BOOK REVIEWS


These essays on biblical prayer appear in the first yearbook of the recently created International Society for the Study of Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature. This interreligious society based in Salzburg was founded to promote research into deuterocanonical and cognate literature. The society has held its biennial meetings in Salzburg (2003) and Barcelona (2005), with a future meeting planned for Tübingen in 2007. The 21 essays gathered here, ten in English and eleven in German, were presented at the 2003 meeting, the theme of which was “The Function and Relevance of Prayer in Deuterocanonical Literature.”

The quality of the essays is high and the volume is a welcome complement to several recent anthologies on biblical and Jewish prayer that, by choosing such a broad theme, have helped to bridge the gulf separating the various subfields of biblical and Jewish studies (for example, Prayer from Alexandria to Constantine [1997] and Prayers from the Ancient World [2006]). The title, “Prayer from Tobit to Qumran,” accurately reflects the Second Temple focus of the majority of the essays, though some contributions, such as those on prayer in the Old Testament (Henning Graf Reventlow) and on the Psalms (Harm W. M. van Grol), are more broadly conceived. Reventlow stresses the intensely communal aspects of prayer in the Old Testament, including the psalms described as prayers of individuals. He notes that Christ’s instruction to his disciples that they should pray alone in their rooms (Matt 6:6) stands in marked contrast to this tradition. Nonetheless, while much modern theorizing on prayer concentrates on individual prayer, both Christianity and Judaism are deeply influenced by the communal and liturgical dimensions of prayer so characteristic of ancient Israelite thought.

The volume is divided into five sections: biblical prayer in general; deuterocanonical texts; pseudopigraphal texts (for example, the Psalms of Solomon); Judaism (Josephus and Early Judaism); and prayer in the New Testament. Only a few essays can be reviewed.

Maurice Gilbert considers the function and relevance of prayer in Sirach and analyzes the book’s three explicit prayers (22:27–23:6; 36:1–22; 51:1–12). Based on God’s previous dealing with Israel, Ben Sira teaches that God both hears and answers the prayers of the oppressed in their hour of need. Gilbert argues that the sage places distinctive emphasis on the incompatibility of sin and injustice with prayer and praise. The remedy he repeatedly offers to sinners is conversion, repentance, and prayer to obtain forgiveness.
Friedrich Reiterer offers a fascinating and detailed exegesis of one of the prayers treated briefly by Gilbert, the prayer in which Ben Sira addresses God as “father and master of my life” (Sir 22:27–23:6). Since the Hebrew text of this double prayer for control of the tongue and of the passions is not extant, Reiterer examines the Greek and Syriac versions, with particular attention given to the prayer’s poetic features. In a study of the function of prayer in the historiography of 2 Maccabees, Hermann Lichtenberger notes the close connection in this book between prayer and the Temple. The turning point in the narrative comes after the remarkable prayer in 2 Maccabees 7:37 when the last of the seven brothers offers his life to God as an appeal for divine mercy on his people.

Helmut Engel deals with a similarly remarkable text about intercessory prayer. In his illuminating study of Wisdom 18:20–25, which describes the power of Aaron’s intercession, Engel argues that the author of this book had a profound belief in the power of the word of God, a power that can be used not only to heal (16:12) but also to kill (18:14–16). When Aaron appealed to God in prayer, recalling “the oaths and covenants given to our ancestors,” he was able to stay God’s wrath (18:22–25).

Jeremy Corley calls attention to the intercessory prayer of the high priest Simon in the apocryphal text 3 Maccabees 2:2–20. Corley describes this lament for the threatened violation of the temple in Jerusalem as “a beautifully rich testament to Hellenistic-Jewish faith and piety.” Eileen Schuller surveys prayer at Qumran in a comprehensive and nuanced manner, complementing other recent treatments of this theme by considering not only new or sectarian materials but reviewing the prayers contained in the biblical materials at Qumran as well. Stefan Reif’s survey of early Jewish prayer emphasizes the diversity of the Second Temple sources that the rabbis inherited and used in developing the biblical prayer tradition.

The volume concludes with a list of contributors and three indexes: modern authors, biblical and ancient references, and a multilingual subject index (English and German, including the most important Hebrew, Greek, and Syriac words).

Dominican House of Studies, Washington


These papers from an April 7–8, 2004, conference in Tilburg illustrate both the rich history of Didache/Matthew studies (in which almost every conceivable relationship or nonrelationship has been argued for) and their extraordinary recent flowering. Developments in historical and liturgical studies, the history of doctrines, sociological and archeological studies of the ancient world, studies in the material culture of Mediterranean and Near Eastern antiquity, as well as recent ecumenical developments, are all reflected in the work of the 12 contributors. These developments have
made possible findings and suggestions of findings that were not possible even a few decades ago.

The 12 chapters are spread out among three parts. Part 1—on the conceivable setting in which Matthew and the Didache could have originated—is made up of (1) Bas ter Haar Romeny’s “Hypotheses on the Development of Judaism and Christianity in Syria in the Period after 70 C.E.” and (2) Clayton N. Jefford’s “The Milieu of Matthew, the Didache, and Ignatius of Antioch: Agreements and Differences.” The two chapters in part 2, (3) Wim Weren’s “The History and Social Setting of the Matthean Community” and (4) Aaron Milavec’s “When, Why, and for Whom Was the Didache Created? Insights into the Social and Historical Setting of the Didache Communities,” start in the texts themselves and move toward the real world to which the writings refer. The remaining chapters, all in part 3, take up relevant themes and topics: (5) Kari Syreeni’s “The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache”; (6) John S. Kloppenborg’s “The Use of the Synoptics or Q in Didache 1:3b–2:1”; (7) Peter J. Tomson’s “The Halakhic Evidence of Didache 8 and Matthew 6 and the Didache Community’s Relationship to Judaism”; (8) Gerard Rouwhorst’s “Didache 9–10: A Litmus Test for the Research in Early Christian Liturgy Eucharist”; (9) André Tuilier’s “Les charismatiques itinérants dans la Didache et dans l’Évangile de Matthieu” (with an English abstract); (10) Huub van de Sandt’s “Two Windows on a Developing Jewish-Christian Reproof Practice”; (11) Joseph Verheyden’s “Eschatology in the Didache and the Gospel of Matthew”; and (12) Jonathan A. Draper’s “Do the Didache and Matthew Reflect an ‘Irrevocable Parting of the Ways’ with Judaism?” A short review cannot summarize or critique all 12 chapters, but I can point out that the editor’s nine-page introduction gives a detailed and fairly reliable outline of each chapter and its relationship to the whole.

Because of the timing of its publication, none of the authors in this volume can be fairly faulted for not dealing with Milavec’s massive and magisterial 2003 The Didache: Faith, Hope, and Life of the Earliest Christian Communities (Milavec himself is the only one to refer to it). Milavec’s basic thesis—that the Didache is a well-integrated work portraying a self-contained religious system, that it is basically a training program for Gentile converts who had decisively broken with their pagan background, and that it is a mid-first-century work with little or no coherence with Matthew’s Gospel or the Matthean tradition—basically undercuts much of the foundations, presuppositions, and, hence, the findings of most of the rest of Didache scholarship. While it is possible to argue that Milavec perhaps overinterprets the evidence, his basic thesis is so convincing that any future work on the Didache that ignores it will simply be self-discrediting. I look forward to the time when scholars have had the time to deal critically with Milavec’s thesis. When the dust from this has finally settled, we will have at least a critical sharpening of Didache scholarship, and quite possibly also a significant sea change therein.

Boston College

Robert J. Daly, S.J.
This scholarly study focuses primarily on John 10. As a long discussion of a single, short text, some will find Zimmermann’s detailed analysis quite riveting, though others might need to proceed with trust that Z. can provide abundant and welcomed insights into the use of images in John’s Gospel (which he does).

Z. groups John 10’s christological images into several distinct sets: metaphorical (for example, “Son of God”), symbolic (“light”), titular (“Son of Man”), narrative (“bridegroom”), and conceptual (“from the Father”). He claims, against literalists and fundamentalists, that John’s images, such as “bread of life” or “lamb of God,” have their meaning as metaphors, that is, that they stand primarily for something other than the verbal pictures they present. To grasp metaphorical meaning requires understanding each image against the late first-century culture within which it was fashioned.

Z. claims that proper understanding of John’s metaphorical images will open the reader to an awareness of the ultimately inexpressible reality of Jesus Christ. For example, the image “I am the door” pictures Christ as one through whom one might pass. Yet, common sense tells us, one cannot pass through an individual. Thus the inadequacy or appropriateness of the “door” image leads the reader to the awareness that Christ is one who remains ultimately beyond the comprehension of any human being.

The “titular” images in John’s Gospel (“rabbi,” “Christ,” “teacher,” “prophet,” “king of the Jews,” “Lord”) are, according to Z., John’s interpretations of Jesus’ actions: “Christ” suggests one sent by the Father; “Lord” is meaningful within the service of washing feet. Similarly, “Son of God,” “King of Israel,” “Devout Mender of the People,” or a “heavenly (angelic) essence” all suggest actions by or to Jesus. These and similar titles, according to Z., were misinterpreted by later Christians as concerned with divine essence, rather than with divine actions. Similarly John’s image of Jesus as God immanent—“the Father and I are one”—point to Jesus as receiving divinity; John had not intended, according to Z., to identify absolutely (ontologically) God and Jesus as one.

The “sheep” metaphor in John 10 includes the contrast between the shepherd and the thief that, again, points to something else. The sheep—that is, believers—know the voice of the shepherd by keeping their eyes upon the wholly trusted Lord, while those who reduce Jesus to logic or science are followers of the thief. John drew his Christology from the first-century interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures. The images of shepherd, sheep, and thief stood for realities within the world and the community in John’s own day, as they can for realities within our own day.

John presented the paschal mystery of Christ as fulfilling images of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Hebrew Scriptures had not understood the Log-
os’s sharing in human nature. John fashioned Christ, the Logos, as fulfilling the hope that the Logos would be one with human nature. So too, John’s Gospel portrays the paschal mystery as fulfilling the Hebrew scriptural expectation of messiah as transcendent.

John’s narrative pictures of the woman at the well and the wedding feast at Cana point to Jesus as initiating ministry that the Christ continues in the community’s reaching out beyond conventional boundaries. Polar images, such as clear-dark, warm-cold, strong-weak, heavy-light, are contrasting images that point to Christ and to those in the community who have lost their orientation. The image of Jesus’ “glorification” in the Crucifixion is fundamentally an image of Jesus’ narrative. As the Father had sent Jesus into this world, so Jesus, in being raised up, returns in glory to the Father. Again, the shepherd/thief metaphor points to narrative stories of the community. Those members of the community who had insisted that all believers be Jews (or any other category), or who seek ever to exclude some from the community, follow not the shepherd, but the thief.

John’s multiple images of Jesus form a mosaic; they fashion a single whole that together present John’s interpretation of Jesus’ identity. Readers are thus challenged to fashion a synthesis of those images so that they too can perceive the identity of Jesus. No image was intended to be removed from the mosaic, say, by focusing on “the bread of life” imagery while ignoring “the gate.” The reader is to perceive the uncontainable by imaginatively interrelating the images with one’s own elementary experiences. Furthermore, the multiple images of John’s Gospel demanded an open-ended reflection on the mystery of Jesus Christ. All these metaphors constantly challenge the believer to avoid idolatrizsing any single image of Christ.

Z.’s book will be of great value both to specialists in New Testament and to serious students of Christian theology. Both will find in this book fresh perspectives and challenges regarding the role of images in John and in the life of the Christian.

Canisius College, Buffalo

Daniel Liderbach, S.J.


Thirty years ago a correct understanding of New Testament texts was thought to depend essentially on an examination of their sources. Then exegetes turned to literary form and editorial arrangement. Of course both approaches are necessary for understanding those texts. Both Maloney and Lincoln deal well with past source methods while offering much newer methods to our understanding of the Fourth Gospel.
The authors honestly ask, “Why another commentary?” M. claims to have paid attention to the needs of the intended reader. He deliberately avoids much “biblical jargon,” trying to create for the contemporary reader an understanding of the “worlds behind the text, within the text and in front of the text” (20). He hopes to “create a space where a satisfied Christian reader is born” (20), and he especially focuses on how the author of the Gospel attempts to bring the listener or reader to a decision (20:30–31). He acknowledges his indebtedness to his own previous studies, but now writes in a more expanded, mature, and complete manner. His commentary fulfills the overall goal and format of the *Sacra Pagina* series by offering sound critical analysis shaped by the Catholic tradition and further reference material after each section, along with a selected bibliography at the end.

L.’s study replaces that of Sanders and Mastin’s (1968) for the Black’s New Testament Commentary, a series long associated with first-rate scholars. L. pays particular attention to the changes in the last 40 years to scholarship on the Fourth Gospel. He also expresses an interest in the hearers of this Gospel. His primary method is to offer much more personal reflection on the biblical texts than does M. L. brings his own personal understanding to the text in a manner that can stimulate and become part of the personal understanding of the reader. He offers his selected bibliography at the end of the text, without references throughout the text—a method more fitting his personal reflective style.

Both M. and L. present the text as it is now written, with no attempt to reconstruct a different order (save on some minor sections, such as the woman taken in adultery, which L. places in an appendix, while M. treats it within the context of John 8). Both follow the traditional division into book of signs and book of glory. (I have never been convinced of this division, but it remains helpful.) M. offers an interpretation of each section followed by notes. L. prefers rather to write his personal reflections on the meaning of the passage with less academic paraphernalia. Both still pay close exegetical attention to key texts. For example L. carefully explains the lack of the article before God (*theos*) in John 1:1. He translates the phrase: “What God was, the Word was,” avoiding the temptation to translate *theos*, the noun, as an adjective, “divine.” M. translates the same verse almost identically: “what God was the Word also was.”

L. offers considerable insight into John’s theology and frequently finds meaning that other authors either do not see or do not deem helpful. He regularly and at length treats the historicity of some episodes, for example, the miracle at Cana. He also questions the historical differences between John and the Synoptics concerning when the ministry of Jesus actually began—simultaneously with that of John (at least for a limited period) or after John’s imprisonment. These forays into theological and historical concerns, however, are well-integrated into his overall method of offering his personal reflections and evoking personal reflection.

One significant substantive difference between the commentators concerns their understanding of the relationship between John and the Syn-
optics. M. follows the more common opinion that the Fourth Gospel has no literary dependency on the Synoptics, while he admits some similarities. Those holding this theory look to a common oral tradition. L., on the other hand, argues that the Johannine author actually knew the Synoptic Gospels. Throughout the commentary he alludes to possible uses of Synoptic material by John. For example, he relates the incident of foot washing to the Lukan material (Lk 22:27). (He adds a historical note that I had never known. In the ancient world writing desks were unknown. If an author wanted to consult a manuscript an assistant would have had to hold up the scroll. Thus ends the favorite artistic image of an pensive, solitary Matthew or Luke having Mark and “Q” resting on their desk in front of them.)

Both commentaries are valuable. M.’s will appeal to those inclined to follow a reader-response hermeneutic. For those who prefer a more personal reflection, L. is the one to read. A minister, in preparation for preaching on a particular passage of John, might find thematic help in reading L.’s work, while finding more technical help in M.’s. Both have their strengths and weaknesses. M. reads too much into the Gospel text. L. can become verbose. Finally, I would have liked the authors to have presented essays summarizing their conclusions on such topics as Johannine Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology. One must retrieve their insights from scattered points throughout their commentaries. I still prefer the brief excurses offered by other commentaries, such as those by Rudolf Schnackenburg and Raymond Brown.

Miami Shores, Fla.

JOHN F. O’GRADY


This is Buchinger’s 2001 Vienna dissertation begun under Professor Jörg Auf der Maur and then, after his death in 1999, completed under Professor Lothar Lies, S.J., of Innsbruck. Even a German dissertation should not be this long, but this magnificent example of Teutonic thoroughness—at first glance almost a caricature—ends up being, if not something to be imitated because of its length, nevertheless, like the example of some of the saints, something clearly to be wondered at. Part 1 devotes 375 pages to a diachronic presentation of Origen’s (ca. AD 185–251) treatment of this “favorite theme” from the first time that it appears in his Commentary on John (post-AD 231) after his move from Alexandria to Caesarea, to near the end of his writing activity 19 years later. More than half of this is devoted to the relatively brief (ca. AD 245) Treatise on the Passover (140–335). Since everything from this chronological presentation comes up again in the 518 pages of the systematic presentation of part 2, one initially questions this apparent redundancy, until one notices that B. uses this detail to make some significant advances in Origen scholarship, most par-
particularly on whether it is possible to detect any development in Origen’s thinking.

Part 2 is arranged under ten “systematic aspects”: Origen’s explanation of the word “Pascha” (392–412); “festival” and “sheep”—basic observations on Origen’s use of the word “Pascha” (412–38); the hermeneutical principles of Origen’s understanding of Pasch (439–44); the reception by Origen of OT Passover texts, from the background of older traditions of interpretation (444–632); the NT Passover texts in Origen and in the older Christian tradition (633–66); the “Passover of the Jews” in Origen (667–708); christological dimensions of Pasch according to Origen (708–83); the Pasch of the Christians—Origen and the shape of the celebration in his time (783–822); the Pasch of the Christians—aspects of its interpretation by Origen (822–92); the question of the Pasch as an example, in Origen, of the biblical celebration of feasts.

After summing up the significance of his findings (908–15), B. offers 122 pages of end material that makes the daunting detail of his work eminently accessible both to the relatively few scholars who will take the time to “live with” the book, and the many, many more who will use it for reference. This material is divided as follows: (a) quoted literature from ancient sources to modern authors under 12 subheadings (916–50); (b) ancient sources quoted or referred to, under seven subheadings (951–1012); (c) Greek and Latin terms, including etymologies (1013–15); (d) modern authors (1016–21). This is followed by an “Index generalis,” an exhaustive table of contents with well over 600 headings, some three dozen of them listed as “Zusammenfassung” or “Ergebnis” (that is, summarizing paragraphs or pages) and another 20 or so sections of “Einleitungsfragen” that alert the reader to the type of material or methodology about to be encountered. All is done so well that this work can serve as a reference model—and perhaps also as a warning model—for introducing graduate students to what research can entail when it tries to approach perfection.

Apart from the merit of being a definitive study of a central theme in one of Christianity’s greatest writers, let me mention two other significant contributions. With more of Origen’s oeuvre lost than preserved, scholars have been hard-put to determine whether there has been significant theological development within it. Now, with a developing consensus about the chronology of his writings and the extraordinary care of a detailed study like this, we can conclude to at least some development or change. For example, part 1 of the Treatise on the Passover argues Origen’s consistent rejection of the then-prevailing Christian identification of Pasch with the Passion of Christ. But part 2, written later, while not repudiating that rejection, is much more christological; it seems to allow for some rapprochement between Pasch and the suffering of Christ. Further, a second contribution is vitally important for the historical question whether, in the early church, theology influenced liturgy or liturgy influenced theology. Origen wrote before the liturgical celebration of the Paschal Mystery became part of the church’s liturgical life (Easter triduum, and so on). Thus, there is nothing in Origen’s writings that refers to any paschal liturgical
celebration. His paschal theology, however, is what the church did appropriate, indeed, in the following centuries, in the development of the liturgical celebration of Easter.

Boston College

ROBERT J. DALY, S.J.


A revision of Norman Russell’s 1988 Oxford dissertation, this book is explicitly designed to supersede Jules Gross’s 1938 standard work on deification (itself recently translated from the French as *The Divinization of the Christian according to the Greek Fathers* [2002]). The book impresses by its erudition, navigating through a wealth of primary sources, all carefully analyzed in their historical context, and bringing into the debate most of the latest secondary studies. Special attention is given to the vocabulary of deification, its exegetical underpinning, and the doctrinal contexts that compelled Christian writers to speak of deification. The bulk of the book consists of distinct but interrelated studies on texts and authors ranging from the New Testament to the Palamite synthesis in 14th-century Byzantium. In separate appendixes, R. offers a very good survey of deification in Syriac and Latin traditions, and a presentation of the vocabulary of deification in the Byzantine tradition.

The book opens with two substantial introductory chapters. The first, “Deification in the Graeco-Roman World,” concludes that “by the time Porphyry first wrote of the philosopher deifying himself, Christians had already been speaking of deification for more than a century” (52). The second, entitled “The Jewish Paradigm,” lays out a nuanced treatment of the various forms of Second Temple Judaism, and uses the best and most recent scholarship on later Merkabah mysticism. R. is among the very few authors who discuss the Second Temple roots of, and rabbinic parallels to, patristic deification. One hopes that this approach will set the standard for future research on this subject.

R. shows that deification as a doctrine starts with the appropriation and reworking of an earlier Jewish exegesis of Psalm 82:6 (“I said, you are gods . . .”) by Justin, Irenaeus, and Clement of Alexandria. R. posits two major “strands” of deification: the first, usually termed “realistic” or, occasionally, “eclesiastic” (139), is rooted in the Scriptures and represented by Paul, Irenaeus, and Athanasius; the second, “fundamentally Platonic” (14) and more interested in ethical amelioration, is represented by Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and the Cappadocians. R. also mentions a third strand, the Jewish apocalyptic imagery that “became part of the stock-in-trade of the perfect Christian” (77). According to R., these strands were synthesized in later authors, culminating with Maximus the Confessor.

While the synthetic character of Byzantine theology and spirituality is undeniable, R.’s forcing earlier authors in some or other category is occa-
sionally problematic. Clement, for instance, is certainly an heir of Philo’s; yet, in his *Eclogae* and *Adumbrations* he is also the mouthpiece of a strikingly “apocalyptic” theology, positing a “realistic” transformation of the holy man.

Another weakness of this volume concerns some significant omissions to R.’s otherwise extensive bibliography. When he posits certain continuities between the transfigured visionaries of Jewish apocalypses and the Christian depiction of martyrs and ascetics (77–78), or when he notes the similarity between Ezekiel’s throne-vision as interpreted by Pseudo-Macarius, and Jewish Merkabah mysticism (245), his remarks are extremely brief and do not engage other scholars. Recourse to a number of studies on this topic published by Alexander Golitzin over the last decade would have allowed a much broader and more fruitful analysis. In his discussion of the Palamite controversy, R. inexplicably ignores John Romanides’ “Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics,” the first study to analyze the exegetical and theological divergences between Palamas and his adversaries in light of possible Augustinian influences. As a matter of fact, R. never discusses the link between deification and the patristic exegesis of biblical theophanies. In the section dedicated to Pseudo-Dionysius, Golitzin’s book on the Areopagite (referred to only in a footnote that directs the reader to a mediocre review of the book) could have been exploited much more, at the very least for the discussion of the vocabulary of deification. Finally, the section entitled “Modern Approaches to Deification” is too short (312–20) to do any justice to the dozen Eastern and Western theologians it discusses. Dumitru Staniloae, for instance, whose *Orthodox Dogmatics* (1985) and *Orthodox Spirituality* (2002) would have been available to R., is given only a footnote reference. This is hardly adequate for a theologian shaped by extensive translations from and commentaries on the very writers dealt with in R.’s book.

There is reason to believe that these regrettable but relatively minor shortcomings will be addressed in future editions of the book, since this work is likely to become the standard treatment of deification in the Greek patristic tradition. As such it is indispensable for students of ancient and medieval Christianity, and belongs in every serious university and research library. The reader would be well advised to read this book in conjunction with David Bradshaw’s extensive study on “energeia” (*Aristotle East and West* [2005]), which complements many of R.’s analyses.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*

**BOGDAN G. BUCUR**


Between the two world wars, the *Literary History of Religious Sentiment in France* by Abbé Henri Bremond (of the Académie française) dazzled its readership not only because of the beauty and depth of its rediscovered
ancient texts but also because of B.’s own virtuosity as a prose stylist. B. breathed new life into the French mysticism that fell into oblivion following the Quietism controversy and Fénelon’s condemnation (1699). Correcting the 19th-century vision imposed by Sainte-Beuve (who claimed Jansenism to be the 17th century’s dominating religious movement), B. brought to light the extraordinary mystical effervescence of 1590–1660.

B.’s eleven-volume monument (1916–1933) has now been renewed and enriched. First, a new typesetting and format make for ease of reading (the original edition’s pagination is indicated at the top of each page). Next, two texts prudently removed by B. from the galley proofs are published here for the first time: the general introduction, entitled L’Échelle mystique (“The Mystical Ladder,” at risk of being put on the Index for “Quietism” and “Modernism”), in which B. had initially laid out his conception of the mystical; and a chapter dedicated to the “peculiarities of M. [Jean-Jacques] Olier,” that is, to the psychological frailties of the founder of Saint-Sulpice, a piece that would have unleashed the wrath of the seminaries. The new edition also includes a volume B. had published separately: the Introduction à la philosophie de la prière, which recounted his argument with the Jesuits about Ignatian spirituality and laid out his ideas about mysticism in general. Finally, the index to all eleven volumes, first published by Charles Grolleau after B.’s death, has been included in this edition.

B.’s text is also accompanied by eight thematic essays. Benefiting from the advantage of hindsight, historiographical progress, and discoveries about B.’s own spiritual life, these essays clarify the historian’s project and bring into relief his presuppositions. Some of B.’s classifications that today seem overly inflated are reexamined, for example, “devout humanism” (characterizing the spiritual movement illustrated by Francis de Sales), the “French school” (designating what today one might prefer to call Bérelle’s posterity), and the “School of Lallemant” (boiling down in fact to the Jesuit Lallemant and his scribe Rigoleuc).

The ambivalence of B.’s method is highlighted. It was not a matter of history properly speaking, nor of literature, theology, or philosophy. Rather, it played in each of these modes (sometimes opposing them to one another!) according to the circumstances and in service of his fundamental theses, namely, that “mysticism” may be considered as a transhistorical invariable beneath the diversity of its manifestations; that Fénelon’s pure love is the foundation and touchstone of all true mysticism; that we are all potential mystics; and that there is no essential difference between “pure poetry” and “pure prayer.”

One also notices alterations in the massive canvas as B. refinishes the painting of earlier characters. For example, in volumes 7 and 8, where B. presents his mystical theology ("metaphysics of the saints"), Francis de Sales, who in volume 1 had been the key figure of “devout humanism” and the “anthropocentric,” is transformed into the paragon of “theocentrism” and mystical passivity.

Other essays are devoted to B.’s estimation of Jansenism, to his extremely critical vision of Ignatian spirituality (he had been a Jesuit for 22
years), and to his understanding of prayer and devotion. An “excursus” surveys the reception made of his work by Claudel, Maritain, Mounier, and Du Bos. A concluding essay situates B. within the intellectual history of his epoch, marked by the Modernist crisis and theological debates about mysticism. Finally, an analytical table provides translations of the numerous Latin citations.

An untimely death prevented the historian Émile Goichot, a Bremont specialist, from being the director of this new edition. His essay reprinted at the beginning of this work, “Henri Bremond, Historian of the Hunger for God,” defines B.’s project as it followed in the wake of Henry Newman and William James: to render an account of the religious aspiration (“inquietude”) at work in every person and of the spiritual “experience” that reason, alone in itself, cannot quench.

Centre Sèvres, Paris

FRANÇOIS EUVÉ, S.J.


Nearly a half century ago, C. Wright Mills characterized the sociological imagination as enabling its possessor “to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two in society.” Émile Poulat has located his own work in the interface between sociology and history, with close engagement of psychology, philosophy, and theology. In previous work he has been able to take an exemplary figure—such as Alfred Loisy or Umberto Benigni—and from that biographical focus illuminate the questions and responses, the intellectual and institutional contexts that shaped and were shaped by that life, the intersections of lives and their ruptures that are indicative of a period and its problems. In this volume P. examines representatives of three generations of Catholics, beginning with those exposed to the shock of Modernism under Pius X and ending with those who came to maturity under the pontificate of Pius XII. With one exception (Miguel de Unamuno) all are French. They encompass the well known and the obscure. In the third generation a number were known to P. personally.

These 29 capsule lives are preceded by an essay reflecting on the place of biography in the study of history. In his earlier work P. had made it clear that the intrinsic fascination of lives drew him to look beyond ideas expressed and positions taken to those who held them. Here he reiterates his conviction that, beyond such interest, there is a necessity in taking and giving account of historical actors. For history is not only the product of economic forces, of movements both organizational and intellectual, of applications of power ecclesiastical and secular; such an “acephelous” history abstracts from the stories of souls that impart to history its existential dimension. To adapt a formula, the personal is the historical.

As a preface to his generational soundings P. looks at two figures: Léon Bloy and Unamuno. Turning then to the first generation, he engages seven men who were involved in the crisis, ranging from the prominent (Alfred
Loisy and Maurice Blondel) to the more marginal (Marcel Hébert, Albert Houtin, Joseph Turmel, and Johannes Wehrle) to the rather obscure (Jean-Marie Grosjean). The “generation of the apostolate” corresponding to the pontificate of Pius XI includes six biographical subjects giving access to such areas as Catholic journalism (Salvien Miglietti), the study of mysticism (Jacques Baruzi), the shock of encounter between Catholicism and psychoanalysis (Paul Jury), the engagement of Catholic theology and philosophy with historical consciousness (Bruno de Solages and Jacques Maritain), and the impact of the religious question on the worker and peasant (Paul Feller). The third generation, that of the “reddening of the revolution,” is divided into those on the right (five in number: Henri Rambaud, François Ducaud-Bourget, Achille Dauphin-Meunier, Paul Carton, Pierre Gordon) and those on the left (eight: Jean-Augustin, Jean Boulier, Paul Vignaux, Michel Cépède, Marcel Légaut, Maurice Montuclard, Henri Desroche, Placide Rambaud). As a counterpoint (or complement) to his extensive research on Modernism, P. has done significant work on intégrisme, research that provides a context for understanding the former. Analogously, his writings on laïcité assist his retrieval of the latter figures. Here again the choice is governed in significant measure by the contribution they make to varied aspects of a Catholicism attempting to come to terms with modern culture, to a “historical sociology of present-day Catholicism” (24). He concludes with some pages on François Mitterrand as representative of “the Catholicism not very Catholic” with regard to the Church’s doctrinal and moral teachings, reflective of the majority of the French.

In this galaxy of lives that emerge from the 19th century and span the 20th, one meets the unexpected. With frequency, areas—indeed entire horizons—of further investigation are opened up within the compass of the few pages allotted to a life. P. succeeds in his stated intent to illuminate the responses of persons of faith, to expose the nature of that faith, and what became of it in the midst of the situations they lived through, and the questions that were opened up and responses that were made (9–10). He makes his case for the importance of family of origin in understanding many of these figures, and for the cautionary note that the image of a period is not the determinant of the actual personal relations that may obtain among members of its cohorts.

Ranging as it does through time and through social, political, and ecclesiastical space, and reflecting the vast erudition of its author, this book makes heavy demands on its reader. An enormous amount of historical background is comprehended. Depending on the reader’s own generational interests, some parts will be more understandable than others. All, however, are rewarding to anyone interested in the foundational concern that runs through these pages: the responses of Catholicism to modernity as those are reflected in the lives of those who stayed, those on the margins, those who became “chrétiens sans Église,” or those who adhered to rationalism and opposed the Church.

University of Saint Thomas, Houston

C. J. T. Talar

Article Four of the 1682 Declaration of the Gallican Clergy said that in questions of faith the judgment of the pope is not irreformable "unless the consensus of the Church is present with it." Here Richard Costigan has gathered the fruit of the many years he has devoted to the study of the 17th- to the 19th-century Catholic theologians who wrote either in defense or in condemnation of that Article. All the authors he has studied understood that the "Church" in this Article meant the bishops as the "teaching Church," and that for a judgment to be irreformable its author must be infallible in pronouncing it. They agreed that a consensus of the whole "teaching Church" (the bishops along with the pope) was infallible. The papalists also believed that since the pope was infallible when he pronounced definitive judgments on matters of faith and morals, the irreformability of his teaching did not depend on the consensus of the bishops. The Gallicans insisted that it did, but since the doctrine of papal infallibility was not then a dogma of faith, they could not be accused of heresy.

C. gives a sympathetic account of the doctrine of five Gallican theologians: Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, Honoré Tournely, Louis Bailly, Nicolas-Sylvestre Bergier, and César-Guillaume La Luzerne, and an unsympathetic account, as I would describe it, of the doctrine of four papalists: Giuseppe Agostino Orsi, Petro Ballerini, Alfonso Muzzarelli, and Giovanni Perrone. The most valuable contribution C. makes is the light he throws on the thinking of the Catholic theologians who were convinced that only the consensus of the whole teaching church could provide absolute certitude that what was taught was true. In support of this view they appealed to the church of the first millennium, when controversies about the faith were settled by the great councils, in which the bishops gave their witness to the faith as it had been handed down in their local churches. The Gallicans were convinced that the practice of settling doctrinal disputes by the consensus of the whole teaching Church represented the genuine tradition of the Church, and that the concentration of teaching authority in the pope, without the collaboration and consensus of the bishops, was an aberration. While they were bound by French law to uphold the Gallican Articles, C. has shown that there can be no doubt about their profound conviction that Article Four corresponded to the traditional doctrine and practice of the Church.

However, one may ask whether C. lets his sympathy for the Gallican theologians influence his judgment when he described the "mainstream Gallican view" expressed by Tournely as "essentially what is today called collegiality" (77). He says: "What is necessary, in Tournely's view of the consensus of the Church, is recognition of the genuine role of the episcopate in teaching the faith" (74). That, no doubt, was what the minority at Vatican I was seeking in vain to have expressed in the formula by which papal infallibility was to be defined. But the minority at Vatican I was
prepared to give their *placet* to the definition of papal infallibility, if the role of the episcopate in teaching the faith had been somehow recognized in the definition. They were advocating what we now call collegiality, but certainly not “the mainstream Gallican view” according to which “the judgment of the Roman Pontiff in cases of faith and morals is subject to error and is not certainly irreformable, unless the consensus of the Church is present with it” (74).

I have space to give but one instance of what I had in mind when I described C.’s account of the papalist position as unsympathetic. He says: “The papalist view does not recognize in the Church any such thing as reception or consensus when a papal pronouncement is issued, if these terms mean anything more than docile assent and obedience to the statement...This doctrine of the papalist authors was strongly asserted in the ex *sese* clause of *Pastor aeternus*, which surely rejects reception along with the consensus of the Church” (33–34). But surely, every Catholic theologian should know that the ex *sese* clause of *Pastor aeternus* excludes consensus to a papal definition only if it is made a condition on which the irreformability of the definition would depend. The Gallican Article made it such a condition, and it was precisely this that the clause was intended to exclude, not reception or consensus as such. The fact that the clause can easily be misunderstood is a good reason why a Catholic theologian who refers to it should be careful to say what it really means.

_Boston College_  
FRANCIS A. SULLIVAN, S.J.


In 1967 Pesch published the book for which he is perhaps best known, his comparison of Aquinas and Luther on justification. He meanwhile went on to publish many more, to become one of the better known historical theologians in Germany, and to assume the unusual position of a Catholic theologian in a Protestant faculty of theology, University of Hamburg. Even though this book on Vatican II, first published in German in 1993, went through at least four printings to become for its genre a best-seller, it has been almost completely ignored in the Anglophone world. I hope the Italian translation will help it receive wider attention.

The subtitle is a little misleading. Although P. sets the council in its context, he is more intent on analyzing the documents and issues than on constructing a continuous narrative from “prehistory” to aftermath. He is, after all, not a historian but a theologian plying his trade. He plies it in this instance with success, for his text is remarkably crisp and straightforward, his points convincingly made. The book grew out of a course P. taught at Hamburg in 1985 and 1990–91, and it reflects the techniques of a good
pedagogue, as in enumerated summaries of what the documents teach and how that teaching is new or important.

P. is evenhanded in dealing with the achievements and the failures of the council, and with what fell in between. He obviously admires John XXIII but does not idealize him or attribute to him a vision he did not have. In that regard P. notes to good effect that John was basically satisfied with the preparatory documents (60), most of which the council ultimately either rejected or radically reworked. He divides the council fathers into progressives and conservatives, categories that are often criticized as simplistic or biased but that are impossible altogether to eschew if one wants to convey something of the dynamics of the council and how it found its voice.

If you know the council well, you will not find anything here particularly new or startling. P. provides some helpful insights, but none of them entail a significant reevaluation of the council. This feature is more a strength than a weakness: the book is a thoughtful synthesis of some of the best scholarship and reflection on the council, especially from the German-speaking world, which is precisely what P. intended the book to be. He wanted to supply a comprehensive treatment of the council that, unlike those that appeared in the late 1960s, would have the advantage of 35 years of hindsight. The book ends in fact with a long chapter evaluating the council. The chapter is entitled, “The Third Period of Church History,” an allusion, of course, to Karl Rahner’s famous article in which he described the council as ushering in the new, “third” period of “the world church.”

As P. recounts in an analytic way the decisions and events of the post-conciliar period, he assesses the gains and losses. He tries to be fair but comes up with only three pages of gains compared to eighteen of losses in these years of “restoration.” The list of losses rounds up the usual suspects, but is impressive for bringing them together and developing them with helpful specificity: (1) the implications of Humanae vitae and the renewed affirmation of the discipline of celibacy, (2) certain liturgical rulings, (3) the crackdown on liberty of expression and inquiry, (4) the practical rejection of the collegiality of bishops, (5) the damper on ecumenical dialogue, (6) the failure to take women’s needs and voices seriously. The book ends with the equivalent of “I-Have-A-Dream” for the church.

Although the book holds up well, it is not new. Especially the last chapter needs updating and revision. The book was published, moreover, before the five-volume history of the council under Giuseppe Alberigo’s editorship appeared, although that does not in fact pose a major problem. While the Alberigo volumes supply a much fuller background and far closer account of how the documents of the council originated and developed, they do not invalidate what P. says in those regards. I detected a few errors of fact (making Pericle Felici a cardinal, for instance, and F. X. Murphy a journalist), but they are inconsequential and almost inevitable in a work of such scope. This is a fine book. To my knowledge nothing like it exists in English.

*Georgetown University, Washington*  
*John W. O’Malley, S.J.*
Systematically written, exhaustively researched, this Catholic counterpart to David Bosch’s magisterial *Transforming Mission* (1991) presents a contemporary theology of mission elucidating the radically contextual nature of Christianity since biblical times (26, 302, 397). While upholding their own liberal Vatican II stance (for example, on such issues as the redemptive status of other religions), the authors fairly present all sides and explicate the more conservative thrust of current Vatican statements. The title’s “constants” are Christology, ecclesiology, eschatology, soteriology, anthropology, and inculturation (33–34)—theological concerns that the authors contend are perennial in the history of missions. (Favoring a “praxis” methodology, the authors make no clear distinction between second-order missiologies and actual missionary practice. They also most often use “mission” in the singular.)

Part 1 on foundations (biblical [chap. 1] and theological [chap. 2]) summarizes the extension of God’s mission beyond Israel, as schematized in the Acts of the Apostles (rather than the earlier, Pauline corpus). Mission begets church as instrument of God’s inbreaking kingdom (7–9). In theology, the authors adapt Justo Gonzalez’s (xi–xiv) and, to a lesser extent, Dorothee Soelle’s (35) notion of three seminal “types” that emanate from Tertullian (A), Origen (B), and Irenaeus (C). Type (A) draws on Roman law, (B) on Hellenistic philosophy, and (C) on Antiochene historical theology to color successive contextualizations of the six constants (37). Surprisingly, Augustine, treated as a crypto-Manichee (46), is (A)-stream, whereas Barth is (C) (63, 65). In ecclesiology (A) is more institutional, (B) sacramental/mystical, and (C) heraldic or servant-oriented.

Ten “summary tables” in subsequent chapters list how, for example, a high Christology and negative anthropology informed type (A) missiologies in the Americas between 1492 and 1773 (197). Despite these aids, readers may be confused by a plethora of further taxonomies: six elements of mission (witness/proclamation, liturgy/prayer/contemplation, justice/peace/creation, interreligious dialogue, inculturation, and reconciliation [2–5, 352–94]), seven stages of mission in Acts (13), various historical “models” of mission (baptism, settlement, accommodation, imperial, prophetic, *tabula rasa*, *convento*, countercultural, translation, evangelistic, monastic, mendicant, missionary societies, dialogical [73, 198–99]), four 20th-century periods of missiological development (244), and various models for dialogue (replacement, fulfillment and mutuality [380]), plus echoes of others (for example, exclusivist, inclusivist, and pluralist [55]).

Emphasizing that all mission is God’s pervading of creation, the authors...
want all church activity to be mission-centered. Every liturgy should be “inside out,” from community to world (362). Rather than vacuously dubbing everything “mission,” the authors do better when propounding a “multidimensional understanding” of mission (350), noting that all types, models, and historic periods overlap somewhat.

Part 2 (chs. 3–8) provides admirably clear, comprehensive accounts, not only of Catholic mission history but also of concurrent Orthodox and Protestant trends, for example, among East Syrians/Nestorians in now predominantly Muslim regions (102–3) and modern conservative and/or fundamentalist Protestants (325–30). The authors give details on the majority of Christians in the southern hemisphere (279) and show how, in origin and current embodiments, Christianity overall should be reckoned a “non-Western” religion (75–77).

While giving their due to the likes of Francis of Assisi, Francis Xavier, Matteo Ricci, Robert de Nobili, and Mother Teresa (184–89, 353), the authors underscore the anonymous contributions of many women religious and laity (255). They follow Lamin Sanneh, Andrew Walls, and others in noting how missions, through the spread of literacy and use of the vernacular, both communicated Western values and helped to undermine colonialism (213, 231, 237).

Ecclesiologically, “church” mostly refers to the universal Catholic Church, whose head is Christ, while acknowledging, especially since Vatican II (97), others’ foci on local churches, including indigenous institutions. Christians go the path we have learned, mindful that God’s mission cannot be limited to church activities (53). Sin never entirely occludes redemptive grace in the church or in the world (7, 301–2).

Part 3 resumes the theological task, taking mission characterized as “prophetic dialogue” (chap. 12) to be the best synthesis of the missiology found in modern encyclicals and parallel Orthodox and Protestant pronouncements—from Ad gentes on “participation in the mission of the triune God” (chap. 9) and Evangelii nuntiandi on “liberating service of the reign of God” (chap. 10), to Redemptoris missio on “proclamation of Jesus Christ as Universal Savior” in 1990. The term “prophetic” denotes the central reference throughout to Jesus’ historic mission (304) and “dialogue” flags interactions pro and con with the secular world and different cultural contexts, including other religions (350–51).

A strength of part 3 is the grounding of mission in God’s triune presence, avoiding polemical oppositions between christocentrism/christomonism and theo/soteriocentrism (54, 292–95, 380). The authors note Barth’s influence here, but not his warning against Hegelian notions of trinity. They are confident that the gospel can always be translated without compromise (49, 108) and that God everywhere promotes inculturation (302). Every library should have this book.

Trinity College, Toronto

Peter Slater

Historian Mark Noll, of Wheaton College, and Carolyn Nystrom, a freelance writer, are eminently fair in assessing Roman Catholicism from an Evangelical perspective, although they note that fairness on either side has not always been the case. Among several examples of a troubled history, they cite a delegate to the 1873 meeting of the Evangelical Alliance who declared: “The most formidable foe of living Christianity among us is not Deism or Atheism, or any form of infidelity, but the nominally Christian Church of Rome” (11). Catholic and Evangelical relations have come a long way since those days, and the change is not just rhetorical.

To show that “things are not the way they used to be,” the authors give numerous examples of new cooperative efforts: the Reverend Billy Graham’s crusades moving beyond interconfessional antagonisms to include Catholics, encouraged by Boston’s Cardinal Richard Cushing who welcomed him to New England in 1964; Catholics and Evangelicals finding common ground on (some) social issues, particularly on pro-life and family questions; leading Evangelicals being welcomed at the Vatican by Pope John Paul II; Catholic and Evangelical editors cooperating on the new InterVarsity Press Ancient Christian Commentary series; representatives from both traditions working together in university campus ministries and pastoral programs such as the Alpha course (see http://alpha.org); using each other’s music; entering into dialogues both international and local.

They also note that, unfortunately, relations in Latin America and southern Europe remain more distant, still burdened by historical antagonisms. The authors also offer a useful survey of past Evangelical-Catholic polemics, mostly from the Evangelical side, from the mixed attitude of John Wesley in the 17th century, Lyman Beecher in the early 19th, Loraine Boettner and Paul Blanchard in the 20th, to the mysterious, atavistic Jack Chick, whose four hundred million anti-Catholic comics appear today in 70 languages. To show why Evangelicals in the U.S. so often saw Catholics as a threat to their civil liberties, they quote Popes Gregory XVI and Pius IX arguing against liberty of conscience and the separation of church and state and for the establishment of Catholicism.

Vatican II gets primary credit for changing Evangelical attitudes toward Roman Catholics, but other factors include the election of John Kennedy as president, the charismatic renewal, and cultural changes in the United States that have brought Evangelicals together with Catholics on a number of social issues and made them more open to Catholic support for parochial education as an alternative to an increasingly secular public school system.

One chapter offers a summation of more than 35 years of ecumenical dialogue, teasing out the basic differences, with Catholics viewing all theology from the perspective of ecclesiology and Protestants putting more
emphasis on the individual Christian. Highlighting the 1999 Lutheran-Roman Catholic Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification, they see the remaining disagreements in the eight dialogues reviewed as rooted in ecclesiology. Another excellent chapter deals with the new Catechism of the Catholic Church. If progressive Catholics tend to ignore the Catechism, Evangelical and confessional Protestants esteem it highly, seeing it as a rich source of Catholic teaching, rooted in Scripture and the fathers, pastoral in tone, and extremely useful for moving beyond popular misunderstandings of Catholic teaching. Later the authors ask, “Why do we not possess such a thorough, clear, and God-centered account of our faith as the Catechism offers to Roman Catholics?” (150).

This is a hopeful book and makes excellent reading. The authors are fair to both sides, discussing questions such as infant versus believer’s baptism, salvation as event or process, and comparing their different understandings of worship, noting that Catholics hear more public reading of Scripture than those in most Protestant denominations. At times their interpretation of Catholic teaching falls short, for example, in asserting that Catholics make recognition of the pope a condition of eucharistic hospitality or that matrimonial sacramentality requires that both spouses be baptized Catholics. They devote considerable attention to the Colson/Neuhaus initiative, Evangelicals and Catholics Together (ECT), but little to the considerably older international Pentecostal-Roman Catholic Dialogue (1972) and Evangelical-Roman Catholic Dialogue (1977). They conclude that Evangelicals are no longer monolithic in their attitudes toward Catholicism; some are antagonists or at least critics, but others are partners or converts.

In the end, they leave open the question posed by the book’s title, noting again the progress made and expressing the hope that God might do even more. But the Reformation apparently is not over at Wheaton, Noll’s own school, which still will not hire Roman Catholics as faculty members, and about the time the book appeared terminated the contract of a popular professor who had converted to Catholicism.

Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles  THOMAS P. RAUSCH, S.J.


Since its defense as a doctoral dissertation at Austria’s University of Graz, this work has received Vienna’s prestigious “Kardinal-Innitzer-Förderpreis” and the “Johann-Kaspar-Zeß-Preis.” Its author was already serving as a Cistercian prior and teaching fundamental theology at Heiligenkreuz’s Cistercian college when then-Cardinal Ratzinger supplied a foreword for this second edition. Heim’s study situates Ratzinger within the Church’s move from its 19th-century apologetic and legalistic ecclesiology (built on the societas perfecta image) to a Christocentric, eucharistic,
and pneumatic ecclesiology. H. traces this shift from Pope Pius XII’s 1943 appeal to the image of the church as the Mystical Body of Christ, to Ratzinger’s important contribution to Vatican II’s decree on the church, *Lumen gentium* (*LG*), a contribution that is the primary focus of this study.

H. begins with the council’s definition of the church as found in *LG*, mapping out the close links between the term “people of God” and other key terms, such as “mystery,” “sacrament,” “mission,” and “communion.” But he highlights the preeminence of the former. Borrowing a line from Hans Urs von Balthasar, he concludes that *Lumen gentium* liberated the church “to its proper possibility: to live under its head Christ from his Spirit” (142).

After noting Ratzinger’s intellectual indebtedness to Johann Adam Möhler and Matthias Scheeben, H. relates how, in 1950, Ratzinger won an academic competition with his substantive response to the question: Can Augustine’s definition of the church as “the people of God” be the hermeneutic key to comprehending the patristic intuition of the church’s essence? He insisted that the church is a dynamic reality, ever renewed by Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit. In its Christocentric and pneumatic reading, the term “people of God” defines the church essentially. Only as both a christological “prolongation” and a sacramental reality does the church become real and historical, while it also transcends pneumatically any empirical entity. The sacramental church cannot be without an institutional form, but can never be reduced to a merely juridical structure—“she is person” (375). Ratzinger perceives the church as “the continuous incarnation,” united as a people “by the unity of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit” (see *LG* no. 4). The church is nothing less than the “transpersonal subject of faith, rooted in the Trinitarian mystery, attesting to its identity in Christ” (147). Based on Bonaventure’s understanding of history (developed in opposition to Joachim of Fiore), in 1959 Ratzinger’s “Habilitationsschrift” concluded that the church needs to be both pneumatic and christological, lest one collapse into Joachim’s heresy of a pneumatic-prophetic church. This, H. claims, is the motivation for Ratzinger’s unequivocal rejection of some aspects of liberation theology.

Possible changes in Ratzinger’s ecclesiology during and after the council are a major concern of the author. He mentions that, during the council, Ratzinger challenged a misunderstanding among some council members, namely, the belief that the council was a parliament meant to produce new doctrinal approaches, that it desired to accommodate to the “modern ways” (1963). This led Ratzinger to newly and increasingly assert the sinful nature of church members (1971), a condition corrected only by personal, sacramental “conversion to Christ.” Another conciliar issue—that of “the plurality of local churches”—led Ratzinger to more forcefully emphasize the Church’s universality. Again, H. examines the hotly contested meaning of “subsistit” (*LG* no. 8) and the way Ratzinger contributed significantly to this formula. He touches on how the Protestant theologian Oscar Cullmann and Romano Guardini’s notion of the “living-concrete” informed Ratzinger’s thought. H. claims Ratzinger’s understanding of collegiality is more
palatable to the Eastern rite churches, while Rahner’s is more congenial to the denominations emanating from the Reformation. In 1964 Ratzinger proposed dissolving the Latin patriarchy and establishing a multitude of patriarchal territories within bishops’ conferences, living perichoretically as “churches communicating with one another.” After the council, he proposed that bishops should share in the responsibility for governing the universal church, later stressing that bishops cannot delegate their responsibilities.

Underlying all of these developments, however, is Ratzinger’s consistent understanding of the ontological priority of the universal church. The one Holy Spirit constantly acts within the church. This is the cantus firmus resonating throughout Ratzinger’s 55 years of writing on the eucharistic nature of the church, demonstrating a “consistency in spite of a change of perspective.”

H. has given us the most exhaustive, comprehensive, and also balanced, erudite, and profound study on Ratzinger’s ecclesiology yet available. It establishes a reliable and indispensable resource in comprehending his ecclesiological loci and central concerns as priest, theologian, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, and now pontiff.

University of St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Ill. Emery de Gaál


Apologetics seeks to give a rational account of faith, thus to integrate faith and reason. Avery Dulles’s A History of Apologetics, first published in 1971, has been republished in a new edition. As in the earlier version, D. focuses on Christian apologists, excluding those more concerned with arguing for a particular confession or doctrine. This second edition pays considerably more attention to the Christian engagement with Islam in the first millennium and to the revival of apologetics in the second half of the 20th century.

Defining apologetics as the effort to persuade unbelievers to accept Christianity or to help believers overcome their own doubts and hesitations (16), he then surveys apologetics in the New Testament, the patristic era, the Middle Ages, the 16th through 18th centuries, the 19th century, and the 20th century in two parts. Especially interesting is the relative tolerance between Christians and Muslims in the early Middle Ages, both in Muslim territory and in Western Europe. John Damascene, son of a tax collector for the Saracen caliph, regarded Islam as a species of Arianism because it viewed Christ as a creature. His Dialogue between a Saracen and a Christian wrestled with the problem of evil from the perspectives of both traditions. Other apologists like Theodore Abū Qurrah, a Mesopotamian bishop, argued for the supremacy of Christianity on the basis of its ability to propagate without the sword, an argument used later by Aquinas. In the 13th century Raymond of Pennafort established a school to train his Do-
minican friars in Arabic and Hebrew. D. comments that most efforts to address Islam, lasting as late as the 15th century, were not successful, hindered by an inability to approach it as a living religion, though some like Abū Qurrah, Abelard, and Nicholas of Cusa took steps toward a comparative study of religions. After the Reformation, apologetics gave way to controversy and polemic. D. considers the 19th century as the most fruitful for apologists. The Protestant Karl Heinrich Sack and the Catholic Johann Sebastian von Drey, founder of the Tübingen School, established the foundations for fundamental theology that, in the 20th century and particularly in Germany, was to include apologetics as a function or subset.

The second edition of D.’s work is brought up to date by reworking the chapter on the 20th century and adding a concluding chapter on its second half. He attributes the 20th-century decline of apologetics to Barth’s influence on the Protestant side and at least in part to Vatican II’s more irenic methods, though the last decades of the century have seen in North America a revival as well as a convergence among both Catholics and Evangelicals. He includes representatives such as Karl Rahner, Hans Küng, Hans Urs von Balthasar, Luigi Giusanni, and John Paul II as well as J. A. T. Robinson, Paul Althaus, Wolfhart Pannenberg, Richard Swinburne, Norman Geisler, and N. T. Wright. New apologists like Karl Keating, Patrick Madrid, Dale Vree, Scott and Kimberly Hahn, and also Peter Kreeft and Ronald Tacelli are mentioned briefly, but D. does not consider them in depth because most seek to persuade Protestants to become Catholics, putting them outside the scope of his work.

The book is less a systematic study of apologetics than a survey of its history. It is not always clear how D. would distinguish apologetics from theology proper, though he cites approvingly Henri de Lubac’s assertion that there can be no valid apologetics that does not begin and end in theology (289). Reviewers of the book’s first edition expressed the hope that he would develop his own understanding of the nature of apologetics in a subsequent volume. He takes a step toward this in the final chapter by providing a helpful outline of the various views or approaches: the classical, establishing the existence of God by means of natural theology and then demonstrating Christianity’s validity as the highest version of theism; the evidential, relying on external evidences, particularly the miracles of Jesus and his resurrection; the cumulative case method, assembling all the arguments for the Christian claim; a presuppositional apologetics, a particularly Protestant approach that proceeds from an assumption of the Bible’s truth; and a Reformed epistemological approach that relies on the testimonium Sancti Spiritus internum to enable one to accept Christian belief without the necessity of prior demonstrations. A few omissions (John Baillie, Erich Przywara) and errors (dates for Bossuet) from the first edition remain. His book is remarkable for the breadth of its survey and extensive bibliography. It will remain a standard.

Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles

THOMAS RAUSCH, S.J.
Practical theology has occupied an amorphous place in the family of theological disciplines despite the ingenious effort of Friederich Schleiermacher in 1811 to give it an integral role along with philosophical and historical theologies. That role was to discern in Christianity’s historical forms needed “rules of action” for church leaders. Eventually this role led practical theology to become the umbrella term for teaching ministers the skills they require to carry out their ministry. In The Analogical Imagination (1981) David Tracy reconfigured Schleiermacher’s schema and assigned practical theology the much broader role of relating critical theological reflection on praxis to public living. Don Browning refined this proposal in his magisterial A Fundamental Practical Theology (1991) by providing a four-step method for reflecting critically on the practices of faith communities.

Into these developments comes Terry Veling. Unlike his predecessors, V. has not written a systematic treatise on the nature and purpose of practical theology, nor constructed an argument for the validity and status of practical theology, nor offered a detailed method for doing practical theology. His work presupposes that the reader is acquainted with the reorientation of practical theology over the last 25 years, and agrees with it. He reflects on the implications of the “new” practical theology and offers a personal assessment of its value. This approach results in more of a “feel” for practical theology than in its precise delineation, an impression that is reinforced by his meditative, often poetic, style.

The book is divided into three parts with four chapters each. The Lord’s Prayer provides headings for the three parts: on earth as it is in heaven; may your name be held holy; your kingdom come. This arrangement highlights the fact that practical theology begins in and is always concerned with the concrete situations and movements of people’s lives on earth. Practical theology seeks to interpret and live these situations in such a way that God’s name is honored and truthfully revealed. Insofar as this is done, the resulting practice of believing people helps to usher in the kingdom of God.

Within each of these sections V. explores a number of related issues: hermeneutics; the signs of the times; action giving rise to knowledge; the sublime importance of each person; the immense challenges posed to the coming of God’s kingdom by multicultural differences, justice without mercy, the taming of the poetic word, and borders erected against immigrant people. Each of V.’s topical presentations could stand alone, with practical theology often simply an implied context. A few points (such as the theory-practice split, or the ancient conviction that philosophy and theology were in the service of living) are repeated at different places as if they had not been mentioned earlier.

V.’s reflections are crafted in engaging dialogue with towering figures like Martin Heidegger, Paul Ricoeur, Hans Georg Gadamer, and especially Emmanuel Levinas. For those unacquainted with Levinas, V.’s chapter,
Can the Wisdom of Heaven Return to Earth?" is an excellent and enticing introduction. V. is clearly influenced by the rabbinic style of commentary, which he knows well. He calls the Talmud a quintessential expression of practical theology (68) and himself tends to rephrase an idea three or four times in slightly different ways within the same sentence. The effect, as with rabbinic midrash, is not repetitious but expansive, moving the reader each time to wider circles of experience.

V. offers a number of fresh insights such as the telling point that theologians are more concerned with identifying and naming God's being than God is, whereas God's concern is to call and move people to act on behalf of a better world (49). He skillfully uses the analogy of an apple to discuss multiculturalism (157) and the metaphor of the city gate to analyze the relationship of justice and mercy (175). He draws on personal experience to convey the alienation imposed by national borders (215–16). His argument that hearing (knowing) comes from doing (acting) is persuasively couched in biblical testimony, and his final assessment that practical theology is like a rolling stone captures the mood and movement of his book perfectly.

V.'s work is an appreciative celebration of what it means to theologize from concrete situations and to let the ambiguous experience of reality shape one's theological reflection. The spirit of his conviction is infectious and invites the reader to go and do likewise.

Center for Theological Reflection, Clearwater Fla. ROBERT L. KINAST


This collection of 14 essays was developed over the course of three conferences in 2003. With fine editing by Braaten and Seitz, it embodies an interdenominational dialogue among representatives of the Anglican, Augustinian-Lutheran, Orthodox, Reformed, and Roman Catholic traditions on the lessons and lasting value of the Ten Commandments. Three authors are ethicists, two are biblicists, and nine are engaged in historical and dogmatic studies or in pastoral practice. No women number among the authors of this text (nor do scholars of color), although other unnamed participants may have attended the conferences. Still, the collection offers a glimpse into contemporary trends in dominant Christian homiletics.

As the subtitle suggests, the conferences pursued a decidedly Christian appropriation of the Ten Commandments. The individual authors claim to have assumed apologetic postures in order to both inspire Christians to consider anew the importance of the Decalogue for everyday life and to challenge the contemporary American refusal to witness—in forms such as public monuments or prayers at football games—to America's debt to the commandments, despite the historic importance of the Jewish-Christian tradition to the Declaration of Independence and the United States Con-
stitution. Many of the authors appeal to what they call the “plain sense” of the commandments to ground their challenges. Given this “plain sense” approach, I was struck by the lack of exegetical discourse (historical critical methods) that might have provided a context out of which Christians today could begin to appreciate and acknowledge both the unique and the rational (natural law) elements contained in the Sinai revelation to the first hearers of this word. Nor do any of the authors engage a critique from critical feminist or otherwise liberationist perspectives.

The collection is divided into four parts: the first and fourth serve as introduction and conclusion; the center parts focus on the two tables of the law. Philip Turner reminds readers of the deconstructive tendencies of the postmodern world and highlights how that postmodern turn challenges any attempt to ground a Christian way of life in the law. Turner further explores the uses of both the natural law and the Decalogue as political, pedagogical, and transformative for the faithful, a recurrent theme in the collection. Seitz situates the Decalogue in the context of the covenant made with Israel and the subsequent extension of the original covenant and its laws to people who stand outside that founding relationship. He locates the Christian embrace of the Decalogue in the parallels between Israel’s recognized protections owed the sojourner in Israel’s midst and Jesus’ own witness to the law and outreach to Gentiles.

The essays that are specific to one or another of the commandments all claim the unity of the commandments, arguing that the first word of the Decalogue, “I am the Lord your God,” is commonly implemented by the remainder of the first table (concerning worship) and the second table (primarily moral proscriptions). The authors present a compelling case for this unity. Each argues as well for the continuity of the Decalogue with the teachings of Jesus and the testimony of the early Christian communities. Indeed, where many may argue that Jesus was antinomian, these authors convince otherwise. In a clever essay on the second commandment, David Hart challenges the claim of Jesus’ antinominianism with the counterclaim that it is the nihilistic (associating this nihil with the nothingness of other gods) and liberalist claims of postmodernity to which the contemporary Christian community—within this post-Christian culture—must answer with service to the one God who clearly commands. Ephraim Radner’s essay illuminates an unusual connection between the words for “vain” of the third commandment (in Hebrew, shav, “lie”; in Greek, mataios, “empty”) with the kenosis, the “emptying,” of Christ.

Not unlike the catechisms of both the Reform and Roman traditions, these essays expound on the exhortative permutations of interpretation that can be traced from the earliest extracanonical Christian writings through the medieval and reform periods to the present. As noted earlier, unfortunately, the homogeneity of authors limits the appeal of the work and may overshadow its service to a heterogeneous audience. Lastly, while the project asks that Christians take seriously the Decalogue as a law for their practice, the failures to refer to God in terms other than “he” and to raise the critique from underrepresented scholars is itself an affront to
God’s sovereignty over and loving kindness toward the poor, oppressed, and marginalized.

_Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla._

MARY JO IOZZIO


Neoclassical economists, with platonic purity and always insistently, regard any market imperfections or external interventions as undesirable, and have been committed, following Adam Smith, to keeping markets as perfect (that is, unhindered) as possible. Albino Barrera starts from a different, much more realistic perspective. While acknowledging the virtues of the market as an efficient decentralized mechanism for allocating resources, he takes seriously the economic distress that markets actually generate in the lives of many people. That distress reaches a critical point in what B. calls “compulsion,” namely, situations where freedom to choose is reduced to the freedom to sacrifice something essential for life in order to save something more essential, even life itself. These unpalatable choices are the staple of economic life for the poor.

Chapters 1 and 2 present the concept of economic compulsion, and how it arises from the regular operation of real markets. The author brilliantly shows that compulsion needs not result only from intentional coercion, but often follows unintentionally from pecuniary externalities generated by the market itself. The different mechanisms through which pecuniary externalities produce economic compulsion are explained in a clear language that any reader, no matter how lay in economics, can understand without difficulty.

Chapters 3 and 4 set a Christian “moral baseline” for judging economic compulsion. B. extracts three theses from the Bible and Christian theology: (1) God has created a world where human beings need not be subject to extreme scarcity or economic insecurity; (2) the divine gift of abundance and security is linked to an adequate structuring of economic life by the community; (3) the gift is also conditioned by personal effort. Particularly interesting are B.’s detailed presentations of the law of Israel and the Scholastic theory of the just price as social mechanisms for restoring those in economic distress, for reintegrating them fully into the productive effort of society and the enjoyment of its fruits. (The traditional theory of the state of extreme necessity, where private property is suspended while necessity lasts, could perhaps have been added here.)

Chapter 5 proposes a reelaboration of social and economic rights doctrine as an adequate contemporary actualization of the moral baseline provided by the Christian tradition. With great analytic depth, B. develops such doctrine within a framework of personalistic humanism. In analytic detail, he counters the most relevant objections to the inclusion of social and economic rights within a general rights theory, and offers not only a list of well-meaning desiderata, but a practical theory able to adjudicate real-
world conflicts. A fundamental structure of the rights, a typification of relationships to which they apply, and lexical rules for their application are offered. Chapter 6 applies that complete analytic framework to the question of agricultural subsidies. It is an intelligently chosen case study that allows B. to show the potential of his theory in a complicated issue where the parties are linked by markets but not by national belonging. The reader will appreciate this remake of the social and economics right theory that makes it useful not only for prophetic denunciation, but also for responsible social decision making.

I offer one suggestion. B.’s argument depends heavily on a personalistic-communitarian conception of the human being in society, a conception that requires a shared vision of the human good and of collective social agency. But Western liberal society does not and cannot promote a communitarian vision of the morally accomplished human being. It is here to guarantee liberty so that each one may pursue the ideal of the good that he or she believes fit. How does, then, B.’s argument hold up before a liberal, pluralistic society?

This liberal objection to a personalistic/communitarian society does not invalidate B.’s argument. First, he proposes a theological stance that Christians can advance in pluralistic public debates. Here Christians will shape only incompletely the outcome of the debate, but will influence it in the direction of more community involvement with the economic fate of the poor. Second, his conclusions about social duties regarding economic compulsion can be accepted also from an individualistic-liberal background. It is enough to notice that supporting and restoring people under severe economic distress does not determine for them, nor society, a vision of the collective good. It rather puts the poor back in capacity to freely choose their own life project. That freedom fulfills the core purpose of the liberal society.

B. offers us analytical tools to detect and understand economic compulsion, criteria to prioritize our efforts for its correction, and both theological and humanistic reasons to take care of people in economic distress within a market economy. A great, most timely contribution to Christian social thought.

_Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas_  
_y Sociales UCAB, Caracas_  

RAÚL GONZÁLEZ FABRE, S.J.


This collection grew out of a summer gathering of young (meaning: new to the field) Catholic moral theologians at the University of Notre Dame in 2002. The New Wine, New Wineskins symposium, convened every year
since, assembles Catholic moral theologians at the beginning of their careers to engage in conversation, prayer, and friendship, and—specifically—to reflect both on their particular vocation in today’s church and academy and on vital issues of contemporary moral theology. In this text, William Mattison has brought together a pertinent and provocative group of essays. Overall, the collection helpfully points to current trends in Catholic moral theology and attempts to situate young Catholic moralists in the contemporary church and academy—offering insight into their formation (for good or for ill), major challenges they face in the classroom, academy, and church, and practices that might best support their work and development.

The book’s introduction usefully groups the essays according to “three important arenas for the practice of Catholic moral theology: formation of moral theologians, the classroom, and engagement in methodological debates in the discipline” (14).

The essays on formation lament that Catholic moral theologians today are not guaranteed ready access to the regularized institutional practices of prayer and worship that used to firmly root Catholic moral theologians in the church, shaping their minds, hearts, and vision. Reflecting on his own professional training and experience, for example, Christopher Vogt speaks of his “only loose, informal connections with the church,” in contrast to the typically clerical and religious moral theologians of previous generations who had tight connections with the church (48). Christopher Steck, himself a Jesuit, similarly warns that a narrowly academic, rationalistic formation is a particular danger for moral theologians of this generation because, as advances in the discipline themselves suggest, Christian ethicists must grasp discipleship and holiness in a more than intellectual way, that is, within spiritual practices that “nurture the ethicist’s Christian vision” (33). One concrete suggestion aimed at better formation of Catholic moral theologians is what Steck calls “discipleship casuistry”—that is, moral reflection on “various kinds of decisions and concrete actions that make up a life of holiness” (37). Specifically, he suggests reflection on the lives of the saints in order to train one’s moral senses and gain insight into what a holy life looks like and to expand one’s moral vision regarding the life of Christian discipleship. Vogt suggests that regular lay preaching at the invitation of the local bishop might better form lay Catholic moral theologians while enabling them to better serve the church, a suggestion that, I imagine, will prompt consideration and conversation.

Kelly Johnson writes of a Christian economic ethic that trusts in plentitude and demands eucharistic solidarity. Though focused on questions of economic justice, she—like Steck and Vogt—asks broader questions about the how the practices of moral theologians (in this case related to economics) are related to their ability to serve the church and academy well. Johnson writes that “we who are called to teach about economic ethics have two closely linked problems: how to teach and how to live,” because to teach about eucharistic solidarity one must “know it from the inside” (172). Margaret Pfeil argues that the theologian is called to mediate God’s love transparently and thus must “surrender all the personal and ecclesial
attachments that might keep them from doing so” (74). For Johnson and Pfeil, doing moral theology fundamentally demands the practice of Christian charity.

The teacher of moral theology is further challenged by Mattison’s claim that, in order to do justice to the discipline and students, one must engage students at the level of faith rather than merely intellectually. He suggests the use of Christian rhetoric as a method for teaching theology. David Cloutier, informed by his experience with students and by the work of Alasdair McIntyre, emphasizes the need for today’s moral theories to better “articulate the intrinsic connections between rules, virtues and the human good” and for teachers to help students develop practical reasoning skills (129). Also helpful and practical is William Bolan’s essay on community-based learning, with its insistence that Catholic educators might best use such a method of learning by connecting it to Catholic social teaching and restoring “its original focus on questioning social values and helping students see themselves as agents of social change” (104).

While I sometimes found it difficult to see how a particular essay cohered with the collection as a whole, the essays are generally well done and I highly recommend this text, particularly for Catholic moral theologians, whether young or established (I dare not write old).

St. Norbert College, De Pere, Wis.

BRIDGET BURKE RAVIZZA


Charles Curran’s latest work reconfirms his well-earned reputation as one of the most intelligent and consistently progressive voices in Catholic moral theology. C. first garnered international attention when he became embroiled with the Vatican over the Church’s teaching on artificial birth control, a debate that ultimately cost him his teaching post at the Catholic University of America and established him as an icon for Catholic liberalism. His history and status can prejudice some readers for/against his latest work on Pope John Paul II’s moral theology. Those expecting a liberal tirade against the late pope will be disappointed, as will those hoping against hope for a blanket psalm of praise for John Paul’s moral theology. C.’s greatest obstacle remains receiving a fair and objective reading (for example, the customer reviews on amazon.com and William May’s review in Homiletic and Pastoral Review [May 3, 2006]). C. finds much to praise and much to criticize in John Paul’s moral methodology, a nuanced reading that can escape the biased reader.

The greatest strength of the book is C.’s systematic analysis and evaluation of the theological and methodological underpinnings of John Paul’s moral theology. In particular, he explores how the pope’s anthropology, use of natural law, Christology, and ecclesiology influence his moral theology and social ethics. C. praises the pope for making the dignity of the human person the cornerstone of Catholic morality, for promoting a rela-
tional understanding of the human person, and for developing the concept of social sin. He notes that the pope’s anthropology links theocentrism and anthropocentrism via the category of truth, whereby Christ is seen as the source of truth. Here C.’s keen analysis provides a critique. He argues that John Paul’s references to truth tend to ignore human sources of truth, use the term generically (that “insinuates that truth is a univocal term” [33]), lack historical consciousness (that is, adopt “a classicist notion of truth as something out there” [34]), and lack sophisticated analysis of the levels of truth. C. concludes that “the concept of truth in the papal encyclicals is overly simplistic and suffers from significant deficiency in light of the Catholic tradition itself and of many contemporary Catholic approaches” (34).

C. challenges the pope’s use of natural law theory by identifying several problems, including (1) an overconfidence in human reason’s ability to discern the eternal law and a lack of attention to how sinfulness distorts reason; (2) a confusing use of the terms “natural” and “human nature” resulting in a tendency toward physicalism, especially in the areas of personal morality and sexual ethics; (3) an elevating of bodily integrity to a moral absolute that runs contrary to the tradition; (4) a failure to realize that human reason is historically and culturally conditioned, and an overall failure “to give enough importance to history and to recognize a more historically conscious approach” (117); and (5) an unwarranted tendency to draw very specific moral claims from natural law theory.

According to C., the pope’s Christology (wherein Christ is seen as the Redeemer and bearer of truth) absorbs his anthropology, resulting in a Christology from above. Regarding John Paul’s ecclesiology, he finds a parallel between the pope’s high Christology and his ecclesiology that C. characterizes as an ecclesiology from above. He criticizes the pope for advancing a model of the church as the “guardian of a deposit of faith” that is too static, triumphalistic, and fails to see the church as a community that learns and grows. C. praises the pope for calling attention to “the sins and injustices committed by members of the church” and for asking for forgiveness (38) and he appreciates the more theological approach of John Paul’s moral and ethical teaching. He notes that the pope uses Scripture more than any previous pope (albeit he questions his exegesis and hermeneutics) and that his encyclicals include spiritual and homiletic qualities.

I offer two criticisms. First, C.’s critique of John Paul’s anthropology is weakened by his failure to seriously consider the prepapal corpus, especially Wojtyla’s The Acting Person (1969, 1979 in English), that provides a fuller understanding of his anthropology. Ironically, in focusing almost exclusively on the pope’s 14 encyclicals, C. falls victim to his own critique of John Paul’s ahistoricism. Second, the primary weakness of the book is stylistic. C. relies heavily on quotations and the tone is “dissertation-like.” It is ideally suited for moral theologians, church historians, graduate students, and seminarians. The last three chapters (on conscience, marriage and family, and social teachings) depart from exploring methodological issues and could prove useful in undergraduate courses. Those chapters
would work especially well in graduate and undergraduate courses because they provide a thoughtful, respectful, and well-defended critique that forces the reader to dialogue with C. and the late pontiff.

Merrimack College, North Andover, Mass.  
MARK J. ALLMAN


These thoughtful essays are the result of five annual meetings by an international group of Catholic theologians and bioethicists. Cahill describes the gatherings as a five-year conversation that moved from particular issues related to genetics, diagnosis, and therapy to larger questions of social justice, the international regulation of research, including, along the way, the traditional topics of patient rights and embryonic research and enhancement.

Section 1 examines foundational issues such as possible theological interpretations of stem cell research and notions of human freedom in relation to the myth of progress. Section 2 explores needed integrative visions of the human person for the development of an ethics of genetics, and the role of a virtue approach in evaluating genetic issues. Section 3 looks at socioeconomic issues such as the role of the common good in contemporary genetics research, and the function of power and vulnerability in the genetics debates, especially in developing countries. Essays of the concluding section explore various themes in the preceding essays or suggest areas of further research.

For American readers, a major value of the collection will be its international character. Brazilian theologian Márcio Fabri’s essay highlights the Brazilian contribution to the screening the human genome, as it also develops an argument from the perspective of liberation theology for the greater participation of all segments of society in the formulation of genetic health policies. Paul Schotsman and Bart Hansen, both at the Center for Bioethics and Law at the Catholic University of Leuven, develop a theology of creation, arguing that, in the act of creating, God is self-limiting, and that humans have what they term a “received autonomy.” However, they insist, this autonomy must be understood in light of the healing narratives of Jesus. Dietmar Mieth, from the Catholic Faculty of Theology at Tübingen, uses Goethe’s Faust—with its image of human freedom and the problematic consequences of efforts at controlling our world—as a context for thinking about various aspects of assisted reproduction. Mieth argues that we need to attend more to the social consequences of these choices as well as to recognize that these choices are made within the context of sinful structures that can compromise our respect for persons.

Kevin Fitzgerald, at the Center for Clinical Bioethics at Georgetown, presents a robust argument for attending closely to issues surrounding philosophical anthropology. Such attention, he argues, can help us expose
unexamined ideas of human nature that stand behind and/or support vari-
ous genetic interventions, particularly with respect to gene therapy or en-
hancement. James Keenan, professor of ethics at Boston College, applies
his well-honed theory of virtue ethics to issues such as enhancement and
germ-line gene therapy. This is undergirded by a relational anthropology
that can help develop guidelines for genetic policy.

Lisa Cahill, a professor of bioethics also at Boston College, continues her
critical contribution to these discussions by raising questions of social jus-
tice and the common good—arguing that these issues need to be at the
heart of the genetics debate as core values in the setting of genetic policies
in research and therapy. Only with these values can market forces be
countered and fairness brought into the distribution of resources.

The book concludes with four conversation partners from various disci-
plines (Bartha Maria Knoppers, Andrea Vicini, S.J., Gerry Evers-
Kiebooms, and Hasna Begum) who individually reflect on the previous
essays, highlighting various perspectives and focusing on agenda that have
been raised. These reflections vary in their commentary, but serve as a
concluding reminder of the major themes of the collection.

The book is a significant step in bringing the resources of the Catholic
ethical tradition to bear on those developing applications that are rapidly
generated by modern genetics. The essays are most helpful in their critical
analysis, their use of the tradition, and their thoughtful and thorough ex-
amination of possible responses to current developments in genetics. The
problems are difficult conceptually and ecclesially. The authors are to be
highly commended for their willingness to engage in the creative develop-
dment of a Catholic approach to them. The book would be most useful for
upper division undergraduate seminars or for graduate courses.

Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.

THOMAS A. SHANNON


D. Z. Phillips, a leading exponent of philosophy of religion from per-
cpectives often identified with the “later” Wittgenstein, examines in part 1
what he calls “the problematic inheritance” of efforts to frame and resolve
the problem of evil—as is typically done in the project of theodicy—in
terms of concepts of God’s omnipotence. After probing what he considers
to be the conceptual incoherence of notions of God’s omnipotence and
perfect goodness as construed by analytic philosophers of religion, he then
canvasses ten views advanced as answers to the question, “Does God have
morally sufficient reasons for allowing evil to exist?” (49). P. finds them all
insufficient for fundamentally the same reason—none of them “treat hu-
man life seriously enough” (89) in its particularity. Here he devotes a
chapter to the free-will defense, that is, to the claim that “a world contain-
ing freedom of the will must be a world containing some evil” (54). Despite
finding this view “profoundly right” in its emphasis on “the freedom with-
out which life would not be recognizably human at all” and in its recognition “that religious belief is a response to that life as a whole” (108), P. also judges it ultimately wanting in that it amounts to a form of “religious utilitarianism” (109). Then, P. provides a two-chapter “Interlude” that considers some consequences for thinking about human life and God in a way that does not try, in von Hügel’s phrase, “to tidy up reality” (141) by abstracting from its intractable particularity. Finally, in part 2 he aims to show “a conception of human life found in Christianity, but not only there, that not only avoids the pitfalls of theodicy, but, at the same time, shows a response to the contingencies of life [from which] . . . concept-formation involving belief in a God of grace is possible” (141). The considerations he offers in this part, framed through discussions of covenant, God’s presence and absence, renunciation, sacrifice, and eschatology, constitute what P. terms a “neglected inheritance” regarding Christian belief in creation and the relation between the Creator and creatures: “To believe in a Creator is to believe in the givenness of life as a grace” (183). Negatively, P.’s targets are views that construe creation in terms of power and that, be it crudely or subtly, instrumentalize the relation between the Creator and creatures. Positively, P. makes a case for taking the stance of “dying to self” as one’s fundamental point of reference with respect to the problem of evil. Texts from Kierkegaard, Simone Weil, and Rush Rhees serve as loci for his philosophical discussion of this theme; the biblical themes of the Suffering Servant and Christ’s passion serve as its formative background.

The issues, arguments, and principal interlocutors (Robert Adams, Marilyn Adams, Stephen T. Davis, John Hick, Alvin Plantinga, Richard Swinburne) P. discusses in part 1 represent styles of philosophical analysis that may be relatively unfamiliar to many Catholic theologians. This unfamiliarity, however, should not stand as an insurmountable obstacle to helpful theological engagement with the important points about creation, grace, and renunciation he insightfully articulates, particularly in the “Interlude” and in part 2. P. is especially good at reminding us how thoroughly a concept of God made in our image—“treating God as a moral agent like ourselves” (107)—has been implicated in the conceptual underpinnings of the project of theodicy.

P. does not contextualize this important point in terms of a larger charting of the intellectual currents of modernity—such as those provided by Susan Neiman (Evil and Modern Thought [2002]) and Michael Buckley (Denying and Disclosing God [2004])—that follow the trajectories along which God and humanity came to be aligned against one another in a zero-sum game of power and inevitable moral rivalry. When read in the context of those larger accounts, however, P.’s critical strictures in part 1 and his constructive proposals in part 2 suggest, first, that analytic philosophy of religion rides on those same currents and, second, that a more appropriate bearing on the problem of evil lies along directions that can be taken once we are ready “to give up the notion of creation as an act of power” (162) and to understand that “the only omnipotence God has is the omnipotence of love” (272).
At least two other conceptual loci in P.’s volume deserve thoughtful theological attention: first, his treatment of the “sense of the eternal” that he claims “has been eroded in our culture, and [for which] the temporal has been transcendentalized as a pseudo-replacement” (273–74); second, his reflections on dying to self and on sacrifice in which Christ’s passion forms the paradigmatic locus from which we are invited to learn “to accept [our] radical contingency and dependence on grace, and to see creation itself as an act of grace and compassion” (240).

Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. PHILIP J. ROSSI, S.J.


Paul Murray writes from a pragmatic philosophical perspective—the kind with which most theologians feel hardly at home. Following Christ’s directive, “By their fruits you will know them,” pragmatists trace out the logical consequences of ideas—even if often with less stringency than did Charles Peirce, the “father” of pragmatism. A careful scholar and researcher at Durham University, United Kingdom, M. is currently interested in Peirce, ecumenical theology, and the dynamics of doctrinal development, as well as in modern Roman Catholic theology, ecclesiology, and pneumatology. Preceded by several articles in leading journals, the present work is M.’s first published book. It deserves careful reading to match its informed and thoughtful composition.

M. searches for that kind of human rationality that fits both the needs of contemporary Christian theology and the demands of our contemporary pluralist, postfoundationalist, and postmodern context. His method employs “charitable critique”—one that probes to save the best elements in an author’s work while indicating its weaknesses (195). Chapter 1 establishes M.’s agenda. In chapter 2 he presents and critiques Richard Rorty’s pragmatism. Chapter 3 explores a far more acceptable rationality in Nicholas Rescher’s later work. Then, in chapter 4, M. measures Rescher’s pragmatic-idealistic account of human rationality to see whether it has adequate correspondence with a faith-filled trinitarian theology. In chapter 5 he proposes Don MacKinnon’s influential writings as an example of the pragmatic-idealistic rationality needed in today’s postmodern context. M.’s conclusion supplies a retrospect and prospect.

M.’s treatment of Rorty strikes me as balanced. Positively, he endorses Rorty’s critique of foundationalist “objectivism” as an unattainable illusion and a stimulus to radical skepticism. Not starting from the radical contingency of human knowing, such objectivism promotes claims to privileged knowledge that thwart democratic processes. Yet M. faults Rorty for neglecting the ordinary conduct of human conversations and, thus, inten-
sifying skeptical concerns. As a prerequisite for practical action, Rorty settles on bare redescription rather than on knowledge. Moreover, he surrenders the floor to the powerful without inserting countervailing forces to buttress the voiceless millions (69). Rorty has identified, M. contends, with the relatively leisured, Western, liberal intellectuals for whom matters of Christian faith cannot be taken seriously (84).

Turning to Rescher (who depends heavily on Peirce), M. treats Peirce inadequately and does not mention the late Josiah Royce’s modeling of a pragmatic-idealist rationality. Yet in a Rescherian appendix, M. reflects something of a Peirce-like dogged, logical thoroughness to establish practical priorities. Rescher heals the ills in Rorty’s own neopragmatism. In recent years Rescher has recognized that his immense labor may have theological relevance, yet he refrains from embracing certain trinitarian dynamics in God’s ratio and truth (146). Relishing Rescher’s repeated use of the aphorism “philosophy has no stairway to God,” M. finds Rescher rightly resisting any ascent to the nature of God from the nature of causality. Yet Rescher views God in a largely deistic way, as “outside” the world. So he regards revelation as an “overwhelming manifestation of divine action” (150). Rescher’s favoring of process philosophy, however, opens him to God’s active role in process, even if his deistic ties prevent him from portraying a persuading God at work in process.

Overall, M. traces the potentially supportive role of Rescher’s philosophy for a theological rationality in tune with deep Christian traditions. Rescher views tradition as a developing process, one in harmony with the development of Christian doctrine and theology (153). He shows the modest self-regard of a fallibilist and an openness to the need for continuing conversion. His rationality embraces both a pilgrim people’s need for risk-taking and its avoidance of that static stability of settled security. Although M. ends by pointing to the crucified Christ, he does not show how so topsy-turvy a reality might concur with Rescher’s philosophy.

Yet M.’s book of suggestions merits much amusement and a creative response. We owe M. thanks for bringing into print this much needed search for a rationality suitable for a contemporary theology, normed by the dogma of the Trinity. Other scholars need to augment his helpful start by critiquing charitably and comparing others’ endeavors to delineate which kind of rationality can best serve as a rational norm in parallel with theologians’ specializations. Coming to mind easily, but only starting a list of entries in this endeavor, are the trinitarian works of Joseph Bracken, derived in part from Whitehead. Also deserving study are Alex Rivera-Garcia’s esthetical approach and the evangelical endeavors of Amos Yong. Finally, the many volumes of Donald Gelpi’s work, based largely on the pragmatic idealism of Peirce and Royce, present a rationality exhibiting deep consonance with theology and contemporary American thought.

Xavier University, Cincinnati

FRANK OPPENHEIM, S.J.
Cardinal Roger Mahony’s recent denouncing of the punitive immigration legislation before the United States Senate—by means of his Ash Wednesday homily and subsequent Op-Ed piece (New York Times [March 22, 2006])—highlights the timeliness of this very helpful book on incorporating Catholic social teaching in homilies for Latino congregations. Indeed, the cardinal’s homiletic call for Catholics to live out the biblical injunction to welcome the stranger among us—and thus to risk fines and jail time should punitive immigration legislation become the law of the land—could very easily have been one of the sample homilies included in the volume edited by Davis and Pérez.

The volume is organized into seven chapters focused on such issues of Catholic social teaching as immigration, domestic violence, the death penalty, and racism. Each chapter presents, first, a magisterial document on a particular social issue of importance to the Latino community, then a theological reflection or sample homily on the document and how it relates to the varied U.S. Hispanic community, and, lastly, liturgical and scriptural ideas, references, and other resources for incorporating social teaching into Latino liturgical celebrations. The contributors are principally Latinos representing the variety of Hispanic communities in the United States, but do include some Anglos. Distinguished contributors include Archbishop Roberto O. González, O.F.M., of San Juan, Puerto Rico, and Bishop Ricardo Ramírez, C.S.B., of Las Cruces, New Mexico, theologians Virgil Elizondo, Mark Wedig, O.P., and Raúl Gómez, S.D.S., and pastors of Latino Catholic parishes including Jorge Presmanes, O.P., of Miami and Arturo Pérez Rodríguez of Chicago.

The volume is not the first to address the issue of preaching to Latino congregations. Others, such as Justo L. González’s The Liberating Pulpit (1980) and Pablo A. Jiménez’s Púlpito: An Introduction to Hispanic Preaching (2005), have done so before. However, those important contributions were from Evangelical and liberationist perspectives. The current work breaks new ground as the first Catholic book that attempts to address the issue of preaching, and it does so by focusing on what Catholic social teaching can contribute to Latino homilies. This is significant because U.S. Catholic Hispanic theology has tended to ignore these magisterial documents, preferring instead to focus on popular religiosity and experience as the starting point of theological reflection.

Readers unfamiliar with the Hispanic community may be surprised by the didactic tone and length of many of the homilies, especially those more accustomed to the prevailing story-model of preaching so common among Anglo-Catholic communities. This difference highlights the importance of incorporating inculturated models of preaching to the Hispanic context. In particular, preachers to Hispanic Catholic congregations would do well to
heed the community’s preference for preaching that is limited neither by the ten-minute rule nor by quasi-aversions to the emotive, the didactic, or the invocation of the Church’s hierarchical authority. Indeed, it is the ability to provide content that is ecclesiastically authoritative, theologically informative, socially relevant, and spiritually nurturing that describes what is most characteristic of good inculturated preaching by and for Latinos.

As with Anglo congregations, the genre of the personal testimonial, made popular by such television programming as *Oprah*, is highly effective in Latino contexts. Still, Latino testimony tends more toward exuberant and powerful testimonies, as opposed to the more soft-spoken and therapeutic rhetoric of the personal Anglo witness. In this regard, Latino preaching has more in common with the enthusiastic style of preaching one hears in African-American communities and in Evangelical and Pentecostal circles than with that experienced in Euro-American Catholic congregations.

While the voices of women are not completely absent from this volume, as evidenced by the contribution by Sister Angela Erevia, M.C.D.P., on economic justice, missing are the contributions of Latino lay people. Another lacuna is that the volume is exclusively in English. It ought to be published bilingually, because the social justice themes that it documents and elucidates so well would greatly benefit many lay preachers of the Hispanic Catholic Charismatic Renewal. Most of the sermons delivered by Catholics, I would venture to guess, tend to be spiritualistic and neglect the Church’s best kept secret, as Catholic social justice teaching has often been called. Seminaries, lay ministry preparation programs, and anyone who finds himself or herself reflecting on and breaking open the Word of God with Latino Catholic congregations would be well served by consulting this volume.

*Graduate School of Religion and Religious Education, Fordham University*

Claudio Burgaleta, S.J.
In modern scholarship, Deuteronomy has been “der archimedische Punkt der alttestamentlichen Literaturgeschichte” (1). It concludes the Pentateuch and introduces the Deuteronomic History. These two sections of Scripture constitute two subdisciplines within OT studies. Recently, scholars have become increasingly interested in constructing a unified theory encompassing both areas of study that would explain the evolution of the Primary History (Genesis-Kings, excluding Ruth). This exploration has opened up new questions and contributed to a reevaluation of previous scholarship.

So far, no consensus has emerged concerning this hoped-for unified theory, and some have abandoned all hope of knowing how this literature came to be. The present collection of ten essays (four in German, six in English, introduced in German by Achen-
bach) are the published results of colloquia from the Society of Biblical Literature International meetings in Berlin (2002) and Cambridge (2003). The contributors include some leading OT scholars who have not given up hope of discovering how the Primary History came to be. Most of the contributions strive to discern the editorial activity that connected diverse parts, especially around the problematic areas involving the relationship between Deuteronomistic and Priestly material.

Although the contributions neither tend toward a consensus nor set forth a theory embracing the whole Primary History, some aspects of approximate agreement emerge. Deuteronomy is not the only book that is "between the Pentateuch and the Deuteronomistic History," but several other Pentateuchal texts prepare for the following history. Almost all the contributions employ redaction criticism to discern how editors struggled to resolve contradictions in the text and reinterpret material for their own ends. Most contributors focus on some aspect of law and its development, and on reinterpretation in subsequent redactional layers. Although the scholars concentrate on different texts and problems, all manage to draw connections among a range of biblical materials in an effort to discern how the parts were redacted into a whole.

DAVID BOSWORTH
Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.


The fruit of over 30 years of reflection, Jürgen Becker (now retired) begins with a compact discussion of the historical development of Johannine Christianity, then analyzes in detail the shifting theological emphases of each compositional stage of its literature. Here B. has updated and condensed his larger commentary (Das Evangelium nach Johannes [1979–81]) to make historical-critical scholarship accessible to a wider audience (thus also avoiding footnotes).

Despite recent use of literary methods in Johannine scholarship, B. argues that historical criticism is still essential since the Fourth Gospel was clearly not written by only one author, but was expanded and reinterpreted over several generations. Little is certain about Johannine Christianity's historical origins, but B. judges that several communities founded by the "Beloved Disciple" (not a literary fiction, but a historical figure well known to insiders and only later "anonymous" to outsiders) were probably located near Antioch. Living for about two generations in relative isolation from other Christians, they developed distinctive theological ideas, before eventually reconnecting with the wider Christian world. B. sees the "evangelist," the "ecclesial redactor," and the writer(s) of the Epistles as separate members of the "Johannine school" (a close-knit circle of teachers/servants) who reinterpreted and developed their traditions in dialogue with each other.

After sketching some theological features of the pre-Gospel stage (especially "signs source" and "passion narrative"), B. extensively analyzes the Evangelist's theology, a theology that focuses not on "incarnational Christology" but on the presence of God's Spirit in Jesus, the Son sent from the Father, and the ongoing presence of Jesus/Spirit in the Johannine communities. The ecclesial redactor (adding John 15–17, 21, and more) later shifts the focus from Christology to ecclesiology, exploring how these communities relate to other Christians. Finally, the writers of the Epistles again reshape and reinterpret Johannine theology in applying it to later conflicts within the communities.

Readers convinced of the narrative unity of John's Gospel may have little interest in this book; but for those who can entertain multiple historical stages in the Johannine literature, B. provides a clear and compelling presentation of how Johannine ideas were developed and reinterpreted over several generations.

FELIX JUST, S.J.
University of San Francisco

Kevin Madigan and Carolyn Osiek have produced a masterful compilation and translation of early Christian sources that dealt with the issue of women deacons and presbyters in the Latin- and Greek-speaking worlds—sources ranging mainly from the earliest communities to about AD 600, but including also some interesting evidence up to the eleventh century. The book does not include all the original texts, although footnotes and a few illustrations provide some Latin and Greek documentation. The preponderance of their literary and epigraphical sources appears elsewhere, especially in Ute Eisen’s Women Officeholders in Early Christianity (2000) and in Josephine Mayer’s Monumenta de viridis diaconissis virginitusque tractantia (1938), but their compilation is a handy reference for the continued discussion of the history of women’s ordination to major orders. Unfortunately, no liturgies are included. Even so, the editors have amassed a substantial portion of the historical evidence for the ordination of women in the early church, much of which seems overlooked in the International Theological Commission’s 2002 document Le diaconate: Évolution et perspectives. Their extensive evidence of women deacons, especially newly discovered funerary epigraphical evidence, should assist the churches, East and West, in restoring women to the diaconate. The letter of Pope Benedict VIII to Benedict, Bishop of Porto (AD 1070) is especially strong: “In that same way, we concede and confirm to you and to your successors in perpetuity every episcopal ordination (ordinacionem episcopalem), not only of presbyters but also of deacons or deaconesses (diaconissis or sub-deacons)” (147). This letter alone would seem to suffice; it supports the authority and power of a diocesan ordinary to restore the tradition where he deems necessary. Further, in light of Benedict XVI’s March 2006 comment to the priests of the Diocese of Rome that “it is right to ask oneself if more space, more positions of responsibility, can be given to women, even in the ministerial services,” the recovered history in this volume certainly will enlighten the further response of Rome.

Phyllis Zagano
Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.


Thome seeks to establish whether and to what extent Emperor Julian and his collaborator Salustius influenced Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia’s rejection of allegory. T. begins with a summary of works published on Antiochene exegesis, then presents and comments on many surviving passages (in German translation) from Julian, Salustius, Diodore, and Theodore on myth and allegory. He argues that Julian and Salustius considered the pagan myths about gods and goddesses to be absurd in se but useful for the unenlightened. The educated, however, through a discerning use of allegory, could attain to deeper levels and meanings of eternal truth. T. contends that their attacks against the Gospel stories as ridiculous myths needing to be “rightly” interpreted allegorically would have awakened Diodore and Theodore to how truly inimical allegory was to the Gospels’ historicity. T. also demonstrates how Theodore incorporates metaphors, parables, and theoria within his hermeneutical understanding and regards them as different from strict allegory.

T.’s work is an invaluable source for those interested in Julian’s and Salustius’s influence on Diodore’s and Theodore’s exegetical thought. His translations provide access to passages hitherto unavailable in ancient languages. Because Diodore opposed Julian in his
lifetime and Theodore wrote a partially surviving work against Julian, some impact is likely. But it is hard to assess in the light not merely of their rhetorical and Christian training, their personalities, and evolutions in thought, but also of when they became convinced that God’s inspired message was inherently connected with what a text actually says, and that a historical account was truly such. Was their thought shaped by Julian and Salustius, or were they applying a well-established Antiochene principle that a historical interpretation had to be explicitly justified by Scripture? For them, allegory was an inspiring (not inspired) imaginative speculation. Perhaps too they obtained insight into how the “body” of a text is related to its meaning from their conviction that Christ’s visible body actually reveals the presence of the Word’s divinity. If Julian was so influential, why is he not named in Diodore’s and Theodore’s surviving works? T. needs a fuller treatment of how Theodore uses sign, symbol, and type to explain baptism and the Eucharist, highlighting thereby a sharp contrast with Julian’s allegorical interpretations of pagan celebrations.

FREDERICK G. MCLEOD, S.J.
St. Louis University


This is the last volume of Vaught’s trilogy on Augustine’s Confessions. V. has developed a unique interpretative paradigm that stretches over his three volumes and is a sine qua non for understanding his methodology. As he has it, “Augustine’s Confessions develops within a three-dimensional framework: the first is temporal, the second spatial, and the third eternal” (5). Thus, in an introductory discussion of the unity of the Confessions, V. identifies his trilogy with his three dimensions: books 1–6 presenting the journey to God, books 7–9 presenting encounters with God, and finally books 10–13, presenting the quest for understanding or access to God. His division is more than cosmetic because it becomes an instrument of interpretation. This schema goes against the commonly accepted division of books 1–9 as autobiography, book 10 as a philosophical treatment of memory, and books 11–13 as an exegesis of the Genesis creation narratives. Some may consider V.’s division and its interpretive consequences contrived. Within his third section, namely the present volume, V. deals with memory (book 10), time (book 11), and creation (book 12–13). He rightly understands the central theme of the Confessions to be the relation between God and the soul and distinctively tries to distance Augustine from his earlier Neoplatonic experience. According to V., book 10 marks a new beginning in the Confessions, giving the reader insight into Augustine’s mind at the precise time that he is writing. Augustine is now a bishop. His words in book 10—and his now Christian experiences that are the basis for these words—may be contrasted with his earlier experiences in books 1–9. Finding a tension between the Neoplatonic and the Christian in Augustine’s thought, V. tends to minimize the Neoplatonic. In this work he emphasizes specifically Christian aspects of Augustine’s thought such as the role of Christ as a bodily mediator, creation ex nihilo by the triune God, and, finally, the seventh day of eternal Sabbath rest.

KENNETH B. STEINHAUSER
Saint Louis University


Comprised of essays by contributors to the current “renaissance” of interest in Jonathan Edwards, this volume is essential for anyone studying his thought, whether for historical or constructive purposes. Readers with historical interests will find essays from Harry Stout, Mark Knoll, Allen Guelzo, Douglas Sweeney, and Kenneth Minkema, each representing the best historiography on Edwards done by Evangelical scholars.
Notwithstanding the individual excellence of the essays, however, this volume does not reflect the diversity and depth of contemporary historical scholarship. Missing are essays by non-Evangelicals such as Ava Chamberlain, Mark Valeri, and Joseph Conforti who argue that Edwards’s prodigious intellect was stymied by the complex issues of gender (Chamberlain), economics (Valeri), and social reform (Conforti). These scholars argue that Edwards’s philosophical genius did not yield a sufficiently complex social analysis, even judged by the standards of his milieu. Further, as Minkema and Stout themselves have argued in recent essays, the abstract nature of Edwards’s later apologetical discourses provided philosophical justifications that later proponents and opponents of slavery both claimed. This collection of historical essays, while individually excellent, does not reflect the variety of perspectives on Edwards or the ambiguity that additional voices would have added.

Those with constructive interests will find important essays by Amy Plantinga Pauw and Robert Jenson, even while John E. Smith’s and Richard R. Niebuhr’s essays break little new ground. Here again, though, the selection is narrow. Missing are essays from scholars whose commitments are not explicitly Christian or are non-Christian, such as Leon Chai and Avihu Zakai. And it is unfortunate that William Wainwright could not have contributed an essay on Edwards’s defense of original sin, a topic that Wainwright has developed in his constructive philosophy.

Aside from these reservations, however, this volume captures well the cross-fertilization that has occurred in Edwardian scholarship in recent decades. That one wishes for a more inclusive list of contributors is a testament to the untapped potential Edwards offers to both historians and theologians.

WILLIAM J. DANAHER, JR.
University of the South,
Sewanee, Tenn.


Mitchell’s work is part of “The Bishop Henry McNeal Turner/Sojourner Truth Series in Black Religion,” the purpose of which is to give voice to marginalized communities. M.’s additional purpose is to redefine, by a historical/Christian lens, American white and black abolitionism. She critiques current models of historic abolitionism and compellingly challenges current classifications of the movement for not fully encompassing black abolitionists (citing Aileen S. Kraditor and Stanley M. Elkins). Chapters 4–7 highlight the historic importance of black-Christian abolitionists such as David Walker, Henry Highland Garnet, Samuel Ringgold Ward, and James W. C. Pennington.

This historical journey yields two substantive climaxes—in chapters 8–9 and in 11. The first demonstrates that abolitionism was in fact a quest for human dignity and speaks of the current realities of racism as a violation of that dignity. The second forcefully claims that the quest of abolitionism remains unfulfilled. However, instead of supporting her claim through her own research, M. summarizes religious thinkers like Kel- sey, Evans, and Cone who “bear witness that the struggle against black dehumanization continues” (152). While we can certainly agree, her argument would be more helpful if she drew out contemporary examples rather than relying on the older assessments of others. Further, we may question whether “aboli-

M. has treated white and black abolitionism fairly, noted their differences, and admitted the Christian limitations and successes in the cause. Suited mostly for the beginning theo-
logian or those interested in the specific Christian role in abolitionism, this work on an important topic holds only limited resources for the general theologian.

S. W. FLYNN
Corpus Christi College, Vancouver, Canada


Founded in 1969 and active through 1989, a group of mostly Chicano priests helped evoke the Church’s eventual support of farm workers and its more robust commitment to Hispanic ministry and community organization. PADRES, as the group was named, was instrumental in the selection of the first Hispanic U.S. bishop and the establishment of the USCCB’s Secretariat for Hispanic Affairs.

This first book-length treatment of PADRES adds overlooked information to those histories of the Chicano Movement that often discount contributions by Catholics. It presents the contexts in which PADRES was founded, namely, the reforms of Vatican II, the turmoil of the civil rights movement, and networking among Hispanic Catholics through the Cursillo. It locates the birth of PADRES in protest. When “Chicano Catholics saw the church for the first time as socially irresponsible” (37), some of the priests who concurred in that judgment were disciplined. PADRES was formed to support its persecuted members and to promote a shared agenda.

Martinez claims that “PADRES functioned as the nonsecular arm of the Chicano movement” (77), that it fought to change attitudes within the church and to develop leadership among Mexican Americans. M.’s account of PADRES’s accomplishments is stirring. He rightly gives voice to actual players through extensive oral histories. This strength, however, becomes a weakness when he relies exclusively on isolated interviews that were far removed from the events narrated. For instance, using only the later reminiscence of one laicized priest, M. concludes that electing (now Archbishop) Flores to chair PADRES in 1972 was a principle cause for its demise. Given that the decline of PADRES did not begin in earnest until a decade later, it seems odd to assign Flores a decisive role. Scanty sources and cramped methods yields less depth and nuance, and even can call into question some of M.’s conclusions. M., though, does present a good and necessary, if imbalanced, history of U.S. Catholic Hispanics.

KENNETH G. DAVIS, O.F.M. CONV.
Saint Meinrad School of Theology, Ind.


On December 2, 1980, Ita Ford and three other women were apprehended, raped, and murdered by the Salvadoran military. How did Ford get there? The reasons were chronological, human, and religious. She documented the journey in her letters; Jeanne Evans brings the story to literary life.

Ita was born in Brooklyn in 1940, sent to parochial school, graduated from Marymount Manhattan College in 1961, and joined the Maryknoll Sisters. She withdrew from Maryknoll for health reasons in 1964, worked for Sadlier, the religious publisher, in Manhattan for the rest of the 1960s, and rejoined Maryknoll in 1971. After profession in 1972 and language school, she worked in a shantytown attached to Santiago, Chile, from 1973 to 1978. She then did a year of renewal and reflection back at Maryknoll, after which she returned to Chile, but only briefly. In 1980 she responded to appeals for help in El Salvador and took up work in Charlatenango on behalf of refugees from the war. She had been to a meeting in Nicaragua when she was intercepted on her way from the airport.

Jeanne Evans, known for her work on Paul Ricoeur, has arranged the letters and occasional papers chronologically. She introduces each stage of Ford’s life with biographical data and descriptions of the historical and social situations...
that allow a contextual understanding of Ita’s words at each stage. These introductions are remarkable for their economical detail and a sharp, limpid, and unobtrusive recreation of the various situations in which Ford lived. Evans has constructed the perfect frame that allows the picture to show itself fully.

In her own words, unintended for publication, Ford communicates spiritual depth in simplicity, passionate commitment in plain and attractive ordinariness as well as in war, steadfast witness to religious ideals in a period of rapid and sometimes chaotic change, human transcendence amid poverty and destitution. She provides the reader with lessons in how this middle-class American Catholic woman recognized the spiritual ideals behind liberation theology. One sees in Ford’s life and words the process of interior wrestling and spiritual discernment, the meaning of finding freedom by commitment to a lofty cause, in this case, accompanying the poor.

Everyone will admire this book and learn from it: the young looking for ideals to which they might dedicate their freedom, those in mid-career trying to cope with routine. Those who are older will marvel at the way one who was killed at 40 could have lived such a beautiful and meaningful life by staying the religious course. She remained consistent in a rapidly developing and troubled time by reflectively reformulating the ways to be true to her early desire to serve those in need. No one will be disappointed with this book.

Roger Haight, S.J.
Union Theological Seminary, New York


This concise but well documented synthesis is an invaluable resource on Catholic ecclesiology, its ecumenical engagements, and prospects for the future as Christianity moves into the postmodern world. Rausch’s mastery of the vast material of both the classical tradition and the last 40 years of reception of Vatican II, of internal Catholic debates and the expansion of those debates, and of ecumenical research could easily be masked by the clarity and accessibility of his presentation.

The book includes eleven chapters. The introduction lays out its methodology, and the global, ecumenical, and Vatican II contexts that shape ecclesiological reflection today. R. is clear that Vatican II cannot be seen simply as an internal, institutional event for Catholics, but rather as a moment in the history of Christianity and of the Christian community’s opening to modernity and outreach to the global human family.

Three chapters are devoted to the key conciliar documents and images of the Church. Three are devoted to the sacramental, traditional apostolic, and ministerial elements of the Church, informed by the results of recent ecumenical dialogues. R. then proceeds with chapters on the marks of the church and their realization in a variety of separate ecclesial traditions, on reception and communion, and on globalization.

In classic ecumenical fashion, R. ends with challenges for the Roman Catholic Church and for its partner pilgrims on the ecumenical journey. In these last two chapters he provides a summary of the fruits of the ecumenical development to date, and its implications in the lives of the still divided Christian communities.

The volume is a summary of a monumental quantity of scholarship. Were it to be used in a graduate class, it could provide the basis for both extensive exploration and intensive specialized research, building on the notes provided. The carefully crafted challenges to the Catholic Church present resources for pastoral formation and theological interchange that make this theoretical work a significant contribution to pastoral and educational ministry.

Brother Jeffrey Gros, F.S.C.
Memphis Theological Seminary

This collection of ten recent essays on various matters by the head of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity offers analyses of the dogmatic status of important Vatican and ecumenical documents, a thorough review and evaluation of the *filioque* controversy, and musings on the impact of postmodern pluralism on church unity. Kasper was a major theologian and a leading ecumenist before being appointed to head the Council, and in that post he has a truly singular position from which to observe and participate in the ecumenical movement. The present book is correspondingly useful, providing accurate and comprehensive information, an authoritative presentation of Catholic positions and ripe insight.

The essays, as is inevitably the case with such collections, differ in tone and level. But they do gather around a unifying motif, namely, K.'s insistence that the great remaining dissensus among the churches, after decades of dialogue, is about the nature of the church itself, and so about the nature of the ecumenical goal itself. Further, K. explicitly aduces the notion of the church as communion as a "guiding concept" for understanding current ecumenical discussions on ecclesiology and as a lodestone for future work.

I offer one warning. For all K.'s travels and linguistic accomplishments, he remains what he was, a German professor. That is to say, his command of the relevant more strictly theological literature is sometimes annoyingly monoglot. But one cannot ask for everything.

Robert W. Jenson
Center of Theological Inquiry (ret.),
Princeton, N.J.


As the preface title indicates, "Reading the Bible in the Face of HIV and AIDS" is the task of this book. The essays are written by "African women and those in solidarity with them," and propose "gender-sensitive multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS readings of the Bible" (13). With well over forty million persons living with HIV/AIDS, the majority of infected persons living in Africa, the task is daunting. However, a note of hope underlies much of the writing as the authors offer "justice-oriented ways of re-reading the Bible in light of HIV/AIDS" (3). After a strong introduction by Dube, the essays are divided into two parts. Part 1 includes essays engaging the Hebrew Bible, HIV/AIDS, and gender. Scripture is brought into conversation with contemporary experiences and understandings of violence, suffering, human sexuality, and stigma. The strongest piece in this section is Denise Ackermann's essay on Tamar's rape (2 Sam 13:1-22) and how such violence can be read with the stories of violence against women in South Africa. Ackermann offers clues for both resistance and hope as she reads the "texts" side by side.

Part 2 considers NT resources in the light of HIV/AIDS and gender. Dube's essay, "Talitha Cum! A Postcolonial Feminist and HIV/AIDS Reading of Mark 5:21-43," is excellent. A NT scholar, she clearly explains her hermeneutical lens and some implications for challenging patriarchy and structural injustice. Malebogo Kgalemang, recognizing that there still exists a perception among some that HIV/AIDS is God's punishment for sin, presents a powerful corrective and caution to this view in "John 9: Deconstructing HIV/AIDS Stigma."

This important book invites us to theologically engage the realities of not only HIV/AIDS, but also the gender inequality and poverty that spur on the AIDS pandemic. While a few essays would benefit from a closer textual study of the Scripture, each author commendably undertakes the crucial work of bridging solid exegesis and contemporary application. The collection is a necessary addition to any library, and select essays would be helpful in many undergraduate and graduate classrooms.

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

Although the common good is among the most foundational motifs within Christian ethics, the notion is notoriously slippery. This volume makes a significant contribution to our understanding of the common good by exploring for our times wide-ranging aspects of socially responsible collective action for the mutual benefit of all.

More successful in raising questions than in providing answers with a high degree of specificity or comprehensiveness, the volume consists of twelve essays divided into four topical sections. The most thorough and satisfying section is the second, which traces the historical roots and contemporary contextualization of common good discourse and includes essays by theologians familiar to many readers of this journal: Jean Porter, Dennis McCann, and Robin Lovin. It is preceded by essays surveying common good themes in three units of Scripture (the Decalogue, the book of Jonah, and the Pauline corpus). The final two parts of the volume, although still valuable, are more diffuse and tend to treat concerns a bit far afield of what most readers probably expect. But even the somewhat tangential historical and sociological concerns of the volume’s second half contribute richly to our understanding of what is at stake when we invoke the common good and by what means it may be more fully achieved.

Among the strengths of the volume are its consistently learned, well-documented presentation and the way the authors reach out to a rich variety of dialogue partners, both within and beyond theological circles. While the volume struggles in its attempt to bring conceptual order to the jumble of concepts relevant to the common good, its very open-endedness is a testament to the complexity of the ethical task facing Christians today.

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


Death is a universal phenomenon. The meaning and approach to death, however, is highly diverse. In this insightful collection of essays, Blank and Merrick provide perspectives from some twelve cultures on dying and the determination of death. These range from the United States with the highly aggressive fights in its ICUs against death to Kenya where a decision to withdraw treatment is near meaningless since, for most, there is nothing to withhold or withdraw.

As these essays make clear, culture and history starkly influence end-of-life practices. The active euthanasia that is widely supported in the Netherlands is not even contemplated in neighboring Germany where the memory of the Holocaust precludes any sentiment for physician assisted suicide or active euthanasia. To American observers brain death is assumed to be a universal definition of death, whereas in Kenya, Israel, and Japan, for example, there is little or no such acceptance of brain death as exclusively or significantly indicating the end of life. In India, although brain death is legally recognized, most families refuse to accept death until cardiovascular death is achieved. However, once cardiovascular death has occurred there is widespread support in India for organ donation; within the Hindu tradition the body means nothing after death. Religion, the role of the family, and social structures dominate end-of-life customs and practices. The great emphasis in the United States on individual self-determination has led to the widespread use of advance directives. In Africa such a directive is seen as “inviting death” and, therefore, something to be avoided. In Africa, as in China and Japan, it is the family, not the individual, who determines what is best for the dying patient.

This rich cross-cultural collection of disparate views on death and dying is a powerful antidote to the notion that, since we all share the experience of
death, we all experience it in the same way.

JOHN J. PARIS, S.J.
Boston College


Readers who stop with Kant’s most well-known works on ethics, The Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals and the Critique of Practical Reason, generally conclude that his vision of ethics is at once individualistic and optimistic. Rossi’s study rightly challenges these conclusions. Drawing heavily on Kant’s Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason and accompanying essays of this late period of Kant’s life (notably “Toward Perpetual Peace” and the “Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View”), Rossi shows that Kant has a profoundly social vision and one that, while ultimately hopeful, is deeply chastened by the reality of human selfishness.

Those who perceive Kant in individualistic terms stress his notion of autonomy—the individual as lawgiver to himself. But, as R. makes clear, Kant “not only articulates the notion of autonomy in terms of the fundamentally social concept of law, he takes it to function most properly with reference to that community of moral agents he terms the kingdom of ends and to be ordered to a social goal, the highest good as its proper object” (140).

Drawing attention to Kant’s treatment of human beings’ “unsocial sociability,” R. documents the extent to which Kant recognizes how much selfishness permeates even our apparently social impulses, but he does not deny that Kant remains an optimist. Despite the themes of radical evil, there is a deep Pelagian quality to Kant’s writings in his confidence that human beings can achieve their ultimate moral objectives both on the individual and the social levels. What R. does not quite develop in this otherwise valuable and helpful rereading of Kant is the extent to which a confidence in divine grace, a theme introduced in Religion, continues to permeate Kant’s views of history. Kant’s “unsocial sociability”—our need to forge community even out of the most selfish motives—is part of a providential scheme that Kant sees behind historical events. What we must ask, as citizens of an era that has witnessed the Holocaust, the advent of nuclear weaponry, and now, global terrorism, is whether there is still enough evidence in history to sustain Kant’s confidence in human moral fulfillment.

RONALD M. GREEN
Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.


By exposing the philosophical consonance that in fact exists between science and religion—a consonance that is mutually affirmed by both—Dowe sets out to demonstrate a foundation for a viable working, even harmonious, relationship between these often conflicted disciplines. He claims to do so in the context of three scientists—Galileo Galilei, Charles Darwin, and Stephen Hawking—whose scholarship has drawn Christian critique. Grounded in shared philosophical insights, D. contends that serious engagement with either science or religion can and often does promote an equally serious investigation of the other. Employing an array of elementary analogies, coupled with function notation, D. aims to clarify the common ground occupied by the disciplines on a variety of topics, such as cosmology and scripture, methodology and epistemology, creation and evolution, miracles, providence, and chance.

D.’s study, however, has several shortfalls that impede these aims. Despite his title, he deals in only a limited fashion with the work of Galileo and Hawking, while thoroughly examining Darwin’s research. Again, while seeking to demonstrate actual harmony between science and religion, D. seldom places the two in dialogue with each
other. Instead, the philosophies of Bacon, Hume, Feuerbach and others serve as arbiters between the disciplines. D.’s philosophical approach does offer reasonable foundations for mutual interaction between the two; nevertheless, it does not take sufficient account of the contemporary scholarship produced by scientists and theologians themselves on this interaction, notably that of Ian Barbour, John Haught, Robert John Russell, and John Polkinghorne. Moreover, when D. does engage Polkinghorne’s work on quantum physics and providence, he neglects finer points critical to Polkinghorne’s position. Regrettably, this lack of careful attention to detail from the perspectives of both science and religion is evident throughout the work. Still, for those looking for the philosophical underpinning of such a discourse, D.’s contribution is illuminating.

GLORIA L. SCHAAB
Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.
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