BOOK REVIEWS


The undiminished flow of Jeremiah studies in the past decade reflects the importance of the prophet and his times; it also alerts us to the considerable number of serious and unresolved problems inherent in the book. For a starter, when did Jeremiah receive his prophetic call? What was his attitude towards the reform launched by Josiah in 622 B.C.? Is it possible to construct an authentic historical and theological portrait of the prophet from the material in the book, or should we give up the quest for the historical Jeremiah and admit that our sources are largely the product of a long redactional process which serves up a Jeremiah reconstructed by Deuteronomic theologians?

Not one of these questions is overlooked in the excellent collection of studies assembled by our two editors. But a choice had to be made and they selected articles which in their judgment have given direction to and set out the main issues for scholarly research in Jeremiah. For the sake of cohesion, six major areas were chosen: The Date of Jeremiah's Call; Jeremiah, Deuteronomy, and the Reform of Josiah; The Foe from the North; The Composition of Jeremiah; The Quest for the Historical Jeremiah: Call and Confessions; New Directions in Jeremiah Research.

The date of Jeremiah's call is important, since other issues hinge on this question. Twenty years ago C. F. Whitley argued against the commonly accepted date of the prophetic call, 627 B.C., proposing a date as late as 605 B.C. Shortly thereafter J. Philip Hyatt argued for 609 B.C. as the beginning of Jeremiah's career. Both essays are included in this volume. Modern support for the view of Hyatt comes from W. Holladay, the leading American scholar on Jeremiah, who has recently proposed that 627 B.C. is the date of Jeremiah's birth, not the beginning of his career. If this is the case, we have an explanation for the absence of any clear stand for or against Josiah's reform on the part of Jeremiah.

On the widespread acceptance of Deuteronomic influence in the prose material of Jer, we must now consider Helga Weippert's work, which is critically but favorably reviewed by Holladay in this volume. Going beyond her doctoral dissertation, she has now examined the Aramaic texts from Deir 'Alla and neo-Assyrian salvation oracles, concluding that a Kunstprosa or stylized prose form was extant at the time of Jeremiah. She finds no justification, therefore, for attributing Jeremiah's formal prose to Deuteronomic editors.
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The Qumran witnesses to Jer have reopened textual questions and the research for the text which is older and more trustworthy. As is well known, the Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) texts of Jer diverge more widely than in any other book of the OT. LXX is about one eighth shorter than MT, and the oracles against foreign nations are found in different redactional arrangements in MT and LXX. Many scholars hold that the short (LXX) text is superior, the MT being regarded as secondary and expansionist. Now we must reckon with R. Althann's philological analysis of Jer 4–6 in the light of Northwest Semitic; it leads him to believe that, for these poetic sections at least, the canonical Hebrew text is older than the text underlying the Septuagint.

This review has given only a sampling of the exceptionally valuable essays which provide us with a fair and balanced account of the methodologies used and the results obtained in Jer scholarship over the past 30 years. As one contributor put it, "There are few OT figures who have sat for as many portraits as Jeremiah." Despite these differences, all will agree that Jeremiah was a major actor in the religious, political, and international drama of that period. These studies place that assertion beyond all doubt.

Gonzaga University, Spokane

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


In this century the fourth Gospel seems to have attracted more full-length commentaries than any other NT book. Weighing in at 700 pages, Haenchen is in the middleweight class, compared to Schnackenburg's 1600 (or my own 1400). Deceased in 1975, he belongs to the frighteningly long list of Johannine writers who did not live to complete their work (Bernard, Hoskyns, Lightfoot, Sanders, Van den Bussche, Richter—not to mention the original author). Mrs. Haenchen gathered her husband's notes, articles, and early sketches; and from them U. Busse painstakingly created a commentary published in German in 1980. Even though lacunae meant that whole sections (see chaps. 12, 14, 15, 16 in Vol. 2) could only be briefly sketched, Mohr/Siebeck did not hesitate to tout it as "the first critical interpretation of John's Gospel since Rudolf Bultmann." While such hutzpah (if one may use the word pertinent to Germany) might be forgiven for dismissing Ausländer such as Barrett and Lindars, the statement is an unpardonable snub to Schnackenburg. It did not "come from the air"; for in the opening lines of the German edition (modified in the English edition) James M. Robinson evaluates the John-commen-
tators of the first century p.B. (post-Bultmann) with the judgment that Haenchen and Richter were "the most full of promise."

The complicated history of origin helps to explain why H.'s commentary has the air of being so dated—not simply to the author's death ten years ago but closer to the 1940's. Strands of debate dominate the work, and the main lines of H.'s positive thought are often submerged in magisterial dismissals of the views of other scholars that fill verse-by-verse comments and even the overviews which conclude sections. (From my own experience I know that a commentator may tend to pull together his personal outlook in the final stages of composition while the notes he has made are comments on others' opinions.) H.'s dismissals, unfortunately too often scornful and sarcastic, are to a high proportion directed at a curious cast of victims, e.g., Zahn, B. Weiss, Büchsel, or occasionally Bengel and Belser. Not only are these adversaries of the early 1900's but so are some of his more appreciated referees (Hirsch, Schwartz). For H., Roman Catholics are still mentioned as a breed apart, frequently enough constituting a cautious, antiquated, and unprogressive lot (1.187, 204, 236). We seem only slightly distanced from a period when some Protestant commentaries asterisked the Catholic works in their bibliographies—a custom perhaps more civilized than having an index of prohibited books but with some of the same sanitizing intent. Discussions favorable to Johannine historicity may bring the epithet "apologetic," e.g., 1.159. A predilection for acid observations about antiquated views too often leaves one wishing for greater clarity about what H. intended. For instance, H. is obviously right that calling Jesus "Rabbi" does not make him "a theologian authorized to teach," but readers might have appreciated a more constructive comment on why the Gospel explicitly translates "rabbi" as "teacher." The combination of brevity and impatience in reporting other views frequently detracts from the nuance with which those views were originally expressed. I am grateful to the translator who on 1.221 finally corrected one of the grosser examples of H.'s failure to present with exactitude what I wrote.

Surely a reason that made some enthusiastic to preserve H.'s work is the contention that it throws light on Bultmann's thesis that material in John had Gnostic or semi-Gnostic origins, as opposed to exaggerations of Dead Sea Scroll influence. Gnosticism does enter the Johannine picture—on that most of us can agree—but there can be an intelligent debate whether the main Gnostic thrust came before the Gospel or was unleashed by a reading of the Gospel that may have gone beyond the author's intent. Although H. contributes to this debate, the timing of his death means that the commentary is largely unaffected by the issue of the character of the Johannine community and its changing stages of existence, an issue that has dominated Johannine scholarship in the last
decade. Robinson's contention that H. is on the cutting edge of Johannine scholarship because he used the Nag Hammadi material represents in my judgment a failure to realize where Johannine scholarship has been going in these recent years. H.'s source-tradition approach (where the Evangelist touches up a source only where necessary) makes recourse to the source a major factor in interpretation, and many of H.'s solutions to problems are on a literary level. I was not overly impressed by that approach when I wrote my own commentary before H. died, and I would be even less impressed today.

Obviously, I have found this work very uneven; but if it is taken as a collection of insights on John spanning the period 1915-75, the commentary is valuable. H. was a brilliant scholar, and I found many observations that I immediately copied into my notes. We owe Busse a debt for making this disparate material so available in German for scholars. My puzzlement centers on the decision to offer a translation of Haenchen as the Hermeneia commentary on John. Professors and students in English-language classes desperately need modern full-scale commentaries on the important books of Scripture, and by the prestige of the publishing houses behind them the Hermeneia and Anchor series have become two of our principal sources for these commentaries. When an inadequate choice is made in either series (and both have their "lemons"), we all suffer. I deem it particularly unfortunate that the Johannine area has represented Hermeneia's weakest effort. A translation of Schnackenburg's Johannine Epistles would have been far more serviceable to professors and students than a translation of Bultmann's much inferior Epistles. For the Gospel of John, the Hermeneia editors would have been wiser to commission a new work by one of the brilliant younger English-speaking Johannine scholars. Culpepper, Kysar, or Painter would have given us something far more on the cutting edge.

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


W.'s aim is to fashion a theory of religion so as to determine a manner of studying religion. After developing a definition of religion, W. identifies various modes of religion; he next explains the derivation of these modes, goes on to propose the mode of religious discourse that is acceptable to moderns, and finally exhorts specialists in religious studies to structure their study according to religion's contours.

Religion is defined as the activity of human persons seeking to master one profound ill by confronting that ill with one profound good. The perception of the ill and of the good is a consequence of a human judgment
Based upon a perceived order within universal human interest. However, the variations in such judgments result from alternative human interests. Consequently, there are various forms of religion: the traditional, the nihilistic, and the critical. Traditional religion is a judgment that attempts to maintain traditions in order to avoid the chaos of life. The fundamental tradition is "the charter," i.e., the exemplary model by which the consensus for living is fashioned. The traditional mind either refuses to acknowledge or is unaware that the charter is a human construct. Nihilistic religion is less of a judgment, more of a reaction to the absence of absolute judgments. It asserts complete freedom for the individual because of its imagined premise: there are no absolutes. Critical religion is a judgment upon the value of religion according to criteria derived from common human experience. The consensus of all rational agents determines valid religion. This consensus follows from rational conversation seeking religion's rational and imaginative justification. This is the mode of religion that is acceptable to the modern mind. The efforts at critical religion include the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali, Paul's Letter to the Romans, and The Myth of Sisyphus of Albert Camus. These pale before Don Quixote of La Mancha's pursuit of a critical vision through venturing and imagining. Critical harmony within life can be pursued only thus. Thus, Quixote represents the critical hero for those persons seeking a mode of religion that can withstand the criticisms that it will have to face in rational conversation. The Epilogue proposes a structure for the study of religion.

Among the slower moments in the book is the rather categorical treatment of the charter in the traditional mode of religion. The illuminating moments are the definition of religion, the description of the task of the custodians of the charter, the clarity of the argument developed by W., the illustration of the argument by examples, and the anticipation of the objections to the critical mind's approach to religion.

Certainly, those who are engaged in teaching religious studies will find the book a source not only of stimulation but of clarity of purpose as well. Moreover, those who lean more toward the traditional approach to theological formulae would find the book enlightening in its interpretation of the efforts being made by theologians of the critical mind.

Canisius College, Buffalo  
DANIEL LIDERBACH, S.J.


With this book Fiorenza has made an important and provocative contribution to both fundamental and systematic theology. He brings a wealth of knowledge—recent exegesis, the history of modern and contem-
porary theology and philosophy, hermeneutical theory—to bear on three central issues of traditional fundamental theology: the resurrection of Jesus, the foundation of the Church, and the mission of the Church. In a fourth part, he addresses the nature of fundamental theology itself and argues explicitly for the method he has used in the earlier parts, renaming the whole set of topics as foundational (in Lonergan's sense, not Rorty's) to distinguish its task from apologetics and suggest its close connection with systematic theology.

In the first part, F. discusses the question of the resurrection of Jesus as it has been dealt with by (a) traditional fundamental theology, (b) transcendental theology, (c) contemporary historical criticism, and then offers (d) his own proposal of a reconstructive hermeneutic. Here the hermeneutical category of “testimony” (Ricoeur) is central. A similar pattern organizes Part 2, on the foundation of the Church, where “reception theory” is the major hermeneutical theory. In Part 3, on the mission of the Church, the move is from traditional fundamental theology to contemporary theology to hermeneutical reconstruction. Here F. emphasizes the integral importance of praxis and the Church’s option for the oppressed. Part 4 performs an “archeology” of the discipline of fundamental theology which uncovers three distinct roots that were gradually joined to form the now traditional (Catholic) notion of an independent discipline whose twofold task was defense of the truth of the Christian religion and the establishment of the foundation of Christian theology. F. challenges the theories of truth (correspondence, coherence, disclosure) implicit in traditional fundamental theology and most contemporary efforts as well. He then proposes his own conception of fundamental theology as a reconstructive hermeneutic that entails three elements (rather than two, as in a correlation model) in continual self-correcting equilibrium or interaction: hermeneutic reconstruction, retroductive (neither inductive nor deductive) warrants, and relevant background theories. The balance among these three, he argues, overcomes the criticism of “foundationalism” in contemporary American philosophy which is based on the intrinsically hermeneutical character of any appeal to tradition or experience. Thus he advocates “a foundational theology that avoids the pitfalls of foundationalism” (xvii); the discipline is metaphorically conceived not as a “pyramid” built on stones of certainty but as a “raft upon the sea” (285–88).

F.'s argument works best in the first part, on the resurrection of Jesus, where his organization is clearest and his synthesis of exegetical and historical material is powerful. Each part, however, comes more complex as new background theories are added and earlier ones apparently dropped. (An index of authors would have been helpful.) But the book is rich and suggestive in both exegetical detail and hermeneutical theory.
and is bound to provoke discussion and debate. My questions include: Is a reflective equilibrium really so different from and more trustworthy than most contemporary uses of correlation, especially when the latter are explicitly hermeneutical? Does F. accept the American critique of foundationalism without argument? Does this critique in fact become F.'s own foundation, and is it not vulnerable to the danger he points to in correlation models, that a nonreligious perspective may dominate the religious interpretation? Is his analysis of transcendental theology as a priori, ahistorical, and circular completely accurate? Or, given the hermeneutical circularity of all theology, is the circle of transcendental theology necessarily a vicious circle? And is not F.'s hermeneutic reconstruction as incorrigibly circular as the many contemporary perspectives he criticizes? F. has given us much to discuss and debate in this work, not only about the subject matter of Jesus and the Church but about theology as a discipline.

University of Chicago Divinity School
Anne Carr, B.V.M.


O'Hear, professor of philosophy at the University of Surrey, has given a clearly written and interesting critique of religion, and particularly of theism, in the tradition of Karl Popper's philosophy. As one would expect, O. finds any reference to divine transcendence incapable of meeting Popper's epistemological demands, and so he rejects talk about God as irrational. Theologians will find this book significant, if for no other reason than that it displays the impressions their writings are making on an erudite nonbeliever. Unfortunately, they will also undoubtedly be annoyed by O.'s caricaturing of important theological positions both ancient and recent. In spite of apparent good intentions and an honest effort to do justice to the theism he refutes, it is often scarcely possible for its theological proponents to recognize their ideas in the truncated versions presented in this book.

One interesting feature O.'s work has that others of the same genre do not is that it deals at some length with the Marechalian Thomism of Rahner and especially of Lonergan. One must commend the author for having taken it seriously and for having read at least a little of (or possibly about) Lonergan. Unhappily, one cannot be very enthusiastic about his interpretation of Lonergan, since he fails completely to understand the central place of cognitional performance in Lonergan's philosophy, and so the presentation as well as the critique are not particularly challenging. Similarly, the book is interesting for its attempt to refute process theology, but again it is quite embarrassing in its impoverished
understanding of it. Interestingly, the author, an ex-Catholic who calls himself a nonbeliever, assails process theology’s idea of a suffering God as “religiously unsatisfying.”

The most important feature of this book, however, is its relentless employment of Popper’s philosophy of knowledge, and especially his rules for explanation and falsification, as the ultimate test for the rationality of theism. Of course, any idea of God fails to measure up to the kind of empirically falsifiable hypotheses one finds in science and therefore it must be rejected. Ultimately, O. finds theism (and along with it the cosmological, teleological, and ontological arguments) incompatible with the open-mindedness of empirical science. He gives an often more closely argued presentation of the Antony Flew type of “theology and falsification” argument than others that have appeared recently, especially in British philosophy, but in terms of substance he has not added very much. He simply carries forward the analytic program of indicting all religious reference to transcendence for its failure to satisfy the demand for rational explanation. One way in which O. might have captured the attention of contemporary theological readers working in the analytic tradition would be to discuss the relation of religion to “limiting questions.” Current theology according to which religious discourse might be partially located as the appropriate response to questions such as why we seek rational explanations in the first place is not discussed.

From the point of view of contemporary theology and philosophy of religion, the school of Popperian argumentation always presents a useful challenge and deserves continued discussion. O. has done a scholar’s work in gathering it together in a novel and very readable fashion. One hopes, however, that future discussions will deal more broadly with the topic of religion instead of focusing on a desiccated version of theism that few theologians today would find interesting. The author fails to discuss religion as a symbolic phenomenon, and he provides no serious treatment of the hermeneutical issues surrounding the meaning and truth of symbol and myth. How a philosopher can deal substantively with the topic of religion without giving any attention to how religious consciousness comes to expression in symbols is hard to understand. The topic of religious symbolism does not arise at all in O.’s book. Indeed, it is doubtful whether this “philosophy of religion” has dealt more than fleetingly with religion as it appears in the concrete lives of people. Instead, it focuses primarily on an academically abstract, socially irrelevant, and psychologically authoritarian concept of deity. Further, there is no discussion of prophetic religion or of liberation themes in biblical theism that have been highlighted by recent theology. For these failures
to deal broadly with the subject of religion, O. himself is not so much to blame as is the whole style of "philosophy of religion" to which he is heir.

Georgetown University

JOHN F. HAUGHT


L. teaches at the University of Louvain and has been among the foremost Continental interpreters of Anglo-Saxon philosophy of language. He has concentrated on applying ordinary language philosophy (especially that of J. L. Austin, the later Wittgenstein, Donald Evans, and John Searle) to the problems of the language of faith. This two-volume work brings together essays published since 1963 on various aspects of the language of faith. The first volume is a reprint of his L’Articulation du sens of 1970, which was reviewed in TS 32 (1971) 348–49.

Both volumes are provided with new introductions wherein L. draws together the various aspects of his 20 years of research into the language of faith. The central problematic motivating him is to make sense out of the language of faith within the same horizon as other forms of language, but especially scientific language. Indeed, the scientific horizon sets the agenda for the study of religious language, inasmuch as criteria of truth, intelligibility, and verifiability are primary for the articulation of meaningful statements. L. turns especially to the ordinary language philosophers in this regard: to Wittgenstein for the concept of language games (i.e., different patterns of intelligibility within language based upon different sets of rules for using language in certain specified circumstances); to Austin for his concepts of performative language and illocutionary acts (language wherein saying something effects action in a situation); and to Searle for his more comprehensive theory of speech acts. These then are applied in the second volume to the various language games of faith: the language of biblical narrative (following especially Donald Evans here), liturgical language, and writers in spirituality, as well as theological discussions of the Church, creation, Eucharist, and, of course, faith itself.

Woven around this central line of development are essays in the first volume which situate the discussion within the scientific horizon and within the larger discussion of the philosophy of language, and essays in the second volume on the nature of theology as a science and a speculative discipline, and its relation to philosophy.

Despite the fact that these essays were written over a period of two
decades, there is a sustained and continuous development here of how ordinary language philosophy can help open up to us the language of faith, and relate it to language acceptable to a scientific horizon. Anyone interested in making sense of the language of faith in a secularized and scientifically-minded culture will find L.'s essays a useful resource and helpful dialogue partner in the articulation of religious meaning.

*Catholic Theological Union*  
ROBERT J. SCHREITER, C.PP.S.
Chicago


This is a revisionist's attempt to argue for a possible radical development within Christianity. S. first establishes his criteria and then rigorously applies these to the questions of evil and suffering. He argues that suffering contradicts the monotheistic claim of an omniscient, omnipotent, and good God by breaking the principle of fairness. He then espouses an agnostic outlook. While careful to affirm that he is passing judgment on beliefs about God rather than on God, he dismisses the notion of a personal God who can act within our material world and regards revelation as being no more than a personal interpretation.

S. next delineates his view of theology. Its task is to articulate the possible—i.e., what the structures of reality will allow and what reason can demonstrate as intelligible. By examining claims, exposing their implications and intelligibility, and revealing how the conclusions reached have to do with the real and the actual, theology opens up possible ways not only of understanding oneself and one’s place in the world but of living in this world. It primarily expounds a vision of life *sub specie aeternitatis*. This is not a viewpoint of some eternal being but a claim about an eternal world transcending all limitations and relativities whether of individuals, communities, ages, or mankind itself. It is basically a conception of a transcendent order which expresses the eternal values against which we measure our own moral or spiritual insight.

S. then explores how the historical sets limits to what is possible and applies this to Jesus’ life. He rejects a strict incarnation, virgin birth, and resurrection as being unintelligible. But if one takes Jesus’ life as a whole, its achievement is: it gives an intelligible form to the claim that goodness, although essentially an inward matter, is a real possibility. This provides the rest of us with grounds for optimism and hope in living out our own lives.

This is a very literate, tautly reasoned, and thought-provoking work. It employs dialectical reason as the sole way not merely to demonstrate but seemingly even to understand the possible structures of reality. This
is, of course, an a priori and disputed presupposition, especially as it allows no dynamic interaction between revelation and reason and logically reduces faith to a rational vision whereby one judges reality from an eternal perspective (not God's but a world of eternal values) and takes hope from the realization that a good life is possible. S.'s approach, in fact, drains faith of any sense of being a divine gift as well as being a loving commitment to and a relational union with God.

S. is sensitive to the charge of reductionism and seeks to counter it. Though he does not reduce reality only to what is sensible but accepts whatever reason can demonstrate as intelligible, his conclusions nevertheless strike at the heart of any revealed religion, particularly his rejection of a personal God who can intervene in history, be addressed in symbolic language, and worshiped in sacramental liturgy. As S. himself remarks, he "dances to another drum" (168). But his vision of the future development of Christianity will inspire little optimism for one who truly believes. This is a work for those who are attuned to or interested in S.'s radical beat.

Saint Louis University  

FREDERICK G. MCLEOD, S.J.


Dreyfus reformulates the question "Did Jesus know that he was God" into biblical terms as follows: "Supposing that Jesus of Nazareth, during the course of his earthly life, had had in his hands the Gospel of John, and that he had read there words attributed to him such as these: 'Not that anyone has seen the Father—only the one who is from God has seen the Father.' [Jn. 6:46 NAB] or 'I solemnly declare it: before Abraham came to be, I AM.' [Jn. 8:58 NAB]; would he have recognized these statements as corresponding to what he thought of himself or would he have cried: 'Blasphemy!' and approved of those who, according to the Gospel, wished to stone him?"

D.'s plan in order to answer these questions is threefold. In the first part, "The Tradition," he studies the Church's tradition and finds that it was unanimous in the belief that Jesus was God and knew it. In the second part, "The Jesus of History and the Jesus of Historians," D. shows that the conviction in question is not opposed to that of historians faithful to rational methods but not faithful to rationalism. In the third part, "The Faith of the Church and Modern Mentality," he points out reasons for hesitations about and denials of the issue in question and why they are erroneous. He concludes that there is no serious reason to refuse to the historical Jesus the knowledge of his proper mystery—that of being the Son of God pre-existing in glory for all eternity. He remarks
that what the Church has believed from its origins and for 20 centuries, the Christian of today can and must continue to believe. The Jesus presented by the fourth Gospel is the true Jesus of Nazareth such as he understood himself. One can prove this because John stated his purpose (Jn 20:31): he wrote his Gospel to show that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God, so that by believing one (the reader) might have life in his name. D. points out that Jesus' miracles do not prove he was the Son of God, but they do attest to the truth of his teaching of his own divinity.

D. explains that, in the Church, traditions have been held in both a critical and a noncritical fashion. He holds that the issue in question ("Did Jesus know he was God?") falls into the first category. There was a period when the issue was contested, namely, during the apostolic period, and the place where the Church affirmed this with a force greater than that of a conciliar text is the biblical text of the fourth Gospel.

D. indicates that because of pedagogical problems Jesus had to teach this mystery in three stages: (1) he revealed to the public all that could be accepted and assimilated without error, given their Jewish mentality; (2) he formed a group of disciples who, because they were attracted by his teaching and personality, had a favorable prejudgment which would permit them to accept eventually a teaching that would surpass and shock them; (3) he selected at the interior of this group a smaller subgroup of privileged ones to whom this higher and deeper doctrine could be confided; eventually they could hand this on to the others when their minds were spiritually mature. Jesus therefore had to come to terms with two issues; his own identity and how to communicate this mystery.

D., professor at the Ecole biblique in Jerusalem, proves himself a capable biblical scholar, a subtle thinker, and an excellent teacher. I recommend this to well-read laity as well as to all theologians interested in the Gospel of John who might be somewhat puzzled themselves by the question "Did Jesus know that he was God?"

College of St. Mary, Omaha

ANITA HYSLOP


This first volume of what is presented as a two-volume study of the Catholic doctrine on priesthood is chiefly devoted to prolegomena. M. starts from the contemporary crisis of the Church. As suggested by the two subtitles, and as explained in the preface and in the "introduction to the first part," the point of departure adopted is localized both in time and in place. The time is that of the postconciliar turmoil; the place, France, where the crisis of the Catholic priesthood, which M. sees as the
focal point of the entire postconciliar turmoil, has reached particularly acute dimensions. Much of the first part of this first volume consists precisely in describing and measuring the parameters of the crisis. Before looking at the source of the traditional theology of priesthood, we are invited to reflect on the contemporary situation. The topics of the chapters follow from this leading idea, though their sequence seems somewhat haphazard: 1: Missionary priesthood and the secularization of the world. 2: Secularization of the world and sacramentality of the Church. 3: People of God and priesthood. 4: Politically-conceived basic communities and the question of priestly ministry. 5: Three typical instances of the theological questioning of the priesthood of priests. 6: Post-Christianity and modernity. Defeat or challenge for the faith. 7: The New Testament under the sign of modernity or the third phase of the crisis. 8: Reductionist hermeneutics and its hidden interdicts.

M. begins with what he sees as the theological impact of the “Mission of France” and the “Mission of Paris,” two movements started by Cardinal Suhard during the Second World War. They would be responsible for the beginning of a secularization of the notion and ideal of priesthood, for in their context priests began to serve the world by promoting the class interests of workers over against other segments of society. This secularization is contrasted with the proper sacramentality of the Church and with the ideal of priesthood at the service of the People of God. A second major step in the dechristianization of priesthood is next identified as the Marxist slant of the comunidades de base, as these imports from Latin America were adapted to the French situation. They tended to promote a “church of the people” with no essential reference to the traditional hierarchy and theology. Theological reflection on, and justification of, these developments came later. And M. devotes some time to the theologies of Hans Küng (who would make the Enlightenment and the French Revolution the norm of theology), of Joseph Moingt (who would do away with the distinction between priests and laity), and of Edward Schillebeeckx (who builds his theology of ministry on a misreading of the sixth canon of Chalcedon). M. then tries to show the philosophical weakness of contemporary philosophy and the disastrous effects that follow from its domination of NT exegesis and hermeneutics.

The second part of this volume begins the theological study of priesthood with an investigation into the NT. Its seven chapters take us from the doctrine of the kingdom of God and its relation to the person and mission of Jesus (chaps. 9–10), to the meaning and place of the Twelve “in the mystery of Christ” (11), and to the preaching and function of the apostles (12). M. continues with an overview of the early Church’s message and structure (13), a study of the presbyters in Pauline and
other communities (14), and finally a description of the growing differentiation between presbyters and bishops before the end of the apostolic period.

This second part abounds in valuable insights. Yet it would be too early to formulate an assessment of the book. A "postface" announces that the second volume will pick up the story with the letters of Ignatius of Antioch and go on, through the Middle Ages, the Reformation, the Council of Trent, and the modern age, to Vatican II and the current crisis. Only at this point will M. propose a "vision" of the Catholic priesthood that will restore its authentic dimensions. In the light of the second part of the present volume, one may entertain great hopes for what M. will say; yet, in the light of the first part, one may wonder if the final proposal will not be too slanted by an excessively pessimistic view of the present situation in the Church and by a polemical approach which, even when fundamentally justified, may not be conducive to the serenity needed for theological elaboration.

Methodist Theological School, Ohio

GEORGE H. TAVARD, A.A.


Sullivan is well known to the international theological community through his teaching at Rome’s Gregorian University and his publications in ecclesiology that began to appear even before Vatican II. Recently he has expanded his research to include pneumatology and charismatic renewal in the Church. Few scholars can match his knowledge of the decrees and acta of Vatican I. He also commands an impressive knowledge of the texts of Vatican II and the views of Catholic ecclesiologists such as Congar, Rahner, de Vries, Ratzinger, Dulles, and Küng. His footnotes show that he has kept abreast of ecumenical dialogues underway between Roman Catholics and both Lutherans and Anglicans.

To review his study of the magisterium is a formidable task, since the book is closely reasoned and technical in nature. S. is rather sanguine in describing his work as within the reach of the "general reading public." I doubt that many students of theology have the background to follow his reasoning step by step, because his writing presupposes command of that "classical culture" whose demise Lonergan announced in Method in Theology. Some Catholics who are troubled with questions about the extent and use of ecclesiastical authority will find S.’s work detached and unimpassioned. Those who resent that too many voices in the Church are not listened to will find the tone of the book too placid and optimistic.

Not addressed are such issues as why the faithful are not consulted in
matters of doctrine and why canonical procedures against controversial theologians are the way they are.

S. generally accepts the texts of Vatican II as formulated without calling for reformulations. Conciliar assertions are given theological weight. Even the 1975 publication by the International Theological Commission on “Theses on the Relationship between the Ecclesiastical Magisterium and Theology” is given a benign exegesis, though he does question the narrow scope of its membership and its close supervision by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. Still, the explanation he provides of the origin of Catholicism’s official teaching on the ecclesiastical magisterium is very helpful. Especially when read in conjunction with some of the proposals for expanding the notion of magisterium by the Canon Law Society of America or the Catholic Theological Society of America, S.’s contribution is important.

Particularly well done is the effort to dispel misguided popular understandings about the scope and force of doctrinal and disciplinary decisions of the magisterium. Translators should note his warning that magisterium authenticum does not mean “authentic magisterium” but rather “authoritative magisterium” (27). Also helpful is his suggestion that those propositions that Vatican I described as “irreformable” should be classified as “irreversible” propositions (81).

One chapter is a detailed refutation of arguments raised by Hans Küng in his Unfehlbar?. Of two distinct English translations of Küng’s work, S. unfortunately relies on the problematic version of Edward Quinn published in the U.S.A. by Doubleday rather than the superior translation of Erich Mosbacher that appeared in England by Collins. I felt several times that the two theologians were discussing different issues; a more satisfying format for that type of dialogue would have been a question-and-answer exchange by both S. and Küng.

The first chapter, on the infallibility of the People of God, is well presented (though S. should have entitled it the “indefectibility” of the People of God). He is unsympathetic to the suggestion that Catholicism admit the existence of two magisteria (that of bishops and of theologians) and he cites R. Brown, R. McCormick, and K. Rahner in favor of the single-magisterium concept. My own view is that Catholic theology needs to rework its terminology and explanation of magisterium if any real progress in ecumenical dialogue is to take place. The French ecumenical “Group of Les Dombes” has noted that the concept episkopë in the Church is in fact exercised by a wider group than just the episcopate. Could we not accept a similar expansion of the notion of magisterium? If the notion of magisterium is so central to Christian self-identity, then surely it will exist in some transposed form in the Orthodox and Protestant churches.
S.’s book is a reliable guide to explain what Catholicism, especially at Vatican I and II, meant by magisterium. Whether that articulation will remain helpful in the near future remains an open question.

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


In this, his second study under the title Marriage in the Catholic Church, Mackin offers an extended critical assessment of the principal theological and canonical sources relevant to divorce and remarriage. His premise is the conclusion of his 1982 work, What Is Marriage?, that Vatican II substantively changed the definition of marriage when it consciously shunned the use of “contract” to describe what marriage is and substituted “covenant” in the biblical model. In the present work he concludes that even this covenant can be, although it must not be, irreparably broken and thus cease to exist, and only a covenant, but not a contract, can be sacramental.

While asserting that matrimony is a sacrament between baptized spouses, M. implies that it exists only occasionally by joining many contemporary Catholic authors in denying or at least questioning the sacramental nature of the marriages of baptized persons who, at the time they marry, lack sufficient faith to celebrate a sacrament or are ignorant that marriage between the baptized is also a sacrament. However, he goes far beyond the usual discussion of such marriages by contending that, if and when the marriage of a couple who did believe that they were celebrating a sacrament when they married ends in divorce, the sacrament itself no longer exists. Indeed, the sacrament and with it the marriage ceases to exist when the spouses or one of them withdraw the will to be married. Divorce merely declares the fact.

In the millennial teaching of the Church, of course, the sacramentality of a given marriage has been the radical ground of its indissolubility, but it is actually realized only in the consummation of the marriage by the first complete act of sexual intercourse. M. claims that this is impossible and has to be discarded in the covenantal model. Only if marriage is viewed as a contract about a mutual right which has in fact been exercised is consummation by intercourse alone possible. Consummation of marriage is the lifelong task of maintaining the partnership of conjugal love until one partner dies.

In M.’s methodology lies the importance of the work. He applies a rigorous and at times complex hermeneutic in the examination of each of his sources. He identifies what he perceives to be the limited scope of each and, where applicable, what he judges to be lapses in logic or
outright errors. He does not, however, address the issue that, however faulty the logic or the exegesis employed in explaining doctrine, the subject authoritatively taught by the magisterium remains the doctrine of the Church and, in the case of matrimony, the basis of its discipline.

This volume does not afford easy reading. M.'s style is dense and at times unnecessarily repetitious. He has the regrettable habit of arguing to a conclusion by means of a series of rhetorical questions, which may connote modesty but which also evade outright assertion. The book concludes with a challenge: "the pastoral charity of the Church demands that these questions be now reopened and the evidence re-examined." It is important that theologians take up this challenge.

Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley

RICHARD A. HILL, S.J.


In this series of nine public lectures given in Tübingen and Ann Arbor, we have the final installment, along with On Being a Christian and Does God Exist?, of K.'s “trilogy” (xvi). His basic approach parallels that taken in On Being a Christian. In the first section, “The Horizon,” K. sets the “background” of his question and poses it from the point of view of medicine, contemporary philosophy, and the history of religions. He confronts the reader with a “decision” between “alternatives”: “a definitive extinguishing in nothingness or an eternal permanence in being” (68). In the second section, “Hope,” he sets out what he takes to be the Christian answer to the question of eternal life. After treating the development of the concept of resurrection in Jewish thought, he sets forth his answer of eternal life as “a new future, wholly different,” based on resurrection as “assumption into the absolutely final and absolutely first reality” of God through a consideration of the “difficulties with the resurrection of Jesus” and then discusses attendant issues concerning ascension, descent, and hell (114, 113). In section 3, “The Consequences,” K. explores the individual, social, and cosmic dimensions of eternal life for people today. He closes with a brief epilogue, comprising a personal confession.

As always, K. is at his best here in two respects. He can tell you clearly and even movingly what practical difference his subject makes: “A dying in gratitude—this would seem to me to be dying, not only with human dignity, but with Christian dignity” (175). He also conducts a wide-ranging and insightful dialogue with representatives of contemporary culture.

The book is disappointing at several key points. K. bases his Christian
answer to the question of eternal life on "the resurrection of Jesus." It is not clear, to me at least, how, if at all, the events of the emergence of Easter faith imply an event of resurrection as their basis. Jesus' followers did, in fact, infer his resurrection from their encounter with the Jesus who had died. But this inference does not show that there ever was such an event. Nor does K. treat this problem elsewhere.

When he discusses the character of eternal life, K. can say that it is a "wholly different, unparalleled, definitive state ... totally otherwise" (105). Yet he can also hold that "the consummation can be described in a dialectical movement of thought: as life, justice, freedom, love, salvation" (220). One runs across the same problem in reading Does God Exist?: K. has not developed a theory of theological language that permits one to judge claims such as that eternity, "understood dialectically," is "the temporality which is 'dissolved' (aufgehoben) into finality" (221).

Finally, K. at one point places "'faith' in God, in an eternal life" in apposition (78). I am not sure K. is sufficiently aware of the temptation to idolatry here or, for that matter, in making the topic of eternal life a third part of his trilogy. The first two books hang together. This one is the odd man out.

Union Congregational Church
Hancock, Maine

PHILIP E. DEVENISH


As we might expect from the codirector of the Annales, this history of the idea of purgatory from its most "ancient imaginings" through Dante is not old-fashioned historical theology but a study in the history of the imagination, of mentalités, of the relations between ideas and society. Everything before the late 12th century, when the noun purgatorium first appeared, is treated as preparatory, and the late 13th century is seen as the time of the triumph of a spatialized purgatory. Part 1 considers ideas of the hereafter before the 12th century. Part 2 is devoted to the 12th century, to the development of both theology and the imagination, to the "geography" of purgatory, and to the relation of the birth of purgatory to social change. Part 3 is on "The Triumph of Purgatory" in the 13th and early 14th centuries.

In its original French edition, this book has been widely reviewed. Perhaps because its strengths are obvious to all, this review may concentrate on a few of its limitations. Especially in Part 1, there is occasional imprecision of detail, overly-bold comparative comment, and some perspectives which are at best suggestive. L.'s argument throughout is that
the spatialization of purgatory coincides with the differentiation of society, but the claim that the development of "something rather similar to the Christian Purgatory" (41) in rabbincic thought is reflective of Jewish social structure is left obscure.

A certain anti-intellectualism of the left sometimes appears: "Purgatory... was... dragged down into a whirlpool of delirious scholastic ratiocination, which raised the most otiose questions... The rarefied argumentation of intellectuals cut off from their roots in society had scarcely any influence on the conceptions of Purgatory held by the mass of the faithful... The theologians and canonists of the thirteenth century were products of a corporate movement, mental workers isolated from the manual laborers in the urban workplace. Increasingly, they barricaded themselves behind their academic chairs and their pride as specialists of the spirit" (217-18). By contrast, L. makes the 12th-century theologians, who for him still were in contact with social realities, into proto-annalistes: "they knew that to think about venial sin or Purgatory was to think about society itself" (218).

Another part of the argument depends on the plausibility of structuralist analysis. L. holds that in the 12th century there was a general shift from binary logical schemes, which had dominated men's minds since late antiquity, to ternary schemes. One can think of so many exceptions to this kind of analysis that perhaps it would be better to say that in societies which lack much social differentiation and rationalized classificatory schemas, thinking tends to be polar (good and evil, weak and powerful, L.'s binary), with an unarticulated middle spectrum between the poles. As society becomes more sophisticated, so does consciousness about variation in the previously unarticulated middle, which now becomes articulate. This sometimes takes the form of ternary schemes replacing binary, of setting the two against the one.

However one reacts to these criticisms, one will find in this book a rich feast of ideas and perspectives which enriches our knowledge of both medieval society and theology.

University of Utah

GLENN W. OLSEN


This is a clear and enlightening study on papal authority and the episcopate as the canonists of the High Middle Ages saw them. Canonists were compelled to address this issue because the controversies and growth of church government required analysis. The major canonists appear in this study, and Innocent III, Innocent IV, Huguccio, and Hostiensis play
dominant roles. There are five chapters: Innocent III and the Divine Authority of the Pope; The Papal Fullness of Power; Episcopal Translations; Provision of Benefices and Papal-Episcopal Rights; Papal Privileges and Exemptions.

P. cautions that one must not read too much into the rhetorical language and flowery exaggerations that sometimes covered basic statements in medieval writers; secondly, bishops were never fully subject to papal power; finally, two conflicting and not really reconcilable theories of authority continued to exist, one stressing inherent rights that must always be respected, the other stressing jurisdiction. P. indicates in his conclusion that later papal absolutism grew when only the latter part of the theory was acknowledged.

The book starts with the image drawn from E. Kantorowicz' *The King's Two Bodies*. For Innocent III, the pope had two different forms of authority: powers that were human (ordinary) and those that were special (divine). In their discussion of this theme the canonists left a gap between their language and their purpose, and not all used the same terms with the same meaning (e.g., Laurentius and Huguccio on *ratio*; J. Teutonicus and what he meant by saying that the pope could make something out of nothing). Most importantly, canonists also knew that not all papal commands were heeded, never mind obeyed.

Language developed as canonists and popes wrote about the problems. Innocent III placed great stress on the papal fulness of power (*plentitudo potestatis*) versus the bishops' participation in the “care” (*pars sollicitudinis*). P. shows that what later might seem extravagant claims may have appeared in their own time as only obscure or unknown documents. The big issue was: Did fulness of power mean that bishops derived their power from the pope? This was to be a major issue for centuries until quite recent times. Hostiensis’ major contribution was the precision of his definitions in place of rhetorical flourishes on certain questions: (a) Could the pope move, translate, depose bishops? If so, when, on what authority, and for what reasons? What was the relation of law and conscience in this? (b) Could popes provide candidates of their choice to benefices throughout the Church at large, regardless of the wishes and rights of local prelates? This question could only be theoretical, since in practice the answer by the dominant powers across Europe was a resounding no. (c) Finally, could popes remove from, or give individuals or communities a special position that freed them from subjection to the local ordinary? If so, how were such documents to be interpreted and what did they say about authority in the Church? Implicit in the canonistic treatment were constant restraint and preservation of order as guiding principles. P. adds that the debate on the mendicant orders in
the 13th century shifted the discussion from canon lawyers to theologians and this altered the whole state of the question, since focus was now shifted from inviolable rights to the issue of jurisdiction and thus the way was opened to ideas of absolute monarchy.

There is a good deal here for reflective thinking, particularly as our times have so often and in so many different ways been re-examining such questions as authority, subsidiarity, collegiality, and jurisdiction. This book is a good place to start a discussion.

State University College
Fredonia, N.Y.

THOMAS E. MORRISSEY


Pelikan has completed the penultimate volume of his monumental history of the development of Christian doctrine. In each volume he reminds his reader that he has not written a history of theology, i.e., a history of the thoughts and formulations of individual theologians. His story concerns the doctrines of the Church, i.e., “what the Church of Jesus Christ believes, teaches and confesses on the basis of the word of God.”

Vol. 1, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600), appeared in 1971. The next two volumes, The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700) and The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300), were published in 1974 and 1978 respectively. A fifth and final volume will complete the series: Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (since 1700). The whole series will certainly be a valuable resource not only for historical theologians but also for speculative and systematic theologians who are trying to recover and renew the Christian tradition as a whole.

The present volume treats the two centuries preceding the Reformation, the century of the Reformation itself, and the century which followed the Reformation. The doctrinal pluralism of the 14th century and the demand for the reformation of the Church in the 15th century are masterfully detailed in the first two chapters and set the stage for the center of the narrative. Chapters 3–6 are that center and set forth the principal doctrines of the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Roman Catholic, and the Radical denominations or confessions of the 16th century. The final chapter treats the 17th century, “the age of orthodoxy,” in which the confessional and dogmatic definitions of the 16th were systematized, clarified, and documented. Because P. has not organized
his study as a history of confessions or denominations but as a history of doctrines, each chapter quite naturally cites sources from other traditions than the predominant one.

An itemized list of the doctrines which underwent significant development during these centuries would be a daunting one. Scripture, tradition, the authority of the Church, justification, grace, predestination, and the sacraments are but part of the story. Yet P. is a superb craftsman and excels at weaving a variety of doctrinal strands into a coherent pattern. He also furnishes sufficient cross-references and signals so that the pattern is not lost.

P. began his scholarly work 40 years ago in this period of history with a dissertation on the doctrinal relations between the Hussite Reformation of the 15th century and the Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth. He now states that, after having studied the doctrinal developments of this period in great detail, he is even more impressed with the importance of understanding the 16th century in the light of its continuity and discontinuity with the history of church doctrine since the second century. He points out that the Reformers themselves, despite their protestations of sola scriptum, showed in their life and work that scriptura has never been sola.

At the outset P. warns the reader that it would be a mistake to sample the book by searching for familiar figures or favorite issues. Only within the total context can his treatment of these figures and issues be understood. This vivid sense of the whole Christian tradition as the context of specific doctrines is the real strength of P.'s work. His erudition is immense; his insights are impressive; his organization of the material is clear. But it is, above all, his own appreciation of the unity and coherence of the Christian tradition which keeps his study from fragmenting and, indeed, gives it a valuable and timely perspective.

Yellow Springs, Ohio

M. EDMUND HUSSEY


Arnau-García has written a penetrating study of Luther's thought in a thorny area. He does not set out to contest Luther's value as a theologian of the Christian ministry, but to comprehend him and dialogue with him on the basis of a broader tradition of doctrine and church law than that accepted by the early Catholic controversialists and the Counter Reformation.

The need for a new Catholic study of Luther on ministerial office is clear enough. The book of Jan Aarts, Die Lehre Martin Luthers über das
Amt in der Kirche (Helsinki, 1972), is sensitive to Luther’s notion of the ecclesial diakonia of God’s redemptive word and to the distinctiveness he ascribed to the commission to preach publicly. But Aarts breaks off in 1525, and so does not treat Luther’s developed thought on ordination. Wolfgang Stein analyzes Luther’s thematic works on church and ministry in Das kirchliche Amt bei Luther (Wiesbaden, 1974), but fails to treat Luther’s sermons, which contain important statements on Christ’s call and commissioning of those who will speak in his name. Peter Manns treats the ordained ministry and the Lord’s Supper, in Peter Bläser et al., Amt und Eucharistie (Paderborn, 1973), and is abundantly informative on Luther’s firm rejection of any celebration of the Eucharist by the nonordained, while understandably forgoing a systematic-theological account of Luther’s constructive doctrine of the ministry in the Church.

Readers may recall the lucid exposition by George Lindbeck, “The Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry: Catholic and Reformed” (TS 30 [1969] 588–612), which set forth the strongly anti-Donatist character of the Lutheran confessional documents, the divergent meanings of de iure divino in its application by Lutherans to church ministry, and the surprising information that the priesthood of all believers is not the ground of the Lutheran ministry. On the last point, some have found Luther teaching otherwise in his works of 1520–25. Thus, a group of 19th-century Lutherans proposed a “transference theory,” according to which the local community, in the interests of good order, delegates one member to do what all are by faith and baptism actually empowered to do. Arnau-García is well aware of the span of views regarding Luther, although he rightly selects representative opinions for his critical dialogical exchanges, instead of elaborating an exhaustive review of previous research.

On Luther’s well-known teaching on the common priesthood of believers, the present work emphatically points out the spiritual and communal nature of this participation in Christ. Luther’s ecclesiology is forthrightly egalitarian, in opposition to any notion of special clerical status or dignity. Ministers do not have more dignity, but more responsibility before God and the Church. A.-G. does not, however, exploit the lexical evidence of Luther’s best-known polemic against clerical status (To the Christian Nobility, 1520), where the target is den geistlichen Stand, to which persons are transferred or advanced not by ordination but by tonsure and/or by entry into a religious order. The privileges of this state were enjoyed by all clerics, nuns, and religious brothers. The ordained priest is a part of “the spiritual estate,” but ordination is not the specifying note of the latter as a class.

The principal finding of A.-G.’s work is that Luther underwent a logical and comprehensible development in his views of both the foun-
dation of ministry and the meaning of ordination. The documentary evidence shows development, in part because of the notable variety of contexts, often polemical, in which Luther spoke on this complex of issues. In 1520–23 Luther’s egalitarian view of Christian society led him to stress how good internal order requires that the Church select ministers and install them as pastors. A.-G. sifts well this mass of material in order to show precisely what Luther was rejecting and what he was affirming. Most interesting is his discussion of phrases from Luther’s 1522 sermons, where he has the pastor acting ministerially an der Gemeinde statt, that is, representing the community that commissioned his ministry (129–32). But as Luther developed, he came to speak of ministerial action an Christi statt, that is, in the person of Christ, who calls ministers and commissions them as his legates for the diffusion of his words of forgiveness and reconciliation (138–49).

The mature Luther gave backing to absolute ordinations and articulated the Christological origin of the commission to preach and administer the ecclesial sacraments. Preaching on John 20:21–23 in 1540, Luther made it clear to the people that their pastor gives absolution and imposes hands by Christ’s commission. Faith is not deceived when it lays hold of forgiveness not as the pastor’s own word and gift but as Christ’s—given through his legate (198 f.).

On the basis of such a retrieval of the mature Luther, one understands far better the convergences set forth first in the fourth American Lutheran-Catholic dialogue statement Eucharist and Ministry (1970), and then in the document of the international Catholic-Lutheran Joint Commission Das geistliche Amt in der Kirche (1981; ET as The Ministry in the Church [Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1982]). These ecumenical agreements on significant elements of the doctrine of the ministry are not building on sand. When, though, will the churches acknowledge them and begin to act upon them in their official relationships?

Gregorian University, Rome

JARED WICKS, S.J.


As he did with Dagger John: The Unquiet Life and Times of Archbishop John Hughes of New York (TS 39 [1978] 357–58), Richard Shaw, a priest of the Albany Diocese in New York, has given us another interesting biography of one of our pioneer American churchmen. John Dubois, the third bishop appointed to New York, is more widely remembered as the founder of Mt. St. Mary’s College in Emmitsburg and director of the infant community of the Sisters of Charity founded by Elizabeth Ann
Seton. This volume was published to coincide with the 175th anniversary of the founding of Mt. St. Mary's.

Born in 1764 in pre-Revolutionary France, Dubois was ordained to the priesthood in 1787 and assigned to the huge Parisian parish of St. Sulpice, where on occasion some 200 ecclesiastics participated in parish ceremonies. In his later isolated missionary life, he would miss the society of his fellow clerics and was ultimately led to join the Sulpicians, although even that never afforded him any real community living. It was providential, because of his later work with Mother Seton, that the young Dubois was assigned as chaplain to the Daughters of Charity at their hospital on the rue de Sèvres, where he came to know their way of life rather well.

With others, Dubois escaped the bedlam of post-Revolutionary France by emigrating to the United States. He carried a letter of introduction from the Marquis de Lafayette which he presented to the eminent James Monroe in Richmond. To support himself as he learned English, he took a position teaching French and shortly founded his own school. He also ministered to the Catholics spread throughout the southern part of the State of Virginia until he was requested by Bishop John Carroll to move to Frederick, Maryland, in 1794.

In 1805 John Dubois acquired some hillside property overlooking a valley already called “St. Mary's” and the major enterprise of his life began. It is clear from the humble beginnings of Mt. St. Mary's that its founder never envisaged the great contribution it would make to the Church in the United States. In 1807 Dubois was admitted to the Society of St. Sulpice in Baltimore and was immediately missioned back to his “mountain” to begin a preparatory seminary. In a short time the recent convert to Roman Catholicism Elizabeth Seton of New York, who had emigrated to Catholic Baltimore, was directed by her new religious mentors to open a school for girls at Mt. St. Mary's. Dubois not only had a seminary and school to develop and direct, but he now became the official superior of this new religious community. The relationship between himself and Mother Seton was always respectful, if somewhat cool.

After 21 years at Mt. St. Mary's, Dubois was named to the See of New York, whose dominant Irish population was rather vocally opposed to the appointment of a “foreigner.” The new bishop was already 62 years of age, and he struggled for the next 16 years to serve his people well. Shortly before the 50th anniversary of his priestly ordination, the elderly bishop requested the appointment of a coadjutor. John Hughes, a former student of Mt. St. Mary's, who never was particularly fond of his ancient mentor, was appointed and promptly overshadowed Dubois in the predominantly Irish church. When Dubois suffered a stroke from which he never really recovered, Hughes became ever more important. In August of 1838, jurisdiction over the diocese was removed from Dubois and
passed to Hughes. It was a shock and a source of great personal hurt to the old Frenchman who had labored so hard. For the next four years he prepared for death, which came to him in December 1842. As he had been neglected in New York in life, so too in death. He was buried under the sidewalk in front of Old St. Patrick’s Cathedral and his remains lay forgotten for the next 134 years.

The presentation of Dubois by S. is always kind, sympathetic, and fair. Even his imperiousness in dealing with students, sisters, and staff at Mt. St. Mary’s during his great building enterprises is treated gently. At times the prose becomes so intertwined with quotations and personal comments on S.’s part that it is not easy reading. None of this substantially detracts, however, from a loving tribute to an important and forgotten American churchman. The collection of imprints and illustrations makes the book even more valuable.

*Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y.*  
*Paul K. Hennessy, C.F.C.*


These two volumes continue the publication of the critical edition of Schleiermacher’s works and give rise to the hope that this major publishing endeavor so admirably undertaken by the publishing firm of Walter de Gruyter will advance with some regularity. The first two volumes to have been published until now were the first edition of Schleiermacher’s *Glaubenslehre*, an invaluable publication because the first edition had become scarce and was obtainable only with difficulty (*TS* 43 [1982] 537–38). Nevertheless, the publication of these two (published as Parts 1 and 2 of Vol. 7) was not a complex editorial undertaking, for the volumes were basically reprints of the first edition. The present publication of the third part of that volume not only brings to completion the third volume, but also makes available hitherto unavailable or scarcely available materials. By publishing at the same time the first volume of the collected works, de Gruyter has produced a volume of Schleiermacher’s earliest writings.

The first volume contains an introduction by Hans-Joachim Birkner, representing the editorial board (Gerhard Ebeling, Hermann Fischer, Heinz Kimmerle, and Kurt-Victor Selge), that explains the scope, organization, and editorial principles of this first critical edition of S.’s corpus. The edition is divided into five basic sections: writings and drafts, lectures, sermons, translations, and finally correspondence along with biographical documentation. In addition, Günther Meckenstock, the
editor of the materials within the first volume, has produced a lengthy introduction (xvi-lxxxix) explaining the historical context and origin of the material published by means of short comments on each of the items. As is proper for a critical edition, the commentary is as objective, descriptive, and informative as possible without any attempt at a constructive interpretation. Quite often the issue of the dating is the main point of the commentary. Of the material published in this volume, only four have been previously published. Six were previously totally unknown. The others were available to Wilhelm Dilthey and partially excerpted in his monumental life of Schleiermacher.

These early excerpts, translations (included here rather than in the later sections), help clarify the relation of the early S. to Aristotle, Spinoza, and Kant. Although S. is well known for his translation of Plato's *Dialogues*, still available in paperback as classic editions, his earliest publication was a translation and commentary of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics. The publication of S.’s essays on “The Highest Good,” “Dialogues about Freedom,” and “On Freedom” shows his early acquaintance and confrontation with Kantian moral philosophy.

S. lectured using as his basic text the first edition of his *Glaubenslehre* and his written comments in the margins. These glosses, previously unpublished, have now been published in Part 3 of Vol. 7 (3-207). In addition, the volume also documents the initial reception of the first edition by printing these contemporary reviews along with relevant excerpts from contemporary theologians. This volume, therefore, provides excellent source material for the transition from the first to the second edition. Along with S.’s *On the Glaubenslehre: Two Letters to Dr. Lücke*, this volume displays S.’s own self-understanding and interpretation of his major work. Although he maintained in his letters to Lücke that the changes between the editions would not be major, the marginal notes and the source material bring to the fore the degree to which these changes are indeed responses to contemporary critiques.

Walter de Gruyter is to be congratulated on the care and expeditiousness with which it is publishing the volumes of S.’s critical edition. No serious theological library or research library can be without these volumes. It is hoped that they will soon produce the critical edition of S.’s *Sittenlehre* and *Dialektik*—the highest desiderata of Schleiermacher research.

*Catholic University of America*  
FRANCIS SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA


No theologian is more deserving of having in-depth studies done on
his work than Congar, but the few done on him to date (as dissertations) seem to remain unpublished. Now Timothy McDonald has produced a study of considerable merit on Congar's ecclesiology. He has worked through the vast corpus of the French Dominican's writings from the 1930's to his recent I Believe in the Holy Spirit (1979–80; ET 1983), and written a comprehensive summary and analysis of C.'s thought on the Church.

Congar has been a leader in the rethinking of Catholic ecclesiology in this century, moving it beyond the description of the structures of authority to a deep study of the spiritual nature of the Church. In an interesting background chapter, M. traces the influence of C.'s historical study, of his reading of Möhler, Aquinas, and others, and of significant Orthodox theologians. The main body of the book consists of lengthy chapters on four principal topics of C.'s work in ecclesiology: reform in the Church, the role of the laity, the relation of Church and world, and the Church as a communion.

One of C.'s greatest contributions has been his perceptive, nuanced, and constructive thought on reform in the Church, well and systematically presented here by M., drawing first on Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église, but also on numerous other works. But here and elsewhere in the book he underestimates C.'s understanding of the historicity of Church structures. The chapters on the role of the laity and on Church and world, though they do include some overlapping of subject matter, carefully and effectively follow Congar's reasoning from theological principles to particular positions.

The authority structures of the Church are dealt with in an admirably well-organized 70-page chapter on the Church as a communion, which begins with C.'s foundations in Trinitarian theology and pneumatology, works through his articulation of the scriptural images of Body of Christ and People of God, and culminates in the expressions of communion: conciliarity, collegiality, and reception. On collegiality, M. draws especially on Ministères et communion ecclésiale (1971), an important post-Vatican II work of Congar's. Eight pages on reception show C.'s stress that the content of a doctrinal declaration by pope or council should be recognizable as stemming from the apostolic faith.

At the end of each chapter and at greater length at the end of the book, M. offers evaluative comments. These show much thought and are not without merit, though one does tend to wonder whether a giant like C., who has written works of great importance for over 50 years, can really be judged adequately simply by the concepts and value preferences of the 1980's. In style this book, an unrevised dissertation, is ponderous, verbose, and jargonistic, and has no index. However, it is methodical and
clear and with its wealth of references provides a comprehensive guide to the work of Congar.

*Loyola University, Chicago*  
Richard F. Costigan, S.J.


*Sex and Gender* is a collection of papers given at a symposium for American bishops at Dallas in October 1982. It deals specifically with homosexuality and transsexualism or sexual dysphoria. These phenomena are treated by scientists and theologians from the viewpoint of their respective disciplines. By way of preparation for the above discussions, the first section of the book is devoted to the origin of sex and gender viewed from a biological, psychiatric, and anthropological perspective.

Sex ultimately is determined chromosomally. The male has a Y chromosome which determines his sex. It does this through an antigen (H-Y) which induces the development of the indifferent gonad into a male testis. The secretion of the male hormone from this testis then stimulates the growth of the other male organs and characteristics. Without the Y chromosome the embryo will develop as a female. If everything goes normally, the sex of the child will be evident at birth. But if something goes wrong in the developmental stages, ambiguity may arise in the internal and/or external genitalia. What is recent is the finding that sexual dimorphism affects even the central nervous system, and that a prenatal deficiency of the male hormone in this area may be a disposing (but not a determining) factor in homosexuality, and perhaps even in transsexualism.

Sexual differences are basically biological. But they are magnified in society by stereotypes formed regarding the ways the different sexes conduct themselves. Initial differences in disposition are magnified by each interaction between biological, psychological, and social factors so that ultimately gender stereotypes appear. These stereotypes derive from sexual differences but go beyond them.

Problems of gender identity may arise from some kind of ambiguity in biological sex. But they may also arise where there is no such ambiguity. This is the case with homosexuality and transsexualism, allowance being made for some deficiency in the central nervous system as a disposing factor.

As is generally known, there is no agreement regarding the origin of a homosexual orientation—whether it is genetic, or at least congenital, or whether it is learned. But there seems to be general agreement that the
orientation is prior to homosexual activity. What seems to be common in the early youth and adolescence of homosexuals is what is called gender nonconformity. Homosexuals do not conduct themselves the way their peers of the same sex do. They also tend to isolate themselves from these peers. One author claims that it is this isolation particularly that surrounds those of the same sex with the kind of mystery that gives rise to sexual interest. There is disagreement regarding the influence parents have in the learning process.

Of greater concern to the theologians is the attitude some of the scientists take toward the homosexual problem. They show little interest in the procreative aspect of sex. Rather, they seem to content themselves with sex as a dyadic activity and the satisfaction it provides. The result is an acceptance of homosexual activity as an option, and a consequent lack of interest in changing a homosexual orientation.

Scientists are less complacent about transsexualism. Although not unrelated to homosexuality, transsexualism involves more than a disordered sexual preference. It is gender dysphoria, or dissatisfaction with one’s own sex. Again the approach of the scientists and theologians differs. The scientists are satisfied if in adjusting the sex of the patient to his desires they can make dyadic sex function possible and satisfactory. Again there is little concern for the basic procreative nature of sex. They show the same lack of concern in sexual assignment where the genitalia are ambiguous. On the other hand, while scientists do not rule out the kind of surgery the transsexualist may seek, they are becoming less enchanted by the results, and feel that generally less radical treatment may be just as effective. Theologians, basing their thinking on the procreative meaning of sex, deny that sex can really be changed. Plastic surgery can only change appearances and be misleading.

*Sex and Gender* updates the reader regarding the most recent scientific study done in the fields discussed. It also brings to the surface the nonscientific assumptions underlying much of this study and assesses them in the light of traditional Catholic theology and teaching.

Loyola University of Chicago

JOHN R. CONNERY, S.J.


The liturgical articulation of the faith corresponds to the experience of the life of faith, which must find its outward expression in images, poetry, and song, as well as symbolic action. This happens because liturgy
is not so much a speaking about God as a speaking from God and to God. It has a dialogue structure in which the external liturgical expression is the response to the word of God spoken inwardly in the depth of the life of faith. The necessary poetic character of liturgical expression has been recognized for a long time and has received some attention in scientific literature. However, these two volumes provide a rather comprehensive treatment of the theme from a variety of standpoints involving interdisciplinary co-operation.

The first part of this impressive compendium offers abundant material from the rich tradition of liturgical poetry which enables the reader to gain a sharper view of the laws which govern effective communal worship. The initial essay on the subject of the religious origin of poetry is followed by four which deal with the role of the Psalms in Jewish liturgy and piety. The next three studies indicate how the NT is influenced by the Christological rereading of the Psalter and the growth of Christian hymns, which together with acclamations played a key function in early worship. The remaining 27 articles provide examples drawn from the old Church, the Middle Ages, and the period from the Reformation to the present day which show the use which liturgy makes of symbolic language, poetry, and musical elements to celebrate the ineffable.

The second volume contains interdisciplinary reflection on the subject of the significance of the tradition of cultic poetry for culture, theology, and liturgy. The anthropological section has 14 articles on the themes of language (and problems of translation), musical and gestural expression, dance, theatre, art and archeology, as well as the psychological, sociological, and political dimensions of biblical and liturgical texts. The theological section contains an important analysis of Ps 30(29) along with insightful essays in the fields of history of dogma, dogmatics, religious instruction, homiletics, and spirituality. Seven contributions to the area of the science of liturgy include such topics as the poetic genre of the Collects and the structure of the Liturgy of the Word. The last two essays form a kind of summary of the whole compendium. The last one is an excellent presentation of the theme “doxology as origin and goal of all theology.”

This description of the compendium may serve to show that it is a rich source of material, a very impressive reference work. The articles, written by almost 70 specialists, are quite original and of a high standard of scholarship. Bibliographies regularly accompany the contributions and there are indexes of names, subjects, incipits of liturgical and other texts, and biblical citations.

Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome  
EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.

Even though eight years have passed since Kilpatrick delivered these Moorhouse Lectures, they now are published in lecture style with no footnoting, bibliography, or attention to subsequent scholarship. Nonetheless, this work deserves the attention of biblical scholars for its careful textual exegesis and use of rabbinic sources. But it is the primary audience of these lectures, liturgical scholars, who should take special notice of the methodology and the challenging conclusions offered here. The development begins with and centers around the four accounts of the institution of the Eucharist. K. identifies 1 Cor 11 and Mk 14 as the two primary sources of the institution account of the Last Supper. The Pauline account, the older of the two, is a Greek liturgical revision of an earlier Semitic account. On the other hand, Mk 14, while not as old as 1 Cor 11, represents a nonliturgical, catechetical tradition which is consistently near the Semitic idiom. Not only Mt 26 but also Lk 22 (the shorter text) depend on Mk 14, and they are also catechetical in nature. Since the command *tou̱to̱ poieite eis tê̱n emê̱n anamnê̱sin* is a result of a liturgical revision, and not a command issued by Jesus at the Last Supper, its meaning is to be drawn from the context of 1 Cor 11, which leads K. to conclude that *kataggellete* gives the true meaning of *anamnê̱sis*. "Proclamation," then, not "memorial," is the reason for the inclusion of the institution narrative.

Rejecting any use of memorial either of the prayer or of the meal, K. argues that the Last Supper was not a Passover meal (eliminating the Seder as a source), nor was it an ordinary Jewish meal. Neither does he admit that the ordinary meals referred to in Acts or Didache 9 and 10 have any Eucharistic significance (eliminating the *Birkat-ha-Mazon* as a source). Instead, K. appeals to religious meals existing in Judaism at the time of Jesus (citing the meals of the Essenes and the account in *Joseph and Asenath*). At the Last Supper Jesus intended the Eucharist as the religious meal of his "society." The interpretation of this religious meal is drawn from ritual anthropology under the category of myth and ritual, and more particularly from the pattern of charter story followed by a ritual act. K. finds a Jewish equivalent of such a pattern not in the Passover Haggada but in the tradition of the observance of the Day of Atonement in the temple. At the Last Supper Jesus recited a charter story (institution account) followed by a ritual meal. The early Church did the same, giving birth to Eucharist. Throughout, the Last Supper is described in sacrificial terms, but not necessarily because of any link to the death of Jesus. K. identifies the biblical notion of sacrifice as a release of God's power, stating that at the Last Supper Jesus instituted a meal in which God's power is released with the intention of establishing a
covenantal relationship. The work ends with observations on the structure of recent liturgical reform, which is criticized for its distance from biblical roots. By way of demonstration, K. offers in an appendix a liturgical draft of the celebration of the Eucharist which clearly reflects his interpretation of the institution account as charter story followed by ritual, anamnesis as proclamation, and sacrifice as a release of power.

K.’s methodology is a departure from that accepted by liturgical scholars. Ever since Dix’s *Shape of the Liturgy* and Audet’s analysis of the berakah prayer form, the origin and meaning of Eucharist has been approached through the structure of the Eucharistic prayer (Ligier, Cuming, Spinks, Bouley, Talley, Giraudo). These scholars try to establish which Jewish prayers gave rise to Eucharist, and in every instance some understanding of memorial is central. K.’s rejection of memorial is deliberate and complete. Not only does he not find it useful or illustrative, but he states that it is disruptive of the true biblical meaning. This conclusion comes from a linguistic analysis of the words “bless,” “thanks,” “anamnesis,” and “sacrifice,” the very same words used by the scholars mentioned above. But in the end K. appeals to charter story rather than Jewish prayer form. If this is correct, one could expect to find evidence in liturgical tradition. While K.’s liturgical draft is faithful to the principles he articulates, it must be noted that it is strikingly different from the shape of the classical Eucharistic prayers.

The sacrificial character of the meal is explained biblically and at the very heart of Eucharist. While it is refreshing to find such a priority placed on sacrifice, the explanation suffers from its weak and unnecessary connection to the passion of Christ. Again, the content of the early Eucharistic prayers indicates a much greater connection of the two. While this is not a major work on the Eucharist, it offers a very useful challenge to liturgical scholars by questioning the widespread agreement on methodology, the importance of memorial, and the sacrificial character of Eucharist.

*Quincy College, Illinois*  
*Emmanuel J. Cutrone*


Judith Dwyer has edited a fine collection of essays presenting divergent views on the value and meaning of the U.S. bishops’ 1983 pastoral letter
on war and peace. Dwyer, Frank Winters, S.J., and Francis Meehan defend the pastoral, while Michael Novak and William O’Brien criticize it. These defenders and critics also disagree in their interpretation of the pastoral’s meaning.

O’Brien argues that *The Challenge of Peace* “is a flawed document” for a number of reasons. While affirming the validity of the just-war doctrine, the bishops, says O’Brien, do not really apply the doctrine, failing to determine whether there is a just cause for nuclear deterrence and nuclear war. They both are viewed as evil means, *mala in se*, apart from any justifying ends. Concretely expressed, the bishops do not balance the risks of deterrence and nuclear war against the almost certain loss of freedom if deterrence were abandoned. O’Brien reluctantly concludes that the bishops write as if they place mere physical survival “before fundamental freedoms, including the freedom to worship God.” Since the bishops do not seriously assess the threats to freedom nor the prospects for countering those threats, “the rationale for continuing the nuclear deterrence system is fuzzy and implicit rather than explicit.” The deterrence embraced by the bishops rests solely on the *possession* of nuclear weapons because they all but rule out any use of nuclear weapons even against a military target. This is a bluff deterrent, says O’Brien, and could not in practice work.

The bishops, says Dwyer to O’Brien, do not condemn every possible use of nuclear weapons as intrinsically immoral, *malum in se*. If the bishops had done so, says Dwyer, then deterrence would have become an empty bluff, “since the deterrence is credible insofar as the enemy believes that some nuclear weapons will be used,” should the necessity arise. Dwyer goes on to point out that leading Catholic moralists—McCormick, Curran, Hehir, Winters, Hollenbach—go a centimeter further than the bishops and condemn any use of nuclear weapons. Hehir believes, says Dwyer, that the U.S. should surrender rather than use nuclear weapons, should deterrence fail. Even though the bishops’ pastoral refrains from outright condemnation of all nuclear weapons, it is still a “document in the ‘spirit’ of Hehir, Winters, Hollenbach, and Curran.” This appraisal seems, ironically, to lend support to O’Brien’s explanation of the bishops’ pastoral. Because of all the strictures on the use of nuclear weapons, and the absence of a strong argument for risking the danger of maintaining a nuclear deterrent, the bishops at least come within a centimeter of embracing a bluff deterrent.

Winters strongly endorses the bishops’ plea for a shift to a “no first use” policy, and their condemnation of any retaliatory use of nuclear weapons as well as the threat to use them against civilian populations or military targets near populated cities. He also strongly supports the episcopal call for strengthening conventional forces, which, he says, might
enhance deterrence in Europe. Winters believes deterrence would remain effective if the bishops’ proposals were accepted, because the Soviets would simply not believe any U.S. promise to renounce the use of nuclear weapons. In summing up the bishops’ position on the use of nuclear weapons, Winters says: “The Bishops’ challenge to national policy can be adequately described as radical.”

The book of essays on *The Challenge of Peace*, edited by Pawlikowski and Senior, is not a commentary on the pastoral letter but a collection of theological reflections on sundry aspects of the pastoral. There are interesting comments on the love of enemies and a thought-provoking argument that the bishops failed to see clearly what the challenge of peace is. “Peace is the achievement of love.” But, as St. Thomas reminds us, “there only will you have true peace where true good is desired.” Several authors rightly call for further development of a theology of power. The essays in general, however, are disappointing, because they do not grapple with important themes and lacunae in the pastoral and also make a number of assertions without sufficient argument.

In future commentaries and reflections on *The Challenge of Peace* much serious attention should be directed to the recent pastoral letters on war and peace of the French and West German bishops. These letters contain a richer theological treatment of peace than that found in the American pastoral letter.

*University of Scranton*  
J. BRIAN BENESTAD


Dougherty is professor of politics at St. Joseph’s University, Phila., and senior staff member of the Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis. This work reflects his extraordinary range of interests and competences, embracing theology, political theory, international-relations theory, and the technical issues of modern weaponry. He addresses the principal issues discussed in the American Catholic bishops’ 1983 pastoral letter against the background of a concise summary and analysis of the evolution of Catholic thought on war. He concludes that the Church has yet to develop adequate doctrine to deal with the novel dilemmas of nuclear deterrence, but considers *The Challenge of Peace* to be a contribution to our continuing effort to deal with this subject.

A useful dimension to D.’s analyses is provided by a chapter on “Changing Bishops in a Changing Catholic Church.” D. places the 1983
pastoral letter in the context of changes in the Church, the American society, and the new perspectives of bishops appointed to office since the 1960's. In this and other parts of the book, D. reveals himself to be an informed and responsible Catholic layman, sensitive to contemporary trends in liturgy, theology, and social thought and action. In another chapter he describes and comments on the process that produced *The Challenge of Peace*. Criticism on specific points is generally balanced with a supportive attitude toward the bishops' work.

D.'s critique of the pastoral emphasizes the need for more thought on problems of deterrence, but also deals with the implications of the letter for arms control, issues of priorities between spending for defense and for social/economic programs, the requirements of co-ordinating our security posture with that of the West Europeans, and the reconciliation of all of these complex considerations in future U.S. strategic policies. His outlook is optimistic, perhaps reflecting confidence based more on faith than on clinical strategic analyses. His book is an authoritative, timely contribution to the ongoing debate on morality, nuclear deterrence, defense, and arms control.

Lawler, Catholic author and editor, is founder and president of the American Catholic Conference, a lay organization. Like Dougherty, L. summarizes and analyzes the pastoral letter. He includes the official summary of the letter as an appendix on the sound premise than many to whom it is directed will not read it in its entirety. He also includes a brief annotated bibliography. His book is more journalistic and popular, intended for average readers and study groups. It is, however, based on a firm understanding of the practical and moral issues and an impressive familiarity with the pastoral’s background. He is more inclined than Dougherty to criticize the bishops, albeit in a civil and constructive fashion, e.g., on their failure to address the war-fighting contingencies inherent in a deterrence posture because of the possibility that deterrence may fail.

L. concludes with a chapter on the power of prayer, a resource that he believes the bishops and most of the faithful who have confronted the moral dilemmas of nuclear deterrence, defense, and arms control to have slighted. This is a clear, interesting book that achieves its purpose of providing a basis for further study and discussion, as encouraged by the bishops and as is required by the nature of the subject.

Both books reflect the moral commitments, as well as the knowledge, of the authors. They are evidence of the wealth of relevant expertise to be found among Catholic lay persons as the Church debates nuclear issues.

*Georgetown University*  
*William V. O'Brien*

Social-justice ministry is a sprawling, frustrating, intimidating, demanding task. Social Justice Ministry by Steidl-Meier seems unusually up to that task. This is a book about foundations, but it does more than lay a base; it constructs a whole framework for conceptualizing and doing social-justice ministry. It has the schematic qualities of a textbook and the comprehensive qualities of a reference book. It is coherent, clear, and complex. It is a book to be studied more than read.

S. begins by reviewing the unresolved dilemma of the Church and social evil. The quest is to avoid the extremes of abstaining from social-justice ministry in the name of an otherworldly religion and of restricting the transcendent character of religion to social improvement. The key to the middle ground is Jesus, whose ministry was metapolitical (normative rather than prescriptive) and whose Spirit guides the Church to minister accordingly. Thus S. stands on the same foundation as Gaudium et spes and the 1971 World Synod of Bishops on Justice in the World.

Moving on to a consideration of method, S. proposes a diagnostic method which is congruent with a relational theology. Both elements reflect the influence of Bernard Lonergan, although in concept and language there is also great similarity to process thought. Indeed, a very complementary parallel to S.'s work could be drawn from a process-relational perspective.

Having declared his presuppositions, S. builds his foundation on five key elements. The first is an understanding of the social, which is mediated primarily through social analysis. This is a helpful overview of the basic forms and dynamics which structure social life. The presentation reminds that societies are complex and anyone seeking to bring more justice into a society needs to know how it works (which supports the appeal in chap. 2 for a diagnostic method).

The second foundational element is an understanding of what justice is and what, consequently, social-justice ministry is committed to. The presentation synthesizes notions from social ethics and church teaching, resulting in a comprehensive schema of definitions and values succinctly assembled on a one-page table.

The remaining three elements move more into empirical-experiential areas. History and Christian social praxis touches on the issues of providence, historical consciousness, suffering, hope, freedom, and pluralism. Such major topics cannot be treated very extensively, even in a foundational way, but S. gives them a fair and co-ordinated look.

Spirituality of social-justice ministry covers some familiar ground about the historically-conditioned rift between spiritual and social ex-
perience. S. tries to close that gap by pairing the categories of social relations with the qualities of spiritual conversion. Like any table of matching categories, there is something a little forced about balancing both sides of a column, but the descriptions in the text are valuable. It is clear that S. advocates an integration of spiritual and social commitment, but it is not as clear how the two actually flow together, especially if social action is the starting point of one’s spirituality.

The final foundational issue is the organization of social ministry. Here S. initially reviews the contemporary models of social-ministry organization and then offers key principles which would govern any organization of the Church’s social ministry. From this position he lists more specific criteria which would characterize a well-organized social ministry.

Throughout this first part of the book, S. is summarizing, surveying, schematizing the constituents of social-justice ministry. The material is concise, condensed, and helpful, but it is also a little distant, disengaged, methodical. The passion for justice, the excitement of ministry, the engagement of real people is, understandably, missing from the presentation. Some of this peeks through in Part 2, where the five principal concerns of social-justice ministry are treated. These are the same five which occupied the second part of Gaudium et spes. Like the conciliar document, S.’s discussion is necessarily and admittedly generic, but dealing with specific issues allows him to claim his own positions and suggest his own solutions. Especially in the chapter on family and workers does S.’s ministerial feeling emerge, and in the chapter on poverty, population, and development his holistic conceptual strength asserts itself.

In some ways the Afterword on human development in ministry could be read as a preface, for it sketches the dynamism and potential of social-justice ministry in a vocational and personal way. The extensive foundational discussion in the book needs this sort of enfleshment to have a motivational appeal and maximum impact. And Social Justice Ministry should have maximum impact. It is a genuine contribution to social-justice work in the Church today. In fact I’m going to read the book again.

Catholic University of America

ROBERT L. KINAST
SHORTER NOTICES


Here is no-nonsense biblical scholarship in attractive style. This is the first of a projected series of four books on the individual Passion narratives. Senior's research in this area began with his doctoral work on Matthew's Passion account at Louvain in the early 70's. Now he is applying his recognized gifts of synthesis and clarity to explain the theological and spiritual significance of these focal Gospel narratives for the nonspecialist reader.

The book is planned in three parts: the preparation for the Passion, an analysis of the Passion narrative, and a gathering up of the results for the meaning of the Passion according to Mark. Along the way, footnotes serve as doorways to the scientific debates, but S. has been able to keep the main text clear of scholarly underbrush (though I wonder about several of the parenthesized Greek words).

S. describes the Gospel itself as also divided into three sections: the bountiful Galilee mission (1:14—8:21) and the story of conflict and death (11:1—16:8) flanking the central section on discipleship from Caesarea Philippi to the entry into Jerusalem (8:22—10:52). He uses the striking term "passion of the community" to describe the fate of Jesus' followers, which is predicted in subtle and not-so-subtle ways (chap. 13) throughout the Gospel.

For Mark, the title Son of Man is a "touchstone" for properly understanding Jesus, though other titles (Christ, Son of God) are also important. The Evangelist draws constantly from the OT, particularly from the Psalms and Isaiah, to illuminate the meaning of Jesus. He always has one eye on his contemporary community when portraying the career of Jesus and the first disciples. S. draws the reader's attention time after time to the literary adroitness of Mark. S.'s own use of metaphor and description ("cobweb of death," "taproot of biblical faith," the "choked voice" of the Agony, the "swaggering" of James and John) brightens the book throughout.

JEROME KODELL, O.S.B.
New Subiaco Abbey, Ark.


Written for the college, seminary, and general audience, this commentary focuses on selected themes from each chapter of the Gospel. A general treatment of each section is followed by detailed comments on selected exegetical points. Several pages at the end of the book contain discussion questions for each chapter. For those who desire to use the book with a class, T. has provided a page of bibliographical references to major works on John in English. He has clearly made an attempt to digest what the major commentators have been saying about John in a form that the upper-level collegian, seminary student, or adult reader with some understanding of biblical studies can grasp.

The task of writing such a commentary is difficult. This book does not always succeed. A good editor might have helped T. catch the places which require explanation, like the confusing treatment of "high" and "low" Christology in the introduction or the use of unexplained concepts like "graeco-roman revelation literature." Sometimes all that is needed is the reference to specific passages in the Gospel as examples.

Anyone who is familiar with some of the basic works on John in T.'s bibliography will have no difficulty clarify-
These obscurities. This is not a "reflective" commentary in the sense that it is oriented toward "spiritual reading." It works best in the classroom or Bible-study setting, where the teacher or leader is able to provide explanations.

**PHEME PERKINS**
*Boston College*


Lindbeck's motivation here is irenic and ecumenical. He seeks a theory of religion and doctrine that will more adequately conceptualize the possibility of constancy and change within church doctrines, as well as provide better categories for understanding agreement and disagreement among the various Christian traditions. He disputes the ecumenical value of either traditional orthodoxy's propositional categories, which see doctrine as ontological truth-claims regarding objective realities, or liberal theology's "experiential-expressive" approach, which roots religious experience in a putative common inner experience of the divine.

L.'s approach is to develop an epistemology of ecumenism based on a "cultural-linguistic view of religion" that operates with a "rule theory" of doctrine. In other words, religion is analogous to language reflecting a culture, and church doctrines are grammatical "rules of discourse, attitude, and action" that retain "invariant meaning under changing conditions of compatibility and conflict." The process is one of continuing articulation of the (biblical) stories and myths found in the commonly held foundations of the religion/culture for the shaping of life and thought in history in response to its changing situations. With such a methodology, intrasystematic consistency with the total pattern of the religion/culture and its interpretations of life in the world becomes the sole norm of truth-claims. Further ontological claims for truth are then left "for discussion among those who genuinely disagree."

L.'s method is intriguing, provocative, and worthy of consideration. He is, above all, honest: he sees the shortcomings of the method and how inhospitable the modern world may be to it because of our penchant for the liberal and propositional-dogmatic approaches, as well as because of our loss of an experience of community as a principle of meaning, truth, and action. Attacks on Lonergan and Rahner are sprinkled throughout the work, for their minimizing the distinctiveness of Christianity, as well as for their over-intellectualizing the experience. L. himself may suffer from the latter.

**MARTIN R. TRIPOLE, S.J.**
*St. Joseph's University, Phila.*


This little book is the fruit of H.'s theological reflection on her experience as the mother of three small children. Its purpose, in her own words, is "to find what truth there is in calling God our mother, to meditate on what human motherhood can tell us about God's love" (3). H. is fully aware that she stands in continuity with a neglected but rich part of Christian tradition which confirms and encourages a maternal vision of God. This tradition, as H. shows, has its roots in the Bible and has been developed by a host of Christian writers from Gregory of Nyssa to John XXIII. Within this context, *Motherhood and God* makes a valuable and somewhat unique contribution to the growing body of contemporary literature on the image and idea of God as mother.

H. divides her book into a prelude
(chap. 1), a lengthy section on her experience of motherhood (2–13), a shorter section on how a mother can nourish her faith by prayer, the sacraments, and theology (14–16), and a postlude (17). H. is at her best when she relates her own maternal experience to such topics as heaven and the beatific vision, God’s patience with and care for us, and the death of God’s Son upon the cross. These connections disclose the richness of an experience-based theology, which nowadays, H. notes, is more talked about than done (129). On a more popular level *Motherhood and God* offers a practical, realistic, and substantive spirituality for mothers in particular and for families in general. Generically, H. sets forth an Ignatian spirituality, growing out of her own experience of the Exercises.

On the whole, *Motherhood and God* can be recommended with confidence to a wide audience: lay people, clergy, religious, and seminarians. An American edition ought to be forthcoming so that this book can be readily available in this country.

**Joseph F. Chorpenning, O.S.F.S.**

*Allentown College, Pa.*


Pancheri’s book offers for the first time in English an objective analysis of the problems inherent in the traditional Scotistic attempt to explain the universal primacy of Christ. The English version is an adaptation and condensation of P.’s original essay, though the translator has carefully sought to respect and maintain the thought and expression of the author, presently president of the Pontifical Theological Faculty Seraphicum in Rome.

Although the doctrine of the universal primacy of Christ is inseparably linked with Duns Scotus, P. provides a very helpful context for understanding the problem by a critical presentation of the positions of earlier authors, including Anselm, Bonaventure, and Thomas. With Scotus, P. finds their contributions inadequate due to the narrowness and ambiguities of their anthropocentrism and hamartiocentrism in approaching Anselm’s classic question “Cur Deus homo?” The reliance of Thomas on Bonaventure’s emphasis on human sin as the ratio for the Incarnation is unacceptable and unworthy of the Christ who from the beginning is the completion and perfection of God’s creation (Eph 1:4, Col 1:16–17). Scotus, however, placed the problem in a new context in linking it closely with the doctrine of Christ’s predestination, which substantially coincides with his primacy. By relating the universal primacy of Christ to the *ordo amoris* of the divine predestination, we better understand Christ’s mission and its relation to all divine works *ad extra*, since the gratuitous love of God is the “ultimate principle that rules, illuminates, and dominates everything.”

Following a critical development of the Scotistic position, P. presents evaluations of later contributions of various theological schools to the understanding of the problem. Most of the Thomistic efforts, including the *tertia via* of Suarez, are forcefully rejected as inadequate or contradictory because of their dependence on basic Thomistic insights. Later Scotistic schools are also evaluated with somewhat more mixed results. Scotists and other sympathetic readers will find much to appreciate in this statement of the Subtle Doctor’s thesis on a critical medieval Christological question with modern applications. Thomists, neo and otherwise, may well have problems with the presentation.

**William Ribando, C.S.C.**

*King’s College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.*

Eventually published in France in 1980 as Petite catéchèse sur nature et grâce, this book first took shape as a set of notes drafted to help the International Theological Commission, then expanded as an article published in the July 1977 issue of the French Communio. The text of this edition runs 173 pages, to which are joined 5 appendices.

The text provides “catechetical instruction” on two associated distinctions: nature (human nature) and the supernatural; nature (freedom) and grace. Although L. has already published two important works on the meaning of the supernatural (Surnaturel: Études historiques in 1946 and Le mystère du surnaturel in 1965), he writes this study with post-Vatican II problems clearly in mind. Drawing freely from his extensive knowledge of the Fathers, L. also cites from a wide range of studies published in the 60's and 70's. While opposing any form of dualism or extrinsicism (Blondel a valuable guide here), L. argues that to deny the distinction between the natural and supernatural, regardless of whatever words express it, is “to deny as well and in its very principle every notion of revelation, mystery, divine Incarnation, redemption or salvation” (22). The supernatural is not abnormal (the miracle), not something adventitious (merely “superadded”), nor defined solely by its characteristic of gratuitousness (though it clearly surpasses the necessary). L.’s remarks on humility, its virtual absence from pagan culture and literature, on the purpose of asceticism (not training but transformation), on the proper understanding of the relationship between evangelization and human progress, and on the loss of a sense of sin are timeless and therefore especially relevant to our own age.

The five appendices treat the important use of the idea of the supernatural in the texts of Vatican II documents, the ambiguities of Schillebeeckx’ treatment of the Church as the “sacrament of the world,” the misuse of Vatican II by certain publicists, the abuse of Paul VI by the extreme right in France, and the contemporary manifestations of the sacred. Besides L.’s own insights, there are striking quotations from other authors. Unfortunately, there is no index or bibliography, a recurrent omission in books published by Ignatius Press. The book is worth reading, especially for an intelligent and historically sophisticated critique of post-Vatican II theological trends.

JAMES HEFT, S.M.
University of Dayton


This book contains a good deal of useful information about the old and the new in Catholic thinking about sacraments. In the first three chapters G. traces the development of the concept “sacrament,” examines the main themes of the scholastic doctrine on sacraments in general, and looks in some detail at each of the seven sacraments. On the one hand, he provides a concise, scholarly inventory of the important elements of traditional Catholic sacramental theology, with a care for historical context. On the other hand, he also reports on the efforts of present-day theologians to reinterpret this tradition. Especially valuable throughout is the fair, objective treatment of scholastic theology (and the teaching of Trent) in juxtaposition to 20th-century theologians such as Schillebeeckx and Rahner (and the teaching
of Vatican II). In all this, G. is critical as well as appreciative, but never polemical. He is looking for continuity and for pastoral relevance, as he contrasts old and new. In the last chapter (4), G. attempts a provisional speculative interpretation of the sacraments in general. Relying especially on the work of H.-D. Bastian (Kommunikation, 1972), he makes an original and creative use of ideas from modern communication theory. While avoiding any kind of reductionism, he is able to understand the sacraments as systems of communication within a whole ecclesial life of communication—all of which reflects and symbolizes the ultimate mystery of God as self-communicating Love. This synthesis of many of the themes uncovered in the earlier chapters gives the book a satisfying unity.

This work should be a valuable resource for serious students of theology, but it is not easy to use in its English version. The translators have too often missed or muddled the meaning of the original German text, or simply written clumsy English. Consequently, the book requires patient and careful study—if possible, with the German original at hand.

WAYNE L. FEHR, S.J.
Marquette University


The role of Mary in God's loving wisdom for humankind would seem to be a fruitful topic for Christian-Muslim interchange. The only woman mentioned by name in the Qur'an, Mary is held up as a sign (aya) of God's power and mercy, a model (mathal) of faithfulness and trust, an upright (siddiqa) person and one of the devout (qanitin). Christians might be surprised to learn that Mary is mentioned more often (34 times) in the Qur'an than in the NT (19 times), and that the Qur'an contains accounts of her presentation in the temple, the Annunciation, and the birth of Jesus.

Unfortunately, the work under review is not the one to initiate such a Muslim-Christian rapprochement. Despite the expressly dialogical intent stated in the Introduction and final chapter, this translation and revision by Fares of a 1940's work by Geagea does not exhibit the respect and understanding for the faith and scripture of Islam necessary to open any serious interchange.

The author's view of the Qur'an is that of a "jumble, a fragmentary work randomly pieced together" by "ad hoc committees" to satisfy Uthman's caliphal ambitions. The result is "dull and tedious" and produces "a nightmare of doubt and perplexity" in the reader; it is "the code of a religion which is flat and formalistic in which nothing transcends the possibilities of nature." The author needlessly repeats the value judgments of Guidi that the Qur'an gives "a disagreeable impression of disorder" and of the 17th-century critic Marracci that the Sura titles are "so ridiculous." It is fair to say that few Muslims would recognize their sacred book in its description given by the author(s), and one wonders why Geagea/Fares found it necessary to discredit and vilify the book from which they were simultaneously eliciting their Marian material.

The genuine Qur'anic concerns and lessons about Mary are buried under this work's Christian preoccupations, such as questions of Mary's "virginity in partu," her immaculate conception, assumption, and public cult. The holy and virginal woman of the Qur'an who prayed and fasted and trusted in God in adversity is obscured by theological issues alien to the time and spirit of the Qur'an.
The studies of the Marian material add little to the more careful works in French by Abd El Jalil, unfortunately still unavailable in English. Fares' translation fails to distinguish between Geagea's original work and his own additions and revisions. Although citations from Vatican I in the text and footnotes give the impression that this is a recent work or at least a thorough revision of the original, the translator fails to take account of the progress which has occurred in the past 40 years in Qur'anic studies, Mariology, and the theology of religions.

The original premise of the book is sound. Christians and Muslims have much to share concerning the divine message for mankind found in the person and role of Mary. However, this work, contentious, unfairly biased, and historically weak, cannot be recommended as the starting point for such a discussion.

THOMAS MICHEL, S.J.
Secretariat for Non-Christians
Rome


Willis began his career as a historian of Christian thought with his revised translation of Rouët de JourIllegal Enchaeridion patristicum (1966), in which his stated intention was “to let the Fathers speak for themselves.” W.'s preoccupation with the original sources also determined the design and execution of his multivolume History of Christian Thought, which systematically sets forth, from a Roman Catholic perspective, the ideas of the most important, representative thinkers of Christianity in their historical context, largely from primary sources. Vol. 1, covering the apostles to Augustine, became an immediate success as a college and seminary textbook because of its clarity, conciseness, and engaging prose style. The same unique qualities are no less manifest in Vol. 2 of the History, which likewise reflects the many years W. has spent reading, researching, and teaching this material to a generation of Boston College students.

Vol. 2, which outlines the development of Christian thought from the end of the patristic period to the humanists of the Renaissance, is divided into three main parts. Part 1, “The Early Middle Ages: 500-1100,” summarizes a great amount of disparate material in a relatively short space. Part 2, “The High Middle Ages: 1100-1300,” offers an impressive in-depth analysis of the great scholastic syntheses. Part 3 is a stimulating treatment of the Late Middle Ages and the Humanist movement.

Few modern studies written or translated into English will be able to match the lucidity and easy flow of W.'s exposition of the intricacies of these great Christian thinkers. Add to that the physical attractiveness of the volume itself, the quality of the paper, and the size of the type, and one has an ideal college or seminary textbook, which the instructor can confidently place in the hands of students with little or no prior background. These fortunate students will soon discover that reading Willis is the closest thing to reading the authors in question and often more comprehensible.

MARGARET A. SCHATKIN
Boston College


The main problem facing the reviewer of this book is determining for whom it was written. The book has few footnotes and appears to be addressing students, but it provides no real account of the doctrinal controversies of the early centuries, implying that the reader should already have a basic
knowledge of them, something few modern students can be expected to have. There is also an annoying polemical tone throughout. As usual in evangelical books, there is a general, if faint, smile in the direction of Jews and Roman Catholics, but "liberal" Protestants come in for much criticism. Alas, B.'s definition of "liberal" is anyone to the left of the evangelicals (who are called "orthodox") and anyone who uses the form-critical approach to Scripture.

B. is obsessed with the modern interpretation of Scripture, so that one third of this book deals with biblical issues. What is an attack on "liberal" theories about Second Isaiah doing in a book on early Christian doctrine (52–53)? Mistakes appear throughout. The main Marian shrines do not date from the 19th century; B. apparently does not know to whom the great French Gothic cathedrals are dedicated (75). Athanasius did not oppose imperial intervention in doctrinal affairs; he opposed intervention on behalf of the Arians (119). The emphasis is also questionable. The second-last chapter, "The Theological Synthesis" (172–94), deals entirely with the so-called Athanasian Creed.

B. does score some points by applying common sense to some "liberal" theories: e.g., the claim of some that the basic Christological formula of the apostolic age was the simple "Jesus is Lord." "It is hard to imagine how the poor Galatians could have gone so badly astray and called down even anathemas on their heads if all they had been taught to subscribe to in the first place was the simple 'Jesus is Lord'" (93).

It would be good for evangelicals to pay more attention to postapostolic developments, but unfortunately this book offers little in that direction.

JOSEPH F. T. KELLY
John Carroll University
Cleveland


This translation makes available to the English-speaking audience the French version published in 1972 (TS 34 [1973] 498–500). L.'s attempt to trace and explain as thoroughly as possible Philo's notion of *eucharistia* still remains the most comprehensive treatment of this important aspect of his thought. It shows the philological, liturgical, cosmological, and spiritual aspects of Philo's doctrine of thanksgiving.

Generally speaking, this study has been well received and is highly recommended as an excellent introduction to the spirituality of the great Alexandrian thinker. The long chapter "Eucharist and Liturgy" (49–97) has attracted the attention of those concerned with the nature and structure of the Christian Eucharistic prayer and its Jewish background. L.'s findings support the theory of Henri Czelle concerning the systematic distinction between *brk/eulogein* and *ydh/eucharistein* and the application of the sacrificial meaning of the latter word-group to the Christian Eucharistic prayer and ritual meal. Serious objections have been raised against the positions of these two scholars by Cesare Giraudo's *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucaristica* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981) 260–68. L. refers to this work in the "Complement to Bibliography" but does not respond to Giraudo's objection that he projects on Philo a eucharistic-sacrificial problematic which he "certainly did not have."

EDWARD J. KILMARTIN, S.J.
Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome


It has long been agreed that the eleventh-century reform was not a uniform movement, and this study is an excellent illustration of the web of conflicting loyalties and interests that composed this tradition. C. discusses Abbot Desiderius as the major theme and then brings in the three key elements of the subtitle—the abbey of Monte Cassino, the papacy, and the Normans—in contrapuntal manner to illustrate the harmony and dissonance these three created in their interaction. Desiderius is presented as a representative and leader of the famed abbey in one of its golden ages. But the limits of both are presented as well as the achievements, as far as can be determined from the records. C. shows that there were varied interpretations, recensions, and disagreements in the records kept by the abbey and others on what Desiderius did and said both as abbot and in the last months of his life as Pope Victor III. The major questions were: Was there more to the golden age than just building and enlargement, better administration of, and a firmer hold on, the patrimonial lands of St. Benedict? In what sense was Desiderius as abbot and as pope firmly or remotely a part of the reform tradition that went from Pope Leo IX to Gregory VII to Urban II?

C. shows well that the key to all interpretations and understanding of Desiderius is to see him as abbot of Monte Cassino. All he did was from this position; i.e., unlike the reform papacy, which lacked a firm power base to counter the German kings, Monte Cassino had a position of strength, and when it negotiated with or allied with the papacy, it could do so on its own terms and not as merely a weak and obedient subordinate. Secondly, the interests of the abbey demanded that at all costs care must be taken to establish a united and friendly attitude among the Normans of South Italy towards the abbey. Anything less than this invited disorder and threatened the stability and perhaps survival of the institution. On this point the reform popes and the abbey were not always in agreement. But for the abbey and the Normans, co-operation best protected them both against the contrary interests of both empires, German and Byzantine. C. takes us through the tortuous and labyrinthine twists and turns of the politics of that era to reveal as best he can the man, his career, his goals, and his impact, and fulfils the task set by his title and subtitle. The complexity of a simple matter like “the reform and freedom of the Church” is ably demonstrated in this worth-while and highly recommended study.

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


Rupert was an anomalous figure; actually from Liège, where he spent the major part of his life as oblate and monk, he got his designation from his last years as abbot of Deutz (1120–29). He was a strong advocate of the Gregorian Reform in a royalist area and an outspoken controversialist. Both stances changed his life, as he had to go into exile on several occasions. His distinctiveness and importance are based on more than just this; he was also a monk-preacher-teacher-scriptural-commentator who took a position on a number of theological issues that were coming to the fore in his era. He is thus a bridge-figure from the age of Gregory VII and Peter Damian to the era of Abelard, Bernard, Hugh of St. Victor, and later Peter Lombard.

His was not the typical monastic career, i.e., living in obscurity and anonymity, writing chronicles, far from worldly affairs and disputes of his age.
Rupert stepped forward as a defender of the "black monks" and their profession, their achievements and vocation, at a time when interest and attention were shifting to the new orders (e.g., Cistercians, Premonstratensians) and to the new life of scholastics. He came forward because in his own account, after he had a vocational crisis which delayed his own ordination, he felt himself called, impelled by God, to demonstrate the dignity, worth, and contribution of the monks. He was attacked and challenged by the new Schoolmen because he dared to enter the lists in controversy without sitting at the feet of the new masters. He was attacked from the other side because he was innovative in his writings and interpretations. Above all, he was prolific in his outpouring of works. Who else dared to attempt extensive commentary on the whole Bible? He took these challenges as personal affronts and fought back, just as in other circumstances of his life he took on the bishop of Liège, the archbishop of Cologne, the people of Deutz, and others when he felt his cause was just.

This study reveals Rupert to be a personality that should be better known. An individual in his own right, he dared to add to and claim to go beyond what the Fathers had written in their biblical commentaries. He had no fear of taking up the most complex theological disputes of the day—on the Eucharist, on the necessity of creation and Incarnation, predestination, etc., and the monumental quality and singleness of vision that illuminated his work anticipated the great summae of later medieval theology. As they would be writing for their time and audience, he was writing for his special audience, the monk-priests who he felt should have a profound and heartfelt grasp of what they were doing every day as they stood at the altar or in chapel involved in the opus Dei. His whole purpose was to enable them to see God's work in action in history and in their lives. Called by God, Rupert dared to be different, and so it is good that this book will make the man and his career, with all its disputes and crises, better known.

Thomas E. Morrissey
State University College
Fredonia, New York


A conference in 1979 on universities in early modern society led to this collection. It includes H. Oberman ("University and Society on the Threshold of Modern Times: The German Connection"), who shows the German universities losing their medieval breadth and becoming localized but also caught in their duty to provide public service and at the same time trying to avoid total subservience to local government. L. Spitz looks at the universities' response to the call of the new humanism, but also to their sectarian commitment once they had opted for one side or the other in the Reformation. E. Grant argues that in a sense the medieval student took more science at the universities than students do today ("Science and the Medieval University"). W. Courtenay discusses the new logic and new theology that came into existence and the link of Oxford with the Continental writers such as Gregory of Rimini. J. Fletcher disproves the view that universities in large part were the result of migration of students and faculty from one center to another. P. Knoll looks at the University of Cracow in the conciliarist movement and points out that the failure of conciliarism led to a gap between the leaders of the Church and the intellectual community. G. Lytle examines the careers of Oxford students in the later
Middle Ages; J. H. Overfield treats the relation of university studies and the clergy in pre-Reformation Germany, and M. A. Schreech presents Erasmus and Rabelais and their views on the study of Hebrew. There is an introduction by J. M. Kittelson, and the book ends with a look at research on universities (1969–79) and a summary bibliography by J. M. Fletcher and J. Deahl.

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


Stapeldon was a man of obscure origins, known as a gifted administrator and learned, who found himself moving among the high and mighty at a very perilous time. He had come a long way and did much to bring other members of his family with him, and in this showed himself similar to many another careerist of his age. He served as a diplomat and adviser to the king, was a founder of what would become Exeter College at Oxford, showed himself to be a stubborn and determined fighter in defending the rights and privileges of his office, especially in the years he spent as bishop of Exeter (from 1307 until his death in 1326). He was a generous leader of the diocese in so far as his contribution to various foundations and especially the revamping and rebuilding of the cathedral are concerned. In many ways he reminds one of a modern-day benefactor of an educational or charitable institution. But the fact was that he was the bishop and spiritual leader of his diocese at least in name, and very little of this quality comes through. This perhaps says a great deal of the state of the Church at this time (the time of the Avignon papacy). Stapeldon had come very far and climbed very high, and his fall was consequently precipitous and bloody. His career as treasurer made him stand out for the many financial exactions of Edward II, and the exasperation and opposition that finally broke out against the king and his favorites, the Dispensers, made Stapeldon one of its victims (his innocence or lack of it is another matter). He met his brutal end at the hands of a lynching mob in the streets of London. The lesson told so well by this study should never be forgotten.

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


Like other recent commentary, this book emphasizes the unity of scholastic thought and mysticism in Eckhart's Latin and German works. The first chapter, "Etre Dieu en Dieu," focuses on E.'s concern with beatitude as knowledge of God; salvation consists in an intellectual conversion and return to humanity's "original being" within the divine Word. The second and longest chapter presents "La métaphysique du Verbe." In developing this "true Christian metaphysics," E. uses a distinction drawn from Aristotelian physics: "alteration" involves succession and motion, while "generation" occurs in the instant and marks the "end" of alteration and time. By viewing creation within the Word, E. then identifies the "instant of creation" with the "now of eternity" wherein the Word is born. Here we may likewise discern the moment of the Word's birth in the soul. This chapter also discusses the unity of forms, the divine names, and E.'s logic of truth. The concluding third

Zum Brunn and Libera attempt a unified account of E.’s variegated work. This account is richly suggestive in the first two chapters but weakens in the third, which relies almost exclusively on the German works and often on Pfeiffer’s edition (whose texts should be used with greater caution). Maître Eckhart’s main strength consists in the prominence it accords dialectic and physics within E.’s thought. The book also contains insightful comparisons of E. to other thinkers, particularly Thomas, Albert, and the Cologne school. The authors thus correctly stress the scholastic sources and themes that shape E.’s theological and spiritual vision. Maître Eckhart is an important contribution to the current movement to see E. whole.

Donald F. Duclow
Guynedd-Mercy College, Pa.


If one really wants to know “Bonhoeffer’s message for today,” then one needs only to read Liberating Faith by Kelly, professor of theology at LaSalle College in Philadelphia. A Catholic theologian who has an intimate knowledge of the Bonhoeffer corpus and of the secondary literature, K. has an appreciation for the complexity of B.’s thinking and the necessity of understanding this German martyr in the context of his family, church, and nation—in short, in his life experience. But K. also has a gift for putting difficult material into easily understood language, so that the book’s potential readership will run the gamut from interested lay persons to students, pastors, and teachers. Provocative discussion questions are provided at the end of each chapter, which makes the book especially useful for seminars and study groups.

What excites me more than anything else is the way K. has managed to focus attention on all the major themes in B.’s theology, to interrelate them, to interpret their meaning in the context of B.’s life, and to relate them in challenging fashion to the Church’s task in the modern world. K. makes the meaning of faith and liberation come alive—for individuals, churches, and movements in society. No one has given a better explication of B.’s dialectic between arcane discipline and social responsibility in a world-come-of-age, and no one has presented the challenge of B.’s life and thought to today’s Christians more clearly.

Liberating Faith represents the fruit of many years of scholarly work by one of America’s eminent Bonhoeffer interpreters. I recommend it with enthusiasm.

John D. Godsey
Wesley Theological Seminary, D.C.


Lewis was one of that rare breed that combines highly specialized scholarship and deep personal piety in the cause of religion. This brief study attests to the modest but persistent, perhaps even growing, interest in his works since his death in 1963. It is a competent introduction by a man clearly familiar with all of L.'s writings and will serve as an able introduction for prospective readers.

The first chapter provides a succinct biographical and chronological survey
of the writings. Here one might have wished for greater emphasis on the Inklings, that group of complex and fascinating men who stimulated Lewis so much. Subsequent chapters sort out the specifics of Lewis' theology under such headings as "God As God," "God As Creator," "Jesus Christ and Redemption," etc. Here one gets the impression that his thought is being strained through the traditional seminary categories of De Deo trino et uno, De Deo incarnato, De creatione, De gratia, etc. The conclusion of this analysis is that L. was very orthodox or "mainline" in his acceptance and understanding of most Christian doctrines.

There are three shortcomings in this otherwise helpful introduction to L.'s ideas on Christianity. First, the book becomes controversial rather than analytical when W. engages Lewis on the question of infallibility and faults him for not following in the footsteps of his fellow Englishman John Henry Newman. As the introductory comments by Walter Hooper point out, in Mere Christianity, originally a series of BBC broadcasts, which W. uses a great deal in this book, L. deliberately avoided such controversial issues because his purpose was to stress that which united rather than divided mainstream Christians in England. Second, any possible link between Lewis' early scholarly work The Allegory of Love (1936) and his subsequent use of allegory to present old ideas in a new way goes totally unexplored. This is regrettable, because his allegorizing constitutes his major achievement as a popular religious writer, as readers of books like The Great Divorce well know. Third, W.'s claim that L. "can certainly still be read, revered, and followed as one of the major theologians of the twentieth century" (xx) is simple hyperbole. He was trained as a literary scholar and was gifted with a deep, theologically informed piety and a marvelous imagination. He was, rather, and remains one of the finest Christian spiritual writers of the 20th century. This should be claim enough.

PHILIP C. RULE, S.J.
College of the Holy Cross


University Asian religion courses have been clamoring for a good general survey text for years. Although several authors have attempted this, no single work capable of combining the broad scope of Asian spiritualities with a genuine critical understanding and assessment of Asian religions has yet appeared. At first, Religions of Asia gives promise of being just that desired work. Norvin Hein, Frank Reynolds, Alan Miller, Niels Nielsen, and John Fenton are all well-established scholars with excellent reputations within their respective fields. Indeed, reading the book certainly increased and enhanced my own appreciation of not only the "philosophy and history" but especially the "social and political aspects" of Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, as well as the religions of China and Japan. The Hindu and Buddhist sections proved particularly helpful. However, when this work was adapted as a class text, most of my students complained about the excessive details and the varying styles which often blocked readability. Several more demanding students considered the book a very good resource work, but only a few judged it a helpful initial introduction to the spirituality of Asia. Thus it seems a valuable work helpful to those with some background in Asian religions.

FRANK R. PODGORSKI
Seton Hall University

POLITISCHE THEOLOGIE—POLITISCHE ETHIK. By Jürgen Moltmann.
Moltmann's latest work is a happy amalgam of new and old essays (as early as 1970), so well constructed and interwoven as to provide a systematic development of his thought that is both theologically rewarding and inspirational in its dedication to Christian commitment.

M. is provoked by history—the ambiguities in the accommodating and resisting Church of the Hitler era, the complacency of the Church of the post-war period that accepted liaison with the state and its middle-class values. He is troubled by division: East-West between communism and capitalism, North-South between the developed and Third World nations. He is inspired by eschatological Christology and the political consequences of the theology of hope that eschatology implies, to overcome these divisions and correct the bourgeois status of the modern Church.

M. sees a unity of history in a future we must create. That unity allows for diversity of peoples and ideologies, as long as they are united by a common humanizing and democratizing goal. His own vision is derived from hope in the unified future revealed in God’s resurrection of the crucified Jesus.

Political theology is the extension of the consequences of that theologia crucis into every realm of human living where there is experience of division and oppression. Not only does it promise Christ’s victory to those presently sharing in his death through poverty and oppression, but it theologically champions discipleship of Christ in political, economic, and social resistance to the “kingdom of evil.” There is no apolitical theology (or church) for M.; a theology not justified by a praxis leading to “public salvation” is without merit.

M.’s vision is perhaps too narrow: it takes democratization as the only truly humanizing form of government. It is uncompromisingly Christ-centered: total pacifism and the vulnerability it implies is the only responsible Christian and ecclesial option in a nuclear age. His ecclesiology of the brotherhood of believers and the poor is as scripturally untenable as ever.

MARTIN R. TRIPOLI, S.J.
St. Joseph’s University, Pa.


A medley of books on music-in-liturgy has appeared since Vatican II, most of them preoccupied with how to make singing attractive, how to program the liturgy, and so on. Medical Mission Sister Miriam Winter goes further back. “As no theology of Catholic Church music yet exists,” she proposes to explore the steps to be taken towards enunciating one.

Part 1 offers an American perspective of the problem of music in liturgy. Part 2 provides an orderly and compact discussion of the liturgical reform and renewal set on foot by Vatican II, particularly as verbalized in the Constitution Sacrosanctum concilium. Part 3 investigates the theological bases for liturgical music by an in-depth analysis of six major documents, beginning with the motu proprio of Pius X (1903) and ending with the statement of the American Bishops’ Liturgical Commission Music in Catholic Worship (1972). The section on “Theological Tensions” (224–29) is of special value in the overall discussion.

W. several times points out that music in liturgy has for most of its history been approached through church legislation. Interwoven with the legislation, however, is a set of theological assumptions. In our own century several terms with theological overtones have surfaced, though their denotations have not always been agreed

A significant book for two reasons. First, it uses the case-study method of doing pastoral theology, i.e., it develops a Christian eschatology out of seven death-experiences which are first narrated and then systematically reflected upon to produce by degrees a coherent understanding of the “four last things.” Second, it employs in remarkably simplified language the principles and concepts of process philosophy (Whitehead’s philosophy of organism) rather than classical metaphysics to explain this area of traditional Christian doctrine. The results are frequently quite striking, as, e.g., when K. suggests that the principal meaning of a person’s life and death is not its meaning for the individual or for the family but for God, who alone sees how this life as summed up in this form of dying contributes to the overall meaning of creation. The seven death-experiences are, in order, the death of an aged grandmother, the death of a child as a result of a tragic automobile accident, the premature death of a young wife and mother, the cremation of an elderly woman against the protests of her family, the suicide death of a brother, the death of an entire people in Southeast Asia through systematic economic and political exploitation, the death of Jesus. Each case illustrates a single point in a coherent eschatology: e.g., the meaning of death as the goal of life, personal immortality, resurrection, particular judgment, general judgment, the redemptive value of Jesus’ own death. All these points are then recapitulated and further organized in a concluding chapter. The book, accordingly, is intellectually stimulating and pastorally relevant.

Joseph A. Bracken, S.J.
Xavier University, Cinn.
discussion. A few of the essays should never have made it into print. Walton begins his article on Moltmann with the following quotation: "Do you want to join my sect? I can give you hope. Let me be your Führer!" Dale Vree, commenting on Gutiérrez, states: "The good father is empowered to turn bread and wine into Christ's body and blood. Now he presumes to turn Marxists into Christians." Such base comments effectively disqualify Walton and Vree from participation in sober and scholarly discussion.

The ideological overdose is even manifested in the superficial categories used in the bibliography. Bigo, McCann, and Vekemans might be uncomfortable being listed, without qualification, as supporters of liberation theology; Pedro Arrupe might squirm in the company in which he has been placed. For the promised serious critique, readers should look elsewhere.

John P. Hogan
Washington, D.C.

The naked public square results when religion leaves the scene; the 1984 election should have convinced everyone that this has not yet happened. N., a Lutheran pastor and political theorist, discusses the needs of both Church and state for religion to occupy a central place. For the Church, it is a matter of fidelity to bringing about the kingdom. For the state, it is a matter of survival: "Loyalty to the civitas can safely be nurtured only if the civitas is not the object of highest loyalty."

N. sees danger signs in government tendencies in recent decades, especially in the Supreme Court, in "the pan-politicizing of life," so that areas formerly handled by home, Church, or school have now been given over to or taken over by the state—a development to be avoided for the good health of both Church and state. Government usurpation of the place of religion is, of course, a problem for N., but he sees the bigger problem coming from mainline Protestantism, which has abdicated its position of moral leadership by its desire to be acceptable, thus allowing the world to set the agenda for the Church—a distinctly unbiblical approach.

N. finds the most hopeful filler of the Protestant void coming from Catholicism. In fact, he speaks of this time as "the Catholic moment in American life," which he categorically rejects as having been the 1960 election of Kennedy, who "reassured the electorate that he was not a very serious Catholic." N. identifies contemporary Catholicism as ready to assume the task because we have weathered the storms of Vatican II; we have the leadership of John Paul II; we possess a tradition of political and social theory; American society is searching for an authentic religious voice, a voice he does not hear in the Moral Majority, although he does not resort to a knee-jerk liberal rejection of them.

Annoying parenthetical notes superabound. The repetition of key quotations and material leads one to conclude that this volume is probably a collection of talks or articles. No matter; the book needs to be read by every preacher and every "Catholic politician" between now and 1988.

Peter M. J. Stravinskas
Trenton, N.J.


As a person on the national staff of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, Schwartz has had an op-
portunity to study anti-Catholic bigotry in the U.S. from books, newspapers, and other media. He begins in the colonial period and continues to today's bigotry. Part 1 gives the historic backgrounds for the biases: the English Protestant prejudices affecting the colonies, the nativist era of the Know-Nothing mobs, the gilded age and the emergence of the KKK, the period from Al Smith to John Kennedy, and the present shapes of anti-Catholicism up to the 1984 presidential campaign. In Part 2, S. gives as his reason for anti-Catholic prejudice to go unnoticed that it parades under many forms, some contradictory. The myths employed against the Church are the "whore of Babylon": that the Catholic Church is a pagan cult; the organ-grinder myth: that Catholics are inferior to "real Americans"; the little-red-schoolhouse myth: that Catholic schools are divisive and un-American; the foreign potentate myth: that Catholics have an allegiance to a foreign prince; the deputy myth: that Catholics have bias against Jews, and many other myths. The fact that our culture has strong biases against Catholicism is no reason for despair, but a point of departure for evangelization. As S. concludes, "We who are hearers of the Word must also be sharers of the Word."

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


This delightful philosophical textbook is a crisp and imaginative primer in moral reasoning. Suitable for college students, it informs, challenges, and trains on several levels. In the first half, H. introduces a neophyte through extended examples into both the theory and practice of moral reasoning. He lays out the logic of moral argument and demonstrates how the process goes awry. He exposes and refutes the evasions and moral skepticism one commonly finds among students. His guiding pedagogical principle is that the more examples the students see of mistakes in moral reasoning, the more they will be able to avoid such traps. Accordingly, he provides a number of student exercises. He includes abundant examples in order to show that moral reasoning is part of everyday life. He relies, therefore, not so much on the "standard," if sometimes extreme, cases found in many philosophical discussions, but rather on materials excerpted from the morning newspaper or a recent biography or a popular magazine.

Rather than present moral theory and then some cases, H. draws the theory out of some 60 quotations dealing with different ethical problems. The range is enormous, from smoking and immigration to Hiroshima and paying taxes. Through these concrete issues he is able in successive chapters to explain his value-balancing ethic, the nature and function of norms, various preference or distribution rules, and the relation between morality and law. The distinctive value of this clearly written book is that a student who works through it will have begun to do ethics rather than simply learn about ethics.

EDWARD VACEK, S.J.
Weston School of Theology Cambridge, Mass.
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Presenting This Issue

The June 1985 issue offers two essays in systematic theology (Holy Spirit; experience of God), two contrasting articles in moral theology (ontic evil; proportionalism), and two historical notes (Olivi; Newman), together with our usual complement of book reviews (27) and shorter notices (26).

A Trinitarian Theology of the Holy Spirit? attempts to situate the Spirit in a biblical-patristic Trinitarian dynamic and to indicate in what sense pneumatology is as important as Christology. The two missions from the Father must be equal, else Trinitarian doctrine collapses. Both Christ and the Spirit are at the center, but in ways appropriate to each. The Spirit is the Father's point of contact with the world and the Church. Pneumatology determines the rules for speaking about the Christological and Trinitarian mysteries. Kilian McDonnell, O.S.B., S.T.D. from the theological faculty at Trier in Germany, is president of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research and professor of theology in the graduate school of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn. His areas of special interest are ecumenical topics, charismatic renewal, and monastic prayer. Published works include three volumes on the charismatic renewal.

Can We Know God Directly? Rahner's Solution from Experience compares Rahner's way of knowing God with Scripture and the tradition, arguing that his philosophical presuppositions lead to unintended positions at variance with traditional views of creation, Trinitarian doctrine, and Christology. By applying his symbolic ontology to these doctrines, Rahner is faithful to his method but effectively reduces God's free revelation to the functioning of his ontological principles. Paul D. Molnar, Ph.D. from Fordham University, is adjunct assistant professor of theology at St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y., and adjunct instructor at the College of Mt. St. Vincent, Riverdale, N.Y. Among his special concerns are philosophy of religion, theological method, the doctrine of God, and Christology. He is currently preparing a book on The God Question Yesterday and Today.

The Disvalue of Ontic Evil argues that a basic equivocity in the use of "ontic evil" and its equivalents prevents proportionalist moralists from formulating a self-consistent position. If the equivocity is removed, they must either permit doing what is morally evil in order to achieve a good end, or treat the alternatives proposed in moral deliberation as nonmoral, contrary to the intrinsic nature of a free act. Paul M. Quay, S.J., with a doctorate in theoretical physics from M.I.T., is research
professor in the department of philosophy at Loyola University of Chicago. He weds three competences: physics (irreversible thermodynamics), philosophy (philosophy of science), and theology (Ignatian spirituality; moral theology seen as part of spirituality). Recent publications move from the theology of recapitulation, through brain death, to temporality and the structure of physics.

Proportionalism: One View of the Debate, an effort to contribute to the contemporary debate between proportionalism and deontology, argues that the former is more adequate to moral experience. The argument is developed on four levels: concrete acts, moral decision-making, image of human existence, and the religious significance of the moral life. EDWARD V. VACEK, S.J., Ph.D. from Northwestern University, is associate professor of Christian ethics at the Weston School of Theology, Cambridge, Mass. His specialties are foundations of Christian ethics, sexual ethics, emotions and the Christian life, and medical ethics. Recent articles on Max Scheler are to be followed by an essay on Scheler's view of emotions. Other work in progress: John Paul II's understanding of cocreation; love of God as foundation of Christian ethics.

John Peter Olivi and Papal Inerrancy: On a Recent Interpretation of Olivi's Ecclesiology takes issue with Ulrich Horst, who has recently argued that Olivi (d. 1298) did not contribute significantly to the development of the doctrine of papal infallibility. Horst's argument is said to rest on a misunderstanding of Olivi's position: Olivi was, in fact, the first major medieval thinker who overtly defended a doctrine of papal infallibility. BRIAN TIERNEY, Ph.D. from Cambridge University, is Bryce and Edith Bowmar Professor in Humanistic Studies at Cornell University. Scholars in the fields are well aware of his important contributions to our understanding of medieval canon law and medieval political thought. His most recent book is Religion, Law, and the Growth of Constitutional Thought (1982). He is currently working on medieval theories of natural rights.

Newman: The Victorian Intellectual As Pastor shows how Newman, once he became a Roman Catholic, chose the life of an Oratorian because it promised to fulfil his lifelong ambition to combine pastoral activity with intellectual work. The Grammar of Assent provides a particularly striking instance of this combination, which, however, was marked clearly by its times; for Newman was the quintessential Victorian. MARVIN R. O'CONNELL, Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame, is professor of history there, focusing on modern European, modern British, and modern ecclesiastical history. He is currently engaged in writing a biography of John Ireland.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.
Editor
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