

Bultmann, and in the last analysis so is also the ultimate implication of Heidegger's concept of authenticity based upon the self-disclosure of conscience. Authenticity is in both a matter of humility and gracious acceptance; but in Heidegger humility is self-devaluation before ultimate nothingness, while in Bultmann it is self-devaluation before God. In fairness to Bultmann, therefore, recognition must be made of the fact that not only frequent disagreements are to be found between him and Heidegger, but also that, contrary to first impressions, his theology does not even depend upon existential philosophy for form and content. Radical biblical scholar that he is, there is a great deal of liberal modernism in his views, many of which views one may or may not consider religiously fruitful or theologically relevant to the understanding of the *kerygma*, such for example, as his views on demythologizing.

The purpose of the present book review not being that of appraising Heidegger's existentialist philosophy, but Macquarrie's book on Bultmann's existentialist theology, it is unnecessary to allude here to the epistemological difficulties and inconsistencies entailed by existentialism. Concerning Bultmann's theology and methodology, however, some comment from Macquarrie on the following questions would have been relevant and fruitful. Is not Bultmann's existential analysis of the presuppositions and content of the original Christian faith by way of Heidegger's *Fragestellung* and *Begrifflichkeit* too much of a quest into etymology? With concepts, as well as with human beings, institutions and processes, origin is always important, but final outcome is more significant. If the Christian faith is life, it is growth; and its nature is bound to be revealed more in what it has become than what originally it was or might have been. And this, not only because of the dynamic nature of all that is development and process, but also, because of the very nature of language, which, as

Wegener, Jespersen, Sapir, and so many other scholars have shown, through metaphor has evolved from initial aesthetic intuition to epistemic warrantability. To assert the opposite would be to fall prey to some form of the fallacy of primitivism in theology, science or any other province of inquiry. All in all, however, Professor Macquarrie's text on *Existentialist Theology* is greatly suggestive and challenging, highly instructive and profoundly rewarding.

J. A. FRÁNQUIZ

West Virginia Wesleyan College

Critique of Religion and Philosophy. By WALTER KAUFMANN. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958. xvii + 308 pages. \$5.00.

Dr. Kaufmann leads the reader on a vigorous, if somewhat erratic, gallop through the luxuriant fields of philosophy and religion, with energetic sallies into many bypaths, especially those of art and literature. The goal of the trip may not always be clearly discernible, but the mode of travel is never in doubt—sharp criticism, high keyed polemic, and epigrammatic conclusions. The reader is assured of an exciting journey.

A list of the subjects and thinkers treated is too lengthy for inclusion in this review. We find positivism, existentialism, faith, truth, mysticism, demythologizing interlaced with Plato, Aquinas, Kant, James, Freud, Tillich, R. Niebuhr, and Fromm. The author has left us in no doubt that he possesses a remarkable acquaintance with contemporary and historic sources. If his knowledge and judgment matched the scope of his acquaintanceship, this would indeed be a formidable volume. Kaufmann lacks nothing in audacity in attacking great issues and figures. Few are the cherished notions of either philosophers or theologians that escape unscathed from Kaufmann's sweeping criticisms and barbed analyses. With what degree of balance and sensitive understanding

all of this is accomplished is an open question, Brand Blanshard's comment on the book jacket about Kaufmann's "rare impartiality" to the contrary notwithstanding. (I presume that by the term "impartial" Blanshard means that the author has laid about him with equal severity in all directions!)

Philosophers of an analytic persuasion may not warm to the author's suggestion that they are engaged in a retreat to a position safe from the further assaults of science (p. 36). Many in the analytic school may well have fancied themselves as leading a revolution, not burying the corpse of philosophy. Kaufmann further suggests that "ordinary language philosophy" has perhaps proved attractive to many bright young men because "one can participate in most discussions and even publish contributions without developing any extraphilosophic competence" (p. 37). Kantians, Thomists, and existentialists also receive their fair share of intellectual knocks, but there is also ample evidence of Kaufmann's sympathy with the insights of many of his opponents.

Some of the most severe blows are reserved for theology and theologians. Kaufmann will not allow the theologians to refine their terms in such a way as to make useless the ammunition he has gathered for the assault. For example, "the theologian defends his religious heritage by sacrificing its plain exoteric meaning" (cf. pp. 128-129). After all, if one is primed to explode "plain exoteric meaning," it is scarcely fair to move the target. Serious-minded theologians may not take kindly to the author's dictum that theirs is a "continued fight for the abundance of mystery and not for rationalistic clarification" (p. 130). Nor will those who ply the trade of biblical theology quite recognize the scrupulous fairness of this judgment: "Out of the New Testament they (theologians) pick appropriate verses and connect them to fashion an intellectual and moral self-portrait which they solemnly call 'the message of the New Testament' or 'the Christian view';

and out of other Scriptures they carve (sic!) all kinds of inferior straw men. Theologians do not just do this incidentally; this is theology" (p. 157). Kaufmann simply does not like theology or theologians as such!

One almost receives the impression that the author has not taken the pains to find out what theologians are doing. How else is one to explain his notions that higher Bible criticism is sprinkled with "anti-Semitism" (p. 205), that Paul made dogma essential to salvation (p. 209), or that salvation is necessarily connected with life after death (*ibid.*)? Has Kaufmann adequately clarified and justified the statement that "the ultimate concern of Christianity has never been with truth in any ordinary sense of that word. On the contrary, Christianity has come into conflict with truth from the days of Paul to the days of Fosdick and Niebuhr" (p. 222)?

Some will read the book rejoicing in Kaufmann's thrusts at the positions of others, and will pass hurriedly over the strictures put upon their own positions. Others will see only those passages where their own ideas are put on the block, and be irritated, consequently. The question is not only how fairly executed the critique is, but how suggestive Kaufmann's criticisms have been for one's own clarification and understanding. On the latter score there is much in the book to be commended to the serious reader. Its incisive, pungent epigrams stimulate thought. Its wit and satire offset the heavy handed demolition of Kaufmann's favorite antipathies. There is much of value for philosopher and theologian alike when one discounts the book's pose of jaunty iconoclasm.

CLYDE A. HOLBROOK

Oberlin College

The Self as Agent. By JOHN MACMURRAY.
New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
230 pages. \$3.75.

In *The Self as Agent*, representing the first series of his Gifford lectures in 1953,