
The role of the Old Testament in Christian ethics has long been ambiguous. Some would reject, or at least ignore, it in favor of "the Gospel"; others would take the few verses of the ten commandments and from them attempt to construct all of moral theology; still others display a more salad-bar approach, selecting and enforcing isolated texts which seem to support positions already strongly held; on the fringes of Christianity there are those who would take the whole OT as a blueprint for a Christian society. Following none of these, Birch takes a committed, critical, ecumenical, and involved approach to the OT as canonical within the Christian community in order to see what resources it has to offer Christian ethics. He seeks to make the OT more readily available to the concerns of Christian ethics in the world of today.

B.'s first major division, "Method and Approach," begins by addressing general questions of the use of the Bible in Christian ethics before focussing more narrowly on the OT. We find in the OT both diversity and unity; emphasizing one to the neglect of the other can seriously distort the biblical witness. Serious hermeneutics also requires that we recognize moral limitations within the OT. While the process of the formation of the OT is important, the final frame of reference is always the final shape of the canon as preserved and handed down. OT narratives, seeking both to disclose and transform reality, are a primary locus for ethical claims. Finally, we must recognize that we have received the OT narratives from a tradition which at times has distorted their meaning. B.'s work is thus situated within and contributes to the expanding areas of canonical and literary criticism of the Bible.

B.'s second major division, "The Old Testament Story as Moral Resource," follows a roughly canonical sequence. Creation has to do not only with the physical universe, but with a theological and moral one as well. The character of the Creator God and the human role as image and steward are tied together. The stories of the ancestors and the exodus show us a God of promise and deliverance who serves as model for our own behavior. The reality and morality of the covenant and its law should shape Israel as an alternative community. The emergence of the monarchy brought new ideals to Israel, ideals often violated by royal practice. The prophetic indictment of king and people (especially
regarding cultic and social failures) rings clear, as well as their message of hope lying beyond the coming judgment. The suffering of the exile and the struggle to survive in the postexilic period, for those in Judah as well as those in the diaspora, present new challenges and make new demands. B.'s final chapter surveys and evaluates the contribution and limits of the Wisdom tradition.

This summary cannot do justice to the scope and richness of B.'s study. Several observations can be made. First, B. very rightly warns against romanticizing early Israel (178–79). In fact, what is being romanticized is an individual, hypothetical, historical reconstruction of early Israel. The temptation then is to use this to reject uncongenial elements of the biblical text. A similar move can sometimes be seen in reconstructions of the historical Jesus. It is the biblical text which is and continues to be canonical in the life of the Church. Second, B. notes that Israel never embodied all that its covenant vision implied (162). Since later the monarchy is discussed under the rubric "Royal Ideal and Royal Reality," I would just underline that we must also think of a "Mosaic Ideal and Mosaic Reality." Neither ideal was realized in practice. Third, I found a real tension in the chapter on wisdom. On the one hand, a more positive assessment of the role and function of wisdom is offered; on the other, wisdom appears almost like a post-Enlightenment, secular, deistic individualism of self-serving misogynistic wealthy men. Further research is certainly needed here.

This important and stimulating work deserves to be read and carefully studied. It is both an original contribution and a stimulus to further study and refinement. Its usefulness is enhanced by the inclusion of four indexes: subjects, authors, Hebrew words, and scripture references.

Franciscan School of Theology
Michael D. Guinan, O.F.M.
Berkeley, Calif.


Amos of Tekoa, an eighth-century Judahite herder and farmer who preached to the Northern Kingdom (Israel) during the divided monarchy, was the first prophet known to have proclaimed destruction upon all Israel, rather than only upon sinners. Though evidently an innovator, his speeches evidence no doubt about his dread message: God has decreed the complete destruction of an unjust society and Amos must announce it. He is a favorite prophet today not only because of his uncompromising demand for social justice but also because the book is
short, vivid, and readily understood by first-time readers. The book’s traditions are familiar from the Pentateuch but some of its other aspects are not so easily explained: Why is Amos (and the other writing prophets for that matter) convinced that all Israel will be destroyed? Does he teach that Israel will survive the judgment? Does he think conversion and worship have real value? There are also many linguistic difficulties, such as one expects in an ancient scroll; e.g., How does one interpret the “seven/eight” phrases in 1:3–2:16? What is the meaning of the crucial Hebrew words *mēʾiq* and *tāʾiq* (“hinder” and “hamper”) in 2:13?

Scholarly attempts to flesh out and interpret Amos’s slim book range from the highly regarded commentaries of H. W. Wolff (German editions in 1967 and 1975; English, Hermeneia, 1977) and of J. L. Mays (1969), which combine theological and philological concerns, to recent attempts to make Amos a radical critic of the social system with no expression of hope for national survival. The commentary of Shalom Paul, professor at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, takes an independent path, showing no great interest in constructing a comprehensive theology of the prophet and avoiding speculation about editorial stages and Amos’s social location. His interest is mainly linguistic; for virtually every significant Hebrew word he lists its interdialectal equivalents in Akkadian, Aramaic, Phoenician, and Ugaritic. He practices meticulous textual analysis, and provides wide bibliographical coverage, mediating superbly the enormous lexical research of recent decades including some by himself. Much research done by Israeli scholars writing in Modern Hebrew has escaped the notice of Christian biblical scholars; through judicious summaries P. redresses this serious gap. From his distinct perspective he is often able to move beyond old dilemmas. An example is his 92-page treatment of 1:3–2:16 with its eight indictments, each beginning, “For three transgressions of [country] / and for four, I will not revoke it.” P. does not accept the popular and attractive interpretation that Amos is indicting the nations as vassals in the old Davidic Empire who have broken their oath by unjust treatment of their former covenant partners. He prefers instead a literary explanation: Amos indicts the nations for unjust and cruel behavior to each other and then, in a surprising climax, indicts complacent Judah and Israel for cruelty to their own kin. Another example of his distinctive approach is his effective rebuttal of the usual arguments that deny 9:11–15 to Amos. He does not, however, explain adequately how the final optimistic verses affect the prophet’s message of national doom. Indeed, if there is a fault in the commentary, it is its reticence to step back from Amos’s texts and put them into the context of other biblical ideas and books.
Given the vast amount of well-informed commentary on the prophets and on Amos in particular, what is the special value of P.'s work? There is no doubt of its value to the specialist; it is unmatched for sustained, skilled, and bibliographically complete lexical analysis. It is also surprisingly accessible to the serious nonspecialist, since it explains in clear prose each verse and, often in the very discussion, suggests the meaning of the section. The lay reader must learn to skip unwanted linguistic discussion for his broader interpretation. P. brings a fresh perspective to familiar texts. Fortunately, that perspective is allied to good sense and literary sensitivity.

Weston School of Theology  


This is the first volume of a massive and substantive study of the historical Jesus that recapitulates a generation of historical, archaeological, and exegetical studies related to the New Testament. Meier adheres to a strict focus, namely "the Jesus whom we can recover, recapture, or reconstruct by using the scientific tools of modern historical research" (1). While well aware of the pressure to make such connections when treating the historical Jesus, M. rules out any theological or Christological interest. At the same time, he notes that taking up once more the search for the historical Jesus does, in itself, serve the theological enterprise by challenging any attempt to reduce Jesus to solely a "mythic symbol" or purely divine being and protects our contemporary understanding of Jesus from being coopted by a particular ideological, cultural, or economic bias (199).

This volume concentrates on method and sources and then examines the origin and formative years of Jesus' life. It concludes with a detailed attempt to establish a basic chronology for the life of Jesus as a whole. The chronological framework of this first segment, however, does not mean that M. will attempt a biographical approach to the life of Jesus; in the second volume he will take up major motifs of the public ministry and the passion events. The limited scope of the first volume does not yet give M. the opportunity to lay out his case for characterizing Jesus as a "marginal" Jew. Because his agenda is solely historical, no treatment will be given to the resurrection.

M.'s method is clear and classical. What his study seeks to retrieve is the "historical" Jesus (i.e. the limited and fragmentary portrayal we can reconstruct from the evidence) as distinct from the "real" Jesus (the total reality of Jesus as he existed in the first century). Both of
these are to be distinguished from the object of Christian faith, namely the Jesus who lived and died and is now the risen Christ exalted with God. While attempting scientific "objectivity" M. does not make exaggerated claims for it and concedes that any interpreter is influenced by cultural, historical, and religious assumptions. While wanting to take into account the social, economic, and cultural context of the first century, M. does not intend an analysis based on sociological models.

He reviews in detail the potential sources for a historical study of Jesus and takes a rigorously cautious approach. The four Gospels, when properly analyzed, are by far the most important historical sources. Paul's letters offer some basic information but little else is found in the NT writings. Josephus's *testimonium* has undergone Christian interpolation, but the retrievable substratum does offer significant historical testimony from a non-Christian text to the fact of Jesus' existence. Little direct reference to the historical Jesus can be derived from other contemporary Jewish or Roman texts. The Qumran materials offer invaluable information on first-century Palestinian Judaism but no data on Jesus. Bucking a more recent trend, M. shows convincingly, in my view, that extracanonical Christian texts such as the Gospel of Peter (including Crossan's reconstruction of a supposed "Cross Gospel") and even the Gospel of Thomas are ultimately dependent on the Synoptics and not independent sources of information.

To retrieve historical data about Jesus from the gospel material, M. utilizes five familiar primary criteria: (1) the criterion of "embarrassment" (i.e. sayings or actions of Jesus that would, in fact, have caused difficulty for the early community); (2) "discontinuity" (data that could not have been derived either from Judaism or the early Church); (3) "multiple attestation" (material attested in more than one independent source); (4) "coherence" (material that coheres with the above stated criteria); (5) "rejection" (the mere fact of Jesus' violent death at the hand of the Romans is a reliable historical anchor to which other material can be related). Other criteria such as the possible Aramaic flavor of certain sayings or the apparent Palestinian provenance of NT data are more elusive in M.'s view.

In the second half, M. gets down to the quest itself. While the infancy narratives are obviously literary and theological creations of the evangelists, they do yield some basic historical data about the origin of Jesus: he was named "Jesus"; his mother was Mary and his putative father, Joseph; he was born toward the end of the reign of Herod the great; he was known popularly to be of Davidic descent. M. suspects that the location of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem is theologically motivated and affirms that his historical methodology does not permit him to comment on the virginal conception. However, the suggestion that
Jesus was illegitimate is unconvincing since it is a polemical tradition not attested until the 2nd century.

There is little direct evidence about Jesus' formative years but here M. draws on accumulated historical data about first-century Palestinian Judaism. Jesus grew up (was probably born) in Nazareth, an agrarian Galilean village of approximately 1,600 to 2,000 inhabitants. He would have spoken Aramaic and as a religious teacher and preacher have been literate in Hebrew, probably had a rudimentary knowledge of Greek but would be unlikely to know Latin. He was a craftsman (probably in wood) and belonged to the lower rung of the "middle" class—thus in the standards of the time poor but not living in destitution. M. is not enthused about some recent theories that Jesus would have had extensive contact with Greek culture because of the proximity of Sepphoris to Nazareth.

In what is likely to be considered one of his "sensational" conclusions, M. contends that Jesus had siblings (four brothers and two sisters), arguing in detail that the Greek term *adelphos* used in the Gospels clearly means "brothers" and not "cousins" and that this opinion, even though conflicting with the prevailing tradition about the postpartum virginity of Mary, was held by several early patristic authors.

On the other hand, M. upholds the traditional view that Jesus was celibate, a status rare but not unknown in first-century Judaism, and one that Jesus may have adopted as part of his prophetic mission to Israel, as the probably authentic saying of Mt. 19:12 suggests. In addition, M. emphasizes that Jesus was a layman, finding his natural interaction with the Pharisees and scribes and not with the ruling priestly class.

M. concludes with a clear and well-demonstrated case for a chronology of Jesus' life: his birth is likely to have been two or three years before the death of Herod the Great, thus approximately 6 or 7 B.C., the beginning of his public ministry about 28 A.D., and his death on Friday, April 7, A.D. 30. To establish this date, M. examines in detail the chronology of the passion narratives, particularly the question of the date and nature of the Last Supper. He concludes that the Johannine presentation is more likely to be historically probable, namely that the supper was not a passover meal but a solemn farewell meal of Jesus with his disciples that the Synoptics later interpreted in the light of Passover symbolism.

Throughout M.'s treatment of his subject is judicious and measured; the two-volume work when completed should serve as an excellent reference tool, almost encyclopedic in style. M.'s exacting historical perspective will be considered a strength by most readers, including this reviewer, but may be judged unexciting by others who prefer more
daring "creative" postulates and freer use of extracanonical sources. But if historical demonstration is the point, M. cannot be faulted for hewing to the evidence. Another strength is M.'s clarity of style. While the book bristles with footnotes and bibliographical references, the text itself should prove remarkably accessible to the "general reader" who is included in the intended audience. An attempt to keep this audience in mind may, in fact, explain the curiously flippant descriptions that slip occasionally into M.'s otherwise seamless text. The quality of M.'s scholarship and the clarity of his exposition make one look forward to the concluding volume where the full span of his historical reconstruction of Jesus as a "marginal Jew" will be revealed and tested.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

DONALD SENIOR, C.P.
While F. discussed many of these rhetorical strategies in his earlier work, *Loaves and Fishes* (Scholars Press, 1981), his primary concern now is with the "rhetoric of indirection" in Mark. This term covers a wide variety of Markan phenomena such as the Messianic Secret, the enigmatic Son of man sayings, and what "is called by others 'figurative,' 'tropical,' or 'tensive' language" (163). While F. calls attention here to widely recognized characteristics of the Gospel of Mark—its frequent use of irony and paradox, its mysterious or enigmatic quality, its strange ending (16:8)—his distinct perspective is to underscore their effect on the reader. He argues that "the process of wrestling with the ambiguity, rather than the final resolution itself is what matters in such an indirect rhetorical strategy" (209), and that "this narrative implies that a person should be able to live with uncertainty and gaps in understanding. It gives us practice in living without full illumination" (220). In effect Mark's medium or mode of discourse has become its message or content.

While many appropriations of contemporary secular literary criticism by biblical scholars devote inordinate space to either theory or to digests of secondary authors, the strength of F.'s work is his constant dialog with the text of Mark and the comprehensive overview he presents of the ways Mark engages the reader. F.'s work should be listed in any canon of important literary studies of Mark.

This reviewer's concerns touch less on the quality of F.'s work than on its implications. While perhaps overcompensating for previous stress on the historical author, context, and readers of Mark, F. presents a reader who is somewhat of an abstraction and quite at home in the twentieth century. How would first-century readers have reacted to some of those things seen as enigmatic or puzzling to modern ears? His "rhetoric of indirection" moves clearly in the direction of deconstruction with its perspective that a text cannot represent reality clearly or embody demonstrable truth claims, but is merely the free play of signifiers. The biblical text could be reduced to an occasion for intellectual play rather than a summons to commitment and conversion (see Mark 1:14–15). Finally, the constant danger in appropriating different movements within the fast changing world of secular literary criticism is that they are often on the wane shortly after their assimilation by biblical scholars. In University departments of literature devotees of narrative analysis, reader response criticism and deconstruction, are now bracing for the assault of the "new historicism" which argues that literary texts are not self-standing entities but expressions and representations of historical forces, and that texts are to be interpreted in light of social, economic and political forces and simultaneously shed light on those forces which influence them. The
quest for the best method of studying biblical texts may be coming full circle.

_Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley_    JOHNR. DONAHUE, S.J.


This significant contribution to the debate on Johannine Gospel origins offers nuanced insights, serious evaluations of other scholars, and is sensitively and economically written. There are impressive appeals to classical and modern literature and to a wide range of literary theory and art in order to understand John's intention and impact. Alas, the outrageous price will make even libraries think twice about purchasing it.

Ashton devotes about one-sixth of the book to presenting perceptive the main issues in the study of John and how they have been answered in modern times. His epigrammatic observations are shrewd: “In France can be seen the two opposing figures of Loisy (1903) and Lagrange (1925), with the squat shadow of Pius X falling between them; more recently the huge and idiosyncratic work of Marie-Emile Boismard (1977). . . .” Although Bultmann is a colossus unrivaled in penetrating observations (in dialogue with whom A. defines much of his thought), “Every answer Bultmann gives to the really important questions he raises—is wrong.”

As one advances to A.'s own approach, one sees why knowledge of what has been done in Johannine scholarship is so important. There is scarcely any serious contribution that he has overlooked, and his own theory eclectically draws on this vast reading.Basically he joins a theory of composition to a theory of community development. A.'s theory of composition combines variations on the Bultmann and Fortna signs-source/gospel foundation document with my own and Lindars's thesis of multiple editions within the Johannine context. His theory of community development is a variation of Martyn's and my own, positing theological and constituency change through influence from various Jewish strains of thought and conflict with the synagogue.

The result is a four-stage proposal: (1) A signs-source portraying Jesus as a wonder worker fulfilling traditional Jewish expectations of the Messiah. A. hesitates as to whether this was a source in the proper sense or a preliminary draft of what would become the Gospel. This stage for the community involved a purely messianic faith without any stress on divinity. The document was a missionary tract to fellow Jews in the synagogue ambiance, and a strong echo of that is found in John 1:19–2:11, where Jesus is presented under many titles and where the
miracles begin. (2) First edition by the evangelist (who was an Essene) bringing dualism into the picture. A prophetic figure himself, he drew on apologetics and prophecy, recasting the Jesus tradition and weaving distinctive Johannine themes, embodied in narratives and discourses, into an impressively cohesive conceptual pattern. The rather long time that separated the source period of community history from the first-edition period saw increasingly bitter conflict with other Jews in the synagogue; and towards the end, before the first edition appeared, the Johannine Christians were expelled from the synagogue. A growing awareness that Jesus was the fulfillment of much more than messianic claims led the evangelist-prophet to speak in the name of Jesus ("Amen" and "I am" sayings), offering new Christological insights. (3) Second edition by the same evangelist. There are no stylistic differences from the first edition, and sharp breaks between the editions are visible only at the end of chaps. 5 and 14. The allegories of the vine and of the good shepherd belong to this edition. Prèexistence was now an accepted element in the community’s thinking about Jesus. As part of the adjustment to their new reality as “a separated community of Jewish Christians,” the dualism became more “churchified.” (4) Final redaction by a hand other than that of the evangelist. A. attributes only chap. 21 and minor touches to this redaction which may have drawn on ancient material.

Since A. follows some of the same approaches I have taken myself, I agree with the overall approach, explaining the origins of the Gospel through the interplay of received tradition and community history. However, as A. notes, I have not generally attempted to assign passages with exactitude to the stages of development or to editions or to a reconstructed source. I have no objection to his attempting to do that, and indeed much careful reasoning has gone into his theory; but he should recognize how tenuous his work is. That recognition should qualify some of his almost pontifical judgments. He criticizes Boismard’s equally detailed reconstruction as “rather outlandish” and hanging “like gossamer on a number of infinitely slender threads” (296, 283). Yet a look at A.’s Greek reconstruction of the beginning of the signs source, involving omissions, changes of sequence, and supplying of words (284–91), suggests that gossamer may not be solely Gallic. The very real objection that his source separates the first Cana miracle from the second, closely parallel, Cana miracle is dismissed without arguments (291); yet he argues from (less obvious) parallels between Cana and 7:11–13 for inclusion of the latter in the source (331).

A. often seems overconfident of his own opinions. E.g., he assures us that Martyn’s “careless, throw-away opinion” that the titles Son of Man and Son of God are interchangeable in John would be revised if
Martyn studied the Son of Man theme carefully (339–40)! He refutes J. A. T. Robinson’s opinion on the historicity of the Lazarus’ story by sarcastically inquiring whether Robinson really believes Jesus raised a rotting corpse to life (429); in fact, Robinson is correct that the raising of Lazarus is no harder to accept than the Synoptic raisings of the dead—whether four days after death or the same day (son of the widow of Naim), physiological irreversible processes have begun. And my suggestion that the Gospel sequence may in some way reflect the development of community history is dismissed as “straining credulity” (even though in A.’s theory the first chapter of John is the key example of the signs source, the initial community documents); and he dismisses my thesis of Samaritan influence on John’s Christology as if the Samaritan preference for Moses idealism were dependent on the identification of Moses and the Taheb and could be written off as 4th-century A.D.

Despite occasional references to reading the Fourth Gospel in its final form, one comes away with the impression that A. gives primacy to understanding John through the optic of his stages of development. Early on, he seeks to eliminate Dodd’s arguments that we have before us the Gospel substantially in the form the author designed (79–81). Whether we approach it scientifically or religiously, the work we call “The Gospel according to John” exists in only one form—that is what should be commented on and interpreted. Theorizing about what existed before helps us to understand the Johannine history and community. I produced two separate books: one on the community where I indulged in detailed reconstruction, and one on the Gospel where I tried (imperfectly, to be sure) not to allow my theories of composition and history to interfere overly with reading the Gospel in its final form. Knowing the prehistory helps us not to misinterpret the meaning derived from the end product, but the latter remains the primary concern of the commentator. That should be kept in mind in reading A.’s valuable reconstructions.

(Emeritus) Union Theological Seminary, N.Y. 

RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.


Jacob Neusner argued a few years ago that first-century Judaism divided into (at least) two streams, one of which emphasized salvation
and the other sanctification (Cross Currents 35 [985] 148–58). It was from the first of these streams that patristic Christianity flowed, and in that period and after the ultimate effects of that salvation, the “last things” were widely preached and debated. Daley explores thoroughly here those various eschatologies present in the Christian Church from the first century to the sixth. He has an impressive command of his (admittedly exclusively textual) material, and the book will be a valuable resource. It is one to consult more than to read, as D. suggests by calling it a ‘handbook.’ Within its genre, it is very good indeed.

It may seem unreasonable, therefore, to wish it had been something more, a something more that D. himself recognizes as he acknowledges its “narrowness of focus” which leaves aside “the cultural and social contexts” (xii). To say that eschatology is “faith in final solutions” is one-handed clapping unless one identifies the problems/questions for which these solutions were offered. To be fair, D. does some of this, but it is almost all intraecclesial in perspective. He recognizes that eschatological faith “has taken many forms in the history of Christianity” (1), and he matches the faith and hope entertained with the fears and tensions experienced—stress on the materiality of the risen body with the Gnostic threat, on natural justice with persecution, on imminent end-of-the-world scenarios with the fall of the Roman empire.

All these manifestations were accompanied by a leitmotif of what D. calls “the school for souls” tradition running from the early Alexandrians through Origen and the Cappadocians to Augustine. His analysis of Augustine's teachings on the last things shows awareness of the many shifts that his thinking on this topic (as on so many others) underwent, although underplaying somewhat the difficulties he had with bodily resurrection. For those in this “school for souls” tradition, “eschatology was simply part of a larger picture: the grace-filled finality of the mystery of growth towards God that is already the heart of Christian faith” (60). The similarities of this tradition to classical “virtue ethics,” which is enjoying a revival today, makes it perhaps the easiest to which the Christian of the 1990s can feel affinity.

What is a well-researched and useful book could have been a fascinating one, if only D. had thrown his net of questions more widely, asking not only what pressures within the Church moulded the eschatological hopes, but what distinguished these Christian hopes from those of others of the Mediterranean basin in the first century. Some hopes were shared. Others too believed in postmortem justice; others hoped for a blissful afterlife; others yearned for eternal contemplation of the divine. What, if any, of the early Christian hope was uniquely Christian and what was its basis? We know that it was belief in the resurrection of the body that attracted the most scorn from those out-
side the Church and the most controversy about its meaning from those within.

If belief in resurrection of the body was the distinctive feature of Christian hope, the basis for the teaching of that belief presents a puzzle. It is often assumed, wrongly, that the Christians of the first centuries reiterated the tight Pauline link between Christ's resurrection and their own hope, but in fact, as I found, to my surprise, when I examined this question some years ago, few of the apologists for the resurrection made this connection. Was it only because other arguments might prove more compelling? D. recognizes this lacuna, but glosses it over, identifying the common hope as an "assumption" based on membership in a believing community (217). But the question is too important to dismiss facilely. Should not the next step be to lay the character and ethos of that believing community alongside those of other believing communities and to try to uncover better the relation between any community and its hope? In this project the historian of ideas and the sociologist of religion could fruitfully cooperate, and I hope that D. will have a hand in it.

University of Toronto

JOANNE McWILLIAM


In this doctoral dissertation in philosophy, originally presented to the University of Paris-Sorbonne, Vannier argues that Augustine thought out the doctrine of creation on the bases of his personal experience of conversion and of the biblical account of creation, and that he developed a "theological ontology" in which the concepts creatio, conversio, and formatio play a key role in articulating not merely God's making the corporeal world out of nothing, but also his creation of human beings and angels and bringing them to their eternal repose in him. She examines Augustine's reflection on creation in five works in which he comments on Genesis, namely De Genesi contra Manichaeos, De Genesi ad litteram liber imperfectus, the last three books of the Confessiones, De Genesi ad litteram, and Book 11 of De cibitate Dei.

In Part 1, V. first examines the sources and meanings of the three key terms, then sketches Augustine's thinking out of the doctrine of creation in terms of the Neoplatonic themes of the return to the self and the degrees of reality and in terms of Augustine's movement away from Manichaean emanationism to the Christian doctrine of creation ex nihilo. Finally, she turns to the impact of Augustine's reading of the Hexaemeron, under the influence of Philo of Alexandria, Ambrose of
Milan, and Basil of Caesarea, upon his coming to the scheme of *creatio*, *conversio*, and *formatio*, in which the latter is seen as the perfecting of the image of God in human beings.

Part 2 offers a systematic presentation of Augustine's thought on creation as found in the five commentaries on Genesis with their differing modes of exegesis. Here V. develops her thesis in three stages. First, she focuses upon God as creator and recreator, the motive of creation, and the trinitarian character of creation. Second, she develops the role of conversion as constitutive of the human subject which has fallen and returns to God through temporally distinct moments. Finally, she takes up *formatio* as the perfecting of created being. While *creatio* and *formatio* are simultaneous in all created beings except for humans, in the latter *conversio* intervenes, and human *formatio* is accomplished, V argues, through divine illumination and reaches its fulfilment in our rest in God.

Among the many valuable features of the volume, there is a select twelve-page bibliography, as well as two appendices. One contains the Latin text and a French translation of *Sermo Denis II* (399), a key text for V.'s thesis, while the other lists the occurrences of the terms *creatio* and *formatio* in the works of Augustine. There is also a list of the abbreviations of Augustine’s works drawn from the *Augustinus Lexikon*.

V. presents convincing arguments that Augustine developed his thought on creation during his own conversion, and that the interaction with Neoplatonism, Manichaeism, and the Bible as read in the Judaeo-Christian tradition exerted a decisive influence on his thought. One might well challenge many minor claims and emphases, but the larger picture seems accurate. So too, she argues well that Augustine used the *creatio-conversio-formatio* scheme, albeit in analogous ways, in his theological-ontological reflection on the creation, salvation, and eternal destiny of angels and human beings, though I remained unpersuaded that the triadic scheme is found in Augustine with the full systematic clarity in which V. presents it.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*  
ROLAND J. TESKE, S.J.


In their introduction the editors of this impressive encyclopedic dictionary state very clearly that they have not attempted to be as comprehensive in information and bibliography as some multi-volume encyclopedias, such as the Pauly-Wissowa *Realexikon* or the French *Dictionnaires*, but selective, as other Oxford dictionaries. They explain the
rationale for the choices they had to make in the number of entries, their length, and the bibliographical references. These have been brought up to June 1989, with some later ones added at the last minute. Still, all aspects of Byzantine history and civilization are covered, with special depth in such areas as bureaucratic titles and fiscal terms, urban life, rural economy, and the ordinary things of daily life. In fact, there are two articles on "Things." The editors have given more thought to such aspects of Byzantine civilization than to a direct enumeration of facts. Since Byzantine studies have not been as thoroughly explored as, say, Classical Antiquity, the Dictionary had to do more than simply summarize already established data. The authors, moreover, found that many questions had not even been asked, and that many traditional views and dates were not substantiated by the sources. Some topics which had been developed by Western medievalists had not yet been studied by Byzantinists. As a result, a number of articles offer a fresh look at the evidence, and some have the aura of research in progress.

The chronological extent of this Dictionary is from the fourth to the fifteenth centuries. Some Classical authors are included, but discussion about them is focused on the transmission and knowledge of their writings in the Byzantine period and also for some, such as Plato and Aristotle, their use by church fathers and later theologians. Post-Byzantine traditions are not covered. The constant fluctuation of the imperial borders and the far-ranging impact of Byzantine culture made it difficult to set geographical limits. There are, for example, articles on Ceylon and Poland. Neighboring regions are viewed in the light of their economic, military, and cultural relations with Byzantium. Since the elements of Byzantine culture did not exist in isolation, an interdisciplinary approach was called for. Each subject is looked at from various angles, history, philology, art, liturgy, and others, and some very brief articles may have three authors. The editors take the position, now prevalent among scholars, that Byzantium did not merely guard and transmit the traditions of antiquity but developed its own models in all areas. They have included many topics not normally found in traditional reference works, and they have made a deliberate effort to highlight the realia of Byzantine life. The bibliographical references are selective, generally giving the most recent works on the subject. The introduction is followed by lists of maps and illustrations, abbreviations, and a register of contributors.

These three volumes, comprising a total of 2232 pages, are presented in a two-column format in large, readable type. The text is accompanied by maps, genealogical tables, and lists of rulers. The illustrations are well chosen and nicely reproduced in black and white. The title of
most articles is followed by its Greek equivalent. The cross-reference system facilitates finding one's way around. The articles are generally quite objective, with divergent opinions fairly presented.

There are entries, as one would expect, for important Byzantine individuals, including all the emperors. Names range from 77 entries for John, 26 for Michael, 25 each for Theodore and Leo, 22 for Constantine, 17 for George, and 16 for Nicholas. Many non-Byzantines are also included: popes, sultans, western rulers and travelers, some church fathers such as Augustine, theologians such as Aquinas, whose works, translated into Greek, influenced a generation of Byzantine intellectuals. The entries on Scriptural personages, beginning with Adam and Eve and on through Abraham, the prophets, and the apostles, stress the role that they played in Byzantine piety and how they were represented in art. Articles on feasts and doctrines, such as the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Trinity, in addition to discussing their substance, also treat of their artistic representation and liturgical commemoration. Liturgy, in fact, receives very complete coverage, and rightly so. Any discussion of piety and religious practices cannot limit itself to hierarchical and formal aspects, but must include the attitudes and actions of ordinary people. Thus there is a fair amount on popular religion, including an article under that very title.

History is about people, and the daily life of the people who inhabited the Byzantine realm is rightly given prominence. One may read about such matters as apiculture, beds, beverages, body language, childhood, cursing, dreams, dogs, mice, damage by quadrupeds, latrines, surgery, tools, toys and games, wine, and women. The reader will also find competent and detailed treatment of military organization, strategy, and weapons, imperial dignities and offices, and law and legal terminology. There are relatively long articles on the History of the Byzantine Empire, on art, architecture, education, agriculture, philosophy, and other major topics.

The student of religion and the theologian will find much of interest throughout these three tomes. In investigating a civilization in which religion and politics were so intertwined, a large number of articles must perforce be devoted to religious topics. Among them are: azymes, Byzantine church law, calendars, a long article on Christology, the Virgin Mary, councils, cross, demons, divorce, various liturgical feasts, Palamism, patriarchate, salvation, schism, soul, theology. More important than the content, though, is the approach taken in these and other articles. For, as much as possible, they focus on what the Byzantines regarded as important, and not always on what Western-trained, especially Roman-trained, theologians have seen fit to emphasize. Consultation of this dictionary should help those interested in
religion to learn more about a millennial Christian civilization and, indeed, should broaden their understanding of Christianity itself. This Dictionary certainly belongs in every university and seminary library.

Catholic University of America

GEORGE T. DENNIS, S.J.


Few great thinkers have developed a doctrine of God in such detail as Thomas and Hegel. This intelligent study illuminates similarities and divergences and indicates how their doctrines complement each other. Brito has structured his book according to the Prima Pars, q.q. 2–26, first explicating Thomas's position, then presenting Hegel's on the same point, and finally contrasting both doctrines. The repetition involved in this last step is outweighed by clarity of presentation.

Part 1 propounds the theoretical foundation of theological discourse, studying God as known and unknown as well as the manner of predicating attributes of God (the divine names). Part 2 treats the divine substance and its attributes: simplicity, perfection and goodness, infinity and omnipresence, immutability and eternity, and unity. Part 3 considers the divine operations: intelligence, will, providence and predestination, power, divine felicity, and, going beyond the Prima Pars, concludes with the divine beauty.

On the whole B. clearly identifies the strengths and weaknesses of Thomas and Hegel. The medieval doctor emphasized God's utter transcendence and perfection. This permitted the clear distinction of God from the world, grounded His absolute freedom and superabundant generosity in creation, and assured the relative independence of created beings. But where Thomas used analogy allowing for transcendence, Hegel employs a dialectic involving God in the world's becoming; indeed creation supplies a necessary moment in God's progression from an initial penury to His complete manifestation and realization in history. Since creation is a negativity that must be negated for the final Aufhebung of history into God, its inherent goodness and subsistence are not adequately preserved, nor is God's freedom to create other possible world orders maintained since the present order must best manifest the divine intelligence, goodness, and love.

Despite Thomas's obvious superiorities B. notes his failure to link God adequately to the economy of history and thereby guarantee the constitutive significance of history and diversity as such. There Hegel complements Thomas by bringing historical negativity, even Calvary's dark night, into God's interior life. Where Thomas saw God's perfection as immutable, self-sufficient plenitude, Hegel sees the Idea as the
dynamic union of opposites realizing Himself through history. B. has developed these and other points in great detail and clarity, producing a very useful work.

The very magnitude of B.'s undertaking invites criticism. How can one book adequately evaluate two major geniuses over whose thought rivers of scholarly ink have flowed? An acknowledged Hegelian scholar, B. is fundamentally just to Thomas's thought, but often that thought is not presented in its complexity. Little awareness of Thomas's development is indicated. Our detailed study of infinity in Thomas (Theologie und Philosophie 61 [1986] 176–203) is unfortunately overlooked.

Moreover B. apparently overinterprets Contra Gentes IV, 11, to uncover a diversity in the identity of God's esse and essence. This also serves to distinguish the divine essence from the verum and bonum with which it is identical. Thus divine consciousness is interpreted not as empty of content but as self-possessing reflection, a philosophical understanding deepened by trinitarian doctrine (e.g. 184–86, 196–99). Yet Contra Gentes presents at best an argument ex convenientia for a supernatural mystery, and the divine esse–essence distinction is hardly discerned in the text. Here and in his suggestion that the Incarnation represents the culmination of divine ubiquity (138 f., 153), one suspects an excessive desire to reconcile Thomas with Hegel.

B. has relied heavily on secondary literature, rarely analyzing Thomas's texts in detail and has not taken cognizance of fundamental differences among Thomistic commentators cited: e.g. Gilson, Sertillanges, Nicholas, Jossua, Rahner, Coreth, Puntel, Siewert, Welte. Though B. stresses the natural-supernatural distinction, elsewhere he generally favors the transcendental interpretation, which had seen that distinction as paradoxical (an opening for the Hegelian dialectic?). Finally, the apparent clarity of Thomas's texts has often proven a mare's nest to commentators, and on such disputed questions as predestination (the reconciliation of divine and human freedoms), evil, the meaning of subsistence and subject (or person) B. does not bestow much attention. Doubtless the limits of his study prevented him from doing everything. Yet if Thomas and Hegel are to be truly reconciled, such fundamental questions dealing with historical meaning must be confronted.

Despite these reservations, B. has produced a fine work of erudite comparative scholarship facilitating dialogue between great thinkers and, by clear oppositions, stimulating their students to work toward a synthesis.

Pontifical Gregorian University

JOHN M. McDERMOTT, S.J.

No one, to my knowledge, has subjected Gerson's treatise *De Consolatione Theologiae* to such thorough analysis as Burrows has here. But B. does more than analyze one treatise; he situates the work both in the context of Gerson's *oeuvres* as a whole, and in the context of the "disordered age" of the early fifteenth century.

The analysis centers on four main themes, treated in the central chapters. First, B. examines Gerson's pedagogy and theological method. He sees the treatise as primarily a comprehensive pastoral handbook reflecting a "paideutic" approach to theology. In other words, Gerson here views theology as chiefly a pastoral not an academic discipline, whose function is to bring consolation to all *viatores*, both learned and "simple" in face of the "spiral of despair" (65) we all face in this life. The treatise, written in dialogue form, functions, B. argues, as "a kind of manual of conversion" (61), reforming the human person by guiding him/her from despair in human effort to hope in God. The second theme is treated in the chapter "Foundations of the Theological Task." Here B. argues that theology for Gerson in this treatise is essentially grounded in Scripture and not in scholastic discussion. He characterizes Gerson as a "biblical reformer" (272), whose theological consolation is essentially a scriptural consolation, and who holds a doctrine of the sufficiency of Scripture. The Scriptures are sufficient, Gerson argues, "to teach and counsel us, providing they are read with a pure, faithful and open heart" (114).

Taking up the theme of soteriology, B. argues that Gerson in this treatise does not propound an Occamist doctrine of justification, which leaves room for human effort with its reliance on the *facientibus quod in se est* theory, and a view of predestination as *post praevisa merita*. Rather, Gerson puts forward a more strictly Augustinian view of justification which leaves no room for human works of merit, and a view of predestination as *ante praevisa merita*. Human freedom and responsibility are not, however, totally obliterated, for "God rewards those who seek him" (Heb 11:6). The *viator* must "seek" rather than "do"; and, although we seek only because of grace, our seeking is an exercise of free choice, because our will is free only by participation in God's higher will (205). B.'s final theme is Gerson's ecclesiology, which B. describes as "the shaping matrix" of Gerson's theological theory and practice. This ecclesiology is essentially hierarchical and conservative. *Viatores* are to seek God with humility and remain obediently within the hierarchical visible Church.
A number of other themes are treated in this rich analysis, but the importance of B.'s book lies chiefly in its relevance to Gerson studies as a whole, for B. claims that his study of this treatise demands "a reorientation of Gerson studies," a revision of the view that has hitherto prevailed in treatments of Gerson's thought. This is a book written with self-confidence. B. knows the secondary literature on Gerson, both recent and earlier, well, and, although he gives credit where he sees credit due, there is hardly an author who escapes his criticism. His basic point is that previous authors have concentrated on Gerson's earlier works and largely ignored the post-Constance writings, with the result that they have posited a homogeneity in his thought that does not exist. It is not that B. sees everything in *De Consolatione Theologiae* as new. He acknowledges the many continuities in Gerson's thought, e.g. his anti-elitism, his impatience with "useless" speculation, the centrality of his pastoral concerns, his conservative ecclesiology. Nevertheless, he considers this treatise "a watershed, marking a new departure from Gerson's earlier, and a decisive pointer towards his later writings" (27). This is especially true of Gerson's soteriology, where B. sees a decisive shift from an Occamist to a more Augustinian position. And indeed, the picture of Gerson that emerges is one closer to Aquinas, on the one hand, and to Luther, on the other, than has hitherto prevailed. For instance, B. sees in this treatise far less reliance on the sacraments as instruments of consolation, far more reliance on Scripture, and, in Gerson's insistence on the inescapability of sin, an anticipation of Luther's later formulation "simul justus et peccator" (188).

In general, B.'s argument is convincing, as is his hypothesis that the developments he finds in Gerson's thought from 1418 were a direct response to the events and aftermath of the Council of Constance, particularly to the Hussite threat. The book is somewhat repetitious in places, but some repetition may be necessary in order to keep the complex threads of the argument clear. Certainly the summaries that occur at the beginning of sections are useful. B.'s monograph will be of value primarily to Gerson specialists, but also to those working more broadly in the field of late medieval theology, for it does "add another clarifying voice to our grasp of the later Middle Ages" (5).

Queen's University, Kingston, Ont. D. Catherine Brown
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Queen’s University, Kingston, Ont. D. CATHERINE BROWN

The French original of this work was first published in 1987 to mixed reviews; this faithful English translation preserves unchanged the original’s faults and merits, both of which are considerable. In the introduction Guenée explains how he came to write the work: dissatisfied with the dehumanized products of both prosopography and the study of abstract institutional structures, he wished to restore the individual to the historiography of the late medieval French church. The result is a serial biography of four churchmen whose overlapping careers spanned the period from the reign of Louis IX to the eve of the Italian wars. His subjects are the Dominican inquisitor Bernard Gui (d. 1331), the Benedictine abbot Gilles Le Muisit (d. 1353), the Parisian theologian and church politician Pierre d’Ailly (d. 1420), and failed-careerist-turned-historian Thomas Basin (d. 1490).

There are several minor complaints that can be made about the English edition. Some works included in the original bibliography are inexplicably missing, and an occasional typographical error causes confusion, as when the introduction mistakenly gives Thomas Basin’s death date as 1450. Although generally effective and unobtrusive, Goldhammer’s translation sometimes falters: when “[Aquinas] faisait vraiment trop confiance à la raison” is rendered as “[he] placed entirely too much faith in reason” (108), the reader is provided with unintended food for thought!

Unfortunately, there are also more substantive problems, inherent in the French original. In some areas the bibliography was and remains sadly inadequate. Easily accessible studies of d’Ailly’s career and thought by such scholars as Courtenay, Swanson, Pascoe, and Glorieux are absent, and it is startling, even granted its brevity, to find G.’s survey of late medieval philosophy (109–10) based on nothing more recent than Gilson. The list of such failings would be all too easy to expand.

More serious yet is the work’s lack of a coherent thesis and a defining structure beyond that provided by the common biographical format. G.’s introduction makes a partially successful effort to compensate for this by calling some interesting and important themes to the reader’s attention. These include the value of academic success to the ambitious ecclesiastical careerist, and the literally vital importance of longevity and good health—longevity to allow time for those born into relatively modest circumstances to make their mark, good health to postpone the inevitable decline of old age (one’s career was effectively over when one was too infirm to ride a horse). But valuable as G.’s introduction is, it stands alone: the work ends abruptly with the death of Thomas Basin, without conclusion or summary.

Having said all of this, it remains true that the book is well worth
reading. In fact, G. succeeds in what he set out to do: he illuminates the personalities of these diverse medieval churchmen. Particularly effective is his brief portrait of the Benedictine Gilles Le Muisit. Although briefly a student at the University of Paris, Gilles had no talent for abstract thought; he was an administrator, a man of practical bent. But at the same time he had a taste for certain forms of literature, and after being blinded by cataracts—he celebrated his last mass on August 15, 1348, on the feast of the Assumption of the Glorious Virgin—he consoled himself by dictating poetry and an idiosyncratic history of his times. These works reveal much about their author. In them, e.g., the old abbot makes clear both his instinctive sympathy for the new flagellant movement provoked by the horrors of the Black Death and his unquestioning acceptance of that movement’s condemnation by the authorities. His story had a happy ending: he was persuaded to risk the necessary operation, the cataracts were removed, and his sight was at least partially restored. He rejoiced: if he could not read or write, he at least could see “the sky, the sun, the moon, and the stars again.”

G.’s lengthier essays on Pierre d’Ailly and Thomas Basin are also effective character studies; in addition, they offer a valuable glimpse of what it took to succeed in the late medieval Church. Especially clear is the need for both the personal qualities suited to the practical political life and a supporting network of family and friends. D’Ailly was one of the victors in this game of ecclesiastical careerism. A complex figure, in whom ambition and principle coexisted uneasily, d’Ailly had a dangerous temper balanced by an enviable talent for measuring caution against daring, and he enjoyed remarkable success in navigating the treacherous waters of French ecclesiastical politics. Less fortunate was the Norman bishop of Lisieux, Thomas Basin, talented but naive, and with a temperament too academic for success. The story of his failure is as instructive as the tale of d’Ailly’s success.

Wayne State College, Nebraska

DOUGLASS TABER, JR.


More than sixty years have passed since the publication of A. F. Pollard’s Wolsey. This collection of scholarly essays edited by Gunn and Lindley supplements rather than supplants Pollard’s masterful biography. Pollard’s work concentrated on W.’s wielding of power. Gunn and Lindley’s centers on his calculated patronage of the arts as one of the means the great cardinal used to impress his contemporaries with his wealth and power.
For fourteen years from 1515 W. was Henry VIII's lord chancellor and chief minister. From 1518 until his fall from power in 1529 W. controlled the English church as the pope's legate a latere. With the exception of the king, he was the most powerful man in England. W. baffled his English contemporaries who had little experience of the many cardinal-ministers who governed the monarchies of Western Europe between the mid-15th and mid-16th centuries. Yet even compared to his peers, cardinals such as Balue, d'Amboise, de Tournon, Pau, Mendoza and Cisneros, W. stood out.

He was the son of an Ipswich tradesman, reputedly a butcher, and his humble birth coupled with his rapid rise to power was without parallel among his peers. So too was his passion for social justice. The English nobility despised W. not only for his lower class origin but for his defence of the rural poor against the seizure of common lands by the nobility. Wealthier by far than any nobleman in England, the cardinal delighted in taunting his well-born critics by a tasteful display of Renaissance affluence that none of them had the resources to match.

But there was more to W.'s elegant life-style than flaunting his wealth and impeccable taste before the nobles who judged themselves superior to him. His patronage of architecture, stained glass, music, sculpture, and above all, goldsmith's work created so splendid and lavish a setting for the cardinal that even his critics admitted he understood the psychological significance of conspicuous display. In this judgment his critics were correct. W.'s magnificence instilled confidence in those who hesitated to accept his often bold and usually elaborate schemes to advance his plans for both the church and the state. His grandiose schemes seemed credible in the dazzling atmosphere which the cardinal skillfully crafted around him.

But the very magnificence of his residences, Hampton Court, Bridewell, York Place, The More, Tyttenhanger, and Esher, underscores the grandiose nature of W.'s imagination and cast of mind. His two ecclesiastical foundations, Ipswich College in his native town and Cardinal's College (Christ Church) at Oxford, illustrate the same force of imagination and passion for detail joined with an extravagance that far exceeded even the cardinal's considerable financial resources.

Gunn and Lindley and the other contributors to this study have shown that W.'s patronage of the arts was an integral part of his policy of building a personal image of competence, taste, and power. But like the cardinal's political and ecclesiastical policies that eventually caused his ruin, his artfully cultivated personal image promised more than his resources could in fact bring about.

Loyola Marymount University, L.A. \hspace{1cm} HERBERT J. RYAN, S.J.

This companion volume to Toner's earlier work, A Commentary on St. Ignatius' Rules for the Discernment of Spirits, focuses primarily on the individual discernment of God's will. An acknowledged authority both on the theory and practice of Ignatian discernment, T. here offers a valuable addition to contemporary works on Ignatian spirituality.

T.'s method is highly analytic, centering his examination on a central text, the Spiritual Exercises [175–189], but analyzing that central text within the larger context of the entire Exercises and the full context of Ignatius' other writings. Insofar as he feels these are pertinent to his analysis, T. engages other, secondary works. Since he considers the present volume important not only for Jesuit spirituality but for those interested in authentic Christian decision making, he targets his study not only for Jesuits but for "those of a much wider readership, even perhaps some who are not Christian but believe in God and strive to follow the light as they see it" (x).

After a brief introductory chapter dealing with the Christian vocation to seek and find God's will, T. divides his analysis under four major headings: God's Will, Seeking God's Will, Times and Modes of Seeking God's Will, and Finding God's Will. Two appendices complete the study: the first criticizes Karl Rahner's interpretation of Ignatian discernment of God's will; the second criticizes Thomas Green's interpretation.

It is important to focus on why T. has written this volume and chosen to present it in a close, sometimes labored, examination of the Ignatian text. First, the call to seek and find God's will is central to the Christian vocation, especially in times like ours when there is an "ever-widening range of choice" and a "bewildering rate of change which continually calls for new decisions" (2). Second, it is the Ignatian teaching "which has principally shaped the recent movement in the Church to emphasize individual and community discernment" (4). Third, there exists today "no well-developed and more or less fully agreed-upon understanding of what Ignatius was saying" (5). Straightforward as these motivations appear, they are complex in their demands both on T. and his readers, moving as they do from practical pastoral reflections about Christian choice to the interpretation of a severely terse text to the theological presuppositions which inform both the text and the interpretation. Such an agenda has a potential appeal to a variety of religious professionals.

In this reviewer's opinion, pastoral professionals will find T.'s close reading and relentless distinctions demanding both on their attention
and their patience. The pastoral dimension of the book needs richer illustrations and examples. Textual critics will ask not only what Ignatius said but what significant historical influences shaped his thinking. In this regard T.'s study is practically silent. Theologians may wish to learn more about biblical and theological influences on Ignatius and how he incorporated these into his own formulations. In short, T.'s work invites discussion, development, and debate. To that extent, then, he does not complete the task he has set for himself.

The treatment on Ignatian confirmation [and disconfirmation] and the use of the Spiritual Diary to illustrate the process of confirmation are outstanding. I wish only that T. had entered into dialogue with Simon Decloux's commentary on the same topic.

In summary, then, T.'s contribution to a difficult theoretical and practical problem is first-rate. It deserves to be read and debated.

University of Detroit Mercy, Mich. Howard J. Gray, S.J.


Few among the 16th-century Reformers can claim to have had such a worthy musical descendant as Luther did in his faithful servant J. S. Bach. In the often unclear and acrimonious debates between Orthodox Lutheran, Rationalist, and Pietist sympathies in 17th- and 18th-century Europe, Bach's achievement in giving musical expression to the heart of the Lutheran genius stands unequalled. Chafe's book addresses itself to the task of entering Bach's compositional world to unravel a major aspect of its musical hermeneutics: How does the tonal plan that Bach adopts for a given work illuminate its theological content? The topic is not new, but C. brings to the subject familiarity with a vast background of ancillary material: the highly organized systems of baroque music theory; the various schools of Lutheran theological and meditational procedure; the documents of Bach's time and the texts of the librettists he used.

In general, C. restricts his field of investigation to the cycles of cantatas that Bach composed for the church's liturgical year and to the two Passions. (While some readers would find it interesting to have had C. apply his methods to the Mass in B minor, the text of the Mass clearly does not fall within the ambit of literary works produced within the Lutheran tradition that so characterize the cantatas and Passion settings.)

The characteristic antitheses in Lutheran (and Pauline) thought—e.g. flesh (Law) and spirit (Gospel), and the conflict between a world of tribulation and the hope of redemption—are audibly represented in
Bach's vocal works thanks to a variety of means he employs. Chief among these, and the one that receives most attention in C.'s book, is the tonal groundplan that governs the choice of keys for the individual movements that constitute a particular cantata, and, more obviously and dramatically, for the individual numbers of the two Passions. Four basic patterns are described: (1) anabasis (or ascent), whereby the sequence of keys increases in the sharp direction, where, say, the cantata begins with feelings of fear, guilt and torment, and becomes more positive as it proceeds; (2) catabasis (or descent), where the keys increase in the flat direction, where the end point is not despair or rejection but, say, the descending of God's spirit into a human being, or the sinking of the human being into God's will; (3) descent/ascent, where the keys describe something like a sine curve, and the spiritual movement might be, say, entering into suffering and then turning upwards towards joy, or the opposition of worldly and divine authority; and (4) ascent/descent, where the rising sequence, say, is associated with praise of God and thanks for past gifts, and the descending sequence expressing the hopes for continuing blessings.

C. does not apply these patterns mechanistically; he is constantly alive to the organic and dynamic nature of Bach's genius. He is more interested in using these patterns for the illumination they provide in developing an understanding of the religious texts than in establishing watertight categories for musicotheological analysis. The book, indeed, does not set out to prove a theory but rather to explore a complex musical procedure practiced in a world where conflicting dogmatic, spiritual, philosophical, and aesthetical positions fueled the debates of the day and exercised a palpable influence on Bach's oeuvre.

The demands on the reader, then, are not slight. C.'s prose, while never rebarbative, does not permit one's attention to slip into low gear. The care and precision with which the argument is presented will be repaid by a proportionally careful reading. And while the work is written by a man who is chiefly a musician, theologians who enjoyed, say, Jaroslav Pelikan's *Bach among the Theologians* will find much that can be profitably gleaned from the wealth of C.'s harvest.

The book is exemplary in its presentation and production. The quality and number of musical examples provided give excellent support to the analyses provided in the text. The rarity of typographical errors and of slips in the notation of the figured bass testifies to the high level of the book's aspirations.

*Jesuit Theological College, Parkville, Australia*

CHRISTOPHER WILLCOCK, S.J.

This work is the fruit of a 40-year engagement with the thought of Karl Barth, begun in studies with him in Basel and continued regularly in graduate school seminars. That an evangelical theologian teaching in a Southern Baptist seminary knows and cares this much about an ecumenical giant should challenge conventional stereotypes of both evangelicals and Southern Baptists.

Mueller had dug deeply and indeed exposed the "foundation" of Barth's theology in his comprehensive doctrine of reconciliation, a treatment M. believes is "unsurpassed in the history of Protestant theology and perhaps the entire history of the Church universal" (252). His exposition follows the development of the doctrine chronologically, focussing on selected segments of Barth's writing career: "the early Barth," from the first edition of Romans to his drafting of the Barmen Declaration (1919–1934), including his debates and exchanges with Harnack, Tillich, Bultmann, Thurneysen and Gogarten; the deepening controversy with Bultmann, a World Council of Churches exchange with Reinhold Niebuhr, and earlier phases of his evolving doctrine of reconciliation (1941–1952); the definitive articulation of Barth's views on the cross and resurrection in Church Dogmatics 4.1–4, all this begun at the age of 65 (1951–1967).

M.'s historical approach helps us better understand the contextual character of Barth's theology. E.g., Catholics and others put off by his assault on analogia entis will be instructed by his 1933 editorial "farewell" to readers of Zwischen den Zeiten rejecting a developing "natural theology" that linked the "Law of God" with the "Law of the German State." Again, Barth's correspondence with Pastor Thurneysen makes clear how profoundly the former's theology is rooted in and concerned about the day-to-day life of the congregation.

In his meticulous citation of passages, with reliance at key places on the interpretation of Bertold Klappert, M. challenges some standard misunderstandings of Barth's thought: No, he did not reject philosophy, but employed it "eclectically," and "under the Word," as flawed human reason cannot be the arbiter of faith; yes, he found a place for critical scholarship, acknowledging, e.g., that the resurrection accounts are fragmentary and contradictory (138) but point as "saga" to an objective bodily resurrection, yet one inaccessible to historical investigation; yes, we should not shrink from asserting the divine suffering, the very "passion of God" (276), for the history of Jesus is God's own solidarity with us.
The first half of the book deals with pre-1952 anticipations of Barth's developed doctrine of reconciliation, with particular attention to clarifying controversies. Of special consequence was his rejection of Bultmann's apologetic efforts perceived as control of the Word by cultural and philosophical preunderstandings. So too, Brunner's "point of contact," Niebuhr's Christian realism, and Berkouwer's Reformed orthodoxy, were seen as concessions to extrabiblical experiences and principles.

The final two hundred pages bring us to "the heart of Christian faith and the center of his Dogmatics" (252), the specifics of the doctrine of reconciliation. Drawing primarily on CD 4.1, M. reminds us of familiar Barthian themes: the Christological reconception of election, the unusual conjunction of the three offices, the two natures, and the two states; a rethinking of substitutionary atonement in terms of "the working person" and "the personal work"; the passion and crucifixion as both the condescension of the Son of God and the exaltation of the Son of Man; the resurrection as both the validation and revelation of the act of reconciliation on the cross.

Whatever questions one might have about Barth's "Christomonism," M. helps us to see his durable contributions. One of them is the exposure of tendencies in Christology and soteriology that weaken the "scandal of particularity," as in theologies of the late-20th century that view Jesus as a species of an experiential genus. So the aptness of Jüngel's words, which M. cites: Barth's "entire life revolved around a simple word: the Yes that God said to himself—the Yes that (because he says it to himself) he says also to the human race. . . . That was his accomplishment" (429).

Andover Newton Theological School, Mass.  GABRIEL FACKRE


We may be grateful to the publisher for making available the full translation of this important collection of fourteen essays written between 1939 and 1961. Part of the book was previously translated under the title Church and World (Herder and Herder/Palm, 1967). All the essays in some sense relate to ecclesiology, but they make no pretense of constituting a unified whole. The book is divided into three main parts, dealing respectively with the Church in itself, with states or callings within the Church, and with liturgy and sacraments.

Of the previously translated essays I particularly value "Office in the Church," which bears in German the preferable title "Nachfolge
und Amt.” As this title suggests, B. argues that ministry cannot be separated from discipleship. The office-holder must be transparent to Christ, who works in and through his faithful representatives.

Among the previously untranslated articles, I warmly recommend “Fides Christi,” a study of how the faith of the Christian participates in the archetypal “faith” of Christ himself. Although theologians have commonly denied that Christ had faith, this denial, as B. shows, must be rightly understood. It is not denied that Christ had total trust, obedience, and patient endurance, all of which pertain to the full concept of faith.

The chapter “Casta meretrix” deals with the paradoxical coexistence of holiness and sinfulness in the pilgrim Church. Consisting principally of a catena of patristic and medieval texts, this essay has been immensely influential. While recognizing the extreme subtlety of the question, B. evidently prefers to think of the Church in concrete terms as a society containing many sinners. While the Church in the abstract is pure, it is truly sinful in its members, even its hierarchical leaders.

In a brief article on the Church and Israel (better titled, in German, “Die Wurzel Jesse”), B. holds that God’s promises to Israel do indeed live on, but only in the Church of Christ. Against Bloy and others, he denies that, theologically speaking, Israel has a mission to fulfill in human history different from that of the Church.

In a very substantial study of “Priestly Existence,” B. emphasizes the servant character of the ministerial priesthood and its character as a participation in the priesthood of Christ. He declaims against titles of dignity, such as “excellency” and “eminence.” (By his own unexpected death, he was spared by several days from becoming an “eminence” himself.)

Though surely not a clericalist, B. is no laicist either. He wants an active laity, but one given to contemplation and to the practice of the evangelical counsels, and one that does not encroach on the functions of the hierarchy. He urges the laity to be concerned with the realization of God’s kingdom in the world, including the realms of culture and the arts.

Finally, B. offers some valuable reflections on the necessary role of reverence in liturgy, on the respective roles of the visual and auditory in the Orthodox, Protestant, and Catholic traditions, and on the need for a proper balance between seeing and hearing.

B.’s theology is highly contemplative and devotional. Taking the biblical text simply as it stands (without historical-critical probing behind the text), he puts the biblical images and metaphors to work in a constructive way. His ecclesiology centers about Mary, Peter, and John as “types” of the Church. On the ground that Mary received God’s
Word at the Incarnation, he argues that the Church existed already in a prototypical way at the Annunciation.

Few readers, I suspect, will peruse this book from cover to cover, but no one interested in the various topics here treated can afford to overlook it. Among modern theologians B. is almost unequalled for erudition, subtlety, and depth. He writes in long sentences that require a high level of concentration.

The translation, by several different hands, is of varying quality and is sometimes misleading. Where B. denies that faith exists in heaven, the translation says strangely that in heaven there is "not only faith but something that keeps calling for faith" (69). Greek oikia is translated "garment" (75). Ignatius of Antioch is confused with Ignatius of Loyola (127), and the "literal" interpretation of Scripture is called "liberal" (127). Then again, the salvation "now conferred" in Christ is said to be "not conferred" (298). In several cases the German Stand, which means "state," is translated "stand" (359, 407).

Regrettably the English publisher has not reproduced the helpful list of dates and places of original publication. An index is supplied.

Fordham University

AVERY DULLES, S.J.


In the ten years following the publication of his book The Trinity and the Kingdom of God (1980), Moltmann published a series of articles on the doctrine of the Trinity which are here gathered into a single collection. The essays are subdivided into two groups: those dealing with the individual persons of the Trinity and their relations to their creatures, and those offering an overall trinitarian interpretation of world history. There is, to be sure, some overlap and repetition, rather than the sustained development of a single theme. At the same time, the reader familiar with M.'s work over the last thirty years will note how he further nuances familiar themes.

In the essays on God the Father, for example, one sees how M. deals with the feminist assertion of patriarchy within the classical doctrine of the Trinity. Rather than search for a new, nonsexist name for the first person of the Trinity, M. makes clear how the term God the Father, when properly understood, has little or no connection with patriarchy and male-oriented structures of domination. The Father is the loving parent whom Jesus addresses as "Abba" and whom Christians should think of in motherly as well as fatherly terms. Furthermore, in today's "fatherless" society where husbands are for various reasons
either psychologically distant or physically absent from their wives and children, "it is necessary to develop a non-patriarchal way of talking about God the 'Father' in heaven in order to encourage people in his name to adopt a masculinity which does not lay claim to domination and a fatherhood without loss of power and feelings of powerlessness, since there is nothing wrong with becoming and being a father" (3–4).

Similarly, with respect to Jesus, M. proposes that the ideal of Christian life should not be *imitatio Christi* but rather *conformitas Christi*, union with Christ in his sufferings and death, and thereby solidarity with one another in combatting the inevitable alienation of modern life. Humans thus share in the "passion" of God for and with creation. Finally, as M. sees it, the Holy Spirit links all creatures to the Son in the Son's responsive love for the Father and prepares all of creation for its final consummation in the Kingdom of God when all things will be created anew. Thus only a trinitarian understanding of the God–world relationship allows one to endorse the doctrine of panentheism in which the world exists in and through the power of God and yet retains its own ontological identity apart from God.

Under the heading of a trinitarian interpretation of world history, M. gathers together several essays in which he reflects upon different phases of his own intellectual career. In two such essays, for example, he expresses his debt to Karl Barth and Karl Rahner and yet indicates his differences with them on various points. Likewise, he recalls his conversations with Ernst Bloch over the principle of (Christian) hope in human life and indicates how his own understanding of that principle has changed over the years. Then, in a concluding essay, he offers a summary of the development of his thought in dialogue with various thinkers and events within his own generation.

My only misgiving with this book is that M. still seems to lack an appropriate metaphysical conceptuality to support his important insights into the social doctrine of the Trinity, the passion of God for and with creation, and the consummation of all things in God at the end of history. As Whitehead noted years ago in *Adventures of Ideas*, one and the same set of metaphysical categories should govern the relations of the three divine persons to one another, the interpenetration of the divine and human natures within Jesus, and the relations of creatures to one another and to the divine persons. Images like that of *perichóressis*, in other words, need to be recast in strictly metaphysical terms which then apply to all entities without exception rather than simply to the divine persons in their dynamic interrelations.

*Xavier University, Cincinnati*  
JOSEPH A. BRACKEN, S.J.

Scharlemann has written a creative book that argues for a new form of reasoning ("acoluthetic" or "following") which possesses foundational contributions for Christology. More concerned with his epistemological ground than developing a full-blown Christology, S. explores a postmodern understanding of the self which he calls the "ecstatic I." He admits that his Christology is "idiosyncratic" when measured by other Christologies, but Christology is "more than a moment in a doctrine of God; it is also and, in historical terms, probably more originally an articulated understanding of the nature and constitution of human being" (1).

S.'s argument has three phases. The first phase is a remarkably lucid rendering of the self (the "I as such") from the contributions of Descartes, Kant, and the existentialists, particularly Heidegger, as well as lesser-known figures such as Wilhelm Herrmann and Georg Picht. S. argues that the "I" can come to itself (a form of knowing) by following another who summons, not as a "thou" whom I trust (Buber, Herrmann), but as an "I" for me that brings my own peace, or wholeness. This summons, as in a master-disciple relationship, turns the disciple back upon the self, and finally sends the disciple forth. The "following" is done not in obligation, as conscience might require, but in freedom. The Jesus-disciple is S.'s prime example, though Buddha and other examples might be acceptable. Perhaps a too controversial move for philosophers, S. says faith should not be compared to knowledge but to thinking, of which there are two modes distinguished by their "objects": faith seeks God, understanding seeks being.

The way the modes of "thinking" configure themselves begins the second phase of S.'s argument. He accepts the theoretical, practical, and aesthetic forms of reason and argues for a fourth: the acoluthetic ("following"). To be related to "the other" in this form requires the "ecstatic I," the capacity of the self to find itself as "I" in the other. S. then further compares, contrasts, articulates, and expands this "reason of following" and its possibilities for a systematic rendering of Christology.

The third phase explores two specific topics of "textuality" and the normativity of Jesus. The former deals with whether a self can be inscribed in a text and make a summons ("inscribed" self). The latter is "an admittedly sketchy account" (205) that employs a nuanced use of symbol and acoluthetic reason to suggest an understanding of Jesus' normativity beyond traditional exclusivism and a traditional universalism.
Grounded in the liberal Protestant tradition and in search of a postmodern self, S. has swung open the door between philosophy and theology. Three limitations might make it hard for either side to step through that door: continuous use of the Jesus-disciple relationship as the prime example of acoluthetic reason ("Christological reason"); a need for a comprehensive grounding of the phenomenon of "following" beyond Jesus; and the virtually exclusive dependence upon German philosophers and theologians of the early 20th century. My hunch is that philosophical theologians will applaud the door opening because it swings outward into the secular sphere, suggesting some new relations between faith and understanding within epistemology. Philosophers, on the other hand, will defer to enter, suspecting a crypto-theology in philosophical guise. Perhaps "entering" through the door is not required. Over such important topics as self, reason, and faith in the postmodern age, theology and philosophy, suspicions notwithstanding, need first at least to stand at the door and converse.

St. Louis University
J. J. MUELLER, S.J.


This book is "an examination of the role of creativity in the theologian's vocational self-understanding" (ix). The study is both historical and theological. Around the beginning of the 19th century, with some help from the Romantic movement, theologians both Protestant and Roman Catholic become highly conscious of the fact that theological writing is a work of creative imagination, and that theological authorship influences the shape, if not the substance, of the Christian tradition. Thiel sets out to explore the resultant modern understanding of the theologian's work, to examine how it has fared in the Church, and to assess its value for the future.

The opening chapters are devoted to two figures who strove to bring this new awareness of theological creativity explicitly to bear upon an understanding of the theological task: Friedrich Schleiermacher on the Protestant side, and Johann Sebastian Drey on the Catholic. For both, a key issue was that of the appropriate relationship between theological creativity and theological responsibility. The theologian is, in one sense, an "author" of the tradition; at the same time, the theologian is accountable to and for the tradition. How are both imagination and authority to be given their due?

T.'s account of Schleiermacher's answer to this question is among the best treatments of Schleiermacher's basic understanding of theology that we have. Of particular value is T.'s showing how the usual
English rendering of one word ("geltend") in the translation of Schleiermacher's definition of the task of dogmatic theology has obscured, at least for English readers, the extent to which Schleiermacher was concerned about the legitimacy of doctrine, and not only about its intelligibility to the modern mind. T. demonstrates that for both Schleiermacher and Drey, theology is responsible reflection, and not a matter of unbridled creativity. For both, theological work requires a moment of discernment, of receptivity to the truth the tradition bears, as well as a moment of creative reformulation.

T. writes as a Catholic theologian, and so it is appropriate that in the remainder of the book he concentrates on the fortunes of the modern understanding of theological authorship within the Catholic tradition. He is not inattentive to Protestant developments, however, and his book is instructive to readers in both traditions. His third chapter traces the reception of the modern notion of theological authorship within the Roman Catholic Church. Especially insightful here is his treatment of the way the image of the theologian-author as Romantic hero has been exploited, both by disaffected theologians at odds with church authorities, and by church authorities wishing to dampen the creative impulses of theologians, disaffected or otherwise. T. does not believe that an acknowledgement of the theologian's creative role requires this particular sort of antagonism, in which the courageous, creative individual is pitted against the unfeeling, authoritative establishment. He advocates instead a recognition on the part of the Church of the teaching authority of its theologians, and an acknowledgement on the part of its theologians of the responsibility they bear. Theological authorship is then a matter of "creative fidelity" (135–37).

In a fourth chapter, T. considers two postmodern challenges to the modern notion of theological authorship: one posed by deconstructionism (e.g. Mark C. Taylor) with its "effacement" of the author, and the other by postliberalism (e.g. George Lindbeck), which tends to limit theological creativity—i.e., reinterpreting the tradition in the light of present experience—in favor of strategies for interpreting present experience in the light of tradition (in Lindbeck's case, scriptural narrative). His expositions of both are perceptive, fair, and illuminating, and two of his judgments about them, at least, are persuasive: first, that the sort of deconstructionism he discusses, though bearing some valuable insights, also carries assumptions which are "irreconcilable with those of the Catholic tradition"; and second, that postliberalism addresses a distinctively Protestant situation, and that to import it into the present Catholic context might create more difficulties than it would resolve.

In the final chapters, T. proposes that the modern notion of theolog-
Theological authorship may, in fact, be peculiarly at home in a Catholic context, with its convictions about nature and grace, just as Lindbeck's suspicions about too much reliance on human experience in theology may be distinctively Protestant (sola gratia). (While some in each tradition might readily embrace that way of distinguishing them, I am not sure that this does justice to the diversity within each, and T. himself gives indications that the generalization should be qualified.) He goes on to expand the idea of "creative fidelity"—illuminated and corrected by the various critiques considered earlier—into a constructive account of responsible theological authorship in the Catholic tradition. In doing so, he shows in his own way what Catholic and Protestant theologians of various methodological persuasions can learn from each other.

The deeply ecumenical spirit of this book is displayed not only in its substance but in its style. It is plainly and accessibly written, with evident respect for the reader as well as for the various other writers whose work is discussed. It is well worth the reading, not least because of the way it exemplifies the responsible theological authorship for which it contends.

Perkins School of Theology, Dallas

Charles M. Wood


At the conclusion of his best-selling book, A Brief History of Time, Stephen Hawking stated that the goal of science is a "complete understanding of the events around us, and of our own existence." He anticipated that physics will eventually answer the question why the world exists, and this would be the equivalent of knowing "the mind of God." After this there will apparently be no more mysteries to explore.

The present book, whose title recalls Hawking's provocative words, draws no such deadening conclusions. Instead it deftly leads us to a sense of the fathomless depths of the cosmos, to what Davies calls "the mystery at the end of the universe." We need not fear that science will ever wrap things up for us as neatly as Hawking and others propose, leaving us with no future of endless exploration. Without being self-conscious about it, D., who is generally considered one of our very best scientific writers, has produced here what amounts to nothing less than a mystagogy. In that sense this book is not only a primer in scientific cosmology but also a work that expresses many of the concerns of fundamental theology.

D., of course, has had no formal training in theology. In the past he has even been openly hostile to religions. In God and the New Physics,
e.g., he stated that science is a more certain road to God than are the morally ambiguous historical religious traditions. Following his own brand of natural theology, he suggested that we may be able to arrive at the sense of a divine reality without the help of religious experience. He has not yet completely abandoned this position, but here there is a more religiously tolerant spirit. D. describes himself as one of those scientists “who do not subscribe to a conventional religion but nevertheless deny that the universe is a purposeless accident.” Through his scientific work he has concluded that the universe has been put together with an “astonishing ingenuity.” Lately he has even been reading a little theology, and he expresses a predilection for process theism as providing the most appropriate theological conceptuality to make sense of the world given to us by science.

Science, D. states, is always an excursion into the unknown, but it unfailingly discovers that rationality and order pervade the universe, though this order is often complex, deep, and incapable of algorithmic compression. D. is particularly impressed by the human mind’s ability to discover and understand the subtle mathematical principles by which the universe runs. That there should be such resonance between the schemes of human reason on the one hand and the underlying order of the universe on the other is a miracle that does not fit very well the scientistic hypothesis of an accidental universe out of which the mind evolved in a purely blind fashion. Instead, as the badly misnamed “anthropic principle” implies, the existence of conscious beings must be a fundamental aspect of the cosmos. We can understand the universe only because it has always been isomorphic with mind. D. agrees with Roger Penrose and those who hold a Platonic theory of mathematics according to which numbers and the scientific laws based on them are much more than our own subjective projections. Rather, they are transcendent, not invented but discovered. It is out of their eternity that the actual universe comes into existence. As to the origin of these originating laws, D. is quite open to a theistic interpretation. However, he persistently adds that the use of the term “God” to name the origins of the world’s design, is a matter of “taste.”

Particularly noteworthy is D.’s affirmation of the contingency of the universe. While theologians have taken the world’s dependency and nonnecessity for granted, modern scientific thinkers have often rejected this notion in favor of an eternal universe that exists necessarily and that therefore requires no eternal ground beyond itself. As Stanley Jaki has forcefully argued, however, the assertion that the world is necessary amounts to a loss of the very idea of the universe. Relativity theory and the big-bang cosmology based on it have helped us recover the idea of a limited and contingent universe, but physicists and phi-
losophers continue to struggle against such an idea. Without any scientific evidence they offer intriguing hypotheses of infinitely many worlds, apparently so that our own world, inhabited as it is by life and mind, will not seem so improbable as to require any divine creation. D. resists this trend. He is more open than most contemporary scientific authors to the contingent and possibly "created" character of the universe.

While one might be troubled by D.'s Platonic notion of existence, his book is an important contribution to the literature on science and theology. And although theologians may find much to debate in this fascinating book, D. deserves our gratitude for laying open so interestingly and clearly some of the theological questions arising out of scientific cosmology.

Georgetown University

JOHN F. HAUGHT


Browning defines fundamental practical theology as "critical reflection on the Church's dialogue with Christian sources and other communities of experience and interpretation with the aim of guiding its action toward social and individual transformation" (36). This process of critical reflection has four theological submoments: descriptive, historical, systematic, and strategic (or fully practical). Case studies of three actual congregations are introduced at the outset and consistently illustrate the proposal, emphasizing especially its praxis-theory-praxis character and the descriptive and strategic submoments of the reflective process.

This critical reflection is carried out within the ongoing flow of experience from deconstruction to reconstruction to deconstruction. This movement or dynamic in life is thoroughly historical. Individuals and communities have recourse to basic narratives or traditions, which are historically situated, as are the very questions of the contemporary moment which become deconstructive by challenging the prevailing (and historically situated) understandings of the narratives. All communities engage in this process and all communities have their distinctive narrative traditions. For Christians, these narratives are the Scriptures, within which B. identifies certain basic principles, such as the love command or golden rule. The essentially public character of fundamental practical theology requires that a case be made for such basic principles which both communicates to those outside a particular narrative tradition and establishes common ground for transformative action.
We are invited to enter the theological and philosophical conversations within which B. has fashioned this proposal. Seasoned readers will recognize how these conversations informed B.'s earlier works and the degree to which this proposal represents their fulfillment. First, there is B.'s concern to recover how the dimension of practical reason permeates, even constitutes, theology. As early as *The Moral Context of Pastoral Care* (1976), B. had contended that pastoral care necessarily had a moral context because it was at root an exercise of practical wisdom or *phronēsis* and thus oriented toward application.

Second, B.'s conversation with practitioners in the expanding area of congregation studies manifests itself in the case studies. His analyses of the cases reveal how congregations and individual members engage in practical theological reflection all the time, even if that reflection is not as systematic or explicit as that of the participant-observer theologian. Further, the cases suggest that leadership in congregations could be enhanced if ordained and nonordained leaders recognized this process at work in themselves and in their congregation and utilized that recognition as an aid toward transformation.

Third, this book represents another moment in B.'s participation in the ongoing cultural conversation about meaning and transforming action. He has long advocated that theology participate fully in the search for meaning going on in our times. B.'s previous writing on this subject had engaged representative theoretical psychologies and psychotherapies as the primary secular "implicit religions" or meaning-givers. Here theology's potential conversation partner is less a particular secular discipline with a theory and corresponding praxis and more the loosely defined yet pervasive cultural philosophies which inform the social, environmental, and ecclesial contexts in which congregations, theologians and the discipline of theology are located.

B.'s proposal establishes the fully theological character of practical theology; unifies many specialized areas of pastoral study (e.g. pastoral counseling, liturgics, and homiletics) within a fundamental theological framework; identifies the processes of practical reason actually at work in real-life congregations; advances understanding of the practical character of all theology; argues for and models theology's contribution to culture. Each of these achievements is grounded in the recovery of the Aristotelian understanding of practical reason as understanding that emerges in dialogue and conversation. B. will continue to have many and diverse partners in this dialogical pursuit of understanding: theologians and philosophers, liberation thinkers of many kinds, ministerial educators, proponents of grass-roots theological-reflection methodologies, and people of good will and hope who look to
churches for reflective and critical moral leadership in challenging times.

_Theological Studies_  
La Salle University, Philadelphia  
Michael J. Mcginniss, F.S.C.


Borowitz has given us a valuable lesson in how theology should be done. Here is the mature statement of a senior scholar who for the past three decades has emphasized the centrality of the covenant for contemporary Jewish thought. The work has direction and passion, eloquence and elegance. It is reasoned and responsible.

B. takes the reader along his religious journey. His theology is personal without being self-centered. Time and again, he gives us glimpses into the inner spiritual life of contemporary Jewry's leading liberal theologian. He shares gently and compellingly the spiritual world he inhabits along with the theological requirements for the establishment of such a spiritual worldview. Thus B. informs us from the outset that he is seeking a theology of covenant that makes Jewish life binding upon the Jew, that does not present Judaism as one viable option in the pluralistic marketplace of contemporary spirituality, but as a covenant that engages and commits this generation of Israel as it did three millennia of Jews before them. He seeks a consciousness of Jewish duty and Jewish obligation that is different in form but not in responsibility from contemporary Orthodox Judaism and that does not require the bifurcation of religious consciousness—a secular world untouched by religiosity or a religious world untainted by secularity—or the renunciation of history. To this reader, a traditional, observant non-Orthodox Jew, B.'s quest itself is a refreshingly honest attempt to answer the religious questions that beseech me.

It is not only B.'s search that is impressive but his methodology. No arena of human learning remains alien. No dimension of Jewish experience is unapproachable. B. considers each of the modern Jewish thinkers from Hermann Cohen, the fin-de-siècle German Jewish neo-Kantian, to Richard Rubenstein whose pioneering work _After Auschwitz_ (recently republished in a second and considerably expanded edition by Johns Hopkins University Press) sought to deny the covenant of faith and build Jewish existence on memory, ritual, and community. B.'s sojourn among modern thinkers is not designed to impress us with his erudition (though he does) nor to refute his predecessors and colleagues (though that too he does en passant), but to learn from three generations of thinkers of diverse and rather differing
points of view. Few books in modern Jewish thought are as open to the diverse trends of Jewish thought. Few thinkers are mature enough to learn what can be learned and must be learned from Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, from Mordecai Kaplan and Abraham Joshua Heschel, from Rubenstein, Emil Fackenheim, Irving Greenberg, and Joseph Dov Baer Soloveitchik. B. learns from them all—Zionists and anti-Zionists, existentialists and rationalists, sociologists and philosophers, teachers and friends, as well as earlier figures. Remarkably, B. neither repeats nor reiterates. He never loses his particular focus as he scours the thought of modern Jewish philosophers and theologians. He never loses sight of who he is and what is the center of his theological quest.

Some may differ with B.'s contention that there are two forms of contemporary Jewish religious thought, Orthodox and non-Orthodox—even if offered by seemingly and self-identifying Orthodox Jews. It seems that the division is too intense and there is greater diversity on what B. formerly regarded as the liberal scale of Jewish thought and now considers merely as non-Orthodox. Yet few can argue with his analysis of the postmodern Jew who lives in a world of freedom and choice less confident in the promise of emancipation, less trusting in the goodness of God's creation and the humaneness of the world. Certainly, B.'s liberalism is deeply influenced by the Holocaust and his consciousness of evil more acute than in any of his earlier works.

Fewer still could take issue with his insistence that Jewish thought must be adequate to entail Jewish obligation and the decisive choice of believing Jews, committed Jews to remain Jews and give voice to a renewed covenant between God and Israel.

This work is not only a summary and culmination of decades of theological reflection on B.'s part, it also charts the direction that his thought must go from here both in theoria and in praxis. We look forward to more.

*Georgetown University*  

*MICHAEL BERENBAUM*


A number of recent books have tried to take seriously the global character of Christianity and the decentering of European theology within that globalization. Some focus on issues of cultural difference; others, upon new sociopolitical and economic realities. Nearly all try in some fashion to address the question of Christianity amid other reli-
gious traditions. All of them have to grapple with how to articulate a universality that is not simply a veiled form of another European hegemony.

Noted author Ninian Smart and graduate student Steven Konstantine set for themselves the task of articulating a global Christian theology within the context of the world religions. In point of fact, their principal dialogue partner is Hinduism, with some references to Buddhism and passing mention of Islam and other traditions. They try to develop a phenomenological typology that will allow for a greater dialogue between the traditions, yet faithfully set forth a Christian theology seen through this phenomenological lens, as well as their respective Anglican and Orthodox traditions. A long methodological introduction results in their presenting what they call a Neotranscendentalist approach with an admittedly soft epistemology that allows room for the variety of worldviews in the world. The second part, entitled "A Vision of Love," develops a Christian theology with a strong trinitarian basis, seeing the cosmos as God's body.

As a global theology, this book misses the mark. It gives the veneer of a global theology by substituting Sanskrit terms for Christian ones. Thus "religion" becomes darsana, "Lord" becomes Ishvara, etc. This is not terribly good phenomenology, and suggests equivalencies that are not there. There is little dialogue with others who have struggled with the methodological questions, such as Raimun Panikkar. While a softer epistemology may be needed in a pluralistic world, this cannot become a warrant for methods not adequately thought through. For a Christian global theology, it is surprising that few Christian authors outside the European ambit are mentioned. There are points where Christian concepts, such as incarnation and sin, are compared with their rough equivalents in Hinduism and Buddhism, but the comparisons are intended to throw light on the Hindu and Buddhist worldviews and not on Christianity.

What is presented here on a social understanding of the Trinity (apparently largely the work of K.) and how it is carried through the discussion of other doctrines is the best part of this book. It is good, too, to see a book on global theology that takes the Orthodox tradition so seriously into account. But readers looking for some new directions in a global theology sensitive to the plurality of traditions and worldviews will have to seek it elsewhere.

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

Thompson continues and deepens his fruitful labors in Christology with this fine, sensitive volume. Pondering it brought to mind Fra Angelico's dictum: "Whoever would paint Christ must live with Christ." Such, in essence, is T.'s conviction as well. The Christologist must participate in the Christic experience which he or she depicts, whether the chosen medium be oil on canvas or words on paper.

In expounding his argument, T. provides a nuanced and helpful treatment of spirituality in the sense of experience formed and transformed in Christ. His discussion also poses some critical questions regarding the now tired disjunction of "from above" and "from below" in Christology. This is often construed as though only the latter bears experiential reference, while the former prescinds from experience. In fact, the perspectives and approaches subsumed under these spatial metaphors represent interpretations and judgements which are themselves constitutive of experience.

A dominant theme sounded throughout the volume, and profusely illustrated in the chapter on Bérulle and the French School of the 17th century and that on the Virgin Mary as a "Christological source," is the centrality of "adoration" in Christology. Drawing appositely on the writings of von Hügel, T. stresses the objective givenness of God's reality, the prevenience of God's grace. Adoration's very possibility depends upon the "over-againstness" of the adored Other.

Yet, in only seeming paradox, adoration also constitutes the royal road to Christology: the discernment and confession of God's incarnational presence in Jesus the Christ who is Emmanuel. For only the God who is distinctly personal and free, and thus radically transcendent and other, "can become fully personal for us in history." Adoration thus becomes the measure of whether we have transcended a merely "intraworldly sacrality" (a sort of hazy pantheism swaddled in Christian clothes). And T. does not shrink from drawing the compelling conclusion: "Where adoration suffers, then confessing the Incarnation suffers too." A descent to the mystical dimension of Christianity, guided by von Hügel, becomes the very condition for the possibility of renewal in Christology and theology as a whole.

The seminal chapter is that on "Jesus' Uniqueness and the Dialogue between the Religions." The trinitarian Christocentrism, so superbly realized in its own day by Bérulle and his School, must be retrieved in a way that is not merely repetitive, but genuinely creative. In our day this clearly demands respectful dialogue with non-Christian religious traditions. T.'s contribution to the discussion takes on added substance through his employment of Eric Voegelin's thought, especially Voegelin's differentiation of the "noetic" and the "pneumatic." This distinction allows T. to affirm the real noetic achievements of the nonbiblical
traditions; and yet to discern a uniquely revelational and personal character that distinguishes the biblical tradition.

In this chapter T. intends, with exemplary modesty and forthrightness, to correct the presentation of Jesus’ uniqueness in his earlier *The Jesus Debate*. His Augustine-like “retractatio” boldly underscores the *newness* of the Christ event, sketching, in the process, a trinitarian Christocentrism of great promise. Though the name of Bonaventure does not appear in the index, nor does the great Franciscan figure among the numerous authors, ancient and modern, who are cited, T.’s project impresses one as increasingly Bonaventurian in tenor: probing the hidden center in whom all things cohere. That the book exudes a sense of praise, peace, and delight shows further kinship with the Seraphic Doctor.

T.’s latest book manifests an impressive congruence of mind and heart. If I be permitted one desideratum, it is that this talented and generous theologian prune an expository style that can become unduly repetitive, so that the fine insights presented might stand out in even bolder relief.

*Boston College*  
ROBERT P. IMPELLI


Sheldrake, senior editor of *The Way*, here attempts to do just one thing, and does it very well: he shows how historical context is to be taken with utmost seriousness in the complex task of interpreting the history of Christian spirituality. Rather than a sweeping survey of this history, S. offers a helpful framework for looking to those committed to “life in Christ” at earlier times and in different places. In addition to a clear articulation of a theory of history and a precise hermeneutical repertoire by which to read it, S. provides vivid examples of how the theory works.

S. provides a probing contemporary critique of general chronological and narrative histories of spirituality. Earlier studies ferreted out historical data as background to the central task of exposition and validation of received traditions. Historical factors were marshalled as evidence in support of claims already made on other bases. Historical scrutiny did little to alter the resounding conclusion: “It has ever been thus.” In S.’s view, taking this approach involves lumping together complex, discrete events and figures in an all too neat and tidy tableau. The effect is to obfuscate diversity of expression, and render inaudible those alternative voices that have challenged and critiqued prevailing
modes of Christian faith and practice. Western spirituality has been dominated by spiritual, cultural, and social elites, which have been bolstered by these theories of history.

S.'s treatment poses crucial questions about the nature of historical processes and, most importantly, about the assumptions behind historical interpretation. His own assumptions are explicated and thematized in a methodological repertoire shaped by post-conciliar ecclesiologies and spiritualities, and by what might be called a hermeneutic of marginality that is attentive to the "underside of history."

S. uses his method in two case studies. In the first study, he calls into question the dominant "Pachomius to Ignatius" model, made popular by David Knowles as an explanation of the development of religious life. This model and others like it reinforce a sense that history is simple, linear, and monolithic rather than complex and plural. From this perspective, religious life develops throughout Christian history as various expressions of an essentially communal and monastic way of life. S. auditions a different scenario. The origins of religious life lie in earlier periods and different historical settings. He draws attention to early autonomous virgins and to the Syriac ascetics, the ihidaya (single ones), as the two earliest instances of what is now called religious life. Thus not only does S. provide a fresh perspective on the origins and development of religious life, but he also presents a framework for evaluating contemporary expressions of religious life as they shake loose from vestiges of monastic influence and practice that are not proper to them.

In presenting his second case study, on the conflict over the Béguines, S. deftly argues that their gradual disappearance cannot be attributed to a purported tendency toward heterodoxy. Rather, the identity, indeed the very existence, of these committed lay women was effectively snuffed out because the canonical, normative framework for evangelical life could not or would not allow for this more spontaneous, free-form evangelical flourishing. The question of orthodoxy or heterodoxy among the Béguines can only be addressed properly in view of the evidence that some among them were theologically literate autodidacts.

S. also provides a critique of the typology of the kataphatic and apophatic ways in spiritual life and development. Based on a careful reading of Pseudo-Dionysius, he concludes that there is no justification for setting these two paths in opposition. Though S.'s treatment of this point is helpful, contemporary discussion of the apophatic and kataphatic ways ordinarily reaches a dead-end. Would it not be better to jettison the typology itself? It would then be possible to give due attention to less problematic images such as "purity of heart" or
“enlightenment” as descriptive of some of the central issues in the spiritual life.

If anything is lacking in this work, it is a greater measure of self-criticism of the premises on which S. builds his study. The work provides a sharp critique of traditional approaches to Christian spirituality. This is a critique with which it is difficult to take issue. There remains, however, a hint of suspicion that greater attention might have been given to the critical function that the tradition itself might serve vis-à-vis some of S.’s presuppositions and guiding convictions.

The merits of this work lie primarily in the methodological form that S. gives to the interpretation of the history of Christian spirituality. S. creates room for hearing the story—and thus the voices—of those groups and persons who have been marginalized and disenfranchised not only by historical processes, but even more by the way in which accounts of history have traditionally been constructed.

*Lexington Theological Seminary*  
*Michael Downey*  

**SHORTER NOTICES**


Burridge’s revised dissertation re-examines the question of the genre “gospel” and affirms that our Gospels are lives of Jesus. He thus agrees with, but also corrects, defenders of the biography genre against its (largely German) critics who saw the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur* unlike contemporary literary biographies, or with no literary character at all due both to their origins in oral sources and to their kerygmatic focus. Further failed attempts to relate them to other genres, like encomia or aretalogies, led the Gospels to be considered writings *sui generis*.

B. first clarifies the notion of genre with the aid of contemporary and classical literary theory. As a conventional (sometimes unconscious) contract, a genre guides the author’s production and the audience’s expectations. Despite prescriptive claims in literary theory, genre describes a flexible range of literary productions with general similarities overshadowing particular differences. After outlining external and internal characteristics for determining particular genres, B. finds how these function in ten examples of Graeco-Roman biographies, from before and after the Gospels, some of which have been cited as comparable to the Gospels but none studied thoroughly. He then examines the Gospels in light of these characteristics of ancient biographies and finds that all four Gospels manifest them.

The evangelists’ choice of the biographical genre over that of the sayings collection or letter is taken as one indication of the general awareness of the literary genre, however humble the Christian community might have been. The development of the Gospels into a sub-category akin
to the lives of philosophers and the multiple uses of the biography genre (e.g. encomium, polemic, apology, entertainment, instruction) are also discussed. Concluding hermeneutical considerations focus on the centrality of the figure of Jesus and his historical existence. In all, the case for biography as the Gospel genre is reasonably argued and amply substantiated.

BENJAMIN FIORE, S.J.
Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y.


Nineteenth-century British theology was hardly a moment of great distinction in the West’s long reflection on matters pertaining to God. Nevertheless, it had some importance, and Addinall tells its story with an erudition that is careful not to suffocate the reader with trivia. In fact, the exceptional literary and historical talents displayed by A. seem to outclass completely their subject. The give-and-take of the protracted debate that occupied the period’s theological attention is traced in a manner that keeps its plot clear, interesting, and subject to A.’s critical eye.

His story, however, no matter how well it was told, would appeal to only a very limited audience except for the fact that it is connected with a claim of truly breathtaking scope that must touch a nerve in any philosopher or theologian who reads it: “It must be admitted that he (Kant) . . . did lay a firm foundation for religious belief in general human experience, and his critical philosophy is directly relevant to the construction of a theology which is meaningful and persuasive to men and women belonging to a science-dominated culture” (2). The case for this claim is presented in chaps. 9 and 10, with the first carrying most of the burden of proof. The results are less than satisfying. One gets the impression that A. had not taken the measure of the task this claim placed on him before introducing it as part of his prescription for curing the ills of the theological speculation he has just so ably reviewed.

This is scholarship at its best: thorough, selective, intelligently critical, and highly readable. It is a very fine book that would have been even better if it had been just two chapters shorter.

JAY REUSCHER
Georgetown University


The parable, one of numerous small literary units found in various rabbinic collections, serves as an entrée to a literary-historical investigation of the relationship between exegesis and narrative. Stern first shows the stereotyped form of the parable, especially in the Amoraic period, and its relationship to its interpretation (nimshál) and midrashic context. He then argues that the rabbinic parable is used as a rhetorical narrative to persuade its audience of “the value of a certain idea or approach or feeling.” One chapter reviews the poetics or narrative strategies used in parables, including intentional ambiguity, editorial guidance toward interpretation, characterization, and anthropomorphism. Another, on thematics, treats parables as ideological narratives used for apologetics, polemics, eulogy, consolation, complaint, regret, and warning. Finally, Stern reviews the midrashic contexts in which parables appear and presents a sketch of the history of the parable in Jewish literature. Each point is illustrated by a series of texts, many drawn from Lamantations Rabbah, which receive detailed interpretation.
The book is well written, comprehensible to the nonexpert and thorough in its description of material and in its use of modern literary criticism to explicate the parables. However, no overall literary or historical theory holds the materials studied together. The parables appear in a wide variety of midrashic collections which have in common only that they were produced in the long and diverse rabbinic period. Neusner's thesis that most collections are held together by literary, rhetorical, and theological characteristics is hastily rejected, leaving the topic, parables, floating in a sea of description and classification with no shore in sight.

ANTHONY J. SALDARINI
Boston College


This original and fascinating book charts the rise to dominance of Christian discourse, a term Cameron defines as "all the rhetorical strategies and manners of expression characteristic of Christian literature" (6), and which she uses in full awareness of its deconstructionist associations. C. experiments with the potential of modern literary theory to illuminate how the "figural" character of Christian discourse was a key to its social power, and heralded its slow usurpation of monopoly rights in the early Byzantine world.

C. argues that Christianity developed a distinctively organized system of thought and expression, both flexible and all-inclusive, which distinguished it from paganism. This blend of textuality, referential language, and "technologized" religious knowledge and expression was central to its attractive power. C. tells the story with reference to the changing historical context in which Christian discourse developed and was received, in particular its prolonged engagement with pagan discourse. In her recounting the empire converted so to speak from the top down, not coercively but persuasively, through the triumph of Christian rhetoric. She concludes that the rise of Christianity did not mean a levelling of intellectual standards or the triumph of popular religiosity, pace Gibbons and his modern derivatives, but a deepening of horizontal channels of communication in a traditional and hierarchical society in which they were in scarce supply.

This thesis is developed in six chapters which treat themes such as Christianity's figural and declarative speech, suitable for a society fond of epideictic oratory; its narrative penchant as evidenced in second- and third-century apocryphal acts and fourth-century biography, which were central to the construction of a Christian mythic universe; the public and politically charged rhetoric of the fourth century, through which Christian writers accommodated themselves to classical standards for the sake of laying interpretive claim to the past, both secular and sacred; the use of the rhetoric of paradox to protect Christianity's foundation in mystery, especially in the abundant literature on virginity and the Virgin; the natural extension of Christian figurality to the visual realm, first in narrative cycles and then in icons; and the final establishment of a closed and absolutist Christian discourse, yet one keenly alert to ineffable mystery, in seventh-century Byzantium.

MICHAEL J. HOLLERICH
Santa Clara University

THE LIVES OF THE MONKS OF PALESTINE. By Cyril of Scythopolis. Translated by R. M. Price, with an In-
SHORTER NOTICES


Cyril of Scythopolis (c. 524–558) is an Orthodox monk who provides us here with extended biographies of two of the most remarkable figures in the Judean desert, the celebrated monks Euthymius (†473) and Sabas (†532), and brief accounts of five others. Though the introductory and instructional sections of his lives reflect standard Christian works and the piety of the times, C. is regarded as the inaugurator of a new style of hagiography that is historically reliable rather than merely an edifying story written according to a biblical or legendary pattern. His book is based mainly upon interviews with those who knew his subjects and recalled stories about their exploits.

This is a significant work for several reasons. First, it deals with the period when the monasteries outside of Jerusalem developed from very modest beginnings into a mass movement. It traces for us the dominant roles the leading monks played both in integrating monastic life within the institutional Church and in promoting monastic and ecclesial power within the political life of the Empire, especially in the Orthodox struggles against the Monophysites and Origenists. It is especially valuable for the historical, chronological, and topographical details C. provides about the period. Finally, it reveals how the Judean Desert conditioned the development of the cenobitic and laura styles of monastic life.

I found the English translation clear and interesting. The lengthy introduction, the copious notes, the up-to-date bibliography, and the maps locating the various monasteries are in their own right worth the price of the book. Highly recommended for libraries and scholars interested in the histories of Palestinian monasticism and the Jerusalem church when they were at the height of their power and prestige.

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


This is a ninth-century text of a polemic by a Shi’ite Moslem theologian against the doctrine of the Christian Trinity, as it was presented orally and in writing by Jacobite, Melkite, and Nestorian Christians. The text is based on quotations in the rebuttal of the Christian polemicist Yahya Ibn ‘Adi.

The volume includes the original Arabic with a facing English translation. The translation is in fluent English considering the complexity of discussing trinitarian relations. It does not, however, take advantage of the linguistic devices that are present in Arabic to show a Moslem theologian’s bewilderment at the complexity of the Trinity. For example, one might translate the Arabic term tath-lith as a verb (the “triangulating” or “trinitizing” of God) rather than as a noun (“trinity”); that would give the flavor of the obtuseness of the Christian doctrine to a Moslem theologian. The translation as a whole, however, is of high quality.

The text includes a comprehensive introduction that gives the historical and cultural background of the personalities and the related doctrinal disputes of the period. The footnotes refine further the precisions attained in the introduction. If there is a weakness it is the anemic index, which does not reflect the richness of detail that the book contains. An index of technical terms, which abound in the text but are not reflected in the index
nor glossed in the body of the text, would enhance the book. This treatise reflects the intensity and the sophistication of theological disputes that took place in the Abbasid period among Moslem and Christian theologians and makes a contribution to our knowledge of that period.

SOLOMON I. SARA, S.J.
Georgetown University


Defining misogyny as a speech act reducing women to a category, Bloch provides an analysis of misogyny that "undermine[s] rather than confirm[s] its historic power . . . by exposing its inner tensions and contradictions" (6). Bloch concentrates on "two moments of rupture or disjunction in the history of sexuality in the West" (9): the period between the first and fourth centuries; and the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. He shows how the misogyny and asceticism of the early church Fathers were transformed during the High Middle Ages into an idealization both of woman and of love.

Bloch's focus on the paradoxes in the writings of these two periods provides much of the interest in his argument. As Bloch analyzes how the Yahwist Creation story makes women seem secondary and derivative, therefore inferior and debased, and how various historical developments influenced the early church Fathers' view of women, the paradoxes include the loquacious attack by male writers on the loquacity of women. In his discussion of French lays and love lyrics, he emphasizes how courtly literature, while encouraging secrecy, reveals the secret love that must be kept secret in order to be love.

To show the relationship between the focus on asceticism in the earlier period and the phenomenon of courtly love, Bloch develops several parallels: the necessity for discretion and distance, an antifeminist tone, and a focus on virginity. Most important is the abstraction or categorizing of woman that keeps her at a distance from history and the world by robbing her of individual identity and of equality.

Bloch makes extensive use of scholarly sources and arguments as he develops his own thesis, and his effective historical analysis reinforces the probability of his theological and literary arguments. The many parallels he develops between the seemingly very different writings of the two periods make his thesis about the transformation of misogyny into woman worship persuasive.

SANDRA R. O'NEAL
Columbia College, S.C.


The central thesis of the volume is that "Petrarch developed a rhetorical theology that deserves understanding and appreciation." Boyle, a respected scholar and theologian, presents her case looking at the complete work of Petrarch—the writing in Latin as well as his writings in Italian, his lyrical verses as well as his prose—exposing with abundant quotations and exegetic parallels the poet's prophetic vocation in scriptural and classical traditions.

P.'s theology is a way to salvation through literature, an alternative to asceticism or contemplative theology. That theology, as seen by the critic, is a conscious effort to communicate apprehended truth in an art mode. The celebrated ascent of Mont Ventoux, e.g., is found to point to "divergent
paths to blessedness,” and yet the ascent is a real event, a physical enterprise. It becomes a theological element as a transfiguration of an action with polysémie connotation. B. convincingly shows that P.’s use of scriptural figures rather than syllogistic conclusions is the basic element of his humanist theology.

As with any reformulation of the poetics of a famous and much-studied author, it is difficult to accept this new thesis readily and uncompromisingly, but Boyle’s brilliant and thorough investigation of biblical, historical, and classical sources elicits admiration and respect. She reveals an important new dimension in P.’s work, and offers valuable new insight into humanist theology.

Florinda M. Iannace
Fordham University


While the increasing hegemony of theory in recent literary criticism has led to spirited debate in the Academy, it has also made it increasingly clear that not every New Historician knows all that much about history. Thus it is a real pleasure to pick up a book by an established historian who knows something about literature. This work, “written by an historian who has been moved by the poetry” of Piers Plowman (2), is not just another general introduction to the 14th century—the sort of thing that Chaucer’s popularity has inspired. Instead it is a reading of Langland’s masterpiece against its specific historical context. While D. is very much at home interpreting the symbolic roles of “Do Well,” “Do Better,” and “Do Best,” he is in his métier discussing Langland’s obvious prejudices against the friars, the rise of Lollardy, and the role of religion in an age of nominal faith.

Not that D. sees Langland’s faith as nominal: “Piers Plowman was and is an address to an unconverted world written by a man keenly aware that many people thought him a fool” (4). A fool Langland was not, and D. does a fascinating job of reconstructing the man as well as his times. As an historian, D. approaches what George Kane has called the autobiographical fallacy from a discipline less self-conscious about reconstructing people from what they have written than literature usually is. D.’s attempt seems historically quite sound; he limits himself to the sort of speculation that any historian would find sensible. The result is not only a better sense of who Langland may have been. D. also gives us an introduction on how to read a poem which deserves to be more widely appreciated outside the confines of graduate classes in Middle English literature.

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


A fine edition of Hilton’s Scale of Perfection which makes this major fourteenth-century guide to spiritual formation accessible to a variety of readers. Working from scholarly editions and manuscripts, Dorward has produced a readable and vigorous modern English text. Because of her careful editorial work, hers may be the most accurate edition of Hilton now available. This may be chiefly of interest to scholars but more general readers also deserve such careful editorial work.

Clark’s Introduction gives us a brief life of Hilton and a survey of his
writings. C. also summarizes Hilton's sources and locates the Scale in the context of other fourteenth-century spiritual writings. His discussion of Hilton's achievement in the Scale clarifies its importance as a guide to full development of the baptismal life. C.'s Notes provide helpful background, translate Latin passages, and explain obscure readings in the text.

An appreciative Preface by Janel Mueller finds Hilton concerned with relations among Christians as well as between individual Christians and God. Mueller sees in Hilton's emphasis on all Christians' equality before God grounds for hope in ecumenical relations in our own day. Overall, this volume exemplifies the Classics of Western Spirituality series at its best.

JOHN N. WALL
North Carolina State University
Raleigh


The meticulous historical reconstruction and elegant new translation of The Only Way is a fitting way to celebrate the Las Casas quincentenary. This volume includes a biographical introduction to Las Casas's spirituality by Parish, which explains the multiple origins, the various versions, and the remarkable impact of his treatise; there are also biographical addenda, textual appendices, and a bibliography.

The treatise begins with a Prologue on the "Humanity of the Indians," in which Las Casas, arguing against those who maintained that the Indians were "servile by nature" and not fully human, describes the quality of their minds, the beauty of their art and artifacts, their political and social order, and their personal achievements and educatability; he concludes that they are apt subjects for evangelization.

In the body of his treatise, Las Casas describes the only way to achieve this evangelization—and this is the crux of his argument—as "the way that wins the mind with reasons, that wins the will with gentleness, with invitation" (68). This was the way of Christ, of the apostles, the way of the kingdom of compassion and peace, and the way endorsed by the pope. This way of evangelization, by invitation and persuasion, is opposed to "false evangelization" by violence and wars for conversion, which is what was happening in New Spain. He condemns the brutality and carnage of war and the enslaving of the Indians to work in the mines and the encomiendas.

The Epilogue calls for restoration of the Indians, and restitution of their property and their kingdoms, because wars of conversion are "mindless and unjust." Those who are guilty of such mortal sins can only save their souls by making restitution and satisfaction. This is the only way.

The treatise, together with the biographical and historical background, provide an eyewitness account of the Conquest as well as a portrait of the spiritual and theological maturing of the great Defender of the Indians. This volume is a major contribution to our understanding of the man and the period.

T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley


Justenhoven's intelligently analyzed and well-organized study of this 16th-century Dominican theologian from Salamanca is timely. Some have held Vitoria to be the father of international law, and his ideas on the just and unjust causes of war resonated
recently in the debates that preceded the war in the Persian Gulf. The pressing issue in Vitoria’s own time was fear of Turkish military intervention in Europe. The conquest of America formed another significant context for his thought. His conceptualization of the possibility of a more humane encounter between Europeans and native Americans exercised great influence over the 16th-century Indian reform movement.

After summarizing Vitoria’s intellectual formation at the University of Paris and the influence of Thomism on him, J. discusses his basic ideas on a just war, the legitimate authority of rulers to declare war, the theological implications of this defense of war, and his political vision. For Vitoria, who rejected the radical nonviolent Christian tradition of, say, Tertullian in his *De corona militis*, self-defense was natural and necessary and extended to avenging serious wrongs. The end and purpose of war, however, was the peace and safety of the community. A ruler could wage war on behalf of an ally or wronged persons because the protection of the innocent was part of natural law. But before going to war in a just cause, the causes must be examined and discussed. Individuals had the right not to go to war if in conscience they found the cause of war unjust. Care was to be taken not to harm the innocent. Vitoria gave three canons of war: (1) Do not look for causes for war, but live peaceably with all men; (2) When war has started, do not ruin the enemy; (3) Pursue victory with moderation and Christian humility.

We are indebted to J. for his keen analysis of Vitoria’s arguments on war. Renewed interest in the U.N. and in international law makes this work required reading for all those interested in a truly new world order.

DAVID M. TRABOULAY
College of Staten Island, CUNY


This is the first volume in a five-volume series which will make available 246 previously unpublished manuscripts of sermons from Newman’s Anglican years, “with sufficient editorial apparatus for the theological development within them to be understood and their historical situation to be clear” (vi). An appendix provides a chronological listing of N.’s 604 Anglican sermons.

The transcription of the 43 manuscripts in this first volume is magnificent. Murray identifies interlinear additions and material from facing pages (both N.’s comments and those of this friends); retains N.’s misspellings, obsolete spellings, and idiosyncratic punctuation; and notes illegible words, repetitions, rearrangements, deletions, erasures, substitutions, and material missing due to torn pages. It is especially interesting to read N.’s self-critical remarks, the longest of which concludes: “Lastly, I did not write this Sermon without much thought, nor without repeated prayer” (Sermon 42, no. 160). These are diamonds in the rough compared with the 217 Anglican sermons N. revised for publication during his lifetime. Scholars will probably delight in this fresh body of material showing N. at work, while other readers would probably be better served by the polished sermons.

Murray’s footnotes are superb in drawing attention to the theological and biographical significance of the sermons. At first, his introductory notes seemed to steal the thunder of the sermons by condensing them and quoting the most striking passages, but later it became clear that this prelection intensifies the impact of
the text. Murray demonstrates an impressive command of N.'s writing, sources used by N., and commentaries on N., and he is not afraid to note theological or rhetorical difficulties in the sermons. Grouping the sermons by theme (in this volume: "A Parish Priest and His Charge," Liturgy, Sacraments, and The Mediator) makes sense, but, especially in the fourth and longest section, produces a moderately unpleasant degree of repetition.

MARTIN X. MOLESKI, S.J.
Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y.


In this valuable book, the world-famous moral theologian reveals many details of his varied relationships with the institutional Church. The format is question-answer; Italian journalist Gianni Licheri is the questioner. Häring describes major theological events in which he participated. The book is extremely interesting for many reasons, not least for tidbits about the personalities we encounter on almost every page. We meet S. Tromp and F. X. Hurth and their machinations. We hear M. Schmaus say ominously, "I doubt whether Father Häring will survive the Council." There are spicy citations and incidents about a host of cardinals and theologians. There are explosive temper tantrums and apologies. There is H.'s attempt to seclude himself after Humanae vitae, and his pastoral dealing with the birth-control teaching.

The centerpiece is H.'s doctrinal trial (1975–1979). First, H. takes us through the trials and tribulations of his friends, including J. Schmidt, H. Doms, B. Krempel, S. Lyonnet, M. Zerwick, G. Gutiérrez, and C. Curran. H. presents his own trial through his correspondence with Cardinal Franjo Seper, Prefect of the Doctrinal Congregation. At one point, after noting that he had stood four times before a Nazi military court, H. says of the CDF, "I would rather stand once again before a court of war of Hitler" (133). Unfortunately, what stands out in this trial is the remarkable incompetence of the personnel of the Holy Office, what Cardinal Pellegrino referred to as "a complete proportionality between ignorance and arrogance" (94).

This is at once a sad and edifying report. Sad, because it is a legitimate hope that Rome would have learned that such curial bullying is no longer acceptable, indeed is, as Cardinal Frings noted during Vatican II, scandalous. Edifying, because we witness a great man suffering courageously and loyally, without a trace of bitterness, for the Church he so obviously and deeply loves and superbly serves.

RICHARD A. MCCORMICK, S.J.
University of Notre Dame


This 1982 dissertation argues that Curran's theology of compromise as the basis for judging the morality of an act does not cohere with his overall method in ethics. Grecco structures his argument according to the four steps of Curran’s method: stance (the perspective of moral theology derived from the total horizon of Christian faith); model (the step which makes Curran's relational-responsibility method a dialogue within the matrix of God, other, nature, and self); person (an anthropology viewed through the meaning of Jesus); and decision (the meaning of conscience).
Since Curran abandoned the use of compromise in favor of his relational-responsibility version of mixed consequentialism, the value of this book today is not so much in its thesis as in its ordering and interpreting the scattered methodological elements found in his writing. Since the dissertation has not been revised for this publication, it does not include Curran’s recent essays on social ethics which would fill out G.’s interpretation of model and person.

G.’s work helps us to appreciate the many contributions Curran has made to the renewal and development of Catholic moral theology. For example, G. shows that Curran has not abandoned natural-law theory but has revised it by situating nature within a theological context and by putting primary emphasis on human experience over reason as the more comprehensive arena in which we know God’s revelation and what is real in life. He underscores how seriously Curran takes sin as a reality in any complete theory of human nature and moral decision making. Above all, G. shows how much Curran thinks about the moral life as a committed Christian believer who is moving Catholic moral theology from isolation to integration with the Bible and with the mysteries of faith, thereby making morality operate very much as a spirituality.

RICHARD M. GULA, S.S.
St. Patrick’s Seminary
Menlo Park, Calif.


Meilaender has an unusual ability to treat complex topics with clarity, charm, and insight. In this book, he masterfully explores how certain central Christian themes must be held in tension together. He argues for a distinctively Christian ethics that is, nonetheless, open to general ethics. He claims that humans are bound by their finitude yet able to transcend it, that their personhood depends not on abilities but on God’s address, and that they flourish not just as universally human but in special relationships.

After discussing sin as pride or sloth, M. explores human responsibility in original sin. He shows that grace, which justifies and sanctifies, is oddly both gift and task. He acknowledges Christian reasons for consequentialism, but then argues that Christians may not and should not try to achieve the “greatest good.” Exploring two forms of natural law, M. Affirms worldly action but denies it ultimacy. He allows no decisive religious significance for political achievements; and he asserts the Church should serve as critic, not program planner. He discusses the moral implications of viewing death as natural or unnatural. He concludes with a lovely comparison of Rousseau’s and Augustine’s Confessions as patterns for Christian living.

M. exhibits the merits of a “both— and” mindset; one-sided positions in moral theology lead to distorted living. Still, this reviewer disagrees on a number of points. That disagreement flows from differences of theological traditions and prudential emphases as well as from M.’s occasional lapses into one-sidedness, e.g. forbidden self-love or a role for the Church in politics. Still, every ethicist can learn from M.’s effort to hold complex themes in tension.

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

I have often found myself uneasy at a tendency among psychological researchers to carry out experimental studies with no attention to the philosophical presuppositions behind their research; indeed, psychological investigation often appears philosophically impoverished. Fortunately, one area where psychology and philosophy foster collaboration, and hence a true interdisciplinary dialogue, is the study of moral development and ethical decision making.

Wren has done an invaluable service in probing the philosophical suppositions behind moral psychology and, in the process, helps to chart its future course. He believes that a climate of readiness now exists in psychological research for movement away from reinforcement-based theories and “for the emergence of a moral psychology that is both mature and truly cognitive” (25). W. supports this statement with a judicious and discerning analysis of psychological theories from radical behaviorism to cognitive-development theory. He argues that most psychological theories utilize an externalist perspective that views the moral self as the mere product of reinforcing experiences. In contrast, the grounds for an essentially internalist perspective of morality, a viewpoint that embraces cognitive evaluation as representing the core desires of a responsible moral self, finds some support in the cognitive-developmental theories of Piaget and Kohlberg. In order to champion this internalist perspective, W. ends with some excellent philosophical speculation that nicely blends philosophical and psychological thinking.

Though W. is a philosopher, his knowledge of psychological theory is impressive. In particular, he provides not only a summary of various theorists’ thought, but often some interesting interpretations of their ideas, especially those of Kohlberg. Personality theorists have become increasingly receptive to life-span developmental theory and a promising mode for this discussion is the life-story model of development. W.’s understanding of moral and personal selfhood would find a ready audience with psychologists favoring this life-story approach. Likewise, moral theology and ethics has come to view the human person not only in context but as a multifaceted being whose complex layers require questions oriented around virtue and character. W. offers a vital perspective for any such discussion. Students of ethics, psychology, or philosophy who are interested in moral development should give his book a serious reading.

Charles M. Shelton, S.J.
Regis University, Denver

Theology for a Scientific Age.

Peacocke speaks to those who would like to follow the Christian way but thought they could not do so with intellectual integrity. He addresses the “myth of the gulf between Christian theology and the natural sciences” and aims “to rethink our ‘religious’ conceptualizations in the light of the perspective on the world afforded by the sciences.”

Under the heading “Natural Being and Becoming,” P. delineates certain features of the world afforded by a range of sciences. P. classifies himself as a theologian, but his background in the physical chemistry of biological evolution offers insight into the natural world which differs from those who write about science and theology out of a background in physics or cosmology. His descriptions of “top-down causality” in nature, based on his overview of the dramatic consequences of recent research into self-organization in biological and human systems, opens new territory for theological reflection and offers a distinct
but complementary insight for traditional notions of "bottom-up causality," commonly associated with reductionistic scientific methodology.

Under the heading "Divine Being and Becoming," P. proposes an answer to the question of the meaning of the universe, which is not answerable by science itself. He develops a vision of God and God's activity which is process-oriented, though not constricted by Whiteheadian metaphysical categories. It is traditional Christian apologetics in a modern mode. Using criteria of fitting the data, internal coherence, comprehensiveness and general cogency, simplicity and fruitfulness in producing new ideas, he argues forcibly that the question of God, no longer regarded as meaningless as in the earlier days of logical positivism, is most reasonably answered in the personal Christian God-Creator of an anthropic universe. Vulnerability, self-limited omnipotence and omniscience, ground and source of law (and chance) are among the many divine attributes considered. P.'s God is temporal and eternal and therefore not immutable in the strong, classical sense. Using the top-down causation model, God's interaction with the world is discussed under headings of creative activity, sustaining activity, final cause, general providence, special providence, and miracles.

Those who are familiar with P.'s previous works will not be disappointed by this one, and they can look forward to a promised sequel in which P. will turn to more specifically Christian doctrines concerned with "human being and becoming."

JAMES F. SALMON, S.J.
Baltimore, Md.


Groome introduced his approach in his Christian Religious Education (TS 41 [1980] 808). By deftly combining scriptural scholarship, philosophical argument, and educational theory, he situated a praxis way of knowing at the center of debate on the goals and methods of religious education. In the present sequel the lineaments of shared praxis are unchanged, but G. has added many refinements. G. notes a contemporary paradigmatic shift in Christian religious education from teaching content for intellectual assimilation to a holistic approach. This shift, he argues, requires a parallel ontological turn in philosophical foundations, which the overwhelmingly cognitivist Western epistemological tradition is inadequate to provide. G.'s constructive proposal, an "epistemic ontology," is a comprehensive anthropology. It lists the five tasks of a "pedagogy for conation in Christian faith" and so describes "the dimensions and dynamics of human being to be consciously engaged" by that pedagogy. The shared-praxis approach corresponds closely with this epistemic ontology. This approach engages the consciousness that arises from people's praxis: it promotes critical reflection on praxis in its sociocultural contexts; guided by the emancipatory interest of the reign of God, it makes available expressions of the Christian story vision; it brings people's praxis and the Christian tradition into a mutually critical hermeneutic for the purpose of personal appropriation; and it elicits more humane praxis in response to this dialogue. At heart, shared praxis is a discipline of genuine dialogue, the art of conversation shaped by the insights of critical hermeneutics and liberation theologies, a revisionist practical theology that provides a way to approach the foundational ecclesiological issues that at-
tend the question of how to hand on the faith.

G.’s book is well organized, but unnecessarily long. His writing is prolix and repetitious; a firm editorial hand could have remedied this problem, and also corrected numerous typographic errors, spelling mistakes, and a few theologically imprecise statements. The rapid survey of Western epistemology and the numerous summaries of the work of other scholars are clear and integrated with G.’s purpose. His use of Gadamer, Habermas, and contemporary theologies of liberation in the shared-praxis approach is one of the book’s greatest strengths. (By contrast, the presentation of Lonergan’s thought is unreliable and its use uneven.) Both concrete and theoretically sophisticated, G.’s shared praxis offers the practical theologian an approach to Christian ministry characterized by the acuity of critical theory and the accessibility of narrative.

KRIStopher L. Willumsen
Wheeling Jesuit College, W.Va.


This thoughtful, thorough, and accessible study explores the status of exotiká defined as an “array of sometimes benevolent, but more often malevolent demons, fairies, and spirits” (xv) in contemporary Greece and its relationship to Orthodox Christianity. Stewart, a cultural anthropologist, argues that exotiká are significant neither insofar as they are continuous with ancient pre-Christian traditions, beliefs, and practices nor as alternative symbols. Rather, exotiká are integral, if subordinate, to the Orthodox Christian cosmology, and their symbolic value must be assessed in relation to Orthodox Christi-

S. offers an important corrective to earlier scholarship. Noting that the paradigm of great and little traditions as an interpretative framework is implicitly class driven, he offers an analytical model that contrasts religion as textual or doctrinal with religion as practiced or lived within a community. He attempts to show how both exotiká and Orthodox Christianity influence the ways in which supernatural forces are imagined, imaged, and narrated in Greek culture.

The first part of this study emerges from S.’s field work and focuses on the “narrative framing devices” for interpreting the experience of good and evil. The second argues for the coherence of doctrine and exotiká in the representation of supernatural figures within an Orthodox Christian cosmology. In the final part S. explores baptism, exorcism, and spells as competing for control over the power of the demonic. In conclusion he argues that there is a consistency in the Greek imagination that suggests a common attitude toward the problem of evil that is expressed in different forms: exotiká on the one hand, doctrine on the other.

IRENA MAKARUSHKA
Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.


Nine essays show the power of religion to create a discourse that counters the American-led coalition in the recent Gulf crisis. They focus, in the light of religious and cultural integrity and political expediency, on the responses and the political ability of “fundamentalist” movements and
groups—from North Africa to the Middle East to South Asia—to deal with the imposition of modern Western political constraints.

Piscatori identifies three directions in which "fundamentalism" will have to make compromises: the state, popular Muslim sentiments, and Muslim patrons. While A. Baram reports that Shi'ite fundamentalist movements in Iraq are showing an openness to liberal democratic principles, S. A. Arjomand sees the response in Iran as a deviation from neutrality without resulting in any appreciable change in foreign policy. On the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, Hamas succeeds in gaining political ascendancy over the PLO and popular support, according to J.-F. Legrain, without aligning with either Iraq or Kuwait. B. Milton-Edwards sees the Jordanian response as resulting in the adoption of a new National Charter based on the Shari'a, without having to concede that any single party is the sole guardian of truth. In Egypt, the crisis exposed weakness in the Muslim Brotherhood theoretical bases, argues G. Auda, whereas in Algeria, it slowed, for H. Roberts, the transition to democracy. In Pakistan, the reaction for M. Ahmad was essentially religious: in connection with solidarity, with safety and integrity of Muslim holy sites, and resulted in the passing of a Shari'a bill. D. Brumberg's summary view is that the crisis created constraints and dilemmas that may undermine the ideological and political influence of "fundamentalist" movements and groups. In a Foreword, Martin Marty and R. Scott Appleby discuss the meaning of Islamic fundamentalism.

Suggesting a shallowness to "fundamentalist" positions in providing practical answers to democratic reforms, the book seems to assume the task of fundamentalist movements in the Islamic world is to accommodate democratic reforms rather than to encourage instituting reforms based on Shari'a.

ABRAHIM H. KHAN
Trinity College, Toronto
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Presenting This Issue

The final issue of volume 53 has two articles featuring significant retrievals from the early and the medieval Church, two articles in fundamental moral theology, an article in theological anthropology and mysticism, and a note on Roger Haight's Spirit Christology.

Two Medieval Soteriologies: Anselm of Canterbury and Julian of Norwich, making good use of the methodological principle of examining all writings in their full contexts, and following Rahner's recommendation to search the writings of the mystics and saints as sources of theology, points out similarities as well as differences which bring closer together the seemingly extreme justice-rationalism of Anselm and the seemingly unqualified universalism of Julian. JOAN M. NUTH, Ph.D. in theological studies from Boston College, and assistant professor of theology at John Carroll University, has a special interest in analyzing the relationship between the experience of God (spirituality) and the articulation of doctrine (systematic theology). She recently published Wisdom’s Daughter: The Theology of Julian of Norwich (Crossroad, 1991), and is now working on Hildegard of Bingen.

Charism in the Early Church since Rudolph Sohm: An Ecumenical Challenge analyzes the influence of Sohm's thesis of the charismatic Church in discussions of the nature of the early Church during our century, and the ensuing synthesis in which both permanent ministry and charismatic ministry are gifts of the Spirit. ENRIQUE NARDONI, a specialist in the Synoptic Gospels, has his doctorate from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome and is professor of Sacred Scripture at the University of Dallas. He recently published “Partakers in Christ (Hebrews 3.14),” NTS 37 (1991), has a further article on charism (in St. Paul) forthcoming in the CBQ, and is working on a book (in Spanish) on social justice in the Bible.

The Challenge of Moral Distinctions explores the conditions and nature of responses to the challenge of moral distinctions in the field of contemporary ethics, with illustrations from medicine, business, and international relations. JOHN MAHONEY, S.J., with an M.A. from Glasgow, licentiates in philosophy and theology from Heythrop College, Oxfordshire, and a doctorate from the Gregorian University in Rome, is the F. D. Maurice Professor of Moral and Social Theology at King's College, University of London. Specializing in moral theology and in medical and business ethics, and well known for his The Making of Moral Theology: A Study of the Roman Catholic Tradition (Oxford, 1987), he recently published Business Ethics in a New Europe (Amsterdam, 1992). He is the founding editor of a new quarterly journal, Business Ethics: A European Review.

Proportionalism and a Text of the Young Aquinas: Quodlibetum IX, Q. 7, A. 2 is a textual analysis of a Quodlibet of Thomas cited by
proponents of moderate teleology as a place in which Aquinas is thought to make a distinction between premoral and moral evil. **Mark Johnson**, assistant professor of philosophy and religion at St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Indiana, has his Ph.D. in medieval theology from the University of Toronto. Specializing in moral theology and medical ethics, he recently published "The Principle of Double Effect and Safe Sex in Marriage: Reflections on a Suggestion" in Linacre Quarterly. He is working on a college textbook, Introduction to Moral Theology, and on a response to recent reflections on delayed hominization.

The Heart in Rahner's Philosophy of Mysticism, maintaining that heart is not a faculty but the highest operation of soul as finite spirit, outlines a developmental continuum from primitive affectivity (Heart I), through the labor of reason and will (Head), toward a Heart II characterized by knowledge and love based on affective connatural understanding as habit (virtue). **Andrew Tallon**, who has his Ph.D. from Louvain and is professor of philosophy at Marquette University, specializes in Rahner, the philosophy of affectivity, and twentieth-century French and German Existentialism and phenomenology. He recently published "Affectivity and Praxis in Lonergan, Rahner and Others in the Heart Tradition" in Religion and Economic Ethics, ed. J. Gower (1990), and has just completed a book manuscript, The Heart's Reasons: A Philosophy of Affectivity.

Roger Haight's Spirit Christology argues against this concept as presented by Haight in TS (1992) 257–87, and contends that central to Catholic Christology is the fact that Jesus is a divine person or subject in a fully integrated human nature, and not simply a human being with the fullest indwelling of the Holy Spirit. S.T.D. from the Gregorian University in Rome and professor emeritus of systematic theology at the Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, **John H. Wright**, S.J. is giving special attention these days to the themes of providence, prayer, and eschatology, and to some recent developments in Catholic theology. He recently published "Theology, Philosophy, and the Natural Sciences," TS 52 (1991) and is now working on a theology of divine providence.

*Robert J. Daly, S.J.*
*Editor*
NOTE

ROGER HAIGHT'S SPIRIT CHRISTOLOGY

The June 1992 issue of *Theological Studies* carried an article by Roger Haight, S.J. entitled "The Case for Spirit Christology." In spite of many very fine features, this article seems to me to be essentially flawed and, as stated, not an acceptable way of understanding the Christian faith.

Since "Spirit Christology" can have many meanings, it seems important to state at the beginning the meaning that emerges in this article. Haight correctly described Christologies as "formulations that express, or explain, or identify who Jesus is on the basis of the experience of faith that Jesus bears God's salvation."¹ Haight's Spirit Christology identifies Jesus as a human being, who from the first moment of his existence was filled with God as Spirit so as to become the bearer of God's salvation. It is this indwelling of the Spirit from the very first that is said to separate this Christology from adoptionism (277). He understands this indwelling Spirit to be the divinity of Jesus:

Jesus was empowered by God's Spirit; the Spirit of God is God as present, and thus a presence, a power, a force, an energy, so that Jesus is an embodiment of God as Spirit. But this is not an impersonal power that takes over and controls, but precisely God who works within human freedom, not from outside and dominating nor from inside and taking over, but actualizing freedom to its full capacity (276).

Two aspects should be noted in this Spirit Christology: Jesus' own religious experience, and the religious experience of those who follow him. Jesus' own experience was experience of God as Spirit present in him, enabling him to call God "Abba!" By sharing the Spirit with us, he enables us likewise to call God "Abba!"

When we penetrate to the inner person or subject in Jesus, we find only a created, human personality, although supremely graced and empowered by the Spirit. Haight denies that Jesus is a divine person: "Historical consciousness prevents one from saying that Jesus' being a human being refers to an integral but abstracted human nature that has as its principle of existence, not a human existence, but a divine person or hypostasis" (275, n. 34). This description of divine personality in Jesus may be somewhat tendentious ("integral but abstracted human nature"), but the meaning seems clear. Because he rejects the

divine subject and, consequently, the communication of properties (275), he will not speak of the preexistence of Jesus (276).

In brief: Haight sees Jesus simply as a human person filled from the first moment of his existence with God as Spirit. There is in him no preexistent divine subject who has become an actor in human history through the human nature he has made his own. There is no eternal Son of God who has become a human being, but simply a man preeminently filled with God as Spirit.

Toward the beginning of his article Haight has provided us with six methodological criteria for judging the adequacy of a Christology. These criteria are well chosen. But using them to evaluate his Christology as described above, I find it to be defective, precisely in his denial that the ultimate personal subject in Jesus, the one who is Jesus, is truly and personally divine. For him, there is no one "born of the Father before all ages," who has, however, become truly one of us, truly and fully a human being. I would like to take these criteria up one at a time:

1. The first criterion is apologetic style: Christology should justify Christian experience of Jesus. It should explain why Christians find their salvation in him (260). And "salvation consists in a revelation of God" (266), which makes God present and empowers us as disciples.

Christian experience is undoubtedly where Christology must begin: the experience of the original disciples of Jesus and the experience of believers throughout the history of the Church up to and including our own day. Christians in their experience do relate to Jesus as Savior, but they also relate to him as Lord. Christian experience of Jesus is expressed in the doxologies given to him in the New Testament (e.g. Heb 13:21; 2 Pet 3:18; Rev 5:13) and found in Christian worship ever since. An experience of Jesus is expressed in Thomas's profession of faith, repeated by countless believers after him: "My Lord! and my God!" (John 20:28). These expressions are not directed simply to God as Spirit dwelling in him, but to Jesus himself. Haight's Spirit Christology does not justify this aspect of Christian experience.

2. Christology must be faithful to biblical language about Jesus. Here it seems to me that all the New Testament is normative, that an acceptable Christology cannot neglect significant portions of the New Testament witness. The prevailing New Testament Christology seems, strictly speaking, to be neither Logos Christology nor Spirit Christology, but a Christology of divine sonship. That Jesus is Son of God is declared or implied throughout the New Testament. Jesus is not just a son of God like every other believer, but God's "beloved Son" (Matt 3:17), "his own Son" (Rom 8:3), to whose image we are predestined to be conformed (Rom 8:29), "his only begotten Son" (John 1:14; 3:16).
Paul's preaching of the gospel "concerns his Son" (Rom 1:3). This Son is involved in the creation of the world: e.g. 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–17; Heb 1:2; John 1:3.

A Logos Christology did indeed lead some, like Apollinaris, to a monophysite view of Jesus that is incompatible with the New Testament. But this view is also incompatible with the Logos Christology of John. He calls those "antichrist" who do not agree that the Christ has come "in the flesh" (1 John 4:2, 3). A Logos Christology need not lead to positions incompatible with New Testament data. It is not unusual that a rich and fertile insight (like Logos Christology) bring forth some weeds which need to be trimmed back and corrected.

I recognize a pluralism of New Testament Christologies, but I am not willing to accept the view that the New Testament expresses mutually exclusive, because contradictory, Christologies. Accepting some formulations does not require us to reject others. It may not always be clear how they are to be reconciled, but this is an invitation to search for what Lonergan called "the higher viewpoint," the perspective which will put seemingly opposed expressions in some kind of genuine intelligible agreement with each other.

It seems to me, in particular, that Haight does not take serious account of the Christology of John. It is not only that he neglects John's teaching on the Logos with God in creation (John 1:1–3) and the affirmation of the incarnation of the Logos (John 1:14), but he also takes no account of the "I am" assertions of the Johannine Jesus. When he argues against the "préexistence of Jesus," he seems to render the matter tautological: the man Jesus did not exist as a human being before he was born (276). No one ever understood préexistence in this way, so why trouble to refute it? But the Johannine Jesus says: "Before Abraham came to be I am" (John 8:58). He also prayed, "Now Father glorify me in your own presence with the glory I had with you before the world was made" (John 17:5). Are these declarations to be discarded?

3. I agree, too, that Christology must be faithful to the Christological councils, especially Nicea and Chalcedon.

It is true that the Council of Nicea did not directly define the incarnation of the Word because Arius and Athanasius agreed on this. Still one must recognize that they agreed because it was the teaching of John 1:14. Nicea and the whole Christian tradition since has accepted this passage as important and significant. Haight does not appear to do so.

The main source of Arius's heresy does not seem to have been a

---

subordinationism implied in "Word," but one implied in "Son." A son cannot be of the same age as his father. The Father must exist before he begets the Son, hence there was [a time] when the Son was not.

It does not do justice to what Nicea was about, to say that it just wished to affirm that what was present and active in Jesus was not less than God. This is true of every good person: no less than God is present and active in them. The Holy Spirit dwells in each of us, in the community of the Church, and God is active in all the good that we do: Quoties bona agimus, Deus in nobis atque nobiscum, ut operemur, operatur, as the Second Council of Orange declared (DS 379).

The point of Nicea, given the agreement on the incarnation of the Word, was that the one acting in the actions of Jesus, the preexistent Son, was no less than God.

The Council of Chalcedon was indeed concerned to teach the full humanity of Jesus, that he is homoousios with us. But it was concerned directly and primarily to bring peace to the Church by finding a formula that brought together the legitimate affirmations of both Word-Flesh Christology and Word-Man Christology, and by avoiding the extremes of both the Monophysites and the Nestorians. The Chalcedonian formula makes affirmations (emphasized below) that seem clearly incompatible with Haight's Spirit Christology:

Following the holy Fathers, therefore, we all with one accord teach the profession of faith in the one identical Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. We declare that he is perfect both in his divinity and in his humanity, truly God and truly man composed of body and rational soul; that he is consubstantial with the Father in his divinity, consubstantial with us in his humanity, like us in every respect except for sin (see Heb 4:15). We declare that in his divinity he was begotten of the Father before time, and in his humanity he was begotten in this last age of Mary the Virgin, the Mother of God, for us and for our salvation. We declare that the one selfsame Christ, only-begotten Son and Lord, must be acknowledged in two natures without any commingling or change [against extreme Word-Flesh tendencies] or division or separation [against extreme Word-Man tendencies]; that the distinction between the natures is in no way removed by their union but rather that the specific character of each nature is preserved and they are united in one person and one hypostasis. We declare that he is not split or divided into two persons, but that there is one selfsame only-begotten Son, God the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ. This the prophets have taught about him from the beginning; this Jesus Christ himself taught us; this the creed of the Fathers has handed down to us.3

Chalcedon did not think it was differing from Ephesus, but clarifying it because of the monophysite interpretations that had arisen. Chalcedon, too, called Mary theotokos, which is possible only through the communication of properties—a device of language which is also found in the New Testament. No doubt the teaching of Chalcedon is historically conditioned and the “two natures, one person” formula can be improved on. But it seems to me that the improvement is not to be found by failing to grasp and acknowledge what the Council formally intended to teach in and through that formula.

An important point here is Spirit ecclesiology. What the believing Church proclaims in faith with virtual universality over many centuries is what the Holy Spirit is leading her to profess. This principle needs to be cautiously applied since cultural overlays can appear as profession of faith, although they are not, as in the widespread assumption of male superiority among church Fathers. But the unanimity of the Church in professing the Christology of divine Sonship as taught at Nicea and Chalcedon cannot be dismissed and its main point explained away.

4. I agree, too, that Christology must be intelligible and coherent; but we will always have to distinguish, as Paul did, between the wisdom of the world and the foolishness of God. Once again, this can be a delicate and difficult matter at times.

It seems to me that Haight’s position is coherent within itself, but not with the experience of most Christians, with the teaching of the New Testament, nor with the Councils of the Church and the Great Tradition generally.

5. A contemporary Christology must respond to our own situation and problems. While it may not be possible to spell all this out, still I see at least three important requirements for Christology and for theology generally: (1) we must recognize the influence of historical conditioning; (2) we cannot be simply mythological and metaphorical in our efforts to understand the faith; and (3) we must recognize and assess positively the religious pluralism of our times.

As Haight well observes, today’s recognition of religious pluralism in the world constitutes a special challenge for Christology. This leads him to say that we must not only admit that God as Spirit is at work in other world religions (281)—a point made, it seems, by Vatican II in the opening section of Nostra aetate—and even more explicitly by Pope

4 “[God’s] providence, His manifestations of goodness, and His saving designs extend to all men (cf. Wis. 8:1, Acts 14:17, Rom. 2:6–7, 1 Tim. 2:40) against the day when the elect will be united in that Holy City ablaze with the splendor of God, where the nations will walk in His light (cf. Apoc. 21:23 E)” (The Documents of Vatican II, ed. Walter Abbott, S.J. [New York: America, 1966] 661).
John Paul II in *Redemptoris missio*—but also recognize "the possibility of other savior figures of equal status [with Jesus]" (280). This latter point seems to undercut radically the mission of the Church expressed in Matt 28:19–20: "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and teaching them to obey everything that I have commanded you."

In Christian experience, Jesus is Lord, the mediator of God's saving action, the incarnation of God's love, power, and wisdom in the world. God has so taken possession of this one concrete human life that in it and through it he acts effectively and definitively for the eternal welfare of the whole human race.

We should acknowledge, however, that the saving action of God drawing human beings to himself in lives of unselfish love is present throughout the whole human race, and that people everywhere respond to this with greater or lesser fidelity. Furthermore, we should acknowledge that God in his gracious wisdom calls some individuals in special ways to be the vehicles of his light and help for others. These individuals are religious leaders in every time and place. None of this is peculiar to Christians, nor do Christians necessarily respond more faithfully to God than any other people.

God, however, makes a special appeal and issues a special call to the world through the mission of his Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus is not simply a prophet and teacher whose insight into the divine mystery is sharper and deeper. Rather he is truly the revelation of God in person, unsurpassable in fullness, intensity, and saving power. Every other gift of God finds its completion in the person and the work of Jesus. It is this which justifies the missionary activity of the Church, while requiring that it be respectful of all that God has done in other ways.

6. Finally, I agree with Haight's last requirement: Christology must be able to inspire Christian life. I am not, I confess, persuaded that Spirit Christology by itself is able to do this without a Christology of divine Sonship. At least for myself, as I contemplate a purely human Jesus, though one in whom the Spirit is fully operative, I experience an immense sadness and sense of loss: for this would mean that God after all did not love us enough to become one of us and die for us. But Haight thinks that such a Jesus is one we can follow more readily.

The Scriptures have exhorted us in the Old and New Testaments to imitate God: "Be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy!" (Lev 19:2). "Be

---

5 "It is the Spirit who sows the 'seeds of the Word' present in various customs and cultures, preparing them for full maturity in Christ" (cited in Francis A. Sullivan, S.J., *Salvation Outside the Church* [New York: Paulist, 1992] 195).
perfect therefore as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Matt 5:48). By becoming one of us the Son of God has shown us what this means, and by sharing with us his Holy Spirit, he has made it possible for us to follow him.

The fundamental norm for Catholic faith for me is \textit{continuity}, not in words or formulas, but in thought and intent. The distinction John XXIII made at the beginning of Vatican II, between the substance of the ancient faith and the formulas in which it is expressed, has become classical. I believe that this continuity in the faith is the work of the Holy Spirit. Another quality of truly Catholic theology is \textit{comprehensiveness}, a both/and stance, rather than an either/or stance. I fully accept Spirit Christology, as stating that the Holy Spirit in divine fullness was operative in Jesus, but I also accept Word Christology. And in the long run the important point for me, one which I regard not as an optional theological position, but as an article of faith, is that Jesus Christ is the eternal Son of God made human—in whatever terms you express this.

\textit{Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley} \quad \textit{JOHN H. WRIGHT, S.J.}
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