outside the Hebrew tradition. Following the leads of Dhorme, Maybaum, and M. Weber, he adds fresh insight to our understanding of Levitism, and his succinct statements on matrimonial symbolism as employed by the prophets, and on Noachism, are among the best this reviewer has seen in print. But Neher’s approach has its shortcomings. It permits him sometimes to develop hypothetical emendations which are not critically sound or logically convincing. His value judgment that the greatness of a prophetic existence is to be measured against the navi’s cultic experience is an outstanding example of this fault.

This is the kind of book every traditionalist will find occasion to have recourse to, and its shortcomings can be overcome without much difficulty. The index and notes are quite bare; the translation by Wolf is excellent but suffers at junctures from the French original (e.g., Haguiga on p. 246 should read Hagiga), and there are typographical lapses as on p. 329, where the first quotation is from Ex 32:32, and the second from Num 11:16.
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The publication, posthumously, of Paul Tillich’s lectures on historical theology, *Perspectives on 19th & 20th Century Protestant Theology* (New York, 1967), will hopefully demonstrate the historical-philosophical basis of Tillich’s thought and also discourage baleful psychologizing of Tillichian terminology. That Tillich’s philosophical theology is not ahistorical or strictly existential, Robert Scharlemann, professor of theology at the University of Iowa, makes clear in this study.

The author uses “the method of constructive analysis” (p. 183) to show that Tillich’s theological system provides a “solution to the problem of the presence of God for historically conscious thinking” (p. 3) which was raised by the speculative idealists of the 19th century (i.e., Hegel and Schleiermacher).

Exhibiting from the outset his constructive aim, the author introduces the terms “critical reflection” and “doubting response” in the title of the first chapter to indicate the point of convergence where thinking is conscious of its temporality. This terminology is derived from a synthesis of Tillich’s own formulations in his *Systematic Theology* (Chicago, 1951, 1957, 1963) and his *Das System der Wissenschaften nach Gegenständen und Methoden* of 1923 (reprinted in Gesammelte Werke, Vol. I [Stuttgart, 1959]). In the remainder of the first chapter, Scharlemann traces the five stages through which reflection and response have moved in the process of becoming historically conscious.

Two other terms important for Scharlemann’s constructive ana-
lysis are “subjectival” and “objectival.” “Critical reflection” and “doubting response” are two sides of an identical act which takes place in the “subjectival” as it grasps the objectivity of the “objectival” or is grasped by the subjectivity of the “objectival.”

In the second chapter, “Self, World, and God,” it is seen that the categories of “subjectival” and “objectival” correspond to the self-world polarity which, according to Scharlemann, is “the basic ontological structure” (p. 22) in Tillich’s system. We shall see later that “subjectival” and “objectival” are categories which also embrace other polar concepts in Tillich’s systematic thought.

Continuing to constructively synthesize Tillich’s earlier and later theological systems, Scharlemann contends that “God cannot be thought without the self-world polarity, but he cannot be identified with it either” (p. 35). Here is where Tillich breaks with the absolute systems of 19th century idealism by maintaining “the infinite gap between God and the self-world structure of finite being” (p. 29).

After describing the “methodological development” (p. 42) of Tillich’s doctrine of God, Scharlemann takes up a discussion of “subjectivity and objectivity in the objectival” (p. 60). At this point the wider aspects of the subjectival-objectival polarity become apparent. In this context also, Tillich’s correlation of ontological concepts and religious symbols may be understood.

Objectival subjectivity which elicits response (faith or doubt) and objectival objectivity which evokes reflection are the ontological concepts that must be correlated with the religious symbol of God. “The ultimate by which we are grasped and the ultimate which we grasp—God and being—are united in the depth of objectivity and subjectivity” (p. 75).

The distinction between concepts and symbols in Tillich’s theology should be noted by those critics who ask, “How can we pray to the ground of our being?” “Ground of being” is an ontological concept which must be correlated with the religious symbol of “God.”

The manner in which subjectival subjectivity and objectival subjectivity are correlated is another question that Scharlemann deals with in Ch. 4. He states explicitly: “The relation of subjectival subject and objectival subject, in Christian theology, is that of our relation to the picture of Jesus as the Christ” (p. 93). The framework for this picture is existence which is distinguished from essence in Tillich’s thought. Existence is a state of estrangement from essence. Thus, in the Biblical picture of Jesus as the Christ, “The New Being is encountered in a man in my world who, though under the conditions of existence, transcends them. He represents both the state of existence and that of essential being” (p. 95). This picture, according to Scharlemann, is the paradoxical reality which solves the problem of “critical reflection” and “doubting response” for historically conscious thought. Jesus as the Christ is the objectival subject which has power to remove the doubt from response and correlative be grasped in the act of reflection.
The author extends his constructive use of the method of correlation in Ch. 5, where it is applied to the aspects of structure and depth present in culture. This is an application that Tillich does not make of his own method. Ch. 6 treads upon more familiar territory in the treatment of Tillich’s correlation of philosophical questions and theological answers. Ch. 7 explores Tillich’s direct formulations of the solution that the Biblical picture of Jesus as the Christ (i.e., paradoxical reality) provides for the problem of historically conscious thinking. Ch. 8 contains a concluding evaluation in which the main themes of the book are summarized.

Portions of the book’s contents were explicated in class lectures and seminar discussions attended by this reviewer. Thus it is difficult to be critical owing to the charismatic presentations and personality of the author. However, it may be pertinent to note Scharlemann’s failure to include in his constructive analysis Tillich’s sermons. Would such an analysis sustain the manifold correlations Scharlemann makes, or would it lead to a greater emphasis on religious symbols as it did for David H. Kelsey in his study of The Fabric of Paul Tillich’s Theology (New Haven, Conn., 1967)?

At the close of this study of the inner dynamics of Tillich’s systematic thought, the author gives promise of a new theological system based on Tillich’s system, but breaking away from it. Perhaps the research into the seminal sources of Tillich’s thought which Scharlemann engaged in at the University of Göttingen during the Fall of 1969 will lead to the construction of such a system.
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