#### THEOLOGICAL SURVEY

cent: in perfect accord with its theme it is both plangent and joyful. I only regret that this supreme symbolic focus has not been permitted to float unencumbered in its recess, instead of resting as it does on a globe containing a representation of St Peter's against a sky-within-a-sky, below which there emerges in turn a rocky landscape with the four rivers of Paradise. Enough is enough. Here if anywhere was a case for the application to iconographic elements of the famous dictum of Mies van der Rohe concerning those of architecture: *Less is more*.

To do anything like justice to the whole opus, a verbal conducted tour and bay-by-bay appreciation would be called for. But it would be tedious both to write and to read, unless one could command the pen of a Ruskin and the Victorian longanimity of his readers. This however matters but little, since we can all sooner or later go and see for ourselves. After prodigies of care and labour these mosaics have now taken the first steps of their long journey into time. What has been expressed here is one observer's reaction after one visit. Thousands upon thousands of others are going to look, discover, enjoy, appraise; and perhaps few or none will share my critical reservations. In a sense I hope they won't. But even those who do will agree unquestioningly that a work of massive dignity, sincerity and substance has been accomplished.

### CHRISTOPHER CORNFORD

# Theological Survey

## THE HERDER LEXIKON:

## A REPORT ON PROGRESS

With its sixth volume the Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche has now reached Marcellino, which is quite a reasonable rate of progress (see BLACKFRIARS, May 1959; June 1960 for earlier reports). The original protector of the work, Archbishop Michael Buchberger of Regensburg, died soon after the publication of volume II, and the Lexikon is now under the protection of Archbishop Hermann Schäufele of Freiburg. Denzinger references are now given according to the numeration of the 31st edition (1957), in which a different system has been adopted for the modern period, preparatory to the more fundamental revision announced by its editor, Karl Rahner, who is also one of the two editors of the Lexikon.

Some of the general principles guiding the editors have now become clearer. This is particularly true of the discussion of major theological topics under two heads, as regards the place and structure of the tractate concerned, and as regards

185

#### BLACKFRIARS

its content. Thus we have an article on ecclesiology and another on Church: a note at the beginning of the former tells us that we must go to the article on Church for the teaching of Scripture and Tradition, the present article concerning itself with the development of the systematic treatment of the doctrine (Bächt) and with certain technically specialized (wissenschaftstheoretische) considerations (Semmelroth). I cannot say that I am particularly enthusiastic about this division, here or elsewhere, though it certainly has the advantage of releasing the theoretician's speculative interests; at any rate it strikes the English reader as showing a somewhat exaggerated respect for the constructions of reflexive thought. In the present case, Semmelroth offers what is more or less a summary of his brilliantly attractive book, Die Kirche als Ursakrament, and suggest thats the proper place in the general scheme of dogmatic theology for the treatise on the Church would be after Christology and soteriology and before the treatise on the sacraments. But when one turns to the main article on Kirche (Schnackenburg on the New Testament, a very compressed summary of his recent contribution to the Herder Quaestiones Disputatae series; Ratzinger on the teaching of the magisterium and for an excellent systematic treatment of the theology of the Church; Skydsgaard for non-Catholic-Orthodox and Protestant, but not Anglican-views; Elbern on iconography) one wonders quite how what is presented here is related to Semmelroth's theoretical picture. To the present writer it suggests the criticism that Semmelroth's ecclesiology is either too empty or too narrow (according to how generally or how sharply 'sacrament' is defined) to serve as a satisfactory framework for the theology of the Church. (Other criticisms could be made of this view of the Church as 'primordial sacrament', one which has been adopted in his own way by K. Rahner; but this is not the place for them).

Ratzinger offers by way of definition the statement that the Church is the People which lives by and from the Body of Christ, and becomes, in the celebration of the Eucharist, that very Body itself. The route by which he reaches this 'definition' (notably the discussion of 'people') and the consequences he draws from it are of great interest: the Church as the new People of God, with the Twelve as its 'ancestors', is constantly re-realizing itself as a Tischgemeinschaft ('table fellowship', the stable fellowship of the common meal) in the Body of the risen Christ. Leaving this article with some reluctance, we must draw attention to the numerous articles elsewhere in the Lexikon to which it refers, and also to the array of supporting articles connected with Kirche. Of the first group, particular mention should be made of the articles Gemeinschaft der Heiligen (Piolanti), Laie (Congar, Mörsdorf) and the group of articles on grace (Mussner, Auer, Rahner, Stegmüller, Lakner); of the second, numerous articles by Mörsdorf on canonical aspects of the Church: it is rewarding to read a really theological treatment of canon law. The article on membership of the Church (Kirchengliedschaft) brings together Mörsdorf and Rahner, their earlier differences now reconciled, or at least not adverted to. Not that all differences between contributors have been smoothed out: J. Betz, in accordance with his discussion

186

#### HUME RECONSIDERED

of the point in his large and unfinished book on the Eucharist, recommends (in the article *Eucharistie*) bisra as the Aramaic equivalent behind the New Testament soma; in the article on the recitals of institution (*Einsetzungsberichte*) Schümann dismisses this out of hand ('sicher nicht bisra'). Short articles on 'tags' should also be noticed; for instance, on *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* (Beumer) or gratia supponit naturam (Alfaro): these seem to me exceptionally valuable. Jedin has good articles on the Councils and the Conciliar movement; Schlier and Ratzinger share an article on the Body of Christ (*Leib Christi;* special articles on the Encyclicals Mystici Corporis and Satis Cognitum are promised).

To attempt to go further in the space available would simply be to list articles and contributors. Enough has perhaps been said to indicate the outstanding value and interest of the Lexikon. Hardly any of the contributors (on theological topics, at least) restricts himself to a summary of approved commonplaces; the general impression continues to be one of a Church intellectually and spiritually alive. It will be interesting to see how the new *Catholic Encyclopedia*, work on which has already started, will compare with this fine achievement of what is very largely German-speaking Catholicism.

The reviewer notes with regret that of his two patrons the Pope appears under 'C' and the centurion under 'K', presumably because of a traditional biblical spelling.

CORNELIUS ERNST, O.P.

# Hume Reconsidered

## HUME'S PHILOSOPHY OF BELIEF

### by Antony Flew; Routledge and Kegan Paul; 30s.

This is an admirably interesting and informative work on Hume's *Enquiry Concerning the Human Understanding*, that is to say on those aspects of Hume's philosophy which Hume himself thought were most important, and which have proved in the long run most influential. Professor Flew has supplied us with an aid which will make it easy for much less learned people to consider and to find in their original places—what probably amount to most arguments of any significance that have been offered in criticism or defence of Hume, so far as they relate to matter covered in the *Enquiry*. For this service he deserves very warm thanks. He himself reports, discusses and takes up a position on the arguments in hand. Only someone who is already as well-read as Professor

187