
The scope of Chilton’s treatise is in reality narrower than its subtitle indicates; for the work is limited, for the most part, to an investigation of the relation of the language and themes of the Targum of Isaiah to Jesus’ preaching about the kingdom of God. The author is careful—rightly so—to disclaim any direct knowledge on the part of Jesus regarding the targum itself; he is content to find evidence of thematic and dictional similarities, while at the same time admitting a creative activity on the part of Jesus, based upon the present activity of God, and not upon the mere interpretation of a written text.

The book itself consists of three parts: an introduction, which treats of some of the aspects of Jesus and the Judaism of his time, along with an extensive treatment of the history and purpose of the targums; a detailed examination of the aforesaid relations of Jesus to the Targum of Isaiah; finally, an expositional section on Jesus’ use of Scripture, based upon the results of the anterior exegetical investigation.

There are many excellent features in C.’s treatise. He evinces a broad control of the literature on the question. His description of Jesus’ use of Scripture as “analogical” is apt and to the point; it is not really “typological.” The lack of footnotes is, to my mind, no disadvantage, since C.’s statements are correlated to the extensive bibliography by appropriate sigla within the text itself. Convenient summaries are provided from time to time, to orientate the reader after an involved discussion.

On the other hand, the work manifests a number of weaknesses. First and foremost, issue can be taken with the assertion that Jesus was a “rabbi” in the proper sense of the word as understood at the time; rather, he should be viewed as a prophet (eschatological or otherwise). C., furthermore, does not really advance the discussion concerning the reliability of targumic traditions for an understanding of first-century Judaism; he repeats time-honored arguments, using the same methodology that has for long been open to serious criticism. H.’s definition of midrash is confused. The final section digresses into the broad issue of faith and history, and loses focus in the process. I would seriously dispute C.’s statement that “no consistent doctrine of Jesus’ pre-existence is expressed by the application to him of passages, terms and images from the Old Testament” (176). Those who use the term “salvation history” will be surprised to find themselves automatically classified as members.
of "liberal Christianity" (197). Finally, the excessive use of qualified statements ("perhaps," "more plausible," etc.) makes it difficult to understand the gist of the discussion, while the frequent emphasis upon the obvious will try the patience of the initiated.

Flawed though it is, C.'s treatise can serve to open new paths of thought for the general reader who is willing to follow up the many leads pointed out by the author's dedicated labors.

_Holy Trinity Abbey_  
_CASIMIR BERNAS, O.C.S.O._  
_Huntsville, Utah_


John Marco Allegro was the person who first took me to Khirbet Qumran in July 1957, at the beginning of a year's work in Jerusalem on the Qumran texts. During that summer I enjoyed many conversations with Allegro in the "scrollery" of the Palestine Archaeological Museum (see photo on p. 60). At summer's end Allegro left for England to resume his lecturing at the University of Manchester. Little did I then realize that his departure was also the parting of our ways about "the relationship of the Scrolls and the early Church," which he now claims is the "subject of this book" (16).


The thesis of the book is that the Christian Church was involved in "the promulgation of a myth full of compromises and illogicalities" (226). To show this, A. indulges in many generalizations, strained etymologies, one-sided reading of evidence, and a patent desire to titillate. "Formally, the Christ/Messiah was based upon the _Essene_ Teacher of Righteousness, and given his type-name 'Joshua/Jesus.' " "The words of the Nazarene Jesus reflected many of the teachings of the _Essene_ Master, but were adapted to a more universal outlook and open social order. Embedded in the narrative were some of the more esoteric of _Essene_ doctrines, titles, names, passwords, incantations, and so on, necessary for the maintenance of occult practices, but considered too dangerous for open publication" (226). One would not expect A. to admit that Mt 16:16–19 had anything to do with the ecclesiastical primacy of the Roman Catholic Church, but he not only insists that there is probably no
historical basis to the incident recorded in the Gospel, but denies that “there ever was one person called Simon Peter who held office in the messianist movement” (209). Yet he knows how to explain whence the various ingredients of the Petrine tale are derived. First of all, Simon is related to Greek sêmeion, “sign.” Cephas may play on Aramaic képhā’, but that is only half the story; for it is really only another form of Caiaphas, the name for an official found in 4QTherapeia, the holder of “an Essene office of a very special nature” (210), meaning “Investigator, Prognosticator,” someone credited with particular insight and the gift of prophecy. And Greek bariônä has to be understood as Aramaic baryônä, “divination” (related to western Semitic baru, “diviner”). The main function of the Caiaphas/Cephas was the recognizing of signs of physically afflicted people. Thus in the Christian myth of these latter-day Essenes Peter rose to prominence, intended by Jesus to assume the function of an Essene Overseer who would loosen all the fetters which bind humans in their sins. So runs the tale of the Christian myth; it is impossible to recount the whole here. But the free associations that are provided say more about the author than about the myth.

The book has two appendixes that call for comment. The first publishes for the first time the text of 4QTherapeia, a ten-line document written on skin, found in 1952, and subsequently bought from the Bedouin who had discovered Qumran Cave 4. The publication of it here raises a serious question in view of A.’s boast in the preface: “I am still the only member of that original team [‘the International Editing Team’ of Cave 4 texts] to have published all of his section of the work in definitive form (1968) . . . ” (6). If he had published “all of his section” in 1968, then why does this fragment appear here, only in 1984 (or originally in England, in 1979)? One begins to wonder how much else A. has withheld. As for the “definitive form” of his publication, one should recall what reviewers have said of it; see, e.g., J. Strugnell, RevQ 7 (1969–71) 163–276. Is A. aware of M. Baillot’s definitive publication, Qumrân Grotte 4: III (4Q482–4Q520) (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)?

In Appendix 2, A. gives a partial quotation of the “Secret Gospel of Mark,” alleged to be the Gospel known to Clement of Alexandria and the Carpocratians and published by M. Smith (The Secret Gospel [New York: Harper & Row, 1973]). One wonders what connection that would have with “the Scrolls and the early Church.” A. thinks that its version of the story of the rich young man (Mk 10:17–23) “involves a nocturnal initiation ceremony of a homosexual nature” (5), and so he concludes that he “may connect the semen-anointing of the gnostics’ ‘Father-son/youth’ ceremony [described in chap. 8, “The Love Feast,” pp. 120–36] with this initiatory ‘baptism,’ and suspect that the ‘water’ used was, in fact, the seminal fluid procured during the Elect’s sexual activities” (243).
In chap. 8 a strange combination of Qumran passages, NT texts, and patristic quotations enables A. to describe "The Love Feast" of the Gnostics; he concludes: "The semen of the Elect also served in the initiatory rites of 'baptism,' and its application by smearing, or anointing, probably gave the latter-day Essenes their most common designation, 'Christian,' the 'anointed ones'" (136). All of this reveals the nature of this preposterous book.

If this were not enough, there is also the revelation A. makes in his preface that, when the book was first published in 1979 by Westbridge Books, the English publisher would not allow Appendix 2 to appear in it, "claiming that their lawyers had warned of the possibility that . . . the publishing house could lay itself open to the charge of blasphemy in a twentieth-century English court of law!" (5). Now Allegro hails his American publishers for their concern about "the integrity of authors' manuscripts." Obviously, I am not alone in my reaction to this appendix—or even to the whole book.

Catholic University of America

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.


This is a noteworthy edition, with French translation and commentary, of a work that has had a very complicated history. The Greek Acts of John (sometimes called the Leucian Acts) was responsibly edited by M. Bonnet in 1898 on the basis of nine mss. Junot and Kaestli, both respected for previous publications on apocryphal acts, have collated another 12 mss. for this edition. "Manuscripts" has to be understood in a special way, for there is no complete copy of the Acts of John. Length and heterodox Christology caused the original work to be dismembered, with sections being preserved as adjuncts to other works about John (textes d'accueil). Retrieving those sections from works that have their own maddening difficulties, deciding the original order and the probable length and content of lacunae left by lost sections, involves minute detection which J. and K. perform convincingly (see the basic outline, 98–100). In their judgment the long original (without chaps. 94–102, 109) was composed between A.D. 150 and 200, most plausibly in Egypt. It may have been the first of the preserved apocryphal acts, although one need not think of these acts as one genre.

The Acts of John was a type of novel aimed at a twofold audience: at pagans who might be convinced and converted by the extraordinary miracles narrated, and at Christians who might be deepened in their perception of the invisible God; these are the two audiences specified in
the comparable *Acts of Andrew*. If one compares the author’s theology to that of contemporary church writers acknowledged as orthodox (Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria), it becomes apparent that his enthusiasm for Christianity does not involve a mastery of some basic concepts. For instance, the one God whom he knows is Jesus, without any distinction between Father and Son. The community envisioned seems to be a union of the reborn with no visible emphasis on liturgical rites or ecclesiastical organization. (Diagnosis from silence is risky; but I was struck how the community that emerges from the *Acts of John* has some of the “weaknesses” I detected as possible derivatives from the fourth Gospel in my Anchor Bible commentary on the Epistles of John.) In the judgment of J. and K., however, the original *Acts* was not a Gnostic work, for it lacks emphasis on salvific knowledge and a saved elite. The Gnostic era in the history of the *Acts* came in the third century with the addition of chaps. 94–102 and 109, which were probably of Valentinian derivation.

A major part of the second volume makes another contribution. It gives a close analysis of later works about the life of John: the Syriac *Acts or History of John*, Prochorus’ *Acts of John*, the Latin *Passio Iohannis* and *Virtutes Iohannis*, and the *Acts of John at Rome*. Completed in the fourth to the sixth centuries and wholly or partly independent of the (Leucian) Greek *Acts of John*, these works attest other traditions and continuing imagination. J. and K. present clearly their contents and probable origins, providing lucidity in a very confusing area. These brief remarks should make it evident that this new edition of the *Acts of John* will be fundamental for all ongoing discussion of the subject. If I may mention an unfortunate fault, the topical index is not really adequate for finding subjects that are in fact discussed, as I discovered when I went looking for Encratites, and the *Assumption of John and of Mary*. Volumes of this size need a very complete index.

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


This two-volume project attempts to provide a relatively complete survey of the various loci of Christian doctrine from the perspective of the Lutheran tradition and in view of the unique questions and issues of the American context.

The project is a composite work of six authors. As one might expect, such a joint effort has both positive and negative aspects. In the first place, composite authorship makes it possible to bring considerable expertise to each locus. Most of the authors have published previous
book-length studies related to the locus for which they are responsible. In one case (the locus on the Trinity) we are simply provided with a minor abridgement of the previous work. In most cases the previous in-depth study is apparent but the material has been rewritten to fit the purpose of the current project. In either case the summary of several volumes of research and theological argumentation within one work makes for a provocative intellectual confrontation and a relative financial value.

Secondly, the various authors are influenced by divergent theological movements. Accordingly, there are often tensions apparent between the arguments and perspectives of the various loci. Indeed, there is at times clear contradiction (compare 2:275 and 2:449 on the third use of the law; or 1:422 and 2:134 on predestination). This diversity can be a healthy part of a theological education. However, one could desire more direct mediation or development of the contrasts.

A third implication of the composite authorship is a certain unevenness of style among the various loci. The basic project is intended to provide an introduction to Christian doctrine for theology students and serious layfolk. Accordingly, the loci typically follow a pattern of (a) introducing the topic, (b) briefly tracing the historical development of the doctrine(s), and (c) highlighting contemporary positions and issues. Either within these basic sections or as a conclusion, the author also advances constructive proposals. Such a pattern is a helpful approach for an introductory treatment. Unfortunately, a couple of the loci that are heavily dependent on previous constructive monographs—especially the locus on the Trinity—were not sufficiently reworked into appropriate style for an introductory treatment. They are much more an argument for a particular (and debatable) position than a survey of the tradition and contemporary options.

One of the most helpful aspects of this project is its clear reflection of the issues and concerns of the American context. It is the first multivolume dogmatic to do so. Examples of this characteristic would include the insightful discussions of creationism (1:314–15), process theology (1:315–18), and the theological inappropriateness (sic) of the separation of church and state (2:459). One could also mention the rather bizarre argument defending designation of God as Father rather than Mother or Parent on the ground that maleness is more easily separable from the reproductive role and thus not as inherently human as femaleness (1:93–95).

Finally, it must be questioned whether the project is truly ecumenical, as the title implies, or more narrowly Lutheran. The verdict is mixed. Most of the material is very ecumenically sensitive and uses the Lutheran
perspective as a helpful highlight. At the same time, a couple of the authors consistently represent Lutheranism in its most extreme and paradoxical form; see especially Forde’s programmatic endorsement of radicalness (2:401) and his general discussion of justification. Whether such a radical form of Lutheranism is desirable for non-Lutheran courses in theology is a decision that ultimately only the instructor can make.

Sioux Falls College, S.Dak.

RANDY L. Maddox


These volumes complete an ambitious project, the first two volumes of which were reviewed earlier in the pages of this journal (TS [1983] 704–5). The treatment of doctrinal theology begun in Vol. 2 is completed in the third volume, on which we will primarily dwell here. The bulk of this volume deals with “Life in the Spirit: Man Is Renewed,” a section that includes studies on Christian cosmology (S. Charalambidis), ecclesiology (J. Hoffmann and H. Legrand) and sacraments (J. M. R. Tillard), Mary in Christian faith (R. Laurentin), and biblical and dogmatic anthropology (L. Caza and D. Mongillo). This is followed by a study of “Creation and Eschatology” by P. Gisel, and “Conclusion: The One and Triune God” by A. Dumas.

The sections on the Church and the sacraments are quite rewarding. Hoffman interprets the origin of the Church as rooted in the preaching and work of Jesus but properly a postpaschal reality. It was constituted by the disciples of Jesus after his death and the experiences they had (he hesitates to say the appearances of Jesus) through which God revealed Himself as the God of Jesus Christ—experiences they interpreted by the eschatological kingdom announced in the preaching and action of Jesus (111). Another constitutive element of the Church is found in the ecstatic experiences which the apostles had and ascribed to the Holy Spirit as marking the inauguration of the last times, and as “the historical effect of the creative and salvific power of God revealed in the resurrection” (112). Both the disciples’ understanding of the community and the community’s actions in history took their origin from these experiences.

H. Legrand contrasts Vatican II’s emphasis on the local Church with the understanding of the Church before the Council as a universal and perfect society centered on Rome in an ultramontane fashion. Through the action of the Holy Spirit, the preaching of the gospel, the Eucharist, and the pastoral ministry presiding at the construction of the diocesan Church, this local Church is fully the Church of God in communion with
other churches. This model is the context for L’s fruitful study of Church ministries and his correction of the pre-Vatican II tendency to disqualify the laity and make the clerical order autonomous. The Church as a communion of local churches is his context as well for a brief treatment of collegiality and of the pope’s universal jurisdiction and infallible teaching office.

There follows Tillard’s excellent though brief study of the Church as sacrament, of sacrament and symbol, and the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, and Eucharist. He situates sacramental symbolism in the context where human symbolism “becomes expressive not first of all of a transcendence or of something inexpressible-in-notional-terms, but rather of the entrance of the Holy God into the full flesh of human life” (397). God’s initiative with the individual believer occurs as he or she relates to the community. And sacramental symbolism is marked by the Pasch of Jesus, the central event of history. The different aspects of Eucharist, e.g., are interpreted in the context of the glorified Christ encountering his people in a sacramental meal in which he recalls his death and resurrection and gives himself through his body and blood.

In general, these studies of Church and sacraments are very fine, but there is not much evidence of the influence of political or liberation theology. It would contribute to the understanding of the meaning and relevance of Church and sacraments in our time if the authors showed the relation of their themes to social justice so widely lacking in our world.

Some other sections of this volume, while fine treatments of their themes, seem too self-contained. The section on Christian cosmology views creation theologically as a manifestation of and participation in God, but integrates nothing from modern science. The section on dogmatic anthropology analyzes the identity of the person and human community through their relation to Jesus Christ, but does not discuss method or other theological or philosophical anthropologies today. The section on the Trinity treats it as a reflexive explication of the event of the Incarnation, but excludes rather than integrates metaphysical reflection. Counter to these approaches, P. Gisel integrates being and eschatology in his fine study of creation and eschatology.

The major sections of Vol. 4, on ethics, deal with situated Christian ethics, the categories of the moral life (such as grace and liberty, conscience and law, courage and prudence, hope and charity), the themes of ethics (e.g., life, health and death, sexuality, economics, politics, law and culture), and, in conclusion, happiness and suffering and the moral and spiritual life. There are many illuminating studies in this volume. But inevitably a reader will have reservations on some sections. I thought,
e.g., that X. Thévenot dealt with specific sexual situations more as a counselor than as a moral theologian, and that he lacked sufficient analysis of the intrinsic meaning of the human acts involved.

Vol. 5, on practical theology, deals briefly with human and Christian experience, pastoral counseling, liturgy, forms of group leadership, social services in the Church, and feminism. The chapters on these themes are written by men and women eminently qualified to treat their subjects.

*De Sales School of Theology*

Washington, D.C.

**JOHN FARRELLY, O.S.B.**


Mackey consistently catches one's creative imagination as he wrestles with contemporary religious problems. *Christian Experience* flows from his previous controversial volume, *Jesus, the Man and the Myth*. In content and method some of the same difficulties arise in the reading of this volume as in his last. There are, however, good points which also pepper the work.

His method of writing forces the reader to think in order to begin to grasp M.'s viewpoint. He may think that the Trinity deals primarily with a Christological viewpoint and is, in fact, surrounded by a Christological view of reality. This is a questionable viewpoint in light of the fact that the Trinity ultimately is more than a Christological reality. Thinking about the Trinity may begin with thinking about Jesus of Nazareth, but it may also flow from non-Christological experiences of reality, including mysticism.

M. attempts to deal with scriptural foundations of Trinitarian thought quite well, but one begins to suspect that his exegetical acumen is less than his hermeneutical talents. He is definitely on his best ground when he addresses contemporary questions and views concerning the Trinity rather than either patristic/medieval or scriptural views. He handles Moltmann and Rahner well, and the contemporary question of relating Trinity to humanism. He even gets one to think quite intriguingly about the relationship of the Trinity to the monotheism of Islam and Judaism. And yet the book, perhaps intentionally, is not well organized, certainly not as well as *Jesus, the Man and the Myth*. Hence the nagging question: Should he have revised sections of it?

M. has a rather novel approach in his efforts to link Trinitarian thought with three distinct categories: secular humanism, Christian secularism, and monotheistic ecumenism. If some “secular humanists” are indeed “atheistic humanists,” they would be enemies of all Christian
secularists. If “monotheistic ecumenism” could include the Jews and the Muslims, they could be more closely merged with Christianity but, of course, to the detriment of Trinitarian thought. Ought Christians sacrifice Trinitarian notions to get aid from the Jews and the Moslems against the “secular humanists” and, more importantly, the “atheistic humanists”? M. thinks that Christians ought to at least think of this as a possible direction for the future of Christianity. If Christians do not take this possibility seriously, they could be accused of a self-defeating chauvinism. One gets the impression that M. definitely wants to push Christians in the direction of a “monotheistic ecumenism.” Ayer, Sartre, Camus, Marx, and Feuerbach would be quite amused. Küng, Gilkey, and Tracy might be quite fascinated. The Jews and Moslems might be quite satisfied to agree with any “Christians” who think of Jesus of Nazareth as a great “prophet.” Perhaps the “divinization” of Jesus of Nazareth in the early Church was a mistake. This is a very great “perhaps” indeed.

Marquette University

TERENCE GERMAN, S.J.


The first in the Introducing Catholic Theology series, S. offers us a competent survey and synthesis of (mostly) Catholic revelation theology. His “experiential theology with arguments of a more inductive nature” (xii) is representative of the current trend of avoiding both theological fundamentalism and excessive liberalism (or what Peter Berger would call the “deductive” and “reductive” approaches, an author upon whom S. relies for his methodology).

The heart and center of the work is the Christological fourth chapter, “The Word Made Flesh.” Relying chiefly upon Kasper, Schillebeeckx, and the historical-critical exegetes, Jesus the Christ is presented as the unrepeatable revelation from God, offering a new possibility of love and liberation to humankind. This love is radical and paradoxical, because it “shoulders the burden of suffering to end suffering” (133).

Leading up to the central chapter we have a discussion of the nature and plausibility of revelation (S. seems most influenced by Gerald O’Collins’ *Fundamental Theology*) in the face of secularism, oppression, and the world’s religions (chap. 1), and two quite thorough surveys of OT history and theology, which argue with Karl Rahner that the OT is the prehistory of Jesus, God’s historical self-communication through human experience leading to the unambiguous revelation of a divine and universal love in Jesus (chaps. 2 and 3). Perhaps Boman and Tresmontant were too enthusiastically relied upon. Flowing from the central chapter we meet with a discussion of the Church as the continuing and
“participant revelation” of God through Scripture, tradition, doctrinal proclamation, and theological development (chap. 5); a helpful confrontation with the world’s religions, which seems to propose that the “Christ” fully revealed in Jesus also reveals itself (partially, it appears) in other faiths (S. appreciates Rahner’s theory of anonymous Christianity, because it warrants a search for traces of the Christ within other religions) (6); a helpful analysis of the life and practice of faith as the response to revelation, personally and liturgically (7); and an attempt to sketch a theology of mission grounded in revelation (8): “There is something wrong with our faith, if we are not mission-minded” (232).

The following seem to be special strengths of S.’s work: (1) doing what it set out to do: present an informed and critical survey of current Catholic revelation theology, yet with an ecumenical sensitivity; (2) a special sensitivity to the world’s religions (S. is a White Father) and the issue of missiology (this is somewhat novel and welcome); (3) a superb attempt to develop a revelation theology more in tune with spirituality and liturgy particularly (surprisingly unmentioned here is Hans Urs von Balthasar); (4) a fine use of Rahner and Cardinal Newman throughout. I felt that the following needed further development: (1) the kind of Church which flows from revelation; (2) the role of liberation, political, and feminist theology in reformulating revelation theology; (3) the contribution of significant American theologians to the debate, especially Avery Dulles and David Tracy (to mention only Catholics); (4) how the concept of mission might need recasting in the light of the world religions.

On the whole, this is an always adequate and at times superb introduction to revelation theology within the Catholic tradition, clearly suitable for college and seminary courses. It reads smoothly, and the author successfully tries to be engaging.

Carroll College, Mont. 

William M. Thompson


Acutely aware that the sacrament of penance is often found to be in disarray on the pastoral, liturgical, and personal levels, Gula is convinced that a sound catechesis of laity and priests is needed to promote more effective and fruitful celebrations of this sacrament. Presupposing the reader’s personal faith and the importance of sacramental penance in the believer’s religious life, G. has written this book to provide a helpful catechetical resource for adult Catholics.

The volume’s seven chapters are constructed according to Thomas H. Groome’s method of religious education, which involves five pedagogical movements: present action, critical reflection, the Christian story and
vision, appropriating the Christian story, choosing a faith response. Virtually all of the material appears under the rubric of Christian story and vision; the other four movements are always represented but are limited to several questions intended to facilitate personal involvement with the issues and better group discussions. After opening with a treatment of reconciliation as an attitude and life-style, the book continues with a basic introduction to grace and sacraments in general. The remaining chapters are devoted to sin, conscience, the history of the sacrament of reconciliation, and the actual preparation for and celebration of the sacrament. Though some might wish that the basic dynamics of conversion and contrition had received greater emphasis and that the treatment of conscience preceded the one on sin, G.'s development is reasonable and his style readable. An appendix gives examples of how the four rites of penance might actually be celebrated. A limited number of references are included, and each chapter ends with several suggestions for further reading; these suggestions, however, mention only author and title and lack publication data.

Throughout G. emphasizes the experiential and human, making generous use of stories, examples, and images. This is not merely a matter of writing style; it reflects G.'s theological and pastoral conviction that good sacramental celebrations presuppose that the worshipers have already known the presence and activity of the Lord in their lives. G. attributes a similar importance to the Church and the community: only to the extent that people truly live within an ecclesial and human community can reconciliation have practical meaning.

The catechetical purpose of the volume requires it to be understandable to a nonprofessional readership, but also alert to the particular difficulties such an audience might have with so large and complex a subject. The experiential emphasis on the sacraments, e.g., might be misleading to some. While certainly legitimate and helpful, this emphasis should not be allowed either to eclipse the radical otherness of God or to distract the worshiper from the hard efforts sometimes required in sacramental reconciliation. In any case, it must be clear that believers do not experience God in the same way as they experience ordinary objects and events in human life. Problems could also arise if certain passages in the book are not read in light of complementing statements in other places or against a context that may not be evident to every reader. This suggests that a theologically competent resource person might be advantageous to groups using this book.

Though G.'s handling of the theological and historical issues is capable, some unevenness can be noted. There are erroneous references to Lateran IV's decree Omnis utriusque sexus as having specified mortal sin (107, 212). One also regrets that in the section on the NT (190–94) G. did not
give greater emphasis to baptism and Eucharist, especially since this would have made more clear the ecclesial nature of reconciliation celebrated in sacramental penance. The discussions of sanctifying grace (66), the history of the distinction between mortal and venial sin (106–8), serious matter (121), sorrow or contrition (183–84, 239), and the modern era (222–24) are weak or too abbreviated. The exegesis of norms in the introduction to the Rite of Penance concerning general confession and absolution relies upon an earlier work (1975) of Frederick R. McManus and does not take into account later and more restrictive interventions of the Holy See on this subject. On the other hand, G.’s treatments of our images of God (53–58), principles of celebration (83–87), conscience (136–73), and preparing for and celebrating sacramental reconciliation (227–57) are well done. Overall, this volume should prove successful in its effort to contribute to a better understanding of the sacrament of reconciliation and can certainly be recommended to those adult groups prepared to give it the careful use it deserves.

St. John’s Seminary, Boston

WALTER J. WOODS


Brown, on leave from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Deerfield, Ill., is interim pastor of the Evangelical Reformed Church in Klosters, Switzerland. The author of several books of a popular nature, he received his doctorate from Harvard in 1967 with a dissertation on the Polish Reformer John Laski. B.’s latest work, Heresies, is a wide-ranging historical survey of Christian doctrine from the perspective of evangelical Protestantism, with particular emphasis on deviations from orthodox Christological and Trinitarian teaching. In general, B. limits the “concept of heresy to doctrines that deal directly with God (special theology) and Christ (Christology) and that diverge so sharply from traditional Christianity that they split the church” (61–62), but he expands this definition to permit classification of Catholicism, at least in its medieval form, as heretical (310–11). Heresies also contains brief treatments of such movements as Donatism and Pelagianism, and includes sections on scholasticism, the Crusades, and various periods in the history of Protestant theology. There is an index of persons but, surprisingly, no subject index.

B.’s basic thesis is “that faith in Jesus Christ as true God and true man, one person, has always been the decisive characteristic of the community of faith he established” (430). Anxious “to contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints” (Jude 3), B. is convinced that the core of Christianity is doctrinal orthodoxy (“For many
religions, the cardinal test is right conduct or right observance; for Christianity it is right faith. Christianity is full of specific doctrines” [19]), especially with regard to Christ. There are only two or three possible interpretations of Christ, and of these only traditional orthodoxy does justice to the biblical message of sin and atonement (cf. 166). To prevent errors which inevitably ensue when human reason oversteps its bounds, Chalcedon erected an “exasperating but necessary” (320) barrier to further Christological speculation. Since the completion of Chalcedonian teaching at the Third Council of Constantinople in 681, “No substantial additional progress has been made to our own day; renewed attempts, such as the kenotic Christology of the nineteenth century or the secular Christology of recent years, must be seen as regressions rather than progress” (193). The authors and positions discussed in the book are all assessed from the viewpoint this orientation implies.

_Heresies_ is perhaps best understood as an anguished outcry against the abandonment of Chalcedonian terminology and doctrine in various contemporary movements and in much modern theology. Despite B.’s welcome emphasis on the soteriological concerns underlying patristic Christology and commendable zeal for conciliar teaching, his oversimplified presentation of Christological issues, undifferentiated treatment of numerous theologians, and failure to address the valid concerns of modern thought prevent him from pursuing his chosen theme in a constructive manner. The ominous isolation of orthodoxy from orthopraxis and odd interpretation of Chalcedon’s purpose as blocking further thought about Christ are not likely to enhance appreciation of dogmatic statements. Anti-Catholic asides, including frequent attacks on the doctrine of transubstantiation (e.g., 305), lower the tone of the volume and betray a limited acquaintance with Catholic theology. Even apart from these issues, the book’s meandering, tediously repetitious style, lack of coherent organization, and inaccuracy in some details make it unsuitable for use as a reference work.

Yet it would be a mistake to dismiss _Heresies_ prematurely. In all likelihood, its main thrust, though not its vehemence, accurately reflects the views of many Christians, both Protestant and Catholic, about modern theology. The causes of this reaction, which differs notably from legitimate concern for traditional doctrine, are complex. To some extent it is beyond the control of theologians; to some extent it is provoked by inattention to language and by superficial popularizations of recent thought. In any case, the attitudes of which _Heresies_ is symptomatic represent a serious pastoral problem which demands due consideration.

_St. John’s Seminary, Boston_  

JOHN P. GALVIN

These two volumes complement an earlier work on the Greek and Eastern Fathers (see my review in TS 42 [1981] 682-84). Both volumes study the authors in question in their historical setting, but as individuals, from a specific point of view. The focus for Tertullian is on his understanding of the mystery of Christ as the heart of Scripture, although attention is also given to his belief that Scripture does not belong to heretics, in the context of his own heretical tendencies and of Vatican II. Hilary’s thought is seen as dominated by the Trinitarian and Christological concerns stemming from his struggle with Arianism, while the hermeneutic of Ambrose is discussed in light of the influence on him of Plotinus and Origen, and of his influence on Augustine. Jerome’s translations are viewed as part of a struggle between profane and religious culture, stirred up by the famous dream where he was told that he was a follower not of Christ but of Cicero. M. does not touch Cyprian but simply refers to M. A. Fahey’s Cyprian and the Bible (2:64). The volume on Augustine is more ambitious and complex. In extensive analyses of Augustinian exegesis and theology, M. discusses inter alia the plurality of senses which Augustine found in the OT and its relationship to the author’s (i.e., Moses’) intention, the influence of Ambrose and Paul, and especially that of Origen on Augustine’s theology of God as love and of the Holy Spirit as a person.

M. deserves high praise for his grasp of patristic exegesis and for the forceful way in which he presents not only its content but its spirit. The manner in which he evaluates and attempts to apply the material, however, raises the same kind of problem for this reviewer as did the earlier volume (see M.’s response to such objections in the introduction to Vol. 2, esp. 16–17). The issue is difficult to formulate, for the volumes, though called introductions to the history of exegesis, are not truly historical. M.’s methodology is doctrinal as well as historical, and his avowed purpose is to present patristic exegesis in order to render it more adaptable for evangelization today. In one sense, therefore, it is unfair to criticize the books from a historical viewpoint; this must be done, however, since M. is using history for his own purposes, and the reader should be aware of these conflicting methodologies.

The patristic authors clearly did exegesis of Scripture not for its own sake but in order to evangelize, or stir up faith in Jesus as Messiah. M. expresses this well but, in turning to contemporary exegesis, he seems to feel that it has no authenticity unless it is aimed directly at evangelization. This theory appears to have grave implications for modern exegetes
and for historians of exegesis, since it seems to leave no room for a more scientific, objective study of Scripture or for a history of that study. Thus M. does not so much adapt patristic exegesis for use today as use it as a norm against which contemporary approaches are compared and usually denigrated. When linked with the doctrinal concerns of his methodology, this attitude also leads to a stress on the role of official Church teaching in evaluating even patristic exegesis; thus early texts are considered correct or important because they agree with, or were used by, e.g., Leo XIII, Pius XII, or Vatican II, as understood by M. Such harmony need not be ignored, but surely one must seek intrinsic value, or its opposite, in the ancient writers. Tertullian will provide an example of the problem under discussion; his refusal to discuss Scripture with heretics is taken up with approval by M., who cites Vatican II as allowing dialogue, but not real discussion, about Scripture with heretics. The distinction is a tenuous one, and the explanation is put in such a way that one may well ask if it is truly in keeping with the spirit of the council—especially if one tries to determine who the “heretics” are (2:37).

Finally, one must note a recurring negativity toward contemporary authors and approaches. One may disagree with Hegelianism without saying that it uses old Gnostic ideas to seduce modern minds (2:24). One may personally believe in the virtue of purity without accepting, as M. seems to do, Tertullian’s extremely negative view of the body (2:51). One can judge that we have too many translations of the Bible today without using the word “bombardés” (2:159). One may disagree with contemporary ethicists without attributing their thought to a stupid or hypocritical interpretation of the biblical admonition “Judge not, lest you be judged” (3:139–40). These are all small points where they occur, but they betray an attitude and lend a negative tone to the books; more crucially, they are simply not germane to the subject matter.

In response, M. has said (2:16–17) that such criticism does not apply, since it does not understand his purpose and methodology. He is entitled to his approach, and one must state that these volumes do provide an abundance of useful material for further study of patristic exegesis. But one must also remark on the tendentious aspect of M.’s purpose, methodology, and evaluations. Caveat lector.

Fordham University

GERARD H. ETTLINGER, S.J.


The appearance of this book is an important event for patristics and for the history of Christology. For years K. has promised a full exposition
of the theory proposed here; now he has laid all his cards on the table. K.'s literary analysis of Ar. 1–3 leads him to conclude that it grew in several major stages. About 340–42, when Athanasius was in Rome, he wrote a treatise corresponding essentially to the present Ar. 1:11–29, 35–64, and Ar. 2:2–18a, 44–72, and sent it back to the faithful monks in Egypt with h.Ar.ep. (PG 25, 692–693) as a covering letter. This first treatise was directed, not against the quotations from Arius' Thalia which appear in Ar. 1:5–6, but against the oral teaching of Arius' followers; and the refutation of those slogans in which Athanasius chose to summarize Arian doctrine was followed by hermeneutical discussions of crucial Scripture texts and by pastoral catecheses aimed at inculcating in the faithful a clear sense of orthodox doctrine. Later, perhaps in the 350's, Athanasius expanded his treatise for wider distribution with the addition of historical introductions, quotations from the Thalia and from Asterius the Sophist, and a lengthy supplementary treatment of Prov 3:22. Two exegetical appendices (Ar. 2:73–82) were added, perhaps at a later time, to complete what we know as Ar. 1–2. Ar. 3, according to K., differs from Ar. 1–2 not only stylistically and structurally but also in its fundamental doctrinal approach, although its author was very familiar with the contents and phraseology of Ar. 1–2. K. suggests that the third book may have been added when Ar. began to be more widely circulated, perhaps by Athanasius' devoted follower Apollinarius of Laodicea.

This theory has important historical and theological implications. It would move Arius' Thalia to the margin of discussions of early Arianism. Studies which depend heavily on Ar. 3 (such as Gregg and Groh's theory about early Arianism, and most modern discussions of whether Athanasius thought Jesus had a human soul) would have to be recast. Athanasius, the "defender of Nicaea," would appear to have been even less devoted to the term homoousion as a theologically indispensable word than modern scholars have thought. The original version of Ar., along with the slightly earlier gent. and inc. with which it coheres very well, would become the touchstone of the authentically Athanasian theological voice and the key to understanding him as a pastor and as a Christian.

Can we take K.'s theory as proven on the strength of this book? The reviewer feels more responsibility than usual in this regard because it is not likely that many scholars will read the first three-fourths of K.'s argument, which is very laborious and often unclear. Despite his subtitle, K. gives us not one but several readings of Ar. 1–3, first outlining the structure and literary unities (21–111), then showing how the various Arians and their writings are used (113–81), then analyzing Athanasius' polemical techniques (181–253), and finally trying to characterize the hermeneutical and catechetical styles of each literary unity (255–368). As a result, most passages reappear several times, and it is difficult to be
sure that K. treats them in consistent fashion throughout. There are no indices of any kind, and when K. promises a later treatment of some particularly difficult question or refers back to points allegedly established, it is often without page references to help the reader check the demonstration. This does not mean that K. does not provide demonstrations, much less that he is wrong; it only means that his book reads very slowly and is hampered in its task of imparting conviction.

Nonetheless, this reviewer found the literary analysis of Ar. 1–2 persuasive in the end. The shifts from caustic description of what are alleged to be Arian positions, to reproaches directed at the heretics, to first-person-plural expositions of what Athanasius knows that he and his Church believe do seem to function as K. suggests. That there was a stage of the work in which Athanasius' target was Arianism expressed orally and another stage at which written documentation became more significant seems very plausible. On the other hand, the contrast which K. wishes to draw between a supposed chronological, salvation-history approach which characterized Athanasius himself and a timeless, metaphysical concentration on the divine unity in Ar. 3 is more impressionistic and not fully convincing. The author of Ar. 3 argues in extended fashion against his opponents' metaphysical reading of scriptural texts, and in some of the very passages adduced by K. in favor of his theory there is salvation-history language reminiscent of Ar. 1–2 which K. overlooks. He may be right about the difference in authorship, but the evidence will have to come from a more exact and sympathetic reading of Ar. 3 and from the lexical studies which K. admits (351) are lacking. One may wish also to see if the scriptural texts themselves do not demand a more metaphysical approach, and if ep. Serap. uses similar arguments for the divinity of the Spirit.

Misprints exceed two dozen, and there are blocks of text misplaced: the latter part of 25 belongs on 29; the end of 95 has been lost and 96 begins with a doublet of several lines; a note is missing on 115; and one of K.'s glosses is printed as part of a quotation on 330, displacing some words of text. K. translates much of Ar. in the course of this book, giving us a preview no doubt of his forthcoming edition in Sources chrétiennes.

Catholic University of America

Michael Slusser


This is a necessary and thus a welcome book. In the last three decades an enormous amount of scholarly work has been done on the Merovingian
and especially the Carolingian period, work on a wide variety of areas—not just the familiar and somewhat overdone theme of church and state but also on theological debates, Greek patristic influences on Carolingian thinkers, Carolingian exegesis, monastic reform, liturgical practices, and the text of the Vulgate. To be sure, W.-H. could not take all of this into account in one volume, but he has produced a general survey which incorporates the fruits of this research and which is likely to be the standard English-language treatment of the Frankish Church until the end of the century.

Like Frankish ecclesiastical history, this volume falls into two parts, the Merovingian and Carolingian. The shorter Merovingian chapters are dominated by the sources: the *Historia Francorum* of Gregory of Tours, monastic legislation, hagiography, and canonical legislation. Since the first is so well known, W.-H. uses chapter 3 to discuss Gregory as much as what he recorded. He understands the bishop of Tours as chronicling a new chosen people and thus presenting an OT view of history, "a theophany or manifestation of God's continuing activity in the affairs of men" (41). "Above all, it is by miracle that God reveals his providential purpose" (51). Gregory, once patronized by O. M. Dalton as "superstitious as a savage," here emerges as a spokesman for the people of his age who used the Scriptures to understand their new place, as Germans and Christians, in history.

The Merovingian period witnessed a host of monastic movements and rules (those of Caesarius of Arles, Columbanus, Benedict). Chapter 4, "The Merovingian Cloister," treats these and also the relation of monasticism to nonmonastic elements, e.g., general ecclesiastical practices, land settlements, and social questions. This was also a period of hagiographical writing, so the next chapter (5) studies "The Merovingian Saints," including the role of bishops in the composition and dissemination of these works. Chapter 6 uses the canonical legislation to study episcopal councils.

W.-H.'s treatment of "The Merovings and the Papacy" (chap. 8) treats the Petrine principatus briefly (110–12) and then goes on to the impact of Roman liturgical practices on the Franks. This is a welcome change of pace in discussions of papal influence on the Franks, and one which scholars have not sufficiently pursued.

The Carolingians produced much more and better literature than the Merovingians, and W.-H. must thus be more selective in the second part of the book. Charlemagne demands a generalized chapter (11), but the subsequent chapters, which have generalized headings, are divided into treatments of significant individuals. For example, the first generation of Carolingian scholarship (chap. 12) is represented by the Anglo-Saxon
monk Alcuin and the Visigothic bishop Theodulf of Orléans, two men with wide-ranging intellectual interests but with the specific technical competence to emend the Vulgate. W.-H.’s treatment of political ideology, “The New Israel and Its Rulers” (chap. 13), centers on Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald and generally overlooks those rulers interested only in power and not in the theoretical questions of church and state.

The two longest chapters (14-15) deal with ecclesiastical reform and learning. The former devotes special attention to the reforming bishop Hincmar of Reims. The latter is much the survey, but a good one which treats several individuals (Lupus of Ferrieres, John Scottus Eriugena) and also the institutions of learning in both East and West Francia. This chapter will not replace M. L. W. Laistner’s Thought and Letters in Western Europe, but no one should now use Laistner without W.-H.’s updating.

The author has provided an ample bibliography, a helpful map, and, regrettably, several misplaced modifiers (97, 332, 405) which the editors should have caught. This is a necessary book for scholars, but also one which students can use.

John Carroll University, Cleveland

JOSEPH F. T. KELLY


When an editorial notation in Heinrich Bornkamm’s posthumous biography of Martin Luther (Luther in Mid-Career 1521–1530 [Fortress, 1983] 103) can identify the “Joachite tradition” with “Joachim, the father of the Virgin Mary,” a book like this fills a definite need. The complexity and density of Joachim’s thought, coupled with discredited stereotypes, simple misinformation, and pseudo writings, conspire to keep the 12th-century abbot imprisoned behind the impenetrable bars of historical exotica. This book works hard to make Joachim more accessible, and by and large succeeds. It is the best single-volume introduction to Joachim’s life and thought.

The authors have incorporated into their treatment many insights found only in hard-to-locate journals (most not in English), and then have gone beyond synthesis to sink their own shafts at critical points in the vast Joachite landscape. At a time when scholars spend much time tracing the spread of Joachim’s influence, the authors begin some much-needed work on Joachim’s relationship to the patristic tradition. Without claiming to have the last word on Joachim’s sources (when they do not know, they admit it and do not guess), they have some useful and
important things to say about the roots of Joachim’s thought in such Latin Fathers as Augustine, Gregory the Great, Jerome, Ambrose, and Hilary of Poitiers. They show how Joachim reflects his time and culture without belittling Joachim’s major contribution, the presentation of history as the mental map of God, or, in their words, “a spiritual perception of history.” They also parenthetically demonstrate how the popular simplism that says Joachim periodized history into an “age of the Father, age of the Son, and age of the Holy Spirit” does an injustice to the rich intricacy and subtlety of Joachim’s theology. The final chapter, on Joachim’s historiography, points to future areas of study and especially highlights the need to begin looking at Joachim as a theologian and “spiritual teacher.”

The picky reviewer is not without pickings. For the Joachim scholar, there is much that is familiar (e.g., the accent on Joachim’s departure from the prophetic tradition, Joachim’s vision of history as “a seed for ideas of progress”), and the treatment of Joachim’s influence among the monastic traditions and Protestant reformers is particularly sketchy. The authors emphasize Joachim’s uniqueness among his contemporaries and do not appreciate perhaps as much as scholars like John H. Van Engen would like Joachim’s debt to the tradition of scriptural symbolists represented by Rupert of Deutz. The hard slog through the bogs of Joachim’s thinking is made more difficult by some repetitiveness (we get the Gerard of Borgo San Donnino story twice, though this is the most drastic example), which betrays the book’s joint authorship, and most especially by some tedious and leaden writing in chapters 3, 4, and 5 (one tires of the piling of paragraphs that begin “According to Joachim” or “For Joachim” or “Joachim finds,” etc.), which betrays the origin of these chapters as a dissertation by Zimdars-Swartz.

Nevertheless, this is a book worth having and saving. Congratulations also should be given to Indiana University Press for such high production standards and an attractively designed book, and also for allowing absolutely essential full-page illustrations, which are properly placed on the facing page of the text that explicates them.

Colgate Rochester Divinity School/ Bexley Hall/Crozer

Leonard I. Sweet


This study asks useful and enlightening questions. D. begins with the society of the 10th and 11th centuries, in which marriage practice was dominated by a “rightful concern for dynastic and family alliance.” In
this time there was a multiplicity of theories and practices on marriage. By the 13th century we have more law and structure and most importantly a system that was more uniform—basically all saw marriage in the same way. He asks, how did the Christian society as exemplified in Northern France get from A to B? What had happened, what had changed, why had these changes occurred?

D.'s main concerns are those of the researcher in social history; in addition, since most of our evidence is the work of males, and a limited group at that (monks, chroniclers, reformers, moralists, etc.), he is concerned that the story of the women involved be told from a proper and fairer perspective. The resultant study is the product of 30 years of teaching and research and updates some of his earlier work. In all, it is a study that should interest researchers in church history, the evolution of canon law, and the development of theology. He investigates some famous marriage controversies, e.g., Philip I, Robert the Pious; looks at what princes and knights did and said, at the views attributed to dissident groups such as heretics, the ideals as portrayed in the lives of saints and in the writings of major figures (Guibert of Nogent, Yves of Chartres); finally asks, how did all these views come together, sift out and form the coherent view of marriage that would dominate for centuries?

In the early period the male heads of families controlled marriage and made their decisions on notions of hierarchy, that fathers were to control and dispose of the family's assets and inheritance. They tried to restrict the family to the father's side and to impose monogamy in order to keep the lineage intact. In tension against this were the traditions of bilateral connections in the family and a tendency on the part of some young men to "free-lance," i.e., to seek out a bride for themselves, even by abduction if necessary. A long struggle took place. It involved religious values, since there were two demands: that the marriage be monogamous and that the pair not be related within the forbidden degrees of blood ties. How were these to be worked out and which was to get preference? Both issues began to involve the Church more and more in marriage affairs. In the end all had changed; what was a family and public event became seen more as a religious and social act. The consent of the fathers gave way to the consent of the bridal partners. The negative view of women that many may have held is shown in many of the stories, but their own ideas also appear. D. achieves his goal of telling how things came to be and of revealing the lives and attitudes of medieval men and women in a crucial area.

A few cautions. In this translation (I was unable to check the French original) statements are made and attributions given without the exact references. On more than one occasion an overly simplistic interpretation
is proffered or a gratuitous assertion is all that is given. Some examples: the reform movement of the 11th century is simply seen as a struggle of the spiritual to dominate the temporal; Duby asserts that the slave or peasant with no patrimony could mate but not marry. Would the Church have admitted this? In reading this enjoyable book, then, it is important to keep such nuances in mind.

State University College
Fredonia, N.Y.

THOMAS E. MORRISSEY


In two other volumes S. traced the development of the idea of a Church council from the Scriptures over the Fathers through the Latin Middle Ages until the Great Western Schism. He now studies the subsequent period to the Reformation. Then for the first time the significance of an ecumenical council was of paramount interest to the theologians and canonists trying to resolve the schism. The relation of pope and council, the decisive point, has been the focus of abundant modern literature. S. does not review that debate in its entirety but concerns himself principally with conciliar questions and works neglected by recent research, yet important in view of the previous tradition. Thus he fills many scholarly gaps, indicates areas for further research, and provides a work that should long serve future scholarship.

S.’s first chapter catalogues chronologically, with a brief description of author and content, 75 major works of the period between 1378 and 1449, the end of the Council of Basel; then he considers the masterpieces of the two great adversaries, the conciliarist Juan de Segovia’s Amplificatio disputationis and the papalist Juan de Turrecremata’s Summa de ecclesia. The second chapter analyzes the period’s most original contribution, Nicholas of Cusa’s De concordantia catholica, summarizing previous research, tracing its sources, elaborating its structural development, and highlighting its basic theme of a polar structure of consensus: pope and council are indispensable for balance, neither totally subordinate to the other, but both subject to Christ. This balance, which refuses to recognize a council without the pope’s consent, explains how Cusanus could later switch his allegiance from council to pope without altering his principles.

The subsequent chapter handles previously neglected themes: the types of councils recognized, the definitions of a general council, the listing and enumeration of ecumenical councils, and the scriptural basis, esp. Deut 17:8–13 and the apostolic councils (plural) in Acts, of theological
argumentation. S. considers at length in chapter 4 the question of the council's infallibility. Occham had raised doubts on the point, and the Hussites refused to acknowledge the authority of a council composed of sinners, recognizing Scripture alone as the rule of faith. Against the Hussites, conciliarists argued that God would never let a council be composed entirely of sinners or appealed to the ex opere operato efficacy of a council, thus innovatively separating infallibility from an inspiration which presupposes grace, or employed Thomas' distinction between habitual grace and gratia gratis data, which need not imply the former. This was important, for most, but not all, conciliarists used the council's infallibility as their chief argument for its superiority over a fallible pope. Papal theologians denied a council's infallibility or derived it from the pope's infallibility. S. follows the debate through many twists and necessary terminological and historical precisions to the conclusions of Segovia and Turrecremata: both agreed on the council's infallibility, the former without, the latter only with, the pope's consent (allowance made, however, for a heretical pope).

Two final chapters study the monumental, erudite De concilio (pre-1521) of the papalist D. Jacobazzi and M. Ugoni's exquisitely structured De conciliis (1521). Sources, structures, influences, and select questions are studied in depth. Though drawing no final conclusion, S. has contributed mightily to research on the councils by uncovering substantial issues and illuminating outstanding thinkers. Especially laudable is his method of carefully outlining a book's structure before analyzing its central thesis.

Fordham University

JOHN M. MCDERMOTT, S.J.


This work is a most readable biography of a student of the Wittenberg Reformer Philip Melanchthon. Ursinus was the primary author of the Heidelberg Catechism and one of the major voices of the German Reformed Church of the 16th century. He was born in 1534, well into the advanced years of the Reformation in Germany; thus he was an inheritor of the heated debates and contentious argumentation between Lutherans and Catholics in the early part of the century. But he was to be embroiled in the second generation of theological debate that was to follow the deaths of both Luther (1545) and Melanchthon (1560).

Coming from Breslau, Ursinus received his early education from his father, Caspar Baer, but soon after came under the influence of Ambrosius Moiban. Moiban was a preacher, school inspector, and the reformer of Breslau's church services. He had a predilection for Calvin's Institutes,
and Visser argues that Ursinus assimilated Reformed principles unconsciously, as does any student. He did not arrive in Wittenberg until 1550, but there became a devoted student of the then leader of the German Reformation, Melanchthon. The bulk of the book is a very thorough and well-crafted examination of the influence Melanchthon had on Ursinus and a comparison of the writings of the two authors. V. is careful in his comparison of the two and presents a balanced portrait, examining much contemporary secondary literature. Of course, the major themes, such as Eucharistic theology, that were of major concern to Melanchthon in his later years become key for V.’s study.

V. does a fine job of showing further Continental influences, such as Calvin and Peter Martyr, while Ursinus traveled about Europe, notably between 1557 and 1561. In the years immediately following 1559, Ursinus was to find his place in Heidelberg due to the desires of the new Elector, Frederick III, and his attempts to further define a Reformed Palatinate Church. Ursinus was in Heidelberg in 1561 and soon became a preacher and a teacher at the local seminary, Sapience College. It was there that the Heidelberg Catechism appeared, in addition to the Minor Catechism and the Major Catechism. The author is very thorough in his treatment of the contribution of Ursinus to these documents and the rest of his career in Heidelberg.

The penultimate chapter attempts to summarize the theology of Ursinus, but V. risks doing too much in too little space. Another criticism is that very little of the personal side of Ursinus is presented, even though V. depends largely on correspondence material. On the whole, this is a fine book that is quite readable.

Loyola University of Chicago                  Carl E. Maxcey


In the short period between 1908 and his death in 1915, Rousselot changed the accepted understanding of St. Thomas as a theologian. L’Intellectualisme de s. Thomas showed that Thomas’ epistemology was not a rationalism rooted in the concepts of the ratio or discursive reason. On the contrary, it was an intellectualism grounded upon a nonconceptual grasp of being by the intuitive intellectus. The natural love of the intellectus for the beatific vision as its end guaranteed the grasp of being through the speculative judgments of the discursive ratio. The metaphysics of the intellectus, linked to the primacy of esse in Thomas’ Platonic participation metaphysics, enabled R. to defend Thomas’
"physical theory" of love in *Le problème de l’amour au moyen-âge*. A few years later, the same metaphysics of participation, love, and knowledge led to R.’s revision of the theology of faith in *Les yeux de la foi*.

This, of course, is common knowledge. It was also known that R.’s unpublished manuscripts, a number of which have since been published, could throw considerable light on R.’s intellectual evolution. They have already been used to solve a number of problems in the interpretation of his theology. No one, however, to my knowledge, had carefully charted the full course of R.’s evolution on the basis of all the evidence available, published and unpublished. This M. has now done, carefully following R.’s progress from his early works on love and knowledge in 1908, through the works on epistemology, metaphysics, and the act of faith in 1910, to his final period. As his unpublished manuscripts reveal, toward the end of his life R., leaving the influence of Maréchal behind, worked out a new metaphysics of love and knowledge, in the light of which he revised his theology of faith and reason, nature and grace.

In M.’s masterly study, both the continuity and the discontinuity of R.’s thought in the three major periods of its development are clearly shown. Whereas earlier studies have tended to focus on individual topics, M.’s comprehensive account of R.’s theology of love and knowledge touches on the whole range of R.’s thought—epistemology, metaphysics, faith and reason, nature and grace, Christology and ecclesiology. As the richness and complexity of R.’s thought are gradually brought to light, a reader familiar with the development of Catholic theology in this century can see more clearly how the heritage of R. has enriched the theology of de Lubac, Rahner, Balthasar, and Lonergan.

Two of M.’s most striking discoveries are the role which R. assigned to the consciousness of the Word Incarnate in mediating the intelligibility of the finite world to God’s creative intellect and the intelligibility of matter which God’s creative knowledge of material singulars demands. For, if matter is intelligible, it follows that the concrete world must confront discursive reason with a set of antinomies or paradoxes which cannot be overcome on the level of static discursive ratio. They can be resolved only on the dynamic level of the intellectus. Yet, if the ability of the intellectus to grasp the concrete intelligibility of the existing world is due to its dynamic drive to the beatific vision, the intelligibility of a purely natural order comes into question.

At first R. believed that a static natural order could be incorporated intelligibly into a dynamic supernatural order whose goal was the beatific vision. He could do so, however, only on the basis of the mediation of the world’s intelligibility to God through the human consciousness of Christ, the “primordial Adam.” In the final state of R.’s development, M.
shows, the purely philosophical hypothesis of the primordial Adam was abandoned. After the sin of Adam, only an intellectus healed by grace and faith could resolve the antinomies presented to discursive reason. The only real order in the world was the supernatural order, and Christ, God’s Revelation and the Redeemer of fallen intellectus, was the supernatural ground of its ability to grasp the world’s intelligibility.

M.’s exegesis of R. is sure to provoke some lively discussion among theologians in the tradition of St. Thomas. They cannot fail to see the historical connection between R. and Balthasar through de Lubac, Rousselot’s disciple and Balthasar’s master. In the most comprehensive and penetrating study of R. to appear in recent years, M. has made an important contribution to the history of 20th-century Catholic theology. Students of theology will find his book a valuable reference work and a stimulus to further study.

Fordham University

Gerald A. Mc Cool, S.J.


This book is a collection of articles which had appeared elsewhere from 1969 to 1983 (original publication dates and places are listed on p. 177). The topic is well indicated by the subtitles: the Church as the People of God and the Body of Christ. Did I not fear that it would be taken pejoratively, I would describe the book as vintage Congar. For it is, in the best sense. Here, as elsewhere, C. has summoned his enormous historical knowledge to illuminate the process of theological reflection and clarification, and especially the meaning and significance of the saving ontology revealed by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the creation, incarnation, and ecclesiation of the nongodly. In this context one can only wish that C. had expanded upon the dangers and inadequacies of Christomonism, which, as he notes, is no worse than a free-floating pneumatological ecclesiology (171, 176). The real, critical deficiency of Christomonism is not primarily its denigration of the Holy Spirit, but its hamartiologically inspired denigration of the Creator and the creation. C.’s historical sense and his Thomistic creational-sacramental ontology would certainly enable him to point out the dangers of Christomonism, as it actually exists in certain Germanbiblicist and American fundamentalist theologies, and to point up the Christic dimensions of being, both natural and supernatural. This comment is not meant as a criticism of this book but as a wish for another book or article.

A major focus of the book is the transition from the juridical, legalistic,
ascetical mentality which dominated pre-Vatican II theology and Church and which produced a dualism not only between the Church and the world but also within the Church, which was conceived as a perfect society of unequals, to a more wholistic attitude which affirms the Church and the world as the communion of the two dimensions of the one creation and the Church as a single communion of diverse members and diverse gifts of the one Body of Christ and of the one Holy Spirit. C. strongly emphasizes the sense of history or historical consciousness and its role as a "liberating catharsis" (82: H. I. Marrou) for both theological theory and ecclesial praxis. Likewise emphasized is the Church as an orderly differentiated "We" (81, 119) of subjects primarily responsible for their own lives rather than primarily subjects of the ministrations of superiors. The Church is not chiefly the hierarchical perfect society of unequal chiefs and Indians, but primarily the communion of the brothers and sisters of the first-born brother, Jesus (Rom 8:29).

Given the renewed Roman emphasis on certain reproductive theories and what can only be termed a papal sacral biologism, C.'s remarks on *Humanae vitae* and the theologico-ecclesial reality and process of "reception," to which C. adds "re-reception" (24, 38, 83–84, 100–105), are of more than considerable interest. Important for an adequate theology of ordained ministry and redolent of Rahner's contention that the ordained priest-pastor is primarily an ecclesial *Bezugsperson* is C.'s description of the priest as "le moyeu qui fait tenir ensemble les rayons d'une roue" (85). There are, of course, many other and diverse insights and contentions which are both interesting and challenging.

Somewhere, I recall, C. once wondered whether he might not have been too much a "théologien du chambre" and not involved enough in the affairs of the real world. What a shame it would have been, had he, like so many other clerics and theologians, run busily about intervening in "real," "worldly" matters in which neither ordination nor theology had provided him with any competence. His own theological principles enable, and compel, him to know that the *Vollzug* of one's own gift—limited of course, as are all gifts—is more than enough. And C. has certainly performed his own gift, historico-systematic theology, superbly. If the Church really lives out its vocation as the sacrament of *this* world's salvation in this century ending and the next beginning, C.'s contribution will have few rivals.

Grounds there are, of course, for Congar, but not for regrets. Only for graced and gracious exultation at having run his theological course so well. For the recognition of his superb contribution to the theology of the "Church which he loves," this little book stands as a token and may this little review stand as a sign.

*University of Illinois*

ROBERT KRESS

This book is a statement of a scholar who has spent most of his professional life studying Islam. The testimony it provides is the set of arguments that he, as a Christian, has constructed in defense of religious truths against scientism. Watt concludes that the same arguments are equally applicable in defense of Islamic religious truths. Thus he lays the foundation for a common defense of the truths of Christianity and Islam confronting scientism.

W.'s defense of these religions leads him into discussions of what he considers the crucial issues in Islam and Christianity. By the judicious selection of the topics, W. has avoided all possible confrontations between the proponents of the two religions in assuming the attitudes of defenders of their respective faiths, and has led them into discussions of their beliefs against scientism and vis-à-vis each other. He also discusses the problematic issues that confront the adherents of the two religions, and exposes issues that have been divisive and difficult to reconcile, e.g., the Scriptures, virgin birth of Christ, the Trinity, and the crucifixion of Christ, and brings them into apparent harmony. W.'s approach to all these topics is irenic. This is in sharp contrast to the negativity of the defenses of one religion against the other in the past. W. sketches these two opposing attitudes and puts them in their historical contexts, not so much to refresh our memories as to neutralize their venom for the current climate of dialogue between the two religions. He judges the sources of historical antipathy to be due to unwarranted assumptions and mutual misinterpretations of each other.

To appreciate the truths that are held in common by both religions, with their proper explanation and understanding, W. proposes to demonstrate how similar the two faiths are in what appears to be different or even contradictory. His achieved communality of understanding is due mainly to the point of view he adopts in presenting a unified front against scientism. The end result of his explanations is a homogenized synthesis of Christo-Islamic beliefs that are not easily distinguishable from each other in many crucial cases: e.g., the Christian and Muslim understanding of the crucifixion of Christ.

There are central issues to this discussion that one would like to have seen more fully discussed. Among these is the mutual acceptance by Muslims and Christians of their respective revelations. The foundation of dialogue between Christians and Muslims hinges on this premise, unless the participants are willing to limit their discussions to philosophical and logical positions based solely on the reasonableness of one doctrine or another. Old and New Testaments are silent about Muhammad and the Quran, but the Quran has much to say about the contents
of both Testaments which is not always in harmony with their accepted meanings; hence the major disputes. Another issue that must be raised follows from the nature of the Christian-Muslim dialogue. Since this dialogue is heavily scriptural in the large sense, it is difficult to imagine that the other natural party to this discussion could be absent. Ecumenical discussions in this instance must be triadic. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam form a cohesive body of "revelation" in which the latter forms expressly invoke a historical continuity with their predecessors. Discussions among the adherents of the three religions are intertwined.

Islamic-Christian dialogue has not been an easy undertaking. Watt attempts a fair approach to the study of the issues that divide the two religions, and readers will accept the topics Watt selects, even if they disagree with his interpretations. He is optimistic about the prospect of reconciliation.

Georgetown University

SOLOMON I. SARA, S.J.


In 1972 Tooley began a public dialogue with the publication of "Abortion and Infanticide" in Philosophy and Public Affairs. The current volume benefits enormously from that discussion. T. is able to clarify and amend earlier statements, to respond to his critics, and to present a comprehensive and painstaking analysis of the morality of killing human beings at early stages of development.

T.'s analysis places heavy demands on the reader. It assumes an understanding of philosophical concepts, metaphysical and epistemological as well as ethical, a willingness to follow complex, closely-reasoned arguments, and an openness to considering hypothetical cases which may appear bizarre. T.'s posture is that of a detached analytician who attempts to put aside all presuppositions in his search for basic moral principles, that is, principles which will hold in all possible worlds. These principles are crucial for T., because the derived principles which follow from them depend also on facts about our world, and factual knowledge is always open to correction or change.

The basic moral principles of interest to T. are those which prohibit the destruction of entities of a certain type. Since a basic principle must hold in all possible worlds, T. is led to invoke hypothetical situations, often farfetched, in order to test each proposed principle.

This strategy, which is central to T.'s project, is open to two objections. The first is methodological: at times T. disparages moral intuitions, and in general he appears ambivalent as to the significance of intuition for moral philosophy. Yet, when he presents an example in order to test a
basic moral principle, he appeals to the reactions which people have to the example, thus relying on moral intuitions.

A second objection: there simply may be no basic moral principles in T.'s sense of that term. This question is a deep one, but it is a question T. essentially ignores. Since any proposed principle must involve concepts, and since our concepts have been formed by the natural and cultural world in which we exist, can we even state a principle which is in no way dependent on the conditions of our world—e.g., its temporality?

In pursuing his central objective, T. discusses these questions: (1) Is it wrong to kill innocent human beings? (2) What sorts of beings have a right to continued existence, and hence are persons? (3) Is it wrong to destroy potential persons? (4) Are newborn infants persons, and is killing them morally wrong?

T. argues that membership in the human species is a biological classification which has no moral relevance. In testing a proposed basic principle which prohibits killing human beings, T. invokes our willingness to "kill" humans with irreversible brain damage by disconnecting respirators, etc. However, since T. is invoking moral intuitions, he is unfair in disregarding the descriptions of these acts which would be given by most people who support them. In case of partial brain damage, treatment which is disproportionately burdensome is discontinued; with total brain damage, the medical/legal consensus that the human organism is dead implies that it cannot be "killed."

The brevity of this review, which has pointed out several shortcomings in T.'s discussion, cannot do justice to the complexity of his arguments. The book deserves to be discussed at length; the dialogue is by no means finished.

College of St. Catherine, Minn.  

CAROL A. TAUER


Typical of the competency, thoroughness, and depth we have come to expect in Balthasar's work, this volume presents a solid, profound, beautiful theology of the two states of election (counsels and priesthood) and of marriage, all of them rooted in the states of Christ and his mother. Though its tone is by no means combative, its strong light dissipates the miasmal thinking behind much recent writing on priesthood, celibacy, marriage, and vocation. Beginning with the call to love and our original state, B. points out that in Adam and Eve obedience was linked with sovereign ruling, virginity with the highest fecundity, and poverty (no "mine and thine") with a superabundance of gifts with no need or want.
This original state was a perfect synthesis of the Christian state of life “whether in the world or in the way of the evangelical counsels, in which the state of the counsels expressed the inner attitude and disposition, the worldly state the outer counterpart and fulfillment” (121). In the beginning, therefore, a distinction between secular state and the state of election was neither necessary nor possible.

A state in life, for B., is a definite, specific life-form binding one irrevocably in his/her deep center and having Christian, not simply civil or professional, relevance. By the bond one participates with supernatural fecundity in the life-giving, self-sacrificing mystery of the cross. Hence singleness without self-giving is not a Christian state, even if by necessity one is prevented from entering a definitive state. B. shows how in the NT there was a unity between the two states of election, the way of the counsels and the office of priesthood; for the apostles were called away from the multitude and from the world (Jn 17:14–17) and to a close imitation of Christ in the counsels and in the priestly office. Even though the NT clearly presents the state of the counsels as qualitatively the higher state, “a Christian marriage lived in holiness causes the Church to shine forth for the whole world” (354). The lay state is not a formless, indistinguishable mass, because grace confers a well-defined task on each person within the ecclesial community (331). With a masterly control of Scripture and patristic literature on the one hand and with his usual insight and creativity on the other, B. develops both the differences among the three states and yet their interrelations, all of them rooted in Christ’s unique state of life eternally “with the Father.”

While B. does not read into Scripture what is not there, he does happily avoid the dry minimalism often seen in exaggerated critical exegesis, a minimalism that can distort a text as much as an exaggeration can. This comprehensive study is a reminder of the value of the analogy of faith, a value that lesser theologians too easily forget. It seems to this reviewer that The Christian State of Life should be required reading (and more than reading, for it demands careful study in its denser sections) for all vocation directors, formation personnel, seminary staff, and indeed for all who work with youth in parishes and schools. People lacking a theological grasp of state and vocation easily fail to recognize the presence or absence of a genuine call. This book makes clear why divine election can be understood neither on mere psychological or sociological grounds nor by assessing only the inclinations or disinclinations of young men and women.

**Bedford, Ohio**

**Thomas Dubay, S.M.**

Religion and art have always met each other coming and going. They have not always spoken explicitly of one another; and when they have done so, they have not always sounded like the coziest of bedfellows. Whether in enthusiastic embrace or frank condemnation, however, religion and art have interacted as have few other expressions of the human spirit. A.-C.'s book is a collection of essays that explore some of the ways in which religion and the visual arts have, on the whole, enjoyed mutual inspiration, nourishment, challenge, and clarification. It moves the reader into an exciting and little-explored region of the humanities.

Twenty-five essays, ranging in length from three and a half to 20 pages, are grouped in five sections, more or less by “discipline.” Part 1, “Artists: The Spiritual Dimension,” includes four short reflections by practitioners in various media. A classic excerpt of Kandinsky suggests some categories needed to launch ACS toward its stated objective, namely, an understanding of the “development and expression of that inner landscape” that is the human soul (viii). Many readers will want to go directly to the source of Kandinsky’s provocative musings about inner direction, ideals, mood, and prophetic power in art. Equally intriguing in the section is Karen Laub-Novak’s “The Art of Deception,” which could as well have been entitled “Art As Discernment of Spirits.”

Historians of art contribute five studies of “The Religious in Art,” from Leonardo and Caravaggio, through two fascinating themes in American art, to a sort of diachronic look at one biblical image’s metamorphoses from a fourth-century sarcophagus down to George Segal’s “Abraham and Isaac.” All are fine pieces, but the second and the last will be the best introductions for readers just beginning to pursue an interest in art history. In Part 3, Coomaraswamy and Eliade bookend five selections by historians of religion on “Art in Religious Traditions,” with specific attention to India, Japan, Judaism, and Islam, and with “modern art” taken as a separate entity. The articles on Japan (Richard Pilgrim) and Islam (Lois I. Al Faruqi) are the best introductions to the sort of interdisciplinary methodology ACS seeks to promote.

A set of theological and philosophical studies is in some ways the book’s most welcome contribution. Artists and art historians have rarely doubted that religion is, at the very least, unavoidable, if not central to their areas of interest; and historians of religion have more often than not taken it for granted that the arts are a source of data equal to any other in their discipline. Theologians, on the other hand, have too seldom acknowledged that the visual has been as significant a mode of theological
expression as the verbal. Theology has had its closest brush with the arts in the more philosophical discussion that suggests there is an “aesthetic dimension” in the verbal expressions themselves. Views of theology-as-art have outnumbered theologies of art or approaches to art as “visual theology.”

Part 4’s range is wide, from the very concrete (John Dillenberger on recent ecclesiastical patronage, and Paul Tillich’s illustration of five types of religious experience with correlative stylistic elements in art), to the more theoretical work of Langdon Gilkey on the roles of art, T. R. Martland on the jarring/transformative function of both art and religion (see his Religion As Art), and Nicholas Wolterstorff on “high art” and culture (see his Art in Action), to the still more theoretical excerpt from David Tracy’s The Analogical Imagination on religious and artistic “classics,” and Thomas O’Meara’s frustratingly disconnected “The Aesthetic Dimension in Theology.”

Four essays comprise Part 5, “Religion and Art: Interdisciplinary Vision.” All are good, with John Dixon’s “Painting As Theological Thought” a standout opening piece. Part 5 ought to be the clear focus of ACS, for the book is intended as a “preliminary statement on the interdisciplinary field of religion and art” (viii). But the line that separates the items in Part 5 from those of earlier sections is not clearly explained and is somewhat arbitrary. Many of the other essays are also genuinely interdisciplinary. The need for a clearly articulated methodology for “religion and art” emerges here. ACS’s arrangement along “disciplinary” lines is useful up to a point, but it prevents the book from truly making a “statement” about the field. It is rather an important clue as to what this new “field” might become, a hint and persuasive reminder that it is time for a statement.

ACS is an excellent source book as it stands. Its scope is broad and its selection of topics balanced. The book could also have been a first-rate teaching tool by itself if, in addition to its very good bibliographical section, it had been fitted with an index and perhaps a glossary of technical terms and artist-data. Finally, ACS needs two changes to move from hint to statement. First, the essays could be arranged along explicitly methodological lines rather than according to the disciplinary categories which, for this book’s purposes, are ambiguous and of limited utility. Second, an introductory or concluding essay outlining the precise methodological needs and resources (drawing on the already-established disciplines) of religion-and-art would be a boon and a major scholarly contribution in itself.

Don’t wait until a revised edition appears. ACS is worth buying now.

St. Louis University

JOHN RENARD, S.J.

Gunn has assembled nine disparate dimensions of American culture to examine two central and interrelated issues: (1) the influence or expression of the Bible in American culture, and (2) the distinctively American character of American arts and letters and their relationship to American religion. In his introduction G. establishes this dialectical relationship in the American situation between Scripture and culture; i.e., Scripture is to be read by the culture just as the culture is to be read by Scripture. Scripture has both passive and active modes in the American situation. Although all the essays hinge on this dialectical relationship, no formative or critical position has been assumed either by the editor or by the writers to "defend a party line"; rather, this volume is as rich and diverse as the study of American culture.

Given that the verbal arts have been central to American culture, this collection opens with essays on American letters which reinforce the fundamental American ambivalence between its European heritage and the search for "America." Herbert Schneidau's study of antinomianism and American poetry traces the tension between the individual's imagination and the culture's heritage from the Puritans to Robert Frost. Edwin Cady examines the influence of the Bible on the 19th-century American novel. The central American problem, "to make it new," has its manifestation in the 19th-century's separation between the Bible's sacramental vision and human melodrama. However, Robert Sherrill finds the separation erased in 20th-century American fiction. He identifies four modes—prophetic, apocalyptic, episodic, and parabolic—by which he suggests that American fiction is integrated with scriptural vision. William Shurr turns our attention to American drama first as the foundling art form of the 19th century, when its themes were abundantly biblical, and then as the synthesis of classical and biblical influences merging in the modern dramas of Eugene O'Neill and Edward Albee.

The second half of the collection shifts from the verbal to the nonverbal arts. The visual arts present an additional burden on the reader: lack of sufficient illustrative materials (a universal problem not unique to this collection). Clifford Clark's intriguing essay on American architecture prepares the reader for this shift as he suggests that American architecture can be analyzed in two modes: vernacular and prophetic. Clark reminds us of the power of "spaces" to shape our sense not only of horizon but of identity. Edwin Good's essay on American music takes us into an unexplored dimension of the arts. Curiously, he finds that although the Bible and religious music per se have been a major force in American music, there is no great individual achievement that has been inspired by or reflects a biblical sensibility. Rather, the split between
sacred and secular is here most apparent: there is liturgical music and there is secular music. In terms of the visual arts, the two essays by John Dixon and Daniel Patterson present opposing interpretations. For Dixon, American painters have expressed an ambivalence if not an indifference to the Bible. Even though he can cite and examine works with biblical themes, Dixon finds these to be without a biblical sensibility. The most profound religious dimension of American painting appears to have been the 19th-century quest for the sublime in luminist landscapes. Patterson, however, wishes to suggest that both the verbal and nonverbal American folk-art traditions are grounded upon an easily discernible biblical sensibility. In fact, for Patterson there is a specific American religiosity and symbolic language expressed by scholars of American art and culture.

In the concluding essay Sacvan Bercovitch offers a response to the central question: "What is the relation between the Bible and the notion of America as a specific mythic entity?" For Bercovitch, what is distinctive about America is a particular language which creates a mythic awareness and symbolic identity that can be traced through all the cultural expressions in American history. This rhetoric takes as its basis the fundamental religiosity of those first American colonies, whose emphasis on *sola scriptura* and the triumph of word over image predisposed "America" to language as the answer to the epistemological question.

*The Bible in American Arts and Letters* is a useful text for students of American religion and culture. Each essay offers a solid basis for discussion and further examination of the central issues in the development of "American" arts and letters. A fine resource book as well. The editor is to be commended for his efforts to present the richness and diversity of American culture in one volume.

*George Washington University*  
*Washington, D.C.*

**Diane Apostolos-Cappadona**

---


After one has read reviews of the present book, or heard it discussed by those who have read it, it is hard to approach it oneself without prejudice. Indeed, it becomes harder still to do so as one goes through the work; for the point that the author, an art historian of some note, seeks to establish is surprising and sometimes even consternating.

Briefly, Steinberg's thesis is that much Renaissance painting and sculpture, both Italian and Northern, consciously either displayed or emphasized the genitalia of Christ for the purpose of indicating his assumption of a humanity "complete in all its parts." Paintings of the
sacred and secular is here most apparent: there is liturgical music and there is secular music. In terms of the visual arts, the two essays by John Dixon and Daniel Patterson present opposing interpretations. For Dixon, American painters have expressed an ambivalence if not an indifference to the Bible. Even though he can cite and examine works with biblical themes, Dixon finds these to be without a biblical sensibility. The most profound religious dimension of American painting appears to have been the 19th-century quest for the sublime in luminist landscapes. Patterson, however, wishes to suggest that both the verbal and nonverbal American folk-art traditions are grounded upon an easily discernible biblical sensibility. In fact, for Patterson there is a specific American religiosity and symbolic language expressed by scholars of American art and culture.

In the concluding essay Sacvan Bercovitch offers a response to the central question: “What is the relation between the Bible and the notion of America as a specific mythic entity?” For Bercovitch, what is distinctive about America is a particular language which creates a mythic awareness and symbolic identity that can be traced through all the cultural expressions in American history. This rhetoric takes as its basis the fundamental religiosity of those first American colonies, whose emphasis on *sola scriptura* and the triumph of word over image predisposed “America” to language as the answer to the epistemological question.

*The Bible in American Arts and Letters* is a useful text for students of American religion and culture. Each essay offers a solid basis for discussion and further examination of the central issues in the development of “American” arts and letters. A fine resource book as well. The editor is to be commended for his efforts to present the richness and diversity of American culture in one volume.

*George Washington University*  
Washington, D.C.  

DIANE APOSTOLOS-CAPPADONA

---


After one has read reviews of the present book, or heard it discussed by those who have read it, it is hard to approach it oneself without prejudice. Indeed, it becomes harder still to do so as one goes through the work; for the point that the author, an art historian of some note, seeks to establish is surprising and sometimes even consternating.

Briefly, Steinberg’s thesis is that much Renaissance painting and sculpture, both Italian and Northern, consciously either displayed or emphasized the genitalia of Christ for the purpose of indicating his assumption of a humanity “complete in all its parts.” Paintings of the
period, e.g., in which the holy infant's nudity is total are familiar to all of us. No doubt unfamiliar, however, is the idea that many of these paintings have as their central theme the manifestation of Jesus' sexual organ. It is this member, S. suggests, which a gesture of Mary's hand often indicates in an ostentatio genitalium, and this member which the gaze of the Magi clearly seeks out as they bow reverently before the child. Another ostentatio occurs in depictions of the suffering, crucified, and dead Christ. Here the genitalia are pointed to by the way in which the loincloth is shown, whether as blowing expansively about Christ's loins upon the cross (even when no breeze is otherwise discernible) or as prominently knotted in front; by the blood that is made to flow from his wounded side to his crotch rather than down the outside of his thigh, as would be anatomically correct; and by the position of his hands, folded over his genitals or even apparently cupping them as he lies on the funeral slab. Most striking of all is the supposed evidence of infant masturbation and erection, sometimes in the infant Jesus and sometimes, it would seem, under the loincloth of the Man of Sorrows, as in a startling painting from the beginning of the 16th century by Maerten van Heemskerk. In the latter case the erection would serve, according to S., as anticipatory of the Resurrection. The post-Renaissance failure to have seen or understood all of this is to be expected for obvious reasons.

S. buttresses his arguments, among other ways, by drawing attention to contemporary theology, which laid great stress on the Incarnation and which saw Christ's circumcision as proleptic of his passion, and to the temper of the times, which was rather frank about the sexual. 246 illustrations, some of which take the viewer aback, are offered in corroboration of the thesis.

Four principles, I think, should be kept in mind in judging what S. says in this unusual book. The first is that Christ's sexuality may indeed be an object of discussion and even depiction, to the extent that this is done within the bounds of the seemly. It makes sense, too, in this context, that his sexuality, and specifically his genitals, could be perceived as the ultimate confirmation of his real humanity and could therefore be dwelled upon in some painting and sculpture. Thus it seems to me that an ostentatio genitalium cannot be ruled out a priori in some works of art.

The second principle is that we in our day ought not to underestimate the genius and subtlety of artists of other eras. It is not inconceivable to me that the artists of the Renaissance were capable of making a statement about the Incarnation that would have eluded us for four or five centuries. To say that these artists were only making use of their new-found prowess in portraying human anatomy, as one objection would have it, is perhaps to demean them.

A third principle is complementary to this: neither must we read back
our own preoccupations and concerns into their work. I am tempted to say that we ought not to read back the sexual preoccupations of the late 20th century into Renaissance art, except that every age has been sexually preoccupied to some degree.

Finally, although orthodox or conventional theology need not be determinative for an artist, nonetheless it would be something to be taken seriously into account, particularly in a society that was as theologically aware as Renaissance Europe. Neither Augustine (cf., e.g., De civ. Dei 14, 23) nor Thomas Aquinas (cf., e.g., ST 3, q. 14, a. 4; q. 15, a. 2) would have allowed Christ either masturbation or erection. Consequently, if masturbation and erection are indeed what some of these artists intend us to see, and if they are not just employing, e.g., realistic methods of depicting a sleeping baby with his hand at his crotch or artful ways of draping and bunching cloth, then the artists in question were venturing beyond what the two great preceptors of Renaissance theology would have considered acceptable. Given this, the viewer of the paintings and sculpture that S. uses to illustrate his thesis must still, even when he or she confronts what seems like irrefutable visual evidence, ask the question: Is it likely that so many artists would have broken the conventions of theology, to say nothing of seemliness (or reverence), and must we not rather look for another solution to the apparent problem posed by these works of art? Sexuality being what it is, do we not risk seeing sexual meaning everywhere once we have been told that it can be an acceptable theme in some religious art?

Much more deserves to be said about this highly interesting and original book, both for and against. Certain it is that anyone who reads it will thenceforth look at the depiction of Christ in art with eyes wider open. The danger, however, is that he or she will be looking for and finding something that the artist never put there in the first place.

Dominican House of Studies

BONIFACE RAMSEY, O.P.
Washington, D.C.


It is disconcerting for the theologian to become aware that historians in America frequently avoid theological ideas and thought-forms, religious personalities and movements as they analyze works of art. Yet, art from most periods in the West up to the 18th century came into existence in a world where religion and art were closely intertwined. So Harries, professor of philosophy at Yale, attracts our attention with the subtitle to his analysis of Bavarian rococo, “between faith and aestheticism.”
Opening the pages of this richly illustrated book, we see that we have before us not only an analysis of church art and architecture in southern Germany between the end of the 17th century and the middle of the 18th but a presentation paying attention to the religious world which conceived, built, and worshipped in these churches.

H.'s task is not an easy one: before the panoply of artistic forms in the churches executed by the Asams or the Zimmermanns, he must set off the rococo from both the baroque and the Enlightenment. H. spends time on the Gothic and Renaissance preludes to this artistic period. Interested in the cultural context of art, he would understand not only rococo forms but why they emerged, held sway, and disintegrated. The book leaves hardly a major church or abbey unmentioned as H. deals with fresco, architectural space, and iconography. This volume is, then, a work in cultural history, art history, and aesthetics, a guidebook *de haut niveau* to the Bavaria which existed centuries ago, existed in H.'s boyhood there, and still exists today.

The theme of Catholic baroque theology is actual grace. Beginning in justification and living on in sanctifying grace, forming the charity affirmed by the Counter Reformation over against the Protestant Reformers, grace is the ground of both the heroic missionary and the ecstatic visionary. In the baroque controversies over grace we have a background for this art. While theology is not at a high point in the first decades of the 18th century, later stages of Jansenism and quietism as well as fixed, competitive positions among the various religious orders—particularly the Jesuits and the Dominicans—reflect the spirit of one and a half centuries of controversy over created grace. H.'s treatments of reality and illusion in fresco, of the theatrical in perspective, are instructive for the student of this period in theology. If baroque theology has appeared at times as subtle or superficial, that is because the vibrancy of its ecclesiological and theological mentality came to us through Neo-Scholastic interpreters or 19th-century hagiography. H.'s volume is a visual guide, a stimulus to research into what is a major period of theological history.

The issue of theatricality is at the heart of much of H.'s book. Why is the rococo theatrical? Ultimately because it is a presentation of lives in action and of actual grace in both. Arguments between the Reformers and Trent did not touch extensively on Christ nor did either side have much salutary effect in questioning widespread Monophysite tendencies in Christianity's view of its Savior. Mary and the saints moved again to the fore to depict between the triune God and fallen humanity the drama of salvific grace. While it may be true that "fresco painting in Bavaria can only be understood if this insistence on the priority of the word is kept in mind" (55), the word and story, for Catholic minds, are not the
sole religious vehicle: the narrative is an expression of a power, incarnational grace. Clouds, drapes, angels, suns, stars, and bursts of light point to, bring forth, the supernatural.

Space is the theater for watching the graced life. One has only to look at the theological encyclopedias and texts after 1700 as they focus more and more on the life of grace, on their reduction to seminary texts and then to books of spiritual reading.

Particularly instructive for theologians is H.’s analysis of space and illusion in the portrayal of theologico-historical themes. “Irreality is a super-reality” (63). The dialectic where illusion supersedes narrative (which H. sees as increasing in the rococo) suggests that the incidents preferred by rococo artists decorating the interior of the church (and by their patrons) are narratives which present grace in individual lives. Rococo art does not arrange abstract symbols or static figures but human incidents. The interplay of St. Bernard and the Christmas scene by Cosmas Damian Asam at Alderbach illustrates that Bernard of Clairvaux, founder of the reformed Benedictines we call Cistercians, is a later human appropriation of Christmas. Bernard in his letters, sermons, and poems knows how the child Jesus lives in a new way in an interior life. For the rococo, Bernard is a successful incarnation of the Incarnation, an empirical form, through Asam a visual and instructive model for the monk and layperson of created grace in finite life.

The variety of fresco themes, the various perspectives leading more or less to a central image—these may have their source in the pastoral diversification of the baroque church. With the advent of Jesuit architecture the choir is removed, because the Jesuits have succeeded in establishing religious life without communal choral prayer. The multiplication of side altars offers a variety of opportunities for the devout and occasional or appointed visitors to attend in a small group the quiet and withdrawn private Mass. These side chapels, too, are places of the saints: often dedicated to recent saints evoked by their relics, they are places where the current spiritual lives of priest and laity, the Jesuit or the Benedictine, are nourished by the source of grace, the Eucharist.

H. notes the intertwining of divine grace and human life as he writes that “the Bavarian rococo church pictorialization is inseparable from sacramization” (119). Sacralization, however, is not quite the best term; for it can imply a modern religious extrinsicism which is generally foreign to incarnational Christianity, at least to Catholic theologies of grace. The theologian would express the theology and piety of the rococo as being “sacramental,” not in the sense of the liturgical sacraments but in the sense of a nonextrinsic grace (a theme at the heart of the Counter Reformation) and of a close interplay of grace and personality (at the heart of the Society of Jesus).
We must leave to art historians the judgment on whether the rococo, retaining the theme of the heavenly realm breaking into the Church, cultivated an aestheticism so that “divine transcendence becomes manifest only as a play within a play” (125). The theatrical need not compromise the theological, for incidents in lives illustrate grace at work in conversion, ecstasy, or apostolate. Usually, certain kinds of saints are chosen for pictorialization: noble founders (laypersons in religious action); founders of religious orders and mystics; Fathers of the Church (representing tradition); popes and bishops (representing Church authority).

It would be interesting to examine seminary theology, popular hagiography, and devotional prayer books in Bavaria at this time. Do rococo methods of prayer, models of actual graces, and levels of contemplation lead the baroque invitation to be a personally but also publicly committed Catholic Christian into a less real aestheticism?

H.’s volume suggests that the history of art and the history of theology bring to each other answers and questions. The forms of art in great epochs are also occasionally the thought-forms of theology.

University of Notre Dame

THOMAS O’MEARA, O.P.

SHORTER NOTICES


Religion as the human response to mystery is the central theme of B.’s essay. The human acknowledgment of mystery or of numinous power is demonstrated with evidence from primitive, archaic, and historic cultures. The human response to mystery is, thus, divided into these stages: primitive, archaic, and historic religions, each of which is sharply defined. These distinct forms of response are manifest in discrete manners of conceiving of the Ultimate, of envisioning salvation, of understanding the religious person, of forming religious guides to life, and of developing religious symbol systems.

The book locates these religious forms in four major religious theses: (1) the concept of the numinous, (2) the meaning of salvation, (3) guides to life, i.e., morality, symbol, ritual belief, and (4) modern religiousness. The development of the three forms of religious response provides the reader with a mechanism with which to reflect upon the human response to mystery in the present, as well as in the past. Most challenging is B.’s demonstration that modern persons often respond to mystery in the manner of archaic and even of primitive persons. Such a probing inquisition into supposedly modern forms of religion thrusts the reader into a defensive posture. This posture is a welcome stance in which to reflect upon contemporary religious attitudes, symbol systems, and devotions.

Attention should be given to the final part, “Modern Religiousness.” B.
provides a good summary of the secularized attitudes toward religion that result from scientific developments, agnosticism, and secular humanism. These are focused by B. into a context in which to reflect upon the forms of religion that are found in the 20th-century Western world.

The book generally is well written. However, the chapter on believing and knowing lacks unity, while that on modern religion fails to demonstrate that there is an experience of mystery to which modern persons can respond. Each thesis is abundantly documented with material from primitive, archaic, and historic religions. The college student will find in the book a well-defined context for religious reflection. The college teacher might well find the book a good text for an introduction to religious studies.

DANIEL LIDERBACH
Canisius College, Buffalo


The complicated title of this volume seeks to reveal its two-part character. It is a monograph devoted to Targum Jonathan, the Aramaic translation of the prophetic books of the Hebrew canon, not a translation of it. Like Tg. Onqelos for the Pentateuch, Tg. Jonathan is the official Aramaic version used in the synagogue for the Former Prophets (Joshua to 2 Kings) and the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets). The second part of the book (229–380) is a reprint of P. Churgin's classic study of the targum, first published in the Yale Oriental Series, Researches 14 (New Haven: Yale University, 1927). It is preceded by a brief introduction (xi–xxxiii) and a lengthy up-to-date study (1–227) of various aspects of the targum. The latter has been written jointly by L. Smolar and M. Aberbach, and it discusses (a) the halakah in Tg. Jonathan, (b) historical and geographical allusions in the targum, and (c) its theological concepts. Churgin's essay treated of the targum's historical background, textual variations, exegesis, general peculiarities, and interpolations or additions. Fifty-five pages contain useful indexes (biblical, rabbinical, and topical).

Whereas Smolar and Aberbach rightly reject P. Kahle's theories about the Babylonian origin of the targum, its dependence on the Mishnah and Babylonian Talmud, and the earlier dating of the Palestinian targums over against the official targums, I am not sure that Tg. Jonathan is "a late first century–early second century work which originated and was first developed in the land of Israel before being brought to Babylonia where it was re-dacted prior to the Arab invasion" (xxviii). I should prefer a date at least a hundred years later, because the targum's Aramaic does not belong in the period along with Qumran Aramaic, Palmyrene, or Nabatean, i.e., in the phase of the language that I have called Middle. It belongs rather to the Late Phase of the language, beginning roughly about A.D. 200. In any case, this is an important study of the targum of the Prophets, and it deserves close study.

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.
Catholic University of America


Based on Brown's 1980 Sprunt Lectures at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Va., this book addresses one question: "What were Christians in the Sub-Apostolic Period (the last one-third of the first century) being told that would enable their respective
churches to survive the passing of the authoritative apostolic generation?" (146). The answer of the Pastoral Epistles was "church structure"; that of Colossians and Ephesians was "Christ's body to be loved"; that of Luke-Acts was "the Spirit"; that of 1 Peter was "the people of God"; that of the fourth Gospel was "people personally attached to Jesus"; that of the Johannine epistles was "individuals guided by the Paraclete-Spirit"; that of Matthew was "authority that does not stifle Jesus."

The book is creative and illuminating, especially in the sections at the end of each chapter in which B. discusses, in a pastoral way, i.e., from an ecumenical perspective, the strengths and weaknesses of each ecclesiology. I have one criticism and that deals with B.'s hermeneutic. His pastoral hermeneutic, while genuinely ecumenical and thus preserving the style of the original lectures, seems to be too narrowly focused. The very formulation of his hypothesis about the subapostolic age would be made more adequately inclusive were he to address the question of the continuity of male and female discipleship after the death of the first disciples. As a matter of fact, Brown seems to be aware that his hermeneutic is too narrowly focused on apostolic succession when on page 97 he alludes to an ecclesiological question which is prior to the question he addresses in his book. That prior question is: "How did the following of Jesus which involved love for him survive after he died?"

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


In this lively book, W. sets out to portray the pagan criticism of Christianity in the second, third, and fourth centuries as seen from the pagans' own religious, intellectual, and social world (xiii). He deliberately tries to present his sources sympathetically. He selects five authors for his study: Pliny the Younger, Galen, Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian. Pliny is the occasion for three chapters: one on Pliny himself and his well-known letter to Trajan; one ("Christianity as a Burial Society") on the term hetaeria that Pliny used to describe Christianity; and a third on the term superstition. W. intends his book for the general reader and for students of Christian history and theology, although it would be hard to appreciate without some elementary knowledge of Roman history and culture.

W. succeeds nicely. He does not minutely examine every fragment, but rather selects the most significant ones and makes them the occasion for short essays on various institutions and concepts known in the Roman Empire: besides hetaeria and superstition, he treats pietas, providentia, Roman religion, philosophical schools, creatio ex nihilo, Christ as magician, Roman fire departments, the book of Daniel as a theology of history, and other topics. His extensive quotation from the by-laws of a second-century burial society (37–39) makes delightful reading: with great precision and high seriousness the members of the club make detailed regulations for the burial of their dead and the provision of "an amphora of good wine" for the survivors. Quite correctly, W. does not propose any single thesis or conclusion. His point is that a study of the remains of pagan criticism, scanty and disjointed as they are, can help one understand the development of Christian doctrine and practice; and he makes his point well.

JOSEPH T. LIENHARD, S.J.  
Marquette University

WHAT ARE THEY SAYING ABOUT THE GRACE OF CHRIST? By Brian O. McDermott, S.J. New York: Paulist,
A fresh and insightful approach to grace. Relying on the works of Karl Rahner, Sebastian Moore, Edward Schillebeeckx, and others, M. highlights modern approaches to grace by forging his own synthesis of the mystery of Christian life.

M. draws on the insights of Christology and ecclesiology and situates the theology of grace in the context of a theological anthropology that views grace as part of a process of development and growth. After reflecting on religion’s concern with culture and the all-pervasive impact of God’s self-communication on human life, M. focuses on grace as God’s gift of unconditional acceptance. The acceptance of self, God, and others draws one from isolation to genuine relationship, to an experience of forgiveness and conversion. The Christian is further called to discipleship with Christ in community with others. Finally, the life of grace manifests itself in witness and service to the world. The process, then, is from acceptance to conversion to discipleship in community to witness and service. Jesus, as the parable of God’s acceptance, as disciple of the Father, and as witness and servant in his life, death, and resurrection, is the model and source of this process.

In a final chapter, M. suggests areas of further development. In particular, future reflection will be focused on religious experience as the place where God’s grace works. Reflections on social and political grace will also be central, as well as the role of grace in human maturation. Finally, M. points to questions about the relation between grace and material creation, questions raised by modern science and technology.

M. dramatizes how far theologians have come from the classic treatises on grace. He also reminds us how much further we have to go in exploring the mystery of God’s graciousness in our lives.

GERALD M. FAGIN, S.J.
Loyola University, New Orleans


In the Introduction Marsh presents the general concept and context of Christian community. Full initiation into the Christian community includes baptism, confirmation, and first Eucharist. The local community gives to the initiated an understanding of life, the world, and reality and mediates that vision to the individual.

Part 1 analyzes the NT origins and beginnings of baptism and confirmation. M. distinguishes two types of NT texts: the first, found mainly in Acts, are narrative texts which describe the event of initiation; the second, found mostly in Paul, concern the meaning of Christian initiation and its doctrinal purpose. M. contends that the themes of water and the gift of the Spirit which dominate NT Christian initiation suggest a temporal sequence that the Spirit was received after baptism.

Part 2 traces the rite and ceremony, the doctrine and theology of baptism and confirmation in church history. While M. acknowledges that baptism and confirmation belong together and that the Spirit initially is given in baptism, he opts for delaying confirmation for those baptized as infants until midteen years. Admitting that this practice is debatable, M. suggests it would enable the ecclesial character of confirmation to stand out more clearly. This sacrament would then signify full entry into a Spirit-filled community in which the confirmed would be called to participate as mature, responsible members.

What would be helpful before theologians, clergy, catechists, or laity set-

Fortress Press is publishing a triad of books presenting succinct, scholarly expositions of three major American religious faiths: Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism. This book is the second of the triad. It is an attempt to identify the distinctive elements of Catholicism by a survey of the history of the Catholic Church. The volume is not a scholar's history nor a specialist's position on the nature of the Church. It is not a catechism of Catholic doctrine nor a systematic treatise on theological ideas. The authors intend the book for the literate inquirer who is surveying one of the major understandings of Christianity. H. and T. take from other writers information about dates and places, interpretations concerning particular episodes, and judgments on individuals, movements, and their purposes. The book has bibliographical notes and indices of persons and subjects.

Several virtues commend this book: the fairmindedness of the authors, the stimulating chapters on 20th-century Catholicism, the integration of culture, theology, and art, and insightful commentary on certain aspects of the Catholic tradition. Still, the book is not without its shortcomings. It compresses the long history of the first 19 centuries of the Church into approximately 127 pages, so that many subjects are treated superficially, a shortcoming inherent in the genre of surveys. Moreover, in a few cases the authors inadvertently create what some would regard as a false impression: e.g., they repeat without explanation the statement of the Syllabus of Errors (1864) that the Roman Pontiff need not reconcile himself to “progress, liberalism, and modern civilization” (114), when in fact the Pope opposed these things insofar as they infringed upon the rights of the Church.

EDWARD J. GRÄTSCH
Cincinnati


The most significant contribution to Marcion studies in the 20th century has been Harnack’s The Gospel of an Alien God (1921). Most studies on the subject in the ensuing 60 years have been based on that work. Now Hoffmann in his Oxford D.Phil. thesis wishes to start on a different basis. Among other things, he treats the patristic evidence with greater scepticism and, of course, he has the advantage of recent discoveries, especially Gnostic sources, to build on.

In his study H. explores the “Hellenistic matrix” of Marcion’s thought, the background in Pontus, religious syncretism. In H.’s view, Marcion’s life spanned the approximate period between 70 and 154; he was thus a contemporary of Polycarp of Smyrna. A convert from Judaism, he believed that Paul alone had the true message of Christ. This gospel was threatened
with disappearance by being reinterpreted to death or at least reduced to harmless domestication. Marcion's apologetic seized upon certain tendencies in the canonical Gospels to argue that the original disciples of Jesus were false apostles. Their chronic incomprehension of Jesus' teaching was unrelieved by any post-Resurrection enlightenment.

In H.'s reconstruction Marcion was neither a Gnostic nor anti-Jewish. The final part of H.'s work studies the relationship of Marcion's writings and ideas to the NT, especially the pastoral epistles and Ephesians as an orthodox reworking of Marcion's own Epistle to the Laodiceans. In view of H.'s critique of the patristic treatment of Marcion, one wonders how one can have any reliable knowledge of the subject. His work is an intelligent and careful attempt to bring about a reconsideration of an important but little-known and perhaps misunderstood figure of primitive Christianity. Given the nature of the evidence, the enterprise must be very speculative and inevitably debatable.

ROBERT B. ENO, S.S.
Catholic University of America


In his presentation of Chrysostom's sermons on the incomprehensibility of God, Harkins has once again produced a masterpiece of translation with a superabundance of doctrinal background, etiological information, and scientific paraphernalia that represents the acme of patristic scholarship. Chrysostom is first and foremost a preacher with a keen polemical propensity and an unfailing eye for audience actuality. While he approaches so profound a subject as the incomprehensibility of the divine nature in refutation of the Anomoean heretics, his argumentation is rooted in a pedestrian type of scriptural exegesis rather than an in-depth theological analysis. This approach permits him a wide extravagation wherein he reveals numerous behavioral, liturgical, and religious practices of the late-fourth-century Antiochene community from its sacramental practices to applauding in church and avoiding pickpockets.

H. begins with a clear, in-depth depiction of the development of the Arian controversy that underlies the Anomoean position. He outlines the manuscript tradition of the texts, giving condign attention to such revered patrologists as Montfaucon, Fronton du Duc, Jean Daniélou, and A.-M. Malin­grey.

The translation is an idiomatic, highly readable accomplishment. The footnotes that accompany the text contain the substance of a scholarship that is obviously profound and all-embracive, down to footnote 6n 'Ebionite'. With a taxative index, the volume is a tribute to the excellence of the series and an honor to the man who can surely say of his author what Chrysostom said of St. Paul: "I have loved him as a brother."

FRANCIS X. MURPHY, C.SS.R.
Washington, D.C.


This is one of those very useful books which meets a real need, in this case a readable, comprehensible, reliable general account of Origen's life and thought in English. This is a book made for classroom use, especially in seminaries and master's programs. T. offers a biographically-oriented account of Origen's intellectual and spiritual development. Each of the first nine chapters deals with a particular period in Origen's life and centers on the effects
of that period on his intellectual activity. The student easily follows the hand-in-hand development of the Christian individual and the great Church Father. Perhaps close-up views of the great figures of Christian history do show the occasional—or more than occasional—wart, but for those starting out on careers in religion, seeing intellectual greatness struggle with personal weakness can be a beneficial experience.

The first three chapters focus more on his environment than on Origen, i.e., on the city of Alexandria, the Church there, and Hellenistic intellectual life, especially the Platonic tradition and Gnosticism. These chapters are particularly helpful, and not just for the neophyte. Chapters 4 through 9 deal with his great intellectual achievements—the Hexapla, the Peri Archôn, the Commentary on John, and the Contra Celsum—but always in the context of Origen the self-perceived orthodox churchman. Since the days of Eusebius, scholars have sided either with Origen or Bishop Demetrius in their famous conflict; T., to his credit, emphasizes the difficulties on both sides: a brilliant scholar whose mind surged in every direction and a church official trying to keep order in a community threatened by persecution and Gnostic infiltration. The last chapter (10) surveys Origen’s influence.

T. has drawn from the works of Pierre Nautin, Marguerite Harl, and Hal Koch, as well as from his doctoral adviser Robert Grant, to produce a fine study of a deeply Christian intellectual in the formative years of Christian thought. I recommend this book for the library and the classroom.

JOSEPH F. T. KELLY
John Carroll University, Cleveland


Severian of Gabala is a shadowy figure from Syria who died early in the fifth century; his literary remains are few, and many of them, ironically, were preserved because they were mistakenly attributed to John Chrysostom, in whose downfall he played a role. The homily which appears for the first time in this volume is typical; listed in the only extant manuscript containing its text as a work of Chrysostom, it was quoted, as stemming from Severian, by the Monophysite bishop Severus of Antioch and by the Lateran Synod of 649, which was directed against the Monophysitical heresy of Monothelitism.

In presenting his edition and translation of the Greek text, A. has done for Severian what he did for Hesychius of Jerusalem in three excellent volumes published between 1978 and 1983. He first places Severian in his historical setting and then discusses his writings, adding a new chapter to the work of G. Dürks, J. Zellinger, B. Marx, D. Alten­dorf, and other more recent scholars. Using the same rigorous methodology employed in his work on Hesychius, A. demonstrates that the attribution of this homily to Severian is correct; he analyzes the external evidence of its citation by Severus and the Lateran Synod, and buttresses his argument with internal criteria based on vocabulary, scriptural exegesis, arguments from another, certainly authentic hom­ily, and a variety of minor factors. Fi­nally, A. studies the Christological thought of the homily and of those against whom it was directed, as well as that of its later users (Severus and the Lateran Synod).

Severian’s text is, of course, impor­tant in its own right as another source for early Christian thought; but A.’s introduction, which is a blend of textual criticism, philology, and history of
thought, should be studied, not only for its contents, but especially for its methodology. The book is, therefore, a rich source of historical and textual information, and of updated bibliographical material, on some of the major figures and trends of Christian theology from 400 to 650. It is a most useful reference tool, with the added attraction of being interesting and pleasant to read.

GERARD H. ETTLINGER, S.J.
Fordham University


This is the publisher’s third volume of articles by this noted author. Previous collections dealt with the general legal structures and medieval aspects of ecclesiology. This book’s principal aim is to expose Thomas Aquinas’ views on theology and the Church. It is fascinating to see how admirably it fulfills its purpose from articles and chapters of books written over such a time span (1957–80) and from such diverse publications.

C. notes that contemporary authors are less favorable to a theology dependent on philosophical categories and are oriented to one which is more biblically inspired and more open to history and criticism. Even so, he claims, it is rare to find among them any to match the stature of Thomas in speaking formally and logically on the totality of supernatural mysteries and Christian existence. In his openness to new translations and new texts and in his willingness to dialogue with peoples of different religions, Thomas can truly be said to have an ecumenical disposition in all that he wrote.

In these 13 studies C. seeks to clarify Thomas’ notion of theology and to synthesize aspects of his ecclesiology. In both Aquinas was helped by his order, which was dedicated to companionship in scholarly research, by a sense of tradition from the Fathers of the Church, by his native systematic organization of Christian mysteries, and by the terminology and structure of society in his time. Thomas stressed the Church’s visibility and external organization, the horizontal, historical value of its apostolicity, and the vertical identity of its faith principles from revelation. He defended the pope’s infallibility not only as jurisdictional but also as doctrinal and sacramental. He urged judgment to be used in interpreting the intention of noted teachers, and even though there are possibilities for a plurality of ecclesiologies in his thought, he generally saw everything from the divine point of view.

Aquinas’ conclusions are looked at from a historical perspective, but C. honestly points out that there are weaknesses in what would have been a Thomistic ecclesiology as such. For reasons given, there are lacking theological considerations on the episcopacy, collegiality, mission, and an understanding of the Church as a community of local churches. But there are strengths to Thomas’ views. The Church is of divine institution. It is in faith, charity, law, grace, and sacraments the real instrumental cause Christ inaugurated to draw people to God.

The book will be beneficial for researchers. Each entry retains its original pagination. Its message, that contemporary theologians respect Thomas for his breadth of learning, clarity of vision, and strictness of argumentation, is hardly debatable.

RICHARD P. DESHARNAIS, C.S.C.
Boston, Mass.


Thirteen Italian historians portray in fascinating detail the perception of
Luther in Italy from 1520 to recent times. At Trent Luther was known only through citations given by his opponents. A long history of distortion rendered post-Tridentine Italy and Lutheran Germany incapable of mutual understanding. Luther was portrayed by rhetorically able polemicists as a Teutonic monster out to subvert good order and open the floodgates to doctrinal anarchy. For over a century and a half down to 1960, the church history manuals repeated stereotypes in pages betraying the work of tired minds. A critical moment had come under Pius IX in 1850, when the Roman Curia sought to have the bishops denounce Luther as the initiator of a European degeneration that had passed from his attacks on church authority through rationalist questioning of the Incarnation to atheist socialism. Luther thus stood at the head of a genealogy of modern errors and played a set role in a forceful case for uncompromising clerical-Catholic rejection of modernity. A moment’s reflection suggests that this is an important contribution to the oft-told tale of Catholic views of Luther. The curial scheme of modern history, one recalls, was also exported outside Italy.

JARED WICKS, S.J.
Gregorian University, Rome


The heart of this short book is a 90-page chapter, “Melanchthon as Patristic Scholar.” Its approach is very straightforward, even mechanical. Meijering takes up Melanchthon’s use of the major Fathers alphabetically and examines citations on the doctrines of Christ, grace, the Trinity, and (less often) creation. First he prints Melanchthon’s Latin, then the patristic original in either Latin or Greek. Translations are not provided. An addendum applies the same technique to quotations dealing with the popes and with tradition and Scripture, and includes a rapid survey of Melanchthon’s more hostile attitude toward the major scholastics. Melanchthon’s attitude and use is regularly compared to that of Luther and Erasmus. He was generally more favorable to the Fathers than was Luther, less favorable than Erasmus. Patristic teaching was not for him a consensus and represented a decline from the pure doctrine of Scripture. The Fathers had little influence on his theology; they simply supplied a quarry of quotations that he used to refute Catholic claims that the Protestants were innovators and to rebut anti-Trinitarians such as Servetus and Stancaro. Meijering repeatedly notes Melanchthon’s often careless and sometimes tendentious use of patristic citations. A second major chapter goes over the same material doctrine by doctrine and shows how Melanchthon gradually grew more open to a philosophical theology that his early writings dismissed as idle speculation.

This is a very careful but rather narrow work by an experienced patrologist. It is not as synthetic or as far-ranging as Peter Fraenkel’s 1961 book on the same subject. Meijering’s work would have been more valuable had he also taken up the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. Curiously, he mentions Calvin only twice, even though he has written a book on Calvin largely parallel to this one. His use of proper names conforms to French or Latin usage as often as to English: e.g., Augustin, Servet, Petrus Lombardus, Theodoretus.

JOHN PATRICK DONNELLY, S.J.
Marquette University

READINGS IN CALVIN’S THEOLOGY. Edited by Donald K. McKim. Grand

A collection of 18 essays by 15 authors that adds up to a handy manual explaining the many facets of Calvin’s theology. All the essays except the two by the editor have appeared elsewhere, and since the majority of them are the works of renowned Calvin scholars, it is good to have such sound scholarship represented in a single volume. Wilhelm Niesel’s The Theology of Calvin, which first appeared in 1956, and François Wendel’s Calvin: The Origin and Development of His Religious Thought, published in 1963, have been, up to now, the standard books that students used to gain familiarity with Calvin’s teaching on any given point. M.’s volume can now take its place next to those earlier giants.

The authors represented in M.’s volume include, among the older generation, Battles, Gerrish, McNeill, Niesel, Osterhaven, Wallace, and Wendel; and among the younger generation, Graham, Hesselink, Holwerda, Partee, and Walker. The topics of these essays range from Calvin as doctor ecclesiae to his interpretation of Scripture, his understanding of providence, justification, and predestination, to his teaching on Christology, sacraments, the role of civil government, and finally eschatology. If the teacher using M.’s volume as a supplementary text in a course on the Institutes or in Reformation theology finds that his or her special topic is not included, e.g., an extended treatment of Calvin’s view of the Lord’s Supper or Trinitarian theology, the teacher is then free to develop that topic in class or refer the student to another volume where it is adequately handled.

By compiling this volume, M. has done a favor for many a teacher who has longed for such a book as well as for students. It is handsomely designed and printed, and though the page is well filled, it still has an “airy” quality about it and is especially easy on the eyes. The book has no index.

JOSEPH N. TYLENDA, S.J.
Georgetown University


Lakeland covers much ground in this small book. His exposition of Hegel’s philosophy not only shows the interrelation between his political philosophy and his philosophy of religion, but also locates them within H.’s basic system and major concepts. At the same time he brings H.’s key ideas about the state, society, and religion into dialogue with current political and liberation theology (Metz, Sölle, Moltmann, Gutiérrez), French Marxism (Althusser), and contemporary sociology of religion (Luckmann and Martin). Naturally, as a result of such a broad scope, major points of interpretation or of argument are more suggested than fully developed.

Since Hegel’s speculative philosophy expresses in concepts what religion expresses in image and representation, then, as L. argues, the covenant demands of justice, freedom, and liberation must have their counterpart in the Hegelian system. By analyzing the theological roots of Hegel’s notion of the state (within an incarnational Christology), he explicates H.’s theological vision as both a Christian anthropology and a political theology. The state represents for H. the objective institutional structures of the truth available subjectively present in the religious impulse.

L. carefully expounds and defends Hegel’s position. His interpretation takes into account much of recent secondary literature on Hegel—no small task. Here L. has done an invaluable
service. His book constitutes another indictment of the caricature of H. so widespread in popular literature as a result of Popper’s classic criticism. Moreover, he underscores the need for an ontological vision as the foundation of any program for social reform and revolution.

Unfortunately, his treatment of Hegel in relation to liberation theology does not quite succeed. Strangely, he has failed to take into account the much-discussed debate between Joachim Ritter and Jürgen Habermas on the role of the French Revolution within H.’s thought and its implications for his political philosophy. Moreover, granted that H. does not glorify any particular state as the ideal, nevertheless his political philosophy does not sufficiently underscore the lack of substantial and objective truth in presently existing states. Such objections would have required L. to be much more reserved and nuanced in his evaluation of H.’s political and religious philosophy as well as in his own Hegelian assessment of the presence of moral insight within secularized society.

Francis Schüssler Fiorenza
Catholic University of America


Crews has written a sympathetic and highly readable account of the most neglected member of the English Modernists, Maude Petre. P.’s major claim to recognition is that she was the first historian of the movement and one of its major apologists. After the formal condemnation of Modernism and its ideal of unifying theology and modern sciences, she described herself as a “solitary marooned passenger . . . [of] the lost cause of Modernism in the Catholic Church.” C. rightly insists that the term “Modernism” has become a word to be used for vituperation, and if he has misgivings about his subject or her general credibility, they are well concealed beneath his fine prose.

Petre was a prolific writer and wrote on a vast number of subjects for the popular press. One of the attractive features of C.’s book is the extensive listing of P.’s many articles and books at the end, and the implicit suggestion that more work is to be done. C.’s discussion of her life and writing traces the fierce individualism of the subject to her Cisalpine background and its enduring opposition to the authoritarian Church as envisioned by Manning. Perhaps so, but P. does seem to have been rather dependent on another “independent” thinker, George Tyrrell; and even in C.’s generous account of Petre's work we do get glimpses of one who was on occasion at least an extraordinarily difficult woman. A sense of persecution seems to have haunted Petre, and for one who was not much of a historian or scientist to insist that Catholic Christianity reconcile itself to both disciplines is unusual. But if anyone could rehabilitate a somewhat inconsistent writer, it is Crews. Strongly recommended.

John Griffin
University of Southern Colorado


D.’s younger daughter has written a pleasant, informative, balanced memoir of her father. It is not pietistic. She does not gloss over his human failings. But neither is it, like some recent filial biographies, hostile. It reflects a happy family life. Of old English stock, D. came into the Roman Church from
high Anglicanism, led by his historical study. He was a person of encyclopedic knowledge, a country gentleman and sometime professor, author of solid works in the history of European culture. His vision was large, his bias pronounced: he was profoundly Christian in his outlook. There was a depth to him that escaped some of his Catholic contemporaries. History was important to him: “A society that has no history and historical consciousness is a barbarous society. It is as simple as that.”

Boston’s Cardinal Richard Cushing summed him up well in a farewell testimonial when D. relinquished the Stillman Chair at Harvard in 1962: “Christopher Dawson is one of those rare human spirits who stands back from the world in which he lives and takes the true measure of time and man.” Some have lumped him wrongly with writers like Chesterton and Belloc. He was more than they and was recognized as such outside the Roman communion.

There were sadnesses in D.’s life. He was vice-president of the pre-ecumenical ecumenical movement in Britain known as the Sword of the Spirit, and he saw it wrecked by Catholic bigotry. Denied adequate academic recognition in his homeland, he finally found it with his appointment at age 69 as the first Chauncey Stillman Professor of Roman Catholic Studies in the Harvard Divinity School. He flourished there and brightened the more general American scene with his lectures on other campuses, only to have the adventure cut short by a year because of the poor health which had been his lifelong plague. But his work in the history of Christian culture has stood the test of time. His daughter has paid him a graceful tribute. It leads one back to his work, and there is immense profit there.

JAMES HENNESEY
Boston College


There is no mystery in the title of this authorized biography; it is one of Higgins’ favorite phrases. “Without fear or favor,” he has said often over the years, the Church must become “the champion of the poor in our society.” Speaking in 1972 of the right of the ordained priest to give witness to justice, to denounce violations of justice, and to help promote the full development of persons and nations, H. added that the priest has a duty “to do all that this involves without fear or favor.”

So it is with Higgins. His favorite phrase mirrors himself. This is a friendly, admiring biography, and deservedly so. C.’s only criticism may well be identical with H.’s only regret, namely, that the book H. could write on the application of Catholic social principles to human work and the human organization of the workplace has not yet been written.

C.’s book draws heavily from H.’s own writings, particularly from the “Yardstick” column which still appears in the Catholic press. The theses, assertions, propositions, and questions are all there awaiting elaboration into a social theology.

Anyone who knows H. will find here the man they know: advocate, mediator, reader, thinker, raconteur, labor loyalist, man of the Church. Anyone who does not know him should surely read this book for an introduction to a great priest and for a short course in church and society—1930 to 1980.

WILLIAM J. BYRON, S.J.
Catholic University of America

UNSEARCHABLE RICHES: THE SYMBOLIC NATURE OF LITURGY. By David
SHORTER NOTICES


A survey of the contemporary liturgical scene in terms of a crisis of vision and a crisis of hope. P. underscores the need not only for a retrieval of the Church's past symbolic heritage but also for a transformative ritual that opens out to the future. He pleads for an understanding of symbol that is tied to use rather than an ontological distinction between sign and symbol. Moreover, in Christianity symbols are not left on their own, so to speak, but are determined by a historical revelation, which relies heavily on verbal forms. As a consequence, liturgy is an act of God which transforms human experience by means of the sacramental canon (or sacramental life of the Church as a whole) and not via discrete moments of grace.

In a critical concluding chapter, P. treats an ontology of symbol as transformative in four modes: from objects to meaning, from utilitarianism to values, from external to inner word, and from image to imaginative. These movements yield three important criteria for validating sacramental practice, criteria which relate to fullness of language, adequacy to experience, and orthopraxis. In his treatment of the current symbolic crisis, P. relies heavily on the critical philosophy of interpretation of Paul Ricoeur as well as on contemporary political theologies with their concern for the memory of the victims of history.

The result of P.'s study is a convincing critique of traditional sacramental theology, which tended to abstract sacraments from their symbolic (ritual or liturgical) context and to offer a one-sidedly hierarchical approach to understanding how sacraments are effective. This is one of the freshest and most provocative studies in the area of liturgical and sacramental theology to appear in a good while.

JOHN F. BALDOVIN, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology
Berkeley


First published in Great Britain (1982) for the Alcuin Club, this American edition adds nothing to the original but a page of short additions and corrections. S. offers a liturgical study of marriage, beginning with the Jewish model and ending with the 20th-century revision and convergence of marriage rituals in the major Christian churches of the West. With interest the reader follows the historical progress (not always consistent) of the various elements of the rite of marriage (consent, euchology, symbolism, setting, and celebrants) as S. presents an overview of their development. The approach is decidedly ecumenical, with a consideration of the rites found in such historically and liturgically diverse times as, e.g., in the Byzantine practice of the eighth century, the 16th-century Traubüchlein of Martin Luther, and the 1969 revisions of Roman liturgy.

Stevenson has written Nuptial Blessing from the point of view of the blessing-prayer, which he sees as the "liturgical expression of what marriage can be when brought before God and offered to him" (vi). It is his intention to move away from that theology of marriage, at times expressed ritually, which concentrates on the matrimonial promises to the exclusion of other more significant elements of the rite. For the Christian, he asserts, "the story starts at Cana, with Jesus coming to bless an unknown couple" (214).

Nuptial Blessing meets a real need among students of Christian liturgy, as it provides a concise account of the
Church's involvement in the institution of marriage. At a time when people are asking if the Church should be engaged in the "business" of marriage, S. helps in the formulation of a responsible response.

THOMAS A. KROSNIKI, S.V.D.
Divine Word Theologate
Chicago


A trip to Israel seemingly triggered J.'s desire to get to the "very origins of that mystical prayer increasingly significant for today's person." Drawing upon Scripture, sacraments, and the community, the Christian mystic for J. is simply someone who lives and is transformed by the Christ-mystery. A sense of God's presence and unrestricted love produces a loving knowledge that generates various altered states of consciousness as it penetrates the psyche. For J., today's "new" mystical movement emphasizes allowing oneself to be loved, consenting to the deepest forces in authentic human living (Mary's fiat), total dedication to and education of the poor, radical nonviolence, suffering for justice, and ecumenical involvement.

By treating the mystical "void" as detachment, nonclinging, and the destruction of idols and ideologies, J. brings out clearly the apophatic and kataphatic dimensions of all Christian mysticism. Also, he emphasizes what many scholars of mysticism overlook: total commitment to God involves a total commitment to humanity. Instructive is J.'s linking of conversion, suffering, and mysticism with their healing impact upon sectarian violence. Especially worth mentioning are the chapters on the Eucharist and J.'s exposition of the mystical dark nights as redemptive suffering for all humanity.

It is not clear enough in J. whether the altered states of consciousness produced by Christian love and those produced by techniques are distinct. If J. rejects with justification the traditional distinction between "acquired" and "infused" contemplation, should he not suggest other terms that preserve the qualitative shift in prayer attested to by most Christian mystics? Is mysticism one and the same the world over, as J. suggests, or can a better case be made for irreducibly plural forms of mysticisms even within one tradition? Is total nonviolence the only Christian option? Finally, do the chatty phrases "Do I hear you say" etc. serve J.'s normally excellent prose?

HARVEY D. EGAN, S.J.
Boston College


This volume, the most recent in the series offered by the Canadian Religious Conference, presents a wealth of contemporary reflections on religious life. It consists of two essays each on chastity, poverty, obedience, community living, prayer/spirituality, and apostolic commitment. The authors were asked to focus on "the grace and sin' history of religious life, as lived in Canada today, in such a way as to open up a vision of the future" (8). Each essay ends with a few interesting questions for further reflection. The volume concludes with a report on the workshops of the Fourteenth General Assembly on formation and a reflection by the Dominican Master General, Vincent de Couesnongle, on "The Institute and the Aspirant."

The contributors bring a great deal of data and insight to their task. Several give the results of surveys of Canadian religious with appropriate analysis and considerations for the future. They show a great concern for human experience and for the present-day situation of the Church and religious life.
Among the essays, the works on poverty by Laurent Boisvert, O.F.M., and Angus J. MacDougall, S.J., struck this reviewer as particularly worth while. Similarly, de Couesnongle shows a great deal of experience and wisdom in his reflections on formation. In addition, the essay by Joseph T. Culliton, C.S.B., on obedience, an analysis of some general sociological data, raises the disturbing question as to whether religious today have an adequate theological understanding of the vow of obedience.

On the whole, this book is a helpful collection of essays on religious life. It brings together much current information and contains many good insights. While based on the Canadian experience, it will be quite useful to American religious as they confront identical challenges.

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


Rural America is in decline, suggests Hart in this his second book, a situation which reopens the issues of land ownership and use. H.’s position at the College of Great Falls, Montana, after studies in ethics at New York’s Union Theological Seminary, has given him a window on the problems of “heartland family farmers and plains Indians,” which form the primary focal point of his inquiry.

H. begins with the usual sketch of our destruction of the earth. Then the bulk of the book pulls together the teachings of four traditions concerning the relationship of humanity to the land. H.’s thesis is that the American Indian, biblical, populist, and Catholic traditions converge: the land is a community interest. This conclusion demands land reform in America. H.’s “theology of the land,” promised in the book’s subtitle, is outlined in the closing chapter. The four traditions combine to suggest that the land is a sacred and social trust to be shared equitably through the ages (164). Humanity’s fundamental relationship to the earth is then developed through the terms “the Spirit of the earth” and “the spirit of the earth.” The former is God, immanent throughout all of creation. The latter is creation’s potential “to evolve toward God,” which “draws the earth toward the Spirit.” This Deity-creation union forms the ultimate purpose of H.’s program and suggests that all persons “should have a land base and a sense of responsibility for it” (164).

H. is to be commended for his reminder that the ecology crisis requires a response which is ultimately spiritual. However, much of the territory covered here has been traversed before. Hart’s Spirit/spirit theology appears forced and is left undeveloped. His final proposal seems simply a return to the family-farm system of an earlier era. One wonders if this is realistic.

STANLEY GRENZ
North American Baptist Seminary
Sioux Falls, S.D.


In today’s world, where cynicism and fundamentalist fanaticism often seem on the verge of displacing that moderate form of Christian faith which seeks understanding, it is unfortunate that many issues of potentially great significance to Christians everywhere are frequently dismissed out of hand by obdurate skeptics or are uncritically accepted by naive believers. Parapsychology is a perfect example.

With few exceptions (e.g., Cobb, Pannenberg), most contemporary theologians have preferred to ignore such “tainted” topics. In this excellent book,
Fordham professor and Catholic fundamental theologian John Heaney ably demonstrates that such avoidance of parapsychology is a mistake, for Psi research contributes scientifically respectable data which can be used as a bridge connecting the secular and the sacred.

H. covers a wide range of topics, including telepathy, clairvoyance, pre- and retrocognition, psychokinesis, poltergeists, possession, healing and nature miracles, out-of-the-body and near-death experiences, apparitions, mediums, and reincarnation. He carefully defines each and presents case histories. He also evaluates the underlying parapsychological theories. Finally, informed by Jung, Teilhard, and Rahner, he analyzes the relevance of these events to Christian theology and faith. For example, he concludes that while divine intervention is possible, most paranormal events involve only human and natural powers. Also, while maintaining his belief in Jesus' divinity, he concludes that Jesus' miracles were the work of his human and natural abilities.

Addressed to a “popular” audience, this book should serve well as a survey text. While inadequate alone to support any parapsychological claim, it does establish H.'s thesis: “The dialogue between theology and parapsychology can only enrich both” (221).

ROBERT P. TUCKER
Yankton College, S.D.
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Presenting This Issue

Volume 46 opens on a distinctive tone. There is, indeed, the usual complement of articles (liberation theology, civil disobedience, collegiality), a shorter note (process theologies), and 50 reviews and notices of recent books. What is distinctive is that the annual Moral Notes are now, for the first time in two decades, a collaborative enterprise: Richard McCormick is joined by three colleagues, to lighten the load he has carried with such distinction and to diversify our coverage of moral issues.

Prophetic-Critical and Practical-Strategic Tasks of Theology: Habermas and Liberation Theology takes for starting point the problematic relationship of theory and praxis in liberation theology as reflected in recent criticism from the Vatican. It then draws on insights of Jürgen Habermas regarding knowledge and human interest, and his account of the dialectic of critical theory and emancipative praxis, to illuminate the twofold task of any liberation theology that seeks to provide a critical reflection on Christian faith in a revolutionary context.

JOSEPH KROGER, Ph.D. in religious studies from McMaster University, Hamilton, Ont., is associate professor of religious studies at St. Michael’s College, Winooski, Vt. He specializes in the significance of the cognitional theories of, e.g., Polanyi, Lonergan, and Habermas for foundational issues in theology. Work in progress includes articles on the contribution of critical social theory (from the Frankfurt School to Habermas) to the development of political theology in a postmodern world.

Civil Disobedience: A Moral Critique addresses a critical issue in contemporary society: the legitimate demands which the virtue of patriotism can make on a citizen versus the right of the citizen to disobey the injunctions of human law under certain circumstances. Sulpician GERALD D. COLEMAN, Ph.D. from the Institute of Christian Thought, University of St. Michael’s College, Toronto, and professor of moral and pastoral theology at St. Patrick’s Seminary, Menlo Park, Calif., analyzes the essential components that should characterize civil disobedience, illustrating the principles from today’s neuralgic example of tax resistance.

Collegiality: An Essay toward Better Understanding argues that collegiality as a unique ecclesial reality was reaffirmed in the Second Vatican Council, and that, with the basic doctrine in place, the lived experience of the Church as well as further theological reflection since the Council have given the term a more precise meaning. CHARLES M. MURPHY, S.T.D. from Rome’s Gregorian University and former rector of the North American College in Rome, is lecturer in fundamental theology at St. John’s Seminary, Brighton, Mass., and pastor of St.
Mary's Parish, Westbrook, Maine. Readers of TS will remember his June 1983 article on “Action for Justice As Constitutive of the Preaching of the Gospel.” He is currently working on the meaning of revelation understood from a literary viewpoint, especially through Wallace Stevens.

Notes on Moral Theology: 1984 divides its material among four authors. RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J., S.T.D. from the Gregorian and professor of Christian ethics at Georgetown University’s Kennedy Institute of Ethics, discusses recent articles on moral norms, especially the pros and cons of proportionalism. LISA SOWLE CAHILL, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago Divinity School and associate professor of theology at Boston College, addresses the relation of the “seamless garment” metaphor to protection of life in its earliest stages, with the focus on abortion and reproductive technologies that involve manipulation of the early embryo. JOHN LANGAN, S.J., with a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Michigan, lecturer in philosophy at Georgetown University and senior fellow at the Woodstock Theological Center, Washington, D.C., concentrates on the reactions to the final version of the U.S. bishops’ pastoral on war and peace. DAVID HOLLENBACH, S.J., Ph.D. from Yale and associate professor of moral theology at the Weston School of Theology, discusses the background to the recent debate on the scope and positions of the first draft of the U.S. bishops’ pastoral on the economy. A theme relevant to all four treatments is the “seamless garment” approach to life issues that has been brought to prominence especially by Cardinal Joseph Bernardin of Chicago.

The Two Process Theologies: A Reappraisal, a response to an earlier article (TS 45 [1984] 307–19), argues that Whitehead’s metaphysics, rather than his analysis of human experience as such, represents his most significant philosophical achievement; for in the cosmological scheme of Process and Reality is to be found a strikingly new answer to the question of the meaning of being. JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, S.J., with a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Freiburg, is professor of theology at Xavier University, Cincinnati. Particularly competent in process theology and in German idealism, he has just published The Triune Symbol: Persons, Process and Community (University Press of America).

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.
Editor
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