BOOK REVIEWS


I love Bibles, from inexpensive paperbacks to luxurious gilt-edged, leather-bound volumes. I have a number of such printed editions in my library. I also love biblical manuscripts, but alas! no originals grace my shelves. I and many others are fortunate that scholars such as John Lowden have devoted their lives to making biblical manuscripts, albeit reproductions, not originals, available. For many, simply having such magnificent full-color reproductions would be sufficient. L., I hasten to observe, has gone well beyond the coffee table genre to produce something that engages the mind in addition to captivating the eye.

In a sense, this is entirely appropriate to the type of manuscript L. works with: the average page or folio of a Bible moralisée functions in exactly this way. There are eight illustrations per page, generally arranged four per column. Each “biblical” image, accompanied by a “biblical” text, is paired with a “moralizing” image, with which a text—in this case a “moralizing” one—is also connected. Unlike better known illuminated manuscripts, where even the grandest illustrations are subservient to the text, in these productions the images are the dominant feature. Thus, it is not entirely a surprise when we learn that extant Bible moralisée manuscripts contain over 24,000 images.

The corpus of manuscripts containing Bibles moralisées is not large, consisting primarily of seven manuscripts dating from the 13th to the 15th centuries. As might be expected from even the brief description above, such volumes were not for the masses, but rather designed for the exclusive use of the royal families of France.

The central part of volume 1 consists of chapter-length analyses of each of these seven manuscripts, in terms both of unique and shared characteristics. L.’s choice of the book of Ruth for volume 2 is supported by this book’s appearance in all seven of the manuscripts discussed above, its relatively compact length (four chapters), and a flowing narrative style that facilitates comparisons between text and images. Other specialists will be able to apply, undoubtedly in somewhat modified ways, L.’s methodological and substantive insights to material outside of the book of Ruth.

For many readers, these data, scant though they be, are sufficient to appreciate and even enjoy the dozens of images L. presents. Of course, there is much more. Among the many additional issues L. raises—some quite technical, others less so—the following were of special interest to me: 1. The relationship of the “biblical” text to its “biblical” image. Often the relationship is straightforward, but on other occasions it is quite clear that
they are derived from separate and distinct sources. As a textual critic, I was especially interested to delve into the nature of the text, generally in Latin, but sometimes in French as well.

2. The priority of image over text. In a typical medieval manuscript, as noted above, it is evident that the scribe worked first, followed by the artist. In the *Bibles moralisées*, the artist often, but not invariably, exercised his talents prior to the introduction of text onto the page.

3. Use or non-use of these Bibles. I imagine that I am not alone in wondering whether these exquisite productions were actually ever read. Or were they simply displayed as beautiful items or perhaps tucked away with nary a page turned? By examination of the extant folios, from which, by the way, he can deduce the extent of each Bible, L. tells a tale, vivid if tentative, of the respective fate of each manuscript.

Everyone involved in this project, from author to press, deserves our warmest thanks. Although few individuals will be able to purchase these deluxe volumes, one hopes that all academic libraries will provide them to their patrons. Larger public libraries should do likewise.

An additional observation: In his introduction to volume 2, L. briefly mentions a number of thematic studies covering several (but not all) of the *Bibles moralisées* that are the subject of his work. Among them is Sara Lipton’s monograph, *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible moralisée* (1999). A richly illustrated summary of her findings about the anti-Jewish imagery contained therein is now available as “The Un-Moralized Bible,” *Bible Review* 17.2 (April 2001) 30–37, 48–50.

*Creighton University, Omaha*

**Leonard Greenspoon**


Paula Fredriksen has written a fresh exploration of the historical Jesus. What makes this book fresh is that instead of stripping away what scholars judge “inauthentic,” she builds up the matrix of first-century Judaism within the Roman world (using mainly Josephus and Philo) and then looks for the historical Jesus by “reading back” through Paul and the Gospels to what those documents imply regarding Jesus and his followers in that first-century Roman and Jewish world.

F. focuses her study around this question: How is it that Jesus was executed by Rome as an insurrectionist but that none of his followers were? The scenario she constructs in answer to this question might have been presented in an article. Yet, since only the thickest possible context renders any such reconstruction plausible, she does well to use the length of a book to lay out that scenario and its necessary context.
The scenario that emerges is this. Jesus, a Torah-keeping Jew, preached the advent of an apocalyptic kingdom of God. Both Jewish and Roman officials, familiar with his message and method, knew him to be no threat to Roman law and order. But when some of the pilgrim crowds, gathered in Jerusalem for that particular Passover around A.D. 30, began to herald him as king at the Triumphal Entry, the impetuous Pilate acted to have Jesus crucified as a deterrent to further likelihood of popular revolt. The prefect left Jesus’ disciples alone, knowing that none of them had Jesus’ charisma for igniting popular enthusiasm.

F. gets to this scenario by working backward from Paul through the Evangelists to Jesus’ mission to Israel. For the shape of Jesus’ public life, she finds John, with his pattern of frequent movement between Galilee and Jerusalem, more plausible than the Synoptics. Mark’s structure of a one-time-only movement from Galilee to Jerusalem owes more, she argues, to theology than to history.

In her reconstruction of history, F. examines several key topics afresh. On the mission of the post-Easter Church, she raises a question rarely asked: Why did those Galilean disciples permanently relocate to Jerusalem? Her plausible answer: They saw their mission as a fulfillment of prophecies of end-time Israel centered in Zion and offering light to the nations. Regarding the Jewishness of Jesus and his immediate, post-Easter followers, she makes a good case that it was not Jesus himself but the Jesus of Mark who was anti-Temple and a nullifier of kashrut (cf. the authorial gloss of Mark 7:19b, “Thus he declared all foods clean”). Against the notion that Jesus countered a “politics of purity” with a “politics of compassion,” she asserts that compassion and Levitical purity regulations were in no way opposed. She argues convincingly that, where there is no evidence to the contrary, we ought to assume that Jesus took for granted what other Jews of his time and place took for granted.

I found most of F.’s constructions stimulating and instructive. Some assertions made in passing, however, call for evidence not marshaled in this book. For example, F. admits that “just because an evangelist refers to the Bible when presenting an episode in Jesus’ life or an element of his teaching does not mean he necessarily constructs the episode or element himself” (27). But then she can assert later, “The evangelists quarry the descriptive details of Jesus’ death from Isaiah, Psalms, Zechariah” (256).

F.’s experiment in historical reconstruction provides several benefits. It makes vividly evident the difference between (a) using the Gospels as data to hypothesize the history behind them and (b) reading the Gospels for what the Evangelists are saying about the Christian understanding of Jesus. Her effort to recover the Jewish life of Jesus illuminates the folly of facile disjunctions of Jesus from his environment (as in portraits of Jesus defining him as anti-elitist, or as anti-nationalist, as or anti-Temple/Law, or as anti-Judean Galilean peasant revolutionary). Her concentration on history apart from contemporary agendas points up the perennial role of theology in interpreting the Christian writings for living Christian faith today. The final sentence of the book captures both the charm and the challenge of her
project: “It is when we renounce the false familiarity proffered by the dark
angels of Relevance and Anachronism that we see Jesus, his contemporaries, and perhaps even ourselves, more clearly in our common humanity”
(270).

In place of individual endnotes, F. offers a useful running bibliographic
commentary for each chapter. Three maps, ten well-chosen illustrations, a
basic glossary, a select bibliography, two imaginative “preludes” on the
Temple at Passover and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and
indexes of Scripture texts, names, and subjects—all these enhance this
volume as an essential tool for contemporary New Testament scholarship
and pedagogy.

Creighton University, Omaha

DENNIS HAMM, S.J.

THE APOSTLE OF GOD: PAUL AND THE PROMISE OF ABRAHAM. By John L.

What was Paul’s understanding of God, and what were the major influ-
ences on it? These questions are customarily pursued by first dating the
undisputed letters and then plotting a progressive trajectory in Paul’s
thought, with his so-called “conversion” as its starting-point, the letter to
the Romans (long considered the quintessential expression of his mature
thought) as its end-point, and Diaspora Judaism as its primary matrix.
Righteousness and justification, faith and the Law, sin and salvation fea-
ture prominently in the construct that results from this approach to Pauline
theology. Such terms are far from prominent here, however. In this creative
study, White seeks to identify Paul’s understanding of God by way of a
unique method, and the results are fresh and engaging.

The introduction sets forth the central proposal: the startling revelation
that God had exalted a crucified Jesus prompted a radical change in Paul’s
understanding of God. Needing to comprehend Jesus’ Resurrection in
terms of his Jewish heritage, Paul did so in the light of God’s promise to
Abraham that all nations would be blessed through his offspring. God had
adopted Abraham—metaphorically speaking—to father a people; but only
with the later adoption of Jesus, the true seed and heir, did God’s procre-
avative efforts come to full fruition with a family composed of both Jew and
Gentile; thus, Paul saw God no longer as lawgiver and judge but as creator
of spiritual offspring, “one who generated life out of Jesus’ sterile-like
death and a power who made ‘lawless’ non-Jews his offspring and members
of the family of God” (xix).

The distinctive method of this study is introduced in part 1, which begins
with a discussion of metaphor that is informed by the work of George
Lakoff and Mark Johnson (chap. 2). To demonstrate Paul’s emphasis on
God’s character as creator, W. first surveys the undisputed letters to sur-
face the images and metaphors contained therein: family and household
images; civic, ethnic, and imperial images; agricultural images; images of
Resurrection and of God as Creator. Underlying this diverse array is the
root-metaphor, God as the beneficial power that directs nature and society’s life processes to maturation. The various forms of Paul’s rhetoric are shown to serve this idea of God as well (chap. 3).

W. then situates the Apostle’s new understanding of God within the context of his Greco-Roman environment (part 2). Distinct from previous studies, which typically grant the influence of Greco-Roman philosophical ideas and rhetoric but deny or overlook the political, W. argues that Paul’s ideas about God’s empire, his conception of Christ as a ruler, and his ideas about the Church were all informed by Roman imperial culture. Part 3 further highlights this cultural influence and discusses three elements of Paul’s theology: God’s identity as Father (chap. 6), Christ’s identity as Lord (chap. 7), and the Church as God’s family and people (chap. 8). W. maintains, for example, that “unlike Philo, who attributed both creative and kingly powers to God, Paul attributes creativity to God but transfers God’s political powers to the risen Jesus” (140). This transferal of divine political authority to Christ, W. argues, “corresponds to imperial-cult ideas about Augustus as the divine agent through whom universal peace was inaugurated” (141).

The arguments here are carefully nuanced, well-documented, and conversant with a wealth of recent Pauline scholarship. That interpreters should not discount the influence of Greco-Roman political ideas on Paul’s theology or on his audience’s reception of his discourse is a point well-taken. Politics and religion were, after all, intimately related in the ancient context. W.’s thorough and informed discussion of the Greco-Roman ruler cult, a prominent institution in Asia Minor, should give pause to those who have dismissed or never seriously considered its possible influence on Paul and his audiences. Moreover, the Apostle’s apocalypticism—problematic for many modern interpreters—appears here in a different light. The Pauline emphasis on growth, completion, and perfection suggests to W. that “apocalyptic judgment was not the primary thrust of his theology” (156) and therefore that “teleological” is perhaps preferable to “apocalyptic” as a description of Paul’s understanding of God.

Most importantly, W. makes the case for the significance of an aspect of Pauline thought too often obscured by the traditional preoccupation with God as redeemer and the sin-salvation schema. The redeemer God and the creator God are not mutually exclusive, of course. Both ideas clearly inform Paul’s argumentation; and since the letters are hardly systematic expressions of his thought, which idea was actually the more fundamental for the Apostle will remain debatable. The teleological thrust of Paul’s thought that W. exposes is surely worth exploring for its theological, pastoral, and spiritual implications. Distinctive in its method and so in its result, this book should stimulate discussion of not only Paul’s thought but also the methods by which it is constructed. I recommend the book highly.

Creighton University, Omaha

Susan A. Calef

In recent years theological and psychological literatures have been steadily accumulating information on the nature of cults. While archeological findings and anthropological understandings have enriched theological investigations of ancient cults, psychological research has often focused on examining the present-day rise of cults that have accompanied the end of one and the beginning of another millennium. At the start of a new millennium, then, how fortunate it is that Meissner, a Jesuit psychoanalyst, offers an analysis of the dynamics of cults and then explores how such dynamics influenced early Christian movements.

Ever since publishing in 1961 a comprehensive annotated bibliography of psychology and religion, M. has provided a wealth of works that demonstrate the relevance of psychology for theology. His latest book builds upon earlier examinations of cults, most especially Thy Kingdom Come (1995), a work on the dynamics of millenarianism. In the present work M., as in many of his other writings, seeks to make applicable the Thomistic axiom that "grace builds on nature." His present study suggests that the axiom may be applicable to groups.

Throughout the five sections and 14 chapters of the book, M. offers refined considerations of the seemingly disparate early Christian communities. He finds that some of these communities exhibited cult-like tendencies, manifested in the formation of subgroups and even opposing factions. He considers these behaviors as having emerged from psychodynamic processes. Chief among such dynamics are paranoid processes, which, he cautiously suggests, runs the spectrum from normal to pathological. He emphasizes his intention not to focus on the pathology of paranoia, but to speak to the pervasive psychodynamics of introjections, projections, and paranoid construction. While advising against psychological reductionism, M. does want his readers to come to a greater appreciation of the intrapsychic and interpersonal forces involved in the establishment and survival of the early Church.

In introducing the reader to the mechanisms of the paranoid process, M. offers an overview of Freud's classic case of Judge Paul Daniel Schreber. Theological readers may not be well acquainted with the psychoanalytic constructs discussed, but they will be familiar with the biblical scholarship from which M. draws in his analysis of early Christianity. He refers to the writings of a host of biblical scholars, among them Fitzmyer, Harrington, Horsley, Meeks, and Theissen. Such authors assist M. in examining the influence that Gnosticism had on pre-Christian, Jewish, and Christian cults. At the same time, in addition to Freud, M. refers to such psychoanalytic theorists as Kernberg, Klein, Kohut, and Volkan.

M.'s psychotheological task is daunting, as it requires him to maneuver between the Scylla of theological technicalities and the Charybdis of psychoanalytic formulations. The verbosity of some passages is distracting, but
a careful reading rewards. M.’s presentation helps one more clearly recognize the prodigious tasks that faced the early Christian movements that found themselves marginalized from both the structures of imperial Rome and the systems of a threatened Judaism. Their outcast status carried with it occasional hostilities so that, when faced with persecutions and prejudices, early believers in Christ felt collectively victimized.

M.’s analysis makes an important contribution in that he leads the reader toward a keener knowledge of the possible conscious and unconscious motivations that propelled the early Christians and the defense mechanisms that protected them. His study invites one to wonder how these early believers in Christ survived socially as individuals and as groups, and what their defense mechanisms were that enabled them to cope with the oppressions. In entertaining such questions the reader is invited to imagine more readily the challenges and consequences of being a member of the early Christian movements.

M. admits that, given the limited data, he can speak only generically about the discontent and frustration experienced within and among the early Christian movements. He nevertheless argues that they were forced to contend with social pressures that promoted a highly sectarian character that in turn resulted in such cultic characteristics as strong group adherence, enforced ideology, a dependence upon charismatic leaders, reactive and self-deceptive narcissism, and tendencies toward paranoid processes. At the same time, the values offered by the Christian groups allowed individuals to assimilate these values and develop a profound sense of belonging, whereby new adherents had a sense of participating in something larger than themselves.

In sum, the unique approach that M. brings to this study represents an authoritative contribution to both theological and psychological literatures of the ancient as well as the contemporary world.

Loyola College, Maryland

C. Kevin Gillespie, S.J.


Winling’s overall view of the early Church’s doctrine on Christ’s Resurrection convincingly shows that explicit thinking about this teaching occupied a central and fundamental place in the thinking of the early Church in a variety of areas. This book begins to palliate the dearth of major systematic treatments of the early Church’s thinking about the Resurrection and its relationship to other doctrines. W. proves that the sometimes bumpy historical development of the liturgical week and year and of the creeds can be understood only by recognizing that explicit reflection on Christ’s Res-
urrection structured them. We are thus convincingly reminded that the
liturgy and the creed, two important ecumenical expressions and instru-
ments, are founded on ancient dogmatic concerns in harmony with the
centrality attributed to the Lord’s Resurrection in contemporary exegesis
and systematic theology.

Chapter 2’s rich presentation of apologetic and anti-heretical works
demonstrates that the defense of the doctrine of Jesus’ Resurrection
obliged Christians to develop a rereading of Scripture, a theory of tradi-
tion, and an insistence on the value of the body—three distinctive and
durable elements of Christian identity. Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrate
clearly and at some length that the early Church generated, often with the
help of Hellenistic anthropology, insights on the Resurrection and the
exaltation of Christ that were basically in harmony with the emphases
contemporary exegesis places in the minds of the New Testament writers.
These chapters also show that conceptions of Jesus’ Resurrection and ex-
alvation represented either part of the stakes or some of the contrasting
conclusions in the most important theological discussions of the first few
postapostolic centuries. Contemporary theology can still consult with profit
the early Church’s witness on the Trinity, the theandric nature of Jesus, and
the unity of God’s creating and saving work. W. correctly points out that
those emphasizing the kenotic victimization and dereliction of the crucified
Logos need to consider the early Church’s emphasis on his victorious de-
scent to hell (473–84).

Chapter 5 shows that the early Christians, writing on our eschatological
resurrection in Christ, developed an anthropology and a soteriology that
depend more fundamentally on the Bible than on the philosophical or
religious categories of the surrounding culture. The last chapter deals with
the early Church’s notion of this present life as the risen Christ’s progres-
sive gift of a share in the resurrected union with him fulfilled at the end
beyond history. W. demonstrates that the early Church used the Bible to
explain baptism and the Eucharist as parts of this process, in which the
risen Jesus gives and nourishes a new life in the Spirit characterized by
Easter joy, upright conduct, and unity in the ecclesial body of Christ.

This study successfully complements the 20th-century contributions
made by exegesis, liturgical studies, and systematic theology toward refo-
cusing the Christian faith on the paschal mystery. The introduction, how-
ever, should have observed that the constructive proposals of, among oth-
ers, Rahner, Balthasar, and their most astute disciples already took inspira-
tion from the Fathers. W. correctly notes that the early Church read the
New Testament in the light of the paschal faith according to which—as
contemporary exegesis shows—it was written. His concluding section could
have better explained the differences between early Church exegesis and
contemporary approaches (472).

A few imbalances in W.’s overview of sources reduce the persuasiveness
of his demonstration. He slights Italian and English secondary sources,
while favoring French and German authors. While his commentaries on
copious citations from the great orthodox patristic sources and of the more folkloric pseudepigrapha before Chalcedon are illuminating and judicious, we see little from later works. The Resurrection did help set the agenda of certain later disputes over what some viewed as excesses in the Chalcedonian definition—a reference to Leontius’s *Against the Aphthartodocetists*, for example, would have found a comfortable place in chapter 3.

In general, the Latins get short shrift—only three pages cite Cyprian, one Hilary, and none Gregory the Great—especially when one compares these few citations with the detailed analysis given to Gregory of Nyssa’s position on most questions treated. Making Gregory of Nyssa the star witness for so much early church doctrine weakens the generality of W.’s conclusions about the early Church’s theology and undervalues the contributions of others.

A few seemingly inaccurate interpretations of quoted texts, certain passages adduced to exemplify doctrinal points which they seem not to support, and a couple of quotations taken out of context do not invalidate W.’s arguments, even if they sour ever so slightly this sweet fruit of over 50 years devoted to reflection on the Church’s early theology.

Marquette University, Milwaukee

JOSEPH G. MUELLER, S.J.


Just as John Calvin gave an important place to faith in the many editions of his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, scholars have paid considerable attention to his doctrine of faith as it developed from his first edition in 1536 to his last in 1559. Barbara Pitkin, however, carries her analysis beyond the various editions of his *Institutes* to his commentaries on Scripture and their contribution to his understanding of faith.

Fundamentally, P. suggests that Calvin shared Martin Luther’s understanding of faith, eschewing medieval definitions such as unformed faith and defining faith essentially as trust in God and God’s promises. Both Luther and Calvin relied primarily on Paul’s epistles for their understanding of faith. For both Luther and Calvin, people are saved by what God has done in God’s redemptive act in Jesus Christ, rather than by any works of merit. Faith is the work of the Holy Spirit. Following from this understanding, the grace of God, for Luther and for Calvin, is like a blanket covering sin rather than like an infusion helping the human will to do meritorious works that could aid in salvation. Since the decision about salvation does not wait until the end of one’s days, Christians on earth are both sinful and saved at the same time.

Soteriology is as basic to Calvin’s understanding of faith as it was to Luther’s, but P. contends that Calvin’s understanding developed beyond
Luther’s emphasis on faith that saves. She maintains that Calvin adopted a twofold understanding that included a second dimension of faith alongside “saving faith,” which P. labels “providential faith, faith in God’s activity as creator and sustainer of nature and history” (130). Through providential faith, believers’ eyes are purified to see God’s hand in everything (thus the book’s title). Nevertheless, P. contends that Calvin did not have a natural theology.

Beyond these basic theses, the book contains considerable information on Calvin’s views on various dimensions of faith and on particular passages from Scripture.

If something is lacking, it is historical context, a common failing of historical theologians. For instance, P. concludes that Calvin’s second dimension of faith in his twofold understanding of it developed especially from his commentaries on the Old Testament, which he undertook after his commentaries on the New Testament (159). While she makes a good case for the influence of his commentaries on his doctrine of faith, she does not adequately consider how the historical events of the last decade of his life might have influenced his thought.

During the 1550s the Genevan Reformation expanded extensively into France, building the ground swell of Protestantism that would lead to the outbreak of the Wars of Religion in France in 1562. It is no surprise that Calvin and his friends saw the hand of Providence in this successful growth of the Reformed Churches and in the events surrounding it. Whether or not one can reasonably argue for “providential faith” as a special dimension of Calvin’s doctrine of faith, Calvin and his friends surely had a strong sense of God’s guidance and God’s will unfolding in all that happened. To her credit, P. does mention briefly the influence of the Council of Trent on Calvin and how he reacted to it.

Although short, the book is sometimes redundant. There is a bibliography and an index, but the index is short and lacks some important items mentioned in the text, such as Trent. P. supplies copious endnotes, but occasionally one could wish for more primary-source documentation, such as when she declares that Calvin was called as a pastor in Geneva at the end of 1536. A historian is eager to know the source for that date.

P.’s study is careful and provocative, and worth examining by anyone interested in either Calvin’s doctrine of faith or in his exegesis of passages from the Psalms, the Pauline letters, Hebrews, James, 1 John, and John. The book is well-written, uses inclusive language, and cites other authors such as David Willis, Edward Dowey, William Bouwsma, and Olivier Millet. For Calvin’s youth, P. relies primarily on Alexandre Ganoczy, The Young Calvin (1987). She has also consulted important contemporary scholars such as Irena Backus, Richard Muller, and David Steinmetz to produce a meticulous and thoughtful work.

Rhode Island College, Providence

JEANNINE E. OLSON
The 400th anniversary in 1997 of the death of the Dutch Jesuit Peter Canisius sparked off a surprising number of celebrations, meetings, and publications, especially in his native city Nijmegen in the Netherlands and in the countries of Central Europe where he was active for many years as writer, administrator, and Catholic reformer. Among all the publications, the present book, one of the most interesting, focuses on Canisius as a humanist and European. It collects the papers of the symposium held at Frankfurt am Main where an official celebration was held at the Paulskirche, birthplace of the new Germany, in the presence of German President Roman Herzog, Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S.J., superior general of the Jesuit order, and representatives of the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches.

At the symposium three main themes were addressed, evident in the titles of three papers: “The Formation Offensive in the Tension between Tradition and Change,” “European Unity in Contradiction,” and “In the Tension between Individual Person and Society.” These papers, complemented by others, 19 altogether, are presented under three headings: “Humanist Legacy and Contemporary Formation,” “Europe and Its Regions and the Crisis of the ‘antiqui et moderni’,” and “The Mission of the Society of Jesus to Germany.” Only seven authors are Jesuits, a sign of the growing interest of non-Jesuits in Jesuit history and culture.

These essays give new insights into the person and the work of Peter Canisius. Since his canonization in 1925, interest in him has declined, due mainly to the inability of most of his earlier biographers to present a more objective and attractive image of this remarkably faithful and zealous Jesuit than the usual pious and rather one-sided ultramontane portraits. Putting Canisius back into the context of his own time, as the study under review does, makes him far more interesting and challenging, especially where he tried to build a bridge between the Middle Ages and modern times in the heart of a Church that did not know how to deal with modernity. For this heavy task Canisius drew energy from three sources: the humanist formation in his family, school, and university; his spiritual and mystical formation by representatives of Devotio moderna and Rheno-Flemish mysticism in the Netherlands and Germany; and his active-contemplative formation in the Society of Jesus.

On the one hand, the essays present Canisius in his Sitz im Leben and show his attitude toward the coexistence of the religions in Europe (Karl Otmar von Aretin) and his collaboration in the Ratio studiorum (Luce Giard). On the other hand, detailed studies are presented on his role as editor of the letters of Saint Jerome (Josef Lössl) and as Latin author faced with Humanism (Fidel Rädle). Some essays give a wider perspective on the ministry of the Jesuits in the 16th century, such as the role of women in...
Jesuit formation (Anne Conrad), Canisius’s politics in setting up colleges (Rainer Müller), his role in Jesuit urban strategy (Thomas Lucas, S.J.), and his contribution to the renewal of Catholicism in Poland (Stanislaw Obirek, S.J.). The critical edition of unpublished letters to and by Canisius is announced (Paul Begheyn, S.J.), followed by an impression of his recently discovered testament (Rita Haub). For the first time the (rather small) role of Canisius in German baroque literature has been researched (Hans Pörnbacher). Exciting reading is the essay on loyalty and loyalty conflicts among the first Jesuits in Germany regarding Rome and the secular ruler (Klaus Schatz, S.J.). The final essay focuses on the theological principles used by Martin Luther and Canisius when writing their respective catechisms (Michael Sievernich, S.J.).

A bibliography and index conclude the book. Its clear layout makes reading pleasant. It is one of the most important studies on Canisius published since his canonization.

Ignatiushuis, Amsterdam

PAUL BEGHEYN, S.J.


Michail Tareev (1866–1934) studied at the Moscow Theological Academy, wrote his initial work on the temptations of Christ (1892), and taught moral theology at the Moscow Theological Academy from 1902 until 1918. When the Academy was closed following the Revolution, he continued to find work teaching philosophy and political economy at other Russian faculties. His work is interesting not only because it represents a strain of Russian Orthodox theology little noticed in the West but also because of the centrality of his dogmatics to his moral theology. Röhrig has made Tareev’s main ideas accessible to a wider readership in this dissertation written for the Habilitation in theology at the University of Freiburg-im-Breisgau. The accessibility comes at the usual dissertation price (laborious and often repetitive presentation, and more than 1300 footnotes), but R. follows a logical and helpful order and strives to answer even tangential questions related to his topic. He always quotes Tareev in German translation, with occasional inclusion of the Russian terms used; on this aspect of the book, I am not qualified to make an evaluation.

R. skillfully lays out the main influences discernible in Tareev’s thought—Vladimir Soloviev and Fyodor Dostoyevsky—and shows how he went counter to or beyond their work. The connections and contrast with 19th-century Protestant kenotic theology are also effectively presented. R. devotes the necessary space to Tareev’s conceptual framework, particularly his understandings of creation and the situation of human nature, and to his development from a focus on the temptations of Christ (which were religious rather than moral in nature) to the kenosis implicit in them.
The following summary is unavoidably an over-simplification of R.’s detailed presentation. “Religious” temptation refers to the way that human beings are tempted to transform their innate striving for the divine into making themselves that goal, instead of practicing the self-denial that is the *kenosis* proper to the human condition. This temptation was uniquely strong in Christ, and his victory uniquely efficacious, because he was (and is) what humanity is created to become, and his human self-denial was therefore all the more conflictual in nature. Tareev, in emphasizing Christ’s victory in this lifelong conflict, was reacting to what he saw as a desiccated and stylized Scholastic reduction of the act of salvation to the cross and Resurrection alone, rather than to the entire work of Christ. He eventually recognized that, in this vision of salvation, the *kenosis* is theologically more fundamental than the temptations themselves, but he never ceased to view Christ’s victory over the religious temptations he faced, living and dying under the constraints of human finitude, as the chief deed by which he saved us. This anthropocentric approach earned Tareev fierce opposition from other contemporary Russian Orthodox scholars, and that opposition in turn drove him to deeper insight and greater precision.

The reader of this review will have noticed how far Tareev was from many more recent attempts to explain the salvific value of the events of the life of Jesus. My impression is that Tareev’s most interesting contribution for today’s theologian may lie in his careful analysis of the consciousness of the incarnate Word. He seems to have avoided or transcended the kinds of psychological analysis upon which Western thought, whether Protestant or Catholic, has often come to grief. R. strongly recommends the book by Nadejda Gorodetzky, *The Humiliated Christ in Modern Russian Thought* (1938), and its presentation of Tareev, but notes that she fails to describe his attention to the human psychology of Christ. R. himself does not describe how Tareev’s theology of salvation affected his approach to the moral theology he taught in the Moscow Academy, but what he has done is quite substantial.

*Duquesne University, Pittsburgh*  

MICHAEL SLUSSER


This book is a doctoral dissertation, masterfully done under the guidance of Giuseppe Alberigo, the historian of the Second Vatican Council. Turbanti shares his mentor’s conviction that history is in the detail, and he has produced a volume that is indispensable reading for anyone researching the history of either the Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World or the council itself. The history, with its complex meanderings and sometimes-spiteful contradictions, is all there.
T.'s sources are those historians dream about, not only the official Acta Concilii Oecumenici but also the archives and conciliar diaries of many of those most intimately involved in the creation of the Constitution: Chenu, Congar, Glorieux, Guano, Häring, Haubtmann, Rahner, Schillebeeckx, Suenens, and Tromp, among others. From these sources, T. retraces, step by contested step, the "uncertain and tormented journey" (785) of the Constitution and the council. He suggests that John XXIII had intimated his choice of pastoral direction for the council by giving the organization of it to the Secretariat of State, with its broader view on the modern world, rather than to the Holy Office, with its doctrinal focus. He documents the constant tension between pastorally-oriented and doctrinally-oriented bishops and theologians, and indicates how that tension bedeviled the council to its very last day. That tension, of course, continues to challenge the Catholic Church as much today as during the council. The frontispiece quotation from Pascal is still à propos: "Everything that does not move toward charity is figure."

John XXIII always intended his council to be for both church and world. At the Mass opening the council, he made his own a distinction advanced by Cardinal Suëmens of Malines: the council would be about the Church both ad intra and ad extra. He imaged this finality in the paschal candle, lumen Christi, lumen ecclesiae, lumen gentium, burning brightly in the heart of the world. Given this double finality, a document dealing with the Church’s place in the modern world was inescapable. The document prepared under the leadership of Cardinal Ottaviani was eventually judged, as were all the preparatory documents, to be inadequate for fruitful dialogue with the modern world, and at the end of the first session in December 1962 the search for a more acceptable document began. T. suggests (170) that the proposal for a new schema on the Church in the modern world was born in the Commission on the Apostolate of the Laity. Its development from birth to final approval on the last day of the council takes another 670 pages, which serves as parable for the constant tensions, twists, and compromises between the pastoral and doctrinal points of view. The final vote on the Constitution, 2309 placet and 75 non placet, may be taken as definitive proof of which of those two views prevailed in both the Constitution and the council.

There are many fascinating nuggets in this book. Space permits only two examples. During the preparatory phase, three Roman theologians, the Jesuit Hurth, the Dominican Gillon, and the Franciscan Lio, preparing the text De ordine morali, were pondering who else to invite into their group. The name of the Redemptorist Häring, who had published his successful Law of Christ in 1954, was raised and rejected because, they judged, he would be "an element of division" (60) in the group. He could be consulted on specific matters but he ought not to be a member of the commission. In February 1965, when the text of Schema XIII, as the Pastoral Constitution was then called, was being frenetically finalized, "the young bishop of Cracow, K. Wojtyła," (402) presented an alternative text. It did not win
approval, but he himself did. Congar noted in his diary that “Wojtyla made a very great impression. He radiated an attraction and a prophetic force which was calm but undeniable. . . . Daniélon has already decided he should edit something with Monseigneur Wojtyla” (511). It is not the only impressive intervention of Wojtyla T. notes.

This is an exceptional book, historically careful, judicious, even-handed. I particularly liked the strategy of citing in the text in Italian and in the original language in a footnote; this feature offers researchers the opportunity to verify translations. T.’s book is required reading for everyone interested in the history of the Council, and it should be in every research library. I would recommend that it be also in every theological library were it not that its Italian puts it beyond the reach of many. That is reason enough to ask for an English translation.

Creighton University, Omaha

Michael G. Lawler


In May of 1940, two days before the scheduled defense of his doctoral dissertation in Rome, Bernard Lonergan boarded the Conte di Savoia in Genoa to return to his native Canada. Europe was in turmoil, already embroiled in the Second World War, and his superiors thought it best that he immediately return home. He carried with him the doctoral dissertation he had written over the previous two years entitled Gratia Operans: A Study of the Speculative Development in the Writings of St. Thomas of Aquin. It would be six years before he would be officially granted his doctorate in Montreal after the war. In the meantime he would publish a “condensed and abbreviated” version of the dissertation in a series of articles in Theological Studies in 1941–1942 under the title “St. Thomas’s Thought on Gratia Operans.” These articles, later published in book form, are about half the size of the original dissertation. The present volume—number one in L.’s “Collected Works”—is a critical edition of both the dissertation and the subsequent articles. The editors and the University of Toronto Press are to be congratulated for making available in a very attractive edition this immensely valuable resource.

The problem L. traced in the thought of St. Thomas was the problem bequeathed to the Middle Ages by Augustine in his writings against the Pelagians who taught that divine grace was meted out according to the previous merits of good will. Augustine responded that God cooperates with good will to give it good performance; but alone he operates on bad will to make it good. Alone God replaces our heart of stone with a heart of flesh. “But when once we have willed to be good, we are not straight-
away saints and martyrs. . . . We have our weak and imperfect good will only to pray for strength and spiritual growth; and when in answer to our prayers God enables us to will so firmly that we do perform, *nobis co-operatur*” (5).

Though Augustine addresses the problem of reconciling divine grace and human freedom, he does not do so with the rigor eventually demanded by the medieval theologians newly awash in Aristotelian thought pouring into Europe through the Arab writers and demanding intellectual rigor. L.’s work is the study of this developing intellectual context and, within it, of the developing mind of Thomas Aquinas on divine grace and human freedom.

Central to Aquinas’s development was the breakthrough to the world of theory and to the validity of a line of reference termed “nature.” Only in terms of such an abstraction can one think clearly of “sin” on the one hand and of the healing and elevating “supernatural” character of divine grace on the other hand. In the long run and in the concrete the real alternatives remain grace and sin. But the whole problem lies in the abstract, in human thinking, and in the need for “a mental perspective, a set of coordinates, that eliminate the basic fallacy and its attendant host of anomalies” (17).

In his *Method in Theology* (1972) L. articulates the notion of “intellectual conversion”; that is, the radical breakthrough from “picture thinking” about oneself and the world to a grounded position on knowledge, objectivity, and reality. In *Grace and Freedom* (orig. ed. 1971) L. in effect demonstrates this conversion operative in the mind of Aquinas as over the years he strove to understand the action of grace. Certainly no area could be more fraught with imaginative figures and “pictures” than this one. What is a “cause”? What does it mean to say that God “applies” a cause to an effect? How conceive of divine providence? How understand God’s operation in general, in the light of which one can think and speak about the specific divine operation that is grace?

Finally, what did Aquinas himself hold on all of these issues? For L.’s primary aim here is not to engage in theological speculation but rather to do concrete historical research. “We ask what he said, why he said it and what he meant in saying it.” Modern thought on these issues was complicated by the *de auxiliis* controversy of the 16th century. L.’s aim is “to get behind the sixteenth century controversy to the intellectual field in which St. Thomas did his thinking” (93).

Thus L. engages in a methodical analysis of the changes in the texts of Thomas: from his initial writings on the issue, which generally reflect the thought of his predecessors, through his developing positions in his more mature writings. Finally, in the *Prima secundae* “the multitudinous developments of the previous fifteen years” converge to his final position. “Metaphysics and psychology, divine providence and human instrumentality, grace and nature at last have meshed their intricacies in synthesis” (147).

Regarding this work on Aquinas, the young L., soon to leave war-torn Europe on the *Conte di Savoia*, wrote: “May it be found by those who, like St. Thomas, are drawn ‘by the admirable delight and love of the truth
which is the very Son of God' to have thrown some light on the principles, the method, and the doctrine of the Communis Doctor” (149).

Seton Hall University, South Orange, N.J. Richard M. Liddy


Not surprisingly in a book coming from the American scholar most closely associated with Jacques Derrida, the title turns out to be a play on words. Caputo’s earlier book Radical Hermeneutics proposed to link hermeneutics and deconstruction, but here he presents us with “More,” first of all in the sense of a sequel (“Son of Radical Hermeneutics”), a further elaboration of his thesis that these two movements in Continental philosophy ought not to be seen as competitors but rather as complementary modes of human thinking and acting. It soon becomes clear, however, that this reading of “More” is not the important one, for what C. really wants to show us is a hermeneutics that is more radical because it has been supercharged by deconstruction. While admitting that the cross-fertilization of hermeneutics and deconstruction has produced “a child whom Derrida would never admit to fathering” (3), C. is convinced that he ought to acknowledge it, or at least that it brings out powerful possibilities inherent in deconstruction that are in keeping with Derrida’s own best intentions.

The book is composed of ten essays written at various times and held together—more like beads on a string than a step-by-step argument—by the thesis, announced at the outset, that “we are not (as far as we know) born into this world hard-wired to Being Itself,” that “the secret is, there is no Secret” (1). The oft-repeated words “no” and “not” set the tone for the book, which is an exercise in the via negativa—initially a philosophia negativa and, toward the end, a full-blown theologia negativa. The essays are grouped into three parts according to theme. Part 1 comprises four chapters that all argue for a “felicitous non-essentialism” by exploring issues in Foucault, Gadamer, Nietzsche, and Rorty, with Derrida hovering as a kind of continuous presence and point of comparison. The three essays in part 2 explore the ethical implications of more radical hermeneutics, with excursions into gender, science, and ethics.

Only in the third and final part does the full extent of C.’s project become visible: he has his sights set on a grand theological vision. He begins by distinguishing “holy hermeneutics” (bad), practiced by those who think they have been granted “a special hermeneutical leave or exemption from the flux” (193), from the kind of “devilish hermeneutics” (good) of those who know, with Derrida, that “textuality, undecidability, and the notorious différence, enter into the structure of sacred texts, divine revelation, and religious faith” (196).
A question arises at this point that Derrida scholars may want to ponder: Has the disciple perhaps wandered too far from the letter and spirit of Saint Jacques? Granted that Derrida has recently shown an interest in religion, C.’s reading turns him virtually into a theologian. His “right-wing” interpretation of deconstruction (one might even speak of “constructive deconstruction”) turns the project into an eager affirmation of tradition and faith. Religion (“good” religion, of course!) is not a matter of oppressive metanarratives after all, but rather our chief bulwark (therapy might be a better metaphor) against them. C. thus rejects vigorously the common campus caricature of deconstruction as the relativistic and nihilistic enemy of tradition. “Deconstruction is affirmation,” he announces: “the affirmation of the possibility of the coming of the other that stirs within the plurivocity and multiplicity of our traditions” (200–201).

Even more important than C.’s deconstructionist revisionism is the question of his interpretation of the Christian gospel. He starts out on solid enough ground with an exegesis of the story of Jesus’ post resurrection appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24). He offers this compelling, if not original, summary of its hermeneutical import: “Jesus took Scripture in hand and offered the disciples a hermeneutic of how the coming of the Messiah can be found in the Book, if one knows how to read” (194; C.’s emphasis). His main theological point has also been made before [e.g., by Kevin Hart in The Trespass of the Sign (1989)], but many will not find it so compelling: that only the apophatic tradition of the mystics, only the via negativa, can do full justice to the message of Jesus and the early Church. It is finally too much to swallow that the gospel is just another way of saying that “the secret is, there is no Secret.” Granted that a certain “undecidability,” a never-ending hermeneutical quest, is a corollary of the gospel, but C.’s deconstructionist reduction identifies it with the gospel itself. Missing is what St. Thomas called the analogical way and what Karl Barth insisted upon as the bedrock of theology, the analogia fidei. C.’s book remains an impassioned, insightful, often witty tour de force, but its negative theology remains insufficient to articulate the positive Good News.

Connecticut College, New London

Garrett Green


At this time in history, when communion ecclesiology is clearly a preferred way to speak about the nature of the Church in Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox circles, Doyle’s book addresses the fact that there are ostensibly competing and/or conflicting understandings of the Church as communion. D. seeks a way forward from these conflicts by arguing for the contribution of a communion ecclesiology “defined more inclusively to embrace a reasonable range of theological approaches”
While D. recognizes that indeed there are obvious divergences in communion ecclesiologies (e.g., Ratzinger and the Himes brothers), he chooses to focus on the similarities, as well as on the possibility of engaging the differences through complexio oppositorum, a method that in the end brings him to the less than dynamic concept of complementarity to deal with deep-seated theological differences. Nonetheless, D.'s methodological strategy of pointing out the positive contributions of many significant 20th-century theologies of communion is an important first step in moving forward any debate about the nature of the Church as communion. Compendably, he takes this step without himself succumbing to a version of communion ecclesiology that is neither extremely on the right (Schindler) nor the left (Lawler/Shanahan).

D.'s text is structured around three “frameworks of inclusion”: Vatican II, an inclusive catholicity, and sacramentality. These serve as the broad themes from which he compares six versions of Catholic communion ecclesiology—CDF, Rahnerian, Balthasarian, liberation (Boff), contextual (E. Johnson and R. Goizueta), and reforming (Küng)—and lead to D.'s vision of communion ecclesiology, characterized by the interplay of divine, mystical, sacramental, historical, and social dimensions. In a straightforward, positive manner, he shows the consistencies between each of these versions of communion and the above three frameworks, pointing out how the frameworks themselves are inclusive enough to contain elements of each version. From the beginning, D.'s assertion of this inclusive vision rightly rests on the legitimate need to correct what he sees as the “reductive distortions” of individualism, the merely human, juridicism, mystification, and exclusivism. However, by using de Lubac’s version of communion as the fulcrum of his argument, he seems reluctant to acknowledge that almost 40 years after de Lubac’s major works and his influence at Vatican II, his theology of communion has been and is being appropriated more by those considered right of center than left of center on the ideological spectrum (Balthasar, Ratzinger, Schindler, Wood). This is not to say that de Lubac’s understanding of communion has little to offer in the contemporary context; it certainly does. In particular, his stress on overcoming extrinsicism and individualism still are (and necessarily so) influential today. Rather, the question raised is about the suitability of de Lubac as a mediating figure. Given his prevailing association with the “conservative” sector of communion ecclesiology, one is hard-pressed to see in him the aforementioned “reasonable range of theological positions,” which D. wants to include in his vision of communion ecclesiology and which presumably does not eradicate real differences.

Although the project that D. undertakes in this text is two-fold, the presentation of various versions of communion ecclesiology and an initial presentation of his own vision of the same, he leaves me wanting more of a sense of what the practice of this vision of communion ecclesiology will look like. Part of this difficulty is related to the fact that much of what constitutes communion ecclesiology today is articulated by those who are not themselves ecclesiologists as such, but are tangentially connected to
ecclesiology via the idea of communion. For example, this dilemma surfaces in D.’s choice to include a chapter on “Communion on the Borders,” which covers the contextual theologies of E. Johnson and R. Goizueta. No serious theologian today would deny the importance of theologies such as these for ecclesiology, and even specifically for understanding the nature and mission of the Church as communion. Yet, Johnson and Goizueta are more systematic generalists than ecclesiologists and, as such, they lack D.’s explicit assistance in making connections to ecclesial life. It is therefore difficult to imagine what concrete impact their work might have on disputed issues in communion ecclesiology, e.g., the relationship between the universal Church and the local church.

D.’s rooting of prominent 20th-century versions of communion in the thought of Möhler and Schleiermacher and his retrieval of Journet’s emphasis on the mystery of the mystical body of Christ (chaps. 2 and 3) are vital for any theologian who wants to develop a concept of communion that is historical rather than ahistorical. Similarly, the breadth of the material, including the number of theologians of communion covered (18, including Protestants Schleiermacher and Volf, and Orthodox Zizioulas), makes this text an essential resource for graduate students and scholars of ecclesiology.

Creighton University, Omaha

MARY A. EHLE


Over the past decade, cultural historians interested in the Great War, the Holocaust, and other 20th-century catastrophes, have been busy exploring the concept of “trauma,” the construction of collective “memory,” and the building of “monuments” as concrete negotiations of communal “identity.” In recent writings, Duquoc, too, has turned his attention to the “monuments” of Christianity, as well as to its “identity,” “memory,” and “amnesia.” He explicitly recognizes the paradoxical ambiguity of memory: on the one hand, institutional memory must be preserved for the sake of self-identity; on the other, without a certain amount of amnesia (as Nietzsche observed), a monumental imagination prevents any innovation for the future and leads to institutional death. How to combine memory and amnesia so as to maintain self-identity while simultaneously freeing oneself for the future? This is D.’s problem.

D. summarizes his fundamental hypothesis in the present book, written for a popular audience: Judeo-Christianity is essentially ordered toward a future in which it hopes but cannot concretely describe. In the 4th-century Empire, this primitive faith perverted itself, set up a “socio-political task” for an essentially eschatological faith, and attempted to install a “terrestrial form of institutional Messianism” (11). Since its 16th-century destruction in the Reformation, this failed “dream” has “haunted” official faith. Vatican
II's acceptance of pluralism and laicism inaugurated the official “mourning” period for this lost dream. However, until the Catholic Church works through its “nostalgia” for this failed project, it will not be free to reimagine its primitive mission under another concrete historical form.

D. arranges his work in roughly chronological order. Part 1 discusses Abraham and Jesus as expressions of the primitive mission of Israel. In both figures, the original “memory” to be recovered is ironically a “rupture” with the past: Abraham's rupture with his land and religion; Jesus' rupture with family, Law, cult, and “nation” (17, 22). Here D. is at his paradoxical best: the memory to which the Church must cling for its identity is a vocation to sever oneself from the past.

From here on the book loses its edge in cliché. Part 2 lays out the early doctrinal developments (Trinity, Christ, grace) as formulations supportive of the millenarian dream, the “reign of God on earth.” Thanks to the doctrine of homoousios, God was “implicated in human history, not by means of a delegate” but rather through “his Son who was of the very same reality” (54). Part 3 traces the tragic slope of the failed wish-fulfillment: “le rêve politique.” D. leap-frogs from Constantine to Gregory VII and Boniface VIII and then to Luther and Calvin. By eliminating mediation and embracing “faith alone,” the Reform ended “Christendom” as well, the “illegitimate union between the ecclesial institution and the political domain” (78). Part 4, “The Mourning,” jumps from the 16th century to late modernity: Gregory XVI, Pius IX, the Modernist Crisis, and the Vatican Council. In focusing on papal fears that “laicization” would only lead to “religious and social catastrophe” (92), D.'s work demonstrates its own location. Perhaps the dream to be mourned was uniquely European and not quite intelligible in the American experience. Concluding remarks point us to the future by returning us to the past: to Abraham, Jesus, and the call to sever oneself from the past.

In this story of emperors, popes, and reformers, D. warns us that he does not intend “to retrace a history” but rather “to locate a logic” that ended up distorting Christianity's primitive project (66). The problem with humanity is that the devil is in the details, and without “history,” D.'s story is not only cliché, it is also untrue. For example: by skipping over seven centuries D. eliminates the very construction of Germanic Christianity—not by “popes” (largely irrelevant) or “states” (completely nonexistent)—as a syncretic invention of nomadic chieftains (Merovingians, Carolingians, and invisible 10th-century tribes). Or again: Luther and Calvin did not so much “destroy” the bond of “church” and “state” as set up the conditions of possibility for the invention of both. Cuius regio, eius religio—“churches” and “states” come to us not from the Roman Empire but rather from the 16th-century rejection of imperialism for incipient nationalism. Finally, 19th-century Liberalism was not just about political or “state” power. Its main battles were fought over school systems and the inculcation of a hegemonic positivist ideology—i.e., the denial of the possibility of any metaphysical or eschatological realities (primitive Christianity). In brief,
the reader with a bent for people, places, and events will find D.’s substi-
tution of an ahistorical “location of a logic” aggravating.

However, D.’s singular contribution is his relocation not of a “logic,” but
rather of the present moment and of ourselves—i.e., of the post-1965 era as
a “period of bereavement.” Over and against liberals (for whom 1965 was
the inauguration of inexorable progress) and restorationists (for whom
1965 demands a counter-revolution), D. offers a location formulated (im-
plicitly) in Nietzschean and Freudian terms. After the trauma of a failed
dream, the Church needs to withdraw its cathexes from the lost love-object,
to work through its melancholic fixation, and free itself for a new object of
desire. One may disagree about the precise nature of the dream, but D.’s
location of the present in terms of trauma, memory, and representations
offers a fresh approach for future exploration.

Boston College

Stephen Schloessner, S.J.

Prozesstheologie: Zu ihrer Würdigung und kritischen Er-
DM 88.

Recent years have seen concerted efforts by various individuals to re-
think the traditional interpretation of the metaphysics of Alfred North
Whitehead as set forth by Charles Hartshorne and other early disciples of
Whitehead. Some of those individuals (myself included) have sought to
make Whitehead’s philosophy more compatible with classical Christian
beliefs such as the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, creatio ex
nihilo, etc. Roland Faber, professor of theology at the University of Vi-
enna, should be counted in this latter group with, however, the further
nuance that he intends to represent Whitehead as a proto-postmodernist
who in his own way was suspicious of totalizing modes of thought or
system-building. As a result the logic of F.’s thought is at times quite
complicated, but fortunately he clarifies his basic argument in the form of
eight summary theses.

In the first thesis F. sets out a typology of different kinds of process
theology, some of which are more naturalistic, others more explicitly reli-
ant on Christian revelation. His own choice, relying on the thought of
Bernard Loomer and Marjorie Suchocki, is to think of God as transcending
the world yet simultaneously immanent within it as the creative source of
its movement into the future. As the second and third theses make clear,
permanence and flux are thus present within the reality of both God and
the world, but in different ways. God moves from serene self-possession in
the divine envisagement of possibilities for the world into the flux of
worldly events so as to incorporate them into the divine “consequent na-
ture.” The world, for its part, moves from the fluent actuality of individual
events into the “everlasting” character of the divine consequent nature.
Hence a “mutual immanence” of God in the world and the world in God
(fourth thesis) pertains: God is neither identified with the world nor in opposition to it; God is rather the world’s salvation.

In theses five and six, F. presents his reasons why Whitehead’s metaphysical scheme should be “deconstructed.” In the first place, it is not a picture of reality but only a provisional description of our human experience of the God-world relationship; thus its key terms (e.g., “God-world-creativity”) can be reordered as desired within different interpretative schemes. Second, a theology true to the dynamic character of divine revelation should not be grounded in fixed metaphysical principles but rather in a never ending remembrance of the universal relevance of a singular historical event (e.g., the life, death, and Resurrection of Jesus). Accordingly, in the seventh and eighth theses, F. proposes that God no longer be conceived as an actual entity, different from finite actual entities only in its reverse process of concrescence. Rather, in virtue of God’s primordial vision of possibilities for the world, God is revealed as the world’s future; God incorporates what progressively happens in the world into the actuality of what already exists in its fullness within God. F. then suggests that, contrary to the conventional understanding of creativity as mediating between God and the world, God should be understood as the transcendent source of the creativity at work in the world process. God, therefore, does not need the world, but the world needs God as its transcendent/immanent source of existence and activity. Concluding chapters deal with the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, Resurrection, and the end of the world, all from the perspective of F.’s revised understanding of the Whiteheadian metaphysical scheme.

The real merit of F.’s project is his creative reworking of the relationship between God, world, and creativity within Whitehead’s metaphysics, thus challenging the tendency to fundamentalism among some of the latter’s disciples. F., however, may have overstated his case in asserting that a theology based on divine revelation should be free of metaphysics altogether. It should be enough, first, to affirm the basic priority of the truths of divine revelation over the logical dictates of any given metaphysical scheme and then to work at their mutual harmonization and creative interaction. This seems to be what F. has achieved in this book, although he himself evidently thinks otherwise.

Xavier University, Cincinnati


In the beginning of this third millennium, the Church is displaying contrasting tendencies. On the one hand, the power of the papacy keeps increasing and expanding: it leads and guides the dioceses and it commands the respect of the nations. On the other, local churches in many regions are
declining in confidence and significance: they display the symptoms of deep-lying, internal weaknesses. The crisis (because a crisis it is) should not be seen as a loss of faith or a breach of unity: no heresy or schism is threatening to tear the Church apart. The malaise is more subtle but no less real: the internal balances of the Church are disturbed and its vital energies cry for better equilibrium.

Lafont, a monk of the Benedictine Abbey Pierre-qui-Vire in France and former professor at the Ateneo Sant’Anselmo in Rome, is eminently qualified to diagnose this “indisposition,” assess its consequences, and suggest the appropriate remedies. The title of his work is about “imagining” the Church, but L. is not dealing in flights of fancy. Rather, he wants to help his readers construe a renewed “image” of the Church that is grounded in our best theological sources, is buttressed by sound philosophy, and respects modernity. His “imagining” is “faith seeking understanding” in the tradition of Anselm of Canterbury.

The introductory and historical part of the book presents the old “image” prevalent before Vatican II and still operative in subtle ways. It originated in a Platonic, hierarchically ordered conception of the universe, where the summit alone possesses pure wisdom and unerring truth. The lower regions have no direct access to the ultimate source of knowledge and energy: they can receive them from above only through mediation. The Church had to be in the same image, and, accordingly, its hierarchical structures were developed and reinforced (especially through the Gregorian reform in the 11th century) well beyond what the evangelical tradition demanded and the Eastern churches were willing to accept. This Platonic vision gave birth to the opinion that all knowledge comes from above (“illuminism”) and the Church is sharply divided into “teachers” and “learners,” as well as to the theory that the power of the bishops to govern (jurisdiction) descended from the pope. Understandably, the laity needed a “mandate” from the hierarchy for any apostolic activity.

Vatican II saw it differently: the Spirit can and does distribute his charism directly to every member and every organ in the Church. The Fathers proclaimed as Catholic doctrine that every single bishop receives his power directly from the Spirit through the sacrament of orders; what Peter’s successor does is to assign each to be the shepherd of a “portion” of God’s people. Further, they proclaimed that the universal people of God cannot err in matters of belief and that the mission to announce the good news is intrinsic to the gift of divine life in baptism. By such strong statements, the Fathers have destroyed the Platonic conception of the Church and put an end to the theory of any general and exclusive mediation from the summit. Their intent was to purify the Catholic mind, not to impinge on our authentic Tradition. They reaffirmed the teaching of Vatican I concerning the primacy of the pope, his infallibility, and overarching authority, but they placed his charisms into a broader context.

This is then the renewed and wholesome image of the Church. The Spirit is holding every part of it and distributes his gifts directly to each member and to each organ as needed for accomplishing their allotted tasks. All
persons and institutions are bonded into one by the indwelling Spirit: they are the “structured communion.”

The substantial message of the book is this renewed “image” of the Church. But to understand this image is not enough: faith demands action. Thus the question: “What to do about it?” L. accepts the challenge to be practical, and he proceeds to “imagine” what the operations of the “structured communion” can be and ought to be. He has the rare gift of moving with ease from subtle insights to down-to-earth proposals. He takes a fresh look at the charisms of Christian life (marriage and celibacy) and of various ministries (including that of theologians). Then, he examines extensively the “diversified charism of presiding,” granted to the bishops singly, to the bishops in college assembled, and to their president, the successor of Peter. He stresses the need for laws grounded in theological values, but for him the purpose of the laws within the “structured communion” is to dispose the people for the reception of the gifts of the Spirit.

The translator deserves credit. His rendition of the French is faithful and smooth; no mean achievement! His preface is a good presentation of L.’s intent; his discovery at the reading of the original, “within the first few pages,” that “this book was special,” was correct. L.’s work is special because he has the capacity to purify our tradition without hurting it, he is able to show that contrasting tendencies can be replaced by an inner harmony, and he can move from theoretical insights to practical proposals for giving full scope to the vital forces of the Church. He is, indeed, a reliable guide toward that holy equilibrium that the Catholic Church needs and longs for in our days.

Law Center, Georgetown University

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J.


This work is a unique achievement. Martinez has given us a guidebook to a striking theological terrain. Johann Baptist Metz (political theology), Gustavo Gutiérrez (liberation theology), and David Tracy (public theology) have kept many of us from giving in to what Gabriel Daly once called “the post-Enlightenment blues.” These faithful Catholic intellectuals have set new markers for intellectual discourse and pulled theological reading away from the traps of banality and accommodation. Theologians already know the impact of Bloch, the Frankfurt School, and Walter Benjamin on Metz’s political theology; of how Las Casas, Medellín, and José María Arguedas mark the work of Gutiérrez; of Tracy’s appropriation of Schubert Ogden, Bernard Lonergan, and the postmoderns. Having all the background collected and organized is useful, but the book is no mere catalogue of influences.
M. contextualizes these contextual theologians: he locates them in their political and geographical settings, intellectual milieus, emerging concerns, and he consistently finds patterns that link them. His analysis is refreshingly on target in its stress on their projects as primarily fundamental theologies: they focus not so much on specific dogmatic tapestries as on the questions for doing and the criteria for judging any theology. M. argues that each in his own way is committed to the public (deprivatized) relationship of religion and society. Each is committed to context and wary of abstraction from concrete social settings. Each negotiates a turn to praxis and a theological return to the mysterious experience of God. In the final chapter M. reflects on common foci including suffering, God, and praxis.

The use of Rahner as a frame for the book brilliantly integrates another “father” of contemporary theologies and justly recalls his influence even on those who do not do his theology. M. calls Gutiérrez, Metz, and Tracy post-Rahnerians. Their work builds on Rahner’s reintegration of nature and grace, his foundational turn to the subject, and his insistence on a theological sense of mystery (20). Though these three turn from Rahner’s transcendental theology to the particularity of history and society, M. shows in his final chapter how they rejoin Rahner in their return to the mystery of God.

The Metz section (chap. 2) really drives the book. Not only does Metz receive the most thorough treatment, but M. uses him to discuss Gutiérrez and Tracy in their own respective chapters and in the final comparative chapter. The Gutiérrez chapter presents a complete picture of his development, with particular attention paid to his later work on Job. The Tracy chapter, while lacking the same force as the others, is accurate and one of the best pictures of Tracy’s project around.

Readers should bear in mind that the actual writings of these three theologians are stimulating articulations and interruptions, for so fine a systematic treatment as M. provides could undercut the interruptive challenge one actually experiences in their writings. Especially in the case of Metz, who labors over words, laces his prose with questions, and relies on metaphors, one must be engaged by the prose to grasp the point. It would be ironic for these figures, who so fight for particularity, to themselves be accidentally elided. Some caveats and questions may help.

For example, do these three really arrive back at the same God or just back at the word “God”? M. intimates that Metz’s “missing God,” the positive manifestation God of Tracy, and the gracious presence of Gutiérrez’s God are similar, but this hint may mislead. Metz stresses suffering and projects a wariness about intellectualizing suffering that is not totally congruent with Tracy’s conceptual focus on the reality of God. Metz and Gutiérrez put suffering—their version of the God question—first. For Metz God’s presence comes in suffering, in the experience of missing God. As M. himself says, “Metz’s leiden an Gott, though, is more tragic than in Gutiérrez. The final self-abandonment into God’s hands takes place not in the final joy of Gutiérrez’s Job but in the midst of an unversöhnheit (irreconc-
cibility) that persists in the very act of self-abandonment” (148). Convergence should not be read as congruence.

Repeatedly calling Metz, Gutiérrez, and Tracy post-Rahnerian could give a false impression of their relationship to Rahner. Only Metz did significant study with Rahner, and it might even be said he was a part of that work as well as its heir. Furthermore, Metz has worked to define his own work as “post-idealistic.” Specifically he insists that it is at odds with Rahner’s transcendental-idealistic thought. Metz is a very clear critic of his teacher’s theology as ahistorical and lacking the turn to praxis. One must be careful, then, not to erase this costly difference by stressing connections.

The cavils I raise here are not a critique of M.’s book as much as remarks for users. The connection to Rahner works well, and the easy contextualizing of Metz, Gutiérrez, and Tracy is remarkable. M.’s reading of their work is consistently trustworthy, and the comparative suggestions in the final chapter are provocative. I found his discussion of their narrative use of Scripture, their anchoring of theology in prayer, and their variations on God’s presence especially clarifying. The book provides an acute synoptic view of the three most stimulating voices in contemporary fundamental theology. And, happily, its prose is a pleasure to read. It reminds us why we enjoy theology.

**Gonzaga University, Spokane**

**JOHN K. DONNEY**


Given Demmer’s outstanding scholarly contribution to moral theology—almost 20 books and over 100 articles—it is impossible to miss the importance of his latest work: a modern handbook of fundamental moral theology. After a brief introduction, seven chapters unpack the central themes: biblical foundation, natural law, principles and norms, conscience, the moral act, sin, and conversion. The chapters are harmoniously integrated, yet each can stand on its own as a small treatise on a specific topic.

D. is quick to point out that, unlike the traditional manuals, the modern handbook cannot aim at the same degree of encyclopedic completeness and trans-temporal endurance. Besides cultural fragmentation and dispersion, moral theology confronts a radically new epistemological sensibility defined by skeptical relativism. This context requires a new strategy in the articulation of moral meaning and truth.

At the core of D.’s undertaking stands the scientific nature of moral theology. His approach is *fundamental* in the sense that it provides a theological perspective on the ultimate ground of ethics and a careful investigation of the epistemological presuppositions of the discipline. Transcendental as well as hermeneutic modes of thinking serve him well in accounting for both the absoluteness and the historical character of moral truth. He also engages in critical dialogue with “communicative” theories of ethics
(Habermas especially). In so doing he retrieves and clarifies the constitutive function of intersubjectivity, while avoiding the pitfall of a formalistic proceduralism.

If dialogue with philosophical pluralism presents the basic challenge to moral theology today, moral theology’s openness to structural adjustments pertaining to both formal categories (Denkkategorien) and content (Denkinhalte) can become fruitful only when it rests upon hermeneutical awareness rather than epistemological eclecticism. The former leads to a more critical understanding of one’s identity; the latter can only end in relativistic resignation. For this reason, the search for new philosophical partners and the retrieval of the tradition cannot be seen as disjointed operations; they are, rather, correlative dimensions whose reciprocity is ultimately predicated upon the analogy of faith and reason, grace and nature, Christian and secular moral experience, church and the world.

Methodological awareness, however, is not self-serving. Moral theology does not find its point of reference in a particular epistemological option, however suitable to its own object, but rather in the historical event of God’s self-communication to humankind. Chapter 2 analyzes the ethical implications of the Christological event; critical hermeneutics of biblical texts is carefully oriented to the systematic reconstruction of their theological meaning.

D.’s sensitivity to the ecumenical difficulty of many issues—made even more evident by his subtle retrieval of Augustine—prepares the ground for the subsequent articulation of the subject-matter. In so doing, he allows the basic features of Christian ethics to emerge through the progressive unfolding of moral theology’s own content.

D. is careful to show how the interplay of anthropological coordinates and ethical insights bespeaks the true nature of moral discourse as an invitation to share in the experience of the good, rather than as a prescription of duties. Christian ethics is only secondarily and derivatively geared to the articulation of norms, principles, and rules. First and foremost, it summons the person to a journey of liberation in which freedom’s transcendental conditions are transformed by encountering the Christological event. The ecclesial mediation of that event in the moral experience of the community presents a vision of human fulfillment that everyone can recognize, at least inchoatively.

With systematic precision, D. scrutinizes all the major categories of fundamental moral theology: conscience and the meaning of moral systems, fundamental option and the theory of action, double effect, intrinsece malum, direct-indirect distinction, etc. His vast knowledge of the tradition enables him to see each problem against the backdrop of history. Thus, past theoretical strategies, which today may appear obsolete, are given new meaning in the light of their proper contexts. Paradigmatic are the observations concerning the much deprecated shortcomings of neo-Scholastic moral theology. Essentialism in the understanding of the objectum morale of the action as well as legalism in the determination of the subject’s moral responsibility acquire a new meaning when seen against the backdrop of a
scientific paradigm defined by the ideal precision of mathematics and law. Clearly, to dismiss such a moral theology as the expression of bad casuistry misses the point.

The book is a major contribution of scientific scholarship and ought not be ignored by anyone seriously interested in the foundations of moral theology. Those familiar with D.’s thought and teaching style will be happy to find here his proverbial rigor and linguistic precision in the pursuit of systematic clarity. The new reader, however, is likely to find these very qualities challenging. The book is neither intended as an introduction nor as a “first level of reflection” on Christian ethics. To appreciate the depth of D.’s insights, knowledge of the field and of the status quaeestionis on methodological issues must be presumed. The book should be approached as the mature synthesis of a moral theologian whose writing displays a remarkable coherence of theoretical presuppositions and interpretation of particular themes, as well as a metaphysical passion that dares to investigate moral experience in its most radical meaning.

Georgetown University

ROBERTO DELL’ORO


Although Klaus Demmer is a renowned professor of moral theology at the Gregorian University and one of the most distinguished contemporary moralists in Europe, few of his works have been translated into English. The present translation constitutes a significant if not complete remedy to this unfortunate lacuna. In this fine introduction to the field of moral theology, D. offers a concise summary of his own approach—so concise, in fact, that the strongest complaint that can be made of the book is that it is only one tenth the length it ought to be.

D. takes his point of departure from the contemporary state of moral theology. The shift in methodology encouraged by Vatican II constituted both a turning point from the old manuals and a promise, not yet fulfilled, for a more appropriate understanding of the Christian moral life. D. emphasizes the centrality of goodness for ethics and the fact that the moral life makes a claim on the whole person, particularly as interpreted in the light of Christ. Thus, although D.’s position is philosophically sophisticated, he insists that Catholic moral theology always be grounded in a theological center of gravity. There can be no moral theology “without explicit relation to Christology” (4); neither can the field progress without explicit grounding in ecclesiology, Scripture, and grace. This theocentric and Christocen-
tric position, however, does not in the slightest tempt D. to develop a subtle form of divine command ethics. Whatever its implication for interreligious dialogue, D. is not reluctant to announce that “Christian morality is human morality brought to its perfection” (6, 23).

D. represents the best of German Catholic humanism. He builds strongly on the turn to conscience advocated by the documents of Vatican II and properly emphasizes the importance of “conscience formation” for morally-mature decision-making. Human reason is not infallible, but a properly formed conscience makes possible a deeper grasp of the dignity of the person and a corrective to the natural tendency to generate social inequalities. The Church, then, should be regarded not as a hierarchical institution insisting on rigid obedience, but as a community inspired by charity and engaged in a common “thinking effort in which all members . . . participate and share—albeit in different measure—the same responsibility” (30). If so, D. reasons, it follows that the tradition constitutes “a living reality that is open to continuous correction” (30). This approach, of course, is reinforced by attentiveness to the natural law underpinnings of moral theology (6). Communio ecclesiology thus generates active coresponsibility within the Church.

Given this perspective, one can see why D. stresses the necessity of “hermeneutic effort” in moral reflection. Moral deliberation takes place in the midst of concrete situations that call for humble openness to concrete goods and evils, a self-critical awareness of the ambiguities of texts and traditions, and an awareness of the obligation to be respectful of others while reasonable in the interpretation of concrete moral norms. D. is acutely aware of the fact that the ability to engage wisely in moral deliberation is itself to a significant extent a function of the moral virtue of the inquirer and his or her “moral performance” (67). This is one reason why the paradigm of scientific explanation and discovery is not particularly helpful for ethics. It also underscores the ethical importance of attending to the agent’s own moral subjectivity, intentionality, and self-understanding, an awareness of which, D. argues, sets limits to “an object-oriented form of thinking” (70).

D. argues that contemporary moral theology must face four tasks: develop the cross-cultural dimensions of the discipline, address the “God question” (a sine qua non of any theology), attend more thoroughly to the necessity of personal praxis and piety, and develop a metaphysical basis for moral theology that can be taken seriously by contemporary philosophy. In these agenda D. displays a healthy balance of important values: conscience and objectivity, loyalty to the tradition and creativity, spiritual growth, and intellectual rigor.

Readers will find themselves provoked, intrigued, and stimulated by this book to want to read more of D. One can only hope that Georgetown University Press will provide more translations of his work (as they did for Bruno Schüller and Josef Fuchs) so that his very thoughtful and self-critical ethical theory can be made accessible to a wider audience. This book
functions as both an excellent primer to the current state of Catholic moral theology and an outline of the ethical theory of one of its most sophisticated practitioners.

Boston College


Hartwig significantly advances the discussion about sexual ethics on two fronts. First, he charges that church teachings are positively harmful when they institutionally mandate sexual abstinence for anyone who is not in a heterosexual marriage. Second, he proposes a heuristic guideline for the development of a positive, developmentally-oriented, virtue-based sexual ethics based on a notion of the poetics of intimacy.

H. acknowledges that readers may initially object to his thesis about the immorality of mandated, life-long sexual abstinence. He recognizes that certain contemporary discussions (about public health issues, professional women pursuing singlehood, and the obsessive interest in sex in today’s culture) make sexual abstinence an attractive good. He argues, however, that, while periodic abstinence can serve the poetics of intimacy, institutionally mandated, long-term abstinence does not. Thus he takes issue with churches that impose abstinence on those in premarital relationships as well as on clergy and religious, the divorced, and those with mental and developmental disabilities.

Borrowing “poetics of intimacy” from James T. Sears (Sexuality and the Curriculum, 1992), H. proposes a sexual ethics that aims at sexual flourishing. He contrasts conservative Christian ethics that promotes abstinence in the name of an act-oriented chastity with a Jewish ethics that recognizes the divine mandates to be fruitful and to pursue sexual companionship (Genesis 1:28; 2:18). Rather than a negative ethics that seeks to contain sexual desire—H. sees containment as risky and believes that only a few norms are necessary to grow into sexual maturity—H. turns to an ethics that stresses the development of an interiority disposed to covenantal, mutual self-giving in sexual relationships. Here he describes the poetics of intimacy as referring to “the different kinds of internal dispositions or attitudes (virtues) that one must cultivate in order to initiate and sustain relationships of deep interpersonal intimacy” (25).

H. exposes many of the problems associated with sexual abstinence, particularly the implicit assumption that it eliminates the unsettledness and disruptiveness of sexual relationships. Abstinence he sees as a denial of our call to embodiment and to interpersonal relationships: it inhibits the maturation of a person’s ability to relate tenderly with others. As opposed to the school of chastity, H. turns to contemporary theologians like Carter Heyward and Christine Gudorf who acknowledge sexual desires and pleasures as good.
H. frequently and effectively weaves into his argument a variety of cases of ordinary persons encountering and even wrestling with their sexual desires and relationships. These cases, reminiscent of Margaret Farley’s *Personal Commitments: Beginning, Keeping, Changing* (1986), sustain his argument beautifully, and their ordinariness lends a “sense of reality” that is so often lacking in sexual ethics. They also make the book highly accessible.

Aiming to provide a mature covenantal sexual ethics, H. offers three stages for developing a poetics of intimacy. First, to introduce younger people to a way to understand their desires and feelings, he proposes an education in the grammar of sexuality in which children can learn about their bodies, their sexual drives, gender, tolerance, gender equality, justice, and fidelity. Here children learn a language of mutual responsibility with regard to the gift of sexuality. Subsequent to grammar, adolescents and young adults need to learn to compose honest narratives of relationality with all the awareness of the tenderness, vulnerability, and dangers associated with such experiences. Finally, the third stage, the poetics of intimacy, becomes a life-long, covenantal process for all adults.

Taking the task of mature adult sexuality seriously, H. expands this third stage by proposing a theological foundation for this covenantal ethics. In particular, he proposes an incarnational, embodied theological context that sees justice as orienting our relationships, love as sustaining them, and a manifold fecundity as their implicit goal. In four rich chapters, he develops these insights as they apply to single adulthood, committed sexual relationships, gay men and lesbians, and people with mental and developmental disabilities.

In each chapter, H. grapples with basic as well as problematic issues. For instance, on singlehood, he raises serious questions about whether celibacy actually leaves clergy and religious more capable of loving. Within committed sexual relations, he proposes a variety of conditions for nourishing those relations, while being particularly aware of the problematic of embodiment, as when he offers a poetics of infertility. Regarding gay men and lesbians, he provides an examination of scriptural texts, arguing convincingly that the Bible does not unequivocally condemn homosexuality nor unequivocally command heterosexuality. He offers an ethics for “coming out,” dating, and entering into marriage or commitment and, relying on Margaret Farley, Patricia Beattie Jung, Ralph Smith, and Andrew Sullivan, he provides one of the finest chapters written on a positive, responsible, Christian ethics for gay men and lesbians. Finally, he describes how persons with mental and developmental disabilities “experience sexuality along the same continuum as those who have never been so diagnosed” (264) and reiterates the importance of taking the gift of sexuality seriously.

In *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), Thomas Kuhn argues that a paradigm shift can occur only when both the credibility of the dominant paradigm is significantly and demonstrably undermined and an effective alternative paradigm is proposed. In this ground-breaking, liberating, theological work, H. does both. It ought to be read by all those open
to a more realistic, humane, and mutually responsible sexual ethics that goes far beyond a chastity-based model.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology

JAMES F. KEENAN, S.J.


Can the concepts of covenant and common good still serve theologically as “deep symbols” for moral discourse? Both symbols bridge the gap between individual liberty and communal solidarity, but both, in Eric Mount’s view, will need significant revitalization if they are to continue as guides.

“Covenant” has a checkered history. While it can evoke memories of strong communal bonds and justice, it can also recall hierarchical domination and exclusivist politics. In response to these negative judgments of covenant, M. notes that it is precisely the differences among persons that make a covenant both possible and necessary. Covenants highlight our connections and obligations to others.

“The common good” also receives mixed reviews as guiding symbol. Who will define it? Who will create it, and for whom? Revitalizing the common good as deep symbol will require recognition of the plurality of common goods and the willingness to see it as a communal process rather than a final product. M. sketches ways in which the common good might serve in business corporations and then addresses Catholic and Reformed attempts at revitalization. He appreciates Vatican II’s definition of the common good but acknowledges its feminist critics who claim that it endorses a traditionalist social order. He acknowledges Reformed feminist Paula Cooey’s call to “think difference differently” but wonders whether society can do so without acknowledging the religious basis that Cooey assumes.

M. illustrates the potential for these symbols with a chapter on sexual ethics, showing how they might address issues of sexual power and intimacy. He sees it likely that same-sex covenants may hold promise for the common good. He notes that there are also implicit parent-child and community-child covenants at work in society. Regarding abortion, he throws out as extreme positions both Donum vitae (instruction of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, 1987) and abortion as birth control. He opts instead for a covenantal model provided by Marjorie Reiley Maguire, in which a potential mother offers a covenant of love to the developing life within her.

M. shows how covenant and common good traditions are influencing dialogue in and about the workplace and the global community. Both symbols counteract individualistic and contractarian traditions and open up
possibilities for all to participate and contribute. While government alone cannot create community, its policies may provide opportunities for its exercise. Covenant and common good may also provide guidance to those who address the difficult question of who shall be included and excluded from communities or nations.

M. believes that to develop communal relationships we must develop communities of virtue and character. True faith itself demands this. Family, schools, churches, and neighborhoods can all nurture such virtue.

M. does not believe, contra Max Stackhouse, that we can “sell a particular theology as the public theology” (155). Rather, we must publicly express our theologically grounded convictions on public issues. Our starting point in societal action ought to be the interhuman connections that oblige us to respond and take responsibility for others. “The quest for community is the obligation of covenant, and the fostering of community of the right kind is at least one understanding of the common good” (156).

M. largely succeeds in showing that the common good and covenant can continue to serve as “deep symbols” for society. His work fits into the widely traversed space between libertarians and communitarians. It is interesting that, while his introduction criticizes Alasdair MacIntyre and Stanley Hauerwas for not addressing questions of the common good, his conclusion—that we need to nurture communities of virtue—is surprisingly near to theirs. M. does go further, however, arguing that these faith-induced positions ought to be directed toward public issues, but he leaves one wondering how he has genuinely moved beyond the positions he criticizes.

On the other side of the spectrum, M. attempts to distinguish his position from that of Max Stackhouse as an attempt to “express convictions in public policy issues” rather than “sell a particular theology as the public theology.” But I wonder here whether the distinction between “selling a public theology” and “expressing theologically grounded convictions” (155) is real and effective. There is, no doubt, a strait between “Scyllatackhouse” and “Chaueryberwas,” but M.’s navigation is uncertain. Nevertheless, he presents strong challenges and possible solutions to those who wish to revitalize the rich theological symbols of covenant and the common good.

Marquette University, Milwaukee

KENT VAN TIL


Making relevant connections between church doctrine and pastoral practice is the particular task of practical theology. Paul Fiddes makes a stimulating contribution to it with his “pastoral doctrine of the Trinity.” Beginning with the assertion that doctrine arises from and expresses pastoral experience (i.e., the actual, historical practice of believers), F. contends
that active participation is a more reliable guide for understanding the Trinity than is conceptual observation. This claim leads him to describe the persons of the Trinity as three dynamic relationships rather than three beings who interrelate and to champion the metaphor of movement or dance (or, more classically, *perichoresis*) as the key to understanding the one divine nature.

F. supports this view with insights from process theology as well as from Eastern theologians of the third and fourth centuries (for the distinctiveness and particularity of persons-in-relation), the medieval Aquinas (for subsistent relations), and the contemporary Barth, Moltmann, and Pannenberg (for interactive relations within the Trinity and between the Trinity and creation). He weaves these and other sources together in a familiar Scholastic pattern, first describing the dominant, received position in its best light, then (*sed contra*) citing problems with that position, and finally offering an alternative based on an ontology of event and an epistemology of participation.

The position F. constructs can certainly be critiqued at a theoretical and historical-hermeneutical level, but his primary intention is to offer a pastoral doctrine of the Trinity. It is from this perspective that his work is most properly judged. Although he devotes the second part of the book to six pastoral issues, his discussion of the triune God and questions of power and authority at the end of part 1 already addresses a basic pastoral concern.

Regarding power and authority, the Christian idea of the Trinity undermines the domination of the One and all its tyrannical implications, but only if the Persons of the Trinity are understood as relations of movement in which all participate. Otherwise one or more of the trinitarian Persons can resume the external, dominant role of the One and be represented (in church or society) by a comparable dominant figure or structure.

Regarding intercessory prayer, F. rejects all forms of a two-cause explanation (God’s will and human choice) as well as an inner transformation theory (prayer changes the pray-er) in favor of prayer as mutually persuasive. The more one prays in harmony with the Trinity’s general action in the world, the more one shapes God’s particular aims for that world.

Regarding suffering, F. contends that theodicies of consolation, story, protest, and free will are credible only if God too is vulnerable. The only way F. can conceive of this is if God chooses to let suffering befall all three persons within the divine *perichoresis* and still be able to overcome it by absorbing it into the movement of divine love.

Regarding forgiveness, F. replaces the concepts of legal pardon and remission of sins with a twofold journey of discovery and endurance. For God, this means entering the experience of the offender and taking this new experience into God’s life in order to persuade the offender back into a loving relationship that is both self-affirming (eros) and self-giving (agape) for God and the offender.

Regarding the threat of death, F. finds room for both denial and acceptance. Death as a relapse into absolute nothingness must be denied, for it can never reach beyond the divine, unoriginate source of being; death as a
perishing toward new possibilities for life must be accepted, for it is the pathway into the distinctive realm of the Holy Spirit.

Regarding the Spirit and spiritual gifts, F. finds the image of breath/wind (internal/external) the most suitable way to express the role of the Spirit as disturber and opener of new depths and futures in the relationships of Father and Son. Similarly the Spirit opens the natural capacities of humans to new possibilities for action (*charismata*) and sometimes creates the natural capacities for these *charismata*.

Finally, regarding sacramental life, F. urges a shift from static, confining substance language to the dynamic ideas of movement and relationship to affirm that God has a body—the cosmos—whose paradigmatic and normative expression is the Incarnation of the Word in Christ. Participation in the sacraments is participation in the interweaving flow of relationships that is the body of the Trinity.

In his effort to meld a revised doctrine of the Trinity with the ongoing pastoral life of the Church, F. consistently shows how a trinitarian theology of persons as relations of movement informs pastoral practice and how the experience of pastoral life is a participation in the movements of the Trinity which confirms this very theology.

CENTER FOR THEOLOGICAL REFLECTION, LARGO, FLA.

ROBERT L. KINAST


This volume like the others in this series is a liturgiological study. That is, it is primarily an investigation of liturgical texts in both the Eastern and Western traditions. Several chapters are devoted to each of the seven sacraments with a final section dealing with the consecrated life, funerals, and blessings. It is a history of the sacraments only to the degree that the texts are treated historically. It is not a book on sacramental theology, although theological observations are made. Usually these are limited to the theology implied in the liturgical texts themselves. This is a valuable reference tool for the scholar who needs to locate the significant text in any research area on the sacraments. For students of the history of the sacraments, the volume indicates which texts would be relevant for their research, but it is not for the student who wants an overview of the history of the sacraments or an introduction to sacramental theology. This is a study of what is found in various sacramentaries, pontificals, missals, rituals, and other collections of liturgical texts with minimal contexts provided.

Because this volume is primarily descriptive, it will be helpful to highlight some of the authors’ observations that the reader may not notice amidst the textual details. More than once the authors note the importance of the introductions to the various rites that came from the revisions mandated by Vatican II. They see these introductions as having a profound
effect on sacramental catechesis, because the theology articulated there begins with the celebrations themselves.

In the section on the sacraments of initiation one author, Adrien Nocent, notes that in the New Testament the trinitarian formula in baptism is not simply a rubric but a theology of insertion into the Trinity, an emerging theology in the New Testament itself (7). Nocent states outright that he is not going to deal with the pastoral issues surrounding confirmation (79), but he is critical of how liturgical commissions approach the theology of confirmation: they start with their pastoral concerns and presuppositions and so lose objectivity, since they want to find the answers they are looking for. He is also critical of the present apostolic constitution on confirmation since it is too tied to a theology of matter and form (81).

Antonio Santantoni, writing on reconciliation in the West, notes that the reason why the practice of penance in the Church changed at the end of the first millennium was that confession was no longer seen as the place where the confessor discerned a just punishment, but confession itself became the punishment. He observes that the Church seems to have no faith in its own recent reforms regarding reconciliation, because it places limitations on the new penitential discipline (the practice of general absolution). The practices of the past no longer work, but the Church, when confronted by the present disaffection toward the sacrament, seems to be tempted to deny alternatives. One size does not fit all.

Regarding the sacrament of the sick, the early sources point to the importance of the oil more than to who can administer the anointing. There is sufficient textual evidence for the Church to allow anointing by those not ordained, should it choose to do so. One of the authors on anointing, Philippe Rouillard, notes that the imposition of hands, which usually designates the coming down of the Holy Spirit, refers in this sacrament to the need of the sick person to be touched physically. He suggests that when the mother of a sick child asks for anointing, it would be appropriate to anoint both mother and child, since the healing of the child is connected to the consolation of the mother (185).

While the section on holy orders is primarily about different ordination rituals and the ongoing changes in them, it does emphasize that the recovery of the sacramentality of the episcopate should move it out of its purely jurisdictional framework of the post-Tridentine period.

In the final section on marriage, the authors see the latest ritual revisions as a model of openness and creativity (301). They note that for the first three centuries there is no evidence of any specific Christian ritual for marriage. Apparently the movement for the development of this liturgy was in part due to the Church’s concern for women, such as insisting on a special blessing for the woman. The present nuptial blessing stresses the equality of husband and wife, which is also highlighted by the use of a ring for both bride and bridegroom. One author (Nocent) would prefer that the epicletic prayer in the nuptial blessing be used at the time of consent.

San Fernando Cathedral, San Antonio

James L. Empereur, S.J.
Bertolt Brecht begins his poem “To Posterity” with the line, “Indeed I live in dark times,” an appeal to readers to remember in what a troubled and complicated age he lived (Selected Poems, 1947). After Brecht’s death, Hannah Arendt included an essay on him in a new edition of Men in Dark Times (1967). Now Sylvie Courtine-Denamy has presented us with a fascinating and powerful account of three notable women whose lives—and in two cases whose deaths—intersected with the “finsteren Zeiten” of Brecht’s poem.

Two sentences at the end of part 1 capture the unifying principle of C.’s study: “Philosophers, women, and Jews: that was the hand they were dealt. What would they make of it?” (52). As philosophers, each of the three proved her brilliance early, coming under the influence of mentors who strove to see the world, life, reality directly, freshly, and clearly. Stein became a favorite student of Edmund Husserl, whose goal in developing phenomenology was “to return to things themselves” (14). Her doctoral dissertation, “The Problem of Intuition in Its Historical Development and as Reflected in Phenomenology,” received the only summa cum laude in Germany during 1916. When she joined Martin Heidegger’s seminar at 18, Arendt found a philosopher who “never thinks about something; he thinks something” (20). Soon she was romantically involved with Heidegger, who encouraged her to finish her dissertation on “Love and St. Augustine” with Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg. At the Lycée Henri IV, Weil studied with Alain, who wanted “not to understand new things, but to succeed by the strength of patience, effort, and a method to understand obvious truths with all of one’s being” (17). Léon Brunschvicq directed her 1930 thesis, “Science and Perception in Descartes,” for the École Normale.

After sketching these formative years, C. turns to chapters on “Three Ways of Being Women” and “Amor Fati and the Fate of the Jews.” Although she had been a feminist at the university, Stein came to argue for a more traditional role for women in society. To some extent, this change of direction coincided with her deepening attraction to the Roman Catholic Church. In 1922, she became a Catholic and eleven years later a Carmelite. As a Catholic and Carmelite, she brought phenomenology to bear on the analysis of Thomas Aquinas and John of the Cross but never ceased to think of herself as a Jew. Leaving Holland for Auschwitz and the gas chambers in 1942, she said to her sister and fellow Carmelite, Rosa, “Come; we are going for our people” (204). Weil hated being a woman and refused to identify herself with the Jews and Judaism. Indeed one of her difficulties with the Roman Catholic Church to which she was deeply attracted was its doctrinal and historical connection to the Old Testament. A related difficulty concerned the signs in Catholicism of the very authoritarianism she disliked in Judaism and in the old Roman empire. She would belong to no group that proclaimed “anathema sit.” Eccentric and idiosyncratic to the
end, she died in London of something approaching self-starvation, her way of identifying with the sufferings of those in battle and under occupation. Arendt, by contrast, was comfortable with herself as a woman and as a Jew. For her, one great task of her life and work was to become what she was.

Through the last two-thirds of her book, C.’s method is to connect her three philosophers to the history of the age, beginning with 1933 and the advent of Hitler as German chancellor and ending with 1943 and the death of Weil. To Weil and Arendt, both more involved intellectually and politically than Stein, she devotes her greatest attention in these sections; in her epilogue, she gives a few paragraphs to Stein before setting the other two women off against each other as competing models of life and thought. Weil’s genius, passion, and commitnent are astounding, but her contrari-ness, her embrace of affliction, her *amor fati* give no this-worldly political direction. C. sees greater resources in Arendt, who had the personal and intellectual good fortune to outlive Stein and Weil by three decades—she died as an American citizen in 1975 after a long and productive career at the New School in New York. Arendt took a lively and critical interest in the establishment of Israel as a state, and yet it was to a sense of Europe and of humankind at large that she beckoned her students, her listeners, and her readers—a sense that she had always recognized at its strongest in her old thesis-father and long-time friend, Karl Jaspers. She wanted *amor mundi* more than *amor fati*.

I recommend C.’s book highly. It inspires one to delve more deeply into the study of these three women and their “dark times.”

*La Salle University, Philadelphia*  
MICHAEL J. KERLIN


Is it really possible to achieve harmony between science and religion? Yes, answers Griffin, but to do so requires uniting scientists and religious people in a philosophical worldview that supports both a scientific naturalism and a robust theism. Scientists must adopt a “minimal” scientific naturalism that allows for no supernatural divine interference with the laws of cause and effect in the universe, but withholds incorporation of the philosophical presuppositions of materialism, sensationism (no perception except sensory perception), and atheism. Religions must give up supernaturalism. But they need a robust theism to survive, one that supports the traditional idea of God as personal, purposive, providential creator, supreme in power, perfect in goodness, and experienced by human beings. This God must also be guarantor of the meaningfulness of life, provider of hope for the ultimate overcoming of evil, the source of moral norms and religious experiences, and alone worthy of worship. Such a naturalistic theism is available, based upon the process philosophy of Alfred North
Whitehead and Charles Hartshorne; although some of these divine attributes require reinterpretation, based principally upon an understanding of divine power as persuasive.

Some theologians have found Whitehead’s thought difficult to understand and his theology sketchy. But as G. points out, the findings of science are demonstrating that the world itself is difficult to understand. Can an adequate theology be less so? To assist in this understanding, G. provides an excellent tool, the best short overview of Whitehead’s scientific and religious naturalism I have seen (chap. 4). This up-to-date version of process theism deserves a fresh look.

In his early chapters, G. explores the history of the interactions between science and religion in the last few hundred years. He shows how the “maximal” view of scientific naturalism commonly held by scientists—with its materialism, sensationism, and atheism—developed. The sources were more social and theological than scientific. G. then challenges three alternate proposals for the relationship between science and religion: those of Alvin Plantinga and Phillip Johnson, who would have science return to supernaturalism; the views of William Hasker, Ernan McMullin, Howard Van Till, and Rudolph Otto, who would achieve harmony by viewing science as a limited enterprise using a methodological naturalism; and the position of William Drees, who wants religion to accept the maximal form of scientific naturalism, and is left with minimal religion.

Rejecting these alternatives as incapable of achieving harmony, G. demonstrates how his model can deal with three troublesome areas for science, philosophy, and religion: the mind-body problem, parapsychology, and evolution and creation. The most widely held scientific view is that mind and brain are really identical. This solution reveals the inadequacy of materialism in science, because it rejects hard-core commonsense notions about reality, such as the efficacy and freedom of consciousness, which we inevitably presuppose in practice. G.’s chapter on parapsychology discusses the history and rationale for the frequent labeling of parapsychology as pseudo-science, and finds the prejudices against it unwarranted. Some results are presented from his earlier volume, *Parapsychology, Philosophy, and Spirituality* (1997), which documented an exhaustive review of the data and found them compelling for some forms of psychic activity, a conclusion that supports both nonsensory perception and the possibility of life after death.

One of the strengths of this volume is G.’s review and analysis of the relationship between evolution and religion. In a clear and compelling chapter, G. dissects the recent literature, defining and clarifying 14 “dimensions” of neo-Darwinism. In conversation with its supporters and its critics, he demonstrates its strengths and its weaknesses. Scientifically, neo-Darwinism struggles with the clash between gradualism and the fossil record, and evidence for need-induced inheritable variations. Philosophically it suffers from its maximal construal of scientific naturalism. G. then demonstrates how application of Whitehead’s naturalism can overcome these difficulties, providing a rationale for, and an understanding of, the emer-
gence of higher-level actualities and the theory of punctuated equilibrium. Even the apparent fine-tuning of the physical universe is susceptible to G.’s process argument, which notes that at a moment approaching absolute chaos (such as the Big Bang), persuasive divine power could have coercive-like effects.

The theological problem for the more conservative will be G.’s rejection of supernaturalism, which means miracles as interruptions of the natural causal order, including the overriding of normal human thought processes to produce infallible revelations and inerrant scriptures. But any theologian concerned with the place of reason and philosophy in theology, and anyone involved in the science and religion debate, should read this book, because the explanatory power of the proposed worldview is enormous.

McMurray, Penn. JERRY D. KORSMEYER


Although Murphy is a professor of German, he writes a book that will appeal to theologians, classicists, and literary scholars interested in the moral and religious discourses embedded in fairy tales. The painstaking and diligent research, done largely in archives in Germany and special collections housed at Yale and Princeton, yields a work that is at once fit for the scholar and enjoyable to the non-professional. Indebted to Bruno Bettelheim’s psychological reading of the tales of the brothers Grimm, M. charts a different course, reading Wilhelm Grimm’s revisions of ancient folk tales as the carriers of ancient pagan (Germanic and Greek) and Johannine-inspired Christian religion. M. retrieves and critically examines Wilhelm Grimm’s Reformed faith perspective as it expresses itself in these tales.

The first three chapters lay out M.’s method of reading. He assumes, as Wilhelm Grimm did, that the tales are repositories and amalgamations of living faith through the centuries; faith for M., as for Grimm, is diachronic and so “the stories express changing forms of religious awareness over the course of time” (14). While these chapters will be of greater interest to scholars, there is much here for the general reader. For instance, chapter 3 discusses the theological sources and lived spirituality of Wilhelm Grimm and his family. Remarkably, the marginalia in Wilhelm’s personal Bible reveal little interest in fatalism or predestination. Moreover, “there are no markings reflecting a moralism, neither Pauline strictures that might support the Protestant work ethic nor any on sin and judgment, which might have been presumed,” given the family’s Reformed background and practice (38). Instead, Grimm seemed particularly interested in the theologies first of John and secondarily of the other three Evangelists. The common thread that ties Wilhelm’s personal spirituality to his rendition of the folk tales is godly and human love in their many earthly manifestations.
The next five chapters trace the lineage and overlaying of traditions within some of the best known fairy tales: “Hansel and Gretel,” “Little Red Riding Hood,” “Cinderella,” “Snow White,” and “Sleeping Beauty.” Conveniently, at the end of each chapter, M. supplies a discussion of Grimm’s emendations and additions to his source texts with their implications for the Christian faith.

One example will suffice to intrigue the reader. Chapter 6 examines Grimm’s rendition of “Cinderella,” but M. rewrites the tale as a spiritual transformation of the humiliated sibling who could easily turn to revenge but does not. Instead, because of the love of her mother, Cinderella remains gracious, that is, graced by God. As the mother lies dying, she admonishes her young daughter to remain “good and devout.” In other words, “she too must remain a part of the communion of the saints,” which encompasses both the living and the dead who are graced (101). But if this is to happen, in the face of life’s temptations and trials, the young girl must receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which come in the form and actions of white doves and turtle doves. Thus, the reading of the fairy tale breaks down into three parts: (1) “The communion of saints obtains between mother and daughter, through the tears which Cinderella sheds as a sign of love [over her mother’s grave]. . . . (2) The communion is extended to nature. The doves come to help Cinderella sort the good lentils from the bad [which task represents the trials of life]. The natural is in league with the supernatural in the ability to discern what is good from what is bad, the knowledge of good and evil. . . . (3) The communion is extended to the head of the communion of saints: the King’s Son and his Father. They too know how to pick the good and reject the bad, thus they reject the two stepsisters and bring Cinderella into their glory” (101).

M. sees the tales through the lens of Wilhelm Grimm’s religious affectivity and piety. What emerges, he claims, is not “a syncretistic credal formulation,” a marrying of Classical, Germanic, and Christian religious sentiment, but Grimm’s belief in “the amazing continuity over time of the act of belief, hope, and love, the goodness of the human heart and its perversity, expressed” in these fairy tales (154).

Written for both the general reader and the serious student, and based on the New International Version of the Bible (though only quoted in small excerpts), this commentary presents a conservative interpretation of the first book of the Bible. In the introduction, Hartley lays out his framework for interpreting the stories of Genesis: the stories present historically accurate accounts of Israel’s ancestors, are structured in palistrophes (chiastic patterns), and intend to reveal the character of God as God worked in earthly affairs from creation to the formation of a special people. The discussion of each ma-
A major passage in Genesis is divided into three parts: an overview of the passage highlighting its structure and prominent themes, a verse-by-verse interpretation of the passage, and additional notes in which technical or scholarly issues are addressed. The volume concludes with a select bibliography for further research along with subject and Scripture indices.

The approach of the commentary is labeled by the editors of the series as "believing criticism"—the use of the full range of critical methodologies and practices from the perspective of faith and for the purpose of enlivening faith. This approach is welcome, but in practice the commentary is shaped more by the author’s ideological presuppositions than by a critical approach to the text. For example, many of H.’s interpretations are shaped by his assumptions that the stories originated during the period of the patriarchs and present historically reliable witnesses of Israel’s ancestors. Many of his conclusions also are too quickly drawn because they easily fit with his assumptions about Scripture. Thus, he quickly dismisses the widely accepted view that Genesis 2–3 represents a second creation account because that text has no concern for elements vital to the creation such as the heavens or the seas. H.’s interpretations offer few new insights and will appeal primarily to those who share his ideological presuppositions.

RONALD A. SIMKINS
Creighton University, Omaha


A brief review can only point out highlights. Creation is seen as dramatic, holding back chaos, making life triumphant. The psalms of Yahweh’s kingship (e.g., Psalms 93, 95–99) show the good ruler taming chaos and caring for the world; in Psalm 104 the care continues in daily life and “nature.” Creation as ongoing drama rather than once-for-all past act is more easily integrated into eschatology. The biblical hope is that at the end of a long history of chaotic happenings God will realize the goal of the beginning: “The coming rule of God is the deliverance of creation from the ultimate and all-encompassing threat posed by the powers of chaos and death” (46). The book takes Judaism seriously. Accordingly, torah is seen as the blueprint of creation, contributing to its continued existence; life in accord with torah is thus life in accord with creation. The final chapter examines how creation, torah, and spirit are present in New Testament books, including Acts.

The work is solid and imaginative, with some treatments persuasive (e.g., Z.’s analysis of Genesis 1–11) and others less so (e.g., L.’s exposition of John). My criticisms are only two: the authors’ late dating of creation as a theme (creation themes in Ugaritic literature show up in the Bible) and their restriction to German scholarship. Liturgical Press deserves praise for making available an accurate and fluent translation.

RICHARD J. CLIFFORD, S.J.
Weston Jesuit School of Theology


Rashkow presents a provocative interpretation of several familiar biblical
stories in this mostly readable volume. Her theoretical approach is feminist and literary—emphasizing the reader’s response—and heavily influenced by the psychoanalytic theory of Freud and Lacan. She focuses on those biblical stories that bring to the forefront the “dysfunctional” family, defined as “those family relationships that are proscribed in the text and hence contrary to the societal norms embedded within the Hebrew Bible” (8).

After describing her approach, R. begins by examining the sexual relations prohibited in the biblical tradition: incest, adultery, prostitution, and homosexuality. She correctly notes that “legitimate” human sexuality is defined in relation to the heterosexual male, and discusses the implications for understanding biblical Israel as a phallocentric society—a society in which the human penis is the explicit, emblematic, and exclusive symbol of community membership and religious identity. In the remainder of the book, R. illustrates how this phallocentrism is encoded in the text of the Hebrew Bible. She reads the stories of Adam (God) and Eve, Moses and his rod, Noah’s drunkenness before Ham, and Lot and his daughters against the backdrop of Freud’s Oedipal complex. Similarly, in the stories of sibling rivalry—Jacob and Esau, Amnon and Tamar (Absalom), and Cain and Abel—she finds examples in which Oedipal feelings associated with the parents are displaced to the sibling. Her readings are also framed by reference to works of art and literature.

R.’s interpretations are creative and original, though also idiosyncratic. The value of her interpretations, however, will largely depend on whether one values the contribution of psychoanalytic literary theory or a reader’s response approach to the Bible. Although provocative and fun to read, many who value the historical and social contexts of the biblical narratives will find her interpretations unconvincing or uninteresting. R.’s interpretations provide insight into her own response to the biblical stories in the light of Freudian and Lacanian psychoanalysis, but they give little insight into understanding the stories within the historical and social contexts in which they were composed and told.

Ronald A. Simkins
Creighton University, Omaha


This work represents Leander Keck’s mature reflections on a topic that has engaged him since his 1957 Yale dissertation. The book grew out of 1995 and 1998 lectures, with an added chapter (3) on Jesus the teacher. It retains an engaging oral style, with pleasant humor.

K. moves beyond historical questions about “Who was Jesus” to “Who is Jesus.” His subtitle refers to the perfect tense of the Greek verb that stresses continuing moral and theological import of completed (historical) action. K. claims that Christians do not internalize Jesus himself, but an image of him (167, 170). As criteria for “self-viewing are socially conditioned into ‘conscience’, so the internalization of Jesus occurs in the community that looks to Jesus and in which the Jesus story is told and re-told” (175). Because of the importance of Jesus’ image, history remains the key to preserving Jesus’ otherness. Chapters on Jesus’ Jewishness, kingdom preaching, crucifixion, and role as judge accentuate his otherness.

K. stresses the importance of history for respecting the integrity of the past in images of Jesus. His approach, however, seems ultimately Protestant in almost exclusively focusing on Scripture’s “image” of Jesus. A more Catholic (even Pauline) approach would internalize not only Jesus’ Scripture-derived image but Jesus himself, the living Jesus of resurrection faith. K.’s mention of a community internalization of Jesus (175) would be enriched by an emphasis on the Church as living body of Christ, not just the society “that hands on the Jesus story and relies on it” (169). I would like to have seen K. dialogue with Luke Timothy Johnson’s The Living Jesus (1999). K.’s emphasis on Jesus’ current
identity beyond historical reconstructions would profit by Johnson’s emphasis not on a “dead Jesus” of history, but on the risen Jesus now living and interacting with those who believe in him.

WILLIAM S. KURZ, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee


Martin Hengel, emeritus professor of New Testament and Early Judaism at the University of Tübingen, offers a very bold and provocative account of the origins of the four Gospels. Convinced that we have had enough literary-critical hypotheses, H. provides a mainly historical argument based on his thorough investigation of the early Church Fathers.

H. argues persuasively that the titles of each of the four Gospels were not secondary additions but part of each Gospel from the beginning of its circulation. The Gospels did not first circulate anonymously, as is often thought. Furthermore, contrary to conventional wisdom, H. intriguingly holds that each Gospel was written from the beginning not just for a particular community but for the whole Church.

With regard to the historical order of the Gospels, H. asserts that Mark is the earliest (ca. 70), written in Rome and based on Petrine tradition. The title “gospel” for the Jesus narrative arose from Mark—the John Mark from Jerusalem as mentioned in the New Testament. Luke (ca. 75–80), whose author is a gentile “God-fearer” and the companion of Paul, used Mark, a logia source(s), and other unrecoverable sources. Matthew (ca. 90–100) is the first Gospel to be attributed to an Apostle. The author, a Jewish Christian from southern Syria, utilized primarily Mark and a logia source(s), but also Luke. H. maintains that an original “Q” sayings source cannot be reconstructed. The Gospel of John (ca. 100–105) was written by the Apostle John in Ephesus with knowledge of Mark and Luke. There is an overall unity in the multiplicity of the four gospel narratives and the gospel proclamation of Paul.

Although H.’s unconventional ideas will not convince everyone, his erudite and fascinating argumentation deserves serious consideration. This stimulating tome will force many to rethink their positions regarding Gospel origins.

JOHN PAUL HEIL
Kenrick-Glennon Seminary, St. Louis


In the past two centuries there have been few books on Christian iconography published in the English language. Among them one can count important contributions made by some Protestant women: Anna Jameson and Mrs. Clement in the 19th century and Jane Dillenberger in the 20th century. Now Robin Margaret Jensen deservedly adds her name to this illustrious list with a study of early Christian art, its symbols and its themes. J., of Andover Newton Theological School, has produced a valuable primer on the subject. Beginning with an awareness of the conflict that has historically existed between scholars of Christian texts and scholars of images, J. skillfully negotiates the biases of the two camps and reexamines the art for interpretive clues suggested in the literature of the period. Her approach fortifies the notion of Christian art emerging from a complex but receptive community of believers who considered visual material to be a legitimate expression of faith.

The scope of J.’s book is useful. She begins by analyzing the Christian application of classical symbols in non-narrative images and progresses to an exegesis of the pictorial “types” recurrent in catacomb art and sarcophagus sculpture. Themes like the Good Shepherd, Jonah, Abraham and Isaac, Noah, and Daniel are deftly treated. But her work centers on the early images of Christ, both as the incarnate God and
the suffering Redeemer. Here she exercises a prudence not found in the work of her mentors. Knowing when she is treading on the thin ice of controversy, she presents all the issues in an unbiased manner and reveals an up-to-date knowledge of theology, history, art history, and scriptural studies.

It is a masterful feat. The book belongs on the shelf of every seminarian and student of theology.

MICHAEL MORRIS, O.P.
Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, Berkeley


This work is a provocative take on the transformation of the image of Mary from the powerful queen of medieval times to the demure maiden of modernity. Much has been written on this topic by recent feminist theologians who see the silent, passive Mary as both reflecting and legitimating society’s cultural expectations of women. Boss, a sociologist, is heavily influenced by the Frankfurt School and its theories of domination (the domination of nature by humanity corresponds to other types of domination, including that of women by men). Through this lens she identifies the early all-powerful Mary (usually pictured with her son) with a Creation (nature) that was a powerful expression of the divine Creator. The modern image of Mary, particularly in its de-emphasis on the theological significance of her physical motherhood, B. suggests, results largely from the increasing human control over nature, reflecting the rationalization, repression, and dualism characteristic of social relations of domination.

How persuasive one finds B.’s rather complex argument depends on one’s acceptance of the sociological and psychological theories of its framework. For example, she suggests that guilt for having caused pain to the mother in childbirth is a psychological universal that is assuaged by the image of a woman spared from such pain. Contrary to many recent approaches to the virgin birth that assume contemporary women cannot identify with a woman who did not suffer the normal pain of childbirth, B. suggests that women in labor will find in this belief a sign of hope in their own suffering.

This work joins much feminist writing on Mary in its critique of using Marian images to legitimate the social domination of women by men and its hope for a liberating future. It criticizes contemporary approaches to Mary that seem to spiritualize her motherhood and avoid the bodiliness suggested by early Marian images mentioned above. Attention to Mary’s physical maternity and the state of unitive contentment this implies, B. suggests, can overcome life’s many dualisms and the negative or exploitative assessment of women’s bodies characteristic of much contemporary culture.

MARY E. HINES
Emmanuel College, Boston


Although Thomas Rausch has been teaching theology to undergraduates in a Catholic University for 20 years, his horizon has not been limited to the academic world. He has been a keen observer of what has been going on in the Catholic Church in the U.S. and has become well-informed about the issues that have been dividing Catholics from one another. His purpose here is to explore the causes that underlie these divisions and to suggest how people who have not been listening to one another might learn to find the truth in the other’s position.

R. begins with a description of the two most strongly opposed groups of Catholics: the “Catholic left” and the “conservative Catholic subculture,” noting a broad spectrum of positions within each group. He then turns his attention to six issues on which Catholics are presently divided, describing the
contrasting positions and offering suggestions as to how common ground can be found between them. The six issues are: contemporary Catholic theology, the “new apologists,” Scripture, tradition and Church, sexual morality, Eucharist and liturgy, and the “new evangelization.” Under each of these headings, R. offers a well-informed and objective description of the contrasting positions that Catholics are taking. While giving each side its due, he does not conceal his own preferences, yet he expresses his judgments in a fair and measured manner. He attempts throughout to promote the search for the common ground on which fruitful dialogue might be conducted and reconciliation achieved. His book makes a positive contribution to this effort.

FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S.J.
Boston College


Republished here are three magisterial studies on Thomas Aquinas by Crowe that originally appeared between 1955 and 1961.

The first, “Universal Norms and the Concrete Operabile in St. Thomas Aquinas” (Sciences ecclésiastiques, 1955), deals with how universal moral norms apply to the concrete moral act in Aquinas’s thought as interpreted by Bernard Lonergan. Valuable as a careful study of Aquinas’s text, it should also be helpful to scholars seeking to respond to contemporary issues of postmodernism through renewed attention to the virtue of prudence.

Aquinas’s theory of love is the subject of the second study, “Complacency and Concern in the Thought of St. Thomas,” (Theological Studies, 1959). C. explains that in Aquinas human love involves both a passive mode of response to the good which is apprehended (complacency) and an active mode of desiring and so moving toward the good that is not present (concern). C. shows that Aquinas affirmed both modes of love throughout his career and argues that, although love as concern has received more attention from Thomist scholars, love as complacency is more fundamental “both psychologically and ontologically” (75). The initial moment of complacency is a “partial possession of that whose perfect possession will be beatitude” (110). The essay provides valuable textual research on Aquinas’s notion of love but also suggests broad applications for issues ranging from existentialism, to trinitarian theology, to theories of eros and agape, to spiritual direction.

The third study, “St. Thomas and the Isomorphism of Human Knowing and Its Proper Object” (Sciences ecclésiastiques, 1961), carefully argues that Lonergan’s notion of isomorphism corresponds to the epistemological theory of Aquinas. C.’s text throughout is a model of clarity, despite the complexity of the issues treated. Included are a preface by C., translations of Latin texts, a lexicon of Latin and Greek terms, and an index. The essays remain a valuable resource for scholars of Aquinas and Lonergan. Their present republication in a single volume is not only warranted but welcome.

MICHAEL J. DODDS, O.P.
Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology, Berkeley


The book is a revision of Leahy’s previously published dissertation (Peter Lang, 1995). In it, L. sets himself two tasks, one explicit in the title, the other implicit in the structure and contents of the work. First, L. admirably extracts the Marian themes from Balthasar’s extensive literary corpus and draws out their relationship to his ecclesiology. In so doing, L. makes the necessary con-
nections between Balthasar’s Mariology and other essential themes of his thought (theological dramatics of trinitarian life, the saints as theological sources, and the relationship of spirituality to theology). As a coherent, synthetic introduction to the place of Mariology in Balthasar’s theology, L.’s work is excellent.

L. is less successful in his implicit secondary task, persuading the contemporary reader of the importance and adequacy of a mariologically based vision of the Church, for three reasons. First, he accepts Balthasar’s reading of Mary uncritically. Balthasar emphasizes the importance of seeing Mary, “as she shows herself, not as we like to imagine her” (164) but then construes Mary as an ontological principle in the Church. L. does not address this tension (contradiction?) in Balthasar’s thought. Second, most of what Mary as “principle” is said to represent can be affirmed of the Church without calling it “Marian.” (Why must obedience to God’s will be construed as “Marian”?) Third, and most troubling, is the complete absence of any serious engagement with contemporary critical scholarship regarding either Balthasar’s thought generally or the legitimacy of using gender typologies in theology (54). These lacunae do not undermine L.’s expository project, but they do limit the value of his book for contemporary ecclesiology.

JAMES K. VOISS, S.J.
St. Louis University


This book treats the many names of God philosophically, theologically, and biblically. It is not, then, a study in the history of religions, comparative religion, or comparative theology. Rather, it is a philosophical-theological essay on naming God.

Cozzi concentrates on the names of God in the Christian tradition, but his perspective, particularly at the beginning, is broader. He includes God’s name in Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam, but he does not distinguish types, branches, or variations within these great religious traditions, and his discussion of them is superficial. His focal questions are these: Can we speak God’s name or names? What are true names for God? What happens when a human creature says God’s name? When one speaks God’s name, does one, by naming the absolutely transcendent, somehow compromise or diminish one’s finite human existence?

C.’s responses to these questions include references to various philosophical authors and schools and to theologians and biblicists, principally Europeans. Thus his descriptive analyses and reflections on Catholic and Protestant thought on God and God’s name, while informative and thought-provoking, are narrowly European. The bibliography, in fact, lists only books in Italian and French (few) and translations into Italian from German and English.

This book, then, has a double limitation: the references, except for Scripture quotations, are all to European authors; and the broad perspective with which the book begins is soon limited to the Judeo-Christian tradition, and especially to Christianity. Within these limits, C. gives us an interesting and sometimes brilliant reflection, rich with insights, on the names of God.

ROBERT FARICY, S.J.
Gregorian University, Rome


For those who assume that the Christian tradition is uniform, even on such a central matter as the Cross, this volume will be a revelation. Making no pretense at providing a systematic overview of the theology or spirituality of the Cross, it presents nine papers from two summer seminars held at the Center for Spirituality at St. Mary’s College, Notre Dame, Indiana. Five scholars open separate “windows” onto particular historical loci and sources of the tradition: Paul, the early liturgy, Origen, August-
ine, and Bonaventure. Their primary intent is to offer “the possibility of greater connection and identification with our ancestors in the faith” (16) in our grappling with the Cross as an aspect of Christian spirituality. While Dreyer’s introduction acclaims the relevance of the tradition, her brief but useful survey of contemporary approaches to the Cross in the afterword demonstrates how foreign many of its assumptions are to modern thinking.

The papers themselves provide a glimpse into the complexity of historical research and the sometimes hypothetical character of interpretations. Nathan Mitchell’s essays on the early liturgy and John Cavadini’s on Augustine perhaps best succeed in focusing directly on both major themes of the volume: the Cross as a symbol and the death of Jesus as a redemptive event. Other contributors adopt wider perspectives. Peter Gorday, for example, justifiably spends considerable time on the theological context of Origen’s theory of redemption, and Dreyer explores Franciscan poverty and humility as correlates of a Cross-centered spirituality.

Whether more academic or homiletic in style, all the essays exemplify good pedagogy. Careful scholarly analysis is presented in a widely accessible and interesting way. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor’s chapter on Paul uses some technical language and textual argumentation; otherwise, the theologically interested general reader will have little difficulty with the essays. At the same time, the specialized scholarship, backed up by endnotes, invites the use of this volume by teachers and scholars as well.

RICHARD VILADESAU
Fordham University, New York


One might expect with good reason to be bored by another in the apparently endless series of books by Catholics (and other Christians) wrestling with modernity. But this sort of thing is what systematics is about: Jacob wrestles the Stranger at the Jabbok, hoping for a blessing before the match is done. As it turns out, he gets one, and the story is worth repeating.

Thornhill, an Australian theologian, has written a particularly good map of the intellectual tensions that have arisen when the Western religious community struggles to understand itself in its culture, especially a culture that has not been hospitable to it. He appeals to a long and broad philosophical literature of exposition and criticism of the ideology of the modern Western experience (modernity) in four chapters. In three chapters he lays out its constructive achievements, among them the never-ending search for the wisdom apparently beyond its grasp, its “affirmation of the ordinary” against classical cultural elitism, its turn to the subject in narrative exploring the truth of human existence, and its creative and costly experiments in social accountability. He rejects claims that such cultural hopes and meanings are incompatible with Christian faith. Quite to the contrary, as the Catholic bishops at the Second Vatican Council nearly unanimously proclaimed. In three chapters he writes of the essential contribution Christian witness makes to modernity’s efforts and of the basic compatibility of the Christian gospel and modernity’s claims, and he calls upon the Catholic Church to provide a religious home to the modern search for existential truth.

The book is not liberal Catholic jargon, in my view, and follows in the line of the great Catholic theologians of the conciliar period in tandem with such sterling historical and sociological probes of post-conciliar Catholicism as José Casanova’s Public Religions in the Modern World (1994). It deserves careful reading.

WILLIAM M. SHEA
Saint Louis University

Great books emerge from great discussions and both depend on great bibliographies. This magnificent work is no exception. V. argues that, since Vatican II, moralists have generally focused their attention on making moral theology more human and more rational, though occasionally they have provided theological foundations for their revisioning of moral theology. V. puts these more occasional contributions to work and provides a breathtaking scope of the theological enterprise of moral theology. Dividing his work into three main parts, V. presents morals within the design of God, the life of the Church, and the public arena. He concludes with a theological discourse on the constitution, epistemology, and method of moral theology. This comprehensive, refreshingly theological, forward-looking work begins with the image of God as foundational to morals, emphasizing the particular relevance of the Trinity, and then explores the significance of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit for moral theology. V. divides the second part (a mere 420 pages) into an historical overview of the various methodological periods of moral theology (Scholasticism, casuistry, manualism, etc.) and a systematic analysis of how moral theology is mediated by the Church and enculturated in the world. In the final part, we find the public, civil, and rational claims that moral theology makes on us.

Among V.'s many talents is his constructive use of the magisterium to demonstrate its significance and relevance. But V., probably the world’s best read moral theologian and certainly the most noted Spanish moral theologian, not only provides us with the benefits of the magisterium but with equal competency he also introduces us to some of the best of moral theology out of Europe and North and South America, with a special nod to Spanish moral theologians. This veritable encyclopedia of the theological resources that have been made available over the past 40 years is a must for any moral theologian able to read Spanish.

**James F. Keenan, S.J.**
Weston Jesuit School of Theology


The ancients advised a sound mind in a sound body (*mens sana in corpore sano*). Psychologist Charles Shelton’s accessible introductory manual on character formation recommends a sound psyche as the setting for a sound conscience. Arguing that humans are fundamentally moral beings with an innate but sometimes confused appetite for the good, and suggesting that the development of a well-honed conscience is both critical and difficult in a culture shaped by individualism, pluralism, and a tendency to play the victim, S. identifies seven “facets of human experience that nourish or impair the functioning of conscience” (53) and lays out a plan for nurturing and balancing these psychological pillars of moral health.

According to S., conscience consists of several interactive dimensions: psychic energy, emotional and psychological defenses, empathy, a sense of guilt, idealization, self-esteem, and moral beliefs. The key to a healthy conscience lies in keeping each of these dimensions in good working order, without allowing any one of them to dominate or distort our overall moral health. Psychic energy, which provides the fuel needed to discern and do the good, is sustained by a balanced emotional life, solid friendships, and the habit of daily self-examination. Meanwhile, maintaining a healthy set of defenses and ideals, as well as a realistic and responsible sense of guilt, self-esteem, and empathy, requires a good deal of balance, and S. often finds virtue in a middle path somewhere between excessive guilt and unchecked self-esteem.

Like Scott Peck’s *The Road Less Traveled* (1978), this book offers a number of useful psychological insights and
practical suggestions about maintaining moral health. S.’s integrated approach reminds us that conscience is neither our superego nor a separate, infallible voice from somewhere outside, but our own best effort to discern and respond to the moral tug. Readers interested in the specific moral beliefs and practices that should shape a healthy Christian conscience, however, will need to augment their reading with other sources.

PATRICK T. MCCORMICK
Gonzaga University, Spokane


Downey’s short text is a necessary and laudable contribution to the burgeoning field of trinitarian theology because it correlates the seemingly abstract, theoretical grammar of trinitarian doctrine with the practice of Christian spirituality, arguing, “Christian spirituality is Trinitarian spirituality” (41). In doing so, D. speaks of the triune God as “altogether Gift”: “Giver, Given, and Gift/ing,” who through the incarnation opens toward human persons, drawing them into the mission of the Word and the Spirit. Thus, men and women are themselves called to be gift to each other, embodying a communion of persons in the image of the trinitarian communion.

Clearly evident in D.’s argument for developing a relational trinitarian theology first from God’s action in the history of the economy of salvation (oikonomia), and then from God’s immanent being (theologia), is a deep respect for the theology of C. Mowry LaCugna. At the outset, then, those whose anxiety rises at the thought of a trinitarian theology resembling social trinitarianism might find themselves averse to D.’s “model” for human personhood, the Church, and society (103). Instead, he finds in the person-al grammar of the Trinity the human possibility of living from this Gift and therefore, the basis for revisioning concepts such as holiness, vocation, and social responsibility.

The book, written to be accessible to grassroots practitioners of Christianity as well as to theologians, concludes with a poetic and prayerful reiteration—meant for lectio divina—of the main points of a trinitarian spirituality. Questions might remain for experts in trinitarian thought about D.’s tritheistic leanings (seen in his option for persons over substance), but his words are an initial, beautiful gift offered to assist those striving as a communion of persons in the world.

MARY A. EHLE
Creighton University, Omaha


Since 1983 the Carmelite Forum has met to study and make accessible to others the Carmelite spiritual heritage. The present volume contains essays presented at the 1994 meeting of the group, along with three additional articles to complement the general theme, “Education for Contemplation.” Together, the essays, suitable for a general audience, offer a well-rounded glimpse into the fundamentals of Carmelite history and spirituality, yet there is also much of interest for those familiar with Carmel. The inevitable overlapping of themes in a collection such as this does not produce a sense of redundancy, but rather deepens understanding as a particular idea is viewed from different perspectives. One theme echoes conclusively: the tradition of Carmelite contemplation is eminently practical, with prophetic and political implications for a lived Christianity.
By far the best is the article by Constance Fitzgerald. Comparing the connection between the treatment of Sophia in Scripture and contemporary theology with specific “wisdom texts” from John of the Cross, Fitzgerald lays out the progressive development of John’s interpretation of Christian spirituality with a richness that provides enough spiritual reading for months. Written with an evocative power that makes one long for the experiences it describes, the article is simply excellent for its depth of insight into prayer, theology, and human psychology.

Other notable essays include John Welch’s informative outline of the reforms in Carmelite history and Bernard McGinn’s study of the place of the Carmelite tradition within the history of Western mysticism. Donald Buggert’s essay on the contemplative as iconoclast brings a systematic theological perspective to Carmelite spirituality, while Kevin Culligan provides one of the clearest explications I have read of the dark night of the soul as it links it to John of the Cross’s experience of imprisonment and to the various analogous “imprisonments” humans can endure.

JOAN M. NUTH
John Carroll University, Cleveland


Lectures given at Princeton Theological Seminary and the University of Heidelberg were the genesis of this book by Michael Welker, a German theologian of the Reformed tradition who draws as well on documents from bilateral ecumenical working groups. I advise Roman Catholics not to read chapter 1. It is peculiarly insensitive to post-Vatican II theology of the Eucharist and seems almost willfully to misrepresent Catholic eucharistic theology. The rest of the book is worth reading, so it is too bad that it begins so polemically.

Of special value is W.’s insight into the context of the Last Supper in a night of betrayal. In the third millennium, those participating in the Supper, in the Eucharist, need to understand that the broken lives and twisted bodies that nightly appear on the news are part of universal human brokenness—as is the complacency with which those of us living in apparent peace and actual plenty watch the suffering of others. The Eucharist is the presentation to all and to each of the radical love of God revealed in Christ’s acceptance of unjust condemnation, torture and death, Christ’s own broken body and blood poured out for us, for the unlimited plural “you.” Given this fine and salutary reminder of the too often forgotten context of the betrayal of Christ and of our own continual betrayal as individuals and as communities, those portions of the book with which I take issue (“Eucharist” as an acceptable term, the notion that all that precedes communion proper is nothing but preparation for communion, and other ahistorical arguments against the “pre-Reformation churches”), become less important.

But the very point that W. makes about the context of the Last Supper, and so of every celebration of it through time and space, would be strengthened if he had stressed as well that through baptism and Eucharist, Christians become the crucified and risen body of Christ. The bond created by the Christian sacraments through space and time is “real” in the ways that W. discusses the presence of Christ in the Supper. Christ, through the Holy Spirit, is indeed present in the action of the gathered community as Church, as itself the Body of Christ. Betrayed and betrayer are both present in the mighty act of mercy made available for healing and for peace.

JILL RAITT
University of Missouri, Columbia


Wood provides a thorough and reliable introduction to the theology of orders on the basis of and in relation to
the official Roman Catholic rites for the ordinations of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. She works from the as yet unapproved ICEL translations of the 1990 typical edition of these rites (with some comparison to the 1968 texts), studying them as liturgical events that both inform and are shaped by the wider theological and pastoral projects of the Church. The method, scope, and depth of W.’s liturgical-theological investigation are delimited by the goal of the Lex Orandi series (ed. John Laurance): “to help foster the fuller liturgical participation called for by Vatican II, and not necessarily to ‘break new ground’ in sacramental theology” (viii).

With that mandate, W. provides a solid introductory chapter on the ecclesial foundations of ministry, followed by three pairs of chapters, each providing first a commentary on the liturgical rite for a given sacramental order and then a more systematic treatment of that order’s theology. With their organizational structure tied to the liturgical texts themselves, the ritually based chapters tend to read a bit disjointedly, somewhat like lecture notes on the rites, but notes that are theologically and historically substantial, accurate, and informative. The book should work well in masters level courses in conjunction with larger historical surveys and theological works.

When W. pursues theological investigation in her more systematic chapters, the book intermittently sparkles with keen insights and helpful summaries. She deftly touches on the work of authorities from earlier generations (Botte, Rahner, Cooke, Power), taking what she needs from them while not hesitating to engage critically their conclusions. The force of her own argument about the sacramentality of orders she derives from her extensive engagement with the relational or “communion” theology of John Zizioulas, with satisfying results. She concludes by outlining questions that remain for the theology and pastoral viability of the Roman Catholic episcopacy, presbyterate, and diaconate.

BRUCE T. MORRILL
Boston College


The book’s unassuming title veils a lengthy proposal and strategy for dealing with the continuing dramatic decrease in the number of Catholic priests, particularly in Africa. Lobinger, a missionary bishop in South Africa originally from the Regensburg diocese in Germany, with a doctorate in missiology, has served as a priest for 46 years and a bishop for 15. He writes with wisdom, experience, politeness, and a genuine sense of urgency. “A long delay,” he says, “can lead to a situation where the shortage of priests becomes so severe that the leaders of the Church are suddenly prepared to opt for ‘panic ordinations’ which can cause great harm for a long time to come” (2).

L. recalls that “many have already suggested that the ordination of community leaders or ‘viri probati’ (proven men) is the solution.... This was proposed by groups of bishops during the Second Vatican Council” (5). He adds that in 1971 at the World Synod of Bishops approximately 45% of the delegated bishops voted in favor of ordaining viri probati. The question L. sees is this: can the Catholic Church introduce a second kind of priest who is living in a way that is similar to the rest of the community, i.e., “like his brothers and sisters” (Hebrews 2:17), and if so, how could this best come about? He details three options: (1) ordaining employed church workers, (2) ordaining one volunteer leader in many communities, and (3) ordaining teams of community leaders. Of these, L. supports the last, although with many qualifications and by way of exception. Already stated in 1971 as the preference of the Southern African Catholic Bishops’ Conference, this third option would present two new kinds of priests. The full time celibate priests (who might choose to form a diocesan religious community) would become the animator priests, i.e., the trainers and mentors of the ordained married community leaders.
L.'s argumentation throughout is clear, cogent, respectful, and presented primarily to foster dialogue. He notes that the openness to women on the teams of ordained leaders will probably depend on the overall level of women's education and their acceptance as community leaders.

RAY R. NOLL
University of San Francisco


This engaging and lucid study brings into dialogue two thinkers whose methods share much in common despite their different purposes. While critical of models of reason that ground truth in apodictic certainties, both thinkers realize that strides in understanding result from the mind's correspondence with reality. Newman, concerned with the certitude of the individual conscience, develops the analogy between religion, history, and jurisprudence. Polanyi, focusing on the role of trust and belief in scientific advances, examines the reliance of disciples on mentors and on intimations in previous traditions of research. Both thinkers attend to the creativity of intuition, affectivity, and imagination in the generation of knowledge. A principal contribution of Moleski's study is thus its cultivation of the common ground that religion shares with science.

M. sees theological significance in the method developed by Newman and Polanyi. Although rooted in the objectivity of conscience and the real order, this method recognizes the particular nature of each individual's appropriation of truth. Thus, it breaches the gap between those who see religion merely as a syllogistic system or merely as a matter of personal preference (xi). It also balances the "severe, quasi-scientific character" of the neo-Scholastic tradition (181). Although M.'s claims cannot be denied, Catholic theology has a perennial need to develop formal reasoning.

Not only is metaphysics embedded in its doctrinal tradition, but the nominalism of postmodernism needs a strong antidote in notions like Rahner's Vorgriff and Balthasar's Gestalt. Furthermore, M.'s Conclusion makes confusing statements like "the God that can be put into words is not the real God" (182). These reveal the need for formal metaphysics to develop a nuanced account of language's symbolism that ensures its ability to communicate an authentic divine revelation. Thus, this helpful dialogue between Newman and Polanyi should not preclude efforts to incorporate their insights into the Catholic tradition of metaphysics.

STEPHEN FIELDS, S.J.
Georgetown University


This volume has the difficult task of making John Scottus Eriugena accessible to educated readers at the university level who have no previous knowledge of him. It succeeds. Eriugena was the least obscure figure of an obscure age at the end of the ninth century. He was, among other things, a poet, a translator of Greek to Latin, a philosopher, and a theologian. Carabine focuses upon the philosopher as expressed in Eriugena's great work Periphyseon (Concerning Nature). After a brief introduction to his historical context, his diverse works, the theological controversies he engaged in, and the intellectual authorities that informed him, C. examines the major philosophical themes of the Periphyseon. With Augustine as the major Western influence, and the Greek Fathers and Pseudo-Dionysius as the Eastern influences, Eriugena describes reality according to the Neoplatonic structure of the procession and return of all things from and to God. C. divides the remaining chapters of the work according to this scheme: The Way Down (3–6) and The Way Up (7). Readers already acquainted with Neoplatonism will find familiar discus-
Eriugena’s insight was to pursue these themes using the notions of nature and creation. C. analyzes very well Eriugena’s fourfold division of nature into that which creates and is not created; that which is created and creates; that which is created and does not create; and that which is not created and does not create. Only the third division covers what we ordinarily consider to be creation, with the others referring to God in some way. With this division Eriugena develops a metaphysics of nonbeing in which nihil is not the absolute privation familiar to Western metaphysics, but the transcendent being of God.

C.’s writing is clear, concise, and unobtrusive. I strongly recommend the book, but with this proviso, that any account of the Neoplatonism that informs a medieval figure is tough going. Here she may presuppose too much on the part of the general reader.

JOHN P. O’CALLAGHAN
Creighton University, Omaha


Formerly professor at the Institut Catholique of Paris and the Gregorian University in Rome, Tilliette began his remarkable career in the study of F. W. J. Schelling, the German philosopher of Romanticism and idealism, by publishing in 1970 a two-volume work: it emphasized that Schelling’s thinking was philosophy of becoming and a philosophy becoming itself. Through subsequent decades numerous essays, some collected into books, followed this work. Particularly notable was the three-volume, Schelling im Spiegel seiner Zeitgenossen (1974), a collection of texts from contemporaries of Schelling describing their personal and intellectual encounters with him. Now this biographical work crowns T.’s research.

As the title indicates, this is a biography and not a presentation of the philosophy. T.’s previous editing of the contemporary observations and his recent careful attention to Schelling’s letters (as well as his friendship with most Schelling scholars around the world) enable him to give a remarkably detailed account of Schelling’s life, of his meetings with countless philosophers, political figures, and artists, and of the various stages of his thinking. In the process, however, T. does describe Schelling’s philosophy being fashioned in the various stages of his life as he pondered transcendental subjectivity, natural science, art, and religion.

T. presents a direct and magisterial account of the several periods (four or eight, depending on one’s perspective) of idealism in which Schelling is a creative catalyst. The narrative moves from the young student’s years at Tübingen and the young professor’s entry into the circle of Romantics at Jena to his lofty professorial positions at Munich, Erlangen, and finally Berlin. The birth of children and grandchildren intersect with plans for publishing final systems, and with interviews with important European intellectuals.

The book’s French style is literary and vivid; the description of events is often dramatic; the presentation of the development and themes of the metamorphosing philosophy is understandable and impressive. As a detailed but inviting guide to Schelling’s life, thought, world, and milieu, this book stands apart.

THOMAS F. O’MEARA, O.P.
University of Notre Dame


Political philosopher Stephen Macedo makes a strong case from the liberal side of the ideological spectrum for the necessity of a strong public education system if democracy is to survive in our present ethnic and religious pluralism. His argument, not unlike that of traditional liberals like John Dewey and made against the background of John Rawls’s philosophy, is persuasive. “Liberal civic ideals” are indeed crucial, and
the public schools are one of the transmitters. Well aware of the objections to his argument and its conclusion, M. hacks away at them.

One of the great values of the book, and what should attract Catholic intellectuals to it, is M.'s historical and balanced critical analysis of, on the one hand, the conflict between Catholic leaders and public education theorists and supporters over the last two centuries and, on the other, what liberals should have learned from it and often did not. The account bristles with insights, and perhaps a few oversights, from which Catholics should learn.

I agree with M.: it is a sad story of good intentions, misunderstandings, and mistakes, perhaps, but (contra M.) one with a happy and ironic outcome: an immense religious school system, now including many “sectarian” institutions in addition to the Catholic schools, which have contributed more than a small share to the public and liberal good. To benefit the public in a society like ours takes more than public education; private education does at least as well.

The book is an important contribution to the continuing national debate as well as to Catholic intellectuals who, as a result, may have to rethink some of their favorite positions.

WILLIAM M. SHEA
Saint Louis University


This book, a reprint of a 1988 volume, extends an argument that Jaki has been developing for some time. His main concern is with the secularization of culture in the name of an erroneous understanding of the nature and role of science. The religious vision of the biblical world, he argues, has been fundamental in opening the physical universe to a healthy scientific study; biblical monotheism can ground a strong cosmological argument capable of counteracting theories of radical scientific materialism that threaten to destroy any real sense of purpose. More specifically, Christian belief in Jesus Christ has made the rise of the sciences possible in the Western world in a way unparalleled in the ancient cultures. Although some non-theological Muslim authors developed Greek philosophical and scientific traditions, more religiously orientated thinkers found serious problems in relating these ideas to the Qur'an. The idea of a universe operating in accord with consistent and predictable laws, so basic to science, was seen by orthodox Muslim scholars as a “taint on Allah's absolute freedom” (78). Even Maimonides did not recognize the negative impact that the scientific enterprise would have on Muslim thought. Curiosity was not enough for “a break-through toward visible science. Nor was the curiosity capable of maintaining its early vigor” (45).

The Christian belief that the divine Logos, through whom the universe was created, became incarnate in Jesus Christ deepened the earlier biblical conviction concerning the de-divinization of the world. The allied conviction that the world, created through the Logos, was orderly and intelligible would be crucial for the development of a scientific perspective in Christian history. Hence, the book's title.

In calling for a new way of thinking about science, J. does not hesitate to argue against any position that savors of “secular humanism,” including various forms of materialistic evolutionary thought and Transcendental Thomism, which he calls Aquikantism since it is nothing but Kant grafted on to Aquinas in a most unfortunate way. The result of this grafting is a style of thought that has become a breeding place for what J. sees as pure subjectivism leading to “doctrinal and moral relativism” (240).

In the present period of history when there is considerable discussion concerning various models of thinking about the relationship between theology and the sciences, J. provides a distinctively different way to think about God, Christ, and our scientifically conditioned culture.

ZACHARY HAYES, O.F.M.
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago
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