

hoch genug veranschlagt werden kann. Umso bedauerlicher ist es, daß Hrss. die – selbstverständlich ebenfalls nichtauthentischen – Paragraphen der Edition Lyon 1495 (Hain Nr. 11942), nach denen bisher in der Literatur durchgehend zitiert wurde, nicht zusätzlich aufgenommen haben. Das macht die Identifizierung der gemeinten Stellen unnötig zeitraubend. Wenn man sich schon nicht entschließen konnte, diese Buchstaben in eckigen Klammern als Marginalien aufzunehmen, so hätte man doch zumindest eine tabellarische Konkordanz begeben sollen. Es wäre sehr zu begrüßen, wenn Hrss. im nächsten Band das auch für den vorliegenden Text nachholen könnten.

Theologen, Philosophen und Historiker werden Hrss. zu bleibendem Dank verpflichtet sein für den ausführlichen historischen Apparat, mit dem sie Ockhams Lehrmeinungen in den Kontext der Diskussion seiner Zeit zu stellen wußten. Aus gedruckten und ungedruckten Quellen haben Hrss. manch neue Beziehung herausgearbeitet (vgl. jetzt besonders den Aufsatz mit Texteditionen des Mitherausgebers S. Brown, *Sources for Ockham's Prologue to the Sentences*, in *Franciscan Studies*, n. s. 26, 1966, 36–65; Forts. in 27, 1967, 39–107, auf den in OT I leider nur 130 A. 1, 159 A. 2 verwiesen wird). Was wir bisher eigentlich nur von Ockhams Benutzung des Duns Scotus und Aureolis wußten, bestätigt sich als durchgängiges Merkmal des Stils seiner Auseinandersetzungen. Sein Bestreben, seine Kontrahenten präzise wiederzugeben, ist ständig zu beobachten; er zitiert ausführlich und so wörtlich, daß seine Zitate für die Textgeschichte der einzelnen Autoren verwendbar werden. Allerdings zitiert er niemals in enzyklopädischer Absicht, sondern um den Argumentationszusammenhang zur konkreten Problematik in der Wiedergabe der einzelnen „*opiniones*“ zu erreichen, um dann nach einer scharfen und scharfsichtigen Kritik seine eigene Position abzustecken (vgl. etwa 277–290, 325–338). Es ist hier nicht der Ort, das im Einzelnen zu verfolgen, hingewiesen sei nur auf die Bedeutung, die diese Beobachtung für die Beurteilung auch etwa des *Dialogus* aus Ockhams Münchener Jahren gewinnen kann. Hrss. taten ein Übriges, indem sie durch 3 sorgfältige Indices (I. Bibliotheken und Mss., II. Autoren, III. Wort- u. Sachregister; 511–533) auch eine rasche Benutzung des Bandes ermöglichten.

Das sorgfältig erarbeitete und hervorragend gedruckte Buch läßt ungeduldig auf einen raschen Fortgang der Edition warten. Es ist mit Sicherheit anzunehmen, daß sie zu einem intensiven Studium Ockhams anregen wird.

Berlin

Jürgen Miethke

Willigis Eckermann OSA: *Gottschalk Hollen, OESA († 1481): Leben, Werke und Sakramentenlehre* (= *Cassiciacum* Bd. XXII). Würzburg (Augustinus) 1967. XXXVI, 391 S., kart.

The study of the theology of the late middle ages has become in recent years one of the more important frontiers in Reformation research. Reformation scholars find it no longer possible to ignore the influence of late medieval theology on the formation of Luther and Calvin or to assume that the importance of Thomas Aquinas for Roman Catholic thought in the modern era is an accurate reflection of the esteem in which Thomas was held in the 14th and 15th centuries. Nor is it any longer possible, since the research of Vignaux and Oberman into the nature of late medieval nominalism, to accept without question the thesis of Gilson and Lortz that nominalism represents the final decay of the medieval scholastic tradition, a tragic apostasy from the Golden Age of the 13th century. Recent critical scholarship has begun to show that this interpretation of late medieval theology is heavily shaped by contemporary dogmatic concerns and not fully responsive to the late medieval sources. Insofar as the late medieval theologians themselves thought of a Golden Age of theology they were far more likely to locate it in the 12th century rather than in the 13th. The 13th century marked for them an apostasy from the relatively unified tradition of the early scholastic age to the warring of the schools which characterized the "high" and "late" middle ages.

The re-appraisal of late medieval theology has led to a re-appraisal of late medieval theologians who belonged to the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine.

Trapp and Zumkeller have surveyed briefly theological tendencies in the Augustinian Order in the late middle ages. While Zumkeller has compiled important lists of manuscripts written by Augustinians, Trapp has described the historical methodology used by late medieval Augustinians in documenting citations from other scholastic authors and from the fathers, quoted by the Augustinians in the course of their own theological discussions. These more general expositions have been enriched by articles and monographs on individual theologians of the Augustinian Order: Schüler, Würsdörfer, Vignaux, Oberman, Trapp and Leff on Gregory of Rimini; Toner on Augustine of Rome; Zumkeller on Hugolino of Orvieto, Dionysius of Montina, and Hermann von Schildesche; Wolf, Weijenborg and Steinmetz on Staupitz; Stakemeier and Jedin on Seripando; Werbeck on Jacobus Perez of Valencia; Lohse and Ferdigg on John of Paltz; O'Malley on Giles of Viterbo – and so the list goes on. For the most part these articles and monographs do not represent a *consensus omnium* on the nature of the theological currents within the Augustinian Order during the 14th and 15th centuries and do not attempt to elaborate an over-arching theory concerning the direction of the theological movement of the Order as a whole. The single exception to this rule – and it is by no means an absolute exception – is what one might call the school of Adolar Zumkeller. It is important to mention this fact because the book by Eckermann on Gottschalk Hollen is an excellent example of an historical monograph, which rests on the presuppositions concerning the nature of late medieval Augustinianism first elaborated by Father Zumkeller.

For Father Zumkeller late medieval Augustinianism is simply another name for the theology of the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine in the late middle ages. Zumkeller does not think so much in terms of theological currents which cross the boundaries of the Orders (though he certainly does not deny that this takes place) as he does in terms of the theologies of the Orders themselves. To the usual classification which one finds in histories of dogma – Dominican theology, Old Franciscan theology, and New Franciscan theology – Zumkeller adds a fourth, Augustinian theology.

In describing the theology of the Augustinian Order, the work of Damasus Trapp plays an important role. Augustinian theology, according to Trapp, falls into two epochs. The first stretches from Giles of Rome to Thomas of Strassburg; the second begins with Gregory of Rimini. Early Augustinianism is heavily influenced through Giles of Rome by Thomas Aquinas. It is not surprising, for example, that early Augustinians joined with Thomas Aquinas and the Dominicans in opposing the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary defended by Scotus and the Franciscans. Later Augustinianism is more heavily dependent on Augustine himself, having recovered a far wider corpus of the writings of Augustine than was at the disposal of Giles of Rome. As a sign of this new independence vis-à-vis its own past, the Augustinians shift their alliance from the Dominicans to the Franciscans on the question of the immaculate conception. Throughout its history, however, Augustinianism is marked by its careful historical scholarship, by its desire for better texts and its concern for proper documentation.

Within the framework of these assumptions Willigis Eckermann has written an exhaustive and instructive study of the sacramental theology of Gottschalk Hollen, a German Augustinian who died in 1481, two years before the birth of Luther. The book is divided into two parts, of which the second is by far the more interesting. The first section surveys briefly the life and influence of Hollen, describes in some detail each of his writings, and traces the manuscript tradition of those writings. It is not until the second section of the book that the sacramental theology of Hollen is expounded and critically evaluated.

In choosing Hollen as the subject for his study Eckermann has consciously bypassed the more important and more theologically profound figures of the Augustinian Order in favor of a theologian who stands within the second rank. Eckermann defends his choice by arguing that "der theologische Gehalt ihrer Aussagen

steht dem Zentrum des Christentums oft näher als jener der großen Meister, ihre Wirkung auf das Volk war oft bedeutsamer als die der Verfasser hochgelehrter Schriften" (p. 346).

Hollen's sacramental theology, according to Eckermann, is not speculative in its direction, but has rather a pastoral orientation. When Hollen discusses the eucharist, for example, he does not lay emphasis on the doctrine of transubstantiation or attempt to unravel the mystery of the relation of substance and accident. It is the religious character of the eucharist, the problem of the relation of the sacrifice of the mass to the sacrifice of Calvary, which claims his principal attention.

In point of fact Hollen displays little tendency to attempt to penetrate the tradition of the Church concerning the sacraments, either to give it a new and profound biblical undergirding or to challenge and remold it with fresh theological insights. Hollen gives no new and profound interpretation of the sacraments. He mediates the tradition of the Church as he has received it; he does not re-interpret it. His support of the traditional interpretation of the Church is itself traditional, drawn from canon law and from anthologies of the sayings of the Fathers.

Eckermann regards Hollen as a representative of the theological tendencies of the *via antiqua*. There is almost no evidence of the influence of the *via moderna*, save for an occasional and isolated use of the distinction between the *potentia ordinata* and the *potentia absoluta*. While one finds in Hollen traces of the influence of Scotus, such as the doctrine of the *acceptatio divina*, one also finds in Hollen the typically Augustinian opposition to the Pelagianizing tendencies of Scotus in the doctrine of justification. In many of his formulations, such as his view of the declaratory function of the priest in the sacrament of penance, Hollen evidences a clear preference for the theological, formulations of Peter Lombard from the 12th century.

On the whole, there are very few criticisms which one can level against Eckermann's treatment of Hollen. And those criticisms which can be leveled have more to do with the context and framework of his treatment than with the details of the treatment itself.

1. Eckermann argues, for example, that there is virtually no influence of the *via moderna* on the thought of Hollen. And yet it is clear from Eckermann's own evidence that Hollen knew and made use of the writings of Holcot and Gerson, both of whom represent the *via moderna* on various theological questions. Furthermore, on a wide range of issues where Hollen is in agreement with Scotus (such as the dialectic of the *potentia dei ordinata* and *potentia dei absoluta*, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and the doctrine of the *acceptatio divina*), Hollen by the very fact of his agreement with Scotus makes common cause with Ockham and the nominalists. Indeed, it should also be mentioned that Hollen's demonstrable preference for the solutions of Lombard and the theologians of the 12th century is not uncharacteristic of the nominalist theologians, who evidence a nostalgia for the theological unity of the 12th century and who wish to heal the divisions in Christendom caused by the warring theological factions.

2. The use of the terms *via antiqua* and *via moderna* raises a further question. Eckermann tends to use these terms as if they were fixed quantities, just as he tends to use the terms Dominican, Franciscan and Augustinian as if the boundaries between them were clearer than the sources would lead one to believe they in fact were. Recent research has uncovered evidence that the words *via antiqua* and *via moderna* were, as often as not, blanks to be filled in by the context of the theological discussion raging at the time. A point of view which is regarded as *moderna* in one context may be regarded as *antiqua* in another. Moreover, the same theologian is perfectly capable of advocating theological ideas which were both *moderna* and *antiqua* without subjecting his theological system to an intolerable strain. Labels such as these must be used with extreme care if historians are not to oversimplify the complexity of the theological situation in the late middle ages or

to homogenize a theological position which is in fact eclectic. Hollen's opposition to the nominalist view of a proper disposition for grace did not prevent him from agreeing, in substance if not explicitly, with nominalist theologians on other issues. This agreement does not make Hollen a nominalist; though it does mean on certain issues that the positions of Hollen and of the nominalists are indistinguishable.

3. More problematic than the use of the terms *via moderna* and *via antiqua* is the use of the term "Augustinian." The term seems to have two meanings for Eckermann. It is used precisely to indicate the theology of the Augustinian Order and rather more imprecisely to indicate a theological position strongly influenced by St. Augustine. Neither of these uses seems to me to be wholly satisfying. By limiting the term Augustinian to a description of the theology of the Augustinian Order, Eckermann excludes such radically Augustinian theologians as Thomas Bradwardine from consideration and presupposes a greater influence of Augustine on the Augustinian Order and a greater theological unity within that Order than in fact existed.

Nor does Eckermann help to clarify the situation by using Augustinian as a label denoting influence by St. Augustine. In a real sense all theologians in the middle ages, including the most Pelagian, are disciples of St. Augustine. When Eckermann speaks of Hollen's Augustinian protest against the Pelagianizing view of the proper disposition for grace held by Scotus (and in a more radical form by Holcot), his observation, while valid, is insufficiently precise. Both Thomas Aquinas and Johannes von Staupitz, to take an easy example, oppose the Scotistic and nominalistic view that a man can, by doing what is in him through the exercise of his own natural powers, earn justifying grace by a merit of congruity. A merit of congruity is only possible for a man in a state of grace. In this sense at least Aquinas and Staupitz represent a common Augustinian front against Ockham, Scotus and Biel. Yet Staupitz returns to a purer form of Augustinianism than Thomas Aquinas, when he maintains against Thomas that not only merit but also virtue is impossible outside a state of grace. To complicate the picture still further, Scotus himself, by holding to predestination *ante praevisa merita* and adopting the order, first glory then grace, places considerable Augustinian distance between himself and the nominalists. Indeed, one might even argue that, whereas on the question of a proper disposition for grace Thomas is more Augustinian than Scotus, on the question of the relation of the divine intellect to the divine will the tables are reversed.

In other words, by restricting the term Augustinian school to the Order of the Hermits of St. Augustine, Eckermann has adopted a usage which is in most cases too narrow and in some cases misleading. It is clear that Gregory of Rimini and Johannes von Staupitz are Augustinian in their theology; it is not at all certain that the title Augustinian can be applied in the same sense to John of Paltz. On the same grounds it is difficult to see why Thomas Bradwardine should be denied the title, simply because he was a secular priest.

In short, the term Augustinian school should be used, neither as the synonym for an Order nor in its most general sense, but rather as a designation for the radical Augustinian protest against the Pelagianizing tendencies of nominalist theology in the late middle ages which cut across the theologically artificial boundaries of the Orders. It refers to a continuing late medieval Augustinian sentiment in theology, more radically Augustinian on the question of grace and justification than Thomas Aquinas. (For further discussion of this question see D. C. Steinmetz, *Misericordia Dei, The Theology of Johannes von Staupitz in its Late Medieval Setting*, Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought 4, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1968, pp. 30-4).

In spite of the criticisms which one can level against Eckermann's discussion of late medieval theology, it is clear that he has made an important and valuable contribution to our understanding of the late middle ages. Hollen was not a seminal thinker. Nevertheless, he was a prolific writer and a mediator of the tra-

dition of the medieval Catholic Church. Eckermann's exhaustive study of his sacramental theology will stand as the definitive work on Hollen for many years to come.

Lancaster (Pa.)

David C. Steinmetz

Reformation

Carl S. Meyer (Hrsg.): *Luther for an Ecumenical Age. Essays in Commemoration of the 450th Anniversary of the Reformation.* Saint Louis/London (Concordia Publishing House) 1967. 311 S., geb. \$ 9.00.

Im Zusammenhang der 125-Jahr-Feier des Concordia Seminary in St. Louis und des 450-jährigen Reformationsjubiläums werden zwölf Beiträge amerikanischer und englischer Autoren vorgelegt. Für vier Arbeiten ist der ökumenische Gesichtspunkt besonders bestimmend. So untersucht Arthur Carl Piepkorn („The Lutheran Symbolical Books and Luther“, 242–270) den Einfluß Luthers besonders auf die Konkordienformel und fragt zugleich nach der ökumenischen Einordnung Luthers. Festgestellt wird die relativ geringe Zitation Luthers, die mit einer ausgesprochenen Beschränkung der Väter der Konkordienformel im Hinblick auf die Anrufung Luthers als Autorität konform geht. Luther wird als der Lehrer verstanden, auf den die ganze Kirche hören sollte, der aber zugleich Gottes große Gabe an denjenigen Teil der einen, heiligen, katholischen und apostolischen Kirche ist, der der *Confessio Augustana* anhängt. Hingewiesen wird im gleichen Zusammenhang auch auf die eschatologische Erwartung dieser Generation. James Atkinson stellt unter dem Programm „*Ecclesia reformatata semper reformanda*“ (271–290) Luther im Kontext der Vätertheologie und der heutigen ökumenischen Bewegung dar. Zwei weitere Beiträge beschäftigen sich zugleich mit dem Täuferum unter Hinweis darauf, daß Luther von den Täufnern wenig wußte, mit keinem von ihnen wahrscheinlich je eine persönliche Begegnung hatte und sie immer in die Nähe von Karlstadt und Müntzer rückte. So versucht Franklin H. Littell („Reformation, Restitution, and the Dialog“, 291–302) eine Parallelisierung des aus dem Grebel-Kreis kommenden Simon Stumpf mit Luther im Hinblick auf dessen Forderung gegen Zwingli auf der ersten Züricher Disputation von 1523, die Entscheidung über die Messe nicht dem Rat der Stadt, sondern dem Hl. Geist anheim zu geben. Aufgezeigt wird das dahinterstehende Restitutionsschema einer Erneuerung durch Rückkehr zum schlichten Evangelium unter Einschuß entsprechender ethischer und moralischer Normen wie etwa der Gewaltlosigkeit. Littell wendet sich damit zugleich gegen die vereinfachende Holl'sche These, wonach die Schwärmer des Reformationszeitalters bereits den Typ der späteren Dissenters darstellen. Die Betonung des 3. Glaubensartikels will er zugleich als Korrektur der spätpietistischen Jesumystik und als Beitrag zum ökumenischen Gespräch verstanden wissen. Der Aufsatz zeigt, wieviel Arbeit noch nötig sein wird, um die Linie Grebel, Simons, Penn, Cromwell positiv in die Reformationsgeschichte einbeziehen zu können.

In den gleichen Fragenkreis dringt Jaroslav J. Pelikan mit seinem Beitrag „Luther's Defense of Infant Baptism“ (200–218) ein. Ausgehend von der modernen Debatte und unter Bezug auf die Schrift „Von der Widdertaufe“ wird Luthers Festhalten an der Kindertaufe interpretiert. Pelikan versteht entgegen anderen Strömungen namentlich der neueren deutschen Lutherforschung Luther ebenso als den Theologen der Gnadenmittel wie als Theologen des Wortes und wendet sich dabei nachdrücklich auch gegen Harnack's These, als widersprache seine Sakramentstheologie