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Presenting This Issue

Our September 1983 issue continues TS's commemoration of the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther's birth with major articles on the reformation effected by Vatican II and on a theological hermeneutic for Christian unity. A third article continues our effort to exploit the American philosophical tradition for the development of an inculturated U.S. theology. A bulletin assesses recent research on the significance of the Arian controversy, and two notes tackle neuralgic contemporary issues: canon 812 of the new Code, on the mandate to teach theological disciplines, and a continuation of the warm discussions in moral theology on so-called proportionalism.

Developments, Reforms, and Two Great Reformations: Towards a Historical Assessment of Vatican Council II attempts to evaluate the long-range impact of the last Council by comparing it with the Gregorian Reform and the Lutheran Reformation. The central question: Did Vatican II, like those two momentous movements, create a new ecclesial paradigm and effectively set it in place? JOHN W. O'MALLEY, S.J., Ph.D. from Harvard, is professor of Church history at the Weston School of Theology, Cambridge, Mass. Among his special interests are the religious culture of the Italian Renaissance and the history of Christian reforms. His most recent book is Rome and the Renaissance (1981). He is currently preparing a history of Christian preaching.

"Leise Treten": An Irenic Ecumenical Hermeneutic proposes to promote Church unity by (1) a theological hermeneutic of "treading lightly," which means that we look at differing opinions in their best light; (2) an articulation of the whole Christian tradition into (a) creed, which contains only that which is absolutely necessary to preserve the Jesus tradition and is required of all; (b) theology, which is the conceptual clarification of this tradition; (c) spirituality, which is its application to conduct—the latter two being optional. ROBERT KRESS, S.T.D. from Rome's Angelicum, is associate professor in Catholic University's department of theology, with particular enthusiasm for ecclesiology, fundamental theology, religion and culture, and Karl Rahner. He has recently published A Rahner Handbook and is readying two books, one on the Church, the other an introduction to the sacraments.

Divine Reverence for Us draws on U.S. philosophers Hocking and Whitehead to develop a thesis of a God who (1) is present, sustaining and inviting us; (2) cherishes, enjoying our goodness and esteeming us as free persons sufficiently to suffer as our companion; (3) persuades and does not coerce, usually whispering but wrestling when we need strength and liberation. JOHN R. STACER, S.J., with a doctorate in philosophy
from Tulane (his dissertation on Hocking was personally suggested by Gabriel Marcel), teaches philosophy at Loyola University, New Orleans. His chief interests are the philosophy of God, American philosophy, Whitehead and William James, the philosophy of person, ethics, and epistemology. His effort to integrate Thomistic and Whiteheadian perspectives on God appeared in 1981 in the *International Philosophical Quarterly*.

Arius and the Arians reviews a dozen recent studies in this difficult field, focusing on primary sources, methodology, the social and political setting, and theology. CHARLES KANNENGIESSER, S.J., with doctorates from Paris’ Sorbonne and Institut Catholique, currently holds a chair in theology at Notre Dame. His special competence lies in the Greek Christian literature of the second to the fifth centuries. His most recent books are *Holy Scripture and Biblical Hermeneutics in Alexandrian Christology* (1982) and *Athanase d’Alexandrie évêque et écrivain* (1983). In preparation are a history of Alexandrian Christology and a biography of Athanasius.

The Mandate to Teach Theological Disciplines: On Canon 812 of the New Code centers on the new requirement in the Catholic Church’s new formulation of its laws. A new provision, it raises a host of problems, especially in the context of higher education in the U.S. The note situates the canon in a broader context, then interprets each word, finally comments on the issues involved. LADISLAS ORSY, S.J., with a doctorate in canon law from the Gregorian in Rome and a master’s degree in law from Oxford, is professor of canon law at the Catholic University of America. He specializes in the philosophical and theological foundations of canon law. Major articles of his on the interpretation of law have recently appeared in the *Jurist* and in *Studia canonica*, and his *TS* article on marriage (September 1982) calling for new insights, broader horizons, and fresh categories has been enthusiastically welcomed. He is now busied with the theological principles that lie behind the new Code.

The Teleology of Proportionate Reason is a response to a criticism of the author in Richard McCormick’s “Notes on Moral Theology” (*TS*, March 1982). The subject of the controversy is what its proponents frequently call the teleological approach to morality. JOHN R. CONNERY, S.J., S.T.D. from the Gregorian, is professor of theology at Loyola University in Chicago. For six years (1954–59) he authored the Moral Notes for *TS* with distinction.

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


This volume is a continuation of the new English version of the authoritative Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch, Targum Onqelos, which was begun with Genesis published last year in this same series (see TS 44 [1983] 132–34). It is good to see that another volume of this English translation has appeared in such a short time, even if it is one devoted to the fifth book of the Pentateuch.

Again, the English translation has been based on the latest critical edition of the targum published by A. Sperber, The Bible in Aramaic (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1959–73) 1, 289–353. But the facing Aramaic text is that of the antiquated edition of A. Berliner, Targum Onkelos (2 vols.; Berlin: Gorzelanczyk, 1884), because the translator did not succeed in getting permission to reproduce the Sperber text. For the problems which this mixing of texts creates, see my comments in the review of the translation of Genesis mentioned above.

One wonders whether each translator in this series is going to discuss ab ovo the origin and date of Tg. Onqelos. In any case, how one puts together what Drazin says in the introduction to this volume with what was said by Aberbach and Grossfeld about these problems in the introduction to the volume on Genesis is puzzling. It is, however, significant to see D. writing about “the rather remarkable reliance by TO [= Tg. Onqelos] on the Sifre, a fourth century composition. Thus, TO was, in all probability, also composed or redacted in the land of Israel, but after the Sifre, in the late fourth or early fifth century” (6). Aberbach and Grossfeld had dated the targum in its final redaction to “the end of the third century C.E.” and located it in Babylonia (Genesis 9).

One major difference in this volume is the space given in the introduction to “Statistics” about the deviations of the Tg. Onqelos translation from the wording of the Hebrew of the Masoretic text. Whereas Aberbach and Grossfeld maintained in the first sentence of the introduction to their translation of Genesis that Tg. Onqelos was “certainly the most accurate Aramaic translation of the Hebrew Scriptures” (9), D. more cautiously states that “although many call TO a literal rendering, TO to Deut contains an average of three deviations for every two verses” (7). Indeed, he has counted 1601 deviations and classed them in 41 categories. This detailed work will be useful to students of targumic translation-practices.
D. claims that his English translation is "a modern, generally literal rendering of the original Aramaic. Freer translations are used only when they do not interfere with an understanding of TO deviations" (6). Having checked the English translation in a good number of chapters and verses, I think that D.'s claim is, in general, accurate. I was made initially skeptical, however, by his rendering of the Aramaic verb 'bd in Deut 1:1 as "serve," when it should be "because they made the golden calf." In this targum "serve" is expressed by plh, as in Deut 5:9. Again, the verb 'll should more properly have been rendered as "enter," not "come." D. regularly renders the singular gentilic adjective 'ymwr'h as plural, "Amorites," and glosses over the difficulty of third personal pronominal suffixes referring to the singular (Deut 1:7). These, however, are minor problems, which the knowledgeable reader will easily correct. The commentary is copious and generally excellent.

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


This is a modification of a doctoral dissertation accepted by the University of Manchester in 1978. Even those who read Greek and are familiar with modern studies on the homily known as the Letter to the Hebrews will find this study difficult both because of its density and its mode of argumentation. Throughout his monograph Peterson constantly refers to and dialogs with other commentators, not only the ten whose research bears special relation to his topic and whom he summarizes in his first chapter, but also many others listed in his bibliography.

By organizing his own explanations in terms of what others have said, P. adds a significant amount of material and diffuses the insights of his own research. The process generates 1071 footnotes, a third of the study. Because these are printed as endnotes, the reader must repeatedly turn pages to find the references and discussion pertinent to the topic. At times significant observations appear only in the notes: e.g., that the author of Hebrews may have coined the term designating Jesus as "perfecter" of faith (282).

The terminology of perfection appears in Hebrews eleven times. Commentators recognize its importance, but their "diversity of opinion suggests the need for a detailed exegesis of relevant passages" (1). P. does not limit his study to these texts but includes related passages that bear on the perfection of Christ, of believers, and of the New Covenant. His
opening chapter, "The Hermeneutical Issues," seeks to "highlight the various methodological and exegetical issues that others have raised." He does this by reviewing previous opinions and concluding with two sets of questions: four "linguistic and methodological questions" concerning the language of perfection and four "more general questions of exegesis" (19).

P. treats the first set in a chapter entitled "The Linguistic Background," but his method bears little relation to contemporary scientific linguistics. Rather, he prolongs the abstract conceptual approach of classical philology. His starting point and method come from J. Kögel, who concluded in 1905 that the verb for perfection in Hebrews demanded a "formal" interpretation, i.e., it was "a general term, without distinct content" (47). No attempt is made to give a componential analysis of key terms or to call attention to referential and associative meanings.

The remaining chapters form an extended exegesis of passages relevant to the concept of perfection. With reference to Christ, P. insists: "The perfection of Christ refers primarily to his vocational qualification" (175). He adds an appendix to show that the Son did not become high priest at his incarnation but only in his death and entrance into heaven. His conclusions on the author's concept of the perfection of believers are complex. "The sacrifice of Christ achieves all that is necessary for the enjoyment of eschatological blessing: cleansing, sanctification and glorification" (167). The complete "Index of Passages Quoted" makes it easy to locate P.'s comments on individual verses.

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


Meeks's most recent book is primarily concerned with the social setting of the early Christian movement. Among the subjects covered are the urban environment of Pauline Christianity, including a short treatment of urban Judaism; the social level of Pauline Christians, with a comprehensive treatment of the prosopographic evidence; the formation of the ekklēsia, and the governance, rituals, beliefs, and life patterns of the earliest urban Christians. The author rightly emphasizes that Paul was a city person and that the city breathes through his language. He was certainly one of the artisans who depended on the city for their livelihood. He could claim with pride before the commandant in Jerusalem that he was a citizen of no mean city. The Pauline churches were urban churches, and their membership consisted almost entirely of persons who had little or no connection with the countryside.
M.'s approach is essentially that of a social historian of early Christianity. He has used the available scriptural evidence with thoroughness, but has viewed it from a somewhat unusual perspective: this is not another coverage in the context of conventional church history, but a genuine attempt to treat the same material from the vantage points of sociology and social history. In the Introduction M. reviews a number of objections to his own methodology, reminding his readers that the two best-known attempts at interpreting early Christianity sociologically have both been reductionist: he refers to the Marxist reading of Karl Kautsky and the functionalist approach of Shirley Jackson Case. Nevertheless M. proceeds to demonstrate in the remainder of the book that secular sociologists have much to offer to the student of early Christian history.

M. counsels caution with regard to a number of positions that have sometimes been taken for granted. Thus, general assumptions about the class composition of churches in the apostolic and subapostolic periods are all cast in doubt by the general averment "We cannot ... fully describe the social level of a single Pauline Christian" (72). However, M. does venture the generalization that the most active and prominent members of Pauline congregations, including Paul himself, were persons of high status inconsistency, i.e., low status crystallization: "They are upwardly mobile; their achieved status is higher than their attributed status" (73). The habitually used translation "church" for ekklēsia is described by M. as "an anachronism, which cannot fail to mislead" (108). But whatever ekklēsia meant to early Christians, the governance of at least the Pauline communities was a "complex, multipolar, open-ended process of mutual discipline" (139). Christian funerals, M. suggests, would likely have been similar to those of contemporary pagans: "Probably the Christians buried their dead in the same places and in the same fashion as their neighbors" (162). He adds the suggestion that Christians would have held funeral meals for deceased brothers: there is not a word about such meals in the NT, but M. proposes that this custom would perhaps have been too well known to mention. And about institutional Jewish-Christian interaction in the Pauline period M. observes: "Socially the most striking thing about the communities revealed in the Pauline letters is that there is no visible connection or even contact between them and the synagogues" (168). The fact that Christian believers were united to one another while being entirely independent of the synagogues is rightly seen by M. as having enormous consequences for the future of Christianity.

The text of this book is supported with copious notes, and there is a full bibliography of secondary works cited. There are also indexes of
biblical references, modern authors, and subjects. This is an important, if sometimes controversial work; it will no doubt exert an influence on future sociological studies of early Christianity.

*University of Maryland*  
*DAVID GREENWOOD*


This expensive volume really comprises two monographs: the first two thirds is a historical overview of trinitarian theology; the last third, Hill's own proposal. As the title indicates, he intends to reinstate the troublesome word "person" as a description of God's inner nature, despite what seem (to me) to be rather sound objections from Rahner, Barth, and others.

No one can write a history of the doctrine without opening oneself to the charges that he or she has overlooked someone important (H. neglects E. Jüngel) or has given disproportionate treatment to another (sixteen pages to Aquinas, less than two to Richard of St. Victor) or has failed to engage the real systematic-theological issues which make the history interesting (e.g., theological language and method).

Part 2 helpfully, informatively and very rapidly scans the history of the doctrine and summarily categorizes various theologians' efforts to rearticulate it. Schleiermacher, Tillich, and C. Richardson are classed together under "The Trinity of Religious Symbolism: The God of Liberalism." Other categories include "Neo-Modal Trinitarianism: The Unipersonal God of Three Eternal Modes of Being" (Barth, R. Jenson, C. Welch, Rahner, and J. Macquarrie in the same chapter?); "Neo-Economic Trinitarianism: The Eternal God of History"; "The Trinity of Creative Becoming: The God of Panentheism"; and "The Trinity as Community: The God of an Interpersonal Koinônia." Surely there are some basic affinities among trinitarian theologies, but the typology here seems forced. Yet it does give H. a way of handling a large body of material in a way convenient to make his basic point: he is dissatisfied with all trinitarian speculations which in any way depart from the classic formula *tres personae*. The Scylla and Charybdis are modalism and subordinationism, with all variations and nuancings imaginable. Barth's preference for "modes of being" and Rahner's for "modes of subsisting" (both of whom make their substitutions precisely because the term "person" is so parlous) are adjudged inadequate. Thus the ongoing argument throughout the book with even so careful (and not especially heterodox) a theologian as Rahner.
H.'s confidence in theology itself seems untouched by hermeneutical and methodological studies which would caution against theological speech that tends towards the literal. Even though he explicitly acknowledges the place of analogy and symbol in talk about God, Hill believes that theology can speak of God \textit{in se}, that theology can give insight into God's own being and identity. For H., God \textit{is} a three-personed trinity.

Part 3 is a recasting of Thomistic theology in order to render workable the term "person." God's triunity is derived from God's essential unity in three steps. First, "Being as Pure Act," which grounds the unity of the Trinity, provides for "dynamic actuality" in God. Second, plurality as real in God posits intentionality at the core of existence; person (as the Greeks used \textit{hypostasis}) is thus a metaphysical principle in God. Third, plurality is personal, which yields the psychological dimensions to person. From this basis Hill proceeds to consider the Trinity as mystery of salvation, which entails relating the triunity to the correlative theological terms: creation, incarnation, theory of appropriations, missions, pneumatology, and even non-Christian religious experience (which is shown to be, however inchoately, also trinitarian).

Hill's rehabilitation of "person" will sit right with those who had no difficulty with it in the first place. Others who find the term too problematic to justify keeping it will bring to this book their same objections. Trinitarian theology, which in a way is uniform from Augustine to Schleiermacher, needs desperately to be explored theologically rather than historically, and it seems unrealistic that Aquinas' version, even if updated by Hill through intentionality philosophy, will rehabilitate this all-important doctrine.

\textit{University of Notre Dame} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{CATHERINE M. LAUGUINGA}


"To sorrow, therefore, over the misery of others," says Thomas Aquinas, "does not belong to God" \textit{(Summa theologiae} 1, q. 21, a. 3). Brune could never countenance this; for he would see such an understanding of God to be not only incompatible with Christianity but also the root cause of the present crisis, the impasse in which Western theology now finds itself. Scholasticism fled the world, whereas the new theology adores it. And in both cases the same rationalism is at play, creating on the one hand a God without a heart, and on the other a world without God. This crisis, B. argues, is caused by our failure to believe in a true sanctification of the world and a real union between God and man.

Consequently, in a work which is indeed a veritable anthology of
Fathers and mystics of the Church, B. invites us to consider afresh two crucial aspects of this crisis: our theology of original sin and redemption. With impeccable learning he traces the cause of the crisis back to the rupture between the churches of the West and the East and their very different conceptions of the union between God and man. While clearly demonstrating the logical continuity between Scholastic theology and the death-of-God theology, he would say that the explosion between Catholics and Protestants had become inevitable in order to bring this crisis to a head, thereby salvaging certain points of view essential to the Christian faith—points of view which became irreconcilable after the invasion of Aristotelian categories into theology.

First, basing his analysis on the understanding of love in the Trinity, B. vigorously repudiates every idea, philosophical or theological, which tends to put the cause of evil, i.e., the origin of evil, in God Himself. For him, the only satisfying response to the problem of evil is not so much the elucidation of one problem as the contemplation of another mystery, more astonishing and more profound: the mystery of God’s love for us. Second, not content just to disagree with Aquinas’ notion of a heartless God, he calls upon the whole tradition of the East—the Orthodox Church—and the mystics of the West to affirm a doctrine of a true incorporation of Christ into our human nature and history: not a juridical expiation, a monstrous compensation to a Judge without a heart, but an experience of divine love which is communicated to man, making him a participant not only in the sufferings of Christ but also in his victory over death. Thus B. succeeds in constructing a work of great interior unity, very satisfying to the spirit.

However, the general presentation leaves something to be desired. Of the seven chapters, the first three and final one address themselves to the public at large. Chapters 4–6, which of necessity, it seems, required much detailed and minute demonstration, concern the specialists. A certain lack of unity, then, has to be admitted, aggravated unfortunately by the absence of an analytical index and the troublesome reading of notes incorporated into the text. Also, the tone of criticisms made of theologians in the West is a regrettable irritation. And there remains the internal problem: How is it that this theology of redemption, perhaps in effect the most profound, the most satisfying for spirit and heart, maybe the most ancient and best rooted in the first centuries of the Church, has been so little developed in the East and has still remained practically unknown in the West? B. does not answer this for us.

Perhaps this work is too mystical for most; but this is also its real contribution, and why I hope to see it translated soon into English.

University of Notre Dame

E. GERARD CARROLL

The title can be misleading. V. makes it clear from the beginning that he is not writing a fundamental theology; he is "proposing a series of related essays in theological reflection, all of them directed to making intelligible what I conceive to be the setting and task of a theologian working within a Roman Catholic theological community" (42 f.). Theology grows out of the religious experience of a theologian, living in a concrete believing community. For V., engaging in theology is one way of living in the Roman Catholic Church.

As a result, this book is a highly personal account (the whole book is presented in the first person singular, in a conversational style) of the experience of being a theologian. V. begins by summarizing his Man as Symbolizer (1981), which presents his philosophy of human being in an existentialist and phenomenological mode. Key to his presentation of being is the notion of symbol, relying principally on the work of Ernst Cassirer rather than on contemporary linguistic or semiotic studies. He defines symbol as "a sensuous image which terminates a human intentional operation, represents the imaged reality, and may affect the human world with a manifold efficacy" (12). This is a very broad notion of symbol, especially when compared to most contemporary discussions. V. specifies it to some extent by concentrating on the intellectual or cognitive dimensions without excluding volitional and emotive aspects. However, it seems that symbol and symbolizing comes to cover most forms of being and communication in divine and human realms. Thus, the Trinity is described as the Divine Symbol, with the Persons imaging themselves to one another; the Church as the imaged reality of the divine symbolizing; sacramentality as a further symbolizing of the gifts of the new creation; and so on.

V. sketches a matrix of God revealing (symbolizing) and the life of the Church in great detail. Within that matrix he then turns to theology itself, which he sees as a search for meaning within a life of faith, which "involves a continuing reflection upon structures of Christian experience within a community of believers, and the continuing effort to understand and to symbolize in a variety of ways" (216 f.). The experience of God, the encounter with what he calls the Mystery, provides the frame and content of the theological process. While he does not wish to propose a method as such, he does take up many of the traditional questions (role of the Bible, magisterium, dogma) and does present three concrete examples of how he sees the theological process happening. Theologizing, he reminds us on a number of occasions, is a mode of living in the Church.
The book closes with a focusing more and more on his own experience as a theologian, ending in an autobiographical account of how V. became a theologian.

This book is valuable as a study in how one theologian actually comes to engage in theology, especially the kinds of religious experience which may be more specific to a theologian. It is of more limited value in accounting more generally for how theology is being undertaken today. Nor does it engage the larger range of issues facing theological reflection today. The book is highly individual and individualist in character; it almost assumes faith; it does not intend to give anything of a guide to the larger contemporary problematic. When read within the confines of its stated intent, it provides an interesting guide to one theologian’s experience.

_Book Reviews_

**Catholic Theological Union**

**ROBERT J. SCHREITER, C.PP.S.**

**Chicago**


This book is both likable and frustrating. On the one hand, it is bold in conception and broadens the reader’s mind by juxtaposing materials from a variety of sources which the theologian in search of enlightenment from history would not otherwise encounter in proximity to one another. On the other hand, it is idiosyncratic, uneven in style, and too frequently inaccurate or misleading.

Wallace-Hadrill is trying to provide students with “a general view of all that was meant by the term ‘Antiochene,’” in the geographical sense of the area dependent on the patriarchs of Antioch, from Cilicia and Palestine to the Syriac, Arabic, and Persian-speaking Christians of Mesopotamia. With that horizon in mind, W.-H. surveys the history of the city of Antioch and the influence of Jewish, Gnostic, and pagan religion in the area. Then he takes up in order the biblical interpretation characteristic of Antioch; Oriental Church historiography; the theology of God, use of Greek philosophy, Christology and soteriology of Antiochene theologians, and their ascetical ideals.

W.-H.’s originality and courage show not in his approach to theological and historical issues, where he is openly dependent on other authors, but in his going beyond the predictable Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyr, John Chrysostom, and Nestorius to the Oriental authors. Severus of Antioch, Ephrem, Barhadbešabba, Henana of Hadiab, Babai the Great, Afrahat, Bardaisan, Ibas of Edessa, Sadhona, Išo‘dad of Merv, and many others appear here, often with generous accompanying quotation. Some
of these writers were, of course, Monophysites, which will confuse readers accustomed to linking Monophysitism with Alexandria. Still, one might have hoped for a fresh but coherent physiognomy of Antiochene thought to have arisen from the synoptic view of all these writers. One reason why it does not is the further inclusion of writers like Eusebius of Caesarea, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Evagrius Ponticus; the latter's only connection with Antioch was his recovery from a love affair in a Jerusalem monastery and the preservation of some of his works in Syriac translation. But that is only one of a number of oddities about this book which prevent it from attaining its goal.

It is odd, e.g., that the chief historian for Christian Antioch in the century and a half after the Council of Chalcedon, Evagrius Scholasticus, is not even mentioned, much less used. It is odd that Henana's "exegetical principles appear to be unexceptionably Antiochene" (49) when the principles quoted are repeatedly stated in similar terms by Athanasius of Alexandria. W.-H. vacillates between using "Antiochene" in a geographical and an ideological sense; on 142 he asks "who was there to maintain the Antiochene tradition against Severus?" It is odd that Paul of Samosata is described so fully and placed so prominently in this book when the modern studies to which W.-H. refers the reader in the notes, taken together, call into question almost all assertions about Paul's theology. The description of Origen's allegorical method (28) and of his doctrine of the Logos (72, 74) are at least misleading. Apart from Arius, the pupils of Lucian of Antioch have not left us evidence that they "were proud to call themselves" Collucianists (83). It is cavalier of W.-H. to trace Christian attachment to Mary as theotokos back to Astarte and the Dea Syria (92) without supporting evidence. It is a surprise to find Apollinarius of Laodicea hailed as "the great Antiochene" (134, and see 92 and 100). It is odd to find ataraxia described as a Stoic ideal opposed to free will (104) when it was an Epicurean ideal compatible with personal responsibility. The whole chapter on the use of Greek philosophy is marred by the assumption that concern for rigor of thought belonged only to Aristotelianism; thus Evagrius Ponticus comes under "the Syrian adoption of Aristotle." An alert editor would have caught the two similar detailed summaries of the same homily of Severus of Antioch, which is first numbered Homily 223 (24-25), then 123 (113).

Such summaries of individual works or parts of works, often quite detailed and interesting, alternate with gnomic but questionable remarks which manifest W.-H.'s disdain for nuance, such as "The two schools, Antiochene and Alexandrian, in starting from opposite ends could hardly be expected to understand the virtues of each other's position" (125). After a book like this, one would hope to be less simplistic than that. We
should be both grateful for and cautious about this useful and undependable book.

_Catholic University of America_  

Michael Slusser


Des Places's focus is on Eusebius as "commentateur," based primarily on his _Praeparatio evangelica_ and, to a lesser extent, on the _Demonstratio evangelica_, his scriptural commentaries, and on a few other works as well. The author has made extensive use of J. Sirinelli's historical study of Eusebius (1961) and is himself one of the collaborators in the Sources chrétiennes edition of the _Praeparatio_: he therefore limits references to Eusebius' historical work to passages used for comparison.

Most useful perhaps is the sheer mass of information contained in the listing of Eusebius' use of the writings of Plato and other pagan Greek thinkers (especially Plutarch and Porphyry), of Judeo-Hellenistic authors such as Philo and Josephus, and of fellow Christians from the apologists to Dionysius of Alexandria. Selected texts from Eusebius on OT and NT passages follow, and of special interest is the comparison of comments from different works on a number of Psalms and several texts of Isaiah.

Eusebius' use of pagan texts and his scriptural exegesis are unified in the concept of "Eusèbe commentateur," and although the book contains little extended exposition, des Places does paint a picture of this personage which complements the more traditional view of Eusebius as a historian. According to des Places, Eusebius is less original as a commentator than as a historian or apologist (193), but his role in the history of patristic exegesis is nonetheless noteworthy. Heavily dependent on Origen, he influenced the work of Didymus the Blind; since he also was used by later historians such as Theodoret of Cyrus, he left his mark on the two major "schools" of patristic thought in the fourth and fifth centuries. The goal of his exegetical work appears to join with apologetics in an attempt to illuminate "le mélange d'ombre et de lumière que le paganisme offrait à Révélation" (36). He cites pagan authors, then, to show the continuity, on the level of rationality, between paganism and OT and NT thought. The errors of paganism (primarily that of polytheism) are indeed exposed, and the originality of Christianity is highlighted; but the good in paganism is acknowledged, and his own leaning toward Middle Platonism leads him to speak of the Word, in Arianizing terms, as a second God. Finally, Eusebius, as interpreted by des Places (following Sirinelli), displays a tendency to twist the meaning of Scripture to suit
his own purpose: proof of the rationality of Christianity (152, 189).

This book is a highly skilful, if demanding, production and will prove indispensable for the study of both Eusebius and patristic exegesis.

Fordham University

GERARD H. ETTLINGER, S.J.


Chastel is one of the most distinguished art historians writing today. His work, beginning with Art et humanisme à Florence au temps de Laurent le Magnifique (1959), has been characterized by an attempt to relate art to larger cultural phenomena. The present book has the same "aim" (20) or methodology and utilizes the sack of Rome by the troops of Emperor Charles V as a focus for studying Roman culture and collective consciousness during the pontificate of Clement VII, Giulio de' Medici. The thesis is straightforward: that event marked a turning point in painting—and in religious and cultural sensibilities—that has been underestimated.

The relevance for the readership of this journal of a book like C.'s is not immediately obvious, but I believe it is profound. Clement VII (1523–34) was the first pope who had to deal with the Reformation over a long period of time. The religious issue is a theme that runs through the book and is a criterion for assessing works of art and the more general culture they reflected. The immense merit of C.'s study is that it integrates religion into culture. This is not, therefore, a work of "church history" in the narrow sense in which it is often practiced, with an almost exclusive focus on institutional and theological questions. My own belief is that the religious crisis of the early sixteenth century was due as much to the conflicting cultural presuppositions of the Mediterranean and northern worlds as it was to strictly religious or theological factors. C.'s study supports and, literally, illustrates this persuasion.

The contrast between the stately paintings of the great masters of the court and what C. calls the "mass media" of the antipapal woodcuts in the German pamphlets is where the difference in culture is most patent. Accusations of "paganism" and "hedonism" from the one side were countered with accusations of "barbarism" from the other. On both sides, according to C., apocalyptic predictions and revelations sooner or later made their mark.

This is a handsome and, for the most part, persuasive book. Some historians will judge that the impact of the sack is overstated. Except for initiates into the period, the details of the argument may be at times difficult to follow, and the translation is not always felicitous. There are
some other minor blemishes. Nonetheless, the book is a significant achievement, and it is especially valuable for its balanced judgments on Clement VII, so often treated by historians only with disdain.

The book and its argument would be strengthened (to qualify somewhat what I stated earlier) if more attention were paid to some of the theological assumptions that in my opinion were operative at the court as part of its culture. The humanist and scholastic theologians in Rome, sometimes obviously dependent upon Aquinas, seem to have functioned out of a basically reconciliatory appreciation of religion. Only in this perspective can the problem of the supposed “paganism” of Roman culture be adequately addressed. This reconciliatory dynamic seems to me to be the theological rationalization for the fervent appropriation of antique culture in which Renaissance Rome indulged. Chastel can hardly be faulted for not incorporating into his book a subject so massively neglected until now by historians of theology. We are only beginning to understand the religious vision operative in Rome at the time it first faced the Reformation.

Weston School of Theology

JOHN W. O’MALLEY, S.J.


Otto Pesch, best known for his monumental Theologie der Rechtferti­gung bei Martin Luther und Thomas von Aquin (1968), has written another fine book about Luther’s theology, this time a broad exploration of the relationships between Luther and the Catholic tradition. His thesis: the gospel of the unconditional grace of God, which appears and is given to us in Jesus Christ, retains its identity not by means of verbatim repetition but through ever new stages of interpretation. Faith in the gospel expresses itself in different and thus new forms of understanding and incarnates itself in these forms. Luther’s Reformation theology is just such a new way of understanding and articulating faith in the gospel. Because this new stage of the interpretation of faith, despite all its connections with tradition, was of a special epoch-making newness, the contemporaries who maintained the traditional faith widely misunderstood it to be a rejection of basic principles of the traditional Christian message. This misunderstanding was historically (almost) unavoidable.

In my judgment the thesis is basically correct, and throughout the book P. does a good job of showing this to be the case. He gives us a reading that focuses on the concerns of sixteenth- and twentieth-century Roman Catholicism, so that we have here a Luther-Catholic dialogue of very high quality. At times he may stretch things a bit—as when he protest that there is no obscurity in Luther’s teaching on Heilsgewissheit,
but then must characterize it as an ungesicherte Gewissheit (120)—but in the main he does a compelling job of showing that Luther’s theology does harmonize with the Catholic tradition without being identical to it, and that it has a great deal to say to Catholic theological concerns in the closing decades of our century. On some issues—e.g., the doctrine of the two kingdoms—he has serious reservations about Luther’s thought, but he is careful to point out that these are reservations shared by many within the Lutheran tradition.

On the question of church and ministry, P. takes a somewhat different approach. He is more restrained about the kind of agreement that he thinks can be shown to exist between Luther and Roman Catholicism. He attempts to show, successfully but perhaps too sketchily, that there is a significant congruence between Luther and Vatican II, if both are read with an eye for their basic concerns. The section on the papacy is surprisingly short—less than half a page. I take it that this reflects, as much as anything, the unresolved character of Roman Catholic ecclesiology at the present moment; but whatever the reason, this section is by far the least ripened part of the book.

Though I am generally convinced by the argument of this book, I have several reservations. Let me state two. (1) Pesch’s handling of “the Catholic tradition” seems to me inadequate. Catholic Luther scholarship, with its denigration of Scotus, Ockham, and Biel, has perpetuated a kind of optical illusion according to which “late scholasticism” is an aberration from the authentic Catholic tradition. Yet, most of what one finds objectionable, relative to justification at least, in these later writers can already be found in Aquinas’ Sentence Commentary, the “amor Dei super omnia ex puris naturalibus,” for example. Such views would seem to have been the dominant tradition throughout the scholastic period, despite the efforts of the author of the Summa theologiae, of Thomas Bradwardine, or of Gregory of Rimini. And when he states (185) that the conception of freedom which Luther rejects in Erasmus “in der Tradition nie vertreten worden ist,” he is overlooking the fact that one can find it in the early writings of Augustine, as well as in the Sentence Commentary of Aquinas, where Thomas seems to find it altogether unproblematic. What Pesch identifies as the Catholic tradition would thus at least seem to have been a series of Augustinian criticisms of what for centuries was the dominant tradition. “The Catholic tradition” is used by P. normatively to identify what the tradition should be; but he often gives the impression that this is how things actually were until a few superficial theologians at the end of the Middle Ages came along and muddied the waters. There are both historical and theological issues here that need more careful attention than P. gives them.
2) In the statement of thesis above, P. asserts that the misunderstanding of Luther was almost inescapable. This raises a question central to any claim that Luther was really much more deeply Catholic than Catholics then or since have thought: Why is Luther so easily misunderstood and at the same time such a popular writer? It is, I think, both true and important to point out that there is much in the scholastic way of theologizing that makes an understanding of Luther difficult, but P. overstates matters. After all, the first generation of Lutherans was composed entirely of *Altgläubigen*, and one assumes that they did indeed understand him. Moreover, some of those who opposed Luther even though they were much closer to him than they realized (e.g., Seripando) were themselves vigorously antischolastic in their theology. And the long-standing debates within Lutheranism over the right interpretation of Luther suggests that it may be more than scholastic habits of mind or lack of sympathy that make a balanced understanding of Luther difficult. The issue which P. dismisses as the most superfluous of controversial questions—the issue of faith and works—was, after all, a matter of controversy within Lutheranism during Luther's own lifetime.

However, though it is possible to raise questions which one would like to see handled more adequately, the fact remains that this is a rich and thoughtful book. P. has tried to guide the reader (Catholic or Lutheran primarily) to a reading of Luther that will not be confessionally narrow but will situate Luther within the larger Catholic tradition and with reference to the contemporary scene in Roman Catholic theology. He has done a very good job.

*University of Iowa*  
JAMES F. MCCUE


The past several decades have witnessed renewed interest in the thought of More, as evidenced since 1963 by the preparation of critical editions of his complete works at Yale and elsewhere. Gogan's theological-historical study builds upon some of that scholarship, yet pursues a carefully defined and significant subject from a fresh and independent perspective.

Through a critical, historically-informed examination, G. investigates a major theme in More's work: his understanding of the origin, nature, and mission of the Church. Closely connected with that theme are related questions which unfold Sir Thomas' perception of the Church as trans-
mitter and interpreter of revelation, and his evolving understanding of
the nature of papal primacy. All of these points were critical issues within
the intellectual ferment of the early sixteenth century.

G. follows a carefully designed analytical framework. Initial chapters
present an excellent survey of medieval ecclesiology from Augustine
through Ockham, Gerson, and Biel, and a careful recitation of More's
theological method and principal sources, which included Augustine,
Jerome, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Henry VIII's Assertio septem
sacramentorum among others.

Having sketched that background, G. examines in great detail and in
chronological order each of More's principal works between 1523–35
(Responsio ad Lutherum, 1523; Dialogue concerning Heresies, 1530–31;
The Confutation of Tyndale's Answer, 1532–33; and letters of the treason-
trial period, 1534–35). In each instance More's work is scrutinized within
its appropriate historical context, and the theological themes are uncov­
ered, interpreted, and analyzed to reveal the course of More's thought.
The progression from the 1523 work addressed to Luther through the
prison letters allows the development of More's ecclesiological ideas to
emerge clearly. It also affords the reader a glimpse into the tenuous
situation which confronted him and into the workings of his incisive
mind.

G. concludes the study by drawing together the various threads of
More's understanding of the Church, the nature of revelation, and the
meaning of papal primacy, weaving them into a fine synthesis. Finally,
he situates More's ecclesiological thought within the larger context of
theological debate as it was in the 1530's.

While the magnitude of this work, as well as its keen attention to
detail, may not appeal to those unacquainted with either More's works
or early Reformation theology, G.'s study provides a valuable and needed
service. The only previous examination of More's ecclesiology was
sketched in André Prévost's Thomas More, 1477–1535, et la crise de la
pensée européenne (1969). But that work dealt with the range of More's
thought and did not pursue his understanding of the Church in depth.
While other scholars have studied More's ecclesiology in one or another
of his writings, none has undertaken to examine that theme systemati­
cally in all of his later works. Extensive notes and a well-chosen bibli­
ography add further value to this volume. G.'s long-standing interest in
More's ecclesiology has led him to make a substantial scholarly contri­
bution which many will find especially helpful.

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

THE THEOLOGY OF SCHLEIERMACHER. By Karl Barth. Edited by
Dietrich Ritschl. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids:

This volume is a fine translation of Part 5, Volume 2, of the Karl Barth Gesamtausgabe currently being published by the Theologischer Verlag, Zürich. The book presents B.'s previously unpublished lectures on Schleiermacher delivered at Göttingen during the winter semester of 1923–24.

At the outset of the course, B. announced his plan to examine S. as a preacher, a professor of theology, and a philosopher. Due to limitations of time, B. omitted analysis of S.'s philosophical works, except for the Speeches on Religion, which, interestingly, he ranks under this subject matter. The editor has divided B.'s lecture material into two long chapters, "The Preacher" and "The Scholar." The first chapter begins with B.'s examination of the prevalent theme of peace in the Sunday sermons from S.'s later years. He proceeds to the Christological festival sermons, in the course of which he closely scrutinizes the dialogue "Christmas Eve" and concludes with an analysis of the "household" sermons of 1818, which address such topics as marriage, child rearing, and philanthropy. The second chapter examines in turn S.'s theological encyclopedia, hermeneutics, the introduction to The Christian Faith, and the Speeches.

B.'s career-long debate with S. is such a well-known dimension of twentieth-century Protestant thought that the reader easily approaches these lectures smugly prejudgmental as to their content. Here as always, though, B. eludes the caricature of neo-orthodox conservatism as he offers his students a critical exposition of S.'s principal writings. While unhappy with S.'s methodological presuppositions and theological execution, B. never fails to appreciate his ministerial and intellectual commitment to the elusive goal of ecclesiastical unity.

One can only be pleased that George Hunsinger's translation of B.'s Nachwort has been included in this edition as an addendum to the Göttingen lectures. This essay, which B. wrote shortly before his death, is a short, though remarkable, intellectual autobiography in which B. takes stock of his fifty-year conversation with Schleiermacher. Its publication in this volume highlights the similarities and dissimilarities in both tone and content between B.'s early and late evaluations of S.'s theology.

Fairfield University

John E. Thiel


When the Dominican cardinal Filippo Maria Guidi, archbishop of Bologna, ascended the ambo on June 18, 1870, he apparently hoped that his speech would persuade the prelates of the First Vatican Council—
already sharply divided over the issue of papal infallibility—to agree that while “the pope has the power of issuing an infallible definition and proposing an infallible truth, nevertheless his own person is not infallible.” Before his speech was over, there were murmurs from the audience who felt that Guidi was “more Gallican than the Gallicans.” Before the day was over, Guidi had been summoned to the papal apartments for what turned out to be a dressing-down by Pius IX. When the cardinal tried to defend his view that papal decisions can be infallible only after the pope has investigated the traditions of other churches, Pius IX reportedly exclaimed: “I am Tradition!”

H.’s study is not only an important correction of the historical record but also a valuable contribution to the theological interpretation of the council’s teaching. Seeking to contextualize Guidi’s speech, H. has studied the positions of selected theologians from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, with detailed treatment given to Melchior Cano, Pietro Ballerini, and Mauro Cappellari (later Gregory XVI). One may be surprised to find that these three proinfallibilists have been largely ignored, especially in the English-speaking theological world, as the ecclesiological predecessors of the majority at Vatican I. One may be even more surprised to find that there are notable differences in the ways in which each of the three understood the pope’s exercise of infallibility. Correspondingly, one may presume that different proinfallibilist prelates heard the debates and understood the decisions at Vatican I in ways that were always propapal but not always identical and so not always rigorously ultramontane.

As prime example of such variations, Guidi found himself in the anomalous position of a proinfallibilist accused of Gallicanism. Following a centuries-old Dominican tradition, Guidi felt that infallibility should not be described as a personal prerogative but as a transient action: just as Eucharistic consecration is the sacramental act of a priest without the celebrant being personally sacramental, similarly a definition of infallible truth is an exercise of infallibility without the pope becoming personally infallible. However, where Guidi was concerned about the scholastic distinction between actus and habitus, many in his audience were more familiar with the Gallican distinction between sedes and sedens (i.e., the Roman see, but not necessarily everyone of its incumbents, can teach infallibly). Thus Guidi seemed to be asserting a distinction which the majority was determined to reject.

Aside from the fact that the individual chapters tend to read more like independent monographs than components of an organic treatment, H.’s volume is an important contribution to the study of infallibility. Two facets of his work are particularly helpful: first, his discussion of the different theological positions on infallibility prior to the council indi-
cates the existence of a spectrum of doctrinal understandings of the definition among the majority bishops; it should then be helpful to restudy the speeches of Vatican I, not simply in terms of majority-versus-minority but in light of the different ecclesiologies of theologians like Cano, Ballerini, and Cappellari. Secondly, the misunderstanding of Guidi’s speech suggests the existence of different vocabularies operative at the council; thus it should be enlightening to re-examine the text of Pastor aeternus to ascertain where its jurisdictional vocabulary ends and where its theological language, and problematic, begin.

Catholic University of America

JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


“The present study has three interconnected aims: to provide a concrete application of Bernard Lonergan’s theological method, to make a significant theological contribution on a topic of Roman Catholic and ecumenical interest, and to experiment with theological teamwork” (xi).

The first aim, applying L.’s method to the problem of infallibility, is achieved with only partial success. In general, difficulties seem to arise insofar as the logical order of analysis does not automatically produce a coherent order of presentation; e.g., while one may logically distinguish research, interpretation, and history as three distinct functional specialties, examining infallibility under each of these headings results in duplication and disjointedness. Not only is a theological narrative more intelligible when findings are organized into a composite picture rather than presented as separate components, the functional specialties, though individually distinguishable, best operate interactively. In addition, at least from an expository perspective, the weakest link in the chain is dialectic. While one might agree that intellectual, moral, and religious conversions are necessary for theologizing, Tekippe’s valiant attempt to utilize conversion as a criterion runs into particular difficulty: “How is it possible to judge a living person morally or religiously unconverted?” (326).

In spite of such dysfunctions encountered in applying L.’s method in literal fashion, there are several useful contributions to the current infallibility discussion. Stephen Duffy’s interpretation (61–115) and history (158–90) of infallibility in the modern period (particularly Vatican I and II, Hans Küng) are notably well balanced, even though specialists might differ on some points. Gerald Fagin, by turning from the juridical focus that has characterized much of the infallibility debate, provides a useful theological-ecclesial understanding of infallibility (252–67). For
the neglected systematic theology of infallibility, Robert Kress summarizes a creative sacramental approach to the topic by describing solemn definitions as "the magisterial-liturgical celebrations whereby the truth of God expressed in dogmas is exhibited to the Church so that the whole Church may publicly rejoice in this truth and celebrate it" (305).

In regard to its third aim, theological teamwork, this volume's contributions are somewhat uneven in quality and, in spite of the editor's dedicated effort, "rarely mesh perfectly at the seams" (330). For example, the sections on foundations, doctrines, and systematics, while linked as apparently co-ordinated components, really could stand as independent essays. In spite of such collaborative awkwardness and inconsistency, the authors should be congratulated for their pioneering effort; future attempts to apply L.'s method to theological issues could well profit from attending to this volume's shortcomings. For the present, readers will find much of the volume useful, both for its survey of a considerable amount of material on papal infallibility and for the extensive bibliography available in the notes (335–96).

Catholic University of America  

JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


This book charts the history of the development of the ideas of Maurras, intellectual leader in the Action française, with special attention to his view of Roman Catholicism, the political alliance he proposed between Catholics and the Action française, and the Catholic reaction to that proposal. The chief characters on whom Sutton focuses are Maurras himself, Marc Sangnier, leader of the Sillon movement of young Catholics for social involvement, Pedro Descoqs and Yves de La Bière, two Jesuits who defended a Catholic alliance with M.'s movement, and Maurice Blondel and Lucien Laberthonnière, the one a prominent Catholic layman and philosopher, the other an Oratorian priest, philosopher, and theologian, both of whom were leaders in the Modernist movement and who strongly reacted against M., these two Jesuits, and any involvement of French Catholics with the Action française.

S. traces the intellectual background, formation, and development of M.'s ideas from the time when, as a disillusioned Catholic, he arrived in Paris from Aix-en-Provence in 1885 at the age of seventeen. Strongly influenced by Auguste Comte, M. gradually formulated an antimetaphysical view of reality in which human existence could find meaning by subordinating and dedicating itself to a political collectivity—in this case, France. S. explains in what sense the following qualities or characteristics
all cohered in M.'s vision: agnosticism, positivism, nationalism, political absolutism, monarchism, anti-individualism, anti-Revolutionism, anti-Republicanism, anti-Semitism, anti-Protestantism, Hellenism, Romanism, and a love for Catholicism (principally as a force for order in society). M. became involved with the Action française in 1899 on the tide of the excitement over the Dreyfus Affair and quickly became its ideological leader. During 1906 especially the movement picked up strong Catholic support because of the restrictions imposed on the Church by the state, coupled with a public debate between M. and Sangnier in which M. defended an alliance between his movement and Catholics. Politically, the Action française defended the Roman Catholic Church against the repressive Third Republic; doctrinally, a separation between the supernatural religious order and the practical political order of nature allowed Catholics to participate and co-operate in his movement with a clear conscience, as many did.

In 1909 Descoqs began a lengthy study of M.'s work in the prestigious Jesuit review *Etudes*, which cautiously endorsed Catholic participation in the movement. The issue was taken up again in *Etudes* by La Bière in 1911. The fundamental theological and ecclesiological logic behind this defense involved the following principles: a strong distinction between the natural and the supernatural orders of reality; thus a separability of the spheres of strictly temporal political activity and religious authority; a notion of the Church as an ordered hierarchical and supernatural institution; a subordination and orientation of the political order, of the state, to the supreme interests of the Church. Thus, "If it was because of his own clear distinction between political society and religious society that Descoqs could tolerate the ideologue of the Action française, it was because of Maurras's image of the Church as distinguishedly Roman and as the guardian of order that Descoqs could allow him a certain approval" (252–53).

Blondel's intervention, beginning in 1909, was both an apology for the Church's engagement in social issues and thus a support for Sangnier's movement, which was to be condemned by Rome in 1910, and an attack on the ecclesiology of Descoqs and any alliance with the Action française. Blondel's whole philosophy and theology was governed by an existential approach (method of immanence) that was designed to bring together the natural and supernatural spheres, even while maintaining their distinction. The point of their intersection is human existence itself as life lived and characterized as "action." With this existential point of view on the whole person, there could be no separation of Christian life in the Church from life in the world and involvement in social issues. "Blondel stressed that the economic or social order was necessarily part
of a wider moral order, while the only moral order that was properly coherent was the one that was infused with the spiritual dimension that resulted from the Christian act of faith” (152). On this basis it was impossible to separate the basic inspirations of either Catholic or Maurrasian convictions from sheerly neutral political activity.

For his part, Laberthonnière dwelt on the spiritual, evangelical, and agapic dimension of the Church as constitutive of its very essence. The Church was not primarily an institution whose ultimate bond was the constraint of authority and obedience. This ecclesiology was unfolded within the context of the discussion of the relation between the Church and the state, and was embedded in a refutation of Descoqs and a virulent polemic against the Action française.

These notations merely hint at the richness of S.’s work. The book is well researched in both published and unpublished sources and carefully documented. Within the limits he has chosen and the finely crafted structure of the work, S. carefully narrates the unfolding of intricately interconnected events and ideas, counterevents and counterideias. The book is extremely well written and there is hardly a throw-away sentence in the whole of it. He moves forward at each stage through great bodies of material by seizing the salient points of an issue, the position taken on one side, and the counterposition on the other. He thus brings out some historical logic, or at least sequence, in a maze of interacting currents of thought and event.

The whole of the study is prefaced by a series of questions posed by current interpretation that need qualification: e.g., to what degree were the French Jesuits as a whole supportive of the Action française and expressly anti-Semitic during this period? On both these issues the general global judgment is qualified or softened.

As a work in the history and theory of politics, the book is an excellent and precise study showing the impact of both the Church and deeper philosophical and theological ideas on the unfolding of events. For students of Roman Catholic Modernism, the work is invaluable for setting the context and a perspective for understanding the theology. In all, the work is fascinating history.

Regis College
Toronto School of Theology


In a letter written to his cousin Marguerite in October 1923, Teilhard describes himself, in a now famous image, as “a pilgrim of the future on
my way back from a journey made entirely in the past.” In his masterwork *The Phenomenon of Man*, he subsequently elaborated upon both his vision of the future as well as his quite innovative understanding of the evolutionary past. It was, in fact, his vision of the past that provided the indispensable point of departure for the way he came to see future developments. In the opening paragraph of the preface to this most systematic of all his many works, he remarks: “If this book is to be properly understood, it must be read not as a work on metaphysics, still less as a sort of theological essay, but purely and simply as a scientific treatise. The title itself indicates that. This book deals with man *solely* as a phenomenon; but it also deals with the *whole* phenomenon of man.”

T. was roundly ridiculed for this assertion from many quarters when the book first appeared shortly after his death. Especially severe were the criticisms of several scientifically oriented reviewers, notably P. B. Medawar and George Gaylord Simpson. It is O'Connell's contention in this rigorously researched, tightly argued, and elegantly written study that T. was grossly misinterpreted by his reviewers, who were doubly deceived: on the one hand, by their own unduly restrictive use of the word science; on the other, by a translator's misstep. It was not T.’s intention, as he makes clear enough by means of various methodological clues, to write a *traité*, but rather, as he actually says, to present a scientific *mémoire*, a quite different literary genre altogether. A scientific *mémoire*, in the manner of works written by other well-known scientific figures of the past such as Einstein, Poincaré, or Jeans, seeks to spell out a total picture of the universe while “it takes its premisses and chooses its evidence uniquely from observation—*expériment*—of phenomenal reality” (134).

The method T. deployed in expositing his vision of the past in the first three books of *PM* was in the making over a period of many years, and, as O. sees it, already by 1928 (i.e., a full decade before T. actually found sufficient leisure to compose the book) “its author had come to express every major facet of the hypothesis and method which he eventually applied in that work of synthesis” (132). Making use of extensive paraphrase and summary, O. delineates the evolution of that “hypothesis and method” as it unfolds in a series of essays written between 1921 and 1930 and later gathered together in the third volume of Teilhard’s *Oeuvres* entitled *The Vision of the Past*, a little-read collection which first appeared in French in 1957 but which was translated into English only in 1966. It is one of the merits of O.’s exploration that it seeks to discern within this “making of a method” the persistent influence of Pierre Duhem (1861–1916), himself a physicist as well as a historian and philosopher of science. Acquaintance with D.’s approach is already evident in the very first of T.’s essays, “On the Arbitrary (Element) in the
Laws, Theories, and Principles of Physics" (1905). Both thinkers, while thoroughly conversant with the science of their time in the familiar and conventional meaning of the term, regularly speak from the perspective of what today would be referred to as the philosophy of science, and therefore they both deny that they are engaged in some type of metaphysical enterprise. Perhaps of greatest importance to T.'s developing outlook was D.'s notion of "natural classification," which "assures us without our being able to doubt it that an ordered group of theoretical structures (arising, of course, from experimental observation) must 'reflect' something of the 'real relations of things'" (22). It was precisely such a natural, and therefore finally satisfying, classification of evolutionary phenomena that T. was in search of and obviously believed that he had come upon in the articulation of his remarkably unifying "law" of complexity and consciousness.

In an extended Afterword, O. takes up in detail the objections of Reader (a reviewer of the manuscript selected by his publisher and expert in contemporary philosophy of science), convincingly defending his decision to limit severely the scope of his investigation to "the precise sense in which, and the grounds on which, T. claimed that the 'vision of the past' encased in the first three sections of The Phenomenon of Man could legitimately be called 'scientific'" (172). The book, in fact, works quite effectively within its deliberately limited compass. O.'s impressively close and careful reading of T. in the midst of his critics is an especially welcome addition to an already vast secondary literature because it serves, as few other studies do, to illumine the specifically scientific side of T.'s oeuvre and thus advance support for his own claims and self-understanding.

Manhattan College

DONALD P. GRAY


An American cleric at Geneva once described the church-state issue as "who puts the gas in the cardinal's car." This volume is a detailed demonstration that this conflict, at least in the nineteenth century, transcended the economic; fundamentally, it was a losing struggle by the papacy to defend its concept of the Church's liberty against the growing power of the state. Unhappily, the Church's leadership was intractable, basing its claims on abstract propositions that had no relevance to a changing reality.

The keystone in its theological defense was the concept of the Church as a "perfect society." This was first introduced into the debate by Pius
IX, though it was foreshadowed by earlier argumentation. Leo XIII gave it classical formulation and it was maintained with some revision through Pius XII. Meanwhile, the reality of religious pluralism was becoming more apparent and inevitable—a fact that impressed those theologians who saw the Church as "communion" or "sacrament." The concept of the "perfect society" disappeared from the encyclicals of John XXIII, and the way was clear for the doctrinal clarification of Vatican II.

The "perfect society" idea, like one of Lewis Carroll's animals, was capable of indefinite extension. It could include not merely the full independence of the Church from the civil power; it could claim, at least in some circumstances, that as the sole agent of Christ, it could call upon the state to aid in preserving the unity of the faith. As support, there appeared such distortions as "error has no rights"; the assertion that while the two societies must co-operate, the Church takes precedence because of its higher aims; and necessary evasions such as "the distinction between thesis and hypothesis." What was missing in all this scholasticism, apart from the fundamental concept of the freedom of the act of faith, was any analysis of the mechanisms of modern government or the actual practices of most confessional states.

Minnerath gives a detailed account of the intellectual domino theory that marked the destruction of this edifice so rigorously patrolled by Cardinal Ottaviani. As is well known, when the fathers assembled at the council, they were presented with chapter 11 of the schema which contained the Preliminary Commission's proposal for this subject, known euphemistically as "the public law of the Church." Beginning with the rejection of the concept of toleration in favor of "the right of religious liberty," the council shifted the focus from the defense of the liberty of the Church to the defense of the liberty of man. Chapter 11 disappeared in the first session and with it went panegyrics on Christian civilization, to be replaced by analyses of the dignity of the human person. Each man was declared to have an absolute right to follow his conscience in religious matters, and the state was fundamentally incompetent to intrude.

The progressive excising of antiquated theses was not a smooth process, and M. does not miss the excitement of the debate. I would have one reservation: John Courtney Murray's writings are cited in several places, but his influence is reserved to a footnote on p. 151 ("was a determining influence on the subsequent elaboration of the schema on Religious Liberty"). The note adds that there was a close relation between the final document and the American tradition. I would find the formulation of George Higgins in America, March 26, 1983, more satisfying: "the final conciliar document on this critically important issue might never have come up for a vote or in any event might have been whittled down or
gutted, had not the American bishops collectively, and however belatedly, taken the lead, with the absolutely indispensable assistance of the late John Courtney Murray, S.J., in calling for its adoption."

Statesboro, Ga. JOSEPH N. MOODY


Although recognized as one of the most influential philosophical theologians of our day, Rahner himself insists that "apart from a few essays on the history of penance ... nothing I have written can be called theological scholarship, let alone (professional) philosophy" (Theological Investigations 17, 247). R. locates his work in a genre he describes as a more "amateurish," first-level reflection. Despite this modest protest, however, his essays demonstrate remarkable consistency and rigor. Admirers seeking to move beyond him and critics seeking to assess the limits of his contribution will be misled if this rigor and consistency are underestimated because of his essays' "occasional" and "first-level" nature. Personal Becoming demonstrates this point convincingly and in the process offers, in my judgment, the best scholarly introduction in English to R.'s philosophical anthropology.

Tallon contends that, although R.'s earliest works did not place the interpersonal dimension sufficiently in the foreground, the common reproach that his anthropology undervalues the interpersonal is incorrect and unjustified. T. substantiates this argument with a meticulous review of the relevant works, each of which is read "as strongly as possible for a metaphysics of person." As T. traces the evolution of R.'s anthropology, it becomes clear that personal becoming was a central concern from the beginning. The foundation laid in the early works provides the basis for a clear assertion in the most recent that personal becoming is always and essentially an interpersonal process. R.'s emphasis on the necessity of interpersonal love for personal enactment, which T. acknowledges is after all a rather banal truth, is so significant because it is grounded in the earlier metaphysics. "Rahner does not merely gratuitously assert, remaining vulnerable to equally gratuitous denial, but thoroughly grounds this doctrine in his transcendental method, thus manifesting perfect continuity and consistency with that method and his starting point" (161).

T. admits that the paradigm underlying this transcendental anthropology needs to be corrected by a more interpersonal point of departure, and his own hints about the possibility of a phenomenology of the heart suggest an intriguing direction. His demonstration of the rigor and consistency of R.'s thought indicates, however, why this anthropology and the theology it serves will not soon be replaced.
Students of Rahner will also appreciate the complete bibliography of secondary literature from 1939–79 not available in the first edition (Thomist 43 [Jan. 1979] 1–177).

Marquette University  ROBERT MASSON


The first edition of this work was published in 1964. This English version is a translation of Dussel's 1971 edition to which he has added a section surveying the period 1972–79. D.'s account, especially of the recent past, reflects his perspective as participant. He states in the preface to the third Spanish edition: "This written history is a lived history, day by day, step by step, which we have wanted to interpret in the light of the risk of faith and with a legitimate historical method." The risks, from the earliest felt "fundamental ambiguity between colonizing and evangelizing" to today's struggles, emerge on almost every page.

D. is the major historian of the Church in Latin America and a leading exponent of the theology of liberation. He divides his work into four parts. Part 1, "A Hermeneutical Introduction," lays the groundwork for his interpretation and employs the perspective of domination-liberation as well as Ricoeur's "ethico-mythical nucleus" for grasping Latin American history and culture. D. uses a dialectical approach to history, but traces of his analytical method appear throughout the study. Part 2 describes "The Christendom of the West Indies (1492–1808)." The analysis of the patronato system is most helpful for understanding subsequent developments. D. presents revealing and often beautiful portraits of the mission Church and colonial-era giants such as Las Casas, Juan del Valle, and Antonio de Valdivieso. Part 3, "The Agony of Colonial Christendom (1808–1962)," begins with the crisis of independence but is especially valuable, if somewhat one-sided, for its chronicle of the intellectual background of the New Christendom movement in Latin America. Part 4, "The Church and Latin American Liberation (1962–1979)," is where history becomes the moving account of an eyewitness. The descriptions of recent events and persons—Medellín, Puebla, Manuel Larrain, Camilo Torres, and Dom Helder—are insightful and intimate. The historical setting of the theology of liberation, "the product of the lives and suffering of our oppressed people," is documented in scholarly and detailed narrative.

The body of the text is followed by three appendices dealing with historical methodology, history of theology in Latin America, and a
lexicon of terms. There is also a series of maps and charts. The text with appendices is valuable for the delineation of historical-theological periods and their dialectical-analytical relations.

Although D. makes a major contribution to a theological interpretation of the history of Latin America, there are some very annoying aspects to his study. He knows historical method well and is at his best when he sticks to the story. However, his forays into hermeneutical theory and history as theology often leave the reader lost in a labyrinth of unexplained jargon. Some of the rough spots might be the result of difficulties in translation, especially in the methodological sections. Also, it appears to this reviewer, sympathetic to D.'s approach, that he leaves himself open to criticism on the grounds that his judgments occasionally are too glib. The Church is too neatly packaged into "two models," with New Christendom types readily dispatched as bad guys. Statements such as "The Trilateral Commission 'invented' Jimmy Carter and put him in power in 1975" demand explanation and documentation. At times D. wanders too far from the historian's craft.

In spite of these criticisms, we are indebted to D. His effort clearly indicates that the political, cultural, and theological awakening in Latin America has been in the making for centuries. He is a pathfinder with his analytical method and the first chronicler of liberation theology.

National Endowment for the Humanities

JOHN P. HOGAN


Brown, a long-time student of Native American religion, has offered the public a brief, highly readable introduction to American Indian spirituality as claiming a place among the great religions of the world. His primary aim is to evaluate these traditions, so that descriptions—the work of so many field anthropologists a half century or more ago—are kept at a minimum. He likewise avoids the functional and structural approaches as risking an impoverishment of the true tradition, and studies it rather in its nature.

B. begins by stating the principles he finds in native traditions: (1) that the symbolic form is what it represents; (2) the importance of units of sacred power; (3) the value of "sacred geography" (the Center, sacred space, etc.). He then discusses, using Wissler's geographical classifications, the growth of present-day native spirituality under five points: (1) "religion" is an abstraction, better rendered here as "religious traditions"; (2) language and names are of primary importance; (3) religion is intimately related to arts and crafts; (4) time and process reflect the whole
cosmos; (5) native religion reflects an intimacy with the environment. Proceeding from these principles, B. offers a brief treatment of such topics as the spiritual legacy of the humanity-universe relationship, time, place, oral tradition, native values (I found this chapter extremely vague), action-oriented contemplation, the timeless value of myth, the Sun Dance as renewal, native mysticism seen in the context of universal religion, time and process (an attack on European evolutionists), and the total human context of native religion. It is to be noted that B. himself uses the High Plains traditions as his focal point.

This short work deserves to be in the collection of any student interested in American Indian life, though it serves best simply as an introduction. I do feel a need to caution the reader about two tendencies of the book. First, there can be a simplistic reading here by anyone romantically inclined (though B. himself cautions against this) to expect to find ancient customs today untouched by very deep changes in the historical process. Secondly, B. has chosen to do an apologia and to refrain (as is no doubt wise for a nonnative person) from a critical evaluation of the possible "dark sides" in tribal religion. It is worth suggesting here that the reader realize that these traditions are being defended in their ideals and that all spiritual traditions vary in degree as to how members live those ideals. Thus, e.g., did Paul Radin argue that shamans are more intense representatives of religious ideals than are other persons in a tribe.

B. has given us a fine brief study of native spirituality set in a nonreductionist context that respects religion as a value.

Regis College
CARL F. STARKLOFF, S.J.

Toronto School of Theology


May is a psychiatrist engaged in private practice in Washington, D.C., and teaches in the training program in spiritual direction sponsored by the Shalem Institute of Spiritual Formation and the Washington Theological Union. He brings a wealth of experience and learning to his task, blended with a good balance of sensible, straightforward, and largely nontechnical writing about a challenging and difficult subject. His project is to bring some psychological understanding to contemplative and mystical experience. His effort is admirable, thoughtful, well balanced, and graced with valuable insights and perspectives that are both clarifying and instructive.

The central insight of this work is contained in the distinction between
willingness and willfulness. May defines them in the following terms: "But we can begin by saying that willingness implies a surrendering of one’s self-separateness, an entering-into, an immersion in the deepest processes of life itself. It is a realization that one already is a part of some ultimate cosmic process, and it is a commitment to participation in that process. In contrast, willfulness is the setting of oneself apart from the fundamental essence of life in an attempt to master, direct, control, or otherwise manipulate existence. More simply, willingness is saying yes to the mystery of being alive in each moment. Willfulness is saying no, or perhaps more commonly, ‘Yes, but... ’" (6).

The distinction serves as a vehicle by which May undertakes the analysis of contemplative phenomena. His insight, to this reader’s eye, seems valid and fruitful, and would seem to provide a useful focus on the set of mind and attitudes that contribute to and facilitate contemplative experience. Willingness, then, is the essential basis for that openness to contemplative experience without which May feels that the possibility of such experience and its connected spiritual growth are negated.

I might add that there is something fundamentally Ignatian about the approach and the spiritual attitude embodied in these pages. I feel the parallels are applicable through the whole of the work, but they become particularly striking when May addresses himself to the question of attachment. The parallels to Ignatius’ treatment of “inordinate attachments” is striking.

In short, the seeker after spiritual truth and anyone who wishes to deepen his understanding of contemplative experience will find much that is useful and illuminating. But if there is good news, there is also bad news. One should not be misled by the subtitle. The psychology May advances makes little attempt to be more than descriptive. There is also little attempt to tie elements or aspects of the contemplative experience to more mundane and more easily understood psychological phenomena. In fact, May eschews psychology. Any messing on the part of psychology with spiritual realities is bound to be bad news in his view, and we are therefore better off without it. The essence of the contemplative psychology, then, is to take matters spiritual and contemplative out of the range of psychological understanding and explanation.

The outcome, in my judgment, mars the overall effort intended. Instead of a contemplative psychology, we are left with hardly any psychology at all. The background, as far as one can identify it, is quite eclectic, touching here and there on Maslow, Freud, Jung, Sullivan, and others, but the dealing with matters of psychological import is always uncertain and uneasy—as if the author somehow felt threatened or sullied by his handling of such sordid materials. Moreover, the reader is left with an
unfortunate impression that May's usage of such sources tends too much to caricature or that his thinking reflects a somewhat dated familiarity with psychological thinking. This is particularly true of the use of psychoanalysis, where the usage seems more intent on setting up an adversarial straw man than in exploring the potential resources of the discipline for deepening the understanding of spiritual phenomena. May is more committed to keeping the contemplative and spiritual perspective unsullied than he is to exploring and exploiting the resources of psychological perspectives in deepening the understanding of things contemplative. This aspect of the work contrasts with the more assured and masterful exploitation of religious and spiritual literature.

Despite the bad news, I trust interested readers will not be discouraged from opening themselves to a rewarding and enriching reading experience. The measure of gold in these pages will well reward the effort.

Cambridge, Mass. 

W. W. MEISSNER, S.J., M.D.


The authors have provided a synthesis and survey of empirical social-psychological research on religious behavior and experience. The survey is comprehensive, thorough, and balanced, and the synthesis is sophisticated, evenhanded, and appropriately complex. B.-V. make a point of sticking close to data and basing their arguments on inferences from the empirical findings. The result is a clearly argued text, unencumbered by special pleading, and leading to rather complex and highly restricted conclusions.

The first issue addressed is what it means to be religious. One could guess that whatever approach the authors adopted, it would be impossible to satisfy the broad range of opinions regarding such a question. They opt for a relatively general definition of religion that to this reader's mind would not adequately distinguish religion from, let us say, philosophical concerns: "whatever we as individuals do to come to grips personally with the questions that confront us because we are aware that we and others like us are alive and that we will die." Theologians would hardly be satisfied with such a definition, but the reader must keep in mind that B.-V. are not writing theology but social psychology.

From a sociopsychological perspective, then, religion and religious experience represent a socially determined effort on the part of human beings related to the purpose and meaning of human life and death. Religious experience involves a stage-sequence, which includes some form
of existential crisis, self-surrender to a power greater than oneself, and the opening of a new vision leading to a new life in faith.

It turns out that, in terms of the empirical evaluations, being religious is a complex human response which can express itself in any of a variety of modalities. B.-V. distinguish three different orientations to religion. The *extrinsic-means orientation* involves the use of religion as a means of attaining self-serving ends, as, e.g., attending church for merely social reasons. This orientation shows no association with a greater sense of meaning in life or a lessened anxiety about death, and seems to be associated with a perception of religion as a repressive set of restrictions. It also seems to show no connection with improved mental health, and in social terms is associated with greater intolerance and prejudice.

The *intrinsic-ends orientation* involves a sincere allegiance to a set of religious beliefs which define a master motive in life. This orientation provides a greater freedom from existential concerns about the meaninglessness of life and the anxiety over death, but at the same time this freedom is purchased at the cost of greater bondage to the belief system, such that the believer is no longer able to reflect openly and honestly on them. The relative freedom from worry over existential concerns may enhance the individual's mental health and increase the sense of control over life events. While this orientation is associated with claims of greater tolerance, diminished prejudice, and greater responsiveness to the needs of others, none of these claims seems to be substantiated in terms of behavior. This orientation seems to involve more a concern to appear loving than to actually be loving.

The last orientation B.-V. call the *quest orientation*. This involves an open-ended readiness to confront existential questions, together with a certain scepticism about definitive answers. While this orientation provides less of a sense of freedom from existential concerns, it also does not produce the same ideological bondage. It is positively related to several indices of mental health, including open-mindedness, flexibility, a sense of personal competence and control, and even self-actualization. It also, in the social context, seems clearly related to diminished prejudice and an increased responsiveness to the needs of others.

The authors clearly seem to prefer the latter orientation, but they are willing to let the evidence speak for itself. The evidence does not offer a decisive black or white solution, but rather a series of pluses and minuses, degrees of positive and negative influence that do not allow a decisive answer to the question of which religious orientation is optimal. Readers will have to assess this for themselves, but I think they can be assured of finding a fair-minded presentation of the available evidence, along with some clear thinking about the methodological difficulties involved.
BOOK REVIEWS

and the rather stringent limitations on the possible conclusions one might draw. The book can certainly be recommended to religious educators as a useful and instructive text.

Cambridge, Mass. W. W. MEISSNER, S.J., M.D.


This book from the Search Institute of Minneapolis reports on an interview project conducted among eighty members of the 96th Congress to explore connections between religious belief and voting on selected policy matters (abortion, military spending, civil liberties, government spending, foreign aid, hunger relief, free enterprise, and private ownership). The research examines popular myths about Congress: that members are secular humanists who are much less religious than the general population, that members' beliefs do not affect their politics, that political conservatives are religious while liberals are not, and that the "new right" exercises a unified and conservative influence in Congress. In the present political climate such research is certainly timely, especially since the results contradict all aspects of the popular myths.

The interview and interpretation procedures are disciplined and explained carefully in the text. The interview schedule, which appears in an appendix, gets behind denominational affiliation to explore a legislator's beliefs about the nature of religious reality and its relationship to the world. The outcome is a sixfold typology of kinds of religion based on three different measures: importance of religion and religious institutions, theological emphases (evangelical, Christian orthodoxy, symbolic), and eight characteristics of religion (individual or communal, vertical or horizontal, releasing or restricting, comforting or challenging). The move beyond denominational affiliation is valuable in light of the pluralism which exists within the mainline American churches. A future project, however, could explore the connections between this typology and the various denominations.

This research calls into question simplistic understandings of the impact of religious experience and conviction on voting on highly volatile issues such as abortion and social-program spending. The texture of an individual's religion is seen to be highly variegated, and the factors which influence a member's vote on a particular issue are recognized as being quite diverse. There is no effort to inflate the significance of the research: the authors continually note that religion is only one among many factors which affect the votes of members of Congress.
The book and research are praiseworthy but not flawless. The text is somewhat repetitious, perhaps because of the need to explain the project and data in lay terms. The chapter dealing with the persistence (or lack thereof) of the religious vision of the nation's founders seemed insufficient in light of recent discussions of civil religion. On balance, this book repays a careful reader. It succeeds within the scope of its aims, and it models a useful approach to the empirical study of the relationship of religion and behavior, especially political behavior.

Washington Theological Union  
Michael J. McGinniss, F.S.C.
Silver Spring, Md.


The development of a model of aging has been hampered by the fact that the Eriksonian stage theory has proved very attractive to nonclinicians, but essentially irrelevant to clinical concerns. Those who have attempted to develop a theological model of aging have too frequently been seduced into a facile stage theory based upon the other end of the life cycle. Bianchi has written a book that avoids this pitfall.

This book considers topics such as personal power, fear, identity, sexuality, contemplation, commitment, freedom, the church, and faith. It does not consider the theology of aging from the perspective of the history of the church, but is loosely based on B.'s "projective imagination" and some open-ended interviews with the aging and aged. Social scientists may justifiably complain that the methodology of sampling and interpreting the responses is quite flawed: the interviewees represent an exceptionally robust and spiritually-oriented minority of elders that provide data especially well suited to B.'s prefabricated views.

Nevertheless, the result is a stimulating integration of diverse theological trends and Jungian psychology in hopes of developing a theology of aging. The individual personality which develops in youth is simply too one-sided, too rigid, to be the spiritual ideal. The second half of life provides a cherished opportunity to develop the previously neglected or repressed sides of the Self, e.g., the anima/animus (contrasexual characteristics.)

The best thing about this book is that it can get into heavy intrapsychic topics without being lost in solipsism. B. contends that people in middle and later life "are called to make their lives more contemplative within the context of active-worldly endeavors" (2) and that "older Christians have no right to retire from stewardship of the world and the life-enhancing struggles to better the lot of their fellows" (161). Indeed, B. sounds very much like Alfred Adler at times (Gemeinschaftsgefühl as a compensation for inferiority feeling).
Stylistically, the greatest problem is that B. tends to be rambling, making numerous allusions and asides; therefore it is hard to keep on the track of his thinking. This reviewer, who was trained in theology but is now more of a clinical gerontologist than a theologian, was further disquieted by several things in (or not in) this book. First, there was too much focus on guilt, which research indicates is not a major psychodynamic in the aged. Second, some of B.’s comments about psychopathology (e.g., hypochondriasis) were quite speculative. Third, at times B. clings too steadfastly to the existentialist-Jungian romantic view of change and suffering. From my clinical experience, I must say that much of the change which befalls elders is more of a crisis than a challenge, and that pain and suffering frequently lead to depression and paranoia rather than spiritual growth.

By ignoring socioeconomic and clinical realities, B. presents a picture of aging that is top-heavy with abstractions. By employing the methodology of “projective imagination,” this discourse on aging is tied to metaphor rather than social science. In terms of its ability to create a historical perspective for the theology of aging or provide guidance for pastoral work, this book does not come close to Clements’ edited book of readings *Ministry with the Aging* (Harper & Row, 1981). Yet, in terms of its theological originality, Bianchi’s work is the best that this writer has seen.

*College of Notre Dame*
*Belmont, Cal.*

T. L. BRINK


Published in a series titled New Accents, meant to introduce readers to the rapid and radical changes modern culture is experiencing, this volume performs the nearly impossible task of being at once an introduction to a vast field of scholarship and a brilliant and original synthesis of the interrelationship between orality and literacy. It is a model of scholarly compression and a breath-taking analysis of the impact of writing and typography on human consciousness. By the end of the book any reader will concede the validity of Ong’s opening statement that “we have had to revise our understanding of human identity.”

After describing primary orality, a difficult concept for the “literate” consciousness to grasp, he surveys a vast body of scholarship that began, for all practical purposes, with the work of Milman Parry and Albert Lord. Drawing on this material, he then describes, in a lengthy and fascinating chapter, “some psychodynamics of orality.” The chapter is more than informative; it is meant to sensitize the literate mind to what
Building on this, Ong next explains how writing restructures consciousness. From this point on, the reader is made to see the radical, profound shift a people make when they move from orality to literacy. The greatest change is internal, for writing restructures the human consciousness and in so doing heightens it. "Writing, in this ordinary sense, was and is the most momentous of all human technological inventions" (85).

The next two chapters, "Print, Space, and Closure" and "Oral Memory, the Story Line, and Characterization," deal more specifically with the literature born of literacy and the subsequent critico-analytical tools developed to interpret the written word. Central to this shift from oral "literature" (Ong decries the lack of an adequate word) to written literature is the fact that writing "encourages growth of consciousness out of the unconscious" (150). Writing is, thus, "essentially a consciousness raising activity" (151). What Ong says in these two chapters will be of great interest to theologians. He says, e.g., that "the influence of writing and print on Christian asceticism cries for study" (153).

A final chapter, modestly titled "Some Theorems," deftly and authoritatively surveys the field of twentieth-century literary criticism and suggests applications in the areas of the social sciences, philosophy, and biblical studies. A final reflection on what precisely it is to be human returns to the opening statement on human identity. The book cannot be recommended too highly.

*College of the Holy Cross*  

**Philip C. Rule, S.J.**

This is an important work. It brings together in one volume the mature insights of a major North American interpreter of Luke-Acts. The text of Luke has been brightly illumined with a Greco-Roman spotlight.

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


Many are familiar with Theissen's picture of early Jewish Christianity: rural Palestinian villages, a population in tension with its environment, mendicant missionaries who preach in return for food and lodging and who are radical critics of wealth and property itself. In these studies on Pauline Christianity, T. depicts a social world which is vastly different. It is a world of cities. Christians are integrated into their political and economic milieus. Missionaries engage in community organizing, planning, fund-raising, travel, and communication on a far wider scale.

T.'s first essay traces the influence of those two worlds on the conflicting theories of missionary legitimation and subsistence reflected in the Corinthian correspondence. It also attempts to explain Paul's toleration of continued social and economic diversity in his churches, an attitude T. describes as "love-patriarchalism." Three central essays review the evidence for social stratification in the community at Corinth and analyze the conflicts over the eating of meat and the celebration of the Supper in terms of class-specific eating habits and patterns of sociability. A final essay addresses the general methodological question: How does one go about reading the NT for sociologically relevant data?

Schütz's informative introduction situates T.'s work within twentieth-century research on the social world of early Christianity, describes the variety of terminology, procedures, and models employed in contemporary social history, and summarizes T.'s contribution to date.

T. does not pretend to deal with his material from every viewpoint (in particular, the influence of "theology" is deliberately underplayed). The problems he treats are often familiar and his solutions not always novel. Yet the application of categories and procedures from social sciences is frequently quite fruitful. At the very least, he gives readers of an old text a fresh sense of its reality and concreteness.

**JOHN R. KEATING, S.J.**
*Jesuit School of Theology*
*Berkeley*


This small volume is translated from the Italian of two expert and experienced systematic theologians at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. Alszeghy and Flick have been co-operating for many years in their theological research and publication, as their works on the theology of development and of original sin testify. The present work is an attempt (successful) to explain what theology is and to help the serious student of theology to come to grips with it. The casual student will
most likely find the book too complex, even too heavy. Yet it should have a real appeal for serious students, both new and old. For the new student it offers a well-developed methodology for studying theology; for the older, particularly those who studied theology before Vatican II, it presents a great deal of what is new in method since that time.

The special value of this book is the way it locates the starting point of theology in the community life of the Church. The ecclesial dimension of theological thought and study can be neglected only to the detriment of theological validity. Another important dimension is the systematic examination of the basis of theology in its past sources, of the function of theology in deepening our understanding of faith, and of the synthesizing and practical dimensions of theology. There is even a chapter on various ways of studying theology, with a valuable reading list.

The value of this book is found essentially in its insistence that Christian theology involves Christian existence on the intellectual level, interpreting critically the ecclesial reality as required by God’s word and in the context of one’s own culture.

WALTER C. McCauley, S.J.
New Orleans


McFague has written another “thought experiment” as sequel to Speaking in Parables: A Study in Metaphor and Theology (Fortress, 1975; under surname TeSelle); in both she is preoccupied to chart what R. Funk describes as “the tortuous route between the parables of Jesus and systematic theology.” The books overlap, but the tenor of Metaphorical Theology is more self-consciously described as “post-Enlightenment, Protestant, feminist,” which translates as “skeptical, relativistic, prophetic, and iconoclastic” (x). In place of incarnational Christology, canonical Scriptures, and classical (Catholic) sacramentality, M. puts parabolic Christology, “scripture as classic,” and a metaphorical sensibility which better match her (Protestant) persistent iconoclasm.

Religious language is primarily metaphorical. Metaphors see similarity in the midst of dissimilars; they predicate a simultaneous “is and is not” (“God is—and is not—a rock”); metaphors see “this” in terms of “that.” Good metaphors “shock, they bring unlikes together, they upset conventions, and they are implicitly revolutionary” (17). Metaphors are closely connected with parables. Not only did Jesus teach in parables; for M. (and others), Jesus is the parable of God. The root metaphor of Christianity is the kingdom of God, which, far from being a literal description of the world, denotes a new way of being in the world; Jesus as parable is what he preaches. A metaphorical theology will thus vaunt the kerygmatic point of view epitomized in the parables and in Jesus as parable over the more insular and univocal didactic tradition of orthodoxy.

A model is a dominant metaphor; like models in science (e.g., “light is a wave”), theological models (e.g., creation) attempt to describe the unknown in terms of the known, especially known behavior and relationships. By not seeing models as discardable heuristic devices, M. takes the “high” view of models, which entails a more ontological commitment: model is a description, if imperfect and partial, of reality.

M.’s final chapter deals with the dominant model “God is Father,” which is dead to the extent that it has become literalized and made exclusive. M. proposes a new model, God as friend, which is meant to challenge the hegemony of patriarchy as well as to reconceive the relationship God offers to us. That this is the least satisfying
part of her otherwise excellent book only substantiates in a left-handed way her main point: theology requires many models, especially initially uncomfortable or revolutionary ones which cause us to reassess how far literalism has infected our thinking.

M.’s book is meant to challenge the idolatry and irrelevance of much of the theological tradition by means of the literary imagination. She begins and ends with Simone Weil, which testifies to her own “spirit of passionate non-chalance” or prayer “which alone is sufficient to keep literalism at bay” (5).

Catherine M. LaCugna
University of Notre Dame


The value of B.’s book is much reduced by her continually confusing ascetical virginity and cultic purity: “The model for the new ascetic views was the Hebrew priesthood” (22). In the opening chapter, “Clerical Marriage before 1060,” insufficient attention is directed to the practice of continence among married priests, the legal status of concubines, whether children were born before or after their father’s ordination, and the possibility of repentance after lapses from chastity. There are many misleading or erroneous statements, such as that marriage was first forbidden to major clerics in 465 (28) and that the perpetual virginity of Mary began to be accepted towards the end of the fourth century (25).

A reliance on primary sources in the chapters on the Gregorian Reform (“The Gregorian Attack”) and the defense of married priests by Ulric of Imola, the Norman Anonymous (whose influence is exaggerated), and others, makes her book valuable for factual information about clerical marriage in the Middle Ages. But recourse toprimary sources seems to have intensified her dislike for the very idea of virginity or celibacy as a religious ideal and her general lack of sympathy for the medieval Church. This may account for her misunderstanding of medieval methods of exegesis (125) and her misinterpretation of the sacramental theology of the Norman Anonymous (165–70).

B. is too susceptible to elementary theories about sexuality, e.g., in her treatment of the effects of “the traumatic events of [Peter Damian’s] childhood” (58) and the unsubstantiated supposition of rampant homosexuality (“gay clergy”) among major clerics including St. Anselm (113). Her habit of accompanying well-known facts with underlined words and exclamation marks irritates. She also seems to think that “uxorious” means “married.” It is regrettable that research important to contemporary Christianity has received inadequate treatment in a book that is, nevertheless, bound to be much referred to.

Daniel Callam, C.S.B.
St. Thomas More College
University of Saskatchewan
ics is portrayed as a clash of Anglo-Norman reformers versus Welsh and Irish traditionalists, of localism versus Angevin centralization. Gerald tells us of the failures of English policy in Wales and why it failed; he does the same for the Norman campaign in Ireland. The troubles of later eras are foreshadowed in his descriptions, and these latter are his major contribution; for from them we learn what an educated person would have thought, felt, and believed at a turning point in Western civilization. He shows how a proud and expanding Europe saw the peoples of the fringe areas (good anthropological and ethnographic evidence), and these views would determine later policies in Africa and the New World.

Gerald did not achieve his aspirations; he was, perhaps, too vain, too harsh a critic to fit in well. He could not identify with any of the groups, but he was close enough to all of them to give cutting criticisms; for he did not seem really to like any of them, Normans, Welsh, or Irish. This book both informs me about Gerald and his world, and it makes me want to know more about both.

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

PROTESTANTISCHE ESCHATOLOGIE
VON DER REFORMATION BIS ZUR AUFLÄRUNG.

K. has composed a clear, succinct overview of German Protestant eschatology from Luther to the end of the eighteenth century. In the first three chapters he handles the theologies of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, indicating how profoundly their methodologies, central insights, and concerns influenced their understanding of the eschaton; even if in major explicit tenets Catholics and Protestants differed only about purgatory, clear, divergent em-

phases are discernible in the various traditions. The following three chapters, where K. relied primarily upon original sources in blazing a new trail, treat the major positions of old Protestant orthodoxy, leading Pietistic theologians, and the new emphases of major Enlightenment thinkers. Besides the references to methodology and central insights, all chapters deal with questions on the soul’s immortality, the resurrection of the body, Naherwarrung, the period between death and final judgment, the relation between God’s justice and love, the eternity of hell, and the fate of the material universe in the final transformation. K. also indicates how the various eschatologies influenced the interpretation of Christian involvement in the world. A final chapter summarizes the major developments of the period and the chief insights of the book.

Brief as is K.’s study, it offers much material for insight. Paradoxically, the Enlightenment, which prided itself on its eternal truths, shows itself to be most time-conditioned in its variations from the overall Christian tradition. K.’s book will prove of service to all scholars interested in the development of eschatological theology. Many of the themes elaborated in the last two centuries were already prepared for in earlier Protestant thought.

JOHN M. MCDERMOTT, S.J.
Fordham University

RESTAURATIONE: CHIESA ET SOCIETÀ.

Using Vatican and diocesan archives, S. paints a picture of the Marches and Legations after the Napoleonic ravages and traces the attempts of the Vatican (Pius VII) not only to reaffirm political sovereignty but also to reform ecclesiastical life in the period 1814–21. This restoration intended no mere return to the ancien
régime but an adaptation to the political, economic, and religious needs of the people. It not only marked an extension of political rights but also emphasized the centrality of the parish in the Church’s apostolate due to the lack of religious expelled by Napoleon and the pressing necessity of alleviating the misery of the poor.

The first chapter outlines the extraordinary success of Card. Consalvi in regaining almost all the Papal States at the Congress of Vienna, the second his plans for a sweeping reorganization of their government. The third chapter studies projects for the re-establishment of religious congregations in the Marches and Legations. The fourth chapter analyzes the structure, composition, method, and activity of the Congregation for the Re-establishment of Religious Houses in the Pontifical Provinces Recently Recovered under the direction of G. A. Sala. The fifth chapter considers the plans of the bishops of the involved dioceses, showing the spiritual and material needs of the population, the situation of the religious orders, and the criteria involved in re-establishment: religious discipline and utility. Seminaries, charitable institutions, and parishes were focal points of renewal. Neither the political nor the religious plans were fully implemented due to curial reactionaries and the lack of religious, but C.’s study testifies to the foresight and zeal of Pius VII, Consalvi, and Sala, which prepared the later renovation of religious life. The appendices provide 190 pages of original documents and statistical tables.

JOHN M. MCDERMOTT, S.J.
Fordham University


This excellent biography is a volume in the valuable series from Notre Dame’s Cushwa Center for the Study of American Catholicism. It tells the story of Francis J. Haas (1889–1953), one of a remarkable generation of priests committed to the ministry of social justice in the U.S. Born in Milwaukee and for two years rector of St. Francis Seminary, he found even broader scope for his skills in Washington, where he served as director of the National Catholic School of Social Service and as dean of Catholic University’s School of Social Science. No priest contemporary filled more public service jobs than he; he took part in settlement of over 1500 labor disputes. Franklin D. Roosevelt came to appreciate his strong support for the New Deal and named him to the Labor Policies Board of the Works Progress Administration, as well as to the Fair Employment Practices Committee. His national involvement slowed during the final decade of his life, which he spent as bishop of Grand Rapids, but in December 1946 Harry S. Truman named him to the President’s Committee on Civil Rights and he played an active role in drafting that committee’s 1947 statement To Secure These Rights.

B., a specialist in the New Deal era, tells the story well. He evokes the midwestern background, reminds us that Haas was a disciple of John A. Ryan from neighboring Minnesota, and leads the reader carefully through the labyrinthine ways of the New Deal agencies. Above all, the book is a reminder that effective social action is a deeply rooted tradition in American Catholicism. In the person of Haas and others like him, Catholic social theory was translated into practice. B. is realistic about the extent of their influence on government in New Deal days. He does not romanticize their achievements; he does describe them accurately as what they were.

JAMES HENNESEY
Boston College
This book is a tool for interpreting more accurately Vatican II's important chapter on marriage and the family. Almost the whole of it is in Latin, excerpted from the conciliar proceedings at their various stages, and rearranged by the author in more accessible, tabular form.

A chronology of the text is provided (23–27). Over a hundred pages (30–133) are devoted to a tabular synopsis. Four columns on a two-page spread present the text at different stages: (1) that sent out in July 1964 and debated in the third session; (2) that sent out in June 1965 and debated early in the final session; (3) that presented for voting in mid-November 1965; (4) the final text. Notes on the same pages account for the development of the text by quoting or summarizing amendments proposed and the way they were disposed of.

The remainder of the volume consists of three appendices. The first provides the text of the first and second schemata. The second and third provide the actual text of the criticisms made of and amendments proposed to the second and third schemata. While the materials drawn from the debates usually are excerpted from longer interventions, sections relevant to the treatment of marriage and the family are given in full.

One limitation of this work is that it is based upon texts published during the council itself, rather than upon the Acta synodalia, which are now fully available. Thus, those using Gil Hellin's work and the acta will be more or less inconvenienced by the need to coordinate the two. Still, this work will be a useful tool for interpreting the text. It also could serve as material for an interesting seminar for students who can read Latin.

GERMAIN GRIZEZ
Mt. St. Mary's College
Emmitsburg, Md.


The continued interest in Rahner's theology and the immense scope of his publications have led to various collections of his writings. Lehmann and Raffelt, coeditors of one such volume, Rechenschaft des Glaubens: Karl Rahner-Lesebuch (Freiburg/Zurich: Herder/Benziger, 1979), have now assembled in a somewhat smaller parallel text a sample of R.'s more spiritual works. Intended for a wider audience, the book incorporates seventy texts ranging in length from two to twenty-one pages, loosely organized into sections entitled faith, love, and hope. Most of the selections stem from the past two decades; while only six are previously unpublished, several are otherwise available only in such relatively inaccessible locations as the Austrian Jesuit monthly Entschluss.

Since the appearance of Hans Urs von Balthasar's review of Geist in Welt (ZKT 63 [1939] 371–79), perceptive commentators have recognized that R.'s more spiritual writings are indispensable sources for understanding his thought. As Robert Kress (A Rahner Handbook [Atlanta: John Knox, 1982] 93) has recently observed, their character as less technical expressions of central theological themes also makes them uniquely suited as a starting place for students seeking an introduction to R.'s theology. The volume under review lends itself well to such use, as its editors have been thorough in their selection of topics and judicious in their choice of texts. Of particular value are
the reflections on the relationship of grace and church in the essay on baptism (no. 7), the brief text on the unity of love of God and love of neighbor (no. 29), the explanation of the interconnection of philosophical anthropology and religious thought in the article on indifference (no. 49), the account of transcendental revelation in the meditation on courage (no. 58), and the comments on the incomprehensibility of God in the pages on suffering (no. 66). I would have welcomed a bit more of R.’s earlier work and would have appreciated the substitution of “Über die Liebe zu Jesus” (Entschluss 36:7–8 [1981] 4–18, 23–24) for nos. 31 and 69. But these are only minor quibbles about a worthwhile collection.

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


The interviewers explore L.’s family background, his intellectual formation, and the persons and books that were influential in his development. L. discusses the meaning and impact of his early work on Aquinas, the development of his reflections on method, and his present work in economics. There are brief reflections on a variety of topics, as well as evaluations of the ideas and contributions of a whole lit-
ments, and the connection between religion and morality. He does all this in a way which shows imaginative sympathy with Aquinas' position and an awareness of contemporary philosophical difficulties with that position. But his treatment of these difficulties is less than satisfactory. Thus, he wishes to uphold exceptionless moral prohibitions while building certain exceptions into our concept of the kind of action that is forbidden, e.g., murder. But the basis for such a move is left unclarified. The whole problem of egoism and altruism with regard to the will's natural direction to good never comes into focus; this produces contradictory statements about the will's need for virtue (99, 109). M. also claims that infused virtues, unlike acquired virtues, are not lost by a single contrary action (123). Thomas' own view is precisely the reverse. M. does offer some useful criticisms of the reading of Thomas by Gris ez and Finnis. The book is perhaps best taken as a corrective to the crude and unsympathetic presentation of Thomistic ethics in D. J. O'Connor's Aquinas and Natural Law.

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


Avvento's work, a concisely written and direct volume, seeks to offer "an integrated vision of sexuality" (2). It consists of sixteen short chapters, each of which concludes with questions for discussion. A.'s initial presentations center on the contemporary secular vision, Christian sexuality, conscience and values, and the emerging role of women, while the remainder deal with specific issues such as artificial insemination, extramarital relationships, abortion, homosexuality, etc. Four of the chapters deal with contraception.

A.'s treatment is a summary one and rests heavily on the more detailed theological elaborations of others. He adopts a "revisionist" point of view and embraces the "proportionate reason" school of thought on many of the specific issues. From such a stance, he tends to dissent on most issues from the teaching of the Roman Catholic magisterium. On abortion, e.g., he adopts a vague position of studied ambiguity rather any precise moral norms.

My reservations on A.'s work spring from (1) his failure to deal in detail with some of the particulars of the scriptural teaching on sexual issues, (2) his tendency in practice to reduce the teaching of the Church to one school or strand of thought, and (3) his adoption of a "proportionate reason" methodology which is still developing and which is the object of intense debate among both Catholic and Protestant ethicists. Given the concise nature of A.'s treatment and the volatility of the issues involved, the reader would be best advised to consult the more detailed works of Philip Keane or Anthony Kosnik et al., on whom A. relies extensively, or the more traditional treatments on many of these issues found in the works of such writers as William E. May or Germain Grisez.

JOHN W. CROSSIN, O.S.F.S.
DeSales School of Theology
Washington, D.C.


It must have been a brave decision for N. to publish a systematic treatise in canon law in 1981, when he knew well that the promulgation of the new Code was imminent. But he knew also that while a number of laws were going to be changed, the main structures of the legal system would remain the same, as indeed happened. Hence his work is not so much out of date as it
may appear. Moreover, his aim was to focus on the central concepts and institutions of canon law, to present them in their historical, philosophical, and theological context, and then to reflect on their suitability for our age. His is, therefore, a commentary with a difference; it is not a "how to do it" book but a critical examination of the whole system and its parts—the term "critical" to be taken here in a respectable sense, as it is used in speaking of "critical commentaries" of Scripture. The Church needs such scholarly works; they can contribute greatly to the development of its legal system. It follows that N.'s enterprise should be highly commended, even if this reviewer would like to dispute some of his ideas in the field of the philosophy of law and the theology of canon law.

Regrettably, N. shows little awareness of the immense work done in English-speaking countries on many foundational issues in canon law, such as the problem of the protection of human rights in the Church, the grounds of nullity in matrimonial cases, the simplification of the procedural norms, the selection of bishops, and others. But all in all, in this Grundriss we have a significant contribution to the science of canon law; N. carries the debates to the level of historical clarification and critical reflection. No matter how sharp such debates may become (N. provoked some remarkable ones in Germany), they are needed. There is future for the science of canon law only if it breaks out of the narrow world of casuistry and finds the great and simple principles which can hold the community in peaceful balance without oppressing the spirit.

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J.
Catholic University of America


Buetow, priest, lawyer, and educator, offers a scholarly, informative book, even a compassionate one. He examines the legality and justice of Jesus' trial and with it compares a trial of Josh, a hypothetical black who comes from the North to the deep South to make blacks aware of civil rights. As for the legalities of Jesus' trial, he reviews well-worn views and concludes with Catchpole that such investigations lead nowhere. As for its justice, he calls it legal murder. Carefully he explicates the legal realities which will confront Josh: arrest, warrant, police, trial, jury, counsel, contempt of court, and habeas corpus. We feel we are reading sharp notes for passing the bar examination. Jesus is Josh, Pilate a Federal judge, Herod State Judge Teepas, but claudicat omnis comparatio. Josh, arrested on a charge of inciting to riot, would be brought to a Federal judge, who would pass the buck to Judge Teepas, who could easily find Josh guilty.

The book indictes criminal justice for its views of truth, justice, and mercy. No judiciary answers the question of Pilate, "What is truth?" Our judiciary takes the pragmatic personal view: that is true which works in the short run and helps me. The adversary system makes this position inevitable: the lawyer opts for his client, not for truth. The law and the evidence make the lawyer's truth. Since the cleverer lawyer wins, a trial is reminiscent of the medieval trial by combat. Hence the lawyer cannot say that justice is truth in action. This world is not a just one; despite modern efforts to assist them, the poor get the short end of the legal stick. The powerful win. B. invokes St. Paul: "If we have been united with him through likeness to his death, so shall we be through a likeness to his resurrection."

THOMAS J. HIGGINS, S.J.
Loyola College, Baltimore

McNamara states: "This is a practical psychotheological book without psychological jargon which zeroes in on the simplest and truest way for people in the West to become mystics: by immersion in the Incarnational worldliness of the Christian Way" (ix). He develops this thesis by focusing upon the mystical vocation, our rational prison, soul-friendship, the experience of nothingness, Christian vitality, and our daily bread.

M. correctly refuses to reduce mysticism to experiences, the psychic, or to subjectivity. Mysticism cannot be dissociated from the Bible, dogma, ecclesial life, or daily life. It is essentially a way of life flowing from and into human authenticity. The "transparent personality" experiences a felt presence of God; the "opaque personality" indirectly experiences this oneness with God through a total presence to daily life. M. also refreshingly states that genuine mysticism must be the basis for theology, the apostolate, liturgy, education, and culture. Worth noting, too, are his criticisms of Jung's "psychiodolatry" (84 ff.).

Unfortunately, M. does not develop these ideas but settles for a long and facile harangue against science, contemporary life, and "the global spread of Machiavellianism." He likewise espouses a romantic view of rural and outdoor living. Phrases like "effete childhood," "cellophane civilization," "pooped-out playboys," "pious piffle," "techno-barbaric juggernaut," "trouser ape," etc., punctuate this work. The aphoristic-style introduction distracts rather than helps the reader. Is the experience of one's nothingness always necessary for prayer, as M. contends, or is it not normally the result of long and serious prayer? Can "jollity and levity" be so easily ascribed to Christ? Also, I see many reasons why the "average priest" cannot lead the "average student" into the prayer of quiet in a reasonably short time. Finally, this book should definitely not be a student's first exposure to Christian mysticism.

HARVEY D. EGAN, S.J.
Boston College


This slim volume is an excellent introductory survey of the recent and contemporary discussion of mysticism. This involves mysticism as a psychological phenomenon, as a kind of prayer, and as a way of life. E. begins the treatment of the psychological approach with William James's classic The Varieties of Religious Experience. He then explores a number of important questions: Does genuine mystical experience differ from insanity, the occult, and regressive infantilism? How important is the distinction between the mystical experience itself and the interpretation given it? Can psychological projection explain the mystical phenomenon? Are all mystical experiences basically the same? He explains R. C. Zaehner's answer to the last question, i.e., that there are three basic varieties of mystical experience: (1) an experience of being at one with the all—a kind of cosmic consciousness of harmony and union, (2) an experience of one's own spirit in isolation from all else, and (3) an experience of transcendent union with the divine Absolute.

Evelyn Underhill and Thomas Merton are taken as examples of those Christian writers who insist that mysticism is more than an unusual experience or even an intense form of prayer: it is a way of life, paradigmatic for all believers.
E. explains that Christian authors are of two minds about the value of Eastern meditation practices as an aid to mystical prayer. Merton and William Johnston underline the advantages to be gained from dialogue with the East, especially with Zen. Teilhard de Chardin and Hans Urs von Balthasar, however, perceive elements at odds with Christianity: dissolution into an impersonal Absolute extinguishes love, personalism, and action. E. asks whether these last have adequately grasped the way of the East.

E. outlines a contemporary mystical theology from the essays of Karl Rahner, who sees the drive of the human spirit toward Transcendent Mystery as the heart of what it means to be human. Finally, E. describes Bernard Lonergan's transcendental method as the basis for a mystical theology of the future, which would integrate the secular sciences, Eastern and Western mysticism, academic theology, and living spirituality.

In a very brief compass this book succeeds in raising all the centrally important questions that enter into the present discussion of mysticism. But E. not only carefully describes the views of some major participants in this discussion; he also expresses his own preferences and judgments in a clear and reasonable way. This book is very much recommended to those seeking a basic acquaintance with what they are saying about mysticism.


The author's Christotherapy: Healing through Enlightenment (1975) sketched "a theology of Christ as healer of the whole person," psyche as well as spirit. It proposed a new form of psychotherapy which made prayer, God, and Christ central to its structure. This second book tries to link the practice of spiritual direction with modern psychology and counseling in a new "holy science." After an overview of the developing self in the various stages of emotional and spiritual growth, and of the deformations which block its progress, T. proposes his own "spiritual-psychological synthesis" as a way of moving beyond the "separate specialization" model of the relationship between spiritual direction and counseling. Having sketched the qualities and methods of the Christotherapist, he examines the healing of sin, neurosis, and addiction in relation to the four weeks of the Ignatian Spiritual Exercises and the process underlying them ("reforming, conforming, confirming, transforming"). The last section of the book treats "the healing and education of feelings"—specifically, the feelings of anxiety, fear, anger, sadness, and depression. A brief appendix discusses guilt and its treatment.

It should be clear from even this brief outline that Christotherapy II is not just Christotherapy Revisited. It is a much fuller, richer, more comprehensive book in every way, enriched both by T.'s wide reading in contemporary psychology and by examples drawn from his life experience as a "wounded healer." Besides the simple techniques of "mind-fasting and spirit-feasting" that were at the center of the earlier book, T. proposes a variety of ways the Christotherapist may promote the growth of others as well as his own. He also offers judicious critiques of other forms of spiritual-psychological syntheses, like those proposed by Thomas Hora and by Roberto Assagioli, while recognizing their contributions to his own thought. Though (like his mentor Bernard Lonergan) T.'s writing tends to a hypertrophy of classifications and lists, this work is clear,
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

stimulating, and full of insights. Highly recommended.

JUSTIN J. KELLY, S.J.
University of Detroit


The Ws.' aim is to clarify the meaning of the concept "community"—a concept clearly central in post-Vatican II efforts at renewing religious life, parishes, and the Church generally. In that aim they succeed admirably. They make available and comprehensible a wide range of modern and contemporary literature from sociology and social psychology which clarifies the notion of community by, first, differentiating it from the feeling of unity and togetherness and, second, identifying it as a social form with characteristics which locate it as intermediate between the small and intense primary group (e.g., intimate group of friends) and the larger and diffuse association (e.g., union local or civic organization). The clarification is continued by exploring how the notion of community operates in imagination in the symbols of Church as community and kingdom of God as dream of future community and the notion of sensus fidelium as a corporate intuition of the praxis of faith. The context is the present pluralism in both Church and culture in which a great variety of styles of community life are emerging in response to the need for intimate contexts of interaction and faith expression.

This book would be useful in a variety of adult-education contexts because of its clarity and the reflective exercises (at the end of each section) which invite readers to name, describe, and evaluate their experiences of community. Theologians might wish for fuller development of the Wa.' ideas on symbols of community in the religious imagination, but the book is a valuable example of a method of interdisciplinary reflection in which theology, social science, and ministry are brought to bear in a critical and constructive manner to clarify the notion of community.

MICHAEL J. McGINNIS, F.S.C.
Washington Theological Union
Silver Spring, Md.


An exposition and critique of the American bishops' mode of addressing political issues in the more than two hundred statements they have issued since 1966. The critique assumes a distinction among proclaiming the life and teaching of Jesus Christ, Catholic social teaching, and policy statements which apply the social teaching to particular issues. B. concentrates his criticism on this last category of statement.

The reason he gives for doing so is that the bishops themselves are more concerned with taking policy stands than with evangelizing and teaching. They tend to separate evangelization from the pursuit of justice and to reduce the latter to concrete policy proposals. These proposals in turn are addressed mainly to issues that appear on a "liberal" political agenda. Thus, B. says, "On the basis of the bishops' political statements, one would infer that they believe the common good to consist mainly in the protection of rights and a more equal distribution of goods" (16).

He attributes this bias in large part to the influence of the U.S. Catholic Conference's Department of Social Development and World Peace, which is staffed by a small group of professionals "of very limited theological compe-
Because the staff members are prone to identify Catholic social teaching with their own political opinions, "the bishops have unwittingly allowed the secular world to set their political agenda" (107).

B. recommends more attention to evangelizing and teaching Catholic social principles, greater reserve in taking positions on policy questions, and more political diversity in the staff.

Francis Canavan, S.J.
Fordham University


This anthology is the product of the collaborative effort, aided by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities, of four colleges in the upper Midwest, two Roman Catholic and two Protestant (College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn.; St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.; Luther College, Decorah, Iowa; and St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., respectively), to introduce students and the wider public to the heritage of Christian humanism. Accordingly, the purpose of the present volume is "to bring into plain view the enduring strength and amplitude of the humanism found in historic Christianity" (17), and the selections are specifically intended "to unfold before the reader the main elements in the tradition of Christian humanism" (ibid.). A brief general introduction first defines Christian humanism ("the interest in human persons and the positive affirmation of human life and culture which stems from the Christian faith" [23]) and then discusses in turn Christian humanism's sources and features, other types of humanism, present attitudes toward humanism, and the impact Christian humanism can have on the contemporary situation.

The editors make a convincing case for the urgency of rediscovering and familiarizing ourselves with the tradition of Christian humanism. Their anthology greatly facilitates this task. The authors and texts selected span from ancient Israel and Greece to the last quarter of the twentieth century and are arranged chronologically according to periods, e.g., Middle Ages, Renaissance, Reformation, etc. There is a brief introduction to each period as well as to each author and selection within a given period. In general, the editors' selection of authors and texts is judicious, balanced, and very ecumenical. However, one rather obvious omission is St. Francis de Sales, whose name, at least in Catholic circles, is virtually synonymous with Christian humanism. In terms of adoption as a course textbook, this anthology would probably be most beneficially used at the junior or senior collegiate level.

Joseph F. Chorpenning, O.S.F.S.
Allentown College, Pa.


This book is exactly what it purports to be: a handbook of styles and forms in Christian art. Divided into four major styles, it offers a structured and a methodological approach to the study of Christian art. Each major section develops in a chronological fashion and discusses the artistic, historical, and theological distinctions between early Christian art, Byzantine art, Romanesque art, and Gothic art. Each section begins with an introductory essay (or essays in the instance of the Gothic, which is divided into "First Period" and "Second Period"), maps, a concise bibliography, and a list of major museums.
whose collections highlight appropriate artworks. Specially commissioned drawings complete and complement each essay.

It is these many fine drawings which are simultaneously the major attribute and the method of this particular approach to Christian art. Here is an iconographic study of visual images. What may initially be thought to have been “aesthetically” sacrificed in the decision not to use photographs for illustrations of the artworks is recovered several times over in the fine drawings. One is able to see symbolic deviations and developments with a clarity sometimes denied in photographs. The serious student of Christian iconography is able to go back to photographs or the original artworks with fresh insights or interpretation. The careful arrangement of these drawings occasionally allows for the placement of variations of an image on the same or adjoining pages—helpful for comparison as well as a developmental study of an image.

Despite its fine attributes, Art of the Christian World is a handbook and as such needs to be used and recommended with the appropriate cautions. The introductory essays are at times too complex for the “vacation traveler” and not complex enough for the specialist. The concise bibliographies are helpful for the beginning student. Like all handbooks, this is fundamentally and ultimately a resource tool. And in this particular instance, the excellent drawings provide us with a useful and insightful volume.

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


As more than half of Jan van Eyck’s known religious paintings focus on a Marian theme, P.’s study is as necessary a thematic study of this major Flemish painter as it is an appropriate theological investigation. Her basic thesis argues against a “hidden symbolism” and for a serious artistic attempt that merges Christian devotional tradition with secular concerns. Van Eyck’s concentration on three Marian images of God-bearer, Bride, and Church is analyzed in relation to the contemporary devotional, liturgical, and theological context of fifteenth-century Flanders.

P. argues for a skilful interweaving of traditional Marian iconography with theological and liturgical innovations, which resulted in a creative, new artistic vision. She examines this interrelationship through an in-depth analysis of Officium parvum, Rupert of Deutz’s exegesis of the Song of Songs, Psalter, Augustine’s City of God, medieval religious drama, sermons, and liturgical practice (e.g., Missa aurea and the structural development of Eucharist and marriage). Van Eyck’s art is a visual unity of elevated theology and popular piety. His symbolism has a “multilevel significance” and deserves both art-historical analysis and theological investigation. For example, a study of the artistic tradition of Maria Sacerdos highlighted by van Eyck’s transformation would be of interest for contemporary students of liturgy and theology.

It is interesting that P. has omitted an important connective to her major interpretive scheme of Mary as Nutrix omnium, the Jungian archetype of the Eternal Feminine. This is a curious lacuna, as P. emphasizes an interpretation of Mary which stresses her symbolic unity of mediation and redemption through container/receiver/vessel imagery. Nevertheless, this is a fine achievement of multidisciplinary scholarship.

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

RELIGION AND FILM. Edited by John R. May and Michael Bird. Knoxville:
Although this work has all the earmarks of a supplementary reading text for an undergraduate course on religion and media, any theologian who wonders what the popular medium of film has to do with theology will find it enlightening. The work is divided into three parts. The first, "Approaches to the Religious Interpretation of Film," contains the strongest and most interesting essays. Bird, May, and Ernest Ferlita deal with the basic critical considerations governing the interpretation of film. The theories of Bazin, Ayfre, Kracauer, Arnheim, Pudovkin, and Eisenstein are explained and related. The importance of Tillich's reflections on culture are recalled, and elements such as story and action are given their due. The second section, "Cinematic Genres and Cultural Trends," demonstrates how film can be used as a mirror in which the popular audience it serves is reflected. Part 3, "Directors and the Varieties of Religious Sensibilities," contains brief essays by a variety of writers on thirteen familiar directors. Each study concludes with a short bibliography.

M. states in the Introduction that "this work is built on the assumption that film is a many-splendored art form and that analysis contributes to a genuine understanding and appreciation of a particular film to the extent that it pursues the question of meaning in terms of cinematic technique." The weakness of the work, however, is its failure to pay attention to the particularity of film. Movies are viewed as a cultural barometer and catalogued accordingly, but nowhere, not even in the studies of directors, does attention focus on a particular film as a unique, revelatory whole. Cinematic theology can deepen our aesthetic appreciation of film; this should have been demonstrated.

KENNETH C. RUSSELL
St. Paul University, Ottawa
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