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BOOK REVIEWS


Except for the Gideon Bible and other such editions that for theological reasons purposely omit explanatory notes, most Bibles in recent generations have been reader-friendly, with textual notes, exegetical and historical annotations, introductory essays, maps, and so on.

Now comes The Jewish Study Bible (JSB), following that pattern of introductory material, verse-by-verse commentary, and supplementary essays. The translation is the New Jewish Publication Society Tanakh (NJPS), the second edition (1999) of the 1985 JPS version. It translates the Masoretic Text (MT), the standard Hebrew text of the Bible, and follows that normative text closely. Footnotes present variant readings from ancient versions that yield a text different from, and in some cases more plausible than, the MT. While other contemporary translations are based on a critical text incorporating these variants, JPS/NJPS simply notes them, not venturing to emend the MT.

NJPS is fresh, avoiding "Bible English," and aspires to being "in the spirit of Saadia" Gaon (882–942) whose vernacular version conveyed the meaning rather than the letter of the MT. This freedom has, however, led to some inconsistency in rendering what might be thought of as consecrated expressions: b_r_k is "blessed" but also "praised"; k_b_d is usually "glory," but it can become "Presence" (e.g., Ex 40:35). Where the MT of different books is the same, one would expect the English to reflect this identity of wording, but in the case of Chronicles and the earlier books it draws from JPS/NJPS can be inconsistent. (Sometimes this editorial oversight is glaring: the MT y_m, "sea," of Solomon’s Temple [1 Kings 7; 2 Chronicles 4] in one place is "sea," in the other "tank.")

As for the JSB itself, it serves the NJPS very well, though in interesting ways. Sometimes commentary takes issue with the translation, sometimes with footnotes, sometimes with both. The effect is that of overhearing a sustained scholarly conversation, or argument, continuous with those recorded in Talmudic and other rabbinic sources. The page layout of the JSB reinforces this impression. Where other Bibles put annotations at the bottom of the page, under the biblical text, here commentary embraces the text on the side and below, an arrangement reminiscent of the Miqra'ot Gedolot and of the Talmud itself.

Not only in format and in the dialogue of translation and commentary but in other respects as well, the JSB evokes the millennia of Jewish belief and practice. The verse-by-verse commentary includes abundant references to prayers (e.g., the Amidah), feasts, rituals, and other observances defining Jewish life, just as it brings in Talmudic and midrashic traditions.
and the writings of Rashi, Nahmanides, Maimonides, and other sages. Similarly, of the three sets of essays at the end of the volume (24 in all), the first two offer a splendid overview of the central role of the Bible in Jewish life. The first set of essays, "Jewish Interpretation of the Bible," contains a wealth of historical and exegetical information arranged chronologically from "inner-biblical interpretation" through early nonrabbinic, then rabbinic, medieval, and post-medieval interpretation to modern times; charts of Tannaitic and Amoraic rabbis in their various generations are especially helpful. The second set of essays, "The Bible in Jewish Life and Thought," covers the Bible in the Dead Sea Scrolls, synagogue, liturgy, the Jewish philosophical tradition, Jewish mysticism, Israeli life, and Jewish women's scholarly writings, with a concluding essay on Jewish translations of the Bible. These essays, by various scholars, are independent of one another, but consistently helpful cross-references give coherence to the whole.

Of the third set of essays, "Backgrounds for Reading the Bible," two—those on concepts of purity in the Bible and the development of the Masoretic Bible—reflect specifically Jewish concerns, while the others deal with history, languages, geography (maps are from the Oxford Bible Atlas), canon, text, religion in the Bible, and biblical poetry, introductory material found in any decent commentary or study Bible; indeed, they incorporate and expand on scholarly writings found in the New Oxford Annotated Bible.

The omission of textual cross-references is puzzling, and its system of transliteration of Hebrew can be frustrating (k represents both kaph and qoph, for example), but, for the rest, as a scholarly achievement that offers the fruits of modern biblical scholarship, the JSB can be warmly recommended. For its careful and generous exposition of the wealth of learning, the exegetical riches, the history reflected in post-biblical Jewish writings and practice—study Bible qua Jewish—it is simply outstanding. People unfamiliar with these traditions can fill in gaps in knowledge and give themselves a treat by working through those first two sets of essays.

Georgetown University, Washington

J. P. M. WALSH, S.J.


Adrian Schenker, professor of Old Testament in the University of Fribourg in Switzerland, a Dominican priest, is known primarily as a text critic and specialist in the biblical themes of law, expiation, reconciliation, and liturgy. In this collection of essays, his two interests come together, for most of the articles stand in some relationship to a text critical issue. Of the 18 essays, six appear here for the first time and four for the first time in German.

Eight articles concern the writing prophets. "Jesaja 19,16–25: Die Endzeit Israels rekapituliert sein Ursprunge" (3–11); "Isaie 63,9, le Livre
des Jubilés de l’Ange de la face" (12–26); “Der nie aufgehobene Bund” (27–52); “Neues Jerusalem, neuer Tempel (Jer 31,38–40)” (53–57); “Neuer Stadtteil oder Neuaufbau Jerusalems? Nochmals 31,38–40” (pp. 58–71); “Kinder der Prostitution, Kinder ohne Familie und ohne soziale Stellung” (pp. 72–82); “Steht der Prophet unter dem Zwang zu weissagen, oder steht Israel vor der Evidenz der Weisung Gottes in der Weissagung des Propheten?” (83–90); “Die Entlassung der Götter aus ihren Funktionen unter den Völkern” (91–95).


Seven articles fall under the heading “Religionsgeschichte—Heilige Schrift”: “Die Stiftungserzählung des Brandopfers (Gen 8,20–21)” (143–54); “Ein Königreich von Priestern’ (Ex 19,6)” (155–161); “Le montheisme israëlite: Un Dieu qui transcende le monde et les dieux” (162–76); “La profanation d’images cultuelles dans la guerre” (177–84); “Die Heilige Schrift subsistiert gleichzeitig in mehreren kanonischen Formen” (192–200); “Urtext, Kanon, und antike Bibelausgaben” (201–10). There is an index of biblical citations and of cited authors, and an afterword by Norbert Lohfink and Klaus Scholtissek to pay tribute to the outgoing editor of the New Testament series, Gerhard Dautzenberg, who will yield his editorship to Scholtissek, and to reflect on the Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände series.

Only a few essays can be reviewed. “Die Stiftungserzählung des Brandopfers (Gen 8,20–21)” (The Narrative of the Establishment of the Burnt Offering) concludes from the remarkably similar divine judgments in Genesis 6:5 (“every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” RSV) and 8:21 (“for the imagination of man’s heart is evil from his youth”) that the reason for God’s turning in mercy toward post-Flood humans was Noah’s burnt offerings in 8:20. Burnt offerings shows the other side of the human heart, the part that can give praise and submit to God. A burnt offering is thus a counterbalance to evil; the burnt offering of a just person moves God to have mercy on the wicked. The altar, mentioned twice in 8:20, is the first human construction after the Flood and the first holy place on earth, where sacrificial offerings can rise up to heaven. Noah’s sacrifice is a model for the nations’ burnt offerings and thus suggests that the nations’ liturgies, as well as Israel’s, can be acceptable to God.

In a lengthy treatment of “the covenant never broken” in Jeremiah, S. shows how the broad context of Jeremiah 30–31 illuminates the divine promises in 31:31–34, and how “broken covenant” in 31:32 is to be understood. A third of the essay is devoted to a comparison of the Masoretic and Greek texts; the Greek is original and the Masoretic Text expansionistic. The Greek highlights the promises of the new covenant, whereas the Masoretic Text lifts up the anthropological dimension, that is, the Torah in-
scribed in the human heart. S. insists that "new covenant" does not imply that the previous covenant had been annulled. As long as Israel and Judah exist, so also does the covenant, for it was ratified precisely as enduring. Nonetheless, by Jeremiah's time God could no longer put up with the people's infidelity (cf. 15:1). The "new" in the covenant of 31:33–34 is consequently the forgiveness and "inoculation" of Israel and Judah against disobedience and apostasy. "The new covenant is the old covenant, but immune to being broken. It no longer requires oath or promise. Its solidity comes from the implanting of the Torah within human beings" (52). It is not, however, simply the same covenant, for with transformed hearts the people can know the Lord in a more profound and fundamental way.

This collection of essays impressively demonstrates S.'s ability to do detailed analysis, converse with many scholars (there is a substantial bibliography), and maintain a theological perspective.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology

RICHARD J. CLIFFORD, S.J.


The collection of essays consists of lectures delivered at a research seminar in Tübingen in 1998, supplemented by seven other papers. The editors have arranged the contributions in six parts. Part 1 (Introductory and Linguistic Questions) includes three articles. A. Lange surveys the approximately 30 Qumran texts identified as wisdom works, J. Strugnell provides a comparison of vocabulary in smaller wisdom texts with that in three major ones (4Q299–301, 4Q415–18, 423, and 4Q525), and A. Schoors studies the language and particularly the vocabulary of the wisdom corpus (somewhat differently defined than in Lange's essay), drawing some tentative conclusions about dating. Part 2 (Contributions to Specific Texts) encompasses two papers. E. Tigchelaar writes a detailed proposal regarding the reconstruction of the beginning of 4Q416 on the basis of overlapping fragments from 4Q418 and 418*. H. Lichtenberger presents a new edition and translation of 4Q185, both supported by detailed notes.

Part 3 (The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Ancient Near East) contains two papers. In the first H.-P. Müller explores fundamental issues in Job (e.g., action-consequences, theodicy) in comparison with similar Babylonian material to show that they offer a heuristically significant analogy for understanding the Qumran wisdom texts. H. Niehr studies the Wisdom of Ahiqar (from Syria, in his opinion) in comparison with 4QInstruction (4Q415–18, 424; from Jerusalem), finding them to be two independent works that embrace common wisdom traditions, although the wisdom in Ahiqar did not find its way into the Qumran work.

In part 4 (The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Hebrew Bible) H. J. Fabry deals with the topic of beatitudes in the wake of the official
publication of 4Q525 and surveys instances of them (they do not occur in the HB) to elucidate the examples in Matthew and Luke. G. Brooke analyzes various kinds of scriptural interpretation in the Qumran wisdom texts (mostly allusory but there are other types, even halakhic exegesis).

Part 5 (The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and Ancient Judaism) begins with P. Alexander's essay "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science." He distinguishes two approaches to nature: Job 38–41 discourages its investigation while Proverbs 8 encourages it. The Astronomical Book first shows the emergence of a Jewish scientific attitude (following the Proverbs 8 approach), roughly contemporary with the Ionian revolution in the Greek world. L. Stuckenbruck tests whether the early Enoch works influenced 4QInstruction and concludes they grapple with similar issues but the latter is not literarily dependent on the former. D. Harrington compares the approaches to wisdom in Sirach and Sapiential Work A (= 4QInstruction) on several topics, concluding that an interest in things apocalyptic is what most clearly distinguishes the Qumran text from Sirach. C. Hempel extends the comparison of Qumran wisdom works to the rule books and finds some overlapping where organizational matters are described. C. Böttich explores early Jewish wisdom traditions in 2 Enoch and at Qumran and finds significant commonalities. J. Charlesworth does the same for the Odes of Solomon and also presents many parallels in support of the conclusion that the Odes arose within the Jewish wisdom tradition. Finally, J. Dochhorn investigates the statement "it/she will not give you her strength" as understood and developed in 4Q423 fragment 2 and Apocalypse of Moses 24.

The final part explores The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the New Testament. J. Frey studies the concepts flesh and spirit in Jewish sapiential traditions as background for understanding Paul's usage. The pre-Essene and Essene texts offer the most interesting parallels and reflect a wider tradition. A. Klostergaard Petersen examines how others are presented in the Qumran Book of Mysteries and in 1 Corinthians 1–2. A. Behringer's appendix outlines the fragment numbers found in the various editions of sapiential texts from Qumran. There are also two bibliographies and an index of references.

The essays place the Qumran wisdom texts, especially the more recently available 4QInstruction, within a very wide context, extending from the Ancient Near East through Early Judaism and on to later literature such as the NT and the Odes. This vast backdrop is clearly the best way to discern the special features of this text (and other sapiential works from Qumran) as well as what is shared with wider traditions. Setting wisdom teaching within a more apocalyptic framework is an important development, previously known but now given early documentation at Qumran.

Several essays argue that a work such as 4QInstruction is old, pre-Qumran (whatever specifically that may mean). But there is very little hard evidence on which to date such texts—a problem shared with the other major Jewish wisdom books. At least we should not say that distinctive sectarian language is lacking in the sapiential texts, since terms such as
hyhn zr are now known to figure in both sectarian and wisdom works. And, of course, as this phrase and other evidence show, both genres share an apocalyptic interest.

University of Notre Dame

JAMES C. VANDERKAM


Martin Hengel has teamed up with his Tübingen colleague, Anna Maria Schwemer, on several volumes recently. This one includes two essays by each scholar. Each essay uses a different data set to argue that Jesus' own messianic claims are the basis for New Testament Christology. Contemporary scholarship has trended in the opposite direction, taking as axiomatic the view that Jesus himself made no christological assertions. All such claims were derived from the post-Easter conviction that Jesus was exalted at God's right hand. H. and S. argue that such hypotheses fail to explain why christological traditions that identify Jesus as Messiah, Son of Man, Son of God, and Pre-existent One are firmly in place within two decades of Jesus' death. Jewish traditions never identify righteous martyrs with the heavenly judge. Further, the pluriform messianic expectations found in Jewish circles cannot provide a template for such developments.

H.'s first essay on Jesus as Messiah of Israel (1-80) observes that Messiah/Christ is already a cognomen in Paul. Through his self-identification with the figure who ascends to God's throne in Daniel 7:13-14 (63-66), Jesus provided the basis for such pre-Pauline creedal affirmations as Romans 1:3-4. Jesus is not only Messiah in the line of David, he is Son of God in power. Without Jesus' messianic deeds associating forgiveness with his person, Paul could not have come to interpret the Cross as justification for sinners (70). Jesus was able to define what it meant to be God's anointed because there was no well-defined concept "messiah" (69).

H.'s second essay on Jesus as messianic teacher of wisdom (81-132) presses very little textual evidence to connect Jesus' use of wisdom traditions with a claim that he spoke in a voice sounding like Wisdom and hence could be identified with pre-existent Wisdom. H. rejects the view that the sayings tradition, Q, is a gospel that identifies Jesus with Wisdom (95). He acknowledges that the Holy Spirit dominates New Testament speech about Jesus' connection with God so that any link to Wisdom is a consequence of that relationship.

The focus of S.'s first essay is not Christology but the claim that the Passion Narrative is tainted by anti-Judaism (133-63). Christology comes into play, since Jesus would never have been crucified had he not claimed to be anointed by God (162). The traditions that underlie Mark's narrative enable a historian to draw conclusions about the complex events surrounding Jesus' execution 40 years earlier, S. insists. Though ecumenical con-
cerns have led scholars to excise all Jewish involvement in Jesus' death and place the blame solely on Pilate, that view will not withstand scrutiny. Mark never attributes Jesus' death to "the Jews" or "the people." Only religious officials associated with the high priest and their partisans ("the crowd") demand Jesus' death. Further, officials had reason to be concerned. Jesus' messianic claims and actions were aimed at their religious authority. The Sanhedrin might even legitimately consider Jesus a blasphemer for identifying with the heavenly Son of Man (Mk 14:61-62). The authorities did not pass a formal death sentence but prepared a consultation to be presented to Pilate (Mk 15:1) who, himself, had little interest in the case. On the basis of information received and the legal requirement that a defendant who offered no defense was guilty, Pilate sent Jesus to be executed. However, as long as Pilate remains in office we find no Roman actions against Jesus' followers. Therefore, S. concludes, Pilate's role has not been minimized by the Passion account. Instead, Mark shows how complex the actual events were that led to Jesus' death.

S.'s second offering is much less persuasive than her first. She begins with the triple offices, prophet, priest, and king, which Reformation theology considers the key to Christology. While it is possible to find these three images in the New Testament, it is much more difficult to attach them to Jesus' own ministry or to early traditions such as one finds in the Pauline epistles. The fact that Paul often uses liturgical metaphors to speak of his suffering as sacrifice poured out for the Gentiles' faith or to motivate ethical obedience does not mean that he views Jesus as priest. The adoption of priestly symbolism for Jesus occurs only after the destruction of the Temple (e.g., Heb; 1 Pet). S. does admit that prophet and king are more widely attested than the triple pattern (230).

In sum, H.'s essay on Jesus' christological claims and S.'s on Mark's Passion Narrative are must reading. They show that historical-criticism can draw conclusions other than those featured on PBS, either pure fiction or literalism. They rightly warn against divorcing Jesus from the religious context of first-century Judaism.

Boston College

Pheme Perkins


Burke's intention is to comprehend more fully Paul's use of familial language in 1 Thessalonians by an investigation of such terminology in antiquity. In this letter familial metaphors are used primarily in two ways: (1) in an intergenerational and paradoxical manner, particularly in Paul's self-description as father, nursing-mother, infant, and orphan; and (2) in an interrelational mode, especially in denoting the Thessalonian community as Paul's children and as brothers and sisters to each other. The volume is
divided into three major sections, Issues and Approaches, Primary Source Evidence, and Paul and the Thessalonians. Almost half the book is devoted to primary source evidence in the ancient world, with both Jewish and non-Jewish materials presented.

On the subject of parents and children, the Jewish evidence (Philo, Pseudo-Phocylides, and Josephus) suggests strong parental obligations to offspring in the context of a hierarchical framework marked by the exercise of authority by both parents, with the father regarded as head of the household. Married couples were not only expected to procreate but also to nurture their children in an affectionate manner. Of particular interest is Philo’s concern with not separating the nursing mother from her newborn child. Further, the literature assumes that the father in particular will be responsible for the broad education of his children. Finally, it is noted that the parent-child relationship is reciprocal: children also have clear responsibilities toward and for their parents. A briefer section suggests that brotherly relationships are hierarchical, largely due to age and social status, that they should be marked by philadelphia, and that brothers are expected to cooperate with each other for the good and honor of the larger family. For the most part these Greco-Roman expectations are remarkably compatible with Jewish views.

Although the first part of this study is performed competently, hesitations arise in the second which attempts applications to 1 Thessalonians. At the beginning of this section, B. asserts that in “1 Thess. 2.10-12 Paul is arguing on two fronts: first, he is providing a defense in light of the criticism leveled against him by unbelievers” (131). Such a claim, however, is not supported by careful exegesis but rather depends on a narrowly selected range of secondary interpretations. Similarly, 1 Thessalonians 2:10-12 is defined as an apologia (156) yet without applying any rhetorical criteria. Similar concerns extend to the exegetical analyses of homeiromai, thlipsis, and the proistamenoi of 1 Thessalonians 5.

The analysis of 1 Thessalonians 4:3-8 argues a position widely held: that Paul is addressing the Christian fraternity in the light of temptations to sexual immorality from the outside community. But to suggest that skeuos in 1 Thessalonians 4:4 is to be translated as to “take your own wife” and that pragmati in 4:6 relates to “business/commerce” without the inclusion of a serious dialogue with the broad range of recent literature does not inspire confidence.

A similar situation permeates the discussion of 1 Thessalonians 4:9-12. After appropriately arguing that philadelphia not only concerns the insid­ers but also relations with outsiders, this proposal continues in a highly speculative manner. Where in the text is there evidence that “some broth­ers had probably stopped working in order to embark upon an intensive programme of evangelization”? (207). Do not 1:7–8 refer to persons out­side Thessalonica describing Paul’s arrival in that city and the conversions that followed? Considering the evidence given it is difficult to concur that Paul’s advice to the Thessalonian believers is “stop witnessing—to the
extent that you will not be able to provide adequately for your own fami­lies—and start working” (218).

With regard to 5:12-15, Burke quite appropriately urges that Paul’s hi­erarchical relations with the Thessalonians are not based on a patron-client relationship but rather on the common assumptions of brotherly relation­ships in antiquity, and that the Apostle needs to correct both brothers at odds with other brothers as well as their relationship to outsiders. Why? Because of “their refusal to work and overly zealous evangelism,” a situ­ation that caused not only the two internal problems but also “a public nuisance” that “incurred the anger of non-believers” (248). Such conjec­ture is based on inadequate exegesis of the ataktoi as those who refused to work.

This monograph, then, wishes to emphasize that Paul was involved in a hierarchical relationship with the believers in Thessalonica, and that the use of household imagery allows him to refer to himself as a nursing­mother and an orphan in order to offset the potentially domineering role of father, a major aspect of which is to instruct and resocialize his converts. The use of brother in a nonliteral sense allows the term to serve as an organizing metaphor that assists the socializing process of this new family in Christ. These thoughtful and constructive insights are immeasurably weakened by a less than meticulous exegetical method.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass. Karl Paul Donfried


If another volume is to be added to the overflowing library on Peter and early Petrine tradition, it must earn its place on the crowded shelves. This work can safely be passed over.

A reworking of a doctoral dissertation at the University of Wales, its aim is to offer “a critical and analytical survey of all the important Petrine writings (apocryphal as well as canonical)” in order to identify “through text and tradition, a distinctive Petrine theology” (ix). In nine chapters Lapham examines in turn Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter, Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles, the Pseudo-Clementines, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, the Epistle of Peter to Philip, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Coptic Apocalypse of Peter. Much space is devoted to the exegetical details of these writings: text critical issues, their features, aims, places and dates of composition, and relation to other canonical and noncanonical writings. Relatively less at­tention, it is surprising to note, is devoted to the question supposedly prompting this analysis, namely, early Christian tradition concerning Peter. This is covered primarily in the conclusion (237-53).

Problems of method abound. The organization and sequence of the sources are never clarified. The nonchronological arrangement works
against an understanding of the historical development of the Petrine tradition, but no explanation is given for the author’s modus operandi. How the sources are to be questioned and evaluated is also left unclear. The difference between writings ascribed to Peter as author, on the one hand, and writings about Peter, on the other, is given no consideration. Throughout the book it remains uncertain how one is to distinguish between, on the one hand, historically reliable evidence concerning Peter and his teaching and, on the other, ideological constructs of Peter that reflect particular and competing interests within the early Church. In addition, precisely how does one go about identifying Peter’s “distinctive theology”?

L.’s conclusions, given these methodological weaknesses, are impressionistic, superficial, and unconvincing. He does not engage with the vast secondary literature on the topic, or even with key representatives thereof, such as the work of Oscar Cullmann, or Raymond Brown. The features of a purportedly “Petrine” theology are hardly unique to, or even consistently typical of, Peter: the idea that God makes himself known in Christ and his Cross (237–40, 250–51); a stress on the positive outcome of necessary suffering of both Christ and his followers (243–44); an insistence on the indispensability of the Law, as interpreted by Jesus, as well as listening to his word (249, 251); or a theology exerting an “essentially moderating influence . . . between the legalism of James and the liberalism of Paul” (ix). “The central and most distinctive feature” of this theology L. identifies as the idea of Christians comprising a “new and wholly other-worldly race” (251), claiming that this idea is expressed as early as 1 Peter 2:9–10 (251). In reality, however, this text speaks not of a “new race” and certainly not one that is “other-worldly,” but rather ascribes to the followers of Jesus the epithets and dignity once conferred on Israel as the covenant people of God. The tertium genus concept emerges after, and independently from, 1 Peter. The features of Peter that L. finds accentuated in the sources require more discussion than their brief mention here: Peter as a “charismatic” figure with a “spiritualized concept of Christianity” (244), having “undeniable ascetic leanings,” though married (248 n. 43), and universally acknowledged as “the authoritative teacher of the Church” (244). This authority supposedly was based on “his ability to see with the eyes of his mind (Acts Pet. 21),” recognizing the divinity of Christ [sic] at Caesarea Philippi as well as the real significance of the transfigured Christ (245). The Petrine community is imagined as broadly commensurate with “the Matthean Church” (Syria and Coelo-Syria) and came to an end with the severing of links between Israel and Church, which is assigned by L. to the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt of 132–135 CE (246–47). Peter died “not in Rome nor as late as the reign of Nero,” but, L. speculates, “at the hand of Herod Agrippa shortly after the death of James, the brother of John” (248)—the vast bulk of the tradition favoring Rome and the 60s notwithstanding (see J. H. Elliott, 1 Peter [2000], pp. 124–38, 880–90).

On the whole, there is little new here, and what is new is not convincing. D. H. Schmidt (The Peter Writings, 1972), T. V. Smith (Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity, 1985), and Pheme Perkins (Peter, 1994), to name
but three studies, offer more instructive discussions of the topic; L. did not mention, let alone engage, any of them.

Given L.'s reimmersion into academia after a near 50-year hiatus (ix), I wish this review could have been more positive. Perhaps other reviews will discover the gold I missed.

University of San Francisco

JOHN H. ELLIOTT


The history of Christianity can be approached in various ways: through the story of the Church, which was the traditional approach for many centuries especially among Roman Catholic historians; a more popular and ecumenical treatment exemplified in Dale Irvin and Scott Sunquist's History of the World Christian Movement (vol. 1, 2001; vol. 2 forthcoming); and many others. Moynahan's entry is through faith, as the book's title indicates. Thirty-five chapters take the reader from Jesus of Nazareth to John Paul II and the new millennium. The chapters follow in chronological order, with some overlaps, but each is an essay in itself centred on the faith of one or more individuals or groups. M. depicts both the energy and the dangers of Christian faith—the energy and commitment of Paul, Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, the desert fathers, the martyrs, in the early Church; of Francis of Assisi, the builders of cathedrals, women mystics, in the Middle Ages; of William Carey in India, Lord Shaftesbury in England, Mormons in North America, Jesuit missionaries in many countries, in the modern period. Yet violence and intolerance feature more prominently: justified early by the post-Constantinian Church and Augustine, appearing full blown in the crusades and the medieval Inquisition, continuing into the religious wars of the Reformation and Counter Reformation and afterwards. The message of the New Testament seems to have gotten lost, Christians fell back too readily on Old Testament models and the politically or socially expedient.

The book is written in fine style, in keeping with M.'s long career as a journalist of the English newspaper, the Sunday Times. M. shows a refreshing directness and an ability to ask pertinent questions, while avoiding the academic perils of becoming lost in details or overemphasizing the importance of intellectual issues. He might be criticized for preoccupation with various present-day concerns—such as personal freedom—which, while always important to Christianity, have not been as central in the past as they appear today. Still, he always makes a genuine effort to enter into the period and the personalities in question. His style is narrative rather than analytic. While he does not venture into the often complex debates of modern scholars on particular issues and provides almost no evaluation of the secondary literature, he does make considerable effort to hold a basically authentic line by quoting from primary sources, in English translation, so that the reader hears living people speak.
Careful historians may feel that many of M.'s statements are too sweeping, that in estimates the higher end of possibility is too readily accepted, that rhetorical effect leads to overly stark contrasts. For example: that the Jesuits opposed the beatification of Savanarola in 1999 because he was a “rebel ... who inspired contradictory passions” (338); converts in China number in the scores of millions (viii); Paul was the first to explore the nature of Christ (34); the doctrine of purgatory was invented in the West in the 13th century (318); Henry VIII of England heard three masses a day when he hunted and five masses on other days (399, “sometimes” might have been added); over a hundred thousand witches were killed in Europe in the two centuries following 1484 (479). The story of Guy Fawkes’s plot to blow up Parliament in London in 1605 is accepted without demur (463–64); the papal schism initiated by Hippolytus is extended to 1439 (117, presumably the year 239 or thereabouts is intended); Vatican I is dated to 1879 instead of 1870 (651, though the correct date is given on 659); Cardinal Richelieu is wrongly described as a Capuchin friar (474); some 150 bishops and monks, rather than “fifty bishops,” attended the Cyrilline council at Ephesus in 431 (126); crusades continued to be called long after 1459 (264)—witness the battle of Lepanto in 1571.

On the other hand, the vigorous style leads to many memorable character sketches and insights that might be lost in a more “professional” and analytic history. Over half the book focuses on the period after 1500, the last quarter of the Church’s history. Plenty of well-chosen illustrations accompany the text.

Gregorian University, Rome

NORMAN TANNER, S.J.


In the last hundred years, Benedictines have become accustomed to readjusting their view of the origins of their monastic tradition. Benedict’s influential Rule for Monasteries has been shown to be a creative editing and tempering of an earlier text (the Rule of the Master) rather than an entirely original creation. Benedictines now understand the key moment in their historical development to have been the emergence of the Carolingian Empire, when the Rule served as a basis for monastic unity and reform.

Amidst this change, the portrait of Benedict provided by Gregory the Great in Book 2 of his Dialogues remained beloved by Benedictines, though not very determinative of their way of life. Then in 1987, Francis Clark published his two-volume, almost 800-page The Pseudo-Gregorian Dialogues, asserting that the Dialogues was a pastiche composed almost a century after Gregory’s pontificate by someone with access to the papal archives. The late seventh century was a period of increasing Byzantine influence in Italy, and a secretary in the archives may have created this promotion of Italian sanctity for patriotic reasons. C. further suggested that
the portrait of Benedict in the Dialogues was almost entirely unreliable, and that even his association with Monte Cassino is suspect. Benedict should instead be seen as a Roman abbot, and his Rule as the product of the seventh century, not the sixth. C. has persevered in his arguments despite howls of outrage and more than a little derision. The present book is a slimmed-down and updated version of the previous study that responds to the various objections raised since 1987. The result is a very readable tour de force.

C.'s starting point is the poor writing and sometimes horrific theology of the Dialogues. Though many of its stories are not unusual for hagiographical literature, they are embarrassingly lowbrow when compared to the rest of Gregory's oeuvre. At times the writing is formulaic, stilted, and obsequious; none of these are Gregorian traits. And yet there are passages of great mystical profundity. C. explains the paradox by suggesting that the creator of the Dialogues had access to unpublished writings of Gregory and was able to graft these into his own framework to give it a more "authentic" tone. C. analyzes dozens of these "Inserted Gregorian Passages," identifying exactly where they begin and end, and comparing them to similarly recycled Gregorian material in other texts.

To his analysis of the text of the Dialogues, C. joins his research into contemporary historical sources to demonstrate that there is no reference to the Dialogues in any extant source before the 680s. Further, despite its traditional dating to the first half of the sixth century, the first mention of the Rule of Benedict is ca. 625, and its popularity becomes evident only later in that century. C. sees a causal relationship between the appearance of the Dialogues and the increasing fame of the Rule. Also curious is the lack of any evidence linking the Rule to Monte Cassino before 717, when a monastery was (re-)founded under the inspiration of the Dialogues. Nor is there any earlier trace of a liturgical cult of Benedict. But from that time, Monte Cassino began to export both the cult and Rule of Benedict, most critically to Frankish regions, where the Benedictine monastic model rose to its Carolingian preeminence and the "Benedictine centuries" began.

If this were it, C.'s research would be of historical and monastic interest only. But there is more, and what brought C. to the topic in the first place: the emphasis in Book 4 of the Dialogues on the propitiatory value of the Eucharist for souls in Purgatory. Gregory has commonly been thought to have played a key role in the development of this doctrine. But it was the "Gregory" of the Dialogues. C. therefore dissociates much medieval eucharistic theology and practice from the traditional source, and instead locates it in the popular imagination and even superstitions of the late seventh century. Anyone who recognizes the term "Gregorian trental" knows the tradition based on the Dialogues and its purported author.

Since the first version of this book appeared, C.'s most spirited opponent has been Adalbert de Vogüé, a Benedictine monk and arguably the greatest monastic scholar of the last hundred years. Vogüé has edited two major texts attributed to Gregory for the series Sources chrétiennes, the Dialogues (1978–) and the Commentaire sur le premier livre des Rois (1989–). Half-
way through his edition of the latter, having already published three vol­
umes, Vogüé announced that the work was a skillful pastiche from the
twelfth century. The only actual quotation from the Rule of Benedict in the
Gregorian corpus is in the Commentaire. Despite his volte-face, Vogüé
remains adamantly opposed to C.'s theses about the Dialogues and the
Rule. As an additional irony, Vogüé had provided the definitive proof of
Benedict's dependence on the Rule of the Master. As both historians ap­
proach the end of their careers, the rest of us watch to see what happens
next.

Saint John's University, Collegeville, Minn. COLUMBA STEWART, O.S.B.

THE REFORMATION: A HISTORY. By Diarmaid MacCulloch. New York:
Viking, 2004. xxiv + 792. $34.95.

"Massive," "encyclopedic," "superb" are a few of the descriptors re­
cently used for Oxford professor MacCulloch's work. Among contempo­
rary studies of Reformation history, M.'s stands out. This book is larger
than comparable volumes, distinctive in its approach, and written with an
engaging style that repays the persevering reader with a panoramic picture
of the Reformation period (1490-1700). M.'s claims are wide: Reformation
history is crucial for understanding European and consequently world his­
tory; the modern world cannot be understood unless this period is com­
prehended; and "American life is fired by a continuing energy of Protestant
religious practice derived from the sixteenth century" (xx). So the Refor­
mation was a cataclysmic period with effects that resound to the present
day.

All these claims stem from what the word "Catholic" means and entails.
Its meaning was at the center of the Reformation that, M. contends, was
really "multiple Reformations" (xvii). This judgment leads him through a
wide-ranging narrative to follow the story of the Reformation beyond
Western Europe, into Eastern Europe, and beyond the pivotal contro­
versies into the history of renewal within Roman Catholicism, and on through
the 17th century. It is "the power of ideas" that explains "why the Refor­
mation was such a continent-wide event" (xxi).

More specifically, basic to Reformation thought and to M.'s interpreta­
tion, is the recovery of Augustine's theology, initially by Luther, the Au­
gustinian monk. M.'s perspectives are captured where he writes: "The old
Church was immensely strong, and that strength could only have been
overcome by the explosive power of an idea. The idea proved to be a new
statement on Augustine's ideas on salvation. That is why there is so much
description of apparently abstract thought in my account of the Reforma­
tion, and why the discussion of this abstract thought sometimes has to get
extremely intricate. Monarchs, priests, nuns, merchants, farmers, laborers
were seized by ideas that tore through their experiences and memories and

Researchers for several generations have tended to describe 15th-century theology as the dark foil against which the light of Luther and his Reformation disciples shines brightly. In recent decades this picture has become increasingly detailed, but the description of late medieval theology has still been ruled by the question about its impact on evangelical theology. Among the group of scholars dealing with this question German-born Franz Posset holds a prominent position. Known for his thorough close-ups of representatives of a certain non-Scholastic theology, in recent years he has focused on the broad stream of monastic theology coming from Bernard of Clairvaux into the 15th and 16th centuries. P.’s outstanding productivity now presents us with a new book on the life and works of John Staupitz.

Staupitz for a long time had been characterized as the superior and father confessor of Martin Luther. Thus his life and work were interpreted as a precondition for understanding Luther’s development. Indeed, Luther himself described Staupitz as the one who lit the flame of the gospel for him. It seems that P. could not completely emancipate himself from this attribution. He presents “a theological biography” that “may be read as a theological introduction to the early reformation in Germany” (xv).

In The Front-Runner P. wants to focus on the continuous reform deriving from late medieval theology until the decision of the Diet of Worms in 1521 to proscribe Luther’s works. Chapter 1 sketches the reform attempts within religious orders in the 15th and 16th centuries. Chapter 2 analyzes Staupitz’s early writings from his years in Tübingen, a detailed, albeit mainly Scholastic commentary on the first chapters of Job. After becoming vicar general of the German Augustinians Staupitz faced several challenges culminating in his finally uncompleted attempt to unite the observant monasteries within a larger province under his leadership. At the same time he became professor of biblical studies in Wittenberg and an influential figure in founding the new university in electoral Saxony. Chapter 3 describes Staupitz as a prominent preacher in southern Germany (1512–1517). Under the pressure of his numerous responsibilities, in 1512 he resigned his chair in Wittenberg to concentrate on his duties within the Augustinians. P. makes this the focus of chapter 4, looking especially at Staupitz’s relation to Luther and the growing challenge coming from his teaching in Wittenberg. While Luther went his way, Staupitz had to face several disappointments that led him finally to accept the invitation of Cardinal Matthaeus Lang to come to Salzburg, become a Benedictine (chap. 5), and accept an appointment as Abbot of St. Peter’s Monastery, Salzburg (1522–1524), where he continued to preach sermons that were widely published (chap. 6). P. also treats here the final publications of the former Augustinian and supporter of Luther, Wenzeslaus Linck, in Augsburg in 1525. Chapter 7
summarizes Staupitz's theological testament and testimonies of him by friends and foes alike. The last chapter argues that “there was no sharp division between the pre-Reformation and Reformation periods” (3).

P. characterizes Staupitz as a major figure in the greater reform movement during the 15th century. In P.'s view, Staupitz's attempts at reform, although finally unsuccessful, prove wrong the still repeated judgment that the Church of the time was generally unresponsive. P. emphasizes the continuity between the various reform efforts of the religious orders of previous centuries and the 16th-century Reformation, and points insightfully to the ecumenical potential of Staupitz for today's interconfessional discussion. “It is time,” P. asserts, “to focus on the ‘catholicity of the Reformation’” (3–4). With this declaration and an explanatory footnote (5) he relates his historical findings to the programmatic writings of “Catholic Evangelicals” such as Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson.

This daring thesis as well as some of P.’s interpretations call for a mutuum colloquium fratorum that cannot be treated in a review. Topics would be: P.’s interpretation of Staupitz’s relation to humanist biblical interpretation; his impact on the development of the faculty of theology in Wittenberg and, with that, his influence on Luther and other young professors who later became involved in the reform movement; Staupitz as the primary reformer of the Augustinians; his relation to Mattaeus Lang of Wellenburg, Cardinal-Archbishop of Salzburg, and his last writings. Finally P.'s thesis that Staupitz is the representative of the “Catholic reform” (the appropriateness of this term also needs discussion) of the 15th and 16th centuries should be critically investigated.

P.'s stress on the importance of Staupitz necessarily provokes critical reassessments. Nevertheless I highly recommend the book. For the English-speaking world it is unrivaled. Younger scholars in particular will appreciate the work: it not only includes several useful translations of Staupitz's writings but also a nearly complete bibliography of relevant sources.

Institute of European History, Mainz, Germany  
Marquette University, Milwaukee

MARKUS WRIEDT


In 1961, when Frank Christ and Gerald Sherry published their anthology, American Catholicism and the Intellectual Ideal, the then bishop of Pittsburgh, John Wright, wrote in the forward: “This comprehensive survey of the intellectual ideal of American Catholicism should provide about the last word on the subject.” Apparently, many agreed. While there has been much ink spilled on the meanings and permutations of the “ideal,” over four decades have passed without a similar collection of primary texts.
This long-awaited anthology (first advertised for publication in 2002) suggests that there is no ideal and never was. While universally convicted by the truths of the Church, American Catholics have never sought a singular model through which they exercised their individual or collective minds either in seeking or establishing those truths. According to the general introduction by Appleby, “‘thinking with the church’ does not mean ‘thinking only what the church tells you to think’” (xxvii). Creativity and fidelity exist “in tension” among American Catholics, but “within each of the intellectual traditions featured in this volume, one encounters faith-filled arguments and faithful adaptations to contemporary horizons of understanding, precisely for the sake of realizing the goods of the tradition in that historical moment” (xxvii–xxviii).

The concrete expressions of the panoply of American Catholic intellectual interests are equally manifold, making selection somewhat dicey. The editors have chosen 95 documents, many of which have appeared in print. Several additional documents are from archival holdings in North America and Rome. The selections are arranged topically under the following headings: Intellectual Life, Scholasticisms and Thomisms, Foundations and Development of Catholic Education in America, Church-State Questions, Moral Theology and Social Thought, Aesthetics, Theology and Science, and two final sections pertaining to the path to and legacy of the Second Vatican Council. Among the texts are letters, sermons, essays, or memoranda from some of America’s leading bishops (John England, John Ireland, John Spalding), clergy (Isaac Hecker, John Tracy Ellis, Walter Ong), and laity (Orestes Brownson, George Shuster, Katharine Drexel, and Flannery O’Connor). Some documents are the products of group efforts, such as the episcopal legislation on education from the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884) or the Land O’Lakes statement on the nature of a Catholic university (1967). The editors provide elucidating introductions to each category.

To be sure, the collection offers a wide diversity of selections, from the establishment of universities to Catholic commentary on the Scopes trial to use of “the pill.” Readers will find the Pontifical Charter for St. Mary's Seminary (1822), a snippet from Thomas Merton on his conversion experience (1948), Dorothy Day on nonviolence (1936), Garry Wills on freedom (1964), Bishop Francis Kenrick on slavery (1841), and Andrew Sullivan on homosexuality (1997). Some documents appear to be relatively straightforward contributions of Catholic intellectual life to American culture, but then others seem to shed little light on what it means to be active intellectually. For instance, a photograph depicts a woman religious in 1948 standing in the midst of her first grade class of at least 48 pupils; another image is of an 1891 cover page of Niedziela, a Polish language newspaper produced by Sts. Cyril and Methodius Seminary. These two images could easily be construed as examples of ghetto Catholicism.

With such a plurality of voices covering so many of the nation’s most burning issues it may be that the collection fails to satisfy on every point. One would have hoped for a larger excerpt from eminent Church historian
John Tracy Ellis's watershed essay, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life"—especially considering that 2005 will be its 50th anniversary. Illuminating footnotes could have been given on terms and persons unfamiliar to most contemporary readers. But more germane to a volume like this and entirely absent is some definition of what counts as "intellectual" for Catholics, or a discussion of whether "Catholic" and "intellectual" may be uttered together without drawing sneers. Perhaps this absence says more about the current ecclesial and cultural situation and less about this book, though it may be that the collection offers a way into a conversation about Catholicism and its intellectual gifts for an increasingly secularized nation.

Insofar as the documentary heritage puts wisdom in the mouths of future Catholic intellectuals, the editors deserve our gratitude. Their volume will be highly useful for courses in American religious history and a welcome addition to the scholar's reference shelf.

Marymount College of Fordham University, Tarrytown, N.Y.

PATRICK J. HAYES


Three concerns afford Gaál Gyulai the main lines of the development of his book. His first concern is to examine ancient Greek philosophy (chaps. 1–3). Platonism and especially Neo-Platonism's exponent, Plotinus, provide vectors for a deeper study of Anselm's thought. The second concern is to discuss the monastic setting in which Anselm wrote (chaps. 4–11). The peace of the monastery, the domus dei, gave Anselm his singular equanimity, allowing him the means by which to construct an intellectual edifice marked by symmetry and balance. In chapters 12–13, G. reviews the contributions to Anselmian research of Guardini, Barth, and Balthasar, hoping, as his third concern, to rekindle interest in an imagined dialogue with Anselm as we begin the third millennium. Finally, chapter 14 assesses whether or not Anselm is a fideist or a rationalist.

While Plotinus and Anselm differ on important issues (Plotinus believed in the preexistence of the soul, that ideas are of universals, not of particulars, that the "One" would never have become incarnate to redeem humanity), neither Plotinus nor Anselm subscribe to some naive form of rationalism or passive fideism. "Rather, it is precisely the human intellect itself which calls for a letting lose [sic] of oneself for divine initiative to take over" (43). It is Plotinus's concept of the One and the possibility of union with the One that helps us understand properly Anselm's writings. But unlike Plotinus, who has a negative view of the material world, Anselm believes that the insight gained and expressed in his famous dictum id quo
maius cogitari nequit is that of humans who are unambiguously and distinctly creatures (44). For Anselm, the cognitional union of the creature is a real union with God, since we owe our rationality to the same God who created us, our minds, and the universe.

The challenge that Anselm willingly undertakes is to permit faith and reason/cognition to retain their autonomy, such that reason does not become submerged under creedal assertions (fideism) or faith become subservient to reason (rationalism) (122). It is the monastic setting in which Anselm wrote that keeps him from the extremes of fideism and rationalism, allowing him to hold both faith and reason as interdependent and yet distinct. That Anselm is able to hold faith and reason in this creative tension is because monastic theology, G. argues, is less formal and more literary and poetic. Anselm, steeped in the writings of Augustine, heeded the latter’s trivium of docere, delectare, and flectare.

Three theologians, Barth, Guardini, and Balthasar, were instrumental in rediscovering Anselm at a moment of Christianity’s ressourcement in the wake of the collapse of a European world view after World War I. For G., Barth’s and Guardini’s writings are particularly insightful.

Barth’s Fides quaerens intellectum (1931) established the foundations of his Church Dogmatics (Engl. trans. 1936–1977) in which he argues that faith “can no longer be grounded in a political order for the Protestant fold” (264). Like Anselm, Barth consciously attempts to ground faith in Scripture, tradition, and the Church. “Faith is not a subjective, individualistic contrivance grounded in a personal angle or affectivity.” Rather, for Barth, “faith is an objective entity with its own effulgent veracity” (264).

Guardini’s contribution is found in a 32-page essay in which he presents Anselm as fresh and youthful, not offering merely a “dry repristination of Platonism” (264). Much like Barth, Guardini maintains that faith is bound to an authority that consists of Scripture, tradition (the Fathers), and the magisterium. Faithful to Augustine, Anselm maintains a unity between thought and prayer: “[t]hinking is adoration of being; as more profound realities coming to light through theology” (265).

Finally, G. examines Balthasar’s appropriation of Anselm within the context of his theological esthetics. Balthasar regards Anselm’s esthetic reason as ultimately rooted in his monastic reason. Unlike the Fathers’ intellectus or high Scholasticism’s ratio, “reason is for Anselm the spirit’s capacity to gain insight. . . . To think means to make something visible” (333). Anselm’s esthetic reason is grounded in contemplation, enabling him to unite all perspectives into one whole vision (334). While Plotinian in his leanings, Balthasar was, like Anselm, able to avoid the temptation to systemize his thinking. Thus, like Anselm, Balthasar was better equipped than any previous theologian to establish a synthetic vision.

G.’s book is not for the faint-hearted. It is a rich, complex, and unabridged form of his doctoral dissertation. Not surprisingly, therefore, we find left untranslated many key texts in Latin, German, and French. This makes the book virtually inaccessible to many readers. For those able to read the languages, G.’s book is worth the struggle.
If G. were to republish his book, he might well supply missing translations and engage an editor who can simplify some of the language, as well as correct misused words and misspellings. As it is, G.'s book will find a home in a graduate school library or an Anselmian collection.

Saint Anselm College, Manchester, N.H.  Benedict M. Guevin, O.S.B.


This is a daring and illuminating book. Schuld's work fits within a larger project of Christian theologians and ethicists interested in applying the critical methods of Michel Foucault to their own fields. Herein, though, lies a challenge. In his cultural analysis Foucault subverts and deconstructs: he offers neither a normative framework nor evaluative conclusions. For some interpreters, his approach would render him useless or hostile to Christian theology. For S., on the other hand, postmodern analysis fails theology only if one insists on a modern frame of reference. And that is S.'s point: Christian theology does not rise and fall with Enlightenment assumptions. If a Foucauldian analysis itself resists a foundationalist standard and an overarching narrative structure, it may still be put to constructive, theological use (209).

Enter Augustine, whose premodern perspective makes him a very interesting dialogue partner for Foucault. Although Augustine certainly is committed to a theological narrative framework, in many respects he engages in “deconstruction” long before Foucault. His thoroughgoing critiques of self, history, and culture reflect a pervasive ambivalence. There he meets Foucault's suspicion. S. places Foucault and Augustine into conversation not through their large-scale interpretative schemes, whose differences she frequently notes. Rather, she concentrates on what they say about the “very finest threads of our relational fabric” (4) and urges us to see in their analyses deeply complementary concerns. Similarities in the performative, operational details of premodern Augustine and postmodern Foucault suggest ways the latter's thought may be useful to Christian theology and ethics.

The conversation may be most intense in the first two chapters, where S. illustrates how both thinkers located power and love within dynamic patterns that are irreducibly relational and problematic. Like Foucault, for whom power is embedded in a complex web of microrelations, Augustine traces the large-scale effects of social power back to tiny movements of desire, custom, practice. Whereas Augustine will interpret these dynamics as part of our rupture from and return to God, Foucault avoids such a comprehensive frame. Nonetheless, S. argues that Foucault's “microscopic perspective is precisely what makes him so valuable to a theologically attentive social analysis” (18). His analytic tools sharpen our focus on the “dynamic fragility” of even the most intimate social networks, on the re-
lational quality of love and power, with all attendant risks and ambiguities. A theologian like Augustine, who grounds such dynamics within a primary (and fragile) relationship between creature and Creator, would find the analysis especially useful. S.'s second chapter, "Vertigo and Complicity," offers a penetrating discussion of the complexity of social evil. Her comparison of Foucault's metaphors of machinery, networks, matrices, and warfare with Augustine's concept of "original sin" elucidates deep similarities between the postmodern's analysis of anonymous mechanisms of social evil and the ancient Christian's understanding of inherited guilt.

The remaining chapters on habituation (chap. 3), the risks of doctrinal certitude (chap. 4), and the perils of glorifying social achievement (chap. 5) carry forward S.'s persuasive argument. Although some sections are densely written and may have benefited from more subheadings, the book is clear and deeply intelligent from beginning to end. S. not only offers reasons for theologians to take Foucault seriously, she also liberates Augustine from readings driven by modern presuppositions rather than by the logic of his own writing. S.'s Augustine is characterized as one who recognizes the "wisdom of sorrow" and advocates an "ethics of humility." Central to S.'s reading of Augustine is his commitment to the power of the Cross, which symbolizes not a will to power but a pouring out of self for God and neighbor. Accordingly, S. argues that an Augustinian ethics "should lay everything, both inside and outside the church, open to critique and revision" (218). Furthermore, since all human relations are touched by the consequences of sin, a Foucauldian analysis "can thus considerably aid Christians in recognizing the difficulties of and in committing themselves to a life of compassion, of care, and of justice" (220).

Not everyone will accept a vision of Augustine as one who resonates with Foucault, and S.'s reading of Foucault is itself open to critique and revision. But to put Foucault and Augustine into dialogue is a great intellectual achievement that testifies to the suppleness of their writings. Given Augustine's view of Scripture, we might imagine his own pleasure at S.'s efforts: "Had I been Moses . . . I would hope to have written in such a way that if anyone else had in the light of truth seen some other valid meaning, that too should not be excluded, but present itself as a possible way of understanding in what I said" (Confessions 12.26.36).

Santa Clara University

MICHAEL C. MCCARTHY, S.J.


In the late 1990s, while working on my own dissertation, I was visiting with Thomas O'Meara, O.P., about the work of the great 20th-century Dominican theologian, Yves Congar. O'Meara posited that much of Congar's early work had been absorbed into the theology of the Vatican II but that Congar had important insights in both Pneumatology and ecclesiology
that he developed out of his conciliar experience and that had not yet been appreciated or appropriately mined by English-speaking theologians. Some of that lacuna in scholarship is corrected by this excellent new study of Congar's pneumatological ecclesiology.

Groppe's basic thesis asserts that Congar distinctively contributed to Roman Catholic theology of the Holy Spirit by retrieving the intimate bond between the work of the indwelling Spirit within the human person and the activity of the Spirit within the Church. The magnitude of this contribution is more fully appreciated both when it is seen in contrast to other pneumatological writing by Western theologians of the mid-20th century, and the more one understands the development of Congar's own writing before and after the Second Vatican Council.

G. begins by demonstrating how Congar's life story serves as a paradigmatic context for the astonishing social and religious ground shifts that are reflected in Western theological writing during the 20th century. He lived from 1904 to 1995 in the heart of Europe, where he personally experienced war, prison camp, and the explosive realities of social and political tumult. Further, he was attentive to the tremendous changes swirling about him, consistently reflecting on their meaning in the light of God's kingdom. His daunting theological corpus includes over 2000 works that range across nearly every topic of relevance to ecclesiology. But his work was not systematic, so the task of tracing the development of a single theme in his work requires a serious immersion into his life and writing.

G. has undertaken one such project in a reasonably brief but thorough exposition that serves as both an excellent entry point into the theological context of Congar's story—itself a worthy study—and a lucid analysis and description of his development from an excessively christological ecclesiology in his early work to a pneumatological Christology in his late writings.

In her opening chapter G. demonstrates that the great influences on Congar's thinking included a strong historical Thomism, a deep appreciation for Johann Adam Möhler's work, and years of study of both the Protestant thought of Luther and Barth and Orthodox theology mediated by the Russian school in Paris between the wars. These various influences helped Congar shape responses to ecclesial questions that were surfacing in various Christian denominations, including and especially the ecumenical currents in play since the World Missionary Conference of 1917.

In this dynamic context, Congar's true starting point is always trinitarian, and G. illuminates both the depth and the development of this dimension of his work in her chapter 2. Out of Congar's trinitarian consciousness G. carefully outlines his position on the indwelling of the Spirit, and the mystery of deification as well as the moral implications of such sanctifying activity. But his Pneumatology does not stop with contemplating personal indwelling; rather his work focuses on the distribution of necessary gifts, both charismatic and hierarchical, that provide for building up the Church in the context of indwelling. This inseparability between the gifts of baptism and the dynamic power of the Spirit unifying and fructifying the
Church lead one to say: where there is the manifestation of the indwelling Spirit, there the Church dwells. To believe in the Holy Spirit, third Person of the trinitarian God, is to believe in the gifts and powers of the Church: unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity.

G.'s final chapter explores three questions of modern theology wherein Congar's insights can be fruitfully brought to bear: the question of hierarchy vs. democracy in the life of the Church, the use of "persons in communion" as a framework for theological anthropology and ecclesiology, and the *proprium* of the Holy Spirit and the theology of appropriations. In each question Congar's ecumenical sensibility is also illuminated in a way that greatly contributes to the overall discussion.

Sixty-five pages of endnotes and 16 pages of bibliographical listings offer the reader rich resources for further exploring Congar's work. G.'s study offers an excellent doorway into Congar's thought or a new lens with which to continue to explore the work of this brilliant ecclesiologist.

_Creighton University, Omaha_  
EILEEN C. BURKE-SULLIVAN


Mühlen is a figure best known for the two works that established him in the 1960s as a major theologian, *Der Heilige Geist als Person* (1963) and *Una Mystica Persona* (1964). He was a peritus at Vatican II. Within ten years, however, he almost disappeared from the larger theological landscape. Despite an astounding number of publications, acknowledgment from the likes of Barth, Balthasar, and Dulles, a groundbreaking program for renewal in the postconciliar Church, and at least seven doctoral dissertations treating his theology, he is somewhat superficially known for his "I-thou-we" model of the Trinity. The real scope and goal of his work remain largely unknown. Vondey hopes to change that.

In his book (originally his doctoral dissertation) V. sees Mühlen and his work from beginning to end in the context of the new evangelization and reform of the Church called for by the council and later synods. The goal of this study, which is descriptive and hermeneutical rather than critical, is to explicate the logic, coherence, and integrity of Mühlen's work. V.'s thesis is that the "reform liturgy" created by Mühlen in 1996 is the key for understanding the integral unity of his theology and praxis. One cannot understand either apart from the other. This twofold focus makes V.'s book unique among works on Mühlen.

The book begins with a description of the liturgy Mühlen developed to reevangelize "cultural Catholics" and help them enter into the full existential reality of baptismal life in the Church. Individual Christian renewal in local groups and communities is what will reform the Church from within. Especially aware of the importance of the embodied or corporeal character of liturgical celebration and witness, Mühlen's ritual calls for individuals to step out in front of the congregation to pray publicly for
repentance and renewal (including specific petitions for grace or strength), and to renew baptismal vows, marriage vows, or priestly promises as appropriate. Lay ministers accompany these prayers throughout by the laying on of hands and blessing. A priest extends a final blessing, and all present extend the greeting of peace to those renewing their vows. The liturgy is easily celebrated in an ecumenical context, as it does not involve sacramental action in the strict sense.

In the succeeding chapters, V. provides a concise exposition of the trinitarian theology of the person of the Holy Spirit (as “one person in two persons”) and the Spirit-oriented ecclesiology (“one person in many persons”) that underlie the reform liturgy. In so doing, he highlights Mühlen’s fundamental insight that the “Holy Spirit is one and the same in Christ and in Christians” (115) and that the Church is more properly conceived of as the continuation of the anointing of Christ with the Spirit rather than as the continuation of the Incarnation. While the Church is the body of Christ, it is, for Mühlen, quite pointedly the sacrament of the Spirit and the historical continuation of the Pentecost experience. The concluding chapters treat: the centrality of covenant in Mühlen’s program for the Church; Mühlen’s participation in and ultimate disenchantment with the charismatic renewal; the seminars and liturgical services he developed as effective alternatives for spirit-filled renewal; and the way in which Mühlen employed his famous “we” paradigm of the Spirit in a critical and constructive response to the individualistic philosophical and theological anthropologies of the West. The book concludes with a new essay by Mühlen that offers a new variation on an old theme: the Holy Spirit as holy, divine we-energy.

V. correctly notes the points of continuity across Mühlen’s long career: the heuristic “we” in trinitarian, ecclesiological, and sociological contexts; the ongoing effort to understand the unique personhood of the Spirit and the insistence on the essential connection between the action of the Spirit in the life of Christ and in the lives of Christians; and the recovery of a covenant-based baptismal spirituality for all believers invited to share and experience the power of Christ’s Spirit.

While briefly summarizing the work of several theologians critical of Mühlen, V. himself has avoided critical engagement with Mühlen, proposing instead to establish the inner coherence and continuity of Mühlen’s theological and pastoral engagement as a whole. This he does admirably, demonstrating how Mühlen’s later focus on congregational renewal (e.g., Kirche wächst von innen, 1995) is organically rooted in his earlier, speculative works and in his experience in pentecostal renewal. It may be an exaggeration to say that Mühlen’s “theology and praxis of renewal offers the only concrete pastoral guideline for an implementation of a new evangelization in the Church at this time” (308), and it would certainly have been interesting to have considered Mühlen’s project in relation to another contemporaneous renewal movement that began in Paderborn and Munich: die integrierte Gemeinde. But V.’s study makes a valuable contribution by revealing the dimension of Mühlen’s work least known outside of
Germany and most likely to be of lasting importance in the life of the Church.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology

JOHN R. SACHS, S.J.


Nietzsche's announcement that God is dead, Heidegger's claim that "thinking" is to be godless, and the early Derrida's denial of the transcendental signified have cast a long shadow over theology and deprived it of a place in public and academic discourse for some time. Some of this deprivation, however, is theology's fault. It succumbed to the pressures of scientific reason in modernity and, consequently, wedded itself too often to an ontotheological metaphysics (foundationalism) and a notion of God as "self-subsistent being" and "causa sui" that is insufficiently grounded in historical revelation. Yet, with the dawning of the third millennium and foreshadowed by the "theological turn" in French phenomenology, one could argue that thinking has entered a postsecular phase where "the trace of and to a living God could be found in this world once again" (116)—what some have called the reenchantment of the world in postmodern culture. Ironically, the end of (a certain kind of) philosophy would be a new beginning for theology (ix).

The book here reviewed is a collection of essays by ten prominent continental thinkers. The text, edited and introduced by philosopher Jeffrey Bloechl, attempts to address the challenges posed to theological thinking in the light of the "end of metaphysics" by renegotiating the place of religious experience after all the postmodern adjustments to subjectivity. Modern theology certainly was grounded in religious experience—the influential transcendental theology of Karl Rahner would be a case in point. However, this approach dealt insufficiently with the influence of history, culture, and language on experience.

Each contributor attempts to philosophically rethink the place of religious experience after Heidegger: there is no world "beyond" this one, the end of metaphysics (as presence) means the end of ontotheology, and thinking should be about Being as such (attunement to nothingness), which is deeply historical (viii). To aid in this endeavor, several other influential continental thinkers who have thought about the place of "the religious" in a critical dialogue with Heidegger, such as Emmanuel Levinas, Jacques Derrida, and Jean-Luc Marion, are also part of the conversation.

While the essays have a general orientation in common, they are very different in sources, themes, and methodology. One way to get a "sense" of the promise these disparate approaches offer is to cite five explored themes. First, human knowledge is always limited and temporary; therefore, there can be no experience of an infinite God (25). God withdraws with the rise of hermeneutics. Thinking about God becomes endless; what
is gained will only be lost again. Second, following the Kyoto school of Buddhism, Being can be conceived as not contained in beings or Being/Nothing. "Absolute nothing" is the true absolute and is self-contradictory: contravening itself and opposing nothing (37). Third, Heidegger's ontological interpretation of the sacred is helpful in its openness to the truth of Being, as a trace of the divine, and as sacred precisely because it is not the divine. However, given the ambiguous content of the sacred (inscrutable abyss of Being) and ahistorical grounding, it loses sight of the highly important personal, communal, and ethical dimensions that, although central to historical religions (60–62), must be used cautiously. Fourth, the religious mode of existence could be seen as a "call from beyond" that sets in motion the response of human desire. The Desirable is what is continually sought but never found; however, it teaches that seeking, if done correctly, is the way of coming closer to the Sought (100). Hence, God's pres-absence (Heidegger) is encountered through the things of the world. Fourth, also from the Buddhist tradition, religion could be seen as primarily a language of mystical ultimacy, a language that voids itself before the numinous real, the divine. Ultimacy would be adjectival and expresses not a new substantial content about the divine but a new depth of realization (194). It is the ultimacy of this conventional world. In other words, the unconditioned is allowed to emerge through a particular set of conditions (religions) yielding a variety of styles to perceive the divine (195–98). Fifth, the impossible in phenomenology of the "saturated phenomenon" and messianic destruction is investigated in terms of Husserl's understanding of intention and givenness.

In sum, these collected essays succeed in three ways: (1) they take seriously history, language, ambiguity, absence, ethics, and the structural openness of human existence in relation to religion; (2) they get beyond the deconstructive phase of postmodern thinking; and (3) they thoroughly present the pressing questions that surround debates about religious experience and offer creative solutions. I highly recommend the text for those engaged in fundamental or philosophical theology.

St. John's University, Jamaica, N.Y. CRAIG A. BARON


To survey and respond to basic questions about the Catholic understanding of mission, Giancarlo Collet, of the Department of Missiology at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität in Münster, Germany, has gathered in this volume 16 of his articles published between 1999 and 2001. Though he tries to order and unify his essays under the three headings, "the profile and function of missiology," "inculturation and identity," and "missiological fragments," a good bit of untidy repetition and bumpy connections remains.
One recurring theme of the book is the need to respond to the "marginalization leading to disappearance" of missiology within Christian theology. This disappearance will require missiologists to deal more boldly and sensitively with the broadly-bruited accusation that missionary activity has been and still is contaminated by the Eurocentrism that drove colonialism. It will also require Christian thinkers and preachers to show how mission work can avoid further contamination by the modern form of colonialism: globalization.

Whatever the complexities of such questions and challenges, C. insists that both the reality and the very term, *mission*, cannot be abandoned. When we speak of mission we are pointing to an essential quality of the gospel and the community it gave birth to: its universal orientation. C. warns against substituting another name for "mission" (though he goes on to offer a few synonyms of his own), for this would too neatly let Christians off the hook of having to deal with the colonialist excesses and exploitations of the past; it would also dishonor the efforts, especially in the Churches of the South, to reinterpret and reinvigorate missionary commitment.

Keeping the term, how might we revision the work and the study of mission? C. is opposed to linking the nature of mission with the contemporary ideals of "comparative theology" or "inter-contextual theology." Yet his own description of what missionary outreach is all about bears natural resemblances to what both these types of theology are aiming at. For C., to speak about and engage in "mission" is to carry out the Church's essential need to converse with the other. To say that the Church is universal is to proclaim its need of those who are other, different, beyond. Christians are people who can understand themselves only if they are in conversation with others. C. therefore offers this definition of missiology: "the science of the encounter of the Church with the other" (4). More tersely and quaintly: missiology is "xenology" (54).

But how carry out this conversation? C. realistically warns against the danger of moving from vandalism to romanticism: instead of the colonialist trampling upon other cultures, we now turn them into consumer goods for the renewal of theology. Both are forms of exploitation. (Here perhaps we have the reason for his caveats about comparative and contextual theologies.) True recognition of the other will require a staunch dose of renouncing of the self (223). This calls for a genuine decentering of Europe (and its satellite cultures in North America). In this regard, C. boldly admonishes the Vatican that its constant concern for unity is stifling the diversity and creativity of Asian and African Churches. In the end, he predicts and urges that the renewal of missiology (and, by implication, of the Church) will come from "Third World" Churches. (He might have updated that term throughout his book.)

What all this means for the prickly question of conversion C. does not explore extensively, but he does suggest that if we want a new word for "mission," it could be "witness" (240). But are we witnessing to a truth that is superior or "final" (*endgültig*) over others? Here C. is ambiguous. Yes,
revelation in Christ is final, but we can never finally grasp its finality. Our understanding of it depends on our communication of it—which means, on our relationship with others (274 ff.)

C.'s collection does line up the "basic questions"—or most of them—confronting missiologists today. However, it is a glaring omission that he mentions but does not really take up the challenge of religious pluralism and the complex relationship between dialogue and evangelization. Also, while he speaks of the injustices of globalization and the stranglehold of poverty, there is little analysis of the links between liberation and proclamation. Still, no review of basic questions will ever be complete. C.'s contribution to the contemporary discussion on the meaning of mission is clear, insightful, and challenging.

Xavier University, Cincinnati

PAUL F. KNITTER


Let me be immediately clear about my enthusiasm for this book. Anyone interested in the challenges of religious pluralism and interreligious dialogue will profit immensely from it. It is a collection of Min's essays over the past 15 years, but where such collections often limp from repetition or disjointedness, this one flows coherently and engagingly.

The basic movement of the book is from critique to proposal. M. offers both lucid summaries and then incisive criticisms of, first, postmodernism (especially E. Levinas and J. Derrida) and then the so-called pluralistic theologies of religions (especially those of J. Hick and P. Knitter). To preserve the merits and remedy the deficiencies of both these perspectives, he then proposes a "dialectical pluralism" or "liberative dialogue of solidarity of others" (174).

For M. the incontestable value of postmodernism is its determination to affirm and protect differences; the problem with the postmodernists is that they get stuck in those differences. They rightly warn against oppression of "the other," but they can't provide the basis for a concerted effort to remove oppression. "Is postmodernism capable of providing a sense of human solidarity adequate to the cause of justice and liberation it is committed to promoting?" (73)

While M. resonates with the efforts of pluralist theologians both to affirm the validity of other religions and to bring them together in dialogue, he also chides them for sacrificing the real particularities of the religions, especially the particular "non-negotiable final or ultimate claims" that most religions make (187). In particular, Christian pluralists fail to recognize that "Jesus Christ as the final, universal, normative savior of humanity is not just one belief among others, but contrary to Knitter, an 'essential' and central part of the Christian tradition" (187).

So to both postmodernists and pluralists, M. offers his proposal: "The
only alternative to sheer pluralism is solidarity of others that indeed affirms otherness but also sublates it into solidarity" (139–40). This proposal is based on M.’s existential, ethical claim that the oppression of many people by some people and the need for liberation is “the theological or religious problem today” (161) or “the most unifying aspect of human experience today” (100). Dialogue can be, and must be, grounded in a liberationist “diapraxis” (161). Such a praxis would provide both the main goal and “the ultimate historical condition for evaluating the relative validity of religious claims” (170). This joint dialogue and diapraxis would be “confessionalist” in that each religious participant would speak frankly and boldly from his or her convictions. And yet, in the conversation, “no group is a privileged center” (176). This is why M. insists on a solidarity of others, not a solidarity with others, for the “with” would imply “a privileged center or a normative perspective” for one’s own group (142).

For his fellow Christian theologians, especially his pluralist friends, M. has both pneumatological and christological advice. He has three different chapters on how a renewed understanding of the universal work of the “liberative” Spirit can facilitate a theology and dialogue of religions in solidarity of others. Regarding the central place of Christ, he states that authentic dialogue does not require Christians to renounce claims for the finality of Christ, but it does require a “temporary or provisional suspension of such claims.” He adds, almost in passing, that while a renunciation of claims for finality cannot be the condition for dialogue, it may be a result (186–87).

I found M.’s book to be a lucid, insightful summary and analysis of the challenges that religious pluralism poses for all religious people in a world drenched in postmodern awareness and horrible suffering due to injustice. And he makes a powerful, coherent proposal for a theology and dialogue of religions based on the solidarity of others. But speaking as a pluralist (I prefer “mutualist”), I found his coherence to break down in the area of Christology. On the one hand, M. advocates a dialectical dialogue in which no one occupies the center, but then he insists that Christians, with their traditional understanding of Christ’s finality, must continue to claim that they do stand in the center. Is M. saying that no religion can occupy the center, but they all may claim to do so? Further, his distinction between not renouncing but suspending our definitive claims for Christ is slippery. How can we even provisionally suspend something that is essential to our Christian identity? How can we be open, as M. suggests, to the possibility that through the dialogue we may have to suspend or modify such claims? My sense is that he wants to have his traditional christological cake and eat it too.

I offer these reservations as a friend and colleague who is grateful for Anselm Min’s work and hopes that others will learn as much from his book as I did.

Xavier University, Cincinnati

PAUL F. KNITTER

In a world where state churches are past and Christian hegemony is quickly reseeding in most contexts, all churches, no matter their ecclesial claims, begin to function like "believers' churches" or voluntary associations. In this new context theological discussion with the classical Mennonite tradition becomes an important source for looking again at the Christian theological tradition. Finger's massive study is an important contribution to this dialogue.

Social ethicists are the most likely theological community to take account of the Anabaptist tradition. The size of Anabaptist churches and style of their theological heritage make them unlikely candidates for serious theological engagement. F., however, is very intentional about providing a point of theological engagement with the very core of the Christian faith in its classical and Anabaptist expressions: "I am proposing that the relatively little-known Anabaptist movement can provide significant resources for many theological issues facing the churches today" (105).

F.'s careful research provides for dialogue on multiple levels of theological methodology: among Mennonite sources, between contemporary Anabaptist theological scholarship and 16th-century positions, and between Mennonite convictions and the classical theological heritage.

Because the Mennonites were of peasant-artisan origin, widely dispersed in Europe, and because most of their leaders were martyred by the Protestant and Catholic establishments, systematic theologies and conciliar and confessional texts do not provide an easy and consistent account of their faith. F. has to mine Mennonite sources for common threads and contrasting theological affirmations. In each section he attempts to synthesize Swiss, Dutch, Austrian/German, and occasionally Polish sources. He then explicates contemporary appropriations in Anabaptist theology and goes on to place the Anabaptist views in dialogue with Catholic, Protestant, or Orthodox positions, ending with his own biblically grounded construction. The historical material and synthetic sections on contemporary Anabaptist theology alone are worth a serious study of the book.

The volume of ten chapters is divided into three parts and concludes with a summary, bibliography, and two indexes. Part 1 deals with contexts, historical and contemporary. Many scholars see the Mennonites, with their emphasis on the believers' gathered Church, individual freedom and decision making, and separation of church and state, as forerunners of modernity. Others see the core of their witness rooted in medieval mysticism and pre-Reformation religious movements. F. tries to situate the movement between Protestant and Catholic theological poles. In his constructive theological project he places his theological formulations against the background of modern and postmodern culture, their challenges and opportunities.

After an initial chapter on the book's aim, F. provides a historical over-
view. He follows that chapter with contemporary approaches to historic Anabaptism and its theology. He finishes part 1 with a chapter outlining his assumptions about the nature of theology, approaches to Anabaptism, and the contemporary audience.

F. begins his constructive theology with what he considers the core unifying theme in historic Anabaptist theologizing: “The Coming of the New Creation” (part 2). He examines this theme according to personal, communal, and mission dimensions, without prioritizing them. As noted before he treats 16th century, contemporary Anabaptist appropriations, dialogue with classical theologies, and his own biblical and constructive syntheses. For example, in dealing with the personal, he brings Anabaptist soteriology into dialogue with the Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification (1999), even though justification was not a central 16th-century Anabaptist theme. He finds that Orthodox developments of theosis more closely correspond to Anabaptist concerns about the person transformed in the new creation.

In treating communal themes in chapter 6, in addition to the traditional ecclesiological concerns of baptism and Eucharist, F. explicates and brings into the dialogue specifically Anabaptist motifs of discipline and economic sharing. Chapter 7 on mission deals with both evangelism and the church-world dichotomy central to the theology of the kingdom.

Part 3, “The Convictional Framework,” outlines the basic systematic themes of Christology; person and work, the Trinity, anthropology, and eschatology. While 16th-century Anabaptist thinking ranges widely from Unitarianism to adoptionism, F. finds the core of Anabaptist faith to be in the tradition of Nicea and Chalcedon, with particular Anabaptist emphases on a Christology from below and a trinitarian faith more concerned with the economic than the immanent Trinity. Chapter 10 on eschatology is particularly interesting because of both the variety and urgency of 16th-century points of view and their contrast with the millennial views current in today's Evangelical subculture.

Readers will find this a challenging book, with its historical detail and a method that contravenes the classical systematic format. However, the richness of the sources, the author’s gift for synthesis, and the variety of non-Mennonite theological interlocutors make the book an important reference and resource for the renewal of theological reflection.

United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, JEFFREY GROS, F.S.C. Washington


In this volume, James Gustafson develops many of the issues raised in his March 1999 Christian Century article criticizing “postliberal” or “postmodern” theology that rejects the interaction of theology with the sciences and
secular knowledge. G.’s basic thesis is that the traffic coming from all forms of secular knowledge affects theological discourse and concepts. Theologians, ethicists, clergy, and intellectually alert lay people have to grapple with this conversation.

The first five chapters of the book, based on the Warfield Lectures at Princeton Theological Seminary, develop this thesis especially in light of G.’s experience in directing a faculty seminar from all disciplines dealing with issues such as the human, nature, and responsibility. G. occasionally points out that the thesis also relates to anyone in our society, even non-religious people, who are trying to understand the human and our world. One chapter illustrates the need for such interaction and conversation by describing the many different courses taken by a fictional student in her college curriculum. How should she deal with what these various sciences and secular approaches tell us about the human and our world, and how does all this relate to her understanding of faith?

The book illustrates the strengths that have made G. the most respected Christian ethicist in the United States today. He is a master at analyzing other positions, mapping out the relationship of these positions, and using typology to help understand what is taking place.

The volume’s purpose is descriptive, analytical, and normative. G. develops his thesis not by comparing abstract concepts and ideas but by relating different explanations of concrete events or texts such as the Native American potlatch ceremony. He carefully points out four overlapping and interlocking processes involved in the analysis of these events or texts—description, explanation, evaluation, and meaning.

G. employs three types to map the various ways in which theological discourse deals with the intersection of the traffic coming from the sciences and secular knowledge. The two extreme types are rejection and absorption. Fundamentalists or conservative evangelicals, on the one hand, and postliberal theologians such as John Milbank, Stanley Hauerwas, Peter Ochs, and George Lindbeck, on the other hand, illustrate the rejectionist type. The absorption type, which is not illustrated in as much detail as the others, sees the theological totally determined by the scientific and the secular.

The middle category of accommodation strategies is obviously the largest. Here, G. explicitly distinguishes a “left-leaning” approach (e.g., Philip Hefner) and a centrist position (e.g., Edward Farley). He does not explicitly develop a category of “right-leaning” strategy of accommodation, but what he says about Karl Barth puts him in that category. The explicit development of a right-leaning accommodationist strategy would have enhanced the clarity of the map. Within the accommodation type, some maintain that the nonreligious account limits but does not determine the religious account, while others claim that the nonreligious account authorizes but does not determine the religious account.

In addition to this academic discussion, one chapter shows the significance of how four different factors or contexts (faith dispositions, moral commitments, social and cultural location, and personal and social experi-
ences) shape the way religious and secular interpretations are related in the faith life of the believer.

Readers expecting specific answers will not find them here. There is no doubt that G. himself favors an accommodationist approach, probably of the central type, but he does not develop his own position. His primary concern is mapping the different approaches and pointing out the problems with the extreme theological positions that reject any traffic coming from science and secular knowledge.

The sixth and final chapter was not an integral part of the original lectures. It illustrates G.'s theocentric ethic by "mediating, thinking, and brooding" about the inherent tragedies of human life and history. In Lincoln's words, the Almighty has his own purposes and we do not and cannot always know them. The book's subtitle, *The Grace of Self-Doubt*, underscores the danger of believers thinking they can always know, and sometimes with great certitude, what God is doing in our world.

The volume illustrates the perceptive analysis, deep and broad knowledge, and the use of types to construct and clarify the map of what is happening that has made G. such a respected figure in Christian ethics. Theologians, other academics, and inquiring believers will find much to ponder in this book.

*Southern Methodist University, Dallas*  
CHARLES E. CURRAN


Bretzke's work is an invaluable addition to the introductory textbooks in Christian ethics. Its unique contribution is its focus on developing a holistic Christian ethical method and the casuistic, pastoral application of that method to concrete moral issues. His use of the "Wesleyan Quadrilateral"—rational reflection on the normatively human (reason), human experience, Scripture, and tradition—as the point of departure for his methodological discussion as well as his inclusion of Protestant ethicists and biblical scholars demonstrate an ecumenical scope that the phrase "moral theology" in the book's subtitle does not fully reflect.

B. divides the four sources of moral knowledge into two axes. The "rational claim" axis, reason and human experience, explains natural law (chap. 2). Exploring the Catholic natural law tradition, and addressing concerns with historical and contemporary formulations of natural law voiced by Protestant ethicists and Pope John Paul II's *Veritatis splendor*, B. develops an objectivist and universalist "Natural Law Draft Blueprint." In this blueprint, the ontological and epistemological dimensions of natural law are defined, and their interrelationship explained, in terms of the human person and human fulfillment considered individually and in community. While the treatment of natural law and its normative claims is thorough and informed, inclusion of perspectives from various social sciences
and a method of incorporating them into the rational claim axis could generate reflections on the tension between the universality and particularity of natural law.

The "sacred claim" axis, Scripture and tradition, proposes a "Multi-Strand Double Helix" hermeneutical model to interpret Scripture (chap. 3). One helix represents individual life experiences and community traditions; the other represents multiple biblical texts, forms, genres, and theologies. Scriptural hermeneutics is an ongoing and living dialectic between these helixes and the strands of human knowledge, understanding, and values which shapes and is interpreted by the individual and community in dialogue. Scripture is the main focus in B.'s presentation; tradition is treated more indirectly.

The account of the axes' intersection in conscience (chap. 4) is insightful and moves beyond the traditional objective (external) and subjective (internal) realms of moral theology to the objective and subjective poles within conscience and the human person. B. alleviates some of the fears of subjectivism and relativism that might accompany such a move by providing extensive and coherent guidelines for the formation and operation of conscience—the "spiral of conscience based moral living"—in objective norms.

The selection, rejection, (re)interpretation, relationship between, and prioritization of the sources of moral knowledge distinguish "modes of moral discourse" (chap. 5) or ethical method—whether Catholic, Protestant, or philosophical—from one another. B.'s method posits Jesus Christ as, for Christians, the norma normans non normata, the "organizing concept" and foundational relationship upon which the sources of moral knowledge must be interpreted and prioritized. However, one must be careful to maintain a dialectic among the sources, lest one source be given too much authority at the expense of the insights of other sources—as has happened in overstressing tradition and "magisterial positivism."

While B. recognizes a plurality of methods based on the interrelationship between the four sources of moral knowledge, he prioritizes the sacred claim axis reflected in the faith ethics school over the rational claim axis reflected in the autonomy ethics school since "in some essential way our faith does make a critical difference in our ethics" (158). One can discern an ongoing tension in the text between striving towards common ground or universality in ethics while asserting the particularity of a lived Christian faith and its impact on moral judgments. What might account, at least in part, for this tension are appeals to different areas of moral discourse. Autonomy ethics focuses on ethical theory and on developing a comprehensive, universal method; faith ethics focuses on the moral judgments of individuals in community through the internalization, development, and manifestation of a lived and living faith. In an ethical method that seeks common ground with both Christian and non-Christian ethical methods, the rational claim axis should predominate. In the particularity of a lived faith in community and personal moral judgments, the sacred claim axis should predominate.
The two final chapters, “Casuistry with a Human Face” and “Sin and Failure in a Morally Complex World” (chaps. 6 and 7) provide pastoral guidelines and specific examples to flesh out the skeleton of ethical method.

B.’s diagrams, clear style, examples, glossary, and overall pastoral approach make the book an ideal text for undergraduates and study groups on Christian ethics. It also provides direction for specialists to further explore and develop questions of ethical method as they face the ever growing challenges of a morally complex world.

Creighton University, Omaha

Todd A. Salzman


This collection of eleven essays by leading scholars, an expansion of a 2001 research colloquy at Garrett Theological Seminary, examines many religious and ethical questions in the stem cell and cloning debates. In her essay, “Freedoms, Duties, and Limits,” Laurie Zoloth identifies with admirable clarity many of the deepest concerns of the volume: “embryonic stem cell research reawakens some core debates about ourselves, debates about who we are and what we are intended to do, core debates about the nature of the self and the duty to the other, the creature that is humanity and our frail creaturely being, and the vastness of our power and hence our responsibilities” (142).

The book is organized into three parts (Frameworks, Embryos, and Research) and weaves together timely analyses of vastly complex scientific discussions of present and potential therapeutic practice. Some subjects considered are: questions of definition of the human embryo and its moral status, the creation of embryos for biomedical research, debates about the destruction of human embryos in harvesting stem cells for biomedical research, theological and anthropological groundings for embryonic dignity, therapeutic and reproductive cloning, embryo creation by somatic cell nuclear transfer, the increasing convergence of in vitro fertilization technologies with stem cell and cloning research practices, legal and economic questions, and possible future medical therapies.

The volume highlights the search for a deeper moral understanding of the human embryo and examines public policy questions in the stem cell and cloning debates. In “The Ethics of Human Stem Cell Research,” Gene Outka explores the potential human capabilities and the serious dangers in stem cell research. He carefully analyzes political and legal contexts and considers the fundamental moral status of human embryos and fetuses. Applying the “nothing is lost” principle to debates about the use of human
embryos in stem cell research, O. proposes that it is possible to distinguish between creating embryos for research and employing them in “the tangled aftermath of in vitro fertilization as a practice in our culture” (56). His analysis leads him to “regard employment of discarded embryos for research as morally tolerable, and no more” (59). He helpfully points to the increasingly close relationship between human reproductive technologies and the ethically contested use of human embryos in stem cell research and cloning procedures.

Brent Waters in “Does the Human Embryo Have a Moral Status?” examines questions of ontological standing, intrinsic value, parenthood, whether or not embryos may be included in a neighborly-love ethic, and how embryonic status is adequately understood and protected in a time when many grieve “the loss of a procreative context” (72). W. argues for “proposed thresholds within the laboratory” that could afford “embryos some minimal protection from the most grievous exploitation” (72–73).

Ted Peters and Gaymon Bennett in “A Plea for Beneficence: Reframing the Embryo Debate,” engagingly argue that the potential good to be achieved through human embryonic research warrants a larger place in the moral debates. P. and B. support stem cell research and cloning for research purposes in the service of healing and observe that “theologically informed beneficence reframes bioethics” (125). Their argument appeals to “an eschatologically informed theological anthropology” (126), but they do not adequately substantiate this warrant, nor do they sufficiently address fundamental questions of human dignity in these procedures.

In “Human Embryonic Stem Cell Research: Ethics in the Face of Uncertainty,” Kevin Fitzgerald carefully studies meanings of the term “embryo” and considers how differing scientific understandings of the human embryo may be related to uncertainties about the meanings of human nature itself. He also offers astute observations on social questions concerning human embryo research in the light of greatly stressed health care systems.

Its focus on the human embryo distinguishes this book from other studies that attempt to address too many issues under the same cover. The editors succeed well in bringing religious and moral views into creative dialogue. The essays are accessible, clearly written, and well referenced. The appendixes present nine official statements and documents of religious communities, as well as “Human Cloning and Human Dignity: An Ethical Inquiry,” the 2002 statement from The President’s Council on Bioethics. Careful readers may notice a few minor text editing errors (e.g., 45) and some repetition, as individual authors provide similar descriptive background in scientific discussions. This fine collection deserves to be warmly welcomed by bioethicists, scholars, graduate students, advanced undergraduate students, and others who wish to reflect on the pressing scientific and moral questions posed by these new technologies.

Fairfield University, Conn.  
Francis T. Hannafey, S.J.
Schweiker’s latest work is an ambitious endeavor to wrestle traditional theological ethics into a globalized world. The book’s greatest strength, its method, is also its greatest weakness. S. admits, “The method of this book is hardly a linear path.” Indeed he weaves several common themes like threads through a fabric. His rationale for this approach is twofold: globalization requires one to engage “complex and interacting dimensions of reality” and to combat “the banishment of religious resources from ethics” (xix).

Those who prefer a systematic argument will be frustrated. The coherence and fruitfulness of S.’s approach, however, becomes apparent as one delves deeper. Those looking for pragmatic conclusions or ethical norms will be equally frustrated. S. offers no practical solutions to global challenges (such as poverty and environmental degradation); instead he prosecutes his wide-ranging approach in a series of loosely related chapters, leaving the concrete implications of his method to the reader. S. moves global ethics beyond the applied and normative levels to the deeper realm of moral foundations. In fact, the closest S. comes to an ethical norm is the ambiguous imperative, “in all actions and relations respect and enhance life” (37). Written on the meta-ethical plane, the work is best characterized as a post-postmodern ethic, as it rejects the secularization of moral philosophy in favor of a thoroughly theological and fully humane ethic, precisely because it is our transcendent capabilities that make us human.

Organizing his study around two major themes (the time of many worlds and theological humanism), S. draws on a host of sources (Scripture, mythology, literature, film) to argue that globalization requires dialogue between religious and secular narratives in order to protect the integrity of human life and safeguard humankind from globalization’s deadening effects. The opening chapter purports to be a description of globalization, but it fails to address the reality of globalization in geopolitical, economic, or socio-cultural terms. Nevertheless, S. draws on his strength as a theological ethicist to argue that the pernicious effects of globalization can be blunted by embracing creation mythologies as a source for global ethics. He expands this understanding with treatises on greed (chap. 3), on the relationship between pluralism, tolerance, and forgiveness (chaps. 2 and 6), and on concepts of time and how they relate to ethics (chaps. 4–6).

The treatment of theological humanism is brilliant. S. describes the contemporary situation as wrought by “moral madness” (i.e., marked by relativism and religious fundamentalism) and “overhumanization,” which is characterized by “a loss of a sense of human transcendence” (12), the suffocating power of technology, and the “ideology and social condition in which maximizing power becomes a good in itself” (202). As antidote, S. offers theological humanism which, like all forms of humanism, is concerned about human well-being, freedom, and the capacity for self-
development. But unlike secular humanism, theological humanism understands human well-being to include the ability to establish a relationship with "the divine or sacred as the source and scope of goodness" (202) and insists on the role of conscience as intrinsic to human flourishing. S. argues that conscience and responsibility are essential to theological humanism (chaps. 7–9). For him, conscience is neither simple self-authenticity, nor "the psychic tribunal where one stands nakedly before a divine judge" (147), but the capacity to discern responsibility in complex situations.

Theological humanism, like secular humanism, accepts the claim that as social animals, we form our identity through relationships. But unlike secular humanism, it rejects mere "lateral transcendence" (i.e., merely being in relation with other humans), in favor of a more expansive understanding of human identity as being in relation with others and with God. For S., secular humanism actually contributes to the process of overhumanization precisely because it denies the ultimate ground of human existence and reduces human value to the purely anthropocentric realm.

Like so many explorations of global ethics, S. writes from a First World perspective and for an academic audience. Although he shows deep sympathy for the plight of the Two-Thirds World, the voice and insight of the world’s poor is missing from his analysis. Adding their voice, narratives, and metaphors could only enrich this significant contribution to the ethics of globalization. S. has advanced this field beyond the prescriptive and proscriptive level. He models a methodology for a thoroughly religious global ethic that can function in a pluralistic setting. While the method is not yet fully formed, S. provides a sorely needed theoretical foundation.

Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio

MARK J. ALLMAN


These previously published essays (with the exception of the concluding one) bring together nearly 15 years of thought on the public role of religion by David Hollenbach, a preeminent scholar in this field. This compilation provides a valuable resource for a broad readership, which probably does not have ready access to the individual articles. In addition, the reader experiences a mutual dialogue among the various essays that situates specific topics within the larger context of the collection. Along the way, H. reviews the literature from recent decades as well as presents his typically excellent analysis, synthesis, and critique of essential scholarship in the field. Most importantly the reader encounters those themes and arguments that define H.'s significant contribution to the study of religion and the political life. The volume is organized around three areas: (1) Fundamental Matters (faith, reason, historicity, universals, virtues), (2) The Church in American Public Life (religion, morality, political engagement, truth, freedom), and (3) Global Issues (economics, development, human rights).
At least three characteristic contributions surface in this volume. First, H. shows himself thoroughly Catholic in his approach. The Catholic life entails ongoing interaction of biblical faith (including tradition) with intellectual inquiry (reason). Faith, then, is a process of reason-driven development because the God of our absolute trust is engaged in human history. In this framework, moral universals are outcomes of this continuing inquiry and dialogue, that is, they result from a faith project. For H., the Cross provides the possibility of social ethics for our pluralistic world, for the Cross "calls us to open our eyes to the suffering of the world today, draws us into solidarity with those who suffer, and leads to action to alleviate this suffering and overcome its causes" (67). In addition, the Catholic tradition provides vision, symbols, and imagination for public discourse.

Second, H. retrieves and revitalizes foundational concepts and values of the Catholic social ethical tradition. Solidarity engages other persons and cultures as partners in the mutual effort to discover how to live together well (48). Religious freedom entails not only freedom from the coercion of an established religion, but also the positive empowerment to influence public culture through participation in the political sphere (14, 143). Rooted in human sociality and the nature of political society, subsidiarity not only emphasizes decision-making at local levels, but also the creation of social conditions so that the various midlevel institutions can exercise initiative and creativity (210). Humility is an embrace of equality that refrains from arrogance and domination in relationships (46), particularly in seeking a consensus on values that shape public life. Human rights inadequately address contemporary issues unless the rights are grounded in the social nature of the human person, rather than in individualism, and include the satisfaction of basic human needs that are usually termed socio-economic rights alongside civil-political rights (chap. 11). Human dignity requires a community that fosters personal initiative and social solidarity (15). The right to private property can no longer refer only to land and natural resources. Technological knowledge, creativity, and intellectual property rights must also serve the needs of all people (universal destination of goods, 204). This process of retrieval and revitalization is vintage H.

Third, H. draws on a full range of the social and human sciences to explore and articulate the properly public dimension of faith. Appealing to the distinction between state and culture/public society as well as to the differentiation (not separation) between religious and secular spheres, H. argues that the public or cultural sphere is the place for direct religious influence. Religious freedom requires such active engagement in the pursuit of truth and common values, while adhering to the norms of public discourse (epistemological humility and intellectual solidarity). H. argues that the very presence of religion as an intermediary institution in the public sphere both resists efforts to exclude religious voices and supports the freedom and rights of all persons against domination by the state or economic sphere. Furthermore, religion offers an alternative vision and imagination (165), symbols, values, ideas, and convictions (182) that resist the hegemony of the dominant world view. In this era when the networks
of relationships (social capital) are becoming depleted in White middle class America, religious congregations also provide valuable resources for developing skills, gathering diverse persons together, and mobilizing action (181). All of these contribute to healthy public life.

Loyola University, Chicago

MARY ELSBERND, O.S.F.


After an introductory chapter outlining major philosophical and religious approaches to environmental ethics, Christine Gudorf and James Huchingson present twelve case studies: the Everglades, persistent organic pollutants, endangered ecosystems, nature preserves, nuclear waste disposal, ecosystem restoration, degraded coral reefs, hydropower, desertification, genetically modified foods, hunting, and xenotransplants. Each study begins with a fictional conversation among several participants, who typically represent widely divergent views and interests. G.’s and H.’s subsequent commentary then sharpens the discussion and provides the conceptual background and empirical information relevant to the respective case. Each chapter includes discussion questions and a supplementary bibliography. The appendix offers various pedagogical techniques for using case analyses in the classroom and discusses common obstacles to the case method approach.

The strengths of the book are many. Much to their credit, G. and H. do not shy away from the complexity that often characterizes environmental issues and cases, and they admirably give voice to the diverse interests, proposals, moral values, and concerns of people affected by environmental decision making. This inclusive representation is especially evident in the conversations at the beginning of each chapter. None of them seems contrived, oversimplified, or formulated to bolster a previously held position. The commentaries on each case helpfully offer a sustained and rigorous analysis of the topic under consideration, and the choice of topics is broad enough to provide a good overview of the state of the discipline of environmental ethics.

I have one main reservation. There is a certain inconclusiveness in G.’s and H.’s normative ethical analysis, that in many instances results in case studies ending without any practical moral judgments being made. In a few chapters, the authors’ position can be readily inferred from the tone or substance of their comments, but in most chapters a reader could easily be left wondering how the respective case ought to be decided. This indecisiveness might actually be beneficial at times, since the complexity of many cases might not readily lead to an unambiguous practical moral judgment. Yet it can also leave readers with few resources to understand how competing claims ought to be concretely adjudicated. My Christian environmental ethics students, who read several chapters of this book, experienced
this very problem. They understood well the environmental implications of particular policies, the benefits and drawbacks of certain positions, and the reasons for and against these positions, but they often had difficulty deciding how the cases ought to be resolved and articulating the normative moral criteria applicable to each case.

Those with an interest in matters theological or religious might also wish for a more extensive and explicit treatment of these topics than is found in this book. Chapter one devotes a section to religion, and a few of the case studies mention religious perspectives, but one finds nothing approaching sustained attention to religion or theology. I mention this not as a criticism—the book seems more at home in the arena of philosophical ethics, and the authors are appealing to a very broad readership—but only to note that those seeking to understand how religious or theological considerations affect environmental thought will need to look elsewhere.

Despite this reservation and limitation, *Boundaries* deserves high marks in a number of categories. It covers important issues that will become ever more pressing in the future. It is clearly written, and the exposition of complex moral concepts and positions is intelligible to the nonspecialist. It presents a wealth of empirical data on a number of environmental issues, while consistently showing why the data are relevant. Its case method approach is highly needed in a field that has been driven largely by theoretical concerns. Overall, this is one of the better casebooks on environmental ethics and is a good choice for an upper level college course. The book will be helpful to anyone looking for an accessible port of entry to the field of environmental ethics.

*Villanova University, Penn.*

MARK GRAHAM


The problems of Africa are as numerous as they are daunting: warfare within and between nations, economic underdevelopment and massive impoverishment, health crises aggravated by crumbling social infrastructures, environmental degradation, human rights abuses, and endemic corruption that sorely weaken civil society. This important book by an up-and-coming African theologian goes beyond a mere cataloguing of social problems; it attempts to search out and identify root causes and to suggest the philosophical and theological underpinnings of renewed social structures that will be apt at establishing and advancing the common good.

Despite best efforts by the current generation of African thinkers to join fundamental notions of human rights and thick conceptions of the common good, Tarimo finds that there is a link missing between personal rights and social obligations in contemporary sub-Saharan Africa. Imported Western notions of human rights fail to take root in African soil because academics and practitioners do not adequately take into account fundamental African
cultural differences with the West, especially concerning notions of the human person and of human community. Nor do many policy makers appreciate the potential of religion in general and Catholic Christianity in particular to bridge this gap.

T. engages his study with tenacity and rigor. In conversation with Western thinkers whose work often sets the terms of the debate about human rights and civil society, T. points out essential weaknesses in African appropriations of human rights discourse over the past 30 years, underlining Western thought’s general failure to inspire a crossover in Africa from theory to praxis. Liberal theories of rights, with their emphasis on the unencumbered individual, do not mesh with African notions of communitarian humanism. Cultural studies to unearth a genuinely African social character by such scholars as Kwasi Wiredu and Francis Deng have indeed discovered the deep roots of respect for, and articulation of, human rights in traditional African cultures, but these scholars have yet to demonstrate how to incorporate old customs into modern institutions. Charting a course between Westernization and traditionalism, T. finds promise in Catholic social doctrine, but only to the extent that this tradition can be read from within varied, dynamic, and battered African historical and cultural realities.

T. seeks solutions to Africa’s most vexing social problems by a constructive and critical borrowing from other parts of the world. “We must continually move back and forth in interactive dialogue with other cultures, taking into account the backgrounds of particular cultures and societies, and go beyond our own particular self-interests” (34). In the thinking of liberation theologians, among them Ignacio Ellacuria, T. finds the most helpful methodology for the construction of a connection between rights and duties: the historicization of human rights (71). Unhistoricized human rights discourse tends toward a mystification and an ideologization of abstract concepts, a process used by the powerful to vitiate the transformative power of human praxis for justice. Only by interrupting the discourse of the elites can the poor hope to interpret and defend their own rights as human beings in community. Dangerous as this may be, it is only by such costly grace that salvation in history is born (84, quoting Jean-Marc Ela). Yet the poor are not called to vanquish the rich—this failed pattern has led Africa down many sad paths.

The heart of the book is T.’s discussion of social reconciliation. Beyond revenge or punishment, reconciliation, rooted in a truly religious decision to forgive one’s enemy and thereby to transform him into a friend, is seen as Africa’s best hope for social progress. “Forgiveness can overcome pain, go beyond legal justice, and empower victims...humanizing [them] and breaking the vicious cycle of counter-violence” (106).

However, forgiveness is a religious rather than a political virtue, and here is where religion in general and Catholicism in particular can best serve Africa, for religion’s task is “to play a public role by being prophetic, to inform public conscience, to denounce injustice, and to call for self-examination and reform” (139). All of these measures precede and support
a humble human spirit that presupposes the goodness of every person and seeks to reform every culture according to the universal human capacity to envision the good and to work together toward that ideal horizon.

This book is a fine introduction to an impressive body of African theology. It is appropriate both for intercultural and systematic explorations of ethics and public theology at the advanced undergraduate and graduate levels.

Santa Clara University

Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.


This volume originated as a 1991 commission from the Center for the Study of Religion and American Culture at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. Funded by a Lilly Grant, the work was part of a series exploring "Public Expressions of Religion in America." Stephen Marini is a historian of American religions and self-professed "lifelong performer of sacred music" (ix). In the introduction he admits the daunting nature of the task, not only because the topic is immense, but also because it required his acquisition of new research techniques and pushed him outside his ordinary métier, "early American Protestantism" (ix).

Three major concerns fuel M.'s inquiry in his acoustic trek across the United States: (a) the definition of sacred song, (b) the meanings and functions of sacred song in representative religious communities, and (c) the contribution of this inquiry to a larger understanding of religious culture (2).

Halfway through his study M. provides the best overview and rationale for the book's design (163). Part 1 examines sacred song in "America's most enduring religious traditions." These include the sacred-song traditions of Native America, the Hispanic Southwest, Sacred Harp singing, the Black Church, and the Jewish Music Revival. While these are immense topics, happily within each chapter M. offers something of a case study providing some focus to each. Thus when considering the Hispanic Southwest, he gives considerable attention to El Santuario de Chimayo in New Mexico, while the chapter on Black Church song richly describes Chicago's Apostolic Church of God.

In part 2 M. turns his attention to sacred song in religious communities and movements that flourished during the last decades of the 20th century. This unusually diverse collection of chapters addresses topics ranging from New Age, Wiccans, and Neo-Pagans to the Mormon Tabernacle Choir.

Even for those conversant with the subject of sacred music, the book is an eye-opener. Chapter 7, "Contested Praise: a Tale of Two Hymnals," for example, is a fascinating stereoscopic consideration of how the Southern Baptist Convention's Baptist Hymnal (1991) and the United Church of Christ's New Century Hymnal (1995) were produced. Specifically, M.
weighs the impact of the inclusive language controversy on these processes. Leadership that shaped the Baptist Hymnal was guided by a principle of "infradenominational inclusivity," attempting to model the unity of the Church and accessibility of the hymnal in the midst of growing diversity. The UCC hymnal committee, however, saw their hymnal as a vehicle for changing denominational thinking. This was achieved by pursuing an aggressive policy of inclusivity—for example, rejecting "Lord" as an unacceptable gender-based metaphor for God and Jesus (197), a position challenged and ultimately overturned by the General Synod of 1993. This balanced, well-written chapter serves M.'s interests and provides an enlightened look at religious culture through a broad musical lens.

In his conclusions M. attempts a thoughtful analysis of this very diverse material by considering the case studies in part 2 as "a set of unlikely pairings" (324). Thus he considers the music of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir together with that of John Michael Talbot, whom he considers "the most popular Catholic sacred-music artist in America" (240). Both, according to M., illustrate the power of media exposure and the performance of popular music repertory to generate financial and cultural support for what he calls "experimental religious communities" (325).

Descriptively rich, the volume is not as successful analytically. Noting the essential role of "language" when defining sacred song (6), for example, M. devotes a chapter to new age instrumental artists who prize tone over text (168) without apparent contradiction. While convinced of the centrality of ritual for defining sacred song (7), M.'s ritual theory is unfortunately anchored in the 1969 work of Victor Turner without any nod to the raft of scholarship that has followed and often critiqued Turner. Even M.'s taxonomy is illusive—for example, there is no clear distinction between "sacred" and "religious" which often appear as synonyms. There are numerous factual errors, for example, confusing thurifer for aspergil (48), maintaining that Francis's rule of 1223 included a provision for the Third Order (60), asserting that Pythagoras named a mode after the Lesbian people of ancient Greece (176), confusing Richard Gelineau for Joseph Gelineau (246), misquoting the dates of Vatican II (1961–1964 rather than 1962–1965) (249).

M.'s book is a treasure of case studies, wonderfully suited for considering sacred music in the United States (not "America"), and useful for pondering what such music contributes to understanding U.S. culture. The nature and role of sacred music in this culture, however, needs further exploration, a clearer taxonomy, and more rigorous analysis.

Chicago Theological Union

EDWARD FOLEY, O.F.M. CAP.


Dupré's magisterial Passage to Modernity (1993) examined the humanist, scientific, philosophical, and theological thinkers of the mid-15th to the
mid-17th centuries, figures who set the stage for the culture of modernity, as they dealt with emerging fissures in an inherited intellectual and imaginative unity among humanity, the cosmos, and God. In this new work, D. treats the Enlightenment as "the second wave of modernity" (3), placing it within a chronological frame from the Peace of Westphalia to the French Revolution. As in the previous study, he carefully differentiates the thought of each figure under consideration as a vector within the broad trajectory of the intellectual features typically identified as "modern." This approach allows him to locate cross- and countercurrents that make the Enlightenment considerably more variegated than often presented by its more vociferous contemporary critics. While D. offers his own pointed criticisms both of particular positions historically espoused in the name of enlightenment and of aspects of contemporary culture shaped by appropriations (and misappropriations) of the intellectual and social heritage of the Enlightenment, he also affirms its significant accomplishments: "an expressive conception of art, a nonauthoritarian view of morality, political theories that build freedom and democracy within the very structures of society" (338). He judges its "painful" critique of religion as both "necessary and overdue," concluding that “[i]n the end religion benefited from it. It forced the religious community to seek the proper domain of religion in symbols of transcendence rather than in science, and compelled it to begin a search for the kind of spiritual depth needed to live in accordance with this insight" (339).

Central to D.’s interpretation is an account of the transformation effected in “the principle of rationality that lies at the core of the Enlightenment project” (16) and the attendant dialectical struggle over the nature of reason that constituted “the crisis of the Enlightenment” (12–17). Reason was no longer construed on the Greek model of “an ordering principle inherent in reality” but as a power that “submitted all reality to the structures of the mind” (16). In consequence the subject became “the sole source of meaning” (17) and reason was instrumentalized. In D.’s account, moreover, resistance to this transformation by figures such as Herder, Shaftsbury, Rousseau, and Fenelon is not considered a “counter-Enlightenment” but a countercurrent internal to the overall direction of the Enlightenment. This view intersects with D.’s analyses in Passage to Modernity of earlier shifts that took place in the construal of humanity’s relationships to God, the cosmos, and culture. Even though D. finds “no direct causal succession [that] links the humanism of the fifteenth century with the Enlightenment” (xi), he considers that first wave of modernity to be part of a “search [that the Enlightenment concluded] for a new cultural synthesis begun at the end of the Middle Ages when the traditional cosmological, anthropological, and theological one had disintegrated” (1).

D. devotes individual chapters to key elements that entered into the synthesis the Enlightenment sought to construct. These include a cosmos that science conceived as “self-empowered” (43); concepts of self fissured between “the self as subject of meaning and the self as substantial reality” (75), neither of which was able “to preserve genuine otherness” (76); an
understanding of art which, as expression displaced imitation as the central model, "played an essential part in moving aesthetic theory in a symbolic direction" (111); and a tension between the universal and the particular that played itself out in the moral realm "by redefining the very notion of ethics" (145), in political thought by "granting the idea of individual freedom a primary position in its theories" (185), and in historical writing by an ideal of a universal history of humanity that sat uneasily with a recognition of the irreducible particularity of nations and cultures. The final three chapters deal with religion—an allocation of space that both reflects D.'s judgment that "[t]he impact of the Enlightenment was undoubtedly felt most deeply in the area of religion, either as loss or as liberation" (229) and allows him to articulate the complexity of various ways Enlightenment thinkers critically and constructively engaged religion. These chapters offer much of substance for theological consideration of religious subjectivity, symbol, analogy, and the relation of religion and culture.

The topical organization D. employs to cover Enlightenment thought sometimes results in obscuring the connections that link each element to his larger interpretive theses about the intellectual dynamics of this "second wave of modernity" and his affirmation that "the Enlightenment, though flawed and one-sided, accomplished an indispensable task in the development of Western thought" (338). There are a few misprints (116, 150, 275), and Samuel Richardson is once misidentified as Herbert Richardson (57). Though this work lacks the extraordinary intellectual crispness of Passage to Modernity, it is not an unworthy sequel.
SHORTER NOTICES


The central section gives an informative rundown on the recent trend to replace “biblical history” with “archaeology-based history,” including earliest Dever himself. But first, pp. 2-74 respectfully dissent from the excessive Albright influence, dismissing other “devout Christians.” Apparently D. nowhere focuses recent studies of the transit from oral to literary cultures, especially in the varied writing down of data known only from oral transmission through centuries. Not mentioned is the plausible view that the experience of one or some tribes was adopted as a symbol of later union. The “archaeological harvest” of the history of Egypt and Assyria to be emulated for Syria-Palestina consists of massive literary histories preserved entire, along with the Rosetta and Behistun keys to their decipherment; while the “hundreds” of Palestine epigraphs are mostly names in small transactions. (The Amarna “Letters from Canaan” [170] and “Merneptah’s ‘Israel’” [201] are in fact from Egypt and its real history.)

Three chapters summarizing “facts on the ground” update us on recent Israeli excavations and surveys. Parallel columns show not how domestic and economic facts support the biblical view, but how they are supported by it. Moreover in drawings by the excavators—Masos (79); Izbet Sartah (81)—the “facts on the ground” are imaginatively completed to form circles of defense like the covered wagons of pioneer U.S. West, but in focusing the parts actually discovered one might plausibly take them to be two jagged lines of a pioneer Main Street.

Frankly polemic are pp. 129-51 on efforts culminating in the demand for a new history of Palestine from artifacts alone; then comes Israel Finkelstein’s and D.’s own synthesis (153-89). A final chapter on “ethnicity” justifies Israel’s claim to reoccupy the territory thus named at least since Merneptah, not stressing the earlier-mentioned “politicized” demand for a dug-up history of the Palestinians (the Philistine southwest corner gave the name only in Roman times).

D. defensively claims to be “dead-center objective” in this hurly-burly of pious and wild claims. But arguably most biblical scholars learned about the trend to “archeology-based history” chiefly from his enthusiastic accounts; despite or because of this book D. may well continue to be regarded as protagonist rather than simple reporter.

ROBERT NORTH, S.J.
Marquette University, Milwaukee (retired)


Mills frames her study of Ecclesiastes between a preamble on “the exercise of biblical imagination” (chap. 1) and a sequel on “the art of biblical imagination” (chap. 12). Imagination is intrinsic to any appreciation of literature.

M. first and foremost applies a literary method that includes both recognition and appreciation of the role of literature with respect to culture—the cultures in which a text is produced and then read. Her goal is to examine Ecclesiastes as cultural criticism (Part III). To that end, she examines how narrative fiction in general functions as social commentary, how a narrative’s narrator is him- or herself a character within the fiction, and how a story functions as social discourse (Part I). While M. gives occasional examples from Ecclesiastes in Part I, its main focus is narrative criticism in general. Part II investigates the relationship between narrative and culture, in that the reader explores the social world of the text within the context of his or her own social world. Finally, M. turns her attention to Ecclesiastes,
demonstrating how the narrator's autobiography unfolds within the text, and how this creation of his self in words provides a commentary not only for the ancient social world but also for the social world of the reader. She concludes that Ecclesiastes provides religio-cultural boundaries, serves as a critique of commonly held religious values, and supports religio-cultural alterity.

While the application of other methodologies to Ecclesiastes may yield valuable conclusions, M.'s methodological approach engages the reader in interpretation that establishes the value of the biblical book for its own culture as well as for intermediate and even contemporary cultures.

ALICE L. LAFFEY


Das's book follows his earlier Paul, the Law, and the Covenant (2001). Like the first book, it deals with Paul's understanding of the Law but focuses more on the Jews in God's offer of salvation through Jesus Christ.

D. investigates Galatians and Romans in the wake of E. P. Sanders's Paul and Palestinian Judaism (1977) which called for a more sympathetic, less-“Lutheran” understanding of Judaism of the first century a.d. The Judaism of Paul's time was not a religion of works righteousness, but included God's mercy and grace. The Law never provided salvation by itself or identified those who would be saved. D. points out, however, that even this understanding is insufficient apart from Christ. For Paul, the overarching framework of salvation is Christ, Abraham's seed.

In Galatians, according to D., Paul is dealing with Jewish Christians, not with the non-Christian Jews, although his rhetoric may at times suggest the latter. Paul is not against the Jews as such, or against the Law as such. His polemic is an inter-Christian dispute. He is, however, against imposing the Law on the Gentile Christians. According to him, it is faith in Christ that saves.

In Romans Paul is struggling against the Gentile Roman community, warning it that God's promise to the chosen people still holds true. The Gentile Church did not completely replace the promises given to Israel. Christianity must therefore not abandon its Jewish roots and must continually return to them. The Law is still binding, as Paul's exhortations indicate.

The book is a welcome correction to J. D. G. Dunn, although D.'s assessment of the Roman situation is rather tenuous. He did not resolve the tension between the Law and the Holy Spirit. Stanislas Lyonnet has some 40 years ago given a deeper understanding of this issue.

JOSEPH PLEVNIK, S.J.
Regis College, University of Toronto


The book says “yes” to the question posed by the title, but not all readers will be convinced. The question itself is reasonable enough, for Greco-Roman culture did practice literary mimesis: imitation of classical exempla was fundamental to Hellenistic education, and if there is a New Testament writing where dependence on Homer would most likely be found, it would surely be in the second volume of Luke-Acts, where the author, largely free of the constraints of prior gospel compositions, was able to shape his narrative according to whatever models lay to hand.

After an extended introduction states his thesis and lays out his criteria for determining literary imitation (1–15), MacDonald considers four passages of Acts in comparison with four passages of Homer's Iliad: the visions of Cornelius and Peter and Iliad 7 (19–67); Paul's farewell at Miletus and Iliad 6 (69–102); the selection of Matthias and Iliad 7 (105–19); Peter's escape from prison and Iliad 24 (123–45). A succinct
conclusion, "Yes, Acts does imitate Homer!" (146–51) is followed by a very helpful display of Greek and Latin parallels (153–65), ample notes (167–207), and a bibliography useful for any student wishing to investigate the New Testament in the light of Greek literature (209–19).

But does M. actually demonstrate Lukean literary dependence on Homer? The inherent difficulty facing M. is the fact that the influence of Homer had already helped shape the many literary constructions of the Hellenistic world that scholars already acknowledge as intertextual resources for Luke, and that these lay much nearer to hand than did the Homeric epics themselves. M. can claim the Iliad as part of the Hellenistic intertexture for interpreting Luke-Acts, but he fails to show that there is anything uniquely in Acts and Homer that can be explained only by literary imitation. The book fails to convince on its central point, and fails to suggest what difference it might make for any reader of Acts if its central point were correct.

LUKE TIMOTHY JOHNSON
Emory University, Atlanta


This first English translation of Augustine’s Commentary on Galatians is welcome not only for the translation (which soundings show to be accurate and to read well), but for the informative introduction. Plumer dates the work at 394/395, noting that it is Augustine’s only completed biblical commentary. Three commentaries on Galatians preceded Augustine’s: Victorinus’s (ca. 362), Ambrosiaster’s (between 366 and 384), and Jerome’s (ca. 384). P. sees Victorinus as the major influence on Augustine on the grounds of antecedent probability. Victorinus influenced Augustine personally (Confessions 8.2) and it is likely that he would have read his Galatians commentary in any case. Moreover, it is certain that Augustine read Jerome’s commentary (Epistolae 28. 3. 3) which criticized Victorinus’s interpretation of Galatians 2:11–14. Could Augustine “have rested content” having consulted Jerome but not Victorinus (20)? P.’s answer is definitely no. He points out several parallels between Victorinus and Augustine and goes on to give a great deal of attention to the exegetes’ reading of the Paul–Peter incident at Antioch which he sees as the most important (31). Both take Paul’s correction of Peter as read, dismissing Jerome’s pious lie theory. While the relation between the Law and grace is “the primary focus of attention” (60) in the commentary, Augustine is also intent on spiritual formation and uses the Antioch incident to point out that Peter’s humility is more grace-filled than Paul’s fraternal correction.

P. puts Augustine’s commentary primarily in the category of textual analysis rather than biblical theology. Augustine kept it simple out of pastoral concern for the Christian community. P. sees “striking parallels” (117) with the monastic Rule. He also finds evidence of both anti-Manichaean polemic (e.g., asserting free choice of the will, the explanation for the presence of evil in the world [63]), and anti-Donatist polemic (e.g., the catholicity and unity of the Church [68–69]). He concludes that “the Commentary furnishes a practical example of the theory of interpretation set forth in the De doctrina (120).

JOANNE MCWILLIAM
University of Toronto (emerita)


Burrus’s thesis is brilliant and important, though her style and discussion of critical theory can be (perhaps appropriately) overwhelming and hard to follow. From page one she challenges approaches to hagiography that dismiss ascetic desire as the sublimation of sexuality and a pathological hatred of the body. Although ascetic texts may not be impervious to such critiques, B. argues that the Lives of the Saints are not “anti-erotic” but manifest a
"counter-erotics" that tests the very meaning of "sexuality" both in studies of Christianity and in the "history of sexuality." The consequences of finding in early Christianity a distinctive *ars erotica* are fascinating and deeply destabilizing. Familiar constructions of "Christian morality" face significant challenge, as do scholarly presumptions. By reading Jerome’s *Life of Paul the Hermit* in the light of Leo Bersani’s psychoanalytic-literary theory, for instance, B. highlights in the text queer desire as much as sexual repression. Sublimation, which dislocates and defers the object of desire, does not become the unfortunate product of asceticism but falls within the condition of eros itself. By placing fourth- and fifth-century hagiographical writings of Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine, Sulpicius Severus et al. against theories of Michel Foucault, Geoffrey Harpham, Leo Bersani, Karmen MacKendrick, Lynda Hart, Anne McClintock, Jacques Derrida, Jean Baudrillard et al., B. opens categories for reading ascetic texts, and the results are startling.

The book is difficult to read, both because it is so drenched in mind-bending theory and because erotics itself treats a subject that resists containment. B.'s discussion will surely frustrate those who wish to pin down the Lives of Saints, their writers, and herself. Yet that is presumably her point. What may be particularly interesting to readers of this journal is what the ancient Christian "counter-erotics" tells us about God, who defies discursive delimitation yet remains the measure "of such a sublime erotic ambition" (15). B. suggests that to reckon with such a God is to reconsider the history of sexuality.

MICHAEL C. MCCARTHY, S.J.
Santa Clara University


This slim volume provides a needed introduction to a tradition sometimes overlooked in the history of Christian spirituality. As Chase points out, the twelfth-century Victorines were important for integrating strands of the inherited tradition with the new spiritual awakening and intellectual pursuits of their day. In particular, they were transmitters of the mystical theology of Pseudo-Dionysius, which affected virtually all subsequent medieval theology.

After a historical introduction, chapter 1 sketches the lives of the most important Victorines: Hugh, Richard, Thomas Gallus, and Achard. The rest of the book is arranged thematically around their contributions. Chapter 2 is particularly fine, clearly charting the Victorines’ creative ways of presenting the stages of spiritual growth. Chapter 3 on exegesis, treats “visual exegesis,” the Victorine technique of describing the life of virtue using architectural images such as Noah’s ark and the Ark of the Covenant as icons. Chapter 4 discusses the interrelationship between knowledge and love in contemplative journey; chapter 5 deals with mystical theology, and chapter 6, contemplation as a way of life. A final chapter summarizes the relevance of these authors for today’s spirituality.

The organization of the disparate material of these authors into a cohesive introduction is superb. In clearly exposing their ideas, C. uses their technique of “visual exegesis.” For example, the image of a set of mirrors reflecting each other’s content explains how the Victorines combined theology, liturgy, biblical study, tradition, spiritual experience, and contemplation into a unified whole, centered always on the imitation of Christ’s compassionate love.

Particularly important is C.’s presentation of the Victorines as integrating spirituality and theology. They found value in all learning: secular philosophy, the new Scholasticism, and the older monastic tradition. In fact, Victorine spirituality has strong foundations in doctrine, and Victorine exposition of doctrine has implications for contemplation and the imitation of Christ. Writers today who try to reunite these disciplines could learn much from the Victorines. Equally important for today is their integration of the active and contemplative life. C.’s appealing ac-
count of these intriguing writers inspires in the reader the desire to learn more—the goal of any introductory volume.

JOAN M. NUTH
John Carroll University, Cleveland


Michel Sales inquires into the dialectic between theology and anthropology primarily through two works by Henri de Lubac: Sur les chemins de Dieu (1953, E.T. Discovery of God) and Le mystère du surnaturel (1965, E.T. Mystery of the Supernatural). Chapters 1–3 treat the theophanous nature of the human spirit, the natural desire to see God, and negative theology as both theological discourse and mystical experience of the desire of God. Chapter 4, based on the thought of Gaston Fessard, reflects on the encounter with the historical Christ in the Church. Four appendices provide the redactional stages of Surnaturel, a brief essay on creation, a commentary on the word “surnaturel” and a hauntingly beautiful meditation by de Lubac on his act of faith in divine Love and his embrace of the dark night of the soul in the cross of Christ.

The structure of the spiritual creature introduces us, beyond the question whether God is, to the heart of the question of what God is. A human being has an idea of God that precedes all thematization, is not objectifiable, precedes all our concepts, and yet is always present in them. This evokes Rahner's idea of the Vorgriff of the unthematic and uncategorical horizon present within all human knowing, leading the reader to wonder whether S. has synthesized the thought of de Lubac and Rahner at this point.

This idea of God is not a concept or a product of our intelligence, but the spiritual image of Divinity. The natural desire to see God does not seek the knowledge of the first cause of the universal, but rather aspires mystically to see “the One himself” in his essence in order to adore him. This natural desire to see God is not an exigency, but the substantial seal of an ontological relationship between God and man. S. quotes de Lubac: “If there is in our nature a desire to see God, this is only because God wishes for us this supernatural end which consists in seeing him.” God places this desire—fundamentally his own call—in our nature.

S. successfully synthesizes mystical theology with the problematic of the supernatural finality of the human person within the gratuity of grace. The result is spiritually satisfying.

SUSAN K. WOOD
Saint John’s University, Collegeville


Boeve's excellent work offers a way to ensure that Christian discipleship and theology remain vital within a seemingly all-encompassing postmodern culture saturated by fragmentation and the hegemony of consumerism.

In a detraditionalized postmodern culture, the most significant task facing Christian churches is to counteract "the ineffectual transmission of the Christian tradition" and "guarantee the survival of the Christian narrative" (4). B. avoids both traditionalist/isolationist and overly-adaptive/relativist solutions by arguing four interlocking theses. First, in dialogue with its radically pluralist context, Christian tradition must undergo "recontextualization" without any reduction of its dogmatic claims. Second, even with the demise of modern "master" narratives, "narratives continue to be told" (61)—but today only "open" narratives (rather than the modern "closed," dominating narrative) are plausible: those that acknowledge irreducible otherness, recognize their limits, and witness to the interruptive truth of alterity through critical praxis.

In a detraditionalized postmodern culture, the most significant task facing Christian churches is to counteract "the ineffectual transmission of the Christian tradition" and "guarantee the survival of the Christian narrative" (4). B. avoids both traditionalist/isolationist and overly-adaptive/relativist solutions by arguing four interlocking theses. First, in dialogue with its radically pluralist context, Christian tradition must undergo "recontextualization" without any reduction of its dogmatic claims. Second, even with the demise of modern "master" narratives, "narratives continue to be told" (61)—but today only "open" narratives (rather than the modern "closed," dominating narrative) are plausible: those that acknowledge irreducible otherness, recognize their limits, and witness to the interruptive truth of alterity through critical praxis.

Third, since "the Christian narrative exists by grace of . . . experiences of alter-
ity,” allowing the believer to recognize “the elusive God who always beckons further” (106), recontextualized Christianity would have the inherent potential to be an open, life-affirming, credible narrative within postmodern culture (with the pre- and post-Easter Jesus, “God’s interrupter” [119], serving as warrant and model). Last, a recontextualized Christian narrative has the power to interrupt the hegemony of postmodern “marketization” by revealing the liberative power of the God of Jesus Christ. However, never again can Christianity claim to be the “master narrative” (149), since it remains challenged by God’s incomprehensible alterity, the limits of its own language and reflection (negative theology), and the presence of other religious narratives.

B.’s important argument is rooted in hermeneutical and liberation methods, but its sure-footed cultural analysis allows it to move beyond what those methods have accomplished.

Theologians must avoid bogging down in left (e.g., Rahner)-vs.-right (e.g., Balthasar) polemics and wrestle instead with the current cultural situation. One cannot close one’s eyes and pretend that postmodernity has not happened. B. offers a way to carry out the mandate of fides quaerens intellectum with eyes wide open.

ANTHONY J. GODZIEBA
Villanova University, Penn.


Hübner, retired Keil University philosopher and past president of the Allgemeine Gesellschaft für Philosophie in Deutschland, refuses to reduce the relationship among religions to a clash of civilizations, and likewise rejects a benign tolerance affirming all religious claims. In our fallen world, religious people on their own succeed only partially in constructing religions adequate to their real experiences of God; their honest but flawed efforts must be assessed by reason and in light of the revelation available to Christians. One must therefore construct a properly Christian tolerance based in respect, the rejection of violence and compulsion, and an acknowledgment of truth wherever found, while nonetheless remaining cognizant of serious differences and the rational and religious shortcomings of other traditions with respect to the Christian.

Working methodically to demonstrate this proper Christian tolerance, H. offers concise, selective analyses of themes in Hinduism, Buddhism, Chinese “Universismus” (perhaps, “a harmonious micro- and macro-cosmic interrelatedness”), Judaism, and Islam. He sketches key elements of each, such as myth and mysticism, metaphysical speculation, reasoning, morals and evil, all contributing to more or less complete religions metaphysically grounded and open to revelation. Each chapter ends with preliminary conclusions and comparisons with Christianity. A final chapter highlights common ground but focuses on real differences apparent in light of the fully adequate metaphysics, historical understanding, and revealed truth of Christianity. Thus, Hinduism and Buddhism, attractive features notwithstanding, are rooted in world views radically divergent from Christianity’s and cannot be accepted as accurate or reliable. Chinese traditions can be respected at least for their sense of universal interconnectedness. Judaism is revered as witnessing to the one God, although only Christianity makes this God’s work entirely clear. Attention to the Qur’an’s centuries-long redaction weakens Islam’s claim to revelation, while its emphasis on Arabic as essential to Qur’anic meaning diminishes its universality.

This candid, careful, and contrarian study is a solid contribution to the philosophy of religions, an old-fashioned yet bracing challenge to both irenic comparativists and clash-of-civilizations theorists. For so small a volume, however, the sweep is vast; the price of concision is H.’s choice to muffle the religions, employing his unchallenged philosophical framework to confirm judgments seemingly already known from the beginning.

FRANCIS X. CLOONEY, S.J.
Boston College

Although Ludwig Wittgenstein and analytic philosophers are presumed to be significant, few reflections on them and Christian theology by American Catholics have been written. American interest is drawn to ethics, ecclesiology, social justice, and various interfaces between culture and faith where logic is of minor assistance.

Klein’s book fashions a valuable dialogue (not just a comparison) between two representative thinkers in their considerations of philosophical motifs and religious implications. Wittgenstein emerges less as a questioner of language than as an explorer of personal milieus affecting life and understanding, and subsequently as a religious thinker. K. focuses on “world” in the five chapters on the Austrian thinker while the remaining three chapters reflect on how Karl Rahner uses motifs and directions similar to the thinking of Wittgenstein in a theology of the presence of God. “Wittgenstein and Rahner arrive at a fundamental concurrence. Meaning exists within the world, within language. . . . Wittgenstein might well say that meaning is incarnate within language; Rahner would insist that meaning bears a human face” (242).

The book pays too much attention to critics who are not so much questioning Rahner’s transcendental theology of grace as objecting to a Catholic mentality, and it could pursue further Rahner’s view of the lengthy history of grace as a world, and the observation that Jesus is said to have the human race for his world. Beyond these two remarks—alternatives rather than criticisms—this book is much more than an academic comparison, for here is a mature acquaintance with both thinkers. This original presentation indicates that K. is moving towards the composition of his own theological reflections, systematic and creative.

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


In this welcome contribution to ecological theology, Scott argues that the alienation of humanity from nature is not resolved by collapsing nature into the human (anthropocentrism), nor by collapsing the human into nature (biocentrism). Rather, both must be situated in relationship to the trinitarian God. S. proposes what he calls a common realm of God, nature, and humanity.

S. builds toward understanding of this common realm in the first, philosophical part of the book, by developing, in the style of Colin Gunton, a new set of transcendentals. His key transcendental is becoming, and related to it are three others: unity, sociality, and openness. Part 2 is an informative and critical review of the positions taken in deep ecology, ecofeminism, social ecology, and socialist ecology. S. is particularly critical of deep ecology, and most sympathetic to ecofeminism, but gathers elements from each of the four positions as contributions to his own political theology.

In the third and last part, S. works out his vision of the common realm of God, nature, and humanity by reference to Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. Reflection on the Resurrection opens out into a political theology of holistic sociality, in which humanity is understood in dialectical relationship with nature. Reflection on the Spirit leads to a notion of fellowship that encompasses the nonhuman. S. critiques the standard options of stewardship and valuing nature, opting instead for a politics of the “democracy of the commons” and for an understanding of the Eucharist as the key Christian resource for an ecological politics.

This is a large and complex book. I had some reservations, as when S. declares that the essence of God is becoming (44), argues against the immanence of the Spirit because of the Spirit’s eschatological character (205), and flatly rejects sacramental approaches to eco-
logical theology (241). But I found the book engaging, challenging, refreshingly political, and deeply grounded in the Christian tradition.

DENIS EDWARDS
Flinders University, Adelaide


These posthumously published essays in radical/secular theology mark Charles Winquist's dialogical path as a scholar. Beginning with a reprinting of his early work (arguing for an ontological understanding of the imagination and a thoroughly hermeneutic theology in dialogue with the transcendental Thomists, the American naturalists, Heidegger, and Tillich) and ending with thoughtful essays on Tillich, Gilkey, Tracy, Derrida, Kristeva, Arendt, and Lacan, the reader glimpses a rich intellectual journey. The middle third of the book holds essays on various topics with deconstructive themes and a focus on the driving, ambiguous power of desire.

"[T]heology is a textual production that is always in the middle of existing discourses and there is always an outside of its achievements but postmodern antifoundationalism leaves it without special privilege. It makes a place of its own through strategies and tactics within a cacophony of diverse textual voices" (201). For W., theology has little to do with religious practice or lived religion. It is an academic discourse in dialogue with other academic discourses. That placement embodies both the strength and weakness of his work.

The fairly short essays on Arendt, Derrida, and Tracy are insightful and each surfaces the nub of the matter at hand. The essays on Kristeva and Lacan are competent. Altizer, Caputo, and Marion are also dialogue partners, but the absence of Foucault as one of the cacophonous voices is puzzling. The apparent absence of anyone who might actually use these concepts in articulating a reflective faith or any community that might hold them religiously means that the work is academically pure and purely academic.

TERRENCE W. TILLEY
University of Dayton


Anyone interested in making sense theologically of eating food and participating in an increasingly global agricultural system should read this book. This nontechnical and highly accessible work compresses a great deal of information into a manageable package, challenges popular misconceptions about agriculture, and forges tight links between individual behavior and policies and institutions that frequently oppress those less privileged who labor out of sight to supply the affluent Americans with food.

Jung frames his theological argument around two poles: food as a gift from God and the appropriate human response of delight; and compassion, justice, and sharing as the proper ways to respect the meaning inherent in the gift of food. After developing this theological foundation, J. moves to various "eating disorders": the international food delivery system that leaves almost one billion people hungry every day; domestic food insecurity and long-term social and environmental problems associated with American agriculture; and personal disorders, especially gluttony, that often inhibit our ability to conceptualize eating as a relational activity that affects others' lives. Along the way, J. not only astutely diagnoses and criticizes these disorders, but also provides a positive portrait of agriculture as it could and should be.

Food for Life is an especially valuable resource for church-related groups and organizations. In addition to its accessibility to the layperson, the selected bibliography and two appendixes on video and educational resources at the end of the book provide valuable leads to those interested in learning more about various facets of agriculture.

MARK GRAHAM
Villanova University, Penn.
Zuccaro continues to emerge as one of Italy's more formidable moral theologians. Here he proposes a Catholic dialogue with postmodern, secular bioethics, using the writings of H. T. Englehardt to focus the discussion. The work is in two parts: a five-chapter study of contemporary philosophical bioethics and a four-chapter Catholic engagement with it.

Z. first presents characteristics of postmodern culture (fragmentation, loss, subjectivity, "the fact of pluralism") and describes the epistemology of contemporary bioethics, giving particular attention to impartiality, contemporary casuistry, and feminism. He introduces Englehardt as a paradoxical symbol of today's bioethics, since Englehardt, a Christian believer, is an influential promoter of a specifically secular bioethics. Z. captures well Englehardt's arguments about an ethical grammar in a society of moral strangers. He then turns to today's anthropological presuppositions about the centrality of conscience, freedom, and responsibility, and concludes the first part reflecting on end-of-life issues, especially how secular bioethics translates the sanctity of life into a quality-of-life issue, privileging one's health above all other values (here he refers to James Rachels, Peter Singer, and Helga Kuhse, among others).

In the second part Z. proposes grounds for a dialogue to enhance both secular and Catholic bioethics. He defines conscience as a decision not only for different ways of acting, but also for different ways of being related to others. Describing conscience as called to realize charity he establishes conscience as constitutively relational despite the call to autonomy. He also offers a more robust notion of sanctity of life than the one depicted by Kuhse and Singer.

From American to Italian, philosophy to theology, secular to religious, Z. attempts to fuse very different horizons of interest and meaning, but he does it very successfully. In fact, he enhances secular ethics by developing its thought in a quintessentially European Catholic framework of anthropological presuppositions and epistemological claims. One only wants to encourage him to read theological ethicists like Lisa Cahill, James Walter, Thomas Shannon, and Maura Ryan, for instance, who have already encountered contemporary bioethics and have offered their takes on the grounds, relevance, and possibility of dialogue.

JAMES F. KEENAN, S.J.
Boston College


This book presents Benedictine Father David Bird’s personal attempt to actualize the Beatitudes, especially with a view to facilitating a deeper appreciation of the Eucharist. (Actualization is a term used in the 1993 Pontifical Biblical Commission document “The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church.” It describes a rereading of the Bible in the light of new circumstances and an application of it to the contemporary situation of the People of God.) B. studied at Fribourg and ministered in Peru. His life experiences convinced him that the teaching of the Beatitudes is identical with that of the Desert Fathers, the patristic tradition, and the Benedictine rule. It was a small step from there to conclude that the Beatitudes are a way to God, a “royal road to joy.” Their connection to the Mass was clear. Both bring the believer through the death and resurrection of Christ into the presence of the Father. Spirituality and liturgy are but two dimensions of the same reality.

To be sure, B.’s commentaries on the Beatitudes and the Eucharist are rooted in scholarship, but the personal dimension of his application is very evident and will very likely appeal to a wider readership than specialists. Even if not directed primarily to a scholarly and academic audience, however, the book presumes some biblical and liturgical sophistication in its readers.
From this point of view, the volume is a fitting addition to the Hillenbrand Books series which seeks to advance the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church. Monsignor Hillenbrand (1904–1979) is a legend not only in Chicago, his native archdiocese, but throughout the Christian world, especially among those familiar with his pioneering work in liturgical renewal. While his pastoral efforts aimed to enrich the lives of the ordinary faithful, his admirers and devotees (including this reviewer as a young theology student), inspired and nourished by his insights, were the ones who worked to implement that goal. Though a musician would appreciate more attention to music and mystagogy, B.'s reflections are a precious gift to the contemporary Church.

JOHN J. PILCH
Georgetown University, Washington


Writing in a clear, almost conversational style that never compromises academic precision, Christie delivers a solid work designed to introduce Catholic moral thought on end-of-life issues to an audience untrained in theology. Her writing bears the mark of a teacher who has developed the right analogy, example, or anecdote to illustrate many crucial concepts. The book includes an extensive glossary that undergraduates might find helpful, and each chapter ends with a series of “discussion questions,” although these seem more suited for reviewing key points than generating discussion.

Scholars who ground their own work firmly in the Catholic natural law tradition will feel at home reading the overview of key aspects of fundamental moral theology that comprise the first three chapters of the book. Others will likely take issue with some of C.’s claims—for example, “Arguably, [the principle of double effect] is at the heart of all medical-moral decision-making” (30)—and find themselves frustrated by the shortage of references to major theologians operating outside the natural law tradition.

One of the book’s notable qualities is its attentiveness to topics that usually lie beyond the scope of bioethics. Alongside typical end-of-life issues (advance directives, artificial nutrition, etc.) are chapters on the interpersonal and pastoral dimensions of dying. Although these chapters are effective for teaching students that the moral life is about more than the rightness of our acts, they could be more thorough. The chapter on pastoral issues in particular (with merely six footnotes) leaves one wishing that more had been said.

The great strength of the work lies in the stories that C. weaves into her consideration of nearly every issue. These go far beyond the case studies that typify bioethics textbooks; they are not mere illustrations, but stories that influence her discussion of moral reasoning and put a human face on the difficult issues that the dying and their caregivers face. Although C.’s concise synthesis of Catholic moral thought on these issues is pedagogically useful, readers will likely savor the sometimes humorous, sometimes heartbreaking stories that make real the complexity and tragedy that surround end-of-life decisions.

CHRISTOPHER P. VOGT
St. John’s University, Jamaica, N.Y.


Schuurman here makes two extremely valuable contributions to the scholarship on Christian vocation. First, he summarizes contemporary criticisms of the concept. He notes James Gustafson’s complaint that the idea of vocation is exploited in a market economy to drive people to work more hours for less money, Miroslav Volf’s observation that the idea of vocation makes people complacent in their station, and Stanley Hauerwas’s argument that the idea of vocation turns work into an idol.

The second contribution is to offer an understanding of vocation that guards against these dangers. S. distinguishes
between two types of vocation, general and particular. The general vocation, which is first and foundational, is the calling of all Christians to love God and neighbor. The particular vocation is an individual's expression of the primary calling in a specific time and place. This latter vocation is derived from and can never contravene the general vocation.

Although the particular vocation pertains to an individual, S. contends that it should not be understood privately or individualistically. Rather, vocations are about an individual's contribution to the common good. Hence, vocations are discerned and lived through one's talents, the support of the community, and the response to others' needs.

Both contributions are substantive and thought provoking but not well integrated with each other because each is approached differently. S.'s summary of the scholarship on vocation adopts an academic tenor of careful summary, argument, and criticism, whereas his development of the idea of vocation is pastoral, relying on stories and scriptural reflections. As a result, the reading is a bit jarring when S. switches back and forth between his academic and pastoral voices.

One other small criticism: because S. focuses primarily on the Protestant tradition, his use of Catholic resources is weak. Ignatius Loyola's ideas on discernment, for example, are conspicuously absent, and the Catholic Encyclopedia S. uses is the on-line version based on the 1917 edition.

These criticisms notwithstanding, the book is an extremely valuable text for anyone working on vocation, discernment, and the response to others' needs.

JASON KING
Lourdes College, Sylvania, Ohio


Through a concise but comprehensive review of contemporary approaches to Christian education, Webb-Mitchell invites the reader to explore a concept of Christian education that moves from an individual to an ecclesial focus.

W.-M. frames his work in the Pauline corpus and from that vantage point explores both the tangible accessibility and the theology of the image of the Body of Christ. He emphasizes hospitality as a natural extension of baptism and Eucharist. It is the rituals and the liturgies for these sacraments that form and transform as persons are received into the Body of Christ. Gestures, for W.-M., become the personification of Galatians 2:20: "I live, now not I, but Christ lives in me."

Through the fusion of mind, body, and spirit, Christly Gestures embodies gospel values that are learned and supported not only on an individual basis but also on and ecclesial/corporate level in a process that W.-M. calls "pilgrim catechesis." This process is intentional, ongoing, and transformative and is rooted in the tradition of the congregation where such gestures are performed. Contemporary culture and its pervasive influence are not perceived to be at variance with W.-M.'s approach to Christian education. Rather, such a method of catechesis provides a direct antithesis to the "radical Individualism" (80) of our times.

Finally, W.-M. offers a catechesis that presupposes the discipline of learning while enroute coupled with an intentional attentiveness to the ways in which the pilgrim is being patterned in Christ. This catechesis takes place in a communal setting where one learns the craft "in the body of Christ" (227).

Christly Gestures is a significant and creative addition to the field of pastoral theology/Christian education. W.-M. offers rigorous scholarship, ecumenical sensitivity, and attention to the differently abled, in a volume that is a gift to Christian educators.

ANNE ANDERSON, C.S.J.
University of St. Michael's College, Toronto


Sanneh engages a range of issues pertaining to the interface between faith
and culture in an African context but with implications for Christianity in other contexts.

In 1978, Karl Rahner spoke of a new epoch in the history of Christianity—the emergence of a world Church, or post-European-centered Christianity. However, in other writings, Rahner muses on the future of Christianity as a minority community in the world. S.'s thesis corroborates Rahner's recognition of the emergence of a post-Western-world Christianity, but in contrast to Rahner's speculations on the future of Christianity, S. is more optimistic, recognizing the continued expansion of Christianity in the developing world.

The current climate of tolerance and pluralism and the heightened awareness of Christianity's fraught colonial past have contributed to the neglect of the data of continued Christian expansion as well as to the indigenous roots of this expansion. Christianity has declined in the West, but has continued to grow in the non-Western world, and S. is encouraged by this trend. He even suggests how China may be poised to embrace Christianity in the main.

S. distinguishes world Christianity from global Christianity. The former differs from the latter in that it has "nothing of the global structures of power and economics" of global Christianity (78). World Christianity is grass roots, emerging from various local indigenous contexts that translate the Christian message into the "mother tongue." In fact, S. argues that Christianity is a religion that, from its inception, lends itself to the language of its followers rather than of its founder. This fact sets the precedent for Christianity to continue translating the Bible into the vernacular of all cultures where it is implanted. It follows that Bible translation should incorporate the indigenous names for God.

The missionary propaganda of the colonial age of Christian expansionism has been replaced by a secular propaganda that is hostile to the idea of Christianity growing in the developing world. However, S. recognizes the possibility of a mutual dialogue between world Christianity and the post-Christian West, especially with respect to democratic principles and the preferential option for the poor.

JOHN DADOSKY
Regis College, Toronto


Achiel Peelman, O.M.I., professor of theology at St. Paul University, Ottawa, has carried on extensive dialogue among the First Nations peoples of Canada. The book is a sequel his Le Christ est Amérindien (Christ is a Native American, 1995) and was suggested to him by a native elder to emphasize the universality of the work of the Holy Spirit. The mission of the Spirit is central to the book, in which P. adopts a position on interfaith dialogue similar to that of Jacques Dupuis, but in a context of dialogue with aboriginal religion. P. maintains a mission/inculturation orientation, on the testimony of many native Christian leaders that a "native Christianity" is possible and desirable.

The book combines a rich fund of theological-anthropological method with a narrative of the author's experience of native ritual, discussion with spiritual leaders, and advocacy on behalf of Amerindian culture and spirituality. P. develops a succinct but thorough description of the world view of native spiritualities, which he sees as not only an essential component of any future native Christianity but also as a valuable contribution to world Christianity and a corrective for certain modern or Enlightenment influences. P. cautions readers against romanticizing autochthonous spirituality, which is not altruistic idealism but rather an expression of humanity's need (at its own peril) to befriend the environment.

Using the documents of Vatican II and of recent popes and Catholic bishops, P. argues that the Church has a long road to travel to achieve true inculturation, of which the major component is a native Church led by native people.

There is little to criticize in this brief
but richly inclusive book, although one might emphasize even more strongly the tensions between interfaith dialogue and evangelization. That is, if all authentic religion (including aboriginal religion) is a work of the Spirit, what is the place of evangelization, even from the beginning? Tribal Christians around the world readily accept a certain syncretism of the Christian and the traditional, but “pluralists” denounce even this as Western imperialism.

CARL F. STARKLOFF, S.J.
St. Louis University


Writing from his experience as both pastor and theologian in the Evangelical Lutheran tradition, Leonard Hummel investigates the relationship between tradition and lived religion in situations of suffering. How do beliefs inform practice, and how do beliefs and practice provide consolation in suffering?

True to his stated conviction that human suffering is the starting point of theology, H. roots his study in the experiences of seven Lutheran subjects whom he calls “co-researchers.” The book successfully witnesses that their lives are “living documents” that bear scrutiny as surely as any theological text. H. dialectically situates these “documents” in conversation with theologies of consolation from the early Lutheran tradition as well as with contemporary Lutheran scholarship, thus illuminating his context in a way particularly helpful for the non-Lutheran reader. In the process, H. grapples with the questions emerging from the living scenarios of his co-researchers and ultimately finds that theoretical contradictions are resolved in the substance of their (albeit diverse) experiences. While H.’s method provides useful insights for theologians and pastors of all Christian traditions, it does so most effectively by analogy via the particularity of the experiences of these distinct Lutherans.

The Lutheran tradition points sufferers away from preoccupation with unanswerable questions and things invisible, and asserts that the means and practices of consolation are to be found in Scripture, the sacraments, the priesthood of all believers, and creation. The co-researchers’ experiences reveal that the means of consolation are in every case interpersonally mediated, and it is precisely the interpersonal dimension that is ultimately experienced as consolation. Luther’s claim that God’s consolation is “clothed in nothingness,” that is, clothed in finite, human, fallible practices, is thus vindicated in what H. describes as a “relational ontology.”

Finally, H.’s analysis of how the lived religion of his co-researchers might “re-vision” Lutheranism engages the work of Kathryn Tanner, among others, and provides an important contribution to the current conversation on culture, “tradition,” and “traditioning.” The book gives needed flesh to that scholarly discourse even as it offers wisdom to the pastoral practitioner.

KATHLEEN MCMANUS, O.P.
University of Portland, Oregon


Jean-Yves Leloup is an Orthodox Christian theologian in France, as well as a popular author on spirituality, particularly as ancient spiritual practices shape modern psychological insights. This volume contains nine chapters, quite distinct in themselves but generically related to the concept of stillness in early Eastern monastic thought. The French original, slightly edited by the translator, appeared in 1990 under the title Écrits sur l'Hésychasme.

Inspired by L.’s personal experience of conversion to the Orthodox Church and pilgrimage to the monastic republic of Mount Athos, and informed alike by the profound ascetic history and theology of the monastic and hesychast traditions, the book opens with a chapter describing the encounter of a young French philosopher with a contempo-
rary Athonite monk. Thereupon, L. returns to the historical and literary sources, exploring their teaching on the practice of inner calm. In the process, he searches for answers to the struggle for inner peace in the face of the anxiety and confusion of today’s world.

The book considers the wisdom of the Desert Fathers (especially of Arsenius the Great), the philosophy of Evagrius Ponticus (who systematized monastic thought), the example of John Cassian (who translated for the West the ways of the Egyptian desert), the importance of spiritual direction and of apophatic theology, as well as the power of the Name in prayer and contemplation. The opening chapter about Father Seraphim is complemented by the chapter about The Way of the Pilgrim, a classic text by an anonymous Russian author who has influenced numerous people across diverse cultures since the end of the 19th century in the use of the Jesus Prayer.

Two chapters are strikingly distinctive in content. Chapter 7 examines the invocation of the divine Name in three great spiritual traditions—Hinduism, Islam, and Buddhism, although the latter two are treated more briefly than the first. The closing chapter creatively develops the concept of “purification of the senses.”

In all, this book provides an engaging reading of the ancient contemplative path and a fresh appreciation of the Eastern Orthodox spiritual way.

JOHN CHRYSSAVGIS
Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America


Written in the spirit of John Calvin and Karl Barth, this clear and concise treatment of Christian holiness issues a clarion call to sola fides, sola gratia, sola scriptura. In four chapters, Webster examines the holiness of theology, of God, of the Church, and of the Christian. He underlines the radical ways in which divine holiness—a movement or event in which God relates to creation—is the cause of all other holiness. To talk about God’s attributes is not primarily to categorize them (humans do not name God) but to confess them in a cry of praise.

Judging that developments in 20th-century theology (postmodernism; turns to subject, history, language, and interdisciplinarity) have caused theology to lose its way, W. offers a “Christian dogmatics of holiness” that he distinguishes from metaphysics, mysticism, and moralism. The two main tasks of this “onto-theology” are exegesis and dogmatics. The theologian probes the reality of a trinitarian God in order to become holy and edify the Church.

Themes of evangelical theology are prominent: priority is given to revelation as the primary context in which theology must be done; theological freedom means being under the tutelage, authority, and protection of the Church; talk of “participation” tends to slight the free majesty of God; election is the correct way to name the divine-human relationship.

W. understands a theology of holiness as the exercise of “holy reason,” which stands under, and is accountable to, God’s sanctifying work. Holy reason has nothing to do with poetics, which W. sees as idolatrous, but with receptivity to God. Holy reason’s primary act is prayer for the Spirit’s assistance; reason’s setting is the communion of saints; its manner is fear of the holy God; and its end is the sanctification of God’s holy name (21). Since the Bible is sufficient, reason is exercised with an acute consciousness of limitation.

For those looking to correct anthropocentric strains in theology, Holiness provides a reorientation toward God’s sovereignty. But it will not appeal to theologians who have a more positive assessment of theology’s engagement with contemporary thought. W.’s utter confidence in his ability to distinguish the true God from “the God of human invention” (9) belies theology’s mandate to take seriously the complexity and pluralism of the human encounter with God.

ELIZABETH A. DREYER
Fairfield University, Conn.

This text is a well-executed retrieval and expansion of Newman’s concept of the illative sense using the resources of contemporary epistemology in the analytic philosophical tradition. Following a fine exposition of the illative sense as a belief-forming process, Aquino argues that Newman’s individualist understanding of it should be augmented by attention to the constitutive role of social factors in the individual’s beliefs. So augmented, the illative sense may then help resolve the problem of a common measure, that is, how radically diverse communities may rationally adjudicate conflicting claims. The remainder of the text draws on a variety of resources, especially virtue epistemology (Linda Zagzebski), reliabilism (Alvin Goldman), and social epistemology (Frederick Schmitt), to trace the dialectical relations between individual and community, and the centrality of a community of informed judgment for the cultivation of the illative sense.

My questions concern the second part of the argument. A. draws on many sources and addresses a variety of distinct issues. It is not clear that the parts add up to a consistent whole. I question the assumption that there is an essential relation between the rational deontologically understood and truth taken in a realist manner. It is far from clear that this assumption, deeply embedded in epistemology since Descartes, is true. A. presents the illative sense as the key-stone in a theory of rationality and as a reliable truth-conducive process, but these presentations tend to pull away from one another because each responds to distinct epistemic desiderata. To emphasize the first arguably undermines the second, and to emphasize the second counter-intuitively constrains the first. Perhaps related to this tension is A.’s tendency to lapse into statements manifesting an epistemic concept of truth contrary to his own and certainly Newman’s intention. Finally, the problem of a common measure is not so much solved as displaced into long-term trust in a community’s well-formed exercise of the illative sense. These issues notwithstanding, there is much to be learned from this text and the author is to be commended for his engagement of a philosophical tradition much neglected in theological circles.

J. A. COLOMBO
University of San Diego