BOOK REVIEWS


No student of ancient Israel can fail to note the extraordinary output, in this decade, of studies on the history of Israel. Apart from the latest edition of John Bright (1981) and the reprinting of M. Noth's classic (1982), we have the histories of J. H. Hayes and J. M. Miller, J. A. Soggin, S. Hermann, H. Jagersma, H. Donner, and the most recent synthesis edited by Hershel Shanks. While this phenomenal productivity is a tribute to the vitality of the discipline, energized by advances in biblical archeology, there should be no doubt as to the methodological differences which characterize the above syntheses. The very question of the stage at which Israel's history becomes recoverable is at issue: Do we begin with the patriarchs, the age of Moses, the settlement in Canaan, or the monarchy? If all this produces a certain uneasiness, it must not obscure the excitement over the new possibilities available through interdisciplinary approaches which are constantly revealing the richness and complexity of the Hebrew record of God's dealing with Israel. As for hermeneutic values, I think it is safe to say that we are more aware than ever that there is not much use in remembering a past which has no influence on the present.

Into this lively, even contentious, picture comes a small book by a professor of Semitic philology at the University of Rome, in a superb translation. It is something of a bombshell, though its importance should not be exaggerated. This is not another history of Israel, but it is probably the most radical example available of a skepticism about the very possibility of writing such a history. The various essays, which makes no pretense at following a chronological scheme, are an assemblage of studies, often polemical in tone, aimed at showing that Israel has created "a fictitious but sacral history come together in a circularity which in our all too knowing language is no longer politics or religion or history—but only ideology" (xvi). In fact, G. claims that ideology has not only conditioned Hebrew history writing but has actually created a historical past. The ideologues belong to the postexilic period and they managed to fashion an idealized past which would comfort them in a distressing present.

A certain amount of skepticism in these matters is quite healthy, but the tone of this book and its dismissive attitude towards attempts at historical reconstruction will tend to discourage rather than promote the interdisciplinary cooperation already begun between biblical scholars and
others engaged in historical and scientific research. A great German scholar like Georg Fohrer deserves better than the belittling remark that one will find in his *Geschichte Israels* "no more than a paraphrase of the biblical text" (7). Albright and his "docile pupil H. B. Huffmon" are said to have made the same mistake as Noth in their common claim that the name Yahweh is nowhere attested outside of and independently of Israel. But I doubt that scholars will rush to endorse G.’s view that a divine figure was worshiped in the region of Syria and Palestine from the beginning of the second millennium, the form of whose name fluctuates remarkably: Yah, Yaw, Yahweh.

One could continue indefinitely commenting on this collection of studies, disagreeing with a good number of speculative and often tendentious views, occasionally finding suggestions which are very promising and might advance our understanding of Israel’s historical record. More than a score of misprints in an otherwise attractively printed book will not make the reading pleasanter. But more importantly, if the overall thesis of this book were to be accepted, then *Tanak* has neither normative nor inspirational value for any community of faith, Jewish or Christian. In the meantime, the task goes on of reconstructing Israel’s history on the basis of our chief source, the Hebrew text, along with the vast amount of collateral material which daily comes to light. Both sources, text and material evidence, will continue to be assessed by new and more sophisticated methodologies placed at the service of a remarkable religious tradition.

*Boston College*

**FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.**


This fine work provides a sound and helpful format for penetrating the biblical text: a fresh English translation of small units; detailed textual, literary, and historical notes; and general commentary on entire passages. The analysis of the text is supplemented with an introduction which orients readers to biblical and Ancient Near Eastern texts, a helpful chronological chart relating the list of Israelite and Judean kings to contemporary events and hypothesized dates, and photos and maps relating to the book.

It is clear from the outset that the authors, in line with mainline Israeli biblical scholarship, will provide a sound, moderate evaluation of the text and of the scholarly questions surrounding it. E.g., they immediately announce their acceptance of the traditional theory of a two-stage Deuteronomistic editing of 2 Kings: the first version under the auspices of
others engaged in historical and scientific research. A great German scholar like Georg Fohrer deserves better than the belittling remark that one will find in his Geschicte Israels "no more than a paraphrase of the biblical text" (7). Albright and his "docile pupil H. B. Huffmon" are said to have made the same mistake as Noth in their common claim that the name Yahweh is nowhere attested outside of and independently of Israel. But I doubt that scholars will rush to endorse G.'s view that a divine figure was worshiped in the region of Syria and Palestine from the beginning of the second millennium, the form of whose name fluctuates remarkably: Yah, Yaw, Yahweh.

One could continue indefinitely commenting on this collection of studies, disagreeing with a good number of speculative and often tendentious views, occasionally finding suggestions which are very promising and might advance our understanding of Israel's historical record. More than a score of misprints in an otherwise attractively printed book will not make the reading pleasanter. But more importantly, if the overall thesis of this book were to be accepted, then Tanak has neither normative nor inspirational value for any community of faith, Jewish or Christian. In the meantime, the task goes on of reconstructing Israel's history on the basis of our chief source, the Hebrew text, along with the vast amount of collateral material which daily comes to light. Both sources, text and material evidence, will continue to be assessed by new and more sophisticated methodologies placed at the service of a remarkable religious tradition.

Boston College

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


This fine work provides a sound and helpful format for penetrating the biblical text: a fresh English translation of small units; detailed textual, literary, and historical notes; and general commentary on entire passages. The analysis of the text is supplemented with an introduction which orients readers to biblical and Ancient Near Eastern texts, a helpful chronological chart relating the list of Israelite and Judean kings to contemporary events and hypothesized dates, and photos and maps relating to the book.

It is clear from the outset that the authors, in line with mainline Israeli biblical scholarship, will provide a sound, moderate evaluation of the text and of the scholarly questions surrounding it. E.g., they immediately announce their acceptance of the traditional theory of a two-stage Deuteronomistic editing of 2 Kings: the first version under the auspices of
the seventh-century Josian reform, and the final edition by a Dtr school a generation after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem. They invariably adopt similarly well-accepted scholarly interpretations of controverted issues. While this is entirely appropriate for a standard commentary of this kind, one wishes at times for more creativity or originality in the interpretation of events recorded in 2 Kings. To their credit, the authors do at least mention more imaginative explanations of other scholars, though they usually label such theories as "speculative," as if the entire interpretive enterprise were not in large part speculative.

From our late-20th-century perspective, the historical events related in 2 Kings are still fascinating: the rise in northern Israel of Yahwistic prophetic groups and their agitation against the liberal Omride regime, the intense political machinations surrounding the Syro-Ephraimite invasion of Judah in 734 B.C., and especially the circumstances of the Josian reform of Judah in 622. All these events ring bells of familiarity with contemporary military, political, and religious events in the Middle East. E.g., the Josian reform (2 Kgs 22-23) betrays many of the symptoms of a fundamentalist-inspired religious and governmental purge of the kind we read about in our daily newspapers. That Cogan and Tadmor eschew the application of modern political and sociological theory in analyzing these events, or of groups such as the "People of the Land" (2 Kgs 21:24), is disappointing; but such is the price general readers typically pay for scholarly caution.

The authors' Israeli conservatism, which is not theological but historical in nature, occasionally results in excessive respect for information given in the biblical text. E.g., when the given chronology in 2 Kings is self-contradictory or at odds with contemporary Assyrian records, they usually resort to scholarly explanatory devices such as "co-regencies" rather than call into question the accuracy of the biblical numbers themselves. Yet they are also willing on other points to adopt a more liberal approach, e.g. in distinguishing the negative judgement of the Dtr historian on Jeroboam II from the more positive evaluation of sources contemporary to this great king. Their use of contemporary extrabiblical material such as Assyrian and Babylonian annals, which at times give variant accounts of events mentioned in the Bible, also indicates some divergence from the classic Israeli tendency to take the text at face value.

The book is extremely readable. The prose is clear, moves along at a fresh clip, and avoids the stultifying effects of "commentaryitis" which afflict most works of this kind. Moreover, the authors laudably include occasional references to rabbinic commentary, a rich resource usually left untapped in Western scholarship. One can easily recommend this book not merely for light on isolated passages or words, but for a sweeping
impression of two fascinating centuries in the history of Israel and Judah.

*Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley*  
**Patrick M. Arnold, S.J.**


De Jonge intends "to describe and analyze the great variety of ways the earliest followers of Jesus responded to him." The "context" of the title does not refer to a systematic attempt to locate relationships between Christology and the social, economic, or political situation of the early Christian communities. Rather it means the "patterns of life" of Christian communities; even at that, J. concedes, he concentrates more on patterns of belief than patterns of life. An introductory chapter sketches the data on which J. will concentrate and the methods he will use. J. also considers here the Jewish intellectual and religious background against which one must understand Jesus as a herald of God's kingdom.

Part 1 consists of three chapters. The first concentrates on pre-Pauline material incorporated in the letters, in an effort to see how Paul and others used that material. Despite some carelessness in using the data, the chapter presents a useful summary of its subject matter. J. concludes that while it is all but impossible to recover the exact wording of that material, it does display great diversity and reveals its origin in early Christian assemblies, particularly baptism and communal meals. Chap. 2 looks at the material in Mark. A lack of sophistication in analyzing some of the data is evident here. E.g., J. reads Mark 12:35-37 from a Matthean perspective, and turns a denial of Jesus as son of David into its affirmation; and he mistakenly finds Marcan editorial activity in the story of the exorcism at Capernaum in 1:25. Chap. 3 discusses Jesus' relation to the kingdom of God. J. vacillates here between finding in Q the presence of the kingdom in Jesus' words and work (75, 83), and the partial realization which announces a full realization in the future (82). J. is also able to conclude, because of common elements in Paul and Q, that Paul "did know Jesus' teaching" as well as traditions about his ministry.


In Part 3 that rich variety continues to be in view, now from the perspective of the religious background of some terms applied to Jesus
by the earliest Christians. Investigating Jewish background, J. finds in Jesus’ use of “Son of Man” a covert reference to Daniel 7 (other scholars attribute that reference to later tradition). Investigating Jesus’ death, resurrection, and exaltation, vis-à-vis Jewish and Hellenistic ideas, J. provides an illuminating discussion of why Jesus’ death would be understood to be redemptive. Examining the theme of Jesus’ pre-existence, J. argues, in connection with Jn 1:14, that even the most advanced NT Christology operates on the level of “reflective mythology” rather than metaphysics.

A final chapter briefly sketches the relation of the historical Jesus and his views to those of his earliest followers. J. finds that the notion that Jesus died for others goes back to Jesus himself, that the title “Son of God” depicting Jesus’ unique relationship with God may derive from his use of “Abba, Father,” and that in these and other ways there was continuity between the ministry of Jesus and that of his followers. The methods used (criterion of dissimilarity, coherence, multiple attestation) are standard, but the last is given a somewhat simplistic application. Multiple attestation refers not only to multiple sources of tradition (e.g., Mark, Q), as J. avers, but also to multiple types of tradition (e.g., sayings, parables, pronouncement stories, acts of healing, meal fellowship, public association), where congruent behaviors in different types of activity can point to authenticity. A brief epilogue re-emphasizes the diversity of even the earliest Christological responses to Jesus, and speaks again of Christology “in context”—a phrase that seems to mean for J. only that different Christologies “answer different needs and address different aspects of the situation,” something affirmed but not really demonstrated. Despite the title, “context” is not a major concern of his book.

Perhaps J.’s major contribution is to have summarized the data needed for serious reflection on NT Christology. The work is clearly written, well organized, and reflects the conclusions of solid contemporary Christological investigation. Though it breaks no significant new ground, it would be useful for students beginning the study of NT Christology.

Union Theological Seminary, Richmond       Paul J. Achtemeier


When Schrage’s Ethik des Neuen Testaments appeared in 1982, replacing H.-D. Wendland’s earlier work in the Das Neue Testament deutsch series, it was hailed by Rudolf Schnackenburg as a “standard work . . . which will be of immeasurable service to all exegetes and ethicists.” My praise is even stronger. This excellently translated and beautifully produced book is the single most important work on NT
ethics now available in English. It is an indispensable tool for the
Christian ethician as regards both individual questions and the founda­
tional issue of systematic ethics.

Some of the book’s more notable accomplishments: (1) Genuinely
international and ecumenical bibliographies (up to 1982) at the beginning
of each section. English translations, where available, are given, and the
documentation within the text refers to the pagination of these transla­
tions. (2) Reliable exegetical and systematic theological presentation of
the problems treated. So balanced is this treatment that, apart from the
Introduction, which seems to reflect more the Evangelical (German
Lutheran) side of the situation, this is a book that might well have been
written by a Roman Catholic instead of a Protestant scholar. (3) Situating
individual questions in their larger context. (4) Careful discussion of, and
judiciously drawn conclusions regarding, the different possibilities of
interpretation. This can also be virtue to a fault, for the elevated level of
reflection sometimes lacks a clear perspective. (5) Tracing the various
lines of development, to the extent allowed by the NT material. (6) The
opening up of many individual questions to our contemporary horizon.

Not everything is perfect, however. A subject index would be very
useful. While S. superbly demonstrates how the positions of the various
NT authors differ from the various Jewish positions, I have the sense
that he is not sufficiently sympathetic to these Jewish positions, although
his treatment of “The Will of God and the Law” is truly excellent.

Somewhat more disappointing is the fact that S. completely omits
Wendland’s final discussion of “The Unity of NT Ethics,” all the more
so in that he does not share Jack T. Sanders’ totally negative attitude
toward such an endeavor. Somewhat compensating for this lack is the
exegetical and theological breadth as well as detail with which S. works
through each of his major topics: Jesus’ eschatological ethics; ethical
beginnings in the earliest congregations; ethical accents in the Synoptic
Gospels; the Christological ethics of Paul; the ethics of responsibility in
the deuto-Pauline epistles; pæreno­sis in the Epistle of James; the
commandment of brotherly love in the Johannine writings; exhortations
addressed to the pilgrim people in the Epistle to the Hebrews; eschato­
logical exhortation in the Book of Revelation. Happily S. does not
uncritically assume that the development from Jesus to the late NT
writings was simply one of decline. However, one would have liked more
attention to the way early Christian ethics related to the ethical teaching
of Jesus. Perhaps he felt that an attempt to meet all these wishes would
bring him into troubled theological waters. Whatever the reason, he has
done all the basic work for us and produced a standard work which will
be of immeasurable value to exegetes, ethicians, and theologians for years

The first two volumes in this four-volume project appeared under the subtitles Discerning the Way (1980) and A Christian Theology of the People Israel (1983); they were reprinted in paperback in 1987. The third volume deals with the major theological problem in Christian-Jewish relations: the person of Jesus and the proper context in which to understand him. Its 12 chapters concern the place and function of Christology, Israel and the Church as the context of Jesus Christ, Christ risen (Easter), Jesus of Nazareth as the presence of God, the crucified one, the novelty of Jesus Christ, the eternal Son, the Incarnate Word, Christ the Lord, and all in all.

V.'s goal is not to make Christology appealing, acceptable, or inoffensive to Jews. He writes as a Christian theologian for what he perceives as a new period in Christian-Jewish history. The Church has moved from being “within Israel” (Jesus, the earliest Christians, Paul) through being “against Israel” (from the late first century A.D. to the Holocaust) to being “with Israel” (the present). Thus it is necessary to develop “a Christology for a church that acknowledges that the reality in which it lives is rightly definable only when Israel’s continuing covenant with God is recognized and confessed as essential to it” (200-201). The point of departure for this systematic-theological development of the biblical evidence about Jesus Christ is the recognition that the basic context of Jesus was and is the covenant between God and Israel. It seeks to show that every proper Christological statement gives glory to God and is an affirmation of the covenant between God and Israel.

V.'s earlier interests in Karl Barth's theology and in linguistic philosophy (see his Secular Meaning of the Gospel [1963]) show through from time to time, but the present book and its companions represent a thoroughgoing and courageous rethinking of Christian theology from the perspective of a Christian who takes “Israel” seriously as a living and theologically significant reality. Whereas Vatican II's Nostra aetate 4 barely cracked open the door to this new relationship, V. urges Christians to open the door wider and walk through. His hope is that “the novelty of God's gracious act in Jesus Christ will appear even more wonderful and awesome when it is set in the context of the continuity of God's covenant with the Jewish people” (300).

V.'s Christology is important not only for Christian-Jewish relations
but also as a fresh way of doing Christian theology. His approach is biblical in its insistence on the covenant and appeal to biblical evidence, historical in that it acknowledges the sad legacy of the Church over against Israel that issued in the Holocaust, and practical in that it calls for a new relationship between Christians and Jews today.

Perhaps the most controversial theological aspect of the book is its dialogue with the early conciliar creeds about Christ. Although some will accuse V. of subordinationism and being “soft” on Christ’s divinity, he is correct in stressing that the conciliar statements took creation as their context rather than the covenant and focused on Jesus’ humanity (and divinity) rather than his Jewishness. These choices had and still have consequences. Others will ask how he defines “Israel” and which Jews belong to it. Still others may object to the almost “messianic” significance that he attributes to the State of Israel (though this is qualified somewhat [126]). On the whole, however, V.’s Christology is a remarkably creative recovery of the biblical tradition and a timely challenge to the theological community today. It deserves careful study and serious discussion.

Weston School of Theology

Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.


Although this book is basically an extended proof for the existence of God, it analyzes many other issues in debate among philosophers. Consequently it ends up being a defense of traditional metaphysical realism, i.e. the starting point of philosophy in intuitively known judgments about existential particulars rather than in reflection on the innate structure of human knowing and willing (as with Lonergan, Rahner, and other transcendental Thomists).

The basic proof for the existence of God may be stated as follows. For things with natures to exist at all, they have to exist not just for an instant but through time. But things with natures do not possess within themselves the power to secure their own continuance beyond the present moment into a future which is strictly contingent and undetermined. Hence there must exist a causal agent existing outside of time but with effects in time which empowers things with natures to continue as themselves into the future. This causal agent, unlike the finite entities which it empowers, must be incomposite, i.e. its essence must be self-existent, identical with the pure act of being. Furthermore, since some of the entities which it thus empowers to exist are persons, it too must be a personal being. Thus identified as a transcendent personal being who is at the same time completely immanent to all entities in time and the
cause of their continuance in existence, this First Cause is appropriately called God.

While B.'s argumentation in support of his case is painstakingly meticulous, some basic questions as to the legitimacy of his approach still remain. First, with respect to his overall position of metaphysical realism, one may ask whether the notions of "substance" and "cause," at least in the sense employed by B., are simply givens of human experience (243). E.g., B. himself describes a substance as that which exercises causal power, but does not specify which entities in nature are true substances and which are simply aggregates of such entities. His comment, "If bricks are real, so is my house" (120), seems to slide over the problem of how microscopic entities of a given nature or type combine to produce macroscopic entities of an entirely different nature or type. Likewise, B.'s conception of causality seems to be restricted to efficient causality. Thereby, however, he eliminates from consideration any notion of formal causality, whereby an entity is in a qualified sense causa sui, cause of its own existence. His argument for the existence of God, to be sure, rests on the assumption that God as First Cause is the exclusive cause of existence in created beings; but elsewhere he too admits that the secondary causality of the creature has to do with the existence of the effect as well as its specificity (207-8). In brief, then, B.'s own use of the terms "substance" and "cause" betrays a certain ambiguity which cannot be cleared up simply by taking a look at what is given in ordinary experience.

Finally, with respect to his proof for the existence of God, it is not clear to me how he can say that the future is really contingent and undetermined even for God (135, 350) and yet also affirm that in God there is "no passage from unrealized to realized potentiality" (133). This, after all, represents a position on the nature of God midway between Whitehead and Aquinas for which rational argument and/or justification would seem to be necessary. Thus, while the book presents a formidable challenge to the reader in terms of the overall subtlety of its argument, it still leaves many questions unanswered.

Xavier University, Cinn.  

JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, S.J.


Brito produced a distinguished and detailed study of Hegel's Christology in 1982, soon joined by a companion book on the role of Hegel's Christology in contemporary theology. Now he has joined the movement (to no small extent composed of Catholic philosophers and theologians like Xavier Tilliette and Walter Kasper) interested in the historical role,
the accuracy, and the relevancy of Schelling's philosophy. He has selected as his area God as Creator. This large study combines both historical and systematic approaches, and so it can be employed (studied more than read) as an exposition of what Schelling thought and as a philosophical-theological meditation upon the issues surrounding creation as stimulated by German idealism. B. employs a historical survey to prepare for reflection upon meaning, fidelity to Christian revelation, and philosophical originality.

An Introduction treats creation in the works written at Tübingen and Jena prior to 1801 on transcendental and natural philosophies. Part 1 under the motif of “Fall” treats the first writings touching religion to 1806; “Theogony” pursues the essay on freedom and the systemic fragment on the ages of the world, while “Creation” heads the explicit unfolding of the topic in the final philosophy. A final overview, a tour d’horizon from the perspective of philosophy and theology drawn into the present, reviews the major issues. Its opening questions are: “Creation, is it a simple involuntary modification of the divine nature or an act reserved to God who alone makes something exist without preexisting matter? . . . The creative decision, is it indifference, an arbitrary choice between two possibilities, or does it unveil the truth and goodness of the personal and essential being of God?” (465). There follows a treatment both from Schelling and from B. of the important issues surrounding creation: ex nihilo, monotheism and Trinity, freedom, time, evil, and the primal and new creations of the human race. An extensive bibliography and index as well as a summary in English complete the work.

B. has shown that views concerning Schelling’s God (whose life is partly the process of the universe and the history of humanity) when they are the product of ignorance, haste, or prejudice (as they often have been) are superficial and erroneous. Schelling can be a formidable defender of divine autonomy and freedom; he works to both preserve and transcend creation from nothing; he is much more intentionally docile to Christian tradition than is Hegel. At the same time, the philosopher wishes to offer a new approach which in a sense is always intent upon getting beyond the reduction by Aristotelians and Augustinians of God to the status of another, if larger, being, and upon avoiding sharp separations between brittle entities like time and eternity. One contribution of the Louvain professor is to show the role of the Trinity, for this triad of powers protects the Godhead from indecent mutation and involvement while bearing the brunt of forces like necessity, chosen options, beginning, and process.

If there is any flaw in the book (and it would be a flaw of welcome excess), it is the presentation of the material in the European genre of
history of doctrine. Resources and opinions are too numerous; there is a lack of evaluation, as sources, opinions, and blocks of background information face the reader like boulders on a mountain trail. Contrary to B.'s intention, the book is as historical as it is synthetic, and the two approaches at times appear together. This makes the book not any less valuable but turns it into a reference work more than an intellectual essay. Those interested in the topics of creation and process, as well as all who find Schelling and idealism part of the backdrop to today's culture and religion, will welcome this study. Nor should the elected theme of "creation" obscure the fact that the book is a thorough treatment not of Schelling's entire thought but of all areas pertaining to God, Trinity, theogony, and creation.

University of Notre Dame

THOMAS F. O'MEARA, O.P.


This book deals first with some major interpretations of Christ's resurrection from the past hundred years. The chapter on B. F. Westcott and Wolfhart Pannenberg illustrates that by itself historical research is insufficient to handle the Easter mystery. A brilliant chapter on Karl Barth and Rudolf Bultmann shows how they went to a false extreme by interpreting the resurrection nonhistorically as an eschatological event of salvation. Archbishop Carnley also clears away the thesis of those who variously hold that no objective event followed for Jesus himself after his crucifixion. Finally, convincing objections are raised against Schillebeeckx' reconstruction of the first disciples' experience of the risen Jesus.

C. then articulates an epistemology of Easter faith in terms of the experience of the Holy Spirit as the medium for the presence of the risen Jesus. In doing this, he links (1) the uniquely self-giving love Jesus revealed in his life and death, (2) the testimony about his postresurrection appearances, and (3) a philosophy of remembering and knowing (by acquaintance) that is partly supported by Norman Malcolm's work on memory. Here C. also draws on (and improves) John Knox's view of the Church and her memory.

Very few exegetes would agree that Luke is "much later" than John (24, 46 n. 40); the dating of these Gospels does not, however, affect C.'s argument. C. tends to dismiss the thesis that Mk 16:1-8 uses a tradition coming from Jerusalem Christians who celebrated a liturgy at the tomb of Jesus. He writes of the "natural Jewish revulsion from tombs as unclean places" (50). But this revulsion did not stand in the way of Jews building and venerating the tombs of great figures from their history (see, e.g., Mt 23:29; Lk 11:47; Acts 2:29). At Hebron the superb wall that
Herod the Great (37-4 B.C.) built around the cave where Abraham, his sons, and their wives were believed to be buried expresses a devotion to, not a revulsion from, tombs. Second, I fail to see how an Easter ceremony in which the president declared, “He is risen, he is not here; see the place where they laid him” (Mk 16:6), could have been “carried on in complete independence of the actual tomb in Jerusalem” (50), as C. thinks was possible. Third, the thesis about a liturgy at Jesus’ tomb concerns stage two of the tradition (30-65 A.D.) and hence does not “beg the question as to why women should feature so prominently in the story” (ibid.). Some women could have been there at stage one to find Jesus’ tomb empty and so originate “the core story” (51).

A further point apropos of the tomb. C. tends to agree with those who locate in Galilee the Easter appearances to the male disciples. He then suggests that it might have taken a long time (even years?) for them and their message to return to Jerusalem (55 ff.). This allows him to argue that, whether historical or not, the discovery of the empty tomb had to be attributed to women (60). But historical evidence does not support the premise for this argument, viz. a long delay by the male disciples in returning to Jerusalem.

Without being able to develop this point in detail, I wish to disagree with the claim that “the pattern of the knowing between religious and natural perception is the same, even if the object of religious awareness is unique” (230; see 243). In his *Contra Celsum* Origen long ago rightly argued that after his resurrection Jesus appeared to those who had “obtained eyes which had the capacity to see” Jesus in his risen state (2:65). Not only with the original Easter witnesses who saw the risen Lord, but also with those who accept their testimony and believe in him without that kind of seeing (cf. Jn 20:29; 1 Pet 1:8), the subject’s pattern of knowing differs somewhat from that of mere “natural perception.”

Some minor disagreements notwithstanding, I must end by saying that C. has produced a truly major book on resurrection belief. No worker in this field can afford to ignore it.

*Gregorian University, Rome*  
GERALD O’COLLINS, S.J.


Boff situates his Mariology on a broad canvas: the feminine dimension in God. He begins by drawing on insights into the feminine from epistemology, biology, psychology, and anthropology, and then moves into a “theological meditation” on the feminine, in which he argues persuasively
for enriching our understanding of God through a judicious application of the categories of the feminine.

The final part of this "meditation" introduces Mary. B. proposes a daring hypothesis: Mary realizes the feminine eschatologically and absolutely, in so full and genuine a way as to be hypostatically united with the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity (93). B. seeks to justify this hypothesis in several ways. He seems to believe that in the fulness of the kingdom all believers will be hypostatically united with God, and that Mary anticipates this eschatological fulfilment. Moreover, the Incarnation of the Word is not sufficient as a paradigm of human destiny, since only the masculine dimension of human nature is divinized "directly and immediately" in the male nature of Jesus Christ. The feminine dimension also needs direct and immediate divinization. This is accomplished through the hypostatic union of the Holy Spirit with the female human nature of Mary.

This bold thesis will demand a robust response from B.'s theological peers, as well as from philosophers who will question B.'s view of what constitutes human nature. It runs counter to consistent teaching in the Church that Mary is purely human, even though she is the Mother of God. By exalting her to divine heights, B. has made her into a "goddess." Moreover, since a "hypostatic union" is normally understood as a union of two natures in one person, one wonders what happened to the person of Mary when the union occurred (at the Annunciation [100]).

B. goes on to discuss the principal Marian themes of immaculate conception, virginity and motherhood, assumption and universal mediation. He also has a marvelous meditation on the Magnificat, where he develops a prophetic image of Mary as the strong, determined woman, the free woman committed to the messianic liberation of the poor (188-203). Much of this discussion is illuminating and rewarding. Curiously enough, it does not depend greatly on his previous proposal of a hypostatic union with the Holy Spirit. Indeed, if he dropped this proposal and instead presented Mary simply as the prototype of the Christian sanctified by the Holy Spirit, he would have enriched our understanding of Mary and avoided a worrying distraction as to its orthodoxy.

B.'s treatment of Scripture is also sometimes questionable. His exegesis of the Marian texts in the Gospels seems to depend on a view of Mary which is the fruit of much reflection and development over the centuries, rather than on what the Gospel writer himself might have meant.

And there are inconsistencies. In looking for the historical Mary, B. discounts the historicity of the Annunciation account in Luke. There was no mystical experience. Mary was surprised one day to discover she was pregnant. She had had no intercourse with anyone. Eventually she
concluded that the baby was the result of the action of the Holy Spirit (111). Yet a few pages later, when giving what he considers to be the historical traits of Mary, B. relies heavily on the evidence of the Annunciation story (118). Moreover, despite maintaining that historically Mary had no opportunity to consent to the Incarnation, B. still gets considerable theological mileage out of her fiat at the Annunciation (117-21, 144-45, 155-56).

Even though there are serious reservations about parts of this book, it is still worth reading for the new insights it gives on the mystery of Mary. The key notions of the feminine as a vehicle for God's self-revelation and of Mary as the historical anticipation of the eschatological are exciting ideas and deserve to be taken seriously by the theological community.

Mount St. Mary's Seminary  
Taradale, New Zealand

PATRICK BEARSLEY, S.M.


The hermeneutic story has strange twists. Although hermeneutics as an activity is as old as humankind, the term itself first appeared in the 17th century to designate the science and art of interpreting and translating texts. The hope was that with a sophisticated set of principles scholars and readers could arrive at an understanding of texts (especially sacred texts) which would have some claim to objectivity and which would resolve the babel of conflicting confessional accounts. However, complications were soon apparent. Not only does the text have a context, but the reader has a background; and so interpretation necessarily moves in a circle different for every text and every reader. And since no one stands at his own source, the circle itself yields no sure rules of interpretation. Hermeneutics, like life itself, is a difficult affair.

Caputo commits himself to revealing just how hard making one's way can be. Four principal writers provide the literary frame of reference here: Kierkegaard, Husserl, Heidegger, and Derrida. The trajectory is thus from protoexistentialism through phenomenology and hermeneutics to deconstructionism. Kierkegaard's distinction between recollection and repetition is the starting point. Pure recollection reduces history to immobility, whereas repetition is the renewal of the past in resolute action here and now. The problem throughout the book is how to remain resolute when everything, oneself included, is in motion. C. sees Husserl, the quest for unadulterated vision notwithstanding, as recognizing the difficulty in his reflections on the constitution of the given, a constitution
which could never be made fully present or fitted under rules of construc-
tion. What was adumbration in early phenomenology becomes central
when, in *Being and Time*, Heidegger relates tradition itself not to simple
givenness but to the projected being of *Dasein*. Before long, he too
intensifies the difficulty by going beyond *Dasein* and calling attention to
the ordinary happening which embraces and historicizes all. Finally,
Derrida has now undercut any talk of presence, meaning, being, or
interpretation. The real affair is always largely offstage and never quite
appears. And so, by a common consideration, the whole hermeneutic
endeavor seems to founder and repetition itself seem impossible.

That common consideration is not Caputo’s. Threading our way
through the last two centuries of philosophy and reading one disturbing
thinker in terms of another brings us not to the end of science, ethics,
and religion, but to a fresh way of approaching them. The science which
is finished is the science of definitive answers based on clear and distinct
axioms; but the new science, decentered and disseminated, will have
room for play and poetry at its very heart. In ethics too we shall have to
abandon reassuring guardrails set up by natural-law theory, utilitarian-
ism, and the like. However, if we are brave enough, we may find ourselves
at the beginning of an ethics of letting-be without the blood-spilling and
bone-breaking associated with the old systems. Finally, the discovery of
the face of the sufferer in the maelstrom opens to us a realm of transcend-
ence not unlike that found by a Master Eckhart.

This is a brilliant book. C. has a marvelous grasp of the history of
philosophy, and he brings its various strands together so as to illuminate
some of the greatest of contemporary concerns. His chapters on “the
ethics of dissemination” and on “openness to mystery” go beyond mere
scholarship and contain passages of genuine beauty. Nonetheless, bril-
liance often has its price. In places I want him to slow down, to forget
about Kierkegaard, Husserl, Heidegger, Derrida, and the whole canon of
current debate, to renounce the too self-conscious pursuit of metaphor
and wordplay. I want him to take a position, to face its difficulties, and
to argue for it against the actual and probable objections of intelligent
readers; i.e., I want him to engage in a more pedestrian form of philoso-
phy. What, e.g., are we to make of his frequent claim that all is flux?
There are surely good reasons, based on ordinary or scientific experience,
for thinking the claim simple-minded and of limited value in talking
about either kind of experience. And does the deconstructive enterprise
of itself really bring us at last to a respect for others and an awareness
of the sufferer? My sense is that C. finds them there because he has
unwittingly imported them from older philosophical and especially reli-
gious traditions. Even these noble conclusions will require some method-
ical sorting out (perhaps a new but now modest metaphysics) if we are not to render the "conversation of mankind" incoherent. C.'s work soars above most such difficulties and remains, for all its richness of learning and rhetoric, a somewhat abstract book which, in proclaiming life to be hard, lets philosophy in general and itself in particular off too easy.

La Salle University, Phila.  

MICHAEL J. KERLIN


This book presents 13 addresses given at the Women in the Church Conference in Washington, October 10-12, 1986. It provides a useful introduction to a number of basic issues affecting women in the Church. The essays are loosely grouped under the topics of tradition, practice, and vision.

In a refreshingly new approach to the biblical material, Donald Senior draws an analogy between the early Church's struggle with the mission to the Gentiles, and so their inclusion, and the question of the role of women within the Church today. The approach is especially valuable because it situates the tension over the role of women within the problem of inculturation. Senior remarks: "The most important consequence of crossing a cultural boundary and being open to another will come when the viewpoint and experience of the other is allowed to have an impact on me" (14). Gender is a boundary often not discerned, much less transcended, but the gospel calls for it to be crossed. What is at stake in the inclusion of women is not membership as such, but the terms of membership. The question is whether the experience of women can be let free in the Church in its theology, its religious experience, and in its leadership. Only when this is done will full communion be possible and the universality of the gospel be incarnate.

Senior's carefully argued case illustrates the quality of the section on tradition, in which ecclesiology (McBrien), canon law (Provost), and women's role as preachers (Hilkert) receive comparable treatment. Collins' essay on clericalism is a tour de force in which she outlines the history of the phenomenon in broad strokes and then subjects it to a sociology-of-knowledge critique. The remainder of the book continues to cast a wide net, including material on topics as diverse as dealing with anger as a woman in the Church and feminine spirituality. Mary Milligan addresses the difficulties of dialogue with Rome under the rubric of inculturation, building on insights closely related to those Senior expressed in the opening essay.

However, as the American Church works with the first draft of the proposed bishops' pastoral on women, it may be helpful to call particular
liturgical texts. Not surprisingly, T. concludes that the debaters were often controlled more by a desire to establish their respective confessional positions than by a search for the intrinsic "objective" meaning of the relevant textual evidence, that all three were to some extent locked unawares into models coming from earlier scholasticism, and that for these reasons the disputes remained largely unresolved—in other words, that differing hermeneutics underlay the differing sacramental theologies and the differing attempts to justify these theologies.

T. is not interested simply in a historical study for its own sake; he states clearly and repeatedly that his purpose is ecumenical, that he hopes to move discussion and attitudes and eventually practice towards some agreement among the Christian churches on the matter of confirmation. He argues, rightly, that this will require from each group an open listening to and learning from the theology and historical practice of other traditions. For the most part, T. sees this in terms of resolving the issues that separated Christians in the 16th century and that continue to separate them. Perhaps, however, the "solution" lies in bypassing those issues, at least as then formulated, because the evolution of human thought has moved into a new stage of understanding what it means to be human and Christian.

More specifically, this volume, when it moves into discussion of today's views on confirmation, is still controlled to a large extent by theological attitudes and formulations that have proved inadequate. For one thing, the context of T.'s discussion of confirmation's effectiveness is that of ritual individualistically affecting people. In this context there is practically no awareness that "the gift of the Spirit" comes about through the person sharing in the Spirit communally possessed by the community. Again, the book implicitly accepts the view that the sacramental ritual works instrumentally in causing something in the realm of grace; and without espousing a theology of the "sacramental character" caused by confirmation, T. does little to question the basis for such a view.

When T. reflects in a pastoral vein, however, he is more attuned to today's developments: he is aware that the present-day Catholic practice of celebrating confirmation in adolescence runs counter to the "ritual logic" of initiation, and he also seems open to a series of "confirming" rituals that would provide for profession of personal faith at critical points of maturation; at the same time, he correctly insists that it is always the Eucharist which is the fulfilment of initiation. He sees as a promise of ecumenical agreement the increased Protestant use of anointing and greater awareness in Catholic circles of the sacramental significance of the imposition of the bishop's hand.

At this and other points in his book, T. indicates the need for more
careful historical research into liturgical practice. Kavanagh’s volume is a masterful instance of such research and of its value for sacramental theology. Already presented in his 1984 Worship article, K.’s thesis is that the origins of confirmation as a distinct ritual in the Western Church lie in the gradual separation of the missa, the bishop’s indicating by the gesture of imposing his hand the neophyte’s passage to full community participation in Eucharist, from the baptizing portion of Christian initiation ceremony. As this separation occurred, the missa acquired symbolic meaning and theological legitimation along with designation as “confirmation.” K.’s careful and uncluttered sketch of the process by which the distinct ritual of confirmation came into existence complements his earlier work on baptism and makes it clear why he is recognized as a leading interpreter of the rite of initiation.

If K.’s historical reconstruction is accurate—the case he makes is solid and persuasive—it renders futile much of the attempt to explain the sacrament of confirmation as a conferring of the Spirit, or as an anointing for active discipleship, or as a strengthening for mature battle with the forces of evil, or as a confession of faith on the threshold of adult Christian life. “One concludes . . . that confirmation should not be made too much over; it is certainly not to be understood as being on the same level with the premier New Testament rites of baptism and eucharist. . . . Making too much over confirmation by forcing it to bear more symbolism than its fundamentally modest structure and subordinate position between baptism and eucharist can support is perhaps one reason for confusion over what it is and does” (117).

In his second part K. examines the official reform of the rite of initiation insofar as it deals with confirmation, and concludes that the thrust of the reform is to reestablish confirmation in its ancient position as a complement to baptism and passage to full Eucharistic participation. He is aware of the need for pastoral attention to the nurture of adolescents’ faith, but views the use of confirmation for this purpose as an aberration in the Church’s sacramental practice, an aberration that has often received a faulty theological legitimation.

As one reflects on these two studies, one wonders if we have come to the point where we should recognize and then celebrate two distinct ritual situations: a ritual (confirmation) that bridges baptism and Eucharist and as such stands in continuity with ancient traditions of Christian initiation, and another ritual (or perhaps rituals) whose purpose is to afford young Christians moving towards adulthood the opportunity to reaffirm their commitment to faith and discipleship.

*College of the Holy Cross* 

BERNARD COOKE
Klausnitzer focuses on the development of the special topic of the papacy in the general context of ecclesiology, both fundamental and dogmatic. The necessary selection of authors to be examined is explained and adequately justified early in the book (14-17). K. states that his method includes the selection of authors so identified with developments and disputes in the theology of the papacy that their very names provide an itinerary for the book (29-30). He properly distinguishes the two allied topics of primacy and infallibility, noting that each has had its moment in the sun as well as its own problematic.

K. begins with Marsilius of Padua and Augustinus Triumphus of Ancona, who represent the two extremes of papal minimalism and maximalism. Hardly had Boniface VIII (Unam sanctam, 1302) elevated the papacy to its zenith when the reaction set in. Luther’s criticism of the practice of indulgences is properly located in the conflict between conciliarism’s reaction to papal absolutism and the papalist reaction to conciliarism.

The heart of K.’s book consists of a presentation of the Lutheran position in the persons of Luther and J. G. Walch and in the Lutheran reaction to Vatican I, and of the Catholic position in the persons of Cajetan and Eck as the immediate opponents of Luther and Bellarmine and in the continuing Catholic ecclesiological discussion after Vatican I. In their proper chronological order the magisterial document Exsurge Domine and those of Trent and Vatican I and II are examined in their historical context. This is followed by a discussion of growing consensus and persisting differences about the papacy, now baptized the “Petrine ministry” in contemporary ecumenical discussions, especially Malta, Dombes, and the Roman Catholic–Lutheran discussions in the United States.

The book concludes with an evaluation in which K. considers many standard topics in the theology of the papacy: NT texts (Mt 16; Lk 22:23; Jn 21:15–17), romanitas, jus divinum, monarchy, sensus fidelium, jurisdiction/order, the principle “prima sedes a nemine judicatur,” and the primacy of the gospel. Finally, the conclusion looks to the future with a double focus: (1) How might the papacy be interpreted and practiced in the future? (2) What are the chances of ecumenical agreement in theory and practice?

The book is well written and orderly. The German itself is easily understandable. The topic of the papacy is always kept within the proper
perspective of ecclesiology. From this book one learns much. Above all, though, I think one learns that just as one must distinguish between infallibility and infallibilism, so also must one distinguish between papacy and papalism. The substitution of Petrine ministry/function for papacy may be helpful, but such terms are as susceptible to abuse as any. Vigilance is much more effective than verbalization.

One is also reminded, especially in this bicentennial year of the American Constitution, of how much easier it would have been to contain papal absolutist pretensions if the papacy had grown up in theory and practice in the limited government of the U.S. rather than in the unlimited imperial and monarchical governments and cultures of Europe. Finally, I am pleased to note that American theology plays a significant role in this book, not only the bilateral dialogue but also other individual theologians. The symposium edited by Terry Tekippe, Papal Infallibility: An Application of Lonergan’s Theological Method, even rates inclusion in the “Abkürzungenverzeichnis” (538). This published version of K.’s Habilitationsschrift is a satisfying theological product, which quite justifiably was awarded the Karl Rahner Preis for theological investigation in 1987.

University of San Diego

ROBERT KRESS


This portrait of Calvin in his times is a provocative addition to Calvin studies by one of the most eminent Renaissance historians in America today. Bouwsma’s thesis, somewhat similar to that of Suzanne Selinger in Calvin against Himself, is that there are two Calvins: a philosophical scholastic Calvin who craved order and was rigid, and a practical humanist Calvin who tolerated individual liberty and was flexible. These two Calvins were often in conflict with each other and account for contradictions in his thought. History has retained the philosophical and systematic Calvin, often substituting a caricature for the real Calvin. This book helps to restore a balance.

As the title indicates, this is an intellectual portrait rather than a biography, but an initial biographical chapter briefly outlines C.’s life, his education, and his relationship to his parents. His mother’s early death and his distant relationship to his father contributed to his subsequent search for a father image among mature men such as Guillaume Farel and Martin Bucer. Bouwsma eliminates the traditional debate over the dating of C.’s conversion by denying that he had one—an unusual position given C.’s own testimony to his heart having been subdued to teachableness. The Reformed definition of such a change of heart in the
16th century was as a call of God from “the idolatries and superstitions of papism” to the Reform of the Word, i.e. to Protestant Christianity, a step C. clearly took.

A chapter on C.’s anxiety builds the framework of the book. C. is an anxious man of his times, caught between the labyrinth of traditional order and scholastic thought and the abyss of freedom and the unknown. He is in many ways a portrait of the tensions and contradictions of his age; it is the world that is out of joint, and not just C. Bouwsma’s clever organization elaborates upon these themes in the central core of the book: “The Labyrinth,” “The Opening,” and “The Abyss.”

“The Labyrinth” deals with the traditional aspects of the 16th-century world that C. shared, beginning with cosmic inheritances and moving to society and natural theology or, as Bouwsma expands it, rational religion. Breaking into this constrained world was an opening toward freedom, that of Renaissance humanism. The rhetorical emphasis on decorum, accommodation to the hearer’s understanding, guided C.’s sermons, his scriptural exegesis, and his writing, especially the Institutes. Christ is the ultimate decorum. God is known only through Christ. C. wrote to persuade. With humanism as an opening, C. moved toward “The Abyss,” a term that for Bouwsma is more positive than it was for C. himself. The abyss represents freedom but also uncertainty. In “The Abyss” Bouwsma covers ontology under “Being,” epistemology under “Knowing,” and predestination and providence under “Power”; a chapter on “Drama” deals with the Christian life as that of soldier and pilgrim.

A concluding section, “A Program for the Times,” portrays C. accurately as a practical man of action and a reformer. Because of his republican concern for the civic realm, Bouwsma considers C. among the civic humanists, but unlike Salutati and Bruni in Florence, he never held a public office in Geneva other than that of Moderator of the Company of Pastors. His concerns went beyond the city to the evangelization of France. His views of society and government were as realistic as those of Machiavelli. Bouwsma calls him a theological analogue to Machiavelli, but whereas Machiavelli praised the prince as lion and fox, C. complained about the immorality of rulers and allowed for civil disobedience and resistance to ungodly rule. C. successfully encouraged the city fathers to be involved in the reform of life and morals that characterized Reformation Geneva.

Bouwsma’s portrait is complex and honest. C. was dependent on Luther, Melanchthon, and other first-generation reformers as well as on the Church Fathers, especially Augustine, for much of his theology. Yet Bouwsma depicts C. as too solitary, anxious, and insecure, less in charge of himself and his environment than he actually was. Absent is that
community of friends with whom he worked and to whom he was tied with such strong emotion as a fast friend and faithful correspondent. C. and the French in Geneva were impatient, eager expatriates, active in a great evangelical effort to convert France. They lived in a sense of calling and a dynamic hope that all of France would be reformed. Missing also is C. as a man of prayer, his piety or spirituality, and his life as a pastor engaged with others, his advocacy of the poor, and his organization of the church in Geneva. It is perhaps more accurate to portray C. as an evangelical reformer, less in a struggle from labyrinth to abyss by way of humanism than aware of the dangers of both and thrust back on trust in God as his only sure repose.

There are some minor questions of fact: Jakob Sturm (1489–1553), cited as the great humanist educator of Strasbourg (240 n. 26, 281), was a member of the city council, and Johannes Sturm (1507–89) was the educator. The consistory of Geneva was composed of both pastors and elders from the city councils (218).

Rhode Island College, Providence

JEANNINE OLSON


An interesting insight into Christian perceptions of Christ’s message during the 19th and 20th centuries. Anyone interested in Christianity today will find a great deal to ponder on the Eucharist, the Christian community, liturgy, church-state relations, Christian social conscience, norms of belief, and the evolution of Christian thought and practice from the end of the Old Regime to the end of Vatican II.

Franklin focuses on three individuals: Johann Adam Möhler, E. B. Pusey, and Prosper Guéranger. One gets insights into their personal lives, their milieu, their development, their influence. The work is an interesting exposition of the intermeshing of rationalism, romanticism, Gallicanism, Febronianism, ultramontanism, biblical criticism, republicanism, legitimism, Anglicanism, nonconformism, Roman Catholicism, ecumenism, and others.

The focus of the work is to show a similar development in the three protagonists away from the rational Christianity of both iconoclastic Protestantism and state-controlled Catholicism as well as from Roman legalism toward a real ecumenical “Catholicism,” toward a Church renewed in the image of the early Christians (as depicted in the Church Fathers), united by the Eucharist, by liturgical prayer, by freedom from state control, by a sense of social action growing out of the sense of the Eucharistic community. The “Puseyite” parish had as its goal to be
“united by their belief in corporate liturgical action,” to possess “objective sacramental theories of baptism and the Eucharist, and the church as the body of Christ, inspiring an organic theology and practice conceived as a power to redeem the shattered social order” (318).

The characterization of the situation in Württemberg, England, and France at the end of the 18th century, the discovery of elements of the renewal already existing in the religious practice of the local parishes, the leadership of the three main actors and that of their many disciples (e.g., Karl Adam, A. G. Herbert, A. M. Ramsey, Romano Guardini, Odo Casel, Yves Congar), the depiction of their opposition (bishops, clergy, laity), and their ultimate success in the liturgical and ecumenical developments of the 20th century form an intriguing web.

The reviewer was impressed by the extent of the historical research and F.’s ability to weave the myriad acts into an intelligible kaleidoscope. Fascinating historical data depict the extent of nonbelief in certain areas of France at the beginning of the 19th century, as well as the endeavor of the English “Puseyites” to cope with the problems of the Industrial Revolution, like the “733 houses, 27 pubs, 13 beer gardens, and 154 brothels” on the doorstep of the parish St. George-in-the-East.

Fascinating, too, are the seeming historical anomalies: evolution in the thought of Möhler and Guéranger from a “liberal” to a “conservative” theology; the movement toward lay participation led by clerics and even monks; democratization coupled with the look to papal leadership; emphasis on the sensus fidelium and the missionary zeal to change that sensus where it disagreed with the principles of the renovators; the romantic emphasis on ornamentation and show and the call toward a monastic or proletarian simplicity; the look to the far past to change the recent past.

The analysis and critique of the causes of the whole movement in chap. 11 respond nicely to some of the questions which arise in reading the work. A minuscule error: Jean Louis Rozaven de Lelsseque is called the general of the Jesuits (415), but in fact he was assistant for France to the Jesuit general Beckx.

*Loyola University, New Orleans*  
L. A. NICOLL, S.J.


Preaching in Baltimore at the centenary celebration of the establishment of the U.S. hierarchy in 1889, Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul stated in characteristically fulsome terms his conviction that Catholicism and America were united in a marriage contracted in heaven: “The
Catholic Church will preserve as no human power, no human church can preserve, the liberties of the Republic. . . . We cannot but believe that a singular mission is assigned to America, glorious for itself and beneficent to the whole race, the mission of bringing about a new social and political order, based more than any other upon the common brotherhood of man, and more than any other securing to the multitude of the people social happiness and equality of rights. . . . Americans have no longing for a Church with a foreign aspect.”

Ireland’s optimism sprang from his own experience. Brought to this country from County Kilkenny as a penniless youngster, Ireland grew into a man who walked into the White House by the front door to confer with the President himself. Small wonder that, in his biographer’s words, he “preached, vulgarly at times, a get-up-and-go variety of religion to a society that avidly read the words of Horatio Alger.”

Not all his colleagues shared Ireland’s soaring optimism. Opponents charged him with underestimating the dangers to the faith of the immigrant masses from the surrounding Protestant culture. Hard-headed German Americans especially insisted on national parishes to preserve the faith of simple peasants and artisans. Curial officials in Rome, who decided many matters of consequence and some trivial ones as well, never appreciated the uniqueness of the American situation. With their exclusively European orientation, they viewed America simply as an accidental collection of displaced Europeans with no national character of its own.

The in-fighting among American prelates, described by O. in absorbing detail and with abundant humor, makes today’s battles pale by comparison. In the corridors of the Vatican these conflicts evoked the habitual hauteur of desk men for those in the field, but also, O. observes, “admirable patience” and “scrupulous regard for equity” toward American bishops “who argued so violently and often indecorously among themselves.”

Partisans on all sides were ultramontanes, by necessity if not by conviction, seeking by all means (not always honorable or fair) to manipulate papal power. The winners praised enlightened policy, while the losers complained bitterly of Italian obscurantism.

O. points out, however, that American prelates actually enjoyed considerably greater independence in the governance of their dioceses than their colleagues in Europe. Free of governmental interference, unfettered by many of the constraints of canon law (because their “mission” status subjected them to the direct control of the Propaganda Congregation), and without cathedral chapters, the bishops of Ireland’s day operated “with little interference from above and none from below.”
No summary can do more than hint at the breadth of issues covered in this magisterial biography. Their relevance to today’s controversies—on such matters as the rights of local churches, the limits of papal and episcopal power, church-state questions, inculturation, and ecclesial unity amid diversity—should be obvious even to casual readers.

There is not a dull page in the book, from the early description of the Irish potato famine of the 1840s to the closing tribute to John Ireland in 1918 by the last of the “giants,” Baltimore’s Cardinal Gibbons. The work of a mature scholar at the height of his powers, the book is a notable example of history in the grand manner.

Immaculate Conception Parish
Arnold, Mo.

JOHN JAY HUGHES


Certainly for the Roman Catholic Church, the Second Vatican Council was its 20th-century turning point. Observances marking the 25th anniversary of the opening of the Council provided the occasion for numerous essays, articles, and retrospective studies. Among these Richard’s collection is particularly useful, for the essays provide assessment of the postconciliar period joined with insightful angles on future trends; almost as much attention is given, in fact, to current and future agenda as to the decades since the Council.

In appreciation for the late Karl Rahner, his address “Toward a Fundamental Theological Interpretation of Vatican II,” delivered at Weston School of Theology in 1979, serves as context for 14 studies by Weston faculty members. Most of these revolve around one of several themes: the critical implications of the Church’s self-understanding as the people of God; explorations of the Council’s emphasis on the Church’s mission and its relationships in and with “the world”; and the significance of the thoroughly biblical thrust of Vatican II.

J. O’Malley suggests that Vatican II must be understood as distinctly different from earlier councils, correctly emphasizing the discontinuity in style, especially the omission of anathemas and the preference for biblical language. The latter point is the focus of D. Harrington’s inquiry into the Church as “the people of God”: he probes the rich scriptural foundations for that term, and concludes that that perspective has yet to be thoroughly assimilated in church life. P. Fink focuses on the complementary description of the Church as “sacrament,” analyzing the interplay between recovery of the sacraments as liturgical acts of the assembled Church and the continuing need to understand what “Church as
sacrament” implies for ecclesial identity and mission. F. Cardman’s study of the ecumenical nature of the Church insists that there is some distance to go in appreciating the truth that ecumenism—openness to the world and other churches—is incumbent on all who are the people of God.

The problematic associated with the conciliar emphasis on “mission” and its various senses receives thoughtful scrutiny from L. Richard. He contributes both a provocative “contemporary agenda” for defining mission in the context of the world today, and a complementary analysis of the challenges associated with understanding inculturation. Recalling the Council’s emphasis on the laity’s inherent role in mission and ministry, V. Finn sketches the contemporary issues impeding a full realization of that potential. D. Hollenbach provides an overview of the social dimension of mission, while P. Roy presents keen insight into the emerging sense of community flowing from a “world-Church” appreciation of the frequent “Church and the world” distinction.

While all the articles note the biblical foundations for the Vatican II vision, J. Neyrey gives particular attention to the pastoral thrust of Dei verbum and its effect on contemporary Catholic life. And the Council’s mandate for a renewed emphasis on the preaching of the Word is viewed from a historical perspective by S. Marrow.

Though the articles vary in depth and density, the collection brings much fresh insight to the continuing effort to appreciate and unfold the message and meaning of Vatican II. Much of the analysis of the Church’s self-understanding and mission is especially thought-provoking and will be welcomed by specialists and informed readers alike. Only the omission of indexes diminishes the book’s value.

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


Langendörfer opens his study by reviewing the Friedenslehre of the Catholic Church beginning with Pius XII, focusing specifically on deterrence, as preparation for a lengthy summary of each draft and the final text of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops’ The Challenge of Peace, and of each draft and the final text of the German bishops’ Gerechtigkeit schafft Frieden. He includes a broad range of commentary from political and academic sources after each summary. L. appreciates Gerechtigkeit’s analysis of deterrence for its ability to link church tradition with current ethical debates on preservation of peace in a continuity
that is clear and promises further openness (85).

L. recognizes that Gerechtigkeit takes an entirely different view on the morality of threat (Drohung) of nuclear annihilation inherent to deterrence than does Challenge. It considers the content of the threat to be a “premoral evil” and concentrates on the suasiveness of the threat against nuclear war or Communist domination. That ethical move, he claims, is preferable, since it allows Gerechtigkeit to employ the hard criterion of proportionality, i.e. threat can be continually adjusted according to its efficacy in the moral project of preserving peace and freedom—and that efficacy is constantly, objectively measurable in the public interplay of international politics. The internality of Challenge’s “intention” and its conflictual nature in the discussion of deterrence (consummate intention [prevention of nuclear war] vs. instrumental intention [to attack with nuclear weapons]) make it a harder moral category to assess.

In the second part, L., under the rubric of Sicherheitspolitik, discusses the status of the East-West conflict—and especially of the NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation—as the political background for his “hard” proportional moral evaluation of deterrence. Here L. seems to lean toward the “flexible response” strategy, relying on the hope that not every use of nuclear arms will lead to total nuclear war. He acknowledges that deterrence cannot be the basis for peace in the long run and adduces various authors to discuss its interim nature.

L.’s claim that “threat” is concretely evaluable is suspect, especially because he does not factor in the Soviets’ perception of NATO’s 4,500+ nuclear warheads in the European theater. The Soviets declare that if they feel sufficiently threatened by the West, they will launch a full-scale pre-emptive strike to protect their often-invaded homeland. The indeterminacy of “feeling sufficiently threatened” certainly rivals that of intentionality. Further, if L. claims the threat is controllable, then he must deal with a history of escalation. And though he cannot have foreseen the impact of the INF Treaty, we are puzzled that he does not mention the USSR’s 19-month freeze on all nuclear testing.

Overall, the book is more valuable as a summary and systematization of authorities than as an argued moral position. But the presuppositions of L.’s systematics inevitably commit him to certain moral positions. His reliance on Sicherheitspolitik as the proper field for working out the Church’s Friedensethik means that he cannot really accept a countercultural stance—whether taken by authors (141 ff., 171 ff.) or churches (103 ff., 179 ff.)—which repudiates use and possession of nuclear weapons. He does not seriously consider that such a stance could be taken by the NCCB if the government fails to satisfy the strict criteria for temporary moral toleration of deterrence. He cannot give structural support for his
concluding discussion of civil disobedience against nuclear armament.
Without serious consideration of *nein*, L.'s *noch* of deterrence threatens
to become an *immer*.

*Fairfield University, Conn.*

G. Simon Harak, S.J.

**DOCTRINES OF RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES: A PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY.**

Christian writes primarily with a philosophical audience in mind, but
his analysis demonstrates amply that students of religion can benefit
from attention to philosophical questions. His approach is distinctive on
three counts. First, he attends not to the “religious reflections of individ­
uals” but to “bodies of doctrines of religious communities.” This focus
immediately moves the discussion away from the personalist and exper­
iential/expressive models often relied on in the discussion of religions,
and toward a more promising commitment to research on religious
communities as intelligible wholes. Second, he focuses not on the primary
doctrines of communities, “their teachings about the constitution of the
world in general and about human nature in particular, or on their
precepts for human conduct, or on the arguments given by teachers of
religious communities in support of their primary doctrines,” but on their
governing doctrines, the “principles and rules [which] govern the for­
mation and development of [a community’s] body of doctrines” (1-2). A
large section of the book is devoted to an exposition of various kinds of
governing doctrines a community might use to determine the authenticity
of its various doctrines; to order and rank them as more or less important,
original or derivative, etc.; to determine its view on the relationship
between the authentic and the true/right, whether and how there can be
truths not traceable to the community’s sources; and to derive its key
doctrines and argue in their defense.

A third distinctive feature of the book is that C. takes a strong
comparative stance in his investigation, at every turn drawing on a rich
range of examples from diverse sources. His ability to do this manageably
and credibly, while working within the inevitable limits of his expertise
and without straying from the specific topic of the book, makes this
volume exemplary. The final chapters focus on the problem of “alien”
claims, either secular or religious, which arise outside the community.
(C. stresses the secular here, and admits that alien religious claims require
more attention than given.) Chap. 6 explores “how various kinds of
logical connections between comparable doctrines of different religious
communities might be studied and, in particular, how intuitions of
connections might be tested” (144). Chap. 7 suggests that “there may be
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A third distinctive feature of the book is that C. takes a strong comparative stance in his investigation, at every turn drawing on a rich range of examples from diverse sources. His ability to do this manageably and credibly, while working within the inevitable limits of his expertise and without straying from the specific topic of the book, makes this volume exemplary. The final chapters focus on the problem of "alien" claims, either secular or religious, which arise outside the community. (C. stresses the secular here, and admits that alien religious claims require more attention than given.) Chap. 6 explores "how various kinds of logical connections between comparable doctrines of different religious communities might be studied and, in particular, how intuitions of connections might be tested" (144). Chap. 7 suggests that "there may be
truths and right courses of action which the community is not bound to teach . . . and [if so] that there are limits on the scope of the primary doctrines of the community” (176). Chap. 8 asks how, if the latter suggestions are accepted, it is still possible that “the pattern of life taught by a community could be comprehensive”; on this point C. concludes that “the community would aim at developing a pattern of life which would have a bearing on any occasion of human activity”—i.e., at “occasion comprehensiveness” (216–17).

C.’s approach will be helpful to those trying to figure out how to do comparative study properly. His attention to what communities say about themselves and their doctrines is a sensible starting point for comparative analysis, a way to begin to understand similarities and differences without either doing away with their concreteness or leaving them honored but inaccessible to rational discourse. C.’s attention to governing doctrines opens up a new area for comparative study, a “comparative dogmatics” which studies the relation between primary and governing doctrines in various religions. He offers us a sophisticated framework in which to consider the theological questions related to religious diversity, one in which we may be able to move beyond the trilemma of exclusivism, inclusivism, and pluralism.

Finally, C.’s work presupposes that while historical and contextual studies are indispensable, the nonspecialist (philosopher or theologian) need not be forever barred from the field; she or he can legitimately study the doctrines of other communities by attending to the “logical connections” of doctrines, “the force, the grounds, and the consequences of what is said rather than . . . how the teaching of it came about” (115). This underlying confidence should make room for comparative study in every area of theology, and likewise make ever more apparent the opportunities missed by a neglect of the comparative approach. In any case, this is a book which is best honored—as it deserves to be—by its use as a modest, programmatic sketch of one articulate and responsible way to go about relating philosophy, theology, and the study of religion today, particularly in pluralistic and cross-cultural contexts.

Boston College

Francis X. Clooney, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES


In the Preface Laffey states her aim to aid in the development of feminist critical consciousness, a goal she suggests for both women and men. L. writes from her experience as a woman seeking a past in the stories of women in the traditions of Israel, mindful that such seeking requires a new way of approaching old materials. The volume presents biblical material—Pentateuch, Deuteronomic History, Prophets, and Writings—giving each body of material a historical and literary introduction. Then both feminist themes and specific texts are discussed. L.’s book must be used in tandem with some other OT introduction, for she intends it to complement, not replace, other more general introductions.

L. has done a valuable service to inclusive biblical scholarship. But the book has a shortcoming, in that it presents a feminist approach rather than helping the reader to develop one of her/his own. The absence of footnote references prevents the reader from a systematic inquiry into the development of the insights L. presents. L. seems to presume that the reader already has a clear perception of feminist goals for rereading the past. The thematic sections presuppose that the reader knows why sex-role stereotypes, exclusive masculine language, male images of God, and presentation of women only in relation to male relatives or husbands are feminist concerns.

The reader already familiar with feminism will find L.’s book helpful for approaching the Hebrew Scriptures. The book contains a list of recommended readings and an index of names and subjects, as well as an index of scriptural texts. Depending on the audience, an introduction to liberation/feminist concerns may also be helpful for fully utilizing this book.

BARBARA CULLOM
Wesley Theological Seminary, D.C.


Early Christianity was distinguished from its Jewish matrix by the worship of “one Lord, Jesus Christ” in addition to God the Father. Nonetheless, the early Christians regarded themselves as strict adherents of monotheism. Scholars of an earlier generation, e.g. W. Bousset, attributed this development to Hellenistic influence as Christianity spread among the Gentiles. Hurtado seeks to understand it in the context of first-century Judaism.

The essential background is provided by Jewish speculation on divine agents in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. H. distinguishes three types: personified divine attributes (Wisdom, Logos), exalted patriarchs (Enoch, Moses), and principal angels (e.g., Michael in Daniel, Yahoel in Apoc. Abraham). Jewish speculation on these figures was not systematic. H. contends, however, that the notion of a divine agent, second only to God, was widespread, and the early Christians believed that Jesus was exalted to this position. No divine agent was an object of worship in Judaism. The Christian development involved an innovation over against Jewish tradition in this respect. This development had its beginning in the lifetime of Jesus, when he was perceived as an eschatological spokesman, but the crucial point of
transition came with the belief in his resurrection.

The strength of this book lies in its treatment of the Jewish background. The discussion of “the Christian mutation” is brief and sketchy. The typology of divine agents is also incomplete; most puzzling is the omission of the messiah, surely a divine agent of major importance. The subject awaits a fuller treatment, but H. has set the discussion in the right direction.

JOHN J. COLLINS
University of Notre Dame


This companion volume to Jesus, Politics and Society: A Study of Luke's Gospel, completes C.'s work on the Lucan corpus. The main text of the book is generally a descriptive study, organizing the material of Acts under categories of social and political interest. Detailed exegetical work is largely left to the footnotes. Many of the current exegetical debates are avoided, since C. is interested only in Luke's final redaction and not in sources or historicity.

C. uses the same categories for analysis as in his first volume: the sovereignty of God, concern for the sick and poor, uses of material possessions, concern for less regarded groups, humility and service, opposition to injustice, rejection of violence, attitudes toward non-Roman authorities and especially the Sanhedrin, and attitudes toward various Roman authorities. These categories are used first to analyze the Jerusalem Church and then to analyze Paul's activities in the second half of Acts.

C.'s overall conclusions from his study of Luke-Acts are a compelling argument against the prevalent view that Luke writes an apologetic for Christianity in face of the Roman Empire. Rather, Luke provides a lesson on the sovereignty of Christ and on how this qualifies and sometimes brings one into conflict with social and political structures. The Acts of the Apostles is a lesson on how to bear witness to Christ in the Roman Empire, including the possibility of trial and suffering. C.'s work has modest conclusions and one wonders if expressing allegiance to Christ is specific enough to distinguish Luke's purposes from any other NT work. Nevertheless, this work should receive the same welcome as his first volume. It is a seminal study encouraging further detailed exegesis pointing in a new direction on the implications of Luke-Acts for social and political questions of our time.

ANTHONY J. TAMASCO
Georgetown University


This edited version of Esler's Oxford dissertation undertakes to determine the social and political characteristics of Luke's community and to show that Luke shaped the traditions available to him in response to the pressures experienced by his community. E. concludes that Luke wrote around 90 A.D. from a Hellenistic city of the Eastern empire. Luke's community comprised both Gentile and Jewish Christians; it encompassed Roman officials and others from the city's elite, as well as beggars and day laborers. Key issues impacting this community were table fellowship, separation from institutional Judaism, attitudes toward generous sharing, and the compatibility of Christian and Roman allegiance.

Although E. demonstrates an impressive command of Lucan scholar-
ship and a commendable interest in utilizing sociological theory (his chapter on sectarian movements is perhaps the most useful), his conclusions about Luke's community are rendered problematic by the reading he gives to much of Luke's text, especially his analysis of various political factors. Principally from his assessment of Luke's reports about centurions and about Paul's citizenship, E. concludes that a significant number of Roman officials and officers were present in Luke's community. Secondly, Luke was concerned to respond to the tensions these Romans were experiencing in remaining Christians. Finally, Luke shaped his reports regarding Jesus' Roman trial, Paul's trials, etc. to provide reassurance that Christian identity and Roman service were fully compatible.

But what if a careful reading of Luke-Acts invalidates E.'s argument that Luke emphasizes Christianity's congeniality with the Roman social order? Would E. then wish to affirm that Luke was instructing Roman officials regarding the challenging character of their Christian allegiance? More fundamentally, would E. then still wish to argue that Roman officials and centurions were among the key members of Luke's community?

RICHARD J. CASSIDY
Franciscan School of Theology
Berkeley


Anyone familiar with his magisterial Greek Religion knows that Burkert is the leading scholar of ancient Mediterranean religion alive today. The present volume, based on the 1982 Carl Newell Jackson lectures at Harvard, merits the attention of all concerned with the social and religious world of classical and postclassical antiquity. It is a broad survey of five characteristic mysteries: Eleusis, Dionysus, Meter, Isis, and Mithras. Although B. carefully distinguishes these groups, he is interested primarily in elucidating the common traits which remained constant over their thousand-year history.

Chap. 1, “Personal Needs in This Life and after Death,” debunks a number of common misconceptions. Adherents of mysteries were less concerned with acquiring secure possession of an afterlife, B. argues, than with achieving “a quite practical, here-and-now salvation.” Unlike Christianity, which in pagan eyes was “a religion of tombs, excessively concerned about death and decay,” the ancient mysteries sought a “safe anchor” in this life. Chap. 2, “Organizations and Identities,” analyzes three types of structures found in the mysteries: the itinerant practitioner or charismatic, the clergy attached to a sanctuary, and the association of worshipers in a form of club. Again the contrast with Christianity proves informative: mysteries did not necessarily lead to any stable form of community; the unity produced was one of experience, not of dogma or creed.

Chap. 3, “Theologia and the Mysteries,” discusses the central role of a “sacred tale” (hieros logos) and the three levels of interpretation given it: myth, nature allegory, and metaphysics. Again, against common notions B. finds little evidence of the myth of a dying and rising god (or initiate) in the mysteries. The Pauline “dying and rising with Christ” is not precisely paralleled there. The final chapter, “The Extraordinary Experience,” does more to document our ignorance of the central pathos of the mysteries than to elaborate its content. Antitheses of fasting/feasting, terror/happiness, lights/darkness were common elements in both the mysteries and in Christian baptism. The fragmentary and ambiguous evidence of torture, sex, and drug use is also reviewed.

On the whole, B. does much to “de-mythologize” the mysteries: feasting
(on foods, not gods) was the central communal activity. "Costly clubs with restricted membership," the mysteries nonetheless produced a "sympatheia of souls" which enabled the initiates "to create a context of sense in a banal, depressing and often absurd world."

DAVID G. HUNTER
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minn.


Compared to the majority of ancient controversies, the Donatist schism is abundantly documented. That does not mean that the affair is easily understood, since the staying power of the Donatist Church as well as the bitter and sometimes deadly consequences engendered by the feud have ever since been deemed inexplicable by the motivation given in the documents themselves. The explanation for the relative abundance of documentation is to be sought in the fact that the origins of the schism coincided with the rise of the first Christian emperor in the West. It is generally agreed that it was the followers of Donatus who, much to their regret, first sought the intervention of Constantine. And he took the view that it was the emperor's duty to enable the Church to solve its own problems.

So much in the controversy hinged on what had happened in North Africa during the great persecution that later enquiries sought to determine who had surrendered the Scriptures to the persecutors. Since the investigations were invariably unfavorable to the dissenters, Catholics compiled a dossier of such documentation as an apologetic weapon. Later generations would find some of this in the treatise of Optatus (ca. 367).

In 1913 von Soden published a brief collection of documents relevant to the origins of Donatism. Now the Swiss scholar Jean-Louis Maier is publishing in two volumes a much more complete dossier encompassing the entire history of Donatism. The first volume includes the material up until 361. All relevant documentation is printed, including acts of Donatist martyrs, in the original language, usually Latin, and in French translation. Introductions, commentary, and notes enhance the value of the volume. M.'s collection should be the source book on the subject for a long time to come.

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


This study strives to prove that both Jewish and early Christians found in Gen 1-3's account of creation and fall the biblical grounds for proclaiming human freedom and moral responsibility; their creation "to God's image" entitled all human beings to both political equality and freedom. Gnostic interpretations to the contrary, the "primary reality" of Genesis' account was human moral freedom. Even those ardent Christians who chose to renounce the world and live the celibate life did so in order to achieve and express their freedom from social bondages.

Pagels (quite gratuitously) sees the early Augustine as agreeing with her brave proclamation of human freedom; but he later wrenched it about, she argues, to proclaim that "original sin" made all of Adam and Eve's descendants both mortal and radically unfree, and therefore, she concludes, morally irresponsible. Sin has altered human nature itself; only with the aid of "outside intervention" (can she mean grace?) could we hope to avoid wrongdoing. Similarly, only by submission to "external government" could we live together in peace.
P. clearly hopes Augustine's "admirers" will find his views as "preposterous" as she does, and so "reassess and qualify Augustine's singular dominance in much of Western Christian history" (153). But hers is history written all too obviously to subserve a thesis, and all too often simplified to render that service. The crux of her anti-Augustine argument (107–11) turns out to be a bucket of slippery imprecisions. She also revives (109, 143, 174 n. 51) the old canard that Augustine's theory of original sin grew out of his having misconstrued the notorious in quo of Rom 5:12. She cites Stanislas Lyonnet, but fails to cite two articles where he has shown that the decisive text was 1 Cor 15:22: "in Adam we all died." But then, Pagels has her troubles with St. Paul as well. . . .

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


Vatican II urged religious to "return to the sources." For Augustinians, Dominicans, and scores of other orders who follow the "Rule of St. Augustine," the return is not so simple. The "Rule" is fraught with problems: principally, which texts are original and what, if anything, they have to do with Augustine. In this useful book, L. undertakes three projects. He studies monasticism in Augustine's early life; he provides Latin texts and English translations of the three documents that comprise the heart of the "Rule" tradition (Ordo monasterii, Praeceptum, and Obiurgatio), and a translation of the version of the Obiurgatio for women; and he summarizes contemporary scholarship on the origins of these documents.

L.'s judgment is worth noting when he writes: "Augustine's persevering response to a monastic calling . . . is possibly the most underrated facet of his personality" (161). Augustine lived in three monasteries: his parents' house at Thagaste, the "garden monastery" he founded at Hippo for lay monks, and the clerics' monastery in the bishop's house there. He also founded a monastery for women and two other monasteries at Hippo. L. demonstrates clear continuity between pagan Roman rejection of ambitio, avaritia, and luxuria and the monastic program of obedience, poverty, and celibacy. He defends at great length the contention that the house of Thagaste was really a monastery. L. prints Luc Verheijen's critical editions of the three key texts. His translations are meant for religious who use the "Rule" and favor clarity over philological exactness. L. concludes that Augustine wrote the Praeceptum ca. 397 for the (male) lay monks of the "garden monastery." He also suggests, very cautiously, that "Augustine single-handedly composed the complete text" of the Ordo monasterii (171). L.'s book is unique in English and a valuable contribution to studies both of Augustine and of early monasticism.

JOSEPH T. LIENHARD, S.J.
Marquette University


This book is both more and less than it might appear to be. The history and theology of the councils involves so much that nothing less than a continuous history of doctrine will do, and that is what D. provides, according fuller attention to the councils themselves than some other histories of doctrine. The proportion is about three parts context to one part council. For those who want a detailed description of the councils themselves, this will probably be a disappointment; for others, the account of the historical con-
text, very compressed though it necessarily is, will be the best elucidation of the councils' meaning.

As a history of doctrine, D.'s book has real merits. It is succinct, well informed, largely free from misleading piety (he entitles the account of Constantinople I "The Unecumenical Council of Constantinople"), and displays in a quiet way an independence of judgment which raises it above the mere retailing of the commonplaces of scholarship. Its shortcomings should not be overlooked. The attempt to compress a complete history of doctrine into so small a compass makes for such a telegraphic style that in places only someone who already knew the story could follow D.'s account without confusion. Although helpful bibliographies of English-language secondary literature follow each chapter, there are no footnotes to help a student to pursue any particular item of interest. Despite D.'s frequent and acknowledged dependence on Meyendorff in the later chapters, I find his descriptions give excessive credence to the Roman view at the time. There is an index of names and subjects, and the chronological tables in each chapter are an additional bonus.

MICHAEL SLUSSER
Duquesne University


A thoroughly commendable 20th-century appropriation of the spiritual way as taught by the 13th-century Dominican Meister Eckhart. Smith skilfully navigates the twists and turns of Eckhart's spirituality, charting a course for contemporary readers who seek an experiential knowledge of God, self, and world.

Conversationally and pragmatically, S. explains Eckhart's vision of the spiritual life. Rightly, he sees the use of paradox as a key to Eckhart's teaching, vividly capturing the "swinging rhythm or oscillation between unlike poles" so critical to Eckhart's description of our experience of the intimate and loving God who is yet nameless and transcendent. He describes the coexistence of attitudes of detachment (toward the means of seeking God) and "fiery striving" (for the goal of finding God). And he defends the Meister from charges of quietism and impassivity: for Eckhart, all seekers have both a this-worldly activism and an insatiable thirst for the Divine. Although I did not find his explication of Eckhart's understanding of the Incarnation entirely integral to the presentation, in general S. patiently guides his readers through Eckhart's process of transforming an individual's affinity for God into an active pursuit of similarity with God—leading at last to the "birth" of God in us.

S. has a sharp eye for the spiritual needs of the contemporary world, and a religiously musical ear, tuned to the resonances of Eckhart's teachings. This marvelous little book provides wisdom, comfort, and inspiration for people seeking spiritual growth. S.'s presentation demonstrates that despite the shadow cast by the 13th-century condemnation of statements excerpted from Eckhart's writings, this Dominican still lives. One note: in light of the importance to Eckhart of his own dialogues with the Beguines, a major women's movement of the later Middle Ages, one might have thought that S. had ample reason to use inclusive language, addressing his book more systematically to both women and men.

ELLEN M. ROSS
Boston College


Ever since Ockham was summoned to Avignon in 1324 and subsequently
excommunicated (not for heresy, but for fleeing the papal court in 1328), he has gotten exceptionally bad press. At the hands of early-20th-century manualists and many historians of philosophy and theology, the English Franciscan is portrayed as the *bête noire* of scholasticism. So it is refreshing to find the Venerable Inceptores' key ideas treated in a sympathetic (though not uncritical) manner.

Adams' hermeneutical approach is excellent in my view. For any given philosophical or theological problem, she first attempts to locate it in its historical context by giving the views of O.'s predecessors, principally Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, Godfrey of Fontaines, and, above all, Duns Scotus, to whom O. is much beholden, even though he critiques the Subtle Doctor's thought more often than the views of other theologians. Then she goes on to formalize what she perceives to be O.'s main tenets or principles, and finally she evaluates his solution.

The two-volume work is divided into five parts: ontology, logic, theory of knowledge, natural philosophy, and theology. While the topics listed in the theological section are not in the forefront of modern religious thought, they are representative of 14th-century theological speculation, dictated largely by the curricular requirement of commenting on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*: How safeguard divine simplicity while speaking of it in a multiplicity of ways? How are faith and reason related? Or divine omniscience and human freedom? Is God obligated to what He has created? How are we to understand grace and merit in the light of God's freedom? How reconcile predestination/reprobation with human freedom?

From this comprehensive study O. emerges as a careful logician, philosopher, and theologian who champions divine simplicity, power, and freedom by liberating the latter from the last vestiges of Greek (and Arab) necessitarianism. O. may not be as sanguine as Anselm or Aquinas as to what tenets of faith can be proved by unaided human reason, taking into account the wide range of "degrees of proof"; yet he should not be called a sceptic. The simple fact that O.'s God is not beholden to creatures does not make the Divinity whimsical, arbitrary, or tyrannical. And since the relation between God's foreknowledge and human freedom has not been resolved by the greatest medieval and Renaissance thinkers, it is not surprising that O.'s treatment, by his own admission, leaves something to be desired.

Adams is to be congratulated for bringing such a comprehensive study to completion and for providing extensive bibliography and indices of names and subjects, so helpful for detailed study of O.'s thought.

GIRARD J. ETZKORN
Franciscan Institute
St. Bonaventure University, N.Y.


In an ironic aside appropriate for a book on Edward Gibbon, Pelikan observes that it is anomalous for someone whose scholarly life has been devoted to the study of dogma, asceticism, and sacramentalism to deliver the Rauschenbusch lectures. For in Rauschenbusch's view these were the things that deflected Christianity from its proper mission. Rauschenbusch, however, would have been pleased with this book, for *The Excellent Empire* is really a book about Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, and Rauschenbusch's and Gibbon's prejudices are very similar. Writing about monasticism, Gibbon said: "On that celebrated ground [Rome], the first consuls deserved triumphs, their
successors adorned villas, and their posterity have erected convents." Not the least of the pleasures in reading this literate book are the countless citations from Gibbon's great work (many from obscure and little-read passages) that exhibit his mordant human, melancholy animadversions, and measured sentences. It is almost a lazy man's Gibbon. His likes and dislikes, especially on ecclesiastical matters, are admirably displayed and they often turn out to be less predictable than expected. As is well known, he disliked Augustine but admired Boethius; he reproved Ambrose for his preaching but praised John Chrysostom for his eloquence. Inexplicably he called Athanasius a "prudent statesman" and he respected and esteemed Justinian. Among the citations, there is, unfortunately, one real howler on p. 13. Peli kan quotes Gibbon as follows: "His [Augustine's] learning is too often borrowed, and his arguments are too often not his own." What Gibbon wrote was "His learning is too often borrowed and his arguments are too often his own."

ROBERT L. WILKEN
University of Virginia


Every student of Christian mysticism is indebted to Evelyn Underhill. This anthology, with Introduction and bibliography, reminds us of our enormous debt. The Introduction offers a sympathetic portrait of a woman whose instinct for spirituality in its richest sense took her into the company of Christianity's most celebrated mystics. She was to be their disciple, advocate, and companion on the inner way. Through masterpieces like Mysticism (1911) and the smaller but no less discerning Practical Mysticism (1914), she brought a clarity to the writings of a St. John of the Cross, St. Teresa, and Ruysbroeck that continues to serve scholars of mystical theology.

The 15 essays in the volume illustrate not only U.'s understanding of mystical truths (see especially "Our Two-Fold Relation to Reality" and "God and Spirit") but also her attempt to approach mysticism from modern perspectives ("Bergson and the Mystics" and "Suggestion and Religious Experience") and to persuade a disillusioned, anxious society to the stance of faith and hope which mysticism reveals is the heart and destiny of human endeavor ("Sources of Power in Human Life"). Her concerns for the world in which she lived actively and practically led inevitably to pacifism as the celebration of mystical compassion; fittingly the last three essays indict war as "the material expression of spiritual sin" (207).

This volume is for both newcomers and seasoned scholars of mysticism; it is a refreshing walk in the garden of the soul which U. watered long and lovingly with her writing, spiritual direction, retreats, and, most of all, her own life of prayer. For, as she counsels, in language that is ever elegant and firm, "a real garden is made, not by sticking in plants, but by unremitting cultivation of the soil" (154).

MARY E. GILES
California State University
Sacramento


De Gruchy, professor of Christian studies at Cape Town University in South Africa, is the general editor of the new series "The Making of Modern Theology: 19th and 20th Century Texts," as well as the editor of its Volume 4 on Bonhoeffer. The objective of the series is "to introduce a new generation of readers—theological stu-
dents, students of religion, ordained ministers and the interested general reader—to the writings of some of those Christian theologians who, since the beginning of the 19th century, have had a formative influence on the development of Christian theology.”

G., a long-time member of the International Bonhoeffer Society and author of *Bonhoeffer and South Africa*, is well qualified to edit this volume. In his 42-page Introduction he provides a lucid survey of the development of Bonhoeffer's theology against the background of the life of this German Lutheran pastor/theologian who suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Nazis. G. also supplies brief introductions to each of the judiciously chosen texts, a selected bibliography of primary and secondary works in English, and a comprehensive index.

A noteworthy feature of this volume is the editor's selection, in chronological order, of entire essays and sizable portions of books rather than mere snippets from the Bonhoeffer corpus. Thus he has made it possible for readers to encounter in one place, and through his own words, a substantial amount of the seminal thinking of one of our century's most influential theologians.

JOHN D. GODSEY
*Wesley Theological Seminary, D.C.*


In keeping with the format of the series “The Making of Modern Theology,” this is neither a full-length secondary study of Bultmann nor an extensive collection of his primary works. Rather, it is a selection of primary writings prefaced by a 35-page interpretive essay. The primary selections are arranged thematically, to demonstrate Bultmann’s convictions about “God as ‘Wholly Other,’” “Existentialist Inter-

pretation,” “Modernity and Faith in Conflict,” etc.

The arrangement of the primary selections is quite instructive, particularly in tandem with the perceptive introductory essay. Johnson provides an excellent placement of B. within the concerns and constraints of his setting. In particular, he shows that B.’s distinctive concerns arose primarily to address unresolved problems in the field of NT studies of his day, not the angst of World War II. He also gives a helpful overview of the sources and nature of B.'s program of demythologization; cf. his previous book *The Origins of Demythologization* (1974).

It is crucial that the particular genre of this book be recognized. It is not a truly introductory volume, in that the opening essay assumes familiarity with the general problematics of contemporary NT studies. It is also not a groundbreaking work to instruct Bultmann specialists. Rather, it is an excellent overview of the main concerns and themes of Bultmann (and existentialist biblical interpretation) for the serious nonspecialist. For all such readers it is highly recommended.

RANDY L. MADDOX
*Sioux Falls College, S.D.*


This slim and derivative volume responds to Don Cupitt’s (*Taking Leave of God* etc.) “expressivist” account of Christianity. Hebblethwaite argues that belief in an objective God is “not only possible but highly plausible, given all the data of science, history and experience” (x).

H. surveys modern attacks upon theism and noncognitivist responses, and the positions of some 20th-century theologians and philosophers of science. After dismissing Kant, he argues
that naturalism cannot explain why either the world or the values the world generates exist, and that a cumulative case supports belief in an objective God. He presumes a metaphysically realist correspondence theory of truth, and borrows arguments against internal realists like Putnam and constructivists. He accepts much of Pannenberg’s position on the finality and uniqueness of Christianity. He concludes with a brief discussion of life after death and an argument that Christian life and faith require objective theism. H.’s prose is readable and his presentations of the positions he takes clear.

Yet one wonders who would find H.’s view “highly plausible.” Surely not Cupitt: H. simply summarizes the position expressivists find reason to reject. Surely not American cultural-linguistic and narrative theologians: their particular insights and arguments are ignored. Surely not pragmatic realists: Putnam’s progress is caricatured. Surely not historians of religions: H.’s claim that Judaism and Christianity “cannot be satisfactorily understood except in terms of divine action and divine revelation” (28) is hardly convincing. H. must be preaching to the converted—modern Christians for whom postmodernists and postliberals present no real challenges to rebuild Christian theology, but only positions to be refuted, and for whom the “anthropic principle” developed out of contemporary cosmology provides sufficient ground for Christian theism.

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

THE MYSTERY OF THE TRUINE GOD.

In ten tightly written chapters O’Donnell systematically presents post-Vatican II theology on the Trini-

ity. The leitmotif running through his work is Kant’s famous dismissal of the Trinity, to which O. gives Balthasar’s increasingly famous rejoinder. O. begins his study with a masterful essay on the problems facing modern theism and atheism. Then he situates the triunity of God systematically in the event of revelation itself. Sensitive to charges commonly made against Barth, O. immediately treats of what Butterworth has called Jesus’ “Abba experience” as foundational of the Christian experience of God as triune. He then proceeds to analyze the paschal mystery as a Trinitarian event and, relying on the work of Rahner, Kasper, and Mühlen, develops from that analysis a contemporary theology of the Holy Spirit.

The next two chapters summarize issues germane to Trinitarian speculative theology on which present-day systematic theologians disagree: the meaning of person in Trinitarian theology (Bracken and Moltmann vs. Rahner and Barth) and the vestigia Trinitatis (Balthasar vs. Barth and Przywara). O. then follows Metz, Moltmann, and Dorr in showing how Christian experience of the triune God leads both to the active promotion of social justice and to the cultivation of contemplative prayer. O. concludes with what really is a summary of the themes of Balthasar’s Theodramatik. This excellent work deserves a wide readership; it would make a fine textbook for upper-division undergraduate theology classes.

HERBERT J. RYAN, S.J.
Loyola Marymount University, L.A.

THE SPIRIT OF LIFE: THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE LIFE OF THE CHRISTIAN.

Bermejo has spent 25 years as professor of systematic theology at the Pontifical Athenaeum, Pune, India.
This book, his fourth, utilizes primarily scriptural resources in providing a description of the action of the Holy Spirit in the life of Christians. B.'s thematic approach resonates with the intent of a number of similar works on the Holy Spirit: to articulate the scriptural images as life-giving and liberating. Themes such as charism, freedom, temple of the Holy Spirit, experience of the Holy Spirit, growth in the life of the Spirit, and the charismatic movement find chapter-length exposition. Pauline and Johannine texts are amply reproduced and serve as primary sources for reflection. Occasional excursions into historical data reveal B.'s familiarity with the writings of the Fathers and the teaching of the councils. As a consequence, the book projects a rather substantive theology of grace.

In general, it seems to this reviewer that the book tries to press too much material within its covers. For example, chap. 6 begins with identifying images of the Holy Spirit in Scripture (Truth, Light, Power, Comfort, and Joy), follows up with some correlation between these metaphors and discernment in the life of the Christian, and moves on to a consideration of the sevenfold gift of the Holy Spirit. "Experience," a term often used, needs to be more clearly defined; it is placed in contrast to faith (230). Yet B. suggests some challenging observations along the way. He notes that the connection between the Spirit and love is "only mildly biblical" (104) and that the symbols of wind and fire are mediocre, obscuring the personalist dynamic of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Christian (79). Each chapter concludes with a select and judicious bibliography. Missing is J. Haughey, S.J., The Conspiracy of God, a concise, lucid, and well-reviewed account of the Holy Spirit's presence in us.

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


How explain the liturgy? Not in terms only of similar human activities, says C.: "We cannot take the liturgical signs as our sole starting point and conclude to an unknown signified..., to think of the sacraments [basically] in terms of sacred things or causalities or participation or signifiers to be decoded" (92 f.). Rather, we need to see the liturgy originating out of John's "river of life" (Rev 22:1-2), i.e. God's self-emptying into creation through the Incarnate Word, and creation's full return of God's glory in Christ's life, death, resurrection, and ascension (Part 1: "The Mystery of the Liturgy"). In light of this vision we will be able to understand from within both the Church's liturgy (Part 2: "The Liturgy Celebrated") and the Church's mission in the world (Part 3: "The Liturgy Lived"). These further activities are actually continuations of "the fontal liturgy" of the Trinity in the kenosis of both the Holy Spirit and the Church together in a threefold "synergy": manifesting Christ, transforming into Christ, and communicating Christ.

Out of this wellspring of theology, and drawing heavily from ancient Eastern Church writings, C. offers new insights into, among other things, the basic structures of Christian liturgy, the interrelationships of the seven sacraments, liturgical time and space, and the intrinsic unity of liturgy and social justice. C.'s creative interplay of biblical imagery demands a close and thoughtful reading, making his work both food for prayer and a rich mine for further theological research.

This work seems certain to be ranked among such earlier classics as Guardini's The Spirit of the Liturgy and Bouyer's Liturgical Piety. It will definitely be treasured by liturgists, as well
as by other readers who want simply to discover a deeper unity to their Christian lives.

JOHN D. LAURANCE, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


In the midst of the current controversies over the nature and role of the magisterium and the place of theological dissent in the Church, O. has produced in his usual workmanlike manner this "theological discourse" on the foregoing and related topics. The heart of the book consists of a reworking of his recent article "Magisterium: Assent and Dissent" (TS 48 [1987] 473–97). This is preceded by a more general theological meditation on the teaching office in the Church, and followed by a more concrete canonical discussion of the relationship between church teaching authority and academic freedom in the context of Catholic universities.

O.'s method here is essentially to reformulate, in language that is theologically sensitive to the issues in question, many of the more controversial terms and expressions used in the discussion of these matters. The teaching office in the Church is understood in a twofold way as the necessary process of "growing into" the Word received from God in which the Church as a whole participates, and the "formal safeguarding" of the same Word, a task which is integral to "the sacramental ministry of the episcopate" (34). The so-called "magisterium of theologians" becomes that of "graced, learned and wise men and women to whom it was given to have new insights into the old truths" (67). That most ambivalent and controversial of terms, "dissent," is construed as "holding another opinion or having come to a different conclusion or proposing a diverse hypothesis" than what is taught officially in the Church (93). Whether or not such reformulations always clarify and advance the discussion, they are usually well grounded historically and provocative theologically.

As we have come to expect, O. supplements his already valuable references and footnotes with a substantial and insightfully annotated bibliography.

JOHN F. MARTIN, S.J.
Regis College, Toronto


Owing to the statement of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985 that "Since bishops' conferences are so useful, indeed necessary in the present pastoral work of the Church, a study of their theological standing is desired" (Final Report C, 8), and to the publication of the draft of such a study by the Congregation of Bishops in 1987, the attention of the theological community is increasingly focused on this relatively new institution. In this book we now have excellent documentation for further research. It contains the statutes of 20 European conferences, and the statutes of the "Council of the Episcopal Conferences of Europe" and of the "Commission of the Episcopates of the European Community."

The text of the statutes in given in the original, if the original is one of the major languages; if not, in Latin, which presumably was the official text submitted to Rome. Each presentation is preceded by a brief note concerning the history of that conference and the particularities of its internal composition. There are also "Bibliographical Indications" listing official sources and other publications.

The Introduction to the collection (55 pages) is a meticulous comparative study of the statutes by the editor.
While the principal lines converge, there are also significant differences. The questions how to find the right balance between the autonomy of a diocesan bishop and the authority of the conference, or how much power to give to various committees within the conference, obviously preoccupied the drafters and were given different answers.

In the Preface two more volumes are announced: one on the conferences of the American continent and another on those which operate in regions supervised by the Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples. The University of Padua is offering an eminently useful service to the theological community.

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J.
Catholic University of America


This survey of writings from different religious and philosophical traditions explores what Shaw calls the paradox of intention: the fact that the harder one tries to achieve a goal, the more elusive that goal becomes. It gives us the opposite of what the many goal-oriented self-help books on bookstore and library shelves purport to offer: this “anti-self-help book” implies a critique of the North American obsession with success and the notion that one should treat one’s life as a project open to infinite manipulations.

According to S., the paradox of intention takes two forms. In both cases we pursue a goal with great intensity and determination and find ourselves blocked, unable to achieve what we had hoped. Then we either relax and find the goal easily within reach, or we relax and experience the type of contentment that we believed could only be felt after reaching the goal. Either way the ultimate goal—happiness—is attained by renouncing it. S. finds this insight repeated frequently in various religious and philosophical writings. E.g., he cites Luther's despair over his own efforts to achieve salvation, the advice of Krishna in the Bhagavad-Gita that one should not become attached to the fruits of one’s actions, and William James’s description of the effortless nature of conversion.

S.’s writing style is graceful and engaging, though at times too dependent on lengthy quotations—remnants, it seems, of this essay’s first life as a dissertation. His work provides a valuable contribution to the psychology of religion and raises questions calling for further exploration. One might ask, e.g.: If the conscious and dedicated pursuit of clearly defined goals is doomed, what type of moral life is possible?

MARY ELLEN ROSS
Trinity University, San Antonio


A collection of papers given at the Catholic Academy of Bavaria's 1986 conference on “What Is Natural for the Human Being?” This theme was prompted by the frequent usage of “unnatural” in evaluations and condemnations of human behaviors, especially sexual, by moral theologians and, above all, the magisterium. The conference was interdisciplinary: the papers are by theologians, philosophers, biologists, physicists, and medical professors.

The papers vary in value. While exposing the polyvalence of the term “natural” in Western Geistesgeschichte, a job done much better by B. Casper in the following chapter, the physicist G. Eder demonstrates that the natural scientist can be unusually unobjectionable and at the same time a Fachidiot. H. Schae-
fer and W. von Eiff point out the difficulty of securing valid universal ethical insights and judgments in the context of the concrete data of the empirical sciences. L. Bertsch, a pastoral theologian, claims that papal writings on sexuality have made a transition from argument based on an empirical biological understanding of nature to one based on the personal dignity of human nature. However, his efforts shipwreck on the persistently sacromystical biology of *Humanae vitae*, the 1987 Instruction on Fertility, and the writings of John Paul II on marriage and sexuality.

This is also noted by Franz Böckle in the finest chapter. He combines general reflections on the foundations of moral obligation and on the natural law as human participation in the divine understanding with reflections on the relationship of nature and person in sexual ethics. In the process he points out the inconsistencies of magisterial documents in this matter. This chapter is refreshing and worthy of being required reading for all moral theologians. Especially valuable for moral and pastoral theology are B.'s comments on the topic/problem of artificial contraception. There is a scholarly and theological solution to this problem. One need not resort to the flight into concern, compromise, and compassion. Refreshing indeed!

ROBERT KRESS
University of San Diego


This revised dissertation aims to redress the loss of an adequate moral, religious, and philosophical way to incorporate death into our experience. H. Richard Niebuhr's model of moral responsibility serves heuristically to assess the moral significance of the leading psychological, religious, and medical responses to death.

Part 1 describes the historical and cultural shifts in religion (Augustine, Calvin, and Schleiermacher), psychology (Freud), and medicine (bioethics literature) which have led to the demise of the moral meaning of death. Part 2 is a critical assessment of our culture's response to death. M. is critical of the death-and-dying movement led by Kübler-Ross for its emphasis on satisfying personal needs and desires apart from a commitment to social responsibility. She finds the psychologies of Erikson and Lifton more adequate because they emphasize individual responsibility within the larger network of intergenerational relationships. Tillich and Ramsey provide the theological foundations of the religious and moral dimensions of death.

M.'s constructive proposal is for a model of death as the dying of a responsible self. No one lives and dies entirely to oneself, since everyone is tied to a complex network of relationships. Death, then, has moral implications that extend beyond the self to the social web in which we are embedded. Although M. does not commit herself to any of the hard choices which have to be made in caring for the dying, she does set a direction for them by emphasizing the value of relationships which embrace the whole of life and by supporting courses of action which achieve genuine community. In these days of increased discussion on setting limits on the resources available to those near death, this book provides a needed sustained reflection on the moral meaning and implications of death.

RICHARD M. GULA, S.S.
St. Patrick's Seminary
Menlo Park, Calif.
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Presenting This Issue

This first of TS's four 50th-anniversary issues focuses on moral theology and ethics. Seven articles, each personally commissioned, concentrate on areas of particular concern to moralists and ethicists today, while reflecting on a half century of developments.

**Moral Theology 1940–1989: An Overview** reflects with broad strokes (and some quite short and pointed) on significant movements in the past half century, indicates whereto we have come, and suggests directions for the future. **RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J., S.T.D.** from Rome's Gregorian University, is John A. O'Brien Professor of Christian Ethics at the University of Notre Dame, with continuing concern for general moral and bioethics. His most recent book is *The Critical Calling: Reflection on Moral Dilemmas since Vatican II* (Georgetown University, 1989).

**Catholic Moral Rationalism and the Philosophical Bases of Moral Theology** is an effort (1) to recall the relationship of Catholicism and modern philosophy back in 1940, (2) to lay out some of the major features that have given the Catholic tradition a sense of confidence in its own rationality and objectivity, and (3) to indicate how the theology of the Vatican II era set out a program that has subjected Catholic moral rationalism to severe strains. **JOHN LANGAN, S.J., Ph.D.** from Michigan, is Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at Georgetown University's Kennedy Institute of Ethics, and a member of the philosophy department at Georgetown.

**Roman Catholic and Protestant Interaction in Ethics: An Interpretation** lines out the state of reciprocal action or influence between RC and Protestant moral theology before Vatican II, outlines salient trends during and immediately following the Council, and describes agenda items currently under discussion. **JAMES M. GUSTAFSON, Ph.D.** from Yale, a major Protestant figure in theological ethics, is currently Henry R. Luce Professor of Humanities and Comparative Studies at Emory University in Atlanta. Coeditor with John Meyer of the forthcoming Ballinger (Cambridge, Mass.) volume *The U.S. Business Corporation: An Institution in Transition*, he is preparing an analysis of the strengths and limits of prophetic, narrative, ethical, and policy discourse.

**The Common Good Revisited** poses a crucial question that cuts across numerous practical ethical discussions: Is the idea of the common good meaningful and usable in today's circumstances—e.g., business, culture, moral and political philosophy? The article outlines why the question has re-emerged in serious moral argument, proposes a pluralistic-analogical understanding of the common good on theological grounds,
and on this basis offers a communitarian interpretation of human rights. DAVID HOLLENBACH, S.J., Ph.D. from Yale, teaches moral at the Weston School of Theology in Cambridge, Mass., with consistent focus on social ethics and the theological foundations of Christian ethics. His latest book, Justice, Peace, and Human Rights: American Catholic Social Ethics in a Pluralistic World, has just been released by Crossroad.

By Whose Authority? Emerging Issues in Medical Ethics addresses three new questions, each an example of one of three ways in which new medico-moral issues emerge, each pointing simultaneously to more basic questions far from new: (1) transplantation of fetal nerve cells into the brains of persons suffering from Parkinson’s Disease; (2) AIDS and the moral responsibility of physicians; (3) moral questions raised by the health-maintenance organizations now dotting the American landscape. DANIEL P. SULMASY, O.F.M., M.D. from Cornell University Medical College, is assistant chief of service in the department of medicine, Johns Hopkins Hospital and Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. His areas of particular interest are internal medicine and medical ethics. He is working on an ethical critique of the statistical method of problem-solving known as decision analysis as it is applied to medicine.

Catholic Sexual Ethics and the Dignity of the Person: A Double Message looks at the influence of personalist thought on Roman Catholic sexual ethics since the 1930s, and argues that the committed love relationship gives the primary moral meaning of sexual acts, with procreation in an important but secondary relation. LISA SOWLE CAHILL, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago Divinity School, is associate professor of Christian ethics in Boston College’s department of theology. Especially concerned with sexual ethics and method in ethics, she has recently published, with Thomas A. Shannon, Religion and Artificial Reproduction (Crossroad, 1988).

Moral Theology and Canon Law: The Quest for a Sound Relationship is an effort to determine the mutual relations of the two disciplines by raising some foundational questions and proposing a few answers. The article reveals the primacy of moral theology over canon law. LADISLAS ORSY, S.J., doctor of canon law from the Gregorian and graduate of Oxford University’s School of Law, is professor of canon law at the Catholic University of America, with ceaseless concern for the relationship between theology and canon law, and extensive research on the hermeneutics of law. A prolific author and lecturer, he is preparing a major work on the interpretation of canon law.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.
Editor
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