to those experienced by U.S. citizens are advocated. Chapter 6 takes up *jus divinum*. D. believes that there are permanent aspects in the Church which derive from divine law. Some of these appeared in NT times; others emerged later. Moreover, there can be aspects in the Church that once emerged from the divine will but which subsequently may be discarded because they cease to be relevant to the goals of the Church.

The Church as teacher occupies three chapters. Chapter 7 surveys the development of the teaching office in history and indicates the lessons history suggests. Chapter 8 contrasts the magisterium of official teachers with that of theologians; it discusses the functions of the two groups, their interrelationship, and the qualities required of their memberships. Chapter 9 explores papal infallibility and proposes an interpretation of Vatican I’s definition which leaves the door open to Orthodox and mainline Protestant churches.

I differ with D. on the elements I would stress in the notion of freedom. I prefer to think of freedom not so much as the power to choose between perceived goods, as rather the power to transcend self which enables one (1) to incorporate the good of others and to share one’s own good with them and (2) to be open to the newness made possible by the operation of the creative Spirit in the world. One is not free to the extent that one can and must choose between goods A and B. Rather, one is free to the extent that one need not make a choice but is able to choose all and impart all. This is the full freedom of the children of God; only the imperfection of the present condition makes earthly freedom the power to choose between goods.

If one looks at freedom in this way, then one modifies the treatment of each of the aspects of the Church contained in the chapters summarized above. For example, such a view of freedom would clarify why each model and all models together are forever inadequate: they cannot take into account the new that has not yet emerged. It would clarify why there must be charisms in the Church, for one is always moving into the partially new and unknown. It would explain why ministerial teachers in official positions are necessarily dependent not just on the tradition of the past but also on those who are at the cutting edge of the present, that is, those who are contacting the new made possible by freedom.

However, those who share my stresses in the notion of freedom will still find themselves agreeing with much of what D. says and with the way he says it. He is concrete, nuanced, practical, and reasonable. We

Congar has developed for a wider public the notes he used for a course at the Catholic Institute of Paris in 1980. As indicated by the title, his purpose was to investigate relationships and contrasts between the idea of pluralism (diversity) and that of oneness (communion). This being done in the context of past and contemporary ecumenical endeavors, it is organized according to a triple focus: the tradition, the dialogue with Orthodoxy, the dialogue with the Reformation. Hence the three parts of the volume.

In the first part, "Diversities in Time and Space," C. studies the notions of diversity and of communion in the NT and the patristic Church. Omitting at this point a systematic presentation of medieval diversities, he passes from there to the modern scene, with a survey of the impact of contemporary cultural pluralism on theological questions of liturgy and ethics, ending with some suggestions as to the possibility of an African theology: his conclusion is that there should be an African approach to theology rather than an African theology. This part ends on a brief statement of the principle that pluralism ought to be conceived as pertaining to oneness itself and should be structured within the one communion of the Church.

This conclusion introduces the second part, "Looking toward the East." Beginning with a study of the notion of adiaphora and related concepts familiar to Oriental theology, C. passes on to the heart of the problem: Are Orthodoxy and Catholicism exclusive alternatives or complementary forms of the traditional faith? His understanding of both East and West, of Greek and Latin theology, leads him to the position that these are two complementary forms of Catholicity, the "two lungs" of the Church. While I would not gainsay this conclusion, I would have liked to see the argumentation developed at greater length, since, if generally adopted, this perception of the ecumenical problem will require a drastic revision of commonly accepted ideas in Roman Catholic thought and practice. I suspect it would have been more convincing not to tie this view of the structure of Catholicity to a broader suggestion that the division in, and complementarity of, East and West, North and South, may belong to the God-given structures of the world. At any rate, having reached this basic principle, C. examines, largely in its light, the notion of rite, those of "sister churches" and ecumenical councils, and returns...
to the basic principle with a reflection on “dogmatic diversity and faith-unity between East and West.” This last reflection, focused on the commemoration of the council of 381, ends with the tentative suggestion that the *a Patre solo* of Photius and the Greeks should not be conceived as being irreconcilable with the *Filioque* of Augustine and the Latins. This, of course, would require further investigation.

In a neat parallel with the adiaphora of the Greeks, the third part begins with the notion of “fundamental articles” and continues with the doctrine of *hierarchia veritatum* at Vatican II. This is supplemented by a brief look at the distinction between Tradition and traditions in the Faith and Order Conference of Montreal (1963). To some extent, this first series of studies traces the parameters of the contemporary “theological agreements” reached in bilateral dialogues. Several of these are studied with care and sympathy; the possibility of an official Catholic “recognition” of the Confession of Augsburg is examined more critically. This third part ends with an open but critical review of the notion of “reconciled diversity” as proposed in recent years by Lutheran authors.

The book closes on a general conclusion which is very rich and nuanced. The most fruitful and challenging suggestion is, to my mind, that a reconciliation of the Church will require a new “reception” of the dogmas defined by the churches in the period of their separation. Such a reception may not be possible without a reformulation.

While the book suffers from the drawbacks of its genre (the pieces of it are uneven in both length and depth of treatment), one welcomes this new contribution of Congar to the developing ecumenical awareness of the Catholic Church. It should help the partners in the dialogues that are still taking place to keep the whole ecumenical question in sight and thus to see where they fit in the ecumenical horizon.

*Methodist Theological School, Ohio*  
GEORGE H. TAVARD, A.A.


A number of Smulders’ former students and colleagues have collaborated to produce an important volume of essays to mark his 70th birthday and last year of teaching at the Katholieke Theologische Hogeschool of Amsterdam. Most of the essays are written with a view to contributing to the rediscovery of the unity of faith and liturgy, an area in which he has displayed uncommon insight.

The historical section contains 14 articles related to S.’s wide field of historical research. There are five contributions to systematic theology.
Some of the authors' conclusions, which may be of particular interest to readers of TS, can be quickly summarized. (1) The use of the theme "milk and honey" in Clement of Alexandria's theology of baptism and Eucharist provides an example of the early church understanding of the affinity and analogy between various sacraments (van de Bunt). (2) Origen maintains an inseparable unity between word, faith, and sacrament (Auf de Maur and Waldram). (3) The Augustinian dialectical tension between sacramentum fidei and fides sacramenti was not sufficiently maintained in part of Western medieval scholastic tradition, which awards greater importance to the word. The Reformers further lessened the tension (Y. Congar). (4) Faith and historical-sacramental revelation go together. This revelation is realized everywhere that Spirit and human freedom exist and becomes irreversible in Jesus Christ (K. Rahner). (5) Revelation is mediated by temporally and culturally conditioned speech. As a consequence, local churches should be allowed as much freedom as possible, under the Spirit, in their liturgical celebrations (W. Boelens). (6) The anamnesis and epiclesis of the III Eucharistic Prayer of the New Roman Mass reflects the essentials of the fourth-century Roman canon. Thus the liturgy receives a dimension neglected since the Middle Ages (H. Wegman).

From the viewpoint of systematic theology, F. Tillmans' article is especially noteworthy. He offers a theological program for the consistent application of the concept of symbol to the sacraments. In this purview there is an indissoluble link between the act which the community places through participation in the faith of the Church set forth in the rite and the saving event which happens to the participants. The community as a whole and the individual participants cannot be adequately described as subjects vis-à-vis a sacrament. Rather, they appear as being realized as subjects of grace through the sacramental celebration. The subjective act of faith, the personal faith commitment of the participants, is essentially overreached. They are carried along and supported by participation in the objective faith of the Church and so enabled to respond more fully to God's self-communication. All at once, as the title of Smulders' Festschrift indicates and Tillmans' phenomenological-theological analysis seems to confirm, the sacraments bestow the life of faith and bring about the response of faith through God's self-communication in the language of the faith of the Church.

*University of Notre Dame*

Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.

**Ecclesial Reflection: An Anatomy of Theological Method.**


In this sequel to his *Ecclesial Man*, Farley presents a theological
criteriology from the perspective of social phenomenology. The work falls into two parts. In Part 1, imitating Heidegger's "destruction of the history of ontology," he undertakes to dismantle the "house of authority," as he calls the classical theological method. Concepts such as salvation history, Scripture (canon, inspiration, inerrancy), dogma, magisterium, and infallibility, he maintains, are all manifestations of a "logic of triumph" that is, at root, unchristian and antiecclesial. Like late Judaism, from which it is partly borrowed, classical Christian theology employs a method of citation rather than inquiry and takes each text of Scripture as having absolute and independent value. The "house of authority" was seriously undermined by the rise of modern scientific thought and social phenomenology; its destruction is completed by internal theological criticism. The resulting crisis is only feebly met by compromises such as neo-orthodoxy, hermeneutical theology, and transcendental method. A clean sweep is needed.

In Part 2 F. proposes a new method based on "fields of evidence" rather than authorities, reflective inquiry rather than citation. He grants that the faith of Israel and of Christians rests on founding events that have become clothed in symbolic language which is itself normative for subsequent generations. The gospel, he holds, continues to live in the ecclesial community thanks to a continuing process of proclamation and interpretation, giving rise to further literary sedimentations. Theological portraiture, as a first reflection on ecclesiality, leads on, in the light of further reflective questioning, to specific doctrines affirmed as true. The doctrines, elaborated in terms of ontological categories, are submitted to the faith-deposits of Israel and of the apostolic community for adjudication. Eventually doctrines are applied to particular concrete situations. Thus F. makes room in his criteriology for equivalents of the biblical, historical, systematic, and practical dimensions customarily recognized in theology.

This comprehensive theological criteriology commands attention by reason of its erudition, inner consistency, originality, and skilful argumentation. F.'s personal positions on many points resemble those of other outstanding twentieth-century theologians. The Catholic reader will note echoes of Blondel, Geiselmann, Rahner, Lonergan, and Congar, all of whom are cited with approval. Indeed, F. seems much at home with the ecclesial universalism, the adaptive traditionalism, and the ontological analysis characteristic of Catholicism. His work is, in his own estimation, geared toward "a post-Catholic, post-Protestant, third epoch and type of ecclesiality."

The undeniable value of this work is limited by several features which I regard as unessential to the author's main intent. First, the lengthy "destruction" of the "house of authority" in Part 1 reads like a caricature
built out of the worst tendencies of a now discredited theology. This portrait does violence to the great theologians of the classical tradition, as F. seems almost to admit by mentioning that Abelard, Luther, Pascal, Schleiermacher, and others are exceptions (a list that could in my judgment be greatly lengthened).

Secondly, in his effort to highlight what is distinctive in his own approach, F. adopts idiosyncratic terminology. Accepted terms such as OT, NT, Scripture, canon, inspiration, Christianity, church, dogma, and magisterium become taboo, and are replaced by clumsy and confusing circumlocutions. Partly for this reason, the book is hard to read and will have a limited appeal, even among the few who could afford to buy it.

Thirdly, F. insists on using the term “authority” in a consistently pejorative sense. Though he would deny it, I find that his discussion of the “fields of evidence” implies certain authoritative loci. For instance, he speaks of the founding events as paradigmatic (salvation history?) and of the linguistic incarnation of these events as being an immanent aspect of the events themselves (inspired record?). He acknowledges the definitive status of the original literary accounts for subsequent generations of the community (canonicity?). The “kerygma” (his term for NT) has “a certain primacy and dominance” over all other testimonies (norma normans?). The perdurance of the ecclesial community, he asserts, requires masters of the tradition (magisterium?) whose interpretation establishes lines of development which the community will continue to pursue (development of dogma?).

If authority were to be understood as offering clues that demand and assist inquiry and discernment, rather than as imposing answers that suffocate thought, Ecclesial Reflection could be seen not as rejective but as impressively vindicating the role of authority in theology. It could be seen not as a repudiation but as a brilliant retrieval of the classical tradition.

Catholic University of America

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


This is in no sense a guide, as the subtitle claims, but rather a constructive systematic theology. Suchocki relies exclusively on her own reading of Whitehead’s metaphysics and philosophical theology for the conceptual resources to develop the content of Christian faith in five main parts: a brief exposition of leading Whiteheadian ideas as S. takes them to bear on basic human needs paves the way for the doctrine of
God, Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. She then concludes with a brief trinitarian interpretation.

The driving force behind S.'s whole discussion is how one is to conceive God as freeing people from the power of sin for a future in which they can realize their potential for a mutuality of relations with others. She poses this issue by asking how a single, actual being may properly be taken to ground the possibilities that exert power in affecting the actions of actualities. Her answer is that this can be done by conceiving the process of concrescence whereby God becomes actual as precisely the reverse of that exhibited by all nondivine actual entities. Thus she proposes that we imagine God to “begin” in the satisfaction of unifying literally all possibilities and to be “completed” in an everlasting provision of appropriate particular possibilities as the initial aims for creaturely prehension. Such possibilities function to release people from bondage to sin. This interpretation of how God grounds possibility underlies her entire doctrine of God, her eschatology, and her trinitarianism.

Unaccountably, S. seems to suppose that one has only to employ Whitehead’s terminology to insure that such a “reversal of dynamics” in God is consistent with his categorial scheme. Of course, this is not so; for, at least on Whitehead’s view, language must ultimately be given meaning through human experience. Reversing the process of self-actualization in the case of God simply severs all connection with the experience of one’s own life to which the scheme must ultimately appeal for its meaning. In particular, “possibility” is given a purely Pickwickian sense. “All things are possible in a realm of sheer possibility” (41). Perhaps so. But what such “things” or such a “realm” might be like, no one could ever tell. Ironically, God is treated here as, in Whitehead’s words, “an exception to all metaphysical principles, invoked to save their collapse.” This example of Whiteheadian scholasticism is not only idiosyncratic but deeply confused.

S.’s approach to the selection and interpretation of texts is breathtakingly naive. She simply treats the Bible as a source book of occasional and disconnected proof texts in the service of an agenda already established by traditional doctrinal loci. She also ignores contemporary historical-critical scholarship and makes no effort to justify the appropriateness of her own variety of “process” interpretations. For example, “the whole transfiguration experience recounted in Matthew indicates that, to eyes which could see, Jesus was already shimmering with the glory of God in his embodiment of the kingdom. Therefore, when we speak of the depths of God as being the actualization of the harmony of the primordial vision, sparkling in the brightness of God’s glory, we must speak of Christ in God, transfigured rather than transformed” (190).

This is not a serious piece of work. It can only contribute to the bad
name this particular sort of "process theology" deserves.

South Bend, Ind. PHILIP E. DEVENISH


In the last twenty years there has been a revival of interest in the work of Lactantius, “the Christian Cicero,” more famous perhaps for his impeccable style than for the depth of his thought. That he is being taken seriously these days is attested to by the appearance of this important work by Perrin, professor at the University of Amiens, which follows upon the careful labors of Antoine Wlosok, Vincenzo Loi, Pierre Monat, Eberhard Heck, and Jacques Fontaine and the Lactantian colloquy of historical and patristic scholars held at Chantilly in 1976. P. demonstrates convincingly how in the Institutiones divinae, the De opificio Dei, and the De ira Dei Lactantius weds his biblical and Christian concept of man to anthropological themes long familiar to the philosophers, physicians, and poets of the late Roman Empire.

P.’s purpose is to weigh Lactantius’ success in producing a synthesis of Christianity and Greek and Latin thought, to discover his sources, his method, and for and against whom he wrote. P. also seeks to identify the “anthropological categories” of the men of Constantine’s generation and so understand how they conceived of the nature of man and of his relationship to the divinity. This P. accomplishes by painstakingly careful philological and literary analysis of key terms.

Lactantius’ purpose was to convince Christianity’s “cultured despisers” that the new religion was intellectually respectable, and so he transcribed Christian doctrine in a language accessible to his contemporaries and according to themes with which they were familiar. He set forth his understanding of the nature of the human body and its parts, the nature of the soul, its origin and its immortality, and finally the nature of the human composite, man himself, and his origin and destiny. These are all theoretical questions about man’s nature, but Lactantius subordinates them to an overriding practical concern: How should a human being live his life?

Is Lactantius’ anthropology coherent? He was attempting to compose an anthropological summa and it is P.’s judgment that the overall shape of his work reveals a coherent whole despite its inconsistencies and contradictions. The Bible provides the ultimate criterion when Lactantius must choose between contradictories and it is the source of what unity his thought possesses. In His creation of the world, e.g., God had a coherent plan in mind for mankind—a finality which Lactantius discov-
ers at every level of human existence. Biblical teaching, moreover, strongly influences Lactantius' moral and philosophical conception of man: his theology controls his anthropology. Thus he rejects reincarnation and the pre-existence of the human soul as being inconsistent with man’s personal responsibility and accountability. Regarding physiological questions about which the Bible does not speak clearly or at all, Lactantius has a tendency to choose among the various scientific opinions of his time according to philosophical criteria which he has adopted in the light of biblical data.

With what degree of success did Lactantius achieve his intention of developing a synthesis of scientific, philosophical, and religious elements? Undeniably, he ran into difficulties: the “stitches” which bind them together are often all too evident. Nevertheless, in P.’s judgment, errors of detail must not mask the relative coherence of the whole. As a matter of fact, Lactantius was operating within two systems. He held to the Bible (he is orthodox) as well as to a philosophical system (he is a Platonist and an Aristotelian, but also at times a Stoic). Thus he uses the philosophical language of learned men of his day, employs a philosophical problematic, but makes philosophy subordinate to faith and clearly implies that philosophy is in no way self-sufficient.

P. has some final observations. Lactantius was a man of the age of Constantine; he lived at court and tutored the emperor’s son, Crispus. He no longer lived in the age of Tertullian, when a Christian was a stranger in an overwhelmingly pagan world, and he did not yet live in the late-fourth-century world, when the institutions of the Empire had been Christianized and Christians far outnumbered the pagans. He lived in between, at the moment of the Constantinian “turn-around”—a period of violent and tumultuous change, when theological discussion was animated and thinking at times a bit “fuzzy.” Lactantius sensed the need of his age for a synthesis. He tried to produce a summa and did not altogether succeed. Perhaps he tried too soon; he made his move before theological reflection had progressed to the point where a synthesis was possible. His Christology was deficient, his theology of God was binitarian, and his moral teaching he drew largely from the Stoics. His natural bent was to present Christianity as a special kind of philosophy which any pagan of good will might embrace if only it were appropriately explained to him. His approach was thus intentionally irenic. He searched for convergences between philosophy and the Bible. He depended largely on the OT and his exegesis approached most nearly the interpretations of Jewish scholars. His God was the vengeful God of the OT and so there is some question whether Lactantius ever fully grasped the originality of Christianity. One scholar wonders whether in the last analysis the Institutiones divinae are more divine than Christian.
One final word. The City of God could not have been written in the years 300–320. Lactantius, as P. points out, lacked the genius of Augustine; and yet he was a pioneer and his work, for all its tentativeness and hesitations, has many merits. Not the least of these is to have opened the way for Augustine.

Baltimore, Md.  

WILLIAM J. WALSH, S.J.


The stated purposes of this book are (1) to honor Paul Woolley, registrar and professor of church history at Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; (2) to explain what Calvinism is; (3) to recount the historical effects of Calvinism; and (4) to stimulate the Christian life.

One assumes the accomplishment of the first objective and hopes for the fulfillment of the fourth. The third is approached by a selective history of Calvinism in various countries: Switzerland, France (with the remarkable omission of Jeanne d'Albret), the Netherlands, Germany, Hungary, England, Scotland, Canada, Australasia, South Africa, and with three chapters on America. The range of this survey is the chief strength of the book concerned primarily with theological, social, and political history. A chapter on Calvinism in literary history might also have been interesting.

The main problem is that the second purpose, the definition of Calvinism, remains unclear. The general conviction that "such is the vitality of Calvinism that it has flourished in different forms, countries, and circumstances" (217) makes a clear, if broad, definition of Calvinism imperative. It is simply not true that "everyone knows what Calvinism is" (129), although it is quite likely that not everyone would agree on any proffered definition. References to "Reformed doctrine standards," "principles of thought," "basic tenets of the faith," "truths of the Bible," "a Reformed stance in basic philosophical presuppositions" are entirely too vague. Several check lists of the "fundamentals" of Calvinism (15, 245, 302, 346) are offered, such as (1) the sovereignty of God, (2) the authority of Scripture (including the surprising suggestion that sola scriptura is a good principle which can be pushed too far) (244), (3) the depravity of man, and (4) the doctrine of grace, but the selection and order of these "essentials" are neither analyzed nor justified.

While the cover of the book presents an attractive, stylized, and hardly recognizable portrait of Calvin, the essays (with one notable exception) assume, without much discussion, that the authentic tradition from Calvin is contained in, rather than distorted by, the Canons of Dort and the Westminster Confession. For example, the question is not addressed,
but it is simply asserted that “Turretin followed the theology of Calvin and should be classified as a Calvinist of the finest sort” (70). This position virtually (if not entirely: see 66 and 134) ignores a great deal of heated contemporary scholarly discussion of Calvin’s theology and on the relationship between Calvin and Calvinism.

The exception is the trenchant essay of R. T. Kendall, which attacks the “popular assumption” that Calvin and Calvinism are identical and that any theology which contains a doctrine of unconditional predestination is properly equivalent to Calvinism. According to K., the theologians in England went beyond Calvin and “[t]his matter of going beyond Calvin is actually what became known as Calvinism.” The implication is that “going beyond Calvin” is not an improvement but an impairment. K. sees English Calvinism as heavily influenced by Theodore Beza’s “systematizing and logicalizing theology, [which] bore Calvin’s name but was hardly Calvin’s purest thought” (201).

Apart from the vexed and vexing problem of an accurate and adequate definition of Calvinism and of Calvin’s relation to it, this book is a most helpful survey of what has been historically called Calvinism.

Pittsburgh Theological Seminary  

Charles Partee


This study interprets the development of Schleiermacher’s early philosophical thought through the interrelated themes of determinism, freedom, and phantasy. Wisely disclaiming the discovery of a single hermeneutical key to the door of S.’s entire thought, B. more modestly offers a phenomenological analysis of these themes in the moral, religious, and philosophical writings issuing from S.’s student days at Halle in 1789 to his return to the same university as professor and preacher in 1804. Never before has a secondary work so effectively integrated the many published and unpublished writings that S. penned during this fertile literary period in his career: On the Highest Good (1789), On Human Freedom (1791–92), On the Worth of Life (1792–93), two essays on Spinoza’s philosophy (1794), several dialogues, notebooks, essays, and book reviews, numerous letters and sermons, the Speeches on Religion (1799), Soliloquies (1800), and the Groundwork to a Critique of Previous Ethical Doctrine (1803).

The first part of B.’s monograph elucidates Schleiermacher’s philosophical determinism by way of contrast with Kant’s thought. B. accepts the scholarly consensus that S. developed his moral philosophy in opposition to Kant’s ethical theory, particularly its aprioristic point of depar-
ture, its identification of transcendental freedom and subjective intention, and its concomitant separation of the noumenal self from the phenomenal world. S. rejects any conception of ethics as the universal application of an abstract moral law defined by reason itself, insisting instead that moral laws “must in part be fashioned a posteriori, from experience” (52). S.’s determinism, then, emerges in B.’s analysis primarily as a world view, one that does not envisage nature merely as a field in which the individual actualizes the dictates of a supersensible moral imperative but as an indispensable co-ordinate point in the formation and execution of ethical principles. S. presupposes that the moral life is an unbroken causal network of situation and response in which self and world are mutually constitutive and moral maxims are historically defined.

B. distinguishes Schleiermacher’s determinism from fatalism by emphasizing that the former philosophical stance does not preclude but necessarily incorporates the free activity of the responsible human subject. In the second part of his book, B. examines S.’s conception of freedom as self-expression, appropriation, and self-cultivation. These three perspectives highlight the Romantic proclivities of S.’s first Berlin period (1796–99), especially the growing importance of the category of individuality for his thought. While B. views self-expression, appropriation, and self-cultivation as exemplars of S.’s philosophical understanding of freedom, his discussion culminates in the Speeches on Religion, in which S. expounds the “highest degree of human freedom...” as “the mystical freedom of religious consciousness” (198).

The third and final part of B.’s book examines the role of phantasy in S.’s Lebensphilosophie, and here especially B. makes a significant contribution to the secondary literature. Frequently scholars overlook the importance of this category in S.’s early thought, no doubt because his unique discussion of Gefühl tends to lure the commentator away from the due regard he gives to the broader spectrum of the experiential. Phantasy, for S., originates in the involuntary exercise of the imagination and is the source of all moral, artistic, and intellectual production. B. convincingly demonstrates Schleiermacher’s high regard for phantasy as the wellspring of individual creativity by combining lucid textual analysis with personal testimony garnered from S.’s correspondence.

While B.’s work is admirable, it is not beyond criticism. Its most striking shortcoming lies in B.’s discussion of the noumena/phenomena distinction in Kant’s thought. B. assumes a complete disjunction of these spheres in the Kantian system and thereby overlooks the problematic defined in and addressed by the Third Critique. As well, B.’s welcome efforts to point out the consistency between Schleiermacher’s early philosophy of life and his later writings should have considered seriously
two lectures to the Berlin Academy on moral themes: Über die wissenschaftliche Behandlung des Tugendbegriffes (1819) and Versuch über die wissenschaftliche Behandlung des Pflichtbegriffs (1824). The important treatise Über den Unterschied zwischen Naturgesetz und Sittengesetz (1825) is only cursorily mentioned (84).

Fairfield University

JOHN E. THIEL


Renz and Graf have collected a series of essays and documents that significantly contributes to Troeltsch studies in two ways: it highlights various aspects of T.'s biographical development that have previously been unexamined and it discusses in detail several important early influences upon the development of T.'s thought. These two contributions provide the division of the volume. The first eight essays focus on T.'s biography, whereas the last three discuss theological and philosophical influences. The volume has a certain unity insofar as all the essays deal with the very early T., that is, with the period of his theological development prior to his maturation as a professor of theology and philosophy at the University of Heidelberg. Moreover, the volume is further unified insofar as the editors themselves have written six of the eleven essays.

The biographical essays cover T.'s early home life in Augsburg, his high-school studies, his theological studies on the university level, his relation to the church in Bavaria, his life as a faculty member of the University of Bonn, and his invitation to accept a professorship at Heidelberg. In this section two essays are of particular interest. Renz has discovered a previously unpublished "prize monograph" that T. had written when the University of Göttingen had established as an award topic "Hermann Lotze's views on conscience and its significance for Christian apologetics." T. had won only half the award, because the faculty judged the monograph to be outstanding but insufficiently focused.

Of more interest is Graf's analysis of T.'s dissertation for the licentiate and habilitation. He demonstrates how central to T.'s method was the development of a "social-historical" method. Tschackert and Schulz, professors at the University of Göttingen, singled out in their evaluations how T. sought to employ a method in which the cultural and social context of a theological position was analyzed. These observations cast light on the important relation between T. and Max Weber in Heidelberg.
Too often, it is assumed that, because Weber was a sociologist, T.'s social and cultural approach to theology was due to Weber's influence. Graf, in addition, relates T.'s uses of a *traditionsgeschichtlich* method in his dissertation on Gerhard and Melanchthon to the work of his fellow students at Göttingen, H. Gunkel, W. Bousset, and A. Rahls. T.'s study moved not from Melanchthon to Gerhard but from Gerhard to Melanchthon, because he sought to analyze the process of tradition from its reception. Not the formation or genesis of a tradition but the development of its consequences was the center of his study.

In the second section, Herbert Will points to the influence of T.'s ethics teacher at Erlangen, Gustav Class, and his modification of Schleiermacher's conception of ethics as a theory of cultural life. Helge Simers deals with the dilemma of the relation between Dilthey and Troeltsch. On the one hand, T. referred to Dilthey as his teacher. On the other hand, he never studied with Dilthey, had personal contact with him only later in life, and maintained several positions at odds with him. Simers suggests it was the fundamental similarity in the type of cultural and historical research that justified T.'s claim. Of most interest is Graf's discussion of T.'s promotion theses within the context of Göttingen. The issue of T.'s role as the systematic theologian of the history-of-religions school is thereby discussed. The volume concludes with the theses for the licentiate in Göttingen by J. Weiss, W. Bousset, E. Troeltsch, W. Wrede, and H. Hackmann. They all point to the common interests of a highly gifted group of students that came to form the history-of-religions school.

These essays uncover aspects of T.'s early development and the origins of the history-of-religions school that were previously unexamined. But the studies are of such a narrow focus that they are primarily of interest to specialists in T. or the origins of the history-of-religions school. The volume lacks a discussion of some very important topics. For example, there is no discussion of the influence of Paul de Lagarde. He taught at Göttingen from 1869 and had maintained that theology should be transformed into the study of the history of religions. Although this important influence is noted (240 and 250), it is not explored, even though it is probably more determinant for Troeltsch's formation than any other influence discussed in the volume.

*Catholic University of America* 

FRANCIS SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA


Lash's *A Matter of Hope* is a major contribution to the current literature
of political theology. It is at once a careful and insightful exposition of Karl Marx's thought and a balanced theological critique of it. But the very care and insight make for a very complex book. L. has read deeply not only in Marx but also in his commentators past and present, and he is fully conscious of the tensions in Marxism from the very origin. He is also a Christian theologian who is honest about the problems of Christian belief—again from the gospel origin on. The complexity is heightened when the theologian goes beyond judging Marx and Marxism to allowing these in turn to open up further critique of Christianity. Nor is the book a purely academic pursuit. L. uses his "dialectical" examination of Marx's contribution and of his own theology to illuminate many issues in culture and everyday existence.

The method of *A Matter of Hope* is fairly straightforward. L. begins with an effort to sort out the young/mature Marx controversy and the variety of approaches to Marx which constitute the range of Marxism. He himself finds unity through the years, and he follows E. P. Thompson in thinking Marxism (and for that matter Christianity) to be most fruitfully understood as a tradition rather than simply doctrine, method, or heritage. A tradition provides intellectual content and strategy without blocking the possibility of self-criticism. A chapter on "The German Ideology" serves as an overview of Marx's central orientation before L. goes on to thematic chapters on such issues as reality and appearance, ideology and superstructure, historical materialism, the critique of religion, and alienation and redemption. In each of these sections he interweaves considerations of Marx's own texts, those of his followers and critics, and the bearing of Marxism and Christianity on each other. The final reflections, on "Utopia, Hope and Revolution" and "The Form of the Future," stress the eschatological dimension in Marx notwithstanding his never-ending resistance to utopianism. Marxism, like Christianity, becomes "a matter of hope." L. qualifies the man and the approach as scientific only in the sense that they work towards a reasoned interpretation of experience, and he classifies the thinking as interrogative in a way similar to the Lashian theology. Yet, in his final remarks, L. makes it clear that he does not think "Christian" can be an adjective for "Marxism" without great qualification. The reason is not that Marx was an atheist or a materialist, since he sees the former as not essential to Marxism and the latter as best taken in a socioeconomic, not a metaphysical, sense. The key difficulty is in anthropology, where Marx appears as "insufficiently recognizant of the limits within which the natural and social production of authentic 'human' existence, as an intra-historical project, is unsurpassably bounded. . . ."

L.'s reading of Marx seems sound for the most part, although "the moor" would surely have rebelled against the effort to take his positions
as more interrogative than declarative. He was a man of few “ands, ifs, and buts.” More importantly, L. leaves a great gap in not attending to the economic analyses of works like *Capital* and in minimizing the periodic efforts to sketch the political future. Surely a theological study of Marx should be a study of economic and political systems. As it stands, substantial agreement on the matter of hope leaves open all sorts of possibilities about this-worldly structures which may be compatible with it. We might even have a Marxist (or a Lashian) theory open to private property, business corporations, market exchanges, and so on. Marx would not have thought so, but perhaps the tradition is flexible enough to allow for this opening.

*La Salle College, Phila.*

MICHAEL J. KERLIN


In this study Vanden Burgt attempts to focus modern attention on James as a religious thinker. James has already been rediscovered in the fifties and sixties as a full-blooded phenomenologist. Thus the *Principles of Psychology* again became current in graduate seminars in psychology and in philosophy. Even earlier, in the forties, Gilbert Ryle had noticed that James’s pragmatic method was singularly like some of the methods coming into prominence in analytic philosophy. James continues to be seminal. Perhaps the eighties will be the decade to give him his proper due as a religious thinker. There may be difficulties, however.

From the very beginning James had a difficult time in being accepted by the religious scholars of his own day. His colleagues at Harvard were more often attracted to liberal Christianity than to the kind of evangelical enthusiasm which they saw in James. Indeed, at the very moment, almost, when the *Varieties of Religious Experience* was just published, President Eliot spirited away Royce’s copy for six weeks of careful study. In a letter of small praise for James, he complains that James is too gullible and trusting in his numerous accounts of the experiences of mystics and other enthusiasts. This hesitancy about James’s religious thought was also shared by Perry, his biographer, by no means given to any celebration of enthusiastic feeling over sober restraint. Perry, himself no amateur in theological matters, wrote that James defended the possibility of human immortality (more urgently as he grew older) but was never “keen” on it himself. Perry even relegates James’s mystical experience during his night-long near ecstasy over the beauty of nature in the Adirondacks to something less than an experience of the presence of God. James would have agreed that he never had a clear experience of the presence of God; but he would have insisted that he and God were surely in vital contact
at moments of prayer. James was well known for attending prayers daily in the Harvard chapel.

But, however strange James may have appeared to Eliot and Perry, he was clearly a religious force at Harvard, not as a sectarian believer but as a believer in the moralistic side of the Protestant tradition nonetheless. Santayana, the liberal nonbelieving cultural Catholic, always detected and slightly resented the kind of strong Protestant moralism that he saw in James.

Clearly James believed in God, believed in prayer, hoped for immortality, thought religion a good and indeed a necessary thing, wrote an interesting—if slightly baffling—essay on immortality, and deserves some recognition as a theologian in his own right. After all, his father, Henry James Sr., is one of the better-known nineteenth-century American writers on the philosophy of religion, and even though the father's long attraction to Swedenborg proved mysterious to the young William, nevertheless interest in religion was to be a lifelong passion of the son as well.

What James did superbly well was to resist the optimistic faith of his time in science as the new religion. He was far too good a scientist himself not to know its limitations. He resisted the nontheistic naturalists of his day in a fair and open manner. With energy he delivered his many passionate lectures on the need for belief to groups of students everywhere. His reputation as one of the founders of the new science of psychology was too secure for him to be dismissed when he spoke of religious matters. It is to his great credit that he wrote these almost pastoral popular essays on religious matters at a time when they were very much needed by young students struggling over the dilemmas presented to them by the followers of scientism and an agnostic evolutionary naturalism.

Vanden Burgt has written a good, brief, and clear book on an important topic for contemporary theologians. He is surely right in his claim that James deserves better attention to his religious writings than he has so far gotten. His book may prove to be a valuable incentive in that direction.

Yet, for all this, Santayana seems to have had a point. Although never a believer himself, Santayana had experienced enough of Catholicism in his own Spanish background to see the need for a speculative vision which would place God, man, and the world in some kind of unified framework. This framework, shared by a large believing community, would include modes of feeling and imagination as well as of doctrine and action. Santayana thought he saw much moral intensity at Protestant Harvard but little real speculative vision. To the extent that Santayana's criticism is correct, James will always be celebrated by moral
philosophers more than by religious thinkers seeking a speculative vision as well as a moral imperative.

In his careful analysis Vanden Burgt emphasizes that James never sought a speculative vision. Instead, we have a philosophy of religion which is pervasively pragmatic. Believing is thought to be good because of its consequences: health of soul, widening of life, remedy for guilt, anxiety, and fear of death. In an interesting section of his conclusion Vanden Burgt notes the deep affinities of the religious thought of James with that of Tillich, Jaspers, and Gilkey. He concludes the book with the following statement: "Like every genius he [James] felt the force of certain tendencies in our culture before they became part of the common consciousness. Certainly he will have had the last word on few of these issues, but he felt their impact very keenly, helped bring them to an articulated awareness, and provided provocative suggestions for their resolution."

Georgetown University

JESSE A. MANN


The story of Dorothy Day's life, writings, associations, travels, protests, and foundations is told very frankly and with as much detail as is available. Miller, professor of history at Marquette, had known her for a long time and had won her confidence by his earlier study of the Catholic Worker Movement, A Harsh and Dreadful Love. D. made all her papers and records available to him, though (as he is careful to point out in the Preface) this is not an authorized biography. She had at first consented to his doing it and then changed her mind and wanted an assurance, which he refused to give, that he would write no such thing. Her reasons, as he discerned them, were her embarrassment about her earlier life and her fear that its recital would lead others astray, but also a certain almost desperate need for privacy in her life and for personal control of her life and impact, which he records throughout the book.

Though it is obviously a labor of great love, M. has set about his task as a historian. He is ruthless as well as affectionate. If D. emerges as a saint, it is assuredly not as a plaster saint in the expected pose. She emerges as an extraordinarily angular person, passionate and compassionate, generous, loyal, and (after her conversion in her mid-twenties) deeply and simply religious, yet also incorrigibly domineering, slow to forgive and forget injuries, harsh in her judgments of others, unbending in her opinions. What is perhaps most astonishing, and makes her life all the more admirable, is her overwhelming need for solitude. Her chosen
life style for almost half a century left her very little solitude, though there is a recurring theme of escaping briefly to the beach, or to a quiet spot to listen to some favorite piece of classical music with a friend, or to bed to read nineteenth- or twentieth-century fiction or biography.

Such is the woman whom one discovers in these pages, but the emphasis is not on her character but on her life, work, and impact. M. traces the extraordinary circumstances of her family and her nonreligious, even antireligious, upbringing, her great desire for independence, her early attitude concerning the dignity of menial work, her entry into journalism, her fearlessness in unsavory parts of the city, in the streets at night, in taverns where people were drunk and drugged, in situations where she would be arrested and jailed, in sexual encounters with some very disturbed men. M. follows her through her journalistic and Bohemian experiences into social and political radicalism, through the birth of her daughter, her conversion to the Catholic Church and her encounter with the persistent Peter Maurin, into the better-known history of the Catholic Worker paper, the houses of hospitality and the Catholic Worker movement, and through all the developments of these until her death.

The book is intricately woven together from all the oral testimonies, published writings, unpublished letters, journals, retreat notes, and other scraps of information available, to show the patterns of influence and association. It is obviously so valuable that it seems ungracious to voice a few complaints. The book needed far more thorough editing: adjectives constantly do double duty as adverbs; sentences sometimes go in search of a main verb; dependent clauses do not always know where they belong in the sentence; proper names are quite frequently misspelled. More importantly, in such a significant and exhaustive study, there is no documentation other than the listing of available sources in the Preface. The book deserves to be a best seller, but it also begs for a second edition correcting these defects.

Georgetown University

MONIKA K. HELLWIG


Over the past two decades, Küngrs theological writings have frequently been a cause for controversy. Although his critics have challenged many of his positions, what has not always been clear during these debates are the respectively different assumptions about theological method. Eschewing both acrimonious denunciation and amiable defense, LaCugna's study, originally a doctoral dissertation at Fordham, presents a constructive yet critical analysis which is most helpful for assessing the methodological differences between K. and his critics.
Central to K.'s methodology is his ordering of theological sources: Scripture as the \textit{norma normans non normata}, tradition as the \textit{norma normata}. In contrast to the "proof-texting" of Scripture characteristic of many systematic theologians prior to Vatican II, K. must be credited for utilizing the historical-critical method as an integral component in his theologizing. While K. has in principle avoided the temptation of allowing historical-critical principles to become the final judge of Scripture, he appears unwilling to probe the limitations of historical criticism: e.g., in his Christology K. "seems to be saying that the Greek metaphysical terminology is inadequate not only for moderns who think historically, but also for those in the early Church who thought metaphysically" (181). In L.'s judgment "historical method may be the most fitting type for our age, but it cannot be thought of as a final or exclusive tool" (182–83).

L. detects even greater problems with K.'s view of tradition. Although K. mentions that certain elements belong to tradition (the canon of Scripture, conciliar definitions, past theological thought), he "does not define what he means by the term, except to call it the \textit{norma normata}" (196); thus K. remains free to use the term tradition "in dissimilar ways, depending on the context" (197). K. does, however, tend to distinguish between the one binding or catholic Tradition (that which is in accord with the gospel) from traditions that are important at particular moments in the Church's history but not necessarily obligatory always and everywhere. L. finds this distinction operative in K.'s view that "Vatican II's definition of papal infallibility was more 'Roman' than 'catholic' " (198).

L. analyzes K.'s \textit{Infallible? An Inquiry} as a test case of his methodological principles. Underlying K.'s view of infallibility is the premise "that theology adhere primarily to Scripture and only secondarily to those parts of Tradition which belong to the universal ecumenical tradition and which are not in error" (170). L. feels that such a "radical subordination of Tradition to Scripture" is at the core of K.'s differences with Rahner and other theologians, as well as his difficulties with the German episcopal conference and the Vatican.

L.'s efforts to accord K. a fair hearing, while confronting him with the criticisms of his opponents, are generally successful. In at least one instance, however, L.'s penchant for fairness seems to have allowed K. to set the terms of debate in a counterproductive way. K.'s "fundamental question," whether the Church's infallibility is dependent on a priori infallible propositions (134), is really a pseudo problem, insofar as Vatican I did not identify infallibility with propositions. Thus K. ignores the fact that Vatican I did not really give a definition of infallibility but only a description of the conditions under which the infallibility of the Church can be operative. Moreover, Vatican I was concerned with "irreformable decisions," while K. has focused on "a priori infallible propositions"; in
other words, the Council's terminology was canonical, while K.'s is philosophical; it remains to be shown that these different perspectives are identical. K.'s attempt to analyze Vatican I's canonical terminology in philosophical terms has not only distorted the interpretation of the Council's teaching but also detoured the infallibility debate into dead ends.

Although L. might have pushed her critique further in some places, on the whole her analysis is clear, concise, and cogent. This study is a commendable accomplishment from a promising young theologian.

_Catholic University of America_  
JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


This study of Latin American theology has a great deal of merit in its own right, but its major importance lies in the fact that it is the first volume of a very extensive and well-organized series on the same theme that has been sponsored by CEHILA (Committee on Historical Studies of the Church in Latin America). Already co-ordinators have been appointed as directors for eight geographical regions (including that of Hispanics in the United States) in a project that is expected to last at least a decade. One indication of its emphatic ecumenical thrust is the fact that the well-known ecumenist José Míguez Bonino has been appointed co-ordinator for studies of the history of Protestant theology.

In the introduction to the book, Pablo Richard provides a concise explanation of some crucial decisions that were made regarding the methodology of the entire series. First, “theology” was to be understood in a very broad sense which would include academic theology but would also encompass a wide spectrum of “Christian thought,” including philosophical, juridical, literary, and other works as long as they were of Christian inspiration. Secondly, only marginal attention would be given to European or other foreign imports that were merely parroted and not adapted to the Latin American situation. Rather, the major focus of interest would be on “those who produced theology from the perspective of the Indian, the black, and the poor person” or, quoting Gustavo Gutiérrez, “theology from the underside of history.” Consequently, R. asserts quite openly that the objective of the series will be a retrieval of a theology of liberation, since this is the authentic theology that has arisen in Latin America.

The book contains fourteen articles, which at first reading give the impression of a theological potpourri. Perhaps sensing this, R. has
entitled the book “Materials for a History of Theology” and voiced his hope that these will provide the building blocks for more synthetic works in the future.

The vast majority of the articles contain either surveys of theology in different countries and historical periods or studies of the works of individual writers. In the first category one finds survey histories of Catholic theology in Chile (1810–80), Brazil, and Venezuela, and of Protestant theology in Brazil, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. Gustavo Gutiérrez has also contributed an overview of the sixteenth-century colonial period, which concentrates on the written works of those who defended the rights of the Indians.

The individual studies include the following: the Portuguese missionary Antonio Vieira (1608–97), called “the most famous Jesuit in the history of Brazil”; the Venezuelan layman Juan Germán Roscio (1763–1821), a writer and active political figure in the war of independence; the priest and revolutionary hero of Mexico José María Morelos (1765–1815); the Colombian curate Juan Fernández de Sotomayor (1777–1849), author of a very influential “liberation catechism”; and Padre Julio Maria (1850–1916), a great Redemptorist preacher and lecturer in Brazil, who advocated many of the reforms later adopted by Vatican II.

In evaluating these contributions, I found the most valuable and informative surveys to be the two by Riolando Azzi and Rubem Alves on Brazil, the Latin nation which I believe continues to be the most productive in theology even at the present time. Among the individual works, the study of the Mexican priest-martyr Morelos by Agustín Churrupa Peláez stands out for its detailed analysis both of the period and of the life and thought of Morelos, concluding with what he calls the author’s “political theology based on charity.” Enrique Dussell ends the volume with a “final synthesis.” Of greatest interest to me were the themes he selected as most prominent in contemporary liberation theology: the organization of the people and the people’s church; Christological themes, as in the work of Jon Sobrino and Leonardo Boff; advances in the theology of women, Indians, and blacks; the role of religion in revolutions; popular religiosity; and—running through all of the above—the commitment of the Church to the poor.

The book provides an authentic retrieval of a liberation theology throughout Latin America’s entire history, thus refuting the thesis that such a theology began in the 50’s or 60’s under the influence of European political theology. It should be quite useful not only for theologians but also for historians because of its social analysis and broad understanding of theological currents of thought. Lastly, the entire series could be of invaluable help for a number of university programs in Latin American
studies, which appear totally oblivious of the crucial importance of religion in understanding Latin American history, politics, and culture.

Woodstock Theological Center, D.C.  ALFRED T. HENNELLY, S.J.


This is a fascinating and substantial design to break new ground in the understanding of Christian formation and education. Chapter 1 sets the stage where the disciples feel frustrated in their efforts to expel demons. M. uses this scene to demonstrate Jesus’ intentions to enable his disciples to celebrate the powers of God’s glory. A developmental process is described as apprenticeship. The powers of Christ are not transmitted magically, as happened to Cinderella. (M. prefers the My Fair Lady approach, where the girl learns to become truly gracious in heart and manners.)

M.’s book is seminal and a reader’s delight insofar as it is the product of personal experiences and substantial investigations of Gospel stories which portray the relationship of Jesus with his disciples. The theological ramifications are placed in the context of biblical, patristic, and historical theology. Such personal encounters are important readings for those who want to learn the deeper dimensions of Christian education and catechetics. It is intriguing to read about Jesus the master, as distinct from the prophet, the rabbi, the Lord. The characteristics of such a Jesus emerge from M.’s personal conversations with the Gospel of Matthew. The practice of apprenticeship is present in the calling of the disciples and the acquired life style which resulted from their living in community with Jesus on a daily basis.

Educational dynamics are described in reflections on how Jesus’ power can be transmitted after his death. The human dimensions are illustrated by truly sensitive examples of common experiences of people who are situated in the context of their own cultural environment. M. emphasizes that the historical fabric of one’s own experiences may lead to the discovery of the new, as happened often in the lives of biblical persons and their understanding of events.

Without explicit references, M. is in accordance with David Tracy’s promotion of the great Christian classics as major sources of a religious tradition. But M. demonstrates how the classics themselves are subject to changes in time and are part of history as a process.

M. presents his material in such a fashion that it becomes spiritual reading. The book radiates prophetic aspects founded on a true Christian apprenticeship of the author. Many homiletic features in the text make
Scripture come alive and available to personal identification and interpretation.

The strength of the book is its ability to challenge existing theories in soteriology and Christology in a true theological fashion. The reader is made aware of prevailing ideas. Then, step by step, one is exposed to the limitations of particular aspects. Alternate and theologically more plausible insights are proposed and likely conclusions are projected. These dynamics are much at play when M. explains the meaning of rites and rituals in liturgy as sources of transformation and spiritual renewal. The final chapter especially deals with the human aspects of Jesus in his development of wisdom and virtue. It demonstrates the basic characteristics of a true apprenticeship as perceived by M. The weakness of the book is at least twofold. First, the index is content-oriented and hardly includes names of authors of significance in the text. Second, M. fails to place his observations in the context of related professional literature: e.g., the names of Ricoeur, Gadamer, and Tracy are absent. This weakness proves to be the book’s strength insofar as it is delightfully genuine in the bulk of personal insights and discoveries which substantiate M.’s own apprenticeship.

University of Dayton  
WILLIAM P. FROST

EXPECTANT CREATIVITY: THE ACTION OF HOPE IN CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

Major publications on hope in the late sixties and early seventies form the basis for this book. Genovesi presents an integrated view with a focus on Christian ethics. Natural-law ethics is compared with eschatological ethics. The former assumes an unwritten law which characterizes human nature. The latter is an ethics of promise inspired by the not-yet (open humanism which responds creatively to God’s invitations). Situation ethics is appreciated for its personal concern in unforeseen problems, but is criticized for an absence of a wider historical context.

Erich Fromm and Gabriel Marcel provide the cultural anthropological aspects. Joseph Pieper’s perception of the fundamental dimensions lets hope transcend this-worldly (e.g., Marxist) expectations. The Christian understanding of hope is anchored in God, who is faithful to those who accept His mission in this world. Thus the human enterprise receives a future in God’s faithfulness as revealed in Christ’s presence.

Chapter 3 centers on Teilhard’s theology of human action. The “God of the Forward” is identified with the “God of the Upward.” Teilhard’s insights on original sin and evil (disunion) demonstrate the significance of Christ’s redemption for a creative unification (the cosmic Christ). A
detailed account of how an ethics of movement supersedes an ethics of balance refers to love as the dynamic by which the universe becomes personified as directed by Christ.

The next chapter summarizes Moltmann’s theology of hope, which is based on biblical revelations about God’s faithfulness. Christ’s cross dramatizes the commitment of God’s love and the unwillingness (sin) of reality to yield. The power of the future (the not-yet) raises expectations about the coming of God’s glory. This motivates human action (mission) in the presence of desperation. Teilhard appears more optimistic than Moltmann about the already-present involvement of the not-yet. Moltmann separates the present from the future so much that it diminishes the human aspect of creativity.

The last chapter describes how Christian hope characterizes Christian ethics. Teilhard urges people to see their spiritual growth in terms of a personal development in responsibility for reality according to the cosmic Christ and the process of transfiguration. Moltmann invites people to anticipate a new but as yet unknown future of God’s glory. Both recognize the human longing for justice which may emerge as an outrage of conscience (Reinhold Niebuhr). The ethics of hope includes a concern for justice as liberation. But hope supersedes forms of justice, because it is the force of the ultimate new. As a virtue, hope is eschatological rather than teleological, insofar as it represents more an openness to the new than a commitment to a particular finalization. G.’s contribution is his analysis of Teilhard’s Catholic identity as different from Moltmann’s Lutheran character. Teilhard envisions the study of reality as a response to the God of creation; Moltmann relies more exclusively on the God of revelation.

The weakness of the book is its context (its references are mainly ten years old). The cultural context has evolved beyond Fromm and Marcel and emerged in publications like Marilyn Ferguson’s *The Aquarian Conspiracy: Personal and Social Transformation in the 1980s* and *New Rules: Searching for Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down* by Daniel Yankelovitch. It would be a theological challenge to discuss Christian hope in reference to the new physics, the implicate order, and the holo-movement, which seemingly interest many people more than the parameters of the creation myth. G. has integrated respectably some major authors on hope. His interpretations in terms of Christian ethics demonstrate great depth and true theological virtue.

*University of Dayton*  

**WILLIAM P. FROST**

This collection of nine essays is the second volume of a projected series whose Volume 1 appeared in 1980, edited, as is this volume, by Thomas P. Doyle, O.P., of the Institute for Tribunal Practice at the Catholic University of America.

The collection begins with Jesuit John R. Donahue's "Divorce—New Testament Perspectives," whose intent is to produce "a summary of some of the recent exegetical studies on divorce in the New Testament, along with an attempt to locate the New Testament divorce texts in their historical context, as well as some concluding reflections on how these texts bear on our present context." Among these reflections is his conclusion that indissolubility in marriage is not an unexceptionable point of legislation in the Synoptic logia about a bond which cannot be broken, but an absolute moral "ought" inherent in the nature of marriage.

The second and third essays, Richard G. Cunningham's "Marriage and the Nescient Catholic: Questions of Faith and Sacrament," and Louis de Naurois' "Marriage of Baptized Persons Who Do Not Have Faith"—examine the problem of celebrating the marriages of Catholics who are ignorant of the sacrament and have no more than an unformed or even implicit faith, and of those who have no faith at all.

Cyril Vogel's "The Role of the Liturgical Celebrant in the Formation of the Marriage Bond" simply traces the history of the role named in the title. It is historically interesting but is of only indirect pastoral relevance. Marie Breitenbeck, O.P., in her essay "The Use of the Psychological Expert in Formal Cases," takes special note of this use "in light of the publicity surrounding the highly controversial canon which has stated that all proofs which are in the Acts and have remained secret must be published under pain of nullity." In "The Samaritan Woman and the Matrimonial Tribunal," Bertram Griffin examines the conflict that can arise when the internal nullity of a presumed marriage is estimated according to canon 1014 of the incumbent Code but the impediment of ligamen is estimated according to canon 1069.1.

The longest of the essays, and the most valuable for those concerned to understand the Church's currently developing marital jurisprudence, is Doyle's own "Matrimonial Jurisprudence in the United States." It is mainly a careful examination of psychological incapacity as a ground of nullity, and a consideration of the difficulties attending a finding on this ground. The volume ends with Doyle's "Rotal Jurisprudence," a study of three recent Rotal decisions in nullity cases that are especially pertinent to the jurisprudence developing in the American tribunals.

Theodore Mackin, S.J.

This is the tenth volume of the Philosophy and Medicine series published by Reidel and is a revision of the Proceedings of the Seventh Transdisciplinary Symposium on Philosophy and Medicine held at Columbia, Missouri, in 1978. The format consists primarily of a major paper for each of the five sections of the book and commentaries on that paper. The sixth section contains brief reflections on the theme by six participants in the symposium.

Of particular interest are several articles. First, the pair of articles by John Duffy and Samuel Gorovitz on the physician as moral arbiter presents a rather good historical overview of the role of the physician in society, as well as an evaluation and critique of the role of the physician as a moral arbiter. These articles bring together in a comprehensive way a history of the physician that is otherwise inaccessible, as well as present a sustained moral reflection upon the social role of the physician. Second, the article by Marx Wartofsky presents an interesting, though controversial, perspective on medical knowledge as a social product. He is interested in not only the social derivation of medical knowledge but also its use and control. Few articles in medical ethics deal with these problems from a Marxist perspective, and while many will not agree with this orientation, the approach opens up a new way of thinking and presents a different and critical perspective on the social character of medical knowledge. Third, Arthur Caplan has a rather interesting article on applying morality to biomedicine. It is a critique of several methodologies of doing bioethics but, more interestingly, it focuses on the problem of the definition of problems in medical ethics. He argues effectively that attention must be paid to the historical developments preceding the particular problem or policy at hand rather than simply either accepting the problem as presented by policy makers or analyzing it as an interesting philosophical issue without attending to its social context.

Other readers, interested in methodological issues and critiques, will find Tom Beauchamp's article on morality and the social control of biomedical technology interesting from a variety of points. In addition to addressing the topic of the article, B. also presents a defense of utilitarianism and begins an initial argument against many of the issues raised by Alasdair MacIntyre. He eventually argues that his utilitarian views on allocative justice are compatible with both utilitarian and nonutilitarian theories of justice. His article is a strong defense of cost/benefit analysis based on utilitarian theory and presents a challenging method for determining how financial resources should be used to provide technical and medical resources.

This book is clearly of interest to philosophers involved in medical
ethics. While the major articles are all worth while, many of the commentaries repeat the obvious or do not make enough of a critical commentary on the major article to be very helpful. Also, while several of the articles are useful, they are useful only to a very narrow bank of scholars, and the high cost of the book will make it difficult for even that group to obtain it.

*Worcester Polytechnic Institute*  
**THOMAS A. SHANNON**


This textbook, designed for theology students who have no background in philosophical analysis, is lucidly organized and splendidly executed. It shows how contemporary philosophical approaches can clarify the significance of key theological concepts.

Part 1, “Conceptual Inquiry,” introduces the notion that saying something is an action we perform, which leads to distinguishing the traditional understanding of words as names of things from a contemporary understanding of words as tools used to perform acts. B. opts for the latter to investigate the conceptual tools of Christian theology. Part 2, “Axiological Concepts,” rehearses the theories of the relation of facts and values in the context of our acts of evaluating, of finding meaning, and of expressing views of life. B. takes a position that adequately and accurately shows the relations of fact and value in the “illocutionary load”—a concept which is treated very clearly—of a value judgment.

Part 3, “Epistemological Concepts,” specifies how people can justify their beliefs. B.’s view of belief is clear and nuanced, and his view of truth as an appraisal of claims (using as appraisal standards the concepts embedded in the various philosophical theories of truth) is apt. This allows B. to respond to rationalist challenges to religious faith on their own terms. Part 4, “Ontological Concepts,” clearly distinguishes ontological claims from epistemological issues. B. reviews classical arguments for the existence of God and retrieves what is valuable in them for his approach. He then shows how the Christian can responsibly affirm her/his faith in God and brings out some of the ontological claims necessary to Christian faith. A list of 189 study questions and a brief index are appended.

Simply, this is the best textbook I have seen which uses contemporary Anglo-American philosophy to provide an elucidation of the concepts used in systematic theology. This is not to say the book is flawless. A comprehensive bibliography is missing. Some supplementary discussion which shows the reasons why B. takes a given side in the contemporary discussion would be useful. Avoiding even those rare hints of biblicism
that creep in would be desirable. Recognition of the internal pluralism of Christianity, especially in the final discussion of the existence of God (276–90), and the implications for interreligious dialogue would be welcome. A clearer differentiation of this approach from a fideistic one would be appropriate. Yet each flaw can be easily overcome by classroom illustration and commentary.

Anyone teaching philosophical theology and not committed to establishing substantive theological claims by philosophical demonstration or to a given philosophical school should consider using this book in upper-level undergraduate or first-level graduate courses in philosophical theology. It would be especially useful as the first text in a course on the doctrine of God. Although more appealing in style to Protestants than to Catholics, its substance should appeal to all who seek clarity, rigor, and sensibility in philosophical inquiry into theological concepts. B.’s work is surely a welcome relief from both convoluted neologicistic tomes and snap dismissals or simplistic defenses of Christian faith which seem to populate the realm of philosophical theology.

St. Michael’s College, Vermont

TERRENCE W. TILLEY

SHORTER NOTICES


The first volume of this “fully revised, illustrated” third edition of ISBE was reviewed in TS 42 (1981) 135–36. It has become, indeed, a new encyclopedia. Of the 257 names in the list of contributors, only 71 bear an asterisk, which means that their contributions have been retained from the 1915/1929 editions (with some editorial changes). Most of the new names are those of contemporary scholars of an evangelical mold. As I pointed out in the case of Vol. 1, there is a strange mixture of accurate information (especially on biblical realia) and tendentious interpretations in many of the articles. In the article on “English Versions” there is a subheading on “Roman Catholic and Jewish Versions” but no mention of the New American Bible. Instead it singles out Ronald Knox’s translation as “perhaps the most interesting and significant Roman Catholic version of the 20th cent” (99). The article on the “Essenes” notes the problem of identifying them with the sect of Qumran but does not mention that the site of Qumran is the only one which fits the location of the Essene between Jericho and Engedi mentioned by Pliny the Elder, Nat. hist. 5.15,73. Moreover, the bibliography on the Essenes contains nothing but references to literature on them up to 1962 (save for the few references to the author’s own writings, which are scarcely pertinent). As noted earlier, the student of the Bible will use this encyclopedia with discretion, i.e., always in conjunction with other works like The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible (and its
Supplement) or Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.
Catholic University of America


The New International Version of the Holy Bible was published in 1978, a fresh translation produced by over a hundred scholars working directly from the original texts and sponsored by the New York International Bible Society (along with the Christian Reformed Church and the National Association of Evangelicals). The scholars were drawn from many denominations (Anglican, Assemblies of God, Baptist, Brethren, Christian Reformed, Church of Christ, Evangelical Free, Lutheran, Mennonite, Methodist, Nazarene, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, and other Protestants). Now this new translation of the OT (protocanonical books only) is presented along with the Hebrew or Aramaic and Greek texts in three columns on imperial-octavo size pages (8½” × 11”). Though Kohlenberger’s introduction sketches the rise of the critical editions of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Texts, these are not used in this book. The Hebrew/Aramaic text is that of E. van der Hooght, Twrh, Nby’ym wKtwbym... (Amsterdam: Etiaash, 1705) as edited by A. Hahn (Leipzig: C. Tauchnitz, 1831), “the most popular of the noncritical editions of the nineteenth century.” The Greek text is the fourth edition of the LXX published by C. von Tischendorf, He palaia diathéké kata tous hebdomékonta (2 vols.; Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1869), which follows basically Codex Vaticanus and supplied the missing parts in the latter from Codex Alexandrinus—again “the most popular edition of the nineteenth century.” The three texts, Hebrew/Aramaic, Greek, and English, are clearly printed and will serve the purpose of quick reference. But any serious study of the original texts of the OT must depend in the twentieth century on the critical editions of them, the Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia and the Göttingen Septuaginta.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.
Catholic University of America


This volume belongs to the series Interpreting Biblical Texts, which deals critically with the historical and contemporary meanings of our canonical literature. The prophetic literature comprises Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve (Minor) Prophets. This segment of the canon offers a vast range of literary forms and, above all, a unique intensity in its proclamation to the people of God. A concise introduction lays out the basic assumptions underlying W.’s interpretation of the prophets. It is helpful on several counts. He breaks down a false barrier which keeps many away from the OT: the erroneous view that in reading the OT we enter a totally different world. Differences there are, but they should not be exaggerated. W. also helps the reader, by selected examples, to understand the complex origin and composition of our prophetic collections, carefully attentive to editorial or redactional emphases.

The heart of the book revolves around four themes which emerge from representative texts in the prophetic corpus. They are: (1) the call and ministry of the prophets, the lengthiest of the themes discussed; (2) worship and idolatry, or the experience of the Holy One in ritual and the abuses which provoked prophetic criticism; (3) the righteousness of God, both judgmental
and loving, summoning us to a fulfilling response of righteousness; (4) the nature of God, as illustrated in Isa 40 and Ezek 34, both from the exilic period when many latent facets of faith in Yahweh were made explicit.

Finally, a brief “Aids for the Interpreter” offers bibliographical guidance on English translations, dictionaries, commentaries, and interpretive works which concentrate on the theological message. At all times the book makes it clear that critical scholarship is no hindrance to faith but an aid. This brief introduction is an attractive and reliable guide to what the prophets said to their contemporaries and what they can say to us when read with open minds and hearts within a community of faith.

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.
University of Scranton


Characteristic of W.’s writings is a unique blending of literary imagination and theological realism. He refuses to be boxed into rigid form. The new pref­­face and opening essay he wrote for this collection of his essays—composed when he was over 85 years old—have the freshness of oral style, charming personal asides, and profound insights into biblical rhetoric. Instead of exe­­geting Scripture to death, he prefers, e.g., to observe “certain features of Hebrew narrative” and to use his conclu­sions to question “contemporary nar­­rative or fiction” (43).

W. treats language as an art form that must be kept plastic, fresh, and dynamic if it is to stir readers to enter into the eschatological vision of Jesus that affirms the “trustworthiness of ex­­istence” (96). Only when exegetes begin “Telling from Depth to Depth”—as he entitles his reflections on the parable of the Sower—will they liber­­ate biblical studies from the “limita­tions of scholarly method,” and only when they break away from identity to “the conative order” will they share adequately the “cognitive and the imag­inative” resources of Scripture (22–23).

These seven essays are divided into two groups. The first is entitled “The Parables of Jesus and the Full Mystery of the Self”; the second group treats “The Symbolics of Jesus and the War of Myths.” The latter part contains W.’s most challenging writing. It syn­­thesizes his vision of the rhetoric of Christian apocalyptic eschatology, the early Church’s expression of its expe­­rience of total crisis and world trans­­formation.

W.’s former pupil James Breech has performed a valuable service in introducing and editing these essays in a way that brings out their message for our time.

JAMES M. REESE, O.S.F.S.
St. John’s Univ., N.Y.C.


This fifth in a series of Stimulus Books which explore the Jewish-Christian dialogue argues that “no lasting resolution of the historic Christian-Jewish tension is possible unless the Church is ready to rethink significantly its traditional interpretation of Chris­­tology.” P. assumes, therefore, that some of those interpretations must be rejected (e.g., Christ is the total fulfil­­ment of the Hebrew Scriptures). After surveying and evaluating the works of several Christian scholars (Hellwig, Van Buren, Eckardt, Parkes, Rylaars­­dam, Baum, Ruether, Sanders, and Thoma) who have been involved in the dialogue, P. examines several contempor­­ary Christologists to see how they handle the question of Judaism. Pan­­nenberg is found to be seriously defi-
icient, Moltmann a little better, King too focused on the uniqueness of Christ, Schillebeeckx the most promising, Gutiérrez severely limited, Bonino somewhat promising, and Sobrino and Boff totally unacceptable.

Most important for P.'s recasting of traditional Christology is Second Temple Judaism, and within it the emergence of the Pharisaic movement, which introduced four major changes into Jewish Life: (1) a new emphasis on the oral Torah, (2) the development of the rabbinate, (3) the emergence of the synagogue as the central religious institution of Judaism, and (4) table fellowship in the home as a symbol of the power of the people. While Jesus may be considered "a son of the Pharisaic" movement, he remains distinctive in (1) the degree of intimacy reflected in his "Abba experience," (2) the degree of emphasis on the dignity of each person, (3) his teaching that riches (and not lust) are the antithesis of authentic commitment to God, (4) his prescription to love one's enemy (in Judaism one was not to hate one's enemy), and (5) his assuming to himself the power to forgive sins. P. concludes his book by challenging Christian theologians to take the Holocaust more seriously and to re-examine their traditional attitude to proselytizing Jews.

P. admits the embryonic nature of his constructive comments. What Christians should not say about Christ is clearer than what they should. The challenge remains: how to allow Judaism continuing validity and yet retain some unique and central content for the Christ event. P. takes a responsible first step towards meeting this challenge.

JAMES L. HEPT, S.M.
University of Dayton


S., pastor of the United Methodist Church of Rochester and adjunct pro-

fessor at Colgate Rochester Divinity School, offers an overview of the theology of the Holy Spirit that is intended for an adult-education audience. Evidencing familiarity with contemporary theological reflection on the Holy Spirit, S. writes in an engaging style as he draws upon literature in particular to illuminate his reflections.

S. begins with Acts 1:8 to provide a chapter on the power of the Spirit. He is careful to situate the meaning of power within a biblical context. The divinity of the Spirit takes up the second chapter, with a brief discussion of the filioque debate between the East and West. He also includes a modest attempt to position the meaning of the feminine relative to the divine. A chapter on the home of the Spirit discusses the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the life of the Church, while a fourth chapter offers a selective view of the language of the Spirit. The fifth and sixth chapters review the gifts of the Spirit and the meaning of ecstasy. Mysticism, the Pentecostals, and the nature of discernment come in for comment and critique. A final chapter on the scope of the Spirit focuses on community building and religious pluralism. A series of discussion questions for each chapter with an accompanying bibliography completes the work.

S. provides numerous quotations from authors but without specific references. Perhaps this was an editorial decision but at times the procedure is disconcerting. Thomas Aquinas is said to define mysticism as "the knowledge of God through experience" (56). Apart from the fact that the quotation appears more Gersonian than Thomas, some elaboration upon the meaning of experience in a medieval context would have been appropriate.

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

SIGNS OF RECONCILIATION AND CONVERSION: THE SACRAMENT OF


These are two in a series of eight volumes on “The Message of the Sacraments.” Each author covers five aspects of the sacrament: the existential/experimental meaning of the sacrament in the context of secular human experience; the historical development of the sacrament; a theological exposition of the meaning, function, and effect of the sacrament in the context of present official Catholic doctrinal positions; pastoral reflections; and a projection of possible future developments in sacramental practice and catechesis.

Hellwig, series editor, authors the superb volume on penance/reconciliation. With “relentless honesty” Hellwig pinpoints where genuine reconciliation germinates and flourishes today and suggests new patterns to solemnize this grace in a community act of worship. She challenges Christians to place trust not in the law but only in merciful love and to facilitate conversion and reconciliation by human loving, cherishing, and forgiving. In “Retrospect and Prospect” Hellwig questions: Will “integral confession,” a medieval innovation, disappear again? Will holiness, experience, wisdom, or skill of the minister again rank before the power of orders and jurisdiction? Is it becoming urgent for Church well-being and world redemption to acknowledge the charism of many women for this ministry of reconciliation?

Keifer contends that the faithful today yearn not for metaphysical answers about the Eucharist but for the trace of their own belief and their own experience of God in the Eucharistic celebration. Without denying the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist or its sacrificial character, Keifer emphasizes the often-forgotten categories of thanksgiving or blessing, and memorial. For useful historic models he turns to the NT and early Christian beginnings rather than to medieval Eucharistic theology. In the current direction of liturgical reform and contemporary popular Eucharistic piety Keifer tastes the new wine of the Spirit bursting old skins.

These books are eminently helpful for college theology classes, clergy, educated Catholic laity, and others interested in life and thought in the Roman Catholic communion; they deserve a wide readership among priests.

Prudence M. Croke, R.S.M.
Salve Regina College, R.I.


This doctoral thesis, appropriate to the anniversary year of the Council of Constantinople which expanded the third article of the Creed, catalogues and analyzes Basil’s language about the Holy Spirit. Luislampe devotes most of her study to the Spirit’s role in the economy of salvation: Basil has spoken of the Spirit in connection with creation, prophecy, the incarnation of the Word, the Church, the sanctification of Christians, and the final judgment. She quotes characteristic passages in each category (in translation) and relates them to one another in a way that makes Basil’s convictions in each area fairly clear. Basilian works less widely known than his De Spiritu Sancto are shown to differ little in language and import from his major treatise. The demonstration of that fact through generous quotation is understandably repetitious. A more impressive contribution to our understanding of Basil is
L.’s subtle analysis of the various ways in which he ties the Spirit’s activity into one with that of the Father and the Son.

What does not issue from this book is a sense of the unity of Basil’s thought on the Spirit. That unity may have been explicit, implicit, or nonexistent, but L. does not attempt to establish which in any critical way. The fundamental role of doxology for this aspect of Basil’s theology is properly emphasized, but L. takes this narrowly in terms of the trinitarian formulas without asking how doxological language is related to the theological description. The title of her book is apt, but the subtitle is a little misleading. Her select bibliography contains some striking items which suggest the breadth of her patient research.

MICHAEL SLUSSER
Catholic University of America


This is a translation of Henry’s La vision d’Ostie, which endeavored to interpret and situate the ascent to “vision” Augustine describes in Book 9 of his Confessions, in the light of a twin theory of conversion and of religion. Primarily a Plotinus scholar, H.’s explorations into Augustine were something of a violon d’Ingres even in 1938, when this essay first saw publication. The intervening years have not been altogether kind to the views expressed here: among them H.’s ill-founded conviction that Augustine had read only a “very few” Plotinian treatises, that Book 7 of the Confessions recounts Augustine’s “ecstatic contemplation” at Milan, that Simplicianus was responsible for discussing with him the doctrinal kinships between Plotinus and the Scriptures, that the year 386 saw Augustine converted simply to “Christianity.” Questionable, too, are features of H.’s appreciations of the roles played by Monica, Ambrose, Cicero’s Hortensius, and the text from Romans highlighted in the famous tolle lege scene. And yet, a number of well-wrought pages and genial intuitions make this little essay still very much worth reading: one is brought to regret that H. never studied Augustine as carefully as he did Plotinus.

The translator has done his job with clear competence. He might have advised his readers where more meticulous scholarship has outrun H.’s views, but he has chosen, perhaps prudently, to limit his introductory remarks to general observations on broader matters like Augustine’s literary style, theological method, monasticism, and the like. If read critically, and with an eye alert to subsequent refinements on these issues, this translation can still be a boon for those unable to read Henry’s own graceful and often lyrical French. The printing is a photo-offset of a typescript; typos are few; but the price will make the book far less accessible that it otherwise might have been.

ROBERT J. O’CONNELL, S.J.
Fordham University


The Irish Carolingian John Scottus Eriugena (ca. 810–ca. 877) was the most important figure in Christian theology and philosophy between Augustine and Anselm. A Neoplatonist with a thorough knowledge of Greek and a good knowledge of the Greek Fathers, he did speculative theology while most Carolingian theologians hesitated to move beyond patristic exegetical themes. Although a great deal of liter-
nature has appeared about John, knowledge of his work outside specialized circles has been retarded by a lack of critical editions and translations. The distinguished series Scriptores Latini Hiberniae is remediying this with a planned five-volume edition of John's greatest achievements, De divisione naturae, to have been prepared by I. P. Sheldon-Williams. He died in 1973 with only two volumes published (SLH 7 [1968] and SLH 9 [1972]), and this volume was prepared from his papers and notes. Who will edit the remaining two volumes has not yet been announced.

This volume presumes the introduction to the first (SLH 7) and thus the introduction is brief, confining itself to a description of the manuscripts, an explanation of the sigla, and an outline of the contents of the book. The book itself, set in dialogue form, deals largely with causation and a Neoplatonic analysis of the Genesis creation narrative. John's main concern is to show that creatures subsist in God and God exists in them but that this is not pantheism; he does this by analogue and metaphor.

JOSEPH F. KELLY
John Carroll University
Cleveland


This is a well-written and imaginative interpretive study of the early history of Cluny. Cluny is portrayed as the conscious creation of a monastic world of restraint, stability, ritual, and lawfulness, a counter to and model for the disordered society of the tenth century. After a short introduction, the first chapter traces the traditional approaches to Cluniac studies with clarity and insight. Chapter 2 then looks at the pattern of gift-giving to tenth-century Cluny. R.'s main point here is that Cluny's benefactors, especially after 980, tended recently to have experienced upward or downward social mobility in a pattern they could not fully understand and which was disruptive of earlier social forms.

Chapter 3 considers the Cluniac perception of the world outside the monastery and rightly stresses Cluniac interest in the moral reformation of the larger society. The chapter is well done, the references to sources to the point, and on the whole on such questions as attitudes toward the powerful and the weak the shift in perceptions from Augustine's to Odo of Cluny's day is clearly shown. One might wish for more precision in this or that sentence: p. 60 says of Christianity, “With the locus of virtue in God, not in man or the state, the importance of the social order was undermined.” The same page contains some dubious biblical interpretation.

Chapter 4 is on Cluniac self-perception and insists that Cluny's intention was a literal imitation of the Benedictine Rule. The difference between the monastic ideals of the Carolingians and the Cluniacs may be overdrawn, but the chapter again is well crafted. A final chapter looks at Cluny in context. Although the survey of early medieval social structures given is useful, the description of anomie theory seems unclear and its application not fully persuasive.

GLENN W. OLSEN
University of Utah


This book presents medieval Italy in an anthropological view. In the earlier period there was a gift society, an era of blood ties and the family, an age of uncertainty, while the later period was marked by the concept of solid public credit, by a sense of security and a trust in human arrangements, a world of impersonal business. Reform movements
and urban growth had challenged and disrupted that earlier world. The quest for evangelical perfection had different effects in each century. The language of each age reflected the change in the basic needs of the society. B. sees a shift that first resulted in challenges to the values, ideas, and language of the society; then there were contradictions and ambiguities that caused anxiety and conflict; finally society began to learn to live with the problematic and the ambiguous. After 1000, authority received renewed vigor in civil and religious spheres, but so too did freedom grow; for the stability and order that authority provided gave freedom this chance to develop. Reform in monastic and clerical life reinvigorated lay piety. Francis of Assisi was the preacher of both joy and judgment; the logic of the carnival made sense: poverty was riches. The heterodox movements tended to be those that could not accommodate themselves to paradox and ambiguity.

This book provides some stimulating reading. One caveat is that in a couple of places B. might have been a bit more careful on theological points: e.g., on the theology of marriage (31) and on penance (136). Still, it is a good study that ties together much interesting information and many insights.

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


This calendar of twelfth-century papal letters to the Church and king in Scotland provides a valuable resource for the historian of the medieval period. Together with G. W. S. Barrow’s Regesta regum Scottorum, it presents scholars with a reliable and up-to-date list of sources especially useful for the history of the Scottish Church in the Middle Ages.

S. gives a carefully researched compilation of documentary sources hitherto available only in scattered volumes. Texts not registered in Jaffé’s Regesta pontificum Romanorum are given in newly-edited form with full apparatus. Those which are listed by Jaffé are noted, and a helpful chart correlates numeration between that work and Somerville’s. The collection of 166 documents includes some which were previously unknown, and others for which no text has survived but whose contents can be discovered from chronicles and other papal correspondence. Each entry includes a synopsis of the letter’s contents, a list of all known manuscripts and editions, and, where an earlier edition was faulty or the text was never edited, an edition done by the editor.

What emerges from this collection of papal letters is a sketch of the integration of the Church in Scotland into the current of medieval Christendom in the Latin West. Perhaps of particular interest to Church historians is the text (no. 156) of Cum universi Christi of Celestine III in 1192, describing the Scoticana ecclesia, which had been subject to the metropolitan see of York, as a “special daughter” of the apostolic see and directly subject to it.

The utility of this volume is enhanced by three indices (incipits, charters and manuscripts, and a general index). S. also provides a bibliography of related sources and works. This calendar will be welcomed by historians of the medieval Church and papacy. The standard of scholarly enterprise it manifests testifies to S.’s diligence, and it serves as a significant contribution to the understanding of the relationship between the Scottish Church and the papacy during the twelfth century.

DONALD J. GRIMES, C.S.C.
King’s College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

The value of D.’s study transcends Sulpician history or the broader world of the seventeenth-century French school of spirituality. It can be read profitably by anyone interested in a rare, intimate look at the workings of grace in a man with many gifts as well as profound emotional weaknesses. By careful analysis D. follows the spiritual development of the last twenty-one years (1636–57) of Olier’s life. Using as his main resource an unpublished autograph journal (1642–52) of over 3,000 pages, D. leads the reader through Olier’s process of transformation from a self-centered, anxious, and at times severely scrupulous young cleric, to a “man of fire” who, freed from his own morbidity, dedicates himself to the loving praise of God and to the reform of the Church through the establishment of seminaries.

The book is arranged chronologically. The chapters are topical, using various psychospiritual issues as tools for the analysis and discussion of the unfolding material. While D.’s sensitivity to spiritual questions is well developed, his psychological analysis is at times too rationalistic. For example, I would have welcomed the application of some Jungian insight to the imaginal aspects of Olier’s journal, as well as to the psychospiritual dynamics of his “great crisis” (1639–41).

This is an honest work. D. does not try to whitewash or minimize the neurotic dimension of his founder’s spiritual journey. “His [Olier’s] concept of our union with Christ is marked by his own sickness. How could it be otherwise?” (124). Yet D.’s treatment is sympathetic, showing how Olier’s particular psychological make-up was the very pathway which led to his abandonment to the Spirit in a life of loving service.

LOWELL M. GLENDON, S.S. St. Mary’s Seminary, Baltimore


This correspondence of the English Catholic philosopher of religion Baron Friedrich von Hügel (1852–1925) with the Scottish philosopher and Kant scholar Norman Kemp Smith (1872–1958) is an important contribution to modern religious and intellectual history. The 130 letters, exchanged between 1918 and 1925, not only reflect the two friends’ interests in a philosophical realism, but also provide judgments on philosophers from Plato to Bertrand Russell and on public figures such as Albert Schweitzer, Gandhi, and Einstein. They also convey intimate glimpses into the personal lives of von Hügel and Kemp Smith and into the religious problems with which the two men struggled. Seven appendices of material relevant to the letters augment the correspondence. The footnotes provide valuable identifications of the persons discussed in the letters. The annotations are less useful in identifying books and issues. Editorial faithfulness to the originals is at times excessive (e.g., “he goes [sic] not go the whole way,” p. 133), and a few times names are misspelled by the editor (e.g., p. 63: read “Huck,” not “Hack”; pp. 117, 265, and 284: “Appasamy,” not “Apposamy”; p. 224: “Kutter,” not “Kutler”). In the appendices one misses Kemp Smith’s obituary of von Hügel in the Scotsman of January 28, 1925.

Despite these criticisms, the correspondence is a credit to the editor and press. A competent introduction by Barmann, two photographs of the correspondents, and English translations
(by David Schultenover) of the German passages in the letters enhance the value of this edition, which is strongly recommended to any institution or person interested in modern religious and intellectual history.

HANS ROLLMANN
Memorial Univ. of Newfoundland


This slim and expensive volume (published in German as Wittgensteins geistige Erscheinung, 1979) collects essays (two of five published elsewhere) relating W.'s work from both published and unpublished sources to the thought of some of his contemporaries.

Anthony Kenny argues that W. is at one with traditional philosophers on the nature of philosophy, even though his view of philosophy as antime-physical and therapeutic is an untraditional position. Brian McGuinness discusses how W. could call himself a disciple of Freud. J. C. Nyiri situates W.'s later philosophy in the context of neoconservative currents in German and Austrian intellectual circles in the 1920's and suggests that his thought could serve as a foundation for neoconservative political philosophy. Rush Rhees offers a complex exegesis of W.'s remarks on language and ritual to show how rituals and language (and explanations of each) similarly go wrong (or right) by how they express (or explain) the myths embedded in each. G. H. von Wright lucidly poses the problem of how to understand the relationship among three key aspects of W.'s thought: that individuals' thoughts and judgments are enmeshed in socially sanctioned forms of life; that philosophical problems are mental disquietudes thrown up by malfunctioning language games and forms of life; and that our scientific-technological civilization is the decay of Western culture.

These essays explore the themes of W.'s Culture and Value (reviewed TS 42 [1981] 706) rather than offer definitive understandings of W., his times, or his work (save possibly Rhees's difficult essay). The volume will be of interest to those actively engaged in Wittgenstein research and rather opaque to those without significant background in W. exegesis.

TERRENCE W. TILLEY
St. Michael's College, Vt.


P. has written ten books on spirituality and literary criticism. The present volume is the outgrowth of a second doctoral dissertation and many years of teaching. For P., the genius of Merton's appeal rests in his personification of the character of the age, which he felt more deeply and comprehensively than others: "He became the symbol of a century—of its turmoil and sensitivity, of its conflicts and restlessness, of its furtive peace and fugitive wars. . . ." P. concludes that Merton's story holds such broad appeal because in it others sense the echoes of their own: "He had a capacity to speak to others as though they were speaking to themselves." As the title suggests, the journey motif prevails. P. concludes that all of Merton's life was "characterized by intense, internal journeys" that parallel every person's earthly pilgrimage.

This study situates Merton well within the contexts of American literature and Catholic spirituality, as poet, essayist, preacher, and teacher. His prose works, poetry, and journals receive special attention, since for Merton "writing was more critical to his identity than any other commitment of his life." Though P. dubs it "cosmic
and visionary” and “perhaps the most important of Thomas Merton’s books,” his epic poem *The Geography of Lorgraire* seems to merit disproportionate emphasis in a work of this size and scope. One would prefer more extensive treatment of certain earlier poems, e.g., “For My Brother: Reported Missing in Action, 1943.”

In all, this is a solid, useful, original study, an attractive blend of primary source material and novel, interpretive analysis. Pending the appearance in 1983 of Michael Mott’s authorized biography commissioned by the Merton Legacy Trust, this will stand as the finest literary assessment of the well-known American Trappist’s career and concerns. The book is carefully documented with endnotes, topical bibliography, and index. Recommended for both Merton aficionados and casual readers.

**Gerald S. Twomey**

*Oakdale/Bohemia, N. Y.*

---


Hans Küng published *Existiert Gott?* in 1978. Hans Albert, the main German spokesperson for so-called critical rationalism, responded in 1979 with *Das Elend der Theologie.* Weger has now taken up Albert’s challenge in *Vom Elend des kritischen Rationalismus.*

The three-way character of this conversation causes certain basic difficulties. As has been shown, the logic of Küng’s extended defense of belief in God is unclear. He vacillates between a broadly factual approach to theistic argument, according to which nihilistic atheism is taken to be at least theoretically intelligible, and a transcendental approach, according to which all forms of atheism are both theoretically unintelligible and practically self-defeating. Albert has responded to Küng the former, Küng the broadly factual theist.

The crux of W.’s argument, however, in both its critical and constructive moments, is that belief in God is a transcendental rather than a factual matter. Thus he faults Albert for supposing that God is “a thing among other things,” rather than “the condition of the possibility of human accomplishments,” indeed, of “all reality” (38, 58). This creates the confusing situation that W., the transcendental theist, is criticizing Albert, the broadly factual agnostic, for criticizing Küng, the broadly factual theist, on Küng’s own grounds.

To my mind, W. presents a strong formal case for regarding the logic of theism as a transcendental affair. It is only in this way that one is able to show how Albert’s own critical rationalism, with its moral commitment to reason, implicitly testifies to that “condition of the possibility of human accomplishments of freedom and knowledge” which the theist calls “God” (52). On the other hand, W.’s material characterization of God as, e.g., “absolute” or “total fulfilment” is less convincing, since it makes it seem that God actualizes really incompossible values (68, 92).

**Philip E. Devenish**

*South Bend, Ind.*

---


Schall has written a very helpful and thought-provoking book about the social thought of John Paul II. He provides an excellent summary of his key ideas, ample quotations, and a most thoughtful commentary dealing with the coherence, implications, and limits of Catholic social doctrine as articulated by John Paul II.
The central theme of S.’s analysis is the truth of Christianity. By insisting on the “whole truth about man,” John Paul II counters all social ideologies that are based on a partial or distorted view of man. It is as the gift and revelation of supernatural life that Christianity challenges and inspires the social order. Thus the first right, and the basis for all others, is the right of religious freedom. Men must be free to hear the word of God and to practice the faith. Religious truth checks the absolutist claims of the modern state and thereby sets limits to its power and scope. By the same token, Christianity is not wed to any one cultural or political order. Its very transcendence allows Christianity to challenge, penetrate, and transform a variety of cultures. Especially in the areas concerning the sacredness of human life, Christian doctrine of the Incarnation has a profound influence. As for global issues, S. carefully probes the Pope’s statements on world hunger and the arms race. He shows how the Church’s valuable guidance to mankind must be complemented by the practical insight and prudence of experts and statesmen.

In sum, Schall succeeds in showing how the truth of Christianity is the source and continued relevance of Catholic social doctrine. The transcendent truth—about God and man—prevents the Church from being manipulated for political ends and gives the Church its power to challenge and inspire all men and social orders. For its keen analysis and its helpful appendices and bibliography, this book is an invaluable guide for any student of Catholic social thought.

JOHN P. HITTINGER
Benedictine College, Atchison


M. examines the creative tension placed on Christian friendship by the competing claims of agape and philia. He finds this tension chiefly in the demand of philia that friendship be a preferential and reciprocal love, while agape pulls us toward a universal love which “seeks not its own.” This tension is creative because it prevents philia from becoming narrow and merely self-interested, and prevents agape from becoming faceless and vapid. This shows most clearly in M.’s treatment of fidelity: philia seeks an elusive faithfulness which devotion to the particular cannot provide in a world of change, while agape, in teaching us to love as God has loved us, schools us in a fidelity which may help friendships endure. M. includes a discussion of politics and ethics, rejecting the notion that society is friendship writ large, yet holding out the hope that citizens might also become friends. He concludes with a look at friendship and work, which he relates through the notion of vocation as a calling that leads us to serve those beyond our friends. M.’s conversation partners in this appropriately discursive argument include Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Aquinas, and Kierkegaard, but the dominant influence is clearly that of Augustine, whose views are juxtaposed with those just mentioned to emerge in a cogent synthesis. One would have liked greater clarity about degrees and kinds of friendship, and especially about its connection with other special relations—M. implies marriage is in some respects not only different but superior, but does not follow this up. Nonetheless, this is a welcome addition to the literature of theological ethics and well serves the intent of the series on Revisions in which it is published.

RICHARD BONDI
Atlanta

LAW AND BIOETHICS: TEXTS WITH COMMENTARY ON MAJOR U.S. COURT DECISIONS. Edited by Thomas A.

S. and M. of Worcester Polytechnic Institute have provided a handy resource of 21 key court cases in the areas of abortion, death and dying, medical treatment and the involuntarily institutionalized, disclosure and informed consent, nondisclosure and confidentiality, organ transplantation, and genetics. Most of the cases are recent; some are older, such as *Buck v. Bell* (1927). Among the classic decisions included are: *Roe v. Wade, In Re Quinlan, Saikewicz, Kaimowitz, O'Connor v. Donaldson, Canterbury v. Spence, and Tarasoff.* Each section is introduced by a commentary of one-to-two pages by S. on the ethical issues and one-to-two pages by M. on the legal issues. While the brevity of these commentaries precludes any in-depth examination of the individual cases, they are helpful in showing the interrelationship of the decisions that follow.

Readers might wish that other court decisions had also been included (e.g., *Tucker v. Lower* on the determination of death of a transplant donor, *Maine Medical Center v. Houle* on the treatment of severely handicapped infants, and the Chad Green case), but within the limitations of space the editors have offered a useful selection of many of the most significant U.S. court decisions in the medico-legal area. Teachers and students of bioethics and medical ethics will appreciate this resource.

JAMES J. DOYLE, C.S.C.

*King's College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.*


This volume contains papers presented at the Tenth Annual Conference of the Notre Dame Center for Pastoral Liturgy, June 1981. The authors included are Eugene LaVerdiere, Robert Hovda, Robert Taft, John Guerrieri, William McCreary, Richard McBrien, Mark Searle, Benedicta Boland, and Godfrey Diekmann—all well qualified in their fields, and all the presentations are of high quality from one or another point of view.

The volume calls attention to the fact that Sunday is celebrated not because Christ rose on that day but because on that day the disciples first experienced the risen Christ. Also stressed is the primacy of the assembly to hear the word of God and celebrate the Eucharist over the "day of rest" aspect of Sunday. All aspects of the day, however, are understood as linked ultimately with mission and service to the world. Sociological data indicate that, at least in the U.S., secularization of Sunday is not as pervasive as it is usually claimed. The pastoral challenge is how to link Sunday observance to the sacred quality still inherent in people's attitudes and activities in regard to Sunday. The problems of Sunday liturgy are not the result of changes in the liturgy; the majority favor the changes and come to worship today with more wholesome religious motivation than in the past. But the individualism characteristic of modern society creates problems: notions of belonging to God's people or the Body of Christ mean very little to people. The plethora of information fed to men and women today and the means by which it is fed to them make it difficult for them to truly hear the word of God. The different expectations of clergy and laity with regard to what should happen on Sunday causes problems also.

This book is definitely a valuable contribution to pastoral theology and strategy in regard to the Christian Sunday.

CHRISTOPHER KIESLING, O.P.

*Aquinas Institute, St. Louis*

RELIGION IN SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. By Bryan Wilson. New
SHORTER NOTICES


This is a study of the sociology of religion; indeed, this paperback could well be used as the basic text in a course on the sociology of religion, for it neatly and with literary panache sums up the past references in the sociology of religion and adds current comments on new sects and movements. It was through the founder of sociology or at least his godfather that sociology and the sociology of religion began simultaneously; for August Comte and his intellectual sire Henri Saint-Simon wrote of the positivism in the religion of humanity, where the framework of Catholicism was employed to buttress the gods of science. As Wilson puts it, "Humanity was to be deity, and altruism the rule of life." Early sociologists like Spencer and Hobhouse and other social scientists like Marx and Freud set what Peter Berger has called the posture of sociology, "methodological atheism." Both Max Weber and Emile Durkheim carried on this work, with the latter contributing to the latent functions of religion. To the sociologist, other people's values are his facts. The method best used is the interview, while questionnaires have limited value. The one thing that a sociologist must strive for is detachment and objectivity in his investigations of religion, as indeed any social phenomena. Next, W. treats of the functions of religion, the most manifest one being salvation, generally attainable by ethical action. Nor were latent functions ignored, such as the explanation of physical universe, the conferral of identity on persons and groups and as an agency for emotional expression. In advanced societies the social-control function may be dying out; certainly the writer suggests that advanced society has replaced the community and its religions with organization and rationality. While Wilson views religions' survival arguable, he finishes with a hopeful note.

JAMES J. CONLIN, S.J.
University of Scranton


This contribution to the Theology and Scientific Culture series edited by Thomas F. Torrance claims a threefold thesis: (1) The present dichotomy between natural science and theology is debilitating and unnecessary. (2) The history of the development of the two disciplines since the seventeenth century encouraged a bad marriage between science and theology on the one hand and a divorce between the two on the other. (3) New conceptions of the world brought to light by relativity and quantum physics offer opportunity for fruitful dialogue between theology and science. Exposition of Part 1 does not break new ground. The heart of the book is in Part 2, a perceptive description of the impact of Newtonian science on selected Protestant thinkers up to Karl Barth. The book does not seriously discuss Part 3.

N. first outlines characteristics of the change in the relation of the two disciplines, from an early holy alliance to self-sufficiency of science and irrelevancy of a God hypothesis. Then in succeeding chapters the movement is traced by analyzing the epistemology and attitude towards natural theology found successively in Hume, Kant, and Hegel (one chapter); Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Herrmann, and Harnack (one chapter); and Barth (one chapter). The final chapter offers symptoms of a modern bifurcation between Protestant theology and science and some Protestant efforts at reconciliation.

The book is clearly written and well structured. The chapter on Barth's break with his theological teachers is outstanding. Truncation of A. N. Whitehead's doctrine could lead one
unfamiliar with process thought to prematurely dismiss it. For example, W.'s causal efficacy is not discussed when critiquing his views on perception (55) nor is mention made of a superject nature in W.'s God (48). Overall, the book is a solid introduction to the history of a marriage and eventual divorce between Protestant theology and Newtonian science.

J. F. Salmon, S.J.
Loyola College, Baltimore


This first publication of the Ridge Row Press (affiliated with the University of Scranton) endeavors, as will the future volumes of its series, to furnish the professor with a representative collection of journal articles on a contemporary theological theme, for use as, e.g., a supplementary classroom text. The presentation consists of an introductory overview by the editor plus eleven essays.

To summarize what seem to me the most noteworthy of the essays: Leonard Swidler's "Ground Rules for Interreligious Dialogue," gleaned from "hard experience" (10), are brief but valuable. Lesslie Newbigin's rich essay shows a theologian who varies between a rather tightly conceived normativity for Christ and Christianity and the exploratory sense of risk and daring that characterizes many veterans of dialogue. S. Wesley Ariarajah's "Towards a Theology of Dialogue" emphasizes in a number of ways the necessity of being able to count the present, not merely the past, as theologically authoritative. Monika Hellwig's "Bases and Boundaries for Interfaith Dialogue" is the jewel of the collection: clear, profound, experiential theology, written warmly yet challengingly out of a dialogue situation. Robert Schreiter first analyzes the many important theological areas touched upon by Rahner's "anonymous Christian" teaching and then creatively proposes that a "Jesus-as-Wisdom" Christology based on early NT sources might cover this complex of areas still better. Finally, Paul Knitter cuts to ribbons (perhaps unravels?) Hans Küng's arguments for the normativity of Christ and Christianity in On Being a Christian, and the three theses with which he accomplishes this also contribute materially to the literature on the question of Christ's uniqueness and finality. The remaining essays, though they contain some important refutations, lack the experiential basis which is in most instances what makes essays on dialogue both exciting and substantive. In this respect, what amounts to a rival publication, G. H. Anderson and T. F. Stranisky's Faith Meets Faith (Vol. 5 in the Mission Trends series; Paulist Press and Eerdmans, 1981), appears to be superior—and at one third the price.

In addition, evidences of sloppy proofreading: misspellings, typos, failures to indicate footnotes in the text, and even omissions of essential lines of print (e.g., 95), are so numerous, disturbing, and detrimental that they cannot go unmentioned. Also, pages were occasionally cracking loose by the time I neared the end of my reading. All in all, then, the maiden effort of the Ridge Row Press has its problems. But it is still quite useful, as the content noted above indicates. And the series of which it is a part shows real promise.

James D. Redington, S.J.
Georgetown University
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SCRIPTURAL STUDIES