

theological studies

VOLUME 38
NUMBER 1
MARCH 1977

*Published by Theological Studies, Inc.
for the Theological Faculties of the Society of Jesus
in the United States*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Liberation Ecclesiology: Praxis, Theory, Praxis
T. Howland Sanks, S.J., and Brian H. Smith, S.J. 3

Secular Theology and the Rejection of the Supernatural: Reflections on Recent Trends
Peter L. Berger 39

CURRENT THEOLOGY

Notes on Moral Theology: 1976
Richard A. McCormick, S.J. 57

NOTES

Doctrines and Historicity in the Context of Lonergan's *Method*
Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. 115

The Challenge of Juan Luis Segundo
Alfred T. Hennelly, S.J. 125

Human Reproduction: Three Issues for the Moral Theologian
Thomas W. Hilgers, M.D. 136

BOOK REVIEWS

153

- KELSEY, D. H.: *The Uses of Scripture in Recent Theology*
The Passion in Mark (ed. W. H. Kelber)
 SENIOR, D. P., C.P.: *The Passion Narrative according to Matthew*
 CULLMANN, O.: *The Johannine Circle*
 MONTAGUE, G. T.: *The Holy Spirit*
 MIGUENS, M., O.F.M.: *The Virgin Birth*
 HENGEL, M.: *The Son of God*
 MOLTSMANN, J.: *Kirche in der Kraft des Geistes*
A Pope for All Christians? (ed. P. J. McCord)
Looking at Lonergan's Method (ed. P. Corcoran, S.M.)
 WERMELINGER, O.: *Rom und Pelagius*
 SAGE, M. M.: *Cyprian*
 DONNELLY, J. P., S.J.: *Calvinism and Scholasticism in Vermigli's Doctrine of*
Man and Grace
 BOSSY, J.: *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850*
 LASH, N.: *Newman on Development*
Ernst Troeltsch and the Future of Theology (ed. J. P. Clayton)
 HUTCHISON, W. R.: *The Modernist Impulse in American Protestantism*
 MCNEILL, J. J., S.J.: *The Church and the Homosexual*
 CURRAN, C. E.: *Ongoing Revision: Studies in Moral Theology*
 JÜNGEL, E.: *Death: The Riddle and the Mystery*
 McDONNELL, K.: *Charismatic Renewal and the Churches*
 TYRRELL, B. J.: *Christotherapy: Healing through Enlightenment*
 FABER, H.: *Psychology of Religion*
 DAVIS, C.: *Body as Spirit: The Nature of Religious Feeling*
 PRICKETT, S.: *Romanticism and Religion: The Tradition of Coleridge and*
Wordsworth in the Victorian Church

SHORTER NOTICES

196

- MARROW, S. B.: *Basic Tools of Biblical Exegesis* ZIMMERLI, W.: *The Old Testament and*
the World CLEMENTS, R. E.: *One Hundred Years of Old Testament Interpretation*
 MOLONEY, F. J.: *The Johannine Son of Man* GRANT, M.: *Saint Paul* RIENECKER, F.:
A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament 1: Matthew-Acts DEMBOWSKI, H.: *Einfüh-*
rung in die Christologie DEISS, L.: *It's the Lord's Supper* RORDORF, W., et al.: *L'E-*
ucharistie des premiers chrétiens GRATSCH, E. J.: *The Credentials of Catholicism*
 HEINE, R. E.: *Perfection in the Virtuous Life* CAMPBELL, R.: *From Belief to Understanding*
 BRETT, M.: *The English Church under Henry I* MAURER, A. A., ed.: *Master Eck-*
hart: Parisian Questions and Prologues ZUMKELLER, A., ed.: *Henrici de Frimaria,*
O.S.A., Tractatus ascetico-mystici 1 HOLWERDA, D. E., ed.: *Exploring the Heritage of*
John Calvin BRAY, J. S.: *Theodore Beza's Doctrine of Predestination* FEY, W. R.:
Faith and Doubt: The Unfolding of Newman's Thought on Certainty DEISS, L.: *God's*
Word and God's People HABRA, G.: *Amour et concupiscence* KELSEY, M. T.: *The Other*
Side of Silence DAVIES, J. G.: *Christians, Politics and Violent Revolution* DEAN,
 W. D.: *Love before the Fall* WILDER, A. N.: *Theopoetic: Theology and Religious Imagi-*
nation MAY, J. R.: *The Pruning Word: The Parables of Flannery O'Connor*

BOOKS RECEIVED

210

Published in March, June, September, and December at Mt. Royal and Guilford Avenues, Baltimore, Md. 21202. Second-class postage paid at Baltimore, Md. 21202 and additional mailing offices.

Yearly subscription: U.S. \$10.00; Canada and foreign \$11.00. Single copies \$3.50.

Renewals and new subscriptions should be accompanied by a remittance in U.S. funds and sent to Theological Studies, P.O. Box 1703, Baltimore, Md. 21203. Changes of address and business correspondence should be sent to Theological Studies, Business Office, 428 E. Preston St., Baltimore, Md. 21202. Send manuscripts to Editor, books for review to Book Review Editor, Theological Studies, Room 401, 3520 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. Back issues available from offices in Washington, D.C.

Unlike the December 1976 issue, which centered on the Church, March 1977 is quite varied: articles on liberation ecclesiology and on secular theology's rejection of the supernatural; the annual Moral Notes; and shorter pieces on the permanent and the historical in doctrine, the challenges posed by Segundo's latest book, and three moral issues in human reproduction.

Liberation Ecclesiology: Praxis, Theory, Praxis explores the relationship between the Church's self-understanding and the way it acts in a given social context. It discloses the social and religious context that gave rise to liberation theology in Latin America, examines the ecclesiology articulated in this theological perspective, and analyzes the new structural and behavioral components that this theology legitimates for the Church. For empirical data, it concentrates on the experience of the Chilean Church over the past fifteen years. Then it suggests some implications of liberation ecclesiology for the next stage of the dialectical process and for theological method in general. T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J., with a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago Divinity School (1971), is associate professor and chairman of Canisius College's Department of Religious Studies. Author of *Authority in the Church: A Study in Changing Paradigms* (1974), he is readying a book on the social location of theology. BRIAN H. SMITH, S.J., doctoral candidate at Yale in political science, is a research associate at the Woodstock Theological Center in Washington, D.C., with special interest in religion and development in Latin America, especially Chile.

Secular Theology and the Rejection of the Supernatural: Reflections on Recent Trends focuses on the fundamental challenge of modern secularized consciousness to the theological enterprise. It does this by analyzing the intellectually respectable, authentically American, confessionally divided work of three distinguished American theologians, criticizing their theological approach on its own grounds, its assumption that only the world of common human experience can base today's theology. PETER L. BERGER, with a doctorate in sociology from the New School for Social Research (1954), teaches in the Graduate School and Douglass College of Rutgers University. Associate editor of *Worldview*, he has authored six books, the latest entitled *Pyramids of Sacrifice: Political Ethics and Social Change* (1975).

Notes on Moral Theology: 1976 focuses on last year's literature in four significant areas: how Christian faith relates to moral reasoning; moral norms and their relationship to conscience; relationship between the magisterium and the theological community; and the Declaration on Certain Questions concerning Sexual Ethics issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith early in 1976. RICHARD A.

McCORMICK, S.J., the Rose F. Kennedy Professor of Christian Ethics at the Kennedy Center for Bioethics at Georgetown University, is widely regarded as the most distinguished Catholic ethicist in the United States.

Doctrines and Historicity in the Context of Lonergan's *Method* uses Giovanni Sala's recent book to explore a complex issue: how to reconcile a permanent element in Christian doctrines with the historicity that affects all human judgments. The problem is explored in the context of the famous chapter 12 in Lonergan's *Method in Theology*; questions are raised that force the theologian out of academic detachment to concern himself with the ethical and the religious. FREDERICK E. CROWE, S.J., S.T.D. from Rome's Gregorian University, research professor at Regis College in the Toronto School of Theology, has recently published articles in *Communio* and *Science et esprit*, as well as a booklet *Escatologia e missione terrena in Gesù di Nazareth*. His special interest lies in Lonergan, whose *Method* he is currently working to implement in the areas of divine grace, the Trinity, and the word of God.

The Challenge of Juan Luis Segundo takes for springboard the English version of his latest book, *The Liberation of Theology*, analyzes its major theses, and refers to other publications in Spanish where his ideas are developed in greater depth. ALFRED T. HENNELLY, S.J., Ph.D. in religious studies from Marquette (1969), assistant professor in the Department of Religious Studies at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N.Y., author of a recently completed book *Liberation in the Americas*, finds Segundo posing a sharp challenge to "academic" or "classical" theology in the West, with possibilities for deepening a whole world's theological dialogue.

Human Reproduction: Three Issues for the Moral Theologian analyzes three problems which have caused concern among moral theologians: (1) aging gametes, spontaneous abortion, and the "rhythm method"; (2) the extent and causes of early human wastage of fertilized ova; (3) twinning and recombination, and their relationship to "final irreversible individuality." THOMAS W. HILGERS, M.D. from the University of Minnesota Medical School (1969), author of three books on abortion, is assistant professor in the Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics at St. Louis University School of Medicine and director of the School's Natural Family Planning Center.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.
Editor

BOOK REVIEWS

THE USES OF SCRIPTURE IN RECENT THEOLOGY. By David H. Kelsey. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. Pp. 227. \$11.95.

The acceptance of historical criticism as normative for interpretation of Scripture effected a collapse of those traditional categories (e.g., inspiration, inerrancy) by which those very Scriptures were authoritative for the Church. The main thrust of K.'s work is: How can Scripture be authoritative in a postcritical age, or, more basically, how can the text of the Bible become Scripture?

The answer falls into three parts: a survey of the ways in which Scripture has been authority for seven theologians, an analytical statement on the possibility of arguing from Scripture, and a constructive suggestion on how Scripture can again be an authority for theologians. The first two theologians surveyed, B. B. Warfield and H.-W. Bartsch, find the authority of Scripture either in its doctrines or contents, as inspired (Warfield) or distinctive (Bartsch). The remaining five agree that it is not any *property* of the biblical text but its *function* which confers authority. For G. E. Wright, the biblical text as narrative claims authority, since its form suggests that God must be conceived in dynamic rather than static terms. In Barth's primarily Christological exegesis Scripture is authoritative because it presents narratives or stories which "render an agent," i.e., make the agent alive or present. L. S. Thornton, P. Tillich, and R. Bultmann say Scripture speaks with authority when "it expresses the occurrence of a revelatory event in the past and occasions its occurrence for someone in the present" (p. 83), even though they diverge on what constitutes the revelatory event.

Part 2 serves as a prelude to the constructive part. Here K. gives an analysis of the structure of informal arguments as developed by S. Toulmin. Theological arguments proceed on a jurisprudential model and involve assembling of evidence and assessing of possibilities. Scripture functions not as a source but mediately for the theologian in tandem with other arguments. In Part 3, K. describes a mode by which Scripture, even when denied the authority of a source, can retain authority for the Church and the theologian. Scripture discloses a way of being Christian to both individual and community and thus has a revelatory and prophetic authority in the Church. The theologian recognizes the authority of Scripture when he or she enters into dialogue with Scripture as part of the theological task. K. is not simply proposing a subjectivistic view of authority, since the theologian has already been influenced by a convergence of other factors, one of which is Scripture's formative power of the history in which the theologian lives and works. In using Scripture the theologian relies on a *discrimen* (a principle of

judgment) which involves the convergence of many factors in correlation, but which is the result of an imaginative act whereby the theologian expresses in metaphor the complexities of God acting in individual and communal life. The implications of K.'s notion of *discrimen* are significant. Presuppositions are not only unavoidable in exegesis but necessary. Conflicts over the validity of interpretation cannot be solved simply by more or better knowledge of the text but involve disclosure of the different imaginative acts by which the conflicting parties imagine God acting toward the world. The admission of the *discrimen* breaks down the dichotomy between Scripture and tradition, for it is precisely in and through living tradition that the *discrimen* is formed.

While representing a fine survey of significant theologians and a creative approach to a perennial problem, K.'s work has certain defects. The theologians chosen represent more the typologies K. wants to develop than the most significant options for using the Bible. G. von Rad would be more significant than Wright, and Bartsch, though a competent exegete, is not as significant in the current NT debate on hermeneutics as other NT scholars, as is indicated by K.'s reference to only one unpublished paper of Bartsch as indicative of his use of Scripture. In his constructive section K. uses the analytic philosophy of language in a rather verbose and labored fashion. In terms of the subject of his study, he is justified in studying only Protestant theologians, but in his constructive part his complete neglect of Roman Catholic thought weakens his claim to be presenting a *Christian* proposal on the authority of Scripture. The work suffers from occasional neologisms such as "normativity" and "Christianly." The bibliography and notes provide a fine compendium of the works requisite for both background and further studies of the issues raised.

Vanderbilt Divinity School

JOHN R. DONAHUE, S.J.

THE PASSION IN MARK. Edited by Werner H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Pp. xvii + 203. \$10.95.

It has long been a commonplace of Gospel studies that one could describe Mk as a Passion story with an extended introduction. While the first thirteen chapters of Mk underwent extensive form-critical investigation in the past fifty years, chaps. 14-16 were regarded as a more cohesive unity, very likely because they depended on a pre-Markan Passion account, and hence they were not subjected to rigorous critical analysis. This volume, a collection of essays by seven authors, seeks to apply the method of redaction criticism to that Passion account, and in so doing shows that the Passion story in Mk owes as much to Mk's creative use of earlier traditions and to his own subtle theological insights as do the prior thirteen chapters.

Each author works with a segment taken from the last three chapters in Mk. Thus the book is more a series of probes than a coherent analysis of the Passion in Mk. That has several consequences. It allows the contributors to ride certain hobbies in the passage each has picked. It leaves large and important sections untouched. Because there are seven different contributors, the essays are of uneven quality, some very good, some not so good. Because these authors are not the first to launch such an investigation into this portion of Mk, one or two are more dependent on predecessors than they always make clear. Yet, when all that has been said, this still remains in many ways a good book, showing the results that can be achieved with a serious application of the still-developing method of redaction criticism.

After an introduction by John R. Donahue ("From Passion Traditions to Passion Narrative") which sets the stage for the discussions to follow, Vernon K. Robbins contributes a study on Mk 14:12-25 ("Last Meal: Preparation, Betrayal, and Absence") which argues, with mixed success, that the account of the Last Supper must be seen as a corrective to a false "meal Christology" associated with the feedings of the multitudes. As do many of the contributors, R. seeks to understand the Markan formulations as correctives of erroneous views held by other early Christian interpreters. Werner H. Kelber studies Mk 14:32-42 ("The Hour of the Son of Man and the Temptation of the Disciples"), arguing that the Gethsemane story links the predictions of the suffering of the Son of Man with the actual Passion of the Son of Man. Donahue, in perhaps the best essay, studies Mk 14:53-65 ("Temple, Trial, and Royal Christology") and makes, to my mind, the most original contribution in the book to Markan scholarship with his analysis of the Markan adaptation of royal (i.e., Davidic) theology in the Passion account. Norman Perrin looks at Mk 14:61-62 ("The High Priest's Question and Jesus' Answer") and finds they are linked to both what precedes and what follows. Kim E. Dewey studies Mk 14:53-54, 66-72 ("Peter's Curse and Cursed Peter") and labors to show that the denial story is intended to discredit Peter and rehabilitate the eschatological interests which D. finds Peter to have denied. This is one of the less persuasive essays. Theodore J. Weeden examines Mk 15:20b-41 ("The Cross as Power in Weakness") and finds confirmed his thesis that Mk opposes a *theios anēr* Christology, in this case in the form of an early apocalyptic Passion account which Mk took from his opponents and reworked to support his own suffering Son of Man Christology. J. Dominic Crossan analyzes Mk 16:1-8 ("Empty Tomb and Absent Lord") and tries to marshal evidence to show that it is a Markan invention intended to oppose a Jerusalem community led by Peter and the disciples. Such Markan opposition to such an early Petrine-Jerusalem Christian community is another theme

frequently sounded in these essays. The conclusion by Kelber ("From Passion Narrative to Gospel") consists largely of a summary of the earlier essays, arranged this time by theme rather than by passage. The final three pages contain a striking and very useful sketch of Mk's portrait of Jesus.

There is much with which one would want to enter into debate here, in matters of detailed exegesis and exegetical presuppositions, of methodology and of conclusions. Yet that is precisely the good service this book can perform. By no means a final word on this subject or on the passages treated, it is still an invitation to other scholars to join this line of investigation and to enter the debate set forward in these pages. If that happens, it will yet be proved an important book.

Union Theological Seminary in Virginia PAUL J. ACHEMEIER

THE PASSION NARRATIVE ACCORDING TO MATTHEW: A REDACTIONAL STUDY. By Donald P. Senior, C.P. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium* 39. Louvain: Louvain University, 1975. Pp. 433. 550 fr.b.

Senior's detailed examination of Mt's Passion narrative (Mt 26-27) makes an important contribution to our understanding of the first Gospel. His goal is twofold. First, he wishes to determine the precise redactional viewpoint that distinguishes Mt's narrative from Mk's. Several themes have been suggested in recent Matthean scholarship. Rather than defend any one of them, S. chooses "to submit the entire account to a leisurely analysis that might test to what extent and in what proportion the multiple redactional concerns of the evangelist are traceable in his Passion story" (p. 4). The second goal is to test the common working hypothesis that Mk is the source for Mt's Passion narrative against the position of X. Léon-Dufour that Mt and Mk are independent of each other.

These goals determine the book's format. Each section of Mt's Passion account is examined in minute detail, verse by verse. The analysis of Mt 27:3-10, previously published as an article, is included as an appendix. In his analysis, S. concentrates on the distinctive features of Mt's rendition in comparison to Mk. He explains each change with great care and precision, amassing a wealth of data concerning the Evangelist's distinctive vocabulary and style. The research is so thorough, the mastery of secondary material so complete, and the presentation so well organized and clearly presented that this study will remain essential to any further discussion of the Passion narrative. Indices of Greek words and phrases and of persons and subjects make this material readily available to anyone interested in the nuances of Matthean style.

With regard to sources, S. concludes that the Matthean redactor faithfully transmits the message of Mk, his source. Mt's contribution

consists not in supplementing Mk's account, nor in imposing on it a unified perspective, but in highlighting and developing the themes and ideas already inherent in Mk. Mt is not an innovator but a creative redactor. His creativity is nowhere more evident than in the special material which has no parallel in Mk (e.g., 26:52-54; 27:3-10; 27:19, 24-25, 51b-53). This material is rooted in the content and context of Mk, and is so carefully stitched to that context that it must be attributed to Matthew himself. So Mk is the sole source for the Matthean account. Not everyone would agree with these conclusions. Some might wonder whether in fact S. has presumed rather than tested Mt's dependence on Mk, since he does not seriously consider alternative hypotheses. Others might see his special material coming out of the life of Mt's church as well as from his own hand. But S. has presented a very strong argument for Markan priority.

Mt's editorial activity also reveals his redactional emphasis and nuance. Above all, he has heightened the Christological portrait. By stressing the prophetic knowledge of Jesus, his dominance in the narrative, his titles (King of the Jews, Christ, Son of God), and the OT background (especially the repeated appeal to prophecy) of the narrative, Mt shows that his basic message, to which all other redactional concerns are subordinate, is acknowledgment of Jesus as Messiah and Son of God. Other concerns include Mt's interest in the responsibility of the Jews for the innocent blood of Jesus. But this interest is not directed toward the Jewish leaders' hostility for its own sake, but rather to serve as an effective foil to the majesty and dignity of Jesus, the central figure in the narrative. S. also points out Mt's increased awareness of the parenetical or moral value of the characters and events in the Passion narrative. Jesus' obedience and fidelity to his Father's will serves as a paradigm for the Christian community in the midst of persecution and apostasy. Also, the contrasting attitudes of Peter and Judas, of the woman at Bethany and the complaining disciples, as well as the new-found faith of the Gentile soldiers and the fidelity of the women at the cross, all exemplify, whether positively or negatively, the moral qualities Mt wished to highlight.

I cannot recommend this work too highly. It will serve as a solid foundation for further study of the over-all structure and movement of the Matthean Passion narrative.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago WILLIAM G. THOMPSON, S.J.

THE JOHANNINE CIRCLE. By Oscar Cullmann. Translated from the German by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. Pp. xii + 124. \$6.95.

Cullmann has long planned a commentary on the fourth Gospel; this book covers the topics one would expect to find in an introduction to such

a commentary. It also gathers together thoughts about Johannine authorship and setting which have hitherto been scattered in C.'s articles. If at times it is repetitive, that may flow from its origins.

The "Johannine circle" is a happier term for what some of us have called a school, for it embraces not only several writers (at least the Evangelist and the redactor) but also a community with a special tradition and outlook. C. makes some excellent points, of which I list a few: (1) The author of the Gospel writes with authority, stemming both from his claim to rely upon valid witness and from his self-understanding as an organ of the Paraclete interpreting Jesus. Consciously he makes an advance over the Synoptic tradition. (2) Since he has deliberately chosen to present his theology in terms of the Jesus tradition, on the one hand history is not a matter of indifference to him; on the other hand, each ministry scene shows a Christ who is already at work in the Church. (3) The community whose beliefs the author shares, guides, and articulates is not a sect in the sense of a small group polemicizing against a larger Church; but it has a distinctive tradition the validity of which it preserves and defends.

There are problems, however, with the main theme of the book; for in my judgment C. presents too simplified a picture of the Gospel's origins. As in his past articles, C. would locate those origins among heterodox Jews (whatever "heterodox" Jews may mean) who were followers of John the Baptist and then of Jesus, and who were the Hellenists of Acts 6 ("a very close connection, if not a complete identity"). He insists on parallels with the Samaritans, the Qumran group, and indeed with the Jewish Christians of the Pseudo-Clementines who were the end product of the Qumran group. (C. never mentions Fitzmyer's rather convincing refutation of this latter point.) He thinks that the Gospel *may* have been written in Transjordan, the place of refuge of the Qumranians-become-Jewish-Christians. That there are vague relationships between these groups is clear, but C.'s synthesis cloaks a multitude of differences between groups who shared opposition to the Temple but would probably have regarded one another with much the same disdain as they regarded the authorities in the Temple. I have thought that John's Gospel reflects a later development of a trend of thought apparent in the Hellenists of Acts 6; but I cannot identify Stephen's attitude that God does not dwell in the Temple (Acts 7:48) with the attitude in Jn 2:16-17 that the Temple is the house of God which is being corrupted and destroyed by "the Jews."

C. traces the historical tradition in the Gospel to an eyewitness of the ministry who was not one of the Twelve. (He several times criticizes Schnackenburg on this point, seemingly unaware that in 1970 Schnackenburg published an article retracting his identification of the Beloved

Disciple as John, son of Zebedee.) This eyewitness was not merely an authority behind the Gospel; he was the author or Evangelist. Yes, the fourth Gospel, C. claims, is the only Gospel written by an eyewitness of Jesus' ministry; and he places "the original composition of the Gospel at least as early as the synoptic gospels and probably even earlier than the earliest of them" (p. 97). The differences are in part explained by the fact that Jesus spoke two different ways. Now it is one thing to say that "John" seized upon a style apparent in a saying of Jesus such as Mt 11:25-27 and developed it into a different discourse pattern; but I find quite implausible the thesis that Jesus had two different styles of teaching, one of which is exclusively preserved by the Synoptics, the other almost exclusively by John. This is just as credible as attributing the differences between the Socrates of Plato and the Socrates of Xenophon to two different styles of Socratic speech.

I predict this revisionist theory of Johannine authorship will find little following, but I hope that disagreement with it will not cause readers to neglect some excellent observations that C. has made about a Johannine circle—observations quite detachable from the claim that the fourth Gospel was written by an eyewitness.

Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C. RAYMOND E. BROWN, S.S.

THE HOLY SPIRIT: GROWTH OF A BIBLICAL TRADITION. By George T. Montague, S.M. New York: Paulist, 1976. Pp. ix + 374. \$8.50.

Although this book is written with great clarity and in language any nonspecialist can understand, it is a scholarly work. Even though it lacks footnotes and a bibliography, M.'s mastery of critical problems is evident in his treatment of the many texts with which he has to deal, and it is clear that his approach to the Scriptures is that of a centrist who respects both the results of modern biblical scholarship and the inspired character of Scripture. The work is primarily an exposition of biblical theology on the single theme of the Spirit. M.'s particular interest in the charismatic gifts of the Spirit are, not surprisingly, a preoccupation, but he never allows himself to be carried away from a carefully qualified analysis of the text. He takes up every text in both Testaments where mention of the Spirit occurs. The chapters place these texts in their chronological order of appearance, so that the passages may be understood in the light of their historical background. Readers who come to this book expecting to find answers to such questions as the relationship of the Spirit to the Father and the Son, or the distinct personality of the Spirit, will be disappointed. Not that M. is uninterested in these questions or does not allude to them, but he has chosen to treat the Spirit functionally rather than ontologically. The ontological

questions are not easy to answer; indeed, they were differently understood and answered by the Fathers of the Church during the first two centuries. An appendix dealing with these knotty issues independently, even if briefly, would have added additional value to an already excellent survey of the growth of this biblical tradition.

More than a quarter of the book is given over to the place the Holy Spirit occupies in the Pauline corpus—not an exorbitant proportion considering Paul's pastoral concern with the subject; but although this material is handled effectively and judiciously, M.'s best insights, original I think, appear more sharply in his treatment of Luke-Acts. He gives, e.g., a most interesting interpretation of Lk 1-2, which he sees "not only as a prologue to the Christology of the gospel but a prologue to the ecclesiology of Acts" (p. 268), and, rather persuasively, he argues that Luke does not mention Paul's death in Rome because he has, in Acts 21-22, shown how Paul's passion parallels that of the Lord in Jerusalem (pp. 297-300). By way of criticism, one might wonder about M.'s interpretation of 1 Pt 3:19 ("It was in the Spirit also that he went and preached to the spirits in prison") and seriously question his exegesis of 1 Jn 5:6-10, which he interprets in the light of Jn 19:34-35, an interpretation abandoned by most contemporary Johannine scholars. Strangely, though he acclaims the fourth Gospel and first Letter of John as high-water marks in NT pneumatology, his treatment of both is inferior to much that precedes it. He takes little, if any, note of the Gnostic allusions in 1 John, and his over-all penetration of the Gospel, especially the Paraclete passages, is disappointingly superficial.

Less serious is M.'s general statement that Jewish "oral traditions began to be written down only centuries after the Christian era" (p. 112). Does he really mean this to apply to the *Pirqê Abôth* and other parts of the Mishnah? And when he asks of the text in 1 Tim 4:1, "where does the Spirit say expressly that in future times people will fall away from faith? If the writer knew of an explicit word of the Lord Jesus it would certainly have strengthened his case," has he overlooked Lk 18:8? These are scarcely flaws in a work of such breadth and depth. Anyone involved in ministry and any layman seriously interested in the renewed movement of the Spirit must have this book as a balanced and reliable guide.

Notre Dame Seminary, New Orleans

J. EDGAR BRUNS

THE VIRGIN BIRTH: AN EVALUATION OF SCRIPTURAL EVIDENCE. By Manuel Miguens, O.F.M. Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1975. Pp. 169. \$7.95.

That there is strong contemporary scholarly interest in the role and function of Mary in Scripture is evident; the scope of this activity is well

summarized in the bulletin by E. R. Carroll in the June 1976 issue of this periodical. While not all the academic publications on Mary in the NT are of equal value, the new achievements of biblical scholarship are rapidly bearing fruit in this area, and such a critical perception of the function of Mary in the primitive Christian texts could reap rich ecumenical results.

It is evident that Miguens is not sympathetic with much of this recent work, and his monograph intends to present a different evaluation of the scriptural evidence on the Virgin Birth. In articulating this intention, he reveals three tendencies: (1) a consistent and sustained criticism of the scholarly contributions of Joseph Fitzmyer and Raymond Brown; (2) an exegesis which finds references to the Virgin Birth throughout the NT, even where such references have to be deduced from the silence of the text; (3) a perspective which argues that the historicity of the Virgin Birth tradition is the only scholarly conclusion one can reach. The basic presupposition which underlies all three tendencies is that of silence, and to M.'s credit it must be stated that he explicitly discusses this presupposition at the outset. Rather than being understood as ignorance, silence eloquently supports the understanding of the Virgin Birth in the NT. Following these remarks, successive chapters follow on Mark, John, Paul, the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke, the historical problems of the tradition common to Matthew and Luke, and a concluding section dealing with the type of Christological materials (advanced or primitive) found in the infancy narratives.

While at points raising significant questions and suggesting viable exegetical possibilities, this is, on the whole, a very uncautious book which is bound to mislead many naive readers. Under cover of academic biblical respectability, it abounds in incomplete and inaccurate exegesis and unwarranted generalizations. The real methodology employed is not that of exegesis but of eisegesis—the repeated forcing of texts to fit into M.'s theological presuppositions. And so, when we come to his discussion of Gal 4:4, we are informed that "Mariology has not yet exploited it as it should" (p. 47). In every text analyzed by M., he discovers the idea of the Virgin Birth; but surely this conclusion can only result because of a massive and wilful exploitation of certain biblical texts and the suppression of others.

Let me be specific. Since M. explicitly states in his chapter on Mark that he is writing in "the name of modern biblical criticism" (p. 23), I focus my attention on that chapter. To support his contention that Mark presupposes the Virgin Birth, M. makes a series of inaccurate, misleading, or unbalanced statements. (1) Since when, according to "modern biblical criticism," does Mark end with the ascension of Jesus? (2) In his discussion of the absence of Joseph, M. does not fully discuss the options,

and when he argues that those who explain the absence of Joseph as due to his death are guilty of an "unverifiable conjecture," then we must ask on what grounds M.'s argument from silence is more verifiable. (3) He constantly confuses two senses of "father" in Mark for the sake of his argument. (4) His discussion of "Son of God" reveals a startling ignorance of contemporary Markan studies. (5) Is it credible that it is precisely the hostile crowd in Mk 6:3 who confess the virginal conception of Jesus? (6) To argue that it is Mark who changes the Matthean/Lukan "the carpenter's son/Joseph's son" into "the carpenter, the son of Mary" is highly doubtful and quite unlikely. (7) M. absolutely fails to seriously discuss Markan redaction in Mk 3:21-35 and it is such a procedure which assists him in reaching his highly speculative conclusions.

Not only with regard to Mark but throughout his study, M. is guilty of simplifying the evidence. In his treatment of John, he asserts that Jn 7:42 ff. tells us that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, that the Gospel of John and even Revelation know the infancy narratives, and that the woman in Rev 12 is Mary. What critical NT scholarship demands is evidence, not unfounded assertions. The chapter on Matthew consists of four pages, and M. is very concerned to show that Jesus did not have an irregular origin. That may be, but to assert this without any discussion whatsoever of Mt 1:1-17 is scandalous in itself. To discuss Mary in vv. 18 ff. without any discussion of the relationship of the genealogy and its references to the four women is irresponsible. How does M. evaluate Matthew's reason for including the references to Tamar, Rahab, Ruth, and the wife of Uriah in his genealogy, and how do these four women relate to the fifth woman, Mary? No answers are given, because this complex set of problems is avoided.

Because of this book's great potential for misuse by the nonspecialist, it is dangerous. The Church surely has a right to expect that its trained scriptural theologians will provide it with sound, critical, balanced, and cautious exegetical fruits. Miguens has not provided this, and therefore the book's greatest flaw is its irresponsibility to the Church.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

KARL PAUL DONFRIED

THE SON OF GOD: THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTOLOGY AND THE HISTORY OF JEWISH-HELLENISTIC RELIGION. By Martin Hengel. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Pp. xii + 100. \$3.75.

Hengel begins his brilliant study of the "Son of God" title by posing dramatically the Christological problem: twenty-five years after the crucifixion of a Galilean peasant, he is hymned as Lord of the universe by Paul, a converted Pharisee, in a letter to a newly-founded Christian community in Philippi (Phil 2:6 ff.). How was such development possi-

ble? For many representatives of the history-of-religions school, including Harnack and Bultmann, this development was possible only because of the influence of Greek thought and at the expense of the historical reality of Jesus. H. vigorously challenges this now classical position of late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century biblical criticism. In pages crammed with erudition, he contends that the evidence for an "acute Hellenization" of early Christology evaporates under close scrutiny and that the real source of early Christological development should be sought in the rich dynamism of OT and intertestamental Hellenistic Judaism.

H.'s "criticism of criticism" turns the scalpel to the usual models appealed to by the history-of-religions school, such as the "divine men," the so-called Gnostic "redeemer myth," and the mystery cults. He doubts if any of these had significant influence on early Christology, since the evidence for the presence of any of these influences in the first half of the first century is highly questionable. Even more telling, H. contends, is the fact that the basic building material for the NT concept of "Son of God" can be fully accounted for within Judaism, a Judaism which had already been influenced by and, at the same time, exercised careful control over Hellenism. Such OT themes as royal messianism, the righteous man (called "son of God" in Wisdom 2), and intertestamental speculation about spirit-filled heroes of the OT, provide important biblical sources. Even the ontological tendency of early Christology can find its inspiration in this rich Jewish heritage. Speculation on the eschatological significance of Wisdom and Torah had already developed concepts such as pre-existence, "sending," apotheosis, and exaltation.

The catalyst that brought these various traditions together was the impact of Jesus. Basic dimensions of the Jesus tradition—his unique relationship to God, his messianic authority, his use of the "Son of Man" designation, and the eschatological implications of his resurrection—"forced" the Christian community to extend its reflections on the significance of Jesus to the full range of eschatological speculation already well developed in Judaism. Thus eschatology led not only to reflections on exaltation and parousia, but necessarily to the "protology" inherent in pre-existence, mission, and incarnation.

Thus H.'s essay (based on his inaugural lecture at Tübingen in 1973) is more than an isolated study of a key NT title; it is a case for how NT Christology as a whole must proceed. Some aspects of this study will undoubtedly be called into question. For example, H.'s thumping denial of any pre-Christian Gnosticism, even in rudimentary form, may have to be nuanced further. Admittedly, the literary sources for a Gnostic redeemer myth are all post-Christian, but the question of older source material within some of the Nag Hammadi texts is not sufficiently dealt

with by him.

But much more should be said in praise of H.'s important essay. His repeated and well-documented insistence that Judaism is the prime source for early Christian thought joins a rising chorus that needs to be heard. Enough evidence is in to demonstrate that Hellenistic thought did make an impact on intertestamental Judaism, but an impact that was thoroughly transformed by biblical anthropology and religious vision. H.'s study also shows it is no longer possible to assert that early Christology was purely functional. Jewish eschatological speculation had already crossed the nebulous border between functional and ontological reflection. To proclaim seriously its belief that Jesus was God's decisive revelation and saving act, the early community had to quickly take the same route.

Hengel's book deserves the attention of both exegete and systematist.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago

DONALD SENIOR, C.P.

KIRCHE IN DER KRAFT DES GEISTES: EIN BEITRAG ZUR MESSIANISCHEN EKKLESIOLOGIE. By Jürgen Moltmann. Munich: Kaiser, 1975. Pp. 392. DM 38.

Those who were captivated by Moltmann's *Theologie der Hoffnung* in 1964 and the historical-eschatological framework in which he set the whole of the Judeo-Christian revelation have long awaited an explicit delineation of the ramifications of that perspective upon ecclesiology. In this last work in his trilogy on central themes of Christian theology (the second was *Der gekreuzigte Gott* in 1972), his all-encompassing dialectic of the cross and resurrection of Christ has finally been brought to bear upon the life of the Church. The results are thoroughly consistent: M. has devised a theology of the Church that is, from beginning to end and everywhere between, historically-eschatologically oriented.

Central to M.'s perspective is the conviction that the Church derives all its intelligibility from its relationship to the mission of Christ. Once that mission is seen in terms of the history of the trinitarian God—the process of reconciling the *world* (not the Church) to Himself through the redemptive activity of Christ now carried on in the power of His Spirit—the Church becomes the community of those who live in the power of that Spirit moving toward its goal: the new, all-inclusive creation of the kingdom of God. This future-oriented and world-open goal of the Spirit makes the direction of the Church's life the same, so that it is never complete in itself nor merely as the community of the justified. "The Church is present wherever Christ is present" (Ignatius) is an axiom fundamental to M.'s ecclesiology. Since Christ has promised his pres-

ence most of all to the poor, the oppressed, the hungry, and the godless, the Church includes not only the "brotherhood of believers" but also the "brotherhood of the least brethren," to whom the believers must be present not only to proclaim the gospel but also to share community living, even in the most sacred experience of gathering for communion at the Lord's Supper.

Since the nature of the Church is to be anticipation, though fragmentary, of the life to be experienced by the universal community of mankind in the eschaton, the Church must not only manifest the freedom of life of that kingdom but also stand as a force of opposition against all present powers of enslavement. In social and political clashes between the downtrodden and the powerful, the Church must be on the side of the downtrodden, though only because this is Christ's way of working for the salvation of both. In its interior life, the Church must also eradicate all privileges, greed, and domination. It must emphasize Christ's commissioning of *all* believers on an equal level (with functional differences) to witness in a community of friendship to the messianic presence of the eschatological future. For M., the Church is essentially present in the community that comes together in the power of the Spirit for *kerygma*, *koinonia*, and *diakonia*, in anticipation of the universal community of God's kingdom. Superecclesial organizations and their representatives must therefore be ministers of unity and service, promoting rather than subordinating the experience of community on local and conciliar levels.

Apostolic succession is better understood as apostolic *procession*. In conflicts between continuity with traditional doctrine and openness to the "surprisingly new," M. gives priority to the latter. How far he would go he does not say. But this provides further indication that for M., in the last analysis, the hope in the resurrection of Christ and the freedom that that event promises mankind in the power of the Holy Spirit must win out.

Eschatological ecclesiology seems now, for the first time, to have received its purest and most comprehensive form. It is time for the Christian churches, in interfaith considerations, seriously to reckon with it.

St. Joseph's College, Phila.

MARTIN R. TRIPOLE, S.J.

A POPE FOR ALL CHRISTIANS? AN INQUIRY INTO THE ROLE OF PETER IN THE MODERN CHURCH. Edited by Peter J. McCord. New York: Paulist, 1976. Pp. 212. \$7.50.

"Whatever happened to the ecumenical movement?" is a familiar question these days. Ten years after the excitement and expectations

aroused by Vatican II, little seems to be happening to fulfil those hopes. This volume is evidence that much has happened and that much more remains to be done. Born of the editor's frustration "with his own church's [Roman Catholic] apparent inflexibility on the subject of authority," and the awareness that the question of authority is critical for any ecumenical progress, the volume does a real service in bringing together the views of seven denominations (Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Baptist, Reformed, Orthodox, Methodist, and Anglican) on the issue of papal authority.

Each of the contributors was asked to discuss his own denominational teaching regarding the sources of authority in the Church, the concrete forms this has taken in history, the relation of this teaching and history to the Roman Catholic teaching on papal authority, the conditions and possibility of changes for future relations between his own denomination and Roman Catholicism, and any immediate recommendations for progress in this regard. Not every point is discussed by every contributor, and some place more emphasis on one issue than on another, but each gives a rather accurate summary of the historical background.

Joseph Burgess, the Lutheran contributor, points out what progress has been made among Catholics and Lutherans in recognizing the historical conditioning of the Bull *Unam sanctam* and the *jure divino* model of the papacy. But he is also quick to point out that the *structure* of the papacy must change, not just the people who occupy the chair. John XXIII was an exception, not the rule, as is witnessed by the fact that Celestine V (1294) was the last previous pope to be acclaimed as a charismatic leader. Burgess is also right on target in voicing the malaise that many feel in even discussing such questions: "Within Christianity itself many are turned off by the ineffectiveness of movements for reform, the hollowness of ecumenical gestures made by many church bodies, and tokenism instead of massive involvement in the problems of the modern world."

The Catholic contributor, Avery Dulles, in his usual honest and balanced style, confronts the fact that the papacy and papal infallibility are problems *within* Roman Catholicism as well as ecumenical problems. He indicates that the emphasis on primacy of jurisdiction in Vatican I was in contradistinction to a mere primacy of honor, and he is at pains to show that every dogmatic statement demands sophisticated interpretation. His awareness of the limitations of language (e.g., "The formulations of faith necessarily fall short of capturing the full richness of the transcendent realities to which they refer") is not always shared by other Roman Catholic theologians.

In a very interesting essay, John Meyendorff, from the Orthodox perspective, raises the fundamental question of the extent of "theologi-

cal pluralism in a united church." Can some of the later dogmatic differences be regarded as theologoumena now, when they have been occasions for centuries-old conflicts? The need to come to terms with the question of the criteria of truth, this he sees as the fundamental issue. "It is the Truth therefore that authenticates authority, and not the opposite." It is not so much the question of papal primacy or even of jurisdiction that is at stake, as the tendency to make the papacy the criterion of truth. Meyendorff believes that this has been the "traditional issue between Rome and Orthodoxy."

Each of the contributors raises questions that are helpful and interesting. The volume would have been greatly enhanced, however, if there had been some opportunity for dialogue among the essayists. For example, some of the questions posed by Wright from the Anglican side might have been answered by Dulles from the Roman Catholic viewpoint. While each contributor makes some practical suggestions for future progress, my over-all impression is that the past is still more important than the future. What we have always said seems to weigh more heavily than what needs to be said (and done) today. History cannot be ignored or forgotten, but neither can tradition be allowed to exercise mortmain on the future. Some of the frustration the editor experienced remains with the reader after finishing the volume.

Canisius College, Buffalo

T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J.

LOOKING AT LONERGAN'S METHOD. Edited by Patrick Corcoran, S.M. Dublin: Talbot, 1975. Pp. 193. £3.00.

The reaction of those who read and are generally satisfied with Lonergan's work may be to dismiss the essays in this book—and with some reason, for they are not without misinterpretations and mistaken criticisms. On the other hand, those who have read and are unsatisfied with *Insight* and *Method in Theology* will find their suspicions confirmed here, namely, that Lonergan's philosophy is long on slogans and intricate intellectual gymnastics and short on successful address to contemporary issues. The latter group may rejoice at a skewering of Lonergan. However, we may hope that both the stage of discipleship (which seems to concern some of the authors in this volume) and that of thin and misguided criticism (which has long concerned Lonergan's students) are over. Some of those who only a few years ago were considered ardent disciples have produced the best and tightest criticisms of Lonergan, and some of the essays in this volume represent enlightened and sympathetic interpretation. Lonergan's work is recognized as crucially important to Christian theology. That fact is indisputable, and this volume of essays is another testimony to the fact. The

claim of some that the volume is a product of Irish theological politics (Maynooth vs. Dublin) and that the conference that gave it birth amounted to an academic lynch party is neither here nor there. The volume furthers our understanding of our common task in theology by pointing up several weaknesses in Lonergan's conception of method and revealing the many misunderstandings of his work that plague even the most intelligent and sincere readers.

I shall simply list some of the criticisms the authors make, first as they bear directly upon methodological issues, then on issues of material significance.

First, it is charged that the theological method rests on a problematic philosophy which cannot command agreement and which may be determined by a prior theological agenda. The philosophical method itself is largely formal ("Kantian") and leads to a theological method which supplies no material criteria for objectivity, provides only description and formal prescription, and so is of limited value in solving particular problems. The familiar distinction, in theory of subjectivity, of four levels of conscious operation either provides no adequate basis for or confuses explanation of theological operations (the eightfold functional specialties are a mystery for several contributors). Finally, and most seriously, the philosophical background for the theological method is taken to be a modernization of Aristotelian and Thomist cosmological and epistemological dualism, or another instance of classical transcendentalism, and as grounding an outmoded propositional theory of truth.

On the material side, Lonergan is indicted for misunderstanding the actual methods of the sciences and for ignorance of contemporary philosophy of science. His hermeneutical theory is thin and does not take seriously the achievements of European theories of interpretation; it is weakened by a simplistic and inaccurate distinction between experience, understanding, judgment, and decision. The horizon image is misleading and inauspicious in that it attributes to positions a mutual exclusiveness that makes common understanding theoretically and practically impossible without the quantum and irrational leap of conversion. Furthermore, the concentration on subjectivity ends in a loss of the possibility of an objective revelation of God in nature and history and a lapse into neo-Protestant fascination with religious experience. Finally, the theologian is taken as an individual and an academic specialist. The first misrepresents the ecclesiological character of theological endeavor, and the second flows from an uncriticized assumption of the sociopolitical context of the university and the limits it places to theology and its self-understanding. The result is that Christian experience is interpreted unhistorically and Christian theology is beset with Lonergan's ideal of explanatory language which leaves no room for its

actually symbolic function.

Most of the authors of the essays make an effort to resolve the problems they raise. Some understand Lonergan quite well, even when they disagree. Some seem to understand very little of *Insight* or *Method*. The most cogent of the essays, it seems to me, are those by W. Pannenberg (on history and meaning), N. Lash (cultural discontinuity), J. Jossua (experience), and D. Dorr (conversion). Most hopelessly threaded with misunderstandings of Lonergan are those by P. McGrath (language and judgment), M. Hesse (science), and E. Maclaren (functional specialties). The volume is of no use to beginners in philosophy and theology or to those who have not read Lonergan. Its value is to the theologically literate who want to know why Lonergan is important, how he sometimes nods, and that he can be easily misinterpreted.

Catholic University of America

WILLIAM M. SHEA

ROM UND PELAGIUS: DIE THEOLOGISCHE POSITION DER RÖMISCHEN BISCHÖFE IM PELAGIANISCHEN STREIT IN DEN JAHREN 411 BIS 432. By Otto Wermelinger. *Päpste und Papsttum* 7. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1975. Pp. 340. DM 140.

Wermelinger focuses on the positions which the participants in the Pelagian controversy took on the transmission of Adam's sin. He traces the course of the debate through five stages from the condemnation of Caelestius in Carthage through the decision of Pope Zosimus and the action of the Council of Carthage. Then he examines the various interpretations of the Roman vacillation in the case of Pelagius. The study is complemented by excellent appendices in which the principal texts are collected and labelled for reference. The bibliography is full, but the indices list only persons, councils, and places.

W.'s account of the doctrinal questions is often illumined by his careful investigation of the relationships between the various participants in the debate. His explanation of the background of the disagreement between Pelagius and Jerome is only one instance of this. He constantly attempts to tie up loose ends by identifying the carriers of letters, the documents available to each of the parties, and the materials which have been lost. While most of his solutions rest on a perceptive reading of the extant evidence, some are only plausible. Among the latter I would include the supposed exchange of letters in the summer of 417 between Zosimus and Bishop Aurelius of Carthage, and the early report of Zosimus' acquittal of Pelagius and Caelestius, which he thinks reached Africa before the papal letters in the fall of the same year.

W.'s analysis of doctrinal backgrounds is also helpful. His exposition of the differing ecclesiologies of the Roman and African bishops proves quite useful in understanding their correspondence and actions. The

letters of both Innocent and Zosimus asserted the primacy for the Roman See in deciding the question which the Africans referred to them. The bishops of Africa, however, seem to have been seeking concurrence in their condemnation of Pelagius and Caelestius rather than papal confirmation of their own preliminary judgment. Although W. cannot establish the influence of this Cyprianic ecclesiology through documentary evidence similar to that of the papal letters, he does show that it accounts for the independence of the Africans in a way which their acceptance of the Roman claims would not. A parallel study of the ecclesiology of the other episcopal parties to the debate, the bishops of Palestine and the Italian dissenters, might prove similarly helpful. This same attention to doctrinal backgrounds makes W.'s analysis of the canons of the Council of Carthage in 418 particularly perceptive. He traces the origin and course of each of the issues on which the bishop rendered a judgment.

I think that his concentration on the *tradux peccati* tends to skew W.'s appreciation of the relationship between Africa and the other churches on other issues of the Pelagian controversy. Neither Innocent nor Zosimus took up the extreme position on original sin that was urged against Pelagius. Innocent, however, fully supported the objections which the provincial synods of Carthage and Milevis (416) raised against the Pelagian teaching on the nature of the divine grace by which sin is avoided. Although Zosimus was not originally troubled by Pelagius' teaching, he too eventually sided with the Africans on this issue.

One must choose one's angle fairly carefully to view Zosimus as favorably as W. does. Unlike Innocent, who condemned Pelagius after reading Augustine's analysis of his writings, Zosimus dismissed the charges upon hearing a profession of faith which was quite vague on the most sensitive issues. His judgment appears to have been innocent of both his predecessor's decisions and the materials which the Africans had submitted in support of their case. He rejected the judgment of the synods of Milevis and Carthage on procedural grounds and by attacking the character of the exiled bishops, Heros and Lazarus, who had brought the charges against Pelagius in Palestine. He accepted at face value Caelestius' claim to have satisfied the complaints of these accusers and excommunicated them in violation of his own procedural standards.

I do not find myself in sympathy with the estimation which W. shares of Augustine's understanding and appreciation of Pelagius' theology. A strong case can be built for Augustine's fairness in dealing with Pelagius, as R. F. Evans has done in the first volume of *Studies in Medieval Culture*. Moreover, one must recognize the degree to which Augustine was arguing with himself in the controversy with Pelagius. The first decade of his writing betrays views on grace and freedom which are

remarkably similar to those Pelagius advanced in his own *De natura* and *De libero arbitrio*. Finally, the arguments which Augustine advances against Pelagius are based not so much upon a peculiar anthropology or an African tradition of infant baptism as upon generally accepted Christological and ecclesiological assertions. The Christian who believes that no one can be saved without faith in Christ and the regeneration of his baptism, Augustine reasoned, simply cannot assert that fallen humanity has the natural power to do anything good apart from Christ's grace. Consequently, he argued that Pelagius' defense of nature emptied the cross of Christ. I would contend that one cannot accurately interpret Augustine's objections to Pelagius apart from his controversy with the Donatists, in which the ecclesiological issues changed his understanding of nature and grace. The analysis of doctrinal backgrounds which W. used so fruitfully in his interpretation of the conflict between the Roman and African bishops would have yielded a different understanding of the dispute between Pelagius and Augustine.

Although the subtitle focuses the book on the Roman theology, W. actually presents the most thorough study of the events of the Pelagian controversy since Reuter's *Augustinische Studien* of 1887. As such, his work should become a standard reference. It will also prove valuable for its analysis of the Roman and Pelagian positions on original sin. Finally, W.'s use of Cyprian's ecclesiology to interpret the actions of the African bishops may provide the key for understanding their involvement in the imperial action which may well have influenced Zosimus' ultimate condemnation of Pelagius and certainly sealed the fate of his outspoken supporters.

Jesuit School of Theology in Chicago

J. PATOUT BURNS, S.J.

CYPRIAN. By Michael M. Sage. *Patristic Monograph Series* 1. Cambridge, Mass.: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1975. Pp. 439. \$7.50.

Given the book's cryptic title, it is impossible to know at the outset whether one is dealing with a new biography (à la E. W. Benson), a new cultural history (à la V. Saxer), or a new theological assessment (à la G. Walker). For this work, produced under the direction of Toronto's outstanding patristic scholar, T. D. Barnes, some subtitle might have indicated its biographical focus. But what differentiates S.'s biography from most of his predecessors' is the unusually impressive command of the pagan primary sources. In his sage preface, he wistfully reflects how secular and religious history have too long been separated. This volume is surely an exception in that regard. Some patristic theologians might have preferred that he broaden treatments of doctrinal issues, yet what is here both fascinates and stimulates.

Among the seven chapters of particular interest are those devoted to Cyprian's rise from rhetor to bishop, another on the Decian persecution, and two chapters on the temporary peace from 251 to 253 and the rebaptism controversy. Especially penetrating is his clear exposition of why the Decian "persecution" was not a specific renunciation of Christianity. Still, the Christian religion was already by the third century a sort of state within a state which threatened the Roman *imperium*. S. suggests that Cyprian retained abiding influence among the notables of Carthage even after his conversion. One rarely gets the impression that S. is simply guessing, as was unfortunately the case all too often in Hinchliff's recent biography on Cyprian.

From the book it is hard to tell whether or not S. admires Cyprian as a religious personage. In that sense his is not standard hagiography. His psychologizing explanation for Cyprian's conversion seems inadequate. He argues that Christianity offered Cyprian an alternative whereby through conversion he could learn to cope with a hostile world. Cyprian, we are told, "discarded the system of values in which he had been reared" (p. 116). Yet, is Cyprian's break with earlier pagan values and culture all that complete when, to give just one example, we observe vestiges of Stoic morality in *De habitu virginum* and even in *De mortalitate*?

A few flaws mark the book. The style is very jerky: too many short, choppy sentences coming in quick succession. Again, though his command of the primary and secondary literature is impressive, several recent important monographs are not cited, such as the works of Marshall, Wickert, and Gülzow. On several small points I found myself in disagreement. S. attaches too much credence to Pontius' *De vita Cypriani*, especially for the chronology of Cyprian's works. Although he is skeptical about the description of the plague in *De mortalitate* 14, he accepts too literally the description of pagan immorality in *Ad Donatum*, a diatribe whose literary genre deliberately encouraged exaggeration. S. is too quick in rejecting Bévenot's explanation of the genesis and date of *De unitate*. Finally, is it so clear that the Jews had no impact at all upon the Christian community in Carthage (p. 145)? J. M. Ford at the Oxford Patristic Congress identified Jewish origins in Cyprian's imagery. Others, such as M. Simon and G. Quispel, would see pronounced Jewish influence; it has even been suggested that the earliest Latin versions of the Bible into *Vetus Latina* forms were begun by Jews.

The editors of the series should be commended for wisely publishing this book by photo offset from a typed manuscript. The result is a readable, highly accurate text, but reasonably priced. The present volume includes careful indices and an impressive bibliography.

Concordia University, Montreal

MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.

CALVINISM AND SCHOLASTICISM IN VERMIGLI'S DOCTRINE OF MAN AND GRACE. By John Patrick Donnelly, S.J. *Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought* 18. Leiden: Brill, 1976. Pp. 235. 68 glds.

High on the list of the anathemas of the Reformers was Scholasticism, but strange to say, their own disciples used the tools and methods of Scholasticism to promote the Reformation. One such was Peter Martyr Vermigli, the subject of Donnelly's monograph. D. brings much erudition to his book; he is well read in the areas of Renaissance Humanism and Reformation, has magisterial command of Martyr's writings, and, most importantly, is well acquainted with Scholasticism, equipping him to undertake the task he has set himself. D.'s subject is Martyr's teaching on man and grace, but he is not satisfied with merely digesting what Martyr said on the subject; he goes further seeking the traces of Calvinism and Scholasticism in Martyr's treatment of this matter.

D. put these questions to himself: To what extent is Martyr a scholastic? Is he a Protestant scholastic? D. begins by examining the origins of Martyr's thought (chap. 2), surveying his intellectual development and the sources of his teaching—the books he read and the authors he quotes. Martyr's early training was Thomistic and in his writings he has more references to Thomas than to any other scholastic except Peter Lombard. With regard to the important question of the relationship between reason and revelation (chap. 3), Martyr saw philosophy as an auxiliary of theology. He rejected the position that Christian theology should only teach that which is explicitly contained in Scripture. Conclusions drawn from Scripture by clear and evident argument have value. In his writing on this relationship Martyr owes much to Thomas, and his words are often a faithful paraphrase. It was in the scholia which he added to his commentaries that Martyr especially used his speculative scholastic theology to show that the theological process must advance beyond a mere exposition of text. Unlike Luther and Calvin, he made room for reason and borrowed heavily from Aristotle and the scholastic tradition.

The core of the book is found in chaps. 4-6. Martyr's philosophy of man was the popular Aristotelianism derived from the medieval scholastics but made somewhat fresh by Renaissance Humanism. In the matter of sin and man's fallen nature, Martyr followed the Reformed teaching, i.e., he adopted man's total depravity and all that goes with it. His position was Reformed, but the methods and terms used were scholastic. In the matter of predestination, Martyr is found to agree with Thomas on several points, and D. feels that Calvin's influence here is rather remote—his teaching derived from Bucer and Zwingli. Against Luther, Martyr rejected the argument that divine foreknowledge precludes human freedom; God so moderates His power that His actions in

the world dovetail with the nature of created things and their operations. Though these middle chapters are important for Martyr's anthropology, they are somewhat less revelatory than those that precede and follow.

D. makes it quite clear that when Martyr turned to the Reformation, he did not jettison his earlier training. It was this same training in Aristotelian philosophy and scholastic theology that gave him a tool to supplement the Protestant emphasis on the Bible. True, Martyr cannot be considered the first of the Protestant scholastics; nevertheless, he was a "limited" scholastic (chap. 8). He introduced reason as an aid in understanding the Bible, but he never gave it a status equal or superior to faith. He was always loyal to *sola scriptura* but also granted reason its proper place. At one point D. interestingly remarks that Martyr assigned a larger role to reason in theology than did Bonaventure and Occam (p. 200). The conclusion of this excellent study is that Martyr represents something of a transition between Calvin's humanist-biblical orientation and the developed scholasticism of the seventeenth-century Calvinists. His thought may have many characteristics in common with the later Calvinists, but many of their other traits (cf. p. 119) are either absent or are found only in an incipient way. In methodology Martyr is scholastic, in teaching he is Reformed; still, he stands closer to Thomism than to any other major school of the Middle Ages (p. 202).

This rewritten dissertation (University of Wisconsin at Madison) is eminently readable and a model worthy of imitation by other doctoral candidates. It demonstrates that Donnelly is equally at home in historical and systematic theology; by blending both facets, he has given us one of the best books on Martyr and his theology in recent years.

Washington, D.C.

JOSEPH N. TYLEND, S.J.

THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC COMMUNITY 1570-1850. By John Bossy. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1976. Pp. 446. \$24.95.

Bossy has examined three centuries of the history and development of English Catholics with a richness of detail to which most future writers on that era will have to pay attention. It is not a narrative history, but a study of a community, which had its beginning about 1570 and its end in 1850. For him, the Catholics under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth were a part of the pre-Reformation English Church, far removed in outlook from those Catholics influenced by the seminary priests from Douai and by the new men of the religious orders and congregations strongly affected by the Council of Trent. "I do not consider the lives of Thomas More or John Fisher, of Queen Mary or Reginald Pole, or of the average Englishman of conservative instincts during, say, the half-century which followed the breach with Rome, as

forming part of the history of the English Catholic Community" (p. 4). There is ample evidence to support this assumption, and some of it B. adduces.

That 1850 marks the end of a distinct era is also an opinion that can be sustained. "1850 is meant to refer to the restoration of the hierarchy, to the climax of Irish immigration into England and most of all to a combination of both these events with other developments which between them produced a critical discontinuity in the history of the community" (pp. 4-5).

B. does not deal with the political problems arising from the existence of a hostile state or with the political activities of Catholics, but with the inner life of the Catholic body as a whole, "with the distribution of power within the community itself, [and with] the religious and social experience of the average Catholic" (p. 6). It is thus a sociological report on a religious community, and it is made up, in part, of a series of studies in detail about numbers of Catholics, the parts of the country in which they were to be found, the significance of their social classes, and the means used to maintain their corporate existence.

Many important and unexpected conclusions emerge. One is the prominent part taken by women in establishing the community between 1570 and 1620. Another challenges the customary assumption that the English Catholics slowly declined in number over the three centuries. B. suggests that, as far as the first two centuries of the community were concerned, it is not to be regarded "as an originally massive body subject to continuous erosion; but as a small community gradually getting larger" (p. 194). "The post-Reformation Catholic body in England continued to expand from the launching of the Elizabethan mission until somewhere a little short of the mid-seventeenth century; during the next half-century or so it ceased to grow and may possibly have contracted; and from somewhere about 1700 it resumed an expansion which was still in progress in 1770" (pp. 278-79).

B. brings forward evidence to change two traditional views of English Catholics in the first half of the nineteenth century. The first view, given notoriety by John Henry Newman's "second spring" address and part of Catholic folklore ever since, is that there was "a miraculous rebirth dating from somewhere around 1840." The second regards modern English Catholicism as a creation of nineteenth-century immigration from Ireland into an England wherein indigenous Catholicism was moribund. B. regards the first view as "a piece of tendentious ecclesiastical propaganda," and the second as requiring "to be modified in important and historically significant respects" (p. 297). Indeed, with regard to the Irish immigrants, caution needs to be exercised as to the sort of religion they possessed. B. cites a recent writer as arguing that the

majority of Irish Catholics did not practice their religion until after 1850, and states that "for a considerable proportion of Irish Catholics their religion was still a folk-religion, barely touched by the counter-Reformation, short on formal instruction, and unfamiliar with the obligations of regular religious observance and sacramental practice" (pp. 315-16 and n. 39).

In a consideration of events leading to the establishment of a hierarchy in 1850, not only is the English contribution to the cisalpinism and ultramontaniam of that European era discussed, but also, and for the first time in any general survey, the important but "abortive attempt to incorporate congregational institutes and lay committees into the structure of the English Catholic community" is interestingly ventilated. The contemporary movement of a similar nature in the United States is noted but not compared with it (pp. 337-54).

B. concludes with a short chapter giving an interesting comparison of three communities: the Catholic, the Quaker, and the Presbyterian, "to offer some view of the history of English nonconformity into which a Catholic community would fit." This he does to emphasize the purpose he has laid down as his major task: "At almost every point of the book I have been guided by a conviction that, speaking historically and for the centuries with which I am concerned, the Catholic community ought properly to be considered a branch of the English nonconforming tradition" (p. 391).

Throughout the study numerous references are provided as footnotes in support of its arguments but most of the references cannot be tracked down without tiresome labor: although a book is given an adequate bibliographical reference when first cited, its next abbreviated citation may be two hundred pages later. Since much of the book is concerned with the careful weighing of evidence, frequently statistical, it requires a steady application in its reading. Throughout, many interesting items, lightly touched on, served to arouse an unsatisfied curiosity; but the entertainment of the reader was doubtless precluded by the length of the book.

Georgetown University

ERIC McDERMOTT, S.J.

NEWMAN ON DEVELOPMENT: THE SEARCH FOR AN EXPLANATION IN HISTORY. By Nicholas Lash. Shepherdstown, W. Va.: Patmos, 1975. Pp. 264. \$17.50.

Almost a half century ago, Francis Bacchus and Henry Tristram, members of the Birmingham Oratory, which Newman founded and where he spent nearly the entirety of his Roman Catholic years, could remark wistfully but symptomatically: "England has contributed little to the study of Newman's philosophy and theology" (*DTC* 11, 398).

Newman's personality and pilgrimage of faith have long attracted the attention of biographers; his *Apologia* and *Idea of a University* have been perennial favorites of Victorian literature; but Anglo-American interest in his philosophy and theology long tended to be content with a perfunctory reading of the *Grammar of Assent* and *Essay on Development*. The theological renaissance in Newman studies is practically contemporary with Vatican II, which some have characterized as "Newman's council" in marked contrast to its predecessor, which he declined to attend.

The claimed kinship can be neatly paralleled: Vatican II authorized a program of changes in the contemporary church, while Newman is credited with furnishing the theory of homogeneous development that justifies such changes. The suspicions of some observers that Vatican II really lacked an adequate theory of change have been amply confirmed by the growing postconciliar discussion of doctrinal development (cf. *TS* 36 [1975] 493, n. 1). In particular, the conventional images—the growth of a child to maturity or the evolving of an acorn into an oak—are more serviceable in catechetical imagination than for historico-critical explanation. Yet if the images must be considered negotiable, what should be said about the supposition that doctrinal development is continuous and consistent, inevitable and irreversible?

Until recently, most Roman Catholic theologians, anxious to absolve Newman from the alleged taint of Modernism and to rebaptize him as a scholastic, failed to ask whether his *Essay on Development* really aimed to present a unified theory of development. Lash argues convincingly that "what Newman needed, and what he sought to provide in the *Essay*, was a 'view' of Christian history" (p. 20). Newman, so to speak, asks his readers to view the evidence in the same way he does: "Do you see what I see?" Captivated by Newman's adroit interweaving of historical examples, philosophical arguments, attractive imagery, disarming apologetics, and polished rhetoric, readers may be tempted to see more than what is critically justifiable. Thus, in contrast to readers who derive an organic theory of development, L. finds that "the *Essay* undoubtedly contains, in rudimentary form, the seeds of a number of such theories, the systematic elaboration of which might show that they are not mutually compatible" (p. 56).

The major contribution of L.'s study is its deathblow to the customary view of Newman as a theorist of organic development; by implication, homogeneous theories in general are rendered suspect. In addition, there are many facets of L.'s detailed analysis that will be of particular interest to students of Newman: his concept of "idea" (pp. 46–54, 94–98), his use of "antecedent probability" (pp. 30–41) and hermeneutical principles (pp. 80–88), his understanding of development as normative

(pp.114-45), etc. While readers may feel annoyed by L.'s parsimonious prose and fastidious technical apparatus, the work, in sum, merits resounding applause—in which Bacchus and Tristram presumably would have joined.

Catholic University of America

JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.

ERNST TROELTSCH AND THE FUTURE OF THEOLOGY. Edited by John Powell Clayton. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976. Pp. 217. \$18.95.

The special merit of this collection of essays is to concentrate its focus on Troeltsch the philosopher and speculative theologian, a neglected study in the editor's opinion. T. is viewed as attempting to place theology on a new basis, to rethink theology from the perspective of historical consciousness.

Part 1 concentrates on T.'s standing as a Christian theologian. Hans-Georg Drescher's essay is particularly concerned to correct Walter Bodenstein's judgment in *Neige des Historismus* that T. turned from theology to cultural philosophy with his acceptance of a philosophical chair at Berlin in 1914. "A metaphysical orientation, and indeed a characteristic mystical trait, persists through all Troeltsch's works from the earlier to the latest. The mystic concept of religion from the early period appears broadened out at the end to a mystical philosophy of cosmic fullness and extent" (p. 29). Robert Morgan's essay analyzes dialectical theology's view of T. Helpfully it distinguishes two wings of the dialectical movement: that "to the right," which refused to come to terms with historicity and thus T. (viz., Barth, Brunner), and a more "leftist" wing: "Troeltsch and Bultmann can be seen to have shared a very similar conception of revelation, if attention is paid not to Troeltsch's idealist language, but to the use he makes of the notion of decision and his emphasis upon interpreting the tradition to shape anew the essence of Christianity" (p. 65).

The essays of Part 2 focus on T.'s *Glaubenslehre*. B. A. Gerrish especially views T., like Schleiermacher, as initiating a new style of systematics, "no longer a deductive, biblical theology in the old protestant style," but a "theology of consciousness." Hence the shift from *Dogmatik* to *Glaubenslehre*. "In *Glaubenslehre* we only acquire information about ourselves." T. approves of Rothe's view that "we analyze, not God, but our own idea of God." Gerrish's helpful critique is that T.'s problem resides less in his emphasis upon subjectivity than in his lack of intersubjectivity. I would only add that were this intersubjectivity broadened to include a relation with the Divine, we might then have an overcoming of the tendency to equate subjectivity with relativism. The essays of Part 3, on Christianity's essence and the world religions,

present T. as a pioneer thinker attempting a middle position between religious absolutism and relativism.

In the end, T. emerges as a true theologian and not merely a cultural analyst, and is vindicated as "intentionally" Christian and not the humanistic reductionist that dialectical theology made him out to be. One is forced to conclude that in the confrontation of theology and historical consciousness T. emerges as neither naively uncritical nor rejecting, but more critically open.

This book is fair and critical, presenting T. more as a pioneer than a "finished" thinker. In the end, one gains the impression that T. was attempting to break out of nineteenth-century positivism and neo-Kantian subjectivism, while using their categories. This contributes to the difficulty in appraising him, and the book could have benefited by an essay on precisely this topic.

The essays are not of equal value. Although each is packed with excellent historical data, Morgan and Gerrish go beyond this to include some excellent speculative insights. Finally, Michael Pye's essay on T.'s views of the other religions, while correctly noting his hidden Europeanism, never really comes to terms with the difficult issue of Christian and Oriental absolutism.

Carroll College, Helena, Mont.

WILLIAM M. THOMPSON

THE MODERNIST IMPULSE IN AMERICAN PROTESTANTISM. By William R. Hutchison. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1976. Pp. 347. \$15.00.

Here is intellectual history at its finest, a brilliant study that will enhance Hutchison's stature as one of the most widely respected historians of nineteenth-century American liberalism. H. denies that he has traced the entire Protestant liberal tradition. Yet his definition of modernism as a cluster of three impulses—adaptationism, cultural immanentism, and progressivism—which he believes leavened liberalism for 120 years and monopolized liberal theology "at least from the 1870's to the 1930's" (p. 2) makes this study the most valuable account of Protestant liberalism in America to date.

H. rejects prior attempts at delineating typologies within liberalism for two reasons: (1) the "modernist synthesis" smashed the partition between sacred and secular, and (2) the intentionality of liberals was the conservation, not subversion, of the Christian tradition. Hence he eschews sustained scrutiny of differing liberal theologians or schools of theology (the "Chicago School" is mentioned only once), opting instead for tracing the development of the three modernist impulses by illustrating in an action-reaction fashion how these impulses fared in the theological marketplace.

By 1875 the main features of modernism had been shaped by Unitari-

anism, which opened the shutters to the world, and Bushnellian views on Christian nurture. The New Theology's contribution to modernism was a pervading sense of the divine presence in the world coupled with an irenic, pastoral attitude towards culture as a potential convert to Christianity. By the mid-1880's liberalism emerged as a self-conscious movement, achieving parity with conservatism by 1900 due to its popularization, systematization, and deculturalization of Christianity. The developing hegemony of liberalism in mission boards, the religious press, the religious education movement, seminaries, and denominational bureaucracies engendered a vocal opposition, especially prominent at Princeton Seminary, which flaunted the liberal claim of Christian uniqueness in the face of its immanentism. Stirrings of criticism within liberalism burst forth after the failures of World War I mocked liberal optimism. External challenges to liberalism surged from the quarters of fundamentalism, secular humanism, and neo-orthodoxy, the latter force spearheading the antimodernist attack in the 1930's. By 1940, the word "modernism" was accumulating cross references in the historians' card file. "Cultural faith" had lost its power and persuasiveness.

H.'s book is packed with fresh insights. He documents the penetration of liberal theology into evangelical bodies and western regions by the 1870's, criticizing the historiographical preoccupation with New England. He cautions about overestimating the impact of World War I on critical liberal introspection. He hears social salvation (not social reform) as the shibboleth of social gospellers, and detects a higher pitch of crisis thinking among the two thirds of liberals who became social gospellers as opposed to the one third who did not. He looks at the modernist-fundamentalist controversy, not through the well-worn spectacles of attitudes towards science, but through the lens of cultural accommodation. Indeed, the Scopes trial is not mentioned in the book. He presents the intriguing thesis that secular humanists supported J. Gresham Machen's systematic denial of liberal credentials as Christian.

One cannot help but be impressed by H.'s grasp of abstruse but precious nuances in theology, the scope of his research, his refreshing wit and lively style, his sensitivity to quantification, and his integrity as a scholar (he even footnotes a graduate student). Yet his study remains an analysis of modernist impulses rather than an intense inspection of liberal theology or modernist theologians, his implicit identification of modernism and liberalism notwithstanding. Ignoring Shailer Mathews' contention that modernism is a method, not a doxy, H.'s three modernist impulses function as a kind of liberal creed, allowing him to scan the wide expanse without probing the depths, leaving unexplained real fissures within liberalism. Rauschenbusch is not presented as saying

anything of importance about sin, and Christological debates are not given prominence. On the other hand, liberal theologians are forced to answer questions, especially regarding the particularity of Christianity, which were not as intrinsic or salient to their thought as H. would have it. Further, H.'s entire analysis of Mathews and Rauschenbusch rests precariously on the fragile foundation of two books, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* and *The Faith of Modernism*, leading him to make some careless and oversimplified statements such as the one about Rauschenbusch's views on personal regeneration. One also wonders why Shirley Jackson Case and Edward Scribner Ames are whizzed past without pause. Quibbles about omission, however, only serve to underscore the merit of this remarkable study and the limelight it deserves.

Geneseo, N.Y.

LEONARD I. SWEET

THE CHURCH AND THE HOMOSEXUAL. By John J. McNeill, S.J. Kansas City, Kan.: Sheed, Andrews and McMeel, 1976. Pp. 211. \$10.00.

In this book McNeill advocates ethically responsible homosexual genital relationships for those who are "genuine" homosexuals, and defines "genuine" homosexuals as those whose "permanent psychological condition" is a sexual orientation toward the same sex. While making room for celibacy and abstinence from genital sex for some homosexuals, M. sees a certain proportion of the human race as created by God for a different kind of genital relationship than that of marriage (p. 194). This "permanent psychological condition" can serve as a basis for genuinely constructive human love, involving genital relationships which help each partner grow as a person. Indeed, not just homosexual relationships, but also heterosexual, can be regarded as good so long as the persons find fulfilment therein. For M., genital expression becomes a form of human play in which the procreative aspect of sexuality is absolutely negated (p. 23).

Turning to Scripture to prove his thesis, M. takes up the Sodom and Gomorrah incident and argues from Derrick Bailey that the heinous sin of these people was inhospitality to the visiting angels. Other biblical references (Lv 18:2, 20:13; Rom 1:26-27; 1 Cor 6:9-10; 1 Tim 1:9-10), which have been understood traditionally as condemnatory of homosexual actions, are dismissed as not dealing with the contemporary situation of "genuine" homosexuals expressing true love toward one another. In M.'s theory, the scriptural condemnation of homosexual actions, found clearly in Rom 1:26-27, refers to perverts, i.e., heterosexuals engaged in homosexual actions. Besides, homosexual actions were condemned not in themselves but only because they were connected with cultic prostitution rites. In all the biblical references the authors allegedly lack the advanced knowledge attributed to current psychological studies of the

"permanent condition" of homosexuality.

While the Sodom and Gomorrah incident is open to more than one interpretation, and while the other texts may be evaluated against the phenomena of cultic prostitution, this does not prove that homosexual actions are not immoral in themselves. It is difficult to see how one can interpret Rom 1:26-27 as referring only to heterosexuals performing homosexual actions. Again, M. does not confront the total teaching of both OT and NT concerning marriage as the norm for the expression of genital sexuality. From Genesis to Ephesians the authors speak of the union between man and woman in marriage as good and holy, but nowhere are homosexual unions approved. On the contrary, homosexual actions are always condemned. It is no argument to assert that the biblical writers lacked knowledge of the condition of homosexuality. If St. Paul, e.g., according to M., is only condemning heterosexuals committing homosexual acts, and not "genuine" homosexuals (Rom 1:26-27), how did he arrive at such a sophisticated knowledge? Already M. has asserted that the sacred authors did not possess the kind of knowledge necessary to make such a judgment. He cannot have it both ways. He has no solid answer to the objection that heterosexual union is normative in Scripture.

Curiously, M. slips into the dualism of which he accuses traditionalists by avoiding the analysis of the human act of homosexuality. Notice the way he justifies homosexual actions. When homosexuals use their genital organs to express love, these actions become good because of their psychic disposition and homosexual "condition"; if the person performing the homosexual action is heterosexual, the action becomes evil because his psychic disposition is contrary to the homosexual action. In short, the physical action has no meaning in itself, but derives its entire meaning from the psychic disposition and intention of the agent. In my judgment, since persons are body-soul unities, one may distinguish, but not separate, the personal intention from the physical genital action. The personal intention cannot obliterate the meaning of genital activity. In short, M. fails to describe all the aspects of the human act of homosexual relationships. Instead of confronting the meaning of the physical act, he superimposes meaning; e.g., he says that love makes the physical act good (pp. 65, 102, 104, 164, *passim*).

Nor can M. explain his thesis in the light of Paul's relating of sexuality to family and to children. Again, he makes assertions incapable of proof. From various selections of Jung he argues that homosexuals can be a mediating influence in the heterosexual culture, helping men understand women better. Because of their sharpened sensitivities about women they can improve relationships between men and women. It is difficult to reconcile this portrait of such insightful homosexuals

with the widespread opinion of psychiatrists that male homosexuals have difficulty in relating intimately with women. M.'s references to the "homosexual community" imply a degree of homogeneity which is not the experience of other students of homosexuality who find homosexuals as different from one another as heterosexuals.

Without proof, moreover, is his theory that an individual who seems to have a "permanent psychological condition" of homosexuality was created by God in this way, and so may seek expression of his love with members of his own sex in what he terms "ethically responsible relationships." In such thinking he overlooks the psychiatric evidence to the contrary. A leading authority on homosexuality and its treatment, Dr. Charles W. Socarides, agrees that it is quite wrong for homosexuals to be treated as criminals, "but it is scientific folly for psychiatry to normalize homosexual relationships as if they had no psychopathology . . . Homosexuality is not just an 'alternate lifestyle.' It is a devastating disease of psychological origin" (*Newsweek*, Oct. 25, 1976, p. 103). Approximately 40% of the American Psychiatric Association would take positions similar to that of Socarides.

M. does not adequately confront two other possible life styles for the so-called permanent homosexual. In some cases it is possible that he can redirect sexual orientation (psychiatrists Haddon, Bieber, Hatterer); in other instances he can practice the virtue of chastity with God's grace and overcome overt practices, a recognized experience of pastoral counselors.

Basically, M. argues that a "genuine" homosexual can have an ethically responsible homosexual relationship. He leaves the task of defining such a relationship to the communal discernment of Christian homosexuals. Careful to speak about stable homosexual relationships involving faithful love between two people, he does not discuss adequately the situation of promiscuity, which is more prevalent than fidelity among overt homosexuals. He praises complete abstinence in priests and religious who have made a commitment to celibacy and chastity, but he does not recommend this to the lay "genuine" homosexual. That through a deeply spiritual life one can transcend the need for genital expression is an alternative to which M. should give more study.

Finally, one must question M.'s premise that a "genuine" homosexual has a "permanent" psychological condition. Does not the word "permanent" seem rather absolute? Would not "habitual psychological situation" be more appropriate for what even M. seems to accept as "learned"?

*De Sales Hall School of Theology
Hyattsville, Md.*

JOHN F. HARVEY, O.S.F.S.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.

ONGOING REVISION: STUDIES IN MORAL THEOLOGY. By Charles E. Curran. Notre Dame: Fides, 1975. Pp. 300. \$10.95.

Once again C. makes available a collection of his previously published articles. In nine chapters various topics are considered: Christian and Catholic ethics in relationship to human ethics; the possibility of pluralism in Roman Catholic moral theology; the status of the Catholic Church's teaching regarding the indissolubility of Christian marriage; the function of civil law vis-à-vis Christian morality and the propriety of seeking a constitutional amendment regarding abortion; the Christian bias toward respect for human life, and the bearing this respect has upon capital punishment, proper care of the dying, preservation of the right to die, and the recourse to war; the effect which an increased sensitivity to religious freedom should have upon the question of moral co-operation in a pluralistic society.

For those not familiar with C.'s perspective and methodology, the last chapter might more helpfully be read first; it lays out many of the personal, intellectual, and ecclesial influences which have shaped C.'s theological reflection. C. is heir to Häring's insights that moral theology and spiritual theology are not dichotomous, that the biblical call to perfection implies growth and change in Christian living, and that this law of growth "would not insist on imposing more than an individual was able to do at a given time" (p. 265). C. is a strong advocate of the traditional Roman Catholic premise that God ordinarily acts mediately with human beings—which means that creation, reason, tradition, and the *koinonia* of the Christian community are the usual media for God's contact with the individual. Acceptance of this principle, and his insistence that the reality of moral matters must be viewed against the horizon formed by the fivefold Christian mysteries of creation, sin, Incarnation, redemption, and resurrection destiny, enable C. to move toward solving the questions raised.

In considering divorce and remarriage and the question of euthanasia, C. seems to be most at the cutting edge of thought among respected Catholic moralists. He calls for a change in the Catholic Church's teaching on the absolute indissolubility of marriage, but insists that "indissolubility remains the imperative goal of every true Christian marriage" (p. 76). The arguments presently urged for readmitting divorced and remarried Catholics to reception of the sacraments are equally pertinent, C. contends, to building a case for allowing remarriage to take place. These arguments are three: (1) the sin against indissolubility is not unforgivable; (2) divorce rather than remarriage constitutes the sin against indissolubility, and once the first marriage is truly dead indissolubility is rather a moot question; (3) the Church will be seen in its role of showing mercy and forgiveness (p. 84). C.'s

eschatological perspective is finally determinative in his dissatisfaction with retaining the theory of absolute indissolubility while advocating in practice a tolerance of divorce and remarriage. In the only world we know, the fulness of the eschaton is not yet realized; this limitation of the present affects the objective understanding of marriage. In this perspective indissolubility is a goal promised by the marriage partners in hope, but it might be unattainable (p. 105). "Christian marital love in this world remains the love of pilgrim Christians who have not yet come to the fulness of love" (p. 104).

Regarding euthanasia, C. suggests that there is no longer an overriding moral difference between passive euthanasia (omitting or terminating use of extraordinary means) and active euthanasia (positive intervention to bring about death) once the dying process has begun. Recognizing the difficulty involved and the danger of abuse, he nevertheless practically identifies the dying process "with the time that means can be discontinued as useless but having in mind such means as respirators, intravenous feeding, etc." (p. 160).

C.'s treatment of the history of the principle of double effect and of Ramsey's thought in relationship to traditional Roman Catholic natural-law theory requires sharper focus and clearer execution. For a book of this kind, there is remarkably little internal repetition. Comparative analysis of various chapters, however, and a sense of C.'s theological development would be facilitated if the dates of the original composition of the articles were indicated. Sometimes C.'s conclusions provoke more than his arguments convince. This at least says something about the nature of Christian morality: there is as much art to it as there is science. Keeping the gospel alive and rendering it redemptive is, at root, always a work of grace.

St. Joseph's College, Phila.

VINCENT J. GENOVESI, S.J.

DEATH: THE RIDDLE AND THE MYSTERY. By Eberhard Jüngel. Translated from the German by Iain & Ute Nicol. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975. Pp. 141. \$6.95.

To a large extent it would appear that the sciences of psychology and cultural anthropology have captured the monopoly on death literature over the past decade (cf. especially the writings of Elisabeth Kübler-Ross and Ernest Becker). In the field of theological thought, where there have been significant efforts by Protestant theologians to reformulate the centrality of eschatology (Pannenberg and Braaten among others), the concern has been the meaning of the eschata in the mind of Jesus. Catholic theology has had to be content with such now-dated works as Ladislaus Boros' *The Mystery of Death* and Karl Rahner's *On the Theology of Death*. In brief, we are faced with a paucity of theological

insight into the death phenomenon.

Within this context we now possess in J.'s book the beginning of a balanced theological response to the recurring question, what is the meaning of death? Does the Christian theologian have something to offer to contemporary man confronted by his own unique problems regarding death? Not only is this book a beginning in the quest of an answer, it is a significant step in the right direction if we are ever to overcome the dominant stress on only the present moment of existence; for if the much-needed role of the eschaton in theology is to become actualized in the existential order, man must thoroughly reassess his attitudes toward death as the last and universal moment of truth in this world.

J. delineates the meaning of death in two parts. First, it is seen as a too pervasive riddle; death still leaves us speechless and helpless. The startling fact is that after many centuries of growth in knowledge, man nevertheless faces his own moment of dying as a more alien reality than ever, obscured in personal anxiety and obliterated in social reality (I would add that this thought is probably more pronounced in Western cultural forms). Is it any wonder that Christians are yet to be convinced that death is to be defeated, as our Scriptures so eminently attest? Furthermore, J. presents a strong case against the Platonic emphasis in Christianity that views death as the soul's release from the body. The central doctrine of resurrection of the dead is quite literally rendered superfluous in such a setting; it becomes a mere addendum.

In Part 2, death is presented as a mystery which has its roots in Scripture. J. concisely sets forth the history of the various biblical approaches, but underlying their apparent diversity he finds a definite genetic unfolding. From the OT's attitude regarding life as a blessing and death as a curse (Dt 30:19) to Job's (19:25-27) insistence upon the perduring excellence of man's relationship to the God who surpasses the alternatives of life and death, we have a preparation for that attitude which becomes fully apparent in the NT: hope in resurrection of the dead. What we give witness to as Christians is man's unrelenting drive toward relationship with God—a relation which remains unbroken even in death. The sign and the assurance of this fact are to be found in the events surrounding the Easter Jesus: man gains victory over death.

My reaction to the general lines of J.'s thought is enthusiastic endorsement; this book provides a reasonable appreciation of the religious element in death. However, in the far-reaching consequences of such an approach there is much work to be done by theologians, but perhaps even more in our pulpits. Many large issues are raised in this small book, and I feel constrained to comment on two in particular that demand further examination. The first concerns the individual's appro-

priation of the religious meaning in death. J. would contend that faith is the needed element, but what quickly becomes clear is that J.'s appropriation of faith is no better than the classical Lutheran approach; in many ways the book is a reiteration of the traditional doctrine of justification *sola fide*. In a wider scope J. would contend that the basic subject matter for any theological enquiry is the individual's faith in God. I believe that most theologians today would be more comfortable in balancing such a subjective approach with a historical and objective centering on the criteria of the Christian fact itself (cf. David Tracy's *Blessed Rage for Order*). J.'s faith concept betrays too much of an existential leap into the dark. Could it not be better conceived in light of a knowledge that will do justice to the basic dignity of questioning man? Admittedly, the answers of faith will look ridiculous to empirical man, but this only points to our need to enlarge epistemological concerns.

Also, the question why the resurrection of Jesus should still be significant to contemporary man needs greater exploration. The answer will not be found in an imputed-faith concept based on the fact of Jesus' divinity; it must be found in the hope that he has shown to us precisely because he was human. To be convinced of this, we must study not only the complicated question of the mind of Jesus but, more importantly for us at least, the values he fostered in his heart.

I recommend this book to serious students of eschatology: it points us well into the direction of our theological quest into death. I hope others will expand on the same theme.

St. Paul Seminary, Minn.

JEROME M. DITTBERNER

CHARISMATIC RENEWAL AND THE CHURCHES. By Kilian McDonnell. New York: Seabury, 1976. Pp. 202. \$8.95.

Theological method today increasingly shows two characteristics that mark it as particularly contemporary: an interdisciplinary scope and a reflection that begins with Christian practice, with the concrete historical situation. These two qualities characterize this study of what has come to be called "the charismatic renewal."

McDonnell draws from recent history of Christian ecumenism, from psychology, and to a lesser extent from sociology and cultural anthropology, to examine the pentecostal-charismatic movement. The interdisciplinary quality of the research makes the conclusions, and the entire study, no less theological; it stands, in fact, as theology at its interdisciplinary best.

The book centers on the phenomenon of speaking in tongues. At first glance this might seem a mistaken focus. As M. points out, "the issue is not tongues. . . . Speaking in tongues is not what the pentecostal-

charismatic movement is all about. To contend that it is would be to give a caricature of it" (p. 11). The whole question of tongues, nevertheless, provides the most suitable and convenient focal point for an interdisciplinary study. Not a central theological issue (though surely important and interesting), speaking in tongues does hold a central place in psychological and sociological studies of pentecostalism and charismatic renewal, and it has been historically a central factor in the discussion in the Christian churches of the pentecostal-charismatic renewal that the churches have found themselves facing in so many of their members.

After a preliminary chapter that situates glossolalia, tongue-speaking, in context theologically, psychologically, and sociologically, M. devotes a chapter to the social psychology of religious movements as applied to pentecostalism and the charismatic renewal. Various theories (e.g., "deprivation" and "disorganization" theories) are discussed and evaluated. There follows a long and fascinating chronologically-ordered description, based on the official investigations and documents, of the reactions of the "main-line" Christian denominations to the pentecostal-charismatic movements in their ranks. The general trend on the part of the more liturgical churches (Lutheran, Presbyterian, Episcopal, Roman Catholic) from 1960 to the present is from great caution and even rejection to a critical and responsible approval. Perhaps most interesting is the crucial role of the Roman Catholic Church, especially of Pope Paul VI and of the North American bishops. On the other hand, some churches closest to the pentecostal tradition are seen to be often opposed to the movement.

Chaps. 4 and 5 describe the extensive recent psychological research into pentecostalism, especially into glossolalia. The material is masterfully organized, presented, and assessed. The final chapter is an over-all evaluation and recapitulation. Here M. pulls together all the psychological, sociological, and ecumenical strands to draw some general conclusions about the pentecostal-charismatic movement.

Theological reflection follows Christian practice; sometimes, as in this case, that practice needs to be investigated by the methods of the social sciences before theology can reflect with adequate knowledge and vision. And theological reflection on the pentecostal-charismatic experience, especially from a Roman Catholic perspective, is badly needed. Beginnings exist in the articles and books of theologians such as McDonnell, Heribert Mühlen, Francis A. Sullivan, Francis MacNutt, and Donald Gelpi; but Catholic theology of charismatic renewal, in spite of the great amount of high-level popular devotional writing, remains an underdeveloped area.

M. is a Benedictine theologian of Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minn. He has long been an outstanding intellectual figure in

matters regarding pentecostalism and charismatic renewal; here he makes an important, needed contribution to the theology of the pentecostal-charismatic movement and to theological method.

Gregorian University, Rome

ROBERT FARICY, S.J.

CHRISTOTHERAPY: HEALING THROUGH ENLIGHTENMENT. By Bernard J. Tyrrell. New York: Seabury, 1975. Pp. 204. \$7.95.

This "nontechnical sketch of the theology of healing" is about the process of being set free by experiencing truth—specifically, the truth of Christ as expressed in the biblical revelation. The book grows out of the author's own experience of prolonged psychic turmoil and anguish, culminating in a conversion and healing in which both psychotherapy and faith played a major role. Through the existential therapy of Dr. Thomas Hora, in conjunction with meditation on the Christian Scriptures, T. came to perceive "a key disharmony" in his existence. This enlightenment and the resulting decision to change brought to him (a Jesuit priest and a professor of philosophy) a serenity and joy he had not known before, and began an upward "spiral of transcendence" which continues to this day.

This personal process is sketched, all too summarily, in T.'s Preface. Succeeding chapters offer a synthesis of insights derived from the writings of Hora and other contemporary therapists, from Bernard Lonergan (T.'s principal mentor), and from the NT, all aimed at providing the foundation for a psychotherapeutic approach based on Christian revelation. Chap. 1 presents four modes or stages of "healing through enlightenment": existential diagnosis, existential discernment, conversion, and mysticism. Later chapters lead the reader through "a dialectic of therapies," which include Frankl's logotherapy and Glasser's reality therapy in addition to the existential therapy of Hora and others. T. draws from each principles which have significant resonances with the teachings of the NT. Chap. 4 proposes a process of "mind-fasting" (a voluntary turning of attention away from evil, illusion, and self-preoccupation) and its positive complement, "spirit-feasting" (or learning to live on every word that comes from God). The final chapters relate Christotherapy to the experience of death and resurrection, and describe the achievement of liberation through self-transcendence in the service of others.

In an era when endless varieties of psychic salvation are produced and marketed, from mind-control and rolfing to synthetic religions and sexual self-stimulation, the sanity and depth of T.'s book are very appealing. Not least among its virtues are the modesty and restraint with which he puts forth his views, and the inclusiveness of his approach. Such a synthesis of Christianity and psychotherapy is obviously

very much needed. Unfortunately, T.'s book falls shy, it seems to me, of communicating fully the experience of the process it attempts to analyze. A few case histories, even a more detailed account of T.'s own sickness and conversion, would give a more concrete notion of what "Christotherapy" is. Without them it remains too general to be practiced or even clearly understood. David Burrell acutely observes that, for all the stress placed on explanation and analysis by philosophers of science, "in fact the bulk of scientific literature is given over to describing what is happening, to teaching us how to see." Christotherapy is clearly a name for the process by which T. himself was taught "how to see"; what his book needs is to include more of the same eye-opening process.

University of Detroit

JUSTIN J. KELLY, S.J.

PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION. By Heije Faber. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976. Pp. 338. \$13.95.

In a field as permeated with pitfalls as the psychology of religion, it is not surprising that there should be a high incidence of bad books. I do not necessarily mean badly written, but books filled with wrong, bizarre, misguided, and inadequate conceptualizations. The history of the interdisciplinary interaction between psychology and religious thought is fraught with such unfortunate episodes. Consequently, when a book appears that is conceptually sound, such a "good" book deserves to be saluted. Faber's book is such a contribution. Despite faults, some of which I will sketch out, F. has succeeded in providing a clear, systematic, workmanlike presentation of perhaps the most important point of view in the psychological understanding of religious phenomena. In this light the book can be effectively used as a clear, competently written textbook to the psychology of religion and can be warmly recommended as such.

The book does have its shortcomings. To begin with, it is essentially a book about books. F. reviews some of the history of the psychology of religion from a psychoanalytic perspective. He does this by selecting some of the key books written in the history of this movement, synthesizing their major argument, offering some evaluative criticism of his own, then indicating the contribution each has made to the understanding of religious phenomena. Consequently, the style is didactic, somewhat stilted and pedantic. Throughout, F.'s point of view is substantially correct, the argumentation is clear, and in general he maintains a balanced and reasonable perspective.

The second portion is perhaps the more valuable and the more useful. F. attempts to apply a psychoanalytic developmental perspective to the understanding of religious phenomena and tries to indicate that the level of psychic development affects the patterns of religious experience

expressed within a specific cultural matrix and that the developmental outcome in terms of the level of psychic integration of inner determinants and cultural perspectives can effect important determining influences on the quality and character of religious ideas.

This point of view is of extreme importance as a vehicle for advancing clarification and deepening understanding of the psychology of religion, but F.'s treatment of it is riddled with weaknesses. In the first place, his theoretical perspective is somewhat limited in that he embeds his theory in an analytic instinct theory and a correlative ego psychology. He leans heavily on the Freudian instinctual phases of development to provide descriptive categories, but seems more or less mired in these categories. Many of the pseudoclinical descriptions seem reminiscent of the types of character descriptions given by early analysts (Abraham and others), which suffered from a restrictive correlation with instinctual categories. Such characterologies have of necessity given way to more nuanced and amplified characterizations in the psychoanalytic clinical armamentarium.

The primary theoretical orientation is that of Erik Erikson, particularly in his notion of identity. It must be said that Erikson's contributions have been extremely creative, stimulating, and seminal in their influence on analytic thinking. However, the work of clinical assimilation and clarification and consolidation of his ideas with other realms of analytic theory remains to be done. F.'s overly literal and sometimes constrained adherence to Eriksonian categories gives his argument a somewhat stilted and dated perspective. Even since the advancement of Erikson's notion about identity, analytic theory has moved on to further ranges of meaningful reflection and careful theoretical and clinical study, which have given rise to theoretical resources that find no place in F.'s account. One can list the developments in object relations, the theory of narcissism, and the evolving conceptualization and reformulation of analytic concepts of the metapsychology of the self. All these areas have been busily productive in the last few years and lend considerable nuance and depth to the account of psychic functioning entertained by contemporary analysts. These elements are, however, not to be found in F.'s reconstructions.

One last point of difficulty deserves to be mentioned, since it is a criticism that F. himself brings to the fore, yet fails to measure up to. He points out that too much of the literature of the psychology of religion has been about religion in general, and that what is badly needed is a redirection of the energies of psychologists to an exploration and investigation of concrete individual existent religious experiences. But throughout F.'s own account it remains a book about books and a book about ideas. In none of his effort does the wealth of experience of the

sensitive pastor or of the participant clinical observer shine through. But even if he does not live up to his own criticism, it is perhaps unfair to take him to task for an important piece of work that no one else has effectively undertaken either. Rather, he is to be commended for a clear, correct, systematic, and sympathetic account of the effort of psychoanalytic theorists to understand the complexity of man's religious experience. Not only does he give us a clear and effective account, but his approach has the added benefit of bringing to our attention the important works of a series of Dutch and other European authors whose thoughts are otherwise unknown to American readers. These merits are not inconsiderable and are sufficient to recommend this work to interested students and workers in this very difficult, yet profoundly important, area of psychological endeavor.

Cambridge, Mass.

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

BODY AS SPIRIT: THE NATURE OF RELIGIOUS FEELING. By Charles Davis. New York: Seabury, 1976. Pp. 181. \$8.95.

Davis has written a book which deserves to be read with serious consideration and mature reflection. He has taken an important and difficult step in the direction of introducing the subject of human affectivity into the realm of theological discourse. His attempt is to reduce the chasm that yawns between the experience of man's physical and emotional experience and the abstract realms of theological theorizing that take place within the Christian schools of theological reflection. His book can be usefully taken as an eloquent plea for the reduction of that gaping vacuity.

There can be little doubt that D.'s basic argument is quite correct. It is often appalling to the psychologically trained and attuned mind that theological reflection betrays so little sensitivity or awareness of the basic issues embedded in human affectivity as well as basic human motivation. Theological reflection tends to be carried on in a rather abstract context, in which any advertence to basically human experience falls under the rubric of a theological anthropology which is governed by somewhat abstract and idealized philosophical concepts that speak little if at all to the rudiments of human emotional experience. On the other hand, particularly within this century, scientific psychology and psychiatry have carried on a rich and probing exploration of precisely this aspect of human experience and have been able to arrive at a significant understanding which is continually evolving and gaining an ever-increasing breadth and depth in its capacity to understand and articulate that experience.

But these two realms of human endeavor have touched only tangentially at a few precious points, and have hardly reached a level of

mutual communication and understanding in which their mutually reinforcing insights might lead to reciprocal penetration and enrichment of their respective areas of discourse. Psychologists and psychiatrists, of course, have their own work to do—and quite consuming work it is. Theologians on their part seem to feel that they have little or no need of input from or exchange with the human sciences (I would include not merely the psychological sciences but the social sciences as well). There are undoubtedly complex issues which need to be engaged even in the understanding of this disparity, but in large measure it may have to do with the set of mind that characterizes the respective disciplines. The theologian seeks a more or less static a priori concept of human nature which he takes as a given in his theological reflection. The psychologist, on the other hand, has no such static concept and is forced to approach his reflection on man's nature from a more strictly empirical, constantly shifting and evolving perspective. If the theologian recognizes the dynamic properties of man's nature, he is generally unwilling to explore or immerse himself, even conceptually, in the implications of that basic proposition.

D., however, has made the attempt, and it is a courageous one for which he is to be warmly applauded. His approach, however, gives rise to certain cautions. While it is refreshing and cautiously optimistic to have a theologian acknowledging the necessity for understanding and integrating the basic nature of man's affective life within the theological frame of reference, it is nonetheless somewhat disconcerting to have him resort to the sort of approach to affectivity as represented in the work of Janov and the primal scream. D. is not only recognizing and acknowledging the relevance of affectivity; he is in fact proselytizing for it, and unfortunately proselytizing for a brand of affectivity which has its inherent risks. It is one thing to place the theological endeavor in contact with human affective experience; it is quite another to push the theological orientation in the direction of an undisciplined, regressive, and therefore potentially dangerous expression of that affective life.

D. presents himself as the apostle of affective spontaneity and addresses himself at various points to an asceticism of spontaneity, which he contrasts and opposes to an older asceticism of restraint and discipline. While there is merit in cultivating the notion of spontaneity, it seems that in trying to make a case D. has unfortunately overstated it. The argument is one which has worked itself out through many decades of psychoanalytic experience. Within an earlier and more limited analytic perspective, it was thought that the origins of neurosis lay within the restraints and repressions imposed by an overly rigid and punitive superego, particularly on the expression of sexual impulses. Consequently, the early direction of analytic efforts was toward the undoing of

such repressions and softening of superego rigidities. Thus there evolved a philosophy of license, spontaneity, and freedom of expression, which has given rise to a caricature of psychoanalysis in the popular mind.

However, it was not very long before analysts began to discover that even more serious difficulties were involved in the failure of restraint and control of instinctual drives. The philosophy of derepression consequently had to give way to a more subtle and sophisticated form of ego psychology, which required a disciplining and strengthening of the capacities of the ego to achieve more effective levels of realistic adaptation and a growth of autonomous capacities to function more effectively and more maturely, particularly in interpersonal relationships. Thus the spontaneity toward which analytic efforts directed themselves became much more a disciplined spontaneity, which allowed itself free and gratifying expression within the constraints imposed by a mature capacity for adaptive functioning and for the involvement in and sustaining of mature and mutually gratifying object relationships. It is this latter aspect of man's affective life that I find missing in D.'s account.

But there is an inherent dialectic in all this that must in a sense play itself out. If D.'s account enunciates an extreme view and an emphasis on the capacity for undisciplined and unrestrained affective expression and spontaneity, he may well be articulating the antithesis through which a more meaningful and maturely productive synthesis may be reached. In so doing, he is certainly in tune with the times. Contemporary religious experience has followed the swing of the pendulum to an extreme of affective expressiveness and spontaneous self-revelation and openness which, to the psychologically disciplined mind, must be too often regarded as neurotically motivated and basically unhealthy in its impulse. However, the swing of the pendulum cannot be stopped, and the natural forces of dialectic may have to play themselves out before we can reach a more mature and integrated capacity for meaningful religious experience. In this sense D.'s book may provide a meaningful contribution to that progression.

In any case, the value and importance of what D. has to say and the centrality of the basic issue to which he addresses himself should not be overlooked or confused with those aspects of his thesis which may be overstated. From this perspective his chapters on death and the inhumanity of evil can be read with particular profit. (The pricing is a perfect outrage.)

Cambridge, Mass.

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

ROMANTICISM AND RELIGION: THE TRADITION OF COLERIDGE AND WORDSWORTH IN THE VICTORIAN CHURCH. By Stephen Prickett. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1976. Pp. 295. \$21.95.

What happened in English theology between the seventeenth and

nineteenth centuries has not yet been adequately explored. On the even larger scene of Catholic theology in general, there are still many unanswered questions about the development, or lack thereof, of Christian thought in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Although this book deals specifically and almost exclusively with nineteenth-century British theology, it will be of immense value to those concerned with the larger questions mentioned above.

In recent years much writing has focused on Coleridge's role as a religious thinker. P. draws on this scholarship and breaks new ground by tracing the impact not only of Coleridge but of his friend and fellow poet William Wordsworth on the religious life of the Victorians. He deals principally with Newman and F. D. Maurice, but gives attention also to Matthew Arnold, John Keble, and George MacDonald. He first expands on an idea set forth by John Coulson in *Newman and the Common Tradition* (1971) showing that Coleridge's theory of the fiduciary use of language and Wordsworth's assertion of the value of "feeling" gave strength to the belief that the language of religion and of poetry is distinct but not separate. Basic to both men was "bifocal" vision, a commitment to a reality transcending space and time that need have no fear of being hauled before the bar of reason (although Wordsworth's commitment to anything like the Christian idea of the supernatural is very dubious). What P. moves toward in these early chapters is the validity, not to say the necessity, of the imagination in both the aesthetic and the religious experience.

What is common, then, to both Newman and Coleridge, in spite of apparent differences and explicit disclaimers on Newman's part, is a vision of the Church as a "poetic" reality and a belief in a fiduciary use of language that grows out of such a community of belief. The parting of traditions (literal vs. poetic) is witnessed in Arnold and MacDonald. MacDonald, a minor novelist but writer of memorable fairy tales, transmitted the Coleridgean tradition to twentieth-century writers such as Charles Williams, J. R. R. Tolkien, and C. S. Lewis.

The chapters on Wordsworth and Coleridge are excellent. They are provocative and reveal a penetrating grasp of both writers. As P. moves on to Newman, Keble, and Maurice, the book's strength becomes a source of weakness. He covers much ground and at times the reader is left wanting more depth and analysis in spite of the convincing overview. This inevitable sketchiness in treating some points should prompt interested scholars to pursue avenues P. has opened up. One glaring weakness is P.'s failure to use or even mention M. H. Abram's magisterial *Natural Supernaturalism* (1971) when dealing with Arnold, Carlyle, and others who rejected the Coleridgean tradition and opted for the complete secularization of religion. In his treatment of Owen Barfield and his friends (Williams, Tolkien, and Lewis), mention of Robert

Reilly's *Romantic Religion* (1971) is conspicuously absent.

Some annoying inaccuracies also detract from the book's over-all excellence. Thus, Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection* appeared in 1825, not 1823 (p. 123); the references on the bottom of p. 112 are definitely wrong and some others seem inaccurate; a mannered British unfamiliarity with American centers of learning is expressed in such gaucheries as referring to the "University of Princeton" and locating Harvard University in "Harvard, Mass."

None of these points, however, should distract the reader from the book's real value. Of special note are the chapters on Maurice's critique of Newman's theory of development and of religious assent, the very persuasive exposition of how the later Newman became more and more Coleridgean (the best explanation to date of Coleridge's influence on Newman), and the relating of this British tradition to the larger Continental traditions of Schleiermacher and Kierkegaard. The book stands on its own as a fine contribution to the history of theology, but perhaps more importantly, through its focus on Coleridge's literary and linguistic tradition (that words are not "things" but "living powers"), it suggests that aesthetics and theology have drifted too far apart in our time, too, and that both are the poorer for that separation.

University of Detroit

PHILIP C. RULE, S.J.

SHORTER NOTICES

BASIC TOOLS OF BIBLICAL EXEGESIS: A STUDENT'S MANUAL. By Stanley B. Marrow. *Subsidia biblica* 2. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976. Pp. 91. \$4.40.

Marrow's manual achieves its modest purpose admirably: it introduces students to the basic tools of biblical exegesis. As M. states clearly, this is not a manual of methodology for biblical exegesis or an introductory bibliography to biblical studies. Such aids already exist. This manual is designed to help the student entering biblical exegesis, whether in preparation for the ministry, as a part of training in theology, or as a propaedeutic to scientific exegesis, to acquire a firsthand acquaintance with the more basic tools of biblical exegesis. It is a small, handy, useful book, within the price range of the average student. As such, it is necessarily selective, but M. has

selected adroitly; no basic tools are omitted nor is there any bias about what the initial steps in exegesis require. English-speaking students will be glad to find English translations of works provided whenever possible.

The manual consists of a descriptive introduction to the tools of biblical exegesis, with many entries followed by selective reviews assessing their value. The descriptions are concise and straightforward. The manual lists the basic bibliographical sources for biblical exegesis, the texts and versions of the Hebrew OT, the LXX, the NT, Gospel synopses, and the main Latin and modern-language versions. Then it lists the grammars of OT Hebrew, biblical Aramaic, and biblical Greek, followed by Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek lexica, and dictionaries of the Bible. Then follow concordances to