

performs his saving work and explains what he has done (or what he is about to do). No theology of revelation that fails to give a

balanced account of both elements is likely to hold the field for very long.

JOHN ASHTON, S.J.

**ST THOMAS AQUINAS: SUMMA THEOLOGIAE.** Vol. XXIX: The Old Law (Ia IIae xcviII-cv), David Bourke and Arthur Littledale. *Blackfriars*; London: *Eyre and Spottiswoode*; New York: *McGraw-Hill*, xxvii + 322 pp. 50s.

The treatise on the Old Law is one of the longest in the *Summa* and it provides one of the largest volumes in the new edition. Also, as the translators remark in their Introduction, it is one of those most often neglected by the student. It presents peculiar difficulties, partly on account of St Thomas's determination to present as a coherent and systematic whole what is in fact a mass of material of very different date and from very different sources, and partly on account of the very imperfect state of Old-Testament scholarship in the Angelic Doctor's time. Many of the interpretations are therefore highly allegorical and some are, by modern standards, quite fantastic.

Nevertheless St Thomas's treatment does bring out impressively the double aspect which characterizes the Old Israel and the Old Law. On the one hand they link up with the natural law common to mankind as a whole; on the other they look forward to the redemptive work of Christ. And St Thomas's allegorizing, dominated as it is by symbolism and *rationes convenientiae*, emphasizes the purely pedagogical nature of the Old Dispensation and the witness which it bears to a future and effective work of salvation which in itself it is powerless to perform. Thus, like the Old Testament itself, St Thomas's interpretation of it is dominated by the concept of *Heilsgeschichte*, the history of God's salvation.

It is apparently not simply for lack of space that the translators have provided only a short introduction and no appendices or glossary; the character of the text, with its dauntingly long and numerous replies to objections, requires extensive comments at the relevant places. These the translators have provided most adequately; they have not hesitated to point out the Angelic Doctor's lack of correct

information and historic sense, and they have made use of the work of all the leading Old-Testament scholars of the present day, both Catholic and Protestant. The serious student will in fact learn a great deal about modern Old-Testament scholarship by reading the footnotes, while the less austere reader will be entertained by the examples which he finds in the text of thirteenth-century natural history and exegesis. Particularly delightful is the reply to the first objection to Question 102, Article 6, in which, in learning that the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law had reasonable grounds, we are given a potted manual of ornithology. 'The hawk', we are told, 'which helps man in the pursuit of his prey, signifies those who serve the powerful in exploiting the poor. The screech-owl, which seeks its food at night, but lies hid in the daytime, signifies the dissolute, who seek concealment in what they do. . . . The moorhen, unlike other birds, has a webbed foot for swimming and a cloven foot for walking, for it swims like a duck and walks like a partridge. It drinks only as it bites, dipping all its food in water. It signifies those who refuse to do anything at the will of another, but do solely what is dipped in the water of their own will.'

In the hands of less inspired or less learned editors this might have been one of the least attractive volumes in the series. It is in fact both interesting and instructive, for they have perceived the essential rightness of St Thomas's basic principle while enriching it with knowledge which the Angelic Doctor did not possess but which, we can be sure, he would have welcomed with delight.

In lines 10 and 11 of page 58, *judicialia* should be *judicialibus*.

E. L. MASCALL

**MAN'S CONDITION, God and the World Process**, by William C. Shepherd. *Herder and Herder*, New York, 1969, 286 pp. \$5.95.

The title which William C. Shepherd has given his book leads the reader to expect something more and something other than the text really offers. This work is really an analysis,

interpretation, and criticism of Karl Rahner's theological writing, both as system and as a technical doctrine on the nature-grace problem. It is on this basis that the book has to be

evaluated. The author's claim to forge 'an argument concerning how God relates to the entire human condition' (p. 23), and to offer a new 'theory' or 'doctrine' (is one meant to understand these terms synonymously?) on the traditional problem of nature and grace cannot be taken seriously.

A new theory on the nature-grace relationship would require a much sharper and detailed analysis of man's *condition* and of *evolutionary world process* than this book offers. The author clearly and frequently distinguishes man's condition from man's being, i.e. his constitution. He clearly, and with no less frequency, distinguishes a unified, evolutionary, process-view of the world from a static picture of the world as hierarchically structured according to a 'three-storied' model. These distinctions are obviously necessary. They are, however, only the first step toward a new theory. And the author does not really move very far beyond this first step.

Because what the author presents as a new theory (in eight pages!) supposedly renders unimportant a host of questions and problems which were central to more traditional ways of treating the nature-grace problem, it cannot pretend to be a coherent position on the nature-grace problem in the same sense that older answers were (p. 260).

Fair enough. One would not expect a new theory to raise the same questions that were central to an old theory. We would then have not a new theory, but simply a set of possibly new answers. And a theory is neither a collection of answers, nor a catalogue of clarified concepts. A theory is a system of questions, defined concepts, and formulations which employ these concepts and express judgments. A new theory on the nature-grace problem would have raised an array of new questions, and upon investigation of these questions, have presented a new system of formulations. The author has not done this. The 'fundamental alliances between man and his environment' which he mentions do indicate a direction along which a new theory could take shape. He, however, does not analyse or exploit these alliances. He simply refers to their existence.

William Shepherd was actually quite correct in the first sentence of his preface. He spoke there of suggesting a new way of conceiving the nature-grace relationship. What this book offers is precisely that—a *suggestion*, an interesting and promising insight on where and how a new theory on the nature-grace problem should begin.

What he has quite ably shown is that Rahner's many and thematically varied theological essays do manifest a closely-knit theological synthesis and that this synthesis may be called a theology of nature and grace. This is not to ignore, as only a superficial evaluation could, that William Shepherd's analysis and interpretation do raise a number of rather serious questions.

First, granted that Rahner's run of essays exhibits contrasting conceptual frameworks and styles of thought, is the author justified in asserting that Rahner's theology is disjointed (p. 25), that he vacillates between a hypothetical pure nature and a concept of concrete historical nature (p. 243)? Is he not failing here to read Rahner historically? It is possible to move forward through inadequate formulations to more adequate ones, from lower to higher points of view. Is this not possibly the case with Rahner? It would seem that an analysis and interpretation should have at least raised this question. Relative to the nature-grace problem in particular, is Shepherd not whipping a beast which Rahner in his later writings has already, even if quietly, laid to rest?

Second, the author is to be highly commended not only for opening his interpretation with a consideration of Rahner's more philosophically oriented works, *Geist in Welt* and *Hörer des Wortes*, but especially for clearly showing the bearing of these works on the development and unity of Rahner's theology. It must, however, be mentioned that Rahner's use of philosophy, especially of the transcendental method, is considerably more supple than one would gather from Shepherd's interpretation. Philosophy does not in Rahner's theological reflection play the role of a set of mathematical functions and operators working on the range of theological variables to produce a system of ordered answers. The author's interpretation, especially with the use of such phrases as, 'It is not difficult to predict where Rahner goes from here' (p. 168), does tend to give this impression.

Third, and finally, a question bearing upon an equivalence series which Shepherd believes to be the fundamental key to an understanding of Rahner's theology of nature and grace. Reference here is to the identification 'of the transcendental scope encompassing all human activity with general revelation, supernatural existential, and uncreated grace' (p. 170). It is highly doubtful that '. . . all mean exactly the

same thing. It is not even proper to say that they all refer to different aspects of the same thing' (p. 206). It is to be feared that such a statement is philosophically naive and betrays the temporary lack of conceptual sensitivity of one who has momentarily departed from the intellectual pattern of experience.

The above elements of criticism are not meant to deny that *Man's Condition* manifests to a great extent a competent handling of the difficult issues involved in an analysis and

interpretation of Rahner's thought. In the assurance that this book will not be William C. Shepherd's last, this review closes with a few remarks on English usage. It should be possible to find more suitable substitutes for such frequently recurring words as: impartation, instantiation, cognized, proleptic, and for the noun usage of the word dynamic. It is not an undesirable thing to show that one *can* carry on theological work in the English language.

DAVID J. ROY, S.S.A.

**MAN AND HIS RELIGION, Aspects of Religious Psychology, by Giorgio Zunini. Geoffrey Chapman, London, 1969, 365 pp. 63s.**

**THE RELIGIOUS MAN, A psychological study of religious attitudes, by Antoine Vergote. Gill and Macmillan, Dublin, 1969, 306 pp. 60s.**

Both these books set out to give a general account of *homo religiosus*. For both authors a man is religious—to paraphrase Thouless' original definition of religion—insofar as he responds to what he believes to be divine. The man whom they discuss, however, turns out to be predominantly modern, Western, and Catholic, although primitive man gets his half-chapter in both books, but perhaps this is not surprising since both authors are Catholic priests teaching at European universities, Zunini at Milan, and Vergote at Louvain. Christian Western man is equated with *homo religiosus* largely by default, since modern work on religious psychology has, by and large, been carried out in the West. It seems important to stress that comparative work needs to be done on Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, and non-Western Christians before conclusions can be validly generalized, unless the rather dubious assumption that Christian Western man is the spearhead of the evolution of religious man is explicitly accepted.

The theme of Zunini's book is that the 'religious sense' which is 'situated in the antagonism between man's limitation and restriction to himself on the one hand and his impulse towards an immutable Unknown on the other hand' (p. 206) is a psychogenous need (a need of the whole person), like the need to know. Or, as the dust-jacket puts it, 'man is inescapably religious just as he is inescapably sexual, sociable, and power-seeking'. It follows that all men are *really* religious and that the religious power within them will drive them to create false Gods if the true God is not given them. This is 'Lord of the Flies' psychology, backed up with a wide-ranging discussion of much twentieth-century writing on religion in which

William James and Allport come out with top marks.

It is difficult to establish from the book any very clear idea of the nature of the religious sense and this is, no doubt, partly due to the fact, pointed out in the preface, that there is no English equivalent for the Italian word '*religiosità*'. However, a concept which enables its author to claim that the irreligious man is suffering from an uncultivated religious sense is bound to arouse suspicion in the Anglo-Saxon mind. The most charitable interpretation of Zunini's thesis is that he is discussing what the logotherapists call 'man's need for meaning'. That this is a universal characteristic of man, and that faith, religious and non-religious, satisfies this need is (if formulated very precisely, and preferably not in 'need' language) an arguable and much-argued thesis, but important issues are obscured if all faith is termed religious. This book contains some interesting discussion but can best be recommended to those who need an antidote to excessive doses of books about secular man who has 'come of age'.

Vergote's book on the other hand, is in refreshing contrast to the banalities of much writing on religious psychology, and can be recommended far more widely. It begins with an introduction in which Vergote discusses the nature and presuppositions of religious psychology ('a science dealing with religious facts; a science concerning the real man who responds to what he believes to be the manifestation of the divine' (p. 17)) and identifies himself as an upholder of a dynamic theory of psychology and religion: 'Man is no more religious than he is a moral or political being. He *becomes* such. True religious psychology, then, must be