

of the gospels and we dismiss the redactor, what are our sources for John's gospel? Here Professor Brodie makes what could be regarded as very startling claims. He argues firstly, that John's gospel is a unity and probably the work of the disciple himself. Brodie suggests that the Evangelist by using a process of transformation, reconstruction and synthesis took his sources straight from the synoptics. All of Mark: chunks of Matthew, including the Infancy narrative and parts of the sermon on the mount, together with passages of Luke and Luke Acts. But there is more: Brodie would also include Paul's letter to the Ephesians (which was to hand) and selected passages from the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and Numbers.

The substance of Professor Brodie's case will be found in Chapter Seven of his study, "A test case" in which he argues that John Chapter 9, the healing of the man born blind, is a re-write "as dramatisation and vision theme" of Mark Chapters 8:11 to 9:8. His understanding of these texts is based upon what he argues to be their intrinsic similarity and the consistency and reasonableness of their difference. Obviously, it is not possible in the space of a short review to document Brodie's argument in detail, but what readers may well find is that there is more reasonable difference than intrinsic similarity and that to arrive at the conclusion he does stretches the text to the absolute limit. What Brodie's argument might show, however, is what most exegetes would accept already, that there was a body of received tradition (oral?) which the Evangelists had in common and reshaped for their own communities and for their own theological purposes.

What, then, are we to make of Professor Brodie's study? As far as this reviewer is concerned he tries and fails to prove too much in too little space. Readers other than professional exegetes will find this book hard going and will be blinkered by the number of texts that they will be required to examine for comparison and discussion. They may be quite bewildered too by the wealth of detail and the criss-crossing of texts. Has Professor Brodie made an important, contribution to the current state of Johannine scholarship? His readers will have to answer that question for themselves. But they will read much that will surprise them.

DENIS GERAGHTY OP

THE GRACE HORIZON. NATURE AND GRACE IN MODERN CATHOLIC THOUGHT by Stephen J. Duffy. *The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1992. Pp. 217. £13.50.*

By the author's own admission, this work is something of a 'period piece' (p. 9), a chronicling and interpreting of the mid-century Catholic debate on the relationship between nature and grace, between the natural and the supernatural orders. Nevertheless, it is particularly useful for the student of more recent Catholic theology, since it provides precisely the kind of survey which is necessary for an informed understanding of Vatican II, political theology and the theologies of

liberation.

Duffy begins with a clear exposition of the issues, terms, and historical background to the controversy (chs. 1, 2). Though abstract, his generalised typology of two basic approaches to the various questions involved (the natural desire for the vision of God, the gratuitousness of the Christian vocation, the possibility of an ungraced 'pure nature', the place of the Christian in the world) offers a welcome mode of initiation into the complexities of the debate.

The bulk of the book is concerned with those theologians who parted company with the post-Tridentine scholastic extrinsicism which understood the supernatural and natural orders to be two almost separate layers and emphasised a state of 'pure nature' without positive intrinsic ordination to the supernatural in order to preserve the gratuitousness of grace. Those who in mid-century rejected this extrinsicism turned attention to the immanence of grace as well as its transcendence, beginning not with a formal conceptual construct of 'pure nature', but with human beings in their actual concrete historical existence.

Among these theologians was Henri de Lubac (ch. 3). By rediscovering the patristic and Thomistic notion of a natural desire for the supernatural, his *Surnatural* challenged the prevailing extrinsicism. Paradoxically, this desire can only be answered by an absolutely gratuitous grace. Duffy, however, finds a difficulty in de Lubac's marginalisation of the concept of pure nature: de Lubac fails to allow sufficiently for the theoretical possibility of a human being created without a calling to a supernatural destiny and so underlines the 'double gratuity' of creation and grace.

Karl Rahner (chs. 4, 8) is judged to be more successful in this regard. Although in historical fact human beings are always the objects of the divine self-offer and so are always within the supernatural order (the hypothesis of a 'supernatural existential'), one nevertheless uses a concept of 'pure nature (historical human nature minus the supernatural existential) as a way of defending the gratuitousness of this universal gracing as distinct from the gratuitousness of creation. Rahner thus steers a course between the standard scholastic view and those (such as the anonymous 'D') who appeared to reduce the gratuitousness of grace to that of creation.

Duffy is extremely favourable to Rahner's solution and the whole Rahnerian theology that goes with it. He therefore attempts a wide-ranging defence of Rahner against his critics. He limits von Balthasar's critical response (ch. 5) to the desire to marginalise 'pure nature' such that von Balthasar is more like de Lubac and 'D' than Rahner and so runs the risk of negating grace's specific gratuitousness. It is unfortunate that in this instance, Duffy did not extend his survey to von Balthasar's later writings to consider the more significant divergences between Rahner and von Balthasar on the supernatural existential and the natural desire for the vision of God.

Duffy deals easily with Juan Alfaro's personalist and psychological approach to the supernatural (ch 6) which is seen as a 'variation in focus'(p 144) rather than a serious divergence from Rahner. Although Duffy accepts Schillebeeckx's view that Max Seckler's theories concerning Aquinas' *instinctus fidei* reduced faith to nature, he rejects Schillebeeckx's trenchant criticism of the supernatural existential. Duffy argues convincingly that Schillebeeckx's critique presupposes a basic misunderstanding of the rôle and origin of the existential in Rahner's thought.

A prominent preoccupation of Duffy's is the positive attitude he takes towards process thought. He considers Eulalio Baltazar's process arguments against scholasticism to be successful only against a decadent scholasticism but not against Rahner whom Baltazar seems to have misread (ch. 7). However, process thought, Duffy believes has come a long way since Baltazar and its theism may become yet more sophisticated. Duffy defends Rahner's theology against all sorts of objections (ch. 8): its supposed equivocation about the supernatural existential, its anthropocentric methodology, its individualism at the expense of the interpersonal. But it is Mark L Taylor's critique of Rahner's impassible (and so not truly a personal and related) God which impresses Duffy the most. Rahner's Thomism is said to have prevented him from following through the transcendental turn to the subject in order to base his concept of God more radically on human experience of love and personal relationship.

But what of von Balthasar's objections to the Rahnerian project? This Duffy passes over in unjustified silence. Although he concedes von Balthasar's work a place within today's pluralism of theologies, Duffy seems to have little respect for it except as an antidote to excessive rationalism. (Given his suspicion of impassibility, one wonders what Duffy would make of von Balthasar's doctrine of God!) Instead, he wants to develop *Rahner's* theology, intertwining the sacred and the secular and envisaging a universal and even cosmic dimension to grace in which 'nature' is not merely 'human nature'. But what philosophy can best articulate such Christian experience? Duffy leaves himself hovering between loyal adherence to the metaphysics of Rahner's transcendental Thomism and a perilous plunge into the philosophy of process.

SIMON G. GAINÉ

LITERARY FORMS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT By James L Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek, *SPCK* 1992 pp. 219 paper £12.99.

The study of literary form is essential to any critical understanding of the Bible. It figured prominently in earlier source and form criticism as a way of detecting underlying material; redaction criticism focused attention on the significance of overall *genre*. With more recent, narrative and rhetorical methods, the whole question has taken on even greater importance. So this book, written by two seminary professors from