New Blackfriars



DOI:10 1111/nbfr 12551

Reviews

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE by Pablo T. Gadenz, [Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture], *Baker Academic*, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 2018, pp. 413, \$24.99, pbk

With this volume the Gospels sequence in the *Catholic Commentary* on *Sacred Scripture* series comes to completion. It follows those on Matthew (2010), Mark (2008), and John (2015), and accompanies the commentary on Acts (2014). The longest Gospel, and its profound but complicated relationship to the others, requires that its commentators exercise great care not to be lost in the available solutions to problems thrown up by the texts. The explanations in Gadenz's *Luke* are consistently sound and detailed, with divisions in the text mainly compatible with those in the Lectionary of the Latin Church. It will be a welcome resource for bible study groups, homilists, and pastoral workers alike.

With very few exceptions, our author is not drawn into controversy; he usually prefers instead to report those positions which have already been adopted by others. The safety of this commentary is no doubt guaranteed by the sources, which are the Scriptures in the main, as well as saints of the tradition and recent exegetes. For example, on the genealogy in Lk 3 and the problems comparing it with that in Mt 1, Gadenz simply notes the Marian and Josephine theories provided by Eusebius and Fortunatianus respectively, and moves on to its numerical symbolism (pp. 90-91). So, it is hardly surprising that Gadenz offers only a curtailed discussion of the Synoptic Problem in the introduction and in passing throughout. The strength of this work is Gadenz's detailed reading of Luke's text on its merits, in dialogue with the Old Testament and especially the LXX. Those who have difficulty sometimes engaging with Luke but without reference to the other Gospels will be aided by this volume.

Via Irenaeus and other pre-Nicene authors, Luke's 'possible relationship' (p.21) with Paul is seen mainly in terms of his discipleship as it is mentioned outside the Gospel. There is just a single sentence on the theological commonalities between the Evangelist and the Apostle: on the lordship of Christ and on justification (p.22). Many of Irenaeus's contemporaries made claims to a sort of 'Pauline orthodoxy'. One only need think of the Valentinians' boast, that their founder had been an auditor of a certain Theudas, whom they said was Paul's disciple (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 7.17). But for us to see whether Luke might be the 'Pauline Synoptic,' we should also draw in another of Irenaeus's contemporaries, Marcion. The Sinopian bishop's *Evangelikon* and *Apostolikon*, two heavily edited scriptural works, were drawn exclusively from Luke and Paul's letters; indeed, his is the first collection known to us of most of Paul's letters. Why Marcion favoured Luke for his greatly abridged gospel may well have been the ease with which he could excise the offending references to Judaism which his theology required. In other words, Luke's relationship to Paul seems to some in the second century to be profoundly theological as well as personal. Hence, a fuller account of Luke's place in the canon than Gadenz's makes much of the text's accessibility to a non-Jewish audience, with or without reference to Paul.

Tatian's *Diatessaron* was also produced in this period. Used at least liturgically by Syriac-speaking churches until the fifth century, this harmonised gospel contains most of Luke's material, approximately two-thirds of the whole, but is on some points independent of any Gospel text. Tatian's omission, for example, of both genealogies may also witness the way in which a second-century Christian author dealt with apparently conflicting details in the Gospels. In this case, neither genealogy was considered so important that it had to be included at all costs. If that is so, Tatian might be allowed to advise modern interpreters against reconciling exegetical difficulties with pietistic motive. The marvel of our fourfold Gospel is that it survives at all, when we consider that these Greco-Roman *bioi* (p.19) were re-written and edited so readily in the second century.

This volume could be further developed in just a few ways. Much more detail is needed if the can of worms on any parallels between John the Baptist and certain Qumran texts is going to be opened (p.83), when broader discussion of the Jewish desert/eremitical tradition might suffice. The sin against the Holy Spirit needs to be included in any presentation of Luke's pneumatology (p.223). Finally, the two cups mentioned in the Lord's last Passover appear sadly without comment (pp. 355-56).

Happily so, Gadenz possibly shows self-awareness as a priest and author. We have some reflection on the priestly character of Luke's text (note on p.22) and the priesthood of Jesus himself (p.117). Those who pray the Divine Office will enjoy the generous treatment which is given to the three Gospel Canticles (pp. 50-53, 56-57, 71) and *Psalm* 110 from Sunday Vespers (p.342). Our author is also a theological teacher, who may well have experienced the work of his colleagues as a hindrance in the past, nonetheless taking the opportunity to exhort his confreres (p.233). Nor is Gadenz's wider audience ever far from his mind. The extended sections devoted to the Infancy Narrative (pp. 33-77), Temptation in the Wilderness (pp. 92-96), the Lord's Prayer (pp. 217-222), and the Last Supper (pp. 355-359) may help with drawing fuller meaning from these texts which appear so briefly but vitally in the course of the liturgical year. There are also pleasing expositions of

the relationship of texts to Marian devotions: the Hail Mary (pp. 42, 48-49), features in the Angelus (pp. 45-46) and the Rosary (p.76).

Gadenz's Luke will no doubt prove to be of great worth to its readers in various aspects of pastoral life. It offers a well-produced exposition of the entire text of the Gospel consonant with the Catholic tradition and some recent exegesis.

PAUL ROWSE OP

THE CLEANSING OF THE HEART: THE SACRAMENTS AS INSTRUMENTAL CAUSES IN THE THOMISTIC TRADITION by Reginald M. Lynch OP, *Catholic University of America Press*, Washington D.C., 2017, pp. xii \pm 225, \$65.00, hbk

The most important question in sacramental theology is undoubtedly that of the relationship between the sacraments and the grace which accompanies them. Broadly speaking two sorts of answers have been proposed: either the sacraments have some causal role in the bestowal of grace or they do not. In the latter case sacraments tend to be described as occasions for the bestowal of grace, or as conditions of varying strength that accompany such a bestowal, or as elements of a divine pact which leads to grace, or as some combination of these (p. 28). In the former case an account of their causal efficacy will be required which in the Thomist tradition at least has always been provided through instrumental causality and about which this book is concerned.

The book is divided into four chapters. The first surveys the main approaches to sacramental efficacy and is largely introductory. It examines the influence of St. Augustine pointing out that subsequent approaches tended to be proposed as interpretations of his work. It highlights the distinctive Franciscan and Thomist approaches, characterising the former as less concerned with the sacraments' causal efficacy, the latter as more so. It points out that Trent only excluded occasionalist approaches and thus left a wide range of options for catholic theology to pursue. It also charts the post-World War II rise of the more experiential sacramental theologies of Cassel and Schillebeeckx and the corresponding, albeit mistaken, decline of interest in the question of sacramental efficacy.

The second and third chapters are the heart of the book, though. Together they offer a detailed examination of Aquinas's theory of sacramental instrumental causality beginning with the Sentence-Commentary in chapter two and continuing through the De Veritate, the De Potentia Dei, and the Summa Theologiae in chapter three. Chapter three also introduces the main commentatorial precisions and developments of Aquinas's position. Whilst chapter four considers moral causality as