BOOK REVIEWS


One of my friends in pastoral work strives to read four major theological books each year, and this year I will urge him to include this account of the Yahwist [J] history. Coote describes himself as a historian who is not content to fit historical evidence into a biblical picture; rather, he and Ord read the biblical literature in terms of historical data, so that "what is known to have occurred provides the framework that allows the Bible to be understood" (22).

Their historical scenario is reminiscent of recent sociological exegesis, in which "early Israel" occupied the highlands of Palestine (12th to 10th centuries B.C.E.). When Egypt began to regain strength after a period of decline, these pastoralists in the highlands felt themselves jeopardized by Egyptian urban power (not by Canaanite city-states), so a Bedouin-based revolt is posited, composed of groups which formed the cadre of David's support around Hebron. David's world reflects this background, and J is a royal apologetic for his court, which needed social legitimation and a national identity. Form-critically, J resembles the story of David's rise (1 Sam 16:14—2 Sam 5:12), another apologetic document, to which the authors make numerous and intriguing references. So C. and O. date J in David's reign, rather than in the more common "united monarchy."

Instead of evaluating their historical perspective, I will discuss their procedures and some theological implications. They interpret J as an integrated whole, "bracketed" from E, D, and P strands. They discuss generally-agreed J passages (without detailed discussion of specific verses and without a list of J verses) and apply the Bedouin perspective to each section, asking what it would mean in David's elite circle. Thus they test their hypothesis against most J pericopes. For example, J's core is Moses' liberation of his Bedouin people from the Egyptian corvée. Specifically, Moses appears first in J when he kills an Egyptian taskmaster (2:11-12) and his righteous rejection of corvée existence accounts for his greatness. Since this killing is not criticized in J, it is apparently justified: in Yahweh's view, corvée is murder, and Moses executes punishment. In David's era the real enemy is Egypt—not the Philistines—so J portrays Moses as a type of David; in fact, Moses is David (234 f.), his movement bringing the liberation from corvée, of which J's Exodus account is the literary expression. This familiar narrative takes on a new twist: the Exodus folk, i.e. David's court, will not be found in the development of a Solomonic urban kingdom, built on corvée.

509
C. and O. view J’s notion of sin as more social and systemic than personal. In the Garden story J does not speak of “sin” but Eve’s “reproductive presumption” (i.e., arrogating from Yahweh the power to reproduce human life [Genesis 3]) does lead to Cain’s sin, the murder of his pastoralist brother. Since Cain is the prototypical city dweller, his sins of lust for power and violence, i.e. arrogating from Yahweh the prerogative to take away human life, represent the logical outcome of Eve’s choice. So sin is regarded as “social violence” (129), characterized also by the brutality of the men of Sodom. Their “sin” should be interpreted neither as homosexual behavior nor as inhospitality (two extremes of contemporary exposition); rather, J accuses them of homosexual “gang rape,” behavior not surprising for urban dwellers descended from Cain. This reading of the Sodom story demonstrates the usefulness of historical criticism for religious ethics, particularly regarding an issue like homosexuality: an exclusively literary approach to the text does not require us to ask “what” was supposed to have happened, but rather how we readers or our “tradition” have understood it. Study of the biblical dimensions of sexuality, violence, and power deserve attempts at reconstruction, which C. and O. provide.

The nontraditional format and style of this work may surprise readers. Omission of chapter and verse numbers facilitates imaginative reading of C.’s richly descriptive translation, but makes cross-referencing more difficult. The jargon-less writing style, combining pastoral and historical interests, makes this a refreshingly readable book, appealing to the senses more than most biblical studies do. It is not, however, always an easy book to read; chapter 6, e.g., is quite challenging at first. I fully anticipate new editions of this work, for which I suggest some technical revisions. Two chapter headings have incomplete biblical citations: on p. 117, add Gen 20:1a and 22:20-24; on p. 257, add Exod 33:1-16. Finally, the absence of indices is a disappointment, especially since their cross-references between J and the passages in Samuel should prove fascinating. In spite of minor criticisms, C. and O. have given us a book which will make us ponder J in new and exciting ways.

Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley

John C. Endres, S.J.


The Forschungsbericht is an art form, and we should not be surprised that the muse does not visit all scholars, even all those whose names win instant recognition in a discipline. The knack consists not only of making a judicious choice of influential titles published during the target period—
in this case the 40 years between the end of World War II and 1985—
but also, and above all, giving the kind of crisp and penetrating account
of each contribution that puts it in a perspicuous flow of understanding
on the subject matter.

Doctoral students and fellow scholars of the NT guild will be the
principal beneficiaries of this handsome and impressive volume. Clergy,
on the other hand, whom the editor includes in the intended constituency,
will not benefit uniformly from the surveys and might well be put off by
some. The reason for this has to do with the survey genre and its topoi,
among which is the ritualistic declaration that some earlier consensus
has come tumbling down of late, leaving all questions open and a
sparkling new horizon for guild workers. On hearing that a 1947 verdict
on Pauline studies practically still stands: “there is no notable agreement
on any major issue” (V. Furnish, 321), or that Lucan redaction criticism
has lost its major control-factor in Marcan priority and stands accord­
ingly at an “impasse” (C. Talbert, 309), a reader innocent of the conceits
of Forschungsberichten might be excused for concluding that the field is
in chaos and has little solid nourishment to offer the Church.

The excellent bibliographies, which cover fully 233 pages by my casual
count, contain relatively few entries from the 1980s, and work published
over the past half-dozen years already stands by to validate or disprove
each surveyor’s definition of prospects. Nevertheless, the book is a mostly
reliable witness to the great bursts of scholarly production which accom­
panied the recovery from the world war and the academic heydays of the
60s and 70s. For the scope and convenient compass of this coverage, it is
presently unsurpassed.

Surveys are divided into four sections: backgrounds (“the world of the
NT”), methods, literature (NT, apocrypha, Apostolic Fathers), and
Christological/theological synthesis. Of the highly informative surveys
of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Qumran backgrounds, that of A. Saldarini
on “Judaism and the NT” is particularly valuable for its exposure of the
artificial prisms Christian scholars have used to examine the subject.
The author justly observed that Christian prejudices have often deformed
scholars’ statements about Judaism (28), and one wonders if this is any
less true now that many of the statements are deferential and expiatory,
as against the patronizing diagnostics of yesteryear.

The “methods” section begins with a dense and abundantly docu­
mented survey of textual criticism by E. Epp, who nevertheless writes
with style and occasional salt. E. McKnight, on form and redaction
criticism, tends to list opinions without commentary (parataxis instead
of hypotaxis), and so one’s impressions of where scholars stand with
these methods remain somewhat confused and inconclusive. Along with
colleagues S. Brown on philology and W. Beardslee on literary criticism,
M. augurs a marriage of diachronic with synchronic methods as the future of the discipline. For all these contributors' enthusiasms over "the new linguistics," however, precious little evidence emerges from the exegesis surveys of the following section that nonhistorical literary method is generating any flow of its own. Moreover, the look of commentaries and widely acclaimed monographs here in 1990 suggests that the augured marriage is still but a frigid courtship.

Part 3, on "the literature of the NT," records the major trends in exegesis over the 40 years affecting NT authors and corpora: Synoptics (H. Kee), Johannines (D. Smith), Luke-Acts (Talbert), Paulines (Furnish), Hebrews (P. Hughes), remaining catholicae (B. Pearson), and Revelation (E. Schüessler-Fiorenza). The ensemble includes fine treatments of NT Apocrypha (R. Wilson) and the Apostolic Fathers (W. Schoedel, with 25-page bibliography). Perhaps it is because expectations are highest here that disappointment is also keenest. The smaller books seem to get the better coverage, while the Synoptics, Luke-Acts, John, and Paul get coverage more or less unequal to the breadth and moment of the debates surrounding them. We expected better when the section was opened by a first-class survey of the vigorous debates over the canon of the NT (H. Gamble)—in terms of both bibliographical support and critical perspicacity, one of the high points of the volume. H. Kee does well enough with the Synoptic problem and form criticism, but treatment of Mark and Matthew as author personalities in their own right remains jaggedly divided between Kee's essay and McKnight's, and is adequate in neither place. The Johannine essay, in turn, was in very good hands (D. Smith), but it is too brief and sketchy for the complex methodological problems and alternatives surrounding this corpus. One does better to consult Smith's richer essays elsewhere, and even his "Proclamation Commentary" booklet.

Least representative of current drift, in my judgment, is the Luke-Acts survey (Talbert). The dichotomy alleged here between scrutiny of Marcan parallels in the Gospel and appreciation of the literary ligaments between the two volumes (308) is upheld in no important commentary of my acquaintance, and nearly all contributors to the flow of Luke-Acts study continue to use the two approaches in fruitful reciprocity. Not even T.'s assurance that ongoing research would move no farther on the historicity of Acts (311 f.) has been confirmed in more recent publications (Lüdemann, Pesch, Hengel).

Paul's coverage disappoints, too, even admitting that Furnish, like Smith, had a nearly impossible mandate. A principal deficit here is perhaps the liveliest Pauline issue at present: Paul's relationship to Judaism and his vision of Israel and the law within salvation history. F. scarcely takes this issue beyond "what kind of a Jew Paul was," and the
absence of influential bibliography pertaining to the matter (Wilckens, Klein, Räisänen) is symptomatic.

The final section of surveys brings one of the two or three finest entries: "Jesus and Christology" (J. Reumann), where the 39-page bibliography matches the depth and coherent sweep of the coverage. R. Fuller, at the end of the volume, appears to leave NT theology stranded at the crossroads of historical and doctrinal approaches. No latter-day Bultmann or (NT) von Rad appeared in his crystal ball.

Fordham University


Black examines redaction-critical studies of the role of the disciples in Mark as a test case for determining the value and viability of applying redaction criticism to Mark's Gospel. He begins by reviewing selected redaction-critical studies in order to discern their disciplinary bases and methodological procedures. He then narrows his focus to the disciples and the theme of discipleship. A "research review" of these issues reveals three distinct positions, each of which is advocated by numerous redaction critics: type 1, the "conservative" position, which emphasizes the favorable portrayal of the disciples; type 2, the "mediate" position, which emphasizes a tension in the portrayal of the disciples; and type 3, the "liberal" position, which emphasizes the unrelentingly negative portrayal of the disciples. B. selects a representative of each type and devotes a chapter to his work. Robert P. Meye represents the "conservative" position; Ernest Best, the "mediate"; and Theodore J. Weedon, Sr., the "liberal."

Although B. has defined his terms carefully and identified traits peculiar to each position, his choice of terms seems puzzling. Terms used in debate and polemic invite value judgments where B. intends none. His language seems to defeat his purpose rather than promote it. Since his typology is central to his project, he might well have sought a terminology more intrinsic to the nature of the critical task and less susceptible to misunderstanding. More importantly, his choice of Weedon over Kelber as a representative of type 3 is at least questionable. It certainly sets up a schema defined by two extremes which are nuanced by a sober and clearer-headed middle position. The reader will not be surprised to discover that Black finds the mediate position most persuasive.

However, B.'s study is not a simplistic setup of extremes against a middle way. In collating his three types of redaction critics, he discovers among them a high degree of agreement on method, even though their interpretations differ widely from one another. More to the point, their
interpretations derive from factors not intrinsic to the methods of redaction criticism. To test whether these results are idiosyncratic, B. goes on to survey the efforts of six scholars who have sought to refine the methods of redaction criticism. In the final analysis each one poses more questions than he answers. Efforts to refine Markan redaction criticism have only proven the task hopeless.

B. assesses redaction criticism and places it in the context of 20th-century biblical scholarship. Three major assets are noted: its attempt to be a comprehensive method integrating historical, sociological, literary, and authorial concerns; its emphasis on “the Evangelists as authors of literary products”; and its insistence on the theological character of the Gospels. These gains are balanced by three liabilities. (1) Emphasis on the evangelist’s intention forced redaction critics to raise questions that cannot be answered and to engage in the futile task of postulating hypothetical sources before struggling to separate them from putative redaction. (2) The impossibility of this task led redaction critics to take refuge in the identification of themes and theology. However, this is not an intrinsically redaction-critical task but one that can be accomplished by other critical tools (e.g., literary criticism). (3) Redaction criticism moved “toward ‘methodological imperialism,’” because it sought to answer questions its critical methods were never designed to address.

The impasse created by the failure of redaction criticism can prove to be an opportunity for creating new models for Markan interpretation, and B. delineates one such model. The model he proposes gathers together five areas of critical endeavor (historical criticism, tradition criticism, literary criticism, authorial-theological criticism, and reader-response criticism) and organizes them into one synthetic approach to the text of Mark.

This summary only begins to suggest the rigor and lucidity of B.’s work. It has accounted for the bewildering variety of redactional-critical “conclusions” reached by scholars using the same method. The hermeneutical questions raised in the “Conclusion: Deductions and Directions” could have been allotted more attention precisely because they assume a greater urgency in light of the painstaking and detailed work that precedes them. In the context of this study they suggest a paradigm shift. No longer can biblical interpreters presume they are engaged in research analogous to the experiments of ordinary science, carefully constructing assured results upon assured results. The task of biblical interpretation is much more akin to work in the social sciences or humanities, where results are relative to many and varied frames of reference, open to dispute and controversy, and embody “a renewed appreciation for the difficulty of interpretation, of the fragility of our exegetical methods, and of the necessity for rigorous examination of the presuppositions on which
are based, not only our methods, but our conception of understanding itself” (256).

Central Baptist Theological Seminary

WILLIAM R. HERZOG II
Kansas City, Kansas


Perhaps the most thorough effort yet to expose the form and function of the Central Section of Luke’s Gospel (9:51—19:44). Moessner’s hypothesis is that Luke has shaped the plot and diction of this material to show that Jesus’ teaching and action fulfil his role as the Prophet-like-Moses of Deuteronomy leading his people on a New Exodus. While this understanding of Lukan Christology has been commonplace, discussion has usually focused on individual passages. M.’s contribution is that he elaborates a theory of Lukan Moses typology that accounts for the whole design of the Central Section (CS), and in a way that is coherent with the form and content of Luke’s entire two-volume work.

M.’s method is composition criticism rather than redaction criticism. He attends especially to the plot (the sequential order) of the story and to the thematic resonances with the Septuagint version of Deuteronomy. M. first explores the dissonance of form from content in Luke’s CS. Typically, scholars have seen the travel narrative as a congeries of L and Q material loosely strung together as a journey narrative that is in itself implausible. M. suggests that previous studies have been led astray by Synoptic comparison and have failed to read Luke’s account on its own narrative terms. Next M. analyzes Lk 9:1-50 as a preview of the journey. Like the figure of Moses in Deuteronomy, Jesus here (1) is called to mediate the voice of God, (2) confronts a twisted generation afraid of hearing that voice, (3) is destined to suffer for his people, and (4) through his death the children who submit to the authority of the Prophet will enter the “land of deliverance” and receive the blessing of the covenant promised to Abraham.

In the long central section of his own book, M. takes O. H. Steck’s four tenets summarizing the Deuteronomistic comprehensive view of Israel’s history (i.e., the popular interpretation prevalent in Palestine during the intertestamental period) and uses these to test Luke’s CS for a similar perspective. These tenets, gleaned from Josephus and the Qumran covenanters, also prove to be true of Jesus. (1) The present generation is an evil, crooked one and as such demonstrates its solidarity with its “fathers.” (2) God has sent Jesus as a prophet to Israel, like all the prophets before him. (3) Nevertheless, this generation rejected Jesus the Prophet, even killing him out of their stiff-necked resistance. (4)
Therefore God will "rain" destruction upon Israel as in 722 and 587 B.C.E. because they did not hearken to Him. Jesus moves through the CS as the Deuteronomistic Prophet and as journeying guest. M. elaborates on this theme with excursuses on the audiences of the CS, on the gallery of characters of "this generation," and on the literary design of "eating and drinking" that structures the CS. M. further spells out the ways the words and the journeying of Jesus parallel the words and journeying of Moses, who serves as a literary-theological model. In a journey in which the "eating and rejoicing" of the stubborn and unrepentant is contrasted with the "eating and rejoicing" of cleansed and forgiven hearts, the Lukan Jesus leads a New Exodus which culminates in the "promised land" of the Jerusalem community.

Finally, M. draws conclusions regarding the significance of the travel narrative in Luke-Acts as a whole. Luke's literary signals point to an intricate set of parallels between Jesus, Stephen (and Moses in Stephen's speech of Acts 7), and Paul. They constitute a resumption of the Deuteronomistic prophetic line. What begins during the journey of Jesus continues in the journeying of Paul: "from the Horeb laos a renewed laos—including the 'outcast' and the Gentile—is being formed" (310). M. finds that his approach illuminates a Lukan theology of the cross: once one recognizes that the death of Moses was integral to the saving of the people and that Jesus, Stephen, and Paul (and any disciple, see Acts 14:22) travel the same suffering journey, then it becomes clear that resurrection does not overshadow the meaning of the cross; rather, the new life through resurrection and exaltation is "an extension of the forgiveness wrought by Jesus' death. For a call to repentance means inherently an admission of one's own participation in Israel's stubbornness and an identification or solidarity with Jesus' death on Israel's (and the nations') behalf" (324).

M.'s study carries the weight of its history as a dissertation. The shifting between the fourfold typology of the prophet Moses in Deuteronomy and the four tenets of the popular intertestamental Deuteronomistic view of Israel's prophetic history is often cumbersome. And the reader feels compelled to retravel the entire journey of M.'s research; consequently some parts of the book are redundant and one recognizes the dissertation writer's compulsion to find a place for virtually every hard-won note. But in the end there is no avoiding this method of exposition, for the design can only be revealed through a painstaking examination of the separate strands of the fabric.

The upshot is that we now have a voice in the conversation of Lukan scholarship that will henceforth challenge any facile treatment of Luke's CS as a mix of "static heaps of disconnected tradition." We now have a
well-orchestrated hypothesis that the CS, indeed the whole of Luke-Acts, is governed by the form and content of the journey of the Prophet like (and greater than) Moses of Deuteronomy; that, indeed, it is in this sense that Jesus "fulfils what was written about [him] in the law of Moses and all the prophets" (Lk 24:44).

Creighton University, Omaha

DENNIS HAMM, S.J.


Gonzalez examines the Christian tradition concerning wealth, poverty, and the use of possessions during the patristic period. The title is perhaps too definite and narrow. This is definitely a "history of ideas," for the author considers one writer after another from the viewpoint of his "teaching" on this subject. But G. considers much more than "the origin, significance, and use of money." His real subject is the way Christian thinkers tried to articulate, within constantly changing circumstances, the perennial ideal of koinônia, the spiritual and material sharing of possessions.

G. acknowledges that he works with a basically "liberationist" perspective, in that he considers these issues not peripheral but central to theological inquiry. He credits the contemporary theological movement with sensitizing historians to the connections between ideas and their social underpinnings, realizations, and consequences. It should be said at once, however, that this is a solid contribution to our knowledge of patristic literature. The liberationist sensibility is here accompanied by sober historical method.

Because he wants to root the Christian traditions in both the ideas and the economic structures of their world, G. devotes almost a third of the book to "the background," considering in turn the "wisdom of the ancients" on the use of possessions and, even more fully, "the Roman economy" from Augustus through Constantine. The survey of economic realities is helpful especially in the way it sets up later discussions. The discussion of ancient views on poverty and wealth is less satisfying, perhaps because the material is so much more difficult to condense. One wonders, e.g., if the discussion of the Essenes is worth the space given it, since the complexity of their practice and ideology cannot be adequately considered.

G. begins his analysis of the Christian tradition with a survey of NT materials. He insists at some length that the description of community possessions in Acts 2 and 4 is not an "idealization" but a historical reality. Whatever the validity of his arguments here, they may be beside the
point for his overall thesis, for, historical or not, the texts in Acts certainly functioned within the subsequent tradition as an ideal of koinônia. Throughout this chapter, in fact, G. seems caught between the task of describing historical practice and that of assessing texts.

G.'s touch becomes surer as he moves into the patristic material. He garners the available evidence from the "subapostolic church," showing in particular how the ideal of koinônia was both persistent and pervasive. He then considers "the old catholic church," giving a particularly sensitive reading to Clement of Alexandria, showing from The Pedagogue just how rigorous was this often misunderstood teacher on the avoidance of luxury and the simple life.

G. devotes extensive attention to the transition from a persecuted and dispossessed church to a triumphant and wealthy one. He shows well how such Christian phenomena as the anchorites in Egypt continue an earlier and economically motivated pattern of anachôrèsis in that area, and how resistance movements such as that of the Donatists in North Africa also reflect deep-seated economic and cultural resentments and not simply theological issues. His main attention, however, is given to the ways in which great bishops like the Cappadocians, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine all respond in diverse ways (and with different kinds of motivation and success) to these new circumstances of wealth and power. G. shows how each tried to articulate the connections between spiritual and material koinônia.

The book has several noteworthy virtues. G. is a patient and fair reader. Even when we sense that he does not entirely approve of a writer, his tone is equable. He has, in addition, brought together a particularly rich collection of texts that can be used by students of church history and theology. He shows in excellent fashion how social realities and ideas must be studied together. He shows convincingly that "faith and the use of possessions" was a constant and central concern for early Christian writers.

Although the economic realities and ideas about wealth are fairly aligned, only occasionally does G. attempt to connect ideas about possessions to broader theological themes in the proper sense. His few forays make the reader wish for more, as when he notes that the orthodox reaction to Gnosticism had a great deal to do with concern for the poor, or when he connects the same concern to the battle against Arianism. Could the same sort of connection help make sense of Chrysostom's less attractive side? One's appetite is whetted for the specific ways in which patristic writers connected their overall theological conceptualization of their faith to their ideas concerning wealth.

Indiana University

LUKE T. JOHNSON

At a time when philosophy of religion is still dominated by the "linguistic turn," there is something refreshing about Davis' elegantly written text and its thesis that religious experience, especially mystical and numinous experiences, can serve as evidence for the common-core beliefs of theism. In defending this thesis, she addresses a variety of topics in an evenhanded and clear way, i.e. a taxonomy of the variety of religious experiences, the relation between experience and interpretation, the nature of cumulative arguments, noncognitive theories of religious language, the referential function of metaphorical descriptions, John Hick's understanding of "experience" as "experiencing-as," Alvin Plantinga's notion of "basic belief." The defense of the thesis, however, can be broken down into three arguments.

First, D. defends a version of Richard Swinburne's "principle of credulity": "What seems (epistemically) to a subject to be the case probably is the case, unless there are defeating conditions" (97). In order to avoid a "skeptical bog" regarding the foundations of rationality, this principle must be admitted as a basic principle of rationality. Religious experiences are thus to be presumed innocent until proven guilty. They are to be accepted as prima-facie veridical perceptual experiences unless this claim is successfully defeated by a specific challenge or cumulative set of challenges. The burden of argument is, therefore, clearly placed on the skeptic who wants to affirm that such experiences are not veridical.

Second, D. argues that mystical and numinous religious experiences can withstand standard challenges which seek to defeat their prima-facie claim to veridicality. While various challenges are examined, two are treated at length: the "conflicting claims" and "reductionist" challenges. By the former is meant the challenge that since religious believers cannot agree on a description of the percept alleged to be present in religious experiences, (1) such experiences must be either illusory or misperceptions and hence unreliable or (2) such experiences are nothing but interpretations and are best explained in light of prior background beliefs rather than by the presence of a holy power. By the latter is meant the challenge which seeks to explain religious experiences (1) by assimilating them to pathological conditions where it is already recognized that such conditions increase the likelihood of nonveridical perceptual experiences or (2) through reference to nonpathological processes which offer better explanations of religious experience because they are naturalistic explanations.

Third, in what is the most programmatic part of the text, D. argues that religious experiences can play a central role in the construction of a "cumulative argument" that theism is more probable than not. By "cu-
mutative argument" she does not mean a simple accumulation of arguments. Picking up on an image from Anthony Flew where arguments for the existence of God are regarded as "leaky buckets" due to their individual flaws, D. suggests that a cumulative argument is one where it is "possible to arrange the buckets inside each other so that the holes do not overlap" (109). Cumulative arguments are therefore synergistic: the different pieces of evidence interact with one another so that "the whole is greater than the sum of the parts" (241). Mystical and numinous religious experiences which attest to a divine "presence" and which withstand challenges to their veridicality, together with positive inductive arguments and evidentially weak forms of religious experience, supply sufficient evidence for a not highly ramified theism, "broad theism."

My misgivings concern this last, schematic part of the argument. First, continuing Flew's metaphor, it is not clear to me that the holes do not overlap in a cumulative argument for theism. The synergy is more affirmed than demonstrated. Second, it seems to me that the cumulative argument against theism or against the veridicality of religious experience is not as fully explored as one might expect. Some readers, depending on their initial standpoints, may well harbor a (justifiable) suspicion that the cumulative case against theism or the veridicality of religious experience is at least as strong as the case in its favor. D. cogently examines the challenges against religious experience and finds each of them individually flawed. Could there not, however, be a synergism between these "flawed" arguments? Finally, D. recognizes that many accounts of religious experiences have only a weak evidential force because they are too highly ramified. Only certain less highly ramified forms of mystical and numinous experiences, therefore, have a strong evidential force for a common or broad theism. Is such a broad theism something more than an abstraction? If it is not, then there is a conflicting claim between the experiences providing evidence for it and their more highly ramified cousins. If it is an abstraction, then it is misleading to speak of a cumulative case for (or against) theism per se, and thus I am not sure if one has escaped the net of the conflicting-claims challenge.

These reservations aside, D. does an admirable job in reopening an issue which many may regard as closed.

*University of San Diego*  
J. A. COLOMBO


Allen, professor of philosophy at Princeton Theological Seminary, starts by telling how he replied to a person who asked why he should go
to church, since he had no religious needs. A. answered, "Because Chris­tianity is true." The aim of his book is to show how one may legitimately arrive at this conviction in today's postmodern world. By "postmodern world" he means the world that has gone beyond presuppositions rooted in the Enlightenment, such as the assumptions that the idea of God is superfluous, that reason by itself can provide a basis for morality and society, that progress is inevitable, and that knowledge of itself always brings beneficial results.

In his first principal part, "The Book of Nature," A. points to the Christian attitudes toward the world which encouraged the development of science in the 16th and 17th centuries. Since then, contrary to the view of many, science has not displaced God by "filling the gaps" God was supposed to be taking care of; for quite apart from such supposed gaps, the mystery of the order and existence of the universe remains. The order of the universe points to the possibility of God, since out of countless possible orders it uniquely establishes the conditions needed for the evolution of human life. The existence of the universe also points to the possibility of God, since the world itself need not exist. This insight falls short of proving the existence of God, since the principle of sufficient reason, used in such a proof, is not itself certainly true. However, a thinking person confronted by the order and existence of the universe may begin to seek and interact with God, and in this way come to conviction about God's existence.

A.'s second part, "The Book of Scriptures," begins by describing faith as the consent to receive God's grace, and in this way to be changed, to seek the will of God, to endure suffering, and to overcome barriers. Faith as a reasonable act is not a leap to intellectual certitude where evidence is lacking, but a move into the order of reasoning which belongs to the heart (a metaphor for our response to the good and our search for well-being). Faith is the appropriate response to God's revelation, the free disclosure of the divine intentions, which takes place more in God's interaction with human beings, especially as described in the Scriptures, than in the processes of the natural world. God can, however, act in the world ruled by scientific laws; for just as these laws do not exclude human and intentional agency, so neither do they exclude divine agency.

In a final brief third part, A. evaluates non-Christian world religions positively, not from the perspective of their own self-understanding but from recognizing (under the guidance of Simone Weil) that the specifically Christian values of redemption and incarnation are also present and operative in them in different ways.

This book has much to recommend its description of the genesis of faith. However, A.'s reluctance to rely on the principle of sufficient reason for coming to know God is hard to understand. People may indeed
differ over the best way to formulate this principle; but without the principle it is not possible to engage seriously in any reasoning at all, for then what is truly positive might conceivably be due to nothing whatever. The world then loses its intelligibility, and the mind its power to know anything.

A.'s analysis of faith as a matter of the heart is helpful, but concretely it seems in some ways to isolate faith from the mind. There is no attempt to show that, even apart from religion, believing pervades all human knowing. The religious element specifies a particular kind of believing but does not introduce a totally novel way of thinking.

Finally, A.'s treatment of divine agency in a scientific world seems to miss the real problem. It is not enough to say that scientific laws do not of themselves exclude divine and human activity; it is also necessary to show how the causal connections of the material world are open to a very different mode of causality, which A. correctly identifies as "intentional." A. simply asserts, "Our bodies are made up of interacting activity systems, such as cells, that together make it possible for us to be personal agents" (176). It may be a matter of immediate experience that these "interacting activity systems" are open to the influence of free choice, but how can this be the case? If it is not delusion, what explanation can be proposed? Such an explanation lies behind the assertion of divine agency in the material world.

Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley

JOHN H. WRIGHT, S.J.


In The Nature of Doctrine (1984), George Lindbeck distinguished three distinct understandings of theological doctrine: cognitive, experiential-expressive, and cultural-linguistic. The unmistakable import of the present book by a long-time professor of Christian dogmatics at the University of Edinburgh is to make clear that the early Greek Fathers who formulated the conciliar decrees of Nicaea and Constantinople I conceived theological doctrine in expressly cognitive terms. That is, they did not interpret the doctrine of the Trinity as the symbolic expression of subjective religious experience. Nor did they consider themselves as setting forth rules for the "language game" of theology. Rather, they thought they were making objective truth-statements about the reality of God and the nature of salvation in and through Christ. As Torrance makes clear in an introductory chapter, the early Fathers were convinced that they were in touch with the objective reality of God and the world through the Father's self-revelation in Christ: not that they knew every-
thing about the divine mysteries, but that what they knew had to be true because of God's own testimony in Scripture.

Taking up in succession, accordingly, the patristic understanding of the Father, the Son, the Spirit, and the Church as the concrete embodiment of the Spirit in the world, T. sets forth "the evangelical theology of the ancient Catholic Church." God, e.g., is primarily Father rather than transcendent Lord and Creator, since in Christ God is revealed as Father. "It is the Fatherhood of God, revealed in the Son, that determines how we are to understand God as almighty Creator, and not the other way around" (7). Similarly, since the Son is *homoousios*, of one being, with the Father, the Father is Creator of the world through the Son. Contrary to Arius, therefore, the Son is not the first creature of the Father, but the divine Word in whom both the intelligibility and the creativity or spontaneity of the world process ultimately reside. Likewise, as Athanasius, above all, realized after Nicaea, the Holy Spirit is *homoousios* with the Father and the Son. Both the Father and the Son are present in the Spirit as the Spirit works in the minds and hearts of Christians to bring about the reality of the Church. God is, accordingly, indivisibly Father, Son, and Spirit, even though these divine persons are distinguished from one another by their objective interpersonal relations. Thus it was a mistake for Basil and Gregory of Nyssa to ground the unity of God in the person of the Father, rather than in the being (*ousia*) of God which the Father shares equally with the Son and the Spirit. For in this way a subtle subordinationism was introduced into thinking about the Trinity which eventually led to the split between the Eastern and Western churches about the validity of the *Filioque* as an addition to the Creed. The Creed formulated at Constantinople I, however, is free of this ambiguity, since the bishops there assembled, without explicitly stating that the Spirit is *homoousios* with the Father and the Son, nevertheless clearly affirmed that the Spirit is to be worshiped and glorified equally with the other two. The *monarchia* of God is thus common to all three divine persons, not proper to the Father alone.

The limitations of this more literal approach to the doctrine of the Trinity should likewise be apparent. The early Fathers, in fact, were employing symbolic modes of discourse subject to further interpretation in setting forth the doctrine of the Trinity. Likewise, they were in effect setting up rules for subsequent theological discourse about the nature of God. Hence they were implicitly using the experiential-expressive and the cultural-linguistic approaches to theological doctrine as well as the purely cognitive in their theological writings. Finally, as T.'s extensive text-analysis makes clear, Athanasius and the Cappadocians did not come to grips with the deeper philosophical issues in their understanding of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. E.g., they did not
make clear how the three divine persons can equivalently be one divine Self and yet three distinct Selves at the same time. Beyond stating that all actions toward creatures are from the Father, through the Son, and in the Spirit, they do not explain how this corporate agency takes place. Do the divine persons constitute a single mind and will or share a common mind and will? Similarly, while praising the “wonderful exchange” (admirabile commercium) between humanity and divinity within the person of Christ, they do not indicate how this is possible without either the humanity or the divinity of Christ being essentially changed. These reservations apart, however, T.’s book is a salutary reminder to contemporary Christians of the purity and simplicity of the theology of the ancient Church.

Xavier University, Cincinnati

JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, S.J.


Every student of ancient and medieval philosophy learns what distinguishes humankind from the other kinds articulated in Genesis 1 is our possession of intellect and will. At least since Philo that has been the accepted reading of the biblical phrase wherein “God created man to His own image” (DRV), signaling thereby that what sets us apart will reveal something of the Creator.

So the singular place of humankind is central to Genesis, and it is quite understandable that exegetes living in the Hellenic world would fasten on Plato’s and Aristotle’s way of articulating that singularity, identifying our intellectual capacities with the privileged image of the divine in creation. Yet Christian readers of Genesis were impelled one step further by the introductory phrase, “Let us make man in our own image, in the likeness of ourselves” (1:26 JB), inevitably hearing an allusion to God as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The image, then, if it be an image of God, must needs be Trinitarian in character. Not so perspicuously that one would be constrained to recognize a triune creator from close inspection of this privileged kind, but necessarily so for those trained to look more carefully by the fulness of revelation.

Such indeed was Augustine’s contention, who sought to mine the image as found in human persons, narratively in the Confessions and dialectically in his extended treatise On the Trinity. It is Merriel’s contention that Aquinas’ subsequent development is rooted firmly in Augustine’s explorations, and indeed represents a faithful and insightful elaboration of Augustine’s cryptic suggestions in the final book of his treatise. M. argues his thesis carefully and persuasively by tracing the evolution of
Aquinas' own thought after an especially illuminating proposal regarding the proper way to read Augustine's *De trinitate*. He sets his task over against two early articles of Serge de Laugier de Beaurecueil, O.P., which had located the movement in Aquinas' thought away from its initial moorings in Augustine "towards a more rigorous realism under the influence of Aristotelian psychology" (6). Development there is, M. will argue, but it looks more like Aquinas using the refinements of Aristotle's philosophy of mind to elaborate a view of the image culminating Augustine's tentative probings.

M. shows how Aquinas works with Augustine's two triads, *mens-notitia-amor* and *memoria-intelligentia-voluntas*, from the *Sentences* through *De veritate* and *De potentia* to the *Summa theologiae*, gradually modifying Augustine's *memoria* into Aristotle's habitual knowledge, and finally forsaking the domain of distinct faculties to "find the best analogy for the divine processions in the processions that accompany the two immanent acts of the intellectual nature" (228): knowing and loving. So the search for the best analogy not only pressed Aquinas to move from powers to acts, but as any effective analogy will do, also shifted the focus on the original from *persons* to *processions*. (It is M.'s reading of Book 15 of *De trinitate* which allows him to assess this movement in a manner different from de Beaurecueil, yet his debt to these seminal articles is evident as well.)

The shift to the act of understanding and loving, executed in *De veritate* and *De potentia*, and secured by the *Summa*, effectively unites two dimensions of the image which had been present in a complementary fashion since Augustine: analogy and conformity. Understanding oneself to be made in the image of God must needs be completed by exercising that image in such a way as to respond to such a gift. Arguably the theme of Augustine's *Confessions*, this active use of the analogy already suggested by Aquinas' focus on the activity of knowing and loving led him to locate the image par excellence in our knowing and loving response to God. This culminating assertion of the *Summa*, however, should not be read so as to obscure the fact that the Trinitarian image is to be found in all human beings—it is part of the legacy of creation, the initial gift of a gracious creator. The elevation of that image to the indwelling of the triune God in us by grace is certainly affirmed by Aquinas, but M. finds, curiously enough, that he does not sufficiently link the two. Other readers of Aquinas might see in his formula for indwelling—*cognitium in cognoscente et amatum in amante* (1.43.3)—an explicit reference to the image, but M. does remind us "that Thomas is not writing about the indwelling as though it were nothing more than a created effect that is loosely associated with the divine Persons. He is primarily trying to show that the divine missions are temporal extensions of the eternal proces-
sions" (232). It is indeed something that startling which this thesis prepares one to hear, and we can only hope that an author so well grounded goes on to develop this dimension of the image.

University of Notre Dame

DAVID B. BURRELL, C.S.C.


Having published Jésus-Christ dans la tradition de l'église in 1982, Sesboüé now offers us a book which focuses on the soteriological aspects of Christology. In addition to providing lay readers with syntheses of the work of specialists in biblical, historical, and systematic theology, he draws upon contemporary (almost exclusively French) works in literature, psychology, and sociology. S. begins his lengthy study by noting a paradox: despite the absolute centrality of salvation in Christian revelation, it has never been the object of any magisterial definition. He suggests that the very richness of the idea of salvation, the many images and concepts needed to begin to grasp what salvation is, have lessened the probability that it ever will be the object of any formal definition.

The first and shortest part of his study sketches the "problematic," concentrating on typical contemporary misunderstandings of Christ's saving role, such as that of René Girard, who like many has depicted Christian salvation as the story of an angry father who demands satisfaction and justice from an obedient but joyless son. Such a misunderstanding is all too common and should be addressed. However, S. spends little time on what may be an even greater problem today: not the misunderstanding of salvation but the apparent indifference to it, and the apparent inability on the part of many Christians to articulate what difference it does make. As Nietzsche once remarked, "You Christians—you do not looked very saved!"

S.'s study proposes a theology of salvation and redemption grounded in Scripture and shaped subsequently through tradition. The salvation of humankind contains two simultaneous dynamic processes: liberation from sin and union with God. Jesus Christ, the unique mediator, achieves our salvation through two movements: a descending one, emphasized by the Eastern theologians during the first millennium, which moves from God to us who are transformed by God's love mediated through Jesus; and an ascending one, emphasized by Western theologians, beginning with Anselm of Canterbury. The ascending movement emphasizes our need to be saved through Christ, who makes satisfaction for our sins. Particularly valuable is S.'s extensive explanation of Anselm's theology
of satisfaction, which he carefully situates in the context of the Germanic and early-medieval feudal system. Along with Walter Kasper and others, S. has explained how the change from the medieval to our own modern individualistic culture has made it almost impossible to understand many of the culture-specific elements of Anselm’s theology.

Taking his lead from Henri de Lubac, who wrote in 1965 that it was time for soteriology to rediscover the great victory of Christ in the resurrection, S. states that today’s theological task requires a clear and more effective reappropriation of the primacy of the descending movement of God’s saving activity. At the same time, however, S. argues that the reappropriation should not in any way weaken the ascending movement, best understood as our solidarity with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

S. not only presents and interprets the many biblical images of salvation; he also evaluates the pastoral effectiveness of their contemporary application. Consequently he favors the soteriological possibilities of the word “liberation” over those suggested by the word “deliverance,” and finds the word “substitution” much less theologically resonant than the word “solidarity,” a word which evokes the ideas of freedom, community, and the image of standing with the poor and oppressed. Although S. recognizes the importance of retaining the many complementary biblical images and theological concepts that express various aspects of the reality of salvation, he gives special preference to the word “reconciliation,” which he believes communicates an “anthropologically pregnant reality”: the inescapable presence of human conflict. Reconciliation underscores our need to overcome all such conflict and alienation through love, first offered by God in Jesus and then acted upon by us.

S. realizes that his second volume still leaves relatively unexplored many important soteriological questions: the profound link between salvation and the resurrection; a properly articulated role for the Holy Spirit in the process of salvation; the relationship of our salvation to the transformation of the earth and indeed of the entire cosmos; and the relationship of Christian salvation to the nature and experience of salvation in other religions. Despite these lacunae, S. offers a readable and comprehensive study of the history and interpretation of soteriology.

University of Dayton

JAMES L. HEFT, S.M.


Kasper has been well known to the theological community as professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Tübingen and, since 1989,
bishop of Stuttgart-Rottenburg. In 1987 he published a collection of 15 previously printed essays under the title *Theologie und Kirche*. The collection could be described as a modern equivalent of the medieval literary genre of "disputed questions": the chapters were loosely knit together by three major themes—foundational issues in theology, Christian anthropology, and contemporary ecclesiology. Even so, there was a logical cohesion in their progress: they moved from the clarification of some basic concepts and epistemological assumptions to inquiries about our redeemed humanity and finally to the great sacrament of salvation, the Church.

In the English version, for reasons not explained, the group of essays on foundational issues has been omitted. Even their titles are stimulating: "The Renewal of the Dogmatic Principle," "Evangelical Freedom and Binding Dogmas," "Tradition as Basic Principle of Cognition," "Church History as Historical Theology," and "The Handing Over of Faith". All of them touched on burning issues, and all were enlightening for the more dogmatic essays following them. The U.S. publisher deserves no compliments for having omitted these essays.

The topics K. treats under "Theology and Anthropology" are the mystery of revelation, the place of Christianity in our modern world, the theological definition of human rights, the understanding of the meaning and purpose of a human being in the light of Christology and in the perspective of Trinitarian theology. The essay on "The Modern Sense of Freedom and History and the Theological Definition of Human Rights" is both topical for present application and stimulating for future research.

K. points to the biblical creation narrative as the first proclamation in history of the unconditional dignity of human beings as *human beings*. Since each of them was made in the image of God, each belongs to God wholly and radically, and no one else can have a claim over him or her. Aquinas was the theologian who understood best the fine dialectics of dependence and autonomy in every human person. Because they are dependent, they must obey God's eternal law, but because they are autonomous, they must find the law through their own creative insights. In this search they are moved by the inner dynamic of love, a divine gift to them. Thus love leads to the discovery of law—in freedom. All institutions exist (or should exist) to promote and protect this freedom in which human beings can find themselves and reach out for the infinite.

The Church, too, has the duty to promote this radical freedom, and in practice can do so by defining and defending human rights. But its "intervention on behalf of human rights in the world today is convincing only if, in its own sector, the church is a model in the way it implements human freedom as the presupposition for Christian freedom." Further,
“there ought to be institutions within the church which do not merely stand up for the rights of truth, but stand up for the rights of men and women too. Up to now the spirit of absolutism has put its stamp on canon law” (71). K. echoes here a principle often voiced during Vatican Council II: only persons can have rights, propositions cannot.

The topics discussed under “The Church as Sacrament of Salvation” are either taken from Vatican II or are organic developments of its doctrine: the Church as a place of truth; the Church as communion among the believers and between God and His people; the Church that finds its divine fulness in the Eucharist. Of seminal importance in this part is “The Continuing Challenge of the Second Vatican Council: The Hermeneutics of the Conciliar Statements.” K. identifies three phases of development after the council: exuberance, disappointment, and now (our present task) the discovery of its true meaning, to be followed by its faithful implementation. But to do that, we must understand the council, which was different from all previous councils. It was not called to condemn errors; its purpose was pastoral; it often put “conservative” and “progressive” statements side by side. It follows that we need different hermeneutics to grasp the meaning of its texts. K. proposes several principles of interpretation. Among them: there should be no search for conservative or progressive elements in the documents, all statements are there to form a unity, balance each other, and mark the limits of the Church’s tradition; the purpose of “pastoral” teaching should be seen as an effort to bring out the enduring relevance of dogmas; the council should be regarded as the unfolding of Christian tradition, not a break with it. He concludes, “I myself have no doubt that the council’s hour is still to come, and that its seed will spring up and bear rich fruit in the field of history” (176).

Occasional checks on the translation showed it not only faithful but also sensitive to nuances. The overall style (sentence structures, flow of argumentation), however, reflects heavily the original German. The reader often has to struggle to find the lucid theological ideas behind the complex sentences.

Altogether, even in this truncated English edition, this is a valuable publication. K.’s principal gift consists in intelligere: he turns to our tradition with an alert mind and comes back with fresh and fine insights. The result is a balanced blend of vetera et nova. It is safe to assume that the international theological community hopes K.’s elevation to the episcopate will not mark the end of his contribution to theology but will be the beginning of a new inspiration, in the tradition set by many bishop-theologians of past ages.

Catholic University of America

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J.

Schwartz collates the teaching of Vatican II and contemporary American bishops on the nature and spirituality of the priesthood, and he does this within the horizon of the distinctly American Catholic Church today. Focal points of his presentation are such couplets as the universal priesthood of baptism and the special priesthood of holy orders, the temporal and eschatological dimensions of Christianity in general and the special ordained priesthood in particular, prayer and action, celibacy and life among people, preaching the word/celebrating the sacraments and action for social justice. He finds that these are not mutually exclusive opposites, but complementary dimensions of the one saving mission of the Church. His emphases are distinctly incarnational and sacramental.

S. offers us a thorough and reliable exposition of the current magisterial understanding of ordained ministry in the Church. Yet precisely because of his success in doing this, S. also reveals the inadequacy of current systematic and spiritual theology of Catholic priesthood in America. E.g., S. makes much of the distinction between the ontological and functional understandings of ordained priesthood. However, does not every grace produce an ontological change in every graced person? What is the precise nature of this change in the ordained? Likewise, one frequently hears the assertion that the priest acts in persona Christi. What does this mean precisely? In any case, in whose name would other Christians act? S. is properly diffident about the term alter Christus for the ordained priest. Should he not be equally cautious about terms like ontological and in persona Christi?

S. properly emphasizes that there is one ordained ministry in the Church, the episcopacy, which can be shared in various degrees and ways. That this office’s mission is the ordering of the Church (197) and can be described as the “director of ministries” (143) is right on target. The best term, however, is only mentioned and left unarticulated: “coordinator” (143) of the various gifts of the Holy Spirit. One is less enthused about the constant emphasis on the priesthood as the participation in the servant headship/leadership of Christ. Although such conceptualization need not lead to clericalism and hierarchicalism, church history’s “courant hiérotcratique” (Congar) hardly nurtures sanguine expectations. Furthermore, this only reinforces the impression that church leadership is primarily and essentially hierarchical. Although S. concedes at times that there may be other modes of church leadership, these turn out to be incidental.

This brings us to the fundamental deficiency of S.’s approach to
ordained ministry in the Church, though originally it is the deficiency of the hierarchy and theology. The particular form of leadership known as ordained, priestly, clerical, hierarchical is only one of the many kinds of church leadership. It is poorly understood today because it is still conceptualized in categories proper to earlier ages and different cultures. We cannot hope to have an adequate understanding of the ordained ministry until we theologize it in terms of contemporary administrative management and leadership theory and practice. After all, that is what “priests” are and do—they are the administrators and managers of the public life and order of the Church. To describe this mode of being and doing in the Church with terms such as priest, bishop, pope, headship is at best to confuse, at worst to betray both priest and people. This is not, of course, “to remove the understanding of priesthood from a theology of grace and to recast it in that of an ‘organization man’ ” (262), although one must ask why grace could not produce an organization man—or woman—in and for the Church.

Furthermore, I find S.’s understanding of the precisely American Catholic experience seriously off the mark. Again, the misperception is not unique to S.; it is the conventional wisdom of what can be called contemporary liberal neoclericalism.

The statement that “The American people have been richly blessed with material prosperity” (149) is illustrative. One wishes to ask, “Blessed by whom?” American prosperity is not a blessing, it is an achievement. As observers of America from de Tocqueville to Goetz Briefs have observed, other nations have been equally “blessed” with nonhuman resources and have remained distinctly “unblessed” with material prosperity. And unfortunately, S. seems to agree with Eugene Kennedy’s assessment about the “end of an immigrant church in which the clergy were idolized, seldom criticized, unquestionably respected and cared for” (259). Yet the immigrant Church has certainly not ended.

Furthermore, an alert reading of the American Catholic experience reveals a history of dissent, independence, and collaboration of the laity with the clergy, not their obedient submission to them. American Catholicism has been dissenting since its founding by a layperson and commerçiant, Lord Calvert of Baltimore, and selective too, as the conduct of the people in regard to hierarchical leadership also makes clear from the very beginning. At times S. acknowledges that the proper virtue between people and priest is collaboration; they are coworkers. But then he slips back into the myth of obedience of priest to bishop and of people to priest, so that “the ministry of the laity” once again ends up “complementing authentic priestly service” (190). That is not necessarily correct theologically; it is incorrect from the viewpoint of U.S. church history.

As a basis for discussion of the Catholic priesthood in America, S.
deserves highest recommendations. As a basis for effective understanding and practice of the priesthood in America now and in the future, high cautions.

*University of San Diego*

**ROBERT KRESS**


These two volumes provide contrasts and corroborations on the functions of the late medieval Church in England. Swanson attempts an overview from the Black Death to the Reformation; Haines brings together vignettes covering selected topics. Each is an accomplished scholar who has much light to shed on this era that continues to fascinate and yield rich results.

H.'s work consists of discrete chapters collected under topical headings: administrative process, judicial conflict, clerical education, church and society, with extensive notes, bibliography, and appendices. The four groups allow the reader to generalize and extrapolate into a wider picture and understanding while recognizing the limitations and individuality of each study, but H. explicitly states that it is not yet time for an all-embracing study of the English Church in that era. His work thus challenges the task Swanson set for himself. H. reveals an institution that had a well-developed insularity—not in the sense that the Church in England was geographically on an island; rather that the leaders, prelates, and figures who appear in these stories seem to have spent so much time, energy, and resources in internal squabbles, fighting each other to preserve, protect, enhance, or expand prestige, position, pomp, and prerogatives, that one wonders how much was left to serve the Church, the believing community.

The appropriation of a church to Westminster Abbey dragged on with many vicissitudes for decades. A secular clerk who was supposed to occupy the post and care for the people obtained eight licenses that allowed him to be absent for 12 years. Another study goes into the details of the election of an abbot by the medieval method known as "compromise" (selection of electors to make the actual choice), then the election of archbishops of Canterbury by the same method and the seeking of royal and papal permissions and assent. Other studies delve into the function of special assistants to the bishop for hearing confessions and imposition of penance, the relation of this office to the deaneries and to the mendicants, into the issue of the jurisdiction of a subdean. The
conflict between Canterbury and York is discussed at length; other ecclesiastical disputes are also treated. How elaborate such cases could become is seen in a stipulation in a 1340 case that “no more than forty witnesses to the facts were to be produced on either side” (119).

Clerical education, a desirable goal, did not come easily and often led to conflicts rising out of reform legislation. What was to be the minimum standard; how was it to be enforced; how were insufficiencies to be corrected? Were manuals enough? Lateran IV put the onus of instruction on the ordaining bishop: Was the issuance of canons enough to clear the prelate’s conscience? How literally can we take the charges and hyperbole of reformers? Then as now, what is it that turns a minimum standard into the normal practice? What were the effects of local and diocesan regulation, of papal and canonical decrees such as Boniface VIII’s Cum ex eo in 1298, issued just after that pope’s quarrel with the kings of England and France? The bishop could allow an incumbent to enjoy the fruits of his benefice while away studying for up to seven years. Most bishops granted shorter terms that could be extended, but all this involved appropriate age and other requirements set over against the rights and claims of patronage. Scholarly bishops were sometimes loathe to grant licenses for study. In one case the revenues from a local church merely subsidized a clerk’s absence until he found a position in royal service once he had his doctorate.

A priest’s commonplace book from late medieval York is filled with reflections, a calendar and other liturgical matters, a mini-tract on the sacraments, and numerous bits of everyday information. This approach flows into the next study on the indulgence as a form of social insurance; it shows the uses to which funds raised by indulgences were directed. Victims of fire, accident and crime, prisoners of war appear alongside the usual repair of chapels. A confraternity document and a study of sermons show the concerns and interests of a wide group, as well as the influence of patriotism and local issues.

In contrast to H., Swanson begins with the overview and the problems in filling the picture: two provinces, 17 dioceses as well as in theory Scotland and Wales, with each diocese subdivided into archdeaconries and rural deaneries, and finally down to local parishes (ca. 9500 in 1291; ca. 8600–8800 in 1535). England was part of the wider Church; there were foreign prelates in England and English career prelates overseas. In a context of numerous transfers, protests, complaints, and appeals, the pope was a focus of loyalty and so the variety and extent of business between Rome and England was formidable. Numerous questions of authority arose: the use of legates, delegation, centralization, and the local ordinary’s position, the proper relation of diocesan authority to mendicants, to “peculiar jurisdictions.” The confusing pattern of juris-
dictions was never static and so one picture cannot fit all. S. presents many topics, each with subheadings; the result is more an encyclopedic presentation than a narrative, a very dense book that will serve as a jumping-off point for further studies and analysis. His headings include: Clerics and Careers; The Church and the Political Order; Two Laws, One Kingdom; Church and Economic Activity; Orthodox Spirituality; Non-conformity and Dislocation.

S. suggests a simple division of clerics as those with a benefice and the unbeficed, and so examines the clerical estate as affected by patronage, education, and supply: “Ecclesiastical careers were essentially a matter of seeking dead men’s shoes, and their revenues” (30). Plague years created shortages and led to demands for better wages and so charges of greedy priests. Lay control over clerical careers, demand for pensions, and pluralism each contributed to new waves of problems and complaints. What were the career prospects for clerics? Universities had one view on patronage, the gentry another, and the papal Curia (often working with the king) yet a third. Most of the 180 bishops of this era were some form of civil servant; royal service led to promotion, and so decisions were made on this basis. Royal power time and again intervened in the name of peace, suppression of crime, and protection of property. Common law reached out to pensions, debts, and wills. The Church both produced for and consumed in the market, and so its welfare fluctuated; a view grew of the priesthood as a job, another form of paid employment. The questions of spirituality—mainstream and orthodox versus nonconformity and heresy—leave many uncertainties. How much has been tainted by later events and readings? How are we to read the complaints that services were not provided by the clergy and sorely missed by the people, the cry that clergy were often little more than hirelings? What segment of that world do wills shed light on? S. points out that the new Jesus feasts established then were strongly Christocentric, a phenomenon that ran parallel to the growth of guilds, confraternities, relics, miracles, and indulgences. The Church was caught between two demands: its spirituality was largely reflecting popular demand and its clerical careers were largely under lay control (315). How could it resist these tides? Wyclif himself was a career cleric, a collector of benefices who spoke out most fervently for reform of the system. What was the relationship of his ideas, tracts, and theories to the popular reform movements?

At the end of the Middle Ages the Church was overwhelmed by Europe-wide changes: nationalization of the churches (to which the papacy with its concordats contributed most), the spread of printing, and the rise of Christian humanism. These two indispensable studies contain a wealth of information; they complement while opposing each other (sometimes
explicitly); this is not to be lamented, but rather shows the fragile nature of our evidence and our explanations.

State University of New York, Fredonia  THOMAS E. MORRISSEY


Brooke’s thesis in this regrettably brief volume is that when searching out the nature of marriage in medieval Europe the historian must go beyond the statistically measurable evidence (of which there is little) into the qualitative evidence that abounds in ballad, drama, letter, essay, diary, lyric poem, folk tale, and even in the record of an ecclesiastical trial. He formulates the thesis tersely: “We cannot study the history of marriage without imagination and insight—without infusing into our scholarship our knowledge of ourselves and of human nature” (258). It is from the several sources listed just above that he would gather this knowledge.

But B. has a second and less obvious thesis; and it may be the one dearer to him. His concern throughout the volume is really about the character of marriage among Christians. He wants it to be sacramental; he is confident it can be an experience of holiness. This second thesis is that only if we penetrate intelligently the experience of marital love can we understand marital sacramentality and the holiness available in it. Its holiness is its love.

To sustain his thesis, B. works through a brave sweep of Christian history and its records. He begins with a 22-page apologia for his method—for his examination of the unquantifiable evidence. He then offers a sampling of this kind of evidence: the exchange between Catherine of Siena and her confessor, the scolding sermons of Peter Damian, the letters of a 14th-century merchant of Frato, the 15th-century calendar of Lady Margaret of Beaufort. After this sample of sources and method B. backs up to the beginning, to the biblical origins of marriage. Here his command of the material is least secure; he is not a biblical scholar and does not pretend to be. So his examination of the Synoptic and Pauline evidence is brief. He carries two main points forward from them; (1) Jesus’ demand, in the Synoptics, for the spouses’ lifelong fidelity, and the perplexing attenuation of this demand in the Matthean exceptive clause; (2) Paul’s conflicted mind about the goodness of marriage on the one hand, but on the other its inferiority to celibacy in the eschatological hour in which he believes the Christian lives.

Among the Fathers B. passes by Tertullian and his gradual bitterness against remarriage in widowhood and then against marriage at all; he
recalls Jerome's sarcastic polemic against Jovinian for daring to suggest the equality of marriage with virginity; he examines Augustine's defense of the goodness of marriage against the Manichees and his fastening in the Christian soul its centuries-long suspicion of sexual expression in marriage because of concupiscence. From there he moves on to the campaign, during and following the Gregorian reform, against concubinage among nobility and clergy. Eloïse and Abelard follow—their love affair, their religious life, their correspondence. Eloïse he remembers as the woman who refused permanent marriage in order to save her lover-husband's career, but gave to the Church and the world an example of marital love, with sexual reminiscence, that she cherished into her old age as a prioress.

In "Marriage in Law and Practice" B. presents a chapter of specific case studies, beginning in the eleventh century and reaching through Henry VIII's battle to have his union with Catherine of Aragon declared null. His intent is to show how European royalty's passion to secure political power (and thrones) for descendants through divorce and annulment when male heirs were not forthcoming clashed with the Church's defense of wives and of the holiness, in casu the indissolubility, of marriage. Here B. the Anglican sides with the popes, with Innocent II, Alexander III, and Innocent III. Out of the conflict came the determination, with compromise, that spouses create their marriage by their own free consent, but leave it incomplete, and vulnerable to dissolution, until they consummate it.

From these case studies B. moves to "literary evidence for the history of marriage." Here the evidence is in the poetic legends of Chrétien of Troyes, of Tristan and Isolde, of Parcifal and the quest for the Grail; of Wolfram's Willehalm, Chaucer's Book of the Duchess, Troilus and Creseyde, the Franklin's Tale and the Knight's Tale; finally of Shakespeare's Theseus and Hippolyta, Rosalind and Orlando, Portia and Bassanio, and Romeo and Juliet. In these stories of passion, romance, adultery, fidelity, and tragedy B. finds the medieval appreciation of the love that draws men and women into marriage. He also identifies this love as the heart of the sacrament—in the judgment of this reviewer, the best and wisest part of the essay.

The strengths of the volume are its elegant but relaxed conversational style, but more its seemingly limitless erudition. The footnotes and index are copious and pertinent; the bibliography fills 25 pages, the yield of B.'s 30-plus years as scholar and teacher of ecclesiastical history. The book's one weakness, if one may call it that, is native to its genre. Being deliberately a survey of 14 centuries of cultural-religious history, it surveys all too fleetingly even where it lingers. Each chapter could be a
volume. But precisely as a survey it is for the student a valuable entrée and enticement to a more inclusive examination of a fascinating portion of Christian history.

Santa Clara University, Calif. THEODORE MACKIN, S.J.


This book “on the mediation of salvation according to Calvin” was accepted as a Habilitationsschrift in 1985 by the University of Würzburg, under the direction of the Catholic systematician Alexandre Ganoczy. It is a Catholic dogmatic dissertation by a layman, which is a remarkable fact by itself, first because it is a nonordained person who was permitted to submit it, and secondly because it is a Catholic theological study of Calvin’s Reformation theology, thus an ecumenical event. Scheld’s previous studies on Calvin (in collaboration with Ganoczy) led to this present work. The question of salvation is answered along the lines of Calvin’s theology, and thus S. contributes to the rapprochement of Protestant and Catholic theology. His topic is Calvin’s understanding of the “means of salvation” (media salutis). Specifically he investigates Calvin’s notions of tangible means. Thus he does not focus on grace, faith, justification, or any other invisible realities, but on creation, the course of history, the biblical word, the humanity of Christ, the Church, and the sacraments.

S. first reviews the treatment of his topic in recent (primarily Catholic) Calvin research, featuring the following authors and their works: (1) Alexandre Ganoczy, Ecclesia ministrans (1968), a study on Calvin’s ecclesiology and the media salutis which represents the guiding spirit of Scheld’s own work; (2) Kilian McDonnell, John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist (1967); (3) E. D. Willis, Calvin’s Catholic Christology (1966); (4) Werner Krusche, Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes nach Calvin (1957).

Next S. presents an analysis of certain Latin terms relevant to his subject. Here he makes use of A Computerized Concordance to ‘Institutio christianae religionis’ 1559 of Joannes Calvinus (Pittsburgh, 1972), and also of the Calvin bibliography of the Calvin Theological Journal with its subsection “Doctrine of Christ and Salvation.” S. features Calvin’s expressions media, remedia, adiumenta, and adminicula. Each of these word studies is introduced by etymological considerations. The treatment of the notion media and remedia leads to the consideration of the personal function of Christ as physician and medicine. The media of salvation are Christ-centered. The adiumenta are the secondary means of Christ the pedagogue. They have the function of leading toward the faith, but they are not necessary for salvation. Calvin calls the preaching of the pure
gospel and the administering of the sacraments *adiumenta*, so to speak, a wider support system. *Adminicula* are even more peripheral; they are like poles that support the vines. Calvin often thinks of rituals, the liturgy, the sacramentals when he uses this term. But these, too, are Christ-centered. Miracles, e.g., are also classified as *adminicula*.

S. concludes by systematizing these findings for a systematic theology: Since after creation man had fallen, God had to use remedies to cure man, mainly His divine word to the patriarchs, with Christ's coming as the culmination point in this process. All *media* of salvation are grounded in Christ, as creation is permeated by the Logos. The divine mediation of salvation is accompanied by the Holy Spirit. Thus any offer of salvation to man is made by the Trinity. Salvation remains uncertain, however. Faith and love are not to be separated, while faith receives priority in this system of thought. Here the clarifying proclamation through the Church is called for, which invites man into the community with Christ. The most noble ecclesiastical instrument in the service of this community with Christ is the ecclesiastical office (*Amt*). This office is threefold: shepherd, teacher, and priest, whereby the latter is pushed into the background. The officeholder (minister) is to be understood as channel or pipe through which God directs His grace to man. The ministers are to be listened to as if Christ himself were the speaker. The community (*Gemeinde*) keeps a watchful eye on the orthodoxy of the minister's teaching and his administration of the sacraments. Thus for Calvin the ecclesiastical ministry cannot be thought of as isolated from the community. The Church remains the "mother" who gives birth to faithful children. She hands on the treasure of the Word of God. But because of the instrumentality of the Church, she is not absolutely necessary for salvation, but remains a *medium*. Sacraments (baptism and Eucharist) are an *accessoire* or appendix to the proclamation of the Word. The sacramental mediation of salvation is *visibile verbum*. The other *media* such as penance, confirmation, anointing, and matrimony are "pious exercises" which cannot claim sacramental rank.

All in all, this study is an impressive analysis of the external means of salvation according to Calvin's thinking, utilizing original source material as well as recent research results. It is not easy reading (as is usually the case with a dissertation); and since it is written in German (with the Latin expressions typically interspersed), only a very dedicated Calvin researcher and systematic theologian will want to undergo the stress this reading may cause. The book contains an extensive bibliography, but no index.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*  

FRANZ POSSET

With the growing popularity of Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross, this overview of their spiritual doctrine fills an urgent need. Nothing of comparable scope and quality has been available in English since E. W. Trueman Dicken's 1963 classic The Crucible of Love.

Dubay's approach is thematic and practical, intended "for all men and women in every way of life" (4). In an initial programmatic chapter he bases the contemporary relevance of John and Teresa on the universal call to holiness and contemplative prayer stressed by Vatican II, arguing that "the teachings of Teresa and John are nothing more or less than the integral Gospel," a claim he supports throughout by identifying corresponding NT passages for every crucial element in their doctrine. This scriptural component is a welcome feature, though D.'s treatment of NT spirituality is developed in relation to Teresa and John rather than on its own terms, so that some themes (e.g., the communal dimensions of holiness) tend to be underrepresented. Still, the biblical citations are handled well, without manipulative "proof-texting."

Chapter 2 offers a brief introduction to the lives, writings, and personalities of the two Carmelite saints, while subsequent chapters provide a synthesis of their teaching on the major phases and elements of the spiritual life; here D. retraces the traditional journey from discursive meditation, through initial contemplation and both active and passive purifications, to transforming union. The final chapters deal with a variety of related topics, including distractions in prayer, discernment, extraordinary experiences, friendships, spiritual direction, wholeness, and freedom.

Since this is a popular rather than academic work, D. avoids technical questions and disputed points in Teresian and Sanjuanist scholarship. He makes virtually no mention of research from the past two decades, preferring (perhaps wisely) to remain in the older interpretive mainstream. Readers will have to look elsewhere for recent discoveries regarding the social, cultural, and economic implications of the Teresian program. Still, it would be hard to find a more lucid general introduction to the basic Teresian and Sanjuanist themes. D. does a masterful job of explaining the essential agreement and occasional differences between John and Teresa, in an engaging style that any sympathetic reader should easily follow.

Apparently some of this material originated in retreat conferences to contemplative religious communities, which may partly explain why D.'s most frequent examples of impediments to spiritual growth include idle
gossip and overexposure to TV and other media rather than, say, a lack of active concern for the poor. D. likewise sees little value in prayer journals, "creation-centered" spirituality, and, especially, Oriental methods of meditation, which he repeatedly claims offer little more in themselves than "a brief, impersonal insight produced entirely by human technique" (54). Not until relatively late does he discuss the far more widespread Catholic temptation (which so preoccupied John of the Cross) toward vain credulity in private revelations, though he does lament, eloquently, that "most people would not even cross the street to witness an unobtrusive act of patience . . ., but they will cross an ocean to visit the locale of an alleged apparition" (247).

Curiously, D. criticizes "minimalism" in moral theology, its divorce from systematic and mystical theology, and the "latecomer" theory of two paths (ordinary and extraordinary) to Christian perfection as if these were recent inventions by contemporary theologians of dubious loyalty. Indeed, he often warns against "the pitiable self-assurance of a dissenting mind" (253), stressing obedience to the magisterium and one's superiors as a crucial sign of authentic spirituality, sometimes (though certainly not always) seeming to rank it even before charity in the list of essential virtues (108 f.). One wishes D. were equally adamant against the evils sometimes wrought in the name of religious observance, to which the Gospels and the Carmelite tradition also clearly testify. It is worth remembering, further, that both John and Teresa were sometimes considered "disobedient" by their superiors; while we now recognize the error of such accusations, this should perhaps give us pause before judging too quickly which of our contemporaries are, or are not, truly faithful to the gospel.

Such observations, however, have more to do with emphasis than substance; this reviewer would have preferred a more balanced admission that not all spiritual dangers today come from the theological left. Still, D. offers an excellent resource for spiritual reading and group study, highly recommended.

De Sales School of Theology, D.C. STEVEN PAYNE, O.C.D.


This anthology of readings assembled from eyewitness accounts offers a sweeping and engaging view of Christianity in the New World over the course of five centuries. The selections have an immediacy and power which only participants in the events can provide. Goodpasture, professor of church history and mission studies at Union Theological Seminary in
Virginia, through a deft and judicious choice of 118 witnesses presents an account of the changing role and structure of the Church in Latin America.

There is no overarching thesis in this history; rather, we encounter recurring themes highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of Christianity alternately collaborating with and challenging secular forces, first in the subjugation and conversion of the Native Americans and then in the building of church institutions as we know them today.

A convenient and logical chronological arrangement breaks the book into three periods: Hispanic imperial Christendom, 1492–1808; the end of colonial rule to the coming of Protestantism in force, 1808–1962; the churches and liberation, 1962–1985. G. provides the essential data of each period as a framework for understanding the documents in historical context, but he offers practically no guidance in evaluating the veracity or genre of the enormously varied and occasionally contradictory accounts. Old problems are cast in new light. Christianity, it is clearly shown, legitimated and promoted a colonial system which was often cruelly exploitative of the Indians, whose religion and culture the conquerors brutally eradicated in the name of God. Often profits counted more than prophets, miners more than missionaries.

The worn themes of “God, glory, and gold” as basic motives for the conquest of the New World take on fresh color, meaning, and excitement with the inclusion of previously unpublished or little-known material about greedy friars, insatiable inquisitors, rapacious royal authorities, and their victims. Indeed, there is perhaps too heavy an emphasis on church affluence and the material side of the spiritual conquest of the Americas. Nonetheless, it would be hard to omit such gripping accounts as that of the expulsion of the Jesuits from Mexico City in 1767. They, along with some 2200 Jesuits in all of Latin America, were exiled and their property seized by royal officials. They were taken prisoner by surprise in the middle of the night. “Then came the first question: ‘Where is the treasure?’” (79). The Inquisition’s avarice behind its ostensible zeal for the defense of the faith jars the conscience in several accounts by survivors from the dungeons of the Holy Office.

There is much that is noble in colonial Catholicism, however, which finds expression in this fast-moving collection of personal accounts. For example, wit, wisdom, courage, and commitment burst forth in every line by Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz (1658–95), a Mexican prodigy of the court and convent, in her protest against restraints on the freedom of the intellectual life of her time, especially for women (68–71). Plantation Christianity on the great land holdings of Latin America is portrayed by many selections not only with its dark elements of slavery and oppression,
but also with its more human and spiritually joyful dimensions of religious beliefs and devotions.

Once the book moves into the 19th century, there is a disproportionately large number of foreign observers, mostly English and North American Protestants, represented in what purports to be an eyewitness history of lands overwhelmingly creole Catholic in character and tradition. There is also a disproportionate emphasis on the Protestant churches' presence in Latin America, when in fact they could claim only 14.5% of the population in 1985. This emphasis, however, can be understood and appreciated, given G.'s post in Virginia. He provides a fascinating study of the systematic expansion of Protestantism from 1930 to 1961, which relied on a variety of methods, including the use of radio and airplanes to reach remote and inaccessible areas with the gospel message.

Part 3, which continues the story from the Second Vatican Council, brings the issue of Latin America liberation alive with clarity and power of exposition and with the prophetic force of a courageous cry for social justice through Christian witness and service. Here we find a striking variety of views, including Ivan Illich's famous 1967 article "The Seamy Side of Charity" in *America* magazine (246-48). Claiming that Latin Americans must jolt themselves into authentic Christian life and growth, he attacked the U.S. Catholic program of sending massive aid to the Latin American Church, including the goal, never realized, of dispatching 20,000 missionaries south.

The Protestants have emphasized three themes: (1) authority of the Bible, (2) conversion as a personal experience, and (3) evangelization. These three themes have been picked up by the Catholic bishops as part of their quincentennial program of evangelization of the Americas.

This fine book could be made even better in future editions. G. would do well to drop some minor contributions and let weightier voices speak. There is nothing included in the readings by first-rank witnesses for liberation such as Dom Helder Camara, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Jon Sobrino, Leonardo Boff, or José Míguez Bonino. Some of the translations need to be polished; a few of them are quite wooden (e.g., 19-21).

G. sets down the good achieved and the evil wrought in the course of Christianity in Latin America. He is decent and fair in digging out the past from the records of eyewitnesses of every sort. His work is indeed a worthy contribution to the upcoming quincentennial celebration of the coming of Christianity to the New World.

*Loyola Marymount University, L.A.*

*ERNEST S. SWEENEY, S.J.*
AWASH IN A SEA OF FAITH: CHRISTIANIZING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Yale historian Jon Butler has produced a strikingly new interpretation of the development of American religious life from 16th-century European background through the American Civil War. Consciously revisionist at nearly every turn (though quite conventional in some respects), this account will make a lasting impact on the field of U.S. religious history.

The overall thesis diverts attention from the 17th-century Puritan “stamp of Geneva” in locating the formative center of the subsequent religious history of the American people. B. concentrates instead on the burgeoning religious pluralism, the denominational institutional formations, the countryside sacralization (church buildings, graveyards, etc.), and popular folklorization of magic and the occult both within and outside of the Christian churches that flourished in 18th-century colonial life. However, not until after the Revolution—“a profoundly secular event” marked by widespread popular indifference to religion generally and to churches in particular—did organized religious life become securely enough planted to blossom and bear fruit in the early-19th-century “spiritual hothouse.”

B. thus agrees with those who point to a “low ebb” of religious life at the time of national birth, but not in contrast to a supposed earlier “high ebb” in the Colonial experience. Throughout the initial three centuries of recorded American history, Christianity made its way slowly and precariously, surrounded and penetrated by waves of popular syncretistic supernaturalism (occult, witchcraft, astrology, magic, etc.) both imported from the Old World (Europe and Africa) and produced in the New World. Having inherited the instability of Christianity in European churches, Americans finally avoided the European triumph of secularism by establishing successful patterns of Christianization within an environment of religious freedom and proliferating religious pluralism.

B.’s scholarship is marked by rigorous attention to detail, richly documented from primary sources, and guided by sensitivity to change and variation in religious life. This approach allows him to question many commonly-accepted generalizations and to argue persuasively on interpretive issues. The result is a fresh telling of the story with a historical dynamism and complexity that ring true to human social life as we experience it.

The best examples of B.’s revisionist interpretations are located in the 18th century—the heart of his telling of the story, of his overall thesis, and of his scholarly success. E.g., B. challenges all accounts of the so-called “Great Awakening” that make of it the primary religious occur-
rence of prerevolutionary American society. Such accounts rely partly on historiographical invention a hundred years after the fact that produced "an interpretive fiction . . . an American equivalent of the Roman Empire's Donation of Constantine" (165). B. then demythologizes the "Great Awakening" by uncovering the development of successful efforts for revivals beginning as early as the 1670s, these taking place in the context of a lively resurgence of state-church traditions (Anglicans and Congregationalists) plus the formation of dissenting denominational institutions (Baptists, Quakers, Presbyterians). Throughout the 18th-century, revivals varied greatly according to factors of doctrine, style, leadership, intercolonial and international connections, and success. Revivals were sporadic, did not appear at all in many regions, usually enhanced clerical status and authority, and increased ecclesiastical discipline and institutionalism.

The impact of slavery on Christianity, and vice versa, is another 18th-century phenomenon that B. treats with convincing scholarly insight. He sets forth what surely will be a debated position. The brutal destruction of African religious systems, an "African spiritual holocaust" in which Anglo-American church leaders had a hand, created a context for the subsequent slow Christianization of African American people almost void of African cultural influences until well into the 19th century.

The antebellum 19th-century period receives less innovative treatment than do earlier periods. Protestant denominations organized for aggressive home-mission Christianization of the westward-moving nation. These were buttressed by cross-denominational voluntary societies that altogether formed what other historians long have described as an "evangelical united front" claiming the nation's historic identity and calling for the government's blessing. Meanwhile, religious diversity and innovation flourished. Popular syncretistic supernationalism not only had a life of its own; it also penetrated such religious movements as Methodism, Mormonism, and African evangelicalism. By mid-19th century the traditional churches were solidly entrenched in the national life (though less than they proclaimed), prepared for the final Christianization of society that would define their mission ambitions during the post-Civil War decades.

B. has offered much for historians to debate in the years to come. His innovative overall interpretation suffers from the glaring omission not only of Native American religiosity but also of Roman Catholicism as part of the U.S. Christianizing process, especially in the antebellum 19th-century period when this major Christian tradition emerged as an enormous religious presence in the nation. Its absence from the story makes the nation appear almost exclusively Protestant in religious orientation, in line with most conventional historical treatments. Moreover, the
strongest public religious forces appear to be those churches rooted in Anglo-Protestant heritage with a strangely familiar mind quasi-theocratic in tone. Could it be that if we look at intellectual as well as social factors, we still must pay large attention to Puritan roots of the U.S. religious experience? Had B. paid greater attention to surging Roman Catholicism, he might have strengthened his powerful thesis that the post-Puritan epoch began in late-17th-century America.

This is a landmark study in the field of U.S. religious history that will alter how we understand the spiritual experiences of the emerging new nation.

Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley

ELDON G. ERNST


Bunnenberg's 1989 dissertation represents the first book-length study of Congar to be published in German. His title, "Living Faithfulness to the Source," is well chosen, reflecting B.'s overarching intention to show that Congar's understanding of tradition entails not a literal fidelity to the past (Buchstabentreue) but the living fidelity of meditation in the heart which affects the way one lives, a fidelity most clearly exemplified in Mary (141).

B. goes about his work in four steps. The first part, "Approaches," sketches the theme of tradition in the early 20th century and uncovers traces of a theology of tradition in Congar's writings, first from the 1930s and later in the postwar period but prior to the publication of his Tradition and Traditions. Here B. displays a gift for the analysis of historical patterns, such as the way in which Modernism revealed the need for a more careful understanding of tradition, the way in which Bergson and Chenu responded to that challenge, and the effect that these developments had on Congar. While Congar did not in this period devote any work specifically to the topic of tradition, B. shows that this theme was already the formal principle of his theology and that a number of the elements characteristic of Congar's later discussion of tradition are already present in Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'église (1950), e.g. the distinction between tradition and the traditions, the comprehensive view of tradition as the lived reality of the Church which is handed on, the role of subjectivity in the process of tradition, the dynamic aspect of tradition, and its Christological and pneumatological basis.

B.'s second and longest section, "The Systematic Presentation of Tradition according to Congar," concentrates on La tradition et les traditions (1960, 1963), with generous references to several other works
of the same period, especially *La foi et la théologie* and *Jésus-Christ.* After stating the question about tradition in the late 1950s and summarizing Congar's biblical and historical presentations of the topic, B. systematizes Congar's view by relating tradition in turn (1) to revelation; (2) to the historical normativity of Jesus Christ and the apostles and the canon of Scripture; (3) to the Church; (4) to the Holy Spirit; (5) to the principal witnesses of tradition—the liturgy, the Fathers of the Church, the magisterium, and lived Christianity; (6) to the Reformation. For Congar, tradition is concentrated ultimately on the fundamental realities of Christianity—the Trinity, salvation history, and anthropology. Doctrinally, tradition does not add to the gospel norm given by Christ and handed on through the apostles; it is the hermeneutical process of translating, systematizing, interpreting, and applying. Even more, tradition is Christian living, expressed in the liturgy and in discipleship. What is normative in tradition can be discerned by such criteria as Scripture, magisterium, liturgy, and the Fathers of the Church. But in such discernment no single criterion ever suffices; a *communio* of criteria is necessary.

A short but dramatic third part analyzes Congar's role in the formulation of the doctrine of tradition in Vatican II's *Dei verbum.* The dramatic element enters when the author cites passages from Congar's private diary (not the several volumes published under the title *Le Concile au jour le jour,* but a diary of which there are but three copies—Congar's own and one each at the libraries of Le Saulchoir and Louvain). These passages convey Congar's personal reflections at the time of the council: the feeling that he needed to be more pertinacious in arguing his opinion, the estimation that he remained "suspect" by such council fathers as Ottaviani and Parente, and comments about the theologians and the discussions within the subcommittee established to rewrite *De revelatione.* B. lines up Congar's draft of 1964 with the final text of *Dei verbum* to show that many of the ideas he was proposing made their way into the final document: e.g., the Trinitarian and salvation-history context for considering tradition; the sense of tradition as a lived reality which develops progressively in time; the subordination of the magisterium to Scripture and tradition; the mutual interrelation of Scripture and tradition against any theory of two independent sources; and the significance of the Church as a whole in the process of tradition (292).

B.'s final section, "Continuations, Applications, Corrections," focuses on Congar's writings after the council. Among the highlights here are Congar's foray into hermeneutics, his comments relating truth to history, the presentation of Vatican II as an example of "living fidelity to the source," and the Christological and pneumatological foundations of tradition. Congar's theology of tradition is a "theology of equilibrium" (367): it binds together historical relativity with the unchangeable truth of
divine revelation, Christianity's capacity to develop with the unalterable norm of its faith, the incommensurability of God with human beings' creative ability to understand.

This is a very good book. B. has a quite thorough knowledge of Congar's theology, to which he applies his impressive abilities of contextual and conceptual analysis. While he does not bring in all of Congar's publications (some concerning ecumenism, ecclesiology, and pneumatology are conspicuously absent), still his focus on tradition, revelation, history, and truth corresponds to the very heart of Congar's thought. For this reason and because of the high quality of this study, one can say that B. has come as close as humanly possible, given the vast number of Congar's publications, to demonstrating his contention that "tradition" is the point of entrance to Congar's theology as a whole.

Gregorian University, Rome

WILLIAM HENN, O.F.M.CAP.


McCormick has been a major writer and lecturer on moral theology for 35 years; he has ranked internationally and interdenominationally among the most distinguished and influential scholars in his field. His writings have been mainly devoted to applying ethical and theological principles to notoriously important moral issues, and to critically elaborating and refining appropriate methods for doing so. In recent years he has given increasing attention to methodological concerns, and most recently to those of a peculiarly Roman Catholic sort, having to do with the claims of official ecclesiastical teachings to normative or evidentiary status in moral argumentation.

Methodological concerns, broadly conceived, occupy the whole of the present volume, which comprises 22 essays, related in various ways but not elaborately linked, grouped in two equal collections, called respectively "Fundamental Moral Theology" and "Practical and Pastoral Questions." The former is mainly devoted to discussing relationships, actual and desirable, between competent, responsible moral theologians and church officialdom, especially at the papal level. By far the largest topical entry in the index is under "magisterium," and all the others having numerous references (e.g., "dissent," "theologians," "authority," "pluralism") pertain to the same area of concern.

For this reader, the book's first half generates a strange, unblendable mixture of admiration and ennui. The admiration is for M.'s unfailingly courteous, candid, clear, and cogent analyses and recommendations touching official responses to moral issues and moralists' opinions. The
ennui arises from a sense that most of this sensitive, articulate reasonableness is uttered into a void. At no point is there any sign that M.'s well-chosen words are part of anything describable as a civil conversation, and at several points M. virtually acknowledges this. It is not a case of two opposing arguments in honest confrontation, but of two incommensurable modes of discourse in perpetual dissonance, the hypothetical ever colliding with the categorical, and the declarative with the imperative. As M. goes bravely on, politely pointing out obviously begged questions and missed connections, evident to any unbiased practitioner of ethical analysis, one's gratitude is overshadowed by regret that professional virtues of so high an order should be lavished so generously on such a task. One moves on to the book's second part with a sign both of compassion and of relief.

Here M. treats mostly bioethical topics. One exception is an essay on admitting remarried divorcees to the sacraments, where he takes the position that "indissolubility," as an attribute of Christian marriage derived from the gospel, refers not to a metaphysically unbreakable bond but to an ethically binding obligation. Having published this view myself on several occasions, I fully agree with it, and agree also that such an interpretation opens the way to more helpful pastoral practice. But the difficulties of reconciling it with dogmatic and canonical tradition seem to me extremely formidable.

Less formidable but probably more heated opposition arises from traditional teaching to M.'s position on the moral options to be presented by the Church to one who is "irreversibly homosexual" and "not called to celibacy." Here, too, I have published views very similar to M.'s to the effect that, given those conditions, one should be helped and encouraged to develop a loving, faithful, and exclusive sexual partnership, and defended against unfair discriminatory practices inside or outside the Church. Less than ideal human relationships may be the best human relationships available to certain people—indeed, in one sense that is always the case—and the cause of morality is ill served by making the best the enemy of the good. On this topic it is to be expected that M.'s position will earn cheers neither from gays nor from Catholic traditionalists, but it makes a great deal of sense and merits careful attention from both sides.

In most of M.'s discussions of bioethical topics (abortion, artificial hearts, therapeutic gene technology, AIDS, reproductive technology, euthanasia, contraceptives) we find not only solidly informed, vigorously intelligent casuistry but something much rarer, a broad, balanced alertness to subtle assumptions and remote consequences whose deep involvement in ethical choices easily escapes notice. He readily anticipates the development of trials into practices and practices into policies. He is
highly sensitive to interaction, often conflictual, of professional and institutional priorities. He gives due weight to the bearing of nonmedical values on medical decisions. He notices how certain Christian beliefs imply a reordering of values that should have practical moral consequences. He neither renounces sound generalizations nor allows them to obliterate individual peculiarities. In these and other respects M. illustrates how the virtues of professionalism and specialization are both preserved and enhanced by a rich humanistic culture in one who possesses them. His essays on medical ethics attest how much that subject can gain from a kind of education that fewer and fewer ethicists or physicians are receiving.

In the second part of this book one senses everywhere the presence of those very qualities that, through no fault of M.'s, seemed depressingly absent in the first part—qualities of collegial conversation, constructive reciprocal criticism, mutual assistance in pursuit of common intellectual goals through honest argumentation. A first-rate thinker, in his element, at his best.

*Loyola University, New Orleans*  
JAMES GAFFNEY


This collection of ten essays and six book reviews is consistently stimulating and informative. With colorful clarity and wide-ranging examples, Burtchaell insightfully critiques contemporary moral oversights and weaknesses. He is a provocateur to both liberals and conservatives. To those who attack church positions, B. points out the gold buried in ecclesiastical trench-digging. To those who defend authority at all costs, he shows how they sacrifice what the Church should be concerned about.

B. disavows an Enlightenment tendency to make free choice or motive the sole moral factor, quite apart from the deed performed. He also distances himself from those who base their moral evaluations solely on particular acts. Just as we first recognize saints and only then elaborate the qualities of sanctity, so also we should chiefly assess acts in the context of the lives of those who perform them. For B., the primary moral concern is how certain behaviors influence or define our character and self. Moral wisdom and tradition describe, not dictate, what people become when they act in certain ways. When Christians give themselves in love, often against their own apparent best interests, they flourish. These wise insights, however, lead B. into an odd and one-sided Socratic emphasis: he is more concerned for the 2000 persons who perform
abortions than for the 20 million fetuses aborted, more for the wife-beater than for the wife. Moral self-development eclipses the good and evil that we do. Likewise, God's judgment or wrath is transposed into the harm that we do ourselves.

B. excels at pointing out how ethicists miss the park for the benches, miss the human significance of our acts by focusing narrowly on aspects of the acts themselves. Thus, in a splendid essay on *Humanae vitae*, he notes that the Church got caught in a discussion of means when it should have been exhorting us to welcome children who will stretch our capacities to love in unforeseeable ways. Similarly, those who recommend reproductive technologies ignore the effects of technology on the whole of our lives. Those who give various arguments to legitimate the use of aborted fetal tissue should see that they, like Nazi doctors before them, are inevitably complicitous in killing. B. argues that liberation theologians who defend the poor end up dehumanizing the poor, indeed making them objects but not subjects of Christian action; further, when these liberationists appeal more to the embattled exodus than to the suffering cross, they show themselves not yet quite Christian. Those who condemn individual terrorists fail to see that whole nations, including the U.S.A., can act like terrorists, and that terrorism is best categorized not as the criminal act of individuals but as a new way of waging war and therefore subject to the canons of warfare. Those who want to reinstate abortion laws fail to see how impotent any law can be, and those who oppose new laws on grounds of their impotence fail to see how morally important such laws can be. Finally, B. notes that, in the debate over abortion, politicians like Ferraro and Cuomo failed the consensus of people they represented and that prelates like O'Connor failed to be moral teachers to their people.

B. is a very readable theologian. His journalistic penchant for the stimulating and offbeat, however, leads at times to unnuanced, unbalanced, and perhaps even contradictory views. In chap. 1 he tells us to trust the contemporary moral experience of common Christian folk and theologians, not just to follow the hierarchy. In chap. 2 he tells us that these common folk and theologians have got the abortion issue wrong and should follow tradition. In chap. 3 he tells us that the scriptural tradition is obsolete for Christian ethics. In treating contraception he argues against taking biological nature as normative, and in treating reproductive technology he warns against technological control of nature. In this way B. does himself a disservice by bringing these disparately published essays together. Still, he does the reader a great service by proffering important, if partial, insights that are too often overlooked. His varying emphases presumably can be harmonized within the sort of
complex ethic that is required for contemporary decision-making, but B. does not here provide such an ethic.

*Weston School of Theology, Mass.* **EDWARD COLLINS VACEK, S.J.**


Nessan thinks liberation theology is valid, but also considers certain North American criticisms well founded. To show this, he presents a conceptualization of liberation theology, an examination of North American theological responses to it, and a judgment on which critical responses hold up.

Part 1 treats the "starting point and basic presuppositions" of liberation theology and its method. Here N. gives lucid, though standard, descriptions of liberation theology's social context, method of biblical interpretation, criticism of Western philosophy and theology, and understanding of praxis. Noteworthy are his analyses of dependency theory (its evolution and architects—Frank, Dos Santos, Cardoso, Galtung) and of liberation theology's selective use of Marxism (Marx's ethical humanism, social analysis, critique of religion, theory of class struggle, analysis of capitalism, and emphasis on praxis are accepted; his atheistic, deterministic, and reductionistic theories of dialectical and historical materialism, as well as the Marxist-Leninist tendency toward authoritarianism, are rejected). N. draws his generalizations from a substantial bibliography of Latin American theologians (complete up to 1985); Jose Miguez Bonino, Gustavo Gutiérrez, Enrique Dussel, Clodovis Boff, and Juan Luis Segundo govern his discussion.

In part 2, N. compiles the merits and demerits of liberation theology from the viewpoints of several North American theologians. Sympathetic ideas are examined in the works of Richard Shaull, James Cone, Frederick Herzog, Robert McAfee Brown, Rosemary Radford Ruether, Ronald Sider, Jim Wallis, and Alfred Krass. These theologians resonate to liberation theology for various reasons: its emphasis on the prophetic element in Judeo-Christian tradition, its attention to God's action in history, its use of social analysis, its praxis orientation. Criticism of liberation theology, ranging from total (James Schall) to partial (Ruether), is organized around six themes: inappropriate use of Marx (Schall, Marc Kolden, Ruether), misunderstanding of democratic capitalism (Michael Novak, Robert Benne), insufficient sense of Christian realism (Thomas Sanders, Dennis McCann), faulty notion of the kingdom of God (Richard John Neuhaus, Carl Braaten), poor scriptural
exegesis (Carl Armerding, John Howard Yoder), and lack of an evangelical perspective (C. Peter Wagner, Carl Henry, Donald Blosch). Though classification and analysis of secondary literature is a common method in current writings by Christian ethicists, N.’s walk through the contemporary theological galleria is a bit tedious—making and remaking points for and against liberation theology several times over.

In N.’s view, liberation theology is a “significant contemporary theological option” validated both in its sincere use of Christian Scripture and tradition, and in its honest attempt at understanding the impact of Latin American poverty on Christianity itself. Some North American theologians have fabricated an “undifferentiated” caricature of the movement, falsely convicting it on charges of veiled Marxism, cynical biblical interpretation, and eschatological leveling. Those with more nuanced understandings of liberation theology nevertheless raise four critical challenges. Latin American theologians would do well to clarify (1) their philosophical framework (Thomistic? Hegelian? Process? Teilhardian?), (2) their theological method (What is the relationship between Christian truth claims and Christian witness?), (3) their theological anthropology (What impact does personal sinfulness have on movements of both oppression and liberation?), and (4) their concept of liberation (What is the relationship between spiritual redemption and social emancipation?).

N.’s arguments are cogent, though clearly premised on the conceptualization of liberation theology offered at the outset.

The opening section is suitable as an introduction to liberation theology for advanced undergraduate and graduate students. The latter would also be stimulated by the issues raised in the concluding section. The title of the book is inexact: beyond simply recording North American responses to liberation theology, N. constructs a judicious defense of the movement. In addition, no treatment of the relationship between liberation theology and the concept “heresy” (nor the latter’s correlation with orthopraxis) appears.

Loyola University of Chicago

MICHAEL J. SCHUCK


Oden has spent much of his writing career trying to show that modern pastoral care’s dependence on psychotherapeutic models of healing is unnecessary. His consistent argument is that the resources internal to the Christian tradition already contain what these therapies have to offer, and more. Most recently he has been mining the field of classic pastoral care with his analysis of Pope Gregory the Great and in the four-volume series to which the present title belongs.
The structure of O.'s book is clear. He identifies nine themes and devotes a chapter to each; in each chapter the theme is divided into several subtopics. The bulk of the text consists of quotations from authors throughout the first 1800 years of Christianity, the majority of references coming from the patristic era. O. ties these excerpts together with brief comments which usually sum up the preceding quotation and lead into the next one. His overall purpose is to show "that many essential elements of psychotherapeutic care were well understood before the modern period."

O.'s familiarity with these classic texts is evident and impressive. He often gives lengthy excerpts to allow the style and insight of the ancient author to speak for itself. He selects freely from Western and Eastern sources, mixes Roman Catholic and Protestant authors, and draws upon well-known as well as somewhat obscure writers. His own immersion in and respect for this body of literature permeates every page. His labor is certainly a reminder to contemporary pastors and pastoral theologians that there is a Christian pastoral-care tradition before Freud. Unfortunately, this volume says little more.

There are three major drawbacks in O.'s approach. First, his retrieval of the classical tradition is almost entirely at the level of definitions and self-evident principles such as the need for timing one's counsel, the necessity of taking into account the specific differences of each individual, the willingness both to confront ("admonish" is O.'s term) and to comfort counselees. He seems too busy trying to lessen the influence of contemporary psychotherapists to draw any really practical helps for busy pastors from the classical tradition.

Second, much of the material quoted implies that the counselor stands apart from the counselee and bears a solitary responsibility before God for the counselee's well being. The constant reference (by O., not just his selected authors) to the counselee as "a soul" carries echoes of a tragic dualism which modern psychology has helped to overcome.

Third, and most distressing, Oden presents his excerpts in a proof-text manner. He rarely gives the context for the statements and pays no attention to the fact that authors in the first, fourth, eighth, thirteenth, or eighteenth centuries might not be talking about the same thing even though it sounds like transference, repressionism, projection, behavior modification, or object relations. The compulsion of his thesis seems to drive O. into an anachronistic reading of his sources. There is no critical appreciation or interpretation of the passages offered as evidence that the classic tradition anticipated the modern insights of psychotherapy. Moreover, the individual passages are cited as if the whole pastoral tradition were of one mind on these points. O.'s comments between excerpts could have supplied this critical framework and provided the
nuance that the original authors could not be expected to offer. Instead, he uses the space to paraphrase the original quotation and raise the question or plant the thought which the next quote will address.

When John Henry Newman listed the eight tests for development of doctrine which he gleaned from the Church's history, he cited as the fourth "an early anticipation," meaning an inchoate glimpse of what would later become more explicit. O. has shown the early anticipation of modern psychotherapy in the pastoral tradition, but he has overstated its presence there and failed to follow its development into the rich field of pastoral care today. If he could unite his fascination with the classics to a historical-critical reading of them, and if he could overcome his suspicion of modern psychotherapy long enough to see its benefits to pastoral care, he would achieve more persuasively what he set out to do.

Center for Theological Reflection
Madeira Beach, Florida


My copy of Vempeny's volume contains an insert from the publishers which advises readers that this book "is not to be read from beginning to end like a biography." Rather, it is useful in other ways: as a handy reference book; for interreligious dialogue; for Hindus and Christians who wish to learn about each other's religion; as a present to a Hindu or Christian friend, especially to a couple of mixed-marriage; for materials for speeches to mixed audiences esp. on national festivals and celebrations; and as a drawing-room book. However useful these recommendations might prove in practice, their immediate value is to highlight the pragmatic and versatile nature of this large and learned study.

After a section on the methodology of the study of religion, which rightly stresses the communal aspect of religions, V. focuses on the figures of Kṛṣṇa and Christ, each located in a scriptural context. He examines the Bhagavad Gītā as a classic religious text, sets it in its proper context, and discusses Kṛṣṇa as presented in it; he similarly introduces the New Testament and treats of Christ in that context. Both texts and figures are competently analyzed in terms of four basic concepts: ultimate reality, world, man, and salvation. V. then narrows his focus to the often compared concepts of avatāra, indicating Kṛṣṇa's multiple descents into this world as promised in the Gītā, and incarnation, as presented in the New Testament. His careful analysis should discourage vague generalizations about similarities; his precise comments on the claims of the Gītā about the reality of avatāra should discourage the notion that only Christianity has a world-affirming commitment.

In an important step beyond the classical texts themselves, V. also
sketches briefly how Kṛṣṇa and Christ were treated by their religious traditions. He introduces two saints, one male and one female, from each tradition: Francis of Assisi and Teresa of Avila, and Narsi Mehta and Mirabai. These examples whet our appetite for more; were the book not already so large, one might ask for more attention to the local, popular forms of each religion.

V. then asks how Hindus and Christians might sort out and respond to the similarities and differences discovered in these texts. He suggests various distinctions and perspectives which may help us to recognize differences while minimizing conflict. Thus, although both avatāra and incarnation entail fact and value, Christianity stresses the fact-aspect of the Incarnation, Hinduism the value-aspect of avatāra; each tradition can learn something from the other on how to think and talk about God in the world. In a remarkably imaginative chapter, V. suggests that the playfulness of Kṛṣṇa, symbolized by the flute, can enrich the Christian understanding of God's work, while Hindus can learn from the suffering of Christ, symbolized by the cross.

This carefully constructed background sets the stage for his final plea: since concern for the world is in keeping with the fundamental truths of each tradition, vigorous religious dialogue must include active co-operation on social and justice issues. Indeed, the whole book points to this appeal; for V.'s goal is not a comparative study of Kṛṣṇa and Christ, but rather the construction of a framework in which dialogue and shared action can occur. The book is meant to help create this situation; though massive and scholarly, it is meant to be carried about and used, tested, argued, and applied in many different situations.

A final observation on the book itself: one of its strengths is that it is clearly the fruit of personal study and reflection. But this also means that V. is not merely reporting; he is also constructing a version of Hinduism and Christianity out of his personal synthesis. Specialists in either tradition may feel that despite his honest assessment of differences, V. reads a great deal of harmony into his research, and that, in particular, he is always the Jesuit who reads Hindu texts with Christian eyes, formulating a Hinduism with which Christianity can dialogue and cooperate. It would be interesting to pair this book with a comparable volume written by a Hindu.

I conclude by suggesting three ways in which the book can be of use to theologians outside India. First (although even the nonspecialist should never depend entirely on secondary sources for knowledge of other religions), Kṛṣṇa and Christ can serve as a good place to start in acquiring a reliable understanding of the Gītā and its religion of Kṛṣṇa.

Second, it is an excellent example of liberation theology in the Indian context. It is rooted in texts, values, and practices specific to India. It
generates its operative concepts out of the Hindu tradition as well as the Christian. It does not rely too heavily on European notions of "history," "progress," "the person," etc., and when it does use such terms, it weaves them into a very Indian fabric. Throughout, it is energized with a zeal for the transformation of this world, yet remains steadfastly theological. Indians will have to be the final judges of how authentically Indian the book is, but for now I do not hesitate to recommend it to anyone who wants to understand liberation theology better by placing the Latin American experience in a comparative context.

Finally, this rich comparative work may also help us to do theology (as distinct from its many subdisciplines) better, i.e. it may actually teach us something about God. V.'s reflections on Kṛṣṇa and Christ, and on how attention to the one enriches our commitment to the other, can enhance our appreciation of God's work in today's world, our skill in finding new contexts for our faith, and our ability to put both into words. The NT has been read "after the Gītā" many times, Christ and Kṛṣṇa have been compared endlessly; this fresh volume makes more persuasive the case that this can be done well, and that we miss a great deal if we neglect to do so.

Boston College

FRANCIS X. CLOONEY, S.J.

SHORTER NOTICES


Miller combines several of his recent essays on the subject of depatriarchalizing biblical religion into a study that provides a thoughtful and serious caveat to liberal theologians who would dispense with the Father metaphor in future God-talk. His book stands virtually alone as a scholarly rejoinder to a host of feminist studies and theological articles which urge the elimination of all masculine metaphors for God, especially the central Christian image of "Father." This calm, rational, and respectful study provides a needed and valuable reflection on the meaning and value of God's fatherhood, and what this important image in turn means for human parenting.

M. claims that the father-involved family culturally cannot be taken for granted, but is rather a fragile social achievement attained relatively recently in human history. Contrary to those who would automatically assume that the patriarchal family represents oppression and domination, he demonstrates that such an arrangement historically proved utterly central to healthy child-rearing and ultimately to the creation of a sane social fabric. M. holds that the strong father-image of God presented in biblical literature not only amounts to an almost unique theological attainment in antiquity, but represents one of the most valuable gifts of Jewish culture to later genera-
tions in modeling the family-involved father. For M., Israel’s faith in God the Father helped create new modes of fathering as men in the Judeo-Christian tradition overcame their primitive alienation from the family and took on full responsibilities to their families in obedience to the biblical message. He assures us that genuine biblical fathering is a blessing to family life, not the curse claimed by some.

M. is as familiar with current biblical scholarship as with the latest psychological research on the role of fathers. The writing is admirably even-tempered, yet quietly forceful in its conclusions. Clergy, scholars, and the public alike would benefit from careful attention to M.’s findings and cautions before allowing themselves to be unduly influenced by the theological hostility to masculinity so fashionable today.

PATRICK M. ARNOLD, S.J.
University of San Diego


Who speaks Christ? Whose voice has a right to be heard? For Mesters, a Dutch Carmelite who has worked for the past 20 years among base Christian communities in Brazil, it is the voice of the people and especially of the poor and marginated. The “people’s reading of the Gospel in the context of life” is powerfully transformative of the people themselves and is consequently very threatening both to the world of generals and capitalists and increasingly to the Church as constituted by authorities both hierarchical and exegetical. “The world is growing afraid of you, defenseless flower!”

The book revolves around the central insight that there are three forces in constant tension, so that “the heart of the problem” in interpreting the Bible is the integration of all three: (1) the “pre-text”: solidarity with the actual lived experience of the people; (2) the “con-text”: the ongoing tradition of the community of faith; and (3) the “text”: the critical approach of scientific exegesis. Clear preference is given to the people’s experience as a method correlative to the way the Fathers of the Church read the Bible, so that scientific exegesis must reorient itself to be in service to the people. “Despite all its defects and failings, this reading of the Bible by the poor creates a new context which enables academic exegesis to rediscover its mission in the church” (159).

The book’s great value is the insight it offers into the process of reading the Bible in the base communities. However, it overdraws contemporary exegetes’ concern with the “letter” rather than the “spirit,” and it virtually ignores the advances of contemporary hermeneutics (Pope Paul VI was not the first nor the only “authority” to insist on the contemporary meaning of the text). Finally, the book is rather repetitive, as it consists of four essays composed between 1977 and 1980.

MICHAEL L. COOK, S.J.
Gonzaga University, Spokane


Garrett tackles the problem of the demonic in Luke-Acts and robs it of its power to confound interpreters. She starts with a good summary of previous work on the topic. Some studies of magic in the NT have employed anthropological methodology, and G. is critical of them. She prefers a combination of ethnography with a literary approach. She presents the substance of her own argument in chapter 2: overcoming Satan and other demons is essential to the work of Jesus and his
followers. The battle, which predates Jesus' earthly ministry, is renewed in the temptation account, where Jesus forces Satan to retreat for a while. The conflict is resumed in the passion, and Satan is finally overcome in Jesus' death, resurrection, and exaltation.

G. also examines stories in Acts about Peter and Simon Magus, Paul and Bar-Jesus, and the seven sons of Sceva, all of which suggest that Jesus' followers continue to exercise power over the forces of evil. Finally, she relates Luke's view of Satan's defeat to the concerns of his community. The theological message is that the victory of Jesus and his followers has rendered Satan and his minions powerless against Christians; they have nothing to fear. The apologetic message is that if Jesus and his followers are accused of magical practices themselves, their opposition to and defeat of magic refutes those charges.

G.'s presentation is not without its problems. The forces of evil, Satan, the devil, demons, and magic are generally identified with one another. She draws little distinction between generic and personified evil. Also, G. presents magic as a widespread and complicated phenomenon in the Greco-Roman world, and claims that Luke gives it considerable attention. But it is nowhere treated in his Gospel, and it seems peripheral to two of the three accounts which mention it in Acts. G. herself has shown that false prophecy is more central than magic in the Simon Magus and Bar-Jesus stories. Despite these reservations, G. has written an enlightened account of the role of the demonic and its demise in Luke-Acts, one that must be consulted before further work is done.

ALAN C. MITCHELL, S.J.
Georgetown University


Some Johannine scholars persist in attempts to isolate an early version of John's Gospel which consists of miracle stories and passion-resurrection materials. This hypothetical "signs Gospel" was supposedly formulated while the Johannine community was still in Palestine. Miracles were viewed as persuasive evidence for their messianic claims about Jesus.

Von Wahlde's book is a popularized version of scholarly articles that he has written over the years claiming to develop patterns of speech and theological perspectives by which to find the earliest version of John's Gospel. He adheres to his listed criteria rigorously, even though the resulting construction includes polemical material that even those exegetes who share his agenda reject. Unlike most exegesis, he refuses to allow the question of parallels between Johannine and Synoptic material or form-critical study of miracle traditions to enter the picture.

Scholars will turn to the author's articles and to the academic treatment of this problem published by Robert Fortna in The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor. Von Wahlde's first and last sections might be assigned to beginning graduate classes for their treatment of Johannine language.

PHEME PERKINS
Boston College


A new English translation of 84 hymns of the pivotal religious figure in the fourth-century Syriac world, grouped under three broad headings: "On the Nativity," "Against Julien," and "On Virginity." McVey offers an insightful historical, theological, and literary introduction, with an up-to-date bibliography, detailed summaries
before each of the hymns, and copious notes explaining significant or obscure points in the text.

This is a welcome addition to the Classics of Western Spirituality. For although E. is widely acclaimed by very divergent religious and cultural traditions, his works are almost unknown in English. M.'s selection of hymns is good, though I would have preferred other metrical and prose works in place of several in the present collection. Her translation, based on E. Beck's critical edition, is for the most part clear, reliable, and, if read slowly, inspiring. Considering the inherent obstacles involved in every attempt to translate the beauty and power of a metrical homily from one language to another, her achievement is commendable.

The hymns chosen are especially valuable for the knowledge they provide about fourth-century use of symbols and types and for their extended treatment of Mary's virginal conception. My only major reservation about the work is that I believe it needed some detailed exposition in the introduction about the poetic nature and structure of E.'s hymns beyond what can be culled from McVey's notes and commentaries. I highly recommend this edition for scholars, libraries, and those seeking to be inspired by a religious, poetic genius.

FREDERICK G. MCLEOD, S.J.
Saint Louis University


In an earlier volume Maier covered the origins of the Donatist schism (TS 50 [1989] 201). The present volume covers the period of the most extensive written controversial material, i.e. the time of Optatus and Augustine, the principal theological warriors against Donatism. Herein lies part of the ques-

...
In this attractively printed and manufactured volume, McMahon would integrate borrowings from a number of other students of the *Confessions*, Durling and Stephany most notable among them, by viewing the allegorical interpretation of Genesis 1–2 which Augustine gives in Book 13 as presenting the nine “divine acts” which provide hermeneutical clues for understanding the first nine (“autobiographical”) books of the work. (The same allegory applies to Books 10–12, but from a different bias.) To make this device work, though, M. must distinguish between Augustine as “speaker” (and pray-er) and Augustine as “author.” The “author” plots and structures each earlier book to “match” the appropriate “act” in the allegory, but since the “speaker” is immersed in a more unstructured dialogue with the mysteriously providential God, M. can account for any looseness in the “match” by appealing to the unpredictabilities of prayerful dialogue, which also mirror the surface confusions characterizing any human life, however providentially ordered. M. is aware that this intricate conception of Augustine’s “literary form” could permit him to give with the left what he takes with the right. And while everyone will admit that Augustine was capable of artful ingenuities, especially of a numerological sort, some of the concrete examples of such ingenuity which M. asks us to swallow don’t digest very easily.

He seems quite on target, though, in stressing Augustine’s metaphorical language and the Neoplatonic “return” of the soul to its “Origin” as a major thematic strand in the *Confessions*. It is less clear how he conceives of that origin, and specifically why he denies eternity as a property of the “heaven of heaven” when Augustine clearly alludes to it as the soul’s eternal home, *domus nostra, aeternitas tua* (4, 31), from which the soul originally “flowed downward” (13, 9). But following that lead would have brought M. into deep waters indeed, and called into question other features of his theory.

ROBERT J. O’CONNELL, S.J.
*Fordham University*


Detweiler sets out “to read some examples of contemporary narrative fiction, along with a few older texts, from a religious perspective that interacts with post-formalist theory” (xiii). He offers readings of Percy, Updike, Kafka, Borges, Atwood, and others. D. derives his model of religious reading from Clifford Geertz, Mikhail Bakhtin, Stanley Fish, and Kenneth Burke. A religious reading is foundational. It creates a “community of readers and writers”—that is, a community formed upon narrative and ritual: “A religious reading . . . would be one in which a reader understands herself as part of a community engaged in simultaneously recognizing, criticizing and reshaping the myths and rituals it lives by” (38). Such a community, in the terms of Detweiler’s pun, “seeks in its fictions to brake/break the fall into meaninglessness and death” (xv).

The chapter “Sacred Texts/Sacred Space” offers genuinely illuminating insights into the relationship of sacred texts to sacred space. Paradoxically, we discover texts, D. says, through the process of making and finding meaning. It seems to this reader that central to D.’s model of “religious reading” is a concept (though he doesn’t use the phrase) of textual intimacies: texts, like persons, become meaningful as we make “space” for them and as they create the spaces in which we live and have our being. Surely an apt analogy
for the way our tradition engages its primary text—the Word that is Christ.

D. is conversant with a wide spectrum of postcritical methods, though occasionally he leans too heavily upon his theories. One example. Attempting to elucidate the meaning of Atwood’s fictional theocracy, A Handmaid’s Tale, D. overlooks its essentially economic motivation. Consequently he misses some of Atwood’s intentional ambiguity and misreads the text’s irony. Further, D. grants the Tale a unity it does not possess, since Atwood makes clear that scholars must "recon­struct" the narrative from a jumble of unmarked recording tapes. Atwood in­tends here, I think, to explore the way a culture "constructs" its foundational texts, while criticizing the economic and political purposes (readings) they are pressed to serve. Reading religiously, Atwood suggests, does not al­ways set us free.

EDWARD J. INGEBRETSEN, S.J.
Georgetown University


Festschrifts are a notoriously difficult genre. Hunter is to be commended for turning this occasion of honoring Walter Burghardt into a useful set of articles. The title does accurately reflect what one finds within. Even the exceptions are appropriate. Gerald Foy­garty provides the opening encomium; Charles Kannengiesser examines the Festal Letters of Athanasius rather than the homilies, given the disputed status of the latter; Joseph Kelly, in the absence of patristic homiletic material, examines the impact of Scripture on the Irish religious consciousness with Gaelic "abandon." The technical quality of the eleven articles is generally quite good, even while they have been kept accessible to a larger audi­ence (translations of the Latin texts in Kelly’s article would have enhanced this aspect of the collection).

Compromises were necessitated by the brief scope of the articles; each of the authors has made his or her own. Joseph Fitzmyer focuses only on Paul and Luke; Joseph Lienhard effectively evokes Origen’s third-century homiletic context with a few notes on his homiletic methodology; Kannengiesser and Agnes Cunningham provide surveys of their material; Gerard Ettlinger and Francis X. Murphy offer insight into the style and personality of their subjects; Robert Eno and Hunter deal in their articles with homilies oc­casioned by specific events (the latter may be the best essay in the collection); Edward Kilmartin deals with a specific theological issue and does not bring contemporary works of Augustine to bear. The overall effect is to produce an enjoyable sampler on the topic of patristic preaching rather than a sus­tained effort following a narrow method­ology or issue. This will be an excel­lent beginning work for those interested in the area, providing abundant references and bibliography for further study.

EARL C. MULLER, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee


After explaining the distinct meaning and function of anagogy among the polysemous structures Dante attributes to his Comedy, Saly traces the stages of human spiritual development. This development takes two directions: inner growth into the depth of one’s being, and outer growth toward the eternal Being. S.’s structure is based on Joach­imism and Neoplatonism, with both of which he believes Dante’s spirituality was primarily imbued. S.’s anagogical
THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

concept is poetically beautiful and psychologically interesting as applied to the hidden intricacies of the human spirit.

S.'s interpretation is original, indeed unique, in the history of Dantine criticism. Commentators on the Comedy have generally applied polysemous structures only to single portions and expressions, and looked for allegorical meaning only in a generic sense. No one before S. seems to have attempted an anagogical explanation of the Paradiso as a whole, running consecutively through its 33 cantos. How close is S.'s explanation to Dante's intention?

In interpreting the Comedy, in whole or in part, either in a generic allegorical sense or according to the three mystical levels (allegorical, tropological, and anagogical), one must interpret Dante by Dante and explain him by the sources from which he derived his moral and theological formation. Aquinas, one of Dante's sources for the polysemous interpretation, excludes the application of spiritual or mystical meaning to human writings, because only Scripture relates to faith, Christian life, and eternal salvation (Quodl. 7, a. 16). In the Convivio Dante himself avoids such application; only in his Letter to Can Grande does he report a polysemous interpretation for a single verse of one psalm. After studying the only two passages in which Dante theorized on the various senses of a writing, Bruno Nardi concluded a half century ago: "Any attempt to draw out from Dante's Comedy the mystical senses which the Hebrew and Christian theologians used to extract from the Bible is ... simply cabalistic."

Saly's book is the work of a poet who conveys enthusiastically to the reader his own psychological and spiritual reactions to a text in which Dante has marked the gradual stages by which human beings reach both their own depths and the heights of the Supreme Being. Though S. goes beyond Dante's provable intentions, many readers will enjoy his work.

LOUIS M. LA FAVIA
Catholic University of America


Genuinely interdisciplinary approaches are always exciting. Gibson uses drama, art, mysticism, Marian devotion, and sociology to illuminate East Anglian piety and culture in the 15th century. Her justification for this regional study cogently reminds medievalists that they, like modern tourists, need to look outside London. The rich, wool-trading counties of Norfolk and Suffolk had a splendid artistic and literary life, supported by great monasteries, such as Bury St. Edmunds, and private citizens, including three important patrons G. particularly examines. Her theme, "theater of devotion," not only considers the role of East Anglian drama in English literature (e.g., the N-Town Mystery cycle) but also expands "theater" to encompass liturgy, iconography, daily life, and mysticism, reflecting what G. terms a highly incar-national emphasis in 15th-century piety. She argues that 15th-century Anglians were not increasingly secular in their outlook; instead, they were devoutly trying to "sanctify the secular."

This is a very appealing book—the wealth of primary evidence alone makes it noteworthy. While not every scholar will agree with all G.'s conclusions, my own reservations are relatively minor. Occasionally I find her use of evidence overly sanguine, especially with wills. When G. argues, "[such] testament preambles are one of the surest barometers of change in the religious convictions" leading to the Reformation (70), I am not so sure. I recall unhappily discovering in a long-
past tutorial that such evidence has proven extremely contentious in determining the religious temper of England. But this hardly detracts from G.’s main argument, especially given the intriguing devotional bequests she cites from these testaments.

It may also seem odd to favor Margery Kempe and not discuss Dame Julian of Norwich, though here G.’s point links Margery’s apparent outbursts with their devotional—and “theatrical”—genesis in the popular Meditaciones vitae Christi of Pseudo-Bonaventure, which is an important insight. Clearly this book is useful for students of many aspects of medieval life.

J. F. R. Day
Troy State University, Alabama


Well known for his defense and articulation of Catholic teaching, Robert Cardinal Bellarmine’s reputation as a spiritual writer has been sadly neglected. Teske and Donnelly fill this unfortunate lacuna by providing an excellent translation of two ascetical treatises from B.’s later years, The Ascent of the Mind to God and The Art of Dying Well. The Ascent, first published in 1615, charts the correct course the soul takes through creation, its progress towards a fuller understanding of the infinite power, wisdom, mercy, and justice of the Creator. B.’s Art, written in 1619, continues within the tradition of Ars moriendi literature, although additions were made which aligned the work closer to Tridentine concerns. B. identifies the necessary preparations for a “happy death” as a life spent in good works and participation in the sacraments, both equally as important as the deathbed ministrations described in the earlier Ars manuals.

These translations will serve as a valuable tool. Current historiography, especially those studies concerned with popular religion of early modern Europe, have promoted further investigations into the world of 16th- and 17th-century piety. The Spanish mystics of this period are well known, but the works of Italian spiritual writers remain obscure. This obscurity has deprived historians and theologians of a fuller understanding of this crucial period. Donnelly’s admirable introduction not only situates these writings within B.’s work, but also identifies their immense popularity and influence for both Catholic and Protestant readers. These lively and readable translations reanimate B.’s texts for 20th-century readers, justifying their inclusion in Paulist’s Classics of Western Spirituality series.

MICHAEL W. MAHER, S.J.
University of Minnesota


Two doctors of theology of the Sorbonne, who were Gallicans in ecclesiology and tended to Jansenism in their theology of grace, dialogued for some three years with William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury. They did so largely through the Anglican chaplain of the British embassy in Paris, William Beauvoir, but also with personal letters. Sundry personages, from the British ambassador to the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, eventually intervened one way or another. Grès-Gayer has grouped 148 documents relating to this correspondence. These are chiefly in French, English, and Latin, with a few in Italian. Most of them have never before been printed, though a number have been quoted here and there. The present archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie, has written the preface. G. has composed a historical introduction and supplied documentary footnotes, the photostatic
reproduction of one document, a long list of archival material, an exhaustive bibliography, and an index.

The protagonists were discussing the possibility of reconciling the churches of England and of France without consulting the pope. But the French theologians were not prepared to reject the principle of papal authority, however strenuously they held to the traditional privileges of the Church of France. The material is therefore divided into four episodes: “Hopes,” “Toward a Schism,” “Failure,” “Dispersion.”

This documentation is invaluable for the history of Anglican-Roman Catholic relations. The Commonitorium of Ellies du Pin on the Thirty-Nine Articles bears comparison with the parallel studies of the Articles by Christopher Davenport and John Henry Newman.

GEORGE H. TAVARD
Assumption Center, Brighton, Mass.


Dick’s doctoral dissertation at Louvain places in their historical context conversations held unofficially between the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church under the aegis of Cardinal Mercier at Malines at periods from 1921 until 1925. Dick’s research is accurate and his referenced documentation complete. The work has six chapters, a brief conclusion, and seven documentary appendices.

Dick first outlines Anglican-Roman Catholic relations from the DuPin-Wake Correspondences of 1717-19 to the death of Herbert Cardinal Vaughan in 1903. He then narrates the complex interweaving of the work of Abbé Portal and Lord Halifax with the rise of the world-wide ecumenical movement and the Lambeth Conference of 1920, finishing with a sketch of the First Malines Conversation, December 1921.

Today one would call this meeting an exploratory dialogue to see if conversations could take place. Next he studies in detail the Second and Third Conversations, both held in 1923, and gives detailed background for the Fourth Conversation, May 1925, showing why the Conversations ceased. Dick brings the narrative of events up to Halifax’ death in 1934. The work ends with a brief, judicious summary of Dick’s research and seven valuable documentary appendices, including the full text of Dom Lambert Beauduin’s “L’Eglise anglicane unie non absorbée,” which Cardinal Mercier read approvingly to the participants in the Fourth Malines Conversation.

Dick’s work does not supplant but complements Aubert’s classic Les conversations de Malines, which appeared over 20 years ago. Dick correctly judges how the experience of the Malines Conversations greatly benefited both the Anglican Communion and the Roman Catholic Church in their current official bilateral dialogue of the last 22 years.

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


Miller effectively argues that both in his person and in his theology, especially his theology of revelation, Rosenzweig made an enormous contribution to the Jewish-Christian dialogue. As a Jew about to convert to Christianity, R. recognized during a Yom Kippur service in Berlin that no one can come to God except through Christ, yet Israel as a people is already with God. R. decided to remain a Jew, but this decision was not a rejection of Christianity,
which he perceived as a true and authentic religion.

Rosenzweig considered revelation to be dialogical in content rather than informational, i.e. revelation does not provide us with new knowledge but with a new relationship, a different orientation, a deeper love. This in turn points to the possibility of different modes of relationship or love, each of which might be valid. M. traces the development of this dialogical understanding of revelation in R.'s early writings, in his epic *The Star of Redemption*, and in his correspondence, especially with Hans Ehrenberg, his cousin and close friend who converted to Christianity in 1910. The dual covenant implicit in R.'s theology of revelation has profound implications for the Jewish-Christian dialogue. No longer does the acceptance of one faith imply the rejection of the other; no longer must the "good news" of Christianity be "bad news" for the Jews.

M. concludes with an analysis of Jewish-Christian relations, especially from a Catholic perspective since Vatican II. Much of what has taken place over the last 25 years testifies to the validity of Rosenzweig's insights into revelation and establishes M.'s contention that in him we have a solid foundation and guide for the future of Jewish-Christian understanding.

DONALD J. MOORE, S.J.
*Fordham University*


This study explores mainly cultural, geographic, and historical factors related to Christian pilgrimages to shrines in 16 European countries over the past 2000 years. Interpretation of patterns of pilgrimage to 6150 active shrines is presented in chapters arranged around central topics: categories of shrines and their geographic distribution; types of pilgrimages (individual and communal) as related to tourism and to annual or liturgical seasons; inception and development of shrines across six historical periods; the holy persons (Christ, Mary, saints) historically or symbolically associated with shrines of particular times and places; the sacred objects (primarily relics and images) which serve as focal points of veneration; the events, miracles, or legends connected with origins and growth of shrines and pilgrimages; and the relation of shrines to nearby communities and to environmental features (e.g., mountains, water, trees, stones, and caves).

The Nolans show that changes in pilgrimage activities have coincided with major events and shifts in European history, and they demonstrate how pilgrimage traditions have influenced the arts, science, literature, and philosophy. Although this study here and there shows how Christian pilgrimage to shrines reflects ideas about God, devotional life, and Christian living, prospective readers should note that no sustained attention is given to theological factors concerning popular devotions and the cult of Christ and of saints.

Thoroughly researched and clearly written, this book is amply enriched with illustrations, tables, maps, detailed notes, and a full index; it ends with an extensive bibliography of pertinent works from many languages.

GEORGE P. EVANS
*St. John's Seminary, Mass.*


This collection of essays from the faculty of the Lutheran School of Theology in Chicago addresses the issue of theological language from the perspectives of the various disciplines repre-
sent on a seminary faculty. The themes of the cross, the Trinity and its representation, the appropriateness of “Father” for God, and the multiple ways the tradition has invoked the name of God run through the essays.

Carl Braaten and Karen Bloomquist solidly and serviceably summarize, respectively, the problems and prospects in contemporary Christian systematic theologies and explicitly feminist Christian theology. Robert Bertram tentatively explores the implications of recognizing that God is not merely “parent” but also, because of the Incarnation, irrevocably “child.”

However, the essays are not much concerned with the problems and prospects which contemporary writing in philosophy of language, poststructuralist semiotics, or critical theory create for their disciplines or for Christians’ talk of God. E.g., Franklin Sherman collapses literal language and referential meaning (35), and the connections between texts, institutions, authorities, and interpretive practices are left unexplored, save for Bloomquist’s report that the “director of a shelter for battered women told some of our students that in that community the chief instrument used to batter women is the Bible. It is used to justify any means to subordinate women to men” (45). Most of the essays also fail to distinguish naming from addressing, invoking, mentioning, or referring to God.

Although the authors are concerned to help the Church address contemporary issues, their essays reflect more of where the discussions have been than where they are going.

Terrence W. Tilley
Florida State University


The authors, research clinical psychologists at the Medical Research Council Applied Psychology Unit, Cambridge, England, employ the contemporary paradigm of cognitive psychology to describe the processes involved in arriving at religious knowledge. Earlier approaches to the psychology of religion used Freudian, humanistic, or phenomenological theories, but W. & W. have achieved a first in articulating an explanation of how people experience religious insight from within the cognitive perspective. Written for both the serious scholar and the educated generalist interested in either psychology or religion, the authors’ clear and engaging style and explanations do not presume knowledge of theory or research, but supply for lacunae while informing throughout. They succeed in drawing analogies between religious and other modes of human knowing: e.g., like aesthetic perception, religious cognition demands both detachment from distracting preoccupations and a degree of emotional involvement leading to a heightened attentiveness. The best analogue, however, is provided by the development of personal insight, especially in psychotherapy.

Excellent literature reviews on the empirical researches into religion within the traditions of social psychology, child development, analysis of religious experience, Freud, Jung, and Winnicott provide a current context for W. & W. to discuss the relationship between faith and knowledge, emotional regulation and religious attentiveness, self-knowledge and knowledge of God, how to interpret the experience of prayer, and concepts of God. Objective and sympathetic throughout, they avoid the twin reductionist dangers of psychologism (religious activity is nothing but another behavior) and fideism (direct religious knowledge is impossible in the religious domain, only faith). They especially succeed in giving the reader a lively sense of participating in the back-and-
forth of argumentation between classical spokespersons on religion like Aquinas, the empiricists, the logical positivists, and recent theorists.

William J. Sneck, S.J.
Loyola College, Baltimore


Religious beliefs and traditions seem to provide or at least want to provide coherence and structure for a wide variety of intellectual, emotional, moral, and social experience. There exists, however, an obvious global diversity among religious traditions. Godlove's question, set in its broadest perspective, is whether our attempts to understand this diversity necessarily lead us to a theory of alternative conceptual schemes and its relativism, or can lead to a view of religions that opens up to a richer appreciation of the rationality of the religious attitude.

G. argues against the first and for the second. He constructs a composite case which is both polemical in its refutation of positions associated with Durkheim and constructive in its design of a more charitable approach to religious diversity. This case rests on three conditions: (1) If Donald Davidson is right that differences worth taking seriously are not possible outside of a network of equally important agreement, (2) if Kant's critical epistemology, properly interpreted, does not lead to relativism, and (3) if Davidson's exposition of the fallacy of a distinction between form and content does not conflict with Kant's views on the origin of knowledge, then it would follow that the role of religions as objective interpreters of experience is not undercut by their deep and evidently irreducible differences.

The scope of this project is so vast and it is argued at such a level of generality that its exposition seemed to this reader to be more of an agenda than a proof. I certainly found it more suggestive than convincing. Nevertheless, I believe this is an important book. Besides writing the obituary for an approach that was probably tied too closely to a narrow and passing fashion in philosophy, it points to a common core of objectivity whose presence in religions, in spite of their diversity, may be presumed because it must be presumed that human beings generally and for the most part make sense. G.'s approach is promising precisely because it begins by giving people the benefit of the doubt and by assuming that in a matter so important as religion they know what they are doing.

Jay Reuscher
Georgetown University


This fascinating book argues that the difference between "the passing world" and "the enduring word" touches on the very nature of religion. The enchanting power of words, so forcefully portrayed in the literary character of Don Quixote, will also regularly emerge in anyone's religious conversion. A new world opens up, and one is drawn to rest in an Eden of sacred texts, often with no clear sense of oneself and of the sense-world as having a reality of their own. King illustrates this phenomenon through the early writings of Thomas Merton, with their assertion that "the old world of our senses ... seems to us strange and remote and unbelievable," while "God himself becomes the only reality" (149, quoting from Seeds of Contemplation).

King's main point is that if such "enchantment" is a necessary condition for full Christian conversion, it is
nevertheless not sufficient. There must follow the difficult reappropriation of personal experience, when the sense-world may even reassert itself with all the force of a Zen awakening and the confusion that such awakening can engender. Since the claims of immediate experience can be just as pressing as those of verbal enchantment, one may try to escape the dilemma through an either-or choice: Quixote or Sancho Panza, Form or Matter, pure Eden (the early Merton) or pure Earth (Faust). Of course, neither extreme will do. King concludes by showing how both the Christian gospel and the later dialogues of Plato point the way to an appropriate affirmation of both worlds.

This challenging work will enable its readers better to understand their own spiritual journeys as well as contemporary tensions between fundamentalist and liberal Christians. One regrettable, if minor, weakness is that not all the works cited in abbreviated form within the text are listed in the bibliography, while some other abbreviations appear in two inconsistent forms.

JAMES A. WISEMAN, O.S.B.
Catholic University of America


In this contribution to the theology of nature, McDaniel gives particular attention to the status of animals. The task he sets for himself is twofold. First, he pursues the problem of theodicy: more specifically, he wishes to show how a loving God could allow the suffering characteristic of animal existence in the state of nature. Second, he makes a case for "postpatriarchal" Christianity that he believes would encourage Christians to be more sensitive to the needs of animals and the non-sentient environment.

To accomplish the first task, M. uses process thought and applies it to the case of white pelican chicks, nearly half of whom die to further the evolutionary ends of their species. To explain God's role in the suffering of these and other beings, M. appropriates process descriptions of God as providing opportunities for freedom and creativity rather than as dominating natural and historical events. While such domination might eliminate suffering, it would eliminate innovation as well. But aware that this benefit offers little comfort to the individual chick, M. asserts that Christianity must hold out hope for the redemption that can restore well-being and peace (shalom) to all creatures. M. also explains the necessity of postpatriarchal religion by pointing to the connection between the domination of women and the exploitation of nature. He suggests feminist theology as a model for the theology of nature, for feminist theology indicates how to incorporate into Christianity the concerns of those previously ignored.

M. uses a rich variety of sources to illuminate some of the most pressing problems facing contemporary Christians. His prose is lively and his scholarship careful. I would recommend this book to anyone interested in theological treatments of environmental issues.

MARY ELLEN ROSS
Trinity University, San Antonio


Perhaps one could say, as Wolfhart Pannenberg does in this book, referencing E. Schlink, that the Priestly editors of the Pentateuch in what they wrote in the first chapter of Genesis are our earliest examples of religious thinkers attempting to put the best science of their age in relationship with theological thought. Unfortunately, for Catholics ever since the Church's ruinous collision with Copernicanism and certainly since the almost equally bad
scene in handling Darwin, and for Protestants ever since the Enlightenment, theologians have run the other way when scientists appear.

Peters here presents a set of essays dedicated to the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. His contributors have refused to abandon the field of modern science as a topic for theological reflection. They search for domains of consonance, areas where what theology says of creation and what science says of the physical world seem to approach each other, seem to speak from different but noncolliding and parallel perspectives. Their work is eminently successful.

The most careful and magisterial offering is from Ian G. Barbour, already a major figure in this field. He studies contemporary cosmology, particularly Big Bang theory, which seems so curiously to mesh with the fundamental picture of Genesis. But the authors are not swept overboard by the fads of the day, for Robert John Russell points out that Big Bang cosmology may fit with Genesis but offers no insight into eschatology. If religious thinkers are not circumspect, they may like the beginning of science’s new book but feel just as uncomfortable with its ending.

FRANK R. HAIG, S.J.
Loyola College, Baltimore


A work of perfect theological poise, which makes it an ideal textbook. Perhaps the first self-standing American Catholic treatise De novissimis, it attempts almost complete coverage in a brief compass: Scripture, philosophical basis, the theology of death and related issues, the end of history, the final condition, the history-eschatology debate (Teilhard vs. Bouyer, the Christian-Marxist dialogue, harsh judgment on Moltmann, liberationists, a very balanced theology of history and of divine-human synergism).

Hayes distinguishes usefully between the early and later Rahner on eschatology (35), but the book as a whole does not draw the obvious conclusion that someone who could be so wrongheaded and dismissive of eschatology in his youth will not be a wholly reliable guide to the subject in his maturity; he will only approach it hesitantly. Yet Rahner and Ratzinger are the most frequently cited authors throughout this work and, along with the magisterium, are implicitly treated as normative. The OT chapter perhaps starts too far away from the theme of the book. The NT chapter suffers from a lack of joyful enthusiasm for and confidence in Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God, and from a persistent labeling of the kingdom as a metaphor, as though no information for a definition could be derived from Mt 6:10, 33 and Rom 14:17. Some apocalyptic language is surely symbolic, but it is symbolic of something. That something can be known from Scripture, at least in general terms. These terms are yet sufficiently specific to frighten tyrants. Hayes knows this, yet remains cautious. He could have taken more seriously his own excellent insight that Scripture can interpret and demythologize us, and that the kingdom is more than an empty symbol (130).

The historical overviews do not discuss Irenaeus, Kant, or Hegel. The rejections of rigid universalism and of reincarnation are well done. The principle from Rahner that eschatology speaks from the standpoint of the present (90, 176, 190) becomes a view that comes close to saying that eschatological statements are only Feuerbachian projections (194). The discussion of the beatific vision remains neutral on the Thomistic-Scotistic debate because it does not see that the question had been
badly posed by Augustine in the first place. If beatitude consists in a vision, a primarily cognitive act, Thomas must win. Only when the Gordian knot is cut by replacing vision language with kingdom language can Scotus win his innings. On grounds of pure lexical possibility, H. prefers to take \textit{parousia} as meaning “presence” (163), thereby neglecting its biblical contexts where it plainly means “arrival.” Despite these cavils, the book will be of profit to all, but especially to students.

\textbf{Benedict T. Viviano, O.P.} \\
\textit{Ecole Biblique, Jerusalem}


Hastings, professor of theology at the University of Leeds, served for many years as a Catholic missionary in Uganda, and has been associated with a number of universities, seminaries, and similar institutions in various countries of Africa. His book comprises twelve essays revolving around the history, development, problems, and prospects of the Church on that continent. Eleven of these, dating from 1974 to 1988, were previously published.

Although H.’s dominant concern is with the Roman Catholic Church, “Catholicism” in his title also embraces other major Christian bodies, especially the Anglican and Lutheran. The book has no unifying structure, but the topics it explores are interrelated. They deal with such issues as African culture and theology, translation of religious language, women in the Church, healing, justice in South Africa, and the impact of Vatican II.

Some themes resurface in several contexts. In general, H. contends that a clerical and ultramontane mentality seriously undercuts the Catholic Church’s fulfilment of its mission. Vatican II opened the way to greater pluralism and more flexible accommodation of local circumstances. Initially the Church in Africa responded enthusiastically to the new possibilities. But then an anxious conservatism foreclosed significant innovation and left the Church passive and conformist. In particular, he faults the Church’s insistence on an unmarried priesthood; among other things, this has led to a dearth of priests and it thus limits the access of rural Catholics to full sacramental life.

H. is exceptionally knowledgeable about religious and secular history and sociology over a wide expanse of Africa. He develops his ideas clearly and imaginatively. He tends, however, to be dismissive of church authorities who disagree with the weights he would assign to factors that enter their decisions. He may also be insufficiently hopeful about the future, not reckoning with currents now in circulation among African bishops that could open the way for fresh dynamism at the forthcoming African synod.

\textbf{Joseph C. McKenna, S.J.} \\
\textit{Fordham University}


Austrian missionary-theologian Staffner summarizes his theme in his subtitle: “Is a synthesis of Hinduism and Christianity possible?” His overall point, well taken and well proved, is that Hinduism is a civilization and social system which does not predetermine a particular religious creed, and Christianity is a religion with a definite creed but without a necessarily concomitant civilization or social system. Therefore, far from being mutually exclusive, the two can flourish together.

S. demonstrates this first by recounting the often thrilling biographies of several Hindus who became Christians but insisted, theoretically and
practically, on remaining sociocultural Hindus. S. next demonstrates his point by a historical essay which establishes that “Hinduism” (a word/idea invented by non-Hindus) became “a religion” only by reaction-formation to the encroaching religions of Islam and, especially, Christianity. But any synthesis that tries to make the Hindu tradition look like a single religion ends up being just a “small packet” of that vast tradition.

S.’s most distinctive and relatively new contribution comes in his final section, in which he reveals the legal disability incurred by Hindus who convert to Christianity—the exclusion of all their heirs from receiving any inheritance from his Hindu family-members. This obstacle to Hindu-Christian synthesis was not invented by Hindus, but developed in the circumstances of colonialism. Hence, says S., Christians should agitate to be reclassified under Hindu law, which (1) uses the word “Hindu” deliberately in the social, not the religious, sense, and (2) is a better law with respect to inheritance and other matters. This would be a reconciliatory move and would show that Christians are, and wish to be, thoroughly Indian.

My one strong criticism is that S. devotes a substantial section of the book (121–217) going against his own and others’ good advice by presenting his own “small packet” synthesis of Hindu religion, followed by a “small packet” of Christianity. This harms the book’s unity, clarity, and internal logic. Even so, S. has given us here a synthesis of a major religion and a major civilization, produced with high intelligence and heartfelt love.

JAMES D. REDINGTON, S.J.
Georgetown University
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Presenting This Issue

Our September issue features five articles (structure of moral understanding, doctrinal reform, Newman on infallibility, Gregory of Nyssa on marriage, and sacramentality of episcopal consecration) and two notes on principles of Bible translation.

**Revisionists, Deontologists, and the Structure of Moral Understanding** discusses recent debates over premoral norms, the direct/indirect distinction, exceptionless norms, intrinsic evil, and moral authority in terms of procedural criteria for data selection, classification, and values-prioritization in the empirical methods of moral theology. **KENNETH R. MELCHIN**, Ph.D. in religion from Concordia University, Montreal, is associate professor of moral theology in the faculty of theology at Saint Paul University, Ottawa, with particular interest in social and economic ethics, moral methodology, and Lonergan studies. His *History, Ethics and Emergent Probability* was published by the University Press of America in 1987.

**Narrative Contexts, Doctrinal Reform** rehearses the emergence of the term “doctrinal development,” examines how recent attention to plurality and discontinuities within history have contributed to the recent devaluation of a developmental model, and probes the significance of all this for theology today. **BRADFORD E. HINZE**, with a doctorate in theology from the University of Chicago, is assistant professor of theology at Marquette University, with special interest in modern and postmodern approaches to fundamental and systematic theology. He is currently studying recent attempts to rethink the nature of history, tradition, and interpretation.

**Newman on Infallibility** reveals how John Henry Cardinal Newman (the centenary of whose death we celebrated on August 11) consistently held that infallibility was the main tenet of the Roman Catholic system. Having first attacked the dogma as an Anglican, he later defended it, with many distinctions, as a Roman Catholic. His emphasis on the whole Church as the seat of infallibility anticipates Vatican II in some ways. **avery dulles, S.J., S.T.D.** from Rome’s Gregorian University, is Lawrence J. McGinley Professor of Religion and Society at Fordham University. Over four decades his particular contributions to theology have focused on revelation, faith, church, and ecumenism. His most recent book is *The Reshaping of Catholicism* (Harper & Row, 1988).

**Reconciliation of Body and Soul: Gregory of Nyssa’s Deeper Theology of Marriage**, an exegesis of what appear to be primarily negative opinions of marriage in Gregory’s *De virginitate*, uncovers a
more profound understanding of marriage that explains how a contemplative life of "nonattachment" is possible within marriage and how nonattachment in fact restores marriage to its true place in Christian life. It also explains how Gregory deliberately hides his full opinion with irony. MARK D. HART, Ph.D. from Boston College, is visiting assistant professor of theology at Seattle University, with particular interest in Christian Platonism and the impact of ancient political philosophy on early Christian theology.

The Sacramentality of Episcopal Consecration asks how that particular sacrament is a sign or sacrament of the Church. It locates the fulness of sacramental ordination in membership in the episcopal college. The college in turn sacramentalizes the communion of particular churches. Thus the sacrament of order signifies the nature of the Church viewed as a communion of communions. SUSAN WOOD, S.C.L., with a doctorate from Marquette University, is associate professor of theology at Saint Mary College, Leavenworth, Kan., with particular competence in systematics, especially ecclesiology and sacramental theology. She has published most recently in TS (marriage of baptized unbelievers) and Studia canonica (theological foundation of episcopal conferences).

Dynamic-Equivalence Translations Reconsidered, responding to J. P. M. Walsh's arguments (TS, June 1989) against the principle of dynamic equivalence in Bible translation, draws on recent translation theories in Germany which are oriented toward the function of the target text to argue in favor of dynamic/functional-equivalence versions. ROGER L. OMANSON, with a doctorate from the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, is interregional translation consultant for the United Bible Societies. Particularly competent in New Testament studies, he has published widely and frequently on issues of scriptural translation.

Dynamic or Formal Equivalence? A Response replies to Oman-son's response, urging attention to the nature of image and experiential concreteness in making translation choices, and cautioning against accepting an understanding of "meaning" as something separable from the words being translated. J. P. M. WALSH, S.J., Ph.D. from Harvard, is associate professor in Georgetown University's department of theology, with Old Testament as his area of predilection. His book The Mighty from Their Thrones: Power in the Biblical Tradition was published in Fortress Press's Overtures to Biblical Theology (1987).
are likely to understand it in the receptor language'... the orientation is toward the function of the target text."

Translation is a matter of choices. According to the principles Oman­son explains, a translator takes a text and makes translation choices determined by several factors. One factor is the meaning of the text, in its original form, as the translator understands that meaning. Another is the function of the translation: to communicate the text's meaning to a reader. And another is the target audience, or intended receptor: What meaning is the target audience likely to derive from the translation?

Now the translation choices are governed by the latter two considera­tions. "Meaning has priority over form when the meaning will not be understood in a formal-equivalence translation." Dynamic equivalence proceeds from the conviction that meaning is (to whatever extent) separate from form, and that that dissociation of meaning and form is not only permissible but necessary in order for the translation to serve its function—to communicate to the intended reader. Thus, the culture, language, experience of the intended reader are determinative of the translator's choices.

Thus, the translator has to be clear on both the meaning of the text and the ways the translation is likely to be understood. The translator has to have a thorough knowledge of the language and culture of the target audience; those are normative for the translation, because anything that fails to meet that criterion—let me call it intelligibility—fails in its purpose: to communicate the meaning of the source text. One does not communicate in general. One communicates to readers of a specific cultural background and experience.

I hope this is a fair summary of the principles of dynamic or functional equivalence, though of course it is only a sketch. In restating them, I have concentrated on the translator and the choices she or he has to make, because the differences between my views and the ones so capably articulated by Omanson can best be seen by attending to the "readiness" of a translator to proceed this way or that in carrying out his or her task.

Omanson's translator is ready to make judgments about (1) the meaning of the original text. He or she is ready to make judgments about (2) the experience and cultural background of the intended reader. And the translator is ready to (3) depart from the form of the original text in order to make the translation intelligible to the reader, as the translator understands what would be intelligible (cf. 2).

Where do I differ? To put the matter strongly: (1) the "meaning" of a text cannot be dissociated from its form. (2) Inevitably there will be differences between the world of experience out of which the biblical text comes and the world of experience of the modern reader; these differences should be taken into account, but the experience of the intended reader
should not be determinative of the translator's choices. Let me briefly develop each of these points.

1) Biblical texts exhibit the richness and multivalence of poetry. They have many meanings all at once. There is no univocal "meaning" that can be extracted from the words and images. Narratives work by leading the reader or listener through a sequence of events, with a variety of narrative rhythms and changes of perspective and focus, that continually set up in the listener certain expectations and then confirm or reverse those expectations. The biblical storytellers knew what they were doing. The sequence and pacing of the original text is all-important for the narrative to have its effect. What the storyteller shows as the narrative unfolds is all-important. The meaning of the text inheres in those images and events. So with poetry: images are concrete and particular, yet have resonances that go beyond their particularity. Narrative and poetry are rooted in the world of experience of the author and of the audience the author is addressing. They are highly culture-bound. It is the associations with the experience of the audience—in ancient Israel, in the early Church—that give biblical texts their "meaning."

This "boundedness," concreteness, particularity, and multivalence of meaning will of course present difficulties to the translator. Poetry is what doesn't survive translation, to paraphrase the old saw. What is the best way to communicate the richness of meaning found in a text? I think the best way is to show what the storytellers and poets wanted their audience to see: to be as concrete and specific as possible. If the text speaks of God exalting or lifting up David's "horn," then show that, even if one is aware that the "meaning" is that God will make David victorious over his foes. If the text speaks of "legs of a man," then show the legs. If people swearing an oath to one another are called "brothers," then let that come through.

2) What of the poor modern reader, to whom biblical images can be obscure—whose world of experience may be so different from that of the biblical poets? Modern readers are in the same position as the Ethiopian eunuch. They need a "deacon." They are not biblical scholars. Someone has to explain the text to them. "Mediation" is indicated.

Here is another difference between functional equivalence and the approach I am arguing for. As I believe in respecting the integrity of biblical language and of the world it reflects, so I believe we should envision the intended audience as people capable of entering imaginatively into that world, on its own terms. To say "midday" and "three p.m." does communicate the "meaning" of Mk 15:33, at least in a minimal and fact-oriented way. But Mark's readers used the Roman way of telling time, and so did the actors in that narrative. "The sixth hour" and "the ninth hour" sounds foreign to our ears, but its very cultural boundedness
leads us into the world of Jesus and the disciples, of Palestine under Roman rule, of that Friday. Explanation of the (literally translated) expression in Mk 15:33 can remove the difficulty; the difficulty itself can be the door to that other world. (For a treatment of these matters from another starting point, see my article “‘Leave Out the Poetry’” in the forthcoming *Horizons* 265–72.)

In short, I believe the text needs to be taken on its own terms. Translators should be ready to assume that readers are capable of dealing with the text on its own terms—and that a “deacon” will make that possible, one who can mediate between those different cultures and worlds of experience. The translation itself is not the place for this mediation. A translator should not take it upon himself to choose one “meaning” and convey it in terms purportedly accessible to readers from another culture.

Will there be a Philip, a “deacon,” for modern readers? My sense of church, and of the role of Scripture in the Church, leads me to answer yes. The generous efforts of the United Bible Societies are one indication that the riches of Scripture can be made available to modern readers of whatever cultural background. Teaching aids are a necessity, not a luxury. And of course the homily is central to this work of mediation.

Finally, the theological implications of these matters are too profound to go into here. Suffice it to say that there are Christological (incarnational) and ecclesiological aspects to these questions. The Word went forth, and became incarnate, in a certain time and world and language. The Church (including biblical scholars!) mediates the Word. The worldwide community of believers is called to perform that diaconal service. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*

*Georgetown University*  
**J. P. M. WALSH, S.J.**
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