

1453 and its intellectual activity had seldom been so high. It had also for the first time become receptive towards the west; Gennadios, who led the party of the anti-unionists, had been deeply influenced by Thomism, and a fifteenth-century broken wall painting uncovered at the Chara

reflects Italian experiments in perspective. If, however uneasily and superficially, the Union of Florence had lasted for a generation the schism would never have reached its present form.

*Gervase Mathew, O.P.*

DOGMATIC VERSUS BIBLICAL THEOLOGY by Karl Rahner and others. Edited by Herbert Vorgrimmler. Translated by Kevin Smyth. *Burns and Oates, 30s.*

These 'essays in two disciplines' should be read by all who would profit from our contemporary biblical renewal, and by all who have at heart a sound and living theology.

There are nine articles from the pens of eight distinguished theologians and exegetes. They are at one in wanting to resolve the antinomies of exegesis and dogmatic theology. The considerable development of Catholic biblical exegesis since *Divino Afflante* now makes possible the confrontation of the two disciplines. That the attempt is made at all shows the difficulties are in part resolved. Gone, we hope, are the days when exegetes would cultivate their little patch, heedless of theologians, and perhaps a little deaf about the Church's teaching. Gone too, we hope, are the days when dogmatic theologians would ignore scriptural findings and go on their way a little blind to the historical and incarnational character of our religion.

Both disciplines are exercised by Catholic thinkers for whom faith is a light and a guide, and who perform all their work within the Church. Significantly, it is an exegete, R. Schnackenburg, who writes that 'the dogmatic theologian seems to be called to wider fields of endeavour because he has to keep in view centuries of theological development, formation of concepts, and doctrinal progress' (p. 157). No word could be more true. But the ideal dogmatic theologian is probably rare.

Among the many good things in these essays,

we might single out E. Schillebeeckx's treatment of exegesis and the development of dogma. His method makes for a reinstatement of the *sensus plenior*, particularly when the development of a doctrine is to be traced from the Old Testament, through the LXX, and so to the New Testament. This would be a most usual process in present-day exegesis, basing itself on the literal sense at every stage. This contrasts with the medieval and sometimes patristic predilection for typology.

Heinrich Gross writes on the 'transposition of motifs', and provides a sound basis for the method of 'themes'. His principal example is that of the Covenant. 'What happened to Abraham was a sort of signpost' (p. 186) . . . to the Covenant of Sinai, and then on from these to an essentially higher level in the progress of revelation in Jeremiah 31 and 32, and then supremely to the New and Eternal Covenant of the New Testament. H. Gross distinguishes his method from that of the *re-lectures bibliques* of French scholars (Gelin, Cazelles), as e.g. the re-reading of the LXX in Genesis 3:15 or Isaiah 7:14. The transposition of motifs 'implies that a certain theme is taken over from a given passage in the Bible, that under certain circumstances, its limits in time and space are removed, that it is inserted into a later passage, and that in this process it receives and expresses a fuller content. The sameness of the motif points therefore to the inner dynamism and direction of revelation'.

*Roland Potter, O.P.*