BOOK REVIEWS


The articles collected here represent contributions from prominent scholars, mostly German, to an international symposium held in May 2001 at the University of Tübingen’s Institute for Ancient Judaism and Hellenistic History of Religion. The individual studies offer a variety of approaches, from detailed exegetical treatments of specific texts, to surveys of the religio-historical trajectories of certain themes and figures, to more theoretical discussions pertaining to methodology.

Following the structure of the symposium, the contributions are grouped under several headings. The introductory chapter features two nonexegetical articles. The first uses a history-of-ideas perspective from Hesiod to Heinrich Heine, to discuss the relation between monotheistic worldviews and the competing “world full of gods” that monotheisms seek to replace. The second essay addresses the methodological difficulty involved in determining the object of demonology and proposes a new criterion for defining “demon.” The presentations continue under the following categories: the Ancient Near East; pre-exilic Israel; the exilic period; Judah and Israel in the Persian era; the Hellenistic era; the Greco-Roman world; the New Testament and gnostic literature; and demonology after the destruction of the Temple. Abstracts of each study are offered in the volume’s foreword, but readers would be ill-advised to treat them as surveys of the articles—they are merely teasers. The last two pages of the foreword sketch the essential ideas exchanged during the symposium’s final debate.

Several of the essays refer to the “demonization” of YHWH resulting from the absorption of competing polytheisms, followed in the postexilic era by an objectivation of evil and the so-called invention of Satan. These studies, mostly exegetical papers on problematic passages—such as Genesis 32:23 (Jacob wrestles with God), Exodus 4:24–26 (God attempts to slay Moses, or Moses’ son), or 2 Samuel 24:1 and 1 Chronicles 21:1 (God or Satan, respectively, tempts David to number the people of Israel and Judah)—are unfortunately not brought to bear on the demonization of the God of Israel in numerous gnostic texts. This lack is understandable, given that the volume resulted from a symposium. Nevertheless, it is regrettable that important areas of research are absent: there is only one paper on the demonology of gnostic texts, Tertullian is discussed only together with Varro and Apuleius as part of a larger survey of Roman demonology, and the presentation on Justin Martyr was published in another volume. This
collection, therefore, is left quite thin in the area of early Christian literature, contrary to what one would expect from the volume’s subtitle.

Numerous grammatical and typographical errors mar the book—at least seven occur on pages 506–9. Some are quite annoying, such as “tempi” for the Latin “tempora” (521); the title of one article is regularly misspelled (“Warum treibt Paulus eine Dämon aus?” instead of “einen Dämon”); and an unfortunate mistranslation occurs even in the volume’s English subtitle: “The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of Their Environment,” instead of “in the Context of Its Environment.”

A point regarding terminological consistency: While the index uses the categories “Hebrew Bible” and “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Hebrew Bible,” many essays in the book use “Old Testament,” “early Jewish,” and even the infamous “Spätjudentum” (288). Such editorial minutiae do not, of course, diminish the value of the almost 700 pages of solid scholarship by leading scholars worldwide.

Most contributions to the volume are exceptionally valuable; even the few that some readers might find less remarkable provide a wealth of data and references to primary texts and scholarly literature. The generous index of authors, texts, and concepts facilitates the use of the volume as a reference to accompany such resources as the Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (1995, 1999). Given the specialized nature of its articles, Die Dämonen will be of interest primarily to researchers and students with a detailed knowledge of (or focused interest in) the demonology of the Ancient Near East, the Greco-Roman world, Judaism, and Christianity. The volume belongs in every serious university and research library.

Marquette University, Milwaukee


Keener completed his M.Div. at the Assemblies of God Seminary in 1986 with a thesis on the knowledge of God in the Fourth Gospel. In 1991 he completed his Ph.D. at Duke University under D. Moody Smith with a dissertation on Johannine Pneumatology. Evidently K. has been studying the Fourth Gospel for more than 15 years. The bibliography in the second of this two-volume work covers 166 pages (small print!) and includes almost ten pages of ancient sources. The work is replete with bibliographical references; thus the reader can be assured that K. actually read the works cited. In the cover endorsements, R. A. Culpepper refers to the work as “monumental,” D. Aune remarks on its comprehensiveness, and R. Kysar notes K.’s “encyclopedic documentation.” Any future student of this Gospel will have to refer to this contribution.

K. seems to have mastered the literature not only in English but also in French and German. Students of Johannine literature will find in each
section of the commentary references to virtually all the pertinent studies connected with a particular passage. This alone gives value to the work.

The serious reader of this commentary might fairly wonder just where K. stands on various issues. He seems to find himself caught between a more traditional understanding of the Gospel and the results of not only historical criticism but the vast hermeneutical developments of the last 20 years. He wants to accept the Gospel of John as it is now and not try to reconstruct how it might have been in the period of its development, and he views efforts to construct the community—such as Raymond Brown’s *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*, 1979)—as hypothetical, as indeed Brown himself did.

Regarding authorship, K. wants to maintain that the Evangelist, or the individual behind the Gospel, was an eyewitness, and so he seems to support the traditional view that John, the Son of Zebedee, stands behind the Fourth Gospel. But since the Gospel does not identify the Beloved Disciple and since it places the Twelve in a negative light (6:67–70; 20:24–25), might not the eyewitness behind the Gospel be a disciple but not one of the Twelve?

In the preface, K. states that he wants to place the Gospel in its social-historical context, paying attention to specific social data lacking in previous commentaries. He also sees his commentary as complementary to the literary approaches of many other contemporary exegetes. While admitting that the author of this Gospel seems to take more liberty in both the sayings and deeds of Jesus than do the other Evangelists, K. follows the general tendency today to see more history in the Fourth Gospel than what had been previously admitted. I suggest, however, that K. sees too much history. For example, in his treatment of the wedding feast at Cana, he quotes John Meier’s *A Marginal Jew* (1991) without responding to his objections to the historicity of this pericope.

Something similar could be said for how K. treats the Samaritan woman. Although he refers to Sandra Schneider’s publications, he fails to acknowledge her pivotal work on John 4 and her effort to study the pericope from a feminist critical hermeneutic.

Most commentaries include chapter and verse numbers in each section under consideration; this one does not. Even if the reader is very familiar with the Gospel, seeing the numbers helps. Also, most commentaries use a format of notes followed by comments on the section under question; K. lists the section of the Gospel as a heading and then combines notes with his analysis of the verses. While I would have preferred to have the actual verses in the copy, the combination of notes and commentary makes for easier reading. Finally, most commentaries frequently offer excursuses on theological themes; K. includes much of this theology in his comments on the verses. This too makes for easier reading of the many issues involved in such an exhaustive study.

K.’s 300-page introduction includes sections on Christology and other theological themes in the Gospel such as eschatology, faith, and love. He
presents an excellent summary of opinions, paying particular attention to the Hellenistic and Jewish social contexts.

Finally, while a reader may admire much about K.’s work, for me the ghost of postmodernism lurks in the background, and K. does not deal with it. When everything in contemporary culture has become relative, something must remain but not everything. The question what to keep and what to discard tantalizes any writer on any book of the Bible, even one of the Gospels. K. keeps too much. Nevertheless, students of this Gospel must remain grateful for what K. has accomplished. Well done!

*Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.*

John F. O’Grady

---


Frank Matera offers an interpretation of what is “perhaps the most personal and revealing of Paul’s letters” (1). Following the format of The New Testament Library series, M. moves through 2 Corinthians passage by passage, giving his own translation of the text, adding brief explanatory and textual notes, outlining the structure and logic of the passage, and offering detailed commentary.

The introductory chapter is an overview of several critical issues. Most notably, M. makes a strong case for the letter’s literary integrity. He maintains that Paul wrote 2 Corinthians to deal with two crises. The first crisis, involving a previous painful visit and an unnamed offender, has already been resolved in Paul’s favor. The second crisis, involving intruding apostles who have unsettled the Corinthian community, still demands resolution. According to M., in 2 Corinthians 1–7 Paul attempts to consolidate reconciliation over the painful visit, while in 2 Corinthians 10–13 he tries to tackle the problems wrought by the intruders. In arguing for the integrity of 2 Corinthians, M. avoids the problems raised by partition theories (especially accounting for its present form). He exhibits due restraint in his reconstruction of the events that transpired between 1 and 2 Corinthians. He also rightly emphasizes our inability to identify precisely Paul’s opponents and their specific teaching.

Part 1 sets forth Paul’s presentation in 2 Corinthians 1–7. Paul’s purpose in these chapters is to narrate his version of what has recently happened between him and the Corinthians. This narration (1:15–2:13; 7:5–16) is interrupted, however, by a lengthy excursus (2:14–7:4) that M. calls “the most profound discussion of apostolic ministry found in the New Testament” (65). Paul’s rhetorical strategy is to insert an apologia for his manner of exercising this apostolic ministry right at the moment in which he has the Corinthians’ full attention. While M. expertly treats Paul’s new covenant ministry (2:14–4:6) and role in the ministry of reconciliation (5:11–6:10), his description of the apostle’s (passive) endurance of afflictions and suffering (4:7–5:10) fails to convey adequately that Paul’s self-emptying mode of living for others “on account of Jesus” (see 4:5) also represents an active
choice on his part. Moreover, M.’s interpretation of the function of 6:14–7:1 relies too heavily on Paul’s generic description of immoral activity in 12:21. A stronger contextual case can be made for seeing 6:14–7:1 as an exhortation to the community to separate itself from the intruding apostles.

Part 2 treats Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians to resume their participation in the collection for the church in Jerusalem. M. argues that Paul builds here upon the reconciliation reported in 7:5–16. M.’s treatment of 2 Corinthians 8–9 is outstanding. In particular, he offers an illuminating discussion on Paul’s rich use of the term *charis* in these chapters. M. appropriately characterizes this section as offering “a theology of grace” (211).

Part 3 deals mostly with Paul’s attack on the intruding apostles (2 Cor 10–13). The main points of contention between Paul and the “super apostles” involve financial support and the status of boasting. M.’s analysis of 10:13–16 is especially helpful, as he demonstrates a critical point of Paul’s argument, namely, that his coming to Corinth and the subsequent birth of the Church are evidence that he is the divinely appointed father of the community. In his commentary on the “fool’s boast” (11:1–12:13), M. acknowledges elements of parody but rightly maintains that Paul’s intent here is serious: the apostle insists that God’s power comes to perfection in weakness. M.’s caution leaves him, however, when he draws too many specific conclusions from 12:20–21.

Overall, there is much to commend in M.’s commentary. He skillfully lays out the structure and logic of the individual sections, and demonstrates their interconnections. He is sensitive to Paul’s rhetorical strategies and techniques, especially the use of “ring patterns.” He conscientiously tracks the referents of Paul’s use of first person plural pronouns and provides convenient contextual summaries (a service to those who will consult the commentary for specific passages).

My criticisms lie in the area of interpretation. For instance, M. does not capitalize on his insight that “Paul forges a chain of faithfulness” extending from God to Christ, and from Christ to Paul and the Corinthians (55). This is a crucial aspect of the Spirit’s “christing” empowerment (1:18–22) and is present in, e.g., 3:1–3 and 4:7–14. And while M. correctly emphasizes Paul’s defense of his own integrity and character, he does not give the apostle’s strategy of inculcating a particular ethos among the Corinthians (as evidenced by the extensive *dokim-* terminology) its due. In the end, however, M.’s commentary, like 2 Corinthians itself, will challenge and reward those who seriously engage it.

*Weston Jesuit School of Theology*  
*THOMAS D. STEGMAN, S.J.*


Readers might find it helpful to turn first to the final chapters. Chapter 17, “The Historical Barnabas—A Reconstruction,” provides the real facts:
Barnabas, by his moderate wealth (and delivery of collected alms!), his social position, and his competence in both Hebrew and Greek culture, was a mediating leader in early Christianity and its diffusion beyond Judaism. Then chapter 16, “The Literary Portrait of Barnabas” by Luke in Acts, with rare reference to Galatians 2:1–14, chiefly stresses Paul’s initial client/patron dependence upon Barnabas, which soon disappeared.

Even in these brief summaries may be noticed the curious evasion of what the name “Barnabas” really means. Ö. enumerates four possibilities, of which “Son of Prophecy (i.e., endowed with prophecy) is more relevant to the controversy evoked by Acts 4:36 (458). There we find son of consolation (paráklesis, rendered encouragement in the 2001 Oxford RSV, F. Grant’s mediating alternative between prophecy” and “consolation,” the latter declared “inaccurate” in the Jerome Biblical Commentary). Less relevant etymologies of “Barnabas” are the proper names Naba (Nob, priest-city), the presumed parent Nabau/os, and the god Nebo (with bar as a name attested in 40 inscriptions). No relevance of page 458 is hinted in earlier treatments (especially 141–66, but also 94 and 133, where “Barnabas” clearly carries the sense of “consolation”; Acts uses the polyvalence to express a consoling “program” [209], but also connotes “prophet” [231n]). Ö. rightly hints that not all readers will attach so much importance to etymology.

Turning now to the book’s beginning, the first two chapters deal with Paul before the Acts’ “we-chapters”; 1 Corinthians 9:6 shows Paul as a true apostle like Barnabas entitled to support (16); but the opening context (4) will be more relevant to the later question of tolerating converts’ eating ritually butchered meat (412). The altering subordination (48) of Paul to Barnabas is seen later in Galatians 2.

Chapters 3 to 8 deal with Barnabas as a Cypriote well-to-do and generous leader of the Christian community (106); his patron/client relation to Paul (195); the successes of “Saul” with Barjesus/Elymas (one person, 282) before proconsul S. Paulus and the gradual reversal of (henceforward) Paul’s subordination to Barnabas; and Barnabas’s relation to “nephew” John Mark (Col 4:10), who, after Cyprus, perplexingly abandoned his participation.

One chapter each is devoted to Paul’s successes in Pisidian Antioch and Lystra. Here, as in the whole volume, we find unrelenting, fine-spun, purely literary analysis, with notice of even the most remote parallels or echoes, but nowhere do we find a hint that these localities form part of a still-existing world. Though a doctorand’s plan and funds would hardly have sufficed for a visit—wisely put off until it could include more of the biblical world—guidebooks and travel accounts could have provided enlivening details. Antioch is now a sizable excavation; in the modern town called Yalvac, a mile distant, the guide and friend of William Ramsay was still active at mid-century. Of Ramsay’s 20 published Pauline-research rambles only one is mentioned (also only one of Barbara Levick’s more recent grass-roots inquiries). Lystra is called “twin Roman colony” (352) with no advertence to its localization supported by these words discovered on an
important artifact; while the localization of Derbe—usually presumed south of Lystra but not even mentioned here—was claimed from a shard publicized around 1960 to be rather east across the highroad.

Chapters 13 to 15 treat the relation of the Jerusalem meeting to the ultimately unexplained split of Paul from Barnabas (445; 449, B. Malina often cited; 455 and 473 M. Bal and J.-L. Ska on “flat/round characters”). The volume is superbly published (and proofread, with perhaps the loss of one iota subscript). Many of the nearly 1,000 titles of secondary literature form in themselves a highly pertinent scenario.


With Reinhard Pummer’s impressive collection of source material for first millennium C.E.’s Christian discussion of Samaritan matters, scholars’ access to this material (otherwise scattered over a great variety of publications) has been immensely facilitated. The material is especially important as witness to this period of Samaritan history since most Samaritan manuscripts, written before the second millennium C.E., have been lost.

In his brief introduction, P. explains his reasons for not including material on the dubious Samaritan heretics Simon Magus and Dositheus, who have been treated by other scholars to which P. refers. It does not mean that these figures are neglected altogether, but that they are present only in material that clearly deals with Samaritan matters.

Portions of the patristic passages have been discussed in earlier works, for example, H. G. Kippenberg (1971), S. J. Isser (1976), B. Hall (1987), A. M. Rabello (1987), J. Zangenberg (1994), P. R. Coleman-Northon (1966); but the present book is the first complete collection with original texts, translations, and commentaries on 47 authors, dating from the second (Hegesippus, Justin Martyr) to the 14th century (Nicephorus Callistus). Each author is presented with an introduction to his personal and academic career. In addition the selected sources are discussed in context with contemporary and later sources of different kinds (biblical, patristic, Jewish, Samaritan, Greek, Latin, and Byzantine) including modern scholarly debates thereon. Salient points are treated in greater detail, for example: early Christian views on Samaritan origin, Samaritan literature, Samaritan theology, Samaritan temple or cult place, location of Gilgal, Gerizim, and Ebal, denial of resurrection, chronological discrepancies, relation to non-Samaritans, Samaritan revolts and persecutions. In general, these discussions are well balanced as introductions to a basic understanding of the material and its usefulness for further research.

The original texts, most of which are selected from recent publications, together with the apparatus, are accompanied by English translations. Each text is supplied with detailed bibliographic information on the origi-
nal text as well as its translation. The book includes extensive bibliographies of primary and secondary literature and author and subject indexes.

In addition to the mentioned topics discussed in P.’s book, several points of interest to both Samaritan and early Christian studies can be derived from the selected texts:

(1) The Samaritan position regarding Scripture and resurrection was quite troublesome for emerging Christianity, which adhered closely to the ideologies about David and Jerusalem and resurrection in the Former and Later Prophets. With Samaritan rejection of both the literature and the core theology of Christianity, Christian theologians had little love left for their contemporary Samaritans, with whom they had less in common than with contemporary Jews. As apertures to early Christian exegetical interpretation of the Pentateuch in favor of resurrection, the texts of, for example, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius of Salamis, and Photius are quite informative.

(2) While, in general, modern research based on Josephus regards the Samaritans as schismatic Jews, the most consistent view on Samaritan origins in the patristic literature is based on an exegetical reading of 2 Kings 17 and Ezra. On the basis of such texts, Samaritans are considered to be Assyrian foreigners who adopted Jewish belief and tradition (the Law given by Ezra). The first author to build on Josephus is Eusebius (third century) in his Chronicle, transmitted through Jerome (fourth to fifth century) and appearing in the writings of George Syncellus (eighth to ninth century). In general, Josephus’s views are unrepresented in first millennium Christian writings! P.’s statement that “Josephus’ account of the foundation of the temple on the mountain is cited by a number of scholars” (8) is an exaggeration.

(3) Regarding studies in Samaritan literature, especially Samaritan chronicles, these early writings implicitly testify to the independent character of the Samaritan traditions. In most cases, seemingly similar events that the patristic writers might have witnessed (e.g., fifth- and sixth-century Samaritan revolts) are described quite differently in later Samaritan sources. For further studies on the origin and development of Samaritan literature, P.’s book is a very useful companion.

In sum, the comprehensiveness of P.’s book and the accuracy with which he selected and presented the sources make it highly recommended.

University of Copenhagen

INGRID HJELM


Larry Hurtado seeks “to offer a full-scale analysis of the origin, development, and diversification of devotion to Christ in the crucial first two centuries of the Christian movement (ca. 30–170 C.E.)” (2). As H. himself notes, such a task has not been undertaken since Wilhelm Bousset’s Kyrios Christos (1913), but is now prudent given both new evidence (e.g., the Nag
Hammadi literature) and the need for a reassessment of a number of Bousset’s positions. In his opening chapter, H. locates his examination within scholarship relative to the positions of Bousset and the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule, while also outlining the scope, terminology, and method to be used throughout. His ten chapters offer a compelling argument for seeing early Christian devotion to Jesus as an extremely early, unparalleled phenomenon that occurred within an exclusively monotheistic framework.

The key to understanding the book lies in being clear about what H. means by “devotion.” He states at the outset that “devotion” is his “portmanteau word for the beliefs and related religious actions that constituted the expressions of religious reverence of early Christians” (3). Thus, he aims to examine the ancient sources for evidence of both beliefs and practices.

The ancient sources are then grouped together into chapters by chronology, genre, and provenance. The aim of each chapter is to uncover evidence for early devotion to Jesus Christ. “Early Pauline Christianity” is the first material examined (chap. 2). H. does not seek to be exhaustive in his coverage of the Pauline material, but instead aims to find “the beliefs and practices reflected in his [Paul’s] letters . . . that likely characterized Pauline congregations by the mid-first century” (153). From this starting point, he then examines the relationship of the Pauline material to that of “Judean Jewish Christianity” (chap. 3).

A significant portion of the book is then given to discussion of the evidence from what H. calls “Jesus books,” by which he means all the earliest Christian writings about Jesus, both canonical and extra-canonical. Chapter 4 covers the hypothetical text Q, which, H. argues, was not the product of a distinct Christian community but is nonetheless “an important body of material” (256). Chapters 5 through 7 examine in turn the Synoptic Gospels, Johannine Christianity, and some extra-canonical sources. The evidence from the “Jesus books” suggests to H. that significantly different views about Jesus were circulating by the end of the first century into the early second century. Such variety led to the Christological debates observed in the sources from the second century. Ultimately, from this milieu would come what H. calls a “proto-orthodoxy,” which contended with other heterodox forms of Christ devotion. The examination of Christ devotion during this pivotal period is undertaken in the remaining chapters, which look at the second century (chap. 8), Valentinianism (chap. 9) and finally “Proto-orthodox Devotion” (chap. 10).

Since a brief review cannot do justice to a work of this magnitude, my aim here is modest. I wish to raise just two points. First, a question of method: how certain can we be of the actual meaning of religious practice of the early Christians based on textual evidence? While one might accept H.’s definition of “devotion” as including both belief and practice, it is difficult to know whether what is said in various texts is what actually happened on the ground. And even if we can be certain of what actually happened, how certain can we be that venerative actions correlated to
acceptance of Jesus as God? Ultimately, we must acknowledge that we cannot be entirely certain of the correlation between beliefs as outlined in texts and actual practice. Thus, the reader will need to consider the merits and limitations of this categorization.

Second, on several occasions H. seemed terse (and even dismissive) in his engagement with other scholars’ work. Certainly, interests of space come into play in a work already very long; however, having engaged several of the same scholars in my own research, it seemed that H.’s treatment of other positions was not entirely fair. In particular, I note his treatment of C. Fletcher-Louis’s work on issues of Jewish monotheism (37–42); the choice not to engage any scholars that oppose the existence of Q (217); and also the presentation of the positions of G. Riley and A. DeConick on the Gospel of Thomas (475–79).

The promotional material for H.’s book states that it is “sure to replace Wilhelm Bousset’s Kyrios Christos (1913) as the standard work on the subject.” Only time will tell, but in the interim it is clear that H. has provided scholars with a study of impressive scope and erudition that should be read and engaged by all those seeking to understand the origins of Christianity.

Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill. 

KEVIN P. SULLIVAN


Only “those in the know” will understand why the title of this excellent book is so clever. King asserts on page 1 that, as a distinct religious movement with a single origin and clearly defined characteristics, there is no such thing as gnosticism. As a construct used to define the boundaries of normative Christianity, however, gnosticism thrives. The problem, K. argues, is that “a rhetorical term has been confused with a historical entity” (1). As a result, our reading of a diverse and complex set of ancient materials has been distorted and oversimplified. K.’s major contribution lies more in her careful analysis of this distortion than in a detailed discussion of the texts as such or in a theological evaluation.

Although early Christian polemists never used the term gnosticism, they did create strategies and frameworks for defining themselves against the beliefs and practices of others. K.’s chief claim is that these constructs have been reified and adopted, if sometimes unwittingly, by 20th-century historians. In Against Heresies, for instance, Irenaeus charts a genealogy of all heresies from one source (Simon) in order to show its essence as corrupt, divisive, syncretistic and to affirm, by contrast, the apostolic origin of the essentially pure, unified, true Church. Throughout her exceptionally useful survey of modern scholarship, K. argues that a continued preoccupation with the origin and genealogy of gnosticism more often serves the apologetic purposes of individual scholars than it discloses anything about ancient religious groups. Harnack’s casting of gnosticism as the “acute
Hellenization of Christianity” looks remarkably like his view of the Catholic corruption of the true, original “essence” of Christianity (chap. 3). Although history-of-religions scholars challenged the notion that gnosticism was a Christian heresy by exploring its Eastern, pre-Christian origins, their colonialist and evolutionary framework presumed the ultimate superiority of the West (and with it, orthodox Christianity). Their interest in “motifs” such as the influential (if invented) “gnostic redeemer myth” did little for the study of individual gnostic religious groups in their own right (chap. 4). While Walter Bauer’s influential *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (1934) challenged the assumption that chronological priority determined theological orthodoxy, his use of the terms *orthodoxy* and *heresy* reinscribed the polemicists’ rhetoric onto earliest Christian origins. Hans Jonas’s *Gnosis* (1934) intended to debunk the genealogical method of determining gnostic origins, but his use of typologies to describe characteristics of gnosticism went far in reifying the rhetorical term into an apparently historical entity (chap. 5).

Chapters 6 and 7 on Nag Hammadi texts offer a *status quaestionis* that will be very helpful to nonspecialists, but here again K.’s real concern is to show that even recent studies continue to struggle against categories insufficient to the immense diversity among individual texts. Easy characterizations of gnosticism as dualistic, incapable of a worldly ethics, and disposed to a docetic Christology simply do not apply universally. K.’s point is not merely to reiterate, for the sake of those who may be interested in these ancient texts, what Nag Hammadi scholars increasingly find: that one size does not fit all. Rather, her overriding preoccupation is with the ethics of identity construction, the various power relations implicit in such construction, and the importance of honest self-reflection among those who render historical analysis. K. follows Ricoeur in urging us “to think more and speak differently” (235). Her analysis of approaches to gnosticism calls us to examine the way our own religious discourse produces habits of thought that may serve some and harm others.

K. is painstakingly fair. She makes no attempt to privilege gnosticism as a new kind of normative religious base. She denies neither that evaluation of different theologies is necessary nor that some kind of normative authority may be crucial to the identity of a religious tradition. But when the exercise of such authority or evaluation styles itself as an “impartial” or “objective” enterprise rather than one that includes important social dynamics, it ceases to be critically engaged and risks significant self-deception. Even worse, it may contribute to a kind of violence that contradicts the very best qualities of the tradition itself.

In her conclusion K. notes that a “fuller historical portrait of religious piety can enrich the funds of religious traditions, providing more complex theological resources to attend to the complex issues of our own day” (246). This deeply intelligent study certainly encourages us to hear differing voices, but it leaves us with more questions than answers. For a theologian working within a tradition that has been largely defined and unified by a
commitment to orthodoxy, the challenge of appropriating these diverse resources may be even more complex.

_Santa Clara University_  
MICHAEL C. MCCARTHY, S.J.


This rich collection of essays originates from a new Oxford-Princeton Research Partnership and a conference at Princeton University in January 2002. The “confrontational” title offers “a challenge to ‘common knowledge’” (87)—according to Robert Kraft in a key contribution. The “common knowledge” at issue might be characterized thus: Judaism and Christianity “parted” in a single, pivotal act of separation that was early (first or early second century) and determinative for all times and places thereafter, with the result that Torah-observance and revering Christ became mutually exclusive ventures. What we usually call “Jewish Christianity” (or “Christian Judaism”) and “Judaizing” are then inevitably construed as idiosyncratic, isolated, and bizarre anachronisms or even pernicious heresies. The essays take aim at all or parts of this perhaps slightly overdrawn conception of “parting.”

On “Jewish Christianity,” we are treated to solid and thoughtful proposals that go far beyond conventional considerations of Ebionites, Nazoreans, and the like. David Frankfurter, for example, shows the plausibility of reading texts such as the _Ascension of Isaiah_, 5 and 6 _Ezra_, and the _Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs_, not as originally Jewish works later edited by Christians, but as “the work of continuous communities of halakhically-observant Jewish groups . . . that incorporated Jesus into their cosmologies and liturgies while retaining an essentially Jewish . . . self-definition” (134–35). E. Leigh Gibson makes a compelling case for the role of Jewish Christianity and the concern for purity at an earlier stage of the writing of the _Martyrdom of Polycarp_. In a penetrating analysis of blocks of the Pseudo-Clementine literature, Annette Yoshiko Reed rejects the reigning assumption that the document is worth studying only insofar as it takes us back to earliest Christianity. She demonstrates, rather, that its final form “attests the divergent concerns of different fourth-century redactors” (223), one attempting to neutralize the “Jewishness,” the other enhancing that Jewish emphasis. John Gager argues that Jewish Christians probably constitute the dominant form of Christianity in Syria and beyond until the rise of Islam. Adam Becker examines Aphrahat’s irritation, in fourth-century Sassanian Mesopotamia, at fellow Christians who apparently flocked to the synagogue for aid when persecution began, and then explores the later orthodox attempt “to reaffirm differences which were seen to be in danger of fading” (387) after the Arab conquest.

Other essays deal perceptively and innovatively with Jewish and Chris-
tian communities, which, though already separate by then, were “inter-
twined” in multiple ways. Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra on the connection be-
tween the Ember Days of September and Yom Kippur in fifth-century
Rome, Amran Tropper on the Mishnah tractate Avot and early Christian
succession lists, Alison Salvesen on what she sees as the “Judaizing” of
Scripture by the Hebrew interests of Origen and Jerome, and Ra’an an
Abusch on the “miraculous conception” of Rabbi Ismael, all reveal influ-
ence in either direction or both, as well as competition. A parade case in
point: Naomi Koltun-Fromm shows how Aphrahat and the rabbis—almost
in dialogue with each other—use extrabiblical traditions about Moses who
“abandons wife and family to serve God” (283) to deal with “the perceived
conflicts between sex, marriage, and divine calling” (306).

Many will approach the book aware of the frequent denunciations of,
and legislation against, “Judaizing” during the patristic era and later. The
studies under review here tend to hold that the denouncers, as Reed
sharply claims, “were so preoccupied with, and so vehement about, the
boundaries between ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity’ precisely because these
boundaries were still being constructed, negotiated, contested, and
blurred” (202) into the fourth century and beyond. Judaism and Christian-
ity today stand as witnesses that the ways did part, but during this earlier
period, as Paula Fredriksen avers in the lead essay, “the ways were not
separating, certainly not fast enough and consistently enough to please the
ideologues” (61). If some find these last assertions too harsh, at the very
least the book makes clear that for centuries in many locales a serious
tension obtained between what Christian leaders of many stripes saw as the
need for clear boundaries and the desire of others to preserve or retrieve
the crucial Jewish heritage of Christianity.

Is that tension and that heritage important enough to care about? It is,
if we want to recapture our own past more accurately, without commonly
held oversimplifications, and if we value, with Gager, those endangered
“other voices for whom the ‘Parting of the Ways’ was nothing less than a
historical tragedy” (372).

La Salle University, Philadelphia

THOMAS AQUINAS AS READER OF THE PSALMS. By Thomas F. Ryan. Stud-
ies in Spirituality and Theology, vol. 6. Notre Dame: University of Notre

A sign of the improvement of Thomistic scholarship is that studies on
Aquinas’s biblical teaching no longer surprise. Due in large measure to the
successes of recent historians of Thomistic theology such as Jean-Pierre
Torrell, younger scholars like Ryan can confidently read for us Thomas’s
biblical writings with the expectation that those texts will be treated as
integral to the overall picture we have of Thomas. In this case, R. has
devoted his efforts to Aquinas’s Postilla on the Psalms, a product of the last
portion of Aquinas’s teaching career, around 1272–1273. This late dating,
for which R. argues successfully (3–4), and which has been independently verified for me by the Leonine editor, places the *Postilla super partem Psalterii* alongside *Pars tertia* of the *Summa theologiae*, where Thomas treats of the constitution, life, and saving work of Christ; unfortunately, like the *Summa*, the *Postilla* was left unfinished, and Thomas covered only Psalms 1–54:16.

So, even admitting the fact that Thomas’s biblical commentaries remain understudied (including the commentary on the Psalms, which is not found in a useful modern edition), why devote special study to this commentary? The answer is that Thomas holds that the book of the Psalms has as its subject matter all of theology (*tota theologia*) and that the truths pertaining to the Incarnation are handed on in the Psalms so brilliantly that it looks almost like a Gospel, and not prophecy (*Postilla in partem psalterii*, prol.: “Omnia enim quae ad fidem Incarnationis pertinent, sic dilucide traduntur in hoc opere, ut fere videatur evangelium, et non prophetia”).

R. is quick to point out that the context in which Thomas’s hearers and readers would engage his Christocentric and theologically comprehensive commentary on the Psalms is one especially of personal transformation, not merely theological or literary erudition. And so in chapter 1 R. focuses on the techniques Thomas employs to get his readers to internalize the text of the Psalms, most notably the technique of dividing the text (*divisio textus*) into intelligible parts, which Thomas then strives to reunite in the hearer’s mind; this chapter takes advantage of recent medievalist scholarship of advancing 13th-century technologies like biblical concordances, and highlights the medieval skill of memorization.

An enduring feature of Aquinas’s manner of interpretation is his use of other scriptural passages to confirm the meaning he sees in a passage from the Psalms; so R., in a highly illustrative chapter 2, discusses how Thomas sees the authority of Scripture generally, and how he uses it especially in his reading of the Psalms. Thomas’s habit of comparative consultation even includes moments where the text of the Psalms occasions an *ad hoc* Scholastic discussion, which he answers by appeals to other places in Scripture (46–47).

Because Christ—more precisely, “Christ-praying-the-Psalms”—is the focus of Thomas’s reading of the Psalms, R. decides in chapter 3 to investigate both the topic of prayer and that of Christ’s salvific example. However, because these two topics are not given sustained treatment in the *Postilla*, R. devotes chapter 3 to the relatively contemporaneous *Summa theologiae*, where they are thoroughly treated—a move by R. that has drawn criticism for not staying within the bounds of the logic he urged at the outset of the book. I am less bothered by it, and in any case the result is an informative chapter on Thomas’s doctrine of prayer (including a dissenting engagement with Simon Tugwell’s account), as well as a clear and edifying presentation of importance of Christ’s example for Christians, as Thomas portrays it in the *Summa*.

Returning to the *Postilla* in chapter 4, R. employs what he gathered from reading the *Summa* and investigates “Christ-praying-the-Psalms.” Christ,
as human, prays the Psalms. But because to pray well is to have one’s “heart correctly aligned” (129), which means that one is praying “by heart, mouth, and work,” the Christ we see in Thomas’s Postilla is our example of how to pray fully to God, first in our hearts, and then in our praise and works. The intended effect of reading the Psalms through the Postilla, then, is not merely an interior change in the reader, but a rendering the reader to be Christ-like in all things.

Quite possibly, because Thomas did not finish the work, and because of the sheer size and complexity of the text he did leave behind, R. is not able to cover every topic and make every connection. Nonetheless, this well-documented book (including consultation of the best available 14th-century manuscript to shore up the shaky printed edition of the Postilla super partem Psalterii) leaves one with a sense of excitement about the future of Thomistic scholarship. As part of a series devoted to spirituality and theology, the book accomplishes its goal of showing the student that consulting Thomas’s scriptural commentaries results in a richer sense of his theology. But R. would hasten to add that Thomas did “theology in the Super Psalms for the sake of spirituality” (146).

Marquette University, Milwaukee

MARK F. JOHNSON


Gilles Emery’s place among the best contemporary readers of Thomas Aquinas was secured by the appearance in 1995 of his magisterial La Trinité créatrice. The seven essays in the present volume evince the same impressive control of the material. This is an important and timely book. Recent scholarship (Lewis Ayres, Michel René Barnes, André de Halleux) has unmasked the prevailing cover story about Augustine’s “essentialist” derailment of trinitarian theology, and, without allowing this problematic to dominate his reading, E. adroitly rebuts the cognate censure of Aquinas’s trinitarian theology as essentialist, isolated, and unbiblical.

E. is at his best when treating Thomas’s use of Scripture and his reception and transformation of the prior tradition. Chapter 1 surveys some of the difficulties bedeviling Aquinas’s Scholastic predecessors as they struggled to provide an adequate statement of unity and plurality in God. This descriptive overview casts in relief Aquinas’s significant refinements in theological method, and invites a more explanatory account of the differentiations enabling Aquinas to overcome earlier problems—theoretical distinction of the natural and supernatural, for instance.

Reprising key aspects of his monumental La Trinité créatrice, E. shows in chapter 2 how Aquinas, in his commentary on the Sentences, transformed and surpassed the achievements of Bonaventure and Albert the Great to present, with “extraordinary prominence” (53), the ordered role of the
divine persons in the work of creation. In this, his first synthetic work, Aquinas even says that the plurality of creatures is caused by the distinction of divine persons (31, 67). Yet, as E. acknowledges, Aquinas is notably more reticent about this theme in his later works. In particular, the claim that creation’s plurality is grounded in divine plurality, which E. tends to characterize simply as Aquinas’s position and to which he ascribes metaphysical significance (31), is not repeated later, and I am not convinced that Aquinas still held it.

Other chapters reveal Aquinas’s profound appropriation of Scripture and the Fathers (and his sometimes surprising—to us—historical and cultural awareness). The biblical presentation of the divine persons in the economy of salvation thoroughly shaped Aquinas’s speculative theology. E. cuts through the problematic of the “immanent” and “economic” Trinity by distinguishing the works of the Trinity from the doctrine of the economic Trinity: The works are first in our discovery of the mystery, whereas the doctrine emerges when the fruits of reflection on the identity of the divine persons as disclosed in “the documents of revelation” are applied to a systematic understanding of their agency in the world (294, 316). E. shows Aquinas in “a constant quest to enrich and deepen his understanding of pneumatology” (226) through biblical and patristic research. As a fine point, E. argues in this connection that Aquinas changed his mind (from the Contra Gentiles onward) about the procession of Love to posit an “immanent term” produced in the will parallel to the word in the intellect (102–3, 139, 154, 185–88). But Aquinas had earlier explicitly denied such an immanent term (De veritate 4.2 ad 7), and I do not find sufficient evidence to substantiate E.’s claim.

Regarding the problematic of “personalism” and “essentialism” into which interpretation of Aquinas has been thrust, E. argues that the whole movement of Aquinas’s treatise on God in the Summa theologiae is toward the conception of the divine persons, into which the prior reflections on the divine essence are integrated (132–34, 142, 175–80). This structure transposes the distinction between “common” and “proper” divine attributes already formulated by Basil of Caesarea (177–78). Aquinas transforms this fundamental distinction in two ways: first, by deploying it in accord with his insight that common attributes are conceptually prior to (and integrated in) personal properties; second, by adhering to a resolutely relational conception of the divine person, so that it is impossible to conceive the Father apart from his relation to the Son. The confluence of these two reasons also explains why Aquinas does not begin with the person of the Father. E. tends to relativize the achievement of the Summa compared to Aquinas’s previous efforts (182), but his superb analysis could be strengthened by insight into the twofold, inverse conceptual ordering governing the Summa’s deployment of the concepts of procession and notional act. Here Aquinas entirely transcends the problematic of the relative priority of the Father vis-à-vis divine generation, in a way E. appears not fully to appreciate (see 192–93, 138 n. 45). On this score, Bernard Lonergan’s Verbum (1967, 1997 crit. ed.) (unfortunately ignored here) is more penetrating.
These critical remarks only underscore the weightiness of E.’s contribution, not only to an understanding of Aquinas, but, more urgently, to deeper reflection on this central mystery of Christian faith. With this handsome volume, Sapientia Press has made a serious and valuable contribution to trinitarian theology in English, and made for itself an auspicious beginning.

*University of St. Thomas School of Theology, Houston*  
JEREMY D. WILKINS


Jean-Pierre Torrell is effectively the doyen of historically based research into the theological writing of Thomas Aquinas. Now professor emeritus at Fribourg and former member of the Leonine Commission for the critical edition of the works of Aquinas, T. has more recently appeared in the consciousness of North American scholarship thanks to Robert Royal’s translation into English of T.’s two-volume study: *Saint Thomas Aquinas: The Person and His Work* (vol. 1, 1996) and *Spiritual Master* (vol. 2, 2003). The former is the standard biography, having replaced that of James Weisheipl. (For more on T.’s work, see Thomas O’Meara’s appreciation, *Theological Studies* 62 [2001] 787–801.)

The present book is a collection of 14 studies that T. originally published separately, all concerning Aquinas in one way or another. Despite the subtitle, T. assures the reader (16 n. 1) that the texts reproduced here are essentially the same as the originals (save correcting textual infelicities and bibliographical updating), so much so that he provides full bibliographical reference for each study’s original location, and places its original pagination in the margins. An index of names (377–83) proves helpful, but there is no subject index.

To provide some internal ordering T. divides the contents into three sections devoted to texts, studies, and spirituality. Section 1 contains just two of the 14 studies produced while T. was a member of the Leonine Commission. The second of these two is of particular importance because it is the quasi-definitive edition of Aquinas’s sermon conferences on the Ten Commandments, “undoubtedly the best known guide to St. Thomas’s preaching” (64). The text provides not only a critical apparatus that explains and justifies T.’s editorial decisions, but also a valuable apparatus of sources where T. has painstakingly tracked down Aquinas’s references to sources ranging from biblical to patristic to Latin poetic. To read these sermon conferences is to appreciate how deeply steeped Aquinas was in the sacred Scriptures.

Section 2 contains seven studies that present various aspects of Thomas’s theological work, covering such topics as theological knowledge, the beatific vision, Christ’s knowledge, the causality of Christ’s Resurrection, Thomas on Isaiah, and Thomas’s preaching. In each of these studies one
sees why T. is held in such high regard as a scholar, for in every instance he
demonstrates his command over current and classic secondary literature,
and, above all, over the entirety of Aquinas’s writings. He regularly refers,
as he must, to well-known passages in the *Summa theologiae* or the *Summa
contra gentiles*, but he never leaves unmentioned salient passages in other,
less-studied works, such as Aquinas’s *De rationibus fidei*, his individual
sermons, or his polemical works. And, not being content simply to convey
the teaching of the master, but rather wanting to test its logic, T. thinks
through Thomas’s texts as well. For instance, in one of the studies (“Saint
Thomas d’Aquin et la science du Christ: Une relecture,” 198–213), T. won-
ders whether Thomas’s soteriological insistence that Christ possessed the
beatific vision throughout his pre-Resurrection existence runs counter to
other key elements in his thinking, and suggests that Thomas would have
been better served by holding that Christ had a knowledge akin to the type
he elsewhere attributes to the prophets, a *lumen propheticum* (which T.
would rather term a “Christic light”).

Section 3, devoted to spirituality, begins with a study on how the word
*spiritualitas* functions in Aquinas’s writings. Thomas does not use the word
to describe anything like the modern understanding of “spirituality” (as an
undertaking somewhat distinct from, say, a Christian’s moral life); he uses
the term mainly in contradistinction to “bodiliness” or “materiality,” and
mostly in philosophical contexts. But for all that there is a way to identify
in Aquinas a certain spirituality, wherein he closely links the life of faith
and faith’s action to concrete personages and topics in Christian history. So
T. provides studies on how Thomas understands our becoming conformed
to Christ, on John the Baptist as a preacher, and on Christ’s preaching. This
section and the book closes with the critically-edited Latin text and T.’s
French translation of Aquinas’s Eucharistic prayer-poem, *Adoro te devote*,
which T. explicates in a fine, sensitive study.

T.’s French is lean and his writing-style clear. Students of Aquinas will
want to have this book as a standard of the kind of scholarship that is
increasingly expected in the international world of Aquinas research, es-
pecially since T. himself has led the charge to have Aquinas principally
seen as the theologian he was. Those whose work touches on the topics
covered in the book will surely want to see how T. handles them, and to
glean from his research in the footnotes. It goes without saying that the
book is a “must buy” for serious theological libraries.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*  
MARK F. JOHNSON


The first decades of the 20th century were not good ones for the Catholic
Church in France. In 1905, the government of the Third Republic severed
its ties to the Church. Pope Pius X reacted by condemning the French
action and refusing to allow the French hierarchy to work within the new legal obligations. As a result, the Catholic Church had no legal status in France for the remainder of Pius’s pontificate. Two years later, the Vatican condemned as “Modernism” the efforts of Alfred Loisy and others to update Catholic teaching, and initiated a fierce antimodernist campaign.

Lucien Lacroix was a bit player in these dramatic events. A committed republican at a time when many Catholics were monarchists, Lacroix moved comfortably in the circles of the French Université during his early adulthood. In 1901, the French government nominated him for the bishopric of Tarentaise and pressured the Vatican into accepting his candidacy. Lacroix’s tenure as bishop was not a great success, but he won notoriety for his support of the government even through the tumultuous years of separation. He suddenly resigned his see in 1907 and returned to the university, teaching history at L’Ecole pratique des hautes études until his death in 1922.

In the 80 years since Lacroix’s death, few studies have been devoted to him. Christian Sorrel has done a valuable service to scholarship on this period by offering what will surely be the definitive biography of Lacroix. But S. offers more than a biography. As he says in his introduction, he seeks to introduce his readers “to the heart of a generation and of a milieu.” He thus uses Lacroix’s life as a lens for studying French Catholicism more generally as it faced “multiple crises, institutional, political, and intellectual” as part of its “difficult transaction with modernity” (20).

Although S. covers Lacroix’s entire life, he concentrates on the critical years between 1890 and 1914, paying special attention to the six years of Lacroix’s bishopric. After two chapters on his religious vocation and early years as chaplain at a lycée that take the reader to 1901, S. devotes the next 243 pages to the period 1901 to 1907 before concluding with 100 pages on the remainder of Lacroix’s life.

S. raises two issues of particular interest to the historian. First, what moved Lacroix to resign his see in October 1907? His letter of resignation blamed his poor health, while the timing might suggest that the promulgation of the antimodernist encyclical Pascendi dominici gregis (August 9, 1907) was the precipitating factor. But S. points to two draft resignation letters to show that Lacroix was primarily unhappy about the papal response to the separation law in France and about the apparent support of the Vatican for plots against Lacroix in his own diocese (366).

Second, S. addresses Lacroix’s attitude toward Modernism. Although the antimodernist reaction was apparently not central to his decision to resign his bishopric, he clearly sided with Modernists. Lacroix did not have the competence to make independent judgments about most of the central questions posed by Modernists concerning the relationship between “science” and faith. But his commitment to intellectual liberty and especially to the importance of the modern impulse towards democracy inclined him to support any movement to modernize the Church (282–83). After the condemnation of Modernism, Lacroix demonstrated his support more actively by surreptitiously agitating on behalf of the cause. At a more per-
sonal level, he sent a letter of sympathy to Loisy when he was excommunicated (413).

The issue of Lacroix’s Modernism is particularly important to S., who concludes his book by returning to it. S. reminds his readers of the complexity of the Modernist crisis and uses Lacroix to show that Modernism went beyond the limited circle of critical Catholic historians and philosophers to include fellow travelers like Lacroix. The full magnitude of the crisis and the bitterness of the antimodernist reaction thus derived from the political as well as the intellectual climate of France and Rome (476–77).

S.’s book is impressive in every way. He draws on voluminous sources to offer a compelling portrait of Lacroix, and he is wonderfully successful at locating Lacroix in the various debates of the day by fully describing the issues at stake and the various positions taken on them. The only criticism that I can offer—and it feels ungenerous even to raise it—is that the book is perhaps too exhaustive. It will surely remain the definitive work on Lacroix for a long time to come, and it is a welcome contribution to our knowledge of this enigmatic figure and his milieu.

Berry College, Rome, Ga. 

Harvey Hill


This volume, the latest in the Jésus et Jésus-Christ series directed by Joseph Dore, is the result of collaboration among seven prominent Blondel scholars, “under the direction of René Virgoulay.” The volume is comprehensive, in that it covers all of Blondel’s works, including letters and other texts not written for publication. The order of the essays is chronological, although for those not well acquainted with Blondel’s writings, after the first essay, which serves as a kind of introduction, it might be best to read the last three essays, beginning with Claude Troisfontaines’s.

The first essay, by Yvette Perico, provides a useful introduction to Blondel’s career by examining his spiritual diaries, Les carnets intimes, which he started writing as a student, a decade before the defense and publication of his thesis, L’Action, in 1893. She shows that Blondel had a very clear sense of his philosophical career as a vocation, rooted in his devotion to Christ. In a prayer to Christ, Blondel wrote, “I would like to guide to you those who have no path” (24). Furthermore, very early in his studies Blondel had become convinced that the problem of the Incarnation was “the touchstone of a true cosmology, of an integral metaphysics” (25). Just what place the Incarnation came to occupy in Blondel’s philosophy, however, is a complicated question; the succeeding essays all address it in some way as they follow his long career.

The question centers on Blondel’s idea of le panchristisme. The order of the essays is somewhat puzzling, however, for both logically and chronologically the topic that provides the essential background is that treated in the fifth essay by Claude Troisfontaines—Blondel’s understanding of Leib-
niz’s idea of vinculum substantiale, the “substantial bond.” The idea of a vinculum substantiale appears in some of Leibniz’s correspondence as a tentative answer to the question of how there could be a composite substance, in which all the monads would not be merely gathered together as an aggregate under a dominant monad but truly united as a substance. In Leibniz’s system, there would need to be something beyond the monads, something that bound them together as a true unity, a “substantial bond.” Whatever its role in Leibniz’s thought, Blondel incorporated the idea of a vinculum substantiale into his own thought in various ways, most prominently by envisaging action as a kind of vinculum.

Inspired by various Pauline texts, such as “in him all things hold together” (Col 1:17), Blondel applied the idea of the vinculum to the Incarnate Word, conceiving of Christ as a universal mediator, vinculum vinculorum, who united humanity and all creation in himself. Blondel came to describe this concept as “Panchristism.” He insisted on Christ’s cosmic function, asserting that nothing in the universe, whether intelligent, living, or material, achieved a stable existence or reached its perfection without the intervention of the Incarnate Word, “solidifier of the universe” (161). Blondel wholeheartedly embraced the Scotist position on the motive for the Incarnation. For him, Emmanuel is an integral part of the whole plan of creation—its final cause. For this reason, he argued that neither the existence nor the destiny of anything in the created order can ultimately be explained apart from Christ, the Incarnate Word. Consequently, the Incarnation has profound metaphysical consequences that must be taken into account not only by the theologian, but also by the philosopher, since “the supernatural is in continuity with metaphysics” (39).

Panchristism, however, rarely appeared in Blondel’s published works and had little influence on subsequent philosophers and theologians. Early in his career, the idea appeared in only three brief and quite obscure passages, with which Blondel soon became dissatisfied. Panchristism did not reappear in his published works for many years and only received prominent treatment in his very last work, La philosophie et l’esprit chrétien. Nevertheless, as several essays in the volume make clear, although Panchristism did not figure prominently in Blondel’s published works, the idea was often a major topic of discussion in his voluminous correspondence with prominent philosophers and theologians.

Taken together, the essays in this volume present a strong case that, although the importance for Blondel of the notion of Panchristism may not be readily apparent in his published writings, this idea of an Incarnate Mediator was a crucial inspiration underlying his philosophical vision. Although he significantly revised his conception, he never abandoned it. The essays also convincingly argue that Blondel’s Panchristism is an idea rich in implications for both philosophy and theology, offering new perspectives on Blondel’s philosophical œuvre, on the relationship between philosophy and Christianity, and on the role of the Incarnate Word in the divine plan for creation.

Years ago, Congar said about his great friend Chenu, “He’s a perpetual eruption of ideas!” With solid theological understanding and erudite historical insight, Chenu tried to reframe the social and pastoral questions of his time. Renowned as a historian of medieval theology and society, Chenu also played a significant role as a peritus at Vatican II.

Until now, however, Chenu’s output of pastoral theology has been largely inaccessible. First of all, he was little known in the U.S.A. Apart from two books, The Theology of Work (1963) and Towards Understanding St. Thomas (1964), and a collection of essays, only an occasional article of his was translated into English. With Contemplation and Incarnation, Potworowski has remedied that situation.

P. reviews the entire corpus of Chenu’s writings, developing thematic frameworks to provide a coherent picture. He also appends a complete bibliography of Chenu’s corpus from 1921 to 1995. The flavor of Chenu’s ideas can be tasted in the two words of the title. For Chenu, “contemplation” is a dimension of the faith experience of every believer, and “incarnation” is a dynamic enfleshment of the Holy Spirit’s agency in each Christian’s life. With almost rash conceptual dexterity, Chenu managed to reshape theological questions to render them fresh and compelling.

Chenu drew from Christ’s Incarnation a series of theological formulas that place our social, historical, and anthropological predicament in dialogue with divine grace. Christ became incarnate to take upon himself all that is human, for the human totality is redeemed and divinized (54); therefore, “what is not assumed is not redeemed” (84). So human bodilyness is drawn into the agency of grace. Perfection consists not in escaping relationships to the material world, but in fulfilling the self in work and society. Historicity is also a dimension of the human, and Chenu explores the idea of humans as “co-creators” with God in building the world in time (95). Chenu wanted to make history and its contingent events a locus for theological reflection.

Also important here is what Chenu calls “socialization,” meaning the evolution of increasingly complex corporate structures for work, politics, communications, and social life. Because of the Church’s failure to pastorally engage the collectivities of work and social communication, today we are dealing not with “dechristianized masses” but with an unevangelized populace. Grace is not just individual but social, and when the Church fails to acknowledge this it presents itself in a “disincarnate state” (137). By contrast, Vatican II’s Gaudium et spes expresses the Church as “incarnate” in time, history, and society (159–61).

In examining Chenu’s enthusiasm for the phrase, “the signs of the times,” P. shows the important role of the Holy Spirit in his theology, and also provides a sympathetic critique of Chenu’s indomitable optimism. In a chapter entitled “Incarnation and Christology,” P. asks just what kind of
Christology underlies Chenu’s incarnational principles. This chapter considers Chenu’s contribution to understanding the plan of the *Summa theologiae* and the controversy that arose from his treatment of Aquinas’s Christology in the *Pars tertia* as what appears a contingent afterthought rather than as its theological center. Ultimately, P. judges that, by holding tenaciously to the historical reality of Christ’s Incarnation, Chenu grounds his Christology adequately in Christian tradition and provides it with a kind of openness to new historical and social phenomena that was foreign to the conceptualism of most neo-Scholasticism.

Chenu’s writing style is poetic and evocative, but often quite dense. P. includes lengthy citations of his writings in French in the notes, a fact that will be a rich resource for scholars and a frustration for those who do not read French. Clearly P.’s work is a labor of love. He obviously believes that Chenu’s is a voice that still needs to be heard and that his approach to the mystery of the Incarnation allows for the productive reframing of social questions.

The volume in whole or in part might serve as an important resource for graduate level study. Few authors treat the Incarnation so imaginatively as a source for social and pastoral themes. Chenu’s verve is contagious. It could be helpful for graduate students and scholars to think through categories like “the law of the incarnation,” “the eternal incarnate in time,” and “grace as social reality.” In the end, however, we are left with the realization that Chenu never elaborated a systematic pastoral theology. Yet P. makes the case that Chenu exercised a prophetic role in large part by writing supportive rationales for people on the cutting edge of pastoral innovations, like the Young Christian Workers in the 1930s, the Mission de France in the 1940s, the Priest Worker Movement in the 1950s, and the emerging new theology in the 1960s and 1970s.

Does Chenu’s vigorous, optimistic rapprochement of cultural evolution and the capital grace of Christ still possess the power to inspire courageous initiatives for the Church’s renewal? P. gives us the opportunity to judge for ourselves.

*Aquinas Institute of Theology, St. Louis*  
PAUL PHILIBERT, O.P.

---


This book, a University of Tübingen dissertation directed by Max Seckler, asks: If the 19th century was the century of apologetics, and the 20th was the century of fundamental theology, was Karl Rahner, one of the very great theologians of the 20th century, great also in fundamental theology?” (1) Three periods in Rahner’s theology offer three forms of fundamental theology: the explicit description of revelation in terms of knowledge, freedom, and history in *Hörer des Wortes* of 1939; plans for a new style of theology expressed in essays and projects from 1945 to 1954; and systematic theology, arranged around personal and contextual analysis, revelation,
and history in *Grundkurs des Glaubens* of 1976. Werner examines not so much the content and conclusions but the approaches of the three enterprises. At the same time, these three models of fundamental theology illustrate the path of Rahner’s thought. W.’s delineation of models and bibliographical sections lead into the narrative of development. The pages hold a wealth of material on Rahner’s thought in its historical context and in its interpretation by others. There are analyses of the transcendental dimension of German theologies in the 20th century, the supernatural existential, the problematic of the extrinsicism of grace, and the nature of a contemporary theology. I could not imagine pursuing the origins and history of Rahner’s thought without consulting this work.

Within its theme of fundamental theology, the book is a reference work for important areas like the passage of apologetics into fundamental theology, the German exponents of fundamental theologies in the 20th century, and the notion and theories of *potentia obedientialis*. There are also a survey of the criticism of *Röter des Wortes* and a narrative of the emergence of the titles of the *Grundkurs*. The considerable literature on Rahner in non-German languages is not really employed.

Going beyond its theme somewhat, the book ends with a valuable retrospective on the *Grundkurs* after 25 years of its study, treating its systematic nature and focal point, the relationships to Christ or to grace and its reception. W. concludes that fundamental theology has several meanings in Rahner’s work, and that Rahner himself was not particularly clear about or conscious of the development of basic themes or systematic forms. The underlying current of his development over five decades is not to be found in overcoming an extrinsicism of grace toward human nature (as one might expect) but in the relationship of faith to revelation. Here theology moves from the explicit to the implicit, and this systematic work begins not with rational principles but with the fundamental message of Christianity. The *Grundkurs* is not about models and arguments but seeks an expression unencumbered by sources and debates on the ultimate contact of God’s self-sharing with the depth of a human personality. Both are mystery. “Neither the anthropological point of departure nor the transcendental method but the way in which faith responsibly unfolds in the form of the content of faith fashions the character of the fundamental theology in the *Grundkurs*” (452). Interestingly, Rahner, a quite speculative theologian, leaves behind the logical syllogisms of apologetics and the essays of introductory theologies to offer the goal of explaining, largely to believers, what is central in what they already believe. In Rahner, apologetics faded before modern philosophy, and fundamental theology ended in a graced psychology for which the revelation recorded in the gospel was the privileged move from the transcendental to the categorical. W.’s study supports the view that Rahner’s theology in the last decades of his life became more simple, more basic, much less interested in intricate or current themes, and it became what he expressly hoped for: more pastoral. “The question remains: to what extent did Rahner see, advance, and formulate this development in its totality as well as... the grounds for change, the intentions
leading to the individual conceptual types, and the stages of his development?” (453) Certainly in the fruitful years of the 1950s and 1960s fundamental theology yielded to dogmatic theology—but in a simpler format, with attention given only to the most profound theological issues (which are also the fundamental realities of the reign of God). “There is a kind of interpenetration of fundamental theology and dogmatics, an interior link of the process of strengthening the credibility of the Christian dynamic with the content of faith” (453).

When one plans a dissertation, one seeks a symmetrical pattern. One can ask whether the second period of fundamental theology has the same significance as the other two, and also wonder whether there is an essential difference between the true fundamental theology of Höher des Wortes and the extensive dogmatic theology of the Grundkurs. But this is to quibble over what is inevitably somewhat artificial: formatting development in an individual’s thought. Rather, disciples of Karl Rahner, whether novices in cultures distant from Europe or teachers who knew him as he composed his many works, can only be thankful for a study offering intriguing research as well as comprehensive analysis. This work, by capturing Rahner’s dynamic of past achievement and future inspiration, will serve as an important resource.

Priory of St. Thomas Aquinas, River Forest, Ill. THOMAS O’MEARA, O.P.


It is noteworthy that the first major biography of Michel de Certeau was written by a historian en vogue on the present French intellectual scene, François Dosse, who had previously published a history of structuralism and a life of Paul Ricoeur. This calls attention to the fact that de Certeau’s work, which resists any attempt at classification, has finally had its largest impact in the somewhat transversal area of cultural studies both in France and the U.S. Surely this impressive and well-substantiated presentation (in the preface D. names and thanks 179 people who, through interviews, contributed to his research) provides a journey into de Certeau’s reflections on the varied disciplines of history, sociology, ethnology, psychoanalysis, semiotics, philosophy, and theology. The biography is compelling, in that de Certeau arguably marked French society more than any other Jesuit in the second half of the 20th century.

It all began in 1968 when the 43-year-old de Certeau found the winning formula to describe the overwhelming event of the May demonstrations that provided him a paradigm for his thought: “En mai dernier,” he writes in Études, “on a pris la parole comme on a pris la Bastille en 1789” (159). From then on until his relatively early death in 1986, the scholar of 16th- and 17th-century Christian mysticism was sought out by the public, media, and politicians alike. His essay “La rupture instauratrice” (1971) advances what became his chosen hermeneutic principle par excellence, finding relevance in the field of historical science: “[W]e do not know what an event
is. But one criterion by which to come to a judgment are the epistemologi-

cal changes that it [the event] provokes” (264), and for the analysis of

language, “the glossolalia reflects an institutional function of language . . .

freed from the determination of meaning . . . having as a model the joy of

being original” (315). This principle is discovered in theology particularly

in Jesus’ post-Easter appearances: each appearance “is followed by a dis-

appearance. The One who comes is the One who leaves” (81). This is why

“faith supposes a confidence that has no guarantee for what it is founded

on, the Other” (204). Also especially in theology the “cartographer of

otherness” (523) endeavours to indicate places where consequences of

these insights should follow: “I do not approve defining Christianity as

‘more sense.’ It is much more about a ‘more in order to act’” (213). “If

tradition stays intact, it can only be dead” (220).

Even this small selection of quotations suggests the power of de Certeau’s

language, to which D. pays homage not only through abundant

references to the Jesuit’s works, but also in the numerous and mostly

enthusiastic reactions of the interviewees. Not everyone, however, fell un-
der his spell. Several of his attempts to gain an academic position in Paris
failed; some of his publications received negative reviews, and Rome
opened an inquiry (although the authorities did not follow through). Here

is the hero’s complementary side that D. reveals with great tact, almost
pathos: a “wounded wanderer,” as the book’s subtitle announces, a hyper-
nervous and agitated (161) man whose rhythm of work stirs the concern of
his fellow Jesuits, a character cruellement ouvert, perpetually skirting the
edge of the cliff (333).

The melancholy that de Certeau singles out as an essential trait of all
modern mystics in reality points, as D. observes in his conclusion, to the

scholar of mysticism himself. Some of the melancholy even touches the
reader of this biography. Is it the extreme “indecision,” maybe even “am-
biguity,” typical of all de Certeau’s formulations, that at first comes across
as a pleasurable surprise in the midst of many high-pitched voices of his

time but with the distance of years reveals itself as a somewhat frustrating
project? This indecision did not cease even in the light of the passion given
by Certeau to the events of May, 1968: “It is certain,” he wrote in the article
that brought him national fame, “that la prise de la parole comes in the
form of a refusal. It is a protest. We will see, this is its frailty, that it can bear
witness only to the negative. Perhaps this is its grandeur?” (159–60).

D. the historian has successfully plunged us into the existential condition
of de Certeau the wanderer who “cannot stop moving, knowing that every
place and every object is pas ça, that one cannot rest here nor settle for
this” (638). My trust is that in the near future a theologian will help us
discover the conditions of the possibility of de Certeau the believer who
had an “experience of otherness indissociable from the experience of
the particularity of faith” (616). Pages 613–19 outline a theological evaluation
of de Certeau’s thought—an excellent foretaste of this project.

Gregorian University, Rome

PHILIPP GABRIEL RENCZES, S.J.

The tensions between Catholic teachings and America’s freedoms are described in this excellent book in an exemplary way. John McGreevy, professor of history at the University of Notre Dame, has been honored for his previous book Parish Boundaries (1996) by the American Catholic Historical Association.

The work under review touches on several major clashes that Catholics have had with America’s freedoms—the Bible in public schools, slavery, the civil rights of Blacks, birth control, abortion, and sexual abuse by priests.

In ten chapters (298 pages of text, 108 pages of notes) M. assembles a remarkable array of information. He raises the basic issues of whether religious groups like the Catholic Church can seek to influence the law with their own viewpoint even though ultimately it derives from their religious commitment. He cites John Rawls and his nuanced approach to this dilemma, but it is not clear that M. has resolved this problem; it may be intractable.

The Church appears to have rejected Rawls’s approach when twice it persuaded the voters of Massachusetts to retain a law forbidding the sale of contraceptives. Later the Church yielded under Cardinal Cushing and the wisdom of John Courtney Murray, S.J.: the Church allowed the voters of Massachusetts to repeal an indefensible law.

M. is especially informative when he treats of the papal commission on birth control and reveals the hitherto unknown information about the activities of the late John C. Ford, S.J., who advised Pope Paul VI. M. is also incisive in his treatment of the struggles within the Catholic community about abortion and the law after Roe v. Wade.

There are many other fascinating items in this book. The pastorals of the U.S. bishops on war and the economy receive attention as do problems related to bioethics and the end of life.

Some readers of this truly absorbing volume will wish that M. had given more attention to issues such as the ordeal of Father Charles Curran at the Catholic University of America, or the cries of Catholic women for a higher place in the Church, and the increasing presence of Hispanics in the Church. Some also will wonder whether M. has focused too much on the fear and contempt for the Catholic Church held by some Protestants in the last century.

The underlying theme of the book is the viscerally charged attempts of some Catholic leaders to reject new freedoms proposed by the government, especially when they curtail the Church’s position. Such reactions of Catholic leaders should have been limited by Vatican II’s proclamations on religious freedom, but the existence of such strong reactions by some Catholic leaders is still annoyingly present.

M.’s book will be most useful to America’s 65 million Catholics as they struggle to resolve the contradictions they perceive between what the of-
ficial U.S. Catholic Church wants and the differing opinions of the most respected institutions and public officials in America.

M.’s book makes clear the sharp differences that exist between the majority view in the U.S.A. on some legal-moral issues and the viewpoint of the Church. There are some factions in the Church who want to insert the official Catholic viewpoint in the public policy of the nation even if it harms the view which 75 percent of the nation that is non-Catholic has of the Church. M. seeks to explain this dilemma, but the questions may be irresolvable.

American Catholics have had reason to doubt and even distrust some of the official positions of the Holy See and the American bishops on public issues. Tensions of this sort are not likely to fade away soon. But M.’s book is probably the best explanation to date of how American Catholics have reacted to the demands of government and religion in a society that cherishes both religious freedom and the separation of government and religion.

Georgetown University Law Center, Washington

ROBERT F. DRINAN, S.J.


Peter Steinfels is—to borrow a phrase he cites—one of those who have Catholicism “in their gut” (120). He looks at American Catholics and sees a great generational shift. We are “on the verge of an irreversible decline or a thoroughgoing transformation” (1). Our leaders, mostly clergy and religious, came of age in a Catholic subculture and lived through Vatican II as adults. Their successors are predominantly lay people from the heart of American pluralism whose knowledge of Vatican II is more historical than formative. His sense of a Church at risk is not theoretically induced but comes from a hard look at “leading Catholic indicators” such as church attendance.

S. writes as a wise confessor whose penitent is badly shaken. He maps four conservative-to-liberal post-Vatican II narratives that shape our arguments about the state of the Church. He pronounces all four “inadequate and outdated” (39). They give too much to inner-church events and not enough to events outside the Church (37). Without ever using transparency, chapter 2 offers one of the best available accounts of the clergy sexual abuse crisis of 2002. A chapter on Catholics and politics is followed by one on health care, social services, and schools. The remaining four chapters treat worship, passing on the faith, “Sex and the Female Church,” and leadership. Having already received wide notice as a trade book, this work, especially the last two chapters, also speaks to theologians.

We are “over-theologized.” S. pleads for “practical skills, pastoral results, empirical measures, organizational effectiveness” (356). He cites Kathleen Hughes’s “deeply disheartening suspicion that something is very wrong” (179) with the renewed liturgy. We do not need more theology but
a focus on “questions of practical competence . . . what in sports is called ‘execution’” (197). But better “execution” does not rule out rethinking. With theology as one of the prime sites of the clerical-to-lay transition, theologians and bishops need to “rethink how doctrinal development can proceed with integrity” in a new environment (252); they need to come up with not more theories of development but a way to talk honestly about it in public. We must also either “rethink sexual morality” (274) or continue having nothing to say about it to young people. The shortage of priests and religious is due to Vatican II’s “new configuration of enduring beliefs” (328), and yet S.’s Catholicism needs priests and religious. In the face of the priest shortage and the “extraordinary innovation” (331) of lay ministry, he calls for “priest leaders for a church of lay leaders” (338), a “further rethinking of priesthood and its current forms in church life and law” (343).

S.’s discussions of politics and sexual morality presume “a Catholic style of moral reasoning” (98) based on natural law as primarily, if not purely, a philosophical position, an approach Mario Cuomo and the G.I. Bill cohort would have learned in college. He knows about “new holistic forms of natural law theory” (265), but fears that their conclusions, in discussions of sexual morality and the priesthood, are rigged. At the same time he implicitly criticizes the notion of analogy at work in such discussions as overly literal and inadequate to the “fluid and multivalent character” of biblical and bodily imagery (298, 305). Much theological lifting remains to be done in the matter of analogy. When it is finished, natural law might look very different.

S. is less a spiritual than an incarnational Catholic. His most precious nugget of practical wisdom for theologians is his sense that overworked priests and out-of-touch bishops are part of the people of God too. Theologians who regularly use the phrase “institutional Church” to imply that they are not part of it ought to meditate on pages 12–14. “There is simply no church that is not an institutional church.” Lest we forsake historical muck for spiritual purity, S. highlights “the institutional rather than the profoundly spiritual or theological.” The book memorializes Cardinal Joseph Bernardin and offers a roadmap for the Catholic Common Ground Initiative’s future work.

As if to underline the spiritual cost of the book’s institutional emphasis, Cardinal Bernard Law haunts its pages as Bernardin’s adversary. Together they define a spectrum of institutional Catholicism’s possible episcopal faces. Balthasar claimed that one could rightly interpret the institutional side of the Church only “in function of the cross, and so of holiness.” S.’s Marianist Lecture, delivered at the University of Dayton shortly after the publication of his book, moves in this direction. Following a spirited defense of liberal Catholics, he urged them to listen to their critics on heroism, joy, and obedience. He briefly suggested the possibility of “a different kind of Catholic subculture.” May S. continue to develop these thoughts. In the meantime, theologians should read his book.

University of Dayton

William L. Portier
The emergence of diversity as a fundamental value in the field of theology has necessarily complicated introductory courses in Christology, challenging the seasoned scholar and often leaving the novice overwhelmed: Where to begin? How to proceed? The answer to these questions can determine the success or failure of a course. Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen’s introduction offers students a useful tour d’horizon of contemporary Christology by situating it within the ecumenical and geographic diversity that characterizes the contemporary theological landscape. The book will be a welcome resource for students interested in contemporary Christology and for teachers looking for sound resources for their courses. Readers will find K.’s organization and presentation straightforward and accessible.

The book is divided into four parts: Christ in the Bible, Christ in History, Christ in the Contemporary World—Western Christologies, Christ in the Contemporary World—Contextual Christologies. The first two parts are prefatory and treat the standard discussion of christological titles supplemented by the use of narrative approaches to NT Christology. While not a thorough discussion, it offers students an opportunity to recall prior learning. Part 2 concentrates on the christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. K.’s narrative is accessible and accurate but leaves the impression that the development of patristic and conciliar Christology was somewhat ad hoc—emerging only with “the concern to secure salvation” (84). An adequate explanatory framework (as found, e.g., in Lonergan’s The Way to Nicea [1976]) would help bring order and meaning to the debates students often find archaic and disconnected.

Every introductory treatment of the history of Christology must be selective, and K.’s is no exception. He jumps from Chalcedon in chapter 5 to discuss monothelitism and then Luther’s theology in chapter 6. One can imagine a Catholic author making a similar choice but including Aquinas instead of Luther. Chapters 7 through 10 provide a bridge to the discussion of 20th-century Christology via the quest for the historical Jesus. K. recounts the rise and fall of the liberal lives of Jesus and the emergence of the “new quest” and “third quest.” The absence of the debates, controversies, and contributions characteristic of historical Jesus research for the past two decades is probably due to the limits of space, but those who adopt the text can easily supplement this section.

K. begins to focus his presentation in part 3 with an extended discussion of ten major Western Christologies. He offers serviceable and brief summaries (approximately seven pages) of each author’s major theological concerns and christological emphases. He treats most of the authors one would expect to find in an introductory text (Barth, Bultmann, Rahner, Tillich, Pannenberg, Moltmann, and Hick, though he omits Schillebeeckx, Schoonenberg, and Haight). However, K. also includes many figures often overlooked (C. Norman Kraus, John Zizioulas, Stanley Grenz). The addition of the latter figures indicates K.’s desire to provide a survey of the
christological scene that encompasses selected Evangelical and Orthodox voices, and this ecumenical inclusiveness complements the other offerings in this section. Particularly interesting and significant is K.’s presentation of Kraus. A Mennonite missionary and theologian who has worked extensively in Asia, Kraus offers a critique of traditional Christology from both an Asian and an Anabaptist perspective.

Finally, K. delves into “contextualized interpretations” of Christ, including overviews (seven to ten pages each) of process, feminist, Black, and postmodernist theologies, each of which receives rather general but sympathetic treatment. The final six chapters examine Latin American, African, and Asian theology followed by a discussion of representative theologians from these regions (Jon Sobrino, Benezet Bujo, and Stanley Samartha). Throughout the book, K.’s summaries of individual theologians demonstrate attentiveness to detail, clarity, and brevity. However, it is noticeable that no female scholar receives individual attention. Feminist theologians have been at the forefront of the christological debate, offering some of the most trenchant critiques of traditional Christology. This oversight is balanced to some degree by K.’s concern for culture and geography as determinative for christological reflection.

Composing a good introductory text is difficult. One must integrate the diverse and demanding research in a given field with pedagogical concerns. K. succeeds. His introduction to Christology is ambitious, clear, and sympathetic to a wide variety of positions. While some gaps remain, the book challenges teachers to embrace diversity as a central concern when introducing students to Christology.

University of Mary, Bismarck, N.D.  

CHRISTOPHER McMAHON


The book is part of a projected five-volume collection, of which the first two volumes have appeared. The first three volumes are to contain articles and texts that discuss Chinese Christologies from the Tang dynasty to the present from the Sinological, mission-historical, theological, and art historical perspectives. Volume 4 will offer an annotated bibliography of the Chinese and Western writings on Jesus Christ in China and a general index with glossary. Volume 5 will present articles on Jesus by Western missionaries and the Chinese.

The work under review (vol. 1) begins with Malek’s introduction explaining the nature and the purpose of the project and indicating how each of the essays in the five volumes (a total of 48) fits in with the project. The introduction is followed by a lively letter of Paul Welte to M. pointing out the dangers of the project. Taking enculturation to mean no more than a “facelift” (the letter’s title is “Does Jesus Christ Need a Facelift?”) Welte takes to task superficial adaptations and urges that “theologians and litur-
gists should never try to make Christ to look Chinese, but rather try to change the way the Chinese look for Jesus and look at Christ” (61).

The four succeeding essays provide the context for understanding the process of christological enculturation from the Tang to the Yuan dynasty. Livia Kohn highlights the similarities and, more importantly, the basic differences between medieval Daoism’s notion of Dao and its “embodiment” in creation and the human body on the one hand, and the Christian notion of God and the divine incarnation in Jesus on the other. Joseph Wong offers an insightful comparison between the Johannine Logos and Lao Tzu’s Dao by way of Philo. J. D. M. Derrett compares the Johannine Jesus, especially his command to eat his flesh and drink his blood, with the Buddha who claims to be the former legendary King Sibi who gave his eyes, his flesh, and his body to heal the sick. Jost Zeitzsche provides a fascinating account of how different groups of Christians—Nestorians, Manicheans, Catholics, Protestants, Russian Orthodox—and Muslims transliterate Jesus Christ into Chinese.

These introductory essays are followed by six analytical and historical studies dealing with the faces and images of Jesus Christ from Tang to Yuan. Of these, four are of great interest. Yves Raguin’s “China’s First Evangelization by the 7th and 8th Century Eastern Syrian Monks” explores the contribution to early Chinese Christology of Johannine and Pauline theologies and, more significantly, of theologians of Eastern Syrian Churches (along with Daoist, Confucianist, and Buddhist terminologies and concepts). Raguin’s explorations are carried further by Stephen Eskildsen (“Christology and Soteriology in the Chinese Nestorian Texts”), Gunner Mikkelsen (“‘Quickly Guide Me to the Peace of the Pure Land’: Christology and Buddhist Terminology in the Chinese Manichaean Hymnscroll”), and Hans-Joachim Klimkeit (“Jesus’ Entry into Parinirvana: Manichaean Identity in Buddhist Central Asia”). Altogether these four informative and rich essays provide a reliable survey of early Chinese Christology.

The book ends with an anthology of eight documents that form the basic sources of early Chinese Christology. Though most of them are available in Paul Saeki Yoshio’s The Nestorian Documents and Relics in China (1951), it is a great convenience for readers to have them collected here.

If there is a desideratum for this excellent volume, it is that it had included in the contextual reflections an essay on the nature and task of enculturation. To view this theological and artistic task as a “facelift” is to caricature it. No one who reads the essays in this and the subsequent volumes on the works of missionaries and of the Chinese themselves would think that, in enculturating Jesus of Nazareth into China, they were engaged in cosmetic surgery. Unfortunately, without a solid essay on enculturation, there is a danger of misrepresenting it, especially in the light of Welte’s letter. M.’s scholarly integrity is well demonstrated and he deserves praise for including the letter despite its heavy criticism of the project; but the letter does little to illumine either the purpose of the project or the task of enculturation itself.
The five-volume *The Chinese Face of Jesus Christ* will be a truly monumental achievement. Its scope is breathtaking, its scholarship impeccable, its technical layout superb. No one doing Chinese Christology can afford to ignore it. The Chinese (and Asian in general) Church owes an immense debt of gratitude to Institut Monumenta Serica and China-Zentrum for jointly publishing this project as well as to the editor and the collaborators who have worked on it. The second volume has already appeared, and one looks forward in enthusiastic anticipation to the completion of the other volumes.

*Georgetown University, Washington*  
**Peter C. Phan**


The essays here presented are the work of ten notable theologians; Tatha Wiley’s excellent introduction is a bonus. The first essays deal with biblical and conciliar contributions to the development of Christology and call us to ponder the “accumulated images, metaphors, concepts and judgments” (15) about Jesus of Nazareth. The next essays invite reflection on the situations and context of Christian belief today and its articulation. These lead to the final essays that point to positive, christological challenges to embrace and live the *basileia*.

W.’s introduction itself highlights the Pauline struggle with the “law/freedom-in-Jesus” dichotomy in Galatians. This narrative witness, she argues, is more about the rejection of exclusivism upon the emergence and acceptance of Paul’s mission to the Gentiles than about the theological and ideological interpretation that Paul’s sole concern is the exaltation of God’s free and gracious gift of grace. This point complements notions developed in essays by John Pawlikowski and Roger Haight.

The first section, “Recovering the Tradition,” reminds us that soon after Jesus’ death the question confronting Christian believers shifted from “Who is Jesus?” to “Who are we in relation to the Jews?” This shift shaped much of what is addressed throughout this collection. One consequence, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza suggests, may have been the devolution of the *basileia* movement from egalitarianism to patriarchy, a process that may well reflect the cultural assimilation undertaken by the Christian community after its separation from the Temple. Another consequence, pointed out by William Loewe, was that Jesus’ concrete and historically rooted message quickly came to expression in a belief system that was logical, compelling, and insightful, but resulted in a somewhat abstract codification. Thus, among the customs that emerge in the tradition will be many that have little implicit or explicit relationship to the historical narrative of Jesus or to the faith community itself. The foundations for this conciliar move are continuous with threads traced by Schüssler Fiorenza who critically assesses the emergence of a patriarchal code within the canon that supplanted the inclusivity of the *basileia* narrative.
These essays raise new questions from an earlier debate. Ernst Käsemann and “early Catholicism” issued a call to deal with the question of a canon within the canon and with the more basic questions surrounding continuity and discontinuity in history. In the concluding essay of the first section, Gerard Sloyan helpfully organizes and examines the tradition’s multiple Christologies and reminds readers of soteriology’s centrality to Christology.

The second section, “New Challenges,” examines issues and conundrums surrounding (1) Judaism and the uniqueness of salvation in Jesus (Pawlikowski), (2) the christological methodologies of Rahner and the later Schillebeeckx (Haight), (3) the pressing demands laid upon the tradition because of the ideology of patriarchy (Rosemary Radford Ruether), and (4) the critique of Christianity developed by a postcolonial and post-Enlightenment world (Robert Lassalle-Klein).

Pawlikowski’s essay contends that the anti-Semitic rhetoric that emerged in early Christianity was not harangue. Rather, it arose to articulate two roles: that of the Church as the “replacement” of the Temple and that of the gospel as the “replacement” of the Torah. For Pawlikowski, neither of these points can be reconciled with Romans 9:11, a key text for Vatican II’s declaration Nostra aetate (1965) which teaches that the Mosaic covenant is not suppressed by the Christian covenant in Jesus. On the use of Romans 9:11, Pawlikowski cites Walter Kasper who argues that, although Jesus is the universal source of salvation, the Jews need not be evangelized. Avery Dulles, however, has more recently attempted to reassert, in opposition to Nostra aetate, the primacy of Hebrews 8:13 with its supersessionist perspective. Pawlikowski’s position should provoke reflection also on God’s fidelity to covenants with Adam, Noah, and Abraham as well as on the Christian articulation of Jesus’ salvific uniqueness.

The final section, “Christ and Social Transformation,” brings contemporary Christologies to bear on the imperative of social transformation. The essays here reflect on the human experience of the denial of personhood, sin, suffering, and death. M. Shawn Copeland poignantly reminds us that Christology can be reduced to neither Jesus of Nazareth nor the councils. Indeed, Christ lives through time in the Spirit dwelling in our midst. Those who most reflect Jesus are those marginal to the standards of our times. They are our salvation and revelation because they call forth compassion and love. Lisa Sowle Cahill concludes the collection with the suggestion that we reappropriate the Johannine tradition and a Christology “from above.” Such a revitalization could contribute greatly to subordinating the “historical particularity of Jesus” and any attendant misogynist overtones. Cahill’s essay calls us back to earlier essays by Schüssler Fiorenza and Ruether and reminds us just how important and useful both ascending and descending Christologies have been and will continue to be.

The book includes an excellent glossary and index and deserves to be in every graduate and undergraduate library.

Georgian Court University, Lakewood, N.J.

LOU F. MCNEIL
The relationship between philosophy and theology has long been a focus in both Catholic and Protestant circles. Mandry, in this publication of his dissertation under the direction of Dietmar Mieth from the University of Tübingen, presents four thinkers to highlight the varying ways the two disciplines have been construed with specific reference to moral theory: from the Catholic perspective, Franz Böckle and Klaus Demmer; from the Protestant perspective, Gerhard Ebeling and Wolfhart Pannenberg. Unlike others (e.g., Martin Honecker, Erny Gillen, and Herbert Schlögel), however, M. does not bring these thinkers into conversation with each other. The central interest in the study is Paul Ricoeur and how his work, primarily his *Oneself as Another* (1992), provides a nuanced understanding of the relationship between theology and philosophy.

The relationship between moral theology and dogma is a central theme of Catholic moral theology. Thinkers like Böckle—and similarly Alfons Auer and Josef Fuchs—have aimed to protect the autonomous nature of moral discourse by underscoring the need for a rational justification of any moral claim. While engaging the language of modernity, these thinkers stand clearly in the effective history of a neo-Scholastic understanding of the natural law. In distinction to them is someone like Demmer who questions the notion of revelation operative in those who propose an autonomous ethic in the context of faith. He offers a more theological methodology: faith provides a radically new horizon for the believer that leads to a fundamental change in her way of thinking. For M., the difficulty is that this position may be understood in a way that handicaps the universality of any moral claim (68).

In the Protestant world, the relationship between theology and philosophy is behind the now classic exchange of letters between Ebeling and Pannenberg in the early 1970s concerning the “crisis in ethics” or how they interpreted modernity’s separation of ethics from theology, and the resultant reduction of moral norms to human values. Influenced by the theology of Wilhelm Herrmann, Ebeling argued for the ethical basis of theology. Moral claims are not justified by authority but by rational evidence. Consequently, theology does not create a unique Christian ethos but must consider what is shared by all humanity. Pannenberg sees in this accommodation to modernity the danger of making theology independent of or supplemental to moral experience. For him, our understanding of reality should take precedence over the recognition of moral norms. This means that the moral consciousness of the believer presupposes the truth of the Christian message. The moral relevance of the gospel follows from the truth about God and God’s revelation in Jesus Christ (108).

In part 2 of the book, M. turns to Ricoeur in order to restructure the relationship between philosophy and theology. Unlike other analytic or deconstructive approaches, Ricoeur’s synthetic project has been used ef-
fectively to bridge a whole series of antinomies: the particular and the universal, tradition and ideology, goodness and rightness, etc. Specifically, M. focuses on the relationship between ethics (understood as aiming at the good life with and for others) in just institutions and the power of religious discourse to effect a radical change in the moral subject (281). For Ricoeur, the idea of narrative is the link between description and prescription. In other words, our description of the world is never pure but always shadowed by meaning. But the same is true for the self’s act of prescription. That is, our practical actions and strategies are of necessity shaped by the central narratives that constitute our self understanding.

M. uses Ricoeur’s concept of the “economy of gift” to go beyond the traditional disputes about the relationship between philosophy and theology. The economy of the gift indicates an economy in the sense of a dialectical exchange between religion and ordinary moral experience and understanding that is never resolved but rather creates a hermeneutical spiral and is rendered more or less productive. The economy of gift describes an ethic of unfolding human transformation in relation to the divine offer of grace. Grace disrupts and disorients our self-understanding in order to raise the possibility of our own new being in the world.

M. presents an accurate description of Ricoeur and contributes to the growing scholarship surrounding his thought. It is unfortunate, however, that, given the limitations of a doctoral dissertation, M. does not directly engage any of the four theologians vis-à-vis Ricoeur’s hermeneutical methodology.

Fordham University, New York

THOMAS R. KOPFENSTEINER


The 16 contributors to this collection stand against a phenomenon familiar to all who care about their religion: oversimplification. Set in the context of 9/11, the book confronts Muslim prejudices that influence views on issues of justice, gender, and pluralism. The authors consider themselves members of the invisible majority of U.S.-based Muslims who believe that their faith is not rigid but continually evolving to address the demands of the time. Their adoption of the label “progressive” indicates a deep commitment to the responsibilities towards their fellow human beings. They express the struggle of voices often muffled by those who try to reduce the teachings of Islam to simplified, rigid statements—this type of reductionism has become widely known as “Wahhabism” or “fundamentalism.” Speaking up is a courageous act, as it risks possible reprisals from within the community itself.

Farid Esack, a Muslim leader originating from South Africa who has seen his share of suffering during the time of apartheid, explains the philosophy of a progressive Muslim. She engages in creating a more humane
society, and struggles for justice for all, including non-Muslims, homosexuals, and those at the fringes of society. Praxis lies at the core of her understanding and critical enquiry of Islam.

It is the narrow-minded, one-size-fits-all form of Islam that bothers these authors who, paraphrasing the words of Marcia Hermansen, are tired of Friday sermons that reject the U.S. culture although the U.S. has accorded Muslims hospitality, civil rights, and opportunities. Such preachers encourage especially young Muslims not to engage with their environment, but instead to float over their new homeland on a feeling of religious and cultural superiority. Progressive Muslims counter the voices of those supporting so-called “pamphlet Islam” or “Web Islam,” that reduce Islam to four-page pamphlets, warn against the evils of birthday parties, and enforce gender segregation.

A principal argument the authors bring against what they see as supremacist puritanical teachings of Islam is that they cut off creative, critical thinking and harm the rich and colorful traditions and expressions of Islam. In his essay, Khaled Abou el Fadl, the first U.S.-based Muslim to openly criticize this type of Islam, traces how this trend evolved from Wahhabism. Born in the arid desert of Arabia, it disregarded the Islamic history and intellectual tradition. Its simplicity, attractive to desert tribes, produced a moral isolationism that idealized the time of the Prophet and was intolerant of diversity. Wahhabism and other similar trends, according to Abou el Fadl, abuse the theological texts of Islam in their attempts to quantify the implementation of God’s word. As Wahhabism cut out the human interpreting agent, it reinterpreted the traditional institutions of religious authority, using only a limited part of the vast tradition of Islamic thought, practices, and jurisprudence. Seeking empirically quantifiable values of Islam, Wahhabism became devoid of spirituality and values such as human dignity, love, and compassion.

The articles by Kecia Ali and Scott Siraj Al-Haqq Kugle illustrate in detail the consequences of selectively upholding some parts of the Islamic law and tradition while ignoring others. They both present cases of sexuality, one on the position of women in marriage, and one on homosexuality.

Kecia Ali, referring to texts of Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh), takes issue with two types of discourse that try to simplify the marital rules concerning women: ultra-conservative Muslims who present semi-scientific arguments to “prove” that a woman’s place is in the home, and Islamic apologists who gloss over contested parts of the jurisprudence. Extolling the freedoms that Islam has granted women (especially those living in the West), ultra-conservatives do not see that “This picture does not resemble at all the laws governing most Muslim women’s marriages today” (164). Tensions within the law are created by local culture and incongruity between injunctions of the Qur’an and man-made legal interpretations. While the Qur’an assigns women certain human rights, the reality is that the jurists who designed the rules of marriage drew from the slavery contracts. In practice, a marriage
contract became a document of ownership that allowed the husband complete control over his wife’s body and gave him unilateral rights to divorce. As this mindset still prevails in many Muslim countries, Ali argues, Muslims can no longer afford to disregard the teachings of the jurisprudence.

Islamic jurisprudence is built on the Qur’an and the Traditions of the Prophet (Hadith). Kugle analyzes how fabricated Traditions evolved to shape the discourse on homosexuality. Fixating on a glorified model of the Prophet, Wahhabi-minded Muslims projected it back on him to underpin their religious views. However, Kugle finds that “the Prophet is not known to have censured any of them [those practicing same-sex] for sexual acts” (222).

This is an important book that rediscovers truths from the Islamic tradition. Representing a critical mass of moderate Muslims, the authors stress that Islam can contribute to building dynamic civilizations, and represents an ever-evolving global tradition that at its core supports civil liberties, human rights, and justice for all.

Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind. NELLY VAN DOORN-HARDER


The book consists of ten articles authored by international scholars in the fields of biblical studies, ancient Near Eastern studies, church history, liturgics, theology, and women’s studies. The collection is an outcome of ongoing discussions among participants of a 1999 symposium on “Women and Religious Discourses” held in Duisburg, Germany. The stated hope of the editors is that the volume may “definitively connect female blood and holiness” (xii). To a very large extent, the authors succeed in doing precisely that.

Excellent examples of this success are essays by Kathleen O’Grady, Deborah Ellens, and Mayer Gruber that challenge the notion that Israelite traditions viewed women as deficient or dangerous simply because they were women. O’Grady’s linguistic analysis of the instructions for menstruation (Lev 15:19–31) demonstrates that their focus, like that of the regulations for Nazirite vows (Num 6:1–21), is not on punishment for immorality or abnormality, but on “the practice of separation as a means for maintaining the sanctified order” (27–28). Her textual study is supplemented by insights from cultural anthropology that lead her to conclude: “The niddah, while excluded from this order, is also the means through which the order is founded and thus is inscribed at the very heart of the sacred . . . its shadowy lining” (28). Ellens illustrates how the deliberately constructed structure of Leviticus 15:19–30 highlights the equal responsibilities of men and women for communal purity, and the typological equivalency of their genital discharges. Just as “seminal emission is a normal condition decid-
edly not associated with illness . . . [s]o also, according to the structure, is menstruation” (42). Mayer Gruber shows that such “feminist” conclusions are consistent with the interpretations of other biblical writers (e.g., the Deuteronomist), the rabbinic sages, and the authors of Qumran laws, none of whom “regard either of the two sexes as a source of pollution per se” (74).

Equally strong is Kathleen P. Rushton’s essay, the only one in the book to explore a New Testament text. She shows how the “parable of the woman in childbirth [John 16:21] explains the death-glory of Jesus as linked to biblical history” and the situation of the Johannine community (91). This largely ignored text, she argues, has “the potential to redefine Jesus’ and God’s activity in imagery, asserting that the female person in her body may, does, and must image God” (96).

The most socially and theologically insightful article in the collection is Anne-Marie Korte’s critique and affirmation of contemporary feminist efforts to (re)create women-centered, especially female blood-related rituals. Drawing upon cross-cultural studies of women’s religions, she points out that these generally feature food and healing rituals rather than blood or fertility rites (170). In a contemporary context the latter may inadvertently reinscribe traditional gender dualisms and stereotypes (181); yet they may have a value as cultural-critical statements and so contribute to cultural transformation (187).

Kristin de Troyer provides an interesting and useful analysis of Leviticus 12 and its early translations, but does not persuasively connect these to the early Christian texts about women’s impurity to which she refers (45–64). Jennifer Schultz makes a much more convincing case that the emergence of menstrual taboos in the early Church owes more to ancient Greco-Roman medical and philosophical influences than it does to a continuation of Judaic practices or Levitical law (97–116). Her article is an excellent example of feminist work that seeks to correct for unwarranted anti-Jewish sentiments in Christian scholarship.

Susan K. Roll provides a valuable historical overview of the Christian practice of “churching” women after childbirth (117–41). Grietje Dresen contrasts and compares this practice with the sacrifice of the Mass in Roman Catholic tradition. She links the latter along with male-controlled rites of rebirth (e.g., baptism and churching) to ancient sacrifices that functioned to seal symbolic bonds of fatherhood and patrilineal descent, and to dissociate bonds based on “the blood of the female cycle” (160). Judith Ann Johnson’s concluding article explores the links between blood sacrifice and hero cults, including the phenomenon of the “top-gun” naval aviator in American culture (189–222). While informative and thought-provoking, these three essays do the least for advancing the editors’ goal of demonstrating the holiness of female blood.

Overall, this is a book worthy of inclusion as required reading in biblical, theological, and women’s studies courses.

Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill. 

RITVA H. WILLIAMS
EVIL IN MODERN THOUGHT: AN ALTERNATIVE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.

In an early 2004 interview with Bill Moyers on “Now” (PBS), Susan Neiman related how she found herself as an undergraduate attracted to philosophy by reading authors like Camus and Sartre and considering the problems of life and death. Much to her surprise and disappointment, she discovered that these were not the key authors or the key questions of her professors and peers in graduate school. However, she did not abandon her earlier concerns. After teaching at Yale and Tel Aviv Universities, she became director of the Einstein Forum in Potsdam, Germany. The book under review presents her consideration on the problems that first brought her to philosophy.

Early in her account, N. tells the story of Alfonso X, King of Castile from 1252 to 1284, remarking after much study, “If I had been present at creation, many things would have been ordered much better.” It was for the medieval mind a blasphemous suggestion, but one that had philosophical as well as theological responses at the time. N. is most concerned with the early moderns, beginning with Pierre Bayle’s 1697 Critical and Historical Dictionary. Although he took Alfonso as more likely challenging the scholars of his day than the Creator, Bayle provided a catalogue of disasters and follies large enough to make one wonder about Creation and Creator and proposed Manicheism as the most suitable explanation of the mix of good and evil that human beings confront in life. The most famous rebuttals of the day were Gottfried Leibniz’s Theodicy and Monadology. We could know a priori from the principles of contradiction and sufficient reason that the ablest of architects and the wisest of rulers would create only the best of all possible worlds.

Such “justifications of the ways of God to man” would prove difficult to swallow after the Lisbon earthquake of 1755. Voltaire took direct aim at Leibniz with the mock figure of Pangloss in Candide, and Hume would challenge all the philosophical justifications of God in Dialogues on Natural Religion. De Sade would go several giant steps further to a direct attack not just on creation but also on the Creator in works like Justine and Juliette. For his part, Rousseau would spare the Creator by distinguishing sharply between natural ills and moral evils with the blame for the latter falling on human beings themselves. Kant too would demarcate the natural and moral orders and make good will dependent on the demarcation: expecting a coincidence between happiness and duty would undermine good will itself. Yet he argued in the Groundwork to the Metaphysics of Morals that good will would be more palatable if there could be some hope that nature and morality could come together. The division between nature and morality, happiness and duty would have no place in the eschatologies of Hegel and Marx: there the catastrophes of history become the instruments of humanity bringing itself to fulfillment. Nietzsche would reject these eschatological and transcendental solutions as life denying, and
Freud would finally turn evil to simply bad and put aside any hope of final human happiness.

Auschwitz and genocide set the problem for the final chapter as Alfonso and Lisbon do for the preceding chapters. N. entitles this part “Homeless” because she sees the significance of Auschwitz as making us strangers to ourselves as well as to the world. Theodor Adorno would say that, in the aftermath of such an event, “silence is the only civilized response” (2). But, of course, Adorno himself did not remain silent and neither does N. In fact, she invokes a dizzying array of late 20th-century thinkers, reflecting on Adorno, Horkheimer, Camus, Arendt, and Levinas, to give just a partial list, and she even tries in a late revision to consider the impact of and response to 9/11.

What strikes me is how N. picks up threads for hope in the very effort to confront evil. She cites Adorno again where he says, “only when that which is can be changed is that which is not everything” (327). Her final belief is that “every attempt to live rightly is an attempt to live in the world” (327). This living rightly in the world involves a metaphysical commitment that would have made sense to a thinker like Thomas Aquinas, one of a different age and of a much different temperament from those catalogued in her book: we cannot think coherently about evil without relating it to good. Furthermore, it makes sense to me in the 21st century. Perhaps my one serious criticism of an engrossing and powerful book is that N. does not give a sustained development of these concluding indications of her own position. Thus she gives us a brilliant history of ideas without writing on the philosophical level of the people she studies and presents.

La Salle University, Philadelphia

Michael J. Kerlin

The Book of Ecclesiastes is the only piece of discursive prose in the Old Testament and is, at least apparently, at odds with the rest of the Bible in many respects. In 1980 Lohfink wrote an influential German commentary on Qoheleth, which has remained in print with minor revisions; it was drafted in conjunction with the translation of Qoheleth for the deutsche Einheitsübersetzung, for which L. was responsible. A 1990 rewriting of the commentary, never published in German, serves as the basis of this translation. The revision has not been updated, but it was well worth translating, not least for the fit it finds in more recent scholarship.

L.’s emphasis on existential philosophy as a partner for Qoheleth’s speculation parallels the work of Michael Fox (1989), who turns to Camus as L. turns to Jaspers. L.’s attempt to describe the social and economic background of Qoheleth is also integral to C.-L. Seow’s Anchor Bible commentary (1997; TS 59 [1998] 722-23); here, L. and Seow are more confident than the evidence warrants. Like many commentators (but not Fox and not W. Sibley Towner [NIB, 1997]), L. sees parts of the book as quotations of popular views or those of other teachers that are cited only for refutation (e.g., 89–91).

L. offers Qoheleth as a third-century B.C. wisdom textbook that attempts “to profit as much as possible from the
Greek understanding of the world,” without abandoning Israel’s religious traditions and wisdom (6). Qoheleth is not, in L.’s view, a despairing study of the “vanity of human wishes,” but an affirmation of the goodness of human life and of the role God plays in it. Will such a Qoheleth prove as popular as the skeptic that both the tradition and modern commentators have usually identified?

M. O’CONNOR
Catholic University of America, Washington


Despite the much used “Good Samaritan,” few today know that a small but growing community of the biblical Samaritans still exists in Palestine and Israel. Even fewer know what the origins and distinctiveness of this religious-ethnic group are. The book by Anderson and Giles should go a long way towards remedying this situation.

A. and G. aim “to uncover the history and religion of the Samaritans” (1), drawing on both literary and archaeological evidence. They recount and reconstruct the history of the Samaritans from antiquity to the present, devoting separate chapters to a discussion of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Samaritan religion and its distinctive traits, and the so-called Chamberlain-Warren Collection of Samaritan manuscripts and artifacts. The latter, named after the American millionaire and churchman, E. K. Warren, and his son-in-law, F. W. Chamberlain, prompted A. and G. to pursue research into the history of the Samaritans. The Collection was assembled in the early part of the 20th century and eventually given to Michigan State University where A. taught. An account of its genesis and contents respectively begins and ends the book.

Titled after the Samaritans’ self-designation, the book is written in a lively style well suited for a general readership interested in this ancient branch of the Israelite-Jewish religion. Moreover, the text is enhanced with quotations from primary sources in boxes, maps, photographs, a bibliography arranged by topics, and an index.

On some details in the book one can have a different opinion: on the identity of the uncircumcised Shechemites in Theodotus’ Greek poem of the second century B.C.E.; on the designation of Samaritan Pentateuch-like texts found in Qumran as “proto-” rather than “pre-Samaritan”; or on the use, in certain contexts, of the term “Samaritans” (members of the distinct religious community) rather than “Samarians” (inhabitants of Samaria in general). These differences, however, do not detract from the fact that the book is a readable and reliable introduction to an important sister-religion of Judaism.

REINHARD PUMMER
University of Ottawa


This richly documented study represents an important step in the maturing of studies on the place of women in the Jesus movement. The subtitle implies that some earlier feminist studies constructed myths or fantasies of Christian origins that gave expression to their authors’ wishes or political agenda. In contrast, C. tries to be rigorously historical, aided by her training in Scripture and classical scholarship.

C.’s praiseworthy effort to be honest historically, however, can lead to other problems. Her effort to correct a common anti-Jewish “master narrative” in NT studies (Jesus must always be superior to the Pharisees) is also a noble agendum, but it risks eradicating Jesus’ historical significance. C. argues that ancient Jewish women were no less free than Greco-Roman women, because Roman Palestine was highly Hellenized. But this claim requires nuancing: one must distinguish between women of different classes (noble women were often quite liberated) and between urban and rural women. To get at the historical Jesus, C. relies on the “official” reconstruction of Q, Mark, and the earliest stratum of the Gospel of Thomas, i.e.,
the approach of the Jesus Seminar or the Third Quest.

C. concludes that Jesus censured class and status distinctions and included women among his disciples, but that he did not directly oppose ancient patriarchal limitations on women. He was not the only teacher in antiquity to have female disciples, but there was no discipleship of equals. The first of five chapters looks at Jewish women’s lives in both the Diaspora and Roman Palestine. The second deals with Jesus’ female disciples as itinerant working women, who were also present at intellectual symposia, their presence a new fashion at the time. Chapter 3 speaks of Jesus’ ministry as a continuation of the prophetic critique of idolatry, e.g., his criticism of burial practices as implying a cult of ancestors (Lk 9:60; 11:47). Chapter 4 looks at mourning and lamentation texts (Lk 7:31–32; 13:34–35), because women typically performed such rites. Chapter 5 examines the burial and empty tomb traditions—burying the dead and visiting tombs were also typically the province of women. These last two chapters are rich in classical learning, archeology, and iconography. I recommend the book, especially in its next printing where its many misprints promise to be corrected.

Benedict Thomas Viviano, O.P.
University of Fribourg


The book is a sociological analysis of Hebrews. Convinced that the letter’s theology functions less as abstract reflection and more as concrete address to a particular social reality, Salevao affords a glimpse into a particular Roman house church besieged by both external and internal threats to its existence. Foundational to S.’s analysis is his classification of the community behind Hebrews as a sect. Recently separated from the Jewish synagogue, the sectarians were suffering both societal scorn from the outside culture and the threat of internal collapse from members tempted to apostatize back to Judaism.

Based on this reconstruction of the occasion of Hebrews, S. advances the theme of legitimation as the letter’s key interpretative strategy. This conceptual strategy takes two forms: Positively, the author of Hebrews attempts to reinforce the symbolic world of the community by showing the finality and superiority of Christ’s salvific activity vis-à-vis the dispensation of the old covenant. Negatively, the author threatens the prospect of eternal exclusion from salvation to any members who apostatize. This threat emerges specifically in the letter’s doctrine of the impossibility of a second repentance.

S. should be commended for his depiction of earliest Christianity as a socially marginal movement estranged from the foundation of the Jewish synagogue and at odds with the larger Greco-Roman culture of imperial Rome. In addition, he argues insightfully that Hebrews’s theology is directed towards a community in the throes of social distress.

The following considerations might have strengthened his argument. Any attempt to address the historical/social situation of Hebrews must reckon with the central role that Christ’s suffering plays in the letter’s Christology. S. does mention the paradigmatic function of Christ’s suffering, but a fuller discussion of its theological and pastoral function would have been welcome. Indeed, might not the emphasis on Christ’s suffering suggest that a concrete pastoral strategy is more integral to the author’s motivation than legitimation? That said, S. has offered a thoughtful interpretation of the social dimension of Hebrews that can only enhance attempts to contextualize its rich theology.

Kevin B. McCruden
Gonzaga University, Spokane


Foskett makes a modest contribution to recent early Christian studies on the
body, sexuality, and asceticism. Using a literary rather than either a theological or historical method, she focuses on two narratives, Luke-Acts and the Protevangelium of James (PJ), to elucidate how the two texts present images of Mary as “virgin.” F.’s thesis, based on reader-oriented literary theory, is that readers always construct character out of clues provided in the text, but also use cultural materials beyond the text. She aims to reconstruct “neither ancient readers nor their experience of reading, but the connotations and images implied by Mary’s sexual status when Luke-Acts and PJ are read alongside other ancient texts” (8).

Chapters 2 and 3, perhaps the most valuable section of the book, explore diverse connotations of virginity in Greco-Roman culture and the ambivalent portraits of virgins in pagan, Jewish, and Christian narratives. F. demonstrates that the virgin in antiquity “is not a single cultural symbol, nor does she bear a single valence. Rather, she is multidimensional, connoting a spectrum of images and meanings” (72). Virginity might connote prophetic power, as well as vulnerability; purity, as well as erotic attraction and danger; single-mindedness, as well as physical integrity.

Chapters 4 and 5 consider how readers familiar with these cultural connotations of virginity might have understood the textual portraits of Mary as “virgin” in Luke-Acts and PJ. Not surprisingly, F. finds that some nuances associated with virginity are suppressed, while others are reinforced. For example, Luke’s Virgin Mary appears as simultaneously vulnerable and prophetic, as in the Magnificat (Lk 1:46–56). Yet, unlike the “virgin” of many Greco-Roman texts, in Luke-Acts Mary “is neither abandoned, nor eroticized, nor exploited as an object of lust” (139). By contrast, F. argues, the Virgin Mary presented in PJ is a passive cult object, the locus of holiness, but neither an agent nor a prophet; her defining aspect is continent sexuality (162).

F. has presented a careful and thoughtful reading of a wide body of literature. The limitations of her exclusively literary method, however, are apparent in the lack of attention to historical context. We learn nothing about PJ or Luke-Acts other than their treatment of the “virgin.” Issues of date, provenance, and theological purpose are not even broached. As a result, attention remains fixed entirely on the surface of the text, as if the image of the “virgin” somehow floated free of the text itself.

DAVID G. HUNTER
Iowa State University, Ames


In the plethora of studies of Mary Magdalene that complement widespread interest in The DaVinci Code, here is something different. Brock’s revised dissertation examines the literary evidence for the gradual principled effacement of the authority of Mary Magdalene in the years before Gregory the Great identified her as the repentant sinner. B.’s interest stems from her being refused consideration for ordination in the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod, but the volume is no disguised apologia. Through the New Testament materials and later Coptic and Syriac sources, B. examines defining characteristics of an “apostle” and illustrates the reduction in authority of Mary as Apostle to the Apostles. While none of the NT evidence is new, B. is more competent than many Scripture scholars in showing how Luke demonstrates this reduction of authority more than the other Gospels. She cites significant trends such as the concomitant augmentation of the authority of Peter and the displacement by, not confusion with, the Virgin Mary.

The book is very clearly organized and written. It carefully compares and contrasts the canonical and noncanonical sources and includes well-chosen excerpts (and translations) from primary sources, some not easily available. The literary analysis is more than satisfactory but the historical contextualization is weak. It leaves many interesting questions for the next generation of scholars.
B. provides an extensive bibliography and indexes. I recommend the book for advanced undergraduate majors, graduate students, and research libraries.

MAUREEN A. TILLEY  
University of Dayton


Maschio’s exposition of Ambrose’s commentary on Psalm 118 falls into three parts: Christological, ecclesiological, and anthropological. The first part of necessity delves into the major doctrinal debate of the time surrounding Western homoianism, less accurately and polemically called Arianism. M. finds continuity and harmony between the bishop’s earlier doctrinal teaching in De fide ad Gratianum and his later pastoral concerns in the homilies on Psalm 118. One finds in the commentary a twofold emphasis: first, on the unity of Christ with the Father and the Holy Spirit in power and in action and, second, on the humility of the incarnate Christ and Redeemer.

The second part deals with the Church as both mother and image. The Church is the true Eve; Mary is a type of the Church. In the psalms David clearly speaks not only for himself but also as the vox ecclesiae ad Christum. Thus, Psalm 118 must be seen as referring to the Resurrection of Christ and to the sacraments of regeneration. The Church as image of Christ is inseparable from him who is the beginning and end of all things.

The third part concerns more controversial aspects of Ambrose’s theology. An Alexandrian anthropology that reduces the human being to the soul was prevalent at the time. This view represented a departure from that of Irenaeus of Lyons, whose anti-gnostic polemic emphasized the unity of body and soul. Nevertheless, Ambrose’s thought is not simply Platonic. His solution to the problem lies in understanding the relationship of the human soul to Christ in terms of both creation and incarnation, in which the flesh plays a significant role. Thus, for Ambrose the entire human being, body and soul, has been created in the model of Christ, according to his image.

M. has presented an excellent theological analysis of Ambrose’s homilies on Psalm 118. M. does justice to their complexity, and his keen historical sense has produced balanced judgments that have enabled him to avoid both the Scylla of anachronistic thinking and the Charybdis of artificial systematization.

KENNETH B. STEINHAUSER  
Saint Louis University


“If I have written anything which is displeasing to the Holy Roman Church, let it be false; I damn and abhor it. Likewise anything which should unjustly offend anyone, etc.” This “Solemn Declaration” accompanied the second edition of Cautio Criminalis, or a Book on Witch Trials by Friedrich Spee von Langenfeld.

In the late 1620s a wave of witch hunts swept across large areas of Germany. Their ferocity rivaled anything that Germany had seen, and it had already endured the worst excesses of the European witch hunts. In 1631, at their peak, S. published Cautio Criminalis, arguing that the plague of witches supposedly infesting Germany was the product of the witch trials, themselves. S., a Jesuit who apparently believed in witches, encouraged the Catholic prince-bishops to examine the conduct of the witch trials, to regulate the use of torture to elicit confessions and denunciations (or the naming of others), and even to end the trials.

The publication of Cautio caused considerable alarm. On a personal level, it jeopardized S.’s place in the Society of Jesus. His reputation within the order was eventually restored, but as of his death in 1635, he was not allowed to
take his fourth vow. Beyond that, he became the most articulate voice among a growing number of skeptics, including some of his fellow Jesuits. His most important individual contribution to the opposition was his warning to the princes that unless they could ensure the safety of the innocent, they must halt the further prosecution of suspected witches or jeopardize their own salvation.

The book’s publication did not lead directly to the cessation of witch trials in Germany, but it did lend significant support to the opposition that, by the late 1620s, led to the elimination of the trials’ worst excesses. The book’s value today lies not only in being a moving example of “an individual speaking truth to power” (vii), but also in its relevance to our own time and our continued propensity to engage in witch hunts that jeopardize the lives of the innocent, long after we have stopped believing in witches.

BRYAN F. LE BEAU
University of Missouri-Kansas City


Barth’s critical study of William Wordsworth and S. T. Coleridge successfully places Romantic literature and theological concern in a meditative conversation on the nature of imagination. For B., overtly reflecting on his own formation as a Jesuit, imagination is “the faculty that allows the human person, whether instinctively or consciously, to shape the world into meaning, much as in the beginning God shaped chaos into cosmos” (1).

The theological import of the book ascends with each chapter. Early chapters on Wordsworth’s The Prelude reveal the poet’s engagement with nature and the articulation of “profound experiences of the transcendent” in symbols (24). B. maintains that while Wordsworth never fully integrates “Christ into his sacramental view of the world” (28), imagination allows the poet to express the experience of transcendent, divine realities through the richness of symbolic language.

The strength of this volume lies in the later chapters on Coleridge and prayer. B. maintains that Coleridge regards prayer as “an essential means of achieving the necessary union of the finite will with the Absolute Will” (90). B. first reads the “Rime of the Ancient Mariner” through the lens of the stages of Ignatius’s Spiritual Exercises in order to draw out the progressive movement of the individual towards union with the divine. Later, a distinctly spiritual and personal tone emerges as B. develops a theology of prayer: “Prayer gives us a means of expressing the hope that there is indeed a realm of blessedness to which we can aspire, and that in the end it is possible to reach that blessed state” (117). The final chapter relates the Coleridgean symbol to the contemporary work of Karl Rahner and George Steiner in order to present a critique of excessively abstract and stagnant approaches to religion.

One need not be an expert in Romantic poetry to profit from this study. While B.’s final proposal that language may “convey an experience of the transcendent” (133) will trouble some critics of Romanticism, the insightful correlation of Ignatian spirituality and Romanticism establishes B. as a guide capable of straddling the oft-fragmented domains of poetics and religion.

JEFFREY W. BARBEAU
Oral Roberts University, Tulsa


The book belongs to the series directed by Philippe Capelle on “Philosophie et Théologie,” a theme very well suited to Blondel’s thought. Indeed, it leads Virgoulay directly into an examination of the heart of Blondel’s philosophical project. The starting point is Blondel’s lived Catholic faith; his “intention is apologetic in the sense that he wants to show the credibility of this Christian faith” (27). To make the faith truly credible to his learned contemporaries, however, it was crucial that the presentation be truly philosophical.
Blondel spent years developing a proper method of achieving this goal, which led to a study of action using an essentially negative and indirect "method of immanence."

V.'s book is centered on the basic methodology that undergirds Blondel's philosophical project. Putting aside any presupposition of faith, Blondel analyzes human action philosophically and finds that there is an inevitable need for the truly supernatural (which is what Catholic faith promises). For him, it is essential that the idea of the supernatural, precisely as supernatural, become the object of a properly philosophical investigation.

Furthermore, V. shows how at various points Blondel "transposed" certain themes from the catechism into philosophy. For example, the teaching that human existence ultimately entails an exercise of freedom for or against God resulting in either salvation or perdition is paralleled in Blondel's assertion that a sanction for the misuse of action is immanent to action itself; the sanction is not applied extrinsically. Thus Blondel argues that an analysis of action supports the idea of human choice as possibly leading to eternal perdition. V. is careful to point out, however, that what is transposed into philosophy is not properly theology but elements of the catechism. Blondel was an amateur in theology (indeed, V. examines quite critically some of the limitations of Blondel's self-taught theology).

This study brings to bear the expertise that V. has acquired over decades of studying Blondel's work, and serves as an excellent overview of Blondel's thought, particularly in terms of its fundamental intention and methodology.

JAMES LE GRYS
Unites States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington


This compact intellectual history/biography provides a fine survey of Jacques Maritain's and Emmanuel Mounier's thought from about 1905 to 1955. Its helpful politico-historical summaries situate this golden age of French Catholicism in context. The subtitle is somewhat misleading—as events change, so do the understandings. The continuous thread is Personalism: an attempt to find a middle way between the 20th century's two great ideologies, individualism and collectivism, and the "resacralization" of a "world without mystery" (124). Maritain's 1920s "anti-modernism"—his enduring contempt for capitalist individualism—begins the drama; his eventual 1950s softening towards American liberal democracy concludes it (60–71; 156–57). In between is Mounier's passionate life, his 1929–1932 founding of Esprit, and an exposition of the 1936 Personalist Manifesto (129–41).

First published in 1975, A.'s work provided English speakers with an introduction to the thought underpinning Vatican II's documents emphasizing the dignity of the person and society as communion/solidarity. Reissued in the post-1979 context of John Paul II's pontificate, it provides insight into the enduring formation of the young Karol Wojtyla.

A.'s exposition is fair-minded; his final judgment is negative. Personalism's "sweeping and imprecise" metaphors and apocalyptic rhetoric (e.g., "crisis/twilight/end of civilization"; or today: "culture of death," "axis of evil") express an "interior sense of crisis" and appeal emotionally. In the end, however, they cannot attend to the complex and concrete details of human history: "hard, irrational, mute forces" like "population, technology, statecraft, etc." Thus A. sees Personalism as "an historical document from a past epoch rather than a living doctrine for contemporary man" that nevertheless remains a utopian "invitation" to become "more than what the powers and anarchy" of our times would make us (140,163). This 1975 conclusion seems even more judicious when read after the 1989 end of communist collectivism.

A.'s work can be highly recommended for introducing a new generation to a forgotten yet crucial age of Catholicism whose thought is essential for understanding Vatican II conciliar and
post-1979 pontifical documents. It also provides a critique, and could be profitably read with Tony Judt’s *Past Imperfect* (1992). Personalism’s “anti-modernist” emphasis on solidarity and embodiment easily turns—and in the post-1944 “cleansing” did turn—into an apologia for another tyrannical form of authoritarianism.

**Stephen R. Schloesser, S.J.**
Boston College


Despite its disclaimer (1), O’Meara’s book is an intellectual autobiography, focusing on 1963–1968, the most formative years of his life, which were spent as a graduate student at the Ludwig-Maximilian University in Munich, Germany. These years coincided with sessions two, three, and four of Vatican II. The book charts O.’s development as a young theologian responding to a unique educational opportunity offered in the midst of momentous changes in Church and society.

These were the years of the great theologians, most of whom were rehabilitated to serve as experts at the council. They included Rahner, Congar, de Lubac, and Schillebeeckx. Despite his then lowly status O. had contact with several of them, and was one of the small group of Anglophone students privileged to have had Rahner as a professor in Munich. O.’s insights into the greatness of this man make some of the most enthralling reading of the book.

One important lesson O. learned from his experience was the confluence of theology and culture. He came to see that no theology was timeless, that all theologies past and present were products of cultures, which were reflected also through the arts, notably architecture and music.

The principal value of the book to theologians, and hence the justification of its review in this journal, is the picture it conveys of the huge shift in theological perspective that began in the mid-20th century and is still underway. Essentially this shift was from an approach that was abstract and, in intention at least, transcendent to culture, to one that is consciously enculturated, vernacular, and ecumenically sensitive, and hence more open to direct pastoral engagement. O.’s book will help younger theologians to appreciate the magnitude and cost of this change, which otherwise they might be inclined to take for granted. The special quality of his depiction derives from the fact that he was there, at the heart of the action, and ideally—if perhaps fortuitously—prepared to register and interpret what was happening around him. Not least among the book’s qualities is that its English style is graceful and imaginative and enlivened by a wry sense of humor.

**David Coffey**
Marquette University, Milwaukee


Swinburne first considers whether God could with reason bring about a resurrection and whether there could be evidence for such a “super-miracle.” Then S. illustrates how Jesus lived the life, communicated the teaching, and made the claims to be expected of God incarnate. Thus Jesus showed himself the kind of person whom God would reasonably resurrect. Lastly, S. weighs the grounds for accepting what the Easter witnesses reported about the Resurrection. He draws attention to the fact that from the beginning Christians celebrated the Eucharist on Sunday—historical evidence that they knew that the foundation of their faith lay in a tremendous happening on that day. In the light of the total evidence, S. concludes that it was more likely than not that Jesus was God incarnate and rose from the dead. S. adds a mathematical calculus of probability for accepting the Resurrection, the divine signature on the teaching of Jesus and on the teaching of the Church he founded.

S. takes into account more evidence than do many authors on the Resurrection. He marshals well the evidence to
show how Jesus is the only serious candidate in history for satisfying the prior requirements of being God incarnate. S. also correctly insists that the discussion of the Resurrection of Jesus is inseparably tied up with the discussion of whether Jesus was God incarnate.

After rightly insisting that the laws of nature constantly depend on God for their operation, S. speaks of God occasionally “violating” or “interfering” in the operation of natural laws. Why not speak of God, for good purposes, occasionally “suspending” or “overriding” the operation of such laws? In any case, does even “super-miracle” fit the Resurrection? What is missing in the book is personal experience, which allows one to move beyond the probabilities of historical evidence to embrace and live Easter faith.

GERALD O’COLLINS, S.J.
Gregorian University, Rome.


The volume’s title derives from the opening remark of John Paul II’s 13th encyclical (1998): “Faith and reason are like two wings on which the human spirit rises to the contemplation of truth.” Editors Foster and Koterski and their fellow contributors seek to promote an understanding, acceptance, and concrete application of papal teaching about these two vehicles of human understanding, as well as about the disciplines of philosophy and theology. The overall theme of the book (and of the encyclical) is well expressed by this statement from one of the essays: “When philosophers and theologians interact in an integral complementarity . . . we synergetically generate something far greater than the simple addition of our contributions” (67).

Most prominent among the contributors is Cardinal Avery Dulles, S.J., who has the opening essay on the encyclical’s treatment of the question of a “Christian philosophy,” and the concluding one on the development of thought in this encyclical compared with earlier magisterial teachings, especially those of the Vatican I. Other contributors are F. and K. (the latter also with two essays), Prudence Allen, R.S.M. (from whom comes the above-quoted summary statement), David Vincent Meconi, S.J., Bishop Allen Vigneron, Michael Sweeney, and Timothy Sean Quinn.

Ten essays are grouped under three categories: Doctrinal Perspectives, Implications, and Historical Perspective. Each essay carefully explores some aspect of Fides et ratio—surely the densest of John Paul II’s papal writings, as well as pregnant with suggestions for the Church’s intellectual life and evangelistic mission. While some essays will especially interest philosophers, no essay should be regarded as irrelevant to theologians. The importance of the central issue raised in several essays—whether contemporary theology should and can be informed by metaphysics of a classical, realistic sort—can hardly be overestimated. Moreover, theologians will be cheered by F.’s views on how Fides et ratio importantly supplements Ex corde Ecclesiae by providing a rational basis for academic freedom.

Two resources of special note add to the book’s usefulness for both students and seasoned scholars: a summary-outline of Fides et ratio and an index of topics and proper names found within the encyclical.

JOHN W. CARLSON
Creighton University, Omaha


Robbins addresses the problem of the relation between philosophy and theology, which he sees summarized in the concept of philosophical theology. Through a scholarly, although at times somewhat simplistic analysis of the thought of major contemporary philosophers (Husserl, Heidegger, Ricoeur, Derrida, Kristeva) and theologians (Barth, Bonhoeffer, Marion), he argues
for what he calls—rather idiosyncratically—“the ontotheological condition” as “the condition of thought in general and the symptom of any and all thinking in particular” (11). What this “ontotheological condition” precisely is remains somewhat undefined, although one learns that it is more than the intermixing of theology and philosophy, for it precedes both (2), that it is the constitutive origin and legacy of Western thought (3), and that it somehow resembles Kristeva’s “abject” (5–7, 148–52). Perhaps it is simply the fact that theology and philosophy cannot be separated from each other, that the one always “informs” (3) the other. Yet, a few words on the nature of such an “informing,” not clarified by a series of “essential” interludes, could be helpful, especially to the reader who approaches the text with a precise understanding of what “ontotheology” means in and after Heidegger. In any event, R. claims that such a condition is not a mistake, but rather “the constitutive destiny that is not to be overcome at all, but instead embraced as the fact of life” (11).

R. finds support for his claim in his somewhat unimpressive reading of Levinas’s ethics, with which the book more or less concludes. What the book does not take into consideration in its advocacy of a Levinasian “dialogue beyond dialogue” (146) between theology and philosophy is how Levinas’s ethics challenges the very notions of faith and thought, God and philosophy, subjectivity and the holy on which philosophy and theology are traditionally based, so that the very notion of an “ontotheological condition,” whatever that may be, becomes problematic within the context of a Levinas-inspired thinking.

SILVIA BENSO
Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y.


In his preface, Jürgen Moltmann relates his intention as a schoolboy to study mathematics and physics. War intervened, and the existential questions it raised led him to theology instead (xi). Yet as early as 1963, as the opening essay of this book attests, he was looking for a way out of the strict neo-orthodox separation of theological from scientific discourse. The book’s title comes from two hitherto unpublished essays in which M. suggests that faith and reason can encounter each other in a common quest for a sort of practical wisdom about human beings’ place and future in the cosmos. He also identifies his effort here as a properly chastened “natural theology.”

The principal themes and arguments of the book are worked out in greater detail in his longer systematic works, and all but two of the twelve essays have been published elsewhere, so there are no surprises here. On divine agency, M. is an “anti-interventionist.” He extends his kenotic Christology to a doctrine of creation (also drawing a parallel with Isaac Luria’s doctrine of divine contraction, or zimzum). God humbles Godself by “making time and space” for an autonomous creation, and acts only as the futural source of possibility, bearing patiently with creation’s failures and tendencies to close in on itself while also offering it ever new possibilities for life-giving actualization now (65–66). This scenario leaves accounting for the present actuality of creation (as a network of “open-ended” dynamic systems) to science, while faith and theology maintain their proper concern for the future salvation or catastrophe of the whole.

How much M.’s conception really overcomes the separation of science and theology is an open question, and those with Thomistic proclivities will balk at M.’s metaphysics, with its assertion of the priority of possibility over actuality and its ontological focus on the future (Ernst Bloch). The volume is, nonetheless, a valuable, concise compendium of how M. applies his theology to an important modern conversation.

J. MATTHEW ASHLEY
University of Notre Dame


The Asian Catholic Church, in its great diversity and complexity, has been about discovering the Christ of history in Asian symbols, cultures, and religions for over four decades now. These three books chronicle this search and delve into the mystery of God unfolding in the rich religious context of Asia. Each affirms that at the heart of this quest has been a commitment to the poor, an en-culturation of the Gospel in Asian voices, and a respectful interreligious dialogue.

The first two volumes compile key documents from the 1998 Asian Synod of Bishops and their theological responses. Phan’s comprehensive volume not only includes the Lineamenta or the working document issued by the Vati-can, but also the insightful, even trenchant responses of the eleven Catholic Bishops’ Conferences and 25 essays by a wide range of Asian theologians. It also includes the pope’s post-synodal Ecclesia in Asia. It will serve as the standard reference for the synod.

The other compendium by Kroeger and Phan provides all the essential documents of the synod and has greater selectivity. Undoubtedly, because of its price and accessibility, it will have much greater use throughout Asia itself. It would also provide an excellent resource for a course in contemporary ecclesiology of the world Church.

The frankness of the Asian bishops and theologians throughout these papers and during the sessions themselves alarmed some curial officials who still assumed a deferential stance of the East toward the West. The Japanese bishops, for instance, asserted they were not “branch offices” accountable to the central office. Two critical essays in the Phan volume—by M. Amaladoss (53) and J. Tan (59)—highlight the inadequacy of the Vatican’s working document. The greatest differences occurred around the controversial issue of Jesus Christ as the “only and universal savior of humankind.” In the multireligious context of most Asian countries, statements about the uniqueness of Jesus Christ and the absoluteness of Christianity foreclose dialogue.

Fox provides an excellent narrative pathway through the vast complexity of “Asian theology” and through the pastoral and theological ferment leading up to the Asian Synod. Having traveled extensively throughout Asia for almost 40 years, F. also provides many firsthand accounts of the economic, social, politi-cal, demographic, and social conditions that beset the various cultures. Each of his 14 chapters reads as a separate essay, and the book suffers from some repetition, but it gives vibrant voice to the Asian ecclesial experience and to the rich variations and exceptions of the churches in such countries as the Philippines, India, Vietnam, and Thailand. Throughout his narratives, F. effectively describes the Asian vision for the integration of mind, body, and spirit, and its resilient belief in dialogue, since there is always more to be revealed (xii).

One group conspicuously absent from the synod was the Chinese bishops. In a separate chapter, F. describes the lingering suspicions between the “official” Chinese church and the underground church and their current convergence with diplomatic encouragement from the Vatican. He highlights the fact that there are almost no priests or nuns in China between the ages of 35 and 70 (82), and that healthy religious formation for the numerous seminarians and religious has now become the top priority. Most theological reflection in China appears to be “borrowed” from other cultures rather than contextualized in its own rich heritage.

For those seeking to discern the vitality and energy of the Spirit working to transform the Church, these books provide tantalizing glimpses of the multiple alternatives to a monolithic Roman ecclesiology.

Patrick J. Howell, S.J.
Seattle University

For Jesuit theologian Carl Starkloff (who has worked for many years among the Arapaho and Shoshoni Indians in Wyoming and is highly respected for his publications in missiology), syncretism is an unavoidable dimension of enculturation, contextualization, and indigenization. Well aware of the fact that syncretism continues to arouse fear among many church leaders and theologians, S. presents both a positive and critical view of the syncretic process, starting with an analysis of the cultural dynamics at work in the development of the Church from its Middle-Eastern origin to its European expansion in the 14th century.

The historical overview is followed by a more systematic approach inspired by Eric Voegelin and Bernard Lonergan. From Voegelin S. borrows the notion of the “In-Between” (the Metaxy) which allows him to understand syncretism as part of the basic tension between the historical incarnations of Christianity and its eschatological fulfillment. Lonergan offers him the theological method by which to evaluate the faithfulness of new local theologies to the Christian tradition. Lonergan’s “transcendental precepts” and “eight functional specialties” help to construct a more systematic approach to syncretism to avoid both its canonization by the defenders of a multicultural or polycentric Church and its demonization by those concerned with the unity and authenticity of the Christian faith.

Throughout his own missionary experience, S. has learned that both the proclaimers and the receivers of the gospel always need to negotiate difficult “passages” between innovation and tradition. In chapter 3, he brings readers into the field of syncretic practices by examining two major ceremonial complexes, the “Sun Dance” and the “Peyote Religion,” along with references to the sweat lodge ritual, all of which offer challenging illustrations of the syncretic tension experienced by many Christian aboriginal persons. These contexts serve as a basis for the construction of a provisional theological and pastoral methodology. Unfortunately, we do not find in this field expedition explicit references to the contemporary Christian experiences of the Anishinabe people in Ontario with whom S. has had a long and profound relationship. Two appendices on Christian and nonconfessional views of syncretism present helpful aids for further study.

ACHIEL PEELMAN, O.M.I.
Saint Paul University, Ottawa


If you wish to understand the mind of a scholar who has spent his life teaching and writing on naturalist theism in a scientific age, this is your book. Karl Peters, President of the Center for Advanced Study in Religion and Science and co-editor of Zygon, offers a personal interpretation of his faith. For him, God is a verb, the “process of creating.” If one thinks of God as a noun, one has difficulty perceiving God in the midst of life. So humans have created analogies to describe the mysterious presence that works within the world to create and recreate. All religions contribute to understanding God, “the event of creation.” A concept of God based on Darwinian evolution of natural selection and random variation can see God in process as a dance. By participating in the creative process one is “dancing with the sacred.”

P.’s account of his first wife’s last illness and the transformation he underwent due to her influence and the influences the historical Jesus had on his followers is deeply personal. P. distinguishes between the man Jesus and the Christ event, “a self bigger than the person on the cross.” The influences coalesced into what “Paul called the mind of Christ or the spirit of Christ—the spirit of undiscriminating love” (123). The Resurrection became a symbol of the greater reality of a social self that transcends death. P.’s testimony of com-
ing to see how human love can continue beyond death even in a Darwinian world of natural selection, and to understand the meaning of nuptial love and then make it a part of his own Unitarian ministry is powerful.

Although a nonpersonal God dominates P.’s thought, he is open to the image of a personal God. The chapter, “At Home in the Universe,” portrays a universal ecological perspective that emphasizes the natural value of death leading to new life. P.’s openness to the salutary meaning of the “Christ event” is evident.

This clearly written book offers the finest personal exposition of the school of naturalist theism that dominates the writings of many contemporary intellectuals and scientists.

JAMES F. SALMON, S.J.
Loyola College of Maryland

TRA TERRA E CIELO: IL SENSO DELLA VITA A PARTIRE DAL DIBATTITO BIOETICO.

In his latest book, Maurizio Chiodi, professor of moral theology in Milan, embarks on a reconstruction of the meaning of life as it emerges in the bioethical debate. According to C., in spite of the obvious centrality of bios for bioethics, the notion of life fails to receive adequate attention within the field: either speculative concerns capitulate to the pressure of ever-cogent normative questions; or its use betrays an objectivist bias that reduces life to a merely biological fact.

In part 1, C. critically confronts different versions of bioethical discourse
on life: from those centering on contrasting notions of quality and sanctity of life (Helga Kuhse and Maurizio Mori), to more recent attempts to overcome altogether that dichotomy in favor of theological (Richard McCormick, James Keenan, Eberhard Schoenkhoff) and philosophical (Corrado Viora, Bruno Cadoré, and Jean-Marie Breuvart) hermeneutics of the dignity of human life.

In part 2, C. provides a systematic reconstruction of the notion of human life in terms of meaning and freedom. In critical dialogue with Bergson, Husserl, Rahner, and Ricoeur, C. pleads for a theoretical model that recognizes the constitutive function of intentionality and moral meaning in the definition of human life’s basic existential components: intersubjectivity, affectivity, suffering, and care.

The book is challenging and interesting, especially in its effort to articulate a phenomenological theory of human life that borrows from a philosophical tradition that C. knows very well. It is not clear, however, how such a theory can benefit the field of bioethics whose theoretical deficits C. so critically analyzes in part 1. Although one must admire C.’s willingness to engage philosophers and theologians from different linguistic milieus, it is difficult to escape the impression that he does so without always doing justice to their positions and intentions. At times, his criticism becomes even pedantic, especially when it misses the point. Perhaps the field of bioethics is theoretically more interesting than C. suspects.

ROBERTO DELL’ORO
Loyola Marymount University,
Los Angeles


Farley argues that the isolation of compassion and respect from one another, a common occurrence in both theory and practice, distorts the meaning of both and thereby undermines our ability to respond appropriately and effectively to those in need. It follows that “only if they [compassion and respect] are integrated, each requiring the other, will their full meaning be conceptually clear and practically useful in moral discernment” (4). The book is an extended defense of this claim.

Using the HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa as an example, F. reflects on the practical implications of the failure to integrate compassion and respect into a single response. She argues that the compassionate responses of the world’s religions to this pandemic, while admirable, are limited by a failure to recognize the degree to which religious teachings and practices with respect to women have exacerbated the crisis. A fully compassionate response, she argues, would seek to revise these teachings and practices in ways that contribute to the full flourishing of women in Africa and elsewhere.

At the level of moral theory, F. illustrates the problem she has in mind by way of an analogous problem in the field of medical ethics: the debate between advocates of so-called “principlism” and advocates of an “ethics of care.” Whereas the former’s commitment to universal principles can obscure the unique needs of particular patients, the latter’s lack of “criteria for true caring” (39) diminishes their ability to care effectively. Similarly, while norms “without compassion can miss the sufferer altogether” compassion without norms can be mistaken, corrupted, and miss the real needs of persons altogether” (64). Compassion is most compassionate, then, when it is tethered to the normative demands of respect for persons.

While this is an expanded version of F.’s 2002 Madeleva Lecture, it remains a very short work. The book’s brevity, however, is more than compensated by its philosophical, theological, and spiritual depth. Rarely does one find a text that combines rigor and insight with elegant and moving prose, but Compassionate Respect is just such a work. Highly recommended.

JAMES P. BAILEY
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

In his consideration of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Nigeria, James Olaitan Ajayi provides a comprehensible, accessible, and in-depth understanding of the disease, how it is contracted, and the factors that contribute to its spread. A.'s primary focus is on HIV/AIDS in Nigeria—second only to South Africa in prevalence of the disease—where the local Church is unresponsive, unjustifiably fearful of being "accused of undermining the Church's teaching" (9). His examination of the debate surrounding ethical responses to the disease and its spread is a positive contribution to ongoing debates about appropriate means of preventing the spread of the disease. A. argues strongly and effectively that an immediate, comprehensive response is required. Such a response has to include clear and explicit HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention education. Emphasis on sexual abstinence except within a monogamous marriage of non-infected partners is essential, but education about other preventive measures, including condom use and needle exchange, is equally important.

One of the book's strengths is its careful exposition of the range of moral arguments and positions brought to bear on the issue. The position of those who support magisterial teaching and view the use of condoms as intrinsically evil is fairly and accurately presented. A. argues, however, that the use of condoms is "a necessary component of HIV/AIDS prevention" (172). He grounds this position solidly in the Catholic moral tradition and, with pastoral sensitivity, effectively demonstrates how the principles of double effect, the lesser of two evils, toleration, and cooperation support it.

The book clearly bears the earmarks of a dissertation—redundancy along with some poor editing is at times distracting. Though A. refers to needle exchange programs, he does not examine the issue in depth—which is not surprising, given that in the Nigerian context there are no reported cases of HIV/AIDS transmission through drug use. In addition to furthering the discussion of HIV/AIDS awareness and prevention, A. has provided a much needed resource for classroom use, particularly for those preparing for ministry.

REGINA WENTZEL WOLFE
Dominican University,
River Forest, Ill.


Williams offers a wide-ranging and spirited commentary on several issues facing the contemporary Church and world. Topics include rapid cultural change, globalization, feminism, poverty, AIDS, environmental degradation, and terrorism. She does not pretend to offer a systematic examination of public issues and theological challenges, but does invoke "the authority of experience" (xi) that derives from a long and prominent career in British politics and American academia. As a Catholic politician, she was a member of the House of Commons for 16 years, co-founder of the Liberal Party, and a member of the British Cabinet. The purpose of this volume, which is based on lectures delivered at Notre Dame, is to explore ethical conflicts associated with maintaining Christian identity amidst contemporary public life. It is heartening to see an accomplished politician concerned not only about the health of our political institutions, but also about "the spiritual void in secular societies" (27) as well as the credibility of the Church amidst crises of sexual abuse and priestly vocations.

W. reveals herself to be optimistic, practical, principled, and a tireless proponent of social justice. While her agenda of inclusion, reconciliation, and human rights is hardly original, her impassioned advocacy for the mustering of the political will to address injustices and invest in a better future emerges as the volume's major contribution. Most impressive is the way that W.'s impa-
tience for social change contains a yearning replete with spiritual dimensions that transcend routine political strategies. Her calls for certain reforms of church practice, mostly pertaining to lay participation and sexual teachings, contain much good sense and are clearly the product of loving concern for the Church rather than bitterness or resentment.

The book at times flirts with the genre of political memoir, as it is filled with delightful anecdotes on world leaders, international events, and even the indignities of campaigning amidst the hedgerows of the English countryside. The result is an account of social concerns and recommendations for new priorities that is often inspiring, but not fully persuasive. A richer volume would tackle these same social issues more directly, thoroughly, and analytically but perhaps with less charm.

THOMAS MASSARO, S.J.
Weston Jesuit School of Theology


By playing on the venerable Augustinian phrase, in the world but not of it, Paul Valadier’s subtitle tries to describe the current state of contemporary Christianity. The problem thus chosen for discussion is profound: how to articulate what is distinctive about Christian life today, and what ought to be.

V.’s account of what is currently the case is discouraging. The worldview of most Christians has become virtually indistinguishable from that of their secular counterparts. Whatever the religious roots of their concerns with, say, the toleration of difference, respect for law, or the pursuit of the good life, it has become increasingly obvious that their Christianity has melded into a vague humanism that tries, above all, to give offense to no one.

By contrast, V.’s conviction is that Christians should be characterized by “the freedom of the children of God.” Those who genuinely live in the “spirit” of Christ should be able to take authentic interest in all aspects of life without surrendering their own religious motivations. They will then bring to bear on modern problems a perspective entirely different from the typical motivations of nonbelievers. Even when Christians come to the same conclusions as nonbelievers, it will be their distinctive Christian convictions that bring them to these positions.

To support this thesis, V. criticizes most of the traditional approaches to Christian morality and champions instead a “historicist” model. The figure of Alphonsus Liguori comes in for special attack, but V.’s opposition extends to all forms of moral theology that have resorted to casuistry or that have accepted such “old-fashioned” assumptions as original sin, the immutability of God, or natural law. Rather, he urges, Christian moralists would do well to adopt a rather Kantian view of sincerity in moral decision-making as a way of using “the liberty of the children of God.” Freed from what he considers the confining limitations of the older styles of moral theology, the contemporary Christian will honor most of all personal conscience and individual decision, free from ecclesiastical authority but ever ready to render a personal account of oneself before God. V.’s emphasis on an individualism “free from ecclesiastical authority” introduces its own set of problems.

JOSEPH W. KOTERSKI, S.J.
Fordham University, New York


The book examines Christian theology through anthropological lenses and provides insight and understanding of the social and cultural realities of faith. Davies, professor of theology at Durham University, makes no attempt to reconcile theology and anthropology, which ultimately deal with the same topic but in very different ways. Anthropology approaches faith neutral to its content, but with high interest in the social realities contextualizing belief. D.’s text employs a variety of anthropological theories, from those of the 19th-
century evolutionists such as E. B. Tylor to the contemporary symbolic and social anthropologies of Mary Douglas, Clifford Geertz, and Marshall Sahlins, to name but a few, demonstrating how they shed light on such theological topics as sacrifice, gift, grace, ritual, conversion, Eucharist, and sacramental transformation. The majority of D.’s theological data comes from Anglicanism, although he also explores beliefs and actions specific to Catholicism and Eastern Orthodoxy and makes occasional fruitful excursions into the world religions.

D.’s method displays both the richness of anthropological thought and its utility in illuminating theological ideas and religious actions. The work is clearly written, often with delightful dry wit (as when D. transforms the title of Durkheim’s key work on religion, The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life [1915, E.T. 1964] into his own heading concerning the Eucharist: The Alimentary Forms of the Religious Life).

This sophisticated, thoughtful work requires a solid understanding of both anthropological theory and theological issues, as D. uses each to illuminate the other. While specific anthropological theory (commonly that of Mary Douglas) has been brought to bear on theology, D.’s book clearly shows the importance of the entire spectrum of anthropology to theological discourse and stands as a model for interactions between the sacred and the profane.

RAYMOND A. BUCKO, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


In its dogged deconstruction of the rationalist hegemony of the modern world, postmodernism overturns the foundations of many disciplines, including preaching. Presenting an insightful analysis of the contributions and limitations of postmodernist thought, David Lose boldly challenges the Church to view postmodernism not as a dire threat to the very nature of Christianity, but rather as a fresh opportunity to clarify the nature and significance of theology and preaching. In the Church’s mission of preaching Jesus Christ, L. teaches preachers how to speak of truth and reality with integrity and to facilitate a mutual and critical conversation with the faith community and world.

Thoroughly researched and written with extraordinary clarity, L. seeks to reclaim the Christian practice of confession. He constructs a confessional homiletic that proclaims faith’s deepest convictions and sparks belief within the faithful that leads to further confession both in worship and in life in the world. Using Paul Ricoeur’s dialectic of participation and distanciation leading to appropriation, confessional preaching functions as both (1) a summary of the “essential” Christian tradition, offering a communal identity and way of making sense of the world (participation), and (2) the expression and actualization of that tradition, creating the space (distanciation) in which the hearer can encounter the claims made by that identity and through the power of the Spirit embrace that identity (appropriation).

Lastly, L. provides an informative and helpful exposition of concrete methods for preparing sermons that require preachers to be involved with two distinct conversation partners: the biblical canon and the worshiping community. “The task is to set ‘our story’ and the ‘biblical story’ in conversation, that they may illumine each other” (219). While I appreciate much of this discussion, I encourage L. to see “our story” as more than simply the “bad news” of human sinfulness, but also as the locus of the “good news” of God’s presence and activity among us today. I applaud his account of the kinds of language used in confessional preaching—ultimate, urgent, relational, and vulnerable—where he provides powerful excerpts from sermons to illustrate the operation of each. I wholeheartedly recommend the book to any serious student of homiletics.

SARAH ANN FAIRBANKS, O.P.
Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.

Albert Borgmann’s work is difficult but worthwhile reading. In part 1, B. harnesses a dizzying array of sociological, economic, political, behavioral, and philosophical perspectives to develop the notion of the “device paradigm.” The device paradigm is a social mechanism that conceals deep social structures even while it reveals a surface appearance. Such a paradigm prescribes a technological way of life in which a “traditional, contextual” substance such as cream becomes an “opaque” commodity such as Cool Whip through a “concealed and intricate machinery of techniques and therapies” (17). In doing so, the device paradigm gives us a superficial sense of comfort and security.

In part 2, B. develops the critique that contemporary culture is indifferent to Christianity. He senses a theological challenge in this indifference in terms of God’s presence or grace and our ability to sense it. As such, it is the difference between the sense of control that the device paradigm gives and the spiritual richness that a sense of contingency nurtures. B. develops this timely insight by describing how two cultures of contingency, the culture of the word and the culture of the table, have been replaced by cultures of commodity and control via the device paradigm. He then raises an important question: “How then do we go about the task of thinking through the relation of Scripture and the sacraments to the culture of technology?” (126) He answers by telling us we must recover our skill to celebrate and bring the liturgy to its cultural context. As such, the answer appears anemic, but it need not be.

Perhaps, B. should have added a third part that fleshes out his answer to his provocative question. This third part could add insights from the field of aesthetics and art theory which B. mentions but does not elaborate. Also missing from the book are insights from another work that explores the role of commodity and our sense of values in contemporary culture, Lewis Hyde’s The Gift (1983). Although these insights would have added much to his thesis, B. presents a convincing and provocative account of material culture that Christian theology dare not ignore.

Alejandro Garcia-Rivera
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


This remarkable book ought to be required reading for anyone who wants to understand the complexity of the current Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is a study of the varied design plans for developing Jewish communities in Mandate Palestine (1923–1948) and subsequently in the established state of Israel. While Troen goes into considerable detail about the designs and includes maps, his clear and direct style renders the book accessible to readers not familiar with architectural design.

Following a historical framework, T. lays out the specific visions for a Jewish national homeland that emerged during the 20th century with occasional references to their relationship to British design plans during the Mandatory period. This relationship is particularly evident with respect to Jerusalem which both British and Jewish planners envisioned primarily as a historical city rather than a political or industrial center.

T. persuasively establishes several critical points: (1) Beginning in the 1930s, strategic considerations in planning outweighed economic and ideological concerns. This priority intensified as Zionist planners lost their dream of a harmonious relationship with the local Arab population. (2) There was an ongoing struggle between emphases: on the urban setting vs. rural developments. (3) While the Zionist designers rightly did not see themselves as engaging in colonization, they gave scant attention to the needs of the Arab section. (4) There was a decided emphasis—clearly evident in the effort to expand communal settlements—on creating communities rather than simply provid-
ing housing and commercial space for individuals.

T. concludes with an excellent overview of design plans for Jerusalem, as they have developed during the past several decades. In this chapter and throughout, although he maintains a descriptive rather than a critical posture, one can detect an underlying opinion that the design plans were flawed from lack of consultation with Arab inhabitants. The last plan considered is the Israel 2020 plan that arose in the 1990s with a view to Israel's moving into a normal nation-state situation. T. regards this plan positively but recognizes that the inability to reach a political resolution of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict may render the plan moot.

JOHN T. PAWLIKOWSKI, O.S.M
Catholic Theological Union, Chicago


In the preface, the series' editor indicates that the books in this series are aimed at a middle ground "between elementary texts and pioneering works" (vii). This work fits that description. While not breaking new ground, it certainly is not a text for beginners. Even competently trained philosophers will have to give the book a very deliberate read. The dense arguments rehearse much philosophical ground. Hoffman and Rosenkrantz weave a tapestry of arguments for God, all with a view toward constructing a credible contemporary case that builds on the contributions of Western philosophy from the Greeks to the present. For scholars, the book presents a thorough and careful review. For students, it introduces them to the complexity of philosophical argument for God. Anticipating uninitiated readers, the authors have provided a well-crafted glossary of terms, which they identify in bold type at the term's first occurrence in the text. As a further aid to students, a brief bibliography follows each chapter.

The book analyzes attributes commonly associated with God: substance, incorporeality, necessary existence, eternity, omniscience, goodness, virtue and morality, and omnipotence. It provides a rational theology to determine if the concept of God is coherent. H. and R. conclude that it is coherent and then (prudently) defer on whether the concept is instantiated. Nevertheless, they rehearse the classical ontological arguments for the existence of God. Often they provide examples that illustrate difficult philosophical concepts, but unless one grasps the concept clearly, the examples do not clarify matters.

In the end, proving the existence of God has not been convincing in the past, and this remains the case. However, a careful, rational analysis of how one might go about the task is always welcomed. The text will best serve graduate students in the discipline.

CHESTER GILLIS
Georgetown University, Washington
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