BOOK REVIEWS


As editor of the Interpretation Bible Commentary series, Mays has a consistently high standard for expository commentaries: the works should be grounded in historical criticism, but they should not assume that the reader is conversant in Hebrew or Greek, and they should aim chiefly to address "the needs and questions which arise in the use of the Bible as Holy Scripture." It is therefore no surprise that his own entry in the series lives up to that standard. This is the best expository commentary on the Psalms currently available.

Like some other Psalms commentaries, M.'s exposition of each psalm is divided into sections. But these sections do not follow a set pattern (e.g., text, form, setting, etc., as in Kraus's commentary). M. may have a section on "type setting" for one psalm but not for the next. Rather, the sections serve to highlight the particular points M. wishes to stress about each psalm and to allow him to cross-reference thematic discussions embedded within expositions. This is appropriate to the kind of commentary he is writing, and it gives the expositions a more holistic character.

In conjunction with this volume, a collection of M.'s essays and lectures on the Psalms has been published by the same publishers. The 14 essays are grouped under five topics: the liturgy of the kingdom of God; prayers of need, gratitude, and trust; the praise of the Lord; David as psalmist and Messiah; the Psalms as book and Scripture. The nature of this book as a collection is evident from repetitions, omissions, and lack of real development from chapter to chapter. Taken together, these essays do not amount to a theological handbook to the Psalms, despite the subtitle. However, scholars who are interested in a theological reading of the Psalms will be grateful to have M.'s essays on the subject under one roof. The approach they take is of a piece with the approach taken in the commentary, so that they do constitute a good "companion" to the commentary.

Both books present the metaphor of God as king as central to the "language world" of the Psalms. Although at times M. seems to assert this by a kind of theological fiat, one can mount a good objective case for his claim. If we analyze the Psalms using Thorkild Jacobsen's three main categories of metaphors for deity in the Near East—the gods as spiritual "cores" of natural phenomena, as rulers, and as parents—the ruler metaphor clearly predominates. But M. is too anxious to distance "psalmic" language from language derived from human experience.
(The Lord Reigns 7, 13, 147 n. 4). I think we have to accept that all language about God, even biblical language, is in some sense a projection of human experience onto the divine. Even if psalmic language has a privileged position in the Jewish and Christian communities, and I think it should, we still cannot ground that position by claiming that Israel came by its God-language in a way that was qualitatively different from anyone else.

M. takes two different approaches to relating the Psalms to modern Christian readers. First, he rephrases the theology of the Psalms in a way that is broad enough to encompass both the ancient psalms and the modern church, accentuating their similarity. This approach evident, e.g., in summarizing statements like “The LORD maintains rule among the peoples of the world by sovereign choice of a people, a place, a person, and a pedagogy” (ibid. 8).

Second, he accentuates the difference between the Psalms and “the sensibilities of modernity” by posing a series of antitheses: “[The language of the Psalms] centers on a sovereign God rather than on a sovereign self. Its ideas are those of monarchy rather than liberal democracy. It ... thinks of the individual in terms of community rather than community as an aggregate of individuals,” and so on (ibid. 9).

This dissonance notwithstanding, M. insists that to abandon the language of the Psalms is to risk great spiritual impoverishment. About this he is surely right. However, psalmic language can clash with the New Testament and Christian tradition, as well as with modernity. In none of these encounters is it appropriate to label one side as simply right or wrong; rather, a creative way must be found to live with the dissonance. But M.’s interpretation in both books tends more towards the first approach: rephrasing the theology of the Psalms in broader terms. Sometimes, this succeeds in establishing a meaningful bridge between the Psalms and ourselves. At other times, dissonances that need to be attended to are blunted or ignored.

M.’s concluding essays emphasize the arrangement or “shape” of the Book of Psalms as a clue to its meaning and exposition. This approach has received much attention in recent years, due in part to the impetus received from M.’s leadership. In the Introduction to the commentary, M. writes that one “could attempt a commentary based on the book itself as a setting for the psalms,” and that “eventually it may be possible to do this” (19). But he has not done so here. While there may be some who are disappointed in this, it seems to me to have been a wise decision. I doubt that such an approach will really be fruitful for biblical theology. The heart of good exposition lies most centrally in the areas M. has embodied so well and so long: solid linguistic and historical knowledge wedded to educated theological passion.

Aquinas Institute of Theology, St. Louis

WILL SOLL

What can we learn from Luke 8:1–3 about the place of women in the public life of Jesus and in the New Testament? An amazing amount if we take the time to read Ricci’s fascinating, scholarly, insightful book. In exegeting the silence of the Gospels regarding women and the exegetical distortion to which Mary Magdalene is subjected, a number of significant facts are established critically and dispassionately. For R., Luke 8:1–3 are critical verses and pivotal to understanding both Luke 4:14–8:3 and Luke 8:1–9:50. The women Luke describes belong to no male disciple and relate directly to Jesus.

Women in general were seen as of little or no importance. Matthew 14 mentions “5000 men, not counting women and children”; Mark 6 mentions only the 5000 men, from which we must conclude that Mark’s silence does not prove there were no women present. Luke describes women following Jesus at the beginning and end of his public life. Only at the crucifixion do Matthew and Mark admit that women had been there from the beginning. Why do they wait so long to introduce women? Since all the men had fled, and eye witnesses of Jesus’ death were needed, they finally had to acknowledge the women’s presences. It is as if women appeared in their narratives only when there was no way to avoid it. R. carefully interrogates this silence, noting that Luke, who admitted their presence in Galilee from the beginning, makes no further mention of them until the Passion.

Mary Magdalene receives special attention because an uncritical Western tradition labeled her a prostitute. The woman who anoints Jesus in Luke 7, Mark 14, and Matthew 26 is nameless. John 12 calls her Mary; in John 11:2 a certain Mary anointed Jesus’ feet and wiped them with her hair. Is John 11:2 referring to John 12:1–8 or to Luke 7:36–50? Were there two or one anointings? Is Mary of Bethany the sinner?

R. explores other questions with equal care: Why are women more prominent in Luke? Is the point of the pattern of cures in Luke 4, 7, and 8 that Jesus always made space for women? She points out texts which omit reference to the risen Lord’s appearance to Mary Magdalene and never say Peter was the first. Perhaps the most significant contribution to the resurrection discussion pertains to Luke 24:5–8, regarding the passion prediction. The women at the tomb “remember” it, so they must have been present in Luke 9 when the prediction was originally made. In addition she culls twelve women from the gospel tradition and discusses the issue of the ministry of serving.

This book forces one to think, to ask question about an androcentric Bible and androcentric interpretation. It is further enriched by R.’s careful examination of past “scholarly” views. E.g., a thesis upholding three separate women in the above anointing texts was condemned at
the University of Paris in 1521; the hapless scholar narrowly missed being charged with heresy. In more recent times Prat concluded to three different women but called the longstanding confusion in the West "harmless." R. asks, "Is it harmless that a cured woman was turned into a prostitute?"


One might imagine that R.'s real agenda is to show that women had roles similar to men. She flatly denies this. What a careful analysis of the text proves is that Jesus refused to relate to people according to established roles and kinship ties. Such an attitude could go a long way toward humanizing, indeed Christianizing Christianity.

George Washington University, D.C.  
SONYA A. QUITSLUND


Witherington gathers together narrative elements of four basic stories behind Paul's thought and proposes a coherent and compelling account of the way Paul relates the life of Christians to the developing history of salvation. The complexity of the book's analyses is at times a weakness, for the focus on story not infrequently becomes lost amid extensive exegetical and theological treatments of long-disputed issues of interpretation.

In the story of Adam's sin and its cosmic consequences, Paul sees a representative figure who passed on the inclination to sin to all humanity. W. observes that for Paul Satan is a being destructive of humans and human community and not just an existential obstacle to development. W. also declares that Paul believed the story of Adam to be historically true and not a "cleverly devised myth" (30). The reader notes that W.'s agenda includes arguing against nonliteral interpreters of the text as well as against theologians whose views do not reflect a close reading of the text.

The Abraham story, prophetic of Jesus and of eschatological fulfillment, passes over Moses to Christ and beyond him to eschatological fulfillment. Abraham's faithful acceptance of the gospel (Gal 3:8) is paradigmatic for all Christians. Not much is new in W.'s chronological argument about promise and law or in the implications of blessing on Abraham's seed (Christ). But W. nicely clarifies that Abraham's righteousness derives from his own faith and is not "imputed" to him. Some
allusion to scriptural interpretation in early Judaism might have helped explain Paul's multifaceted use of the Abraham story.

The story of Christ, divine creator, obedient redeemer, and end-time Lord, appropriately focuses on the crucified conqueror. W. develops the view that Paul understood Christ to be Wisdom come in the flesh and active in creation and in the story of Israel. He highlights the importance of the worship of Christ as expressed in spontaneous or planned liturgical hymns, prayers, creedal statements, testimonia, and doxologies for the development of early, "high" Christology. His analysis of the hymns in Philippians and Colossians is valid for Paul, but more evidence is needed to draw conclusions for all of early Christology. He assumes Pauline authorship for the letter to the Colossians (and possibly Ephesians), which is not unreasonable, but some allusion to the authorship debate might have been made. The discussion of the titles Son of God and Christ, linked to the Christological hymns, the redemption story with its Wisdom basis, and consistency of thought in the various letter sections provide good grounds for his high Christological interpretation of Rom 1:3–4 and other texts.

Paul treats the humanity of Christ, particularly the passion, death, and resurrection, in counterpoint to the first Adam, especially in 1 Cor 15 and Rom 5:12 ff. He makes a good case for Paul's interest in the historical Jesus (pace Bultmann). The notions of atonement, expiation, and propitiation are confused by theological positions on sacrifice, cleansing, and covering. W.'s conclusion that Jesus' death is substitutionary atonement is valid.

Jesus' resurrection is not surprisingly related to Christians' spiritual renewal on earth but more importantly to their eschatological destiny at the parousia of the Lord. The parentic thrust noted at 1 Thes 5:23 is appropriately observed at the end-time scenario in 1 Cor 15. Although W. admits that some end-time details are not clear, such as the fate of nonbelievers and the millennial age, he concludes from Rom 8:20–21 that Paul envisioned an eternal gathering with Christ on a transformed earth. In this he tends to take narrative images too literally, as he does later when he speculates about the resurrection body before and after the parousia.

The story of Christians, at the first stage of a reordered world, centers largely on Christian behavior in response to the other stories. W. observes that for Paul imitation of Jesus and cooperation with divine grace lead to the Christians' "new creation" and insertion into the story of Christ. This constitutes the efficacy of Christ's story, mediated to the Pauline Christians in the story of Paul. W. thus takes good account of Paul's repeated calls to imitate him. W. persuasively argues that justification is not central to, but rather is at the start of, the Christians' story. Sanctification, the relationship with God, is the fundamental consequence of their cooperating with God's gift of transforming faith, in the model of the faith of Jesus. Paul's "new creation"
language is given full play here. The discussion of sarx/soma in Pauline anthropology needs clarification.

Considering community worship rites as experiences wherein to learn and express membership in the Pauline community and to experience union with Christ and his body is welcome and an appropriate complement to the treatment of story narrative. I wonder if treating the Jewish ritual category of remembering would have been useful in W.'s otherwise sensitive treatment of ritual symbols. His emphasis on the community aspect of the ritual helps avoid an overly-individualistic reading of the stories and their promised salvation.

In all, W.'s book accomplishes a great deal and rewards the effort to work through its details.

Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y. Benjamin Fiore, S.J.


Seagraves’s impressive lexical study of the extant Cyprianic correspondence (66 letters of the bishop and 16 addressed to Cyprian) involves two separate but related investigations. The first aims to unfold the technical terms used for the grades of clergy in Cyprian’s North African diocese in the years of the correspondence, 250–258. S. begins by showing that none of the 18 major works on Cyprian investigate “specifically and solely” the clergy at Carthage, and then briefly discusses the Cyprianic meaning for such basic terms as clericus, ordo, gradus, locus, honor, dignitas, officium, and condicio. This is followed by S.'s major research on Cyprian's understanding of the grades of bishop, presbyter, deacon, subdeacon, lector, exorcist, and acolyte. For each grade S. presents from the correspondence a consideration of the terms used and their origin, the method of appointment and installation, the role or functions of their particular cleric, and the qualities and traits required for that grade.

Regarding the bishop, S. confirms the position of Bévenot and others that for Cyprian the term sacerdos (priest) always means the bishop. “Cyprian sees clearly his emphatic duty as bishop to act as sacerdos vice Christi” (68). S. calls Cyprian the first author to make the transition from the universal sacerdotalism of the New Testament to the particular sacerdotalism of a later age. As to the Cyprianic presbyter, S. reports that his duties and functions at Carthage were to distribute food and funds in charity, to teach candidates for the clergy and catechumens, to concelebrate Eucharist daily with the bishop, and to serve in major and minor positions in local synods and councils. S. documents that Cyprian in his secret retreat during the Decian persecution delegates authority to his presbyters to celebrate Eucharist in his absence (Ep. 5.2.1, 5.1.1)—the first written testimony for presbyters to...
celebrate the Eucharist without the bishop, although Cyprian adds that the presbyter should be accompanied by a deacon. In an interesting excursus on married clergy at Carthage, S. reports that Cyprian's Ep. 67.6.3 mentions that the former bishop Martialis was married and had children, and that two of Cyprian's presbyters, Numidicus and Novatus, were married (eps. 40, 52). S. states that although Cyprian encourages celibacy or continence for his clergy, "it was nevertheless perfectly legitimate for the clergy in Carthage to be married during Cyprian's reign as Bishop" (132).

The second half of S.'s work, a complementary investigation, focuses on a number of key concepts essential to Cyprian in his own understanding of his pastoral mission at Carthage, primarily disciplina and diligentia, but also his use of justitia, auctoritas, and potestas. The final chapter develops Cyprian's own understanding of his duty as bishop in terms of the major functions he sees himself called to fulfill at Carthage, namely those of shepherd, priest, teacher, and judge.

His 1177 footnotes bear eloquent testimony to S.'s meticulous research, but his text is also very readable and easy to use. To the four pages of primary sources and a 20-page select bibliography, S. adds five helpful indices and four appendices. There appears to be a slight inconsistency on occasion where a Latin passage appears in the text with the translation in the footnote followed shortly on by a translated passage of Cyprian in the text and the Latin in the footnote (e.g. 48–49). Overall this superbly researched lexical study with its many helpful resources represents a truly significant contribution both to Cyprian studies and to the history of Christian ministry.

University of San Francisco

RAY R. NOLL


The title and subtitle are well chosen. As Christian baptism radically reforms or remakes the persons baptized, while leaving them with many of their old problems unresolved or even, in some case, felt more acutely, so Augustine's baptism of the philosophies of the ancient world effected a radical transformation of Greek and Roman thought, while retaining a good many of its problems, some of which are more sharply felt in the Christian context.

Rist brings to the topic of Augustine's Christianization of ancient philosophy a profound knowledge of ancient thought. He sidesteps the difficult problem of distinguishing philosophical from theological questions in Augustine and leaves much of his philosophical thought embedded in its theological context, while avoiding a good many churchy topics so that he can focus upon "Augustine's evaluation and transmission of Greco-Roman 'philosophical' ideas" (6). While recognizing the major turning points in the development of Augustine's thought, R.
wisely concentrates on themes with which Augustine dealt during most of his life as a Christian. In recognizing that Augustine often drew his "philosophical models" from the Scriptures and the belief and practice of the Church, R. opens to philosophical examination areas of Augustine's thought that others operating with a more Thomistic distinction between philosophy and theology would have to have left for the theologians.

After sketching his approach to Augustine, R. devotes six chapters to various themes. "Words, Signs, and Things," e.g., ranges over such topics as language as a result of the fall, difficulties of communication in his life, and the role of sacramental signs. His chapter on Augustine's epistemology offers some excellent insights into Augustine's refutation of ancient skepticism and his development of a new form of skepticism in his reflections on time and belief. "Soul, Body, and Personal Identity" examines the relation of soul to body before the Fall, in this present life, and in the life to come. R. traces Augustine's growing awareness of the incompatibility of his earlier more Platonic views with his deeper understanding of the Scriptures. On the fall of the soul R. follows to a large extent the views of R. O'Connell, while avoiding some of the complications the latter finds with the dating of *De peccatorum meritis*. His suggestions regarding the Plotinian origin of our transpersonal union with Adam and with Christ are extremely helpful for Augustine's understanding of original sin and of salvation in Christ.

R. sees Augustine's treatment of will and love as another area in which he moved from an initial Platonism to a more Christian perspective. E.g., he shows well how Augustine's early views on the love of neighbor as soul were transformed through his growing appreciation of the full humanity of the neighbor as both soul and body. A chapter on Augustine's political and social philosophy throws considerable light on a host of topics, such as family, empire, power and law, the two cities, slavery, marriage, and persecution.

In the chapter "Evil, Justice, and Divine Omnipotence," R. argues that Augustine's claim that God is omnipotent as well as just and merciful leads him into inextricable difficulties, especially insofar as he holds that God's will cannot be thwarted and emphasizes the love of God for human beings manifested in the death of Christ, while maintaining that there is no salvation apart from baptism or martyrdom. Finally, R. examines what Augustine might do if he had the chance to update his *Reconsiderations* today. He notes that Augustine rapidly became a figure of unparalleled authority in Christianity whose ideas were often misused in ways that he himself would not have countenanced. Augustine redivivus, R. contends, would find in the history of the present century confirmation of his pessimistic views of human nature and the evils of the *libido dominandi*. R.'s reflections on how Augustine redivivus might rethink some problematic positions in the
areas of scriptural exegesis, philosophy, and theology are astute, intriguing, and challenging.

All told, this volume is a welcome contribution by a learned philosopher to our understanding of Augustine as the principal figure in the transmission and transformation of classical philosophical thought to the West. There is, I believe, a factual error which I mention only because R.'s book is likely to be widely read and deservedly influential, namely, his statement that Monnica was baptized along with Augustine, Adeodatus, and Alypius in 387. Otherwise, though I might want to differ on various minor points, I confess that I learned a great deal from this volume and I highly recommend it.

Marquette University, Milwaukee

ROLAND J. TESKE, S.J.


A detailed and comprehensive account of images of persons, i.e. holy images, from the early Church to the beginning of the Counter-Reformation. Physically, the 490 pages of Belting's own text, printed on relatively large pages with fairly small print, disclose the prodigious labor that went into this work. No one has so thoroughly documented and examined the range of images. Yet that single-minded perusal of how the images functioned brackets out an analysis of what images mean. Perhaps that is because B. believes that until the renaissance and reformation periods, images are noted for how they function within societies rather than what they are as realities in and of themselves. That historical judgment has much to be said for it, even if it is only partially true.

While it would be difficult to summarize B.'s text, one can point to several subjects in which his treatment is unique. More than anyone else I know, B. deals with the interrelation of images and relics in early periods, times in which it is hard to distinguish the two. His account of images not made with hands, i.e. images that come directly from a divine source, such as the well-known Veronica veil in the West, is particularly instructive. Such images directly disclose that which they image through both sight and touch. Indeed, when touch is no longer possible or permitted, seeing functions in lieu of touch. When that disposition prevails, even the images made by hands center not in the one who made them but in how the image functions as a redemptive force.

B. gives a good deal of attention to how Eastern images arrived and functioned in the West. That is an important issue, for the Eastern influence is incontrovertible. At the same time, while the West borrowed from the East, it also, through the filter of its own perceptions, changed the understanding of what it received. I wish B. had given
more attention to that issue. One could make a case that from the Carolingian period on, images in the West were seen as if they were relics, while in the East relics were seen more as images. Indeed, that difference accounts for the Reformers' being so suspicious of paintings and sculpture, for the seeing of images increasingly gave them the power and status of relics. Seeing in the West, as contrasted with the East, was a more literal modality, one less enveloped by imagination and mystery. Hence, the use of images in processionalps in the West made the distinction between veneration and adoration less believable, indeed tilting the understanding to the latter. But given all the materials B. deals with on this issue, one can only be grateful.

Generally, the accounts on various issues are so extensive that few may read the volume from cover to cover. Rather, it will be used as if it were a dictionary. It is a volume into which one will continually dip, not a volume one reads and then discards. The German original was published in 1990. That may account for the fact that recent work, particularly on the early Church, is not mentioned, work that would partially challenge B.'s generalizations about the church fathers and the role of images connected with Roman emperors. One thinks, e.g., of the contributions of Paul Corby Finney, Robin Jensen, Thomas F. Mathews, and Mary Charles Murray. Furthermore, the materials on the Reformation and Counter-Reformation are sketchy. Undoubtedly that is because B. merely wants to show what a difference the new consciousness of the art objects in their own right makes for the viewing of art, including the new consciousness characteristic of the artists.

In addition to B.'s text, one should note that there are over 300 plates, well selected and placed, and over 46 pages of notes to the text. More importantly still, B. includes relevant texts representative of the history. Many of the 65 pages of 44 texts have had to be shortened; nevertheless, relevant material is quoted and much of it is generally hard to find elsewhere. Thus, taken as a whole, this book is a gold mine for which readers in general and individuals working in the visual arts can only be grateful.

Graduate Theological Union
Berkeley, California

John Dillenberger


The series in which this volume appears is “specially commissioned for teachers and students.” Rarely does a volume so completely fill the ambitions of the series.

B. has carefully planned this work. She starts at the year 1000 when the Anglo-Saxon and Viking ages were virtually over, and she closes at 1300 when all the major medieval religious orders had entered Britain
and become part of its ecclesiastical life. One might wonder why she did not start at the Conquest, but she makes it clear that many elements of the Anglo-Saxon church order survived, and she goes on to show how these elements persisted or were altered by the Normans.

The opening chapters move chronologically from the pre-Norman period to the coming of the mendicants. The general reader will recognize most of the names—the Benedictines, the Cistercians—but the church historian will be glad to see the inclusion of the Gilbertines, an order of women founded by Gilbert of Sempringham in 1131 with a modest cell adjoining the church for devout women parishioners. B. not only recognizes an order of women but also the role of a native, secular clergy in an era when most English religious orders were branches of continental ones.

Subsequent chapters dealing with the practicalities of religious life, including the physical setting, daily life, economy, intellectual life, and the role of founders and patrons, are particularly valuable. Many treatments of religious life center on an order's spirituality because it is what is deemed to be most relevant to "modern" Christianity, thus divorcing that spirituality from the life in which it originated. Furthermore, as studies of Cistercian architecture have repeatedly proved, the physical environment often reflected the spirituality of the order. B. here provides readers with a grasp of the whole of the order's life and its involvement with the general community, thus placing not only spirituality but also liturgy and theology in their context. A brief concluding chapter surveys religious life in Britain in 1300.

As for some specifics, B.'s attention to the physical order of life includes maps for all of the religious orders, e.g. the Augustinian canons, the mendicants, the women's orders. She also provides diagrams of their houses. When the reader compares the organization of a Benedictine monastery with that of a Cistercian one, and then compares both to a Dominican house, the nature of their lives becomes much clearer.

Clarity characterizes much of the book. It is easy for the nonspecialist student to become confused by the welter of orders (thus confirming the wisdom of Lateran IV in 1215 in limiting their number), but B. lucidly distinguishes among them, e.g., the differences among monks, canons, and mendicants, then among the individual orders. She explains why the Benedictines stayed close to urban environments while the Cistercians headed into the wilderness, and why the Dominicans moved into an education ministry sooner than the Franciscans. To make these distinctions comprehensible, she judiciously combines anecdotes and statistics.

The orders constantly interacted with those outside, and B. explains their relations with the episcopate and secular clergy as well as their role in the welfare and even the governance of the kingdom. Those who picture medieval religious life as dominated by mystics will be surprised at the debt it owed to those distinctly secular people, the
founders and patrons of the various houses, whose spiritual concerns were indeed very practical—burial in the house's cemetery, and unceasing prayers by the religious for their souls.

In treating British orders, B. is concerned mostly with England, but she includes Scotland and Wales, noting the difference in religious life there. Ireland lies outside Britain, but the Normans invaded Ireland in 1181, and there were many Anglo-Norman foundations in Ireland. Some treatment of those would have rounded out the picture.

Learned, clear, well-written, balanced—this is a superb classroom volume, and anyone teaching medieval church history will join me in encouraging B. to contribute again to this series.

John Carroll University, Cleveland


In this superb work, Baldwin analyzes and compares five very different genres of discourse on sex. He deliberately limits himself to literature produced in northern France from 1185 to 1215. This limit allows him to examine his texts in extraordinary and illuminating, if also repetitious, detail.

The period was one of change. The Church was trying to universalize its control over marriage, and it resisted the customs of both aristocracy and commoner. Nevertheless, other ecclesial strictures were weakening. E.g., in the early Middle Ages married couples had been allowed sex only one day in nine, but those proscriptions were nearly gone.

B. sets each discourse in its literary tradition. Thus he examines the theology of Pierre the Chanter within the Augustinian heritage, and he rightly finds some mitigation of religious pessimism about sinfulness in all sexual activity and of the demand for the celibacy of all clerics. B. studies the medical literature of the Salernitan school within the tradition of Galen, and he notes how this tradition promoted an equality of men and women that was soon to be overthrown by scholastic theology's embrace of Aristotelian biology. He develops the work of André the Chaplain who like a secularist drew up an encyclopedia of seduction techniques in the tradition of Ovid, but then as a churchman warned against all such delights: God is the author of chastity; the devil is the author of love. Situating the romances of Jean Renart among such legends as Tristan and Iseut, B. displays their passion and attractiveness to aristocratic classes. For contrast, he analyzes some 50 bawdy fabliaux—complete with four-letter words—that reacted against the "outbreak of decency" found in the romances.

The bulk of the book is devoted to gathering what each type of discourse said on various sexual issues. On the one hand, theologians,
who are treated fairly by B., not surprisingly appear more concerned
with control of sex than with seeing it as a gift. Theologians com-
plained that homosexuals, whom the Church at the time threatened
with excommunication and banishment, were being treated too
lightly; and they held that sexual pleasures and desires were them-
selves sinful. By contrast, romance authors more ambivalently pointed
to a mix of joy and suffering in sexual desire; and some medical experts
recommended the therapeutic benefits of frequent and even multipart-
tnered sexual intercourse. On the other hand, B. rightly notes that
three ecclesial tenets promoted the equality of women and men within
marriage: the canonical claim that mutual free consent constitutes
marriage, the Pauline doctrine that both husband and wife owe one
another the marital debt, and the view that conception happens only
when women are filled with sexual desire and contribute their own
seed.

Each literary type varied in the ways that it understood, described,
or blushed before the sexual body, passion, and procreation. Where the
romance tradition spoke only suggestively about the female body, the
fable tradition was quite graphic. Where theologians emphasized
shame in sexual intercourse, medical doctors saw a natural gift from
creation. Theologians made procreation the primary justification for
sexual intercourse, while other literatures emphasized sex’s pleasures
and often omitted its procreative possibilities. Both secular and reli-
gious literature debated whether (erotic) love died with the marriage
ceremony.

Through this survey, a broad contrast develops: theologians and
preachers warned against and tried to constrain sex because it leads to
sin or sickness, while the writers of aristocratic, popular, and medical
literature portrayed it as a natural activity that could be sublime or
earthly. While B. speculates that each literature influenced the others,
secular authors seemed not much disturbed by the worries of church
teachers.

The great merit of this book is that it makes accessible in organized
fashion through paraphrase and translation—along with some origi-
nal texts—a fascinatingly diverse body of literature on sex. These five
kinds of discourse are not often treated together in scholarly writing,
let alone compared and contrasted so well. In this intertextual study,
B. avoids deconstructive and literary critical methods and strives to
present the plain-sense meaning of the texts, an effort that misses
much but pays well in what it reveals about how quite distinct medi-
eval discourses portrayed sex.

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

LAS CASAS: IN SEARCH OF THE POOR OF JESUS CHRIST. By Gustavo
Gutiérrez. Translated from the Spanish by Robert R. Barr. Maryknoll,
Traditionally the genre of spiritual biography has inspired discipleship and invigorated theological reflection by offering believers a concrete pedagogy of Christian virtue against the background of historical experience. Not a spiritual biography in the conventional sense, G.'s scholarly study of the intellectual and spiritual development of the great 16th-century Dominican missionary to the Indies, Bartolomé de Las Casas, certainly intends both to inspire and to invigorate contemporary theological reflection grown complacent by the rhetoric without the practice of liberation. Although the book represents years of investigation into the historical roots of Las Casas's theological defense of the new world's indigenous populations, G. has in fact written an essay on theological method that analyzes how cultural and religious perspectives either distort or sharpen theological vision. There is no such thing as an innocent theology, G. maintains, however innocent the theologian, because there can be no theology free of perspective and existential commitment to a particular culture or value system. This book is about the human capacity to attain vision of that which is new in each historical epoch. As Las Casas learned, it is not possible either to experience or to comprehend the other, unless one becomes other.

To understand the radical novelty of Las Casas's methodology, it is necessary to understand the historical conditions in which his reformulation of theological perspective occurred. By the end of a little more than a half-century of Spanish domination, native populations had suffered a staggering demographic catastrophe, caused by malnutrition, disease, hard labor, and war. A recent study estimates that at the beginning of the conquest the lands under siege were occupied by some 65 million human beings, but by 1570 the number had fallen to 9 million. To speak of a culture of death and destruction, then, is not to engage in hyperbole. And into such a world the young Las Casas arrived as chaplain to a military campaign of pacification, for which he was granted his own encomienda—the social and economic system under which land and human beings were distributed. Although Las Casas treated his workers humanely, the question why he was not able to see the cruelty and devastation being inflicted upon the inhabitants for what it was—the result of human greed and not love of the gospel—haunted him for the rest of his life. His own analysis was decisively simple: both the contempt for the native peoples exhibited by the worst of the Spaniards, and the Church's own condescension that tolerated the destruction of entire cultures in the name of Christ, were racist. "This society is the expression of a mentality, indeed a theology, that accepts as self-evident the human superiority of the European" (291).

The transformation of Las Casas's purblind experience of reality to the lucid comprehension of the immense human suffering about him was occasioned by the grace of seeing the real world reflected in the light of Scripture. But grace is never just a beholding of the other as
other, but requires the adoption of the other's perspective and the active engagement in that reality as one's own. To love the poor as God loves them means to become poor with them. Las Casas's criterion of theological and political discourse, "si Indus esset," radically transforms intellectual discourse about the other by inviting us not simply to think differently, but to exist differently. Indeed, a central claim of G. is that a transformation in perspective necessarily entails a transformation of both the content and the quality of experience.

In the intellectually most interesting chapters, G. presents Las Casas's disputes with theologians, including the renowned Francisco de Vitoria, a man of intellectual integrity and moral conviction, who was also extremely well informed about events and conditions in the Indies. G. extols Vitoria's theological approach to the question whether pagan nations could be forcefully compelled to accept the faith. Vitoria's treatment proceeded from genuine pastoral concern, to reflection on Scripture, and finally to the application of theological and legal principle to the concrete case. But something went wrong along the way. For after having argued that there were no theological grounds to justify either Spanish occupation or the imposition of faith, Vitoria concluded that the abandonment of Spanish commerce and interests "would be intolerable" (343). The weight of an established social order forced a theological conclusion untrue to the facts. G. argues that theological method is only more or less adequate to any subject matter, but in itself never sufficient to ensure just results. Here G. has contributed a new insight: to employ a theological method as an academic discipline, even when that method is that of liberation, is still to miss the point of the radical transformation brought about by living and thinking from the perspective of the poor.

The one substantive criticism I would offer concerns the category of experience: even as qualified by the concrete encounter with Christ in history, its meaning remains somewhat vague to bear the kind of methodological weight required. For certainly almost any theological method or position could claim a legitimating experience of Christ's presence in history. On the other hand, G. might respond that the required precision and specificity must be supplied by God's unconditioned acting in history, and that is precisely what a category should not try to determine. But should such an assertion be the end of the discussion or the beginning of a new kind of enquiry?

Gregorian University, Rome

TERRANCE G. WALSH, S.J.


Galileo remains the most intriguing figure in the history of science
for the modern biographer. In the past two years alone, four book-length biographies have appeared in English. It might seem as though at this point nothing much can remain to be said about the great Florentine. Fantoli’s massive new work, many years in the making, soon convinces the reader how wrong such an assumption would be. The book is not, it must be said, an easy read; the style is somewhat stilted. Nonetheless, the reader will be well rewarded; for the author and translator alike, this was obviously a labor of love.

The book’s subtitle suggests the dual emphasis of the intellectual efforts of Galileo’s maturity. An opening chapter on the reactions of astronomers and theologians to the *De revolutionibus* of Copernicus (1543) leads into a detailed consideration of Galileo’s gradual involvement in the defense of Copernicanism. The events leading up to the banning in 1616 of Copernicus’ book (on the authority of the Holy Office, the Roman congregation charged with the defense of Catholic orthodoxy) and the mandate given to Galileo not “to hold or defend” the proscribed doctrine are traced with care. How then did he come to publish the *Dialogue on Two Chief World Systems* in 1632 in which he most certainly did defend the Copernican account of the earth’s motion as the theory in closest accord with the observational evidence? F. follows step by step the writing of the Dialogue, the reactions of the Roman authorities to its publication, the trial of Galileo, and, in a particularly illuminating final chapter, the subsequent glacially slow attempts on the part of church authorities to come to terms with the disastrous failure on the part of the Holy Office in 1616.

The most valuable feature of the book to my mind are the immensely detailed footnotes, some 640 of them, many of them two or more pages long, occupying almost a third of the work. This is by all odds the fullest treatment yet available in English of the “Galileo affair,” with an abundance of documentation that allows readers to decide for themselves on the merits of the many disputed points in the reconstruction of that complicated story. It brings home to us, in fact, just how good that documentation is, relatively speaking. Not only do we have some detailed Holy Office records (whose own story, since they were seized almost two centuries ago by Napoleon’s agents, would make a book in itself), but there are scores of letters by Galileo himself, by his many friends, by the successive Florentine ambassadors in Rome, and many others. F. draws on this treasure house of evidence with skill and care, but inevitably has to admit that there are silences and ambiguities and possible deceptions in the documentary record that make interpretation often hazardous.

The fact that the book is published by the Vatican Observatory might lead readers to assume that this is one more apologia for the Church’s handling of the Galileo affair. But this, happily, is not the case. The book is admirably evenhanded in that respect. F. does justice to the notable complexities of the story, and draws attention to proce-
dural irregularity or poor theological or philosophical judgement where he sees it. Indeed, it might be said that this book, coming as it does from a Vatican publishing house, constitutes the best fruit of the endeavor to reconsider the Galileo case set in motion by Pope John Paul II in 1979 with the setting up of a special research commission. Though the pope on terminating the mandate of this commission in 1992 acknowledged more explicitly than any of his predecessors had done the repeated failures of the Roman theologians in dealing with the Copernican challenge, many still found that the final report of the chairman of the Galileo commission was insufficiently detailed in some key respects, reflecting the fact that the task of the commission itself had been carried out for the most part in a somewhat perfunctory way. But there is nothing perfunctory about F.'s achievement. He has done as much as any single author could be expected to do to set a tangled record straight.

University of Notre Dame  
ERnan mcmullin


Properly speaking Jansenism is a heresy circumscribed by five propositions associated with a book, Cornelius Jansen's Augustinus. If one considers that from the bull In eminenti (1642) to the Constitution Auctorem fidei (1794) no less than eight major papal pronouncements and about as many from Roman congregations were devoted to this issue, it will appear that it was a particular concern of the Church's magisterium. In this learned essay, Neveu examines the matter from the perspective of the discernment and judgement of theological errors by popes and their advisers. Following a procedure particular to the universities, the inquisitorial institutions established a system of notations which qualified the degree in which a given expression or quotation differed from the truth. This *ars censoria* evolved during the 16th and 17th centuries under the influence of positive theology, which complicated it by the authority given to historical precedents and the writings of the Fathers. The Jansenist conflict is exemplary of this evolution as the question of the hereticalness of the five propositions (the right) became compounded by that of their origin (the fact), namely their association through Jansenius with the writings of Augustine. The Jansenists considered that they were equivocal and capable of both a heretical sense—the one condemned in relation to the decisions of Trent—and an orthodox one, as faithful to the thought of Augustine.

The originality of N.'s reflection is to study this theme from the perspective of the post-Tridentine papacy, and to expose how, for the
Romans, the Jansenists’ attitude challenged directly a renewed sense of authority and indirectly the claim to infallibility that was so strong during this period. N. has collected an impressive documentation and offers a very plausible interpretation of the rationale behind the specific process of condemnation: he sees it as an effort by the “teaching authority” not only to protect Catholic faith (*police ecclésiastique* [49]) but to define it. In proceeding in an interpretation of the sense of the propositions, especially in their association with the work of Jansenius, the Roman commission of theologians and cardinals with the pope who endorsed its conclusion went further than a mere condemnation but acted as judge of doctrine, eventually demanding the assent of faith to his decision. N. sees here “the development of the theology of the act of faith, by insisting on the fact that this act is not only directed to the object of belief but to the motivation to believe” (635). He also notes that from this perspective, heresy “arises from a refusal, a disobedience much more than doctrinal dissent” (636).

This erudite demonstration which shows masterly knowledge of the dossier concerning Jansenism is also supported by the cases of other Roman pronouncements during the 17th century. N. concludes on a distinctive self-understanding of the “magisterial organ” of the Church which he does not hesitate to identify with the Church herself. In his last pages he shows how this perception was integrated by many theologians and grew into the modern concept of magisterium.

N., who has read many writers forgotten today, offers therefore a weighty contribution to a major theme of historical theology: the growth of the Roman magisterium and the connected issue of infallibility. Certain expressions suggest that he adopts an “oracular” conception of infallibility that was certainly present in the ultramontane schools but that Vatican I did not endorse (401). The wide perspectives he adopts suggest clearly the continuity in the exercise of the magisterium that places each pronouncement not just as a proof of Roman authority but as an element of the doctrine of which the popes have the responsibility. As N. notes (614), his demonstration suffers from the inability to peruse the archives of the principal congregation involved, the Holy Office of the Roman Inquisition. Nevertheless the items that several trusted researchers have extracted and the copies saved by some of the participants offer enough elements to illustrate his point and support his conclusions. One might regret however that he does not give systematic reference to some of the texts he abundantly quotes.

There was, of course, another perspective that N. exposes extensively in order to refute it: that of the Jansenists and Gallicans who had a more classical approach to the determination of doctrine. Antoine Arnauld, who is often cited, followed an approach both antiquarian, with his “fundamentalist” use of the Fathers, and modern in his rationalistic methodology, and was totally opposed to this “oracular” conception. This confrontation exposes admirably that these tensions
are not easily resolved. In his conclusions N. alludes to more recent times; it is clear that *mutatis mutandis* his analysis of the Church in the 17th century offers keys applicable to the present.

A very dense work, one that every historian of theology should know and meditate. It is to be hoped that a second edition will provide the bibliography and indexes that would expand its use and value.

*Catholic University of America*  
Jaques M. Gres-Gayer


The question of the uniqueness or universality of the Holocaust has generated intense discussion among scholars. Katz, Professor of History and Thought at Cornell, is unalterably convinced of the total uniqueness of the Holocaust, which he regards in its essence as the systematic effort by the Nazi leadership to exterminate the Jewish population of Europe and beyond. This belief has heightened his consciousness about the many superficial comparisons now in vogue between the Nazi attack on the Jews and other examples of massive human brutality. To put a definitive end to these facile comparisons, Katz has undertaken an extensive project—the present volume is the first installment of a projected trilogy.

K. is not opposed to all discussion of forms of mass death throughout history in connection with an examination of the Holocaust. In fact, this first volume, which concentrates on history up to the Holocaust, examines virtually every imaginable example of mass death including the Armenian Tragedy, the situation of Australian Aborigines, the Spanish Inquisition, Crusade violence, slavery, witchcraft and misogyny, the oppression of homosexuals, and the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacre. K. exhibits deep sympathy for the victims involved in these atrocities. In no way does he belittle their significance despite his insistence that in the end the Nazi attack against the Jews must be seen as sui generis.

In Volume 2 K. plans to consider the massive loss of life in Mexico and South America under European colonization, the treatment of American Indians, mass suffering during the Stalinist period in the USSR, and a broad potpourri of contemporary African and Asian examples of large-scale violence and politically inspired persecutions and mass murder. Volume 3 will focus on the Holocaust in itself, what sort of event it was, what special face of dehumanization it brought to the fore, and what unconventional forms of collective death it generated.

Volume 1 is the result of more than a decade of intense work. This is apparent in the extensive footnotes, which often fill most of a page, and the bibliography of almost 100 pages. As a result of this initial phase
of his research K. feels confident in making certain assertions about
the uniqueness of the Holocaust in light of previous examples of mass
human brutality. The first is that the uniqueness of the Holocaust does
not lie in the numbers of Jews who were murdered. Even if respected
scholars (as opposed to pseudo-historians) should revise the conven­
tional “six million” figure somewhat downward, as some have, this will
not affect its unique quality. Second, the Holocaust does represent a
novum, at least within the narrow confines of Jewish history, despite
the many appalling historical precedents.

K. does not accept the view that the Holocaust is the final and most
gruesome chapter in the long history of Christian antisemitism. While
the Nazis appropriated much of traditional Christian antisemitic
teaching, this was not per se the reason that ultimately motivated
them. Unlike medieval Christianity which offered Jews a possible es­
cape from their sentence through conversion, the Nazis left no such
option. If there was a choice for Jews, it consisted in deciding how they
would die.

In the concluding section K. summarizes the distinctiveness of the
Shoah relative to nine other previous forms of mass suffering and
death endured by Jews and others. While his full explanation will
come only in Volume 3, he ends this first installment with a strong
affirmation that, when all is said and done, Nazism’s uniqueness will
be seen to arise from its ideology, not primarily from its numbers nor
from its combination of classical antisemitism with the modern tools of
bureaucracy and technology. Every step of the process was the expres­
sion of an innovative and genocidal dogma which viewed the Jews as
antihuman and was utterly determined to destroy them, even at the
risk of military defeat in the parallel, more conventional battle with
the Allied armies.

It is difficult to offer a thorough evaluation of this volume for several
reasons. For one, few are versed in all the sources he cites. Based on
the materials familiar to me, K. has used his sources well and I basi­
cally endorse his conclusions, including his strong emphasis on the
ideological uniqueness of the Holocaust and its differentiation from
classical antisemitism. But it is hard to go much beyond this judgment.
Before I could ultimately endorse or critique K.’s understanding of the
uniqueness of the Nazi ideology I would need to have a better idea of
how it relates to the perspective of the late Israeli scholar Uriel Tal,
who has exercised a strong impact on my own thinking. I suspect there
may be some important disagreements. And I will want especially to
see how K. eventually incorporates the other Nazi victim groups (e.g.
Gypsies, Poles, gays, the disabled) into his vision of their ideology. The
brief footnote in this regard that we find in the Introduction to Volume
1 persuades me that I may have serious reservations about his view­
point when it appears in fully articulated form.

Anyone interested in 20th-century history or religion will want, or
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

JOHN T. PAWLIKOWSKI, O.S.M.


Newman’s thoughts about papal infallibility have been reviewed by all his major biographers and analyzed and criticized by a variety of theologians. Nevertheless, Page’s contribution to that subject is distinctive and valuable. The title question was cited by an Anglican friend who hoped the answer was that N. would rejoin the Church of England in outrage at the 1870 definition of papal infallibility. Although N. rejected that suggestion and others like it immediately and vehemently, it had long been clear to acquaintances that the prospect of such a definition worried him. That preoccupation and thoughts it stimulated appear in several private theological papers and a multitude of letters written during the five years preceding the definition. Subsequent letters reveal a development of N.’s personal interpretation of the definition, made public in the famous 1875 Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, which directly defended the doctrine against a critique published by Prime Minister Gladstone, while obliquely defending his own understanding of it against what he considered the exaggerations of Ultramontane Catholics led by Cardinal Manning. N. succeeded admirably in achieving both objectives, despite a second exchange of pamphlets with Gladstone and efforts by Catholic adversaries to elicit a condemnation from the Vatican.

Page provides a unique review of N.’s thoughts and feelings about the defining of papal infallibility as revealed by his letters during the decade from five years before to five years after the first Vatican Council defined it. He proceeds chronologically, quoting generously and judiciously from the letters, while filling in background of the correspondence with exceptional clarity and sensitivity. As one who read N.’s letters of this period with the aid only of general biographical and historical works, I envy those who will come to them with this excellent resource at their disposal. And despite having read with some care the letters Page cites and discusses, I must acknowledge that his single-minded pursuit of a single theme through this multitudinous correspondence provides a focus that is newly illuminating. It shows how superficial are the standard summations (including N.’s own) that show him as having at first doubted the opportuneness of defining this doctrine which he heartily accepted, and afterwards embraced the new dogma and furnished it with a soothing interpretation. The doubts N.
had expressed in his *Via Media* about the Church's infallibility were shed in the process of his conversion to Roman Catholicism, but specifically papal infallibility was not what he had in mind. Rather it was church consensus, expressed normally through the bishops and most solemnly in general councils with which he associated infallibility. His touchstone was always the Augustinian formula *securus iudicat orbis terrarum*, a phrase that recurs mantra-like through all this correspondence.

Anger and anxiety are conspicuous in these letters. The anger is mainly at churchmen N. considered to be pushing an extravagant agenda towards a dubious consensus contrived by arrogance and guile. The anxiety is focused on his unsettled personal role, which he kept private throughout the controversy despite friends who urged him to take a public stand. To one correspondent he states candidly that his reticence was motivated by fear of being officially denounced and thereby discredited. In fact, his opposition became effectively public when a strong letter to his bishop, Ullathorne, was circulated and eventually disclosed by the press, an outcome at which his professed surprise can hardly have been total. There was additional anxiety over how—not whether—he would personally embrace the doctrine, and he was prepared to base that commitment on sheer obedience, since the pope's jurisdictional power to command was not in question. During the time of widespread uncertainty about the definition's doctrinal status, a number of English Catholics sought N.'s counsel after being told in confessionals that it was sinful to doubt papal infallibility. His advice, to seek less narrow-minded confessors, was not always easy to follow.

N.'s impassioned correspondence during this whole time makes it hardly credible that his misgivings were no deeper or more complex than simple doubt about the definition's "timeliness." That is not to suggest that N. retained to the end his doubts about the genuineness of consensus. But he only relinquished them after the Council was suspended, when it became clear that the opposition minority of bishops had passively acquiesced in the definition. He had no sympathy with Döllinger's readiness to break with the Church over the issue, and there is no reason to suppose N.'s defense of the doctrine in the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* was in any way disingenuous.

At the same time, the letters do support Page's conclusion, which he saves till the end of the book, that N. rightly perceived the definition of papal infallibility to have introduced a lopsided view of the magisterium, which in after years the Church would need to correct. Something of this was achieved at Vatican II, and the achievement probably did owe something to N.'s influence. Since then, however, the Church has experienced a renewed emphasis on doctrinal authority concentrated in the papacy that is strongly reminiscent of Pius IX. Page shares a hope that he cites from Nicholas Lash, for a third Vatican Council at which N.'s perspective would be better appreciated and would find
expression in more historically enlightened and consequently more balanced doctrine.

Loyola University, New Orleans

James Gaffney


A succinct, sophisticated, at times exciting account of the principal papal elections from that of Simon bar Jonah as the Rock to the two-day conclave in 1978 from which the Polish cardinal Karol Wojtyla emerged as John Paul II.

In dealing with the papacy two remarkable facts should be kept in mind. One is its uncontested longevity; the other, its ability to mold history to its ideological needs. This is most noteworthy in the use it has made of the myth or mystical facts surrounding its origins. While modern scholars question the authenticity of the Petrine pericope (“You are a Rock,” in Matthew 16:16–18), the statement nevertheless serves as the cornerstone of an institution that has played a major role in the unfolding of Western civilization and that is still a basic factor in church and world politics.

Zizola recalls the almost incredible trajectory of the frequently-tumultuous line of Roman bishops—some saints, some scoundrels, many worthy, countless mediocre, a series of 11th-century young scamps appointed by the dowager Marozia, along with great medieval pontiffs from Gregory I and the monk Hildebrand as Gregory VII to Innocent III and Eugene IV—before describing the magnificent as well as scandalous accomplishments of the renaissance pontiffs and winding down with an account of the extraordinary 20th-century popes.

The papal office has been sustained by a remarkable variety of elective processes that have included every vicissitude and machination imaginable, from simony and nepotism, fraud and assassination, to dynastic interference and power plays, as well as orderly procedures from the prescription of Pope Leo I (440–461) “Let him who is to be obeyed by all be selected by all,” down to the current practice in a procedure known as a conclave (“with a key”), signifying the isolation of cardinal electors in a locked-in space surrounding the Sistine chapel in the Vatican.

Since the 12th century, conclaves have involved various numbers of cardinal electors from 12 and 14 to 50 and 60. In 1967, Pope Paul VI issued a motu proprio limiting the number in a conclave to 120 and eliminating cardinals on arriving at their 80th birthday—a regulation vociferously denounced by cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, the enfant terrible of Vatican Council II, as well as by the formidable French cardinal Eugene Tisserant and others.

While electioneering in preparation for a conclave while a pope is still alive is strictly forbidden, discussions in the papal curia as well as
among cardinals in various parts of the world are inevitable. In June
of 1993, the curial cardinal Achille Silvestrini acknowledged this fact,
seemingly recognizing the criticism of the Polish pontiff’s policies on
the part of Italian prelates whose motto was “Never again (a candi­
date) east of Frascati!”

In an attempt to assess the current pope’s universal outlook on the
papacy’s participation in world affairs, Z. detects a startling conjunc­
tion in John Paul’s thinking between Christianity and the world reli­
gions. There is astir, he feels, an apocalyptic conviction that something
of eschatological proportions may be in store for the next millennium.

It is in this perspective that Z. brings his study to a climax. Citing
the prophecies of the 12th-century Irish monk Malachi, Z. presumes
there are but two popes to follow John Paul II. One is designated as De
gloria di olivi; the other Petrus Romanus. The Polish pontiff is char­
acterized as de labore solis, which he has fulfilled in his herculean
worldwide pastoral jaunts as well as in his incredible political and
ecclesial pronouncements and activities.

Z. cites the cardinal of Milan, Carlo Maria Martini, a biblical scholar
who adds to John Paul’s apocalyptic vision of the year 2000 by theo­
rizing that the “original sin” of the primitive church was constituted
by the divergence between the Judeo-Christians championed by the
apostle James and the gentile church led by Peter, who “for fear of the
Jews” fled Jerusalem, the bedrock of the church, eventually settling in
Rome, thus giving rise to a fundamental divergence between the Eter­
nal and the Holy City that has tormented Judeo-Christian relations
down the centuries.

Annapolis, Maryland

Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R.

Religious Melancholy and Protestant Experience in America. By
$35.

Rubin wants to convince his readers that certain forms of Protestant
piety have engendered a distinctive psychopathology that he calls “re­
ligious melancholy.” He thinks that we err when we interpret it as
merely an expression of some other form of psychiatric disorder. The
insights of ethnopsychiatry and cultural psychology enable us, he be­
lieves, to see religious melancholy as a singular culture-bound syn­
drome, different both from its antecedents in the ancient and medieval
world and from the forms of depressive illness recognized by modern
secular diagnosticians.

It appeared in recognizable form by the time Robert Burton wrote
his Anatomy of Melancholy in 1621, and the melancholy Burton was
the thinker who first clearly identified it. It emerged from an exag­
gerated sense of sin, a morbid conviction of the danger of damnation,
and a terrible fear of being abandoned by God. Pietists and Puritans
suffered from it in the 17th century; revivalism subsequently spread it
widely throughout American culture. It manifested itself not only in morbid fears of damnation but also in suicide and in evangelical anorexia nervosa, an inability or refusal to ingest food. Far less frequent now than it once was, it continues to appear both among 20th-century evangelicals and despairing Protestant liberals.

The thesis is provocative, and it raises several questions. First, how does one distinguish pathological melancholy from forms of melancholy deemed acceptable, even desirable, in a religious culture? R. lumps together the people who killed themselves—people whom the religious culture itself recognized as acting abnormally—with people who underwent nothing more than the despair and humiliation that their spiritual leaders told them that they should undergo. Was it all pathological? By what criteria does one distinguish pathology from cultural practices that seem morbid to us because we live outside the culture?

The same question arises in assessing evangelical anorexia nervosa. R. lumps together under this category such disparate persons and groups as Samuel Hopkins and Mary Moody Emerson, who in accord with a long Christian tradition fasted one day a week to prepare to receive the Lord’s Supper; the utopians at Fruitlands who adopted a stern vegetarian diet; the Oberlin Perfectionists who for a while adopted the dietary nostrums of Sylvester Graham, which never included extreme fasting; and the distraught inmates of a Hartford asylum who, convinced that God had damned them, came close to killing themselves by refusing to ingest food for extended periods. Do we not need to make some distinctions?

My second question is about consistency of definition. At the beginning of the book, R. defines religious melancholy as a form of melancholy induced by a sense of sinfulness and a fear of damnation. By the end, he includes among its victims Edward J. Carnell, an evangelical theologian who killed himself for complex reasons that included a disenchantment with his fundamentalist past; Anton Boisen, a religious liberal with schizophrenia who maintained a deep interest in religious experience; and Robert Raines, a rebellious young minister who rejected his Methodist heritage as prudish and legalistic and adopted a modern psychological spirituality. Even in treating his 19th-century figures, R. includes someone like Mary Fish, who fell into depression after losing her husband, her mother-in-law, and her youngest child. Was this really an instance of “culturally induced illness” rooted in religious convictions? The definition of the topic seems, at a minimum, unduly flexible.

R. depends heavily on secondary accounts and he has some difficulty whenever he descends into Protestant theology. To make N. W. Taylor into a proponent of an “omnicausal self” is, to say the least, an unusual reading of Taylor, and a reference to the fundamentalist doctrine of “postmillennial” dispensationalism must certainly be a slip of the typewriter. But R. presents useful data about a form of piety that obviously harmed some people psychologically, and he uncovers some
fascinating 19th-century instances of a variety of anorexia closely linked to distinctive religious beliefs. Obviously I remain unconvinced by the argument, but R. offers us complex and interesting questions about the relationship between religion and health, and we can learn from them even if we find his answers too imprecise.

Emory University, Atlanta

E. BROOKS HOLIFIELD


This revised dissertation is bold and original in conceptualization, thoroughly researched, and written with great passion. Showing a creative lack of respect for disciplinary boundaries, Smith draws deeply and creatively upon American, especially African American, religious history, folklore and musicology, aesthetics, literary criticism and critical theory, history and phenomenology of religion, and biblical hermeneutics in order to produce a brilliant and sophisticated interpretation of the construction of the worldview that can be associated with a significant segment of African Americans. This worldview is argued to have been effected through the engagement of the Bible as a “conjure book,” a “kind of magical formulary for prescribing cures and curses, and for invoking extraordinary powers in order to reenvision, revise, and transform the conditions of human existence” (6).

Influenced by N. Frye's *The Great Code*, in which the Bible is viewed as “a source of representation and of cultural meaning in Western civilization and history” (6), S. organized his book around a total of nine parts of the Bible—Genesis [cosmogony], Exodus [conjuring-God-for-freedom], Law [curing violence I], Spirituals [psalms; aesthetics], Wisdom [proverbs, worldview], Prophecy [oracles; vocation]; and Gospel [curing violence II], Praxis [acts/activism], and Apocalypse [judgement; revelation]. These parts correspond to “typological codes” that African Americans used to “conjure culture.” With such codes S. understands himself to be engaging in the analysis of what W. Sollors called “typological ethnogenesis,” the formation of peoplehood through . . . biblical typology.” The nine parts are divided into three overarching rubrics which allow S. to analyze the practice of “typological ethnogenesis” from three different perspectives: ethnographic (Genesis, Exodus, and Law), theoretical (Spirituals, Wisdom, and Prophecy), and theological (Gospel, Praxis, and Apocalypse). A concluding parenetic section argues that African Americans are “coparticipants” in a contemporary worldwide configuration of diasporan peoples seeking solidarity. As such, they are called upon to help transform the world through the “optimal” balancing of relationships and structures that is fundamental to “conjuralional culture.”

With its focus upon the concept of “conjure” the book models a type of religious or theological studies that breaks away from focus upon texts, institutions, and great personalities, as well as the confining
discursive formations of systematic theology. The employment of the concept of "conjure," with its multidisciplinary foci, leads to different ways of schematizing religion. For this contribution alone all students of religion are in S.'s debt.

Yet in the tradition of original and brilliant works, the book raises more questions than it answers, highlights more problems than it solves. The lack of consistent diachronic analysis gives the impression that African Americans' conjuring efforts were fairly limited in range, the attention given to the different typological codings associated with the different canonical text-parts notwithstanding. How are the diversity and dynamism of African Americans' conjuring efforts to be comprehensively registered? Is it enough to argue that the biblical conjuring efforts can occur "partially, proleptically, or retrogressively" at any time in African American history? To be sure, this points to a degree of dynamism and fluidity, but insofar as it limits the conjuring efforts to the (western defined) Bible, conjure-culture efforts among African Americans nevertheless cannot be comprehensively described or accounted for.

What, e.g., happens to S.'s nine-part schema when the "sects" and "cults" in African American religious and cultural history that conjure culture with texts outside the "canon" are added? Should it be assumed that only "canonical" texts have been engaged? What are the wider sociopolitical, aesthetic, and other implications of the biblical-canonical circumscription of conjuring efforts? And how can the exclusion of the letters of "Paul" from an analysis of African American conjuring be justified? What becomes of the schema when the widely recognized history of controversial engagements of the letters among African Americans are figured into the schema?

S.'s argument about the perduring legacy of biblical conjuring efforts among African Americans is very persuasive. Less persuasive is his argument that this legacy has been mostly liberating. Even less persuasive is his argument that as it points to "possibilities for transcendence," conjuring requires "theological... figural reading" (254), so as to help African Americans avoid being absorbed by the biblical text or falling into ideological rigidity or sedimentation. This undeveloped reference to "theological reading" as solution is odd, more a statement of hope, I think, than argumentation. Such readings have rarely functioned in the way that Smith suggests they might. History suggests that they have contributed to the very sedimentation of which S. speaks with horror.

This is a learned and provocative work precisely because it raises so many questions that get at the heart of the challenges in the study of religion and culture. That it does not answer all the questions it raises is far less important than that it calls the reader into the conversation on different terms. It is must reading for all serious students of religion.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y. VINCENT L. WIMBUSH
After a period of neglect, the thought of Teilhard de Chardin is making a serious comeback; Trennert-Helwig’s book is already the second volume on Teilhard in the Freiburg Theological Studies series. T. is able to build on a broader base than previous studies of Teilhard for he had access to most of the known unpublished texts (diaries, letters, retreat notes, etc.), which enables him to clear up a number of misconceptions.

After placing Teilhard’s work in the context of growing contemporary awareness of the cosmos and its genesis, T. can claim the support of the best theologians of our time when he declares that “theology must dare a ‘theology of nature’... in order to search with all one’s cognitive forces for God’s mystery in his work and interpret human existence, as experienced in unbreakable interconnectedness with nature, in the light of revelation” (18).

T. traces back to Teilhard’s childhood the two foundations on which he built his life: the love of the earth and the love of God. T. calls Teilhard’s Comment je vois “the most authentic and complete summary of [his] position with regard to God and the world” (8). Accordingly T. follows the outline of that work in dividing his own text into three parts: Physics, Metaphysics and Mysticism.

Physics is shown to mean much more to Teilhard than just the science of physics; it concerns the whole physis, the all-encompassing nature of which we are a part. After showing that Teilhard was well aware of the problems of human cognition, and defining Teilhard’s phenomenology against the background of phenomenologists like Husserl and Merleau-Ponty, T. describes in detail the physical world of Teilhard. He uses actual events from Teilhard’s biography to show how his ideas developed and became more concise. Evolution became for Teilhard the most basic feature of his universe, which Teilhard described by its general properties. T. analyses these as the notions of complexity and the “within” and the correlating concepts of radial and tangential energy—terms that have often been misunderstood. He shows how reflection relates the social phenomenon and the rise of the Omega point. In doing so he carefully establishes that the Omega point cannot be separated from its Christological interpretation. This is seen to distinguish Teilhard’s thought from the new-age and other contemporary esoterical movements. Teilhard extended the notion of nature to include religious phenomena and believed that the Church formed evolution’s “axis of convergence” (175–92). Thus, though Teilhard had difficulties with the official church and his Jesuit order, he never broke with them.

Turning to metaphysics, T. shows that Thomist concepts are inconsistent with Teilhard’s thinking and with the world we know. Outlining the controversies associated with names like Garrigou-Lagrange
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and Maritain, T. sketches a way in which Teilhard can be considered "genuinely Thomasic" (206). Teilhard's understanding of "creation as union" (207) is linked with seeing the spirit as the base of all existence: "All that exists does so on the basis of thought" (210). The idea that the whole is more than the sum of its parts (an understanding essential for Teilhard's metaphysics of becoming) is traced through texts from 1916 to 1955. Creatio ex nihilo, i.e. the beginning of creation, cannot be explained within this metaphysics. As Teilhard quite clearly recognized, it remains a postulate answered by faith, as it was in the view of Aquinas. Teilhard changes the notion of creation so that God's transcendent creative force calls forth all being "from ahead" that is, from the future; in constituting them in this way he reverses the traditional understanding of metaphysical causality (224). By using what later became system-theoretical structures, Teilhard was able to elaborate the hierarchy of evolutionary levels; T. parallels these to the work of Bertalanffy and other system theorists.

Mystically, the creative force is identified as love, and Teilhard's vision is rooted in Christ, in quo omnia constant. Final union in Christ is prepared for by all the forces of love. For Teilhard, the mystic does not refuse the energies of the world; rather he integrates and transcends them. Seeing things from this evolutionary perspective, the very nature of sin is transformed. T. views Teilhard's thought as an attempt to clear new paths, a work necessarily unfinished. But he insists that it was important for Teilhard "to preach the attitude of strained expectation, which is expressed by a passionate active love of the earth and a boundless trust in the goodness of God, the great mystery of the cosmos" (521).

T. introduces readers into Teilhard's vision in a very comprehensive way, supported by abundant references to the texts. The history of the evolution of Teilhard's thinking and its conflict with authorities within and outside his order is vividly described. This makes for a study that is interesting reading theologically and historically, and which opens new vistas for theology.

Center of Theological Inquiry
Princeton, N.J.

Karl Schmitz-Moormann


The recent successful repair of the Hubble space telescope has brought a rush of new data and an explosion of sharp conflicts to the field of cosmology. The size and the age of the universe are prime examples. Nonetheless, big-bang cosmology is still robustly alive and screaming like any newborn child.

At some point philosophers and theologians will begin the evaluation of the implications of big bangism. Some skeptics will snort at
such activity since the theoretical ground is so mushy. After all, cosmology depends on general relativity and quantum mechanics taken together. These two theories, however, have resolutely refused fundamental intercommunication.

The early moments of the universe in big-bang perspective involve unlimited density. Such a state must require a description in terms of quantum gravity. That is, high density involves a strong gravitational field and small size requires a quantum-mechanical description. We have, however, only hints at a theory of quantum gravity. Perhaps string theory will get us there. It is not possible yet to say how long it will be till a clarifying development occurs. In trying to understand the special moment in big-bang theory which is the beginning of all things physical we may be trying to cross bridges that do not exist.

Yet, we must live in our own age. We cannot wait for some future decipherment, some instant of total transparency. Craig and Smith start on the process.

Craig, currently Visiting Fellow at the Higher Institute of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Louvain, holds that big-bang cosmology is naturally patient of a theistic interpretation. Aquinas thought that Aristotelian assumptions concerning an eternal universe meant that only revelation can show that the universe began in time. But a straightforward reading of big bangism demonstrates a finite age for the universe. Then a reasonable application of causality requires that something (or someone?) must have given the whole show a push to start it on its way.

Smith, currently at Western Michigan University, argues that general relativity produces no such understanding. The big bang is a moment of intense density and resultant gravity. Work by Penrose and Hawking establishes that the first moment is a singularity, an instant when the laws of physics break down. The result is that the outcome of the big-bang explosion is in principle unpredictable. If God created the big bang, God could not know what kind of a universe would come out since the singularity is lawless. God could not even know that human beings would result since any style of universe can emerge from the weird physics of a cosmic singularity.

C. and S. proceed in a classical debate. C. states a theist interpretation of big bangism. S. replies with an atheistic version. Then the process starts over again. At the end, the writers leave the question in conflict. It comes down to a choice. Do you like a causal explanation or do you prefer an acausal scenario? An intense and very technical interchange provides ample material to support either resolution.

Philosophers and theologians will find the price to enter the discussion high. One should have a knowledge of quantum mechanics up to an understanding of Richard Feynman’s sum-over-histories path integral approach and H. Everett’s many-worlds interpretation. Needed also are an acquaintance with special and general relativity and some background in Cantor’s transfinite set theory.
The contest between the two disputants is intense but always carried out with the civility that makes educated discourse possible. On one point both agree, and that is the amazement Aristotle spoke of before the mystery that the world exists at all. S. says, and C. echoes, that the impact of the world's existence overwhelms him. "I am completely stunned," he writes. "I take a few dazed steps in the dark meadow, and fall among the flowers. I lie stupefied, whirling without comprehension in the world through numberless worlds other than this one" (217).

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


Reading Pannenberg's systematics can produce a feeling like that generated by a lively intellectual conversation: the sense of challenge and excitement that comes from encounter with a fine mind thinking deeply about important matters. One may disagree with his positions; but one can hardly avoid being stimulated by the power, scope, and coherence of P.'s scholarship and reasoning.

This second volume is central to the series in both position and content. Its two principle subjects, creation and the reconciliation of the world, are united by theological anthropology. The existential plight of humanity reveals the debatability of the doctrine of creation: that the world has a loving and almighty Creator as its origin and consummation can only finally be affirmed in light of humanity's reconciliation with God through Christ. Thus the theological consideration of the world and humanity culminates in Christology. The understanding of the New Testament testimony to Christ gives the theoretical basis for P.'s doctrine of God (vol. 1), and grounds his ecclesiology and eschatology (vol. 3).

P.'s effort to integrate contemporary science into the Christian description of the world as God's creation admirably sorts out the issues. He warns theologians against confusing scientific and theological levels of explanation, and shows how such confusions have historically led to an erosion of the credibility of the doctrine of creation. His careful treatments of miracles and of contingency (scientific and theological) are excellent. Nevertheless, despite P.'s caution not to offer direct theological interpretations of physical theory, his easy juxtaposition of biblical, philosophical, and scientific ideas (as in his explanation of divine Spirit and angels as concretions of force fields) may cause discomfort in scientists as well as theologians. The same is true for P.'s Christologically based anthropocentrism, which leads to sympathy for the weak anthropic principle and for Tipler's "Omega point theory."

Creation, anthropology, and Christology are closely connected to the central affirmation of P.'s trinitarian theology: that the eternal Son is divine precisely in his self-differentiation from the Father, in which he
allows the Father alone to be God. As in Hegel, the self-differentiation of the Son is the basis for the creation of what is other than God. Our goal of fellowship with God is accomplished by acceptance of finitude, or distinction from God; sin is essentially “pride” (Augustine), or making the self into God. This provides a good basis for P.’s treatment of Christ as the new Adam. But problems arise with P.’s apparent identification of “original” and personal sin—especially in his attempt to reconcile human responsibility with his affirmation of the inevitable perversion of creaturely independence.

P.’s Christology makes a number of significant changes from his positions in *Jesus—God and Man* (1964). In particular, he now recognizes the Incarnation as a lifelong process in Jesus. In line with his trinitarian theology, P. centers on Jesus’ “self-destruction from the Father by subordination to his royal rule” (363), whose eschatological coming he proclaims. But there are difficulties in P.’s move from this relation of Jesus with the Father to Jesus’ “indirect” identity with God and thence to the eternity of the Son. P.’s emphasis on Jesus’ self-distinction from God makes it difficult to see why this relation is more than creaturely, or why its occurrence precisely in Jesus should be definitive for our conception of the eternal God. (Comparison with Rahner’s affirmation of Jesus’ union with God through the mediation of the notion of an “absolute saving event” of God’s self-gift is instructive.) Likewise, I wonder whether God’s relationship to the world should be conceived so exclusively in terms of “lordship”—notwithstanding the term’s obvious connection with the image of the “kingdom.” The schematic treatment given to the credibility of the resurrection is surprising, given P.’s accent on its historicity and its centrality to his argument.

P.’s method is scripturally oriented; but one sometimes wonders whether the texts can bear the weight of the systematic structures he builds on them. His Protestant heritage is apparent in his treatment of such issues as original sin and redemption by vicarious substitution. But he also shows how far contemporary theology has transcended the traditional confessional differences among Christians. On the other hand, the world religions are mentioned only as competitors to Christianity’s truth claims. Clearly, P. could not be expected to engage in a comparative evaluation, which he sees as the province of philosophy of religion. But a systematics that incorporates the function of fundamental theology (as P. holds it should) might be expected to advert to new perspectives raised by the present dialogue among world religions.

The translation generally gives a good sense of P.’s meaning without slavishly following his complex constructions. The close paraphrases that replace P.’s Latin quotations in the footnotes are well done (although one sometimes misses a particularly relevant quote). There were several places where I needed to consult the German to clarify P.’s point; in one, the translation was mistaken. Kasper’s *Jesus the Christ* is cited without page numbers, and in one footnote two of his
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works are confused. There is some inconsistency in citing works that have been translated into English, including P.'s own Basic Questions in Theology.

_Fordham University, N.Y._

_RICHARD VILADESAU_


In his challenging and original systematic theology, Hodgson brings to completion the Hegelian project initiated in _God in History: Shapes of Freedom_ (1989). There H. developed an Hegelian trinitarian theology in somewhat speculative terms. Here he rereads the Christian doctrine of God in the light of the Hegelian studies, and comes to some provocative conclusions. The introductory third of the book surveys both the role of theology today and the types of theological thinking that can be included under the “postmodern” umbrella. The remainder is divided into three subdivisions, corresponding to the three moments of the (postmodern) trinity: God as “the one who loves in freedom,” “world” in which Christ is at work as the “shape of redemptive love,” and “spirit.”

The importance of H.’s work is evident from the opening pages, where he insists on the necessity for theology, even of a postmodern kind, to see God as its object. Self-professedly postmodern, H.’s text stands as a corrective to much of the theology that bears that label, where authors so frequently seem not to have noticed the absence of God from the text. While H., in contrast, accepts of course that God is only known in and through the world, through the self and other selves, he contends that this is real knowledge of God. God’s revelation is a partial disclosure through the effects of God in the world. As H. puts it so eloquently, “we do not see wind but rather what it moves, we do not listen to breath but to the words that it forms” (129). This profoundly Hegelian idea allows for the focus on God to be at the same time a focus on the world.

H. presents a radical revisioning of trinitarian thought. He dismisses the traditional trinitarian formulation of God as “patriarchal and hierarchical.” Instead, God is the “ultimate event of communication,” nameable cognitively and existentially as the Hegelian “dialectic of identity, difference, and mediation,” open to description in more personal terms as “the One who loves in freedom,” and finally expressible symbolically as “God, world, and Spirit.” Secondly, he proposes to “loosen up” the connection between Jesus and the Christ. While Jesus incarnates the “Christ-gestalt,” that is, the God-given normative shape or paradigm of transformative praxis, he does not exhaust it. Indeed, says H., it empowers the distinctive being of human being, and thus the more human Jesus is the more he is the Incarnation of the Christ-gestalt. This feels a little bit like salvation by semantics, and it shows up again in his treatment of death and resurrection. Since, H. argues, both the individual self and the world within which the risen
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self is newly embodied are contained—in Hegelian terms—within God, so we can say that "in rising into the world, we rise into God" (274). Finally and perhaps most interesting is H.'s treatment of Spirit as an "emergent person," an actualization of what would only have been a potentiality in God without the creation of the world. So the Spirit proceeds from God and the world, not from Father and Son, though it is "a world in process of being shaped and configured by Christ" (291). At the same time the world grows into Christ through the power of the spirit.

H.'s book works on a number of levels. It is a presentation and rehabilitation of Hegel's Christology. It is a postmodern revisioning of trinitarian theology. And it is a contribution, as he avows early in the book, to Reformed theology. Conservative and evangelical theologians will not welcome H.'s prioritizing of context over text. The book is certainly beyond "the house of authority," to use Edward Farley's term. H.'s metaphor of theology as sailing gets this right. The postmodern theological boat is unmoored, buffeted by the winds, finding its own way across the seas. Some would say that it is merely drifting. However, in an extension of the metaphor that H. does not make, we might recognize the importance of navigational charts. H. uses Hegelian charts, venerable but reliable. With charts in hand, there is little danger of running aground, but this is not enough. The art of the theological navigator lies in catching the breezes and controlling the boat, and the fun lies in what you do within the boundaries the chart lays down. In the present work, the theological soundness and security are provided by the Hegelian charts. The elegant play of the text comes from H. the sailor. But its creativity and importance lie in the marriage of system and bricolage. Even Karl Barth would be heartened, I imagine, by the intensity of focus on God.

Fairfield University, Connecticut  

Paul Lakeland


Theology should be fun, says Hauerwas in the Preface to his most recent collection of essays. By "fun," he means that theology should risk the potentially humorous consequences of letting unapologetic Christian discourse reframe the way we see and talk about the world.

H. is largely successful in making this book fun. A good example is the short essay entitled "Why Gays (as a Group) are Morally Superior to Christians (as a Group)." This essay is not about homosexuality. Instead it illustrates the kind of difference H. thinks Christian convictions should make: if Christians were known to take their convictions seriously, then they would "be seen by the military as being as problematic as gays" (153). Christians trained in just-war considerations would worry about bombing civilians and would try to incapacitate
(instead of killing) enemy soldiers. Christians in the barracks would hold prayer meetings, including prayers for the enemy. Christians' first loyalty would be to God, and then to their commanders. They would keep their promises, maintain marital fidelity, and would always be trying to convert their fellow soldiers. Such people, suggests H., would be seen as unfit for military service.

Although most of the essays are less playful, H. repeatedly tries to get us to see that Christian convictions make a difference. He therefore challenges Christian justifications of democracy, arguing that those justifications have taught us to police our convictions in the name of sustaining the social order. Similar efforts to take Christian convictions seriously are seen in essays on nonviolence, medical ethics, and the mentally handicapped.

There are a few problems with this book. H.'s train of thought is sometimes difficult to follow, forcing one to reread sections and to supply connections that H. leaves out. Another problem is the aggressive, polemic tone that permeates the Introduction and second half of the book. This tone discourages a sympathetic reading and makes it too easy to dismiss H.'s arguments without critical engagement. That tone also occasionally conceals the considerable ground H. shares with some of those he critiques. E.g., there is significant overlap between H.'s position and that advanced in Ronald Thiemann's *Constructing a Public Theology*, but one would never guess it from the tone of H.'s lengthy footnote on Thiemann's book (189–90 n. 6).

A further problem is the relationship between H.'s interest in the virtues and his insistence that Christian convictions make a difference. In the first two essays, H. uses Trollope's novels to offer narrative displays of the virtues of forgiveness and honor. These essays are helpful and enjoyable. Yet the first one makes "little of explicit Christian teaching and practice of forgiveness" (56), and the second uses Trollope to critique Barth's more abstract but also more overtly theological account of honor. There is a disjunction here between H.'s almost "theologyless" treatment of the virtues and his otherwise persistent claim that theology makes a difference. This discrepancy is not new to H.'s work, but it is particularly evident in this volume and needs to be addressed.

One of this collection's merits is that it offers a clearer view of H.'s politics. H. is often accused of being apolitical or advocating social withdrawal. That is not the picture that emerges here. What emerges is the steadfast belief that Christians should engage the world, but they should do it as Christians, on Christian terms.

This does not mean that conversation concerning public policy or social issues is at an end. It does mean a refusal to forfeit what H. takes to be central Christian convictions and practices (like nonviolence) in the name of political realism or responsible politics or pluralism. But this refusal does not force H. into advocating social withdrawal. It does force him to focus on a different kind of politics. For H., authentically
Christian political involvement looks more like that of a “peasant” (105) or a servant than a ruler. It is less interested in balancing power between interest groups than in becoming communities who can offer an alternative to the violence that so grips societies and nations. It is a politics more concerned with offering a faithful, prophetic (even “apocalyptic”) witness, than with being “effective” (110). One can argue with H. about whether Christian convictions force the conclusions he draws, but, as even the book’s title suggests, H. should not be accused of advocating Christian isolation or retreat.

First Mennonite Church, Allentown, Pa. JOSEPH J. KOTVA, JR.


Oelshlaeger’s basic thesis is that religion has an indispensable role in resolving the ecocrisis. His own conversion from the long-held opinion, common among environmentalists, that religion is the primary cause of ecological crisis (cf. Lynn White) is detailed in the opening pages. O. begins with an empirical fact: the threat of an ecocatastrophe is due to human actions which bring about, among other things, climate heating and extinction of species. Solutions that have been offered for this crisis are, he believes, more part of the problem than of the cure. Effective solutions are unlikely to come from three of the four institutions that shape natural and human ecology. The state and politicians are frequently driven more by private interests than by concern for the common good. Corporations, even when they take ecologically favorable actions under the banner of social responsibility, are merely adopting stop-gap measures, and their ecological policies are undermined by competition. Universities, now run like corporations, are rendered ineffective by their “disciplinolatry,” and are in effect little more than “associations of individuals”—students, faculty, administrators—in pursuit of their selfish ends” (199). The root cause of the impotence of these institutions to resolve the ecocrisis is what O. calls “utilitarian individualism.” In the modern worldview, also called “utopian capitalism” or “the dominant social matrix,” nature has instrumental or anthropocentric value only, to be exploited or at best “managed” for human consumption (55).

This leaves the church, or more broadly, religion as the only beacon of hope for the world threatened by ecocatastrophe. O. understands religion sociolinguistically here; i.e., he prescinds from religions’ metaphysical assertions of ultimate knowledge about reality (their “sky-hooks”) and considers them only as institutions with religious narratives, especially their myths of origin. His only claim is that religions, in particular the Judeo-Christian religious tradition, can and should draw from their religious classics, especially their myths of origin, to
forge a new metaphor of "caring for creation" in order to end the ecocrisis.

O. is acutely aware of the differing interpretations of the myths of beginning; indeed he devotes a large chapter to expounding the four trends within the Judeo-Christian tradition, which he labels conservative, moderate, liberal, and radical (incidentally, Rosemary Radford Ruether will be surprised to read that she is a Protestant!), and alternative traditions (radical feminism, wiccans, Native American faiths, and deep ecology). But these theological differences, some of which are mutually exclusive, do not hinder O.'s projects of constructing, by means of the myths of creation (which he terms "toeholds"), a new ethics of solidarity with creation to counteract the "first language" of utilitarian individualism; of formulating a new cosmology and a "new social matrix" (56) to promote a sustainable society instead of attempts at managing planet Earth; and of inculcating the new virtues of "citizen democracy" instead of revindication of rights without responsibilities.

It is ironical that religion and church appear here as disembodied entities rather than as actual social organizations fighting (sometimes tooth and nail) with each other for social privileges and material benefits. When one reads, e.g., that "religious discourse ... is the primary form of cultural discourse outside the modern story of economic growth and technological fixes" (47), should one ignore recent stories of ministers of the "gospel of greed" who validate their gospel on the basis of Scripture? Or when O. writes that "the church presents the readiest opportunity for most Americans to engage in a discourse for public good" (76), and that "religion has been throughout history and remains today the central source of criticism and resistance to the state" (80), one may ask what Christian denomination(s) he has in mind. When he argues that "the church is perhaps the only institution in modern society capable of resisting administrative despotism" (109), one wonders if he has had the experience of an average Roman Catholic. And when he commends the Christian churches for their contribution to the abolition of slavery and to the protection of civil rights (50), one may question whether the sole basis of their actions was their religious narratives, without the forceful urging of modernity.

O. deserves our praise for pointing out (with many others before him) that the ecocrisis has a moral dimension, and that therefore a purely political, economic, and technological solution is not sufficient. He demonstrates well that religion has the capacity and duty to contribute to the solution of the ecocrisis. But his excessive confidence in the churches and their religious narratives to find a solution to the ecocrisis as well as his restriction to the Judeo-Christian tradition makes his arguments much less convincing.

_Catholic University of America_  
_PETER CHO PHAN_

Saliers has added to our ongoing discussion of liturgical theology by a thoughtful analysis of the experience of worship. In the act of worship we are formed in Christian life. Rooted in the reality of our existence in this world, the experience of worship enables us at the same time to transcend that experience, now illuminated by an eschatological horizon.

S. has drawn from several years of his lectures at host institutions to focus the present volume around three themes: liturgy and theology, liturgy as prayer, and liturgy in its human social, cultural, and aesthetic context. The origins of the volume “are not in academic circles, but in the travail of Christian churches I know and in which I have worshiped. Thus it is a book originating in Western, ecumenically-informed Protestant circles” (9).

The reader will, indeed, find the volume ecumenically informed. As the various Christian denominations of the West have moved through decades of liturgical renewal they have rediscovered their common heritage and, along with it, the core meaning with which S. deals so effectively here.

S. highlights the function of worship as bringing together pathos (the human suffering of the world) and the divine ethos (liturgy as the self-giving of God to us): “Christian liturgy transforms and empowers when the vulnerability of human pathos is met by the methods of God’s vulnerability in word and sacrament” (22). Holding these two dimensions of worship together lies at the heart of Christian worship: “Pathos without God’s ethos is tragic self-expression; God’s ethos without human pathos figured in Jesus is opaque, that is, sovereign but not saving” (36). This emphasis well reminds us of the radical nature of God’s Incarnation in Jesus and in the often-agonized world Jesus came to save.

S.’s work proves especially helpful in the four chapters of Part 2 which elaborate the four dimensions of true liturgical prayer (praise, thanksgiving, blessing; invoking and beseeching; lamenting and confessing; interceding) and their formative effect on the community at worship. Our continuing exercise in worship reminds us of what God has promised to be for us and what God has promised that we can become. These chapters assist in a full appreciation of our formalized liturgical texts and guide the composition of original texts meant for the worshiping community. S.’s elaborations can even be seen as a guide for personal prayer, sketching out the horizons for a fully Christian experience of prayer.

The final section represents a medley of themes relating to the understanding of worship. There is an analysis of symbol in worship along with a reflection on the major structures of Christian liturgy in the context of time, space, sound, sight, and the kinetic dimension of worship. One chapter spells out the relation of Christian worship to
Christian ethics and another the art of integrating human experience, especially the experience of suffering, into the redemptive art of worship. Another reflects on the role of beauty in effective worship. And finally S. uses the Advent season to illustrate the eschatological hope breaking through the liturgical encounter between pathos and ethos.

Certainly a wide range of topics in a volume of modest enough size! While S. frames the pieces in an overall setting as described above we can see his work here as an anthology of helpful topics under the general heading of liturgical theology. Individual chapters can stimulate reflection when read independently, which, in the opinion of this reviewer, opens the volume to a wide variety of uses. S.'s command of the details of liturgical history assures the reader of sound conclusions drawn from tradition. His erudition combines with a great sensitivity to the liturgical needs of and possibilities for today's worshiping Christians.

_Xavier University, Cincinnati_  
J. Leo Klein, S.J.


Carman brings together expertise in Hinduism, familiarity with a broad range of religious traditions, especially those of India, and mature Christian theological sensibilities, all for the sake of exploring the theme of polarity in the divine. We learn a great deal about the Śrīvaishnav Hindu tradition of South India, particularly the vernacular Tamil-language songs of Nammālvār (9th century) as interpreted according to the Sanskrit-language Vedānta theological tradition of Rāmānuja (1017–1137), whose writings set forth and defend a highly sophisticated (mono)theism focused on Viṣṇu and his consort Śrī. Nammālvār's poetry and Rāmānuja's theology serve as the foundation for a rich theological tradition and communal life even today. From these Hindu sources C. gained his sense of polarity in the divine: "[polarity] is the link between two apparently opposite qualities that belong to or describe the same reality," yet without being merely contradictory (11).

C. is thinking particularly of divine “supremacy” and “accessibility,” but also of other pairs: the ascetic and the erotic, the concealing and the revealing, the masculine and the feminine, the personal and the transpersonal. Using the phenomenological approach to the study of religion proposed by W. Brede Kristensen and Gerardus van der Leeuw, C. ventures to generalize this polarity as a facet of religious experience and theological reflection in every tradition: "I hope to show in this book that the recognition of various pairs of contrasting attributes—especially majesty and meekness, and justice and mercy—may help Christians better understand other religions" (11).

In support of his thesis, C. leads the reader through a dazzling sur-
vey that traverses numerous traditions: the cult of the Amida Buddha in Japan, and the cult of Hindu goddesses compared with devotion to the Virgin Mary; the theology sung by the congregation in the hymnal of Scotland's Reformed Church; Martin Luther's sense of divine hiddenness and revelation; Jonathan and Sarah Edwards's experience of divine majesty and grace; ideas of God in rabbinic Judaism and Muslim monotheism (where some polarities are clearly downplayed, while others persist). Each chapter is refreshing, insightful, and, though detailed, free from needless technicalities and jargon. Readers just finding their way into comparative studies will welcome the wealth of sources, the bibliography, and intelligent and moderate theological assessments; it is on this level that the book will be most useful.

Not only instructive, the book is intended to facilitate and encourage dialogue and comparative theology. Following in the footsteps of his Harvard colleague, W. C. Smith, C. is interested in refining our models for crossreligious understanding and dialogue, working out the implications of his effort to establish polarity as a viable comparative theme; theology must always be tending toward comparative study, and such study must occur in the midst of the back-and-forth conversation among believers. The book seeks also to provide pastoral encouragement for theologians and church members who seek a sure Christian theological basis on which to begin to take other religions seriously; "polarity" seems to mark C.'s confidence that God works both inside and outside our home traditions, that there is a wideness to divine activity that will always surprise us, but then also strengthen us. It is revealing that the book's title is drawn from Jonathan Edwards's testimony about a powerful moment in his own faith journey: "There came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God, that I know not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction; majesty and meekness joined together" (237).

C. has a leisurely writing style. He tends to meander, albeit instructively, stopping to enjoy his varied topics, relishing numerous insights drawn from his research, travels and colleagues, returning every now and then to the theme of polarity in its many forms. To prove his stated thesis—that Rāmānuja's theological insight on polarities in the divine nature illumines many traditions' understandings of God and serves as a convincing basis for comparative study—a different book would have to have been written, either more tightly focused (on just two or three traditions), or very much larger (in order to fill out our understanding of so many traditions), or very much more abstract (so as to retreat to preliminary hermeneutical issues). But any of those alternatives would have greatly changed this book and detracted from its most valuable qualities.

Boston College

FRANCIS X. CLOONEY, S.J.
SHORTER NOTICES


This is a very unusual book in that, on the one hand, it offers a chapter-by-chapter commentary on Deuteronomy, but it focuses, on the other hand, on a single theological theme, the death of Moses and its role in unifying the book. Olson views Deuteronomy as a catechesis, which he defines as a "distillation of essential tradition" which is socially transformative and communally oriented (7–11).

The book can be read with interest by scholars, but it is fully accessible also to any biblically literate reader. Footnotes provide an excellent review of important recent scholarship on Deuteronomy, making use of both Christian and Jewish studies. The text provides a very thorough, and often original and illuminating, study of the structure of the book as a whole and of its sections. This is a literary, rather than a historical, study; it seriously undertakes the task of explaining the text as a unified form of words in which the whole shapes the parts and the parts define the meaning of smaller units.

Its major contribution to scholarship is its extensive reflection on the theme of Moses in Deuteronomy as mediator of revelation, and in particular of his death in God's hands outside the promised land as symbol of Israel's (our) religious experience. O. shows every facet of this theme, sometimes going further in perceiving meaning than seems entirely justified. But, in the end, he is convincing; one begins to see the personal life of Moses within the teaching of Deuteronomy as important—more important perhaps than Isaiah within the book of Isaiah, but perhaps slightly less important than Jeremiah within the book of Jeremiah.

Because of this focus on a theological theme within a methodical presentation of the book as a unity, there is no verse-by-verse exegesis nor concern to explain difficult passages. E.g., the ordering of the legal material, largely as worked out by Kaufman and Braulik, is presented in some detail, but exegesis of individual laws, and even of the ten commandments, is simply passed over.

SEAN MCEVENUE
Concordia University, Montreal


Minear here brings his own special kind of literary sensitivity to bear on texts that appear to draw upon early Christian understandings and appropriations of Genesis 1–4. These include the announcements about Jesus to Mary and to the shepherds, the victories of Jesus over Satan throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts, Paul's language of death and life in 1 Corinthians 15, the "two families" in the Fourth Gospel, and other passages that illustrate early Christian readiness to use the language of Genesis to interpret and proclaim their own experience of the "new creation."

This slim volume is not easy reading. M. leads us through a close and necessarily demanding explication of the text. Yet it is well worth the effort he demands. M. is working with an insight that has claimed the full attention of some scholars only recently—namely, that early Christian authors do not merely quote the OT writings. Rather, they speak of their own experience of God in Christ Jesus by using the very language of the Jewish Scriptures (usually in the Greek version). M. explores the infrastructure of the early Christian imagination to recover the original meaning of the repertory of images that were second-nature to the writers and their audiences. Virtually every NT text carries an intertextual resonance with the OT, a resonance that was spontaneously available to the original readership but one that must be
laboriously recovered by today's readers.

If contemporary readers remain unconvinced of specific details of M.'s exegesis of particular passages, as was this reviewer on occasion, the collection as a whole illustrates convincingly how the imagination of early Christians was permeated by reinterpreted OT language and imagery. Implicitly, the book also challenges us to recover that resource for our own religious wholeness.

DENNIS HAMM, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


Amid the avalanche of studies of the Gospel of Mark over the last three decades, there has been no scholarly study in English of the patristic evidence on the authorship and setting of Mark. B. admirably fills this gap in a meticulously researched and engaging study that spans the references to Mark and John Mark from the New Testament to the Eastern and Western patristic traditions of the fourth century. He concludes with three chapters exploring the theological and literary significance of the patristic attribution of the Second Gospel to a Mark who was associated with Peter, and with some creative suggestions of his own on why the location of Mark at Rome may claim some plausibility.

Constantly B. steers a careful course between those who dismiss all patristic evidence as worthless due to its origin in the testimony of Papias, which itself is accorded little validity, and those who develop a maximal reconstruction of the authorship of the Second Gospel by harmonizing the NT evidence with the diverse patristic statements. B. finds five "salient features" of the patristic evidence: (1) Mark is a literary figure, or evangelical author, (2) whose relationship to the apostle Peter (3) accredits, to a chastened degree, his Gospel's presentation of Jesus, and (4) Mark's association with Peter, or his literary activity, is typically localized in Rome, (5) though Mark, if not the Second Gospel, is sometimes associated with Alexandria (196-97). B. often explores the significance of these features by suggesting, e.g., that the Petrine connection which is based on 1 Pet 5:13 may reflect the origin of 1 Peter and Mark among beleaguered communities who prized martyrdom, and that the concern for apostolic association of the Second Gospel may function to validate its distinctive Christology.

The comprehensive and close reading of all the available patristic texts, along with original suggestions for future research make this work indispensable for any serious student of the Second Gospel.

JOHN R. DONAHUE, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley


This valuable book was written in response to the extraordinary popularity in Germany of The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception (1992) by M. Baigent and R. Leigh. That book, which popularizes the views of R. Eisenman, alleges a conspiracy, directed from the Vatican, to suppress publication of the Scrolls which might threaten the claims of the Church regarding the origins of Christianity and the distinctiveness of its teachings. The refutation of these—and other—allegations is the leitmotif of this book.

Betz and Riesner accurately narrate the discovery of the Scrolls and their publication (almost 80%) by Christian (Roman Catholic and Protestant) and Israeli scholars—hardly a Vatican conspiracy! They then carefully review Eisenman's claims that the Teacher of Righteousness was James the Just, the "Man of Lies" was the Apostle Paul, the Essenes and early Christians were Zealots, and
that 4Q285 referred to "the crucified Messiah"—a proposal generally rejected.

Included in their detailed survey are the suggestions of N. Golb (that the scrolls were rescued from libraries in Jerusalem and hidden at Qumram, a Herodian fortress, and that the Copper Scroll is a record of where the treasures of Qumran were hidden, etc.) and of B. Thiering (that Jesus did not die on the cross, but married Mary Magdalene and had children, and eventually died in Rome at the age of 70, etc.).

Perhaps thanks to Hershel Shanks and the Biblical Archaeological Review, Baigent and Leigh's book has not been nearly as popular in the U.S. as in Germany, but the critique of it as well as of those by Eisenman and Wise and by Thiering remains most useful. In the course of the book almost all of the various theories about the Scrolls and the people of Qumran have been carefully examined. The people of Qumran are Essenes and the Scrolls are their witnesses. There is no threat to the tradition of the Church's history or to the teachings of early Christianity. There was no need for and has never been any suppression of the publication of the Scrolls by the Vatican!

VICTOR ROLAND GOLD
Pacific Lutheran Theol. Seminary
Berkeley, Cali.


Scholars desiring to penetrate the fascinating world of patristic exegesis will not advance far without encountering the name Simonetti. He has completed numerous studies on topics ranging from patristic exegetical method to the role of biblical interpretation in the formulation of early Christian doctrine, but until now his work has been accessible only in Italian. While not one of S.'s most important works, Biblical Interpretation provides a useful sketch of the development of patristic exegetical methodology from its beginnings in the first and second centuries to its "decline" in the fifth and sixth centuries. S. focuses on major figures (Origen, Theodore of Mopsuestia, etc.) and schools (Alexandria and Antioch), but he also manages to include dozens of lesser-known early Christian exegesists. This information alone makes the book especially helpful as a guide to early Christian exegetical literature.

As a general introduction, the book is of mixed value. S. implies that the story of patristic exegesis revolves around the search for a coherent methodology. Methodological differences account for the conflict between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis, and methodological laxity accounts for the inferior quality of exegesis before the third and after the fourth centuries. However, since the publication of the Italian original (1981), studies of patristic exegesis (e.g., R. Greer) have often emphasized that differences between interpretations derive less from methodology and more from the theological and cultural perspectives of the interpreters. While S. recognizes that, during doctrinal debates, theological perspective determined interpretation of key texts, e.g. the interpretation of Proverbs 8:22-25 during the Trinitarian controversy (121-32), overall, he leaves the reader with the misleading impression that patristic exegesists were preoccupied with methodology. Still, despite its shortcomings, this book helps fill a gap in an underrepresented area of early Christian scholarship.

JOHN J. O'KEEFE
Creighton University, Omaha


Peters' depth of historical scholarship on the Near East, and his sustained concern with the interactions
of the three great monotheistic traditions, make this book an invaluable resource, both for the classroom and for the general reader. Its methodological insights and sifting of recent scholarship should make it no less valuable to the specialist.

His expertise, however, makes P. all the more aware of what an enormously difficult task the "quest for the historical Muhammad" remains, and he addresses this issue in a most important appendix. The reader is well advised to begin there before approaching the body of the work, which makes critical use of almost entirely Islamic sources to construct first a history of Mecca and Muhammad's ancestry and then a biography of the Prophet himself. The sources (apart from the Quran, mostly Ibn Ishāq and al-Tabari) are quoted at great length and so we are given a good feel for the genre of prophetic biography. At the same time, the critique of those sources is woven into the text so as to remind us at every turn of the precariousness of the biographical edifice being constructed. By contrast, in other similar modern works, critical caveats are entered in the preface only to be ignored thereafter.

The result here is as good a portrayal of Muhammad as the modern historian can achieve—a Muhammad substantially as Muslims know him, given that our only sources are Muslim. One might prefer that P. had not devoted two-fifths of the text to the background of Muhammad's life and had rather offered us more on the period immediately following his death, when reflection on the significance of his life began in earnest. The use of vowel-diaccritics would have helped the non-arabist avoid the more egregious errors of pronunciation.

DANIEL A. MADIGAN, S.J.
Columbia University, New York


Cohen here provides an important, synthetic, and interdisciplinary study on the life of Jews as a religious minority in the medieval world. He rightly challenges both the myth and the countermyth associated with this history. Medieval Jews did not live in an idyllic Islamic haven in the East or under systematic and relentless Christian persecution in the West. That myth was originally constructed in the 19th century to shame "liberal" Christian Europeans into granting Jews the political equality and socio-economic opportunity they had promised. The myth remained unchallenged until Arabs adopted it to assert that Jews were responsible for disturbing interfaith harmony through their Zionist agenda, a message that even permeated Arab schoolbooks found after the Six Day War. A countermyth then developed, which asserted traditional Islamic persecution and relative Christian toleration of Jews in the Middle Ages.

After tracing these undesirable interpretations, C. provides evidence drawn from a host of sources, to comparatively illustrate the religious, economic and social position of medieval Jews within both contexts. He skillfully weaves theological, legal, poetic, epistolary, and iconographic evidence—even employing sociological methods and terminology in the process—to argue that generally, conditions under Islam were better than in Christian lands. He properly identifies many of the numerous exceptions that limit the usefulness of that generalization. The evidence simply doesn't permit application of the term "toleration"—at least not as defined in the 20th century—to the Islamic or Christian position on Jews in medieval culture. That statement is anachronistic, but so are the myths C. is up against.

This book is a "must-read" for anyone who teaches overviews on the history, culture, or theology of the Middle Ages, especially in light of the current, explosive argument over whether or not peace with Israel conforms to Islamic teaching and tradition.

WILLIAM V. HUDON
Bloomsburg University, Pa.

McGuire offers a biographic sketch of Aelred, 12th-century abbot of Rievaulx, beginning with the milieu of Aelred’s birth and following with Aelred’s formative years and his life at the Scottish court. The bulk of this study highlights the duties, skills, and virtues of the Cistercian abbot, concluding with M.’s discussion of possible further study of his personal definition of the meaning behind Aelred’s life and work.

The chapter on sources and documentation shows a great variety and depth, and the chapter on “ends and beginnings” is a fine attempt at placing the study in a larger historical context; however, the methodology employed throughout the work deserves serious consideration. First, M. relies on published translations rather than original texts, and even more troublesome, he has banned footnotes from the book, virtually eliminating the reader’s ability to check his evidence. E.g., examination of the citation on p. 30 reveals that M. has summarized Aelred incorrectly and has then spliced in parts of Aelred’s work. Second, M. uses hagiographic evidence of Aelred’s life and the saint’s lives penned by Aelred in contradictory ways: first he denies their reliability, and then he uses them as authoritative primary sources. Finally, although M. admits there is little or no reliable evidence on Aelred’s mother, he includes an entire chapter about her, employing psychoanalytical method to yield dubious conclusions; moreover, these conclusions serve as premises for discussions later in the book.

These methodological problems stem from the agenda admitted in the Preface, where M. states: “Aelred deserves new attention in the face of neo-conservative apologists in the Christian churches” (ix), and “I have decided to leave out any attempt to ‘prove’ that Aelred was physically more attracted to men than to women” (xi). In fact, M. merely assumes Aelred’s homosexuality in every relationship. Although M. aims his book at a popular audience, his authoritative tone and disingenuous method may mislead nonspecialists.

DANIEL MARCEL LA CORTE
Fordham University, New York


This first systematic treatment of an important aspect of the life and thought of Pierre d’Ailly, his interest in astrology, originated as a doctoral dissertation supervised by Steven Ozment and John Murdoch of Harvard University. Smoller offers a sound exposition of d’Ailly’s writings on the stars and his use of astrology as a means for finding a pattern to the world’s history, placing it in context of the medieval debate about astrology. She distinguishes three periods in the development of d’Ailly’s thought on astrology: from 1375 to 1380, from 1381 to 1409, and from 1410 to 1420, with the Great Schism acting as the pivotal point. She sees a major shift from d’Ailly’s earlier apocalypticism to his later reliance on astrological calculations which postponed the end, bringing with it new hope that human means, and in particular the conciliar solution, could be brought to bear upon ending the schism.

Students of medieval apocalypticism, late medieval theology and the conciliar movement will find some points of fact and interpretation to query. Apocalyptic notions did not preclude reform and human efforts to end the schism; in fact, both d’Ailly and Henry of Langenstein advocated the conciliar solution as early as 1381. The reasons why it was shelved and not revived until 1394 are to be found elsewhere.

In attempting to identify the sources of d’Ailly’s astrological ideas and the development of his thought, especially during the middle years, S. would have done well to consult Mo-
linier's catalogue of manuscripts of the Bibliothèque municipale de Cambrai; the holdings include mss. from the old cathedral-chapter library which belonged to d'Ailly when he was bishop of Cambrai, among them most of the medieval authorities on astrology. Further investigation of these mss., along with some in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal and the Bibliothèque Mazarine, would help refine S.'s thesis and would strengthen her overall argument for d'Ailly's interest in astrology and its importance in the medieval world. The book provides a good entrée to medieval historical astrology as well as the most complete treatment to date of an aspect of d'Ailly's personality which has usually been neglected or ignored.

IAN MURDOCH
Salesian Theological College
Oakleigh, Australia


Is love purified and proven by suffering? The French Carmelite mystic examined in this book answered "yes" to this question in his life and in his poems. Blind from early childhood, orphaned at age ten, a victim of plague and poverty, John of St. Samson dictated poems celebrating the paradoxes of the crucifixion. Stefanotti does a good job of presenting these French texts to an English-speaking audience; he also shows how their author was influenced by early-17th-century music, by the poetry of Ronsard, by the Imitation of Christ, and by the Rheno-Flemish mystical tradition of Eckhart, Tauler, Suso, and especially Ruusbroec. For John of St. Samson, there is peace in suffering and life through death. Rich with spousal images and analogies, his poems speak of Jesus as the Spouse and His sepulchre as nuptial bed and delicious tomb.

Though the first half of S.'s study is entitled "The Historical Framework," it makes little effort to see connections with John of the Cross or Teresa of Avila. It would be interesting to know if currents of thought from John of St. Samson's fellow Carmelites from across the Pyrenees informed his spiritual idiom. Framework or context could also be further elucidated by reference to Terence Cave's work, Devotional Poetry in France c. 1570-1613 (Cambridge University, 1969), an excellent study which S. does not mention. Yet S. has given us a useful introduction to a neglected figure who can shed light on the history of Catholic Reformation piety and literature. Peter Lang's new series has made a promising start.

THOMAS WORCESTER, S.J.
College of the Holy Cross, Mass.


Disciple of Jonathan Edwards and minister of the Congregational church in Bethlehem, Ct., during the second half of the 18th century, Bellamy occupies a place in textbook versions of American Protestantism as architect, with Samuel Hopkins, of the "New Divinity." At one extreme, modern interpreters of the New Divinity fault it for lapsing into "moralism" and for separating theology from everyday life. At another, Edwards and his heirs have been cast as founders of a democratic nationalism that energized the revolutionaries of '76 and, long afterwards, political debates of the early-19th century.

Building on the revisionist scholarship of Conforti and Breitenbach, but going very much his own way, Valeri has written a theologically grounded biography of Bellamy that is at once good intellectual history and an effective refutation of much of the prevailing wisdom about the New Divinity. E.g., V. shows conclusively that Bellamy was a providentialist in his thinking about history and never espoused a civic or proto-democratic
millennialism. He also shows that, in response to the New Light, quasi-"Antinomian" strain within evangelical Calvinism, Bellamy insisted on a social ethics of "order," by which he meant social hierarchies ordained by God. Political and cultural Federalism of the 1790s was thus the appropriate political vehicle of the New Divinity. V. carefully demonstrates that, as a theologian, Bellamy responded to the intellectual challenge posed by the free-will or natural-virtue moral theorists of the 18th century by incorporating elements of natural religion into his Calvinism.

But the case V. most wants to make concerns Bellamy as a "popular" theologian addressing the social issues of his day, including the "market revolution." To this end V. provides a community history of Bethlehem, though without providing data on the gender or life-cycle patterns of church membership, data which would tell us much about the laity and their version of "popular religion." Much over stating the case for Bellamy's influence, V. does not persuade me that Bellamy was responsive to the economically disadvantaged or that his Calvinism was relevant to social affairs.

David D. Hall
Harvard Divinity School


Although there have been books criticizing U.S. frontier policy since Helen Hunt Jackson's A Century of Dishonor in 1882, it is only with more recent "revisionist" histories that the 19th century has come under wider scrutiny. Since Vatican II, the Church has also joined in the self-criticism of its missiology, either subconscious or articulated. Killoren engages the question of critical history with both precision and fairness, always seeking to view history through the eyes of those under discussion. The fact that K. accomplishes this task with an elegant and even epic prose makes the book all the more worthy of recommendation. If it is an effort to clear the name of a great missionary and statesman of badly conceived charges, it never descends to hagiography; it admits that De Smet too made mistakes and was at times deceived.

The book interweaves the earliest Jesuit missions west of the Mississippi with an account of the policies of the government trying to deal with a runaway expansionism and a naive 19-century myth of progress. The reader is thus introduced to all the important government figures, from the benignly paternalistic Jefferson to the despairing and ruthless Sherman. The book includes an excellent collection of portraits, photos, and maps that could make it a highly sophisticated "travelogue," were it not dealing with such a catastrophic theme.

K. situates the missionaries within this series of secular events, as they too struggled from a hopeful, almost optimistic plan to implement a "reductions" policy among the Indians, to a later realization that the traditional way of life was doomed. While trying to understand what caused this cataclysmic history, K. leaves us with a portrait of a man whose career created for him an indelible place in history. The book is a must for all those interested in the history of this continent, both political and ecclesiastical.

Carl F. Starkloff, S.J.
Regis College, Toronto


If you are looking for a comprehensive and clear presentation of the doctrine of the Trinity from its biblical origins to issues of the current day, this might be the book for you. Marsh, who teaches at Maynooth, explains the development of trinitarian doctrine with precision and accuracy while attending well to subtle nuances. He treats the origins of trini-
tarian doctrine in the Hebrew Scriptures, its development in early Christianity, theological stirrings before Nicea, the fourth-century debates culminating in the councils of Nicea and Constantinople, later Latin development, and the contemporary focus since Rahner upon the economic Trinity, which marks a return to the original emphasis of a God-in-relation with human beings. There is a short bibliography, but no index. Footnotes are few, in keeping with the nonspeculative nature of the book.

While this is largely a historical treatment of doctrinal development, several of M.'s asides hint at a hermeneutical principle at work (48, 91, 96). The first two chapters seem to endorse an “experiential-expressivist” approach to the development of trinitarian doctrine, whereby Israel’s and the early Church’s experience of God is gradually expressed in doctrinal language. This doctrinal expression, in turn, is reread and reinterpreted and, as it is gradually refined, new meanings emerge alongside the old.

Augustine comes in for some serious criticism for having “unwittingly” given us an impersonal notion of God by emphasizing the one divine nature over the three distinct persons (132), which is carried over into Thomas (145). M. does not stress as much as one might the dialectical and mystical dimensions in both these trinitarian theologies. But we get very clear presentations of processes, relations, persons, and missions—terms the average theology student today rarely encounters. The last chapter, on modernity, situates various contemporary problematics within the context of historical theology. As this is a work in historical theology, M. only touches upon the speculative issues raised by LaCugna, Johnson, and others.

M. delivers on this promise to offer a general and broad treatment of the development of trinitarian doctrine, as opposed to a detailed and originally speculative approach, but does not skimp on detail when it is called for. A book like this could well help make the Trinity “less abstract and remote” and “more actual and relevant” (12) to the theology student or general reader with a strong theological interest.

Paul G. Crowley, S.J.
Santa Clara University


Highly recommended as a reliable, readable, and scholarly introduction to contemporary trinitarian theology. Emphasizing the theology of Karl Barth and the B.C.C. report, The Forgotten Trinity, though not uncritically, Thompson shows how the doctrine has functioned over the last twenty years for knowledge of God and of the mystery of salvation. T. discusses briefly but clearly what the issues are, how they are rooted in Scripture and tradition, and provides intelligent but fair critical evaluations of important contemporary theologians such as Rahner, Moltmann, Jungel, Pannenberg, Kasper, and Torrance. This is one of a few contemporary works on the Trinity which argues effectively and consistently for the union and distinction of the immanent and economic Trinity and thereby avoids agnosticism, pantheism, and dualism. The ecumenical stress on Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox scholars who recognize God’s freedom as the basis of human freedom is shown in T.’s reliance on Kasper and von Balthasar and in his discussions of Western and Eastern theologies of the Trinity.

T. firmly rejects Arian dualism which fails to see that “the relation of oneness of Father and Son is the heart and substance of the Christian faith” (15), arguing that the unity and Trinity in God are equally ultimate and that there is an order within God that cannot be changed arbitrarily (118, 130, 133, 142 ff.). He opposes both panentheist confusion of the immanent and economic Trinity (34) and incorporation of suffering into God’s nature (Moltmann, 61 ff.), while affirming that God is not re-
mote or separated from us. He correctly rejects any view that God will be complete at the end (51, 121, 145) and criticizes views which drive a wedge between God in se and God for us and which equate God's oneness with the person of the Father. T. connects the Church's mission with the Trinity and offers an interesting analysis of the Trinity and feminism, politics, language, Spirit Christology, and the Filioque. After careful consideration T. concludes that including the Filioque in the Creed was unfortunate but that it is better than some alternatives and should be accepted as a theologoumenon. I look forward to further discussions of the issues raised in this work.

PAUL D. MOLNAR
St. John's University, New York


What did Wittgenstein really think about religion (and theology)? We know he was baptized Catholic but abhorred the Church's apologetics. His religious loyalties seem to have arisen from certain philosophical convictions about human living, rather than from an institutional faith-form. Beyond this, details emerge from select textual remarks; they are the guides for a lengthy list of interpreters.

The setting for Malcolm's essay is a remark W. made to his long-time disciple Drury in 1949: "I am not a religious man but I cannot help seeing every problem from a religious point of view" (1). Malcolm was convinced that clues to understand this puzzling remark were to be found by tracing philosophical developments from the Tractatus to the Philosophical Investigations. He offered four analogies or comparisons between philosophical and religious positions to illuminate W.'s religion: "First, in both there is an end to explanation; second, in both, there is an inclination to be amazed at the existence of something; third, into both there enters the notion of an 'illness'; fourth, in both, doing, acting, takes priority over intellectual understanding and reasoning" (92). Clearly, there are primordial religious Lebensformen, but to affirm a creed or a dogma or an intellectual proof for God's existence? By no means!

After Malcolm's death in 1990, Peter Winch edited his essay and added his own interpretation, with differing results. Rather than analogies, there are already existing spiritual dimensions in W.'s philosophy, as well as a host of unique religious problems. Winch provides an especially convincing datum with a letter W. wrote to Drury the day after the conversation. It indicates that W.'s religious belief is never separated from a certain kind of knowledge of self: life imposes duties on us, life is a gift, and gratitude for this brings true peace. But then there is another puzzling remark: "I think in some sense you don't look at people's faces closely enough" (126). Winch culls further religious dimensions from Culture and Value: wisdom is cold, but faith is a passion; the Christian religion is not for the man who seeks philosophical clarity but infinite help. I think Winch presents a more convincing portrayal of W.'s religion. Nonetheless, there are still many puzzling remarks to interpret.

JEROME M. DITTBERNER
St. Paul Seminary, Minnesota


In this poetic, deeply felt, well-researched-and-reasoned analysis of the inadequacy of traditional theological interpretations of evil that exclude the experience of women and nonelite men, Sands provides a model for thinking about evil and tragedy that avoids the pitfalls of rationalism and dualism. The focus of her attention is on lived experience, "the conflicted context where we must create what right and reason we can" (xi). Her aim is to enter into conversation with theo(log)ians who have wrestled with the problem of evil, to ex-
explore their work and to move beyond dualisms, including that of feminist theologians.

Following a critique of traditional interpretations of evil in androcentric theology that try to protect God from culpability, S. explores the responses of religious feminists who return to metaphysics. She tries to negotiate between those who posit a metaphysics of presence over against a metaphysics of absence. In either case, metaphysics is the problem, not the solution. S. offers a competing narrative that stresses the process of reflection, the “dance” that leads beyond the patriarchal garden walls.

Focusing on the writings of Radford Reuther and Christ, S. suggests that in the end both thinkers offer a theological defense of God/Goddess in relation to the problem of evil. S.’s own position emerges in her sensitive and thoughtful interpretation of literary works that narrate lives of muddle, messiness, pain, tragedy, evil, and, in the end, transcendence.

In our reactionary political climate, S. offers a reminder that it is possible to overcome the systemic evil of exclusion that defines the parameters of patriarchal traditions such as Christianity by looking deeply into the lives of ordinary women and nonelite men who have the courage to “dance” the tragic. This excellent book deserves a wide readership.

IRENA MAKARUSHKA
Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me.


Shute’s book is a study of manuscripts written by Lonergan in the ’30s. It examines the development of the notion of dialectic which would be key in Lonergan’s lifelong interest in history and its relationship to philosophy and theology. S. begins by providing an interpretive context for the manuscripts. He examines Lonergan’s ideas of the stages of history, the tension in consciousness between reason and sensitivity, and dialectic as an unfolding of linked but opposed principles—a heuristic notion that is capable of synthesizing any possible set of historical data.

S. next orders and dates the manuscripts, separating them into batches written in 1934–36 and 1937–38 respectively. He indicates various versions of an understanding of history developed by Lonergan and the gradually emerging idea of dialectic as a way of structuring that understanding. Finally, S. provides a synthesis of the development from batch A, in which Lonergan attempted to construct a Thomist metaphysics of history as a basis for Catholic social action, to batch B, in which he elaborated a theory of history per se. Here Lonergan discovered a general form of the movement of history deduced from the laws of human nature which he called a threefold approximation—progress, decline, and redemption. S. argues that many of the mature Lonergan’s characteristic ideas began to emerge here—emergent probability, the priority of community, the notion of dialectic, and the stages of history.

This volume will be of principal interest to those with some familiarity with Lonergan’s thought. It retrieves key unpublished sources, examines them in careful detail, and integrates them skillfully into the more familiar, mature works of Lonergan. Although occasionally repetitive in its treatment of certain issues, S.’s book has unmistakable value as a contribution to the ongoing study of an influential thinker.

JOHN DOOL
Boston College


Wogaman here offers a history of Christian ethics such as only a senior scholar could write. His first half presents biblical and philosophical legacies, and early and medieval Christianity, with particularly balanced and
eloquent treatments of Clement, Augustine, and Aquinas. Then he turns to the Reformation and the subsequent Rationalist and Evangelical Movements, and concludes with an examination of the 20th century and forecasts for the next millennium.

This history of (mostly) individual theologians’ contributions to the development of ethical thought is not purely descriptive. Throughout W. provides markers to illustrate how a theologian’s thought drives the Church’s self-understanding and mission vis-à-vis the world. Moreover, while Catholics tend to distinguish personal from social ethics, W. offers an ethics of church members in which personal ethics is decidedly social. Moreover, in evaluating the contributors, W. looks not only at their scriptural, philosophical, and theological presuppositions, but also their concrete views, e.g., on women, equality, violence, and wealth. This is a very rich work with no equal in English.

There is one major shortcoming. Despite its inclusivity, this is still a very American, Protestant view of Christian ethics. After describing Catholic humanism with a brief nod to the Jesuits, W. seems unfamiliar with or uninterested in Catholic thought since the 16th century. In “Formative Christian Moral Thinkers,” e.g., W. treats Barth, Bonhoeffer, Tillich, the Niebhrs, Ramsey, Fletcher, and Yoder; he devotes two pages to Häring, but Lehmkuhl, Lottin, Fuch, Murray, Gillemen, Auer, Schüller, Janssens, and McCormick get no notice at all. And though Gutiérrez is later given some attention, the only other Catholic material mentioned (in two chapters!) is the papal encyclicals. Focusing on Häring and the papacy as the sole contributors to Catholic ethical thought over the last 400 years does little justice to the Catholic legacy.

Nonetheless, while we wait for a truly ecumenical historical introduction to Christian ethics, W. has at least provided us with a worthy herald.

JAMES F. KEENAN, S.J.  
Weston Jesuit School of Theology


Although primarily intended as a “vade mecum” for undergraduate study of Kant, Sullivan’s short, lucid exposition offers a perspective on Kant’s moral theory which challenges, quite rightly in my estimation, key features of what is often presented, even on a quite sophisticated level, as “Kantian ethics.”

The distinctive interpretive strategy which S. employs places Kant’s major ethical concepts within the context of his political philosophy. This allows S. to make a crucial point which can be obscured or even missed in treatments which take Kant’s ethics to be “concerned mainly with the moral character of individuals and of their actions,” namely, that “[Kant’s] moral philosophy provides the underlying conceptual structure for a community life that can be shared by everyone” (1–2). By locating Kant’s moral theory within the ambit of a larger concern for the ordering of human society, S. is able to show that Kant’s moral vision, rather than being simply a rigid and abstract deontology which leaves little room for the exercise of concrete moral judgment, instead quite subtly encompasses and respects the full concrete complexity of human moral existence.

Just as S.’s earlier work, Immanuel Kant’s Moral Theory (Cambridge, 1989), has become indispensable as a scholarly study of the full range of Kant’s moral theory, this current work should become the initial book to recommend for anyone in need of a first, nontechnical overview of Kant’s ethics. The short annotated bibliography is also quite useful, since it includes a judicious selection both of time-tested commentaries and of the most important recent work on Kant’s ethics.

PHILIP J. ROSSI, S.J.  
Marquette University, Milwaukee

THE BOUNDARIES OF MORAL DISCOURSE. By Mane Hajdin. Values and Ethics Series. Chicago: Loyola
What makes moral discourse different from other discourses? What are its defining features? In seeking an answer to this, Hajdin presumes his readers are familiar with R. M. Hare's later works, principally *Freedom and Reason* and *Moral Thinking*. H. follows and yet critiques Hare. Moral discourse is characterized by prescriptivity. However, H. observes that prescriptivity is not peculiar to moral discourse alone. Etiquette is prescriptive, as are the rules of games; but neither of these is moral discourse. Therefore moral discourse must have additional defining features. A second feature of moral discourse is overridingness. But overridingness is also found in other prescriptive discourses and is therefore not unique to moral language. Here H. could have engaged in the kind of detailed casuistical analyses that are required to illustrate the particular overridingness of prescriptive statements in their referential loci.

A third feature—universalizability—is necessary in order to fully draw the boundary of moral language. But here again we find that universalizability can be a property of other kinds of prescriptive discourse. Hare's solution to this same dilemma was to say that the universalizability of moral discourse is unique in that its consequences involve weighty matters. H. sees this as an insufficient argument for the belief that universalizability is a defining trait of moral discourse. H. argues instead that universalizability actually entails the ability to extend moral language to *each* of the two "argument-places" within moral discourse (the moral agent and the moral patient).

Though H. agrees with Hare that the boundaries of moral discourse are prescriptivity, overridingness, and universalizability, H. reinterprets each within the context of his own system. This book is tightly argued and persuasive. H. goes on to develop very interesting implications of his thinking for moral communities, and he includes practical applications in a final chapter.

**JOSEPH H. MCKENNA**  
Irvine, California


This is a wonderful introduction to the history of welfare as a public-policy issue in the U.S. Anyone who wants to follow the welfare-reform debate that will occupy the Congress in the months and years ahead will find here the vocabulary and categories needed to frame the issues for easier comprehension. Copeland also offers an exposition of ethical principles that any reasonable person might hope would inform the debate. This alone is worth the price of the book. Less helpful, in my view, is C.'s decision to devote separate chapters to thinkers (Charles Murray, Lisbeth Schorr, Lawrence Mead, Frances Fox Piven) not simply to represent divergent policy perspectives, but to lay the groundwork for the application of his "theology of freedom and community." The result is confusion rather than coherent policy direction. What might have been an acceptable organizing device serves instead to tax the memory of the reader and impede the application of the principles to the problem—not the problem as ideologically divided observers see it, but the welfare problem as C.'s best judgment believes it to be.

C. is on target with the comment: "Our inability to reconcile our nearly unanimous condemnation of welfare recipients with our equally unanimous sympathy for their children is but one of our fundamental moral ambiguities about poverty, which we must look squarely in the face if we are to think creatively about welfare policy." This book is a good place to start looking.

**WILLIAM J. BYRON, S.J.**  
Georgetown University, D.C.

**BREAKING THE THREAD OF LIFE: ON RATIONAL SUICIDE.** By Robert L.

Barry presents a comprehensive review of traditional Roman Catholic arguments against suicide, providing a cogent defense of prohibitions on self-destruction and, especially relevant today, assisted suicide. A great value of this book is its consistent argument against the claims of those who view suicide as a reasonable action that would improve the human condition by releasing those who suffer from a supposedly futile existence. Special attention is paid to claims regarding the voluntary and rational nature of suicide; B. argues that it is difficult philosophically to defend a claim to rational, voluntary suicide. Particularly useful is the discussion on the strength of Catholic teaching regarding the imago Dei in human-kind and the need to reverence human life. B. presents data from a variety of cultures to suggest that claims regarding the moral nature of suicide are a special threat to the weak, the poor, the chronically ill, and the despised.

A chapter on the use of analgesics to control pain and the risk of causing death is uneven. B. provides an impressive review of literature regarding pain control to emphasize the increasing ability of modern medicine to control pain without risking death. There remain, however, difficult cases of terminally-ill individuals whose pain requires the use of analgesics which run the unintended risk of causing death by respiratory depression. Unfortunately, B.'s discussion regarding what is morally permissible in controlling pain in these instances is clinically confusing and may perplex the conscientious medical practitioner seeking guidance.

This book is especially valuable for those who seek to investigate the philosophical and theological arguments against suicide. One wishes, however, that B. had devoted more attention to a consideration of why these arguments leave many unconvinced.

MYLES N. SHEEHAN, S.J., M.D.
Harvard Medical School


Rue begins with the assumption that the universe is dead and devoid of meaning. Accepting this thesis of nihilism, he asks what can be done to defeat its appeal. Do we have the resources to reenchant the universe despite the truth of nihilism? R. believes that guile can stem the advance of the nihilistic thesis. The ultimate purpose of his book “is to oppose a monstrous truth with a noble lie” (3).

R. examines the phenomena of deception in nature, history, personality, and society. Human beings, he claims, simultaneously fear and practice deception. His historical survey of intellectual and moral traditions show the consistent fear of deception, while the biological history of the world shows bias favoring traits for deceiving. Nature promotes deception at every level of life. This power of deception for survival is applied to human affairs, both in the collectivity and individual personality. R. takes up an argument in favor of the noble lie. The argument agrees with the nihilists that universal myths describing the origins, nature, and destiny of human existence are pretentious lies, but insists, against the nihilists, that without such lies humanity cannot survive.

The argument is redolent of the als ob philosophy, but with the twist that the concept of deception encompasses natural and human history as well. This is one weakness of R.'s work. Further, how can deception possibly serve as a satisfactory solution to the question R. raises once deception itself is unmasked? R. has not so much answered the question, then, as rearrange its terms. A noble attempt does not justify even a noble lie.

EDWARD M. O'FLAHERTY, S.J.
Boston College

Uneasy Partners: The College and the Church. By Merrimon Cun-
Cunninggim suggests three stages of relationship in the history of church-related colleges in the U.S. All are determined by power relationships. In the current stage, the college rather than the church is and should be the pivotal partner.

Three chapters offer very general assertions about what “church leaders,” “secularist,” and “neoconservatives” think the church-related college ought to be. Despite C.'s wealth of exposure to church-related higher education, these chapters mostly discuss types of people in categories too broad to be clarifying or fresh. The remaining chapters posit that the visions of these three strawmen are misguided.

C.’s argument is tilted much more heavily against church control than against secularism. He rejects the “extravagant claim” of neoconservatives that only their evangelical positions are worthy to be called church-related. He does favor the presence of (deliberately unspecified) courses in religion, and opportunities for service and worship. In his conclusion, C. offers what he claims is a “hardheaded” prognosis for the future success of church-related higher education, but the prognosis is short on empirical evidence and on detail about what mechanisms will actually maintain it. Religion courses, service opportunities, and worship may help shape the students, but exactly who or what will influence the institutions remains unclear.

Two helpful appendices list all church-related colleges and universities, by denomination, in America.

THOMAS M. LANDY
Fairfield University, Connecticut


Writing from the perspective “of a North American living in the last decade of the second millennium” (9), White, a leading Protestant historian of the liturgy, identifies “Jacksonian democracy” as his fundamental norm for evaluating Christian rites across the ages. Accordingly he characterizes the liturgies of various denominations as “right wing,” “moderate,” “left wing” or “radical.” W. reserves his highest praise, “true liturgical democracy,” both for the Society of Friends who never had clergy and whose ministry has always been open to women, and for the Disciples of Christ who allow laity to preside at Eucharist. Conversely, Catholic practices are typified as “mandatory,” “obligatory,” or “imposed,” even when originating out of popular piety (Corpus Christi) or never having been “mandated” by Rome (Mass facing the people), as W. claims (176).

The first five chapters summarize traditional periods of liturgical history while the sixth gives predictions of liturgies to come. Individual chapters first describe the social background, then provide notes on contemporary rites of initiation, public prayer, Eucharist, liturgical year, pastoral rites (reconciliation, healing, marriage, etc.), leadership, preaching, music, and architecture. The best findings of liturgical historical scholarship are admirably summarized, especially in the areas of initiation, liturgical year, and church architecture, W.’s specialty over the years. No mention, however, is made of church vestments, except that liturgical black signifies “despair” (167). Neither is there any discussion of eucharistic reservation or daily Mass in the early Church.

Although there is much to argue with in W.’s political interpretation, especially regarding ecclesiology and the theology of ordained ministry, his authoritative presentation of the rites of various Protestant communities alone makes this work a valuable secondary textbook in college courses.

JOHN D. LAURANCE, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee
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Presenting This Issue

The second issue of volume 56 begins with ARTICLES on Jesus' baptism, on Augustine, on Teresa of Avila, on Hegel, and on American Ultramontanism, moves on to a CURRENT THEOLOGY review of recent feminist theology, and concludes with a brief NOTE on the ordination of women.

Jesus' Baptism in the Jordan describes the high reverence in which Jesus' Baptism was held in some of the early churches, especially in the East, where it was taken as the primary paradigm for Christian baptism and seen as the order and image of salvation, KILIAN MCDONNELL, O.S.B., who has his S.T.D. from Trier, Germany, is president of the Institute for Ecumenical and Cultural Research. He specializes in areas related to the Trinity, pneumatology, and ecumenism, and is preparing a book-length publication on the subject of this article.

Augustine in Contemporary Trinitarian Theology argues that many treatments of this theme are based on an incomplete reading of Augustine by contemporary systematicians, who read Augustine in a fundamentally ahistorical and idealizing way. MICHEL RENÉ BARNES has his Ph.D. from the University of St. Michael's College, Toronto, and is an assistant professor in the theology department of Marquette University. Specializing in the development of doctrine in the patristic area, he is coeditor and contributor to Arianism after Arius (T. & T. Clark, 1993) and is currently working on a monograph on the polemical context of Gregory of Nyssa's trinitarian theology.

Writing Anxiety in Teresa's Interior Castle describes Teresa's attempt to clarify the soul's mystical union with the divine Spouse, especially by distinguishing various kinds of fear which serve as mediations between the finite person and her mystical center. TERRANCE G. WALSH, S.J., who has his Ph.D. from Yale, is assistant professor of philosophical theology at the Gregorian University, and professor of metaphysics at the Escuela Superior de Filosofia in Lima. His "The Essence of Belief: The Place of Religion in Hegel's System" will appear shortly in Hegel-Studien. His current work focuses on Hegel and Heidegger.

Hegel on the Incarnation: Unique or Universal? distinguishes Hegelian thought from traditional Christology by pointing out that in Hegel's philosophy, universal divine essence appears in the individual subject who thinks universally. This locates the incarnation not exclusively in Jesus but in every rational human being. DANIEL P. JAMROS, S.J., who earned his Ph.D. at Vanderbilt and is associate professor of religious studies at Canisius College, Buffalo, specializes in Aquinas and Hegel. Author of The Human Shape of God: Religion in Hegel's "Phenomenology of Spirit" (Paragon House, 1994), he is currently working on Hegel's eschatology.
American Ultramontanism, beginning with the origins of the U.S. Catholic Church in the 18th century, examines the cultural and ecclesiological foundations of a phenomenon which exerted primal influence on American Catholicism for more than a century. PATRICIA BYRNE, C.S.J. earned her Ph.D. at Boston College and is assistant professor of religion at Trinity College, Hartford. Coauthor with Jay Dolan et al. of Transforming Parish Ministry: The Changing Roles of Catholic Clergy, Laity, and Women Religious (Crossroad, 1989), she is currently researching the modern histories of the Society of the Sacred Heart in the U.S., and the Sisters of St. Joseph in North America.

Feminist Theology: A Review of Literature, after a brief introduction to the state of the question by Elizabeth A. Johnson, C.S.J., and Susan A. Ross, has two parts:

1. The Physical and Social Context for Feminist Theology and Spirituality arranges its survey under the categories of embodiment, mutuality, social location, and ecology, which are seen as both grounding feminist theology and raising normative questions. SUSAN A. ROSS has her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and is associate professor of theology and director of the Women's Studies Program at Loyola University Chicago. Coeditor of Broken and Whole: Essays on Religion and the Body (University Press of America, 1995), she is currently working on feminist sacramental theology.

2. Key Religious Symbols: Christ and God surveys constructive feminist approaches to questions in Christology, soteriology, and the mystery of God, with attention to African, Asian, and Latin American women's theology as well as to feminist, womanist, and mujerista perspectives. MARY CATHERINE HILKERT, O.P., earned her Ph.D. at the Catholic University of America, and is associate professor at the Aquinas Institute of Theology in St. Louis. She specializes in the thought of Edward Schillebeeckx, in theological anthropology and feminist theology, and is the author of the forthcoming Naming Grace: Preaching and the Sacramental Imagination (Continuum).

A Scotist Aside to the Ordination-of-Women Debate reports Scotus's view that only a direct command from Christ could explain the Church's prohibition of women from ordination. THOMAS A. SHANNON, Ph.D. from Boston University and professor of religion and social ethics at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, is the author of "Method in Ethics: A Scotistic Contribution" (TS 54/2 [1993]) and is currently working on a revision of his What Are They Saying about Genetic Engineering? (Paulist, 1996).

Robert J. Daly, S.J.  
Editor
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