BOOK REVIEWS


In the hope that Pentateuchal studies in the 21st century can manage without the figure of the Yahwist, the editors of this work invited leading scholars to contribute their “farewells.” The collected essays show why the Yahwist, once the most beloved figure of the four-source hypothesis, is now more than ever a questionable reality.

The introductory essay by Jean-Louis Ska, however, points out that our leave-taking may not be an easy task, for the Yahwist is a figure “with a thousand faces.” While the name may have remained similar over centuries, the man behind the mask has repeatedly changed. In his conclusion, Ska raises the critical question: why has the Yahwist not received a literary study comparable to those of P or D (20, 23)? Without an accurate picture of Yahwistic style, phraseology, and compositional devices and patterns, why should one conclude that these texts come from the same source? The fundamental challenge is thus issued in the first essay. Unfortunately, this challenge is not taken up. Instead, the subsequent essays reiterate well-known arguments for the demise of the classical Yahwist.

This classical Yahwist wrote in the early monarchical period. Such an early dating has often come under attack; so, too, in this work. Joseph Blenkinsopp studies Genesis 1–11 and finds that the J texts are in fact a post-priestly supplement to an underlying P text. This fragmentary supplement, datable to the Persian period, was written to counteract an overly optimistic P. Hans-Christoph Schmitt analyzes Exodus 34:10–28 and finds that this text, traditionally assigned to J, is rather an original work of a late Deuteronomic Pentateuch redactor. Witte examines the Balaam passages and finds three layers. Both the basic and the “blessing-layer” (again, traditionally attributed to J) are seen to be post P and post D, and most closely related to later prophets. Since these “Yahwist” texts build upon priestly, Deuteronomic, and prophetical precursors, the “Yahwist” must be dated relatively late. However, these studies have a limited scope; no attempt is made to broaden their results to a theory that might encompass non-P texts throughout the Pentateuch. No successor to the Yahwist emerges here.

The question of continuity receives the greatest attention. Many authors ask whether a pre-priestly connection between the Pentateuch’s distinct narrative blocks exists; three study the connection between patriarchal and exodus narratives. Gertz studies Genesis 15 and finds that material from the pre-priestly Exodus narrative is reworked here to provide an alternative explanation for Israel’s origin. The Genesis texts are connected to
those in Exodus only by a post-priestly redactor who makes of the alternative history a mere prolepsis. Schmid examines the Joseph narratives that bridge Genesis and Exodus in the final text of the Bible. Once an independent, pre-priestly account, these narratives offer a critical counterpoint to the Deuteronomistic History. Independence is thus the hallmark of the non-P texts of the Pentateuch; no continual Yahwistic source is found (114).

As is to be expected in a collected work, the essays are not uniform in quality or readability. Indeed, it seems that each author was given leeway to say his own personal goodbye to the Yahwist. This leads to some outlier contributions such as Thomas Dozeman's survey of the changing image of the Yahwist through the lens of geography and its ideological use, and Ernst Axel Knauf's attempt to root literary traditions in history with the help of the "New Biblical Archaeology" (The Bible Unearthed, by Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, 2001). Still, the generous approach accords the reader the opportunity to encounter a wide variety of material and such provocative essays as that by Albert de Pury. He describes the "Copernican revolution" when the undetermined appellative 'elohim was employed as a name: "God." This innovation gave a name to the universal God and fostered the concept of a monotheistic and interreligious God. It was a creation of the priestly redactor, the true theologian of the Pentateuch.

In the end, however, we must return to Ska's opening salvo. The farewells presented in this work merely bid adieu to the classical face of the Yahwist. While most tend to agree that the non-P material in the Pentateuch exists in fragments and not as a continual source, no consensus is offered on a new terminology for this material. Nevertheless, this work provides a rich picture of the current, chaotic state of Pentateuchal studies and offers a formidable contribution to the ongoing dialogue. Its concluding bibliography provides a valuable tool for both student and professor.

Gregorian University, Rome

THOMAS ANDERSON, S.J.


Elsewhere Brown suggests that readers hear biblical literature in a new key. Now he invites us to see the Psalms in a new light, that of imagination, which speaks through metaphor to communicate in language that is visceral and sublime, evocative and intense (12). Eschewing a form-critical approach, he focuses on the concreteness of metaphor rather than on the general literary characteristics used to describe laments, hymns, thanksgivings, and other types of psalms.

After his introduction, "A Poetics of the Psalmic Imagination," eight chapters explore various metaphors. I will list all of them and describe the contours of some. First comes refuge (chap. 1, "In the Shadow of
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Elsewhere Brown suggests that readers hear biblical literature in a new key. Now he invites us to see the Psalms in a new light, that of imagination, which speaks through metaphor to communicate in language that is visceral and sublime, evocative and intense (12). Eschewing a form-critical approach, he focuses on the concreteness of metaphor rather than on the general literary characteristics used to describe laments, hymns, thanksgivings, and other types of psalms.

After his introduction, “A Poetics of the Psalmic Imagination,” eight chapters explore various metaphors. I will list all of them and describe the contours of some. First comes refuge (chap. 1, “In the Shadow of
Shaddai"): it has specific connections to Zion and temple, rock and wings, but really focuses on “a more general and desperate desire to enter into God’s protective presence” (24). In this chapter B. moves from the cultic piety of form criticism to the Torah piety of recent works by George Wilson, Clint McCann, and James Luther Mays. B. also charts a movement of praise from David’s monarchy to the reign of YHWH; he will further demonstrate this shift in his presentation of the final psalms of the collection (chap. 6). He also emphasizes a balance between the metaphor’s salvific weight and its moral import: while this metaphor illuminates blessing and protection, it concurrently “excludes things that do not warrant ultimate reliance” (31). Thus B. counters a claim that hymnic praise typifies the stance of the established and the powerful, without balancing demands.

Chapter 2, “I Shall Walk in Freedom,” connects refuge with pathway. Even Psalm 119, the Torah-psalm par excellence, contains a reference to refuge (v. 14). While other scholars have argued that the Psalter stretches the notion of Torah, B. demonstrates how the Torah of God’s mighty acts in history charts a pathway in human freedom to a new experience of refuge. B.’s new ground here is his claim for the coherence of pathway and shelter, of the didactic emphasis on moral integrity and the cultic experience of divine presence (49). His intriguing theological quest stretches the notion of Torah (too often considered constrictive) into its opposite, a path of freedom effected by God’s acts.

Chapter 3, “The Transplanted Tree: Psalm 1 and the Psalter’s Threshold,” traces both the literary and iconographic associations of the tree metaphor. B. first describes biblical and Ancient Near Eastern literary traditions that enrich our appreciation of the tree, and then discusses iconographs from Palestine, Ugarit, Mari, and Nineveh, that lead him to speak of the Temple as God’s garden. Psalms transform the metaphor from a deity’s marker (e.g., an asherah) to a disciple of torah (Psalm 1). In chapter 4, “The Sun of Righteousness: Psalm 19 and the Joy of Lex,” B. joins other interpreters who resist dividing this psalm into three parts with distinct origins; rather a single cosmological image, the sun—at a remove from worship of other gods—incarnates the soteriological and restorative power of Torah-piety. Commenting on a stele representing Hammurabi’s codification of law (#13) B. shows the sun-god serving this king as judge, bringer of order and justice (96). To those puzzled by the mosaic floors in Galilean synagogues (Hammath-Tiberias and Bet Alpha) with the sun god Helios at the center, B. suggests viewing this iconic program in a way that parallels the sun metaphor in Psalm 19.

Other chapters deal with chaos moving into community (“The Voice of Many Waters,” chap. 5), the divine theater of praise (“The Song of Leviathan,” chap. 6), a personal God’s anatomy (“On You I Was Cast from My Birth,” chap. 7), a mapping the divine (“As the Mountains Surround Jerusalem,” chap. 8). B. concludes with an original presentation of Psalm 139 (“In Defense of Iconic Reflection,” conclusion).

The power of B.’s presentation is evident in his demonstrating the transformation of a metaphor in the canonical shape of the Psalter, while deep-
ening with psalms and iconography the fruitful work of Othmar Keel (*The Symbolism of the Biblical World*, 1978). Particularly valuable is B.'s elucidation of how the iconic metaphor brings psalms into the range of human experience. While he frequently speaks of the genre classification of a psalm whose imagery he discusses, he urges us to move deeper and experience in our imagination the very images and metaphors that the psalmists knew from their own social, cultural, and religious heritage, and to let the metaphors teach us, for the Psalter is the "schoolhouse of incarnational imagination" (13).

B. intends to shift the ground of Psalter interpretation, and to demonstrate the theological impact of close attention to iconic representation in concert with canonical critical observations. His book would prove challenging for beginning students, but advanced students, pastors, and scholars will discover here new paths to theological reflection on psalms, especially from a more esthetic and artistic perspective.

*Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley*  
JOHN C. ENDRES, S.J.


In the wake of the publication of the voluminous commentaries on 1 Peter by P. J. Achtemeier (1996) and J. H. Elliott (2000), is there a niche for the recent addition to the Sacra Pagina series on that NT book? And, in the light of the recently published and serviceable guides to 2 Peter and Jude by J. H. Neyrey (1993) and S. J. Kraftchick (2002), does this new volume offer anything useful? The answer to both questions is yes. Senior and Harrington have collaborated to produce solid studies on these biblical books that are combined in one attractive and sturdy volume. It is a significant and welcome addition to the Sacra Pagina commentaries.

The authors furnish introductions to the letters, their own translations, notes, expositions, lists of works "for reference and further study," and indexes. Greek terms are transliterated. S. and H. draw upon much of the latest scholarship, especially in English, French, and German. The quality of the presentation is high. I was disappointed, though, that S. and H. did not discuss the rhetorical arrangement of the letters in the body of the commentary, despite the fact that they are aware of rhetorical studies of the documents. And, although the "Interpretation" sections offer useful homiletic outlines, the reader will have to look elsewhere for substantial discussion of contemporary application (the NIV Application Commentary Series supplies this kind of help).

In his introduction to 1 Peter, S. argues for authorship by a "Petrine group" in Rome sometime during the final 25 years of the first century. Silvanus is the probable bearer (not amanuensis) of the letter. He carried it to various Christian communities throughout Asia Minor. The members of those communities experienced localized, sporadic, and unofficial verbal
abuse and harassment. S. agrees with Elliott that the recipients’ Christian faith had led to social estrangement, but disagrees with Elliott’s view that the estrangement was an exacerbation of a literal cultural alienation. The author of 1 Peter “writes to bolster the faith and perseverance of his fellow Christians” (13). I question S.’s dismissal of the possibility of Peter himself as author of the letter. Peter may have had more facility in Greek and in rhetorical composition (especially after several years in Rome) than has been recognized.

H.’s introduction to 2 Peter and Jude includes a very interesting discussion of the scholarly study of the letters since 1975. A Petrine circle in Rome, using portions of the earlier pseudepigraphon Jude, produced 2 Peter. Jude, having originated in an eastern Semitic setting, may be classified as a “homily” in letter-form, whereas 2 Peter is a “testament” in the form of a letter. Both documents, from the late first or early second century, confront crises within the early Church that involve “intruders” (Jude) or “false teachers” (2 Peter). Their teaching may be an “overly enthusiastic version of Paulinism” that, at least in 2 Peter, focuses on the present aspects of salvation at the expense of future ones (2 Pet 3:3–4).

Both S. and H. helpfully address interpretive cruxes. For example, S. concludes that Christ’s proclamation to the imprisoned spirits (1 Pet 3:19) happened after his resurrection and before his exaltation. Christ’s announcement is likely a declaration of his own victory over death, and the spirits to whom the declaration is made should probably be identified as evil spirits—the fallen angels who had sexual intercourse with human females (Gen 6:1–4; 1 Enoch). Thus the traditional view that 1 Peter 3:19–20 describes a descent into hell is incorrect. S. provides a concise early history of this doctrine. The intention of 1 Peter 3:18–22 is to assure suffering believers of their own ultimate triumph. The dead to whom the gospel was preached (4:6) are “those Christians who heard and accepted the gospel yet subsequently died.” To be “judged in the flesh according to humans” probably “reflects some of the hostile derision nonbelievers had directed at the community” (116).

H. understands the pursuit of “other flesh” (Jude 7; cf. Gen 19) not to be homosexual behavior, but the intention of humans to have sexual relations with angels. His interpretation is well informed by reference to the OT, 1 Enoch, and Philo.

The volume by S. and H. should prove to be an excellent first resource for the busy pastor, college student, or graduate student who requires a quick but informative read on a text in 1 Peter, 2 Peter, or Jude. The inquirer should then consult the volumes by Achtemeier, Elliott, and Neyrey for extended discussions.

Simpson University, Redding, Calif.

BARTH L. CAMPBELL

The book is a translation of *Historische Psychologie des Neuen Testaments* (1991), in which Berger sought to apply historical psychology to the study of the New Testament. He believed that modern social scientific analyses of the Bible set aside the uniquely historical aspect of the material. The distinctiveness of his historical psychological method (which he believed differed from modern or contemporary modes of psychological understanding) lies in an entire arsenal of questions directed to the New Testament. These questions are subsumed under a few general psychological categories: semantic field, semantic connotation, the function and intended effect of the text, the generating conditions of the text, the causes and conditions for specific experiences and modes of perception, how experiences get assimilated, and fundamental categories of experience such as time and identity. In sum, historical psychology does not employ any new methods of inquiry. Yet, according to B., reliance on psychological expertise in any of its current manifestations or on any leading psychologists would be a mistake. Thus he uses colloquial terms in the area of the psyche and fleshes them out with material garnered by the historical-psychological approach so as to delineate the contours of New Testament experience. The specific topics studied by B. are identity and person, demonic possession, experience of the body, interior and exterior, perceptions (facticity), emotions, suffering, religion, and behavior. The volume concludes with endnotes, bibliography, and an index of references.

I focused especially on two topics of interest and long-standing research: visions (96–103) and journeys to heaven (108–14), which B. examines under perceptions (facticity). He accepts their facticity, but interprets them by reading the account "closely" and integrating psychological insight. Since the bibliography lists no references to cultural anthropology (notably the pioneering work of Erika Bourguignon and Felicitas Goodman on altered states of consciousness) or to cognitive neuroscience (which in 1991 was not yet in full bloom as it is currently), one can only marvel at the sharp focus and relevance of some of B.'s questions about these experiences. At the same time, in 2004 the literature of biblical research, not to mention the social sciences, is quite extensive on these topics, as I suspect it also is on his other topics. This more contemporary research would have nudged B. into more plausible interpretations than those he proposes. One wonders then why the book was translated now?

Moreover, a comparison of the bibliography in this translation with B.'s original bibliography highlights puzzling differences, especially regarding the precious few English language resources. B. listed 29, many of which were basic textbooks or key articles. The translation lists 14, most of which are translations of texts (such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Artemidorus). Thus the translation creates the impression that B. made little use of English language resources, while his actual work creates the opposite impression. If he has kept abreast of biblical research on the topics in his book, especially on research published in English, he would surely have written a very different book today and might even have been unwilling to allow the translation of his original work. Indeed, given his conviction that
"the existence of anthropological constants has not been demonstrated and therefore none will be presupposed here" (18), it would be of great interest to see how he might reply to the work of Bourguignon and Goodman, among other social scientists, as well as to biblical scholars who have used their insights to great hermeneutical advantage.

A fair judgment of his book would therefore be that in 1991 the book (and a timely translation of it) could have helped frame key questions about his principal topic: historical psychology (the actual title of the German book). The translation, appearing in 2003, reduces the original work to an item of historical interest, a witness to scholarly thinking on this topic in 1991. Most, if not all of B.'s observations, insights, and caveats have been adequately confirmed, sharpened, or refuted by interdisciplinary biblical scholarship since that time. This is certainly true concerning visions and sky journeys.

Georgetown University, Washington

JOHN J. PILCH


Presented as a survey of ancient Jewish, Greco-Roman, and early Christian sources, N. T. Wright's massive study is also intended as a response to current scholarship. In his view, an interpretation of early Christian resurrection belief based on "all kinds of misconceptions about both the key ideas and the key texts" (xvii) has pervaded the scholarly guild to the detriment both of the historical evidence and of the guild itself. In fact, W. likens his task to weeding a garden and "sowing . . . the seeds of what . . . is the historically grounded alternative" (xvii).

W.'s argument is a stepwise response to a set of views that characterize the "broadly dominant paradigm for understanding Jesus' resurrection" (7) that he opposes: (a) "resurrection" could mean a variety of things in early Judaism; (b) Paul's understanding of resurrection was more spiritual than bodily; (c) the earliest Christians believed not in Jesus' bodily resurrection but in his "exaltation/ascension/adoration," and bodily resurrection language developed afterwards; (d) the resurrection narratives themselves are later developments; (e) the appearances of the risen Jesus are to be understood as internal visionary experiences analogous to Paul's conversion experience in Acts; (f) Jesus' body was not resuscitated or raised in the sense of bodily resurrection and tomb-emptying.

W. begins with a discussion of historical enquiry and how and why it is appropriate to ask about the Resurrection in such categories, answering a variety of objections (from both historical/biblical and theological perspectives) to the historical study of the resurrection of Jesus (12–28). There is no direct lexicographical analysis of anastasis or egeirō or their cognates; W. works inductively in his discussion of primary sources. He defines "resurrection" as "life after 'life after death'" (30–31), that is, a renewed embod-
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W.'s argument is a stepwise response to a set of views that characterize the "broadly dominant paradigm for understanding Jesus' resurrection" (7) that he opposes: (a) "resurrection" could mean a variety of things in early Judaism; (b) Paul's understanding of resurrection was more spiritual than bodily; (c) the earliest Christians believed not in Jesus' bodily resurrection but in his "exaltation/ascension/glorification," and bodily resurrection language developed afterwards; (d) the resurrection narratives themselves are later developments; (e) the appearances of the risen Jesus are to be understood as internal visionary experiences analogous to Paul's conversion experience in Acts; (f) Jesus' body was not resuscitated or raised in the sense of bodily resurrection and tomb-emptying.

W. begins with a discussion of historical enquiry and how and why it is appropriate to ask about the Resurrection in such categories, answering a variety of objections (from both historical/biblical and theological perspectives) to the historical study of the resurrection of Jesus (12–28). There is no direct lexicographical analysis of anastasis or egeirō or their cognates; W. works inductively in his discussion of primary sources. He defines "resurrection" as "life after 'life after death'" (30–31), that is, a renewed embod-
ied existence that follows (narratively) an intermediate postmortem disembodied state.

W.'s survey of "ancient paganism" (33–84) covers the variety of ways life after death was imagined in the Greco-Roman world, most of which had little or no concern about the fate of the body. He concludes that "outside Judaism, nobody believed in resurrection" (35), and he finds that possible analogies, such as postmortem translation and apotheosis, "shed no light" (or, had no influence) on early Christian resurrection belief (76–77). Within biblical Judaism, however, W. argues that it was impossible to conceive of a nonbodily resurrection; Daniel 12:2–3 (often used in current scholarship as a counter-example) is read as referring to bodily resurrection (109). Even when used metaphorically to refer to the restoration of Israel, the idea of resurrection did not lose its original, concrete referent (204). W. notes that a critical mutation in Jewish resurrection belief occurred in early Christianity: whereas resurrection was a future corporate/national hope peripheral in Jewish theology, it was particularized in the case of Jesus, became central, and had new metaphorical associations.

The discussion of resurrection in Paul's writings is thorough and valuable. Interestingly, W. says that the problem of Paul's silence about the empty tomb (e.g., in 1 Cor 15) is "not significant," as the resurrection is incomprehensible apart from the emptying of a tomb; therefore, the sequence "was buried, then raised" necessarily implies what was universally accepted in Jewish discourse on resurrection (321). However, this terse dismissal evades the rhetorical problem of why Paul makes no mention of the empty tomb in his argument for "the resurrection of the dead."

After surveying other canonical and noncanonical early Christian writings (to Origen), W. finally comes to the resurrection narratives of the Gospels. Here his work seems less thorough than with Paul, largely because he eschews tradition-historical and redaction-critical investigations. In W.'s view the texts demand this: he says the narratives appear not to have undergone much theological development, and they show little sign of literary interdependence (which W. does not sufficiently demonstrate). This means that the narratives of Matthew, Luke, and John go back "very early oral tradition, representing three different ways in which the original astonished participants told the stories. These traditions have received only minimal development . . . for the very good reason that stories as earth-shattering [and] community-forming as this, once told, are not easily modified. Too much depends on them" (611).

In the final chapters W. does not retreat from building to a conclusion about what really happened to Jesus. The early Christian reshaping of traditional Jewish resurrection belief cannot be explained on any other historical grounds than those of the empty tomb and the meetings with the risen Jesus, and in W.'s view these events together supply the necessary and sufficient condition for the fact and the shape of early Christian resurrection belief. W.'s complex argument concludes that "the explanation of the data which the early Christians gave, that Jesus was really risen from the
dead, 'explains the aggregate' of the evidence better than . . . sophisticated scepticisms" (717).

The style throughout is direct, colorful, and engaging, and W.'s work with the primary literature is wide-ranging and judicious. On these grounds alone the book is to be recommended. At times, however, W. is hostile to opposing views. His occasional polemical tone might achieve a positive rhetorical effect in readers predisposed to W.'s position, but it will not encourage others to rethink the issue. These concerns, however, can perhaps be overlooked in the light of W.'s impressive contribution in framing the question and presenting his readings of the evidence.

Huron University College, London, Ontario

DANIEL A. SMITH


Dennis Smith, professor of New Testament at Philips Theological Seminary, began the study of ancient banquet traditions and Christian meals with his 1980 doctoral dissertation at Harvard. This volume makes two decades of further research available to students of early Christianity. Footnotes and bibliography provide all the details scholars might require. At the same time, S. provides for nonspecialists translations of ancient sources. Senior undergraduate theology majors were able to use individual chapters of this book.

The first five chapters treat banquets as a central institution of Greco-Roman culture. S. argues that there was a common set of rules, behavior, and expectations attached to banquets. He rejects the distinction between meals that occurred in sacred contexts, such as those following animal sacrifice in temple precincts, and those in a secular context such as a trade association or private home. All meals exhibit elements of ritual honor to the gods, of social bonding among participants, and of pleasurable entertainment. Degrees of emphasis may distinguish one type of meal from another. Certainly the pleasures of philosophical conversation on the latest literary work differ from the drunken riot of sexual and culinary excess depicted in Roman satire.

Most modern readers think of banquets as large affairs. For an ordinary household only nine or so guests could be accommodated. A trade guild of carpenters in Ostia had a membership list of some 350. Its hall could not accommodate more than 36 persons. Reclining is the social privilege of freeborn males. Any slaves, women, or children present would sit or, in a very exceptional case such as a wedding, be together on the "lowest" couch (11-17). S. provides drawings of the ancient dining area with its reclining guests.

From his study of the rules of various clubs and cult associations, S. concludes that an ethic of communal solidarity was reinforced by participation in such activities. Not only was disorderly or insulting behavior at the meal proscribed, but members were also to settle disputes with one
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Dennis Smith, professor of New Testament at Philips Theological Seminary, began the study of ancient banquet traditions and Christian meals with his 1980 doctoral dissertation at Harvard. This volume makes two decades of further research available to students of early Christianity. Footnotes and bibliography provide all the details scholars might require. At the same time, S. provides for nonspecialists translations of ancient sources. Senior undergraduate theology majors were able to use individual chapters of this book.

The first five chapters treat banquets as a central institution of Greco-Roman culture. S. argues that there was a common set of rules, behavior, and expectations attached to banquets. He rejects the distinction between meals that occurred in sacred contexts, such as those following animal sacrifice in temple precincts, and those in a secular context such as a trade association or private home. All meals exhibit elements of ritual honor to the gods, of social bonding among participants, and of pleasurable entertainment. Degrees of emphasis may distinguish one type of meal from another. Certainly the pleasures of philosophical conversation on the latest literary work differ from the drunken riot of sexual and culinary excess depicted in Roman satire.

Most modern readers think of banquets as large affairs. For an ordinary household only nine or so guests could be accommodated. A trade guild of carpenters in Ostia had a membership list of some 350. Its hall could not accommodate more than 36 persons. Reclining is the social privilege of freeborn males. Any slaves, women, or children present would sit or, in a very exceptional case such as a wedding, be together on the "lowest" couch (11–17). S. provides drawings of the ancient dining area with its reclining guests.

From his study of the rules of various clubs and cult associations, S. concludes that an ethic of communal solidarity was reinforced by participation in such activities. Not only was disorderly or insulting behavior at the meal proscribed, but members were also to settle disputes with one
another, not in public courts (120–21). Paul's prescription in 1 Corinthians 6:1–8 would have come as no surprise to the Corinthians (110). Punishment for violating association rules could include fines or exclusion from communal activities for a period of time.

In the second half of the book, S. applies his studies of Greco-Roman banqueting to Jewish banquets, 1 Corinthians, and the Gospels. A very thin concluding chapter entitled “The Banquet and Christian Theology” (279–87) lacks substance as either liturgical history or theology. S. argues throughout this half that Jews and Christians employed the same banquet customs and ideology as others in their social context. He relies heavily on the symposium form in which discussion of philosophical topics constituted the entertainment. Since consumption of wine occurred during the second part of the proceedings, after the food tables had been cleared away, S. concludes that even the Passover Seder as represented in the Mishnah followed Greco-Roman custom (147–50). Similarly, Torah study with an emphasis on how members of the Essene sect were to treat one another bring the Qumran meal traditions under the umbrella of the common banquet tradition (154). S. assumes that diaspora Jews were not isolated in a separate cultural enclave. Dining with non-Jews was not out of the question. Heroes or heroines who refuse the food served by their royal masters in Daniel (1:8), Greek Esther (14:17), Judith (12:1–2, 19) and Tobit (1:5) are making a point about Jewish identity and opposition to idolatry (163–64).

When S. turns to early Christian texts, he employs the dominant meal paradigm to challenge consensus opinions about the Lord’s Supper. He does not think that a form of Jesus' words over bread and wine, cited as tradition by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:23–26, represents the central ritual focus of the Christian meal. Instead, he insists that all the references to Christian meals and to other forms of worship in Paul’s letters belong to a single assembly. After consuming the meal, the wine/entertainment part of the gathering encompassed such activities as praying in tongues, prophesying, and discussion of the ideology and virtues such as love (1 Cor 13) that united members of the group. Paul introduced the formula as part of his attempt to regulate disruptive and competitive behavior, but did not consider it the key to the meal gathering.

Similarly, S. rejects any connection between the Last Supper narratives in the Gospels and the historical Jesus. In his view, early Christian stories about Jesus at meals were intended to use familiar cultural paradigms to present Jesus as their hero and teacher. In S.’s view, even in Paul’s use of the eucharistic words, a christological focus on Jesus as Lord makes it historically implausible that Jesus instituted a meal tradition focused on himself. On the academic “left wing” reduction of theological questions to group solidarity and narrative imagination typifies the reconstruction of early Christianity. Catholic exegetes and liturgical theologians will certainly demur at this point. However, S. provides a wealth of historical and cultural detail that is crucial to understanding these texts.

*Boston College*  PHEME PERKINS

Iogna-Prat studies the polemical works of Peter the Venerable, twelfth-century abbot of Cluny, seeing his Contra Petrobrusianos, Adversus Iudeos, and Contra sectam Sarracenorum as pivotal markers in the growth of religious intolerance in the West. I.-P. relies explicitly on R. I. Moore's argument that the growth of ecclesiastical authority following the Gregorian reform increased the marginalization and persecution of Jews and heretics (21). He also draws on the social histories of Barbara Rosenwein and others, who have so well explained Cluny's seigniorial dependencies. I.-P. aims to understand the "logic of Christendom" within Peter's ecclesiology (23), especially since it necessitated for Peter and his contemporaries a crusading struggle between the Church and unbelievers both within (pur­gado) and without (dilatio) an ever-expanding Christian society.

Twelve chapters are divided into three sections. Part 1 recounts the early history of Cluny, its rise as a "church system" stretching to the limits of Christendom, and its identification of itself as a microcosm of the wider Church. With prestige approaching that of the papacy, Cluny arrogated to itself authority "to define rules constituting Christian society," especially rules for social inclusion and exclusion, rules governing Christendom's purification and extension (95). The section summarizes patristic and early medieval ecclesiology and also serves as a convenient précis of Cluny scholarship.

The great central portion of the work, a close reading of Contra Petro­brusianos, shows how Peter's understanding of Cluny's relationship to the wider Church informed his views of heresy. He addressed followers of heresiarch Peter of Bruis, who rejected many important tenets of the faith—infant baptism, the sanctity of church buildings, the beneficent symbolism of the Cross, the real presence, and prayers for the dead. Peter the Venerable's response to this heresy was comprehensive enough to be a "sociology of Christendom in the feudal age" (254). As I.-P. understands it, Peter inherited the greater part of his argument. The case for infant baptism came from Scripture and the Church Fathers. By the mid-eleventh century the church building came to signify the universal Church (162), and by the 1130s arguments for the real presence "had all but won the day against the 'Symbolists'" (180). Prayer for the dead had long been a staple activity of black monks, with the justification stemming from Gregory the Great (221). The issue involved in these controversies about "essential transformations" was the sacramental ordering of sacred space and the priestly mediation that effected transition from one level of existence to another. Peter, whether he knew it or not, was arguing on behalf of "the spatialization of the fundamental hierarchies of Christian society" (259).
Christendom “defined itself as much by what it excluded as by what it sought to transform and include” (261).

In part 3, I.-P. considers Peter’s diatribes against the Jews and the Muslims. Peter noted that they, like the Petrobrusians, did not sacrifice: incapable of or insensitive to the human need for sacrifice, they lacked the means of transformative mediation between this world and the next. Peter’s arguments against them were less discursive and more polemical than those he had used against the Petrobrusians. “The topology of exclusion enabled the Cluniac monk-priest to define a sociology that was also an anthropology” of dehumanization (362). Jews, with their “bestial” talmudic blasphemies (318), and Muslims, being lascivious adherents of “the sum of all heresy” (356), were not fully human. Peter’s words were abrupt, and so are I.-P.’s: “At best the abbot of Cluny’s sin is unconscious; at worst, it is blind” (300). Peter does not merely misunderstand the Talmud: his “incomprehension is total” (304). “Peter was the living incarnation of the sexual phobia inhabiting the contemplatives” (356). As Peter became increasingly less sympathetic with the non-Christian subjects of his writing, I.-P. also seems to lose patience with his subject. Surely this happens because he is convinced that Peter’s exclusion of Jews and Muslims from the human family had implications for the “genesis of our stereotypes” (364).

Finally, I.-P. imports themes from Lessing’s play Nathan der Weise, an 18th-century recommendation of natural religion that does not greatly discriminate among the three monotheistic religions. Cluny’s (and the medieval Church’s) expanding yet exclusionary mission “entailed, in the age of the Crusades, a head-on collision between Christianity and the two other religions of the Book” (360). I.-P. reckons the exclusivity of medieval Christian dogma as a kind of “tyranny” that “imposed on the world the certainties of clerics charged with the blessed morrows of humanity” (364). Some readers will interpret the author’s aversion to this exclusivity as a failure “to understand . . . Peter’s all-or-nothing logic” (3). I.-P.’s argument for toleration may presuppose a theology of inclusion that cannot help but contest the medieval Church’s exclusionary approach to non-Christians. Nevertheless, there is much of value here. Order and Exclusion merits endorsement, on balance, as an ambitious work of scholarly synthesis and textual analysis.

*Fordham University, New York*  

ROBERT J. JENSEN


This dissertation by Thomas Marschler is the first complete, comparative study of the themes of the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ in the
Christendom “defined itself as much by what it excluded as by what it sought to transform and include” (261).

In part 3, I.-P. considers Peter’s diatribes against the Jews and the Muslims. Peter noted that they, like the Petrobrusians, did not sacrifice: incapable of or insensitive to the human need for sacrifice, they lacked the means of transformative mediation between this world and the next. Peter’s arguments against them were less discursive and more polemical than those he had used against the Petrobrusians. “The topology of exclusion enabled the Cluniac monk-priest to define a sociology that was also an anthropology” of dehumanization (362). Jews, with their “bestial” talmudic blasphemies (318), and Muslims, being lascivious adherents of “the sum of all heresy” (356), were not fully human. Peter’s words were abrupt, and so are I.-P.’s: “At best the abbot of Cluny’s sin is unconscious; at worst, it is blind” (300). Peter does not merely misunderstand the Talmud: his “incomprehension is total” (304). “Peter was the living incarnation of the sexual phobia inhabiting the contemplatives” (356). As Peter became increasingly less sympathetic with the non-Christian subjects of his writing, I.-P. also seems to lose patience with his subject. Surely this happens because he is convinced that Peter’s exclusion of Jews and Muslims from the human family had implications for the “genesis of our stereotypes” (364).

Finally, I.-P. imports themes from Lessing’s play Nathan der Weise, an 18th-century recommendation of natural religion that does not greatly discriminate among the three monotheistic religions. Cluny’s (and the medieval Church’s) expanding yet exclusionary mission “entailed, in the age of the Crusades, a head-on collision between Christianity and the two other religions of the Book” (360). I.-P. reckons the exclusivity of medieval Christian dogma as a kind of “tyranny” that “imposed on the world the certainties of clerics charged with the blessed morrows of humanity” (364). Some readers will interpret the author’s aversion to this exclusivity as a failure “to understand . . . Peter’s all-or-nothing logic” (3). I.-P.’s argument for toleration may presuppose a theology of inclusion that cannot help but contest the medieval Church’s exclusionary approach to non-Christians. Nevertheless, there is much of value here. Order and Exclusion merits endorsement, on balance, as an ambitious work of scholarly synthesis and textual analysis.

Fordham University, New York

ROBERT J. JENSEN


This dissertation by Thomas Marschler is the first complete, comparative study of the themes of the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ in the
Scholastic theology of the 12th and 13th centuries. M. begins by collecting and classifying the relevant systematic texts from those centuries. Unpublished material, written in Latin about the Resurrection and Ascension by eleven identifiable authors and twelve anonymous ones, is reproduced in volume 2. What M. has gleaned from this literary and historical sifting is then placed in the context of the Christology of early and high Scholasticism. He explains those aspects of Christ’s person and saving work which emerging systematic interpretations of the Resurrection aimed to clarify, and helps the reader to understand how such interpretations fitted into various Scholastic syntheses.

In a third and longest step of nearly 400 pages, M. examines the focal points and lines of development in the Scholastic doctrines of Resurrection and Ascension. When the medieval theologians faced the demands of scientific reason, expounded the Easter reports from the New Testament, and developed their speculative reflections, they turned not only to basic motifs of revelation but also to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church and to contributions from natural philosophy (which they critically received). M. pays particular attention (around 20% of his first volume) to the thought of Thomas Aquinas. The book clarifies the background to Aquinas’s teaching on the Resurrection and Ascension and comments excellently on what Aquinas developed, above all in his *Summa theologiae*. When doing so, M. rightly takes issue with a couple of superficial judgments about Thomas’s views of the Resurrection that I passed years ago (in a 1970 article in *Theological Studies*).

M. describes and elucidates what Aquinas proposed about the nature of Christ’s risen body in answer to the question: how can we substantiate the identity-in-change between the earthly body nailed to the cross and the glorified body which transcends the normal limits of time and space? Other issues are expounded such as the Easter experience of the first disciples (including Mary Magdalene) and the revelation to them of the risen Christ. Did he show them the marks of his wounds and eat with them, and how was this possible? How did they see him and even touch him? M. spends pages on a major contribution from Thomas about the instrumental causality of Christ’s risen existence, a causality that includes both a present “justifying” efficacy (e.g., in and through the liturgy and all the sacraments) and a future efficacy (as the cause and model of our coming resurrection). M. also takes up the closely associated question of the link between the glorification of Christ and the sending of the Holy Spirit. When M. turns to the Ascension, he shows how Thomas and some other Scholastic thinkers tried to explain it through critical dialogue with the best natural philosophy of their times. They did so in the face of those who took “ascension” to be merely Christ’s passage to omnipresence, or else gave the Ascension an “existential” explanation as part of a rational apologetic.

This work comes out of very thorough research into the primary and secondary sources. M. is admirably international; he is in dialogue with authors who have written not only in German but also in English, French, Italian, and Spanish. Yet the impressive scholarship does not turn the work
into a ponderous tome; it moves along briskly and is clearly signposted by appropriate headings and subheadings. Blemishes hardly make any appearance. The names of F. X. Durrwell and G. Iammarrone are misspelled. In the index, Caroline Walker Bynum should be listed as Bynum, C. W., and Marilyn McCord Adams as Adams, M. McM. The only name I missed in the secondary sources is that of Eleonore Stump, who has made some important contributions in her work on Aquinas. All in all, this is wonderful, magisterial work, which sets out convincingly the enduring significance of what the medieval theologians contributed to an understanding of Christ's Resurrection and Ascension.

Gregorian University, Rome

GERALD O'COLLINS, S.J.


In the words of David Steinmetz: "Ockham could move with ease from logic to metaphysics to theology to political theory to epistemology. We who are expert in only one of the fields which Ockham mastered find that we need each other's help in order to understand our own special discipline correctly" (Luther in Context [1995] 46). Leppin's biography undertakes the daunting task of setting Ockham's works in their historical context and evaluating their influence on the subsequent history of thought. The study begins with a brief review of Ockham's origin in Surrey, England, his ordination to the subdiaconate in 1306, and his subsequent entries into the Franciscan Order and the ranks of the professional clergy. L. situates Ockham's career with a useful survey of conditions and key figures at work in the university of Oxford, together with a discussion of the condemnations of 1277 and their impact on intellectual life at Paris and Oxford in the final quarter of the 13th century and the first decade of the 14th. He highlights the influence of Henry of Ghent (d. 1293) and John Duns Scotus (c. 1265-1308) in contemporary philosophical and theological debates, thereby effectively mapping the background to Ockham's early work.

Having probably completed his liberal arts studies in London, Ockham would have proceeded to comment on the Sentences of Peter Lombard as an inceptor in theology at the university of Oxford. L. situates Ockham's commentary on the Sentences in both the political context of the ongoing conflict between university authorities and the mendicant orders and the intellectual context of theological and philosophical resources. The section concludes with a close look at four major doctrinal problems on which Ockham exercised his originality as a thinker: (1) the question of proofs for the existence of God; (2) the application of logic to the doctrine of the Trinity; (3) the doctrine of the Eucharist; (4) divine foreknowledge and predestination. L. further contributes valuable discussions of the tensions between the study of philosophy and the presentation of theology as a science, and examines in detail the role of logic in the university curriculum of Ockham's day, hence also setting the scene for Ockham's contributions
to renewed discussion of the problem of universals within theological discourse.

The next stage of Ockham’s career takes him to London, where he taught and worked on his *Summa logicae*. At this time, he was denounced by John Lutterell, chancellor of the university of Oxford, to Pope John XXII at Avignon. The scene accordingly shifts to Avignon, where Ockham remained while his works were examined and censured. L. includes in this section an overview of the quodlibetal questions and other writings produced by Ockham at Avignon, as well as a discussion of Ockham’s association with Peter John Olivi and their involvement in the dispute concerning Franciscan poverty. In 1328, Ockham fled from Avignon with Michael of Cesena, minister general of the Franciscans, and from then on his intellectual endeavors would take him into the realm of political theory, as he began to write for Louis of Bavaria against the pope, and to uphold the Franciscan doctrine of evangelical poverty. L. situates Ockham and his writing with a brief but informative summary of the conflict between Louis of Bavaria and the Avignon popes, as well as with a history of the Franciscan convent in Munich that was to become Ockham’s home for the next several years. L. covers Ockham’s career and teachings from 1328 to 1347 in careful detail, discussing the theological and scriptural elements of Ockham’s doctrine of poverty, focusing especially on the *Dialogus super dignitate papali et regia* (pre-1334) and the *Breviloquium de principatu tyrannico* (ca. 1340–1342). He then briefly wraps up the historical narrative, presenting the few details that can be ascertained regarding the Ockham’s final years. The study closes with a discussion of Ockham’s impact on late Scholasticism, the conflict over conciliarism, Biel, Luther, and the 16th-century Reformation, and finally some aspects of the modern philosophical renaissance in Ockham studies.

For some historians, Ockham was a heretic and rebel; for others, he appears as a harmless Franciscan, overshadowed in history by the reputation he found with Protestant reformers. For others, perhaps more accurately, he was a brilliant social philosopher and logician, whose thinking heralded the beginning of modern language theory and scientific thought. L.’s study touches on all aspects of Ockham’s reputation, and provides a valuable introduction to this multifaceted mind. The reader will also find an excellent and up-to-date bibliography of editions, translations, and international scholarship, some black-and-white illustrations of maps and photographs, and detailed indexes of persons and subject matter. For specialists and students of theology, philosophy, and church history, this biography is a welcome addition.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*  
WANDA ZEMLER-CIZEWSKI


When asked to review this publication, my first reaction as a Protestant theologian was to wonder why we needed yet another reference work on
Protestantism. With the latest editions of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* and the *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* (the latter undergoing translation into English), as well as the succinct *Encyclopédie du Protestantisme* and the massive *Theologische Realenzyklopädia* (at 30 volumes and counting), I wondered what another such work could possibly add. But in surveying this *Encyclopedia of Protestantism* I discovered the answer to my question: Hans Hillerbrand—who has already given us the *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation*—has rendered yet another signal service to the theological community, for in these four volumes lies a vast amount of material not readily available elsewhere. And this material is handled in a manner that we Protestants definitely need.

What that need is and how this publication addresses it are set out in the somewhat disjointed preface (xxvii–xxx). H. makes clear that this reference work faces a twofold challenge. The first has to do with the *Encyclopedia* itself: the challenge of properly identifying its object of inquiry. Protestantism, he notes, is marked by an astounding diversity, because it has no central institutional authority that maintains unity in the midst of plurality. This lack of centrality has two important consequences for a publication of this sort: first, it is difficult to speak of the Protestant view on almost any issue, and second, researchers are always tempted to speak of Protestantisms rather than Protestantism. How is a reference work to cope with such a state of affairs? This *Encyclopedia* will cast its nets widely: it defines Protestantism as that 40 percent of Christianity that is neither Roman Catholic nor Eastern Orthodox. Its approach to this polymorphous object is strictly historical. Thus, while theology was central to the Reformation, in this *Encyclopedia*, H. declares, “the historical dimension dominates” (xxix). Regarding the aims and editorial policies of the work, he writes that the *Encyclopedia* seeks to be accurate, comprehensive, neutral, and global, with the last qualified by the fact that the work “understandably, however, favors North American topics” (xxix).

But the question of the identity of Protestantism challenges this *Encyclopedia* in a deeper sense. H. observes that “in these days of ecumenicity and post-Enlightenment understanding of the Christian faith, the Reformation of the sixteenth century and the ensuing Protestant traditions often seem terribly distant and without dynamic response to the issues and questions of the twenty-first century” (xxix–xxx). While none of our traditions are exempt from this challenge today, it is rare for a major reference work to acknowledge it. This one does, and in so doing it casts the whole work in a new light. It becomes an open invitation to explore and consider the Protestant tradition in all its multifaceted history; to examine again what led to its emergence, what convictions and questions and disputes have animated this tradition in ever-changing ways; and to ask anew what it means to be Protestant—indeed, what it means to be Christian in a world so unlike those our traditions have known before. This *Encyclopedia of Protestantism* faces that question squarely, and by doing so helps everyone who refers to it face that challenge as well.
All articles accord with the *Encyclopedia*’s stated policies and its historical rather than theological orientation. Thus, one finds important entries on the theological issues that were the basis of the Reformation and have been recurrent questions in the tradition. *Authority, Christology, justification, ecclesiology, election, faith, grace, church and state:* each is treated in a manner that places it in its 16th-century context, demonstrates its modern developments, and then clarifies the contemporary state of the discussion. The articles are uniformly excellent. While articles such as Colin Gunton’s on Christology are especially good, the center of gravity of this *Encyclopedia* is clearly found elsewhere: in the articles depicting the historical unfolding of Protestantism in all its many forms. From the Magisterial to the Radical Reformers and Reformations of the 16th century, to the development of Orthodoxy, Pietism, Confessionalism, and Puritanism in the century that followed, to the rise of Neology, Deism, and Liberalism as one kind of response to the Enlightenment and Evangelicalism, Revivalism, and Restorationism representing another, to 20th-century Social Gospel, Fundamentalism, Pentecostalism, Neo-Orthodoxy, Feminism, and Liberation Theology: the leaders and movements that have shaped Protestantism are presented for the readers’ consideration. To mention but two of the many fine contributions: Douglas John Hall on “Neo-Orthodoxy” and Alistair Kee on the “Death of God” are exceptional.

But for all that is gained, the work’s historical orientation results in some notable anomalies: there is an article on “Creation Science” but not on *creation*, on “Tongues” but none on *Pneumatology*, on “Christology” but not on *Trinity* or *God*. How does one produce a major reference work on Protestantism that ignores the profound developments in these issues in the 20th century?

Every theological library should own this *Encyclopedia*, and everyone interested in Protestant theology should consult it. Each article comes with a bibliography, and the work as a whole has excellent indexes. The work is appropriate for students and scholars alike. It gives readers a new appreciation of how far the tradition has come, and how far it has yet to go.

*M. Marquette University, Milwaukee*  
*D. Lyle Dabney*

---


The reception given to the publication of most papal documents and decrees tends to be quiet; a few generate noisy debate. In the 18th century none generated louder or longer controversy than Clement XI’s *Unigenitus*, issued in 1713. A condemnation of propositions taken from a work by Jansenist Pasquier Quesnel, *Unigenitus* enjoyed an exceptionally long shelf life, as its supporters sought to use it to finally silence Jansenist dissent. Yet the Jansenists would not be silenced, and they appealed to a future general council for vindication of Quesnel and of a version of Christian doctrine.
that they believed was faithful to Scripture. Ephraim Radner’s book, a revision of a Yale dissertation directed by George Lindbeck, explores some of the ways in which Appellants (those calling for a council to alter Unigenitus) claimed the Holy Spirit as a witness to the truth of their cause.

One strength of R.’s study is its demonstration of how a theology of efficacious grace remained at the heart of the Jansenist agenda not only in the 1600s but in the 1700s as well. Many histories of the movement that bore the name of Cornelius Jansen posit a shift in the 18th century from a theological focus to an increasingly ecclesiological and political one—in which opposition to papal (and royal) authority eclipsed other concerns. But R. shows the remarkable continuity of a causa gratiae, pursued by a first generation of Jansen and Saint-Cyran, then by Blaise Pascal and Antoine Arnauld, later by Quesnel, and by Appellants such as Jacques Joseph Duguet.

Jansenist deacon François de Pâris (1690–1727) died young, and in the midst of the uproar over Unigenitus. He left a reputation for an austere holiness of fasts, hair shirts, spiked belts, and unwashed clothes. His reputation grew further after his death when miracles were alleged to have occurred at his grave in the churchyard of the Parisian parish of Saint-Médard. R. points out that although Jesuits and their allies accused the Jansenists of being closet Calvinists, one way that Jansenists clearly differed from Calvin (and Luther) was on the question of miracles. These Protestant reformers had rejected the authenticity of postbiblical miracles; Jansenists, in sharp contrast, relied heavily on them. R. shows how miracles alleged to have occurred at Saint-Médard were used to bolster the credibility of theological assertions. Both miracles and holiness were used to give an imprimatur to anti-Unigenitus agitation.

The aptness of the title R. gives his book becomes clear in his discussion of Duguet’s writings on nature and grace. For this spokesman and leader of the Appellants, there was an “absolute” distinction between nature and grace; there was “no middle ground” between the two (59). In Duguet’s view, the Holy Spirit was manifested in grace made visible in miracles and in holiness. R. shows how the concept of “figures” was central to Duguet’s style of biblical exegesis and to his Pneumatology. In Duguet’s “rules” for understanding Scripture, the cross of Christ with “its affronting folly, the violence of its surprise, and the terrible efficacy of its power to save” (260) was the central “figure” of God’s wisdom. It was this figure that disclosed the “shape” of salvation history and the form in which the Spirit manifested itself through miracles and sanctity. In the penitential severity of Deacon François de Pâris, and in miracles at his tomb, Duguet and other Jansenists saw a manifestation of the Holy Spirit and an éclat of divine glory in the midst of human darkness. In their own sufferings as a persecuted minority, Jansenists also saw themselves like the Jews in Babylonian captivity, and like the crucified Christ.

Though R. presents and explains 18th-century Jansenist theology very well, he is less successful in articulating a theology—especially a Pneumatology—for today’s Christian churches. Throughout the book he suggests
that he is trying to do something beyond the work of a historian of a particularly thorny chapter in the history of early modern Christianity. His obvious admiration for Duguet and other Jansenists, together with his criticism of the work of Henri de Lubac and his praise of that of Hans Urs von Balthasar, disclose at least parts of his theological agenda. In his last chapter R. lauds the kenotic Pneumatology of early 20th-century Russian theologian Pavel Florensky as a Pneumatology that could show how the events of Saint-Médard "constitute a proper appearance of the Holy Spirit's vivifying self" (385).

Even for readers who do not share R.'s theological sympathies, the book offers an exceptionally lucid study of Appellant theology. It is well worth close attention.

teaching and ultimately threatening the foundations of Catholicism itself. Critical reviews by Duchesne of books championing the apostolic origins of certain French dioceses drew fire from ecclesiastics who had a stake in defending such traditional attributions. Similarly, the critical tenor of reviews in the *Analecta bollandiana* raised suspicions in the Society of Jesus and at the Vatican itself that led to an extraordinary regime of censorship being imposed on the periodical. Moreover, the appearance of Duchesne’s work in the *Analecta bollandiana* and of Bollandist reviewers in his *Bulletin critique* gave tangible evidence of cooperative efforts among like-minded critics.

Against this larger backdrop, this correspondence gains interest, as it provides access not only to points of scholarly discussion, but also to the state of mind of these men, and to their reactions in the face of opposition. The subjects discussed in the letters are wide-ranging. The correspondents exchange their views on publications by their contemporaries, on controversies raised by their own work, on substantive matters of mutual interest; they proffer advice on how to conduct their research and its public expression, share news regarding sanctions applied to fellow scholars, and give mutual support. J.’s copious notes contextualize and clarify the matters discussed. His introduction provides the necessary background on the correspondents and is particularly helpful in shedding light on Duchesne’s “Modernism” via a careful exegesis of a 1907 letter from Duchesne to Delehaye. Thus the interest of this initial volume is not limited to hagiographical concerns, or to the history of the Bollandists, but engages the personal reactions of men caught up in the renewal and unrest of those times, and who were seen as contributing to that renewal and unrest.

Volume 2 contains correspondence of Friedrich von Hügel (1852–1925) with De Smedt, François Van Ortroy, and Delehaye—though principally with the last—and between Cuthbert Hamilton Turner (1860–1930) and Delehaye exclusively.

Von Hügel may be considered a pivotal figure in the Modernist movement, in the sense that he sought out scholars who were contributing to the intellectual and institutional renewal of Catholicism through their work, put such scholars in contact with others of like orientation, took initiative to make their publications better known, and organized support when he saw them threatened with ecclesiastical sanction. His own research on St. Catherine of Genoa and on mysticism more broadly provided overlapping interests with Bollandist concerns. On Delehaye’s part, beyond a specialist competence in Byzantine hagiography, there were larger issues of methodology in writings such as *Les légendes hagiographiques* (1905) that dovetailed with von Hügel’s initiatives for renewal, but that heightened Roman suspicions of the Bollandists. Thus, beyond discussion of hagiographical matters, the correspondence—particularly from von Hügel’s side—is filled with references to figures familiar to readers conversant with Roman Catholic Modernism. As with the previous volume in this series, the letters provide a window into that period and additional perspectives on some of the personalities involved.
The correspondence between Turner and Delehaye (51 letters spanning 1900 to 1929) centers more on their scholarly pursuits. Turner, a High Church Anglican and fellow at Magdalen College, developed competence in the history of the primitive Church; thus he was engaged in the serious study of biblical texts. Not least of interest in these letters is the ecumenical dimension of the relationship between the two scholars—a kind of "Ma-lines Conversation" in miniature. As the correspondence proceeds, the warmth of friendship becomes apparent. Indeed, theirs are the most personal of all the letters in the first two volumes.

As a man of the 18th century, Jean Lebeuf (1687-1760) is perhaps less well known than the figures of the first two volumes. However, he was hardly an unknown in his own day. Expert in hagiography, local history, musicology, and numismatics, he was widely consulted on a variety of subjects. He is called the father of monumental archeology and could distinguish the chronological accretions to a building through visual inspection of its architectural features, statuary, etc. A seeker of texts scattered in libraries, and a proponent of the importance of his native Auxerre in the history of hagiography and of the French Church, his interest in the work of the Bollandists is not difficult to fathom.

The discovery among previously uninventoried Bollandist papers of documents emanating from Lebeuf and two letters to him augment knowledge of his relations with the Society. Combined with previously published (but unannotated) letters, this volume comprises 21 letters between Lebeuf and Bollandists spanning 1718-1739, principally with Jean-Baptiste Du Sollier; they are supplemented by three dossiers that center on hagiographical subjects relating to Auxerre.

The letters, which focus on often technical matters of hagiography, manifest a critical orientation to the legendary character of the sources, while preserving an awareness that the legendary has value for understanding the psychology of the period. The claimed apostolic origins of certain French dioceses, that will figure again in 19th-century controversy, is touched upon, along with difficulties in identifying saints of the same name that will later exercise Delehaye in Les légendes hagiographiques.

Just as Modernism forms part of the context of the Duchesne and von Hügel correspondence in the earlier volumes, so Jansenism's influence is present here, although more recessively. The additional documentation J. brings to light enables some nuancing of the characterization by Henri Leclercq of the relations between the Bollandists and their Jansenist correspondent over the question of the relics of St. Germain of Auxerre (Jean Lebeuf, 9). Once again, the value of this published material transcends the specifics of hagiographical discussion to open onto a historical period and vivify its figures.

Though volume 2 is marred by a few typographical lapses in Turner's letters, the series is marked by the erudition characteristic of Bollandist scholarship.

University of St. Thomas, Houston

C. J. T. Talar

The present volume, successor to Dorrien’s The Making of American Liberal Theology: Imagining Progressive Religion 1805–1900, is a superb study. It combines thorough scholarship (including considerable archival research), authoritative exposition, keen judgments, clear and engaging writing, all graced by a fine use of biographical detail that illuminates the leading theologians’ personal struggles and disputes with colleagues and critics.

The centerpiece is the examination of three influential theological movements, each identified with a university-associated theological school. All the leaders were academic theologians, not ministers as was the case in the 19th century. Each movement, in its own distinctive way, shaped liberal theology during the first half of the 20th century. At the beginning of the century, Union Theological Seminary in New York City produced a characteristically American Ritschlian theology. William Adams Brown, both a professor and president of Union, was its influential leader for 40 years. D.’s discussion of Brown includes a brief but discriminating account of Ritschl, Harnack, and other Ritschlians; but this is only one of many concise accounts in the book that demonstrate D.’s sure grasp of the European theological background, as well as those philosophical currents so essential to an understanding of both theological Liberalism and Modernism in America.

The new Divinity School of the University of Chicago soon moved theology onto a post-Ritschlian trajectory to a Modernist-centered naturalistic empiricism. D. gives an extensive and revealing account of how Chicago, led by George Burman Foster and Shailer Mathews, shifted its base from Ritschlianism to social-historicist and social-process themes and then on to a more radical and pragmatic empiricism influenced by William James and John Dewey. D. further clarifies how, later, both Douglas Clyde Macintosh and Henry Nelson Wieman shifted empirical theology to a more realist epistemology and an organismic process metaphysics, such as that proposed by Alfred North Whitehead. However, D.’s nuanced yet critical reflection on Macintosh, and especially on Wieman, also demonstrates how far the Chicago school had, by mid-century, moved away from central concerns of the Christian theological tradition.

A more contestable claim for some readers will probably be D.’s selection of Boston University Personalism as the third critical source of the new American Liberalism. It was a theology anchored by a metaphysically-based Personal Idealism. A number of studies of this era of American theology have given Boston Personalism short shrift. D. rejects this negative appraisal, giving Personalism considerable (70 pages) and often favorable attention. He demonstrates both the continuity with Personalism’s founder (Borden Parker Bowne) and then underscores the distinctive contributions of Personalism’s early leaders (Albert C. Knudson, Francis J. McConnell, and Edgar S. Brightman). Moreover, D. clarifies the particular
early 20th-century context of the school and what these theologians were attempting to protest against, namely, both Chicago Naturalism and what they saw as the "irrationalism" of Karl Barth's dialectical theology.

D.'s analysis of Personalism is justified and corrects its too-peremptory dismissals. At the same time, D. is entirely candid about Personalism's limited influence—largely within liberal Methodism—and the fact that it suffered from the same persistent and telling critiques of philosophical Idealism generally between the 1880s and 1930s. My own experience of studying and teaching at Union and at Southern Methodist University (whose liberal school of theology was distinguished) in the 1950s and 1960s is that the response to Personalism was not engaged criticism but indifference.

D. correctly insists, nonetheless, that the philosophers Bowne and Brightman did genuinely influence American theology early in the century. He concludes that the Personalists built a distinctive school, not a dominant movement. But the plain fact is that neither Personalism nor Chicago Naturalism nor Ritschlianism were influential theological currents by 1950. D. rightly reminds us, however, that it is simply unhistorical to judge the earlier importance of these movements from our post-1950s, rather condescending perspective. He insists on how impressive were the courageous probings and the real achievements of these early liberals—despite their limitations.

The latter chapters of the book, especially the one entitled "Revolt of the Neoliberals," convincingly demonstrate how swiftly pre-1940s Liberalism lost its support, even on its home grounds. D. persuasively underscores the compelling role Reinhold Niebuhr played in the American liberals' loss of credibility and influence. While Niebuhr's *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932) was severely criticized, it nevertheless proved to be an epoch-changing event in American theology.

And herein lies the paradox and, in my judgment, D.'s most important contribution to the historiography of 20th-century American theology. In nuanced and discriminating detail, he demonstrates that Niebuhr, Paul Tillich, John Coleman Bennett, and many other leading critics of liberalism from the 1930s to the 1950s nonetheless stood clearly in the liberal tradition—in their view of the symbolic-mythic nature of much of Scripture (and how one is to understand its authority), in their theology, in their social ethics, and in their openness to the historical and natural sciences. And in this they actually advanced the legacy of liberal theology.

What these neo-liberals rejected was, basically, the excessively sentimental moralism, optimism, and idealism of their liberal teachers. Liberalism, they insisted, must be modified, not rejected; and it was this neo-liberal program that distinguishes them from some followers who, often cavalierly, repudiated Liberalism itself. Contrary to what conservatives-for-Niebuhr may say, he spoke of himself late in life as "a liberal at heart," and acknowledged that much of his early polemic against Liberalism was indiscriminate.

D.'s rich treatment truly conveys the complexity of Liberalism's story
and, I believe, validates his thesis regarding the fundamental continuity of Liberalism before and beyond the 1950s. Those who disagree face a substantial challenge, for D.'s book is the best history of this subject to date and may well remain the definitive study for a long time.

*College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.*  
JAMES C. LIVINGSTON


This volume, the penultimate in the series, continues the high standards set by the previous ones and follows the same format. Each author deals with a document or issue but does so in the chronological order in which they were handled in the council. The result is the happy but unusual combination of both a thematic and chronological approach. Alberigo deserves the highest praise for undertaking this daunting project, and Komonchak deserves the same for the care with which he has overseen the English-language version.

The volumes have already become the standard history of the council, and it is unlikely that they will ever have to be substantially revised. Some important documentation is not yet available to researchers, most notably the private papers of Paul VI, which leaves tantalizing questions unanswered, especially about certain moves of the pope and the motivation behind them. But we have more than enough in both quantity and variety of provenance to assure a sound interpretation of the general course of the council. This did not happen for the Council of Trent until 400 years after it ended. For those of us who got our first account of the council from Xavier Rynne in the pages of *The New Yorker* while the council was still in session, it is comforting to know how the narrative and interpretation in these carefully researched volumes tally on essential points with Rynne's gossipy story-telling.

Here of course we have much more detail, much better substantiated, and we have as well an obvious desire to be fair to everybody who played a role in the great drama—no more good guys, bad guys. Nonetheless, the division of the council into two parties—variously referred to as liberal and conservative, majority and minority (as in this volume), or, to use Cardinal Siri's words, the transalpines and us—is here once again vindicated beyond all doubt. In the third session the minority, after suffering bitter defeats in the first and second sessions, operated with ever more determination just as the energies of the majority began to dissipate and sag. The volume makes clear just how important this third session was and how especially in it were sown the seeds for the great battles after the council about how to interpret both the documents and the event.

The important players that emerge in this session, therefore, are not so much the earlier protagonists like Suènens, König, and Bea but their op-
posite numbers—Ruffini, Siri, and Browne. Then there is Felici, the General Secretary, who seems almost ubiquitous in these pages and whose actions in the council chamber and behind the scenes did not always radiate the neutrality his office required of him. The hotly divisive issues continued to be chapter 3 of *Lumen gentium*, the “Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation,” the “Declaration on Religious Liberty,” and the “Declaration on the Relation of the Church to Non-Christian Religions.” The minority’s dogged resistance to certain aspects of these texts only intensified as the weeks moved along.

It is in this context that Paul VI emerges as newly pivotal in the functioning of the council. The minority kept insisting that he intervene in their favor, and when he did, the majority was forced to approach him, if only to ask what his interventions meant. The center of gravity of the council shifted in subtle but crucial ways from the basilica of St. Peter to the papal apartments.

In some ways, therefore, the volume’s part 6 on the “black week” of the council, November 14–21, 1964, is the most important. That was when Paul VI made the interventions, including the famous *Nota praevia* to chapter three of *Lumen gentium*, that threw the council into turmoil just as the third session was ending, and created a climate of great uncertainty about what the future of the council might be. One of the great achievements of this session was the final approval of *Lumen gentium*, but, after all the controversy over it, bishops and others were left wondering about the import of Paul’s statement in his closing address that “this promulgation [of *Lumen gentium*] really makes no change in traditional teaching” (633).

I found the work of the eight authors uniformly excellent, so as to make the volume a model of what a collaborative venture should be. The interpretations offered are based not only on the official documentation but on the letters, diaries, and other recollections of participants, as well as the reactions in the world press, the World Council of Churches, and similar bodies. This documentation is vast almost beyond telling, as befits the biggest meeting ever held in the history of the world.

*Weston Jesuit School of Theology*

JOHN W. O’MALLEY, S.J.


The first of these books (*TDS*) is Pasquale’s doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University. It is a monumental work of historical theology, analyzing 37 Catholic authors who wrote between the years 1950 and 1970 on the theology of history; all the authors are European except James Connolly of New York. There are the usual suspects: Thils, Balthasar, Danielou, Ratzinger, Hugo and Karl Rahner, Congar, Mouroux, Seckler,
and Kasper. But there is also a helpful collection of less well-known figures who contributed, without gaining English-language fame, to making the 20th century the century "of the theology of history" (29). Inevitably, Vatican II is an omnipresent subtext, specifically *Dei Verbum*, to which I will return, and *Gaudium et spes*. The council, of course, introduced the term *historia salutis*.

After he has researched, collected, and analyzed the historical data (in the first 470 pages), P. proceeds to the specifically theological part of his project, the theology of the history of salvation, where he offers doctrinal proposals. The historical section is a goldmine for the historical theologian, the speculative part a solid example of how good theological history is the necessary underpinning for authentic theological speculation. P. has provided theologians with a resource for many years to come. The book demands serious commitment, however, even for those fluent in Italian. That is where the second book (SDS) comes in. It offers the condensed version for the nontheologian, assuming the historical analysis done in *TDS* but presenting a more readable theology of the history of salvation as passed through P.’s interpretative lens.

In the years just prior to council, Catholic hermeneutics treated the theology of history from the perspectives of a twofold dialectic, that between the supernatural and the natural, and that between the kingdom of God and worldly reality. The treatment underlines two, equal freedoms, the freedom of God who reveals and the freedom of women and men who receive that revelation and discern God’s intentions. These two freedoms come together in the man Jesus—who is the focal center of history, sacred history, and revelation—in the events Christians name Incarnation, death, Resurrection, and transforming glorification.

P. credits Vatican II with a new conception of history as a *locus theologicus*, and locates this development in two sections of *Dei Verbum*. The first defines the action of God in history “in deeds and words having an inner unity” (*DV*, no. 2). The second defines the place of the Church in *historia salutis*: “God, who spoke of old, uninterruptedly speaks with the Bride of his beloved Son; and the Holy Spirit . . . through her, in the world, leads unto all truth those who believe and makes the word of Christ dwell abundantly in them” (*DV*, no. 8). After *Dei Verbum*, beginning in *Gaudium et spes*, the history on which theology reflects is not only the history recorded in the Scriptures but also that ongoing worldly reality and history in which salvation is realized. The 20th century becomes the century of the theology of history precisely because history as salvation history enters into all of theology. History, as interpreted by the Church under the prompting of the promised Paraclete, informs theology about the presence and action of God in the world, about the Incarnation, death, and Resurrection of the beloved Son of God, about the crucial role of Christ’s Church as interpreter of history, and about the eschaton already present in history.

P. concludes both books by quoting with approval from Pope John Paul II (a truncated quote in the scholarly book, full citation in the popular one). “The history of salvation,” John Paul believes, “offers new inspiration for
the history of humanity... It offers, in fact, a more impassioned theme... It confronts the meaning of human existence" (TDS, 495; SDS, 161.). For those who have eyes to see, the mystery of salvation is always present in the mystery of history, freeing history from any suggestion of absurdity or meaninglessness. Hope is possible even when history seems at its most absurd, because the presence and action of God can always be discerned in history by those of Christian faith. Humanity is once again at a moment in history when such a message of faith needs to be heard.

I recommend both books to those who can read them, each for a different reason, and assure readers that they will not be disappointed in either.

Creighton University, Omaha

MICHAEL G. LAWLER


This is a worthy successor to Torrell’s excellent volume 1, *The Person and His Work* (1996). All of Thomas’s theology is spiritual theology, since faith enlivened by charity seeks understanding. The saint’s spirituality is mirrored in his theology. The divine reality is known through conceptual formulations, even while surpassing them. So Thomas is the Christian spiritual master presenting a Catholic view of God and man. Part 1 concentrates on the trinitarian God, the Creator beyond all things, treating analogy (negation as the third step), the Trinity as beginning, end, and experienced presence in creation, the roles of Son and Spirit in creation and redemption, and the community of the redeemed. Part 2 develops Thomas’s spiritual anthropology grounded in a theology of creation whereby all things both possess an inherent consistency and stand in a one-sided relation to God. The consistency allows room for creation’s goodness and free cooperation in the return to God upon whom all depends. Man is the composite of body and soul, whose unity under reason and God is perfected by habitus. Society likewise reflects a delicate balance of individual and group, while the person surpasses the material world and is under a special providence. An excellent chapter relates synderesis, conscience, natural law, knowledge, and the responsibility of forming conscience in truth. Respecting the natural order with the relative autonomy of the state and secular professions, Thomas nonetheless has everything depend ultimately on supernatural charity, which presupposes faith and hope (the locus of prayer) and integrates all the natural and supernatural virtues. The natural law is implanted in man’s tendencies but comes to perfection in love, which means loving God above all and the neighbor as oneself and adhering to Christ.

Thomas’s synthesis of Aristotelianism, neo-Platonism, and revelation was ongoing from the more Aristotelian categories of the *In sententias* to the more neo-Platonic emphasis of later works. Presupposing that earlier explanations are continued unless explicitly rejected, T. joins the earlier
emphasis on conceptual clarity, distinction of orders and virtues, and the
primacy of natures with the later dynamic integration of the universe in
charity’s return to its source. This joining leaves many tensions. How are
nature and grace distinguished if the natural desire to see God is a major
thrust of Thomas’s thought? How can the Trinity be intellectually and
affectively experienced on earth if faith comes from hearing and man
knows through the senses? If faith is dynamically oriented to God, how is
it distinguished from charity? If charity supplies the norm for every just act,
how can any act be good if charity is lacking (359, 364–65)? If man knows
God through nature, how is a vestigium Trinitatis (supernatural mystery)
found in all things? Explaining appropriation as the manifestation of the
Person in the midst of essential attributes (159) does not ontologically
ground separate roles for the Persons in creation. If all grace is given by
God, how can Christ the man cause it? (The notions of “ontological ex-
emplarity” and instrumental causality, however conjoined, animate, and
free it might be under God, are clearly a pis aller.) The grounding of
Christ’s status as firstborn of many brothers in his eternal generation (148–
49) guarantees his role at the culmination of creation, but it threatens the
natural-supernatural distinction. Thomas enjoyed a Christocentric spiritu-
ality but had difficulty enunciating it coherently within a Plotinian exitus-
reditus schema with an Aristotelian nature as principle of activity and
efficient cause. Participation in infinite Good explains divine causality in
grace and freedom as choice of the good, but does it fully correspond with
a more Aristotelian freedom of indifference that guarantees human coop-
eration? Love is not only the fulfillment of a natural drive; it is also nature’s
estasy (50, 357).

These tensions that have plagued Thomism through the centuries are
rooted in Thomas’s works. T. has mirrored the balanced richness of
Aquinas’s thought, “a rarely broken equilibrium” (383), without recourse
to simplifying schemata. For Thomas fidelity to reality’s mystery is more
important than myopic rational syntheses. So his spirituality is trinitarian,
theocentric, Christocentric, objective, realistic, and ecclesial. It lives from
the Bible, the Fathers, and Dominican spirituality. The surety of his Catho-
lic faith and the vitality of his interior life made him sane and profound in
employing Aristotle and neo-Platonism while preserving the balance of
reality’s polar tensions. Perhaps the major lacuna in Thomas’s thought is
the incomplete notion of person as acting subject and in its relation to
natures. In T.’s magnificent presentation one wishes more on original sin,
assimilation to Christ crucified, the meaning of suffering, and sacraments.
But one cannot do everything, even in a magnum opus.

Pontifical College Josephinum,
Columbus, Ohio

John M. McDermott, S.J.

God and the Future: Wolfhart Pannenberg’s Eschatological Do-
xx + 262. $75; $24.95.
Wolfhart Pannenberg’s three-volume *Systematic Theology* (original German, 1988–1993, ET 1991–1998) has confirmed his standing as a truly creative and original thinker. Christiaan Mostert skillfully traces Pannenberg’s thought from its early foundations to its full articulation in the *Systematic Theology*. Professor of systematic theology in the Uniting Church Theological Hall, Queens’ College, University of Melbourne, M. offers us a beautifully written and thoughtfully structured introduction to the center of Pannenberg’s thought, his eschatological doctrine of God.

M. shows how Pannenberg’s eschatological theology builds on Jesus’ message of the kingdom of God and on his resurrection from the dead. He accepts Pannenberg’s claim that both are to be understood within the interpretative framework of Jewish apocalyptic. Pannenberg takes from apocalyptic the idea that history forms a whole. M. shows how this “ontology of the whole” leads to what is truly distinctive and controversial in Pannenberg’s thought, his concept of the ontological priority of the future. An event in time, the resurrection of Jesus, has determined the final outcome of history. What we experience in the present is an anticipation of the future. As M. makes clear, for Pannenberg this anticipation is not only epistemological but also ontological. The future is real and has priority over the present, even though it does not yet exist. The essence of a thing is determined only by its future end. But the principle of retroactive permanence means that this future is already constituted as a thing’s essence, in anticipation of its end.

There is a satisfying and logical progression in M.’s exposition of Pannenberg, that takes us from apocalyptic to the ontology of the whole, and from there to the ontological priority of the future. This progression leads, in turn, to the two major chapters on the God of the future and the reign of the triune God. M. points to a movement in Pannenberg’s mature work away from his early emphasis on God as the “power of the future” to the concept of God’s eternity, which Pannenberg understands as the totality of life. This divine eternity encompasses all modes of time: past, present, and future. M. shows how this concept of God’s eternity coexists in Pannenberg’s thought with a theology of God’s becoming in the history of salvation. God can become, not in the immanent Trinity, but in the economic Trinity, in a self-creative and self-actualizing way. In the economy of creation and redemption, God actualizes God’s self in relation to the other of creation.

M. directs us to Pannenberg’s guiding principle that God’s being is God’s rule. The being of God and the kingdom of God are identical. The culminating chapter of the book explores how the kingdom of God relates to a fully articulated doctrine of the Trinity. After discussing various aspects of Pannenberg’s trinitarian theology, including his idea of reciprocal relations that extend beyond the relations of origin, M. engages with Pannenberg’s claim that the saving events of Jesus’ death and resurrection have a constitutive significance for God’s being. In fact, Pannenberg makes two claims: (1) that God is eternally what God is (the immanent Trinity), and (2) that the events of history are constitutive for God’s being (the economic
Trinity). Pannenberg sees these two as coinciding eschatologically. It is only in the eschaton that the economic Trinity will be identical with the immanent Trinity. Again, M. insists, this claim about God is to be understood on the basis of the principle of retroactive permanence. The essence of God established in the eschaton will have been God's essence all along. Pannenberg is not simply making a claim about our knowledge of the Trinity. He is making a claim about the divine being, about ontology. God's eternal trinitarian being is established retroactively from the point where eternity and time meet. M. seems able to accept Pannenberg's thought here, but I admit to still finding some difficulty in embracing the idea that God's trinitarian being is constituted retroactively from the eschaton.

M. engages not only with Pannenberg, but also with his critics. By and large he defends Pannenberg against all comers, but he admits that there are gaps and problems in Pannenberg's thought, and that it is still too early to tell whether his ideas about the priority of the future will prove to be the beginning of a paradigm shift. M. succeeds in communicating the energy, insight, and depth of Pannenberg's thought. He takes his readers by clear and systematic steps into the very center of Pannenberg's theology of God. This is an excellent book, highly recommended to all seeking to understand the thought of a leading figure in contemporary theology.

Flinders University, South Australia

DENIS EDWARDS


In 1550 the second edition of Philip Melanchthon's *Initia doctrinae physicae* was published at Wittenberg. It was the text used at the seminar for every incoming student of theology. A similar text, *Physica christiana* (1576) by the French Calvinist Lambert Daneau, was used for all incoming theology students at Geneva. Similar texts were employed by Jesuits at the Roman College. Thus, in pre-Enlightenment days, all Christian students of theology, as they began serious studies, were expected to have a basic scientific understanding of the universe in which they lived. Stephen Barr's book is not unlike the texts cited above, although the intellectual climate in contemporary culture is quite different.

B., a physicist at the University of Delaware, begins his book by proposing that a collision between religion and science does not exist. On the other hand, there is a bitter intellectual battle going on between religion and philosophical materialism, which grew up alongside of science. Many of the arguments of scientific materialism developed during the Enlightenment and into the early 20th century. B.'s objective is to show that recent discoveries and theories about the physical universe offer fresh reasons for sensible people to tilt the advantage away from materialism to the side of religion. He makes it clear from the start that it is not a matter of proofs for religion. Rather he writes in the role of an enlightened apologist who sets out to refute the thesis that only matter exists.
B. is familiar with the current literature of physics, astrophysics, and the philosophical questions they raise about the origin of the universe and its evolution. He is also familiar with the popular nontechnical writings of scientists like Stephen Hawking, Stephen Jay Gould, and Steven Weinberg that are sometimes slanted against belief systems. B.'s description of sophisticated and complex scientific theories is as clear and accurate as any in nontechnical literature. Nevertheless, although he tries to clarify the concepts used in his discussion of contemporary science, some readers unfamiliar with the ideas and mathematical terminology will probably find the arguments difficult to follow in places.

The book's five parts comprise 26 chapters. The relatively brief introduction in part 1 exposes the very real philosophical bases of scientific materialism and advances the valid claim that the remainder of the book will show how contemporary science confounds the materialist rather than the believer. In a discussion of Big Bang Theory in part 2, B. uses his constant application of practical examples to illuminate for the nonscientist the overwhelming evidence of an expanding universe. Clear distinctions between meanings of creation in theology and beginnings in physics are included in the discussion.

In part 3, "Is the Universe Designed?" B. evaluates two versions of cosmic and biological arguments from design. His originality is exhibited by separating the meaning of the word "structure" into patterns of symmetry and beauty in the laws of nature and into the complexity of living organisms. The separation permits analysis of the three ways structures are known to arise naturally: by pure chance, by the laws of nature, and by natural selection. B. is especially skilled in his analysis of physical laws as indicators of order that point to some cosmic designer. However, as a physicist, he argues that it would be unscientific to go beyond that conclusion.

Part 4 discusses various interpretations of coincidences in the universe that have led to an anthropic principle. The principle states that the physical universe is constrained by the fact that humans are here to observe it. In other words, there is a link between the laws and constants of nature and our being human observers. B.'s evaluation of various interpretations of the principle shows the weaknesses of speculative hypotheses offered by nonbelievers to explain the amazing congruity of data that have led to the principle.

A relatively long part 5 is broken into chapters that discuss a series of topics of interest to those concerned with the interaction of philosophy and contemporary science: determinism and free will, Gödel's contribution, the mind and the computer, and interpretations of quantum theory. B. concludes that the materialist position is not logical because it holds ultimately that all rational explanation must be given in terms of quantities and equations. In B.'s words: "[W]hat gives us the right to expect that all of reality is reducible to . . . mathematical treatment? How often are the questions we ask in life answerable by equations? And yet, if the answers cannot be reduced to equations, are they for that reason to be regarded as irrational?"
Is all wisdom, all of morality, all of beauty, all of understanding a matter of numbers and laws? There is a circularity about the materialist position that becomes obvious whenever its logic is carefully examined" (256).

B.'s study should interest any theologian or philosopher who wishes to understand why observers see the table tilting from triumphal materialism to reasonable belief.

Loyola College of Maryland

JAMES F. SALMON, S.J.


Albert Einstein famously said that the most incomprehensible thing about the universe is that it is so comprehensible. No one denies that to make sense of the universe a theory is necessary. But theories come and go, and even the most prestigious of them, such as Newton's law of gravity, eventually get superseded. This process has caused any number of thinkers, Thomas Kuhn most prominently among them, to wonder if Einstein did not get it wrong: perhaps theories are merely pragmatic ways humans devise for coping with the sheer contingency of the world and thus are always and inherently fallible, with no more claim to an overarching purchase on the world than a rain dance would be for drought-stricken aborigines.

Alister McGrath addresses this dilemma in his third and final volume of his remarkable A Scientific Theology (the previous two volumes were reviewed in TS 64 [March 2003] 171-72 and 65 [June 2004] 407-9). Taken together, this trilogy proves that M. can now claim to join the ranks of the most significant theologians of this new century, a claim that will prove to be even more justified if he proceeds to publish a full-scale systematic theology, which in the preface he promises and to which this trilogy is meant as only the prolegomenon!

Although M. does not mention Charles Sanders Peirce explicitly, or seem to rely on him for any of his argument, the informed reader will note "elective affinities" between their two approaches to the problem of theory. On the one hand, the history of theory has clearly proved its ongoing and pervasive fallibility (theoria semper reformanda, one is tempted to say); while on the other hand, the history of postmodern irrationalism shows the dangers of asserting that theory is purely a matter of social construction and pragmatic utility. For M., theories are genuine responses to external reality, but they are active and socially mediated responses. In other words, "theory is to be regarded as a communal beholding of reality" (xi) based on a collaboration of many researchers, whose work is then mediated by such social structures as schools, books for the general reader, and journalism.

Such a concession might sound as if M. is veering toward the socialconstructivist view, but in the first chapter (actually, chapter 12, as the chapters are numbered consecutively across the three volumes), he shows
the inevitability of theory, despite its inherent fallibility. The charge is often brought against theory, especially by humanists in the Romantic tradition, that theory deals only in abstractions, bloodless universals, thereby slighting the particular. M., however, shows that, far from being a reductionist foreclosure of the particular deliverances of the senses, theory *liberates* the particular by showing individual and separate things in the nexus of their interrelations, which interrelations constitute the individual thing as precisely particular (42). If hermeneuticists can proclaim, "a text without a context is a pretext," M. would say the same of particulars: they do not exist except in a context made known only through theory.

Another issue that has often bedeviled defenders of theory is the question of language: if language cannot give access to reality, then the social constructivists win out, since, to be communicable, theory must be formulated in language. Rather than take on the Wittgensteinians head on, M. shows that only a genuinely theological account of language can address this challenge. Here M. reaches a most fascinating conclusion: that in the famous debate between Karl Barth and Erich Przywara on the legitimacy of the concept of the analogy of being, Barth had it wrong. I find this conclusion particularly intriguing because of M.'s own debt to the Barthian tradition. But in that regard, it is not so much that he regards Przywara as right, for he seems to agree with Hans Urs von Balthasar and Edith Stein that Przywara represents only one particular version of the Thomistic doctrine of analogy. Nonetheless, M.'s concession is important and could well be the most important conclusion of this volume.

The third chapter (14 in this numbering) takes up the issue of just what role scientific explanation bears in rendering a true account of reality, and here again affinities with Peirce are marked, especially in M.'s discussion of abduction. But more crucially for the theologian, this volume also contains a vigorous polemic against the idea that God is the "last stop" in explanatory hypotheses (the old idea of the God-of-the-gaps that proved so fateful for the rise of atheism). In other words, belief in God does not arise from the human mind's hunger for ultimate explanations but out of a need to give praise to the origin and goal of contingent existence. The final chapter (15) concludes with a ringing defense of metaphysics. For M. metaphysics went into decline *pari passu* just as skepticism about theory began its ascendancy.

To paraphrase Kant, one cannot imagine a more well-grounded "prolegomenon for any future theology" than this remarkable trilogy.

*University of St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Ill.*

EDWARD T. OAKES, S.J.


This is a tantalizing, uneven, ambitious book. Throughout its eleven chapters I found many discussions that were exceptionally well done and
illuminating, alongside other instances of confusion and superficiality, as well as some surprising omissions. A nagging question remaining is just how Odozor views the “Church.” This Nigerian Spiritan Father was educated in Africa, Rome, and Canada, and has taught in a seminary in his homeland and, since 1999, has been associate visiting professor at the University of Notre Dame. Yet, as Karl Rahner suggested, if Vatican II represented a real coming of age of the “world Church,” evidence of this shift is underrepresented in this work. Most of the debates and much of the sources are Eurocentric, with revisionist theologians (many of whom work in the United States) being cast against either the Vatican or those others in particular favor in Rome (such as the Grisez school). O., of course, is hardly the only person to express this perspective, but in a work so “globally” subtitled (“A Study of the Catholic Tradition since Vatican II”) readers might expect to see in greater depth how that tradition plays out in other parts of the world such as Latin America, Asia, and even the author’s home continent of Africa, not to mention how inculturation, globalization, poverty, social sin, feminism, ecumenism, etc., have all helped shape this contemporary Catholic tradition.

Part 1 looks at the historical, ecclesial, and theological contexts for moral theology, concentrating on Vatican II and *Humanae vitae*. O. tends to look at “Vatican II” somewhat monolithically, however, which is a weakness in a work that aims to be essentially historical. Upon closer analysis we find several “Vatican IIs”—the Vatican II of Ottaviani and the Vatican II of Bernard Haring, *Lumen gentium* no. 25 (on the obsequium religiosum due to the ordinary magisterium), and the autonomy of conscience found in *Gaudium et spes* no. 16.

Part 2 turns to the nature of Christian ethics, with chapters on the distinctiveness (*proprium*) of Christian ethics, Scripture and ethics, natural law, and the role of the magisterium. While treatment of these themes is often a bit too wide-ranging and repetitive, I found this to be the strongest section. Part 3 focuses on the debates over moral norms and includes recent work in virtue ethics and a renewed casuistry. Part 4 tries to sum up the discussion. In his penultimate chapter, O. acknowledges that the Catholic Church “is often accused of ‘intransigence’, wanting to keep women under control and domination by men, insensitivity to the plight of those suffering from HIV/AIDS or sexual diseases which could be alleviated or contained through the use of condoms, insensitivity to the plight of poor families who could not continue to care for their increasingly large families, and so forth,” but concludes that it is “important here to point out that such accusations often fail to understand the fundamental basis of these positions” (280). It would seem, however, that the failure to communicate moves in both directions, and that those who continue to insist on the moral illegitimacy of condom use when one partner in a marriage is HIV positive and the other is not may be failing to understand the fundamental basis for the counterpositions. O. seems not to grant this possibility of mutual misunderstanding as he concludes that “when the opponents of the
teaching of the Church on contraception argue that the Church cannot
teach authoritatively on the issue, for whatever reason, they are in effect
saying that contraception must not be seen as a theological issue" (281).
Both his argumentation and conclusions here fail to convince me that this
is the only way to look at the issue.

The book concludes with an appreciative summary of John Paul II's
_Veritatis splendor._ Surprising is the missed opportunity to use this encyc-
clical and subsequent debates to tie together the various strands of the
history of post-Vatican II moral theology. It seems that, if O. is not exactly
trying to spin the moral equivalent of string theory, at the very least he is
trying to interrelate everything he had ever read or thought about a par-
ticular topic. This makes for much repetition, some difficult reading, and
oversimplifications (such as O.'s references to Boethius, Kant, and Leibniz
in a single paragraph [287], and his argument that for Louis Janssens “an
act is morally right if it is beneficial to the human person in himself” [290]).

For scholars this book is well worth reading, but it would be difficult to
recommend it for course adoption or general readership.

_University of San Francisco_  

JAMES T. BRETZKE, S.J.


Catholics and Jews work together in health care facilities under the
auspices of one religion or the other. Their ethical traditions are similar yet
distinctively different. The similarities make working together possible.
The differences can be a source of frustration or an opportunity to widen
one's perception of the implications of their shared values. Aaron Mack-
ler's comparative study can enhance this opportunity and may minimize
the frustration.

While the book presents and compares the substantive positions of Jew-
ish and Catholic thinkers on bioethical method and five issues—euthanasia,
forgoing treatment, abortion, in vitro fertilization, and access to health
care—M. attends a bit more to Catholic than to Jewish writers. M., a Jewish
ethicist from Duquesne University, has done his Catholic homework well.
He shows a keen grasp of Catholic natural law method, the role of the
magisterium, who's who in contemporary Catholic bioethics, and their di-
verse substantive positions. His exposition dispels any notion that either
Catholic or Jewish bioethics is monolithic.

M. gives a fair-handed presentation of positions in an accessible style. He
closes each chapter and the book with a comparative analysis. He shows
how both traditions share some common ground from drawing on common
sources, the Hebrew Bible and human experience, that yield some common
values, such as the dignity of the person, life as a basic good, love of
neighbor, the sovereignty of God and human stewardship, healing, social
responsibility, justice, family, personal autonomy. The two traditions also
show remarkable similarity in framing issues, identifying primary concerns of issues, and often using the same language to express these concerns.

Differences are in the emphasis given to these common values and the relative priority given to sources of moral knowledge that influence their methodological approaches. Catholics tend to favor teleological arguments based on a normative model of the human person drawn from natural law. Jewish writers make a stronger deontological appeal by drawing on textual sources and the tradition of halakhic responsa, or casuistic-like arguments by individual rabbinc authorities addressing particular cases.

On particular issues, the two traditions show an impressive convergence in opposing euthanasia and favoring allocation of resources to provide health care to all. Jews and Catholics stand together on these issues even if they provide different rationales for their shared commitments. But they diverge on issues of forgoing treatment, in vitro fertilization, and abortion.

For Jewish ethicists, the obligation to preserve life supersedes all other duties. Thus, they are more reluctant than are Catholics to forgo interventions near the end of life. For example, even though medically assisted nutrition and hydration is distinguished from medical treatment, many Jewish ethicists require it under most circumstances, even for patients in a persistent vegetative state. While quality-of-life factors for the patient and burdens to family and society can figure into Catholic thinking, these are not given any play in Jewish thinking.

Catholic and Jewish ethicists part ways, in principle, on the abortion issue, largely due to their differing interpretations of the status of the fetus. For Jewish ethicists, the fetus is a potential person and so ought to be treated with respect, but it is not regarded as equal in value to the mother, because the fetus does not attain personhood until birth. This position does not lead to supporting abortion on demand, but it does open the way to permit abortions in situations where official Catholic teaching would not.

M.'s survey of in vitro fertilization [IVF] is one of the best I have seen. While Jewish thinkers overwhelmingly accept IVF in homologous cases as an appropriate therapeutic intervention, Catholic ethicists are divided. For the Jewish ethicists, the Catholic commitment to the inseparability of the unitive and procreative meanings of marital sex is an ideal that should be maintained when possible. But when a couple needs external help to have a child, then technological interventions like IVF are acceptable. While Catholic ethicists worry that IVF demeans and harms the child, Jewish ethicists urge the importance of parental love and care to offset the technological intervention in the procreative process.

Overall M.'s presentation of the various positions and rationales for each is well balanced. The section on approaches to determining whether to forgo treatment is repetitious. There M. separates the burden/benefit criterion from quality of life considerations. But inevitably, as he admits, any consideration of benefit and burden already includes an appreciation of quality of life. So, by separating these approaches, he embarked on repetition and backpedaling to explain them.

M.'s hope is that Jews and Catholics learn from one another. The book
is a testimony to how M. has learned from Catholics to consider his Jewish values and tradition in a new light. Now with this comparative analysis available, Catholics can more easily learn from Jews.

Franciscan School of Theology, Berkeley

RICHARD M. GULA, S.S.


A major debate is ensuing in the bioethics literature concerning what it means to be a person. Transhumanists declare that with the use of technology we now have the power to restructure ourselves into new beings with powers beyond our present condition. These speculators advocate moving into a posthumanist future in which we will be able to transcend the limitations of human anatomy through biotechnical enhancements. Traditionalists, such as Verhey, approve of therapies that would return us to a certain norm, but they see a grave danger in trying to refashion ourselves to attain superhuman capabilities. Traditionalists advocate setting boundaries between therapeutic procedures and those undertaken without any underlying medical reason or need. V. uses the Bible as a guide in maintaining those boundaries.

Throughout the book, V. places the person in relationship with God and with others. Part of being in relationship is concern and care for the other; V. begins by reminding the reader that Jesus expressed this care through healing. Christianity from its earliest days focused on welcoming the stranger and caring for the sick. Medicine and technology are not the overarching practices into which one inserts God, but medicine flows from one’s love for God and concern for one’s neighbor. If this approach is inverted, medicine takes over the role of religion, creating the “strange world” alluded to in the book’s title.

“Reading the Bible,” V. argues, “may help us to keep medicine in its (modest) place and then to celebrate it as good, without extravagant and idolatrous expectations of it” (60). The overriding good is God; all else is something created by God. Danger ensues when one forgets that one is a creature of God. This approach to bioethics is theologically grounded and is incoherent without a belief in God.

Although V.’s theological grounding of bioethics might cause some to view his approach as sectarian, it creates a framework in which to consider issues that involve more than concerns of autonomy and freedom; it broadens the discussion of health care choices. He states: “The sort of dominion that keeps faith with God the creator and provider will be more care-taking than conquering, more nurturing than controlling, more ready to suffer patiently with nature than to lord it over and against nature” (286). Further, V. balances his approach by describing the experience of needing health care and trying to negotiate the intricacies of our current health care system and medical practices that can cause patients to feel disregarded as persons and abandoned.
The book also raises specific health care issues and deals with them using a scripturally oriented approach. Separate chapters examine from a biblical perspective issues such as gene therapy, abortion, assisted reproductive technologies, physician-assisted suicide, care of neonates, and distribution of health care resources. Most of these chapters ask us to reframe the question. For example, in the chapter on abortion, rather than attempting to balance the rights of the child against the rights of the mother, we are reminded that we need to honor certain moral obligations simply because they are embedded in our relationships. The issue is not so much whether or not the fetus is a person as it is that this fetus is mine and therefore I have obligations toward it. Likewise in the chapter on physician-assisted suicide, we are reminded that “therapeutic” suicide represents a refusal to depend on God and that it will force the weak and the sick themselves to justify their own existence.

Each chapter stresses that our hope lies in our dependence on and trust in God rather than in a trust in our children or medicine. In the chapter on the distribution of health care, V. concludes by recalling that, although tragic choices are involved in medical care, it is God, not medicine, who brings about our good future; medicine cannot deliver us from our finitude. The book’s central theme is that we should live out our relationship with God to the fullest by living with and caring for others in a spirit of gratitude. Community is essential.

V. successfully accomplished his goal. The book not only grounds medicine in Scripture and theology but offers hope. One hopes that this book will be read by general readers as well as by scholars.

St. John’s University, Jamaica, N.Y. 

MARILYN MARTONE


Brugger’s tightly argued historical examination of Catholic teaching on capital punishment focuses narrowly on two questions: whether contemporary magisterial teaching on the death penalty reverses the Church’s longstanding support of the state’s right to execute criminals, and whether such a reversal can be understood as a legitimate development of Catholic moral doctrine. He argues persuasively for affirmative responses to both questions.

B. concedes that the 1997 edition of the Catechism of the Catholic Church repeats the traditional defense of the state’s theoretical right to execute criminals—now limited to those “practically non-existent” cases where modern societies lack other means to protect the innocent. Still, he adroitly uncovers a sea change in the magisterium’s supporting arguments and concludes that this shift implies (and must lead to) the development of a “new position” rejecting capital punishment as intentional killing.

Reflecting contemporary Catholic moral analysis, especially that of John
Paul II, the *Catechism* explicitly eschews traditional defenses of punishment (retribution, deterrence, and rehabilitation) as justifications for the death penalty, and rejects Aquinas's and the Council of Trent's notion that capital punishment is an exception to the prohibition against intentional killing. Instead, the text relies exclusively on the argument of legitimate or self defense, in which the killing of another person must always be the indirect or unintended effect of an act. B. interprets this distinctive treatment of the death penalty by the *Catechism* as arguing that any justifiable killing must meet the criteria of the principle of double effect and can never be directly intended. The problem, B. points out, is that capital punishment must involve the intentional killing of a human being—a direct attack on human life and dignity—and thus cannot be justified as legitimate or self defense. So while the *Catechism* does not explicitly condemn the death penalty, the logic of its underlying arguments leads to the inevitable conclusion that capital punishment is always wrong.

After a brief (and curious) excursus arguing for the superiority of Catholic justifications for punishment, B. sets out to determine if the Church's longstanding support for the death penalty has left any room for a future magisterial condemnation of this practice. After a slow start examining the biblical sources traditionally used to support capital punishment, B. offers a lucid and informative description and analysis of the treatment of capital punishment from the early Fathers to the present. From Justin Martyr to Pius XII, B. finds a broad but largely uncritical acceptance of the state's right to execute criminals. Within that tradition are developments concerning the role and participation of Christians, clergy, and the Church in capital punishment, as well as shifts in the importance given to retribution and other justifying arguments. Only in the middle of the last century does official Catholic teaching begin to seriously question, resist, and ultimately oppose the death penalty.

Applying Vatican II's criteria for infallibility, B. rigorously examines the depth and breadth of the Church's traditional teachings on the death penalty and argues persuasively that Catholicism's longstanding acceptance of the state's right to execute criminals could be a reformable church teaching, leaving open the possibility of a "new position" condemning any intentional killing as a violation of human dignity. In the process B. also ably dispenses with two arguments: Aquinas's and others' "medical" argument supporting the sacrificial killing of individual malefactors for the health of the larger body politic, and the notion that persons could lose their human dignity and right to life through sin.

In exploring the larger implications of a "new position" condemning capital punishment as intentional killing, B. is less persuasive in his argument that punishment does not violate the principle of double effect's prohibition of direct attacks on human goods, even though it inflicts deliberate harm on persons (as a means to the end of rehabilitation or retribution). At the same time his argument that the "new position" would alter the just war doctrine by forbidding intentional killing of combatants seems to make little practical difference, if military commanders can still
launch direct attacks for some larger, proportionate good. These problems raise the question as to whether the principle of double effect, particularly as B., John Finnis, and Germain Grisez interpret it, can serve as the cornerstone of a theory of justifiable killing. Still, B.’s analysis offers good reasons to believe that the moral and theological ground under the state’s right to execute continues to give way, and to hope that a consistent Catholic position will soon need to officially condemn this practice.

Gonzaga University: Spokane

PATRICK T. MCCORMICK


This rewarding book comprises 16 papers, mostly in German, presented in October 2001 for a research symposium on “Identity through Prayer,” under the auspices of the liturgy area at the Friedrich-Wilhelms University in Bonn. As the subtitle suggests and the editors make clear, prayer and liturgy play a central role in any discussion of community-building in both Judaism and Christianity, since therein one finds “in an ordered praxis of lived belief a level of experience and an ordering in its larger connections” (8). Therefore, to discover the dynamics of religious identity, liturgical disciplines must not only engage in a close analysis of texts but also benefit from interdisciplinary research.

The book’s five sections serve as a model for this interdisciplinary approach. In one sense, the three articles of part 1, “Possibilities and Limits of Comparisons of Jewish-Christian Liturgical Prayer Traditions,” are the heart of the book. Gerhards and his co-authors (“Identity between Tradition and New Creation”) give a cogent rationale for the selection of the symposium’s topics. They also emphasize that liturgical prayer in both traditions is a source of a never-ending process of religious self-definition that renews and transforms self-understanding and community. Furthermore, these liturgical traditions always challenge the praying community to accept God’s eschatological promises more deeply.

Paul Bradshaw (“Parallels between Early Jewish and Christian Prayers”) in his typically incisive way delineates some of the major presuppositions to be avoided in discussing the historical development of Jewish and Christian prayer. For example, the investigator should not assume that an “original simplicity” is indicative of an older core or source, or that an Urtext exists from which later forms evolved. Bradshaw then applies his guidelines to the most recent research on the Our Father. Gerard Rouwhorst (“Identity through Prayer”) employs sociological models to examine prayer texts as witnesses of continuity and discontinuity between Judaism and Christianity. Rites partially reflect the identity of the communities that use them. Rouwhorst uses social theory to demonstrate how simplistic models of
first-century Jewish communities (Pharisaic vs. later Rabbinic models) lead to incorrect assumptions about early Christian prayer texts.

As the next four parts are a test of the methodological cautions and suggestions of part 1, I limit myself to a less detailed outline of the subsequent articles. In part 2, "Jewish Liturgical Prayer in Intertestamental and Rabbinical Times," Johann Maier discusses the prayer texts of Qumran and what may be inferred about the community's attitudes toward their shared lives, while Joseph Tabory and Ruth Langer, in their papers, provide a careful analysis of amadah (tefillah) before and after the destruction of the Second Temple. In these articles, covenantal relationship emerges as a theme and variations.

In parts 3 and 4, "New Testament Stimuli from Contact with Jewish and Pagan Prayer Traditions" and "The Historical Reception of the Prayer Texts in the Context of Religious Identity Building," eight scholars range over a large number of related areas from the Our Father as a Jewish prayer to highly specialized assessments of I Clement, Origen, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, reexamined from the perspective of the process of community identity building.

The final part, "Theology and Anthropology in Light of Liturgical Prayer Formulas," might best be described as reflections in liturgical theology. Reinhard Messner and Martin Lang reassess the eucharistic prayer from the viewpoint of related Jewish prayers. Marcel Poorthuis reflects on the notions of God, the soul, and the body as core anthropological questions in the light of Jewish morning prayers.

"Interdisciplinary" means different things to different scholars and academic disciplines. There is not, for example, in most of these essays a strong or consistent sociological component or a close cultural analysis of prayer texts. But the authors accomplished what they set out to do. Familiar liturgical texts emerge from their contextual settings with new meaning. The links between Jewish and Christian prayer traditions are clarified, and some cherished connections are challenged. The project's wider concerns provoked questions that might not otherwise have been posed. Finally, although this book is not designed for the casual student, it should serve as both a model and incentive to scholars and graduate students in liturgy.

St. Bonaventure University, N.Y. REGIS A. DUFFY, O.F.M.


Keith Pecklers, S.J., professor of liturgy at the Pontifical Gregorian University and at the Pontifical Liturgical Institute of Sant' Anselmo in Rome, has given us two very different books in the field of liturgy. Worship: A Primer in Christian Ritual is precisely what the title says: a primer or an
introduction to the subject matter. Those who teach introductory liturgy courses have looked for such a primer as this. There have been other introductory books, but many no longer are as engaging for the student as I believe P.'s book will be. Those introductions to the liturgy, written 15 to 20 years after the Second Vatican Council, were able to presuppose a certain basic liturgical literacy in the reader. The student often came from a background of at least a minimal socialization in the Catholic faith, including the liturgy of the Church. Also, most college and renewal programs contained courses or other forms of instruction that had some bearing on the liturgy. In this atmosphere the student could develop some basic liturgical sensitivity. These two realities—the atmosphere and liturgical sensitivity—no longer exist. Few students entering college (even Catholic ones) are really socialized in their faith. And there are now many courses of study or ministerial programs that have little or no liturgical content. Often the practice of liturgy in these programs is haphazard, tangential, and frequently optional. P.'s book is directed to this new situation.

Why is P.'s primer to Christian worship different? Like other authors he devotes the first half of the book to history, the favorite topic of liturgists. In accessible and reader-friendly language he traces the earliest historical foundations of the Church's liturgical life through the Middle Ages, the reforms of the 16th century and the Council of Trent. He concludes with the efforts of the modern liturgical movement, culminating in the liturgical reforms of Vatican II. But the second half of the book deals with the contemporary issues facing Christian worship today: inculturation, popular religion, social justice awareness, and postmodernism. Other liturgists have studied all four of these topics previously, but they have done so more in specialized works than in introductory volumes. P. elaborates on these topics, which are of a greater concern than the history of worship to students who are not specializing in liturgy. Certainly, his emphasis on American popular religion enriches this introduction in a unique way. This second half makes Worship a book to be highly recommended for introductory liturgy courses.

The other book, Dynamic Equivalence: The Living Language of Christian Worship, is quite different. The title may mislead some readers to expect a detailed discussion on the philosophy of translation that is more than a definition of terms. P. makes clear what "dynamic equivalence" means, namely, a method of translation that intends to communicate the meaning of the text from one language to another. A one-for-one transfer of meaning is rarely achieved by a new literal translation, and so dynamic equivalence has become understood as not a literal word-for-word translation.

What P. has given us is really a history of the use and/or promotion of the vernacular in the liturgy. In fact, a major emphasis of the volume is to provide a kind of journal of the history of the Vernacular Society. After chapter 1, which briefly and clearly covers the history of the vernacular, chapter 2 presents the work of the Vernacular Society in some detail. Although P. places his discussion of the Society in the larger context of the
efforts being made at liturgical translation, in the remaining chapters he does highlight the work of the Vernacular Society as the time of the Second Vatican Council approaches. For instance, chapter 3 describes the mounting pressure for the vernacular from 1956-1962. Chapter 6, "Vernacular Worship and Ecumenical Exchange," deals with some of the Protestant churches—with emphasis on the Anglican Communion—as they move to improve the vernacular in their liturgies. Chapter 5, covering the years 1962-1965, concerns Vatican II and the vindication of the Vernacular Society's work. As P. notes in his introduction, he is tracing the "history of liturgical language in the Western Christian tradition as a dynamic and living reality. Particular attention is paid to the twentieth-century Vernacular Society within the United States and how the vernacular issue was treated at the Second Vatican Council" (xix). Given these parameters P. has accomplished his aim with clarity, precision, and interest—his rather journalistic style holds the reader's attention.

Every author has the right to establish his or her limits and intentions, and so they should be judged by them. Nevertheless, it is still appropriate to ask about the intended audience of the book. I personally found it engaging because as a young liturgist I lived through part of the era described. Most of the personalities in the book I knew by reputation and in some cases personally. The conflicts and issues portrayed were mine at the time. All that, however, would be beyond today's undergraduate or even graduate student. While master's students might read the book as part of some project, the professional liturgiologist would find the book too much of a survey to be helpful. Of course, there is always the person who is curious about this matter of dynamic equivalence, and such a person would enjoy reading the book. But those who are seeking a serious discussion of the philosophical, philological, and theological underlying presuppositions to the translation of liturgical texts today will have to look elsewhere.

P. has given us two very good books. One's first impression may be that the more scholarly, well-documented one, Dynamic Equivalence, may be the more significant, whereas Worship, devoid of scholarly notation, might fall into the category of "another introduction" to the liturgy. But the opposite is true, and so those whose task is to promote a deeper understanding of the Church's liturgy at the basic level are very much in P.'s debt.

San Fernando Cathedral, San Antonio
JAMES L. EMPEREUR, S.J.


This is an important and useful book. John O'Callaghan, professor of philosophy at the University of Notre Dame, aims to show how Thomistic realism in epistemology can help break the impasse that has plagued mod-
ern Western epistemology from Descartes, and especially Locke, right down to the present. The central problem for this whole tradition, particularly in its Anglo-American and analytic version, has always been that of reference, that is, how our perceptions and concepts (ideas) relate realistically, if at all, to the real world outside the consciousness of the human knower.

The fatal wrong turn of this tradition, as O. shows with abundant texts, is first made explicitly by Locke, with his affirmation that the direct objects of all our sense perceptions and ideas are the perceptions and ideas themselves as mental entities in our minds, without bearing any intrinsic relation to real objects outside our consciousness. The resulting problem has then always been to explain how we are justified in taking for granted, as we instinctively do in the naive realism of common sense, that these inner mental states or entities represent reliably a correlative real world outside our consciousness. But Locke's starting point, once accepted, introduces the problem of realistic representation, to which no one has yet found a convincing solution.

O. traces carefully all the main steps in this long search, culminating in Kant's dramatic Copernican revolution: we know the real world, not as it is in itself, but only as it appears to us, as we cannot help but perceive and understand it through our own built-in a priori forms of sense and rational understanding. All the succeeding epistemological theories of reference remain in some degree Lockean and Neo-Kantian, unable to break away decisively from the original position of the problem. In a word, for Locke and Kant there must always be a "third thing" as intermediary that somehow joins the inner mental states with the outside world. O.'s careful study of leading contemporary analytic philosophers like Hilary Putnam shows how they, despite their best efforts, still remain caught within the Lockean impasse, and how their perspective leads them to misinterpret Aristotle, Aquinas, and other realists.

But Thomistic realism can help contemporary Anglo-American (primarily analytic) philosophy break out decisively from the Lockean-Kantian impasse. O. shows how, from the very beginning, Aquinas insisted that our ideas and perceptions are not the immediate objects that we know first in themselves, but rather "that by which" or through which we know real agents in the world acting upon us. These perceptions and ideas are forms impressed upon our receptive cognitive fields by active agents in the real world, that reveal themselves immediately as formal similitudes received from outside and so point back directly to the active sources from which they come. Their purpose is to reveal, not replace, the real beings from which they derive; their revealing is not exhaustive, but realistically informative as far as they go.

This position enables Thomas to solve also the questions raised by the linguistic analysts about the relation of language to ideas and the real world. Thus, for Thomas, words are signs, not directly of things, but of our ideas, and ideas refer directly to things. This epistemological realism also enables Thomas to fulfill the book's subtitle, "Toward a More Perfect
The power of intellectual beings to relive truthfully within their own consciousness the whole vast real world beyond them expands immensely the richness of their own horizon of conscious living within this world, yet without becoming ontologically identical with it. Thomas calls this power "a remedy for the finiteness of a being that is also an intellectual knower" (De veritate q. 2, a. 2c).

In sum, the book renders a valuable service from Thomistic resources to contemporary thinkers struggling with the perennial problems of realism—anti-realism in Western thought. My only criticism is that O., for unexplained reasons, avoids ever using the traditional, and—I think—uniquely illuminating terminology of Thomas and the whole Thomistic tradition: that of "intentionality" and "formal, or self-effacing, signs" for explaining the cognitive process. The first, "intentionality," highlights the power, unique to cognitive beings, of recognizing the formal similitudes impressed on the knower by agents in the real world precisely as received similitudes, and so enables the knower to refer these back immediately to the real beings that are their source. (The Latin root of "intentionality" is intendere, which means to tend toward, to reach out toward another. The rediscovery in the 20th century of this power of intentionality in human knowers, lost in the mainstream of Western philosophy since John Locke, is one of the notable achievements of contemporary phenomenology.)

Fordham University, New York

W. Norris Clarke, S.J.


Despite the almost continuous assault on the design argument for God since Hume's initial attack, the argument remains popular. This is why Michael Ruse's reexamination of the argument and its long history is appropriate. Longtime professor of philosophy at the University of Guelph but recently appointed the Lucyle Werkmeister Professor of Philosophy at Florida State University, R. focuses his study of the design argument on the claim that all traditional design arguments tend to blur two arguments: the "argument to organized complexity" and the "argument to design" (294). Does nature have a level of complexity that demands an explanation, and then, assuming this is the case, does this complexity demand an explanation in terms of God?

R. proposes that one can argue for organized complexity without arguing for God as a designer. Any scientist or philosopher who sees the biological world as displaying, for example, harmony between the organs within organisms, and the fitness of organisms to their environments, accepts the organized complexity of the living world. Aquinas, Paley, Darwin, Huxley,
and many others accepted it. But Darwin's momentous insight was to see that this organized complexity did not require the move to God as a designer of this complexity. It can be explained by natural causes, and for Darwin, chance and natural selection, combined with immense time, explain this complexity by natural causes. But R.'s point of emphasis is that, without the assumption of organized complexity inherited from the long Western tradition of teleology and arguing to God the designer, Darwin would not have been able to move to selection and adaptation. In a quite direct way, therefore, one of the basic traditions of Judaism and Christianity paved the way for Darwin's theory.

Does Darwinism mean that the design argument, at least the version based on the realm of living things, is dead? Not quite. R. fails to mention the currently popular move of appealing to the well-tuned nature of the evolution of the cosmos as a possible basis of a new design argument. But he does propose that the old versions of the design argument still have theological value. He argues that "the acceptance of the existence and creative power and sustaining nature of God" casts illuminating light and makes complete our understanding of the realm of living things (331). We need to revive our wonder at the organized complexity of the living realm. And belief in a creator God is what leads us to see the grandeur, elegance, and beauty of the living realm. R. declares the death of the old natural theology (attempting to prove God by appealing to the organized complexity of nature) and pleads for a revival of a "theology of nature which sees and appreciates the complex, adaptive glory of the living world, rejoices in it, and trembles before it. . . . Not proof, but simply flooding, overwhelming experience" is the way theology today can be reconciled with Darwinian theory (335-36).

Much of the book is historical, but R. is not interested in straightforward chronology of evolution with all names and dates filled in and with copious references to primary sources. This is history with a point. R. uses history to dwell on the distinction between an argument for organized complexity and the argument to a designer God. His treatment of the early history of the design argument from the Greeks through the 17th century is quite breezy and a bit slapdash. But once he moves to the theory of evolution in the 18th and early 19th centuries, and the aftermath of the theory in the 19th and 20th centuries, he is completely at home with his material. Indeed, one would be hard-pressed to find a clearer, livelier, and more straightforward treatment of topics such as the object of selection (genes, individuals, or groups), optimality models, evolutionary accounts of animal and human behavior, and evolutionary explanations of sex-ratios.

Finally, R. debunks very well the "potted histories" that portray the Darwinian revolution as yet another battle in the ongoing war between science and religion. He shows that wars between science and religion were rare, and that, despite periodic revivals of anti-evolution in the United States, most Christians have made peace with evolutionary theory.

Creighton University, Omaha

EUGENE E. SELK

The Archabbey of Beuron began to publish its edition of the "remains of the Old Latin Bible" in 1949, under the editorship of Bonifatius Fischer; the series (and the associated monograph series) has moved slowly under the succeeding editorships of Hermann Josef Frede and Roger Gryson. The only complete text volumes are Fischer's own Genesis, Gryson's Isaiah, and Walter Thiele's Wisdom of Solomon, certainly a good selection of biblical books important for the history of the Church in the West. The book of Esther now begins to appear under the editorship of Haelewyck. The first fascicle of H.'s edition is taken up with the bulk of his introduction; the second fascicle will complete the introduction and begin the text proper.

Many facets of Esther are of interest to the student of the Latin West. The omission of Esther from the current Roman lectionary makes one sit up and take notice that in the ninth century the Pechianus manuscript contains forms of Tobit, Judith, and Esther slightly abridged and arranged for reading on the Rogation Days, albeit in monastic settings. The conclusion of the prayer of Mordechai, "Do not silence the lips that give you praise" (NAB C:10), was used in the liturgy of the second week of Lent; H. repeats the common belief that this prayer was especially apt for use in the stational liturgy of the Church of Saint Cecilia outside Rome (31). Thomas H. Connolly has suggested, rather, that the Roman martyr Cecilia was later associated with music precisely because of this prayer used in her liturgy (see The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 2001, s.v. Cecilia).

More arresting for the student of biblical literature are the many forms in which the story of Esther appears. The discrepancies between the Hebrew and the two Greek versions (Septuagint and so-called Lucianic or Alpha) make for a great tangle, and the Latin-speaking Church struggled with the narrative omissions and contradictions in producing a remarkable number of different arrangements of the material. Of greatest interest is the oldest form of the Vetus Latina, which witnesses to a third, now lost, Greek form. Esther is thus the only biblical book for which Latin provides a significant direct witness to the Hebrew. H. has made a wonderful contribution in assembling the materials and presenting them clearly.

M. O’CONNOR
Catholic University of America, Washington


This is an unusual book. At first it may appear to be just another guidebook to the Holy Land, as it is organized according to geographical locations important to Jesus and his earliest followers: Galilee, Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Nazareth, etc. Its concern, however, is not with the places themselves, but with what happened there, with what makes them "sacred." Patterson draws on geography, history, archeology, Scripture, and theology to make those happenings come alive for the person of faith who is on pilgrimage, whether in fact, in memory, or simply in imagination. Many clear maps and original photographs illustrate the book and serve to anchor the text firmly in the concrete world.

P. is uniquely qualified to write this book. Having received a doctorate in theology from the Gregorian University, he taught many courses in Scripture and systematic theology before recently retiring as professor emeritus at Loyola College in Maryland. Over the past 40 years he has led 17 study tours to the Holy Land, frequently accompanied
and assisted by his wife, Lorna, who provides many of the photos that illustrate the text. He also participated in the archeological excavation of Tel Nagila, Israel.

Each chapter provides geographical and historical descriptions of sites, explanations of their importance for Christians, along with maps, photographs, and pertinent Scripture passages. Illuminating end notes conclude the chapters. An appendix lists the sacred sites and their complementary biblical passages. A chronology relates events of sacred history to events in world history from the time of Abraham in Ur and King Hammurabi in Babylon (ca. 1900 B.C.) to the death of Nero (A.D. 68) and the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). Finally a bibliography lists salient books and articles from The Biblical Archaeology Review. The book is an ideal vade mecum for every kind of Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

JOHN H. WRIGHT, S.J.
Gonzaga University, Spokane


Distinguished church historian Justo González gathers the fruits of lectures he has delivered in North and Latin America. The book forms almost an autobiography of a lifetime of teaching and writing. The roots are the North Atlantic (Northwest Europe and North America) assumptions about Christian history upon which he was brought up: male, White, and predominantly Protestant. Moving on from there, G. courageously confronts the changes of the past half century and its postmodernism: the growing consciousness and articularteness of the wider world, voices of women and of the marginalized, the unraveling of traditional hermeneutics, discourses, and meta-narratives.

Church history based on institutions and denominational loyalties gives way to a “from below” approach through popular and universal Christianity and the latter’s interplay with other religions as well as with the secular. G. looks back to and draws from the figures of premodern times. Thus we are given nice reflective pieces on Eusebius of Caesarea, Bede, the Centuriators of Magdeburg, Baronius, Harnack, and others. There are more questions than answers, yet G. hopes that revisiting the Church’s past will provide wisdom for the future.

G. writes as a United Methodist and a Latin American, yet he is broadminded in his sympathy for other traditions and continents, while remaining ready to speak out as appropriate. Although the subject is church history as a discipline, it is seen as integrally involving theology and the personality of the historian and as having relevance to lifestyle as well as to knowledge. Thus theologians and all those interested in an informed approach to the faith, as well as more specialized church historians, can appreciate these reflections of a learned, thoughtful, and committed Christian.

NORMAN TANNER, S.J.
Gregorian University, Rome


Eleven essays (all previously published) continue Muller’s efforts to describe and define the development of “Calvinism” after Calvin. His The Unaccommodated Calvin (2000) sought to set Calvin and his works in historical context and approach them without what M. considers the theological templates of contemporary interpreters. In After Calvin, M. wants to reframe historiographical questions that inform many current scholarly perspectives on post-Reformation Protestantism. After an opening programmatic essay, the others fall into two parts: “Reframing the Phenomenon—Definition, Method, and Assessment”; and “Scholastic Protestantism—Foundational Perspectives.”

M. sees the rise of Scholastic orthodoxy after the death of Calvin as “a single but variegated Reformed tradition, bounded by a series of fairly uniform confessional concerns but quite diverse in patterns of formulation—not
two or more traditions, as is sometimes claimed" (8). This is a key methodological point; failure to recognize it is at the root of attempts "to pose 'Calvin' against 'the Calvinists'" (8). M. sees this mistake in current scholarship in various ways—from making Calvin alone the standard of orthodoxy, to attempts to drive a wedge between the first generation Reformed theologians and their successors on matters such as predestination, covenant, Christology, and atonement.

M. emphasizes that "scholasticism" is a "method rather than a particular theological or philosophical content" (16). While there are continuities and discontinuities in the forms of theological expression between the earlier and later Reformed traditions, M. argues that Reformed orthodoxy must be studied in its own historical contexts, in the light of issues faced by those who sought a continuity with Christian orthodoxy in the midst of new questions and concerns. His critique is potent against the scholarship that has been "so profoundly rooted in its own dogmatic projects—all of them originating in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—that it consistently failed to read and interpret the documentation of the Reformation and subsequent Protestant orthodoxy in its historical context and on its own terms" (191).

M.'s mastery of these sources is on full display here. His powerful presentations make his voice now the dominant one in assessing the period "after Calvin."

DONALD K. MCKIM


Baroness Augusta von Eichthal (1835–1932) resided in Rome on the Via di Ripetta, and welcomed to her salon church officials, nobility, and scholars from around the world. Supported by the wealth that her family had amassed in Germany, this unmarried woman was intent on forming a network of influential Catholics committed to renewing the Church's intellectual and cultural life and to resisting the Vatican's centralization of ecclesiastical power. She included among her conversation partners Ignaz von Dollinger, Baron Friedrich von Hügel, Franz Liszt, and some of the key figures associated with "Americanism," namely, Archbishop John Ireland, Bishop John J. Keane, and Monsignor Denis J. O’Connell. She was particularly close to Franz Xaver Kraus (1840–1901) who was one of the 19th century's most respected Catholic scholars of church history and the history of art.

This collection of Eichthal's letters to Kraus from 1895 to 1901 was translated into English by Robert Curtis Ayers, who is emeritus rector of the Church of Saints Peter and John (Auburn, N.Y.) and who served for 22 years as the Episcopal Chaplain at Syracuse University. A. became familiar with these previously unpublished letters while he was researching his doctoral dissertation, "The Americanists and Franz Xaver Kraus" (Syracuse University, 1981). A. has illumined Eichthal's letters with his introduction, annotations, appendix on Charles Warren Stoddard, and bibliography concerning Americanism and German Catholicism.

The book is a rich resource for understanding Kraus's activities and his German-speaking world, for grasping points of similarity and difference between Kraus and the so-called Americanists, and for glimpsing how an intelligent, perceptive, and energetic woman played a constructive role in the renewal of Catholicism.

ROBERT A. KRIEG
University of Notre Dame


In 1995 the Society of Jesus convened its 34th General Congregation. Its De-
cree 14 concerned the situation of women in the Catholic Church and in civil society. This document inspired Jesuit Tom Powers, with this book, to give voice to the ecclesial and civil situation of the women of Peru. P. “aims to illuminate the words and deeds, the reflections and the faith of a group of women who live and work in El Agustino, one of the poorest barrios (neighborhoods) of Lima” (1).

Using principles of liberation theology in a fresh way, P. creates a polyphonic work that brings a chorus of women’s voices alive from the urban despair of El Agustino. He portrays these women as agents of change who, while lacking a sophisticated theological approach, nevertheless resoundingly express concerns about their social reality that are impossible to ignore. Quoting their distinctive voices, P. weaves together the threads of their faith and life to describe how their llamado de Dios (“call of God”) confronts hard realities: poverty, suffering, conservative church structures, a culture that presumes—often implicitly, sometimes explicitly—women’s inferiority.

P. argues that the women’s experience suggests a different kind of liberation. Although the local church provides their foundation, their faith sometimes diverges from the hierarchical church—issues surrounding reproductive rights serving as a prime example. To fail to listen to the Peruvian women’s articulation of their faith would be to fail to hear a significant voice in the Church. With P.’s help these once muted voices create a resounding chorus.

One weakness of the book is that P. postponed far too long a concrete analysis of what he means by “doing theology.” Most of his theological analysis only comes in chapter 4. In chapter 5 he strikes an important final chord: What these women “have to say we must hear; what questions they pose, we all must toil to answer; what challenges they present, we must work together to meet” (138).

JOHN THIEDE, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


Edwards’s book joins a 40-year-old body of literature mining biblical sources and the history of Christian theology to construct a robust Pneumatology that would reform late-modern Christianity in thought and practice. E. marshals the best contemporary contributions across disciplinary (biblical, historical, systematic) and ecclesial lines in the “hope” that “a renewed theology of the Holy Spirit . . . may have practical effects in the life of the church, in ecumenical relations between East and West, in a communitarian politics, and in an ecological vision and praxis” (16).

The strength of the book is E.’s reliable, well-organized rehearsal of the literature, delivered in an admirably clear style. His constructive efforts, on the other hand, fall short. The depth of insight in two introductory chapters lucidly discussing current data and projections of scientific cosmology and the Pneumatology of Basil of Caesarea ultimately do not materialize into a solid argument for not only why but how increased theological attention to the Holy Spirit can have a broad, concrete impact on the beliefs, attitudes, and practical priorities of Christians. The result is a book that raises all the right primary and secondary issues, shows the basic connections between them, only to indicate that with such causes as church order, inculturation, and social ethics (including various liberationist theologies) “much needs to be done” (e.g., 92).

The constructive shortcomings of the book, nonetheless, do not defeat its utility as a thoroughly up-to-date, well-footnoted textbook. In each chapter E. starts with critical questions—such as the integral relationship between Wisdom and Spirit Christologies, the proper (as opposed to appropriated) roles of trinitarian persons, divine suffering—and then engages the categories that have both benefited and frustrated the tradition: hypostasis, ekstasis, perichoresis, koinonia, sophia, prolepsis, pannentheism. Such terminology unfolds
clearly in the course of E.'s summaries of the work of Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox scholars.

Overall, E. succeeds in outlining a Christian theology of God that names the thorniest of modern issues, both ecclesial and societal, that threaten the content of the faith with practical irrelevance.

BRUCE T. MORRILL, S.J.
Boston College


The books arose from two lecture series, which accounts for their manner of presentation—short, conversational, eminently crisp and clear. The Asian book emerges from three Placid Lectures (Rome 2001); the Democratic volume presents the six Bishop Jonas Thalithiath Lectures (Bangalore 2003).

Tanner is a recognized authority on church councils (he edited Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils [1990] and authored The Councils of the Church [2001]). Currently, he is professor at the Gregorian University, Rome, and serves as book review editor of Gregorianum. His rich background plays a pivotal role in the works under review.

Both books explore the role and impact of councils in the life of the Church. T. believes that councils were central to the evolving identity of the Church, particularly during the first millennium; this heritage offers much hope for ongoing Church renewal in subsequent eras (e.g., Trent, Vatican II). This "council" potential is to be realized on several levels in general, regional, national, and local assemblies and synods. T. asserts: "The most important lesson of all is surely to recognize the action of the holy Spirit in the councils. They are such a miracle of grace that without the Spirit they cannot be understood" (Democratic, 13). How does T. unfold this general thesis in his two books?

The Asian lecture series includes three presentations: (1) a survey of the seven ecumenical councils of the first millennium; (2) an overview of the Middle Ages and Trent; (3) a panorama of Vatican I and II. Throughout, T. keeps the reader's attention focused on the Asian contribution to each conciliar era. He concludes: "The Church certainly cannot be called too Asian—to answer the question provocatively posed in the book's title. On the other hand, the councils show that Asia has been well represented in this key dimension of the Church's history" (Asian, 86).

The six Democratic lectures address: (1) the pivotal importance of the first seven councils and the lessons to be learned; (2) regional or "grass-roots" councils; (3) the demise of regional councils and the deleterious consequences; (4) collegiality in Vatican II; and, (5-6) application of Vatican II thought to ecumenism and interreligious dialogue.

Together, the volumes contain much to recommend them. They present the Church's conciliar experience in an engaging manner, asking provocative questions: "too Asian"? "too Democratic"? T. creatively communicates the formative influence of the councils on the very identity of the Church. In addition, the conciliar tradition has kept the Church relevant, "up to date, indeed ahead of its time" (Democratic, 19). T. also makes a strong case that shows "the demise of regional councils after the period of the early church as one of the gravest wounds in the history of Christianity" (Democratic, 26).

The books communicate many valuable lessons from church history: the importance of discussion and consensus within the Church; the amazing achievement of the early councils in their delicate faith formulations that have, for the most part, endured down to today; the positive potential of episcopal collegiality as a cornerstone for renewal as envisioned by Vatican II; cautions against a false expectation that the Church will be (or ever was) fully united on all levels of doctrine and governance;
the caveat against putting too much focus on the reform of the papacy and of the Roman curia. Reading these volumes renews one's realistic enthusiasm for the Church to become an authentic community in today's fragmented world.

A few reservations remain. Is T.'s use of the term "Asia / Asian" misleading (though technically correct as he defines it); does it match the contemporary cultural, sociopolitical, and geographical usage of the term? Do the titles of both books, though provocative and enticing, reflect the dominant content of the works (possibly better represented by the subtitles)? There is a curious absence of any discussion about the Federation of Asian Bishops' Conferences when regional episcopal associations and contributions are presented (Democratic 50–53, 61–65).

On balance, the books are stimulating and rewarding. Much history of the church councils (context, questions faced, major decisions, wider impact, lessons to be learned) is presented concisely and creatively. The extensive presentation of Vatican II in both volumes informs and enlightens. The smartly produced volumes contain indexes and footnotes; Democratic has a table of the councils and a helpful map, showing the locations of councils. In words addressed to Saint Augustine, who was invited to the council of Ephesus but died before the invitation reached him: Tolle, lege!

JAMES H. KROEGER, M.M.
Loyola School of Theology, Manila


For the first time, Remaud's 1983 Israël serviteur de Dieu is available in English. The translation is based on a 1996 edition of the French text, for which R. wrote a new foreword and appendix. He tackles a challenging and important issue: the Christian theological status of contemporary Jewry. We Christians easily acknowledge our Jewish origins, but we are reluctant to find theological significance in the ongoing existence of the Jewish people, for their enduring vitality in the centuries after the Christ event can appear a threat to our own identity. R. proposes that our own election as Christians can be a bridge of understanding to the election of Israel. Jesus Christ, the Servant of God, is inseparable from Israel, the Servant of God: "it is by the first-born Son, the Servant, who is Jesus and Israel at one and the same time that God's gift comes to us" (13). Israel the Servant is the mediator of God to the Gentiles, a mission that gives life to the Church, and an identity that the Church does not replace.

The book includes a major section on the Shoah, including a reflection on theological silence and Christian complicity. R. describes the decimation of European Jewry in the Nazi era as a revelation of the identity of Israel the Suffering Servant (Is 53), an "unveiling" that challenged the hardness of the hearts of Christians who had denied the enduring validity of Israel's election. A strength of this theology of the Servant, R. notes, is that it is integral to the Jewish tradition and does not impose an external religious interpretation on the Shoah. R.'s 1983 text does not discuss the work of Jewish theologians such as Arthur Cohen who maintain that the Shoah is a caesura that fractures all traditional theological categories. R. implies that there is a religious meaning to the Shoah, even as he himself astutely warns that the attribution of such meaning can attenuate the scandal of the event (47).

These reservations notwithstanding, R.'s book is a pioneering and important Christian effort to affirm the theological significance of the Jewish people.

ELIZABETH T. GROPPE
Xavier University, Cincinnati

CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE. By Roger Aubert. Edited and translated from the French by David O. Boileau. Marquette Studies in Theology, no. 40. Milwaukee:
The book contains ten essays (some are effectively book reviews) by the noted church historian Roger Aubert. Most of the essays deal with figures, movements, and events that either preceded or were part of the immediate aftermath of Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum novarum*. Of particular note, the 1966 essay, "On the Origins of Catholic Social Doctrine," is a fine overview of social Catholicism in France, Italy, Germany, and Belgium prior to Leo's encyclical and includes useful detail about the actual writing of the document. Another essay, "The Beginning of Social Catholicism," written in 1978, adds to the narrative by sketching out the development of Christian Democracy in those same countries after 1891. These two essays cover much of the material that shows up in different places throughout the book.

It is evident in both his brief opening preface and extensive closing essay that Boileau esteems A. As Charles Curran suggests, in a second preface to the volume, A.'s scholarship provides nuggets that will interest social ethicists, political theorists, and social activists as well as historians.

Despite the benefit of now having these essays in English and readily available, there are difficulties with the volume. A.'s style is difficult. He writes sentences with multiple subordinate clauses (one sentence is 39 lines long!). His writing is a challenge to any translator, and Boileau is not always up to the task. And neither author nor translator is well served by the proofreader. There are numerous typographical errors, and six pages of the text (166–71) are in jumbled order.

The biggest drawback to the volume, however, is the selection of essays. There is excessive repetition: the same topics are covered two, three, even four times throughout the book (some paragraphs are nearly identical). One wonders why essays that make the same points using the same language are both included.

A selective reading of some of the essays (those already mentioned and a 1991 piece on "The Encyclical Rerum Novarum") will interest specialists and some graduate students.

KENNETH R. HIMES, O.F.M.
Boston College


Many theologians, physicians, and politicians agree that the late Richard McCormick greatly influenced moral theology, bioethics, and public policy in the United States. This influence extends to decisions regarding critical issues that have arisen with increasingly technological approaches to medical care. Clark approaches McCormick's work with an analysis of three constitutive elements from which he constructs the methodology implicit in McCormick's own writing; C. then applies his analysis to specific decisions regarding the care of handicapped newborns.

The text is extensive. C. considers the 20th-century context of McCormick's theology, developments in bioethics, and the state of neonatology in the U.S.A. He argues that McCormick's ethical methodology is grounded in the theological doctrines of Creation, the Fall, and Redemption in Christ. From McCormick's theological anthropology, C. uncovers a shift in his moral reasoning: prior to 1983, McCormick followed a neo-Scholastic moral epistemology that finds human goods and values according to natural inclinations; post 1983, he adopts a prediscursive and discursive reasoning informed by the Christian story that finds goods and values according to the meaning and dignity of human persons. Finally, C. presents two criteria of McCormick's approach to problematic healthcare treatment decisions: the potential for relationship and a benefit/burden calculus.

C. has provided an important systematic reconstruction of McCormick's methodology that will be instructive for
critical studies of his work: the insight of McCormick's epistemological shift is considerable. Based on McCormick's mature methodological criteria of relationship and benefit, C. proposes public policy about new technologies in the light of a patient-centered personalism integrally and adequately considered. C.'s casuistry of five neonatal crises can be applied paradigmatically. Following McCormick's lead, C. attempts what most would rather avoid: the critical decisions to withhold, withdraw, or provide technological interventions that may remedy health crises of compromised neonates. Especially as new technologies develop for treating handicapped neonates, parents, physicians, and policy makers will find this text useful in negotiating the difficult terrain of treatment decisions. The reader may be disappointed by the lack of an index.

MARY JO IOZZIO
Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.


For Cortina two parables capture the contemporary Western understandings of justice: the biblical story of the covenant (stressing mutual recognition, identity, and obligation) and Hobbes's Leviathan (emphasizing self-interest, fear, and the logic of exchange). C. argues that the two are complementary, not exclusive. After lamenting Liberalism's impoverished understanding of human rights—it fails to honor the inter-subjective bonds that make contracting possible—the remainder of the text largely abandons theological understandings of justice in favor of political philosophy. C. draws on a variety of political theorists (Aristotle, Tocqueville, Rawls, Walzer). For those well versed in these authors, her critiques of Liberalism, Republicanism, Communitarianism, and Cosmopolitanism are engaging, thoughtful, and rewarding. For those less familiar with these debates, her work might prove confusing.

C. joins the host of political theorists trying to navigate the quandary about universal and particular ethical claims. Deftly drawing on Kant and Hegel, C. argues for an ethical civil society that recognizes the symbiotic relationship between political and moral communities. C. posits her own third-way theory of "deeply-rooted cosmopolitanism, which attempts to embrace the best part of abstract cosmopolitanism and deep-rooted particularism" (89). Her proposal of a civic morality (moral pluralism rooted in an ethic of discourse), while promising, could be enriched by a more systematic engagement of Deliberative Democracy.

C.'s model reflects a Western bias that presumes a community of persons who value tolerance and diversity, are devoted to dispassionate and rational deliberation, and enter the public square as equals seeking consensus. Such a model, while intellectually promising, cannot adequately accommodate nonrational deliberators—for example, protestors, religious and political fundamentalists, racists, or anyone who enters the public square not seeking consensus, but conversion or conquest. However, this omission is not a fatal flaw. For not only does C.'s book expose the English-speaking world to a major European political theorist, it also represents an insightful engagement of the central fault line in contemporary political philosophy and theology, namely, how to reconfigure moral demands in the age of globalization.

MARK J. ALLMAN
Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio


In this remarkably well-documented volume, Ezumezu undertakes an ambitious and surprisingly rarely attempted endeavor. In the light of the desperate poverty of his homeland of Nigeria, E. seeks to offer theoretically grounded
economic advice to policymakers in economically developing nations. In the search for appropriate guidance, he turns to two sources: the constructive economic principles contained in Catholic social teaching and the theory and practice of social market economy. The primary instance of the latter offered here is the postwar experience of the Federal Republic of Germany. While E. might be faulted for conducting a somewhat selective reading of West German economic performance, he derives many useful lessons from his case study and applies them in a felicitous manner.

Most readers will likely find quite belabored E.’s treatment of Nigeria’s systems of banking, public finance, and entrepreneurship, nevertheless he maintains a balanced and consistent focus on the anthropology contained in official Catholic social teaching documents. Despite indulging in rather compendious treatments of the history of economic thought and the economic experience of both Germany and Nigeria, E. sustains a clear line of analysis that unifies the far-ranging chapters of this volume. This integration is effected by the thesis that the basic principles of Catholic social teaching (subsidiarity, solidarity, common weal) are fully capable of generating practical strategies to guide contemporary economic policy.

The volume’s unique contribution lies in how E. develops his claim in the light of the economic realities within both industrialized and less developed nations. He consistently steers a prudent course between the extreme arguments of laissez-faire capitalism and socialism, and offers rich insight into the economic challenges facing poor countries today. The volume addresses the puzzle of the persistence of dire poverty in economically developing nations that have an abundance of natural and human resources. Very few authors combine the fields of theological social ethics and developmental economics as skillfully as E. does here.

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


The aim of the conference that produced these essays was to “generate more light than heat—to move the discussion on stem cell research forward” (1). The effort succeeds, contributing an important framework for the discourse from science, ethics, and public policy. Nancy Snow frames the discussion with a fine introduction to each section.

Part 1 includes essays from science and public policy. While positive and hopeful, a decidedly cautionary note pervades. David Prentice stresses the need to differentiate scientific claims from scientific facts even as he names the root of the debate as “What does it mean to be human?” In examining the ambiguities surrounding stem cell research, Kevin Fitzgerald powerfully critiques two major arguments for embryo research, need and benefit. The chapter includes helpful website resources. Scientists Ira Black and Dale Woodbury, while noting successes in experimentation, raise several important considerations when comparing embryonic, fetal, and adult cells. Ronald Kline’s essay exudes hope as he suggests using umbilical cord blood as an alternative to human embryos. John Langan offers refreshing suggestions for how a Roman Catholic tradition that supports religious freedom can debate public policy issues in a pluralistic society.

Part 2 considers ethicists’ perspectives on stem cell research. Karen Lebaaqz argues for such research through the principle of respect for persons, contextualizing her discussion around in vitro fertilization and extracting comparisons with embryonic stem cell research. This essay is best read alongside Therese Lysaught’s excellent article, which considers the justification of self-defense, defense of another, and just war. Lysaught’s argument is especially compelling in the light of the recent Gulf War and aggression rhetoric permeating public discourse. Edward Furtan appeals to the principle of cooperation to address questions about the involvement of Catholics in using for research products derived from embry-
onic stem cells. Lisa Sowle Cahill argues that no one ethical argument is sufficient, and instead offers a cogent “convergence argument.” Cahill’s appeal for a “social ethos of generosity and solidarity” is particularly strong (136).

This collection is an important resource for any bioethics course. A listing of additional pertinent websites for interested readers would be a welcome complement to the bibliography.

Maria Cimperman, O.S.U.
Oblate School of Theology,
San Antonio


Davis and Hernández contend that seminaries and other centers of theological training are often inaccessible “sacred towers” for Latina and Latino Christians. In the first major study of the subject since Justo González’s 1988 report The Theological Education of Hispanics, they pose a blueprint for “reconstructing sacred towers into lighthouses of Christian learning” (113).

The authors’ statistical overview of enduring realities such as Hispanics’ poverty, educational gap, and lack of representation in professional ministry positions, theological schools, and their faculties will surprise few readers. Nor will their conclusions that Bible Institutes and Diocesan Training Institutes offer valuable lessons for accredited, degree-granting institutions such as the need for financial aid, Hispanic professors, policies and curricula contextualized within the lived reality of Latinos/as, Spanish-language courses, and programs that accommodate the schedules of working students.

The book’s greatest value is its long litany of recommendations for recruiting and retaining Hispanic students and faculty in theological education. Successively, the authors address their recommendations to various stakeholders in this enterprise: educational institutions, accreditng agencies of theological schools, private foundations, denominations, and theological school administrators. Some recommendations seem laudable but frustratingly deferred, such as the call for the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) to serve as a “broker of ideas and best practices” for increasing the Hispanic presence in their member schools (88). While it is essential that the ATS continue to expand its role in this regard, as a reader I would like to have learned some of the best practices to date from D. and H.’s perspective. Surprisingly, the authors also identify the Hispanic Theological Initiative (HTI), the Hispanic Summer Program (HSP), the Asociación Teológica Hispana (AETH), and the Academy of Catholic Hispanic Theologians of the United States (ACHTUS) as resources for Latina/a faculty recruitment, but they do not offer specific recommendations as to how these leading Hispanic theology groups can be part of the broadly collaborative effort they propose. Nonetheless, their wide-ranging vision and insistent emphasis on the need for alliances among institutions and leaders provide wise counsel for the desperate need to rapidly expand Latina and Latino participation in theological education.

Timothy Matovina
University of Notre Dame


Historian Edward Brett has written a well-researched and balanced assessment of the reporting of the U.S. Catholic press on the dramatic events in Central America from the mid-1950s to the defeat of the Sandinistas in 1990. He studies the liberal/progressive press as well as the moderate and conservative elements. From the serene stance of hindsight he presents the actual events that took place on the ground, documenting the remarkable loss of inno-
rence, the shift of large segments of Catholic press reporting as it transcended Cold War anticommunism in the face of the complexity of both Catholic Church and U.S. relations with Central America, and explains how U.S. missionaries returning from Latin America played an essential role in this evolution. B. devotes an entire chapter each to Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

For those who lived through (if only at a distance) the horrors of civil war, of U.S. government complicity in the violence, of disillusionment with groups like the Frente Farabundo Marti or the Sandinistas, and finally the decline of the base Christian communities, this book provides insight and even healing.

While truly impressed with the overall contribution of Catholic newspapers and journals like the *National Catholic Reporter, America,* and *Commonweal,* B. demonstrates how they were occasionally either wrong or less than insightful about what was really going on. Perhaps B.'s most interesting observations have to do with the embattled Cardinal Ovando y Bravo, who, in B.'s rendering, emerges in a more favorable light.

B. has made a much-needed contribution to U.S. church history. He illuminates a fine, if not perfect, moment in the U.S. Catholic Church's coming of age, the period when large segments of the Church moved beyond a naïve Americanism that fed its preoccupation with anticommunism to a more sophisticated vision of itself, one informed by the actual experience of injustice and by the Church's social teaching. The period studied here brought U.S. Catholicism into ongoing tension with the policies of the U.S. government. In the current age of terrorism and preventive war strategies that tension remains. Detailed endnotes and a meticulous index enhance the usefulness of B.'s excellent history.

ALLAN FIGUEROA DECK, S.J.
Loyola Institute for Spirituality,
Orange, Calif.


This book by a leading Roman Catholic theologian of Malaysia is a thoroughly reworked project report for a D.Min. degree from the Catholic Theological Union, Chicago. Fung divides the book into four parts corresponding to the four stages of his theological method: lived-experienced, analysis, theological reflection, and response. The first part (chaps. 1–3) narrates F.'s sojourn among indigenous peoples: the Orang Asli in Western Malaysia; the Adivasi in the State of Bihar, India; the Sioux Indians in South Dakota; the Apaches in their White Mountain Reservation in Northern Arizona; the Inuvaluit in Paulatuk, Canada; finally and again, among indigenous peoples of Western Malaysia. Part 2 (chaps. 4–6) offers a historical, political, and sociological analysis of the Orang Asli's current situation to highlight their marginalization, their being forced to live at the "water's margin." In addition, F. presents a semiotic and subaltern analysis of a well-known myth among the Ma' Betisek, a subgroup of the Orang Asli, namely, "The Myth of Moyang Pongkol [The Tiger Myth]" to show that the Orang Asli's marginalization is not only a negative reality but also an opportunity for them to "accommodate and resist the dominant culture" (155) and in this way to negotiate their identity and future. Part 3 (chapters 7–8) brings into theological conversation three partners: F.'s lived experience with the indigenous peoples, the Orang Asli's oppression, and the Jesus movement in Palestine and the Greco-Roman world. Part 4 (chaps. 8–10) develops what F. calls "cross-cultural solidarity" by which members of the dominant class learn to cross over to the "water's margin" and then come back to their own society to transform it. F. also develops seven strategies by which these cross-cultural people, whom he calls *homines solidaritatis,* can become "ripples on the water": inculturation, consciousness-raising, influencing pub-
lie opinion, empowerment, mobilization of resources and expertise, networking, and formation of effective catalysts (218–22).

The book is a trailblazing work in contextual and crosscultural theology. In addition to offering valuable information on indigenous peoples, whom urban Westerners tend to ignore, the book presents both a solid and rich theological methodology and an insightful and practical crosscultural theology. It deserves to be read with care not only by Malaysian Christians but also by Americans, especially those working with ethnic groups and Native Americans.

Peter C. Phan
Georgetown University, Washington


During the past three decades, the role the Church should play in economic development, and, by implication, politics, has increasingly become one of the most controversial subjects in the Sub-Saharan Catholic Church. Zalot engages this important question by articulating selected biblical texts, Catholic social teaching, and reflections on liberation and development by Catholic theologians especially Englebert Mveng, S.J., Jean-Marc Éla, and Laurenti Magesa. Z. argues that the quest for a theology of economic development is an inevitable task and process challenging the Catholic Church in post-colonial and independent Africa. He exposes and analyzes positive contributions by church leaders to development and highlights the important link between evangelization and human promotion.

Z. evaluates pitfalls to this link that include material and anthropological poverty mainly as a result of colonial and neo-colonial legacies, corruption, greed for power, cultural and financial dependency on foreign donors, lavish lifestyles of clergy, market controls by foreign powers, control of bureaucratic institutions by African political leaders, and control of local churches by the Vatican. He concludes that both bishops and liberation theologians should contextualize the gospel message and make their teaching credible and relevant for the faithful to become free and responsible for their human and economic well-being.

Z. could have strengthened his argument by clarifying a few points. The Sub-Saharan Church is too vast to be painted with a single broad brush. He should have focused on a few countries and/or dioceses. He overlooks the composition of church leadership in the period he is considering, which has largely consisted of foreign missionaries rather than African. He neglects important contributions by dwelling too much on the definition and preparatory documents of the Synod of Africa instead of actual interventions by the participants and the response of the Holy Father in Ecclesia in Africa (1995). Z. also overlooks the important role African traditional religions play in development and in enhancing human dignity. The book does not break new ground, but is an easy read and satisfies the purposes of an introduction to an African theology of economic development.

Lawrence Daka, S.J.
Boston College


This valuable work puts us in touch with real people across the United States, for whom poverty is a fact of daily existence. In exploring the struggles and successes of these individuals, the book serves as an important introduction to the work of the Catholic Campaign for Human Development (CCHD), whose projects have served to aid and empower the poor.

The personal tone and limpid style of Hogan’s community-based narrative approach connects us with the stirring wis-
dom of ordinary people like Blanche in Iowa, and with the courage born of empowerment for Claudia in Los Angeles. Six informative cases reflect H.'s insights not only into situations in which people suffer social injustice, but also into the structural and institutional causes of injustice. Project participants of CCHD inspiringly “speak in their own voices” (xii).

The title is well chosen. In each case H. discovers how the meaning of otherwise abstract principles like “option for the poor,” “solidarity,” “human dignity,” and “participation” are incarnated in the vibrant virtues of people in concrete situations. This is particularly evident in the “evaluation/impact” section of each case.

We travel with H. around the country, from hog farms in Davis County, Iowa, to the struggle for affordable housing, jobs, and youth education in Springfield, Massachusetts, and to hope for transformed urban policies in the city of Camden, New Jersey. In cases involving Latinos, H. offers keen insights into how cultural values underlie creative alternatives. In other cases, it is more difficult to capture the cultural dimension of people’s experiences.

The book is pedagogically well suited for parish adult education programs and other classroom uses. It enhances the method of the pastoral circle by exploring each story to identify the specific issues that people face, how they act, and what they accomplish, and relates all of these to broader issues of faith and justice. H. also highlights the ways one’s spiritual life and commitment to social justice are integrated and mutually reinforcing.

Those looking for a way to relate Catholic social teaching to real-life examples will find this a good companion volume to Thomas Massaro’s Living Justice (2000).

GASPER F. LO BIONDO, S.J.
Woodstock Theological Center,
Washington


Miller argues that consumer culture is both threat to and opportunity for Catholic religious practice. Consumerism is a threat because it forms human desires into habits of commodification that migrate into the realm of religious practices. Both consumer goods and spiritual artifacts become not just conceptualized but experienced as objects able to be abstracted from the communities that give them rich significance. M.'s dialectical approach, however, offers a theological affirmation of some elements of consumerism, such as privileging choice and individual responsibility for identity-construction, which can be useful for the mature Christian. To keep consumer choice about Catholic identity from becoming a form of cheap grace, M. recommends many ways to "stabilize" theological concepts and teachings and to empower an active lay Christian adulthood in the Church, involving rhetorical work for theology in restoring lay agency and historicity to Christian ideas and practices.

Two problems haunt M.'s argument. First, how adequately is the practice of Christian belief in consumer culture imaged by the consumer use of commodities? The analogy or even identity between use of goods and use of beliefs is asserted throughout, though not satisfactorily defended. M. sometimes gives the impression that Catholic faith practices are the most proper property of Catholic communities, despite his awareness of the social constitution of religious practices. His admitted awareness of this problem indicates the challenge for Catholic theology of escaping modern romantic thinking about identity. Second, the role of philosophy of practice in the argument seems underdeveloped. M. uses Foucault as a basis for theorizing consumerism’s nonconceptual formation of identity, but seems to save Christian desire among other theological topics from a Foucaultian analysis. Has M. abstracted and commodified Foucault in a book that works to save religion from just such evils? A response to this second problem could become a way of thinking about the first.

This creative, demanding, learned, and almost inordinately balanced book
is required reading. It is a pleasure to read such an outstanding introduction to who Christians have already become, and to how theology can assist in the postmodern cure of souls.

TOM BEAUDOIN
Santa Clara University


Since the early 1960s Andrew Greeley has been gathering data on American Catholics and interpreting its significance. In Priests he relies primarily on two surveys fielded by the Los Angeles Times, the first in 1993, the second in 2002 in the midst of the sexual abuse crisis. In chapter 1 G. sets the criteria for any study that would be representative of American priests: a valid sample and relevant comparison data. Judged by those criteria, commentaries by authors such as Eugene Kennedy, Richard Sipe, Peter McDonough, and Eugene Bianchi are anecdotal and ungeneralizable.

While survey analysis has inherent limitations, carefully executed surveys do yield valid probability samples and, in conjunction with other research, permit the necessary comparisons. Thus the maturity level of priests can be gauged only in relation to that of other professionals (it emerges as favorable), while morale level is meaningfully assessable in comparison with Protestant ministers (again favorable). There is much here to debunk conventional wisdom: for example, regarding celibacy, the data do not support the contention that it creates major psychological problems for those who practice it; and on the question why priests leave, job dissatisfaction far outweighs celibacy. These results are consistent with the 1972 National Opinion Research Center study, The Catholic Priest in the United States: Sociological Investigations.

Two of the most sobering areas in the volume under review concern the laity’s satisfaction with ministerial performance by priests as compared with Protestant clergy (priests score consistently lower) and clerical perception of issues of importance to the laity (priests are distempering clueless). The last chapter suggests policy implications based on the survey data. The book should be required reading in every seminary course on priesthood.

While The Catholic Revolution draws on empirical data from G.’s previous work, it is a more interpretive enterprise than Priests. It argues that the “relatively modest changes to the church” introduced by Vatican II proved “too much for the rigid structures of nineteenth-century Catholicism to absorb” (1). The old wineskins simply could not contain the new wine. G. rightly focuses less on the moderate reforms instituted by the council and more on the inability of existing structures to absorb change. This inflexibility engendered a short-lived revolution (maximally 1965–1974 but perhaps more realistically 1966–1970) that was “aborted” by a church leadership fearful of destabilization and multiple challenges to authority (15). The fact that change occurred in a Church “utterly unprepared for change” (19) created on the part of many of the lower clergy and the laity expectations of far-reaching reform. An argument can be made that problems in the postconciliar Church stem to a significant degree from the structural change that did not occur, rather than from what did.

In short, part 1 of the book attempts to account for the religious dynamics of change with the aid of sociological perspectives. Part 2 puts forward policy reflections that go beyond the analysis but appear to G. to flow from it (131). Topics include catechesis, authority, liturgy, church architecture and art. The result is an accessible synthesis of much of G.’s previous work, the fruit of decades of reflecting on contemporary Catholicism. It affords a valuable perspective on the council, as it situates that catalytic event in the context of changes that were already occurring within U.S. Catholicism, and it assesses the desire for institutional reform in U.S. Catholicism.
relative to other major Catholic countries (the available international data fail to support the contention that American Catholicism is unique). The combination of empirical data and structural interpretation make this volume a worthwhile addition to the body of literature on the postconciliar Church.

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


I am delighted to see back in print this 1965 highly influential book on the medieval rites of Christian initiation by J. D. C. Fisher, and I commend Hillenbrand Books for taking the initiative to republish it. F.’s work is so well known by teachers and students of Christian initiation that his categories for describing and interpreting the changes in those rites from the seventh century to the eve of the 16th-century Protestant and Catholic Reformations are widely recognized as authoritative. That is, according to F., the story of Christian initiation in the medieval West is the story of sacramental and liturgical dissolution, disintegration, and separation. He speaks of four unfortunate developments: (1) the separation of confirmation from baptism; (2) the separation of Communion reception from Christian initiation; (3) the separation of initiation from Easter/Pentecost; and (4) the fragmentation of the unitive rite of initiation into three distinct sacraments separated by increasingly larger intervals of time. Each of these transitions is well documented with the pertinent liturgical, doctrinal, conciliar, and canonical sources, thus making this study an excellent introduction to medieval liturgy. Moreover, the volume contains rites that cannot be found elsewhere in translation. In addition to the complete baptismal and confirmation rites from the late medieval Sarum Manual (pp. 178–200), the volume provides in English the rite of confirmation from the 1595 Pontificale Romanum.

While contemporary liturgical scholars would want to nuance Fisher’s approach to various “separations” outside of Rome itself, where the history of the rites is different—and I am referred to as saying as much in the helpful new introduction by initiation scholar Gerard Austin, O.P. (p. viii)—this work remains required reading for the study of the history and theology of Christian initiation. I only wish that in this North American edition the publishers would have kept the same pagination as in the original to avoid the confusion that will surely result from trying to track down references to this study from other sources.

MAXWELL E. JOHNSON
University of Notre Dame


This relatively small work tries to do an exceptionally big job: explore the whole of the Scriptures while focusing on their potential to transform readers who encounter God in the process. Bowe’s initial invitation to readers to “touch their fingers to the flame” (3) of the Word summarizes her aim. She wants them to connect “the wisdom and witness of Scripture with everyday life and spirituality” (6) and, in the process, effect personal and social transformation. Her invitation is communicated in a book that many groups will find useful.

Initial chapters effectively explore questions related to spirituality—What is it? Who is the “God beyond all names” spoken of in the Scriptures?—lay the foundations of a biblical anthropology, and consider how God interacts with the world and humanity. Subsequent chapters move through the history of the covenant community—a study of “That Man Jesus”—and conclude with a synopsis of Pauline spirituality and the vision of Revelation. In the final chapter, B. proposes nine prin-