

# theological studies

VOLUME 38

NUMBER 2

JUNE 1977

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

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### ARTICLES

- The Theological Significance of Rudolf Bultmann  
*P. Joseph Cahill* ..... 231
- Jesus Christ, the *Kyriakos Anthrōpos*  
*Alois Grillmeier, S.J.* ..... 275
- Johannine Communities behind the Fourth Gospel: Georg  
Richter's Analysis  
*A. J. Mattill, Jr.* ..... 294
- The Bhagavad Gita as Way-Shower to the Transcendental  
*John Moffitt* ..... 316

### NOTES

- Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran  
*Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* ..... 332
- Rawls, Nozick, and the Search for Social Justice  
*John P. Langan, S.J.* ..... 346

BOOK REVIEWS ..... 359

- KÜNG, H.: *On Being a Christian*  
*La notion biblique de Dieu* (ed. J. Coppens)  
 ORR, W. F., and J. A. WALTHER: *I Corinthians*  
 PAGELS, E. H.: *The Gnostic Paul*  
 GOPPELT, L.: *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* 2  
 MARSHALL, I. H.: *The Origins of New Testament Christology*  
 PEUKERT, H.: *Wissenschaftstheorie—Handlungstheorie—Fundamentale Theologie*  
 SELBY, P.: *Look for the Living*  
 BERKOUWER, G. C.: *The Church*  
 WARNER, M.: *Alone of All Her Sex: The Myth and Cult of the Virgin Mary*  
 HODGSON, P. C.: *New Birth of Freedom*  
 MARTY, M. E.: *A Nation of Behavers*  
 VAN DIJK, S. J. P., O.F.M.: *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VII and Related Documents*  
 PURCELL, M.: *Papal Crusading Policy*  
 LA BROUSSE, O. DE, O.P., et al.: *Latran V et Trente*  
 LOEWENICH, W. VON: *Luther's Theology of the Cross*  
 RYAN, T. R., C.P.P.S.: *Orestes A. Brownson*  
 GREEN, C. J.: *The Sociality of Christ and Humanity*  
 PELOTTE, D. E., S.S.S.: *John Courtney Murray: Theologian in Conflict*  
 MINUS, P. M., Jr.: *The Catholic Rediscovery of Protestantism*  
 GILL, R.: *The Social Context of Theology*  
 ATTARD, M. V., O.C.A.R.M.: *Compromise in Morality*  
 GUINDON, A.: *The Sexual Language*  
 BHARATI, A.: *The Light at the Center*  
*Women and Catholic Priesthood* (ed. A. M. Gardiner, S.S.N.D.)

SHORTER NOTICES ..... 402

- PITKIN, R. E.: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* 10: Index LOHSE, E.: *The New Testament Environment* NEILL, S.: *Jesus through Many Eyes* MINEAR, P. S.: *To Heal and to Reveal* McNAMARA, M.: *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church* HAYES, J. H.: *Son of God to Superstar* VERHALEN, P. A.: *Faith in a Secularized World* SWIDLER, L., ed.: *The Eucharist in Ecumenical Dialogue* LUCAS, J. R.: *Freedom and Grace* FRUCHON, P.: *Existence humaine et révélation* GOVAERT, L.: *Kardinal Neumanns Mariologie und sein persönlicher Werdegang* HEBBLETHWAITE, P.: *The Runaway Church* CHESNUT, R. C.: *Three Monophysite Christologies* WHITE, R. C., tr.: *Melito of Sardis: Sermon "On the Passover"* ABATE, G., and G. LUISETTO: *Codici e manoscritti della Biblioteca Antoniana* COLOMER, E.: *De la edad media al renacimiento* MOORE, W. L., ed.: *In primum librum Sententiarum annotiunculae D. Iohanne Eckio* LOESCHEN, J. R.: *Wrestling with Luther* KINDER, A. G.: *Casiodoro de Reina* BARTNIK, C. S.: *Teilhardsowska wizja dziejów* HUNSINGER, G., ed.: *Karl Barth and Radical Politics* FERRÉ, F.: *Shaping the Future* WEBER, L. J.: *Who Shall Live?* QUEBEDEAUX, R.: *The New Charismatics* DONOVAN, P.: *Religious Language*

BOOKS RECEIVED ..... 417

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.

Our June 1977 issue is quite varied: an appraisal of Bultmann, a study in patristic Christology, a "new look" at John's Gospel, a facet of Hindu spirituality, the new Enoch literature from Qumran, and an appraisal of two significant books on justice.

**The Theological Significance of Rudolf Bultman** is the result of a happy coincidence. When Bultmann died last July, I wrote to P. JOSEPH CAHILL at the University of Alberta in Canada, suggesting a lengthy reflection stressing Bultmann's significance for the theologian. Two weeks later came a reply from the Philipps-Universität in Marburg, where Cahill is completing intensive work on Bultmann, to advise me that he had just been thinking of doing "a theological article on Bultman for *TS*." The result lies before you, a genetic and a systematic analysis, concluding with a summary of a hitherto unpublished article on theology as science. Cahill's competence is unquestioned. S.T.D. from the Gregorian (1960), he is professor in Alberta's Department of Religious Studies. Soon to be published in his *Theology and the History of Religions*; he has finished a complete Bultmann bibliography, is editing a collection of Bultmann's essays with introductions, and is preparing a genetic and historical study of Bultmann.

**Jesus Christ, the Kyriakos Anthrōpos**, is a dense but rewarding piece of research highly important for Christology. A "singular term for the designation of the human reality of Jesus" in the post-Nicene and post-Chalcedonian periods is examined for the first time in its full detail; the conclusion is a masterly summary of the evidence. ALOIS GRILLMEIER, S.J., professor of dogmatics and the history of dogma at the Hochschule St. Georgen, Frankfurt-Main, may well be the ranking expert on the history of Christology. Scores of publications have been crowned by *Mit ihm und in ihm* (1975) and the second edition of *Christ in Christian Tradition* 1 (1975). Last month the University of Mainz awarded him an honorary doctorate in theology.

**Johannine Communities behind the Fourth Gospel** records and evaluates the effort of Georg Richter, a brilliant student of Anton Vögtle, to explain certain crucial problems of eschatology in John by four phases of theological development within the Johannine communities and three resultant strata of Christological and eschatological deposits. A. J. MATTILL, JR., Ph.D. in biblical studies from Vanderbilt (1959), taught the Bible for seventeen years in college and seminary; he is now devoting most of his time to NT research, especially Luke-Acts (date and eschatology). His chief "existential interest" is in the effect of higher criticism on Christian faith.

**The Bhagavad Gita as Way-Shower to the Transcendental** interprets the four disciplines which a remarkable Hindu scripture suggests for achieving communion, through grace, with the Transcendental, then

initiates discussion of the relationship of all this to Christian spirituality, specifically by searching out counterparts to the four ways in the Christian tradition. JOHN MOFFITT was a probationer in the Ramakrishna Order 1939-49, novice 1949-59, monk 1959-63; he served under Swami Nikhilananda at the Ramakrishna-Vivekananda Center in New York, where he helped edit N.'s many translations and original works. A Roman Catholic since 1963, he is poetry editor for *America*; he has published four volumes of poems, has edited two volumes relating to East-West religions, and has written a number of articles on the Hindu-Christian encounter (two in *TS*, 1966 and 1969). His contacts with Hinduism, Buddhism, and Zen have gradually convinced him that these religions are in some way in direct contact with the person of "the subsistent Intelligence or Logos" who was from the beginning.

*Implications of the New Enoch Literature from Qumran* uses "an extremely important book" by J. T. Milik as a springboard to reveal the significance of this discovery for students of intertestamental literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Aramaic language, and NT theology. JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J., Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins (1956), is currently professor of NT in the Department of Biblical Studies within Catholic University's School of Religious Studies. His area of special competence is the NT and its Semitic background, with particular reference to the Aramaic language and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Author of several books and numerous scholarly articles, he published in 1975 *Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*; two books are in the press; he is preparing the commentary on Luke for the Anchor Bible.

*Rawls, Nozick, and the Search for Social Justice* appraises two works of political philosophy that "bid fair to occupy a dominant place in the development of political thought in our time"—books that should interest Christians concerned for social justice and the cause of freedom. JOHN P. LANGAN, S.J., doctoral candidate in philosophy at the University of Michigan, is a research associate at the Woodstock Theological Center, Washington, D.C., and is currently researching philosophical and theological concepts of freedom and human rights.

I would call your attention to the Instructions for Contributors published in our March 1977 issue. This stems from an effort on the part of a handful of scholarly journals, biblical and theological, to produce and follow a uniform style sheet, long recognized as a basic need by editors and authors alike. *TS* will conform to this set of instructions in the main, departing from it only on a small number of individual items. Prospective contributors and others may obtain reprints by sending thirty-five cents in stamps, for postage and handling, to *Theological Studies*, Room 401, 3520 Prospect St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20007.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J.  
Editor

## BOOK REVIEWS

ON BEING A CHRISTIAN. By Hans Küng. Translated by Edward Quinn. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976. Pp. 720. \$12.95.

"This book is extra-ordinary in many respects" (p. 5). Thus does Küng introduce his work, which wants to be an apology for the Christian faith suitable to the modern mind. And so it is: a puzzling conglomerate of modernity and obsolescence, of deep insights and surprising mediocrity. The major concerns and articulations are not new; they are borrowed from the older apologetics of Neo-Scholastic textbooks. Like these, K. wishes to establish the rationality of belief in God, the originality of Christianity over against the world religions, the superiority of Jesus over the prophets and founders of religions, the higher dignity of the manner of his death over theirs, the credibility of the NT, the reasonableness of Christian belief, its compatibility with basic rationality. Unlike his predecessors in the tradition of apologetics, K. also wishes to establish the congruity of the Christian faith with contemporary philosophical opinions, scientific advances, social concerns, political ambitions. He does not see his task as defending the classical dogmas or doctrines. Indeed, he discards several of them, especially in Mariology. His purpose is to lead rationally to a decision for Jesus Christ. Yet K.'s apologetics differs also considerably from the method of immanence which grew out of the Modernist crisis. Instead of leading people to analyze human motivations and discover the congruence of these with Christian doctrines, K. makes a sort of Copernican revolution; he locates the credibility of Christianity in its ability to reform itself in line with the demands of the contemporary mind. While remaining at a critical distance from secularism, he adopts from it all that will not compromise the heart of the gospel.

To reach this purpose, K. chooses an inductive method, which he briefly describes several times. On belief in God he writes: "The experience of reality accessible to every man will be inductively elucidated, in order . . . to place him before a rationally responsible *decision* which claims more than merely pure reason, which claims in fact the whole man" (p. 69). On belief in Jesus: "It is better—as originally—not to postulate and deduce theologically from above divine sonship, pre-existence, creation mediatorship, incarnation, but—as we are attempting to do here—to proceed by way of induction and interpretation from below" (p. 449).

This purpose and this method explain the plan of the volume. Christianity is challenged by modern humanisms (A-I; the division of the book is not by chapters), against which the Christian posits "the other dimen-

sion," God (A-II), but finds himself challenged by the world religions (A-III). K. then explains "what is special to Christianity," namely, Christ (B-I); he examines the relation of Christianity to myth (B-II-1), to the NT (B-II-2), to history (B-II-3), and to Judaism (B-III). Section C is focused on Christology, showing the social context of Jesus' life (C-I), his devotion to "God's cause" (C-II), which he equates with man's cause (C-III), his unavoidable conflict with the Jewish hierarchy (C-IV), the "new life" or resurrection which follows his death (C-V), several theological interpretations of the death and of the origin of Jesus (C-VI), and the emergence of the Church as a "community of faith" in Jesus (C-VII). The last section examines critically the "practice" of the Church (D-I) and the norms of being human (D-II); it defines "being Christian as being radically human" (D-III), ending on this summary: "By following Jesus Christ man in the world of today can truly humanly live, act, suffer and die: in happiness and unhappiness, life and death, sustained by God and helpful to men" (p. 602).

This conclusion, which suggests that, by being Christian, man does what he would do anyway without being Christian, reflects two aspects of K.'s apologetics: his interpretation of the heart of the gospel, and his systematic minimalism.

The gospel is Christ. It is not a theory or a doctrine about him, not a belief or a piety focused on him, but the man Jesus himself, understood to be the Christ by what, for lack of a better word, is called his resurrection. Beyond the religious titles that the later NT authors gave to Jesus, beyond the speculation about him, which is already advanced in the Johannine writings and the (unauthentic) Pauline literature, the Christian follows Jesus himself as he appears in the earlier NT, especially the Gospel of Mark and the (authentic) letters of Paul.

K., therefore, rightly places Christology at the center of apologetics. Who is Jesus? Born to very ordinary parents who opposed his mission, having brothers and sisters (K. rejects all dogmas on the Virgin Mary), Jesus is a wandering, uneducated Jewish layman who identifies with none of the parties active in the Judaism of his time; he is "indifferent to the most sacred traditions and institutions of the nation" (p. 252); expecting the reign of God soon, he organizes "feasts held in an atmosphere of joy, in which people celebrated their common membership of the future kingdom" (p. 323); in his prayer "Jesus constantly addresses God as *abba*" (p. 314); in his preaching he reverses the proportions of biblical religion by making man, rather than God, the center and norm of all things; because he has become "the public advocate of God and man" (p. 294), Jesus is on a collision course with official Judaism. His death on the cross is that of a blasphemer, condemned by the religion of his own people and feeling totally abandoned by God; but it is followed

by the disciples' experience of his "new life" (p. 343), which shows him to be God's representative among men and men's representative before God. The classical Christologies project this representativeness back to the times before Jesus was born, claiming that he pre-existed in God, giving him titles that he did not use, and calling him God. But true theology is not speculation about Jesus or about God; it is narration of Jesus' deeds and invitation to follow him, accompanied, however, by critical reflection (p. 418).

This Christology corresponds to a systematic minimalist option. K. uses Ockham's razor to uproot all triumphalism from Christian thought. The New Testament? It is only a historical collection. As in *The Church* (New York, 1967), K. takes as normative only what modern research considers to be early: Mark's Gospel is primordial; then Paul's letters. One should trust German scholarship as to what is early. 2 Thessalonians is "presumably not composed by Paul" (p. 392); Colossians and Ephesians are "of course" not from Paul (p. 543); the Johannine Gospel provides an answer "only in a very relative sense to the question of who the historical Jesus of Nazareth was" (p. 153); 1 Peter is "late, inauthentic" (p. 367); as for James, "that Hellenistic Jewish Christian, unknown to us" (p. 588), he is of little value compared to Paul. Indeed, K. is carried into a point-by-point comparison of Paul with Jesus: "Like Jesus, Paul . . ." (pp. 406-8): only Paul formulated the Christology that was implicit in Jesus' actions. The Pauline message "becomes the critical norm for the correct application of Christology" (p. 408). The titles of Jesus? In the NT they are only "honorific" (p. 384). They should now be reduced to something understandable to modern man, such as "mandatory," "plenipotentiary," "advocate," "spokesman," "representative," "deputy," "delegate" (p. 390). The doctrine of the Incarnation? Descending Christology eventually prevailed because "the idea was in the air" (p. 445), that is, the idea of pre-existence; but "we can no longer accept the mythical ideas of that age about a being descended from God, existing before time and beyond this world in a heavenly state" (p. 446). The doctrine of redemption? It is a mythical form of the belief that God "revealed all his com-passion in Jesus' Passion" (p. 435). The doctrine of the Trinity? It needs to be "discriminatingly interpreted for the present time" (p. 476); it should not impose belief in a pre-existent Logos; it should only assert the "co-ordination" (p. 476) of God and of Jesus as His representative, while "the Spirit is the presence of God and of the exalted Christ for the community of faith and the individual believer" (p. 477). The priesthood? Since Jesus was not a priest, Christianity is without a priesthood. In Hebrews the priesthood of the risen Jesus is only meant as a "radical criticism of the Jewish cult" (p. 424). Yet the "universal priesthood of *all* believers" is acceptable to Christians; but K.

understands this in the individual sense favored by Protestantism, not in the corporate sense given to "royal priesthood" in 2 Peter and Revelation: it "has as its concrete content the immediate access of everyone to God" (p. 487).

It is to be expected that K. will be accused of betraying the Catholic tradition. Yet this is not his intention. No doubt, he criticizes the Catholicism which has promoted "myths, legends, images and symbols," thus spreading "ignorance and obscurantism among the ordinary people" (p. 413); and he does seem arbitrary in his identification of several dogmas, especially in Mariology, with myth or legend. Yet K. recognizes Catholics as "the party of Cephas" (p. 501), and he defends the papal primacy—though not infallibility—both in its theory and in its historical achievements (pp. 494–502). In many ways, certainly, K. is close to Protestantism in its Lutheran and Calvinist forms; he is critical of their biblicism, yet he recognizes their Pauline inspiration and he sees Protestants as "the party of Paul, who is in fact the father of their community" (p. 501). This would, of course, be an unbelievable statement if we took "in fact" literally and historically. Furthermore, it ignores the Pelagianism which is predominant among American Protestants; and it pays no heed to the blatant contradiction between K.'s Christology and the *extra Calvinisticum*. But K., as we shall see, is not always consistent. In any case, he shows a special fondness for "the Free Churches"—which, however, he does not identify further—seen as "the party of Christ himself" (p. 501); this would be a surprising assessment if one did not suspect that these churches presumably come near to K.'s most questionable opinion that Paul's churches were "communities of free charismatic ministries" (p. 489).

K.'s great enemy is "Greek speculation" (p. 472). The "Eastern Orthodox would be the party of Apollos, explaining revelation in the light of the great tradition of Greek thought more spiritually, more thoughtfully, more profoundly and even more correctly than all the others" (p. 501). Here, as elsewhere, the intended irony does not quite come through. Yet it is undoubtedly there; for the Greek Church is that of the Cappadocians, who, as K. believes, introduced into theology a "formal logic" opposed to the NT (p. 474). The Trinitarian and Christological controversies of the Greeks went on "endlessly," becoming "more and more confused," ending with a "terminology" that is now "unintelligible" (p. 302). The Council of Ephesus made "ambiguous statements" (p. 448), presumably Cyril's anathematisms, although, as all historians know, these were not even endorsed by the Council. The Greeks were responsible for the Marian title *theotokos*, which K. rejects as having pagan overtones and Monophysite implications (p. 460). The "sublime Greek theology of redemption . . . is a Hellenization of the Christian



message of redemption and liberation with too many negative features" (p. 442); it makes the cross "accidental"; its concept of deification is "almost completely unintelligible today . . . means nothing at all," for our problem "is not the deification but the *humanization of man*" (p. 442). But is this an objective, dispassionate account of Greek theology? Is it not rather a demonstration of K.'s excessively limited Western theological horizon?

I have said that K. has deep insights. His description of the meaning of the cross I find truly valuable (pp. 396-402). It is less polemical, warmer, and more spiritually oriented than most of his volume; it has a pastoral and devotional tone that will appeal to many. Yet K.'s inductive method fails to find any reason why it is Jesus who becomes God's representative, rather than another of the innumerable innocents who were crucified under Roman law. In the absence of any higher status for Jesus than that of a crucified victim of Jewish religion and Roman government, Christianity seems quite arbitrary.

Yet K.'s understanding of the Resurrection is also helpful. "Resurrection means dying into God" (p. 359). "Death is man's affair, resurrection can only be God's" (p. 359). It implies a "radicalizing of faith in *God the Creator*" (p. 360). But K.'s account of the Resurrection is marred by his acceptance of a nonempty tomb for reasons that are particularly weak: "historical criticism has made the empty tomb a dubious factor and the conclusions of natural science have rendered it suspect" (p. 360). He should have added that contemporary philosophical reflection on the ties between the self and the body (in the perspective of Merleau-Ponty) makes the empty tomb a necessity for those who believe that Jesus who was raised is the same who died and was buried. In any case, the faith is not in the empty tomb, or in the apparitions, but in the raising of Jesus by the power of the Creator, "to whom the believer entrusts everything, even the ultimate, even the conquest of death" (p. 360). Here is the heart of the gospel. This is where K.'s interest lies. His is a *theologia crucis* taken to its logical extreme, where the only ultimate is Jesus' experience of the cross.

Presumably, this is also the reason why K.'s treatment of other questions is so careless.

K. is clearly not at home in comparative religion. He judges religions according to their concordance or nonconcordance with Christianity, with modern science, and with modern social aspirations: the religions think "unhistorically"; they entertain a "cyclical world picture" (pp. 106-7); they "contradict the modern spirit of occupational mobility" (p. 108). K. confuses Sankhya, an early system of Hindu philosophy, with Sankara's "classical Vedanta system" (p. 108). His treatment of Islam is quite unsatisfactory; his insistence on the Koran as a book descended

from heaven by dictation blinds him to the place of the Prophet as a man still felt as present in the actual life of devout Moslems. Above all, one misses a consideration of the Jewish religion. This is replaced, in B-III, with a discussion of Christian anti-Semitism; but that is another problem. K. even seems unaware that religious Judaism has evolved since the destruction of the second Temple: he blames the "Jewish worshipper" for needing a priest as mediator (p. 481). His listing of Simone Weil among "the great minds of Jewry of this century" (p. 171) ignores her philosophy and her violent attacks on Judaism, including the OT.

In general, the demonstration of K.'s theses is disqualified by deficiencies which may escape the casual reader, yet unavoidably undermine his seriousness as a theologian. K. is notoriously ungracious toward his favorite target, the Roman Curia: Pope Paul is "the Montini Pope" (p. 32); Vatican II's preparatory theological commission is said to have "twisted" Heb 4:15 ("tempted in all things as we are, but without sin") to mean "almost the opposite: without sin or ignorance" (p. 218): in reality, the text refers to Hebrews only for sin, not for ignorance. There is also a personal attack on the preaching of Cardinal Bengsch, Archbishop of Berlin, in the style of Kierkegaard vs. Bishop Martensen (p. 573); surely this was not essential to the argument.

K.'s information concerning modern science and philosophy is highly selective. He frequently alludes to Marxism and existentialism, but he shows no acquaintance with any form of linguistic studies or with structuralism. Yet this is fatal to much of his argumentation; for structuralism would object to his historical (diachronic) partitioning of the Gospels in favor of their literary (synchronic) integrity, and linguistic philosophy would question his trust that his own language, rather than the more traditional usages, effectively expresses transcendent belief. In ethnology, the most recent author with whom K. seems to be familiar is Lévy-Bruhl, who is by no means up to date. As for historical accuracy, K. is not demanding. Errors and half-truths abound. A few instances will suffice: Karl Barth reacted against "cultural Protestantism" and "the National Socialist ideology" "after the First World War" (p. 408); allusion is made to "the medieval, baroque tradition" (p. 518), evidently unknown to art historians; the "opinion of a member of the Roman Curia for many years on the Vatican" is reported, to the effect that in the Vatican "no one ever asks what Jesus did and said" (p. 513), but the person in question, who is named in a footnote, worked at the Vatican, in the Secretariat for Unity, for only five or six years. This sort of thing is all the more unpleasant as K. keeps urging the Church to practice "absolute truthfulness" (p. 456).

K. frequently contradicts himself or is inconsistent. He rejects miracles that would be against nature (pp. 229-31); yet he piously explains

that Peter walked on the water as long as he looked at Jesus, then sank when he stopped looking (p. 378). He insists that "a critical interpretation of Scripture" is necessary (p. 414); yet he interprets allegorically Jn 21:22 ("What is that to you?") as implying that Peter's and, by analogy, the pope's jurisdiction is not universal (pp. 499-500). He states that one cannot be certain if Jesus expected the kingdom "at his death or immediately after it"; and on the same page he affirms that Jesus and others "reckoned with the advent of God's reign in their lifetime" (p. 216).

Küng's theological horizon is excessively narrow. The German language accounts for more than 90% of his bibliographies. While the general bibliography at the end of the volume includes a few more English titles, he ignores French scholarship. No doubt, the translator could have made the bibliographies more useful to American readers. But he is to be congratulated for a very smooth translation. The index, however, is too incomplete to be useful.

All in all, Hans Küng is right. This is an extraordinary book. Impressive by its concerns and goals, it is arbitrary in its use of Scripture and often at fault in its historical scholarship. Its last sections—on the Church and on practice—add nothing to his previous writings besides a little more acrimony. Küng should have written a meditation on the cross and the raising of Jesus. His ambition to write a summa of apologetics for our times was clearly beyond his capacity.

*Methodist Theological School, Ohio*

GEORGE H. TAVARD

LA NOTION BIBLIQUE DE DIEU: LE DIEU DE LA Bible et le DIEU DES PHILOSOPHES. Edited by J. Coppens. *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium* 41. Gembloux: Duculot, 1976. Pp. 504. 1,100 fr. b.

This volume offers us the papers presented at the twenty-fifth annual meeting of biblical scholars in Louvain, a fitting testimonial for the jubilee of "les journées bibliques." The topic—the notion of God in the Bible—will be particularly welcome to systematic theologians, who will find here many papers by highly qualified participants on different aspects of this question. The two central sections contain articles on the notion of God in the OT (ten articles) and in the NT (ten articles). This is preceded by a short section of congratulatory messages and an account of the twenty-five years of these gatherings (1949-74). The fourth section contains several papers from the perspective of systematic theologians dealing with the question of God. The book concludes with a select bibliography of fifty pages.

An excellent article in the final section by A. Gesché on the God of the Bible and speculative theology offers a context for the systematic theologian's interest in this volume. G. points out that Catholic theologians in the recent past were excessively preoccupied with natural theology, but

now they tend to center their interest on the God of the Bible. He develops the reasons for this important and valid shift. But he cautions that this development must not be allowed to degenerate into a biblicism. The theologian is a debtor to reason as well as to the Bible; and if he slights the former, the God of the Bible will become the God of the ghetto rather than a transforming influence in our culture.

In the section on the OT, there are, among others, papers on the historical development of the notion of God (J. Coppens), on the God of the Yahwist and the Elohist (H. Cazelles), on God in Deuteronomy (N. Lohfink), in the preaching of the prophets (W. Zimmerli), in the wisdom writings (A. Barucq) and specifically in the Book of Wisdom (M. Gilbert), and on God in apocalyptic literature (M. Delcor). It would be an injustice to these fine papers to attempt to say a few words about each. But it certainly stands out that the God of Israel has a definite personality, that it is a matter of life and death for the Israelites to understand Him and His relation to them, that this understanding develops and is articulated in specific generations in reference to the needs of each age. We see how true it is that "in times past, God spoke in fragmentary and varied ways to our fathers" (Heb 1:1). The message of the prophets had to be complemented by that of the wisdom writers. Since wisdom too comes from God, experience and humanism also have contributions to make; without them, faith becomes dogmatism and limits experience, as we see in Job's friends. We also need the message of the writers of apocalyptic literature that the transcendent God plans history even when His people may doubt this because of the oppression they experience, and that He leads it as *one* history toward a foreordained goal where all evil will be set aright.

Among the papers on the NT, there are discussions on the understanding of the kingdom in Jesus and Paul (E. Schweizer), on Paul's understanding of justification and the Last Judgment (K. P. Donfried), the God of the New Alliance in Hebrews (A. Vanhoye), Paul's Areopagus speech (L. Legrand), Johannine contemplation and Hellenistic mysticism (P. Bonnard), and the theocentric character of the fourth Gospel (C. K. Barrett). The understanding of the kingdom and of justification reveals much about the character of God that is important for those of us who are ill at ease with the tensions and incompleteness of our present existence. The Areopagus speech shows us a typical early Christian proclamation to the Gentiles, one that can be properly characterized neither as challenging nor as fulfilling the Greek's religious relation to God, but rather as dialogical — a speech that reflects care to understand the religious groping present in the Hellenistic world of the time. A reading of John with the understanding that his Gospel answers Gnostic distortions of contemplation toward the end of the first century adds

insight into his message that God is revealed in and through Christ. Tensions are evident among some of these articles, but this adds to their interest and value.

I heartily recommend this volume to theologians concerned, in the midst of quite varying current theologies, with articulating the meaning of God in our time. With the help of studies such as these, we are better able to evaluate current theologies and to dialogue with Western secularism and Eastern religions, and in the process contribute to the development of the Christian understanding of God that is so needed today.

*St. Anselm's Abbey, Wash., D.C.*

JOHN FARRELLY, O.S.B.

**I CORINTHIANS.** By William F. ORT and James Arthur Walther. *Anchor Bible* 32. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976. Pp. 392. \$9.00.

The variety of approaches to the task of commentary in past volumes of the *Anchor Bible* has prepared the reader for surprises with each new publication. This volume on 1 Corinthians, by two professors at Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, takes its cue from the part of the format which describes the series as "aimed at the general reader with no special formal training in biblical studies." The notes and commentary are brief, avoiding technical issues as much as possible. This has its merit, but the occasional skimming of controversial issues (e.g., Gnostic elements at Corinth) gives the impression that the authors felt squeezed for space.

If so, the culprit is a "life of Paul" which takes up fully one third of the volume. There is no explanation why this biographical section should be attached to a commentary on 1 Corinthians rather than 1 Thessalonians, Paul's first letter chronologically, or Romans, his first letter in the NT sequence. Most of the material is a summary of the data of Acts (juxtaposed to information from the letters) and belongs, if anywhere, in the commentary on Acts. The only interest and value in this section is in the chart comparing the data from the different sources. The more pertinent introductory material for 1 Corinthians is hard to locate: its literary features and theology, the circumstances of writing, the character of the Corinthian community.

On the positive side, by keeping the notes unobtrusive, O.-W. maintain a close connection between text and commentary. Most technical quarrels are handed by references to *TDNT*, Zerwick, and Metzger. The principal comment on a given verse is easy to find; it is usually a summary of the common view. The authors are particularly effective on two questions that were matters of hot debate then and are again today: the place of women in the Church and the discernment of spiritual gifts.

They mention the theory that 11:2-16 is an interpolation but do not avoid comment because of that possibility. One may dodge the passage as non-Pauline, but not as uncanonical (cf. J. Murphy-O'Connor in *JBL* 95 [1976] 615-21). In this passage and in the related material in 14:33b-36, the theological and sociological issues are clearly isolated. The remarks on "headship" could correct mistaken notions about the subordination of women in some charismatic groups. The question of tongues in the hierarchy of spiritual gifts is discussed in the same fair and dispassionate manner.

The commentary has to be faulted for its practical avoidance of important questions about the addressees of the letter. Whatever conclusion is reached about the stage of Gnostic development at Corinth, pros and cons of the argument deserve more space than disclaimers with parenthetical references to Schmithals (pp. 152, 227). With so little explanation, the mention of Gnosticism at all is misleading. The most questionable section is the tendentious interpretation of the Lord's Supper (11:17-34). The bread and cup shared to proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes (v. 26) are not the Eucharist but any common meal among believers. "This is my body" refers not to the bread Jesus is holding but to the apostles gathered round, or to the whole community they represent. The concept of "body of Christ" here, to judge by other references in the commentary (6; 12:12-26), never gets beyond a social collective. There is no allusion, even bibliographically, to the work of J. A. T. Robinson and E. Best.

The translation tends to literalism and is often stilted ("You know that, when you were pagans, you were led off to dumb idols whenever you were being led": 12:2; cf. 3:17, 7:31). It is, however, faithful to the text even when preferences of the commentators might have caused glossing. Good indexes make the volume easy to use. But it will not replace the commentaries already available.

*New Subiaco Abbey, Subiaco, Ark.*

JEROME KODELL, O.S.B.

**THE Gnostic PAUL: GNOSTIC EXEGESIS OF THE PAULINE LETTERS.** By Elaine Hiesey Pagels. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. Pp. 180. \$10.95.

Over the next few decades we will be treated to many a treatise on Gnosticism, now that the Nag Hammadi trove is becoming more available both in the original Coptic and in translation and commentary. This important and somewhat neglected area of theological history will doubtless give rise to new theories on doctrinal development and will add fuel to the present debates concerning the validity of the Church Fathers' estimate of the Gnostic phenomenon. Perhaps of more immediate concern, the Gnostic documents will force scholarship to redefine, more or less, the present theories of "Gnostic schools," the better to place our documentation in usable categories.

Pagels' recent book, following on her *The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis* (1973), is a fine example of the necessary spadework which must be done before the rich resources of the second century can truly become available to us. Her question: What hermeneutical methods do Valentinian exegetes use to derive Gnostic meanings from the letters of Paul? Her answer is a careful listing and interpretation of the Valentinian exegesis of the Pauline and deuter-Pauline corpus. (Valentinians rejected Pauline authorship for the pastorals, in all probability; at the very least, they were unaware of their existence.) P. carefully lays out for us, with appropriate documentation, the methods used to make Paul a Gnostic whose written words cloaked a "spiritual" meaning, understandable to the elect. The Valentinian mythic system, so often presented in surveys simply as bare bones, can be seen "from the inside," as it were, and what emerges from P.'s work is an admiration for the thoroughgoing consistency of the Valentinian tradition of exegesis.

P. herself is extremely cautious in drawing conclusions from her work. She avows that she is not dealing with the question of "Gnosticism" in the first century—was it present in the Pauline communities? Did it influence Paul's theological formulations? She confines her scholarship to a careful presentation of second-century exegesis, and this is the strength of her work.

While not an introductory work, this book is recommended not only to those whose area of interest lies in the early centuries, but to anyone wishing a careful tour through the early development of Christian theology. Gnostic exegesis seems to us fanciful, but it is much closer to the exegetical and homiletic methods of the orthodox Church Fathers than is the exegesis taught in graduate schools today. The book will be useful, then, as a workbook which the reader may use to investigate the first semisystematic presentations, within Christianity, of the great religious questions: predestination, anthropology, the problem of evil, the basic religious myths of creation, redemption, and final salvation, and see the biblical hermeneutic which underpins the answers.

As faith and practice became theology, the Gnostics were among the first on the scene to offer a system for Christian self-understanding. Much of orthodox theology developed as a reaction to the Gnostic systems. P.'s book is a welcome help toward understanding the exegetical methods of these early "opponents."

*St. John's University, N.Y.*

JOSEPH A. GIBBONS, C.P.

THEOLOGIE DES NEUEN TESTAMENTS 2: VIELFALT UND EINHEIT DES APOSTOLISCHEN CHRISTUSZEUGNISSES. By Leonard Goppelt. Edited by Jürgen Roloff. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976. Pp. 317-669. DM 36.

For my review of the first volume (*Jesu Wirken in seiner theologischen Bedeutung*) see *TS* 36 (1975) 514–516. This part is concerned with responses to the event of Jesus Christ as seen in the literature of the NT. After treating the Palestinian community (the Church as the fellowship of Jesus' disciples, the beginnings of Christology), G. turns to the presuppositions of Pauline theology in Hellenistic Christianity and to Paul's major theological themes (Christology, the continuing activity of Jesus, the gospel as the revelation of God's righteousness, the shaping of the gospel in the Church). Then, under "the theology of the post-Pauline writings," he discusses Christians within society (1 Peter, Revelation), the preaching of the Syrian Church (James, Matthew), the way of the Church in the world (Hebrews, Luke–Acts), and the presence of the eschaton in the self-revelation of the Word become flesh (1 John, John). Roloff assumed the tasks of editing and preparing the manuscript for publication after G.'s death in late 1973. The index of Scripture passages for this volume and the subject index for both volumes conclude the project.

As the subtitle suggests, G. aims not only to describe the theologies of the individual NT books but also to discern the continuities and interrelationships in the Scriptures. The extent to which his theological emphases are reflected in the presentation can be seen from a listing of particularly interesting points: the dialogue between the Jesus tradition and the Church's preaching as the matrix of the earliest Christology, the typological use of the OT in Paul's letters and Hebrews, Christology rather than anthropology as the starting point for Pauline theology, the Lord's Supper as the most direct continuation of Jesus' activity, 1 Peter as encouraging social responsibility in a "pre-Christian" world, James as consistent with the teachings of Jesus and Paul, and Luke–Acts as stressing the continuity of God's action in salvation history. Central to G.'s project is the notion of "apostolicity" (see E. Lohse in *Kerygma und Dogma* 21 [1975] 85–98). An apostolic document (as opposed to early Catholic, Gnostic, or Jewish-Christian ones) proceeds theologically along the trajectory initiated by Jesus and carried on by Paul. This notion may explain the absence of chapters on the deutero-Paulines and Jude–2 Peter, though Mark is not treated simply because recent redaction-critical study has made difficult the adequate reconstruction of Mark's theology.

Taken together, the two volumes constitute an original synthesis of the theological thoughts of the NT and the precious testament of a learned scholar who was keenly concerned with the life, activity, and preaching of the Church. In translations and future editions, the claim that Aramaic *mr'* never appears as a designation for God might be corrected with a reference to *11QtgJob* 24:7.



**THE ORIGINS OF NEW TESTAMENT CHRISTOLOGY.** By I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1976. Pp. 132. \$2.95.

Small surveys of any area of scholarship suffer from significant drawbacks. This is particularly true when someone tries to survey the origins of NT Christology. Too many opinions have been proffered over the past hundred years and too many variables crop up. M. is concerned with pre-Pauline Christology and limits himself to the Christology behind the Synoptics. He is most critical of the methodology utilized by the historical-critical school and points out flaws in the works of Bousset, Hahn, and Fuller. Needless to say, he does not approve of Bultmann or Käsemann.

The work treats of the early Church and the stages of development that Fuller and Hahn find in its Christology, only to reject the hypothesis and to propose that NT Christology "sprang fully grown from the early Church in Jerusalem and that there was a minimum of basic development at later stages" (p. 41). He also concludes that the opinion that Jesus used the title "Son of Man" offers the least number of difficulties; the title "Christ" was applied to Jesus as a result of the Resurrection; the use of "Lord" had its basis in the ministry of Jesus but was finalized only after the Resurrection; "Son of God" was connected with Jesus' own estimate of himself.

It should be evident that M. covers a great deal of territory and easily takes sides in disputed matters. The final chapter accepts this situation as inevitable, with M. again admitting the deficiencies of his work. He concludes by stating that the roots of NT Christology lie in the OT, along with the claims that Jesus made of himself; the Resurrection, however, gives decisive stimulus to Christological thinking. Finally, M. states that while the divinity of Jesus was not the specific concern of the early Church, neither was his manhood. Rather Jesus was the agent of "God who was in Christ reconciling the world to himself."

The book is interesting reading, but I wonder if its alleged audience will actually understand it. If the purpose is to "trace out some kind of path through the tangled undergrowth so that the student may have some idea of the route and the destination, the alluring side paths and the recommended road," even someone well versed in the Christology of the NT feels as if he has become entangled in the undergrowth. The conclusions are clear enough, but whether the evidence merits these conclusions is the question.

*Albany, New York*

JOHN F. O'GRADY

**WISSENSCHAFTSTHEORIE — HANDLUNGSTHEORIE — FUNDAMENTALE THEOLOGIE: ANALYSEN ZU ANSATZ UND STATUS THEOLOGISCHER THEORIEBILDUNG.** By Helmut Peukert. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1976. Pp. 367. DM 28.80.

When empirical method became foundational for the validation and elaboration of science, theology lost the bonds it had shared with the sciences since the Middle Ages. As time proceeded, however, it became increasingly evident that empiricism could not of itself provide the basis for a unified theory of science. The failure of the projects of the Vienna Circle turned researchers to other areas to find that commonality which would not only allow for interdisciplinary work in the sciences but also provide some mutually acceptable assumptions about the nature of reality and the purpose of science.

Most recently, this commonality has been sought in the communication sciences, with work in language and linguistics providing the principal paradigm. In this book P. contends that the sciences (especially the social sciences) and theology can once again come to share a common ground in what he calls a theory of communicative action. The result of this new contact will be the emergence of a fundamental theology once again in touch with larger areas of scientific discourse.

P. devotes the larger part of his book to showing how this convergence is taking place. In reviewing the work of Bultmann, Rahner, and Metz, he concludes that theology deals with the elucidation of reality and with intersubjective and societal communication about that reality. Theology's task today is to enhance its powers of describing the transcendental base of intersubjective communication and express this within a theory of society and history.

From this P. turns to developments within the theory of science. He recounts Wittgenstein's and the Vienna Circle's early rejections of theology's claims of describing reality. Then he provides lucid evaluative summaries of the work of the late Wittgenstein and ordinary language philosophy on the nature of language and human communication; Chomsky's work in linguistics and other American studies in semantics; G. H. Mead and Talcott Parsons on symbolic interaction, social systems, and the emergence of the social self; and the critiques of positivist sociology by the Frankfurt School (Adorno, Horkheimer, Habermas, Wellmer).

P. then presents his proposal for a theory of communicative action, indicating how it will provide a convergence in the theory of science. Foundational to this theory is the Erlangen School's (Lorenzen, Kambartel, Mittelstrass) work in normative reconstruction of the praxis of everyday life. Principal concerns within the theory are communication as dialogal rather than informational (thus excluding much work in information theory, cybernetics, and systems theory from his discussion); the importance of semantic innovation in communicative action (thereby moving beyond the rule-governed models of linguistic description of Chomsky, Austin, and Searle); the growth of communicative

competence, which is reciprocal between the partners, free from oppression, and egalitarian (incorporating the concerns of the Frankfurt critical sociologists, especially Habermas). P. sees these concerns as correlating with those of theology mentioned above, culminating in a theory of intersubjectivity, society, and history.

The final short section on fundamental theology is disappointing. Returning to Bultmann's existentialist premise that the elucidation of the world is the elucidation of the reality of God, P. shows how theology, like the theory of science, is currently concerned with overcoming the ambiguities in communicative action arising out of the conflict between communication's ground or ideal and the historical experience of oppression in communicative action. While this does provide good insight into key moments in the history of Judaism and Christianity (the rejection of the prophets, the rejection of Jesus), it would have been perhaps more helpful to deal with that central communicative category of theology, revelation.

But P. does provide a clear overview of some developments in the last decades in logic, linguistics, and theories of social science. For the theologian unfamiliar with these areas, this is an invaluable service. Some of his discussion of communication and oppression within critical social theory will be helpful within liberation theologies as well. P. admits that his work in developing his theory of communicative action, and its application to fundamental theology, is just beginning. With his command of significant sections of the theory of science, and the clarity of expression he brings to very complicated debates, it can only be hoped that he will continue to develop both his theory and his theology.

*Catholic Theological Union, Chicago*

ROBERT J. SCHREITER

**LOOK FOR THE LIVING: THE CORPORATE NATURE OF RESURRECTION FAITH.** By Peter Selby. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Pp. 207. \$5.95.

Contemporary studies on Christ's resurrection have made clear the possible differing, and at times contradictory, interpretations. This book, originally a doctoral thesis, is an attempt to correlate ideas of biblical and theological interpretation of the Resurrection with fundamental and contemporary issues of discipleship, arising from the author's own experience in lay training.

S. takes into account the most significant trends in biblical and theological research on the Resurrection. His predominant concern is to tell a plausible story of Easter by restoring to the Resurrection the connections between past, present, and future, between the individual and the communal, between event and meaning. Contending that most contemporary approaches are too one-sided, and therefore a source of

confusion for the contemporary believer, S. rejects any radical break between event and meaning, history and faith.

According to the author, most contemporary studies on the Resurrection lack a basic awareness of the corporate nature of the NT proclamation, and therefore fail to underline the communal dimension of the Resurrection faith. That faith, as a form of communal believing, rests not merely on what can be verified historically, but primarily on the manner in which, and the extent to which, the community's life has been molded and shaped by the implications of the event. The Easter story was, and is, only believable on the strength of the existence of a community in which the values implicit in that story were and are being acted out. Such an existence gives access to a past which, in turn, is then able to be the bearer of meaning and judgment about the future life of the community of faith. For the Church of the NT, the resurrection of Christ as event was experienced through the present realities of mission, forgiveness, and newness of life.

Contemporary appropriation of the Resurrection faith depends upon the life and present experience of the believing community. And no community can credibly speak of the Resurrection unless it has placed itself in the situation of the struggle for justice and truth, staking its whole life on something new and totally demanding.

While S. makes a very good case for the impossibility of any one-sided interpretation of the Resurrection, and for the communal dimension of the Resurrection faith with its corporate intentionality, he does not demonstrate convincingly the reasonableness of using the believer's life style as evidence for the truth of the story it tells. It is extremely difficult to analyze the relation between the event and the continuing situation which seems to have resulted from it. Can the contemporary experience of the presence of the risen Lord stand on its own feet and become self-authenticating, independent of the historicity of the event in which it was originally grounded? The author has not given us a convincing answer.

*Weston School of Theology*

LUCIEN J. RICHARD, O.M.I.

THE CHURCH. By. G. C. Berkouwer. Translated from the Dutch by James E. Davison. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976. Pp. 438. \$9.95.

B., the well-known Dutch Reformed theologian, is now professor emeritus of systematic theology of the Free University of Amsterdam. This volume is part of his extended series *Studies in Dogmatics*. B. studies the Church in terms of its four properties professed in the Nicene Creed: unity, catholicity, apostolicity, and holiness. These four properties refer to the Church as it is in history and not merely to an ideal Church for which Christians long. Still, these properties are capable of

growth and development. For example, the unity of the Church can be strengthened and its catholicity extended. The properties of the Church are not grounds for complacency but demands made upon the Church for even greater fidelity.

With respect to unity, B. maintains, one can still point, in the midst of all divisions among Christians, to unity in the fellowship of the Body of Christ. Visible unity is incumbent upon the Church; but it is not clear to me what forms visible unity is to take in B.'s mind. For him, the Church's catholicity is to be understood in three ways: quantitatively, qualitatively, and as continuity. The Church's quantitative catholicity reflects God's love for the world. Qualitative catholicity means fidelity to God's word. The continuity of the Church is another aspect of catholicity. B. denies all claims to unchangeable continuity on the basis of an office or charism; rather, continuity is maintained by fidelity to the word. Apostolicity implies human functionality and empowerment. Apostolic means in the discipleship, in the school, and under the normative authority of the apostles. There can be no a priori, prefatory verification of apostolicity which is itself unassailable. Finally, with respect to holiness, the Church is *simul justus et peccator*, just as the redeemed believer is. The Church as a fellowship does not stand above and beyond sin.

B.'s work is characterized by an ecumenical spirit, scholarly serenity, constant reference to the Bible, and a penetrating analysis of a wide range of past and contemporary views. He does not discuss the historical question about the role of Jesus as founder of the Church. One of the most basic issues raised by B. — one which radically divides Protestants and Catholics — is the matter of apriority. B. believes that every identification of the Spirit with an agency or structure of the Church must be excluded. Everything must be tested in the light of the Scriptures. The Church can be the Church only in faith and prayer, only in obedience to Jesus Christ and fidelity to the Scriptures. B.'s position reminded me of Hans Küng's *Unfehlbar? Eine Anfrage*.

Of course, Catholics along with other Christians recognize the Scriptures as normative. However, only the true sense of the Scriptures is normative. How is that true sense to be discovered? With or without a living magisterium assisted by the Holy Spirit? That is the question.

*Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Ohio*

EDWARD J. GRATSCH

ALONE OF ALL HER SEX: THE MYTH AND CULT OF THE VIRGIN MARY. By Marina Warner. New York: Knopf, 1976. Pp. 400. \$15.00.

Marina Warner starts her reflections on the Virgin Mary by reminiscing on her early Catholic education. She recalls that, as a "devout mariolater," she placed great emphasis on the feasts of the Virgin

Mother, who, it seemed to her, demanded purity at all costs. Having abandoned the "safety and purity of the salvation" found in Mary, she now explores the paradoxical aspects of the Virgin's cult in Europe.

Five major roles of Mary are examined: virgin, queen, bride, mother, and intercessor. W. contrasts Mary's purity with Eve's sinfulness and sees a close connection between the stress on Mary's virginity and the Church's puritanical attitude towards sex. The Virgin's queenship is interpreted as a symbol of the wholeness of the Catholic Church, especially its repugnance to change. This, we are unexpectedly told, is in direct opposition to Buddhism (p. 102). In general, Mary becomes in Catholic piety a sign of woman's submissiveness and of the Christian's disparagement of earthly love. The Virgin Mother is symbol of a "goddess of vegetable and animal and human fertility" (p. 269).

No doubt, W.'s book reveals aspects of the cult of Mary often neglected in treatises on Mariology. In spite of this, it is doubtful that her book has added much understanding to the theological significance of Mary in the Christian Church. W.'s knowledge of the exegesis of Marian scriptural texts seems to date from her early school days. None of the contemporary Catholic exegetical studies seem to have been consulted. She has a tendency to choose historical data which illustrate her point, forgetting that much of her information might be seen quite differently in a larger perspective. Especially marked for attack is the Church's attitude towards sex. No attempt is made to understand this rather negative attitude in the cultural context of its origin and spread. The end result is little or no insight into the link which is made between the virginity of Mary and the sinfulness of sex. The intelligent reader does not quite see how the short references to Venus, Hera, Juno, Aphrodite, Diana, etc. can throw much light on the subject. Such dilettante mention of classical goddesses is an example of comparative religion at its worst.

W. does not appear to have outgrown her early Catholic educational emphasis on the cult of Mary. Examples abound to show her residual bitterness. "The doctrine of the Virgin Mary has become more and more curious," we are told, with the rise of scientific discovery (p. 39). The sovereignty of Mary and her cult are the greatest perversion of the Sermon on the Mount (p. 117). The cult of the Virgin Mother perpetuated the myth of female inferiority and dependence (p. 191). In the Epilogue, W. asserts that the "effect the myth has on the mind of the Catholic girl cannot be but disturbing" (p. 337). Besides, the Virgin Birth is seen as "the instrument of a dynamic argument from the Catholic Church about the structure of society, presented as a God-given code" (p. 338). W. rejects both the reality to which the Virgin Birth refers and the moral code implicit in the belief. The Virgin Birth is but a myth in the worst meaning of the word and it has no future but to recede into legend.

Anger and dissatisfaction are hardly the qualities which make a good, unbiased scholar. *Alone of All Her Sex* is a good example of what a disgruntled Catholic can produce. W. provides practically no theological understanding of the Christian belief, few, if any, historical revelations, and no social scientific analysis of worth. She lets her anger get the better of her judgment and occasional insights. Had she pursued the theme of symbolism understood in its historical and cultural contest, without a constant preoccupation to debunk a central Christian belief, Warner's study would have been less negative, to say the least. The myth and cult of the Virgin Mary will certainly outlast her book.

*University of Detroit*

JOHN A. SALIBA, S.J.

**NEW BIRTH OF FREEDOM: A THEOLOGY OF BONDAGE AND LIBERATION.** By Peter C. Hodgson. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. Pp. 368. \$14.95; \$7.95 paper.

Theological works treating themes of liberation and freedom have multiplied in recent years. Two gaps may be found in such works: critical analysis from a biblical and hermeneutical perspective, and a specifically American treatment. H. has filled both gaps. The work is "a theological interpretation of bondage and liberation at the most fundamental and inclusive level attainable" (p. xiv). The American hope of "a new nation, conceived in liberty" provides the vision. H. then proceeds to trace the faulting of the vision through the exploitation of the land, Indians, blacks, and women. The fault in the vision helped shape American attitudes towards others: the Third World, the poor, and the young. Lincoln's image, "a new birth of freedom," provides the motif for the need to regain the lost freedom of creation. The symbolism implies a painful rebirth and embodies well the cross and resurrection of Jesus.

H. clearly and concisely outlines "rival freedoms." From both the ancient and modern perspective, he discusses freedom under political-economic, rational-psychoanalytic, tragic-existential, ecstatic-vitalistic, and pragmatic-technocratic. His constructive argument in response to these understandings of freedom begins with the human essence as created freedom. The essential structures of freedom are autonomy (subjective freedom), community (intersubjective and objective freedom), and openness (transsubjective freedom). To analyze freedom according to this triadic structure, H. dialogues with the "rival freedoms," which fall short of encompassing all that is involved in freedom as the essence of humankind created in God's image.

Christian categories of creation, fall, redemption, and consummation are treated in terms of essential freedom, bound freedom, liberated freedom, and final freedom. Jesus, the radically free person, provides the key to understanding freedom and the way for its needed new birth.

He shows humans the essence of freedom by his openness to God, communion with the downtrodden, and his "radical selfhood or sense of personal identity and authority" (p. 108). In responding to the "rival freedoms," H. draws heavily on Ricoeur. He presents "Jesus the Liberator" as the means of translating the phenomenological categories of autonomy, community, and openness into more personal equivalents—selfhood, brotherhood/sisterhood, and sonship. While Jesus is no political revolutionary, his central image, the kingdom of God, is to be interpreted as a kingdom of freedom, "a true communion of free subjects in which alienation and power struggles are overcome, a communion in which the conflict between individuals and society is resolved" (p. 232). The establishment of that kingdom calls for the actualization of freedom, which is liberation. This leads the Christian to involvement with institutions and politics. Jesus lived his freedom by confronting poverty, disease, and all forms of religious and political exploitation. Relying on Hegel, H. discusses this actualization. Liberation is "both a task to be carried out . . . and the gift of transcendence" (p. 271). The two constitute the "dialectics of liberation" and are unfolded through negation, conflict, and conscientization. Present-day liberation movements attest to this process, but only Christ provides the perfection of the task-gift model and is authentic freedom.

In the last chapter, "The Symbolics of Freedom," H. provides a response to Marx and Freud. Against the "opium" and the "illusion," he presents a Trinitarian doctrine which affirms a God who lives and liberates. The Church is called to be the nonseparated, nonalienated community which, in spite of its own shortcomings, hopes for and is a sign of the kingdom of freedom.

This is a welcome and significant work, because it brings a systematic presentation, exacting detail, methodological rigor, and American experience to the current theological discussion of liberation and freedom.

*Loyola College, Baltimore*

JOHN P. HOGAN

A NATION OF BEHAVERS. By Martin E. Marty. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1976. Pp. 239. \$8.95.

Straining the cartographic metaphor on which he relies, and writing in a curious combination of stuffy academic and breezy journalistic style, M. proposes to draw "a new map of religious America" (p. 2). This map is drawn along lines dictated by the observation that social-religious behavior has become the chief distinguishing feature of religious groupings in America today. Three older kinds of maps or paradigms (he uses the terms interchangeably) of American religious history M. takes as no longer generally useful or descriptive except as points of intellectual history: the regional and largely theological map of religion in the



American colonies; the denominational and institutional map of eighteenth- to early-twentieth-century America; and the essentially "political" map of the central portion of this century, a map of "the religion of the American Way of Life" as classically analyzed by Will Herberg in 1955. A fourth map is now needed as a result of what M. labels the "identity incident" (p. 8) of the 1960's and early 1970's—a time when Americans experienced an unprecedented loss of identity ("identity confusion" or "identity diffusion," according to the Eriksonian terminology M. employs) and consequently undertook a search for a new sense of identity. Because established religious groupings could not provide the kind of demarcation that a sense of identity requires, this period saw the emergence of new religious groups, the resurgence of others, and the rise to respectability of still others. It is M.'s contention that all six of these groups—Mainline Religion, Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism, Pentecostal-Charismatic, the New Religions, Ethnic Religion, and Civil Religion—are best observed, described, and "mapped" in terms of social behavior.

Certainly there is a need for this fourth kind of map. But it is hardly a new need, nor newly discovered as such by M. *A Nation of Behavers* is, nevertheless, probably the only book-length treatment of topics that M. admits to have been the purview of "journalists, feature writers, television commentators, friends and neighbors, pollsters, anthropologists, and sociologists" (p. 19). It is a less rewarding book than one might have hoped from M. Too much of the book is devoted to recapitulation of the sociological theory and analysis of others, and even in the area of contemporary religious movements M. relies on secondary works to a surprising degree. Despite his disclaimer that such works are "contemporary events" and in themselves primary sources for current history (p. 60), they function more as substance than as evidence at many places in M.'s text. Although the book looks more like a pastiche of M.'s reading and occasional writings of the past few years than a serious exercise in a new kind of methodology for religious history, a number of major points from his discussion of various groups bear noting. Mainline Religion is losing ground to smaller, less acculturated groups, and its future is questionable if it continues to offer no distinctive behavioral patterns for those who belong to it (chap. 1). Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism, on the other hand, are representative more of "temperaments" than cognitive systems and are best distinguished from each other and from other religious groups in terms of behavior rather than theology or institutional structure (chap. 2). Pentecostal-Charismatic religion (chap. 3) is highly visible behaviorally and hence attractive to those seeking social demarcation. The New Religions (Eastern religions, Zen, the occult, American Indian religion, and black religion) are attractive

because they provide "substitute identities" (chap. 4). Ethnic Religion (chap. 5) is part of a phenomenon of "plural belonging," and Civil Religion (chap. 6), while a reality of some sort, is more the creature of academics' speculations than the object of sociological research into the lives of those who supposedly practice it.

Although telling and perceptive at times, M.'s observations are seldom startling but rather are what one might reasonably expect from the application of basic sociology of religion and sociology of knowledge to recent religious history. The historical analysis and narrative of the background for current movements is neither organized nor clear, the major structural principle of each chapter apparently being an examination and rejection of the three other kinds of maps as inadequate for sketching the story M. wants to tell. M. justifies the book's loose organization by analogy with recent "break-throughs" in literary story telling: "there will be prehistories and flashbacks interspersed with simple narrative and nonhistorical analysis—all in the interest of better ordering the map" (p. 43). The reader is fairly warned, and prospective travelers can judge for themselves how useful such a map might be.

Wesley Theological Seminary, D.C.

FRANCINE CARDMAN

**THE ORDINAL OF THE PAPAL COURT FROM INNOCENT III TO BONIFACE VIII AND RELATED DOCUMENTS.** By Stephen J. P. van Dijk, O.F.M. Completed by Joan Hazelden Walker. *Spicilegium Friburgense* 22. Fribourg: University Press, 1975. Pp. 707. 118 fr.s.

Every student of liturgical history is familiar with the contribution of van Dijk, who worked for over thirty years to establish the liturgy of the papal court of the early thirteenth century and to delineate the role which the Friars Minor played in spreading its use throughout the Church. In 1960, in conjunction with Joan Hazelden Walker, he published the important survey *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, and in 1963 the two-volume introduction and edition of the Ordinals of Haymo of Faversham (1243-44), *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*. The present volume presenting his reconstruction of the Ordinal of Innocent III (1213-16), was published posthumously and completed by his colleague J. Hazelden Walker. At the time of van Dijk's death in 1971, the edition of the texts was in first page proofs and the introduction merely in outline form, his intention being to publish a more extensive study at a later date. Walker has left untouched van Dijk's introductory notes as they were found on his desk, but has filled in the blanks in the footnotes to complete them as best she could.

This volume contains three Roman calendars of the thirteenth century: the calendar of the papal court according to the "sacramentary"

tradition (ca. 1175–1202), the calendar of the Roman court according to the "Regula" edition of the Friars Minor (1227–30), and the urban calendar revised by Cardinal John Cajetan Orsini (ca. 1255). The edition of the Ordinal of Innocent III, the major portion of the volume, follows, comprising the temporale, general rubrics, the sanctorale, common of the saints, offices of the Virgin and of the dead, and the order of grace at meals. Other texts included are: general rubrics of the Mass, before 1227; order of the Mass according to the use of the Roman Church (Court), before 1227; Ordo Romanus, notes on the order of the Mass, before 1238; and the Ordinal of Gregory X (ca. 1274). A comprehensive set of indices (prepared after van Dijk's death) concludes the work.

The concern of Innocent III in reforming the liturgy of the papal court resulted in the production of two important liturgical books, a new edition of the pontifical, and a revision of the ordinal for the daily office of the papal court. The first of these has been available to scholars in the edition of M. Andriew and now, thanks to the researches of van Dijk, we have at last an edition of the second. It has long been known that the Order of Friars Minor adopted and adapted the office tradition of the papal court for their own use, and that it is due to the Friars Minor that this tradition spread throughout the Church. The lines of development and the dimensions of the influence of the office of the papal court, however, have been a quagmire for the student of liturgy. The present edition provides a much-needed, welcome tool for the work of the liturgical scholar.

The only disappointment this volume brings is the knowledge that the complete study of the ordinal contemplated by van Dijk was not finished. As Walker points out, it will be the work of some student of medieval liturgy to use the gold mine of information contained in this volume and complete the work of van Dijk. It would be a fitting tribute to such an outstanding scholar.

*Aquinas Institute of Theology, Dubuque*      DAVID F. WRIGHT, O.P.

**PAPAL CRUSADING POLICY: THE CHIEF INSTRUMENTS OF PAPAL CRUSADING POLICY AND CRUSADE TO THE HOLY LAND FROM THE FINAL LOSS OF JERUSALEM TO THE FALL OF ACRE, 1244–1291.** By Maureen Purcell. *Studies in the History of Christian Thought* 11. Leiden: Brill, 1975. Pp. 236. 84 glds.

The political and military aspects of the Crusades have often been discussed, sometimes in excessive detail, so that one is happy to report that increasing attention is being given to the theological and canonistic themes inherent in the subject. Purcell has made a useful contribution to these studies by her volume on papal crusading policy during a

comparatively short but critical time from the fall of Jerusalem in 1244 to the final collapse of the crusading states in 1291. From its very inception, she notes, the crusading movement was characterized by a fundamental dualism, not always apparent to contemporaries. On the one hand, crusade (for most people) implied the launching of a holy war against the infidels to recover the Holy Land; but more subtly perhaps, crusade was also seen, chiefly by the papacy, as an instrument of Christian unity. Contemporaries did not always grasp the latter notion, nor indeed did the popes always recognize the implications contained in it, and sometimes they tended to see crusade as an end in itself, rather than as a means to an end. Considering the crusade as an instrument of Christian unity, the papacy diverted crusading energies from the Holy Land as occasion seemed to warrant; thus crusades were directed against the Albigensians, the Hohenstaufen dynasty, King Pedro III of Aragon, the pagans of eastern Europe, and others who could be classified as enemies of the Church and whose actions imperiled Christian unity. Ultimately, the effect of this transformation of the idea of crusade was to sow confusion in the minds of the populace, who could understand easily enough the rationale of a holy war to expel the infidels from the holy places, but who saw crusades in the West too often as serving the political ambitions of the papacy.

P. devotes considerable attention to the instruments of the Crusades and their organization, viz., the offer of an indulgence, the taking of vows, the extension of papal protection to crusaders, the use of ecclesiastical revenue to finance the Crusades, and so forth. But she points out that these were extraordinarily complex matters, as vows oftentimes were commuted or redeemed rather than fulfilled, partial rather than plenary indulgences were gained, and funds were diverted to other purposes. Thus it became more difficult to interest western Europeans in the plight of the Holy Land, while the colonists there recognized that crusades would only hasten their destruction. Much of the confusion and disorder in the organization of crusades in the late thirteenth century was due to the failure of the papacy to establish clear priorities and to check abuses that crept into the granting of indulgences, the commutation of vows, and the like. In the long run, the lack of certain purpose in papal policy weakened the crusader states and brought the whole concept of crusade into disrepute.

Much of what P. has to say has been said before, but she has brought together in convenient form a body of information relating to the instruments of papal policy and she has given a very fine exposition of the theology behind the Crusades. Her treatment of crusades outside the Holy Land tends to be rather cursory. I particularly found it distressing that she gave so little attention to the Crusades in the Iberian peninsula

and seems to be unacquainted with José Goñi Gaztambide's *Historia de la Bula de la Cruzada en España* (Vitoria, 1955).

The book includes a good bibliography and two appendices; the first presents the crusading decrees of the councils of 1215 and 1245 in parallel columns and the *Zelus fidei* of the council of 1274. The second is a reprinting of the liturgical ceremony of conferring the cross, taken from the *Pontificale* of 1520.

Fordham University

JOSEPH F. O'CALLAGHAN

**LATRAN V ET TRENTÉ.** By Olivier de la Brosse, O.P., Joseph Lecler, S.J., Henri Holstein, S.J., and Charles Lefebvre. *Histoire des conciles oecuméniques* 10. Paris: Orante, 1975. Pp. 510. 89.50 fr.

A valuable addition to an excellent series that now nears completion. The present volume provides an up-to-date synthesis, scholarly, critical, clear, orderly, of Lateran V (1512-17) and the first part of Trent (1545-47). The remaining Tridentine sessions, up to 1563, will occupy Volume 11. All four authors are well-known ecclesiastical historians. De la Brosse composed the approximately 100 pages of text on Lateran V; Lecler is responsible for about 200 of the 300 on Trent, Holstein for 65, and Lefebvre for 35. The remaining pages include footnotes, a helpful chronology of both councils, an analytical bibliography of printed sources and literature, and an index of names, places, and topics. Added to this are conciliar and related documents in French translation. Useful as these are for French readers, they are of much less utility for the English-speaking world; for students who do not prefer Latin originals (readily available in the handy *Conciliorum oecumenicorum decreta*) have recourse to English versions, along with the Latin in H. J. Schroder's two volumes *Disciplinary Decrees of the General Councils* (through Lateran V) and *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*.

Introductory chapters (pp. 13-34, 117-218) explain adequately the backgrounds of both councils, the situations that urged their convocations, the political and other factors that complicated matters and retarded the actual openings. The course of both councils is well described, with extraconciliar influences not neglected; but more attention might have been focused on leading personalities. For both doctrinal and disciplinary questions, there are good explanations of the problems involved and of the conciliar debates, and competent analyses of the final decrees. Lacunae in conciliar agenda and accomplishments are also pointed out.

Because of the dearth of recent substantial syntheses, the treatment of Lateran V is particularly welcome. This synod, to be sure, despite some worth-while doctrinal decrees, is far less momentous than Trent.

Ending its reform sessions just as the Reformation began, it rates as a classic example of opportunities missed, if even appreciated. De la Brosse's judgment is severe but soundly based. For him it appears "un moment de faiblesse dans la vie de l'Eglise; faiblesse de pensée, faiblesse de langage, faiblesse d'action. Ce 'brouillon de concile' ou 'ce concile de poche' fut surtout un concile de velléitaires." Its reform decrees "n'ont prévu que des réformes théoriques, irréelles, assorties de trop nombreuses exceptions, et surtout les hommes qui les édictèrent se soucièrent peu de les appliquer" (p. 144).

A new history of Trent faces much stiffer competition, particularly from the work of Jedin, whose volumes on Trent excel as a landmark in twentieth-century ecclesiastical scholarship. Given its different scope, this work stands up quite well in comparison. Jedin, who is utilized by the authors of this volume, is, of course, much lengthier. Thus he requires two volumes (1200 pages in English version) for the period up to 1547. Background material, allotted 100 pages here, extends to 600 in Jedin.

It is a pity that this whole series is not being made available in English. Hope for this blessing cannot be held very high, however; for the translation of Jedin's famous history ceased after the publication of Volume 2 in 1961.

*Campion Center, Weston, Mass.*

JOHN F. BRODERICK, S.J.

LUTHER'S THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS. By Walther von Loewenich. Translated by Herbert J. A. Bouman. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976. Pp. 224. \$8.95.

Walter von Loewenich's *Luthers Theologia crucis* first appeared in 1929; the English version here presented is from the German fifth edition of 1967, which differs from the original only by a brief Addendum. It has long been regarded as a classic of Luther scholarship, as well as an expression of the theological ferment of the 1920's.

Von Loewenich's thesis, simply stated, is that theology of the cross (in its opposition to theology of glory) is basic to the structure of Luther's mature theology and is not a pre-Reformation residue visible merely in 1518 (*Heidelberg Disputation*, theses 19 and 20, and *Explanations* on the 95 theses). As such, theology of the cross as understood by Luther is in essence antithetical to the German mysticism to which it is sometimes likened.

As to the first part of the thesis, von Loewenich still seems to me to be basically correct that by 1518, and even a bit earlier, Luther had developed the views that would remain central to his thought. What is less clear to me is that *theologia crucis* is a particularly useful or fruitful category to use in establishing this. For what is meant by "theology of

the cross"? Luther is fairly brief on the point, and not particularly systematic. The central idea would appear to be that the theology of the cross is the reversal of the theological wisdom of the natural man: "without the theology of the cross man misuses the best in the worse manner" (*Heid. Disp.*, thesis 24). "He who has not been brought low, reduced to nothing through the cross and suffering, takes credit for works and wisdom and does not give credit to Gods" (*ibid*). It is spelled out more fully in the explanation of thesis 21. Theology of the cross thus involves both the self-interpretation of the theologian and the doctrine of God's self-revelation in contrariety.

Unfortunately, von Loewenich does not so much explain Luther as show that other, similar paradoxes can be adduced from elsewhere in the corpus. But the paradoxes remain impacted, even when, as in the case of "God's concealment," Luther suggests how this is to be understood with reference to justification. It is not that what von Loewenich is arguing is incorrect. But he could make much the same point (and others have) without making the category of theology of the cross central. As he acknowledges (p. 173, n. 4a.), Luther for the most part leaves the expression behind in his later writings. Von Loewenich is correct, however, in making the point that the content of Luther's theology requires a new manner of theologizing, so that the differences are not only differences of content but of thought structure as well.

As to the relationship between Luther and mysticism, von Loewenich seems correct in his claim that the differences are quite basic, whatever the similarities of influence. He acknowledges in the Addendum (p. 222) that the 1929 work assumes too simple an antithesis between mysticism and the gospel, after the manner of Brunner's *Mysticism and the Word*. He has succeeded in showing, however, that what Luther says in 1518 about theology of the cross is already part of his understanding of justification and as part of that complex differs significantly from what has gone before.

*University of Iowa*

JAMES F. McCUE

ORESTES A. BROWNSON: A DEFINITIVE BIOGRAPHY. By Thomas R. Ryan, C.P.P.S. Huntington, Ind.: Our Sunday Visitor, 1976. Pp. 872. \$29.95.

Several years ago, when I mentioned to some Catholic graduate students of theology that I was writing a short piece on Orestes Brownson, I was shocked by their quizzical question: Orestes who? One of the startling issues in American Catholic intellectual history is the eclipse of Brownson until recent times. In his own day (1801-76), Brownson was the best-known American Catholic intellectual and public figure. Tragically, he had no natural constituencies.

A layman in a clerical church, an Anglo-American convert who had antagonized the "foreign element," especially the Irish, in a largely ethnic community, a towering intellectual who wrote a nonscholastic American philosophy in a church largely bent on brick-and-mortar construction, Brownson was nobody's natural hero when he died. Protestants—especially his transcendentalist friends such as Emerson and Thoreau—snubbed him after his conversion. Many Catholics suspected his orthodoxy or his prudence. Moreover, with the exception of two books *The Convert* and *The American Republic*, Brownson's voluminous writings, which cover twenty volumes in the collected works, mainly appeared in periodicals or journals, especially his own *Boston Quarterly Review* and *Brownson's Quarterly Review*.

That the American Church forgot Brownson would be comparable to English Catholics forgetting Newman. He is a fascinating subject for biography, because his life spans rich spaces of American and American Catholic history. He was, perhaps, the first of the Americanizers. His writings on church-state separation rival John Courtney Murray's. He was importantly involved in the Civil War. *The American Republic* is, arguably, the most profound American Catholic book on the destiny and mission of our republic.

Brownson was a bear of a man, caught all his life in the swirl of polemic. Moreover, the life creates problems for biographers, since, at least on the surface, there are four distinctly different periods which show abrupt changes in Brownson's religious and political thought.

The Brownson revival of recent years has produced several important new books on his literary criticism, political thought, and philosophy. Both Notre Dame and Fordham celebrated the centenary of his death with major symposia. R.'s biography also appeared for the Brownson centenary. It is likely that it will remain the definitive biography for some years to come. Earlier biographies by Henry Brownson (3 vols.), Arthur Schlessinger Jr., Doran Whalen, and Theodore Maynard all failed to give a rounded view of the man and his thought.

R.'s book is the definitive work on B.'s life. It is not equally strong, however, in dealing with his thought. R. fails to do justice to B.'s central idea, the doctrine of life in communion, by totally overlooking its roots in the American transcendentalist stream of philosophy with its appeal, beyond logical argument, to sentiment and experience. Similarly, he is weak in expounding the positive features of B.'s epistemology. He shows that B. was not an ontologist, without clearly telling us what his positive position was on a doctrine of knowledge. He is best in treating B.'s political philosophy.

One of the tragedies of B.'s thought was his inability to come to grips with Newman's development of doctrine theory. Unlike Newman, B.



turned ultraconservative after the Syllabus of Errors and Vatican I. He had no theoretical resources, except an authoritative faith, with which to deal with the Church's rightward turn. Part of B.'s failure is to be found in his philosophy of history, which R. also largely neglects.

In his last years B. was more a faithful apologist than the brilliant and innovative speculative philosopher/theologian of the period 1857-67. R.'s weakness in dealing with his philosophical and theological thought is all the more regrettable since B.'s is the one example of a uniquely American Catholic theology based on American philosophical resources. Almost all agree that he was the most original mind of the nineteenth century among American Catholics. Some claim that he has, as yet, no peers.

R., a lifelong Brownson scholar and *aficionado*, seems overly defensive in his treatment of B.'s last ten years. At times one feels that R. would also reject a theory of development of doctrine, so intent is he in "justifying" B. Sometimes R.'s theological editorializing is an irritant and detracts from his first-rate historical research. An example is a remark (p. 275) excoriating those who hold that the Church itself might be in need of reformation, as if that is a nondefensible theological proposition. The frequent references to Vatican II as an external authority legitimating B.'s position also seem out of place.

R. writes with an elegant and readable style, although his choice of words and cadences sometimes suggest an earlier century. I recommend the book as a "must" for all Brownson scholars and as "very highly suggested" for those interested in American Catholic history.

*Jesuit School of Theology, Berkeley*

JOHN A. COLEMAN, S.J.

**THE SOCIALITY OF CHRIST AND HUMANITY: DIETRICH BONHOEFFER'S EARLY THEOLOGY, 1927-1933.** By Clifford J. Green. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975. Pp. 356. \$4.20.

This brilliant book, G.'s doctoral dissertation from Union Theological Seminary, is a refreshing indication that Bonhoeffer studies have indeed moved far beyond the earlier faddish phase into an era of serious scholarship. He presents a careful, systematic-historic analysis of B.'s early theology and, in light of this, shows how the concept of sociality and theological anthropology not only inform B.'s earliest writings but also provide the key to understanding the development of his entire theology.

G.'s study, as the subtitle indicates, accentuates the formative period in B.'s career, when he laid the systematic foundations which would shape his later theology. B.'s doctoral dissertation, *Sanctorum commu-*

nio, e.g., highlights his basic methodological contention that the whole of theology must be interpreted with social conceptuality. All the fundamental Christian concepts, person, creation, sin, redemption, and revelation, are consequently situated in the network of human relationships and social communities. This human sociality is, in turn, grounded by B. in God's own social being in Christ. History in this perspective is the concrete locus in which God speaks and establishes a personal-social existence with people. G. notes that even B.'s concept of transcendence must be understood in terms of this sociality. B. speaks of Christ as the new humanity and of God's transcendence as principally His presence in human form transforming the believing community from its sinful condition into a true community of love. This is a socioethical transcendence whose form is human, personal life and whose content and goal is the believing community in which Christ is the animating center. God's lordship is thus manifest in the world through His sustaining, reconciling love revealed in Christ.

According to G., the sociality of Christ and humanity further programs B.'s theological reflections in his *Habilitationsschrift, Act and Being*. G. demonstrates convincingly how B.'s critique of philosophical anthropologies reveals his own concern with the individualistic "knowing I" tempted to make itself the center of all reality. If B.'s earlier dissertation had been influenced by the "actualism" of dialectical theology, in this second dissertation Bonhoeffer seeks to overcome egocentrism in theological reflection and to establish an ontology of God's relationship with man in the social relations of communities. His description of God's freedom as a being with and for man is a prelude to the later Christological formula "Christ the man for others." G. uncovers strong evidence in *Act and Being* to conclude that theological anthropology is the fundamental issue of B.'s theology.

From this there emerges the corresponding soteriological problem, the isolated, self-contained I violating social relationships through the pursuit of unlimited power. G. analyzes this problem in the light of B.'s "turning away from the phraseological to the real" in 1932. From a meticulous exegesis of seven texts, G. is able to document the strong autobiographical dimension which underlies B.'s exposition of the conflict between the dominating power of the ambitious, manipulative ego and the mutual love which makes community possible. This concern informs B.'s understanding of Christ's freedom as the "man for others" liberating a person for responsible action on behalf of the community. G.'s study of these texts also leads one to see *Nachfolge* as itself deeply rooted in B.'s own existential crisis, the struggle between self-seeking and the call to be a servant of Jesus. It was in rediscovering the Sermon on the Mount in this period that B. was able to curb his ambitious ego

and to recommit himself to the Church. G. shows that B.'s own progression in discipleship becomes the "real" behind his challenge to the German Church to pursue "costly grace" and the single-minded obedience of discipleship. Here B. would set the power of Christ over against the power of unbridled egocentrism and the evil of Hitlerism. B.'s Christology of this period constitutes, in G.'s opinion, only a partial resolution of the soteriological problem of personal power.

Not until the period of the prison letters was B. able to resolve for himself more fully those problems which were heightened in the *Nachfolge* theology. From B.'s involvement with the resistance movement and from other evidence in the final writings, G. concludes that he seems to have found freedom from his own ambitiousness in order to affirm his ego strengths in this last period of his life, when he was engaged in authentic and responsible service for others even at great risk to himself. G. observes that in these letters B. introduces the anthropological category of *Mündigkeit*, which he links with autonomy to assert that modern man, endowed with ego skills and strength, is able to solve problems formerly in the domain of organized religion. This enabled B. not only to criticize the problematic status of religion but to insist that true transcendence is derived from the weak and suffering Christ, who is paradoxically the guarantee and support of human maturity and autonomy. Through the refinement of this strength-in-weakness motif, B.'s Christocentric concept of discipleship is thus freed from the submissiveness of the *Nachfolge* period and allowed to develop into an attitude of self-affirmation. This makes possible B.'s description of faith as mature, responsible living on behalf of others.

The strength of this thesis lies in G.'s ability to combine careful, systematic analysis of original documents with an informed, psychohistorical interpretation of the autobiographical dimension of these texts. In this way, not only is B. permitted to speak for himself but the reader is led to appreciate the personal tensions and experimental background which makes his theology more comprehensible and so compelling. In this connection, one can only regret the book's subtitle: it is "early" B. and more. From G.'s study we can glean an accurate interpretation of the entire evolution in continuity of B.'s theology. It would have been desirable to see more consideration given to the sociopolitical dimension, which is also very instructive for understanding B.'s theological development, even though this aspect was beyond G.'s announced intention. As it stands, however, this book is a major event in Bonhoeffer literature. It is safe to predict that all serious researchers into B.'s theology must now somehow come to grips with G.'s interpretation.

La Salle College, Phila.

GEFFREY B. KELLY, F.S.C.

JOHN COURTNEY MURRAY: THEOLOGIAN IN CONFLICT. By Donald E. Pelotte, S.S.S. New York: Paulist, 1975. Pp 210. \$9.95.

By focusing almost exclusively on one phase of Murray's theological career, P. has produced a remarkably sensitive and sophisticated portrait of Murray the churchman. But, like all portraits, it catches the subject at a single point in his life and omits many other significant moments.

The focus chosen for the portrait, which was prepared originally as a doctoral dissertation at Fordham University, is Murray's contribution to the Vatican II debate and declaration on religious liberty, *Dignitatis humanae*. It is a focus well chosen, for M. was the decisive influence in shaping the American episcopal intervention, which was principally responsible for the final content of the decree. In many ways the Declaration is M.'s most lasting monument—a fine moment for his portrait.

P. traces with singular skill the subtle interweaving of personal curiosity, historical circumstance, and religious obedience which brought Murray to occupy his authoritative position on the issue of religious liberty in the double context of Roman ecclesiology and American constitutionalism. By judicious selection from the personal correspondence between M. and his religious superiors, P. is able to highlight the essentially ecclesiastic commitment of the scholar, who thought of himself always as an instrument of the Church and of the Society of Jesus in meeting the intellectual challenges of the time. To those who did not know him personally, or who are unfamiliar with the Jesuit ethos, this intimate portrait of the man will be the most striking feature of the volume. To some, I would hazard, M.'s docility and disposability to his superiors will strain credulity. To others, the stunning indifference of the man to his personal fortunes will enhance his stature.

Equally illuminating is P.'s careful tracing of the lines of conflict between Murray and his principal American antagonists, Catholic University theologians Fenton and Connell and various Roman authorities. Later chapters also provide a broader historical study of the Americanist controversy, which helps to explain the conflict between M. and his adversaries at the Catholic University of America. This is, in short, a portrait in depth of Murray at a pivotal moment for himself and for the American Church.

Yet it is only a portrait and so catches only one long moment in a life; for Murray had many other concerns, some quite closely related to the question of religious pluralism in America, which are only hinted at, or even completely ignored, in the volume. The most glaring omission is the lengthy and amicable controversy with Reinhold Niebuhr on the issue of morality and public policy, which occupies much of Murray's

most influential book. *We Hold These Truths*. Niebuhr's absence from the volume not only suggests the need for a further volume to complete this portrait, but also weakens this study itself. For example, the charge of doctrinal indifferentism which was leveled at M. would appear even less plausible in the light of his often acerbic polemic with the Union Theological Seminary professor. Unfortunately, neither the author nor the publishers indicate anywhere the restricted focus of the study. To have done so would have clarified the reader's expectations and enhanced his enjoyment of the volume.

*Georgetown University*

FRANCIS X. WINTERS, S.J.

THE CATHOLIC REDISCOVERY OF PROTESTANTISM: A HISTORY OF ROMAN CATHOLIC ECUMENICAL PIONEERING. By Paul M. Minus, Jr. New York: Paulist, 1976. Pp. 261. \$5.95.

This book offers Roman Catholics a chance to see their past as others see it. To bring this off in 261 pages is no mean feat, given that the period of observation stretches over four centuries. It took Roman Catholics that long to rediscover Protestantism—so the author. To chronicle how that rediscovery came about and to indicate its Roman Catholic promoters forms the scope of Minus' study, which develops out of research first undertaken at Yale University over fifteen years ago. What results is a helpful survey of Roman Catholic ecumenical pioneering with emphasis understandably placed on the period from Leo XIII to the conclusion of Vatican II.

The book's nine chapters trace the course of a long journey begun in a wilderness by the likes of Adrian VI, Pole, Contarini, and Erasmus, this soon after the onset of Luther's reforming campaign. These were followed by George Cassander, Christopher Davenport, Jean Dez, Bossuet, and Louis du Pin. Notes of promise were sounded by Johann Sailer, Charles Butler, Johann Möhler, James Doyle, and John Henry Newman. But it was the time of Leo XIII that gave Catholics a vision of hope for a united Christianity, a vision shared and expressed in different ways by the Pope himself, Fernand Portal, and Fr. Paul of Graymoor. How difficult the path to a realization of that hope would be is shown by the fact that it would include revived antagonisms in the anti-Modernist campaign and the study of Luther by Heinrich Denifle. The modern pioneering work of Cardinal Mercier, Lambert Beauduin, and Bede Winslow are given due treatment. A new view of Protestantism was forthcoming in the work of Yves Congar, Paul Couturier, Max Josef Metzger, and Josef Lortz. The Second World War, when Christians were brought together in so many joint efforts, provided a time for sowing seeds of future endeavors for unity. But it was the pontificate of John

XXIII that pointed Roman Catholics toward the promised land of genuine ecumenism and (given transalpine reconceptualizations of traditional doctrinal differences—e.g., Küng on justification in Barth and Trent) the achievement of the Second Vatican Council. M. concludes with brief remarks on some postconciliar developments and with an expression of hesitancy as to where Roman Catholicism is headed presently.

His sympathies are with the transformationist rather than preservationist motif (as he calls them) in the Roman Catholicism he assesses. Still, he manifests a fairness not easily achieved by an interested outsider looking at these developments. Some of the positions taken by Paul Blanshard and by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State hindered Catholic efforts at rediscovery more than Minus indicates. What is more, the positive ecumenical import of the revival of Thomism is more hinted at than established. Attention to the connection between the practice of transcendental method and a recognition of the conditioned character of doctrinal statements might have been a way to make a case for this. Finally, progressive positions were modified in conciliar documents in an effort to harmonize them with traditional theological patterns. Despite this, most knowledgeable commentators agreed that those documents would facilitate continued convergence of Catholic and Protestant thought (p. 233). This reviewer thinks it may well turn out to be that the qualification helped rather than hindered Catholic commitment to ecumenism, especially after the crowds stopped cheering ecumenists. But that verdict will have to wait for knowledgeable commentators of the future. Surely their work has been helped by Minus.

*Catholic University of America*

CARL J. PETER

THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF THEOLOGY. By Robin Gill. London: Mowbrays, 1975. Pp. 150. £3.75.

This volume is a modest contribution to the growing body of literature dealing with the relationships between theology and sociology. G. argues that theologians have been astonishingly casual in their knowledge and use of sociology. Theologians always make some assumptions about society and, since they are also human beings living in some particular society, they are necessarily conditioned by their environment to some extent. Even when theologians have made use of sociological information, however, they have frequently been uncritical and seemingly unaware of the ambiguity of such data.

Of the three basic sociological approaches to theology—a study of the social *determinants* of theology, a study of the social *significance* of

theology, and a study of the social *context* of theology — G. focuses on the third. This is obviously more oriented to the theologian than to the sociologist, and specifically to the methodology “by which one might establish an adequate understanding of this context.” The book is not an exercise in the sociology of religion or in “religious sociology.” Rather, G. is concerned with the relationships between sociology and the technical area of theology, and the methodologies employed by both. He suggests that both sociologist and theologian must adopt an “as if” methodological stance if they are to avoid both reductionism and sociological or theological imperialism. An “as if” methodology in both disciplines may show that the two disciplines are complementary rather than antagonistic.

G. argues that any theologian who wishes to communicate with contemporary man must take seriously the social context in which he lives. While not all theologians would agree with this rather obvious assertion (e.g., E. Mascall), even those who do (G. selects Harvey Cox and J. A. T. Robinson as examples) do so in a rather unsophisticated manner. G. criticizes such theologians for lacking evidence and for not taking sufficient account of alternate hypotheses. As a detailed example, G. selects the Honest to God Debate, in which all the theologians concerned (pro and con) assumed a process of secularization in the West as the context in which their theological discussion should take place. G. then proceeds to outline two versions of the secularization model, that of Peter Berger and Bryan Wilson, and the counterarguments of three critics, David Martin, Larry Shiner, and Andrew Greeley.

G.’s point is that the evidence and analysis of the social context in which theology is carried on is far more complex than most theologians have recognized. Theologians are prone to generalize about “modern man” on the basis of their own limited perceptions, without adverting to professional sociological studies. Even when theologians do turn to the sociologists, they are not sufficiently critical in their use of sociology. In the case of the secularization model, G. suggests that the ambiguity of the evidence and analysis should not be ignored and that theologians might do better to work on an “alternating model” along the lines of the wave-particle dualism in nuclear physics, or that less historically-sweeping models might prove more valid to theology than ignoring sociological input altogether.

It is difficult for this reviewer to disagree with G.’s main points: theologians should take seriously the social context (societal plausibility structures) of theology and should do so in a critical and sophisticated manner. Such a dialogue between sociology and theology need not threaten either discipline nor does it necessarily collapse one into the other; they can be complementary. As G. remarks, sociology may be

able to provide a critical perspective for theology comparable to that previously provided by the historical and philosophical disciplines. G.'s contribution is to make theologians more aware of their societal assumptions and more critical of the ambiguity of sociological analysis. Much more remains to be done on the social determinants of theological positions and on the social significance of theology. We look forward to hearing from the author in these areas also.

*Canisius College, Buffalo*

T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J.

COMPROMISE IN MORALITY. By Marc V. Attard, O.Carm. Rome: Published privately, 1976. Pp. 370.

So much of contemporary speculation in moral theology is familiar to the moral philosopher already conversant with diverse teleological and deontological normative theories of obligation. It is beginning to become acceptable that for anyone to propose an explanation of moral rightness and wrongness as plausibly valid and true, he must be willing to confront serious objections to his theory and to submit adequate responses. In addition, there must be cogent reasons in favor of the theory and it must explain the range of phenomena better than other competing theories. The several centuries during which moral theology was controlled by the manuals, with their high optimism on the location and number of universal affirmative and negative norms, have now finally been succeeded by a period of agonizing reappraisal of the most probing and skeptical kind. The moral philosopher welcomes this and recommends some of the penetrating searching that has already been done by Frankena, Carritt, Ross, and Rawls. Granted that they articulate their philosophical positions from different traditions with their own presuppositions, nevertheless a Christian who proposes his theory on universal moral norms will find it difficult to maintain the reasonability of his own tradition if he fails to recognize some of the best reasoning on these questions done elsewhere.

These reflections are stimulated by this work with its ambiguous title. Undoubtedly A. is referring to compromise in Christian morality, and yet as one works through the text the impression begins to grow that he would want the field to be wider than Christian morality. If this impression is valid, a critical philosopher might well cavil over the omission of philosophical sources that might creditably have contributed to the discussion.

A. discusses the several solutions to conflict situations: compromise, the theory of exceptions, the principles of double effect and of totality, the principle of overriding right, the love-centered ethic, situation ethics, etc., and then analyzes three examples of conflict situations involv-



ing war and pacifism, love and life, and abortion. For A., conflict situations are not real and objective in the concrete but only subjective and apparent in the abstract. This position is in its conclusion similar to that of the manualists, but the reasoning is different, because for the manualists morality was determined by its conformity with the natural law and so God in His wisdom could not impose contradictories of conflict in this present state of life. For A., the reasoning is based on the consideration that norms are limited and must be referred to a hierarchy of values. The agent is limited by the real possibilities offered to him. The philosopher would here be tempted to submit the distinction drawn by W. D. Ross and his conception of *prima-facie* rules. There may be moral absolutes of *prima-facie* duties but there are no moral absolutes of actual duties. This accepts the limitation on norms which moral theologians such as Fuchs, McCormick, and de Broglie would grant. How far such a limitation would proceed is a tantalizing question for a philosopher to raise. Would a moral theologian be as willing to accept what many moral philosophers would accept in such a conflict situation as the deliberate intention to murder Hitler, that such a murder could be the least moral evil? Would A. consider that while murder may be *prima facie* wrong, it is not always actually wrong? In other words, in the congeries of values and disvalues, could the murder of Hitler be the least moral evil in the conflict situation? To advance this far seems to this observer to imply the adoption of summary rules and the renunciation of constitutive rules in morality (the terminology is that of Rawls).

The book fascinates in many ways. It makes one question whether intrinsic evil is a viable term at all in a moral conflict, especially if it implies something that may never be done. Whether intrinsic evil is regarded physically or morally, there certainly are grades of such evil and therefore limitations on its exercise. What those limitations might be would be a legitimate question to raise in a discussion that recognizes the inadequacies of legalistic interpretations of natural law and the contributions of a more dynamic, historic, and personalistic approach to norms and rules. In this sense natural law is considered in the light of its historicity, and the person is regarded from the context of his actual existential situation. A. insists that from this point of view the person's human nature is preserved, protected, and promoted; his relationships with other people are developed; he is seen as a person who has been created and redeemed, who resides in a world disordered by sinfulness, which is one of the principal causes of situations of conflict. It is sinfulness in the human order which Curran takes as a starting point in his exposition of a theory of compromise, which, he claims, tries to do justice to the whole sinful situation. In such a situation we are not obliged to fulfil all the values or to eliminate all the disvalues, and

therefore there is a true objective conflict only if the obligation is categorical and affirmative with regard to the totality of values.

The philosopher is left to translate much of this reasoning into his own specialized language, and it would seem that a kind of nonformal act deontology that would be associated with a number of wise summary rules might be helpful towards the final position A. takes. Issue might be taken with his unwillingness to accept sin in the world as the unique cause of conflict and also the cause for compromise. Such resistance as he seems to endorse tends to absolutize a freedom of self-determination. Others might be less sanguine and more often found on their knees.

*Southeastern Massachusetts Univ.*      THOMAS A. WASSMER, S.J.

THE SEXUAL LANGUAGE: AN ESSAY IN MORAL THEOLOGY. By André Guindon. Ottawa: Univ. of Ottawa, 1976. Pp. 476.

This essay in sexual ethics is written by a moralist who characterizes himself as "unambiguously situated within Catholic theology" and who attempts to present, beyond "new morality" versus "old morality," "radical views" versus "traditional views," a work that will make sense for contemporary North American Christians. Guindon does not believe that sexual ethics is a confessional issue. Catholic moralists are judged by him not worthy of being heard who, in the face of solid statistical evidence that masturbation is a nearly universal, frequent, and regular practice in adolescence, still continue to teach that such an act is always a grave sin. Likewise, the *sensus fidelium* within their own situational life experiences is an important locus of God's continuous, active presence among us and the statistical data from not only nominal Catholics but from authentically committed Christians regarding contraception and their religious opposition to it demands that *Humanae vitae* be given a rigorous critical examination. In all areas of sexual activity, if moral considerations, theological or nontheological, Catholic or non-Catholic, are not grounded in "statistical, psychological, sociological" and other such relevant data, they are simply an exercise in futility.

G.'s study concentrates on just such data in his criticism of moral imperatives in the sexual order, whether they are proposed by Catholic moral theologians or by secular scientific sexologists who would at once deny that they proceed from an "is" to an "ought." Kinsey's equation of sexual behavior with genital release is seen as a parascientific view which affects the whole methodology of his inquiry and the significance of the results. A human male's sexual behavior can never be merely an activity affording sexual outlets, and to insist upon this equation is as much an ethical evaluation as the directive Kinsey gives for counseling those who seek to come to terms with their own feelings concerning these experiences: "The clinician . . . can reassure these

individuals that such activities are biologically and psychologically part of the normal mammalian picture . . . " (*Sexual Behavior in the Human Male*, p. 677). Albert Ellis plays the role of the ethicist without any disguise when this paternalistic advice is given: "You are not here on earth primarily to achieve something wonderful during your life-time, to be of great service to others, to change the course of the world, or to do anything else but (in one way or another that you find particularly pleasing) to enjoy yourself" (*Sex and the Single Man*, pp. 46-47). This is not just a statement of psychological hedonism but an uncritical assertion of ethical hedonism. The outspoken champions of "unanxious sex, of sex without hang-ups are themselves viscerally uptight—for some obscure reason—about sex and Catholicism." There are few sexologists even among those who are proud of their commitment to the scientific method and avoid moral evaluations. To this extent they are as unscientific and uncritical as the Catholic moralist who refuses to look at the statistical data because he has already made up his mind about human nature and its sexual activity.

G. scores repeatedly on normative positions in sexual ethics taken by those who would resent others doing the same thing. However, he saves his strongest criticism for Catholic manualists who concentrate so much on the physical side of sexuality and so little on the psychological and the personal. The description of the two kinds of homosexuality, perfect and imperfect, is represented as a preposterous and grotesque account of homosexual love in which the most elementary notions of what real homosexuality is are totally ignored. Genital positions are decisive in distinguishing between perfect and imperfect immoral acts; interiority, desires, motivation, and circumstances are unimportant; physiological release of muscular and nervous tension is the determining element for moral distinctions, and the fascination for erections, orgasms, and the loss of seed displays an infantile and primitive mentality on human sexual behavior. The manuals in moral theology contributed very little to the profound meaning of human sexuality, where man and woman are coresponsible for their mutual sexual growth. It is through their love relationship that they act out their quest of a true humanity, created male and female in the image of God. The search for sexual meaning must be constant, and to read accounts of sex and love in the Bible is to understand how the People of God addressed themselves to this quest: "We know that sexuality should be relational and loving, as well as integrative of those elements of *one* humanity, man-woman, body-spirit. But what this means concretely for us today is something to be discovered, re-invented, indeed realized anew."

G. examines the writings of Von Hildebrand and finds his *Defense of Purity* to be Neoplatonic, dualistic, opposing sex genitality on the one side and spiritual love on the other. Sexual mastery is the result of

mystical and intellectualistic purification, different from the ascetical, voluntaristic self-discipline of most Christian moralists. The guilt that is experienced from this inability to attain self-mastery can become neurotized, but it is impossible to exorcise all guilt and the Promethean efforts of some sexologists to eliminate all guilt feelings remind G. of Spinoza's *nec spe nec metu* — to hope for nothing so as to fear nothing.

This is a book which every priest has in his system to write but never produces. G.'s work is impressive, although some repetition and hammering away at his theme gives the impression of overkill. But that theme is clear: 'Because sex in us is never mere genitality, it always says who we are beyond our too facile oral discourse. Its own truth, source of rejuvenation, of fecundity, and of incommensurate joy and pleasure is never established outside the global context of our real life. We do not become meaningfully and happily sexual, independently from our responsible self, the one who works and prays, sings and cries, eats and sleeps, speaks and meditates, dreams and plans, prays and loves. This is the truth that makes us free. Sexuality is fully liberated when it speaks our truth integrally.'

*Southeastern Massachusetts Univ.*

THOMAS A. WASSMER, S.J.

THE LIGHT AT THE CENTER: CONTEXT AND PRETEXT OF MODERN MYSTICISM. By Agehananda Bharati. Santa Barbara: Ross-Erikson, 1976. Pp. 254. \$4.95.

Agehananda Bharati makes certain that we know who he is: a former altar boy from Vienna who eventually went to India to become a Hindu monk; LSD experimenter and lover; a professional both in mysticism and the social sciences; a now very busy American university professor; someone who has undergone at least three "genuine" "zero experiences." He has written his book for the students of the "Age of Aquarius." He thereby denounces "coffee cake Protestantism," "dogmatic medievalism," "theologians and ecclesiastics," and "Hindu Puritans" for their alleged fear of mysticism. But he also castigates the "pathological eclecticism" of America's neomystical movements.

B. stridently asserts but hardly proves that the mystical experience is necessarily monistic; theistic mystics are only "mystics by courtesy;" the gods and God are ultimately psychological projections; psychoexperimentalism is the hallmark of the mystical quest; the mystical experience is autonomous, value-free, and totally unrelated to religious, moral, and ontological implications; moral judgment is ultimately an aesthetic judgment; the mystic is necessarily antinomian and self-indulgent; the mystic must use ecstasy and euphoria as his method, etc. The distinction between *-etic* and *-emic* statements ("one made in a universal

context under the assumption that all sane people in the world would understand the meaning of the statement," and "one which is understood . . . only in a specific social or cultural segment") provides the cutting edge of B.'s analysis of mystical experience.

The book abounds in "I would like to think" arguments. Jesus, Moses, Vivekananda, Eliade, Zaehner, John of the Cross, Aquinas, Paramahansa, the TM movement, the Hare Krishnas, etc. are all put in their place *ad hominem* style or via paperback psychologizing, undergraduate in depth. B.'s understanding of Christianity and the Christian mystics hardly surpasses his altar-boy days in Vienna. He violates his own rules of "ethno-science" with his inane analysis of Jesus' person, preachings, and miracles.

If the mystical experience is value-free, why must it be antinomian? If a "genuine tradition" must be followed, why does B. praise the eclecticism of Timothy Leary and Allen Ginsberg? If psychoexperimentation is so important, why B.'s diatribe against those who preach mysticism's "hard way"? If the processes leading to the mystical experience are irrelevant and madness only socially relative, why not a Charlie Manson "zero experience"? What does "sane" mean in B.'s definition of *-etic* statements?

The Christian, Sufi, Jewish, and Hindu theistic mystics certainly proffer enough evidence for an experience of union with differentiation. Indwelling is not merging; the love experience manifests two who have become one, yet remain two and not an absorption of one by the other. Perhaps B. does not know whether an experience of perfectly deep sleep, an orgasm with Miss Universe, or the ecstatic zero experience is preferable in the long run, but a St. Augustine or a St. Ignatius of Loyola certainly does. The least knowledgeable about Christian mysticism disproves B.'s assertion that "only the mystic who has no other interests will give way to the Dark Night of the Soul."

B. seems totally ignorant of mystical states, rules for the discernment of spirits, and the consistent Christian distinction between genuine and pseudo mystics. *Pace* B., interpretation of an experience is not extrinsic to the experience, but an integral dimension thereof. A careful reading of, e.g., St. John of the Cross or the *Cloud of Unknowing* clearly indicates that the "tiny flame of love" purifies, illuminates, and *transforms* the person. Moreover, B.'s disdain for the social, historical *nature* of the person gratuitously reduces person to mean "autonomous individual."

In summary, B.'s book offers little more than his own brand of "goosey eclecticism." He is more than at home with the contradictions in America's neomystical movements.

Boston College

HARVEY EGAN, S.J.

**WOMEN AND CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD: AN EXPANDED VISION.** Edited by Anne Marie Gardiner, S.S.N.D. New York: Paulist, 1976. Pp. 259. \$5.95.

This book is a historical document of paramount importance. It is the record of the first public national conference concerning the priesthood of women. This was organized by nonhierarchical persons in 1975. Its import is as great as the first movement for the abolition of slavery in the United States and it will produce as much emotional reaction. The book in itself says nothing radically new, but it gathers together the oral and written reflections of prophetic women and men since Vatican II, a people who wish to see the Church respond to all that is good, true, and holy in the twentieth century.

The book is comprehensive, for it gives not only the main lectures but the responses to each; a synthesis of the conference as a whole; the text of the liturgical prayer used together with the homily delivered by a Canadian laywoman: an address to the assembly by Nadine Foley, O.P.; a model for Theological Reflection and Just Actions by Nancy A. Lafferty, F.S.P.A.; the ordination conference questionnaire and its result; full details of the people who comprised the task-force; a call to the priesthood by Rosalie Muschal-Reinhardt, mother of five, who herself has received a call to the priesthood; the Episcopalian Women's Statements, the Las Hermanas Statement and the Black Sisters' Response. Appendices include the Bernardin Statement; a select but very comprehensive bibliography; the roster arranged by states; a list of those who gave public endorsement of the Conference; an essay called "Theological Questions on Ordinations" by Joseph A. Komonchak, which was included not because it was given at the Conference but because it was so pertinent, as it directs itself to the Bishops' Statement on the Ordination of Women (1973), which received scant attention at the Conference. Those who were not able to be present at the Conference have not missed a great deal, because its very flower is in this book.

It is impossible to comment on each talk; it must suffice to mention some key concepts. The lectures reiterated the importance of creating a new priesthood which is not based on power (p. 21); indeed, women do not wish to enter the priesthood as it is in the present, but wish to see a radical transformation. Carroll Stuhlmueller, C.P., in an excellent short response, warned the audience that unless women are admitted to the presbyterate, the Eucharist will lose its central place in the Church (p. 28). This calls for radical thinking on the part of the bishops and laity. George Tavard made a perspicacious response to Margaret Farley in taking a more positive attitude than she and demonstrating the leadership positions which women have held throughout Church history, e.g., abbesses and queens, and that even Aquinas stated that

women shared equally in the *imago dei* (a point greatly obscured by fundamentalists). Both Anne E. Carr and Elizabeth S. Fiorenza stressed the absolute necessity of sisterhood among women (pp. 78 and 100-101 respectively). Dorothy H. Donnelly was perhaps misinformed when, though emphasizing the diversity of gifts in the Church, she stated that the overwhelming majority of women religious present at the Conference "points out that religious women are the most advantaged, highly educated, privileged, prestigious group of women in the Church" (p. 119). The statistics merely show that women religious have more funds and time available. It was pointed out to the sisters as early as March that all the major talks were to be given (and were given) by religious, who were as educated as but not more educated than laywomen. Arlene A. Swidler pleaded for the ordination of married partners (p. 134), and Leonard Swidler urged "nuns to follow the examples of Jesus, particularly, and to work most of all to bring to full maturity the most suppressed element of the world and of the Church: laywomen" (p. 134). He also pleaded that they not identify with the male clergy over against the laity. This was perhaps the most controversial point in the otherwise amicable Conference, for the question was asked repeatedly "Are the nuns going to form a second hierarchy?" However, one is happy to say that the sisters have responded with humility and grace, in that after the Conference every effort was made to include laywomen and minority groups in the twenty-two persons serving on the permanent W.O.C. (Women's Ordination Conference) to continue the work of the Conference. They will also be included among the consultants.

Anne M. Gardiner, S.S.N.D., is to be congratulated on this book. It should be indispensable reading for bishops and priests, the basis of discussion for many local W.O.C. groups, and the first of a series of its kind. Other subsequent books might give more major attention to Scripture, especially the Old Testament priesthood in contrast to the Epistle to the Hebrews; to Mariology and Mary's priesthood as represented in art and patristic writings; to the mission fields, where women are performing all priestly privileges save the Eucharist and the sacrament of reconciliation. World justice requires that we, the Church, provide the sacraments and the word to all our sisters and brothers whether these be administered through male or female hands.

*University of Santa Clara*

J. MASSYNGBERDE FORD