
This large monograph follows Begg’s earlier work on Josephus’s retelling (in *Jewish Antiquities* = *AJ*) the early history of Israel’s divided kingdom from the death of Solomon to the death of Ahab (*Josephus’ Account of the Early Divided Monarchy*, 1993). The present volume carries the investigation up to the governorship of Gedaliah and the aftermath of his assassination. B. divides this extensive material into 24 chapters, which facilitate the handling of the material and also correspond (except chaps. 11, 15, 17, 20, 21, and parts of 23) to B.’s previous studies published as journal articles and book chapters from 1989 to 1997. The work is not, however, an anthology of previously published articles. B. has completely revised and updated the articles, especially in the light of other studies on the subject by L. H. Feldman and P. Spilsbury. Moreover, with the addition of the fresh chapters (noted above) to the independent studies, B. has provided a continued treatment of *AJ* 9.1–10.185.

The result is a significant and detailed redaction-critical analysis of Josephus’s rewriting of the biblical material. B. is guided by the same issues that inspired his first volume: the sources for Josephus’s narrative; the biblical text-forms used by Josephus; Josephus’s rewriting techniques; and the results of Josephus’s application of these techniques, especially his intended message to his dual Gentile and Jewish audience. B. devotes the bulk of his text to a detailed comparison of Josephus’s narrative with the biblical sources. Discussions of the rationale and results of Josephus’s redaction are for the most part relegated, together with other analytical and text-critical matters, to his very copious footnotes. He provides each chapter with a summary of the conclusions of his analysis, divided according to the guiding questions. A general conclusion (623–35) further summarizes these conclusions.

B.’s analysis makes it clear that Josephus’s sources are primarily the biblical historical books (1 Kgs 22:51–2 Kgs 25:30 // 2 Chr 19:1–36:21). These provide the continuous narrative framework into which Josephus works other biblical material taken from five (later) prophetic books (Jon, Nah, Is, Jer, and Ez, with allusions to Zec 14:4–5 in *AJ* 9.225 [= 2 Chr 26:19], and to Mic 3:12 [= Jer 26:18] in *AJ* 10.92). Josephus is shown generally to prefer the fuller, more detailed sources, with the “intention of making maximal use of the data of both his historical sources—in so far as these do not militate against other of his authorial purposes” (623 et passim). Given Josephus’s understanding of prophecy as the accurate prediction of future events, his incorporation of extensive prophetic material into
the historical narrative accentuates the “prophetic presence” during this period.

B. also provides insightful analyses of Josephus’s explicit references to extra-biblical sources (AJ 9.283–87; 10.18–20; 10.34). He further notes the many points of contact between Josephus’s account and rabbinic traditions, for instance, in the case of Hezekiah (437). Josephus’s sources, he concludes, ought to include his “apparent utilization—in whatever form he made [sic] have known these—of post-Biblical Jewish midrashic traditions concerning various figures and events” (625). B. does not, however, explore the question thus raised, even though he often notes how Josephus rewrites biblical passages to conform with the realities of his day. B.’s analysis seems most helpful, then, where there are explicit and/or extant sources. We cannot tell, therefore, to what extent Josephus’s modifications of his sources are due to his incorporation of variant (contemporary) traditions or to his own creative composition.

B. completes in this volume his detailed comparison of Josephus’s text with four biblical textual witnesses: MT; LXX, in its “Old Greek” recension (Codex Vaticanus B), and in its (proto-) Lucianic recension (L); and Targum (Pseudo-) Jonathan on the Former Prophets (TJ). He rejects the earlier view that Josephus knew the later historical books in their LXX (L) text-form, rather than the MT. B. concludes that, although in specific instances noteworthy points of contact exist between Josephus and all these different text-forms, definitive overall judgment cannot be made about the texts used by Josephus. He used a variety of text-forms available to him.

Josephus’s redactional techniques, B. repeatedly concludes, result in a narrative “with distinctive features,” designed to serve Josephus’s many apologetic purposes. The evaluation of Josephus’s intentions and their impact on his Gentile and Jewish audiences belongs, however, to other more specific studies. The value of B.’s impressive work lies above all in the details of his comparative analysis.

University of Notre Dame

FABIAN E. UDODH


This lengthy book abridges Pérez’s dissertation in which he examines the Pasión y Pascua of Jesus—what we might call the “Paschal Mystery”—in the Gospel of Mark.

Chapter 1 gives a fine overview up to Mark 14 (34–44) and a brief but effective discussion of the problem of Mark’s ending (45–49). P. discerns seven “literary unities” (14:1–11, 12–31, 32–52, 53–72; 15:1–20, 21–41; 15: 42–16:8) in the 18 or so subsections of the Passion Narrative. He bases this division (not commonly recognized by scholars) on grounds of the concrete themes, specific characters, temporal limits and geographical indications,
repetition of key words, parallels, and inclusions. In these seven “unities” P. further identifies the “key” episode of each (14:3–9, 22–25, 32–42, 55–65; 15:1–15, 33–39; 16:1–8) which, he suggests, “form the backbone” (44) of the Passion Narrative. He is convinced that these seven pericopes, which he analyzes, express the meaning of the whole (49).

Keeping in mind the teaching of Vatican II that the study of Sacred Scripture is the foundation and the “soul” of theology, P. approaches the Markan Passion Narrative as a testimony of faith written as a narrative with historical roots to nourish the faith of the believer (21). Thus he proposes to interpret it as a believer and for believers by making a fourfold presentation on each of the seven key episodes: a synchronic, a diachronic, and a theological analysis followed by a parenetic perspective. I will assess each of these separately, since they are far from equal components in this study.

The best part of the book by far is the análisis sincrónico of each of the seven pericopes. Since Mark is a narrative, P. says that he must first examine the text in its final configuration before any discussion of its sources. He does not consider necessary the methods of rhetorical, narrative, and semiotic analysis, as long as one pays attention to the context, the literary structure, and the sense of the language. Thus in his “synchronic analyses” he attempts to derive the meaning of each text as a coherent whole by judging the relationships of all its diverse elements while acknowledging the extratextual reality to which they refer (25).

P. is quite successful in this literary critical approach. He gives a very sensitive and sensible reading with the philological astuteness we have come to expect from Spanish exegetes. One regret is his apparently total lack of consultation of Latin American scholars. This oversight has diminished the book’s effectiveness.

In the análisis diacrónico P. attempts to get at the “unquestionable historical dimension” on which the Gospel’s faith testimony is based. To do this he uses historical-critical method (1) to determine the most ancient version of parallel texts (which, for P., is in every case the Markan), (2) to separate the Evangelist’s source material from his redaction of it, and (3) to set forth the historical foundation of the tradition. All well and good in theory, but these are notoriously difficult questions. P. handles them in all-too-brief discussions that do not even begin to engage the vast secondary literature on the subject. His results are either controversial and as yet unproven or perfectly obvious.

In assessing the sínteses teológicas, again one can only lament P.’s total lack of consultation of Latin American exegesis. He would have gained much insight from Markan scholars Gilberto Gorgulho, Carlos Mesters, Carlos Bravo, and José María González Ruiz, to name just a few. Instead, he usually presents us with discussions of ancient and recent systematic theology. They are often interesting, but usually they simply do not deal with the Evangelist’s theological agenda. The excessive and overly long quotations of secondary literature on virtually every page of the book may be acceptable in Spain for a dissertation, but they should have been greatly
reduced in the published monograph. They are very distracting, particularly as they often appear at key points in P.’s argument. He would have advanced his argument more coherently and economically by paraphrasing in his own words.

The fourth component of the book is the perspectiva parenética for each section. These are brief and usually rather obvious pastoral applications, but at least they stick to the obvious Markan interests of the text.

In sum, although the análises sincrónicos that make up about a third of the book are quite worthwhile, it would have been much better to publish this very fine “close reading” of the text with an occasional, though detailed, historical note and a few insights into the Evangelist’s theological conclusions.

St. Vincent Seminary, Latrobe, Penn. ELLIOTT C. MALONEY, O.S.B.


Study of Q, the material that Matthew and Luke have in common but is not drawn from Mark, continues unabated. Arnal’s book, however, is not simply one more that fits the familiar pattern; his argues a distinctive thesis and grows out of a creative method. This stimulating and refreshing book is a revision of a 1997 dissertation produced at the University of Toronto under the direction of John Kloppenborg.

A.’s use of the extensive archeological work done in Galilee in the last 25 years alone makes the book a joy to read. His methodology, which also employs literary criticism and social science theory, is well conceived and effectively applied. The book is as much a credit to Kloppenborg as to its author.

The book argues that Q is the product of Galilean village scribes, something Kloppenborg suggested a number of years ago. It also builds on Kloppenborg’s stratigraphy of Q, in which he finds three basic layers: Q¹: the formative stratum; Q²: the redactional stratum; and Q³: late additions and glosses. The focus is on the formative stratum. A. also presupposes the Critical Edition of Q (2000) produced by the International Q Project, though from time to time he departs from it.

A. believes, somewhat gratuitously, that the objections to Q research and its stratigraphy arise mostly from its implications for our understanding of the historical Jesus (7). That may be true in some cases. But objections often arise because of the lack of coherence between the results of Q research and the results of scholarship concerned with other sources inside and outside the New Testament. This tension gives some of us pause when it comes to the results of Q research. Moreover, it is the highly dubious conclusions that grow out of the itinerancy hypothesis and its younger cousin the Cynic hypothesis—hypotheses against which A. himself argues—that provoke criticism and encourage skepticism. A.’s work, one hopes, will put to rest some of these concerns.
Chapters 1 and 2 trace the history of the itinerancy hypothesis, which imagines Q as the product of itinerant teachers. The point of departure is Adolf von Harnack’s 1884 study of the Didache, especially 11–15, which stresses wandering prophets and apostles. From this source Harnack inferred much and left a lasting influence on subsequent scholarship. A.’s insightful discussion is a treat—although I am puzzled why Harnack’s Sprüche und Reden Jesu (1907) = The Sayings of Jesus (1908) is not brought into the discussion. In recent times it is the work of Gerd Theissen that has influenced a new generation; he too promotes the itinerancy hypothesis, dubbing the itinerants “wandering charismatics.” This understanding of Q has accommodated the Cynic hypothesis. A.’s assessment of contemporary scholarship is insightful and rewarding.

In chapter 3, A. addresses what he regards as the weaknesses of the itinerancy hypothesis. He finds it textually unfounded and sociologically vacuous. In short, there simply is no evidence for these hypothesized itinerants. What is needed, instead, is to situate Jesus and his movement in a better documented, more concrete economic and social context.

Chapter 4 attempts to construct the economic and social context out of which Q emerged. A. believes that this context was Galilee of the first century. The coherence of the Q material with what is known literarily and archeologically argues for such a context. Tiberias and the Herodian building program are viewed as especially important.

A. concludes in chapter 5 that Q1 was produced early in the history of the Jesus movement by scribes in village settings in Galilee, especially in and near Capernaum, not far from the larger city of Tiberias. He finds that there simply is no evidence of itinerancy.

A.’s work has dealt a serious blow to the related itinerancy and Cynic hypotheses, a blow that adherents to them ought not ignore. Form critics too should find the book of interest, as the respective Sitze im Leben of the Q materials are considered. Interpreting Q in the light of recent archeological findings in Galilee, which have underscored the depths of Jewish identity and commitment throughout the region, is an exegetical and contextual step in the right direction.

How the Q tradition relates to the historical Jesus remains an open question. A.’s study should assist scholars in the task of identifying with greater precision the early community’s contribution to Q.

Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Nova Scotia

CRAIG A. EVANS


The book is González’s own translation, revision, and updating of his 1992 commentary, Hechos, for the Commentario Bíblico Hispanoamericano, which was explicitly aimed at Spanish-speaking readers—mostly but not exclusively Protestant—both in Latin America and in the United States. G. decided to translate rather than fundamentally alter the earlier
edition as an invitation to English readers to “look over the shoulders of Hispanics as we seek to read Scripture in our own context,” and decide how much of it is relevant also to them (xiii). It must be said at once that, at least for this Anglo reader, the commentary serves as an exceptionally helpful resource for knowledge of the target audience’s (and G.’s) social location and experience, as well as for knowledge of aspects of the biblical text that such a situated reading yields.

The general introduction covers the basic questions concerning dating, authorship, and purpose. G. regards Acts as the continuation of Luke’s Gospel particularly by showing a Church that was as much in conflict with the “powers of the old age” as Jesus was with the authorities in Palestine, and he thinks that Luke wrote to those in danger of severe discouragement because of this clash. In Acts, the main character is not the apostles but the Holy Spirit. The Spirit empowers the apostles but also moves ahead of them, “to correct and even slightly to mock, what the apostles and other leaders of the church do and decide” (8). By showing how the Spirit worked both to empower and to subvert within Luke’s story, G. hopes to show contemporary Hispanic-American Christians how the Spirit can lead them to challenge values in the larger society but also to “subvert or question practices and values within the church itself” (8).

The commentary proper for each section of text is set in two text formats. The first contains the familiar combination of factual information, clarification, and comment in essay format and is largely historical-critical in character. Not much attention is paid to the literary themes of Acts itself or of Luke-Acts as a whole. The comments are competent and generally appropriate, but, in the manner of commentaries, they are also occasionally arbitrary: something is discussed because it is discussable in historical terms rather than because it is particularly significant in literary or religious terms. Readers familiar with other commentaries on Acts will note that G. leans on the work of Haenchen and a selection of studies composed before the 1992 publication. This part of the commentary is derivative and at best adequate.

Far more impressive is the second part of the commentary (set in a different font) for each section of text. This part seeks to engage the text from the perspective of the experience of the (mostly Protestant) Hispanic Church in Latin and North America. Here, the designation of Acts as the Gospel of the Holy Spirit comes alive. In contrast to the many readings of Acts that consider it to betray the prophetic portrayal of Jesus in Luke’s Gospel, or that read it entirely in terms of a triumphalistic early Catholicism, G. sees and exploits the radical edge that runs through Luke’s second volume. The text of Acts comes alive as it is read in terms of the Christian mission today, especially the way in which the Holy Spirit gives growth and freshness to the Church “from the margins.” Read this way, Luke’s account of the stages of the Church’s first mission becomes a source of powerful, and sometimes painful, reflection on the Church’s contemporary experience of imperial economics and politics from without but also of corruption and cowardice from within.
The same Spirit whose action we see in Acts continues acting among us; we are still living in the time of the acts of the Spirit; we live, so to speak, in chapter 29 of Acts; and for as long as we live in such times, this book will be a Word of God for our benefit and direction (280).

The first contribution of this commentary is not to inform readers about the Christian past described by Luke, but to inform Anglo readers about the way in which Acts challenges the Hispanic-American Church. The second contribution is to make the spiritual force of Acts so vivid that it becomes a prophetic challenge to readers in all cultures and all churches.


The purpose of this collection of 14 essays (plus Introduction, Summaries, and Conclusions by Carson) is to reexamine the appropriateness of E. P. Sanders’s proposal that “covenantal nomism” is an appropriate rubric to describe the theological substance of the writings of Second Temple Judaism, and to ask whether the categories of “getting in” and “staying in” are appropriate to describe how such covenantal nomism functions. In general, the answer is that while these terms may be useful, they must be nuanced, and in some cases discarded, to account for the theological variations found in the literature of Second Temple Judaism. The ultimate purpose of this first of a two-volume set is to see whether the so-called “new look” in Pauline studies is correct in portraying Paul’s understanding of the Judaism he opposed, not as a merit theology based on works-righteousness, but as a religion of grace which, since the advent of Jesus Christ, is to be applied now to Gentiles as well as Jews.

In the opening chapter Carson announces the volume to be a “fresh evaluation of the literature of Second Temple Judaism” (5). The ensuing chapters in fact evaluate portions of that literature. In two instances, a concept (chap. 14, “Righteousness language in the Hebrew Scripture and Early Judaism,” Seifrid) and a religious “party” (chap. 15, “The Pharisees between ‘Judaisms’ and ‘Common Judaism’,” Roland Deines) are examined. The former concludes that “righteousness” must be understood in a context of creation rather than covenant, the latter that even before the fall of the Temple, one can speak (pace George Foote Moore, Jacob Neusner, et al.) of Pharisaism as a kind of “normative Judaism.”

Some authors find Sanders more correct than do others. Daniel Falk (chap. 2, “Prayers and Psalms”) must concede the appropriateness of the term “covenantal nomism” as a theological description (43); nevertheless, he argues that the term is “ultimately not very helpful” (51).
(chap. 4, “Expansions of Scripture”) finds Sanders basically correct if sometimes a bit imprecise—for example, in his use of the term “salvation.” Robert A. Kugler (chap. 7, “Testaments”) finds Sanders’s examination of that literature to be basically accurate, as does Donald E. Gowan in the material he surveys (chap. 8, “Wisdom”). Martin MacNamara (chap. 11, “Some Targum Themes”), in a detailed, at times linguistically complex study, finds that the Targums witness to what could be called covenantal nomism. Markus Bockmuehl (chap. 13, “1QS and Salvation at Qumran”) argues that his findings are “not fundamentally incompatible with those reached” by Sanders, although he questions the appropriateness of the categories “getting in” and “staying in,” as Sanders used them, for this literature. An indirect approval of Sanders’s concepts is provided by Philip S. Alexander (chap. 10, “Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature”). He notes that the tension between election and free choice, while always present, is never resolved in this material, but that in the end God’s purpose, as expressed in the covenant, must prevail.

Other authors are less sanguine on the usefulness of Sanders’s work. Paul Spilsbury (chap. 9, “Josephus”) argues that “patronal nomism” would be a more appropriate descriptive term for Philo’s thought than “covenantal nomism”; Mark A. Seifrid (chap. 14, “Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism”) finds Sanders’s use of “righteousness” terminology inadequate for the widely varying uses found in the OT and Second Temple material.

Several authors make no direct comments on the appropriateness of Sanders’s terminology for the material they survey. David M. Hay (chap. 12, “Philo of Alexandria”) has no express comments on the applicability of Sanders’s categories to Philo’s works. Craig A. Evans (chap. 3, “Scripture-Based Stories in the Pseudepigrapha”) draws no conclusions about the appropriateness of Sanders’s terminology, nor do Philip R. Davies (chap. 5, “Didactic Stories”) or Richard Bauckham (chap. 6, “Apocalypses”), although the latter finds 4 Ezra less works-oriented than did Sanders.

On the whole, then, while Sanders’s work is found inadequate to some degree or other by a number of authors, the main criticism leveled against him is that his concepts are not nuanced enough for the widely varied literature represented by Second Temple Judaism. Hence the “variegated nomism” in the volume’s title. As in any collection of essays, some are better than others, but for those interested in this topic, the book can be read with some profit. The concluding pages contain extensive and impressive indexes to ancient and modern names, to subjects, and to every piece of literature discussed in the various essays.

Union Theological Seminary-PSCE, Richmond, Va. PAUL J. ACHTENEMIER


BOOK REVIEWS

405
By a thorough and systematic development of biblical evidence, Eskola establishes a broader contextual framework for the approach to earliest Christology proposed by M. Hengel and P. Stuhlmacher. E. argues that the development of belief in the divinity of the risen Christ as the Lord enthroned in heavenly glory involved a radical intertextual transformation: Metaphors from the tradition of Jewish Merkabah mysticism—about God reigning as King from a heavenly throne—were creatively placed in service to the new message and discourse of early exaltation Christology, ascribed “even to the first Jerusalem community” (283). Working on subtexts such as Psalm 110, Christian Merkabah speculation confessed that Jesus was not merely an exalted patriarch, prophet, or king, but the Son of God who brought salvation and was to be worshipped together with God the Father.

For E., the theory of an early adoptionist Christology proves inadequate for explaining such a confession of faith. Previous searches for a “divine agent” or “angelic figure,” that might have served as a prototype for presenting the resurrected Christ as a heavenly being, have likewise not provided an adequate foundation for the presentation of the risen Christ as a Davidic Messiah enthroned at God’s right hand. New Testament exaltation narratives involve an essential transformation of Old Testament and Jewish ideas about God’s kingship and thrones. E.’s extensive and well-reasoned analysis of passages shows that God’s throne was a metaphor of power and also of mercy, since God could not be approached without an atoning sacrifice. E. then surveys Merkabah passages in the writings of Second Temple Judaism that deal with throne visions in the prophetic books; next, he analyzes the visions in apocalyptic writings that describe a journey of a chosen one called to visit the heavenly throne to hear God’s words in order to proclaim them on earth. The symbolic universe of traditional Old Testament religion maintained its relevance. In the intertestamental and pseudepigraphal works, heavenly journeys still reflected a theocratic theology, and, as in Qumran material, communication with God is linked to heavenly liturgy. The chosen one’s encounter with God is cultic in nature.

In the Merkabah passages within apocalyptic writings, the throne served as a fundamental metaphor for the Lordship of God—worshipping the Enthroned One as heavenly King preserved the identity of Jewish faith. According to E., the fact that heavenly beings and eschatological luminaries were likewise usually understood as enthroned beings provided a perfect model for early Christians to express how Jesus had been exalted. Merkabah passages also reflected the expectation of an eschatological Davidic. Qumran material contained throne visions, a hymnic reference to a heavenly enthronement, the expectation of an eschatological (but not heavenly) enthronement of a Davidic Messiah, and allusions to the priestly Melchizedek presented as an angelic figure. Such elements, sometimes not connected in Jewish mysticism, were creatively brought together in early Christology and integrated into the mosaic of a new discourse. This was achieved, says E., by an innovative interpretation and application of Psalm 110, which “does not seem to have a special place in merkabah mysticism”
E. attributes much to the creativity of the early Jewish Christian Church. He might further address the issue of continuity/discontinuity between the pre-Easter Jesus, particularly as portrayed in the so-called Third Quest and such post-Easter perspectives.

E.’s discussion of New Testament material is arranged under the rubrics of enthronement discourse, resurrection discourse, cultic (enthroned high-priest) discourse, and judicial (enthroned supreme judge) discourse. E. pays particular attention to the interpretation of Psalm 110—with its references to a Davidic messiah (v. 1) and the priestly Melchizedek (v. 4)—in the Christology of the early Lukan tradition. He concludes that it reflects a completely new application of the Merkabah tradition. He also surveys selected Pauline passages, Hebrews, and Revelation, again showing the influence of Merkabah mysticism.

There is a certain bold simplicity to E.’s position. Turning to resurrection discourse, he analyzes Romans 1:3–4, with an overview of efforts from Bultmann to Fuller, to reconstruct the layers of the tradition reflected in those verses. Applying his thesis, that a heavenly enthronement takes place in the Resurrection (a Christology paralleling that of Acts 2), E. proposes a “dynamic translation”: “From the seed of David, the promised Son of God in power, according to the Holy Spirit, through the resurrection of the dead, Jesus the Messiah, our Lord” (243). Given that this translation encapsulates E.’s fundamental thesis, the scholarly community’s reception of that reconstruction will be especially significant.

E.’s work demonstrates an impressive grasp of biblical and intertestamental sources, and of recent scholarly positions on the earliest post-Resurrection interpretations of Jesus. Given the complexity and diversity of all the resources and scholarly positions and the bold simplicity of E.’s conclusion, it will take time to form a firm judgment on its acceptability. The book is a valuable contribution to an ongoing issue in Christology.

Villanova University, Villanova, Penn.

Bernard P. Prusak


Writing a general history is no mean feat. Irvin and Sunquist have attempted an overview of the entire Christian movement from the time of Jesus onward. This volume covers nearly 15 centuries, the period before Western dominance, through wars and overseas missions, became fully established. With so wide a scope, the volume suffers occasionally from the effects of excessive compression. Nonetheless, augmented by selected readings, it could serve as a solid textbook for a survey course on Christian history, especially when the teacher strives to break out of the Western mold to convey the geographic and historic sweep of the topic.

The volume is divided chronologically into six parts, starting in the time
of Jesus and extending to the fall of Constantinople to the Ottoman Turks (1453). The first four parts treat the Christian world movement broadly, making geographic distinctions only where necessary. Part 1 describes the background of “the Jesus movement” and its emergence. Part 2 traces the spread of Christianity from Palestine throughout the Roman world and into regions to its east. Syria and Egypt emerge as the seats of important theological schools with their own unique emphases. Part 3 discusses the emergence of a more coherent “great church,” distinguishing only as necessary between what became orthodoxy and other currents. The disappearance of specifically Jewish practices and the development of competing ideas about Jesus are emphasized. Part 4 describes the rapprochement with the Roman Empire and the consequent suspicion in which the Church was held by the Persians. The same age saw the great ecumenical councils strive to define authoritative answers to theological questions about the nature of God and the Incarnation. Only with parts 5 and 6 does division—geographic, cultural, linguistic, and theological—become predominant. The West emerges as an active force while Eastern churches suffer eventual, but not inevitable eclipse. The appearance of Islam and its subsequent triumphs in the East serves as a substantial theme of these parts. So too does the impact of the Mongol invasions on Christians and Muslims alike from Poland in the West to China in the East.

The tone of the book is moderate. Competing groups and ideas are outlined fairly. Gnostics, Manicheans, and Cathars receive appropriate attention, as do the several schools of theology that competed for dominance in periods of crisis. Balance also is sought in weighing the political and theological factors that helped determine the choices made by an increasingly fragmented Christian movement. This temperate tone might ruffle some in the neutral discussion of Jesus, which avoids asserting or denying claims for his divinity. The emphasis in the narrative is on the political and institutional, together with adequate, if detached, consideration of dogma.

A strength of the book is its attention to the roles of women from the earliest days to the late Middle Ages. Liturgy and spirituality receive less attention, and the daily life of the faithful gets only occasional notice. The effort to keep a world perspective sometimes requires the authors to expand on fragmentary evidence, but their efforts to include such areas as India is laudable. The treatment of the Syrian churches is particularly enlightening.

A few errors creep in. The work of inquisitors, for example, is treated as if there had been a monolithic institution before the 16th century. And the unavoidable compression of topics leads to some shortcomings. It is impossible to cover long periods so broadly without sacrificing something. The treatment of Iconoclasm, for example, slights the theology of icons. Likewise, the reform movements in the medieval West are treated without adequate discussion of the theology of reform. Compression is most obvious in the later parts. Part 6 tries to fit five centuries into nine short chapters. Innocent III’s role gets less coherent attention than it deserves, and Dante is ignored. Western mysticism is telescoped into a treatment of a few figures, particularly Meister Eckhart and Julian of Norwich, without
adequate context for either; and this treatment is separated by several pages from the treatment of the Beguines. And despite the compression, the same topic might appear more than once—for example, the Fourth Lateran Council.

Each of the six parts concludes with a brief but useful bibliography of recommended readings. Although the selected titles are solid and diverse, any teacher using the volume as a textbook will need to supplement this list, particularly with primary sources. The Paulist Press series, Classics of Western Spirituality, comes to mind as a source to flesh out the bones provided by I. and S.

The indexing by name and subject is thorough enough, the illustrations are well chosen and well produced, but the maps are merely impressionistic.

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore  

THOMAS M. IZBICKI


The book is a new edition of Madec’s 1989 La Patrie et la voie: Le Christ dans la vie et la pensée de Saint Augustin. The text is virtually unchanged from the earlier edition, while the bibliography and notes have been updated to reflect the current state of scholarship, including new evidence such as the sermons discovered and published by F. Dolbeau. In one sense these relatively modest changes may not seem to justify a new edition, but the very paucity of new literature at all relevant to the subject vindicates the reappearance of this richly textured and deeply erudite monograph. Scholarly trends have moved away from contextualized histories of doctrine such as this, and recent more monochromatic treatments of Augustine’s thought have had little use for the sort of thick analytic description that this book offers. It reclaims for Augustine the depth and opacity, in the sense of resistance to easy categorization, that less learned studies are apt to overlook.

To say this is a study of Augustine’s Christology would be at once correct and misleading. It is not a study of how Chalcedonian (in advance) Augustine may or may not have been, though there is generous coverage of the “structural” issues regarding the person and natures of Christ. Even here M. warns against simplifying shortcuts, observing (for example) that none of the Fathers, and much less Augustine, understood themselves as making a conscious choice between the two paradigms (Logos-Sarx and Logos-Anthropos) of A. Grillmeier (70). The typical jargon used in expositions of Christology, such as communicatio idiomatum (149), is not Augustinian and is just as likely to obscure rather than evince the particular genius and most significant accomplishments of his thinking, such as his exploration of the unique psychology of the incarnate Word (148). M.
invites us to stretch the traditional Greek categories by using them in striking ways, for example, in talking about the “hypostatic union” between Christ and the Church, or, alternatively, the Church as an “incarnation ecclesiale” of the Son of God. Only from this perspective can one understand “la personnalité du Christ, sa psychologie et sa vie affective, indissociablement individuelles et collectives” (155).

M. warns us to resist other tempting simplifications. In assessing Augustine’s claim that the Platonist philosophers had attained to some knowledge of the Trinity, M. admonishes us not to read these claims as though they were founded on later Scholastic distinctions between philosophy and theology or between “natural” and “supernatural” orders of knowledge (204; 56). These distinctions only serve to hide the subtlety of Augustine’s thought, which is interested more in exploring the status of “understanding,” as something that is never morally neutral (205). It is impossible to separate the truth of what one understands from the spirit in which one understands it. That the Platonists know the “Fatherland” but reject the “Way” (see 232) does not imply that their knowledge issues in true understanding, or that faith in the incarnate Word as the “way” to understanding supplies merely a means to complete possession of the same knowledge they had before. Rather, one comes to know in a different spirit, and so faith provides genuinely new understanding. In this connection, M. warns against simplifying Augustine’s doctrine of “spiritual interiority through participation in the Word” by reducing it to a variant of Platonist illumination instead of recognizing its equally important biblical and theological texture (in the theme of the “bread of angels” and its history of exegetical elaboration) (139).

M. mercilessly requires his readers to march through long, salutary quotations from Augustine, often juxtaposed in interesting ways, to show how impoverished more simplifying readings of Augustine’s thought can be, relative to the richness of the thought itself, powerful in its very resistance to systematization; though he does try a kind of summary systematic at the end (in chap. 9).

But M. has earned his way to this point, for along the way we recover all of the rich resonances Augustine’s thought on Christ carries with it. We see its primary roots in the liturgy, the most fundamental “locus” of Augustine’s Christology (80), and in liturgical exegesis and preaching (see chap. 5). We look anew at major controversies, learning to think, for example, of the Pelagian controversy as in some ways primarily a controversy over the doctrine of Christ (221–28). We stop to consider so many smaller points of interest, too, such as the composition of the Homilies on John (160), the Augustinian dictum, “If you understand it, it is not God” (128), the interruption of the De doctrina christiana (201), the Sibylline Oracles and Christ (238), and many other reminders of the wide implications of considering the Christ of Saint Augustine.

M. is saying, in effect, that, if we want to think about the Christology of Augustine and his theological heirs, we will have to work patiently from the ground up. We will have to find new categories that arise from the texts
themselves and enter the Augustinian contribution on this topic into systematic theology only when a deep enough study of that contribution has affected the very categories of systematic theology itself.

University of Notre Dame  

JOHN C. CAVADINI


Neither the imposing title nor the quantity of text devoted to stories of werewolves and other monstrous admirabiles mixturae should frighten prospective readers away from this wonder-ful collection of essays. Bynum considers various constructions of “a world characterized by both flux and permanence” and—insofar as metamorphosis is intimately linked with personal identity—confrontations with “both the promise and horror of change.” Her study can inform a broad array of readers in the study of religious culture.

The Introduction unites the four essays that follow. Taking werewolf tales as her primary example, B. examines change and identity in three primary paradigms: hybridity (a wolf added to a person); over-clothing (a wolf pelt covers a person); and metamorphosis (a person becomes a wolf). Hybridity and metamorphosis both raise anxieties about “the possibility we all face that a thing may be, or become, partly or totally something else” (29). A “quite stunning shift of intellectual paradigms” about the nature of change occurred toward the end of the twelfth century: newly-popular metamorphosis stories (vampires, fairies, and werewolves) as well as controversies in eucharistic theology suggest a shift from change as “evolution” to change as “replacement.”

Socioeconomic conditions serve as a context: “Agricultural, economic and urban growth . . . had led to transformations of familial and social structure that made it increasingly possible (if still not easy) for people—especially privileged people—to change their social roles” (25–26). Fluidity entailed anxieties: fears of “identities” and “boundary crossing” led to a need for limits, for knowing what is “outside, other, different.”

“Wonder” (chap. 1) examines one response to the “other.” By imitatio, Bernard of Clairvaux meant “appropriation,” “taking into oneself,” and “consuming.” Its opposite was admiratio, for “We wonder at what we cannot in any sense incorporate, consume, or encompass in our mental categories; we wonder at mystery, at paradox, at admirabiles mixturae”—i.e., hybrids (52–53). Both fascinating and terrifying, this response included “dread”—stupor, timor, horror—in the face of what resisted appropriation (57). Finally, “wonder” responded to a singular’s significance whereas too much generalization (inductio exemplorum) suppressed amazement (73). B. suggests a task for teachers of a calculating people in a consumer society: “We must rear a new generation of students who will gaze in wonder at
texts and artifacts, quick to puzzle over a translation, slow to project or to appropriate, quick to assume there is a significance, slow to generalize about it” (74).

Chapters 2 and 3 amplify B.’s earlier work on the Resurrection of the Body (1995). Insisting that exactly the same bodily “particles that lay in the grave” would be raised from the dead, writers ca. 1200 held a “deep resistance to severing of body and soul, to metempsychosis” (98). In the present study, entertainment literature mirrors high culture’s anxieties: in Gerald of Wales’s paradigmatic tale (ca. 1182) profound change is illusory: the werewolf’s skin overclothes both a perduiring human body and the soul it encloses (108–9). Likewise, Aquinas discounted angelic assumptions of human bodies. This severance of “animals and angels from the human body suggests the importance of understanding person as psychosomatic unity” (110).

Returning to Bernard, chapter 3 delineates the fragile unitas of a person which is “ever in danger of fragmenting into parts, particles, varietas” (159). The post-colonialist term “hybridity” seems “an appropriate term for Bernard’s rhetorical and ontological stance”: he speaks “less of radical transformation than of dichotomy, contradiction, opposition” (161). Hybridized admirabiles mixturae invite a wonder-response.

Comparing werewolf stories from the first, twelfth, and twentieth centuries, chapter 4 explores our own epoch’s concerns about “personal identity.” When “outer behavior and inner intentionality seem fundamentally out of synchrony”—as in the case of depression, schizophrenia, Tourette’s syndrome, and Alzheimer’s—where does identity lie? (164) The same question applies to “identity position” (ethnic and political group membership) as well as to physical alteration (sex-change operations; complete cosmetic surgery). Werewolf stories suggest that dichotomies are not helpful paradigms: nature v. nurture, biology v. social construction, mind v. body (187). Rather, a hybrid imagination saves us from choosing between false alternatives: “We need . . . metaphors and stories that will help us imagine a world in which we really change yet really remain the same” (188).

B.’s work amplifies that of John Boswell, Gavin Langmuir, and R. I. Moore: a new social fluidity ca. 1200 seems to be related to synchronous developments—werewolves, Waldensians, witches, Jews, lepers, sodomites, and the Eucharist all served as sites of contestation over change. I wonder how B. might causally relate these.

Both sacramental and moral theologians will benefit from this volume. Eucharistic connections are self-evident. Moreover, reading B. alongside Stephen Toulmin’s Cosmopolis (1990) reminds the ethicist of singularity’s value. One senses that “modernity” lost something of tremendous value in privileging the general law over the singular case—“a deep and burning sense that a particular event involves us in more than its specific details” (192).

Reading B. renews one’s faith in the crucial value of stories. We stand
once again in wonder at their capacity to shape—or shipwreck—our very selves.

Boston College

Stephen Schloesser, S.J.


David Burr’s scholarship has merited praise among scholars of medieval theology and spiritual movements. The present book, a history of the Spiritual Franciscans, likewise deserves acclaim. The brief preface clearly delineates the parameters of the study, which traces the emergence and persecution of the Spirituals as a “group of rigorists” (viii) within the Franciscan order. The period considered ranges from the 1270s—when various factions were forming—through the 1330s. B. acknowledges that the events considered form part of a whole, “spun out over a much longer period” (ix).

A major problem addressed by various Spirituals was the “right” observance of poverty as a lived reality for Franciscans. Though careful not to place responsibility with Francis himself, B. notes common sources, such as Francis’s Testament, which both the “order” and the Spirituals later used against one another.

The book sheds light on views expressed during the early post-Francis period. B. is fair to both Thomas of Celano and Bonaventure, neither of whom may be classified as Spirituals. One becomes more sympathetic to the later Spiritual Franciscans while attending to B.’s review of II Celano, friar Thomas’s second “life” of Francis. Completed in 1247, it strongly emphasizes lived poverty and remarks on friars’ movement away from Francis’s ideal of humility, simplicity, and obedience. Since Celano was “considered a responsible, respectable member of the order” (25) and commissioned by the order to write, one may trust that he chronicles already existent difficulties. Minister General Bonaventure’s Major Life of St. Francis offers a Francis who is still “a model for perfect disciples of Christ” (37). Moreover, Bonaventure’s 1257 and 1266 letters to the entire order attack the friars’ laxity and do not even suggest any “threat from zealots” (35). B. remarks on several parallels between Bonaventure’s concerns and that of named Spirituals, such as Petrus Johannis Olivi. B. does not amalgamate Bonaventure’s thought with that of later Spirituals; rather, he confirms that Spirituals’ critiques have a basis in reality, whether for the pre-1270 period or the post-1270 period through the 1330s.

The treatment of the major figures is even-handed. B. builds upon his decades of research on Petrus Johannis Olivi without simply rehearsing materials from his previously published works. Olivi had first been censured in 1383 after a lengthy theological quarrel over several issues, including poverty. The poverty debate revolved around whether usus pauper,
the restricted use of goods, was essential to the Franciscan vow. B. assesses Olivi’s view as “more faithful to the original Franciscan spirit” than many of his opponents’ views (53). As B. remarks, Pope Nicholas III had entered this chapter of the usus pauper debate at least as early as his 1279 constitution, Exiit qui seminat, which interpreted the Rule of 1223. This constitution provided Olivi and his opponents with further arguments both prior to and following the 1283 censure. B. rightly posits that Exiit sets a precedent for further papal involvement in the controversy. Later, when B. treats the harshly decisive John XXII’s confrontations with the Spirituals, one might easily imagine John as a relentless hound after prey.

The treatment of Ubertino da Casale, a Spiritual who, though influenced by Olivi, later stood at some distance from his thought, is firmly grounded. Ubertino appears ubiquitous within the movement, defending the Spirituals even at the papal court at Avignon. Ubertino appears intermittently at the papal court until his 1325 flight from John XXII. His disappearance after 1329 leaves one saddened over his possible fate, which, B. notes, is inconclusive due to lack of solid documentary evidence.

The varied fortunes of Italian spiritual leader Angelo Clareno are well analyzed. When writing his Chronicle, Angelo shows himself to be “apocalyptic without being particularly Joachite” (287). B.’s argument helps one distinguish various layers of apocalyptic and eschatological thought that permeate Franciscan Spirituals’ writings. In his brilliant conclusion, B. recaps the fluidity of the whole movement positing that, once we move outside the witness of Angelo’s Chronicle, the movement’s contours begin to blur. While the Spirituals were far from a monolithic unit, a degree of “family resemblance” remained among them (310). B.’s stand is accurate regarding the official defeat of the Spirituals, which did not mean the end of reform. Perhaps we can hope for another study from him, focused on the Capuchin reform.

The present work has much to recommend it. However, readers might give greater attention to the appendix material, had it been published separately. The detailed endnotes are exquisite and provide commentary on other reputable scholars’ work. The bibliography is impressive, demonstrating the use of a treasury of sources.

Mount Angel Seminary, Saint Benedict, Oreg.

Brigid O’Shea Merriman, O.S.F.


Allen’s is perhaps the best text currently available for disciplined and serious gender study. Encyclopedic in both length and depth, this is the second of her volumes on the topic.

Most refreshing about A.’s approach is that its exhaustive methodology
reveals aspects of the tradition often glossed over or completely ignored by less rigorous projects. She evaluates sources written by men and women equally. One does not find here the difficult to define and, I believe, false dichotomies separating theology from spirituality, and monastic works from those written in the university. A. chooses her sources according to the criterion of “discursive or logical reasoning,” thus successfully avoiding the prejudice against women’s sources that has existed from the rise of the universities until the present. She handles potentially contentious issues with cool objectivity. Her comments regarding gender inclusive language as primarily an issue of vernacular translation are particularly useful.

Rather than limit the discussion of gender to academic sources, A. also includes material from religious communities, popular satirical sources, and Italian, French, and German humanists. In fact, she identifies as the most fertile ground for source material literature composed within the culture of women’s religious communities and humanist writings.

A.’s approach accomplishes a sociological reading of the concept of woman that yields a much richer and more gender-inclusive history than one is accustomed to find both in feminist texts and in texts that exclude the contributions of women. Contrary to what is frequently proposed, there was more educated opinion in the air concerning gender issues during the years 1250–1500 than Aristotelian misogyny. A.’s progressive historical approach to the text deconstructs any false assumption that notions of complementarity have evolved only since the modern women’s movement.

A.’s use of sources is critical and relies on primary texts. The charts used throughout the volume to illustrate difficult arguments are extremely useful. Key texts are quoted within the argumentation, allowing the reader to examine the evidence without having to lay down the book. Since the volume is expensive, this inclusion of essential source material makes the purchase of other volumes unnecessary for use in a survey course.

A. divides her book into two sections. The first explores separate gendered discourse about women’s identity. Authors are chosen from the academy, religious communities, popular sources, and humanist writers. The second section, the beginning of public dialogue about gender, explores the analogical thinking of women religious—as opposed to inferior, non-academic thinking, the deterioration of intergender dialogue in later satires and public trials, early humanist dialogue about the concept of woman, the early humanist reformation in education for women, the early humanist reformation in theory about gender, and the early humanist reformation by women philosophers. This material is charted in an extremely useful summation that crystallizes the arguments and allows the reader to follow A.’s encyclopedic survey without getting lost in the details.

Adding to the pedagogical value of the volume is a time-line of contributions to the concept of woman (1250–1500). The timeline actually begins ca. 1200 when women were excluded from universities, followed by the 1210–40 translation of Aristotle and Averroes into Latin in Spain.

Two negative critiques of this remarkable work are in order. The year 1250 seems a bit artificial as a beginning point. A. herself seems to make a
better case for the year 1200. Second, apart from its academic contributions, the early Franciscan tradition—with its revolutionary emphasis on mutual relations and its extraordinary following of men and women, both lay and religious, especially as their mutual relations were imagined by Clare of Assisi—is unfortunately ignored.

In short, A.’s text is an extremely valuable and astute contribution to philosophy, theology, and history. Its precise methodology, rigorous discipline, and elegant readability make it an essential volume. The scholar will no longer be able to do women’s studies without it.

Creighton University, Omaha

JOAN MUELLER


In Die christliche Gnosis (1835, 1967), Ferdinand Christian Baur argued that one could find a gnostic thread in Protestant thought, a third way distinct from orthodoxy and liberalism. Baur traced this line from Jacob Boehme to the German idealists, particularly G. W. F. Hegel. More than 175 years later, Cyril O’Regan resumes, expands, and qualifies Baur’s argument, bringing it to bear on literary figures like John Milton and William Blake and contemporary theologians like Thomas Altizer and Jürgen Moltmann.

When Baur wrote, his knowledge of gnosticism was limited mostly to secondary sources, indeed mostly to ancient Christian writers like Irenaeus of Lyons who presented the gnostics as renegades perverting the Christian message and demanding refutation. In contrast, O. has the advantage of having primary sources, especially those discovered at Nag Hammadi in 1945, and thus he is not limited to seeing the gnostics only through the eyes of their adversaries. He is able to reconsider Baur’s position in the light of these subsequent discoveries about the original advocates of gnosticism as well as to take up new genres and later thinkers.

Central to O.’s work is the claim that the main gnostic texts have a dramatic structure and that something like this dramatic structure has appeared in significant Protestant literature until our day. In supporting his claim, he appeals primarily to three sources associated with Valentinus in the second century: the Gospel of Truth and the Tripartite Tractate from the Nag Hammadi Library and Irenaeus’s presentation of Ptolemy’s doctrine, a presentation he sees as supported by the 20th-century discoveries. Baur too had seen a narrative structure in gnosticism, but O. tries to show that his predecessor was mistaken about the surface material and that one must go to a deeper structure to find this narrative. O. works through these texts to show the pattern from pleroma to Fall to Savior to eschaton in all three works. The structural analysis, schematized at the end of the chapter, almost makes sense of an extraordinarily complex, indeed fantastic, worldview. I found this analysis the most satisfying part of the book.
In making his move to the gnostic line in Protestant thought and literature, O. insists that just as Valentinus and other gnostics transformed Christianity in their view of the gospel and the world, so Boehme, the poets, the German idealists, and the more recent theologians transformed gnosticism. There is enough continuity to talk about an alternative movement in Protestantism without suggesting that there is any direct mirroring going on.

O.’s study is the introductory volume to a series on Boehme, English and German Romanticism, Hegel and Schelling, anti-gnostic thinkers in the 19th century such as Kierkegaard and Coleridge, and finally gnostics such as Altizer and Moltmann and anti-gnostics such as Balthasar in the 20th century. Here O. does not give an extended defense of his claim about this later material, nor does he explain his reasons for siding in the end with Irenaeus against the gnostics. He does defend himself for using gnosticism as the point of reference rather than neo-Platonism, apocalypticism, and kabbalism and for not making the same analysis of Roman Catholic thought.

The book is a work of high scholarship. O. shows a great knowledge of literature, ancient and recent, and a considerable ability to craft a very nuanced argument as he deals with this literature. I learned much from reading the book. It is important to realize, though, that it is in no sense an introductory book, however much it might be the introduction to several other books. O. writes densely, often using quasi-technical terms without adequate definition and personal names without adequate identification. He presupposes much knowledge and interest on the part of the reader. Anyone looking for an introduction to gnosticism and the discussions surrounding it might well turn to Kurt Rudolph’s excellent *Gnosis* (1977, English 1983) or to the several articles in Mircea Eliade’s *Encyclopedia of Religion* (1986).

*La Salle University, Philadelphia, Penn.*

MICHAEL J. KERLIN

**BOOK REVIEWS**


Teachers of secondary and university courses that involve Canadian Catholic history have, over the years, faced a dilemma. Given the burgeoning interest in this nation’s church history over the past two decades, finding material for discussion groups has not been a problem. Several published anthologies prove useful, and it is also possible to mine the pages of the Canadian Catholic Historical Association’s *Historical Studies, Cana-
dian Historical Review, and various regional journals to create a customized reader. A complementary textbook, however, has been nonexistent. General texts mention the Church only en passant if at all. Histories dealing with Canada’s Catholics are generally subject-specific, regional in approach, and, except for a three-volume set on Quebec available only in French, were written several decades ago. Terence Fay, whose previous major project was Dictionary of Jesuit Biography: Ministry to English Canada, 1842–1987 (1991) has taken on the herculean task of remedying this situation, and he has succeeded admirably. Although in the introduction he calls this work an outline history, it is much more than that. This very well-written tome is full of useful, often detailed, information.

As the title indicates, the work is divided into three parts. The first, “Gallicanism,” deals with the Church in New France beginning with early missionary activity, including that of Jean de Brébeuf and the Canadian martyrs and the establishment of a permanent structure under the leadership of Bishop Laval. The sections on Native-European relations are particularly well done, reflecting one of F.’s areas of expertise. Chapter 3 deals with the early years in the Maritimes, emphasizing the unique experience of Catholics in this region.

Part 2, “Romanism,” begins with the clearest explanation of ultramontanism that I have ever seen. What became and continues to be one of the most important issues in the history of Canadian Catholicism—the existence of separate Catholic schools—is fully explored. Of particular note is an account of women’s education in Catholic institutions of that era. Complex issues such as the New Brunswick and Manitoba school controversies and the No Popery campaign in Ontario in the 1880s are explained succinctly and accurately.

Part 3, “Canadianism,” is the longest: it deals with the plethora of issues facing the Canadian Church in the 20th century. F. confronts the major issue head-on when he analyzes the often antagonistic relationship between English- and French-speaking Catholics that had its roots in the 19th century but had come to a head in the 20th.

As is the case in all three parts, women are prominent at the communal level through organizations such as the Catholic Women’s League, which in most Canadian Catholics’ eyes is probably seen as a rather irrelevant group but which in reality, having fought for its existence against priests and bishops alike, has taken strong public stands on various issues. Individual women are highlighted. A lengthy account of the work of Catherine De Hueck Doherty is balanced by an analysis of the views of Joanna Manning. The latter, a former high school chaplain, is a high profile, media-friendly critic of the institutional Church’s stance on the role of women. Particularly well done in this chapter are explanations of the charismatic movement and the effect of Vatican II on Canadian Catholics.

There are some minor editing problems: It is George Etienne Cartier not Georges—his parents named him after the English monarch George III. In the index, my own institution is not listed under its name as are others—St. Mary’s, St. Joseph’s, etc.; one finds the very accurate account of its found-
ing under the name of its founder, Father Louis Funcken, C.R. As to significant figures, John Joseph Leddy is mentioned but activist Mary Jo Leddy is not—one wonders why. These problems, however, are minor. F. deserves much credit for producing a history that will not only be very useful in higher education circles but that is accessible to the lay reader as well.

Raymond J. Lahey is the Bishop of St. George’s diocese in Newfoundland. He is also a former member of the Department of Religious Studies at Memorial University of Newfoundland in Saint John’s. At first glance, it would be easy to dismiss this slim volume as a superficial look at Canadian Catholicism. To do so would be a mistake. Despite its size the book reflects L.’s well-deserved reputation as an accomplished researcher and writer. The volume consists of vignettes, usually four pages in length, beginning with the first Christians, the Vikings (thus the title) and ending with “Canadian Catholics Today: Launching Anew into the Deep.” In between the consistently entertaining anecdotes focus on personalities such as Joseph Chihwatenha (Canada’s first martyr), Jeanne Mance and Marguerite Bourgeoys, Paul Émile Léger, and L’Arche founder Jean Vanier. There is also an account of the 1984 papal visit.

Although this volume was included as part of the press kit given to journalists covering World Youth Day in summer 2002 in Toronto, a spokesperson for Novalis indicates that it was not published specifically for that purpose and will remain in print. The book is suitable for the general public and would be useful as a text in senior elementary religion courses. It could also be a helpful addition to the materials for the Rite of Christian Initiation for Adults.

St. Jerome’s University, Waterloo, Ontario

Gerald J. Stortz


Athans has produced a most important historical study of a seminary that has had a significant impact on the national as well the local church and society. The St. Paul Seminary has for over 100 years served the upper Midwest and has produced alumni who have been creative agents of reform and renewal in American Catholicism.

Archbishop Ireland established the seminary as his most important work for the Church. Of course, he could not have built the seminary at the end of the 19th century without the aid of prosperous laity. He was fortunate to have the indispensable financial contributions of the Methodist railroad magnate James J. Hill and his Catholic wife Mary Theresa Mehegan Hill. They single-handedly financed the building of the seminary and established a comfortable endowment for the education of priests, and James personally supervised the construction of the multiple buildings that constituted
the seminary complex. A’s book focuses on the changes in the actual physical structures during the last century, calling attention to the role of space, architecture, and art in the total atmosphere of a seminary education.

The title reflects Ireland’s vision for seminary education. A seminary education was to radiate throughout the whole Church in the Northwest, invigorating the Catholic laity but also extending beyond the Catholic Church into the whole population of the country. The seminary’s “spirit will be to work for the whole people, offering its strength to uphold every noble cause, and willing to cooperate with all men who labor to serve God, humanity, and country” (69). Ireland’s ecclesiological vision, which had roots in the thought of Isaac Hecker and Orestes A. Brownson, reflected the optimism of the progressive age and Ireland’s own sense of the Church’s mission in America. To a great extent A. shows how that vision governed so much of what actually happened in the seminary’s past 100 years.

Readers may want to peruse chapter 16, “To Work for the Whole People,” first. That concluding chapter measures the repercussions of the seminary on the national Church, arguing that the seminary had a major impact on four major areas of the Church’s mission: social justice, liturgical renewal, rural ministry and catechesis, and preaching and teaching. Alumni of the institution who led such movements need no introduction to readers of this journal: John A. Ryan, William “Billy” Busch, Edwin Vincent O’Hara, and Fulton J. Sheen. These men and their intellectual successors at the seminary contributed much to the renewal of Catholicism in the upper Midwest and throughout the nation before and after the Second Vatican Council. That story is well worth reading.

A’s work is a history of the interaction of clergy, laity, and religious in the Northwest but is structured understandably around the reigns of the episcopal leaders of St. Paul. More generally, it is organized around three stages of development: (1) the French precursors and founding generation (1850–1918); (2) the period of significant growth and development from the implementation of the Code of Canon Law to the advent of Vatican II (1919–61); and (3) the stage of renewal, decline in seminarians, and the restructuring of the seminary in affiliation with the University of St. Thomas (1962–2000). A. has a knack for sufficient detail, based on extensive research into the archival and published sources, that makes for interesting reading and for insight into the life of the times she records.

The book has many strengths, some of which I mentioned above. Disappointing is a lack of sufficient attention to the changing philosophical and theological contexts in which seminary education took place. Perhaps there were not sufficient sources for such an examination, but it would have been helpful to focus on the influences of neo-Thomism, the New Theology, and/or the amalgam of these theological orientations in the period prior to Vatican II and to demonstrate more precisely the intellectual grounds for the shift that clerical education took in the 1960s after the impact of that council.
Despite these reservations, I highly recommend this text for all those interested in clerical education, theological education in general, and the history of American Catholic culture in the 20th century. It is well researched, well written, and easy and enjoyable to read. The index provides a helpful guide for researchers in American Catholic history.

Marquette University, Milwaukee

Patrick W. Carey


This well-written doctoral dissertation is an assessment of George Lindbeck’s postliberal theology in the light of the Goh’s own theology of tradition. G. “critically extract[s]” (19) elements of Gadamer’s and MacIntyre’s arguments on the anthropological dimensions of tradition and uses them to argue for what he calls “the dialectical revelation of truth.” He then brings these elements to bear on “three clusters” (126) of Lindbeck’s theology in three-fourths of the book: Lindbeck’s theology of Scripture-in-tradition, of religions, and of the Church. It is the first book-length treatment in English of the argument over Lindbeck’s theology, and the sources gathered here will be invaluable in determining what Lindbeck’s theology has to teach us. Andreas Eckerstorfer’s *Kirche in postmodernen Welt: Der Beitrag Georg Lindbecks zu einer neuen Verhältnisbestimmung* (2001) obviously appeared too late to be included.

In beginning with Lindbeck’s view of the Bible, G. gives an unusual and quite correct priority to Lindbeck’s theological center over his well-known cultural-linguistic theory of religions (130). Less correctly, he ascribes Lindbeck’s theological “base” to Barth (144). G. acknowledges Lindbeck’s own claim that Barth’s theology has been influential “at second hand” (145)—which G. interprets to mean that Lindbeck departs from Barth “on particular points” (144). Something closer to the opposite is at stake: Lindbeck’s Evangelical Lutheran base (his particularly “evangelical catholic” readings of *The Book of Concord*) departs from Barth’s Evangelical Reformed “base,” while agreeing with Barth on particular points—those on narrative elaborated by Hans Frei, pertinent strands of whose theology G. nicely summarizes (156–71). Lindbeck once described himself as a “Wittgensteinian Thomistic Lutheran” [*Pro Ecclesia* 3 (1994) 235]—in reverse order of importance, but all without reference to Barth. But this characterization makes little difference for large tracks of G.’s analysis. His reading of Lindbeck on the Bible, from his treatment of nonfoundationalism to his innovative five “rules for intratextual reading of Scripture,” is astute. G. goes on to propose that Lindbeck’s narrative intratextuality is necessary but not sufficient and that his nonfoundationalism needs to be supplemented by “a foundational alethiology” (222).
Lindbeck’s cultural-linguistic theory of religion including its rule theory of doctrine, G. argues, excludes contemporary experience (324). The critics impressively marshaled here and throughout the book are both those one would expect (David Tracy, e.g.) and those one might not expect (Placher, Hauerwas, e.g.). G. himself is more deeply critical of Lindbeck’s cultural-linguistic anthropology (chap. 4) than of his biblical and christological theology (chaps. 2 and 3)—in the book’s title, “Christian tradition” is inseparable from “today” ( = “present experience”) (e.g., 451).

Is G. taking back with one hand (chap. 4) what he gave with the other hand (chaps. 2 and 3)? The final chapter argues that, while Lindbeck’s rule-theory of doctrine is not—contrary to some criticisms—relativistic, it does need to be complemented by G.’s notion of truth as “revealed dialectically” (457, 529). G. also here proposes a view of the Church that agrees with Lindbeck’s nonsupercessionist Church, while lamenting the silence of Lindbeck’s Church about the public square and other matters. Inadequate as G. finds many of Lindbeck’s theological arguments (Tracy’s “mutually critical correlations” ultimately wins the day [594]), he also finds that it “can nevertheless act as a powerful impetus for much constructive possibilities across the whole spectrum of Christian theology” (539). But whether G.’s alternative is preferable depends on his working out ambiguities in his central notion of the “dialectical revelation of truth.” It is hard to tell whether this is a definition of truth or a definition of how we test for the truth—surely a crucial distinction for any alethiology. In either case, it is not easy to say whether and how dialectic applies to itself, or itself provides a way beyond the continuing debate between ressourcement and aggiornamento views of tradition. Nonetheless, this book is a worthwhile contribution to the argument over Lindbeck’s theology.

Loyola College in Maryland  

JAMES J. BUCKLEY


The scope of this book is precisely limited. It aims at understanding the hypostatic union, grasping its intrinsic intelligibility, in the context of two interlocking sets of clearly defined terms and relations. The question is not cur Deus homo, why there was a God-man, but what this God-man was. In the incarnate Word there is both unity (Chalcedon’s “one and the same”) and duality (perfect deity, perfect humanity). How then might this presumably unique and admittedly mysterious reality be conceived? Into what elements or principles can it be analyzed, and how is it possible to think of these all together?

Such questions do not cover the whole of Christology, and this is not a textbook, although Lonergan did write it for the instruction of his students.
at the Gregorian University. It is a “supplement,” which as such presupposes that certain prior issues have been settled. Assent to the truth of the Chalcedonian definition is assumed; only the coherence of that definition falls under investigation. L. first treats the constitution of Christ using the standard tools of scholastic philosophy—subsistent, esse, essence, supposit, nature—which, however, he shapes and sharpens for his own purposes. His investigation then moves into the psychological field, where the relevant notions include Existenz, subject, consciousness, and “I.” These are not separate topics, as though psychological realities were somehow apart from being. Both pertain to a theoretical understanding of persons, whether divine or human, and thus L.’s initial discussion of how different conceptions of the person are related is an important key to the rest of the book. When he reaches the end, he has effected a kind of transposition. Christ, one distinct (and divine) subsistent in two intellectual natures, is moreover one psychological subject of two consciousnesses, which, in keeping with Chalcedon, are unconfused, unchanged, undivided, and unseparated.

The argument for this conclusion can be assessed from the standpoint of the subject matter, the author, or both. Its contribution to contemporary systematic Christology is not likely to be direct, inasmuch as the metaphysical categories that pedagogical necessity constrained L. to use no longer structure much theological discourse. The ontological inquiry, however, comes between two sections that may nevertheless prove to be permanently valuable: the psychological inquiry that follows it, and a methodological discussion of just what theological understanding is and achieves. Here L. is on his own ground. Although the functional distinction of different theological specialties that he would advocate 15 years later in Method in Theology (1972) is only hinted at, the careful, extended exposition of consciousness and its subject is unquestionably the clearest and most thorough of any that he wrote.

Consciousness, L. argues, is not perception of an object. It is just experience. The difference is crucial to his solution of a question that can be put briefly as follows. If consciousness is an awareness of self, and if the incarnate Word was truly human and thus humanly conscious, then who was conscious of whom? The point is by no means trivial. On the one hand, the position that L. defends rules out the subtle Nestorianism of a homo assumptus Christology. It was the eternal Son of God, a divine subject, nobody else, who consciously suffered on the cross. On the other hand, the same position enables L. to specify an intelligible sense in which it was possible for Jesus of Nazareth to know and affirm, truly and humanly, that he was himself the divine Word.

All this may not command the same interest it did when it was written nearly 50 years ago. Perhaps it should. In any case, those who know L.’s Insight (1958), with its somewhat sketchy suggestions on how cognitional theory might bear on theological issues, will find in this, his next book, ample clarification, even without the larger context provided by the much longer textbooks on the Trinity and the Incarnation that he wrote not long afterwards. Besides the application to Christ’s natures of the analysis of
conscious intentionality worked out in *Insight*, there is a 17-page section that shows in concrete detail how “dialectic,” in L.’s sense of a theological procedure, might be deployed.

For the eventual publication in L.’s collected works of another five or six volumes of Latin theology, this one sets an admirable precedent. The original text is printed, most helpfully, on facing pages with the translation. As befits a highly technical treatise, Michael Shields has translated closely but not woodenly, dealing deftly with a number of tricky terminological problems. There was no great need for explanatory footnotes, the treatise itself being straightforwardly clear, so only a few of these have been added. The very high standards of editing and production that characterize the ten previous volumes of the series have been maintained in this one.

*Boston College*  

**CHARLES HEFLING**


The document, *Dominus Iesus*, issued on September 5, 2000, by the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), provoked widespread comment in the media for what many saw as its negative attitude to ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. Others thought that it presented traditional doctrine. This book is a welcome contribution to the debate. Part 1 gives the full text of the document, part 2 presents some immediate reactions from various leaders including the pope and a Jewish scholar, and part 3 gathers twelve scholarly studies on the document. The geographical context of the debate is the U.S.A.

The reactions in the book fall into two groups. The Catholics argue that *Dominus Iesus* only repeats traditional teaching regarding the “unicity and salvific universality of Jesus Christ and the Church” and that it is not really against ecumenical dialogue. The Protestants, on the contrary, affirm that the Second Vatican Council was more nuanced and regret that the document has not taken into account the real progress made in the ecumenical discussions of the past 30 years. David Berger, a Jewish scholar, protests against the inclusion of Judaism among the non-Christian religions and shows that other documents of the Church and a recent book by Cardinal Ratzinger, *Many Religions, One Covenant* (1999), recognize the special covenantal status of Judaism. The studies by Ruth Langer and Philip Cunningham reinforce this point.

The critical studies in part 3 also fall largely into two groups. One group—Harvey Egan, Robert Imbelli, and Anthony Akinwale—maintains that the document repeats traditional teaching as a clarification in an atmosphere of relativism prevalent among some Christians engaged in interreligious dialogue. The others offer various critical comments. Francis Sullivan thinks that the CDF may not maintain that “the church exercises instrumental causality in every instance of salvation” (51). He also clarifies
that *subsistit in* does not mean *is* and that the Council never flatly declared that the ecclesial communities are “not churches in the proper sense” as the document (par. 17) says. Mark Heim largely agrees with the document and suggests that every religion is exclusive, but he regrets that the document does not betray any deep knowledge of or respect for other religions. Pheme Perkins thinks that the document shows very little eschatological awareness. The “absolute” statements regarding the Church in the New Testament are eschatological and “the New Testament churches understood themselves as God’s advance teams” (88). Frederick Lawrence observes that the role of the Holy Spirit calling us to contemplate and listen is not sufficiently emphasized. Charles Hefling faults the document for being simply assertive, repeating past statements, without any attempt to explain and justify. Its stress is rather on the authority to affirm. He argues that the document revolves around the theme of “the oneness of Christ-Spirit-salvation-kingdom-church” (120) leading to the oneness of the eucharistic and apostolic ministry around the Roman pontiff. He comments: “Yet it may be doubted whether the unification is anything more than verbal” (122).

Qamar-ul Huda affirms that Muslims believe the Qur’an to be final revelation. But Mohammed considered the Bible as authentic revelation and ascribed to the people of the Book a special status. Islam itself does not make any claims to exclusivity, because “any exclusive claim remains with Allah alone” (153). Francis Clooney comments from the context of comparative studies with Hinduism. As every religion considers its faith affirmations to be true, the only way ahead is a serious study of the other, not a repetition of a priori absolute claims. Clooney also points out internal inconsistencies in the document. For instance, the distinction between faith and belief is not very clear and some passages seem to suppose faith also in the members of other religions. “All religions err” is as sweeping a claim as “all religions are nice.” It is not proper to make such a statement without any effort to point out the errors. Maybe the Church should start compiling a global syllabus of errors. Finally, Clooney observes that we could hardly engage in any fruitful dialogue if we start out with the determination to respect the other persons but not the doctrinal content or the founders of other religions (166 and par. 22).

This book is a very good aid to a critical study of the document. Its only limitation is the absence of voices from other continents. *Dominus Iesus* was widely credited to have been directed against Asian theologians. I am sure that these will have much to say from their own historical experience and context.
This text is a continuation of Nichols's effort to summarize Balthasar's magisterial trilogy. His previous work on Balthasar's esthetic, *The Word Has Been Abroad* (1998), finds its complement in the current text on Balthasar's *Dramatics*. However, one need not have read the former to grasp the argumentation of the latter.

Balthasar's writing style is famously circuitous, taking the reader through a labyrinth of historical, scriptural, and literary reconstruction and is, therefore, exceedingly difficult to encapsulate. N. excels at combining a straightforward, sequential summary of each volume of the *Dramatics* with a deft interpretation of what constitutes Balthasar's “canon within the canon.” N. correctly identifies the dramatic interplay between finite human freedom and infinite trinitarian freedom as the leitmotif that guides the whole. Salvation history is not simply making explicit or “thematic” what is implicit and “unthematic” in general human history. Something “happens” in the divine economy of salvation that involves a genuine dramatic “moment” (the “hour” of Jesus' Passion) where all that is opposed to God from within the realm of finite freedom is met and conquered. This theodramatic moment now becomes the catalyzing event that provokes the “yes or no” of the creature. History now unfolds “apocalyptically” as the intensification of this decision for or against Christ.

Related to this theodramatic theme is Balthasar's distinction between the self viewed as a conscious subject and as a theological “person.” Balthasar grounds the notion of “person” in the theological linkage (following Thomas Aquinas) between the procession of the Son from all eternity and the “mission” of Jesus in the divine economy. Only in Jesus' person do we see the total coincidence of “identity” and “mission.” Likewise, no human self can truly be called a person unless he or she has grasped and appropriated his or her divinely granted “mission,” i.e., made one's mission progressively more coincident with one's identity. The “yes or no” to Christ is made every day within the context of this progressive appropriation of one's mission. Furthermore, the individual's mission is a participation in the universal mission of Christ, and this participation requires nothing short of an “ontological transformation” (105). Thus, the Church is the *communio* of all such christologically grounded personal missions and, through its sacramental life, provides the christological “space” and “time” for their interplay and growth.

N. is quick to point out that Balthasar in no way means to imply that we can make civil decisions (e.g. on human rights) based on this theological development of the concept of person. Even the subject who is not, in Balthasar's understanding, a “person” is still an agent of spiritual dignity capable of intimacy with God. Balthasar admits that his terminology here can be misleading and specifies that what he is really talking about are two different forms for the notion of “person.” Nevertheless, he insists that such a notion of person is necessary to avoid a very undramatic leveling out of the texture of the world's relationship to God. As N. puts it, “the notion of theodramatic dramatis personae” requires “that not everybody can be regarded as players to the same extent, and indeed at a limit some are not
at all—and in this sense the differentiated concept of what it is to be a person [that] Balthasar proposes here is absolutely integral to his project” (89).

Those who have always wondered what the essential argument was between Rahner and Balthasar should read these sections of N.’s text carefully. Balthasar certainly accepts the notion that the salvific grace of God is offered to all and is available to all. However, Rahner’s attempt to situate this offer in a transcendental anthropology (supernatural existential) fails, not because it is incorrect—Balthasar, after all, admired the Blondelian and Augustinian theology of the restless heart yearning for God—but because it lacks any sense of dramatic differentiation within the one offer of grace. In short, Rahner’s theology is hamstrung by an inability to move beyond its transcendental anthropology and by its concomitant lack of attention to the role of dramatic “agency” (mission) in the scriptural data.

N.’s text does not deal with the Balthasar-Rahner issue head-on at any great length, but his summary of Balthasar’s Dramatics is so well developed that the theologically astute reader can make these and many other connections without N.’s needing to stray from his fundamental focus. The ability of this text to draw the reader into deeper theological conversation while remaining a “summary” makes it one of the more important studies in English of Balthasar’s theology.

De Sales University, Center Valley, Penn.

LARRY CHAPP


Balthasar’s vast theological legacy has generated secondary literature in two waves: expository and evaluative, the former usually preceding the latter. The expository works generally fall into one of two categories: sweeping introductions to Balthasar’s complete thought, or monographs on a single theme. An example of the former would be Aidan Nichols’s three-volume vade mecum of Balthasar’s 15-volume trilogy—see Nichols, The Word Has Been Abroad (1998); No Bloodless Myth (1999); and Say It Is Pentecost, (2001). An example of the latter would be Gerard O’Hanlon’s The Immutability of God in the Theology of Hans Urs von Balthasar (1990).

Now that such important preliminary work has largely been accomplished, the time is right for more active engagement with Balthasar’s thought. The reviewer’s task of judging the first type of secondary literature is relatively easy: one need only compare the study in question with the original texts to see how the two works match up. But an interpretive work is bound to be more controversial, for it will seek either to take issue with the positions adopted by the author or to insist that one theme among all others deserves pride of place as the interpretive key. To be successful, such a work of evaluation must demonstrate a certain interpretive flair—which itself is not easy for a reviewer to evaluate.

Kevin Mongrain’s monograph constitutes not only the opening salvo in
what bids fair to become the “interpretation wars” over Balthasar’s thought, but might well set the standard for all future interpretations of Balthasar. At first M.’s thesis struck me as implausible, but it eventually won me over. To show how he managed that, a brief summary of the book’s remarkable thesis needs stating. In essence M. claims that Balthasar’s massive oeuvre must be read through the lens of the thought of Irenaeus, the second-century (so-called “sub-apostolic”) Church Father—or more precisely put, Balthasar’s work must be read not so much through “the historical Irenaeus” as through Balthasar’s own interpretation of Irenaeus.

The initial implausibility of the thesis can easily be seen from two factors. First, the extant works of Irenaeus would hardly seem to constitute a foundation on which to build so vast a systematic theology as Balthasar’s (Irenaeus’s main extant work is the famous Against All Heresies; another work, the Demonstration of Apostolic Preaching, was discovered in the 19th century, in Armenian translation). Second, Balthasar has written monographs on quite a few other Church Fathers, including Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Maximus the Confessor, and the sixth-century Syrian monk known later as Dionysius the Areopagite. Why not one of them as a hermeneutical key? Is not the choice of Irenaeus somewhat arbitrary, if not willful?

Not so. With astonishing rhetorical skill and an enviable command of Balthasar’s vast corpus, M. convincingly shows that Irenaeus is both the most crucial early Christian writer for Balthasar (about the only one whom Harnack could not accuse of false “Hellenization”) and a man whose basic mental outlook and theology of history, despite his second-century provenance, closely parallels Balthasar’s own. (It must be stressed that for M. this is merely Balthasar’s “take” on Irenaeus, and M. has wisely decided not to defend it on its own terms, that being unnecessary for his purposes.)

Space does not permit a stepwise analysis of M.’s argument. Its two central assertions are: first, that Irenaeus’s main object of apologetic attack was gnosticism, a heretical threat he met with a biblical theology of providence and salvation history, with the Incarnate Jesus as both the center and anticipation of all history (and thus with the Incarnation itself the ground for Irenaeus’s faith in providence); second, that all the major objects of Balthasar’s own theological polemics are themselves varieties of gnosticism, threats which he too meets as Irenaeus did, with a biblical theology of providence grounded in the Incarnation. Whether Balthasar is right either in his interpretation of Irenaeus or in his view of the gnostic strain in, say, German Idealism is a separate question, one that for the most part M. judiciously declines to address. Perhaps one can say that this issue belongs to the third wave of secondary literature on Balthasar: Once the scholarly community reaches a consensus on what Balthasar means to say, the question will then have to be addressed: was he right?

University of St. Mary of the Lake/Mundelein Seminary, Mundelein, Ill.

Edward T. Oakes, S.J.

A major novelty in Clooney’s reprise of philosophico-theological arguments for the existence, identification, incarnation, and revelation of God is its juxtaposition of contemporary Christian and classical Vaishnava and Shaivite Hindu thinkers on each topic (chaps. 2–5). Chapters 1 and 6 introduce and recapitulate his approach.

“Minimalist” claims that neither Christianity nor Hinduism is reducible to one position and that similarities and differences cross cultural and religious boundaries (60) are supported by connecting Richard Swinburne’s mix of cosmological and teleological arguments (29–35) with similar expositions in medieval Nyaya commentaries (36–59).

How rational plus scriptural considerations may specify which Lord is God is shown by Balthasar’s argument that Christ is God’s perfect self-communication (64–68), Ramanuja’s identification of “Brahman” with “Lord,” and later Vaishnava and Shaivite debates (68–88) concerning whose Lord is preeminent.

Rahner’s theory of symbol, explaining how Jesus is “the unique point” of divine-human encounters, is paired with the linga and mantras in Shaivism and Vaishnava references to dramatic gestures expressing divine grace (94–128). Barth’s doctrine of the Word of God leads into Sanskrit and Tamil texts on scriptural authority (129–62). Throughout, historical contexts and contentious issues are noted in ways accessible to nonspecialists.

Inductively and incrementally, C. shows that, while each religion is unique, it shares patterns of theological reasoning. Good theologizing is interreligious, comparative, dialogical, and confessional (7–15, 163–76). Dichotomizing faith sets boundaries in religion, but reason carries us over them to deeper knowledge of God.

For most, “theological dialogue will be primarily textual.” Dialogue makes us “doubly accountable,” to our own and others’ traditions (here echoing W. C. Smith). Theology is necessarily “confessional” and “apologetic,” because properly it “is always the work of believers” (9–11).


C. assumes that “reason” is the same for modern Christian and medieval Hindu scholars, does not analyze the “gaps” bridged by reason, and pays scant heed to modern Indian philosophers of religion. His eye is on basic similarities rather than dialectical correlations, looking more for corrob-
ration of already held positions than for how others’ faith might reveal aspects of our own Christian tradition that we minimize. (Contrast S. Mark Heim, The Depth of the Riches [2001], p.183, relating Buddhist Emptiness to Trinitarianism.)

Old style comparative religion generally meant bracketing commitments and valuing generic similarities over local differences. Comparative theology nowadays is an attempt to appreciate from within one’s own tradition the significance for both it and others of similarities and differences among traditions, as these are presented by one’s peers from those traditions. By comparison with Jacques Dupuis, Heim, and Keith Ward, C. notes that he probes just two traditions in much greater depth, commenting on only a few “focused comparisons” (21–27), inviting others to do likewise with other traditions.

Inasmuch as dialogue (not “dilogue” or “duologue”) ideally involves more than one conversation partner at a time, a discussion of Christ the incarnate Word and Hindu “mantra bodies,” for instance, would benefit from some attention to other relevant examples, such as Muslim reverence for the Arabic text of the Qur’an. Also, it would have been good to learn why an older generation of Christian apologists was wrong to subsume Hindu talk of “maya” under gnosticism.

Overall, C. seeks to restore a theological context of “remembering how God has worked in our Christian and Hindu traditions” and allowing us “to be educated in authentically Hindu or Christian ways” (177). What counts as authentically Hindu he leaves to Hindus, thereby still giving faith priority over reason. His concern is not to argue such specific conclusions as that Jesus is God and that the same God is the divine source of both traditions, but to show how rationally defensible such professions of faith can be.

What shines through is C.’s scholarly integrity and religious acumen. His corpus to date is a virtuoso demonstration of comparative theology. As he says, “theological credibility may be rooted in one’s home soil, but it flourishes abroad” (174).

Trinity College, Toronto

Peter Slater


Pope has assembled an impressive range of contributors to provide the most complete and authoritative commentary on the ethics of Thomas Aquinas available in English. The 28 essays situate the teaching of the Secunda pars of the Summa theologiae, progressively analyze its subordinate sections in the light of pertinent loci in his other writings, and describe its impact on 20th-century moral theology. The wealth of material presented in this large double-column format, ample footnotes with extensive Latin citations, and select bibliography for each essay makes it an indis-
pensable resource for moral theologians and philosophers. It should be a goldmine for graduate students for decades to come. To the editor's credit, the essays are balanced and surprisingly readable.

The authors are mostly North American but include a number of notable European scholars. Their scope indicates the resurgent influence of Aquinas in the past 30 years: senior scholars like Leonard E. Boyle, O.P., and Servais-Theodore Pinckaers, O.P., are joined by scholars from the next generation who bring fresh questions about moral psychology, virtue ethics, and Aquinas's role in a Catholic moral theology where his thought is no longer established by ecclesiastical fiat.

P.'s overview of Aquinas's ethics deftly traces the theological pattern of *exitus-reditus* that sets the architecture of the three parts of the *Summa*. The commentators on the individual sections are careful to note where they are located in this architecture, since their placement reveals Aquinas's methodological priorities. The *Secunda pars* considers the moral life as the midpoint in “the emergence of all creatures from God the Creator and the return of creatures to God the Redeemer” (30). It first considers the sources of fully human acts (including law and grace) and then the theological and moral virtues. In his prologue to the *Secunda secundae*, Aquinas writes that “the whole of moral matter is placed in the context of the virtues,” a methodological axiom utterly ignored by Scholastic manualists between Trent and Vatican II. Virtues are considered first, followed by the corresponding gifts of grace and opposing vices; only then are the respective precepts discussed. The argument here is essentially theological: the treatment of Christ comes in the *Tertia pars*. The New Testament narrative does not shape the dynamics of the Christian moral life except through doctrines like Incarnation and justification.

Almost all of the essays combine a close reading of a specific section of articles of the *Summa* with indications of its relevance for current moral discussions. An exception would be Georg Wieland's essay on happiness. David M. Gallagher argues that placing Thomas's detailed analysis of the will's operations in the context of love and friendship, “allows us to see that for Thomas the moral life is essentially a matter of relationships among persons” (84). Without such reminders the reader might get the impression that the moral life was about the relationship of faculties in the psyche and their proper goals.

P. persuaded Clifford G. Kossel, S.J., to write his final essays for this volume, the first on natural and divine law and the second on Thomistic moral philosophy in the 20th century. They manifest the capacious knowledge and lucid expression treasured by generations of his students. Kossel makes the case that Aquinas does not offer a free-standing virtue ethics, but one ontologically grounded in natural law and the dynamics of grace. In the second interpretive piece, Kossel analyzes how Dom Odon Lottin, Jacques Maritain, and Yves R. Simon revived the philosophical study of Aquinas's ethics when moral theology was in the straightjacket of legalism.

The commentators analyze Aquinas's reliance on the thought of Aristotle and his modifications of that framework. Theo Kobusch questions
whether the Aristotelian categories of motion and causality can adequately express the interpersonal realities of grace and freedom. Jean Porter analyzes the virtue of justice, the longest and most complex treatment of a virtue in the Summa. In contrast to contemporary writers who attribute justice primarily to social institutions, Aquinas always considered it to be “a personal virtue to be analyzed in terms of those actions of individuals which either express justice or are contrary to it” (277). He treats the sins opposed to commutative justice at length, unlike those against distributive justice.

The essays on 20th-century interpretations are alone worth the price of this volume. Pre-Vatican II uses of Aquinas by Dominicans, Jesuits, and Redemptorists are described. Thomas S. Hibbs points out how the post-conciliar contending camps of proportionalists and “absolutists” could have both benefited from closer attention to Aquinas’s thought. These essays show how the Angelic Doctor remains a necessary conversation partner for moral theology today, and this landmark collection ensures that the conversation will occur.

Santa Clara University

William C. Spohn


Among H. Tristam Engelhardt Jr.’s many contributions is his depiction of contemporary bioethics as a world of “moral friends” and “moral enemies.” “Moral friends” can reach genuine agreement on moral issues because they share a common moral world view, i.e., they agree, more or less, on the sources of moral intuition and the foundations of moral obligation. Lacking this shared moral world view, “moral enemies” can do little more than give mutual consent to procedures deemed to be fair.

Wildes argues that Engelhardt’s influential categories fail to capture the complexity of contemporary moral discourse. It is true that morality today is less a comprehensive language than a field of competing local dialects; however, W. contends, most of us do not experience our moral universe as discretely divided into “friends” and “enemies.” Rather, there are people with whom we share quite a lot, people with whom we share nothing, and many people in between. Moreover, W. shows that these categories, although helpful in explaining the often intractable disagreements that characterize moral debate within morally and culturally pluralistic societies, cannot account for the all too common phenomenon of “overlapping consensus.” To explain why people who are not “moral friends” in the Engelhardt sense can nonetheless come to fairly substantive agreement on moral issues (e.g., on the requirements of informed consent for biomedical research), we need a third category: “moral acquaintances.”

Part 1 surveys dominant methods in contemporary bioethics (founda-
tional—encompassing thinkers as diverse as Peter Singer and Edmund Pellegrino; principlism, and the rebirth of casuistry). In addition to being a helpful map of the moral geography, W.’s exposition of debates over method effectively makes his case for a rich and healthy moral ecumenism. Evidence of a common morality in medicine (whether of the thicker version espoused by those who favor a view of medicine as a moral community with discrete practices and particular virtues, or the much thinner version reached via agreement on mid-level principles or paradigm cases) rests on acquaintanceship, i.e., a “coincidence of moral commitments.” At the same time, what we make of the fact that people with different moral worldviews are willing to acknowledge the weight of principles such as respect for autonomy or are capable of agreeing on an authoritative description of a difficult case depends on what we mean by “agreement” and, even more, on what significance we attach to consensus in particular contexts. That reflections on the state of contemporary bioethics so often either overestimate or underestimate the significance of such agreements argues for more substantive accounts of both moral agreement and moral disagreement than Engelhardt and others have given us. W.’s careful critique of various methods suggests as well an argument for context-specific methodology. Secular casuistry may be most appropriate in the clinical setting where a kind of narrative agreement is important, while principlism may be most appropriate for public policy debate where consensus on middle-level principles is all that is required.

Having argued that moral pluralism does not necessarily mean moral isolation, W. attempts in part 2 to identify the common ground in contemporary bioethics. Here he develops Engelhardt’s defense of proceduralism as a means of affirming the particular role of secular bioethics. He argues convincingly that it is a mistake to dismiss procedures (e.g., informed consent) as lacking moral content. Rather, we should see procedures as “moral practices that embody certain moral commitments” (163). Doing so leads bioethics in two fruitful directions: toward a critical examination of the moral assumptions underlying the procedural resolutions that have been so much a part of bioethics as a discipline, and toward the development of a methodology that attends adequately to the organizational and institutional settings for decision-making.

My suspicion is that theologically-minded readers will find part 2 of the book more interesting as well as more frustrating. W. offers a compelling and insightful argument for a substantive philosophy of method for bioethics and, in identifying the sphere of moral acquaintanceship, enriches the usual ways of mapping the geography of moral discourse. At the same time, many people, including many religious ethicists, will find W.’s defense of proceduralism unsettling. As valuable as it may be to locate the sphere where moral acquaintances can agree across communal boundaries, it is not obvious that proceduralism contains the capacity for self-critique, specifically, the resources to question the moral commitments that justify practices. Thus, it is not clear that proceduralism, as a secular morality, can take us beyond the individualistic and market-driven bioethics that has
increasingly come under attack. Moreover, although the category of acquaintance suggests a range of moral relationships, W. says little about what we should hope for in moral discourse. Are there any conditions under which, giving pluralism its due, we should hope to see moral acquaintances become moral friends?

Whatever one’s quarrels with W.’s conclusions, he has done a valuable service in bringing rigorous attention to questions of method. His book should be required reading for graduate courses in bioethics.

University of Notre Dame

MAURA A. RYAN


Peterson’s purpose is to connect ideas about nature and humanness with environmental ethics in an ecologically sound “ethical anthropology.” The book’s nine chapters explore human and nonhuman nature in a variety of religious traditions, philosophical positions, and scientific theories with emphasis on how they are related to ethics.

Following the introduction, the next two chapters examine the historical roots and manifestations of the Western ideology of human exceptionalism. P.’s analysis in chapter 2 leads her to conclude that traditional Christian and modernist narratives posit an unbridgeable gap between humans and other species, resulting in ecological destruction. Chapter 3 addresses social constructions of nature, noting the dangers associated with constructs that attribute to humans a special elevated status in the world.

Her negative appraisal of Western thought leads P. to search for correctives elsewhere. In chapter 4 she examines two Asian traditions, Buddhism and Taoism, focusing on their narratives’ tendency to define the human self in terms of multiple interdependencies. Chapter 5 turns to two Native American cultures, the Alaskan Koyukon and the southwestern American Navajo, giving attention to their conceptions of nature and the human, and to how their attachment to specific sacred places motivates them to protect nonhuman species.

Chapter 6 examines ecofeminist critiques of Western male-dominated philosophical and theological traditions and their tendency to locate nonhuman nature outside moral consideration, thereby creating narratives that justify human domination of nonhuman nature. Of particular interest is the feminist rejection of anthropocentrism and feminist advocacy of an ethic of care, which favors relationality and community over abstract moral principles. In chapter 7 the findings of evolutionary biology and ecology, which recognize the links between humans and other animal species, are drawn upon to provide a further challenge to the ideology of human exceptionalism.

In the final two chapters P. lays out her alternative to Western main-
stream anthropology and environmental ethics. The book’s major contribution is found in chapter 8, in P.’s proposal for a “chastened constructive anthropology” that attends to humans as natural and cultural, terrestrial, embodied, and relational (185). P. argues that, although traditional Christian anthropology has been deficient in its conception of these characteristics, Christian theology can still play a role in constructing an alternative ecologically sound anthropology. To this end, she draws on several theologians, including Philip Hefner, Sallie McFague, and Rosemary Radford Ruether. P. regards her own construction as “chastened” in that it calls for restraining oneself with humility and gratitude to live within limits (209), and for accepting these limits without resignation to inaction and failure (212). The final chapter offers ethical correlates to the ecological anthropology developed in the previous chapter. With the goal of outlining a type of ethic (and not arguing for a single ethical position), P. proposes a narrative-based ethic that builds on the insights of religious, feminist, and scientific understandings of the different ways of being human, of the differences between human and nonhuman nature, and of different conceptions of nonhuman nature.

Frustrating repetitions aside, the book has many strengths: it surveys a breadth of literature in the fields of theology, philosophy, comparative anthropology, ecofeminism, evolutionary biology, and environmental ethics, and provides a very helpful 16-page bibliography. It is evident that P. seeks a balanced treatment of the positions she surveys. For example, she points to what Westerners can learn from Asian and Native American religious narratives while also realistically acknowledging the problems entailed in trying to bring their perspectives to bear on Western narratives and ethical behaviors.

Because the book casts its net so widely, it has inevitable shortcomings. P. tends to treat the Christian tradition superficially and too quickly jumps to sweeping negative judgments. For example, although Thomas Aquinas’s theology does not feature strongly in the book, her critique of his thought ignores Thomas’s fundamental sacramental vision of the universe and his attention to the diversity and intrinsic goodness of creatures. In the Thomistic tradition, humanity may use other creatures for its own well-being, but humans may not treat other species wantonly with impunity. In one instance she attributes directly to Aquinas Paul Santmire’s interpretation of him (47).

The main shortcoming of this quite fine book is its final chapter that ends, not so much with a conclusion, as with the recognition that we live in a world of wounds and are connected to the wounded. This recognition leads P. to muse that the meaning of ethics may well lie in defending what we love against further wounding (239). This underdeveloped reflection leads me to conclude that we must await a further work from P. for a more thoroughly developed ethics that builds on her proposed ecological anthropology.

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Anne M. Clifford
Kirk-Duggan joins a growing chorus of theologians who invite readers to see the connection between the violence that pervades our culture and the Judeo-Christian tradition at its very foundation. Her contribution is distinctive in that she juxtaposes her commentaries on several biblical stories with the rehearsal of several Western film and opera “classics.” When placed in such proximity, these “texts” sometimes prove not only to be mutually illuminative, but shed light on the true nature of the violence that plagues us. As suggested by her analysis of The Night of the Hunter in which Robert Mitchum portrays a murderous preacher, any criticism of our contemporary culture of violence, to be effective, must include a critical reinterpretation of its religious underpinnings.

K.-D.’s loosely comparative approach proves most successful in her analysis of scapegoating. Citing lynching as a paradigmatic example of this form of violence, she uses René Girard’s theory of mimesis to illumine the deep roots of such cruel practices in certain portions of our biblical heritage (such as the story of the surrogate sacrifice and dismemberment of the Levite’s unnamed, secondary wife recounted in Judges 19) and in scripts deeply engrained in the West such as Puccini’s Madame Butterfly. Clarity about the cultural function of such violence enables K.-D. to shed much-needed light on contemporary hate-crimes. In the light of her commentaries on these texts, she offers a compelling analysis of both the crude manifestations of scapegoating and its more subtle expressions (as in a small town’s backlash to interracial dating).

K.-D. juxtaposes her rehearsal of the slaughter dramatically portrayed in Spielberg’s war epic, Saving Private Ryan, to the numbing death toll credited to wars of the 20th century. After highlighting in sweeping strokes where and how these 200 million people died, K.-D. explores what our contemporary killing fields might have in common with the Elijah/Jezebel sagas found in 1 and 2 Kings. Here I found her analysis thought-provoking but less fruitful. The link to religiously sanctified colonialism and holy wars of earlier eras can hardly be denied. Yet the religious roots of those realities are more complex and ambiguous than her account suggests, and the quantum leap in violence in the past century needs further explanation.

Lest the true context of violence remain disguised, K.-D. broadens the scope of her analysis. She connects this epoch’s staggering number of violent deaths and these intimate tales of torture and atrocity with many other forms of human brutality. For example, she assesses Seven Brides for Seven Brothers in the light of the ancient Roman tale of the “The Rape of the Sabine Women” and the biblical story of the rape of Dinah. In this (patriarchal) context, the sexist lyrics and plot of this musical suddenly seem far from the light family comedy its billing still suggests. Having made this connection with patriarchy, it is easy to see how marital rape and spousal abuse could go unrecognized as such for so long. The romanticization of
sexual violence has deep roots in lies told about gender in our sacred scriptures and elsewhere.

How these dangerous scripts resurface in fantasies nurtured in more recent expressions of pop culture (such as music videos) might have been more thoroughly addressed, but K.-D.’s good work succeeds at demonstrating that the violence inscribed in these roles is effectively obscured by the narratives themselves. A similar analysis of classism is developed in conjunction with commentaries on the parable of the unjust steward found in the Gospel of Luke and the film *Cry, the Beloved Country*. The complex ways racism and ethnocentrism intersect with sexism are examined in the light of K.-D.’s rereading of the biblical story of Samson and Delilah, and in her review of Spike Lee’s movie *Jungle Fever*.

Embedded as violence is in this matrix of gender, race, and class oppression, K.-D. argues that it will remain central to our way of life until we confess our complicity with these intersecting structures. Contemporary theological education, she concludes, must make room for a righteous rage against violence and those portions of our tradition, sacred and profane alike, wherein its roots are obscured.

Loyola University, Chicago

PATRICIA BEATTIE JUNG


This book shows why peers regard Charles Curran as the most important Catholic moral theologian working in the U.S. today. He is much esteemed for his ability to join critical theological analysis with sensitivity to urgent practical problems facing the Church. This volume brings C.’s theoretical and practical concerns to bear on the official social teachings that have been evolving in the Catholic community from Leo XIII’s *Rerum novarum* to the most recent writings of John Paul II. It also deals with some major documents of the U.S. Catholic bishops and places official teachings in the context of related discussions by theologians. The result is the single best analysis of the modern tradition of Catholic social teaching to be found in one place.

Part 1 addresses the theological, ethical, and ecclesiological methods that form the teachings. In the domain of theology, C. affirms that the post-Vatican II reemphasis on scriptural and Christological bases of the life of discipleship is central to Christian life in society. At the same time, he holds that reason and natural law must continue to play a role in bringing Christian social thought into active engagement with the non-Christian world. C. concludes that there is an “unresolvable tension” between the reason-based and revelation-based aspects of Catholic social thought. On the ethical level, a similar strain exists between the quest for universal norms and the desire to respect the differences among cultural and religious communities as they evolve through history. In the domain of ecclesiology, there
is tension between the desire to be a community that addresses the challenges of an increasingly interdependent globe and the need for the local church to become fully enculturated in its setting. These are only a few of the methodological matters C. discusses, but they indicate that he pays careful attention both to the strengths of the received tradition of Catholic social thought and to the problems it has yet to confront successfully. This book is, therefore, faithful to the tradition while at the same time offering critical assessments of where the tradition needs to change and develop. Such a combination of faithfulness and readiness to acknowledge the need for change has always been C.’s style. The present book suggests why it was no accident that the recent Festschrift in C.’s honor was entitled *A Call to Fidelity* (2002).

Part 2 turns to the content of the teachings on matters of anthropology, politics, and economics. Anthropologically, the tradition’s stress on the dignity of the human person has gradually opened it to learning from the liberal tradition about the importance of human rights and especially religious freedom. Appreciation of the strengths of liberalism reached its high point in the *Declaration on Religious Freedom* of Vatican II. At the same time, Catholic tradition strongly stresses the social nature of the person. This gives Catholic political and economic ethics a much stronger awareness than liberalism of the requirements of the common good in our increasingly interdependent world. C. presents careful arguments about the implications of this stress on the common good for understandings of private property, response to the needs of the poor, the meaning of justice, and the ideological split between Marxism and capitalism that divided the world throughout the Cold War era. Even today, however, a tension remains between the teaching’s recent appreciation for personal freedom and its stress on the common good. The tension shows up especially in conflicts over the role of the state in the enforcement of morality that are unresolved issues in the life of the Church in the U.S. and elsewhere today. C. shows where some of the difficulties in these conflicts come from and sheds light on where to seek resources to resolve them.

The book contains much more of value. Its goals of exposition and assessment of the principal elements of the modern tradition of Catholic social teaching are fully achieved. C. does not intend to make major proposals about changes that may be required by new circumstances. So one will not find discussion of how, for example, the tradition should develop in response to phenomena such as globalization and the changing role of the nation state. Nevertheless, this volume is likely to become a standard point of reference for scholars seeking a succinct presentation of the most important aspects of Catholic social teaching as well as a sympathetically critical assessment of its shortcomings. It will very likely remain for many years the best overview of the tradition of modern Catholic social thought through the early 21st century. All who want to appreciate that tradition’s strengths and limits should study this book with care.

*Boston College*  

**David Hollenbach, S.J.**
SHORTER NOTICES


This welcome addition to the SBAB series by one of Europe’s foremost specialists on Deuteronomy takes its place alongside two earlier volumes by Braulik: Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums (1988) and Studien zum Buch Deuteronomium (1997). Nine articles are arranged in two sections: five on Deuteronomy and four on texts in the Prophets and the Writings. These studies, all of which concern intertextual relations with Deuteronomy, continue B.’s preliminary work in preparation for a commentary on Deuteronomy, written in collaboration with Norbert Lohfink, in the Hermeneia Series. The first essay in each section concerns matters of general introduction (from Einleitung in das Alte Testament by E. Zenger, et al., 1998).

The article on “Das Buch Deuteronomium” (11–37) is a masterful summation of the content, structure, context, major problems, and relevance of Deuteronomy. The brief presentation of Deuteronomy as the “center of the Old Testament” and its role in shaping theology in the early Christian Church carries the discussion beyond that of other introductory essays. The articles on “Konservativ Reform” (39–57), “Durften auch Frauen in Israel opfern?” (59–89), “Von der Lust Israels vor seinem Gott” (91–112), and “Die Völkernichtung und die Rückkehr Israels ins Verheißungsland” (113–50) include discussion of social utopia in the Babylonian Exile, the role of women in pilgrimage practices and festal meals, and the spiritual transformation of “holy war” ideology.

The second half of the book begins with an article on the study of the Former Prophets in relation to Deuteronomy (“Die Theorien über das Deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk,” 153–69), which sets the stage for three studies: “Ezekiel und Deuteronomium” (171–201), “Gottes Ruhe—das Land oder der Tempel?” (203–11), and “Das Deuteronomium und die Bücher Job, Sprichwörter, Rut” (213–93). The latter is the longest article in the book, and perhaps the most important. It focuses on the “canonical process” and demonstrates the central role of Deuteronomy in shaping significant texts in the Writings of the Tanakh. The discussion of Job 24 and the book of Ruth, particularly in relation to the sevenfold groupings found also in Deuteronomy, raise profound questions about the canonical authority of Deuteronomy in shaping these later texts.

DUANE L. CHRISTENSEN
William Carey International University, Pasadena, Calif.


Clifton Black presents revised versions of seven articles that apply both ancient and contemporary models of rhetorical criticism to the Gospels and Acts. Written with both clarity and wit, this book provides an excellent introduction to the topic. Though B. emphasizes classical rhetorical categories in his examples, he provides readers with insights into the various methodologies that show up under the heading “rhetorical criticism” by applying them to a single passage, John 4. Contemporary literary treatments of character and narrative shed light on Matthew’s understanding of faith and on the brief appearances of John Mark in Acts as clues to Luke’s view of Paul’s mission to the Gentiles.

B. applies the categories of classical rhetoric to texts often described as early Christian sermons (e.g., Acts 13:13–41) as well as to discourse material in both Mark and John. Mark 13 is not a patchwork of apocalyptic oracles but a carefully crafted epideictic piece. John’s farewell discourses employ stylistic features the ancients attribute to the sublime. 1 John imitates the model set by
the Gospel. He admits that these pieces are not directly comparable to the example pieces we study in classes on Greco-Roman rhetoric, but insists that the traditions of formal rhetoric provide our best guide to their formal composition. Mark 13 seems the most problematic example to me. Throughout the book, B. takes care to show that rhetorical analysis can serve to elicit theological meaning from the biblical texts. It is not empty formalism. The final piece explores the meaning question with suggestive reflections on a “parabolic homiletic.”

In a rhetorical peroration B. reminds us that the Evangelists were not composing for the sake of something new in speech but because God’s Spirit was “radically re-creating their very selves” (154). Because the chapters are individual pieces, they provide excellent supplementary reading for courses in the Gospels, classical rhetoric, or humanities.

THE GOD OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Thompson provides a much-needed contribution to Johannine literature by moving beyond the predominantly Christological to a broader theological focus on what John tells us about God. She studies the roles of Jesus as the unique and comprehensive revelation of God in the world and of the Spirit in carrying on Jesus’ work, examining the relationship of both to the Father, whose identity and functions they manifest. She argues that both the Christology and the pneumatology of John are essentially theocentric.

It is from the Father that the Son comes to possess life in himself and to communicate that life to others, whether in the past by creation, in the present by faith and love, or in the future by Resurrection. The Son alone has seen and known God directly; others only indirectly in Jesus, whose every act is an act of God. Indeed, “the Son so fully embodies the Word, glory, and life of the Father that to see the Son is to see the Father” (114).

By indicating how many functions of the Spirit are also predicated of both Jesus and the Father, T. shows that for John the Spirit, like the Word, is both identified with and yet distinct from God. Indeed, John views the Spirit primarily as “the Father’s life-giving power that has been granted to and is conferred through the Son” with its functions being “directly related to the reception of new life, the forgiveness of sins, and testimony to Jesus” (186). T. concludes that the Spirit is neither to be simply identified with Jesus nor to replace him.

The relational and functional unity of the Son with the Father in the exercise of divine prerogatives leads to two results: first, to the recognition of God’s presence and activity in the person of the earthly Jesus; second, through the work of the Spirit, to the relocation of worship in the person of the risen Jesus. T. presents a persuasive case for the primacy of this theological over the more common Christological or historical focus in Johannine studies. In the process she provides a fresh and potentially fruitful path for appreciating the distinctive character and message of this Gospel.

J. WARREN HOLLERAN
St. Patrick’s Seminary, Menlo Park, Calif.

AQUINAS AND HIS ROLE IN THEOLOGY

Chenu occupies an impressive place in the history of 20th-century theology, especially on account of the adjustments that he introduced into the climate of French Thomism. This introductory essay on the life and thought of Thomas Aquinas first appeared in 1959, a few years before the convocation of the Second Vatican Council (1962–65). C. emerged from the conciliar period as something of a prophet, although when he first announced the themes for which he later was to become celebrated in some circles, his suggestions met with
measured resistance from theological authorities.

More than 40 years later, Paul Philibert provides a very readable translation of the book that C. considered the “best thing that I have written” (v). The eight short chapters supply an introduction to both Aquinas and his broad intellectual achievement. Each treats an aspect of Aquinas’s contribution to Christian thought illuminated by those historical circumstances that C. considers indispensable to achieve a proper comprehension of the Angelic Doctor’s genius. For example, the first chapter argues that one cannot understand what Aquinas is up to without taking into full account his wholehearted commitment to the Dominican vocation. C. completes each chapter with well-chosen excerpts from primary sources and very select secondary ones. It may reveal something about the limits of historical perspective that C. includes no excerpt from the biblical commentaries, although he amply documents the attention that Aquinas accorded the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius. Of course, specialists may debate (and even correct) details, and historians will recognize that other scholars, such as L.-B. Geiger and C. Fabro, anticipated the research that C. popularized. Still, the book’s importance may be found in the fact that much of what today is commonly held about Aquinas and his thought was advocated by C. in the 1950s and earlier.

This edition presents C.’s research with admirable pedagogical effectiveness, including images that should attract the attention of students meeting Aquinas for the first time. Those introduced to Aquinas and his world by C. will welcome the work of another French Dominican, Jean-Pierre Torrell: Saint Thomas Aquinas (2 vols.) (1996, 2003).

ROMANUS CESSARIO, O.P.
Saint John’s Seminary, Brighton, Mass.


After Luther died in 1546, there followed four centuries of polemical denigration of his person and facile dismissal of his teaching by Catholic historians and religious popularizers. But new currents began flowing in the middle third of the 20th century in studies appreciative of Luther. The present study relates this historical shift, but then investigates the magisterial reception of Catholic scholars’ new views of Luther.

After relating official views in the 16th century, a brief review of pre-Vatican II magisterial hostility to ecumenical initiatives introduces the significant shifts of the council. Within a communio ecclesiology, recognition is given to the ecclesial nature and saving role of the confessional bodies outside Catholic Christianity, bodies which cherish and actualize “elements of sanctification and truth” coming from Jesus and his Apostles. But Luther taught the truth of human sin and stressed Christ’s redemption which enters lives by faith and the Gospel, and he inculcated lived religiosity centered on Word and sacrament. Thus J. Willebrands spoke respectfully of Luther in 1970 (Lutheran World Federation, Evian, France) and in 1983 (Leipzig), followed by John Paul II in 1983 (Letter to Willebrands, fifth centenary of Luther’s birth), in 1989 (discourses in Scandinavia), and 1996 (third visit to Germany). Bilateral reviews of the Tridentine anathemas opened the way for the Lutheran-Catholic 1999 Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification.

S. does not treat the doctrine of the 1999 Declaration, which is unfortunate, because it offers both an insightful reception of Trent and significant perceptions of Luther. S. calls Trent “scholastic,” whereas on justification, Trent’s Scholastic analysis consolidates consensus with Luther by excluding any human causation of justification. S. states that Catholic magisterial appreciation rests on the Reformer’s biblical spirituality, liturgical awareness, and evangelical catechesis (149). But the book does not tell of these traits in Luther’s work, leaving the reader to search for studies highlighting Luther’s contributions in these areas. S. handles well the story.
This clear and thorough study of Gott- hold Ephraim Lessing (1729–81) ap- proaches him as a theologian, that is, as a thinker conscientiously coming to grips with his inherited Christianity in the face of the Enlightenment of his own time. Toshimasa Yasukata demonstrates how Lessing rejected the irra- tionality of contemporary Lutheran theolo- gians as well as that of enlight- ened philosophers.

Lessing’s project was to develop revealed truths into truths of reason. Y. carefully analyzes Lessing’s “sensa- tional proposition” (96) that revelation gives to man nothing that he could not also get from within himself if he only made sufficient use of his intellect. Lessing emphasizes the “inner truth” of the Christian religion, which is more a matter of the heart (“inwardly felt”) than of the mind. With such thoughts Lessing’s famous dictum that “accidental truths of history can never become the proof for necessary truths of reason” (9) in a time of such great challenge to traditional religious thought? Von Hügel lived in times of historical and her- meneutical crisis and did not back away. Rather, he experienced these times as enriching to thought and remained as faithful a Catholic as ever, if not more so. H. sees von Hügel as a model for living successfully in the Church in times such as our own.

A coherent picture for a believer requires some acceptance of Christ as the Word of God mediated through the Church to us humans with all our flaws. H. seeks in von Hügel a key to a healthy, contemporary stance in faith that will yield an honest view of Christ, Church, and ourselves. He finds this honest view of all three gathered around the reality of the Church: The Church “is where God (in the world) meets Christ (in the Christian community)” (71).

Rather than finding the challenges of history, science, and philosophy de-structive of faith, von Hügel found them to be the necessary, good, and “costing” vehicles to purer, more lively faith. Not to be avoided or shunned, these seem-
ing obstacles to our stability or complacency are divinely-ordained ways for humans to grow into maturity. The tension of the mystical, intellectual, and institutional elements of religion, all essential to health and completeness, is natural and beneficial. Avoidance only causes distortion in what can be stimulating to growth and vitality.

H. clearly and convincingly outlines an ecclesiology for our times from the thought of Baron von Hügel. In an accessible and inviting style, he successfully and frequently connects von Hügel’s thought with the ideas of theologians of the later 20th century. The book, with a bibliography and a good index, presents a fresh and contemporary perspective for newcomers to von Hügel as well as for those more familiar with the Baron’s depth and spirituality. A more synthetic summary following the careful and interesting analyses would have rounded off my satisfaction.

JOHN A. MCGRATH, S.M.
Dayton University


Filling in a significant gap in contemporary scholarship, Marlett examines the anti-urban and romanticized theology of Catholic agrarianism, its intersection with similar movements in the Protestant and Jewish communities, its numerous practical manifestations and failures in homesteads and Catholic Worker farms, and its innovative evangelizing expressions in “motor missions” and street preaching. The timeframe moves from the Protestant precursors of agrarianism in the early 20th century, through the formation and development of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference (1923), to the decline of the organization in the late 1950s.

M. makes a significant contribution to our understanding of Catholic identity as it evolved in rural America and presaged environmental, ecumenical, liturgical, and conservative political developments in the post-conciliar Church. Tied to an ideology of Catholic Action and the agricultural world of the Great Depression, this brand of agrarianism lost its social force after World War II under the impact of technological developments, the growth of agribusiness, and the Catholic appropriation of values associated with the 1950s “culture of abundance.”

Sprinkled throughout the work are insightful but very undeveloped indicators of the intersection between broader Catholic trends and American culture that would explode in the 1960s: the increasing split between an institutional rhetoric of domesticity and self-denial and the modernized identity experienced by the populace; and the emergence of a political vision anticipated in agrarianism and forming a partial base for the ascendant conservative values of the Sun Belt. The study could also be strengthened through a broader discussion of developments in the Catholic community in the 1950s and a consideration of the relationship between this agrarian evangelizing model and the considerable influence of Bishop Edwin V. O’Hara on re-framing currents in the preconciliar Church. M. has written an important work that opens up numerous avenues of new research for the historian of American Catholicism.

JOSEPH P. CHINNICI, O.F.M.
Franciscan School of Theology, Berkeley


Though much has been written about Loisy, he has remained an elusive figure, giving rise to diverse interpretations. Harvey Hill has succeeded in breaking new ground in this study, in which he insightfully sets forth issues underlying Loisy’s writings, and tests his judgments against the secondary literature. In examining “the opposition . . . between the modern spirit and religions of authority” (3), H. highlights the importance of Loisy’s earlier intellectual
formation for approaching his mature modernist works. Also important for this understanding is H.’s reliance on unpublished works, which figure prominently in the analysis. More than previous scholars H. clarifies the extent of Loisy’s political interests. This emphasis serves to contextualize Loisy’s reform agenda in relation to “developments in France and in the French Church more than as part of an international modernist movement” (10).

H. interprets Loisy’s development from the early 1880s to his excommunication in 1908 as developing along a trajectory that traces Loisy’s view of the “religious problem” and its “solution” (5). The issues that engaged him throughout his career included intellectual, moral, and political autonomy—collectively bearing on matters of authority, ecclesial and secular. The book’s earlier chapters foreground Loisy’s early intellectual concerns, while his moral and political concerns—fueled by events of the period—dominate the later chapters.

H.’s ability to combine narrative and analysis is impressive and productive of real insight. I highly recommend this well-written and well-presented study to all who have an interest in Loisy or in the modernist movement, as well as to those concerned with the more general thematic issues treated. Even those who may ultimately not follow H. in his portrait of Loisy will find much profit in perusing it.

C. J. T. TALAR
University of St. Thomas, Houston


Bell asserts that Christian faith is antithetical to capitalism because of a clash of “technologies of desire” (e.g., assemblies of persons, institutions, systems of judgment, and practices that shape desire). Capitalism’s technologies of desire engineer the human heart to be acquisitive, consumerist, and competitive. In contrast, Christian faith’s technologies transform desire through God’s gift of forgiveness mediated by suffering, worship, prayer, and repentance within a community of believers. B. uses the language and analysis of postmodern critical theorists Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault to present his case against capitalism as a destructive force. Then using liberation theology as background, he finds it inadequate in countering capitalism, largely because liberationists employ standards of distributive justice and rights easily co-opted by capitalists. B.’s fundamental claim is that not justice but forgiveness transforms desire and dissipates capitalism’s power over people.

Although critical of liberationists, B. supports the kind of Christian communities upon which liberation theologians reflect. Guided by these same theologians (J. Comblin, J. Sobrino, E. Tamez), B. highlights the desirable qualities of the forgiving Christian communities he wishes to model.

This is an important but controversial book that will generate debate between liberation theologians and their critics. B. uses postmodern critical theorists well to analyze capitalism’s ontological problems; however, he would make a clearer case if he were to relate his assertions about the ontological problems of capitalism to economic laws and practice. For example, would economists grasp what he presents? While his overview of Catholic social teaching is solid, his claim that liberation theologians have bought into the same type of justice requires more evidence. It seems contradictory that B. criticizes the liberationists’ emphasis on justice and rights that lack the gifts of mercy and forgiveness and then calls upon the same liberationists to interpret how the “crucified communities” embody the very forgiveness that B. finds laudable. In short, B.’s stance toward liberation theology is ambiguous and at times confusing.

THOMAS L. SCHUEBECK, S.J.
John Carroll University, Cleveland

The stated intent of Crockett’s study is “to read Kantian critical philosophy as theology” (3). The theological optic for such reading is Tillich’s notion of “ultimate concern,” radicalized in terms of American “death of God” theology. Heidegger, Derrida, Deleuze, Lyotard, and Vattimo are key philosophical interlocutors for C.’s engagement with a range of texts drawn principally from the First and the Third Critiques, that bear upon Kant’s articulation of a notion of the sublime. C. also addresses claims that Milbank and other proponents of Radical Orthodoxy make about the Kantian sublime as a central token of the modernity from which God is absent. C. agrees that the sublime is central to the project of modernity but argues that Milbank “recoils from the theological implications of this insight” (28) which, on C.’s reading of Kant, places the radically decentering power of imagination at the core of subjectivity.

The adequacy of C.’s philosophical analysis of Kant turns on the plausibility of efforts to exploit aporias in Kant’s texts in service of a postmodern fissuring of subjectivity. C.’s use of these efforts signals the importance of Kant’s work as a locus for identifying inner tensions in the projects of both modernity and postmodernity, but does not yield much that is useful for discerning the actual lineaments of Kant’s critical philosophy. Even more problematic is C.’s theological proposal, which takes it as given that “traditional” theology—i.e., one grounded upon the faith of the Church—has been rendered irrelevant, if not impossible, by contemporary intellectual culture. C. acknowledges that his alternative—“the most negative of negative theologies” (112), emergent upon a fractured subjectivity of imagination and desire that overthrows all boundedness and yields only and at most an immanent God—bears the stamp of Feuerbach and Freud. He concludes, with Lacan: “God is (the) unconscious” (111).

Philip Rossi, S. J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee


This revision of Miguel Díaz’s dissertation convincingly argues that a dialog between emerging U.S. Hispanic theologies and the theological vision of Karl Rahner can enrich both perspectives. Beginning with an overview of contemporary U.S. Hispanic theology, D. highlights points of convergence and diversity within U.S. Hispanic thought to illustrate its diversity. This overview allows him to characterize U.S. Hispanic self-understanding and experience in general terms without falling into a reductionistic essentialism.

Two themes consistently emerge in D.’s development of U.S. Hispanic theological sensibilities: (1) attention to the role of the particular cultural matrix in shaping the self-understanding of the individual person before God, and (2) the awareness permeating U.S. Hispanic culture that local, particular realities in general and the distinctive religious practices shaping that culture in particular are sacramentally charged. They are vehicles of grace.

These themes, finely elaborated in chapters 1-3, set the stage for the exposition of Rahner’s theological anthropology in chapter 4, where D. attends to how the essentialistic, transcendental anthropology of Rahner’s earlier years evolved in his postconciliar writings, as he gave greater attention to the particularity of human experience. This observation lends greater weight to D.’s thesis that Rahner’s theology can enter into fruitful dialog with emerging contextual theologies, thereby paving the way for the “conversation” presented in the fifth and final chapter. There D. demonstrates the thesis presented in his introduction that U.S. Hispanic theologies can find “further grounding in the Catholic tradition” (xiv) by drawing on Rahner’s transcendental anthropology and theology of grace, and that Rahner’s transcendental anthropology acquires breadth, particularity, and concreteness when read through the lens of U.S. Hispanic experience.

Regrettably, this fine work suffers from multiple editorial oversights. The
erroneous statement that the *nouvelle théologie* flourished in the 1840s and 1850s (88, n. 46), numerous misspellings, and grammatical irregularities unnecessarily diminish the positive impression the book should make. One can only hope that D.’s future work, which promises to be creative and fruitful for both U.S. Hispanic theology and theology generally, will receive more careful editorial attention.

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


Modern theology since Schleiermacher has been founded in the presumption of a universal human experience or subjectivity wherein language communicates but does not constitute such experience. Postmodern thought rejects this foundation in its claim that experience is a result of the constructive role of language. The postmodern turn to constructive linguistic pluralism, the other, and the different entails a rejection of the modern turn to the subject. Kelly distinguishes moderate postmodernism from deconstruction or strong postmodernism, as he seeks critically to accept the constructive role of language in theology while denying that experience is solely a linguistic construct.

K. begins with the father of modern theology, Schleiermacher, whose project illustrates the basis of the postmodern critique with its focus on a universally accessible experience of God, an experience prior to language but expressed in language, and its understanding of theology as essentially expressive and apologetical of this universal truth claim. He then considers Wayne Proudfoot’s work on religious experience which exemplifies a use of postmodern thought against Schleiermacher with its thesis that an experience of God is the projection of presupposed beliefs. K. then turns to the work of Lindbeck for a theological critique of Schleiermacher and similar understandings of experience and language. Moving toward his conclusion, K. presents George Steiner’s *Real Presences* (1989) as witnessing to a mutuality between experience and language, while he rejects Steiner’s theological functionalism wherein God is the guarantor of a correspondence between language and reality.

Finally, K. turns to Karl Rahner’s theology of Mystery—God as always incomprehensible and ineffable. This Mystery is both Whence and Whither of human graced a priori transcendentality, but language is the a posteriori that really opens up our transcendentality; language clarifies experience while original experience of God and self in God clarifies language—thus, the relationship between experience and language is dialectical. Like other authors (e.g., Fergus Kerr and Karen Kilby), K. finds Rahner a superb illustration of moderate postmodernism.

K.’s book is a timely contribution to a central issue in contemporary fundamental theology.

**MICHAEL J. SCANLON**
Villanova University, Villanova, Penn.


Gaian theory is used here to describe the interrelatedness of everything in a coevolutionary narrative. Primavesi presents a bold synthesis that brings out the breadth and freshness a consistently evolutionary perspective provides, a perspective she names in metaphors for the various processes of life and thought that appear throughout the multidynamic world and our pluralistic experience of it. She seeks a language that can integrate theological and scientific perspectives and be “accessible to the largest possible number of people” (xiii). These are the two central themes of the book—integrating science and religion around coevolutionary, ecofeminist themes and suggesting a particular way of doing so. P.’s summary of the power and span of such a perspective is impressive; she uses evolutionary ideas to make clear the great promise they
hold for a future integration of knowledge and experience.

On the other hand, her metaphorical approach seems vague. It says little about some of the hard questions suggested by her method. Emphasis on our coevolution with and complete integration into the universe seems to devalue (without explanation) ideas the old language seeks to protect—consciousness, selfhood, and freedom, for example.

The book’s second half brings out some of the moral and religious values of P.’s holistic perspective. She is rightly sensitive to how the concept “God” (or Jesus) is used within different systems of thought to accomplish different purposes, often to the detriment of the powerless and to the nonhuman world. Her statements of newer theological themes—contingency and freedom, self-emptying love, life as gift—are perceptive and strong. But though she talks of a theological perspective or of “Christian theology,” she speaks as an outsider to any established tradition. Her overall stance is often critical rather than prophetic. Generalizations like “coming to see our species . . . as still evolving, as mutable, deeply disturbs Christian consciousness” (44) are common. Her synthesis makes scant reference to Christian theologians with similar interests. Despite the book’s real power, its intended integrative perspective turns out to be rather unfriendly to the Christian tradition.

ANTHONY BATTAGLIA
California State University Long Beach


Thatcher, professor of theology at the College of St. Mark and St. John in Plymouth, England, uses extensive research to support his overarching argument that betrothal should be ritualized within the Church and considered the beginning of marriage. T. meticulously examines the biblical and historical roots of betrothal to show that there are strong grounds supporting the formalization of the betrothal period as part of the marriage process. He compares betrothal to the “catechumenate,” a period of instruction during which individuals learn the skills necessary to be fully initiated as members of the Church.

T. attempts to objectively address the physical and emotional aspects of contemporary betrothal practices, specifically premarital cohabitation and intimacy, while upholding Christian teachings on marriage. With regard to couples’ physical intimacy during betrothal, he tries to reconcile the tension between the reality of couples’ experiences in contemporary Western society and the tradition that sexual intimacy should be reserved for marriage only. Although he disapproves of cohabitation that does not have marriage as its object, he views cohabitation after betrothal as acceptable.

As to the emotional and relational issues of betrothal, T. argues that betrothal is the beginning of the marriage commitment, but he recognizes that, as couples learn what is necessary to keep their relationship alive, they may realize that the relationship should be severed. He expresses reluctant approval for allowing the termination of a betrothal within the religious construct. Betrothal, therefore, becomes a period of provisional commitment: T. refers to it as a liminal stage. The central question remains, and is still ambiguous: whether such a threshold stage to marriage can carry the weight of a sacramental reality of marriage.

T. concludes the book by describing how the “betrothal solution” might also be extended to divorced or widowed individuals who are again considering marriage, and to gay and lesbian partners.

This well-researched and creative work offers much for serious thought about updating Christian sexual ethics. The numerous historical references to betrothal, however, may seem tedious. What the book captures that is of great importance is the need to view marriage as a process rather than as a single event.

MARILYN MARTONE
St. John’s University, Jamaica, N.Y.

Murphy defends a “naturalist, objectivist, cognitivist, welfarist, anti-particularist, anti-consequentialist” (5) natural law theory. Dissatisfied with traditional inclinationist and derivationist accounts of natural law, he proposes an alternative “real identity thesis” that establishes the reality of human flourishing and the ability of practical reason to understand specific goods conducive to human flourishing. He then discusses nine basic goods—life, knowledge, aesthetic experience, excellence in play and work, excellence in agency, inner peace, friendship and community, religion, and happiness—the pursuit of which provides a justifiable reason for action. In the latter half of the book, he identifies principles of practical reasonableness that regulate the pursuit of basic goods, and shows how his theory offers a comparative advantage over egoism, consequentialism, Kantianism, and virtue ethics on certain critical points.

The book is a creative contribution to the contemporary discussion of natural law, although it will be accessible only to specialists in ethical theory. M. develops his ideas thoroughly, treats his critics fairly, and presents a well-argued, highly sophisticated case for his version of natural law. Some of M.’s positions are highly controversial, including the degree of egoism consistent with his natural law theory, his endorsement of a strong incommensurability thesis that precludes any hierarchical ordering of the basic goods, and the irrelevance of negative indirect consequences caused by actions intended to realize the basic goods. The book should generate considerable discussion in philosophical circles, but I suspect that it will be less appealing to moral theologians, since it overlooks much of the recent discussion of natural law in theological circles.

MARK GRAHAM
Villanova University, Villanova, Penn.


Budde and Brimlow, two Roman Catholic laymen, complain about the problem of Christianity Incorporated—“a church that has bent to capitalism and economic power so long that its own practices and beliefs become shaped by the corporate form and spirit” (24). The book offers far-reaching criticisms of the extent to which Christianity has been co-opted to support the inherently exploitive and violent status quo of the new multinational capitalism. The authors see themselves in stark disagreement with John Paul II (especially in Centesimus Annus) and the peace he has made with liberal institutions and practices. They see all this colorfully as a sort of “cross dressing” in which the Church wears the suits of Armani instead of the armor of Christ.

The book does point out the real dangers of using the gospel in a crass way for profit and other unworthy secular ends. It also points out the daily trivialization that the gospel can suffer from excessive compromise with the powers that be. The “corporatization” of Christian funerals is one interesting example of the practical loss of distinctively Christian values. Strong and thought-provoking criticisms make the book worth reading.

At the same time, the book does not help one to see how actually to apply the gospel in the present situation. The criticism of the major statements by the churches on economics is disturbingly brash. The “Woodstock Business Conference” is also criticized in practice and in principle as merely reformist. I cannot help but think that something might be learned from more moderate approaches that, I believe, do mediate the gospel to the current situation. Furthermore, many readers will see the book’s final chapter on how to apply the Sermon on the Mount to a Christian economics as naïve on several levels and of little guidance to the Christian in the world.
The authors maintain a web site: www.ekklesiaproject.org.

RICHARD C. BAYER
New York, N.Y.


Scarcely a branch of our constitutional law displays a greater disarray in scholarly interpretations and judicial decisions than that which concerns the First Amendment. Curry’s study cuts through the maze of the complicated and convoluted arguments and brings into the debate a surprising conceptual clarity that ought to lead to sensible practicality.

On the basis of a historical critical inquiry, C. concludes that the First Amendment “contains one single clause with regard to religion, the ‘Free Exercise’ and ‘No Establishment’ provisions [that together] . . . combine to serve the single unitary purpose of depriving government of power in religious affairs” (71). The intent of the framers was not to create a new right but to protect an existing inalienable right from all government interference. While they were inspired by Protestant theology with its high regard for freedom of conscience, it is interesting that Vatican Council II arrived at a similar stance grounded in the conviction that the search for salvation ought to be free and that no secular authority is capable of discerning the truth of faith.

The abandonment of the idea of a “confessional state,” however, need not lead to the building of a rigid “wall of separation”—which is the product of a casuistry driven by abstract logic with little regard for history and common sense. Church and state ought to work together in harmony for the common benefit of their subjects, while each institution must follow its own specific and distinct mission.

In the midst of disarray, C. provides a powerful opening for a renewed public debate. The academy should be the first to take up the challenge, and then “may it please the Courts” to follow.

LADISLAS ORSY, S.J
Georgetown University Law Center, Washington


The late Wilfred Cantwell Smith, one of the greatest historians of religion in the 20th century, suggested that Christians of a Calvinistic background (like himself) were connaturally disposed to understand the religious traditions of Islam. Both Calvinist Christianity and Sunni Islam emphasize predestination in their theological and political thought. While this generalization may apply to Calvinist Christianity and Sunni Islam, Bill and Williams propose that Roman Catholics might be better able than Calvinists to understand Shi’i Muslims. The latter, heavily concentrated in countries near the Persian Gulf, constitute the largest minority tradition of Islam, accounting today for approximately 140 million of the world’s more than one billion Muslims.

B. and W., respectively a political scientist and a historian of religion, bring considerable expertise to the study of mainline Twelver Shi’s, that is, those who trace twelve successors to Muhammad in the legitimate rule of the Muslim community. They have also supplemented their familiarity with their own Catholic tradition by consulting specialists in areas like natural law theory, popular piety, and liberation theology. The Shi’i see the death of Husayn (A.D. 680), the grandson of Muhammad, as redemptive of the past infidelities of the Muslim community, and compare this interpretation with the New Testament’s presentation of Jesus’ death as expiation for the sins of humankind. They see parallels as well between the extravagance of the Shi’i annual mourning for Husayn and the practice of penitential processions and self-flagellation on Good Friday in certain countries of Christian Spanish heritage.
Even more significant are the comparisons that B. and W. make between the authoritarianism of the Shi‘i tradition, especially in contemporary Iran, and the centralizing papalism of the Roman Catholic tradition. Significantly, however, the authors admit that facile comparisons between Pope John Paul II and the late Ayatollah Khomenei fall short: “Centralized papal control cannot begin to match the power of the Shi‘i faqih” (137).

PATRICK J. RYAN, S.J.
Loyola Jesuit College, Abuja, Nigeria


This study situates George Eliot’s early novels within the 19th-century debates on the historicity of the Gospels and the significance of systematic theology. Keuss argues that Eliot dismissed both the attenuated version of Christ in Higher Criticism (Bauer, Strauss, Renan) and the systematic Christology of philosophical theologians (Kant, Hegel). Seeking instead a way to retrieve the emotional and imaginative impact of “the beautiful story” of the Gospels, she created, through the “true fiction” of her novels, scenes, characters, and symbols analogous to the person of Christ and his ethical message. Her purpose was not to affirm a theological interpretation of Jesus Christ but to engage the reader through the imagination to search for ultimate meanings and to lead an ethical life of love. K. calls this novelistic purpose a “poetics” of Jesus, who is “the ultimate nexus of subject and sacred in place and temporality” (197).

In each of Eliot’s first three novels, Scenes from a Clerical Life, Adam Bede, and The Mill on the Floss, K. finds a progressive attempt to “figure” or re-embody Jesus in the female main characters. As K. sums up his thesis: “I argue that Eliot as an ‘unhappy lover’ of the theology of her time, still found a compelling drive to re-tell through her poetics something more akin to Gospel as showing forth Jesus and telling this simple story in both content and form of her fiction” (201).

As a sequel to the five biographies of Eliot since 1990, this critical study both intrigues and baffles the literary critic. Unlike Hodgson’s The Theology of George Eliot (2000), which argues for a sort of pantheistic theology in Eliot, K.’s work both agrees with her biographers that Eliot lost all belief in doctrinal Christianity on the intellectual level, but dissents from other critics by claiming she retained a “poetics” that retrieved Christ as both an ethical ideal and a divine/human being on the imaginative level. Unfortunately, K. tries to include theological history and post-structuralist literary theory of “writing” that overbalances the much too brief analysis of the three novels. The study would have benefited by beginning with the chapter on “Victorian Poetics and (Re) Writing Jesus,” in which novels by Froude, Pater, and Ward are examined as failures to provide what Eliot created—a modern novelistic embodiment of characters analogous to Christ.

DAVID J. LEIGH, S. J.
Seattle University


In this intricately woven text, Saroglou, professor of psychology of religion at the Catholic University of Louvain, offers an integrative approach toward understanding the structure of several psychological dynamics involved in spiritual relationships. In developing a clinical anthropology of monastic spiritual mentorship, he examines the function and structure of the relationship between the monk and his spiritual father and highlights its paternity. As a principal pathway into the analysis, he relies on the wisdom of John Climacus, who composed the earliest texts on the subject: Letter to the Shepherd and The Ladder of Divine Ascent. S. supplies his text with ample psychoanalytic perspec-
tives, among them Lacan’s theory of paternity. Using such perspectives, he argues that, while the monastic community and the Church as a body serve a maternal structuring function for the individual monk, his spiritual mentor serves a paternal function.

Without slighting Freud’s psychogenetic approach to the role of father, S. finds greater value in Lacan’s three logical orders of father: the symbolic, the imaginary, and the real. Through such a schemata, S. explores the psychodynamics within the monk as well as the paternity function and structure provided by the spiritual father for the monk. He goes on to weave into his text the categories offered by other European writers such as Patrice De Neuter, Jean Gagnepain, Daniele Hervieu-Leger and Antoine Vergote, placing special emphasis on the latter’s understanding of the orality of mystical desire. Finally, he examines the significance of the symbolic law of filiation within the context of a monk’s spiritual development.

In his intertwining of seemingly disparate concepts, S.’s style becomes at times esoteric, and the back-and-forth movement between psychoanalytic theory and spirituality taxes one’s attention. Nevertheless, the careful reader may find that S., by employing psychoanalytical theory to interpret Climacus’s ancient insights into monastic paternity, enhances our contemporary understanding of spiritual direction, monastic and otherwise.

C. KEVIN GILLESPIE, S.J.
Loyola College in Maryland


Even most basic bibliographical details concerning this volume reveal why this book is so at odds with much current scholarship on Flannery O’Connor. It is, after all, a book written by a Catholic priest and theologian at a Catholic university, and is published by a major Catholic press. Read alongside other significant works recently published on O’Connor’s work that “explain” her Catholicism as something to be overcome, Kilcourse’s book is swimming determinedly upstream.

K. interestingly attempts to locate O’Connor in the “modern Catholic contemplative” tradition of Thomas Merton (6). He promises “new readings of familiar stories,” and frequently delivers, but because his range ambitiously covers all of O’Connor’s published stories and novels, his treatments are often too scant and unbalanced. On the other hand, this book attempts something novel, in that it situates O’Connor’s artistic imagination in a specifically Catholic theological context.

This latter aim constitutes a real achievement of the book, insofar as K. gives us a much-needed and very helpful reading of some of O’Connor’s direct theological influences, with close attention in chapter 3 to Romano Guardini and William F. Lynch, S.J. K. thus makes a strong claim for a deliberately theological reading of O’Connor’s work, and the book’s success lies in its ability to substantiate the claim that her imagination is determined by the peculiarity of her Middle Georgia Catholicism—although the accent here is much more on Catholicism than on Middle Georgia.

Finally, and perhaps most significantly, K.’s study is not so much theological literary criticism as pastoral theology. The real interest of the book lies predominately in the homiletical and catechetical wisdom of O’Connor’s fiction, a fact that, one suspects, will unfortunately give some O’Connor scholars an excuse not to read it. However, K.’s intended audience is not primarily academic. Thus he claims hopefully at the outset that the “genius of O’Connor’s Catholic imagination awaits only the discovery by gifted pastoral ministers and theologians” (13). This volume is as good an introduction and aid to that end as one could hope.

PETER CANDLER
Peterhouse, University of Cambridge

Huchingson’s theology of “divine information” draws on modern systems theory, cybernetics, and information theory to construct a model of divine creation. The term Pandemonium Tremendum refers to the field of infinite chaos upon which God continuously draws through decisive acts of divine self-communication to bring about the patterns of harmony and intelligence that constitute the cosmos. Information theory understands communication as the narrowing down of a variety of possibilities into some specific meaning. The variety of unrealized possibilities is thus the condition for the possibility of any information that is actually communicated. H. understands God both as chaos (the infinite field of possibilities) and the process of communication by means of which cosmos arises from chaos. The act of creative communication thus constitutes God’s own being as the Janus-like correspondent or mediation between the field of potential chaos and the actuality of the world. God furnishes the plurality of determinative contexts for creation, and also the chaotic potential without which there would be no freedom. This providential creativity is thus understood as a continuous cybernetic optimization of harmony and freedom.

Chapters 1 to 4 offer a readable introduction to the aspects of cosmology, metaphysical theology, and communications theory relevant to the task. The book’s second half constructs the theological model from the macrocosmic level of Pandemonium Tremendum down to the microcosmic level of human life. The task H. faces is in working out the analogy from information theory in reference to the established models of creativity and creation. He rests, finally, on the irreducibly duplex character of God as both primordial chaos and emergent creativity, a position that process theologians and defenders of creatio ex nihilo will doubtless wish to debate. Even if readers disagree with the logic of H.’s final position, the process of applying information theory to cosmology produces stimulating insights that make this book well worth reading.

JAMES MILLER
Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada


In this collection of eleven essays, Thomas McPartland explores Bernard Lonergan’s contribution to the philosophy of history. M. highlights two elements of Lonergan’s “foundational worldview”: his experientially verifiable account of consciousness, which reveals (authentic) subjectivity to be not an impediment to objectivity, but rather the sole means of attaining it; and his view of history as a dialectic of progress and decline grounded in, respectively, communal fidelity and infidelity to the transcultural norms of human performance that reside in the dynamism of consciousness itself. Together these elements provide a propaedeutic to an evaluative, nonutopian, nongnostic, nonreductionist philosophy of history uniquely capable of navigating “between the frozen shores of classicism and the turbulent chaos of historicism” (109). For Lonergan, the ultimate aim of such a philosophy is practical and political, namely, assisting humanity to understand its past and to assume greater responsibility for its future.

Among the more rewarding essays are the final two, in which M. discusses substantive affinities between Lonergan’s work and that of Eric Voegelin. Both scholars locate the foundations of philosophy in the concrete process of inquiry. Both regard human consciousness as radically open to being and as operating under the influence of a divine pull. Both pursue a reoriented philosophy as a way of addressing a cultural crisis brought on by ideological deformations of consciousness. Though they travel by different routes—Lonergan via cognitional theory and Voegelin via the history of symbols—they arrive at very similar positions. In M.’s estimation, any future philosophy of history must build on these two thinkers’ achievements.

This study has one obvious weakness: Lonergan’s cognitional theory, on which M.’s entire case hangs, is presented in such a condensed and abstract
fashion that readers not already familiar with Lonergan’s work may be left puzzled and unpersuaded. But M. succeeds in serving up a trenchant critique of modern and postmodern philosophies (his analysis of the erroneous and pervasive “confrontation theory of truth,” according to which objectivity involves the unobstructed perception of an object by a subject, is particularly illuminating), and he offers numerous insights into a promising alternative.

J. Michael Stebbins
Gonzaga University, Spokane


This book does a valuable service by clearing up some long-standing confusions on the question whether “exists” is a meaningful predicate. It is well known that most analytic philosophers, following Russell, Frege, Quine, etc., have rejected Thomas Aquinas’s entire metaphysical doctrine of the real distinction between essence and existence in all finite beings, and his doctrine of the nature of God as pure Subsistent Existence, as meaningless from the start, because “exists” by itself can never be a real predicate as applied to individuals; it is either an incomplete statement or a pure tautology.

Barry Miller, well acquainted himself with analytic philosophy, shows cogently that all such objections are based on flawed presuppositions, such as that all real predicates signify a property that inheres in a pre-existing subject, which cannot be true of “exists.” “Socrates exists” signifies rather that Socrates is a “bounded” instance of existence.

The second key objection that M. refutes is that “exists” must be the thinnest or emptiest of all predicates, signifying only a minimum property applying equally to everything real from quark to Creator. The contrary view of Aquinas, that “exists” is implicitly the richest of all predicates, the positive core and ground of all real perfections, thus admitting of endless degrees of intensity, and that the nature of God himself is pure unlimited Subsistent Act of Existence, is said to be a meaningless set of propositions.

M. ingeniously shows how the predicate “exists” does not signify merely a minimum level of being; it also signifies that by which all the other real properties of anything are constituted as real, and hence already enfolds within itself all the positivity of all the real perfections of every real being, thus leaving open the possibility of an upper “limit case” of pure, unbounded existence transcending all the limited instances beneath it. The aim of M.’s work, however, goes no further than a clarification of concepts; it does not include a proof that such an unbounded “Fullness of Being” actually exists as the ultimate cause of all the limited stances of existence, without which the analogous character of “being” cannot be adequately grounded.

W. Norris Clarke, S.J.
Fordham University, New York
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