BOOK REVIEWS


The distinctive and characteristic note of the new literary-critical approach to the Bible is its concern with the text as we have it rather than with any pretext or prior stages of the actual text. For more than a century, critical study of the Bible has been dominated by a source-oriented model, expending its energy on genetic theories which underscored the complicated process of composition in back of the biblical text. J, E, P, and D are familiar symbols typifying this kind of excavative scholarship which gives priority to origins rather than to the finished product. Polzin, professor at Carleton University in Ottawa, continues to challenge this essentially reconstructive procedure as he did with his first volume, Moses and the Deuteronomist (1980). In both volumes he has, in his own words, tried “to give a more satisfactory account of how the real text, whatever its pre-texts, may be not only creative but also ideologically, historiographically, and esthetically valuable to ancient and modern readers alike” (227). To keep things in balance, P. nowhere questions the validity of text-critical work, source criticism, or efforts at reconstructing the history behind the text. He simply claims that attention to the final form of the text and a more holistic reading of it will disclose hitherto unrecognized unities and depths in the narrative. I believe that he has brilliantly and convincingly made good on this claim.

The influence of “The Bakhtin Circle,” a group of Russian theorists identified with a certain philosophy of language and literary stylistics, is apparent, even though this school seems never to have applied its literary theories to biblical material. Mikhail Bakhtin’s The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin (1981) and Meir Sternberg’s Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction (1978), not to forget the old classic of S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel (1913), are works to which P. often appeals. Reassuring to those who are more conservative in their approach to the Hebrew text (MT) are his words, “The reader will notice that I am inordinately attracted to interpretations that avoid disturbing the text, provided that they fit the context” (231).

No reviewer can do justice to the splendid insights, character analyses both divine and human, and hitherto unnoticed unities which P. unfolds in his close reading of the eight divisions in 1 Samuel which constitute the eight chapters of this book. His overall perspective is that the
Deuteronomic History comes from the exilic period and is written to show the disastrous consequences of kingship in Israel. "If, as I suggest, the rise of Samuel and the fall of Saul form a kind of parabolic inclusio about the role of kingship in the exilic fate of Israel, then this particular manner in which Saul dies may form the Deuteronomist's epitaph over the corpse of Israel buried in Babylon: kingship, despite all its glories, constituted for Israel communal suicide" (224). How sharply P. departs from the position of his former teacher, Frank Cross, is clearly described in the Introduction (11–13). Curiously, although Martin Noth's elaborate theory about the sources making up the Deuteronomic History would be defended by few today, his perception of its powerful antimonarchic viewpoint receives strong support from P.'s persuasive analysis of 1 Samuel.

Let me conclude with one suggestion. P. has written this quite extraordinary work for a community of scholars, and he has every right to do so. For a community of believers, Jewish or Christian, there are important theological values (see 100, 125, 137, 146, 224) to be disengaged from this holistic approach to the biblical material. These religious elements are distinct from, but in no way opposed to, the literary and esthetic values so competently described in this work, which no biblical scholar can afford to overlook. Scripture and subject indexes facilitate consultation of this substantial contribution to OT exegesis.

Boston College

FREDERICK L. MORIARTY, S.J.


Two significant currents in contemporary biblical research coalesce in this important new study. Saldarini explores a very active area of scholarly interest, the structural organization of Palestinian Judaism in Greco-Roman times, and he utilizes in this exploration a variety of tools and perspectives drawn from sociological method. In the initial major segment of the book S. sets forth and explains a number of relevant sociological categories and models. He then finds himself able to formulate a preliminary working hypothesis about the precise nature of the three Jewish groups in question. In doing this, he insists upon the necessity of not separating religious concepts and beliefs from political, economic, and social realities and concerns.

If in the course of this sociological analysis we end up with more information on certain more general categories, such as "status" and "class," than most of us might need, we do gain considerable insight from the categories and models which more closely relate to the actual historical situation of Greco-Roman Palestine. Indeed, in S.'s capable hands
Gerhard Lenski's analysis of the class structure of agrarian empires provides the key to a new and more comprehensive understanding of the precise social identity of the Pharisees and Sadducees. It is Lenski's contention that the Roman Empire and other agrarian empires had no middle class but only a tiny governing class and a very large lower class comprised mostly of peasants and artisans. The rulers, the elite of this governing class, were supported by a dependent subclass of "retainers." These retainers, among whom S. locates the Pharisees, Sadducees, and scribes, carried out military, judicial, administrative, educational, and priestly duties on behalf of the elite powerholders.

While the term "scribe" seems simply to have designated a literate individual who served the rulers in various ways, the Pharisees and Sadducees were small but formally structured groups with their own distinctive political agenda and, at least in the case of the Pharisees, rituals and practices. As such, the two groups often were in competition with one another and with other groups of retainers for the rulers' favor. Jesus and his chief disciples, on the other hand, belonged as artisans to the lower class.

In the second major portion of his study S. tests his working hypothesis against the relevant literary data: Josephus, the NT, and the rabbinic writings. Of these documents, Josephus proves to be the key resource, with the NT data functioning in a confirmatory role and the rabbinic materials proving, as S. argues convincingly, largely unsuitable for resolving key questions. Finally, S. concludes with three chapters which respectively summarize his understanding of the scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees. Beyond locating the scribes in a broad social class, S. is unable to offer much new information about them. He does sum up, however, a broad array of general data on the scribes drawn from the OT and other Near Eastern sources.

The Pharisees, the "literate servants of the governing class" proper, had as their political goal the attainment of power over the laws governing domestic Jewish life. Although they were often quite influential among the people, their overall political effectiveness rose and fell with different rulers. Contra Jacob Neusner, they never became an isolated sect and never gave up an active political role even if at times they disappear from the pages of Josephus' history. Both their fate after 70 A.D. and their relationship to developing rabbinic Judaism remain much more uncertain than is commonly assumed.

S. cogently argues that only a small number of the governing class were members of the Sadducees. This group had closer ties with the rulers and so depended less than did the Pharisees upon influence with the people. Consequently, the Sadducees tended to resist social and religious change and to support the status quo. There is no evidence that
this group supported a literal interpretation of the Scriptures over against any appeal to an oral Torah. Rather, they simply observed the biblical laws according to their own traditional interpretation and resisted the "novelties" of Pharisaism, apocalypticism (e.g., resurrection of the body), and the like.

I find S.'s analysis of the Pharisees and Sadducees clear and compelling. Indeed, I would raise more than passing concern only about S.'s discussion of the relationship of Jesus to the Pharisees. Jesus, says S., created a new community outside of Pharisaic control and so provoked "quite naturally" their hostility. But why "quite naturally" if, as S. further asserts, "Jesus ... did not have the social standing, honor and influence to command respect as a teacher" (150-51)? If Jesus did not command such respect, why do the Gospels depict the Pharisees not simply as rejecting Jesus as a fraud but instead as engaging him in face-to-face debate about, as S. himself notes, legal agenda specific to their own party? I do not believe that S.'s own solution, that the Pharisees and the Jesus movement were leadership forces competing for popular loyalty, fully resolves this problem.

Whether the overall solid results of S.'s work demonstrate the general effectiveness in biblical exegesis of a sociological methodology remains to my mind an open question. As we find this methodology employed here, it functions much more as an enrichment of the traditional historical-critical approach than as a separate and distinct mode of investigation. In that role, however, it does indeed open up new ways of looking at data that has been inspected many times previously.

*Loyola University, Chicago*  
ROBERT A. WILD, S.J.


Freyne's magisterial *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian* (1980) argued that central Galilee's topography formed a stable peasant society bound to those conservative Jewish values of temple, land, and torah which produced a fertile agricultural economy. Galilee was neither transformed by Hellenistic culture nor a seedbed of revolutionary ferment. F. thinks exegetes have ignored the social, political, and religious conditions of Galilee which shaped Jesus' personality and career. Now is the time to bring together a reader-oriented literary approach to the Gospels and the social-world approach of his earlier study to investigate Jesus the Galilean. F. begins this study with a literary reading of the Gospels, as the method less liable to the bias of the exegete, and lets the texts
establish the proper set of questions for the historical investigations of Part 2.

Mark's rural Galilee, because unencumbered by restrictive religious institutions, fosters an itinerant teaching and healing ministry which breaks down barriers and thus alienates the scribes centered in Jerusalem. And so in Galilee Jesus is definitively revealed as God's salvific agent. Matthew highlights the polemic between Jesus and the Jewish teachers in Galilee. Galilee is that part of Israel where Jesus conducted a teaching ministry which grounded an eventual messianic ministry to Israel from God's holy mountain of eschatological hope. This visitation encompasses all nations, as Isaiah had foretold. In the limited economy of Luke's Galilee great inequalities separate rich and poor. Jesus' teaching there subverts the Pharisees' and scribes' social control. Galilee functions as the bridge from Judaism to the universal gospel for the nations. In John, Jesus' journeys to Jerusalem establish the pattern of rejection in Jerusalem, acceptance in Galilee. Jesus' Galilean ministry is limited but significant: the disciples see his glory (2:11), as has the narrator (1:14, 16), and so the final commissioning is in Galilee.

Part 2 takes these favorable views of Galilee and probes the socioeconomic setting of Jesus' career. Chapter 5 is mostly a summary and reaffirmation of the findings of Galilee, with a few specific pointers to Jesus' career. F. finds, e.g., that Rome pressured Antipas to maintain that order which would ensure annual collection of the tribute. That Jesus did not run afoul of Antipas argues to his avoidance of the Herodian centers and that his movement was not perceived as a disruptive political threat. Chapter 6 asks how Galilee's rural social world affects its Jewish symbolic worldview. Temple and land were important to Galilean peasants not as source of revolutionary action for the deprived, but as confirmation of their position as small landowners blessed by Israel's God dwelling in the temple. That these farmers emphasized those elements of the law (tithing, pilgrimage, sabbath) that established possession and fertility of the land, and so were disinterested in the niceties of (Jerusalem-based) Pharisaic interpretation, does not make them, by contemporary standards, ignorant or unobservant of torah.

Chapter 7 investigates the historical Jesus: If the social and religious situation was so conservative, how could Jesus' charismatic/prophetic ministry play any role in Galilee? F. answers that Galilean attraction to the wonderworking hasid allowed Jesus to make God present away from the temple, thus provoking Jerusalem's opposition. But Jesus' reinterpretation of the land as God's universal care for all creation (which mandates radical divestment) undermined the land-based peasant economy, and the Jesus movement foundered in those furrows. Jesus' understanding of torah derived primarily not from texts but from his social
and personal experience of the radical demands of God’s call for those who wished to share in the blessings of the new age which he proclaimed as present. This view had points of correlation with that of Isaiah as the prophet was understood in Jesus’ time, and it grounded a movement which uniquely blended apocalyptic and wisdom.

This is a pioneering book. Its clarity owes more to its structure than to F.’s somewhat verbose and repetitive style. It is important for its method. At the right time to join literary and social-world analyses in various modes of NT criticism, F.’s book is in the vanguard of a delicate hermeneutical move. His choice of sequence (literary analysis to social world, and back to the texts for control) seems not only viable but best. His fine sense of how much the interests of later tradition have shaped texts enables him to read judiciously between the lines as a historian. In response to Neusner’s critique of Galilee, F. studiously avoids rabbinic sources in this study.

The book seems less successful in its conclusions. F.’s dialectic with the Lohmeyers and Horsleys has pushed him to a picture of Galilee so removed from Hellenistic and apocalyptic influences that it does not seem able to provide the cultural matrix for the Jesus who eventually emerges. Jesus the hasid who speaks out of his own experience does not seem to have sufficient social definition to give the new impetus to exegetes and Christologists which F. had intended. In that case this book may serve best as a pioneering setting of the horizon and method in which F. and others who employ more single-mindedly a sociological model may subsequently focus a clearer light on Jesus the Galilean.

Seattle University  

JOHN TOPEL, S.J.


This book, apparently designed for educated readers with some limited background in biblical studies, addresses the failure of modern commentaries to systematically employ Greco-Roman as well as Jewish literary conventions in expounding Mark’s work. An eight-part introduction (with bibliography) advances three major theses that Stock uses to organize the rest of his commentary. (1) As the traditionally attested hermeneut of Peter, Mark addresses his testimony to the concerns of the persecuted Roman Christian community in 69 C.E. (2) Mark’s Gospel was designed to be read through completely, not piecemeal, as a kind of Christian Passover haggadah (reframed in view of Jesus’ passion) during an Easter vigil ritual for baptismal candidates. (3) The use of chiasmus and concentric development throughout Mark reveals a fivefold concentric structure within his Gospel, mirroring classical Greco-Roman five-
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Seattle University

JOHN TOPEL, S.J.


This book, apparently designed for educated readers with some limited background in biblical studies, addresses the failure of modern commentaries to systematically employ Greco-Roman as well as Jewish literary conventions in expounding Mark’s work. An eight-part introduction (with bibliography) advances three major theses that Stock uses to organize the rest of his commentary. (1) As the traditionally attested hermeneut of Peter, Mark addresses his testimony to the concerns of the persecuted Roman Christian community in 69 C.E. (2) Mark’s Gospel was designed to be read through completely, not piecemeal, as a kind of Christian Passover haggadah (reframed in view of Jesus’ passion) during an Easter vigil ritual for baptismal candidates. (3) The use of chiasmus and concentric development throughout Mark reveals a fivefold concentric structure within his Gospel, mirroring classical Greco-Roman five-
part structure for rhetorical discourse, i.e. prologue/introduction, narration, argumentation, refutation, and conclusion/epilogue. Having identified five major sections of Mark to correspond with this scheme (along with four brief transitional “hinge” passages), S. examines each section with a brief introduction and a more detailed verse-by-verse-commentary.

In general, S.’s commentary offers a rich lode of interesting sociocultural and literary data from the Greco-Roman world, along with suggestive insights concerning Mark’s intent. But these must be mined with caution in view of occasional lapses; e.g., the portrayal of Peter as the “foundation rock... on which the church is built” (125) suggests a Matthean rather than Markan agenda.

Unfortunately, this book suffers basically from lack of a coherent, truly anthropological model to organize and test such data within Mark. What is more, the literary-structural models offered are used inconsistently. The Greco-Roman rhetorical scheme and the fivefold chiastic structure proposed for Mark do not coincide. The result is two overlapping fivefold schemes that S. never fully reconciles, i.e. (A) Wilderness (Prologue) 1:2–13; (B) Galilee (Narration) 1:14—8:26 (1:14—6:13); (C) The Way (Argument) 8:26—10:52 (6:14—10:52); (B’) Jersualem (Denouement) 10:53—15:41 (10:53—15:47); (A’) The Tomb (Epilogue) 15:42—16:8 (16:1–8). Further ambiguity over the definition of basic chiastic structure as ABB’A’ or ABCB’A’ leads S. to sometimes force the crux of a proposed chiasm or to miss its overall symmetry (see the murky structuring of Jesus’ hearing before the Sanhedrin [377], which unhinges a fine example of extended chiasm in 14:53—15:1).

Early on, S. suggests combining B. Standaert’s fivefold rhetorical model with other theses about Mark’s composition according to a fourfold Passover haggidic pattern. Later introduction of “three-part structure” (69–71; cf. V. Robbins) as a supplementary organizational principle for Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem and for the Markan passion account complicates matters further by allowing organization on a basis of three, four, or five respectively.

This is not to say that these models are wrong; indeed, each seems fertile and useful in its own way. But as it stands, they simply fail to manage the material and need further refinement. Mark 1:1, for all its importance to the Gospel at large, falls outside S.’s dominant scheme altogether and winds up being treated as a “Caption-Summary” (with no comment on the mixed testimony to the phrase “Son of God” in the manuscript tradition). The variant endings of Mark are treated, but only as “Supplemental Reading” under (but not included within) the Epilogue. Both examples point to the limits of S.’s approach, which favors synchronic literary models largely to the exclusion of more diachronic historical, tradition, text-critical, or anthropological models for assessing
Mark's writing and intent. The result is a nagging lack of precision that compromises a work of considerable industry and attention to detail.

St. John's University, N.Y.  
FRANCIS CONNOLLY-WEINERT


Dronke claims this is "an exciting moment to be looking at twelfth-century philosophy," and this book of 16 original essays amply proves his point. As a history of philosophy, it focuses on writings where "reasoned argument, bearing on a traditional sphere of philosophical enquiry (such as logic, epistemology, or metaphysics), plays a considerable role." The book thus excludes the century's spirituality, but, unlike the narrowly focused Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy (1982), it regularly addresses theological concerns.

The opening section surveys the "Background" for 12th-century thought. T. Gregory discusses the Platonic tradition and announces one of the volume's major themes: the emerging "idea of nature as a complex of causes endowed with an ontological coherence of its own" (63). The natural world was coming to be seen as less symbolic and sacramental, and more an area for rational inquiry. In one of the book's richest chapters, J. Jolivet develops this theme. He describes how Arabic medicine and astrology transformed the liberal arts and "secularized" both learning and nature. Essays by W. Wetherbee on Platonic cosmology and by M. Lapidge on the Stoic inheritance round out this section.

The book then turns to "New Perspectives." C. Burnett describes two forms of "scientific speculation": demonstrations modeled on Euclid's geometry, and "physical speculation" focusing on elements and causes. These geometrical and physical arguments found theological applications as well, e.g. in Nicholas of Amiens's axiomatic apologetics and Thierry of Chartres's commentary on Genesis "secundum physicam." New approaches to language and logic also emerged in the 12th century. K. Fredborg traces these developments in speculative grammar, and M. Tweedale in logic up to Abelard. In a shrewd and delightful essay, K. Jacobi uses John of Salisbury's critique of logic to analyze later 12th-century developments in the discipline; whereas John considered logic a practical art, not a science to be studied for its own sake, it became just such a science in the course of the century.

The longest portion of the book concerns individual thinkers or "Innovators." These richly detailed essays develop the earlier sections' themes. D. Elford probes William of Conches's teaching on the elements and causes in nature, and C. Burnett analyzes Hermann of Carinthia's cosmology in terms of his familiarity with Arab physics and medicine.
According to S. Gersh, Anselm of Canterbury's understanding of ratio is broader than that found in Aristotelian-Boethian logic. By tracing Anselm's reasoning in the Monologion and Proslogion, Gersh shows that Anselm also argues differently than commentators have generally thought. D. Luscombe's well-rounded portrait of Peter Abelard presents his ethics and theology as well as his logic, and notes how a concern with the mind's activity shapes his work in all these areas. J. Marenbon discusses Gilbert of Poitiers's theory of argument, and claims that his philosophy only makes sense in light of his theological aims. We should note, however, that Gilbert's teachings on the Trinity and Christology have been considered problematic since the 12th century. Hence, if his philosophy serves his theology, it may not do so as well, or as clearly, as Marenbon suggests. Dronke's article on Thierry of Chartres is perhaps the book's most impressive essay. Attempting to see Thierry whole, Dronke shows that his "originality lay in combining an extreme Platonism... with a far-reaching naturalism," and in grounding this synthesis in a novel metaphysical scheme. Thierry thus fuses the century's impulses toward both Platonic vision and analysis of the natural world.

Two articles discuss "The Entry of the 'New' Aristotle." D. Jacquart analyzes the use of Aristotle's natural philosophy in the medical literature of Salerno. E. Maccagnolo's death prevented completion of his essay on David of Dinant, but under Dronke's editing Maccagnolo presents the tantalizing thesis that David's Aristotelianism marks out an itinerary leading from physical phenomena to God. Brief "Bio-bibliographies" on individual thinkers and an extensive "General Bibliography" complete the volume.

Dronke modestly describes this book as an exploratory "opening-up of problems, and an invitation to take them further." True enough, yet this understates the book's achievement. For it not only probes new scholarly frontiers but also consolidates and extends research in more familiar territory (e.g., the essays by Gregory, Luscombe, and Dronke). Further, the book skillfully portrays philosophy's role in 12th-century intellectual life. For it rightly considers philosophy not as an isolated, autonomous discipline but as engaged in vital dialogue with many disciplines and traditions: with theology, medicine, and the natural sciences, and with the Christian, classical, and Arabic traditions. This volume presents the rich variety, tensions, and accomplishments of that dialogue.

Gwynedd-Mercy College, Pa. DONALD F. DUCLOW


If one can speak about a quest for the historical Aquinas, this volume surely provides a starting point for the search. Weber uses his obvious
talent for historical research to give us Aquinas’ doctrine on the person of Jesus Christ pure and simple. Unfettered by a slavish involvement in the commentatorial tradition, he offers an innovative reading of Aquinas’ Christology. Thomas before Thomism, if you will. The book includes five principal parts, a useful glossary of technical language, several scholarly indices, and a chronological appendix of Aquinas’ life and works.

W. frequently employs annotated catenae of diverse primary texts in order to draw the reader directly into Aquinas’ thought. Thus a long excerpt from the *Summa contra gentiles* 4, 53–55, introduces Part 1. Part 2 questions the aptness of the distinction “from on high” and “from below,” and seeks to uncover how Aquinas rather sought a point of convergence between Christ’s divinity and humanity. Toward this end W. signals three important co-ordinates for Thomist Christology: (1) the intellectual nature of the intra-Trinitarian procession of the Word; (2) the proper attribution of creation to the divine Word; (3) the visible “mission” of the Word to created souls (52). W. clearly shows his Paris colors when he finds little to appreciate in the “l’académisme scolastique” and when he criticizes “la scholastique tardive” for failing to grasp this important Trinitarian perspective of Aquinas’ Christology.

Part 3 considers Christ’s humanity. After sketching the historical development of Thomist philosophical anthropology, W. designates “second perfective act” (126) as crucial for understanding the relationship between an individual nature and the person. “[L]e Moi de la personne” rests essentially in activity toward objects known and loved (127). This opinion admittedly risks conceiving the metaphysics of personhood as a highly developed philosophical functionalism. In any event, later scholastic developments on the constitutive of personhood sought to avoid such a reading of Aquinas. (A typographical error on p. 117 wrongly dates the *Second Quodlibet* from 1720 instead of 1269.) Still, this “intentional” construal of personhood puts a certain perspective on the “grace of union.” In brief, an eschatological knowledge of God in His very essence accounts both for Christ’s distinctive “I” and the Savior’s unique relationship with God. Thus W. distinguishes the senses in which the *gratia unionis* remains uncreated and at the same time the “summit of creation.” A theme at once Dionysian and Johannine inspires Aquinas’ account of Christ’s human activities: “The love wherewith the Father loves Christ is the prime exemplar (exemplum) for the love wherewith Christ loves us” (185).

W. warns against anachronistic attempts to discover a “phenomenological psychology” in Aquinas’ treatment of Christ’s knowledge (199). Still, he stresses the noetic character of Christ’s psychology. So he makes a perfectly clear case why, e.g., Aquinas accepted the threefold knowledge of Christ: acquired, beatific, and infused. Interestingly enough, W. shows
that the traditional doctrine that Christ possessed the beatific vision from the first moment of his conception represents an antiadoptionist viewpoint (217). Again, he rightly relates Christ’s infused knowledge to his salvific purposes, especially his knowledge of each individual for whom he suffered and his capacity to judge personal intentions. But he disclaims later rationalist interpretations of Christ’s infused knowledge which make him out to be an Encyclopedist.

Concerning the delicate question of the unity of esse in Christ, W. argues that from Aquinas’ point of view “the attempt to establish a human I [in Christ] remains quite superfluous” (235). This reductionism will certainly elicit replies from those who have recently engaged in prolonged debate on this subject. Still, W. adduces multiple appeals to the biblical commentaries, where, he alleges, the “moi humano-divine” of Christ appears and reappears.

A final part outlines some basic principles of Christ’s work which, W. insists, only open up the important questions of soteriology, ecclesiology, and sacramentology. His treatment of the acta et passa Christi emphasizes the work of image-perfection (resurrection, regeneration, adoptive sonship, and the new creation) which Aquinas announces as the first of the “pertinent” reasons for the Incarnation. As a preface to his presentation of the sacraments of baptism and Eucharist, W. remarks briefly on the redemptive mission of Christ. Numerous allusions throughout to the similarities between Aquinas’ views and those of Eckhart may explain why W. gives short shrift to Aquinas’ discussion of the reatus poenae and malum culpa. Although the topic does not form W.’s principal concern, sin and original sin remain marginalized in his account of Aquinas’ soteriology. Rather, knowledge-mysticism obviously influences this fresh reading of the Common Doctor’s teaching on Christ’s person.

Dominican House of Studies, D.C.


For over 30 years Hick has explored problems in the philosophy of religion. His developing understanding of the significance of the multiplicity of religious traditions, and of their epistemic parity (no tradition can show it has a superior way to know, love, and serve the Ultimate), has moved him from a fairly conservative approach to a neo-Kantian pluralism. This text, based on his 1986–87 Gifford Lectures, creatively synthesizes, thoughtfully nuances, rarely repeats, and imaginatively extends his earlier work. It is a masterpiece, destined to be a (if not the) classic of its type.
In an opening "phenomenological" part, H. distinguishes preaxial religion (concerned with preserving order in cosmos and society) from religions which arose in the axial age (concerned with soteriology, eschatology, and ultimately optimistic, even if proximately pessimistic). He finds all the great contemporary religious traditions rooted in the axial age. All construe salvation/liberation/enlightenment as a person's shift from self-centeredness to reality-centeredness. All provide paths for ultimate human transformation. All give humans hope.

Part 2 portrays "the religious ambiguity of the universe." After exploring classic and contemporary arguments for the existence of God, the significance of religious experience, and the naturalistic (atheistic) option, H. concludes that the universe is finally open to be experienced and understood in multiple religious and naturalistic ways. Any "analysis of religious belief and experience, and any realistic defence of the rationality of religious conviction, must therefore start from this situation of systematic ambiguity" (124).

Such a defense is found in the third (and longest) "epistemological" part. For H., all experience is "experiencing-as." After too briefly examining natural, ethical, and aesthetic meaning and experience, he turns to religious meaning and experience. Faith provides the necessary interpretive component (the "as") in religious experience. Recognizing the realistic intent and cognitive claims of the religious traditions, H. rejects the nonrealist explanations of religion (Feuerbach, Cupitt, Phillips) as unable to represent and account for the practical and theoretical orientations of the great traditions. But participants in each of the traditions experience and conceptualize life, the world, and the Ultimate as different "things." Ultimately relying on James ("The Will to Believe"), H. argues that theistic beliefs can be natural, foundational beliefs, and that religious folk can have an epistemic right to trust their experiences. But this means that people are justified in holding contradictory beliefs and trusting varied experiences generated in the great spiritual traditions.

Part 4 explains this "religious pluralism." Rejecting exclusivism (our religion is true, the others phonies) and inclusivism (our savior is the real one, whose power is the [hidden] saving power even for other traditions), H. presents his "pluralistic hypothesis." Developing S. Katz's neo-Kantian approach, he postulates an Ultimate Reality, a Gott-an-sich, beyond the varied experiences and concepts of the Ultimate as both personal and impersonal. Religious (even mystical) experiences are authentic (perhaps even complementary) experiences of the various manifestations of the Ultimate, mediated by cultural conditioning, i.e. the faiths of the various religious traditions.

But H.'s pluralism is not pure relativism. The fifth, "criteriological"
part presents a basic soteriological criterion: religions "have greater or less value according as they promote or hinder the salvific transformation" (300) from self-centeredness to reality-centeredness. Saints provide evidence of traditions' efficacy. A second criterion is moral: each valid tradition teaches a moral ideal epitomized in the Golden Rule.

But what of the differing cognitive claims that the traditions make? Factual historical claims are to be judged by historical canons. But factual transhistorical claims, e.g. the fate of individuals after death, cannot be settled here and now, and the truth about Gott-an-sich is by definition beyond our ken, so we must be agnostic about the Ultimate. H. finds much religious discourse to be "mythical," stories or statements not literally true but evocative of a proper dispositional attitude to their subjects. Myths' "truths" are judged not by any correspondence to reality but by pragmatic soteriological and ethical criteria. Thus many conflicting myths can be "true." For instance, H. asserts that the Incarnation is best understood as myth, since taken as factual doctrine it has "shrunk the image of God to that of the tribal deity of the West" (372), but as a myth it can be an efficacious concept of the Ultimate.

H. is a model liberal scholar: he has a comprehensive and conciliatory vision, has developed his position by adapting ideas from other scholars, and has learned from many of his critics. His lucid writing invites dialogue and criticism in ways convoluted conceptualizations couched in jargon (so common in philosophical theology) never can. One can suspect his categorization of religions as "preaxial" and "postaxial" (and his dismissal of the former) is too facile, quarrel with his hyper-Kantianism, challenge his understanding of religious narratives by proposing their logical (not merely experiential and categorical) primacy for understanding religious concepts, question the validity of his criteria for religious truth, doubt the adequacy and wisdom of collapsing all religious ethics into versions of the Golden Rule, wonder where one can stand to experience (rather than ratiocinate) the Universe as ultimately ambiguous, question whether his soteriological and ethical criteria do not finally render him an unwitting inclusivist, point out the problem of saying that the Ultimate is unknowable but somehow provides information (not just stimulation) through religious experience, etc. Bluntly, I think he is off track on all these areas; I would prefer a much more particularistic and pluralistic path. Many others have also criticized him on these points. Nonetheless, H. sets a standard in philosophy of religion few can hope to match. Generally accessible to advanced undergraduates, yet nuanced enough for scholars, he will remain required reading for a long time.

Florida State University

TERRENCE W. TILLEY

Like all generalizations, speaking of a "Yale school" of theological interpretation may conceal more than it reveals. But Tanner's interesting methodological proposals share at least a family resemblance to a "Yale" approach in their insistence on the priority of scriptural meaning and their suspicion of resolving the modern crisis of theology by appeal to an experiential grounding of the theological task. T.'s book is a theoretical extension and particular application of the culture-linguistic rule theory detailed in G. Lindbeck's The Nature of Doctrine (1984).

T. responds to the fragmented state of Christian identity in the post-Enlightenment period by sketching a variation on Lindbeck's methodological theme. She is confident that a close analysis of the workings of Christian discourse through the ages will exhibit the acceptable parameters within which authentic Christian identity flourishes. T. proposes a method which functions as a "qualified transcendental argument"—an approach which intends to establish the possibility of the meaningfulness of Christian discourse but whose principles are neither necessary nor unique. In this respect T. eschews the a priori character of transcendental deduction in the Kantian tradition and embraces the more modest approach of empirical examination and description, which, she believes, will allow the regulative assumptions of Christian discourse to show through. The test case that T. employs is the God-world relationship, and, more specifically, the relationship between God and creatures.

The early Christian appropriation of the Greek philosophical tradition provides T. with evidence sufficient for the articulation of two rules which serve as the doctrinal grammar of the God-world relationship: (1) "avoid both a simple univocal attribution of predicates to God and world and a simple contrast to divine and non-divine predicates"; (2) "avoid in talk of God's creative agency all suggestions of limitation in scope or manner" (47). The principal contribution of T.'s book is to show how these rules function in a variety of theologico-cultural circumstances. T. illustrates cogently how theologians as different as Irenaeus, Aquinas, Schleiermacher, Rahner, and Barth are faithful to the rules of divine transcendence and immanence while yet articulating remarkably different theological stances, a demonstration that brings life to Lindbeck's theoretical claim that the objectivity of the rule is not impervious to change. Indeed, T. contends that it is from the consistent stability of the tradition's grammar that doctrinal diversity unfolds (32).

Further evidence of the wide latitude of theological discourse permissible in the cultural-linguistic approach is provided in T.'s extended
discussion of God and the efficacy of creatures. T. draws on the work of Aquinas, Luther, Calvin, and Barth to exemplify the inevitable mutuality of the rules at work in particular theological applications, as well as the consequences for particular theologies of applying the rules negatively or positively, i.e. stressing God’s transcendence and majesty while diminishing claims on behalf of human dignity coram Deo or vice versa. Here Roman Catholic and Reformation Protestant positions on justification serve as the backdrop for T.’s analysis, the conclusions of which reflect the ecumenical consensus of the 1983 statement *Justification by Faith* by the U.S. Lutheran–Roman Catholic dialogue group.

T.’s concluding chapters argue that the modern period has witnessed a departure from the grammar of meaningful theological discourse about God’s relationship to the creaturely world, and that the skewed environment of Pelagianism resulting from this departure must be consciously addressed as theologians apply the traditional rules in a contemporary setting. This “rhetorical stance” (161) is necessary in T.’s view to parry the untraditional assumptions of unnamed “revisionist theologians” who, in emphasizing the dignity of the creature, forsake traditional claims for a transcendent God (164).

In spite of its unnuanced judgments about the liberal trajectory of modern theology, T.’s work is a valuable resource for current discussions of theological method. She has elucidated well the range of the cultural-linguistic approach, and her understanding of theologies as strategic applications of the regulative tradition does much to illustrate the limitations of naively foundational theologies. As much as I appreciate her work, however, the persuasiveness of her methodological proposal might be attributed to the relatively uncontroversial nature of the doctrine that serves as her test case. One could argue against T. that there are doctrines utterly central to the tradition of the faithful (the doctrine of Christ could serve as an example) which exhibit not only an applicative but also a regulative diversity. T. would be suspicious of any modern theological example invoked as an illustration of the regulative diversity of the tradition. But perhaps the various Christologies preserved in the canon provide examples of normative diversity that is regulative and not simply applicative in nature. For any such case to be made consistently according to T.’s empirical method, one would need to cite evidence from the entire tradition and not assume too quickly, as T., despite her disclaimer, does, that a completely unified doctrinal grammar abides in some dimension of premodern theology.

*Fairfield University, Conn.*

*John E. Thiel*

A well-crafted, humanist intervention into the postmodern field of theological discourse in which the spell of the classical eschatological picture (which stretches from OT to Calvin, Tertullian to Barth) has not only been broken but the very intelligibility of a discourse of God, history, and their relation has come to be radically questioned. In the wake of the demise of the hegemony of the classical eschatological picture, Hodgson advances a properly theological alternative to the agnosticism and nihilism which have in postmodernity exercised no little appeal. This theological alternative, minted from postmodern resources such as political and liberation theology, narrative and critical theory, and specifically modern resources such as Hegel and Troeltsch, is revisionist in nature and consists of three interlocking elements: elucidation of a postmodern construal of the divine as essentially open to history; articulation of a view of history which sees the divine as the horizon, not the cause, of meaning; the presentation of a particular kind of praxis as the point of intersection between the divine and history.

H.'s revisionist construal of the divine is unabashedly Hegelian in inspiration, with Hegel's Trinitarian theology playing the role of foundation. That a foundational role can be played by Hegelian Trinitarian theology is, for H., perfectly cogent, since that theology offers one of the most sophisticated critiques of the monarchical position which insists on divine aseity and the intrinsic nonrelationality of the divine and history. Deconstructing the classical position, Hegel can think through the intrinsic relationality of the divine and history, their mutual interaction in the self-actualization of the divine and the historical.

Chapter 3, which outlines the basic framework of his reconstruction of a theology of history in the wake of poststructuralist critiques, may be H.'s finest chapter. Again Hegelian thought is foundational, this time Hegelian reflection on history. In making a truly illuminating application of Hayden White's trope analysis to interpret the Hegelian construal of history, H. makes a strong case for Hegel as an important resource for any contemporary reconstruction. On H.'s reading, Hegel's theology of history not only eschews an ironic, nihilistic response to history (a response found in deconstruction) but provides at least the first draft of an adequate theology of history which would avoid triumphalistic (or comic) or pessimistic (or tragic) extremes. Given a number of influential "comic" readings of Hegel, H.'s point is not uncontroversial. However, in fairness it should be said that H. is not advocating a pure retrieval of Hegel nor a retrieval of a pure Hegel. Both emendation and amendment are necessary. If emendation is introduced by focusing more than Hegel did on the tragic dimension of history, amendment is introduced by
focusing upon the structural correction of the Hegelian enterprise witnessed in the thought of Ernst Troeltsch.

In the final step in his argument, appealing to the resources of liberation theology, political theology, and critical theory, H. comes to see praxis as the point of intersection between the presence of the divine and the human desire to transform and be free. Yet once again Hegel is an inexpungeable presence, since his theology of history is a theology of the exegesis of freedom, an exegesis that admits of a divine as well as human description. Of course, Hegelian theology, to the degree to which it suggests anything by way of linear teleology or totalitarian closure, must be amended. In a revisionist theology of history freedom is an open-ended experiment, with pluriform concrete shapes. No shape is in principle unsurpassable, and history shows disfigurement as well as configuration of meaning, regression and atavism as well as progress and humanization.

This thoughtful and passionate work displays an impressive grasp of the major players in the contemporary theological field. Yet it is not without its flaws. It is suffused with a not-all-together-justified certitude that the classical salvation-history model has not only lost its hold but is unredeemable in principle. The same kind of certitude characterizes H.'s negative assessment of the classical construal (and language) of the Trinity, as well as the assertion of the superiority of Hegelian archetypal Christology over classical varieties. Again, while H.'s presentation of Hegel is always adequate and often exemplary, nevertheless, sometimes so much interest is betrayed in having a redeemable Hegel at hand that H. involves himself in special pleading or at least plea bargaining. If Hegel is to be convicted, it seems necessary that the conviction have to do with misdemeanors. These flaws do not, however, vitiate a book which is timely, intelligent, and constructive.

St. John's University, Minn. 

Cyril O'Regan


A well-documented and well-written volume on the liberating aspects of Trinity as a community of sharing for church and society. Boff begins by explaining his three-step method: encounter, understanding, and worship. He then compares today's encounter with past contexts: the polytheism of the Greco-Roman world, the Greek philosophy that influenced Aquinas, modern humanism that has made Trinity seem irrelevant speculation. He argues that renewal of society is needed today, and that
total mutual sharing of Trinity is precisely what can inspire it. Social and structural sin blocks this revelation.

From this perspective Boff reviews NT revelation and OT lines. Jesus’ actions more than doctrine serve the “kingdom” of God (justice for the poor) and “Abba” (intimate family with the poor). With authority and God’s Spirit he teaches, casts out evil, heals, and loves. And the Spirit reveals the Father as “Abba” and Jesus as “Son of God.” The coworking of all three persons is revealed in action, and expressed in NT triadic formulas.

There follows a clear and readable review of the early apologists, theologians, and conciliar decrees. After examining the Latin and Greek approaches, Boff opts for an approach from distinct, equal persons to one sharing or perichoresis. He does not neglect symbolic approaches (“economic,” archetypal, liturgical, family, social, ecclesial, and material), showing their importance for daily life, but also their need for the complement of reasoned approaches.

Boff then moves to modern approaches and his own. He opts for deepening our understanding of person (Lonergan, Mühlen), rather than substituting for person “distinct mode of being (Barth) or distinct mode of subsisting (Rahner).” Then he presents the societal view (Moltmann), which he builds on, and the transsexist view which attends to feminine aspects of God (Mary Daly etc.), which he also uses. Surprisingly, Boff omits here reflections on Trinity seen through the crucifixion (Moltmann, Mühlen, Balthasar, etc.), which he has treated elsewhere. His own approach emphasizes God as eternal living, infinite communing, and total mutuality (perichoresis). Each person is equally eternal. He sees a danger of subordinationism in traditional expressions like causality, origin, “begetting,” and “breathing,” which must be viewed as analogous. He critiques capitalism (domination of one) and socialism (imposed by bureaucracy) and calls the Church beyond a pre-Trinitarian (patriarchal) structure to a Trinitarian ideal of total sharing. Finally, Boff uses the doxology “Glory be...” to move beyond logic to prayer and celebration. As mystery, God is beyond reason, an ultimate reality calling for surrender in faith, an ultimate beauty calling for praise, adoration, and silent worship.

Some of Boff’s ideas can be disputed. (1) He seems to stress eternal life to the neglect of God’s role in dying. Because of difficulty with Moltmann’s Crucified God (which tends to make the Father the crucifier), he does not highlight Jesus’ death/resurrection as his culminating self-expression (as is well argued by Mühlen, Die Veränderlichkeit Gottes [1969], which Boff does not cite). It would not oppose his thesis, but actually deepen it, to include free surrender of one’s self as eternal principle of total sharing. (2) With Moltmann, Boff emphasizes the
renewing, future-oriented power of the Spirit, who "sets humankind free from an obsession with its origins, its desire to return to the original paradise, access to which has been finally closed" (193). He neglects the healing power of the Spirit, which must "renew origins" if it is to move to a healed future (hence Jesus as "new Adam" etc.). As eternal, Trinity transforms past and future. (3) Boff’s suspicion of “causal” analogies for God and focus on “sacramental” aspects of Trinity, together with his experience of charismatics as too focused on inner life, seems to lead him to overlook God’s present transforming and healing power. The healing works of Jesus’ disciples were a social force and cause of hope in the early Church and could well be that today. Trinity is cause for praise, yes, but also for transformation.

These points of difference are all integratable within Boff’s perspective. His book is careful, reflective about method, and thorough. It is less fully annotated, but more readable, than Rasper’s The God of Jesus Christ. Except for one place (“childish” is more likely “child-like” [29]), the translation is excellent. This would make a fine text for college or seminary students, as well as challenge the more proficient, and it presents a clear challenge to society and church to work for social justice.

Loyola University, Chicago

ROBERT T. SEARS, S.J.


In the immediate aftermath of Vatican II, Irenaeus of Lyons awoke to new-found notoriety. Banners blithely heralded his aphorism, “the glory of God is man fully alive.” Like so much of the exuberantly American reception of Vatican II, the banners only managed half the story. Indeed, they missed the more properly theological part: “but the life of man is the vision of God.” This elegant first volume of God Encountered, van Beeck’s projected three-volume “contemporary Catholic systematic theology,” integrates both anthropology and doxology, both homo vivens and visio Dei. However, it is definitely the latter which receives the primacy. For the heart of the matter is that God is encountered and only this encounter truly enlivens the human called to awe-filled intimacy and transformation.

Instructive here is the author’s appreciative and critical dialogue with the most influential of 20th-century Catholic systematicians, Karl Rahner. Rahner’s “turn to the subject” and the coherence and depth of his transcendent reflection upon the human as possible recipient of God’s self-communication finally settled the “long-standing debt” owed by Catholic orthodoxy to the Enlightenment. And yet, such transcendent
reflection, however necessary and integral to the theological task, depends upon and subserves the categorical reality of concrete Christian faith. It is this latter that is epistemologically prior and theologically superior.

For reasons both theologically profound and pastorally compelling, B. contends that the “present-day need [is] for a positive starting point of systematic theology” (139), i.e. for a phenomenological setting forth of the Christian faith that discloses its objective structures. Hence the primary appeal of B.’s theology is not to the religious self-consciousness, so prized by Schleiermacher, but to the objective realities of historic Christian faith: God, Christ, the Spirit, Church as these are witnessed to in “the great Tradition” of the undivided Church. Only such a starting point can promote a renewed and comprehensive sense of Catholic identity in the post-Vatican II era—an identity so deeply rooted that it discerns the theological and spiritual inadequacy of those competing half-stories: integralism and modernism.

In elaborating his positive program, B. accords a distinctive place to worship. Here doxology is most fully celebrated and the God of Jesus Christ most explicitly encountered. Again, it is the objective dimension of worship that is highlighted. “Worship is abandon, not cultivation of self. Its focus is away from self, on God” (162). In Christian worship the reality of the triune God is encountered and this encounter confers on the creature “a new responsive identity” (166). Worship, then, is the connatural and ecstatic response to the realization of the wondrous exchange God has wrought, the admirabile commercium that is the leitmotif of B.’s book.

If worship displays the Trinitarian essence of Christian faith, its origin and focus are given through Jesus Christ, God’s Son and our Lord. In particular, it is the resurrection of Christ that establishes and inspires Christian worship, as it is the living presence of the risen Lord that continues to found the Church. For the risen Christ breathes out the Spirit, thereby extending and fulfilling the wondrous exchange. “The risen Jesus, present in the Spirit, evokes not detached affirmation, but participation in, his divine identity” (159). Hence the great theme of divinization, so dear to Irenaeus, receives in B.’s theology new and exemplary statement. It is in the process of maturation in the Spirit that we have access, through Jesus Christ, to the unseen God. Spirituality that is expressly Trinitarian is no longer “extracurricular” to theology; it is the curriculum itself.

Though worship enjoys a primacy among the responsive structures of faith, it forms a perichoretic unity with conduct and doctrine. Each of the three testifies to and verifies the other; one without the other diminishes and distorts Catholic identity. B.’s elaboration of their mutual relatedness restores to theology its living link with the liturgical and
pastoral life of the Church. Though proceeding from a different vantage point, B.'s concerns strikingly parallel those of such Latin American Catholic theologians as Gustavo Gutiérrez.

There is much else in this remarkable volume that must be left to the reader's own discovery. The pattern of presentation allows for some splendid mini-essays on figures as diverse as Celsus, John Toland, and Rousseau. Extended footnotes offer the occasion for pointed insights into the strengths and weaknesses of important contemporary figures and positions. The one puzzlement, in a work whose range of references is most impressive, is the complete absence of any mention of the work of David Tracy. Tracy's is the only other endeavor in systematics by a North American Catholic that I would rank in importance with the present volume and project. A taking of position vis-à-vis Tracy's oeuvre would have been as instructive and illuminating as addressing Rahner's views proved to be. Nonetheless, that is a small regret in the midst of such riches. All will want to savor this Babette's-feast of a book: the first course provides great promise of good things yet to come.

Boston College

ROBERT P. IMBELLI


Rabbi Lawrence Hoffman of New York's Hebrew Union College has provided a significant introduction to the liturgy. It is significant because it begins with the experience of the congregation and its attempt to identify with its symbols rather than attempting to explain the symbols and then indicating how the congregation should be praying. The Art of Public Prayer will serve as indispensable reading in introductory courses in liturgics, in seminars on religious ritual, in discussion groups in religious education, and as a magnificent resource which brings the human sciences to bear on worship. It is the most articulate and credible book I have read on liturgy in years. It is credible because it begins with experience and not a menu of liturgical a priori.

The two keys for understanding and taking full advantage of this book are that it views liturgy from the point of view of systems analysis and it considers liturgy an art form. The first section deals with the system in trouble. It is in trouble because the ritual no longer structures time in a creative way, has lost much of its symbolic power, and is sending mixed messages. The remedy lies in treating liturgy as a comprehensive art form in its own right and not merely the depository for other art forms. This notion is developed in detail in the following chapters, where Hoffman examines the language of worship, the dramatic quality of liturgy, sacred design, and spoken text, and the sung words.
Hoffman has modeled for us an effort in ecumenical theology. His own Jewish background is always clearly discernible, but his familiarity with Christian worship is also evident. Because he does not treat liturgical issues as primarily denominational in character but as stemming from a breakdown of a system, he brings a fresh outlook to perennial liturgical problems. For this reason I found the book more helpful and more believable than most of the "introductions to liturgy" written by my Roman Catholic colleagues. Too often the latter identify the cause of the failure of worship and its renewal as a lack of appreciation and full understanding of a received ritual and are loathed to blame the ritual structure itself or the system that supports or does not support that structure.

H.'s refreshing solution is actually not particularly new, as it has been put forth by others along different, more strictly liturgical lines. On the horizontal axis the group of worshipers must be unified around an alternative world view, and so the rituals must articulate the favorite themes and conventions of a particular religious tradition. On the vertical axis it must be clear that this group is really praying, and today this means more the intimacy of community than it does the numinosity of former times. For this interaction of the vertical and the horizontal dimensions of worship to take place, there must develop a new master image, a view of God which is in accord with the cultural backdrop of our age and is expressed in a vocabulary which is contemporary, i.e. one which is familiar to those involved in that process of communication called liturgy.

For those who are looking for another recipe book on liturgical preparation or celebrational style, this book will disappoint. For those seeking a deeper understanding of the liturgical situation of the present time, it is clearly the companion for that journey.

Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley
JAMES L. EMPEREUR, S.J.


An attempt to bring the resources of the psychoanalytic perspective to bear on understanding certain more or less popular expressions of Catholic folk devotion. Carroll's basic thesis is that the nature and popular appeal of such practices rides on unconscious motivations based on gratification of infantile instinctual desires. Is this news? No! The thesis is as old as Freud and does not tell us much that significantly deepens our understanding of these phenomena. In any case, readers will find here a careful and competent survey of the history of each devotion. C.
relies heavily on Herbert Thurston, the English Jesuit scholar and authority on such devotions.

There are problems with C.'s approach. E.g., his analysis of the rosary rehearses Freud's by now tired theme of the ritualization and repetition of the recitation of the rosary reflecting obsessive-compulsive characteristics that derive from anal fixations, even to the point of proposing that the fingering of the beads is a sublimation of impulses to fecal play. What comes of this way of thinking is a simplistic and reductionistic understanding that does not do much to raise esteem for psychoanalytic thinking among religious thinkers. Even psychoanalysts would have to be disappointed by the limited theoretical perspective—early Freudian instinctual theory and a bit of basic Klein. I doubt that any serious thinker will be impressed by C.'s argument about the rosary. It makes just as much sense to explain Van Gogh's hands-on smearing of paint on canvases as an example of fecal smearing. The appeal to anal derivation may not be wrong; in Vincent's hands one can make a case. But I doubt that anyone would claim that an appeal to fecal smearing completely explains the results of Vincent's genius. There had to be more to it.

This touches the basic methodological issue. C.'s method of argument applies analytic ideas to extra-analytic material. No data are provided from the analytic setting to confirm or substantiate his claims. Such data might show that the inference had merit in certain cases. But C. reaches a more or less general conclusion without substantiation. Slippery business. Even worse when the implication is left that such unconscious determinants are the sole basis of explanation. Much better if we are helped to understand that other motivational forces are at work and to grasp how the unconscious determinants enter the picture and interact with other levels of motivation—religious motivations that are also the business of psychoanalysts to explore and understand.

One conclusion is that C. is asking the wrong questions. Better questions might be focused on the role devotional practices play in the lives of individual believers and what kinds of meaningful role such religious belief and devotion play for them. The motivational components of these devotions are more complex than an understanding in merely unconscious terms would allow. Further, the unconscious motivational structure itself is more complex than would be reflected by an appeal only to instinctual theory. Psychoanalysis has come a long way since Freud. So while I applaud C.'s valiant effort to bring some degree of psychoanalytic insight to bear on these striking examples of folk belief and cultic inspiration, I find myself forced to issue a cautionary warning. The nonpsychoanalytic reader should realize that C.'s argument is flawed in several places and his conclusions do not represent the last word in
psychoanalytic understanding even of these cultic expressions of Catholic popular piety.

Boston College

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


There is nothing obvious about the linking of these six thinkers. Several of them could as easily be designated philosophers against consciousness as philosophers of consciousness. A minimalist reading of the book would suggest another subtitle: six thinkers I find very interesting. A maximalist reading would make of it a kind of phenomenology of spirit, moving from abstract and less adequate accounts of consciousness to more concrete and comprehensive accounts. Neither is quite right. The book has a rambling character, but it also has more continuity than the minimalist reading would suggest. On the other hand, while it tries to build and not just juxtapose, it does not possess or even strive for the kind of teleological wholeness suggested by the Hegelian model.

Written by a professor of comparative literature and comparative religion, and presenting itself as primarily of interest to those in philosophy, theology, and psychology, the book makes the philosophy of science its point of departure. There is an irony in the presentation of Polanyi and Lonergan. The primary focus on Polanyi concerns his account of the tacit dimension in knowing, the subjective factors that render positivist accounts untenable; and Lonergan is presented as fulfilling his insights by developing a richer conceptuality for expressing them. These two are then presented, vis-à-vis Voegelin, as representing the objective and rational over against the subjective and spiritual.

Voegelin is presented as an existentialist in the tradition of Jaspers and Kierkegaard, and a romantic in the tradition of Schelling. There seems to be at least as much about these thinkers as about Voegelin in the chapter devoted to the latter. The result is to present Voegelin as something quite different from the conservative political thinker he is often taken to be. The contrast between his subjectivist themes and Lonergan’s objectivist themes is the heart of the dialogue staged between them.

It is Voegelin’s interest in myth as the symbolic vehicle for human consciousness that makes the link with Ricoeur. Both seek wisdom in myth and use the Platonic metaphor of recollection in seeking to develop a hermeneutic of mythical experience. But unlike Voegelin, Ricoeur finds it necessary to supplement this with a hermeneutic of suspicion, recognizing that symbols can generate and sustain idols as easily as truth. By
this time Polanyi has disappeared completely, but the Kantian themes in Ricoeur form the basis for a comparison with Lonergan’s more nearly Aristotelian orientation.

The developmental character of the dialogue seems to come to a halt with Girard. His thought is presented primarily in relation to Freud, his mimetic theory of desire being contrasted with Freud’s object-oriented theory. While this is both interesting and important in its own right, it is hard to see its connection with the one point that relates Girard to the other main characters in the book, his basic distrust of myth by contrast with the hope expressed by Voegelin and Ricoeur that myths are the bearers of a certain wisdom.

Although Webb tells us that Kierkegaard is too well known to need a general exposition, he devotes most of his longest chapter to basic exposition of such familiar themes as recollection and the leap, the moment and the paradox, subjectivity and objectivity, and sin and offense. Occasionally he brings the other characters in. But the dialogue with Lonergan about subjectivity and objectivity essentially reprises earlier discussions of this issue in connection with Voegelin and Ricoeur. The dialogue with Girard about the offense is the one really interesting conversation in this chapter.

The final chapter seeks to bring the whole journey into focus around what Webb sees as a shared concept of the human challenge, “a differentiation of consciousness leading toward a new, more reflective integration of the human agent as a rational and responsible performer of the intentional operations that constitute specifically human existence” (284). Had the categories of differentiation, integration, rationality, and responsibility been more explicitly built into the serial expositions which precede, it might well have been possible to find with their help the sharper focus needed by the conversation this book seeks to generate.

Fordham University

MEROLD WESTPHAL


About 400 years ago a simple Italian miller, Menocchio, was tortured and put to death at the urging of the Roman Inquisition and Pope Clement VIII. His crime, like Giordano Bruno’s, was cosmology. He had proposed an adventurous, imaginative, and heretical reconception of the universe and its relationship to God. Two years ago the Vatican itself sponsored a conference on religion and scientific cosmology, inviting scholars in theology, philosophy, and physics. This book includes the papers submitted there, along with several others. Some of them are no
less adventurous, and inconsistent with traditional theism, than was the speculation of Menocchio. This time, however, if there is any torture, it will be of the educative kind undergone by readers as they grapple with the theological implications of modern physics and astrophysics.

Relativity and quantum physics have altered the cosmological landscape, and we struggle to keep pace with the almost daily advances in the science that Newton thought would be a timeless foundation for the theological enterprise. But the relationship between physics and theology is no longer as simple as Newton imagined. And while several of these papers would allow for a new version of physico-theology, most of them indicate a reluctance to forge too tight a link between physics and theology. They are more or less aware of the disastrous results of what Michael Buckley calls the “Newtonian Settlement.”

Buckley’s summary statement of the thesis earlier presented in his *At the Origins of Modern Atheism* is one of the most intriguing papers. It argues that after Newton much Christian theology made physics, not religious experience, the foundation of theology. Simultaneously theology became the crown and seal of physics. But when physics became aware of its autonomy, theology was left stranded, bereft of its formerly unshakable foundation. Buckley thinks the beginnings of modern atheism are directly tied up with the impression by prominent modern intellectuals that once physics had abandoned it, theology was left devoid of any solid grounds. Atheism in its modern form is the result of the fact that theologians carelessly exchanged religious experience for science as the foundation of theology.

Many of the other authors share Buckley’s distrust of physico-theology. The most notable exception is Frank Tipler, who presents a theogony (constructed out of his own peculiar version of the anthropic principle) certainly no less at odds with classical theism than Menocchio’s. Instead of imprisonment and execution, however, Tipler and the other venture-some essayists whose papers appear in this volume are graced with a congratulatory statement bearing the signature of the pope himself. A case could be made, in fact, that the most important single feature of this valuable collection is the introductory message by John Paul II. It is an enthusiastic and very forward-looking call for more fruitful exchange between science and religion.

Relating physics to theology, however, can easily lead to confusion. Physics advances only by virtue of a deliberate decision to abstract from most of our very complex world. But since it does leave so much out (including the story of life’s evolution and all of human history), any concept of God that we might connect to the ideas of physics alone would itself be rather insubstantial. Most of the essayists represented here seem to be aware of this limitation. But several of them mistakenly assume
that somehow physics gives us a more fundamental access to reality than any other discipline, and that therefore theology can profitably be built directly on such allegedly foundational ideas as physics gives us. This is clearly the case with Tipler, but apparently also with Robert Russell. The latter argues that contemporary physics provides a rich arsenal of metaphors for systemic theology.

Mary Hesse, on the other hand, cautions that part of the game of science is to "eliminate meaning and value from nature." Therefore, any deity deduced from physics, including any associated with the anthropic principle, will be nothing more than a deist God "who is allowed to choose the right constants at the creation. Nothing follows that is like the God of Abraham, Issac and Jacob and our Lord Jesus Christ, nor of any of the other traditional religions" (198). In the same spirit Nicholas Lash observes that "we are as close to the heart of the sense of creation in considering and responding to an act of human kindness as in attending to the fundamental structures and initial conditions of the world" (213).

Nevertheless, as Holmes Rolston has written elsewhere, physics (as well as other sciences) does place constraints on what may be plausibly stated about God, even if we cannot derive a theology from science itself. For that reason it is imperative that theologians acquaint themselves with science, to the extent that this is humanly possible. Such familiarity not only enriches our understanding of divine creativity but also helps prevent our discourse about God from collapsing into intellectual incoherence. This volume is an important step toward implementing the papal challenge to a deeper understanding of science and its relationship to theology.

Georgetown University

JOHN F. HAUGHT


Official histories are too often dry, uninspired narratives of institutional development. Happily, O'Brien's work does not fall into such a stereotype. He has organized an enormous amount of political, economic, and social history into a coherent and lively account of how American Catholics and their pastoral leadership have defined their role in the shaping of public policy. He emphasizes the uniqueness of the twofold challenge "to build one nation, ... to make one church," but he does not belabor the point. He shows the Church continually tacking as the winds of social change shifted. He highlights the tentative, experimental approaches of pastors and laity as Catholics tested the uncharted waters of
living in a pluralist and democratic society. He analyzes each of the sequential "styles" of public Catholicism—republican, immigrant, industrial, liberal, reform, social, and American. He surfaces the tension produced by two basic choices which still confront Catholics in the U.S. They could choose segregation from American culture and resultant privatization of religion, hoping to survive as an intact community of faith, or they could opt for openness to American culture and accommodation to the basic institutional imperatives of the U.S., with all the problems of involvement in the development of American society.

Throughout the book the Church appears to be a counterculture challenging and challenged by the dominant forces of American society. Unfortunately, counterculture in this sense meant that Catholics were better known by what they were against than by what they espoused. The Church was most often perceived as opposed to secularism, opposed to individualism, opposed to voluntarism. This type of counterculture often obscured the image of the Church as a living community of believers with a positive contribution to offer to the wider society. While Catholic social teaching was often ahead of the times, Catholic leadership failed to communicate these teachings, as well as other values, even to its own people, much less to the nation at large. O. believes the Church has attained adulthood in the present era and cites the recent pastoral of the bishops as evidence of this, while lamenting the average Catholic's lack of awareness of these same documents. Plus ça change.

O. is to be commended for his skillful blend of narrative and analysis. Encyclopedic in his coverage, he avoids trying to tell "too much" and enriches the text with well-chosen quotations and lively portraits of some of the major protagonists. His thumbnail definitions and descriptions are often quite well done. E.g.: "the ethnic community maintained a distinct way of life, at times standing at some distance from that of other Americans, at times appropriating American values and symbols in ways that reflected a determined effort at 'self-development,' denying the need to choose between the Old World and the New World, between being a part of a particular people and part of the American people. It was an alternative, not necessarily an oppositional, community."

One may disagree with aspects of his analysis, as well as some of his nomenclature. E.g., O. classifies the protagonists of the late-19th and early-20th-century struggles as "conservative" and "liberal." Such categorizations are not as useful as they once were. Much of the agenda of turn-of-the-century "liberals" is now espoused by "conservatives" and vice versa. One area which might have been probed more deeply is the relation of the pastoral leadership to Catholics in politics. While O. notes that direct involvement in politics normally was left to the laity, there is no analysis of indirect influence on Catholic politicians, although O. does
mention the controversies resultant from episcopal statements about candidates in recent national elections. This reviewer hopes that the author will pursue this topic elsewhere.

In his final chapter, O. departs from his usual careful selectivity and tries to cram in a bit too much. It is rich but too rich, and the reader must proceed very slowly to mine it fully.

The Catholic Church in the U.S. has always been, in one form or another, a “public church.” This book is an excellent account of “public Catholicism.” In his preface O. expressed his reluctance to take on the writing of this volume; we should be grateful that he overcame his misgivings.

Seton Hall University, N.J.  

ROBERT J. WISTER


The first advocate of women suffrage in this country was a Catholic, Margaret Brent, who in 1648 argued her right for two votes before the Maryland Assembly. Catholic too were Ellen Sherman and Madaline Dahlgren, founders of the first American antisuffrage organization. These protagonists typify the wide spectrum presented in this diverse and intriguing study, one of six volumes authorized by the NCCB to mark the bicentennial of John Carroll’s appointment as first bishop of the U.S. In a laudable effort towards inclusiveness in regard to race, ethnicity, and gender, the editors have devoted an entire volume to Catholics who are women. The array is myriad: there are Leonora Barry Lake, “the best labor man among them all,” and Sarah Hackett Stevenson, first woman member of the AMA; well-known figures like Mary Grove Nichols, Mary E. Switzer, Dorothy Day, and Ella Grasso; and less publicized women such as Margaret Gaffney Haughery, “the Bread Woman of New Orleans,” and a native American religious superior named Mother Catherine Sacred White Buffalo.

Seven essays by recognized scholars in women’s history develop various aspects of Catholic women as American. The book happily avoids a mere recitation of “how bad it’s been” and achieves a commanding overview of the real contributions of Catholic women to American society. The first three essays treat women in relatively private spheres: “feminine” ideology, the convent, and Catholic domesticity; three deal with women in public roles, including laywomen in the labor force, Catholic women reformers and activists, and Catholic involvement on all sides of women suffrage and the ERA. A final chapter on post-Vatican II feminism brings the study up to the present.
The volume views its subject through the prism of culture and religion. A recurrent motif is the influence of the American Protestant cult of “true womanhood” on Roman Catholic authors and its selling power with (particularly Irish) immigrants anxious to gain respectability by internalizing the Victorian social mores of a people they simultaneously despised and envied. Not all Catholic women, however, subscribed to this form of Americanization. Female colleagues of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union demanded to be recognized as “women’s, not ladies’ societies,” and Agnes Repplier defended single status for the Catholic woman, declaring, “She does not owe matrimony to the world!” In short, the book gives the lie to stereotypes of the Catholic woman while revealing their ever-present grain of truth.

Carefully researched and well written, the essays represent creative exploitation of sources, particularly the 19th-century Catholic press. Some chapters are better conceived and documented than others. There are a few very minor errors. Perhaps a future collection will include treatment of the underside of Catholic women’s history—prostitution, alienation, and criminality, all of which are usually connected to gender roles and tell a sad but real side of the Catholic story.

The book provides an extraordinarily broad view of American Catholic women. Patterns highlighted by each author form a larger design across the essays, which taken together complement and nuance one another to a striking degree. Needed is a unifying thread to stitch together the pieces of the quilt of American Catholic women’s history. Difficult archival excavation remains to be done, and Catholic women, perhaps for the first time, have begun to enjoy the education and incentive to tell their own story. While two surveys in this decade, James Hennesey’s *American Catholics* and *The American Catholic Experience* by Jay P. Dolan, illustrate an increasing sensitivity to the role of women, little has been available up to now for historians working at a general level. This collection, therefore, provides a necessary step in the long process of writing more and more comprehensive Roman Catholic history, by taking into account the 51 percent who are female.

Finally, it contains significant theological data. Pervasive Americanizing themes, as well as the multiplicity of roles and ideologies represented by the women in this volume, raise inevitable questions about patterns, if indeed they exist, of being genuinely Catholic in the U.S. The volume’s contents also suggest basic ecclesiological issues touched by the very fact of women’s history. For scholars and for the interested reader this is a welcome addition.

*Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.*

*Patricia Byrne, C.S.J.*

The present volume confirms the favorable impression created by Fogarty's earlier works. I have read this book as a historian of American Catholicism with no pretense of trying to play the role of a biblical expert, and find here further proof of Fogarty's competence as a professional historian, a scholar whose thoroughness of research, clarity of expression, and felicity of style leave little to be desired.

F.'s work is an example of intellectual history, which many would agree is the most difficult type of history to write. That difficulty accounts in part for the notorious differences in interpretation that characterize its practitioners. The terrain over which the historian must tread is like a mine field wherein at frequent intervals explosions occur, the prime players burst into conflict, and the atmosphere is charged with dissent from left and right with claims and counterclaims struggling for mastery. It is no small compliment to F. to say that he makes his way through this thicket with admirable objectivity. If his sympathies are obviously with the side that espoused openness to new ideas and to freedom of research and writing, he permits the opposite camp to have its say—indeed, to a degree that may embarrass the conservatives. This is preeminently true in regard to the members of his own Society of Jesus; Jesuits like Anthony Maas, Walter Drum, et al. are treated with a critical analysis that must win the confidence of non-Jesuit readers. Would that all authors from religious congregations, and from the diocesan clergy as well, displayed the same objectivity and honesty regarding their own members!

Here the reader will find a detailed and measured account of the Bible in the American Catholic setting from 1790, the year that marked the Philadelphia publisher Mathew Carey's publication of the first Catholic Bible in the new United States. The latter work was based on Richard Challoner's second edition dating from 1763–64. The narrative continues through the pioneer efforts of Francis Patrick Kenrick, archbishop of Baltimore, the first significant American Catholic name in biblical circles, a man who without formal training in Scripture made a notable contribution to the discipline. The account unfolds as F. moves into the troubled last decades of the 19th century, where such movements as Americanism and Modernism left their scar upon scriptural studies as well as on the ecclesiastical sciences in general. He carefully picks his way through the 1890s and into the present century as he records with compelling detail the anguished situation that arose in the wake of Pius X's Pascendi dominici gregis of 1907. The relatively meager progress in scriptural studies in American Catholic circles was frightened into silence...
as the anti-Modernist witch hunt expanded with the oath of 1910 and its accompanying vigilante committees. Incidentally, F. provides evidence that the pope was personally responsible for urging on the witch hunt (118, 169). Eventually Pius XII’s *Divino afflante Spiritu* encyclical of 1943 gave progressive biblical scholars fresh hope. The road ahead was still a rocky one, with intervals such as that highlighted by Pius XII’s warning encyclical *Humani generis* of August 1950.

The story took on increasing interest for the present reviewer once F. reached the 1940s, when I began my teaching and research in American Catholic history while viewing from the sidelines the deepening conflict that centered in no small measure on my own institution, the Catholic University of America. Honesty compels me to say that no other institution comes off in a sadder way in these pages. Here the reader will find the disgraceful dismissal in 1910 of Henry Poels, the Dutch-born professor of OT, approved I regret to say by Cardinal Gibbons, the chancellor, who was counseled by Thomas J. Shahan, the rector and one-time professor of church history. There followed the equally disgraceful dismissal in 1963 of my good friend Edward Siegman, C.P.P.S. I lived through that shameful episode in the university’s history when a key administrator poisoned the wells by his inability to tell the truth, when an aggressive and scheming professor of dogmatic theology was allowed to run rampant because of fear of his high Roman connections, and when an apostolic delegate outraged many thoroughly devoted Catholic intellectuals by his egregious interference and woefully ignorant interpretation of events. It was an especially painful time for the Catholic Biblical Association and its distinguished quarterly journal, but they survived and were to no small degree vindicated by Vatican Council II’s broad and wise enactments. All of this is told with rich detail and solid documentary support.

Should the work go into a second printing, a few minor slips require correction. But these do not detract from the high quality of this book and the debt we all owe to its learned author for producing yet another prime sample of the coming of age, as it were, of American Catholic historiography.

*Catholic University of America*  
*JOHN TRACY ELLIS*


The thesis of this ambitious and informative study is confirmation of the claim of a number of writers in 19th-century Britain and America that positivism represented the century’s most fundamental challenge to religious belief and that it significantly transformed theology not only
among radical thinkers but within the ranks of liberalism and conserva­
tism as well. Cashdollar makes it abundantly clear that Auguste Comte
was widely read by theologians and clergy. However, the claim of some
19th-century writers, a claim which C. accepts, that “Comte cut more
deeply into traditional theology than did any other thinker” is moot.
What effect the reading of Comte had on transformations in theology is
even more difficult to assess.

C. has demonstrated Comte’s importance for our understanding of
Anglo-American theology. He has carefully researched the sources, par­
ticularly the unpublished mss., papers, and letters, which often tell
important things about the reception and influence of Comte and posi­
tivism, things we would not have known from a thinker’s books alone.
Furthermore, he provides significant information about numerous other
19th-century figures. Finally, his courage in undertaking a study of such
scope and complexity, which demands great synthesizing skills, in an
attempt to see the period whole elicits our praise.

Part 1 deals with the transmission of Comte’s ideas and of positivism
until 1865 among the British and American clergy. A chapter entitled
“Positivism and the Theologians” deals at greater length with the rela­
tionship between Comte, Mill, and Spencer and the debate over Comte
and positivism in the important British monthlies. Here C. offers only
brief overviews of discussions of Comte in the lectures, publications, etc.
of numerous theologians and clerics; later in the book he returns to some
of these thinkers to discuss in detail the way they used and assessed
Comte’s doctrines. Finally, C. examines how positivism became associ­
ated with Darwinism and with biblical criticism, although Renan is,
oddly, the sole example offered of the latter connection.

Part 2 deals with the variety of ways that theologians, philosophers,
and writers responded to Comte and positivism, thereby influencing
variously the directions that theology was to take between 1830–90. (1)
Some left Christianity and became disciples of Comte, e.g. F. Harrison
and George Eliot. (2) Some conservative or reactionary thinkers, in
explicit resistance to positivism, took refuge in church authority or
biblical literalism, e.g. Newman, W. S. Ward, W. H. Mallock, and Orestes
Brownson. Discussion of the biblical literalists is brief, C. concluding
that “the trail of evidence linking the threat of positivism to biblical
literalism . . . is quite sparsely marked.” (3) Those who were religiously
most thoroughly changed by the influence of positivism were the radical
Unitarians and theists. The Unitarian radicals include the Americans J.
Fiske, O. Frothingham, and Frances E. Abbot. The English Unitarians,
especially under the leadership of J. Martineau, remained largely opposed
to positivism. British examples of radicals driven from the Church into
some other form of theism through the influence of positivism are Leslie
Stephen and Henry Sidgwick. It is debateable how decisive Comte’s influence was on these two complex men; other influences were more decisive. Neither was a positivist or a theist. (4) Two final groups are the “Judicious Conservatives” (e.g., R. Flint, H. Calderwood, N. Porter, and J. McCosh) and the “Liberals” (e.g., Jowett, E. Caird, A. M. Fairbairn, and the Americans N. Smyth, J. Bascom, and B. Bowne).

Clearly C. has cut a wide swath. He acknowledges some of his difficulties up front. First is the problem of definition, “which sits awkwardly at the heart of this book because it was at the heart of the nineteenth century debate.” Is Comtism positivism? In what sense is positivism Comtism? The difficulty is that few thinkers took Comte neat. They accepted aspects of his analysis and mixed them with other doctrines that often were antithetical to Comte’s thought. Then as now the word “positivism” was used to mean both more and less than any reader might assume: the doctrines of Comte, including the Religion of Humanity, or something vaguer, e.g. a commitment to scientific method and verification. One need not be a Comtist to be a positivist, and the latter often is linked with or is a synonym for materialist, empiricist, agnostic, etc. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that many theologians and clerics came to know Comte through writers like Mill and Spencer, who were highly selective in their use of Comte.

In my opinion, this valuable study would be a better book if C. had set stricter limits on his subject. He includes too many references to figures, e.g. Newman, whose debt to Comte or a Comtean form of positivism is very slight. The inclusion of scores of biographical vignettes and summaries of thinkers’ work is not required, especially when, as is often the case, the material does not illuminate the subject. There should have been more in-depth attention to how the truly influential thinkers did use or contend with Comte. Finally, C.’s valiant effort in Part 2 to bring order out of a complex phenomenon leads him into some ill-fitting, even erroneous categorizations. The above criticisms notwithstanding, this study will long remain a valuable resource for scholars in a variety of fields.

College of William and Mary, Va.  
JAMES C. LIVINGSTON


The title of this book, with its reference to Bonhoeffer’s well-known but enigmatic complaint about Barth’s “positivism of revelation,” does not indicate what the book is primarily about. It is only in a concluding chapter that the question is discussed. As is so often the case these days,
the subtitle is a better guide to the main contents. The “Marburg School” refers to the philosophers Herrmann Cohen (1842–1918) and Paul Natorp (1854–1924), who fashioned their version of Neo-Kantianism while teaching at the University of Marburg, where Barth studied. The young Barth was a close student of their writings, and a dozen of their works have been found in his personal library. Fisher notes that nothing of Natorp and very little of Cohen have been translated, so that English-speaking theologians are largely unfamiliar with the precise nature of the Marburg philosophy, let alone the ways in which Barth was influenced by it. This book seeks to remedy that lack.

Cohen was concerned with “those deep structures of mind upon which all cognitive experience rests” (22). F. places Cohen’s system somewhere between Kant and Hegel. He observes that, according to Cohen, “thought not only supplies the logical a priori structures which make knowledge possible, it also generates the reality to be known” (39). The idealist character of Cohen’s system is evident in the claim that thought generates its own content. “Strange though it may seem, the object of cognition for this philosophy is not something discovered, but rather created by thought in response to a cognitive challenge” (46). Cohen always insisted on the “radical independence of cognition from empirical intuition” (49). The resulting system could be characterized as “a monism of pure thought” (59). In his later years Cohen adopted an ethical view of religion, using it to round off his system.

The young Karl Barth learned and used the philosophical apparatus of the Marburg School, but he rejected the religious views of Cohen and Natorp. A Marburg contemporary of theirs was Barth’s mentor, Wilhelm Herrmann (1846–1922). F. provides a useful summary of Herrmann’s theological method. Despite his adoption of the Marburg Neo-Kantian concept of knowledge, he tried to carve out a place for faith (and therefore theology) that was not governed by the philosophical system. Herrmann’s position was that “religion has privileged access to a reality which could not in principle be known by either philosophy or natural science” (133).

Even at this early stage Barth never fancied himself a philosopher. “His way of approaching philosophy was, first, to reduce it to epistemological technique and, secondly, to contrast its epistemological idealism with the realism felt to be necessary for religion” (204).

Students of Barth’s theology are accustomed to references to the “early Barth” (the Romans commentary and the dialectical theology of the 1920s) and the “later Barth” (the theology of the Church Dogmatics). What we have here, however, is neither of these well-known phases of Barth’s thought, but what may be termed the “early-early” Barth—a study of Barth’s earliest work as a writer and speaker, before he became pastor at Safenwil and proceeded to make his famous break with the
liberal theology he had been taught at the university. Speaking of these writings and lectures as a whole, F. observes that “there is a definite vision animating the earliest theology of Barth,” one which is very different from that normally associated with his name; “that it achieves only a fleeting expression is something which few will regret” (5).

How important is this book? For Barth aficionados, the story of Marburg Neo-Kantianism and its influence on the young Karl Barth is an interesting sidelight. No doubt it made a suitable topic for a doctoral dissertation, and one is grateful that this work has been done. References in the literature on Barth to the Neo-Kantian philosophy now become more intelligible. Beyond that, there is a good account of the young Barth’s dependence on Schleiermacher. In that connection, F. points out that the mature Barth’s harsh criticism of Schleiermacher also constitutes an indictment of his own earliest theology. In criticizing Schleiermacher, Barth was in effect also reacting against his own youthful work.

F. acknowledges his debt to the late Hans Frei’s brilliant dissertation (unfortunately never published) on The Doctrine of Revelation in the Thought of Karl Barth 1909–1922: The Nature of Karl Barth’s Break with Liberalism (Yale, 1956). While F.’s work is solid, readers seeking an understanding of the early Barth (and willing to invest the sort of money Oxford University Press is asking for this volume) might prefer to inquire of University Microfilms about the availability of a photocopy of Frei’s dissertation.

University of Nebraska at Omaha  
RUSSELL W. PALMER


Ernst sets out to examine the place of the analogy of being in the thought of Paul Tillich—a task which might seem more than challenging, given the fact that Tillich uses the term only rarely and does not view analogy in a particularly favorable light. But Ernst not only succeeds in achieving his purpose; in addition, he has given us an excellent introduction to T.’s thought precisely because he has located its hidden center; finally, he has linked T.’s thought to a perennial question of the Western philosophical and theological tradition in a way which reveals some of the hidden riches of his Systematic Theology.

Ernst does not start with a concept of the analogy of being as it was worked out in the neo-scholastic period (from the papacy of Leo XIII in the late 1870s up to the Second Vatican Council). He starts rather from the principle of analogy, as he sees it in the work of Aquinas. He is sharply critical of Cajetan’s interpretation of analogy as constituted by
proportionality, and his points are well taken. As Ernst shows, apart from its own intrinsic weakness the analogy of proportionality effectively isolates the analogy of being from history and from the estrangement of human beings and their world in the historical process. He argues correctly that the question of analogy is the question of the existence of a point of contact between God and the world, and that it is the question of the possibility of revelation.

Ernst gives a fine analysis of T.'s principle of correlation and finds in it not merely a methodological tool but rather a theological insight into the relationship of human intelligence and God, which reveals the point of contact between human thought and divine revelation. In the light of the principle of correlation he examines the main structural elements of T.'s system. When he compares T.'s ideas about "being," "existing," and the "power of being" with those of Aquinas, Ernst is able to show some remarkable coincidences which are by no means merely verbal. His analysis of the problem of the "existence" of God is excellent and his treatment of T.'s extreme reserve in speaking of God's existence is critical but sympathetic. There may be some exaggeration in his reference to T.'s concept of causality as "univocal" ("categorial" would probably be better); after all, T. himself knew that in his notion of the "ground of being" the idea of cause, even first cause, was symbolically present.

Ernst is more critical of T.'s rejection of the proofs for the existence of God. He feels that no one really intends these as proofs in the strict sense (i.e., logical conclusions which proceed from the known to the previously unknown) and that T. may have created a straw man to facilitate his rejection of the proofs (T. has said that the proofs were neither proofs nor led to the existence of God; they were rather the expression of the question of God). However, given the way the "proofs" were understood in the documents of the First Vatican Council and in the standard theology textbooks in use between the two Vatican Councils, Ernst might be unduly optimistic. He is also critical of T.'s refusal to speak of the "existence" of God, and asks whether biblical or philosophical language ever intended the naive distortion which T. seems to imply. But here again, when biblical and philosophical language make the transition to conventional church language, these naive distortions are almost inevitable.

In the fourth chapter, talking about polarity in God, Ernst makes the only statement to which this reviewer would take exception: "The conquest of non-being in God is not an event which can be perceived next to others in space and time, which would permit us to equate it with other cases. It has happened from all eternity." But it has not. In Jesus and, above all, on the cross, God participated in the estrangement of human existence and he took the brokenness of the world into itself.
cross is the final, definitive revelation, in and through which the analogy of being, which has been “darkened” in the estrangement of existence, becomes once more the place where God can be found in the brokenness of the world.

In chaps. 7–8 Ernst develops an understanding of the analogy of being which is the basis of a truly ecumenical theology in T.’s sense—i.e., the reunion of Catholic substance with the Protestant principle. He shows that the doctrine of the analogy of being, properly understood, is not an arrogant attempt to grasp at God from the top of a metaphysical Tower of Babel, but is rather the awareness on the part of a human knower that finite being exists on the boundary between infinity and nothingness. Ernst’s work is an excellent study of a question which is located “on the boundary” between God and the world, between theology and philosophy, and between Catholic substance and the Protestant principle. Paul Tillich would have been very pleased by this book.

St. Mary’s College, Moraga, Calif.          John C. Dwyer


McElroy has given us a fresh reading of Murray’s life project, suggesting anew the possibility of an American public theology, while drawing the contours of that theology from Murray’s treatment of secularism. He first surveys the present public-theology debate, concluding that the foremost hindrance to generating a public theology is not a secular-humanist conspiracy. Rather, it is the inability of theists to make a compelling case for a “strong and substantive public role for religious values in the U.S.”

Drawing broadly on Murray’s writings, M. identifies three sources of secularism that preoccupied Murray: America’s practical orientation, militant liberal attempts to restrict religion to personal realms, and elitist assertions that science alone yields true knowledge and that democratic majoritarianism alone yields valid judgments of value. Murray’s natural-law theory, joined with natural theism, then is presented as capable of reversing secularism’s cultural fallout—scientism, skepticism, pragmatism, relativism, and philosophical pluralism. M. considers a presumptive theistic premise indispensable for giving spiritual values a nonrelativistic grounding.

M. then demonstrates natural-law’s adequacy. First, he asserts Murray’s historical claim that Anglo-American constitutionalism and natural law both grew from similar roots and both affirm religion’s import for public morality. Then, regarding domestic issues, he reclaims Murray’s
notions of the limited state, the priority of society to state, civil law's limited effectiveness, and five ends for governmental action. Finally, he offers natural-law concepts as capable of restraining nuclear violence while encouraging broader international economic participation, steering between utopianism and amoral realism.

M. then tackles suggestions that natural-law theory and natural theism are inadequate for reconstructing American public theology. He admits the need for symbolic embodiment of the nation's abiding theistic commitments, but only as filtered through, and limited by, natural theological categories. He admits that revelationally based claims ought to reach the public forum, but again as controlled by natural theology. It remains unclear whether this control is asserted for authoritative, practical, or theoretical reasons.

Murray's treatments of economic and racial issues were clearly inadequate in M.'s estimation. Likewise, he claims that Murray never gave an adequate epistemological grounding for a natural-law theory that must move beyond the naive premises of America's founding fathers. Contemporary natural-law theorists must include such concerns and formulate such a grounding.

This study is provocative, particularly in its weaving between neoconservative appropriations of Murray on nuclear and economic issues, liberal notions of spiritual neutrality, and postliberal attempts to import revelationally based moral imperatives into the public forum by whatever means possible. Yet several points need further discussion.

First, M. outlines a public theology without considering Murray's treatment of the development of theological knowledge within (and later outside) the Church. Here he might have found some epistemological groundings that he claimed Murray lacked, though not groundings for Murray's earlier presumptive natural theology. Rather, Murray's later cognitional theory directed him toward new perspectives within which theological conversations with Protestants and Marxists could develop.

Second, by staying within Murray's earlier nonhistorical natural-law theory, M. downplays the "cutting-edge" problems and possibilities that preoccupied Murray's last eight years. M. rightly highlights the contingency of specific civil laws and public institutions. He has not, however, taken sufficient account of Murray's later realization that the very principles of natural law had to be rethought, reappropriated, and in some cases revised in response to changing social configurations of insight, value, and sinfulness. Murray's later claims for public conversational freedom both within and outside the Church, as well as his inability to point to any permanent, always complete source of moral and religious insight, were based on concerns for cutting-edge construction of public
value commitments. Murray had clear, cognitional-theory reasons for these later recommendations.

Third, M. leaves unchallenged a vulnerable American theological prejudice: that revelationally based beliefs are inherently sectarian, arational if not irrational, and incapable of assuming recognizably reasonable social roles. Murray's call for the teaching of the "epistemologies of faith" by committed believers in public universities was aimed precisely at the American conviction that intricate thinking and belief cannot mix, that religiously based claims are essentially inarticulate, and that reason itself is not caught up in redemption.

Finally, there remains the problem underscored in Michael Buckley's *At the Origins of Modern Atheism*: the historical tendency of nature's God in deistic or other non-Christological forms to engender modern atheism. As Murray sometimes wrote in exasperation, can we adequately understand even our secular world without (nontotalitarian) theological perspectives not only motivating our inquiry into that world, but also helping us to understand substantively what is going on in it?

Woodstock Theological Center, D.C. J. Leon Hooper, S.J.


This first of three projected volumes is dedicated to reflection on the Christian faith in the context of the current crisis of North American Christianity. Distinctive and refreshing about Hall's approach is his conviction that this is not so much a crisis of declining church attendance or loss of political influence, as it is a crisis in thinking. He argues that North American Christians have failed to reflect carefully upon and clearly articulate the import of their faith for their context. Instead, they have allowed public ideologies to shape their world view and/or uncritically borrowed theological articulations from other contexts—especially the postwar European context of existential despair or the present Third World and minority context of oppression. As a result, North American Christianity often lacks both theological integrity and contextual appropriateness.

This first volume, the Prolegomenon to the overall work, provides a prolonged articulation and defense of the contextual nature of theology. Hall dialogues attentively with the various currents in contemporary reflection on theological methodology, particularly those seeking an approach to theology that is more pastoral, political, communal, dialogical, or globally aware. He also challenges several prevalent caricatures
of a contextual approach, while recognizing and warning against the undeniable dangers that could attend the enterprise. E.g., he convincingly argues against the charge that a contextual theology necessarily enthrones the present context as the norm of theological judgment. At the same time, he criticizes Tillich's correlation method for not taking contexts seriously enough. Likewise, Hall refuses to allow an appropriately contextual theology to become either a mere "intellectualization" of the faith or a surrender of theoretical claims through an uncritical immersion in "practice." His call to contextual theology is a call to Christian praxis.

To facilitate a focus on the North American context, Hall devotes a significant portion of his Prolegomenon to an initial analysis of this context. He highlights two elements in particular: (1) that North American Christianity has moved into a post-Constantinian era (the Church is no longer the dominant force in our culture); (2) that North American culture increasingly senses the failure of the (optimistic) modern vision. As a result, Hall argues that the North American Church needs to speak a word (as a minority tradition) that relates God's promise for the world to a culture that is increasingly hopeless.

Hall derives this appropriate word from the theological tradition of a "theology of the cross" (22 ff.). By this he means an affirmation of God's commitment to the world, over against all "religiosity" that separates sacred and secular. Importantly, he does not affirm this tradition because the "world" already senses that it "fits," but because it is the message the world needs. Actually, Hall appeals to the theology of the cross for more than just a single appropriate Christian response to our current setting. It is invoked as a type of orienting perspective that provides consistency to various contextual theological judgments. This is apparently how Hall hopes to incorporate the legitimate concerns of "systematic theology" within a contextual theology.

While the implications and fruitfulness of Hall's approach must ultimately be judged in light of the succeeding volumes which articulate the core of the Christian creed and ethic for the North American context, this volume makes a significant contribution to current discussions of theological methodology. I would recommend it as the most articulate and persuasive presentation of contextual theology currently available.

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


The field of medical ethics seems to be flooded lately with books and papers of dubious importance. This new book by Graber and Thomasma
stands out like a blossom rising above the murky waters of the flood. The work makes cohesive sense out of a quarter century of controversy and extends the discussion in medical ethics an important step further.

The problem they treat is a difficult one—the relationship between theory and practice in clinical ethics. Over the last 25 years enormous attention has been paid to particular ethical “issues” in medicine and to morally perplexing “cases.” In the process, G. and T. ask, have ethicists learned anything generalizable or new about “method” in clinical ethics? Is there any method which is proper to clinical medical ethics? Or ought one simply apply the methodologies of general ethical theories to particular clinical situations? Can what has been learned in the practice of clinical ethics shed light upon general ethical theory?

After carefully defining their terms, they begin a systematic classification of modes of reasoning in ethics, starting with the most deductive, “linear” approaches and ending with the most inductive, “pragmatic” approaches. Their system of classification cuts across the columns of Sidgwick’s *The Methods of Ethics*. The result is refreshing. Considered in terms of the account each ethical system gives of the relationship between theory and practice, unlikely partners are discovered together between the sheets. Looked at from this point of view, e.g., both act-utilitarians and strict deontologists are seen as linear thinkers who proceed deductively from their perspective principles to the prescription of concrete actions. Kant and Bentham are strange bedfellows, and G. and T. seem to argue that they deserve each other.

They also argue, quite correctly, that many ethicists move back and forth along the continuum from theory to practice, at times arguing that practice should determine the “middle-level axioms” of ethics and at other times arguing that abstract principles should determine ethical behavior. The authors favor a modification of the former approach, but they are balanced and fair in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the five models they propose along this deductive-inductive continuum. Seasoned as they are by their experiences as “philosophers on the wards,” they seek a *via media* in which neither practice nor theory is abandoned. This book may serve as a prime example of “how medicine has rescued ethics.” Metaethics founders in the intensive-care unit. G. and T. offer helpful hints, such as their innovative “grid” system for classifying cases and assigning the degree of patient autonomy proper to the clinical circumstances. But while pragmatic, the authors maintain the rigor of careful philosophical analysis.

The surd which remains after their reductive step of classifying ethical systems along the deductive-inductive continuum is virtue. G. and T. note this, unsure whether the virtues should be grafted onto a deductive system of ethics, function as mediators in the deductive application of
principles, or serve as independent guides to action alongside the middle-level axioms of an inductive system of ethics. They favor the latter approach. But if this is so, one may ask how an axiom differs from a virtue on their analysis? And how does their account of the virtues fit with their definitional statement that virtue regards "the kind of person we should each strive to become"?

G. and T. do much more than merely apply ethics to medicine. They cogently make the case that medical practice is inherently a moral practice, involving a powerful moral relationship between doctor and patient, a moral goal (the good of the patient—"healing" in its broadest understanding), a system of medical judgment characterized by "compassionate discretion," and a system of diagnostic categories characterized as inherently "value-laden." Because this is so, they argue, a medical ethics which derives its axioms at least in part from the experience of the practice of medicine is a genuine medical ethics, and not just one more deductive application of an abstract system of ethics.

In their final chapter they construct a very interesting "biomedical hermeneutic" which forms the basis of their attempt at a "unitary theory of clinical ethics." This attempt is made with clarity, rigor, and boldness. Whether their proposal truly "unifies" previous theories or simply takes its place alongside a host of other theories is open to question. Nonetheless, these ideas are fresh and vivid, and should serve to enliven the general bioethical discourse.

There are a few problems worth noting. In their discussion of medical decision-making in general, the authors do not address the very large body of medical literature in artificial intelligence and decision-analysis which attempts to model the medical decision-making process along highly deductive lines. It may be true that the cybernetics approach will necessarily fail. Nonetheless, it would seem to be an oversight not to address this literature if the authors wish to prescribe the use of inductive reasoning in medical ethics because of a purported inductive reasoning process in all clinical-medical decision-making. There are a few points in the text at which the distinctions between primary, secondary, and tertiary medical care seem to be confused with severity of illness. The authors also seem perhaps to have an incomplete understanding of the natural history of hepatitis. But these latter points do not detract from their major arguments. Clinicians with an interest in medical ethics should be actively encouraged, along with philosophers and theologians, to secure a copy of this book. It is well written, well referenced, well argued, and definitely well worth reading.

School of Medicine
Johns Hopkins University

DANIEL P. SULMASY, O.F.M., M.D.

In differing degrees the study of history embodies an intertwining of description, interpretation, explanation, and argument. When one has studied a certain period of history, or a locale within a certain period of history, or when one has attempted to grasp even a bit of history's grand sweep, one might be left without much of a conclusion as to why things are the way they are. What one set out to elucidate at the beginning of one's study might, during the process of historical investigation, result in obscuring events and their relationships rather than elucidating them. This is not all bad. For the historian, elucidation might just be a mask for smugness. The late church historian Valentine Moran, S.J., of Australia, put the paradox of history this way. On the one hand, history, like culture, has an inaccessible dimension to it; on the other hand, while history does not repeat itself, it does sometimes give a very passable imitation of itself. W.'s book on China and Christianity—and here we have a history of the grand-sweep genre—describes, interprets, explains, and argues, but, as its title states, Christianity's encounter with China is not yet finished, as some thought it was a few years ago, and therein lies the inaccessible aspect of a history where only bits and pieces become clear. The Chinese insist on the long view of history and they are right.

A deacon in the Church of England, from 1975 to 1986 W. served as project officer of the China Study Project for the British Council of Churches. His book is a result of that tenure. It is not a history of Christian missions in China. Rather, it traces the history of Christianity as a religion in its relationship with the world's oldest civilization in light of the Church's present-day situation in China. W. argues that even in its best of times, the Christian encounter with China was superficial and that the 1949 Chinese Communist revolution was a judgment on the Church because the Church relied too much on Western power and remained captive within its own ethnocentric conceptual frameworks. His book will either make one's blood boil or it will make one think; it might do both, particularly after the June 1989 Tiananmen massacre. Accepting W.'s argument will be difficult after Tiananmen, and one might turn his argument on its head and ask after Tiananmen: Has not the Chinese Communist Party rendered a historical judgment on itself by adhering rigidly to a power gerontocracy and a head-locked-in-cement attitude toward the dynamics of Marxist history? As John King Fairbank has remarked, "By fearfully treating the student demonstrations as a counter-revolution Deng has called one into being."

W. is at his best when he narrates the history of Christianity, beginning with those Nestorian missioners who traveled the Silk Road in 635 A.D. A much-needed scholarly history of Christianity in China will be indebted
to W. when, and if, that book will ever be written. He is quite correct when he states that absent from the Nestorian China mission was military and political expansionism. Although Matteo Ricci did not have diplomatic, military, or commercial protection when he went to China in 1583, not far off China's coast was the threat of Western power. Twenty-five of Ricci's confreres had been refused entry, and Ricci himself vigorously protested against a plan for a military invasion of China advocated by Jesuits of the sour-grapes vintage, Juan Bautista Ribera and Alonso Sanchez, two of the 25 rejected ones.

W. also clears up another misunderstanding which might provide some enlightenment on the contemporary situation. The Jesuits were directed to “Sinicize” themselves, but one might ask to what extent that was possible given their Counter Reformation theology, which opposed the fundamentals of traditional Chinese thought. Thoughtful Chinese critics of Christianity were more than xenophobes; they saw Christianity as a direct threat to the Chinese way of thinking. The Emperor Yong-zheng (1723–35) told one of the Jesuits that he thought that Christianity as “a whole was revolutionary and subversive of Chinese institutions” and that he was not about to preside over the dissolution of the Middle Kingdom.

There are other points which W. rightly emphasizes and then there are some disappointing ones. He is very helpful when he analyzes 20th-century indigenous Protestant movements and how a Chinese church is emerging from them. He does not give much credit to the Catholic Church in China and its attempts to survive; here he makes a serious mistake. As part of his grand sweep, he should have included as a thematic thread what provided continuity to Christianity's survival in times of persecution: suffering Chinese Christians. To expect, as W. seems to expect, that Christianity will have an easy time of it anywhere simply by means of friendship, attempts at accommodation, and the absence of nonreligious people, defies the history of Christian mission. W. argues that missioners should have emphasized the Chinese concepts of friendship, beauty, and nature, but his arguments lack cohesion. The overall value of W.'s book, however, is that it succinctly states the question. Christianity in China has endured periods of great struggle and is in China to stay. It has an influence far beyond its relatively few members. It is becoming Chinese and thus China's encounter with it is far from finished.

Songang University, Korea

PETER FLEMING, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES


The series in which it appears, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, determines the direction and tone of this volume by a distinguished British Baptist OT scholar. An important and recurring theme for Clements is the move from oral to written prophecy. What would Jeremiah's words have meant to his first hearers in Jerusalem? What would they have meant for the later, exilic readers of the book? A good illustration can be seen in the so-called Confessions. They have their origin in Jeremiah's own struggles and anguish in understanding the ways of God; in this, however, he has anticipated the feelings and experiences of the later Jews in exile who can now find in Jeremiah's words a keen expression of their own struggles. The later people can identify personally with the words of the prophet. While C. does not often make explicit the move to a third level of readers, ourselves in our contemporary situation, the way he treats his themes is sensitive and insightful, so that this later move is not hard to make.

Jeremiah's overriding concern is theodicy: How are divine justice and mercy to be reconciled? Beyond the anguish and the questioning lies hope, but it is not an easy hope: "hope that cannot face the abyss of despair is not hope" (100). This recalls Chesterton's dictum, "Hope means hoping when all things are hopeless or it is no virtue at all." This hope is based ultimately not on human calculations but on the reality and the presence of God. No disaster could take it away. But even though it is a transcendent reality, hope finds expression in historical events and institutions. Beyond the exile lies a return to the land and restoration of the nation's life with king and temple.

C.'s commentary abounds in provocative insights, e.g. about idolatry and those who make an idol of opposing idolatry, about false prophecy, about the wrath/anger of God, etc. Jeremiah has lately been receiving a great deal of scholarly attention; at least four major commentaries on all or part of the book have recently appeared in English. It is a pleasure now to have C.'s volume, which makes much of this research available to a wider audience and in a way more easily accessible for teaching and preaching.

MICHAEL D. GUINAN, O.F.M.
Franciscan School of Theology
Berkeley


What does it mean for Luke to call the Pharisees philargyroi, "lovers of money" (Lk 16:14)? With that question as his starting point, Moxnes draws upon ancient economics and cultural anthropology to develop a model of economic interaction that would be plausible to Luke and his community.

As the "money lovers" of the Third Gospel, the Pharisees are stereotypes exhibiting how the usual patterns of exchange in the patron-client setup can be dominated by an idolatrous subjection to mammon. Against this, Luke's Jesus advocates generalized reciprocity and redistribution, which turns out to be a fulfillment of the "old law" which acknowledges God as the ultimate patron and benefactor. The social world pictured by Luke is generically typical of eastern Mediterranean village life.
rather than historically particular either with respect to the historical Jesus or Luke's specific community.

The key chapters of M.'s study are exegeses of the three passages in which Luke characterizes the Pharisees as greedy: (1) 11:37-44, where the transformation of “purity” from a ritual concept to a concept of societal solidarity through almsgiving means a break with the structure of the society upheld by these norms; (2) 14:1-14, where the guest list of v. 13 extends hospitality to the unclean and promotes God as the ultimate benefactor and patron; (3) 16:14-18, where the context interprets the epithet “money lovers” as meaning that they have become slaves of mammon and examples of the way the patron-client relationship can violate our collective “clientship” with regard to God.

M.'s introduction of models from ancient economics and current cultural anthropology brings new precision to a topic sorely in need of disciplined study: the cultural context of Luke's treatment of “poor and rich.”

DENNIS HAMM, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


These seven essays derive from a Catholic Biblical Association task force that met between 1982-86 with the dual goal of relating the Bible to Christian ethics generally, and specifically to war and peace in the nuclear age. The goals of the study group and the presented essays are introduced by the editor’s “Method and Content in Peace Studies.” The idea seems to be that the contributors would try to be hermeneutically self-conscious and not simply run through “biblical themes” concerning peace.

In content and perspective the essays fall into three groups: those by J. A. Fisher, K. M. O'Connor, and Tambasco best fulfil the mandate of correlating biblical data with contemporary questions; those of H. M. Humphrey and D. P. Reid are more traditionally exegetical; and those of R. J. Daly and D. W. Smith are straightforward surveys of opinions expressed in patristic and later Christian authors.

Oddly, the two studies that eschew hermeneutical jargon (by Humphrey and Reid) offer the best insights into the ways the text can open to new situations. Humphrey's study of the Sermon on the Mount is particularly perceptive in this regard. Reid's essay on Luke-Acts teeters on the edge of incoherence, but ends with the book's best line: "The vision of Luke is: ‘think globally, act locally.”' The only problem is connecting that conclusion to his previous analysis.

There are occasional moments of insight in this collection, but as a whole it has far too much of an unfinished, ad hoc character; the transition from task-force paper to article has in several cases not been successful. This reviewer also continues to be puzzled by the fact that no one in peace studies ever seems to think it worth while to study James 3:13—4:10, the only passage in the NT that explicitly takes up the causes of peace and war.

LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON
Indiana University, Bloomington


In recent years Neusner has analyzed several rabbinic midrashic collections through structured translation and brief commentary. N. here synthesizes his research for students (and teachers) who need an introduction to midrash. The book is especially useful
for theologians, because N. systematically addresses the larger issues of the relationships among Scripture, Mishnah, Midrash, Talmud, authority, and the development of Jewish thought. Not mechanical details of the works nor the myriad of detailed exegetical problems in the literature, but the author/editors’ world views, goals, modes of communication, and fundamental assumptions about God, humanity, sanctification, and salvation are his topic.

The prologue and first chapter summarize his work on the relationship of both midrash and mishnah to Scripture and each other. Chapter 2 treats the halakic midrashim, which comment on Scripture verse by verse and which struggle with the relationship of faith and reason. Successive chapters analyze the changing relationship between creative thought and Scripture in Genesis Rabbah, Leviticus Rabbah, and Pesikta de Rab Kahana. One chapter shows how narratives about the rabbis were used to comment on the fathers, and another explores midrashic activity in the two Talmuds. Finally, N. sets midrash and its study within the modern context of poststructural literary criticism, the problem of reason and revelation, and the struggle of Jewish culture to make sense out of its tradition as it develops historically. Specific midrashim are illustrated with substantial selections from the text, and a vocalized Hebrew text for many passages is given in the back of the book.

N. is pioneering the study of midrashic collections as whole documents. When an uninitiated reader approaches these texts, their detailed exegeses and unfamiliar interpretative techniques tend to block wholistic understanding. N. helps us see in the details of the text overarching themes, not explicitly or discursively developed, but implicit in the sequence of comments, the piling up of examples, and the repeated logical and rhetorical patterns. For one who wishes to enter into Jewish thought in late antiquity, this book is a good entree. It also gives insight into N.’s larger project: to recover and make intelligible and efficacious for 20th-century Jews the ancient Jewish tradition of the oral and written Torah.

ANTHONY J. SALDARINI
Boston College


This encyclopedic survey may be struggling to do too much: describe the historical-critical method and account for its unsatisfactory features, critique the inadequacy of New Criticism (Welkek) as a literary theory suited for the Bible, trace the philosophical history of hermeneutical epistemology and assess its decline in critical usefulness, present a summary of structuralist thought (Saussure) and show the application of its categories to the description of codes organizing biblical texts, undergird the entire discussion by affirming the reader-oriented aspects of each critical strategy, and finally demonstrating the process of a reader in the act of discovering the organizational patterns while actually reading the biblical text.

Because of the necessarily generalist nature of the treatment, one may find the topic headings and their ordering useful, but not the inevitable sweeping evaluations. Exceptions include the summary and evaluation of Stuhlmann (82–87) and Gottwald (87–92). The latter is the only treatment in the volume of the sociological study of Scripture, one McKnight considers unharmonious with a reader-oriented approach. While Frye and Iser are relied upon, there is no reference to significant “post-modern” female readers of
the Bible (e.g., Schüssler-Fiorenza, Tri- ble, Bal, Fuchs).

M.'s major discussion is a lucid re-
view of the basics of semiotic, linguis-
tic, and structuralist categories, and the
wedding of these with reader-response
language. While he appropriates some
of the vocabulary of Sternberg's *Poetics
of Biblical Narrative*, his focus is on
aesthetic devices, divorced from S.'s ar-
gument about the interrelationship of
the aesthetic and ideological. Since
there are a number of viable strategies
of historical, literary, and social criti-
cism practiced by the biblical exegete
today, it may be premature of M. to
suggest that a radical reader-oriented
criticism is the postmodern successor
to New Criticism, the New Hermeneu-
tic, and the historical-critical method.

**Marie-Eloise Rosenblatt, R.S.M.**

*Catholic Theological Union, Chicago*

**A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiolog-
y and Paraenesis in Clement of
Rome.** By Barbara Ellen Bowe. Min-
$14.95.

In the wake of general assumptions
about *1 Clement* as early witness to the
hierarchical model of ministry, this
study proposes that the primary con-
cern of the letter is not legitimacy of
office (not even mentioned until chap-
ter 44) or assertion of the ecclesiastical
power of Rome over Corinth, but the
restoration of peace and concord in
Corinth—perhaps because the Roman
church was struggling with quite simi-
lar problems itself, and therefore had
something to lose if its sister church
was torn by factionalism. In the wake
of the usual assumption that one must
disregard the Roman viewpoint of the
letter in order to get at the real situ-
tion, Bowe rather focuses on it in order
to understand the "rhetorical situ-
atation" as the key to interpretation.
Through the use of what she calls the
"rhetoric of stasis," she demonstrates
how the rhetorical situation is con-
veyed in the language and images used.

Particularly in three important pas-
sages (37–38, 46–48, and 42–44) she
analyzes how this rhetoric functions to
create a direction for crisis resolution.
She shows how the allusions to the
levitical priesthood in these chapters
are meant not as paradigm but biblical
analogy, and how the overall concern
of the letter is restoration of unity and
harmony.

The book is well argued and concise.
It is a welcome contribution to the
study of the Apostolic Fathers and the
early history of the Roman church.

**Carolyn Osiek, R.S.C.J.**

*Catholic Theological Union, Chicago*

**The Letters of St. Cyprian of
Carthage 3–4.** Translated and anno-
tated by G. W. Clarke. *Ancient Chris-
tian Writers* 46–47. New York: New-

In *TS* 46 (1985) 557–58 I had occa-
sion to hail the first two of four pro-
jected volumes of Cyprian's letters su-
perbly translated into English by this
classics scholar who serves as deputy
director of the Humanities Research
Centre at the Australian National Uni-
versity. The publication in 1989 of Vol.
4 now brings the project to a felicitous
conclusion. Although one can regret
that the actual printing took so long,
the wait has been well rewarded.

Again we are provided with pains-
taking historical introductions shed-
ing light on events both imperial and
ecclesial that help to contextualize the
correspondence composed by Cyprian as well as
several North African conciliar texts.
Care is taken both to establish a prob-
able chronology and to elucidate the
implicit theology of synodality con-
tained in these valuable documents.
The endnotes account for the heftiest
section of both the third and fourth
volumes. C.'s command of the second-
ary historical literature and his sensi-
tivity to nuances of North African
Latin are impressive.
For those studying the liturgical practices and sacramental theology of the third-century church of Carthage, the translations of Ep. 63 to Caecilius on the Eucharist and Ep. 73 to Iulianus on baptism will provide rich sources of information. Given the present-day interest in matters relating to the competency of regional episcopal meetings and the relationship of synods to governance by the See of Rome, the content and tone of these letters are illuminating.

What better way to instil a sense of wonder and reverence for the pre-Nicene Church among modern students of theology whose knowledge of Latin is negligible than to urge their reading these 82 letters in crystal-clear prose? C. merits our congratulations on a task brilliantly executed. Is it too much to hope that he might take on another Latin writer such as Tertullian or Novatian to make their works come alive for readers of the next century?

MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.
St. Michael’s College, Toronto


Though Chazan concentrates on developments in Christianity’s approach to the Jewish community and its religious tradition during the 13th century, his material is profoundly relevant. Issues facing Jews and Christians in dialogue today are deeply rooted in the argumentation fashioned by 13th-century preachers in their proselytizing efforts.

C. first offers a thumbnail sketch of missionizing approaches prior to the 13th century, concluding that little evidence exists for organized endeavors in earlier centuries, though there were sporadic attempts at forcing Jews (and Muslims) to attend conversionist sermons. Why, then, did a change occur in the 13th century? C. attributes it to a combination of circumstances: growing institutionalization of the Church; the rise of the mendicant religious orders, particularly the Dominicans and Franciscans with their commitment to spiritual renewal, who took the lead in the missionizing effort; and the founding of the European universities.

C. also grapples with the additional question whether a major theological change in the Church’s outlook on Judaism contributed to the growth of proselytism. His response is negative, contrary to other authors such as Jeremy Cohen. C. does grant one shift of emphasis: the turn towards the argument that Jewish law was invalidated by the coming of Christ rather than the more traditional claim that Jesus fulfilled Jewish messianic vision proclaimed by the prophets and hence Jews should accept him and his teaching. On the lack of a theological change in the Church’s outlook, C. is not entirely persuasive; the issue requires further exploration.

The central section details the development of the missionizing arguments through figures such as the Dominican Friar Paul and Friar Raymond Martin, author of the classical Pugio fidei, as well as Jewish counterargumentation by Rabbi Solon ibn Adret and others. Overall, a well-researched work that makes a central contribution to Christian-Jewish understanding in our time.

JOHN T. PAWLIKOWSKI, O.S.M.
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago


Published on the occasion of the author’s retirement from a distinguished career as a scholar of the Reformed tradition, this work was originally written as his doctoral dissertation at Yale University in 1949. It remains, how-
ever, a relevant and insightful study of Calvin’s thought, especially as the latter is represented in the definitive 1559 edition of the Institudes of the Christian Religion.

Leith compares Calvin’s theology to “a wagon wheel without the rim” (16). The hub of the wheel from which the spokes extend holds it together, yet there is no outer rim adjusting the spokes into a self-contained order. The hub is the personal relationship between God and humanity, the human side of which is faith and the Christian life, and the spokes are Calvin’s various nonsystematized theological explications. Accordingly, Leith treats Calvin’s doctrine of the Christian life as it extends into the areas of justification, providence and predestination, history and the transhistorical, and church and society. The result is a balanced study of Calvin’s thought as theologia pietatis that does not fail to elaborate those contradictions within Calvin’s thought that cast a dark shadow upon much subsequent Reformed theological development.

The strengths and the weaknesses of a dissertation are present, of course: it is well documented but reads somewhat tediously; a lengthy bibliography is included but there is no index. Nevertheless, it represents a fine contribution to Reformation scholarship.

Arie J. Griffioen
Marquette University, Milwaukee


Finocchiaro, professor at the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, offers us an outstanding new work of Galilean scholarship. Favaro’s classic work (1890–1909) yielded 20 volumes of the Opere Galileane and opened up a new and fuller view of Galileo; this was followed by Pagano and Luciano (1984), who published the last items known to exist in Vatican archives. Most English students of the case have relied on translations of single works achieved by Salusbury (1662) and in our own time by Stillman Drake of Toronto. Drake’s classic Discoveries and Opinions of Galileo presented fine translations from key works of the Florentine master along with several of Drake’s own essays, so filled with caring insight into the complexities of this “case.”

Finocchiaro’s book presents a more extensive coverage than Drake’s. His translations are excellent; his comments are presented in a fulsome introduction; there follow several “golden” appendices, which include a chronology of events, a concordance to the published texts of Favaro and Pagano, a glossary (so needed by beginning readers and veterans), then notes (some 40 pages given with clear references to text-pages), plus reference bibliography and index. Thanks to F., a scholar just beginning to study Galileo will have a far easier path to understanding than was open even a few years ago in this involved and intriguing field.

Martin F. McCarthy, S.J.
Vatican Observatory


The received interpretation of Collingwood is that his understanding of history is idealist and historicist. His dictum that historical knowledge is “the re-enactment of the past in the present” is taken as evidence of a kinship with the psychologism of Schleiermacher and Dilthey. Hogan attempts to reverse this interpretation, arguing that Collingwood’s understanding of history, historical knowledge, and the historian’s method converges with the
understanding of “hermeneutical consciousness” as found in H. G. Gadamer. H. clearly explicates the various themes of Collingwood’s position within the context of his entire corpus: the logic of question and answer, the doctrine of absolute presuppositions, the nature of historical evidence, the historical imagination, the encapsulation of the past in the present, the “inside” and “outside” of historical events, and the re-enactment of past thought. The author argues that, for Collingwood, historical knowledge is the imaginative re-enactment of the past in the present, the interpretation of the “inside” (thought) of an event which proceeds inferentially from evidence and has as its necessary condition the continuance (incapsulation) of the past in the present. This, he suggests, is a truly hermeneutical understanding of historical inquiry and one which helps to uncover lacunae, i.e. the suspicion of “method,” in contemporary hermeneutics.

Less developed is H.’s demonstration of the relevance of Collingwood for solving the impasses of contemporary theology. While the final chapter on Bultmann and Pannenberg is insightful, a suspicion lingers that given the nature of the events witnessed to by Christianity, what is normally inseparable—the “inside” and “outside” of events—splits apart. Yet, even if this observation is cogent, H. is persuasive in his reassessment of Collingwood and will force many who like myself had closed the book on Collingwood to pull his texts off the shelf again.

J. A. COLOMBO
University of San Diego


This work addresses the roots, development, and actualization of the notions of community in the thought of Howard Thurman and Martin Luther King, Jr., outlining their respective familial, intellectual, communal, and ecclesiastical sources, and follows with a comparative analysis of their thought. This volume is particularly valuable because the two men had much in common in their personal and educational backgrounds. Although Thurman is the lesser known of the two men to the general public, the biographical information provided on both is concise and well researched. In fact, one of the strengths of this book is that it grounds the thought of Thurman and King in their respective experiential contexts. Among the very few works which attempt a comparison of Thurman and King, Fluker’s work stands out by virtue of its breadth and its depth. This is a very readable account and would make an excellent primary text for courses in religious studies, theology, and African-American studies.

JAMES H. EVANS, JR.
Colgate Rochester Divinity School


This carefully-researched, well-written, and profound psychological study of Merton resembles the psychological biographies that Erik Erikson has written of Luther and Gandhi. Cooper brings out new information about the childhood of Merton to show how M.’s appreciation of his father (idealized as artist and saint) and his mother (seen as a demanding perfectionist) shaped all of his life and thought. In doing so, he uncovers “a darker side of Merton” that erected barriers for himself that he could then surmount. This is the
“art of denial,” and it is used to interpret M.’s conflicting identities as monk and writer: he would make plans to live in a hermitage without a typewriter while signing contracts to write additional books. Cooper is the first to give extended treatment of M.’s writing of *Art and Worship* (first drafted in 1954, endlessly revised, radically changed, and never published); the changes offer a compelling perspective on M.’s humanistic development.

Cooper’s outlook was strongly influenced by Erikson, but like Erikson he seems unable to appreciate the religious message of the subject he has studied. His chapter titles speak of M.’s “failed mysticism” and the “secularization” that finally left him a “radical humanist.” Here his conclusions ignore M.’s continued interest in Christian prayer and the possibility that his mysticism might have a connection with his social concern. The mystic’s difficulties do not mean failure, and M.’s critiques of religious formalism were in defense of true religion. Still, the present psychological study gives a fresh and even moving perspective on a complex man.

**THOMAS M. KING, S.J.**
*Georgetown University*


At age 83 Dom Bede Griffiths does not hesitate to advise the pope or anyone else who will listen, as he did recently in the *London Tablet*, that if the Church wishes to respond adequately to the moment, then we must have married priests, the ordination of women, and major decentralization—which he envisions along the lines of the ancient relatively autonomous patriarchate system.

To read G.’s life is to recall the missionary tradition of acculturation practiced by Roberto De Nobili, Merton’s final Asian journey, and Rahner’s sense of Vatican II as the first act of Catholicism as a “world church.” “The Semitic religions . . . reveal the transcendent aspect of the divine Mystery with incomparable power,” G. wrote in *Return to the Center*. “The oriental religions reveal the divine Immanence with immeasurable depth . . . . We have to discover the inner relationships between these different aspects of Truth and unite them in ourselves. I have to be a Hindu, a Buddhist, a Jain, a Parsee, a Sikh, a Muslim, and a Jew, as well as a Christian, if I am to know the Truth and to find the point of reconciliation in all religion.” This is the voice of 21st-century Catholicism.

Once a monk of Prinknash Abbey and prior of Farnborough Abbey in England, in 1955 at age 49 G. settled in India, assisting in the foundation of Kurisumala Ashram, a Syrian-rite monastery in Kerala. In 1968 he took over the direction of Saccidananda Ashram, Shantivanam, in Tamil Nadu (the former Madras State), which had been founded in 1950 by J. Monchainin and H. Le Saux as a pioneer experiment to adapt a Christian community to Hindu ways of life and thought. Out of this life-experiment in religious diversity G. has forged a reconciliation act not dissimilar to that of R. Panikkar and A. Pieris: the radical interiority and cosmic spirituality of Hinduism and Buddhism with an equally radical Trinitarian faith that gives meaning to time and history.

“[G.] made himself as available and as open as he could, and I was conscious of the great trust vested in me,” says biographer Spink. “Yet there remained as if in the air between us a feeling that the real substance of his life was something which defied expression.” Though all the turns of G.’s life are marked out—the years at Oxford, a hermit’s life in the Cotswolds and conversion to Catholicism, the lifelong
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friendship with C. S. Lewis, the busy life of a monk and the even more hectic public life of a Christian guru and sannyasin—one comes away from this competently researched and well-written story with a sense that G.'s life remains hidden in the mystery he serves. Reading the man himself in his own inspired words is advised.

David Toolan, S.J.  
America Magazine, N.Y.C.


Rather than attempting to trace the development of Schillebeeckx’s thought, ten different authors concentrate on presenting clearly his overall contemporary views for the purpose of leading the reader to his writings. Each of the first nine chapters traces one overarching characteristic or theme of S.’s corpus (e.g., method, Christology, soteriology) and its implications. This leads to some overlapping but it also allows the reader to see interconnections among the themes. In the last chapter Schreiter ties much of the book together around four focal commitments which have marked S.’s views since 1960: working inductively by starting from experience, stressing the narrative character of experience, focusing on the experience of suffering and contrast, and meeting that suffering by a significant stress on the soteriological.

The articles are all of good quality. Galvin’s chapter on Christology is especially clear and perceptive. In general, the authors are admirers of the great Flemish theologian; except for Galvin, they merely present S.’s views and do not question or oppose them. However, criticisms of other theologians are occasionally mentioned, generally in the context of S.’s attempt to meet them. I would have appreciated some evaluation of S.’s use of modern exegesis, since some exegetes, e.g. Raymond Brown, believe his use of biblical scholarship, particularly in Jesus and Christ, is selective.

The value of the book is enhanced by an introduction which summarizes the individual chapters and indicates the direction they take as a whole, by an index of topics treated, and by suggestions for further reading at the end of each chapter.

Peter Chirico, S.S.  
Seattle University


Kelly takes the biblical revelation that God is Love and attempts (through an analysis of human consciousness) to develop classical theology’s psychological analogy along more biblical and contemporary lines (164). His basic thesis is twofold: he maintains throughout that “God is confessed as Trinity because God has been revealed as Love,” and that “the more we allow the notion of love to interpret the Trinity and the Trinity to interpret the meaning of love, the more radically healthy Christian theology will be” (xiii). In an effort to be faithful to the method articulated by Bernard Lonergan, K. concentrates on the importance of the human experience of love as the foundation upon which all our Trinitarian theology is grounded.

In his opening chapter, K. distances himself from the approach of classical theology and aligns himself with the contemporary search for a new, more dynamic and interdependent paradigm for reality. In chaps. 2–5 he reflects on the Trinitarian data in Scripture, and Trinitarian judgments articulated in the conciliar doctrines, systematic theology’s need for a Trinitarian hologram, and the psychological analogy.
articulated by Aquinas. In chap. 6 K. attempts to transpose Thomas’ “metaphysical psychological analogy into a more phenomenologically-oriented description” (148) in terms of Lonergan’s reflections on the peak experience of self-transcendence, i.e. the dynamic state of “being-in-love” in an unconditional manner. The remaining four chapters elucidate this approach in terms of its usefulness in addressing various theological concerns.

The task which K. set himself is laudable. His fundamental insight, that the Johannine affirmation of God as Love is a rich reservoir for Trinitarian reflection, is undeniable. The book, however, is marked by excessive mechanical and stylistic difficulties.

BARBARA FINAN
Ohio Dominican College, Columbus


As its subtitle indicates, this work is a collection of essays thematically centered in postmodernity. In content the essays are explorations of the contributions that process theology can make to questions raised by the postmodern. There are no new turns to surprise readers already familiar with the process theology that Griffin ably represents, but the essays provide a lucid and well-informed account of the ways in which typically postmodern questions (such as those occasioned by the centering of the self and the collapse of the self-dominating notion of rationality) are treated. G. rightly reminds readers that Whitehead’s Process and Reality had already broken away from the subject-object orientation of thought and had thus anticipated some of the themes now usually connected with deconstruction; and, lest readers think that process theology is here only trying to ride a current wave by calling itself “postmodern,” G. is careful to document the fact of his having used the term before it achieved its present popularity—a defense which, one suspects, will not altogether convince readers.

The essays are mostly expository, not argumentative, and they are directed to showing what adopting process views of God, self, and the world (views oriented to the power of persuasion rather than to that of domination) as well as of such contemporary problems as imperialism and the nuclear threat means for understanding and religious faith. Read with that purpose in mind, the book is helpful for understanding process theology as postmodern. It is not especially helpful if one is looking for a debate, partly because no debate is carried on but also because alternative positions are defined too abstractly or, where specific descriptions are given, e.g. of Heidegger and Tillich (17), they are just enough skewed to make a reader wince.

ROBERT P. SCHARLEMANN
University of Virginia, Charlottesville


This book has already earned high praise in European theological journals, but to date it has not received the same attention in English-speaking countries, although its contribution to some burning questions of our days is significant. The author is professor of theology at the University of Montreal and a foremost authority in Canada on value-oriented education. Importantly for our context, he was a peritus at Vatican II and a member of the commission that drafted Dei verbum.

The topic around which the book revolves is the “uncertain magisterium,” i.e. the noninfallible magisterium. Naud examines it virtually under every major aspect. He begins with a diagnosis: the Church suffers from an internal dislocation that he calls le mal
catholique, an ill disposition that affects the whole body, head and members. He sees its cause in "a spontaneous and irreversible tendency to increase the importance of the tradition of the church, as it exists in its different institutions, in its discipline, and above all in its teachings" (23). This tendency is rooted in a conceptual confusion: historical traditions of secondary importance are uncritically identified with the original apostolic tradition. Once this happens, it is only logical that the later creations are defended and promoted with the same zeal as if they had been handed down by the apostles. Particularly interesting is the report (a participating witness speaks) of how Vatican II struggled with this problem and failed to resolve it.

The topics treated in the five chapters indicate that the author did not try to avoid any of the hard issues. They are: the infarctus of Vatican II, the magisterium and the natural law, the bishops encountering the magisterium of the pope, the magisterium facing the theologians, and the magisterium standing before the intelligence and conscience of the faithful. Enough to whet any theological appetite.

There is a good balance in the book between reporting historical data and reflecting on them critically. The work is an honest and outstanding piece of "faith seeking understanding."

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J.
Catholic University of America


This translation of his posthumously published Evkharistiia (Paris 1984) represents Schmemann's final addition to what H.-J. Schulz has called "the most recent contribution of Orthodox theology, its persuasive development of a 'eucharistic ecclesiology.'" Through a "series of reflections on the eucharist" S. continually stresses the "triunity of the assembly, the eucharist and the Church" (11).

In a manner similar to Eastern Church liturgical commentaries of the past, S. proceeds chapter by chapter through the Byzantine liturgy from initial gathering to the final Communion rite. He nevertheless eschews the "illuminative symbolism" of earlier commentaries, i.e. those overlaid explanations not directly based upon the sacramentality of creation itself, the presence of the kingdom within the liturgy "given to man for conversion of creaturely life into participation in divine life" (34). Consequently, each segment of the liturgy is seen as a more or less essential, integral part of a single sacrament. As in earlier works, S. points once again to Western scholastic theology, because of its concern for causality, as a primary cause of the fragmentation of the rites.

S.'s reflections on each stage of the Byzantine liturgy result in deep meditations on universal theological themes, meditations which are therefore valuable for all Christians regardless of their ritual background. This resulting faith compendium effectively illustrates the vital interdependence between lex credendi and lex orandi. However, S.'s powerful use of symbolic language occasionally lends itself to ambiguity and misinterpretation. For example, the transforming power of the liturgy unnecessarily appears to be called into question: "For what is manifested [in the rites] is not something new, that did not exist before the manifestation" (225).

This summary work of one of the finest liturgical theologians of our time highly deserves a meditative reading by anyone wanting to be led more deeply and surely into the Church's celebration of the sacred mysteries.

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

H.’s text analyzes, catalogues, and assesses the strengths and weaknesses of six versions of neighbor-love offered by various exponents of agape: self-preference, parity, other-preference, self-subordination, self-forgetfulness, and self-denial. H. carefully constructs this typology both to bring clarity to the diversity of interpretations of love and also, more importantly, to establish the fourth type, self-subordination, as the account of neighbor-love most faithful to the Christian tradition. The argument naturally leads him into an interpretive discussion of the various accounts of agape provided both by NT sources and by some of the major figures in the Christian tradition.

The strengths of this work are many. (1) If “agape is the center of Christianity, the Christian fundamental motif par excellence,” as Nygren argues, then surely it deserves the kind of careful and thorough treatment H. gives to it. (2) His typologization illumines distinctive features of various approaches to agape that are not discussed in other treatments of the question. (3) H.’s analytic task is pursued with an eye to his constructive agenda, and his treatment of the relevant authors is always focused, orderly, and to the point.

H. might be criticized for a problem that besets all typologists: he isolates and assembles the positions of a multitude of theologians rather than treating the position of a few in great depth. In the case of the theologians as complex and nuanced as Aquinas, this at times leads to less than fair and insightful treatment. Other difficulties can be mentioned. H.’s “rules of preference” are more concerned with altruism and egoism than with love per se. Further, H. omits any consideration of the classical Thomistic account of caritas as friendship, mutuality, or communion. Finally, H. does not consider ways in which theological convictions, like that regarding nature and grace, affect the ways in which neighbor-love and self-love are construed by authors like Aquinas and Luther.

These weaknesses aside, H.’s book is the most careful analysis of the ethics of love since Outka’s Agape, and it deserves to be read by every moral theologian.

STEPHEN J. POPE
Boston College


A leading figure in liberation theology, Dussel draws creatively upon biblical categories and a conflict-model of social analysis to address some fundamental principles of ethics and some disputed questions in social ethics. He argues for a clear and sharp distinction between ethics and social morality. Social morality designates the moral injunctions used to legitimize and protect a prevailing social order. “Morally good” means compliance with the system, without ever questioning the moral of the system itself. Its moral code and laws are relative, fitted to the dominant system they serve. Ethics, in contrast, represents absolute principles. It draws from the Bible one central injunction above all: liberate the poor. It stands in judgment of social moralities; it makes its standpoint the needs of the “community,” above all the community of the poor.

D. sees the world as sharply and clearly divided: good versus evil; oppressed versus their oppressors; a new Jerusalem versus Babylon; an approximative socialism versus a sinful capitalism. What he says about capitalism and dependency needs to be heard, in North America especially. “Exploita-
tion” is real in Latin America. Concentrations of ownership and power have denied access to the vast majority. But D.’s ethical dichotomies and underlying social analysis tend to absolutize positions that even many Marxist thinkers would challenge. He accepts as an unquestioned given a labor theory of value that many neo-Marxists have rejected as inadequate. He adopts the dependency view of capitalism as the cause of Latin American poverty, even though the most famous Latin American Marxist, José Carlos Mariátegui, considered “feudal” elements as far more basic.

D.’s insightful work merits serious study, but it oversimplifies the complex tasks of social analysis and making ethical decisions.

ARTHUR F. McGOVERN, S.J.
University of Detroit


Levi analyzes the Church’s attitude toward poverty and social change during the 19th and 20th centuries. His historical and sociological perspectives render important insights bearing on evangelization, church-state relations, and especially Latin American liberation theology. As a political scientist, he examines the social encyclicals concerning Marxism, socialism, and poverty and points out that “many of the ideas condemned today as Marxist were expressed by theologians and clerics in the nineteenth century before Marx was born.” He laments the fact that the Church’s inability to translate word into deed cost the loss of the working class in the 19th century and could be repeated by misunderstanding and mistreating liberation theology and the Third World in the 20th. His conclusion is that the Church, in spite of its rhetoric, is still too attached to safe and protective regimes.

After examining Rome’s response to 19th-century poverty, L. moves on to analyze the reaction to contemporary Latin American theologians. He claims Pope John Paul as something of a supporter, if a critical one, of liberationist ideas, but emphasizes the deep-seated hostility of Vatican officialdom. This hostility is bolstered by official U.S. policy in the region. He maintains, however, that liberation theology is a “danger to the unity of the church only if the church makes it so.” In spite of the apparent standoff, L. claims that three practical elements propel the official Church and Latin American theologians toward unity: (1) agreement on the preferential option for the poor; (2) the Church cannot risk a repeat of the 19th century by not adjusting to social conditions; (3) the seemingly different theologies actually have much in common, including support for certain aspects of socialism. Hence L. is optimistic about reconciliation. Obstacles come “mostly from those who need earthly liberation the least....”

There are points which could be questioned, e.g. the carrot-and-stick interpretation afforded the pope and various Vatican offices in the liberation-theology discussion. Nonetheless, the work brings something of a calm, historical, social-science perspective to a heated controversy.

JOHN P. HOGAN
Washington, D.C.


An excellent presentation of the dialectical methodology of liberation theology in lucid and enjoyably readable language. Min sets out the philosophical sources of the theology and then the chief doctrines of its theological method. This leads to a consideration of the relationship between transcend-
ent salvation and sociohistorical liberation and between personal sin and social sin. Throughout these chapters and then in a concluding chapter he defends this method against its prominent critics, especially the Vatican in its two instructions on liberation theology. Indeed, he demonstrates that the difference between liberation theology and the Vatican is not over particular opinions within the same horizon, but is a difference of basic horizons.

While many books deal with the methodology of liberation theology, few concentrate on its philosophical underpinnings and even fewer on the importance of Hegel behind Marx. Min shows how the Hegelian-Marxian view of the sociohistorical understanding of human existence and the actualization of freedom within society as a concrete totality gives importance to the primacy of praxis, sociohistorical conditioning of theology, option for the poor, and a hermeneutic circle. Strong defense of these doctrines of method leads to a thorough treatment of the intrinsic dialectic between transcendent salvation and concrete historical liberation. Min carries this out in a treatment of social sin, a topic rarely discussed so explicitly in the literature. In the light of these philosophical considerations, Min shows that the debates over liberation theology ultimately center on the relationship of transcendence to immanence and on the nature of human freedom and a basic anthropology.

This book deserves wide circulation.

ANTHONY J. TAMASCO
Georgetown University


Paul VI's On Evangelization in the Modern World stated: "Every effort must be made to insure a full evangelization of cultures." The task of appraising different cultures and working within them has never been easy. Fortunately, Luzbetak's classic 1963 work is now available in a revised, greatly expanded edition which offers an updated understanding of culture and reminds evangelizers that they must in a sense be reborn into other cultures and discover them like children. In evangelization proper understanding of other cultures is as important as linguistic ability.

L.'s opening chapters stress the role of the Spirit, the personal spirituality of the church worker, and the use of human knowledge in evangelization, clarify the relationship of missiology to anthropology, explain that the primary task in inculturation is the integration of culture with Christ and his message, and offer a summary of missiology since Vatican II. Chapters 5–7, the heart of the book, describe culture as a set of ideas a society has for coping with its physical, social, and ideational environment. It is made up of patterns of regularized guidelines for behavior. Culture is learned from one's society, and this process is called enculturation. The learning process is accomplished by education and imitation, and no change can be directed in any culture unless society itself feels the need for change. This section is technical and somewhat complex for beginners, but a summary to each chapter explains the application of the material to the work of evangelization. Sets of review questions for each chapter in the first edition have been dropped from this revision; in view of the complexity of some of the material, it would have been helpful to retain them.

This work is valuable reading for those involved in evangelization. It emphasizes the complexity of culture, its relation to anthropology, and their importance in the work of evangelization. It will not serve as a reference book with ready answers to all questions. But it contains an excellent biblio-
ography, listing for serious students all pertinent works related to culture. For many of the topics discussed L. also provides good background information, explaining the history and development of the subject matter.

Matthew H. Kelleher, M.M.
Kwun Tong Pastoral Center
Kowloon, Hong Kong


Novak, professor of modern Jewish thought at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, describes his work as "a philosophically formulated theological argument for Jewish-Christian dialogue" (ix) from a traditional Jewish perspective. He admits that until this century the relationship has been theologically disputatious. Nevertheless, he discerns some small Jewish openings to dialogue with Christians in the rabbinic doctrine of the Noahide laws, medieval European halakhic discussions about the status of Christianity, and Maimonides' assessments of Islam and Christianity. One modern step toward dialogue has been the interest of certain American Reform rabbis and Martin Buber in the Jewish Jesus. But N. criticizes them for rejecting the halakhah and separating Jesus from his role as Christ, thus trying to transcend both historic Judaism and historic Christianity. He also doubts that Franz Rosenzweig's theory of mutual dependence between Jews and Christians is appropriate to the realities of the (increasingly secular) 20th century.

In the final chapter N. outlines his own approach by reflecting on the singularity of Jewish revelation and its relation to the general and the possible, calling for a dialogue to be constituted on the common anthropological border between Judaism and Christianity, and stressing the importance of theonomic morality ("hearkening to God's voice") in the dialogue. His proposal goes beyond the position of Joseph B. Soloveitchik in openness to dialogue about the theological foundations of ethical matters. Though not as comprehensive and tight a package as the book's title and the author's statement of purpose might indicate, this philosophically sophisticated discussion of some important moments in Jewish-Christian relations should serve as a stimulus to Jewish (and Christian) participation in the dialogue.

Daniel J. Harrington, S.J.
Weston School of Theology, Mass.
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TS opens its 51st year with two full-length articles (on the historical Jesus and on the consensus of the Church), the annual review of moral theology, and a note on Augustine and evil.

The Historical Jesus: Rethinking Some Concepts traces the origins and history of the famous distinction between the "historical" Jesus and the "historic" Christ, advances reasons why the distinction is not serviceable, suggests a new set of distinctions in its place, and closes with some consequences of this new position for faith and theology. JOHN P. MEIER, with a doctorate in Scripture from Rome's Biblical Institute, is ordinary professor of NT at the Catholic University of America. His areas of special interest and competence are the Gospel of Matthew and historical-Jesus research. His article on "Jesus" has recently appeared in The New Jerome Biblical Commentary, and he is preparing a full-scale volume on the historical Jesus.

The Consensus of the Church: Differing Classic Views studies the background of Vatican I's doctrine of papal infallibility, exploring what Gallican authors actually said in defense of the Church's consensus to papal definitions and what papalists said against any such role of the bishops in the teaching of the faith. RICHARD F. COSTIGAN, S.J., Ph.D. in theology from the University of Ottawa, is associate professor of theology at Loyola University of Chicago, with particular involvement in the history of ecclesiology. His important article "Lamennais and Rohrbacher and the Papacy" appeared in Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa in 1987. He is preparing a book on papalist and Gallican views on the Church's consensus between the Gallican Declaration of 1682 and Vatican I.

Notes on Moral Theology: 1989 divides its material into four categories with four authors:

1. Feminist Ethics provides an overview of general contributions to the field, outlines some responses to magisterial pronouncements, examines "motherhood" as a biological and social role, and addresses fundamental ethical and epistemological implications of feminist thinking. 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. In 1988 she authored with Thomas A. Shannon Religion and Artificial Reproduction (Crossroad).

2. Ecology, Justice, and Development examines important connections between global environmental problems, economic development, and international justice. DREW CHRISTIENSON, S.J., Ph.D. from Yale, associate professor of theology and faculty fellow of the Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame, finds
orthodox Christian spirituality and ethics consonant with ecological responsibility, and identifies parallels between the "deep ecological movement" and Catholic teaching on "the common purpose of created things."

3. **The Ethics of Business**, "a field that covers a vast range of problems from affirmative action to toxic wastes, from Third World debt to management styles, from fixing prices to closing plants, from supporting ballet to paying foreign officials," argues that five interrelated tasks or functions shape its distinctive character: the corporate, the academic, the existential, the analytic, and the interpretative. **JOHN Langan, S.J., Ph.D. from Michigan, is Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at Georgetown University's Kennedy Institute of Ethics, a member of the philosophy department at Georgetown, and senior fellow within the Woodstock Theological Center.**

4. **Parable and Narrative in Christian Ethics** has for springboard contemporary questions such as whether biblical stories, symbols, parables, and proverbs address conscience as importantly as do the Decalogue and other explicitly normative material. In this context the article examines the appeal and problems posed by narrative theology, then turns to the discussion of biblical parables and stories to see how these literary forms shape moral consciousness. **William C. Spohn, S.J., Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, teaches theological ethics in the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley.**

**Augustine, Evil, and Donatism: Sin and Sanctity before the Pelagian Controversy** claims that Augustine's anti-Donatist treatises tell more about his developing sense of sin and evil than hitherto suspected: Augustine's efforts to suppress the Donatist schism shaped his sensibilities and suspicions even before he formulated his opposition to the Pelagians. **PETER Iver Kaufman, Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, is Bowman and Gordon Gray Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina. He specializes in historical theology from the patristic age to the Renaissance and Reformation. In 1986 he published The Polytyque Church: Religion and Early Tudor Political Culture, 1485–1516.**

An important note. The four 1989 (50th anniversary) issues of TS (reviewing a half century of moral theology, biblical studies, systematics, and interdisciplinary research) are available from this office (Theological Studies, Box 1029, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20057): within the U.S., $5 each issue, $20 for all four issues; outside the U.S., $6 each issue, $24 for all four issues, payable by international money order in U.S. dollars or by check in U.S. dollars drawn on a bank in the U.S.

*Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.*
*Editor*

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

HISTORICAL
Kennedy, E. Cardinal Bernardin. Chi-
188 THEOLOGICAL STUDIES


MORALITY AND LAW


PASTORAL, SPIRITUAL, AND LITURGICAL


Ochs, C. An Ascent to Joy. Blooming-

SPECIAL QUESTIONS