BOOK REVIEWS


This volume, the first of three, is an analytical, critical, and constructive reflection on the rich and heterogeneous narrative of the OT (“First Testament” [FT] is here the preferred term). At issue for Goldingay are not simply the putative views expressed by the Bible itself or by those who produced it. It is the grand biblical narrative he is after; he claims to remain close to the order and feel of the biblical narrative. In fact, the frame of his work does closely follow the basic storyline of the Bible. Chapter headings are actions ascribed to God: God Began (Creation); God Started Over (Eden to Babel); God Promised (Israel’s Ancestors); God Delivered (Exodus); God Sealed (Sinai); God Gave (The Land); God Accommodated (From Joshua to Solomon); God Wrestled (From Solomon to the Exile); God Preserved (Exile and Restoration); and God Sent (The Coming of Jesus). The narrative G. seeks is that of God’s actions.

As the title of the last chapter and G.’s introductory discussions make clear, by including NT themes G. seeks to overcome the fact that the church does not always integrate its biblical metanarrative with its ecclesial and creedal materials. For G., the OT/FT provides lenses for identifying how God generally deals with human beings, but also for understanding how God acts in Christ Jesus. Both testaments taken together are critical for our understanding of God’s action. G.’s “aim . . . is to discuss the Old Testament’s own theological content and implications, working with the assumption that the Old Testament is Act I to the New Testament’s Act II (or Acts I–IX to the New Testament Act X!” (25–26). The testaments must be understood together. Still, G. wants to avoid reading the NT as foretold or predicted, hidden or signified by the FT. He disclaims any sense that the NT completes or supersedes the earlier moment; each testament enriches the understanding of the other.

G. clearly and strongly affirms the entire trustworthiness and authority of Scripture, and he underlines its theological significance in its parts and entirety. To do so, he avoids as much as possible questions concerning historical fact and processes of biblical formation. Yet, in doing so, he sometimes leaves his theological reflection sounding like New Criticism, that is, a discussion without much reference to anything outside the text. A similar problem dogs his sidestepping most philosophical and literary-critical issues. Without such theory, statements become misleading. For example, his claims for an omniscient narrator or author (a literary matter) are likely to be conflated with his discussion of the dogmatic truth claims made about the text.

The vast middle of the book (42–858) affirms both explicitly and by wonderfully vivid chapter titles and subheads that God is involved in world
events. Each chapter then unfolds beautifully, capturing G.'s sense of God's dynamic action. For example, in his ninth chapter, which treats the period from Solomon to the Exile, G.'s meta-commentary or reflection on the monarchical period unfolds in several steps: Where Yhwh Is Active (and in what relation to other deities); What God Expects (wholehearted reliance and exclusive commitment); How Yhwh Reacts (varying from anger to pity); How History Works (acts have consequences which may pile up); How Yhwh Works (using natural human processes); How Kings Exercise Leadership (powerfully and typically badly); and Prophets as Men of God, and as Seers and Sentinels as well as Troublemakers. G. concludes his exposition by asking: Is There a Future? (yes). Thus G. writes comprehensively and in a fresh manner on many issues between prophets and kings, as he does for other periods of God's action. My only critique is that there is occasional repetition.

In his postscript, G. struggles with the thorny questions of what actually happened, and whether any of us can ever know. What is the significance of genre differences such as history, myth, and reflective narrative? What motivates communities to reflect and interpret? What role does faith play? How different are the grounding assumptions of premodernity, modernity, and postmodernity? Urging—and demonstrating—a faith-filled but critical stance that never forgets how little can be known, G. addresses these questions briefly within the context of the narratives of creation, the battle of Jericho, and the death of Dathan and Abiram. This is a rich and valuable volume.

Dominican School of Theology and Philosophy, Berkeley  BARBARA GREEN


Drawn from a 2001 symposium celebrating the birth of Nicholas of Cusa (1401–1464), this collection explores the Cusan concept of "learned ignorance." In his introduction, Casarella distinguishes the way each author considers Cusa's work in light of his predecessors, in its own right, in relation to his contemporaries, or in terms of a contemporary retrieval. The articles represent diverse disciplines including historical theology, philosophy, art history, political science, mathematics, and physics. Although such methodological diversity makes the volume resistant to uniform analysis and appropriation, it appropriately reflects a man who was famous as a theologian, philosopher, canon lawyer, mathematician, and reform cardinal.

C.'s introduction also orients the reader to the controversies and questions that, over the last half century, have driven Cusanus studies. Using papers published after the fifth-centenary jubilee of Cusa's death, C. describes a shift from understanding Cusa as a forerunner to modern German philosophy to seeing him as a "paradigm of a globalizing culture." The
current scholarship, C. indicates, is more concerned with esthetics and spirituality, an orientation highlighted in the number of essays focusing on prayer, apophatic mysticism, perspectival knowing, liturgy, visual arts, and ecclesial infallibility. While C. identifies as the thread weaved through this volume the notion that the fragility of the human arts reveals the embodiment of the divine in the world, such a theme is at best a broken thread, as a majority of authors do not treat the theme at all.

In chapter 1, Nancy Hudson treats Nicholas of Cusa’s sermon on the Lord’s Prayer, providing a solid philosophical introduction to the sermon—without, however, alluding to the vast scholarship available on medieval sermons. Again, she recognizes aspects of pastoral care, yet misses the sermon’s many liturgical and eucharistic allusions. The chapter includes a complete and readable translation of the sermon by Frank Tobin, helping to address the shortage of medieval sermons available to students in English.

The subsequent three chapters compare Cusa to his predecessors and contemporaries. Bernard McGinn admirably places Cusa’s vision of God in the context of the medieval apophatic tradition, and provides a rhetorical analysis that draws out its trinitarian and christological dimensions. Jasper Hopkins explores Anselm of Canterbury’s influence on Cusa, supplying a helpful backdrop for understanding the latter. (However, Hopkins provides no evidence for his claim that “Nicholas had read the entirety of Anselm’s corpus and was not drawing his knowledge of Anselm’s views merely from secondary sources” [57]). Finally, Louis Dupré insightfully discusses how Cusa and his mentor, Meister Eckhart, understood formal causality and contingency in their attempts to explain our ability to know God through the attribute of immanence without succumbing to pantheism.

Four articles take up esthetic categories from a variety of disciplines. Wilhelm Dupré presents what is arguably the collection’s most thought-provoking essay as he explores how the Cusan concept of human beings as living images provides a principle that unites esthetics and epistemology—which concept, he claims, also can provide a valuable perspective for evaluating contemporary philosophical developments. Kirsten Harris carries the esthetic theme forward by arguing that Cusa’s understanding of perspective was influenced by the Renaissance artist Leon Battista Alberti. (Inexplicably C. then includes an essay by Walter Euler that is convincingly refuted by Il Kim in the next chapter, a serious flaw, especially for unwary readers.)

The book is rounded out by three chapters on Cusa’s political thought and two focused on his relationship to mathematics and science. For the church historian, Thomas Prügl’s essay on Cusa’s concept of infallibility is provocative and provides a wealth of bibliographical resources. The contributions of Cary Nederman and Paul Sigmund reflect ongoing debates over whether Cusa and the conciliarist movement should be seen as fore-runners to the nation-state and the rise of modern constitutionalism. The final chapters by Elizabeth Brient and Regine Kather concentrate on Cusa
as a mathematician and physicist (and extend beyond my competence to evaluate properly).

While the number of methods employed is disconcerting, the collection accurately reflects the diversity in Cusanus studies. Given its interdisciplinary quality, this book would be useful for most collegiate and university libraries, or for the serious Cusa scholar.

University of St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Ill. C. COLT ANDERSON


The controversy over Theodore of Mopsuestia and the adequacy of his understanding of Christ continues unabated. In this volume noted Antiochene scholar Frederick McLeod directly addresses this controversy and argues for a reassessment of Theodore’s account of Christ and of his condemnation by the fathers of the Council of Constantinople II (553 CE). M. proposes a new approach to the question of Theodore’s thought based on the principal roles that Theodore assigns to Christ’s humanity within the history of salvation (9).

M.’s crisp and balanced introductory examination of Theodore’s exegetical practices serves on its own as a fine introduction to Theodore’s life and work. M. insists that we must allow “a prominent role for Theodore’s own temperament and the evolution in his thinking” (43), and rightly describes him as an independent thinker who notably diverged in exegetical style and theology from his Antiochene associates, John Chrysostom and Theodoret.

Then follows a long, painstaking investigation into “the three principal roles that Theodore assigns to Christ in salvation”: Christ as the head of his body, the church; Christ as the head who recapitulates the “body” of the universe; and Christ as the perfect visible image whose “bodily” nature reveals the invisible God (9). In each case M. shows how the Adam-Christ typology is crucial for Theodore’s overall scheme, and how key texts from Ephesians 1 and Colossians 1–2 are central to his argument.

On the basis of his reassessment of the roles of Christ’s humanity in Theodore, M. addresses two key issues that have bedeviled Theodore’s Christology: the meaning of Christ’s “common prosopon” and “the indwelling of good pleasure” by the Word in the assumed man. M. concludes that Christ’s “common prosopon” is not merely an external appearance, but reflects the inward reality of the union of the natures, equivalent to Theodore’s understanding of Christ as the image of the invisible God. He admits that Theodore’s approach to the union will not satisfy as a metaphysical explanation, but he defends Theodore’s “indwelling of good pleasure” as expressive of a functional Christology that assumes a “semi-organic” unity and reflects the presentation of Christ that Theodore found in the Gospels (203–4). From this platform, M. reviews the case brought against Theodore by the Council of Constantinople II (and by modern
theologians), and concludes that, whatever Theodore’s theological deficiencies, he should not have been condemned personally, and that his Christology—when understood on its own functional terms—should not be regarded as heretical.

M. certainly brings clarity and insight to what Theodore meant by his novel terminology and approach, but several difficulties with his argument remain. First, despite clarifications regarding what the “common prosopon” indicates, it is difficult to see what exactly the underlying “ego” of Christ’s common prosopon is—what M. candidly calls an “unknown” center of unity (239). Though M. attempts to show that Theodore held to a real unity between the natures that somehow governs the visible Christ, the “unknown” center remains troubling. Calling this a functional Christology describes what is going on in Theodore but does not establish its adequacy.

Second, though M. unfolds the distinctive meanings of Theodore’s technical terms (nature, hypostasis, prosopon), in the end it is not the technical language that presents the greatest stumbling block, but the way that Theodore describes the plain activities of Christ in the Gospel. Theodore’s repeated distinction between the Word and the assumed man as distinct agents does not obviously reflect how the Gospels treat the single identity and personality of Christ—despite M.’s assertion that Theodore’s functional Christology reflects the Synoptic Gospels (255). Rather, one is left with the impression that it is Theodore’s own presuppositions regarding the need to sharply separate the divine from any created nature that gives rise to this kind of language.

Finally, M. seeks to absolve Theodore from the charges laid against him, in part because Theodore’s intention was good and he was sincerely convinced of what he taught (253–54, 257). But this is surely beside the point. No one can seriously question Theodore’s intention, and even Cyril of Alexandria counseled against bringing any condemnation of Theodore by name. The issue is the adequacy of his account of Christ. M. has made a significant contribution by unfolding an integrated understanding of Theodore’s account of Christ. However, despite M.’s best efforts to explain why Theodore felt constrained to adopt the approach he did, one may still conclude that the christological teaching of this innovative and independent Antiochene thinker is seriously deficient and is inadequate to account for the presentation of Christ given in the Gospels.

Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit

DANIEL A. KEATING


The self is notoriously difficult, even impossible, to define, and so the editors of this volume leave any defining of the term to their contributors. Drawing from a 2003 conference hosted by Indiana University, but also from separately requested papers, the collection includes 13 articles, mostly
by Americans, with more than half from just two universities (four each from Indiana and Brown). The broad range suggested by the title is absent in the final collection: five chapters deal with Judaism, six with Christianity, only one with paganism, and one ranges over Christianity and paganism. Here I focus on five of the more significant and valuable pieces.

Patricia Cox Miller’s “Shifting Selves in Late Antiquity” discusses how pagan and Christian thinkers dealt with changing images of the self, from Plotinus’s belief that the soul’s inward concentration opens it to all so that “knower and known become one” (20), to Origen’s labors to relate the soul to those revealed books of Christianity that took corporality seriously. She shows that later thinkers, building upon these insights, could take seriously theurgy (Proclus) and relics (Victorius of Rouen), insisting that the later thinkers did not weaken early theories so much as shifted the locus where transcendence could be found.

Albert Harrill considers another literary locus, taking literally the Apostle Paul’s statement that “with my mind I am a slave to the law of God, but with my flesh I am a slave to the law of sin” (Rom 7:25). “In the rush to analyze the Platonic ‘background’ of Pauline theology, there has been no serious inquiry into why Paul chooses the persona of the slave as his model of the *anthròpos* containing both an ‘outer’ and ‘innermost self’” (53). What follows is a complex and persuasive discussion of the slave in ancient society, of Roman musings on slaves’ inner subjectivity and moral agency, and of the reason Paul chose that image. I strongly recommend this chapter.

In the only article on a pagan author, Peter Struck deals with self in Artemidorus’s *Interpretation of Dreams*. Insisting that Artemidorus was not a Stoic, Struck shows how Stoic notions of divination prevailed in the second century CE. Artemidorus “adds a few bits of information to our picture of the self” (114), specifically the self as molded by society, culture, bodily necessities, and law, even while the religious self appears mostly in divinatory dreams.

Several articles treat the topic of the body (from which the human self cannot be separated). In “Locating the Sensing Body” Susan Ashbrook Harvey notes that Christians began with a distrust of the body, but, after the Constantinian settlement, they “showed increasing interest in claiming the physical world as a realm of positive spiritual encounter through the engagement of physical experience” (143). This new attitude manifested itself in the arts, ritual, and emotional piety, because now the religious life of Christianity had to be “publicly practiced and publicly displayed” (143). These attitudes produced a new understanding of the body. “For the ancient Christian...the body is both the place in which salvation happens and the instrument by which it is done” (150); this attitude manifests itself both in liturgical splendor and rigid asceticism. The body did not triumph over the spirit, but “God cannot be known except when allowed to permeate the whole of one’s being” (158), including the physical. This article brilliantly counteracts the common notion of an ancient Christian rejection of the physical and mistrust of the body.
Also noteworthy is Jonathan Schofer’s “The Beastly Body in Rabbinic Self-Formation,” an informative discussion that details how ancient rabbis dealt with the most physical aspects of bodily existence—eating, drinking, reproduction, and excreting—labeled by one rabbi as the beastly elements of the body. For example, excretion constantly reminds humans that no matter how they envision themselves, they are not gods. But the Law also can impact rabbinic understanding of the self. Since Genesis presents Adam as a perfect man, several rabbis insisted that he was born circumcised! Most important for the rabbis, fearful perhaps of Hellenistic influence, is their insistence that “the person is monistic, not divided between spirit and flesh” (202).

Several other essays deserve some mention, but suffice it to say that this is a fine collection, and that some of these articles will guide future research into the ancient concept of the self. Although too advanced for undergraduates, the collection can inform both the scholar and the graduate student.

John Carroll University, Cleveland

JOSEPH F. KELLY


This collection of eleven impeccably edited studies demonstrates that from late antiquity to the 16th century, Christian/Catholic women, religious and lay, cloistered and secular, sought knowledge of God, shaped their lives by this knowledge, and undertook to impart their spiritual wisdom in active ministry. The names of some are familiar: Heloise, Hildegard of Bingen, Douceline de Digne, Catherine of Siena, Birgitta of Sweden, Margery Kempe, and the Protestant martyr, Anne Askew, all of whom have had an enormous role in shaping Christian culture. No less influential, however, are the cloistered religious who spent their lives within the anonymity and safety of the convent. These studies demonstrate that, regardless of calling, all were women of intense faith who engaged creatively and, indeed, bravely as readers, authors, copyists, dictators, compilers, illuminators, editors, and disseminators of the sacred texts of faith, producing letters, poems, liturgical texts, devotional books, prayers, sermons, and autobiography.

This study focuses on six topics: women’s literacy, questions of authorship, women’s cultural relationships, and their homiletic, liturgical, and sacramental roles both within their conventual communities and in society generally. But their ministry was never easy. Medieval clerical culture was clannish, inwardly turned, and misogynist. Ordination and the sacramental privileges it underpinned, preaching included, created a permanent climate of hostility toward the outsider woman who was viewed as the lustful, heretical issue of Eve, fundamentally ineducable. Albertus Magnus formulated the quaestio “Whether the male is more apt at learning good behavior
than the female.” Female humidity, it was determined, rendered women incapable of being educated. In a similar vein, Boccaccio sneered at the notion of women’s creativity, attributing to women only an unappealing practical capability he called astutia. *Voices in Dialogue* is candid about such blatantly systemic misogyny. Its studies show that many reading women understood well the nature of the hostility they faced, and that some, such as Margery Kempe and Anne Askew, responded by devising a protective “rhetoric of evasion” through which they discharged their public ministry.

Reading medieval women necessarily includes reading medieval men. In analyzing and contextualizing the women’s writings, *Voices* underscores a persistent critical problem concerning gender and women’s authorial identity. The engagement between reading women and men of faith was not always baneful, and there are numerous instances in this volume of genuine mutual interest and communal spiritual helpfulness. But even here the evidence creates unease about how central the women really were to the men’s pastoral ministry and to what extent the men consciously encouraged the women to spiritual initiatives. Did the men envisage the women as teachers? Augustine, for example, wrote letters to women, whom, it appears, he viewed as theologically responsible, perhaps even interesting. Gender distinction seems not to have impeded his discourse. But the women are essentially faceless since their own letters are not extant, and their literacy, if not wholly lost from view, has been obscured by being transmitted through the filter of a reading man. Anselm of Canterbury wrote prayers for the nuns of his friend Abbess Eulalia. Whether Anselm had any special interest in the nuns’ devotional lives, or whether he was fulfilling an obligation to Eulalia who had supported him through his political difficulties, is hard to say. The prayers, it seems, are not of outstanding merit, and would have been read for communal, not individual formation. The point is that, like Augustine’s women, the nuns are remote, absorbed into the man’s measurements; their reading mode is now unknowable.

Ambiguity of readerly identity, that is as author and/or reader, stemming from gender tensions, cautions against an excess of scholarly certainty. Are the unattributed *Epistolae duorum amantium*, which surfaced in the 15th century, the much ballyhooed “lost” love letters of Abelard and Heloise? Is Heloise to be identified certainly as the creator of the learned love lyrics, the creator of an intriguing assimilation of Ciceronian friendship and Ovidian sensuality, or is this, in fact, the fictional work of a man, a bit of male fun? Does the illumination in Admont MS 18, folio iv, depict a nun preaching (a reserved clerical occupation) or merely reading? Why is it so difficult to read the illumination’s meaning? Is this the consequence of a deliberate act by the illuminator? And if Mary Magdalene, represented in a 16th-century painting as standing in a pulpit, a sacred space for ordained men, is not preaching, what, in fact, is she doing? How is the iconography to be explained? Equally tantalizing are the critical problems of identity surrounding Margery Kempe’s autobiographical *Book*. Can her priestly
scribe’s imprint be detected in the text? What was Margery’s active authorial role in the Book’s production? Does she provide any clues concerning her own theology? Has modern scholarship missed the force, intimated rather than stated, of her theological literacy? These are merely some of the problems examined by the contributors to Voices, where lively discourse and insightful scholarship abound. The contributors provide few definitive solutions, but one fact is sure: medieval women held fast to their religious ministry. “I xal spekyn of God,” declared Margery Kempe to the archbishop of York. And so she did.

Trinity College, University of Toronto

PENNY J. COLE


It is important for Catholics to be clear about the role played by their religious culture and ecclesiastical institutions in the ongoing degradation of Jewish people. The Church’s animosity disfigured its faith, and accurate understanding of that mutilation is a necessary prelude to a renewed witness to a God of love. Coppa’s study is, to my knowledge, the best available, single-volume survey of the relationship in the modern period between the papacy and the Jews. The text is full of incidents that must make contemporary Roman Catholics grimace. There are, for example, Gregory XVI’s exclusion of Jews from Rome’s hospitals, and Pius IX’s canonization of Pedro d’Arbues (the first inquisitor of Aragon, infamous in the eyes of Jews for his responsibility in the execution of their coreligionists) (101). Then there was Theodor Herzl’s astonishment when, in his attempt to secure Pius X’s blessing for the Zionist project, the pope declared: “If you come to Palestine and settle your people there, we shall have churches and priests ready to baptize all of you” (107).

While C. helpfully relates many such stories, his most important contribution is his exposition of how effective the papacy was in determining Catholic attitudes toward Jewish people. Contrary to the ecclesial tendency to place the Vatican above common Catholic social attitudes, the papacy, in fact, exercised considerable influence over the promulgating of those attitudes. For example, C. traces changes in the editorials and reporting by La Civiltà Cattolica—a papally controlled Jesuit newspaper—from the “irresponsible and racist” (118) pages at various points in the 19th century to Pius XI’s anti-Fascism and his opposition to racial doctrines, and to the Vatican Radio’s invoking prayers for persecuted Jews throughout 1936–1937.

Among other major themes, C. takes up the interaction between religiously inspired movements against the Jews (anti-Judaism) and racially motivated ones (anti-Semitism). C. recognizes that often “many in the Church who espoused anti-Judaic sentiments did so in language strikingly similar to the racial slurs uttered by anti-Semites” (305), but also that the
“extent to which anti-Judaism facilitated anti-Semitism is difficult if not impossible to assess” (310).

C.’s study will not enhance Pius XII’s reputation. He draws attention to Pacelli’s toning down of Pius XI’s statements regarding Fascists and the Nazis; the fact that there are only two references to the extermination of the Jews in the two volumes of correspondence between the Vatican and Polish bishops; and Pacelli’s failure to publicly protest against the Nazi murder of as many as 20 percent of Polish priests. C.’s judgment on Pius XII is direct: “His ‘silence’ on Nazi aggression toward Catholic Poland foreshadowed his silence during the larger genocide that ensued” (188). C. then notes that Jacques Maritain, the French ambassador to the Holy See, thought that the pope’s postwar attitude to the Jews was even “more damning than his silence during the war,” leading Maritain to resign his position in disgust (213).

Nevertheless, there are papal heroes in this volume. Certainly the esteem of scholars for Pius XI will rise much higher as they work through the recently released archives from his years as pope. And of course there is John XXIII and his collaborator Cardinal Augustin Bea. Their work at Vatican II and in the adoption of Nostra aetate prepared the way for the extraordinary effort at reconciliation that was embraced by John Paul II. C. opens his conclusion with a quote from James Carroll’s Constantine’s Sword: “By bending in prayer at the western wall, the kotel, the pope symbolically created a new future. The Church was honoring the Temple it had denigrated. It was affirming the presence of the Jewish people at home in Jerusalem. The pope reversed an ancient current of Jew hatred with that act, and the Church’s relationship with Israel, present as well as past, would never be the same.” And, let us hope, neither will Christianity ever be the same.

Boston College

JAMES BERNAUER, S.J.


In 1852, John Henry Newman preached a sermon at the first Provincial Synod of Westminster in which he spoke of the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in Britain as the coming of a “Second Spring . . . a restoration in the moral world, such as that which yearly takes place in the physical” (Sermons Preached on Various Occasions [1874]). Accompanying the more juridical aspects involved in this budding season of British Catholicism was the fact that a good number of British intellectuals had also turned to Rome, among whom were notables such as Coventry Patmore, Alice Meynell, Oscar Wilde, and, of course, Newman himself. For Newman in particular, the decision for Roman Catholicism meant more than simply his acknowledgment that only Rome had preserved the historical link to the apostolic church and to Jesus himself. Rome alone, he had decided, was the
church’s only hope for standing strong against 19th-century liberalism’s disregard of dogma, authority, and tradition, and its naïve belief in inevitable human and historical progress. Ironically, Newman, with his theories of the authority of the laity and his notions of doctrinal development, was often suspect within his new church. However, his conviction that liberalism’s path led ultimately to the betrayal of Christianity never wavered.

In this scholarly yet readable book, Schwartz builds on Newman’s image of a “Second Spring,” naming an early 20th-century movement in British Catholicism a “Third Spring.” In this new springtime, what most attracted the “considerable number of intellectuals” (6) who joined the Catholic Church was its strong opposition to modernity, liberalism in doctrine, and secularism. “Thinkers drawn to the church,” S. says, “were . . . almost exclusively those enticed by its own increasingly radical rebuttal of prevalent norms” (8). Christianity’s task, they were convinced, was not to reconcile itself with contemporary culture, but to take a countercultural, prophetic stance that preserved the truth of Christian tradition.

The book focuses on four thinkers—all men—who illustrate in a particularly vivid way this early 20th-century, general countercultural pattern of women and men attracted to Catholicism. They are the journalist, poet, and novelist G. K. Chesterton (1874–1936), the novelist Graham Greene (1904–1991), the historian Christopher Dawson (1889–1970), and the poet David Jones (1895–1974). While each is unique, all shared a distaste for what they considered a doctrinally weak Anglicanism, a suspicion of modern relativism, and a love for Catholicism’s strong authority and rich tradition.

Chesterton is described as a seeker who found wonder and joy in life, and found these deepened by his Catholic faith, wherein lay true safety and sanity in an age of “Progress, industrialism and imperialism” (31). Despite the fact that he had difficulty with a number of the Church’s dogmatic teachings, Greene felt deeply that the Church’s greatest strength was its “contrarian ethic” (195). Dawson saw Catholicism as “the sole avatar of faith that had retained its subversive legacy” (22), and Jones was convinced that only Rome’s doctrine and authority could effectively rebel “against dehumanizing modern technocracy” (289).

The three who lived into the Second Vatican Council (Greene, Dawson, and Jones) felt betrayed and disillusioned by some aspects of the Church’s commitment to aggiornamento, especially regarding liturgical reform. “I thought the Church and I wanted the same thing,” a frustrated Greene cried out (192). However, some rethinking of Vatican II during the pontificate of John Paul II, as well as contemporary movements such as Pentecostalism, S. suggests, might be proving his subjects’ conviction to be correct. In any case, he says, their prophetic stance still poses a challenge that is constantly proving relevant in today’s rootless world.

Some years ago in America magazine, Avery (now Cardinal) Dulles wrote that Christianity is always in some sense countercultural. Christianity also, however, signifies much more than a prophetic stance against this age. There exists a specifically “Catholic imagination” that embraces the world,
its goodness, and its cultures, as sacraments of God’s presence in a creation that is nevertheless shot through with imperfection and evil. S. does not totally deny this Catholic imagination to his subjects, but it is clear that his interest in their lives and witness lies elsewhere.

Catholic Theological Union, Chicago  

STEPHEN BEVANS, S.V.D.


The continued publication of the critical edition of the Schleiermacher works has stimulated fresh research. Peter Grove has taken advantage of these resources and made an important, indispensable contribution to Schleieracher scholarship. The result is arguably the best book on Schleiermacher in recent decades, and it will clearly rank as a standard that future studies must both consult and be measured against. The Danish equivalent of the German Habilitation or French agrégation, this volume deals comprehensively with Schleiermacher’s philosophy of religion and its central concepts. It analyzes Schleiermacher’s views on the relationship between philosophy and theology, metaphysics and religion, within the context of his conceptions of subjectivity, feeling, and self-consciousness.

The book is divided into two parts. The first provides a historical, genetic, and contextual account of Schleiermacher’s philosophical beginnings. It seeks thereby to elaborate the philosophical presuppositions of Schleiermacher’s mature philosophical and theological thought. Locating Schleiermacher’s theory of subjectivity within the philosophical and intellectual currents of his day, G. pays special attention to Kantianism (its reception and development by Reinhold and Fichte), the Spinoza renaissance, and early Romanticism (especially Schlegel). He interprets Schleiermacher as developing Kant’s practical philosophy and as furthering the Romantic emphasis on subjectivity. Schlegel’s influence shows itself in Schleiermacher’s approach to the foundation of philosophy. In contrast to interpretations that attribute a foundationalism to Schleiermacher and identify his position completely with Fichte, G.’s interpretation carefully delineates Schleiermacher’s proximity and difference. Schleiermacher argues neither for an immediate certitude of principles nor for an infinite regress of reason. Instead, he postulates a continuing mutual exchange or correlation between the totality and the individual.

Part 2 moves from Schleiermacher’s philosophical presuppositions to his constructive theoretical affirmations. It traces their development from their initial formulations in his 1799 Speeches, through his philosophical ethics and his lectures on the Dialektik, and finally to the two editions of his Glaubenslehre. G. analyzes each work in dialogue with current scholarship. In tracing Schleiermacher’s developing position, G. focuses on the relationship between subjectivity and religion, between religion and metaphysics, and between metaphysics and theology, placing these binaries in rela-
tion to Schleiermacher’s theory of the self, especially his understanding of feeling as it develops in his philosophical ethic, especially in *Brouillon zur Ethik* (1816/1817).

G. writes clearly, so his overarching interpretation and argument come forcefully to the fore. In tracing a development in Schleiermacher’s thought, he nevertheless argues for a basic consistency in Schleiermacher’s epistemological presuppositions. According to G., Schleiermacher defines religion in the *Speeches* as neither knowledge nor an action, but rather as a specific feeling of immediate consciousness. He clearly distinguishes religion both from a theoretical cognitive consciousness and from a practical consciousness. Schleiermacher’s later writings drop the term “intuition” (*Anschauung*) and develop the notion “immediate self-consciousness” in order to continue to differentiate religious consciousness from objective knowledge and from practical action. The notion of the universe in the *Speeches* becomes further specified through the distinction between the notion of the world as total and the idea of God.

G. carefully observes and explicates the important distinction between religion and metaphysics. He is at pains to demonstrate, correctly in my view, that Schleiermacher’s distinction between metaphysics and religion goes beyond merely criticizing the conflation or mixing of the two. They are distinct but interrelated. The thought of God is both a metaphysical and a religious concept: as metaphysical, the notion of God is general and unspecified, while, as religious, it is determined or specified. From a metaphysical point of view, the notion of God has a general validity, but is undetermined. Religion provides a specific, but subjective, meaning. Metaphysics can, therefore, of itself not provide a completely meaningful interpretation of life. Religion does, but it is a subjective interpretation.

G.’s analysis of Schleiermacher remains at the interpretive level. He closely identifies Schleiermacher’s resolved positions in the face of competing answers contemporary to Schleiermacher, and again in the face of competing interpretations contemporary to G. himself, thus clearly situating Schleiermacher within his and our historical philosophical context. Such an approach leaves open the systematic question: how does G. himself judge the adequacy of Schleiermacher’s position? One would hope that an author who has written such a finely textured interpretation might answer this question in his next book.

*Harvard Divinity School*  
 Francis Schüssler Fiorenza


This is a remarkable book about a remarkable episode in modern Catholic history. In the decades before World War I, French Catholicism had set its face against modernity, doubly so against the modernity of France’s Third Republic. Yet leading figures in this Catholicism suddenly found
themselves operating at the very center of France’s literary and artistic avant-garde.

“After the Great War,” Schloesser writes, “Catholicism came to be imagined by certain cultural and intellectual elites not only as being thoroughly compatible with ‘modernity,’ but even more emphatically, as constituting the truest expression of ‘modernity’” (5). The pivotal figure in this startling development was Jacques Maritain. In 1906, he and his wife Raïssa found refuge in the faith from a despair-inducing skepticism. By the 1920s, these converts, now armed with a fresh reading of Aquinas, were reaching out to figures like the composers Erik Satie and Igor Stravinsky and avant-garde poets, novelists, dramatists, and essayists, many of them orbiting around the protean Jean Cocteau. The Maritains’ home and its private chapel became the site of dramatic spiritual scenes: lapsed Catholic writers returning to the sacraments, non-Catholics seeking instruction and baptism. And beyond the conversions of individuals was a sympathetic reception of their art.

From 1925 to 1932, Jacques Maritain and his collaborators published novels, stories, poems, essays, criticism, and plays in the Roseau D’Or, a series of volumes featuring Cocteau and his fellow travelers, along with the Russian Orthodox theologian Nicolas Berdiaeff, the great Islamic scholar Louis Massignon, and the Catholic poet and playwright Paul Claudel. Novels by Georges Bernanos, Julien Green, François Mauriac, and the converts Graham Greene and Giovanni Papini appeared there—all authors who scandalized the pious and upset church authorities. Undeniably orthodox Catholic thinkers like Romano Guardini, Chesterton, and Maritain himself were published alongside the heterodox and the inquiring.

Only in France did Catholicism become “a normal feature of literary life in the interwar years” (4), S. argues, and he offers a theological explanation as well as a contextual one. The context of course was the postwar climate of bereavement. Artists and writers groped for an antimodernist modernism, trying to turn prewar modernism on itself, especially insofar as the “modern” presumed a liberal rationalism now held responsible for the war. For this hybrid of modernism, antimodernism, and ultramodernism, Catholicism possessed a rich fund of memory and tradition but also of cultural defiance.

If that was the context, for S. the catalyst was the “retooling,” especially by the Maritains, “of three traditional Catholic ideas: hylomorphism, sacramentalism, and transubstantiation” (6). The Aristotelian-Thomistic concept of matter as potency given actuality by form, the understanding of sacrament as a visible sign of an invisible reality, and the Scholastic explanation of the Eucharist in terms of real substance and superficial accidents—each in its own way exemplified “a vision of the world as a dialectical composite of two interpenetrating planes of reality: seen and unseen, created and uncreated, natural and supernatural” (6).

The result was a “mystical realism” (surrealism was its most notable secular counterpart) able to overcome dichotomies haunting French religion and culture—church versus state, science versus religion, realism ver-
sus supernaturalism—and also able to embrace the transgressive, grotesque, dissonant, or extreme in art, literature, and music. S. traces this embrace in chapters on the work—and especially its reception—of the painter and printmaker Georges Rouault, the novelist Georges Bernanos, and the composer and organist Charles Tournemire.

The story of Jazz Age Catholicism is one not only of ideas but of people. More than a few of those to whom the Maritains extended a religious welcome were homosexual or given to drug addictions or both. Jacques’s solicitude, sensitivity, and tact regarding matters always of potential or actual scandal were remarkable. The Maritains’ own vowed celibacy adds a dimension to the human drama here that one senses essential but always elusive. Occasionally I wanted S. to toss aside his critical apparatus or skim over his painstaking summaries of reviews, and just concentrate on the fascinating tale.

Jazz Age Catholicism provokes further questions—about the larger map of French interwar culture and religion, about continuity with the prewar phase of renouveau catholique represented by Charles Peguy, Leon Bloy, and Paul Claudel, and especially about whether these overtures of the 1920s were always doomed to fall short of what they promised. Was the gap between Catholicism and the cutting-edge artistic milieu simply too great? Did politics, beginning with the papal condemnation of Action Française in 1926 and continuing with the great crises of the 1930s and 1940s, simply overwhelm cultural concerns? I suggest that no Catholicism that hopes to respond adequately to the largely secular but spiritually hungry culture of our time or that wishes to garner more than nostalgic pride from the French Catholic revival can afford to ignore this richly documented and analyzed study.

Fordham University, New York

Peter Steinfels


Bonhoeffer’s life and death continue to fascinate lay and academic readers alike, encouraged by recent new translations of his works that provide wide views of his activities and thought. This volume, on B.’s last years, includes letters, notes, documents, and treatises that, in their overall effect, are chilling. The collection is superbly translated and expertly edited, providing context for its primary materials and useful supplemental appendices. Here we see B., former head of the Finkenwalde seminary, become B. the conspirator, then B. the prisoner, leading up to his execution. B.’s indomitable Christian faith is evident, as it helped him along the road through various forms of resistance to active conspiracy. The letters and documents detail B.’s activities on behalf of the Confessing Church, both in Germany and abroad. Through circular letters (seven in this volume), B.
continued to communicate with his former Finkenwalde students, many of whom had been conscripted into the German military.

For “his activity of subverting the people” (volkszersetzenden Tätigkeit [71]) while working in the “collective pastorates” of eastern Pomerania, the government banned him in August 1940 from speaking publicly “within the entire German Reich” and placed residency requirements on him. The Ettal monastery near Munich provided B. a place to work on the manuscript that was eventually published as his Ethics (this was to be his major work). B. soon entered into a “double life,” posing as a government agent for military intelligence while, through his travels and connections with church leaders in other countries, trying to establish directions for a post-war Germany. His ties with Willem Adolph Visser ‘t Hooft of the World Student Christian Federation (later of the World Council of Churches) and George Bell, the Anglican Bishop of Chichester, were especially important. Working through Bell, B. hoped—without success—to persuade the British government to indicate discreetly that it would be willing to negotiate with Germans who opposed Hitler, should Hitler fall from power. The included correspondence between Bell and British foreign minister, Anthony Eden, provides a rare look at such “inside diplomacy.” B. also kept Bell informed on resistance efforts.

B.’s brother-in-law, Hans von Dohnanyi, who worked in the Military Intelligence Office, arranged for B. to pose as a military intelligence officer both to avoid active conscription into the German military and to continue to pass along information and forge alliances for the Confessing Church with international church leaders, particularly in Switzerland and Sweden. While B. was progressively drawn into resistance and conspiracy against the Reich government, he could not disclose the range of his activities, even to his fiancée, Maria von Wedemeyer. Ten previously unpublished letters in this volume from B. to Maria indicate the difficulties they encountered in persuading Maria’s mother to permit them to continue their relationship, especially after his arrest.

On April 5, 1943, B. and Hans and Christine von Dohnanyi (the latter, B.’s sister and Hans’s wife) were arrested and taken to the Tegel Military Detention Center. Materials from “File Z,” collected by the Nazis against B. and von Dohnanyi, are included here, as are their indictments. Originally B. was charged with avoiding military conscription, but then indications of his involvement with “Operation 7” surfaced, including the smuggling of 14 “non-Aryans” into Switzerland under the guise of a military intelligence operation. The “camouflage letters” that were earlier constructed to shield B.’s various activities were exposed. Most damning, of course, was evidence of B.’s participation in a plot to assassinate Hitler on July 20, 1944. Also included in this volume are a variety of B.’s late essays, sermons, and meditations written during the period leading up to the morning of April 9, 1945, when B. and other conspirators were executed.

This close-up of B.’s last years, here presented in primary and secondary materials, reveals B.’s thoughts and activities as he cast his lot with those who resisted evil, even as he agonized over appropriate Christian ethical
action. Evaluations of his choices will vary. But this volume is indispens-
able for perceiving the contexts of B.’s fateful decisions to conspire.

*Westminster John Knox Press, Germantown, Tenn.* Donald K. McKim


This book serves as a fitting pendant to several studies of French Modernism, including Laplanche’s *La Bible en France entre mythe et critique: XVIIe–XIXe siècle* (1994). L.’s 1994 study traced the rise of critical biblical scholarship within Catholicism up to the brink of the Modernist crisis, shedding light on the “upstream” of Modernism, on how that late 19th-century crisis was produced. Our understanding of French Modernism leading up to its condemnations has benefited from the serial contributions of Émile Poulat and the magisterial study by Pierre Colin (1997). L. now takes up the fortunes of critical exegesis in francophone circles (Belgium plays a significant role) from the condemnations of Modernism through the two decades after Vatican II.

If Loisy’s application of historical-critical methods to biblical texts could evoke responses ranging from nausea (“seasickness,” as one bishop put it) to high anxiety, the use of those methods to revise understandings of Christian origins occasioned acute terror at their corrosive effects on traditional apologetics and dogmatics. The “crisis of origin” serves as a guiding thread in presenting the responses of *la science catholique* to the history of religions school, the changing application and reception of comparative method, the constraints imposed by the Vatican—and the mutations within this orientation in Catholic approaches to the problem of religious truth—leading to the demise of the orientation after World War II.

Even as restricted to biblical exegesis and to francophone scholarship, this is a complex story. In tracing a route through the 20th century this volume doubles the number of pages its predecessor spent on multiple centuries. Here L. makes important contributions to our understanding of the “progressistes” in Catholic biblical scholarship who carried forward the trajectory of critical biblical studies. His overview of these networks over the period following on the Modernist controversy, his appreciation of the diversity that obtained within and between these networks, and his inclusion of lesser known members are immensely helpful in situating the discussion of specific works and notable controversies. The progressives are in turn positioned with respect to the independent sector of exegesis (engaging Loisy’s later work, along with that of Charles Guignebert and Maurice Goguel), and to the regnant Catholic theology. In portraying the practitioners of *la science catholique*, L.’s command of the archival material is crucial, given the constraints on what could then be said openly in print. Truer comments and commitments regularly emerged from correspondence, a good deal of which is still unpublished.
L. presents a synthetic overview of his chosen terrain, engaging personnel, principal currents of thought, the works that conveyed them, the support or opposition they raised, and the institutional infrastructures that sustained and constrained persons and positions. Still, L. does so without neglecting the wealth of detail necessary to convey what was at stake for the various parties and how those currents continued to develop. He supplies the background necessary to appreciate the 20th-century context of Vatican II’s contributions to revelation and its interpretation, a story of the eventual hard-won victory within Catholicism of historical-critical exegesis. And L. continues the narrative to include initiatives to communicate the theology of Vatican II, particularly impinging on the understanding of the Bible, to French Catholics. The book ends with an account of a new transitional period in which critical methods, having successfully negotiated their challenge to the received paradigm, are themselves undergoing challenge from new methods of interpretation derived from literary theory and the social sciences.

Other studies have taken up the particular areas covered in this volume (e.g., Alan Jones [1983] on the independent sector of exegesis in France, or Hans Kippenberg [1997] on the rise of comparative religion), or overviewed the period (Etienne Fouilloux’s study of Catholic thought between Modernism and Vatican II, though concentrating more on theological aspects of that development). L’s book fills a gap in our knowledge of where critical biblical scholarship went after the convulsions of Modernism, communicating the methodological and dogmatic constraints exegetes labored under, the progress gained at what price, and the reversals that followed with depressing frequency. L. weaves together a large cast of characters (a helpful series of biographical sketches is given at the end of the volume) and a complex of ideas and their environing contexts in a way that advances our understanding of this formative period in modern Catholic history.

University of Saint Thomas, Houston

C. J. T. TALAR


Of the publications occasioned by the death of Pope John Paul II and election of Pope Benedict XVI, these two focus on the head of the Catholic Church as diplomat and the Holy See as a force in international relations. Neither includes substantial new material, but each presents existing writings in useful ways.
Most commentators, believers or not, politically left or right, agree that John Paul II was an astute political actor who helped hasten the collapse of communism in Europe. Gillis’s collection supports this view, though its scope is broader than O’Connor’s. G. has put together writings that range across diverse subjects—from social teaching to interfaith dialogue to bioethical issues—as seen by both Karol Wojtyla and Joseph Ratzinger. Papal statements are presented amid writings by an unusual array of authors: academics, journalists, commentators, and papal observers. These works are of mixed quality, and some of the more journalistic entries could probably have been omitted. Yet, the combined effect is satisfying.

Each entry adds to a blend of flavors, from the hagiographic opening essay by Jo Renee Formicola to the only markedly critical essay by Robert Grant. The latter focuses on the pressure exerted by members of the Catholic hierarchy on Catholic politicians for their public positions on issues such as abortion, embryonic stem cell research, and same-sex marriage. The coercive tactics to which Grant draws attention contrast with the popes’ calls in other contexts for dialogue. More critique of this kind would have been welcome, because John Paul II showed that diplomacy and dialogue can be effective even in the absence of an army to back it up, and this message—so important to states, both weak and strong—is diminished if church officials wield power tyrannically.

The book highlights how John Paul II combined engagement, reasoned argument, and highly symbolic gestures to great effect in Poland, Israel, and elsewhere. The academic contributions are meaty. For me the most interesting are the entries by Yehezkel Landau and Ibrahim M. Abu-Rabi on John Paul II’s relations with Jews and Muslims, respectively. Also engaging and rewarding is Derek Jeffreys’s substantial study on a tension in the social and political thought of John Paul II between support for the rights of nations and support for individual human dignity, and between affirming state sovereignty and upholding personal freedom. Jeffreys proposes resolving the conflict by prioritizing the rights of the person and applying rights only to collectives analogically.

While Gillis gives us diversity, O’Connor pulls out one multi-faceted theme from 63 statements spanning 26 years of John Paul II’s papacy. Focusing on addresses to diplomats, O’C. provides a primer on the “Culture of Peace,” a phrase he detects in a number of papal statements and to which he gives content when introducing each of the volume’s four sections.

The first half of the book, given over to John Paul II’s annual addresses to the diplomatic corps attached to the Holy See, shows the pope as an accomplished diplomat, using circumstances of the day to promote perennial values. So, too, does section 2, a selection of speeches made when newly appointed diplomats presented their credentials to the pope. Here O’C. includes many of the ambassadors’ speeches to which the pope responded, enabling the reader to see how John Paul took opportunities to convey concerns about particular issues of justice within the customary form of diplomatic discourse, such as his measured words to Ethiopia’s
ambassador in 1985 in the context of famine and war. To complete the collection, O’C. includes the pope’s two addresses to the UN General Assembly, several other addresses to UN bodies, and a number of special addresses to diplomats during papal visits, as in Lusaka in 1989 where he touched on southern African issues of apartheid, international debt, and refugees.

When we read these occasional statements together, we glimpse a quarter of a century through the pope’s eyes, including brief annual surveys of the global scene in terms of war and peace, poverty and development. Warnings on issues such as the growing ethnic tensions in Rwanda in the years prior to the 1994 genocide show a pope in touch with emerging threats. His 1986 reflections on terrorism and responses to terrorism could today be aptly repeated unedited.

The contexts for each address illustrate how John Paul applied broad norms in practice. Recurrent concerns (core elements of Catholic social teaching found also in the more familiar social encyclicals) stand out: respect for the rights of nations and affirmation of state sovereignty as a positive form of social ordering that protects cultural identity; promotion of the universal common good as a good embracing and surpassing the common good of each state; the importance of solidarity as a moral sentiment drawing us to the other and as a necessary feature of relations between nations; and affirmation of the dignity of the human person and of rights flowing therefrom, in particular, the right to religious freedom and freedom of conscience, seen as the cornerstone of all rights and freedoms.

The central value of the collection lies in O’C.’s collation and framing of these papal statements, as many are readily available elsewhere. His brief introduction invites research, reflection, and discussion. His essay on the pope’s vision of international diplomacy, an appendix to the collection, identifies key features of morally good diplomacy. O’C.’s presentation of John Paul II, the diplomat addressing diplomats, shows the efficacy of such diplomacy for building a safer and more just world.

The volume suffers from inadequate proofreading—errors include a page out of place (the text on p. 49 should follow that on p. 33) and instances where a word or more appear to be added or missing (71, 127). Nevertheless, as an introduction to John Paul II as diplomat, the book serves well and can lead the interested reader to consult primary sources.

That only one speech is common to both collections—John Paul II’s landmark 1995 address to the UN General Assembly—testifies not only to the different interests of the collators but also to the prolific papal output on social and political issues and to the breadth of this recent Catholic heritage. They invite us to delve into this resource and apply its lessons in practice, in both pluralistic societies and a still divided world.

_Theoeli, Dili, Timor-Leste_  
Francis Elvey

Cardinal Augustin Bea (1881–1968) served as the first president of the Vatican’s Pontifical Council (initially called a Secretariat) for Promoting Christian Unity (PCPCU). In 1987 Stjepan Schmidt, a Croatian Jesuit and for ten years personal secretary to Bea, published a definitive biography of the cardinal that was translated into English in 1992. Those familiar with Schmidt’s biography might well ask, What could possibly be added to that thoroughgoing account of the German ecumenist’s life? In fact, however, this volume by Vereb, now professor of ecumenical theology at Immaculate Conception Seminary (Huntington, N.Y.) and onetime staff member at the PCPCU, is a trove of new documentation, most of which has not been known except to a small circle of specialists. The present book, despite its curious title (more about that anon), includes much more than incidents in Bea’s life as outlined beginning only in chapter 3. Before that, we learn much about several requests to the papacy for an office for Christian unity and about the numerous ecumenical initiatives of Bea’s pioneering German predecessors.

“A Middle Eastern Prelude to Vatican Two” (chap. 1) reports on a pre-Vatican II letter of Maximus IV Saigh, Melkite Patriarch of Antioch between 1947 and 1967, written to Pope John XXIII on May 23, 1959, to urge the establishment of a Vatican bureau or “congregation” to promote Christian unity. This was one year before the secretariat was established. The chapter includes information about little known meetings as early as 1949 under Dutch auspices of the Catholic Conference for Ecumenical Questions (CCEQ), and a confidential consultation of some 20 Catholic and non-Catholic ecumenists that year at the Dominican Istina Center in Paris. Then chapter 2 reports on “The German Theater of Ecumenical Activity,” largely during the first half of the 20th century. It takes up the committed ecumenical activities of several German Catholic theologians (Adolf Herte, Lorenz Jaeger, Joseph Lortz, Karl Adam, and Max Metzger), while most German Catholics were still reeling from the Kulturkampf.

Bea comes to the fore in chapter 3. Details are provided about his early administrative responsibilities in Germany, as well as his appointment in 1924 to Rome. In addition to lecturing on Scripture at the Biblical Institute, he eventually became confessor and advisor to Pope Pius XII, and also became especially influential in the formulation of Divino afflante Spiritu, the progressive 1943 encyclical on biblical studies. Bea later assumed even closer collaboration with Pope John XXIII who saw in him common sensibilities and relied heavily on his advice for dealing with the Orthodox and Protestants.

Chapters 4 and 5 describe the extensive correspondence, dating from 1951, between Bea and Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn. Since
Jaeger was one of the most visible and committed ecumenists at the time and founder of the Johann Adam Möhler Ecumenical Institute, their exchanges were fruitful. The two men collaborated extensively on an official letter to Pope John XXIII under Jaeger's signature, dated March 4, 1960, that petitioned the establishment of the PCPCU. The Latin letter, mostly the work of Bea, is translated here and published for the first time in English (184–88). The carefully crafted petition, detailed and canonical in tone, was enthusiastically received by Pope John who immediately acted on it—well before the opening of Vatican II. V. notes two characteristics of the letter, its “Germanness” (all the document’s collaborators were German) and its insistence on the need for serious scholarship for promoting rapprochement. When V. was researching this book in 2000, he interviewed Archbishop Loris Capovilla, Pope John’s private secretary. When asked why Bea was chosen as the first president of this new curial office, he replied immediately: “because he was a German!” Hence the book’s unusual title.

The most creative section of this informative book (chapter 6) evaluates Bea’s overall ecumenical endeavors over several decades, but focuses especially on his interventions at Vatican II. The biographer’s sources are extensive and in many cases original. They illustrate Bea’s scholarly insights and his patient diplomatic skills.

This remarkable book will be a necessary vade mecum for all interested in Roman Catholicism’s late entry into the search for Christian unity. If I may be allowed one criticism of the book: its lack of chronological exposition is disorienting for the reader who needs to flip back and forth at times to verify which event came before or after another event.

Boston College

Michael A. Fahey, S.J.


These collections on the Trinity—the first in memory of Colin E. Gunton of King’s College, London, and the second a Festschrift to mark the 80th birthday of Jürgen Moltmann—are each from a well-known Protestant house. Unsurprisingly, they reflect predominantly Protestant viewpoints, with only occasional notice taken of Catholic or other positions. As is true of most collections, some contributions are of lesser quality. For the most part, however, both volumes achieve a high standard and can be recommended for their insight into contemporary explorations of trinitarian doctrine.

The first, edited by Paul Metzger, is a worthy memorial to Gunton and his considerable achievement. For the most part, the articles constructively
engage Gunton’s theology. As M. tells us, they “explore interfaces between Trinitarian thought and major themes of systematic theology” (6). The dominant spirit behind the book is that of Karl Barth, of whom Gunton himself was a notable exponent. In a perceptive afterword, Robert Jenson notes the inconspicuousness in the volume of the “English ecclesial establishment” and the total absence of Lutherans like himself, and muses that this might have to do with Reformed theology’s insistence on a distinctively high concept of the divine transcendence that balks at the doctrine of the communion of attributes in Christ (219–20).

The outstanding contribution of the volume is Georg Pfeiderer’s, titled simply “The Atonement.” It is a model of carefully considered and well-planned theological argument. Pfeiderer aimed to combine some “fundamental insights of Gunton [on the Atonement] with some structural elements of Barth’s systematic approach,” and more specifically, “to take up Gunton’s typological use of metaphor, but unfold it in a way that allows it to link up consistently with the three aspects of the doctrine of the Trinity” (130): thus victory is correlated with the work of the Father, justice with that of the Son, and sacrifice with that of the Holy Spirit. (We are told nothing about the translator, but apart from one small mistake in the opening paragraph, “represent” instead of “represents,” the article reads like homegrown English.)

Other superior articles are “Prologomena” by Murray Rae (whose reference to Gunton is minimal—just one endnote), “The Personal Spirit and Personal Appropriation of the Truth” by James Houston, and “Revelation and Natural Rights” by Esther Reed. Rae argues that theological prolegomena are not outside, but firmly inside, the field of theology itself. Thus they are “pro” only in the sense that they are the first things to be said in response to God’s revelation. And, Rae continues, theology is to be construed not “as a merely human endeavour,” but as “a mode of participation, enabled by the Spirit, in the Triune God’s identification of himself” (19). Houston’s essay is a wise foray into the field of spirituality. An entire paragraph (147–48) deserves to be quoted, but let one sentence suffice. After criticizing the modern psychological concept so often inflicted on the Trinity of persons as self-asserting, Houston continues that “selflessness is more than professional expertise likely to get closer to the person of the Holy Spirit” (147), a comment reminiscent of Catherine of Siena’s analogy of the Holy Spirit as the “waiter” at the heavenly feast. Houston adds the interesting detail that Gunton once confessed that he always felt he had been inadequately trained as a theologian, a feeling with which many can identify. Reed’s closely argued piece presents and evaluates Gunton’s theology of nature, and then constructively explores its implications for a theology of natural rights, a subject on which Gunton himself was relatively silent. In this, Reed reconvenes teleology with eschatology and makes a strong case for intercessory prayer.

The second book, edited by Volf and Welker, has a companion volume in German by the same editors. V. has both the preface and an article (he also had an article in M.’s book), but there is nothing from W., who,
however, has an article in the companion volume. The 18 contributions here are distributed over four parts, Trinity and Humanity, Trinity and Religious Traditions, Trinity and God-Talk, and Trinity and Historical Theology.

In part 1, the outstanding articles are Nancy Elizabeth Bedford’s “Speak, “Friend,” and Enter’: Friendship and Theological Method,” and John Polkinghorne’s “Jürgen Moltmann’s Engagement with the Natural Sciences”; in part 2, Daniel Migliore’s “The Trinity and the Theology of Religions”; and, in part 3, Sarah Coakley’s “The Trinity and Gender Re-considered,” John Webster’s “God’s Perfect Life,” and David Fergusson’s “Divine Providence and Action.”

Much could be said about these articles, but I will highlight just one point from Coakley’s. It was a revelation to me that the famous Pauline text on the removal of all distinctions among those who are “in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28) has a different structure for the gender division than that governing the other two divisions, that is, the religious and racial distinction of Jew and Greek and the social distinction of slave and free. Whereas the religious and the social distinctions are joined by “neither . . . nor,” the gender distinction is structurally related by “neither (or not) . . . and.” Specifically and literally, the passage should be translated, “there is not male and female.” The difference has to be both intentional and significant—this is Coakley’s point. There is much to be said also for her interpretation of its significance: “It is not, as I see it, that maleness and femaleness are necessarily obliterated by what Paul envisages, either now or eschatologically, but rather that they are rendered spiritually insignificant” (140). If this exegesis is accepted, its implications for church order are far-reaching and important.

Gunton and Moltmann, though sons of the Reformation, are very different theologians. Gunton represents a particular Protestant tradition to which he remained steadfastly loyal all his life. Along with his strengths he had limitations impeding a more general acceptance, not least of which was a justly criticized anti-Augustinian bias. Moltmann, as a theologian of eschatology and hope, is less tied to past traditions; he is already a Christian of the future in his belief that truth lies more in dialogue with other Christians than in received systems. The two theologians appeal to different constituencies, and the volumes here well represent their respective approaches. Each in its own way is a challenge to contemporary practitioners.

**Catholic Institute of Sydney**

**DAVID M. Coffey**


In keeping with the early 21st century’s increased attention on the Trinity, Ormerod brings together three reworked articles and significantly new material to make his case for the reappropriation of the distinctly Western theological tradition—in particular, the insights of Augustine and Aquinas—as a needed and significant contribution to, even correction of,
contemporary trinitarian theology. In a series of passionate exchanges (verging at times on the polemical), O. retrieves various key features of the tradition in the face of those theologians who, to his mind, dismiss the Western tradition out of hand.

For example, he argues for a retrieval of the psychological analogy brought to light by Augustine and later refined by Aquinas. O. clearly judges that many contemporary theologians do not grasp the nature of the psychological analogy; consequently “it is too easy and too common to dismiss as a mistake, or a historical dead end, what one has not understood” (52). Again, O. calls for a reclaiming of the doctrine of appropriations “within a more modern setting, while remaining faithful to the insights on which it was originally based” (21), thereby laying the groundwork for a significant contemporary expansion of trinitarian thought “beyond the cognitive function of meaning to embrace other meanings as well” (150).

O. ’s determined stress on the tradition’s intellectual coherence leads him to applaud Barth and Rahner, on the one hand, for reclaiming the centrality of trinitarian doctrine from the margins to which it had been relegated. On the other hand, however, his chapter “Wrestling with Rahner on the Trinity” concludes that within Rahner’s work are clear signs of an “incomplete appreciation of the Western tradition on the Trinity” (140), and suggests that his work suffers an impoverishment quite as extensive as what Rahner himself saw in neo-Scholasticism.

In exploring the doctrine of appropriation (predicating functions but not specific actions of the persons of the Trinity), O. cites Hans Urs von Balthasar, John Zizioulas, and Denis Edwards as three theologians who have suggested new avenues for trinitarian theology. Yet again, however, O. undoes much of what he has asserted by countering that each one has moved beyond what may be said “in a cognitively coherent manner, at least from the perspective of the tradition” (108). (Here, we might take issue when he relies on secondary criticism [Guy Mansini] for his informed opinion.). O. asserts that it is difficult to establish an effective dialogue between Balthasar and the Western tradition without embracing Balthasar’s idiosyncratic methodology and personal style. This O. is reluctant to do. Strikingly, Balthasar’s writing on the Trinity is both intensely linked to the tradition (primarily through the fathers but not negating the Scholastic tradition) and, at the same time, distinctly unique and idiosyncratic. The latter characteristic has irritated critics of his theology. However, O. ’s statement that “without great care this type of writing can spin out of control, and transform belief in the Trinity into an elaborate religious myth” (113) moves once more into the realm of unhelpful polemic—even as he remains not entirely dismissive of Balthasar, Zizoulas, and Edwards; he sees the possibility of making sense of their contributions by a judicious use of the tradition of appropriation.

More sharply focused is O. ’s criticism of Roger Haight and John Hick. Following Kantian principles, both Haight and Hick, according to O., consider what occurs within the Godhead to be completely inaccessible, and
thus any reference to the immanent Trinity is seen as an anachronistic remnant of Scholastic theology. O. judges that these conclusions stand at variance to the Western tradition of faith but are consistent with erroneous presuppositions from which these theologians work.

Throughout the book the major guiding spirit is Bernard Lonergan, whom O. understands as both rooted in the Western tradition and yet as pushing the boundaries of coherent trinitarian thought. O. cites Lonergan’s concern about historical scholarship and emphasizes that Lonergan’s *Method in Theology* provides a framework for combining historical scholarship with fidelity to the tradition. By contrast, O. castigates much modern theology for not distinguishing biblical commonsense, philosophical theory, and the realm of interiority. Rather, one finds among them an “undifferentiated eclecticism” that is inimical to the “cognitive function of meaning.” It is clear that neo-Scholastic trinitarian theology does not provide all the answers for contemporary believers. Yet there is a richness in the Western tradition that is timeless, and without which contemporary theological conversation about the Trinity is sorely impoverished. Thus O. has made his substantive, if convoluted, case for the inclusion of the Western tradition in contemporary trinitarian discussions.

*Regis College, Toronto*  

GILL GOULDING, I.B.V.M.


Contemporary debates over the language of sacrifice in atonement theology generally resolve in two directions. Some view the Latin tradition (as systematized by Anselm) as an indispensable framework for understanding the saving significance of Jesus’ death. Such a view generally maintains that while Anselm’s *Cur Deus homo* reflects the feudal culture of his day, the language of sacrifice and penal substitution is not an alien imposition upon Scripture; it comes from the New Testament itself. Others find the notion of penal substitution not only offensive, since it portrays God as violent and vengeful, but a potential source of oppression. Black, feminist, and other liberation theologians have shown how certain interpretations of the cross can promote a cult of suffering so that, rather than seeking to overcome injustice, oppressed groups passively identify with Jesus’ death as though suffering itself were part of God’s redemptive plan. On such a view, the language of sacrificial atonement must be minimized, if not rejected, in order to see the cross as God’s liberating solidarity with those who suffer.

Mark Heim adopts a third position. Convinced that major strains of sacrificial atonement theory, including Anselm’s, have misread the New Testament, H. argues that only by understanding the relationship of Jesus’ death to the language of sacrifice can we truly grasp its saving and liberating significance. The language of sacrifice is crucial, for it reveals what we are saved from. “Jesus didn’t volunteer to get into God’s justice machine. God volunteered to get into ours. God used our own sin to save us” (xi). Christians are correct to say that Jesus “died for our sins,” but about this
we must be very clear: Jesus’ death is not God’s act of scapegoat violence; it is ours. Jesus’ death on the cross reveals in starkest outline the scapegoat violence that humans use to establish social order. It unmasks the mechanism of sacrificial violence found in our myths, cultural systems, social practices, political ideologies, and interpersonal relationships. By projecting upon a victim our inner rivalries and violences, by transferring upon an Other the chaos generated within and among groups entangled in competing desires, we may find temporary peace and unity as this Other is objectified and lynched.

Jesus’ crucifixion in Jerusalem was neither a historical accident nor a death wish on Jesus’ part to fulfill God’s need for a victim-substitute to discharge divine wrath. Rather, Jesus was swept up into a process of scapegoat violence whereby various groups and powers, who were otherwise at odds, could find unanimity and peace. Caiaphas’s words reveal most clearly this sacrificial logic: “It is better that one man should die for the people than that the whole nation perish.” The scriptural story, argues H., is a story of progressive revelation about violence, especially the violence of sacrifice. Why is there so much violence in the Bible? “It is telling us the truth, the truth about our human condition, about the fundamental dynamics that lead to human bloodshed, and most particularly, the truth about the integral connection between religion and violence. There is no way to be truthful without exhibiting these things” (101).

H. has drunk deeply from the well of René Girard’s thought. As he states, at times he wishes he could simply tell his reader to pick up Girard’s works (or some of his most important interpreters) since they do so well what he himself seeks to accomplish. So, why add to the growing number of works adopting Girard’s theory of mimetic rivalry and scapegoat violence in theology? The answer, H. believes, is that Christians must be adamant about getting a crucial distinction right. God does not use sacrificial violence to save us, but saves us from it. God has uprooted our sin from within. Because the tendency to implicate God in our projects is so strong, the Christian revelation can be (and has been) misread to ascribe to God the very thing it seeks to overcome.

In support of his reading, H. meticulously works through some of the most important and difficult passages in Scripture, passages that are sometimes cited as evidence against Girardian readings. H. also expands his scope to include penetrating analyses of early Christian art, martyrlogy, gnosticism, anti-Semitism, medieval soteriology, sacramental theology, and the apocalyptic dimensions of 20th-century ideology. The result is a remarkably rich yet coherent reading of Christian theology and history that does more than simply compile what others have said. Though H. states that his intentions remain focused on a single problem, and thus do not presume to be the final statement about the Christian theology of the cross, one cannot but be impressed by how this razor sharp focus lends itself to diagnose so much.

Saint Louis University

BRIAN D. ROBINETTE
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BOOK REVIEWS
More than 40 years after the concluding Te Deum of Vatican II, we are tempted to think its major debates are over. They are not. Rather, they have spread throughout the Church—mostly under the heading of “interpreting the Council.” Such development is not unusual. After having resolved some burning issues, great councils often left behind broad and new insights into old mysteries, mysteries that then the church at large pondered, came to understand more accurately, and applied to daily life (see Lumen gentium 12). Whenever an important council ends, a new era in the doctrinal development begins.

A better understanding of the office or munera of the bishop was a major issue at Vatican II. Do bishops receive all their power (dynamis, potestas, munus) through the sacrament of orders as an unbroken unity that no human authority can ever increase, decrease, or divide? Or do they receive it in parts: first, “the power to consecrate” (as the capacity to confer orders and to confirm) through the sacrament and, second, “the power of jurisdiction” (to govern) through a papal grant? As far as we can ascertain, the council responded affirmative to the first query and negative to the second.

If so, another question springs up immediately: What then is the role of the pope who appoints bishops and seems to give them power? The answer (in the terms of the council) can be only that the pope does not give power to any candidate; what he does is to insert a person who has been (or will be soon) “anointed with power in the Spirit” into the external, visible, and juridical structure of the Church. In other words, the pope has the authority (exousia) to build, shape, and supervise (episkopein) the operation of the episcopal college. This authority is rooted in the pope’s own episcopal power (given to him by the sacrament of orders), but in him it is extended over the whole Church. He received this “extension” when he accepted his legitimate election to the See of Peter. The extension was not given to him by the electors (hence they cannot depose him) but by Christ who instituted the office of the primacy.

The council’s doctrine has consequences. It brings us a fresh understanding of the episcopal office. Every bishop receives his full power from the Spirit in a sacramental action; therefore, first and foremost he will be accountable for its use to the same Spirit. But he must operate in the visible communion of the Church that is under the authority of the See of Peter. We have a unique combination of episcopal independence and dependent coherence within the college of bishops. The bishop must make autonomous judgments in the Spirit and must operate with respect for the communion of the churches presided over by Rome.

Our Church is still struggling to assimilate this complex and delicate vision. As the theological debates continue, Faggioli offers his study; its title in English is: The Bishop and the Council: Episcopal Models and Aggiornamento at Vatican II. It is more than a faithful account of the conciliar debates (on which he reports well); it is a historical narration on
how the issues developed before the council, how the council fathers handled them, and how the debate continued after the great assembly.

F. has given us thorough and reliable documentation; no more useful contribution can be demanded while the doctrine is still developing and the practice is hesitating. F. shows how new insights about the episcopate surfaced first in the responses of the council fathers to the draft of *Lumen gentium*, and then how the need for more practical and pastoral directions led them to the composition of *Christus Dominus*. His research has been thorough; he has ferreted out information far and wide in official publications and private collections. His main text is supported by numerous footnotes, but I have not found one that is superfluous. His evaluations of the weight and authority of his extensive sources are balanced and competent.

F. concludes that there is still much to study and comprehend in the “determinations” of Vatican II. True enough, but I would like to add that we already know enough to initiate some structural changes and new practices that, in their turn, can bring new understanding. As the Spirit guided the council, so the same Spirit today guides the Church at large. It is now the turn of the *sensus fidelium* to contribute to the authentic interpretation of the council.

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


Geffré sums up his own work as an effort to develop a key intuition of Marie-Dominique Chenu “who insisted on the radically historical character of Christian theology, historical as a function of the evolution of human reason and as a function of the experience of the Church responding to new states of consciousness in the world” (7). Thus G. considers the primary task of contemporary theology to be the reinterpretation of the Christian revelation in correlation with the historical experience of contemporary humankind. This collection is an important contribution to that wider reflection on theology’s hermeneutical shift in and beyond the 20th century. G. argues eloquently that the experience of religious pluralism in the context of globalization constitutes the basic horizon within which contemporary theology must reinterpret and reactualize the Christian message. The essays in this volume take up that challenge.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first, entitled “No Other Name” (Acts 4:12), G. proposes the fact of religious pluralism to be a sign of the times and the basic datum for Christian theology in the 21st century. He presents Christian theology’s evolving attempt to account systematically for the plurality of religions, by building on Vatican II’s positive assessment of the salvific value of the non-Christian religions, while surpassing the council’s underlying theology of fulfillment. He adopts a religious pluralism that sees each faith tradition as having an irreducible char-
acter in its own right, desiring thereby to avoid the imperializing tendencies of inclusivism, yet he distinguishes his position from that of the pluralist who asserts simply that all paths to salvation are of equal value. He appeals for respect for other religions in their otherness (altérité). Two essays are particularly illuminating. The first reflects the intellectual debt G. owes to Paul Tillich. The second develops the key to G.’s compromise position, reflecting on how “Christological paradox” permits one to maintain both the unicity and the universality of salvation in Christ while recognizing the revealing presence and saving activity of God in other religious paths. Through a theology of the Word that views the Incarnation as the presence of the divine Absolute in the historical particularity of Jesus of Nazareth (inspired by Nicolas of Cusa’s discussion of the concrete universal [118]), G. seeks to avoid absolutizing Christianity as a path of salvation that excludes all others.

Part 2 argues for an interreligious theology that is distinct from a comparative history of religions. With considerable attention to the need for dialogue between Christianity and Islam, and to the responsibility of the three monotheistic faiths in the present context of global conflict, G. provides numerous examples of how various religious traditions can be mutually enriched through dialogue. Whereas in part 1 he had argued for a more relativized understanding of Christianity as an incomplete expression of the eschatological reality revealed in Christ, here we begin to learn how this incomplete understanding of the Christian God might grow and be enriched through dialogue with the religiously other.

In part 3, against a pluralistic horizon, G. broadens his discussion to the difficult question of mission and inculturation. While the signs call for a new style of being church, G. observes that the credibility of the Church’s proclamation is weakened by its entrenchment in patterns of Western thought, patterns rooted in Jewish, Greek, and Roman worldviews. Theology can play a humanizing role, G. asserts, in the face of the dangers of globalization, calling us to a more creative and active effort at inculturation, to a greater openness to the riches of cultural diversity. In the case of the encounter of Christic or saving values in other religious traditions, G. maintains a legitimate place for certain forms of “double belonging” (340).

Though the chapters have been previously published between 1993 and 2005, G. has revised, rewritten, and updated them. Where collections are sometimes uneven and disparate, this volume presents a sustained reflection on significant challenges to doing theology in our time. The book should interest not only those who specialize in interreligious theology and dialogue, but anyone looking for measured and considered reflection on the challenges facing contemporary Christian theology.

Saint Paul University, Ottawa

Catherine E. Clifford
Sponsored by the Cardinal Suenens Center of John Carroll University, this volume of proceedings witnesses well to the current state of ecumenical dialogue, expressing the joys, hopes, griefs, and anxieties of ecumenically minded people of our time. The resulting collection’s 19 essays examine the place of the Holy Spirit in historical and current theology, in the history of dialogue, in current discussion and practice, and in possibilities for further ecumenical progress. Eight offerings are by Roman Catholic theologians (Godfried Danneels, Walter Kasper, Michael Fahey, Joseph Famerée, Lorelei Fuchs, Ralph del Colle, Adelbert Denaux, and John Haughey). Two each are by Methodists (David Carter and Geoffrey Wainwright), Anglicans (Elizabeth Hastings and Mary Tanner), and Orthodox (John Zizioulas and Boris Bobrinskoy). The remaining five are by a Reformed theologian (Alan Sell), an Anabaptist-Mennonite (Helmut Harder), a Quaker (Ann Riggs), a Pentecostal (Cecil Robeck), and a Lutheran (Harding Meyer).

For many authors, the focus on pneumatology goes hand in hand with an emphasis on a trinitarian ecclesiology of communion, along with their calls for a relational ontology. In their view these themes represent the progress that has been made in ecumenical reflection and offer hope for future developments, based on the churches’ christological interconnectedness, a progress more important than the nastiest of our institutional splits. Hastings points to ways in which Christian belonging can transcend denominational divisions, while Denaux reminds readers that institutional divisions remain and solutions must be perseveringly sought on that level as well.

Several essays address ecumenical relations with those in the Pentecostal movement, an important link, given the movement’s explosive growth worldwide and its reliance on experience of the Holy Spirit. That Pentecostals would benefit from more structural safeguards and that comparatively older traditions could use a more evident influx of the Spirit’s immediate working are commonly expressed convictions; both the call for mutual criticism and the recognition of the possibility for the reciprocal filling of needs are evident throughout these discussions.

The episcopacy as it emerged in the second century is another recurring question. Was this development primarily pragmatic? Was it necessary? Is it necessary for all times and places? Carter recalls how fellow Methodist Benjamin Gregory cautioned in the 19th century against limiting the work of the Holy Spirit to the incalculable and the inconsequential. Is it not possible for the Holy Spirit to work through enduring institutions? Yet Carter and several others insist that the work of the Holy Spirit in non-episcopal traditions must also be recognized.
The extent to which the Spirit’s workings can be recognized in the world apart from explicit connection with Christ surfaces as a controversial issue. Two authors refer to the World Council of Churches’ meeting in Canberra in 1991 when Chung Hyan Kyung, during a barefoot dance, evoked spirits from Asian popular religion. Most of the authors in this volume agree with Wainwright that the incident calls for a firm christological grip. Haughey’s concluding essay, however, while acknowledging the importance of a high Christology, emphasizes at least as much the need to be open to the Spirit wherever it blows.

Two authors raise and explore questions that are insufficiently addressed in current ecumenical discussions. Meyer poses the question of criteria for recognizing the work of the Holy Spirit in historical development. Ecumenical progress cannot be limited to historical questions, but how we narrate our shared and separate histories as Christian communities and the criteria we use to make historical judgments concerning the Spirit’s work stand as critical areas for further development.

Riggs takes on another underexplored issue: the role and status of images in Christian worship and practice. The iconoclastic controversy of the Byzantine Empire and the iconoclastic leanings of traditional Calvinism reveal points of rupture that extend into many fundamental theological issues. In ecumenical discussions that focus on structures and relationships of communion, differences of basic beliefs and sensibilities concerning art, transcendence, and incarnation are ignored at our peril.

The volume ends with the “Bose Statement,” a three-page document of shared affirmations.

The collection offers a wealth of material and perspectives on the ecumenical movement. Like the movement itself, it is simultaneously exhilarating and frustrating, as full visible communion even among the authors of these studies appears to be so near and yet so far. At this point, though, all the authors are united in agreement that, to the extent that more ecumenical progress is made, it will not be the work of human beings alone. Come, Holy Spirit!

University of Dayton, Ohio


Lisa Sowle Cahill ranks as one of our most prolific and influential moral theologians, respected alike by Catholic and non-Catholics thinkers. Her book is an ambitious effort to find the right entry point for theology into bioethics. As do many others, she notes how moral theology has in public discourse become, in too many respects, marginalized—either ignored altogether when seemingly too sectarian or neutered when it tries to avoid a sectarian label. She aims to find a central and strong role for theology in an American culture that, she believes, is far more open to religious ideas than
is commonly thought—and as the recent force of conservative theology during the George W. Bush era has demonstrated.

While C. takes up a variety of clinical issues, such as end of life care, reproductive ethics, and aging, she focuses mainly on issues of justice, particularly global health justice. She does not downplay the importance of such volatile issues as abortion and genetic engineering, but she sees them as too often stealing needed attention from hardly less important matters. She stresses the value for health care of “the language of the common good, inclusion, distributive justice, and solidarity... in helping theology to raise the profile of justice in public discourse” (2). In her appeal to that language, she is decisively working out of the Catholic tradition. Yet that language and tradition (along with my favorite moral principle of “solidarity”), while easily invoked in Europe, have little or no resonance in America, in great part because our individualistic culture is not given to talking about those values.

If C. brings a communitarian perspective to her notion of bioethics, still she understands participatory democracy as an important civic tool for implementing that communitarian ethic. That version of democracy almost certainly leads us to begin with local communities, and to move on, if possible, to higher levels. The difficult question for a large and diverse nation is just how far the idea of participation can be pushed. It is easier to make sense of solidarity and participation as moral principles in, say, the Scandinavian countries than in the United States. The same problem arises even more intensely with global health issues of justice. While justice is a needed and legitimate language for theology, empathy remains a more important motivator of action; or perhaps justice without empathy (and vice versa) provides too thin a foundation for getting things done.

In my own experience with domestic and global health care, in addition to articulating lofty ideals and working out their embedding in participatory ways, theology needs to find ways to better mix it up with the technical issues. If theology aims at helping us understand the world and human nature, it can still leave us a long way from being able to decide just what, for example, in the face of scarcity are the right priorities for health care—a global problem that mixes together economics, politics, and culture in a most complicated way. Our deepest values and convictions, including our religious perspectives, should come into play, but determining just how to carry out their mixing in practice is a difficult step to take, and not one of theology’s strengths (nor do we philosophers do any better). One reason those in health care take seriously neither philosophy nor theology is our seeming indifference to the nuts and bolts of policy.

C. has articulated a visionary and persuasive agenda for bioethics. If I am left uneasy, it is not because I question the vision. My nagging question remains, Can you get there from here? In my own experience, the hard work of policy (bearing at least on global health care) is done at the middle level—inspired, it is hoped, by high moral and religious values and duly sensitive to public participation, but, in the end, still concerned with trying
to make it all work. If Aristotle were still alive, he might tell us: do not forget practical reason.

At one level, as C. puts it, theology should have a subversive impact on liberalism, science, and the health care market. True enough, but on another level it has to pitch in and join a messy world dealing with messy problems. If theology is to play the role of opposition, it must be that of a loyal opposition, allowing the grease found on the nuts and bolts of practicality to stain our own hands.

The Hastings Center, Garrison, N.Y.

Daniel Callahan


The Linacre Centre is a British think-tank informed by Catholic moral teaching on matters related to health care and bioethics. Its services include online papers and publications, a reference library, consultations, public lectures, conferences, and seminars. The Centre has sponsored three conferences to date (1997, 2000, and 2003); a fourth, on “Incapacity and Care,” will be held in July 2007. “The Linacre Centre is the only Catholic bioethics centre in the UK and Ireland . . . affiliated to Ave Maria School of Law, Ann Arbor, Michigan” (http://www.linacre.org/). This collection is the proceedings of the Centre’s 2003 conference.

In line with the natural law manualists’ efforts to discern degrees of personal culpability, the authors of these chapters explore in healthcare and medical practices the determination of licit or illicit cooperation in another’s evil or wrongdoing—practices such as research or therapeutic use of stem cells derived from aborted fetuses, other uses of embryonic/fetal material, physician-assisted suicide, legislation and votes for/against legislators, and conscientious objection. These determinations demand attention to the parts of an act that both provide moral species and distinguish species from those choice of means and circumstances that touch the act materially—therein cooperation is licit or not. While few persons deliberately intend and choose the objectively wrong for themselves, the liceity of cooperation in, complicity with, and tolerance of another’s objectively wrong intention or objectively wrong choice often remains unexamined and rightly needs to be explored.

Bishop Donal Murray draws heavily on the work of John Paul II to establish fundamental principles of human freedom, embodiedness, abilities and limits, individual choices and team efforts, concluding with the primacy of conscience for the individual in relation to self, others, and God. Luke Gormally explores the ramifications of radically different reasoning for secular (read: utilitarian) and Christian discourse. For the secularist, it does not matter who cooperates in wrongdoing. Morality is determined by outcomes. Where outcomes are the same, no moral difference can be claimed. For the Christian, responsibility for my cooperation bears on me
and my neighbor; the Christian must ask how this cooperation measures against the goods proper to human flourishing. The answer may in fact yield to licit cooperation in wrongdoing. However, Bishop Anthony Fisher argues that it is never licit for a Catholic health care worker to cooperate in sterilization, to support condom use against HIV, to accommodate needle exchange programs, to participate in state-sponsored pregnancy counseling, or to vote for a program or law that contradicts the contents of faith and morals. (He is here disputing the conclusions of James Keenan.) On the other hand, Cathleen Kaveny explores the possibility of positive obligations overriding noncooperation in another’s wrongdoing. Starting from the obligation to witness to Christian commitments, she recognizes the importance of the eschatological now and not yet, and the response of “the Pilgrim on the Way” to the suffering of others in need of justice and mercy. Further, Kaveny wants to identify the meta-effects/influence of personal and cooperative action on moral agents themselves by the often neglected “who we are becoming” question—the answer to which she holds paramount for the determination (contra Fisher) of licit cooperation.

With the Alexander Pruss and Neil Scolding articles the collection turns to health care and medical practitioners’ casuistic questions of conscience. At issue are initiatives indirectly related to embryonic and fetal stem cells research, the commitment to protect vulnerable life, and collaboration with seemingly objectionable protocols. Charlie O’Donnell, Mike Delaney, and Helen Watt rely on prescriptive deontological norms in their discussions of junior physicians’ complying with questionable clinic practices, reproduction—infertility—erectile dysfunction interventions, and withdrawal of life-sustaining technologies in suicidal patients, respectively. Jane Adolphe explores whether the Holy See, in ratifying the United Nations’ 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child, is cooperating with or complicit in the evils of contraception, abortion, and the dissolution of parental rights. Adolphe’s questions have implications beyond this UN Convention; they point to the possibility that, with ratification by the Holy See, the UN can exert its authority over the Church and require compliance (read: change) of those doctrines that conflict with the provisions and principles of the Convention—this possibility warrants further attention.

Finally, Colin Harte, John Finnis, and Richard Myers determine whether cooperation with or complicity in unjust laws by legislators and the voting public (in issues such as legalized abortion, permissive laws, ballots for more restrictive laws, and health care facilities’ conscientious objection) are licit (narrowly, so they judge). The Harte and Finnis dialogue offers contextual nuance.

The collection can be useful for graduate courses, if only to highlight the difficulty of the questions treated. Some will welcome the authors’ conclusions, while many others will find that, absent other (dissenting) voices, the collection unfortunately lacks the diversity of opinion the tradition holds.

Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.  
Mary Jo Iozzo

The book divides into two parts. In the first seven chapters, Curran tells his personal and public story, while in chapters 8 to 10 he details his theology and his relationship with the Church. Chapter 1 includes a basic, personal biography, then describes his six years in Rome (1955–1961), followed by his teaching at St. Bernard’s seminary in Rochester. After Rochester, his bishop “allowed” him to move to the Catholic University of America (1965), the early years of which are covered in chapter 2. It does appear that C.’s Roman experience left an enduring negative impression on the young theologian.

The next five chapters tell the story of C.’s controversial years at the Catholic University of America, though not simply his story but the story of an important period in the American Catholic Church. While Americans can learn much from this account, I recommend these chapters even more strongly to non-American readers. C. provides valuable insights into the controversies—from the Humanae vitae crisis to problems of academic freedom—describing how these evolved and were understood in the American context.

C. describes clearly what he intended to accomplish as he dragged the Church (university, institution, and bishops) into the secular courts, in full view of the American public, and why he has written this memoir. His targets were and are the myths and prejudices that shape most people’s perception of the Catholic Church, views of the Church as monolithic, static, and self-importantly infallible on just about everything. I am convinced, after reading C.’s account, that, as a matter of principle, he understood that crisis to be a “teaching moment” (126–32) for all peoples, not the least for Catholics. Serious moral truths about modern social living were, and still are, at stake.

In chapters 8 to 12, C. lays out the theological background of the controversies he faced, namely, the changing understanding of (moral) theology over the last 50 years as an academic discipline. He suggests that Catholic theology became increasingly characterized by positive, overlapping claims to universality (catholicity with a small “c”) and by its public role in mediating theological truth. That is, the discipline became more consciously a typically Catholic (moral) theology of “both . . . and”: Scripture and tradition, faith and reason, grace and works (187–95), based on a drive to understand all of God’s dealing with creation inclusively. Linked intrinsically to this inclusive theology is a social methodology claimed to be necessary for both the theologian and the teacher (magister). To “do” theology seriously as an academic discipline, one needs to expose and explain one’s method, and demonstrate arguments as they move toward conclusions. Many do question whether Catholic theologians are capable of publicly “doing” theology in this manner and whether the Church itself is capable of such a Catholic theology. C. is convinced that theologians and
the magisterium can “do” theology in such a moral, public, and catholic manner, and I agree; but the enterprise will never be without tension.

C. grounds these notions of Catholic, inclusive theology and of “doing” theology publicly on what he calls the Catholic belief in an “intrinsic morality” (195–97). Although the label is unfortunate, it is traditional and drives home the point that the cornerstone of Catholic moral theology is the conviction that the moral truths are not voluntaristically fabricated; they do not come into being by, say, hierarchical fiat. Theological and moral truths emerge outside our own consciences and even independently of hierarchical will. Moral truth is the third term between conscience and hierarchical teaching, from which conscience and the hierarchy must learn as they attempt to live and teach the truth (196, 219). On the grounds, then, of “intrinsic morality,” C. challenges any attempts to impose the truth by simple will, even ecclesial will.

In his closing chapter, C. describes his relationship to the Catholic Church. Most pertinent to his own predicament is the distinction between core and peripheral teaching about the faith. There is no question about C.’s commitment to the core of the faith; his bishop, Matthew Clark of Rochester, stated explicitly that C. is a priest in good standing and would be welcome to function within the diocese should he so choose. C. has, however, opted for the academic life where he can pursue theological ethics, relying solely on the account he can give for it. In doing so, he gives valuable service to the Church and to the theological community by being a witness to loyal dissent, something very much needed and increasingly missing within the confines of the institutional Church.

*Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*

JOSEPH A. SELLING


There is only one gospel, the gospel of Jesus Christ crucified and risen. Yet this gospel, Coste emphasizes, is also of the Spirit, a confession too often neglected by the Latin tradition. C. welcomes both Vatican II and the Catholic Charismatic Renewal as existential manifestations of that same Spirit. Still, he notes, preaching and catechesis have not offered the majority of Catholics a fully trinitarian spirituality, nor has pastoral theology moved beyond an ecclesiology that is too narrowly christological. This book, serving in part as a corrective to that spirituality and ecclesiology, is written for a broad audience, emphasizing that all adult and authentic Christian lives must be lived in the Spirit.

The book offers a valuable survey of the theology of the Holy Spirit in Scripture and the tradition. C. draws heavily from Paul whose experience of the Spirit he considers paradigmatic, and from theologians and mystics such as Irenaeus, Basil of Caesarea, Augustine, Teresa of Avila, John of the Cross, Ignatius of Loyola, Louis Bouyer, Serge Boulgakov, Hans Urs
von Balthasar, and Yves Congar. He insists that the communion in absolute love of the trinitarian persons should be the model and paradigm for all human life. Sketching the development of the theology of the Spirit, he underscores the infinity of this the most mysterious trinitarian person, expressed in symbols (such as wind, water, and fire) that are not as precise as conceptual formulations, but are much more evocative. The Spirit is the source of all life. C. offers a strong spirituality and ecclesiology of communion, discussing the Spirit’s divinization of the human person and the evangelical need for a church that ministers in the Spirit by welcoming the charisms of all. C. highlights the indissoluble synergy of the activity of Christ and the Spirit, and the imperative of an ecclesial mission of reconciliation, justice, peace, care for a threatened creation, ecumenical and interreligious dialogue, and evangelization of the entire human family. Globalization, he writes, is not only a tremendous challenge but also an unprecedented opportunity for the actualization of new communion in the Spirit.

As the subtitle indicates, the book intends to offer an integrated theology and spirituality of the Holy Spirit, transcending the 13th-century divorce of scientific theology and spirituality. Yet C.’s laudable reach to a broad audience limits his execution of this goal. His discussion of Pentecost, for example, includes long citations from both the Acts of the Apostles and the so-called “Johannine Pentecost” but does not enter into discussion of scholarly endeavors to account for differences in John and Luke-Acts. C.’s discussion of the person of the Spirit emphasizes that the Holy Spirit is God’s very self (Dieu lui-même) and that the Spirit is a distinct person (une Personne distincte). However, he attempts this emphasis without discussing the work of theologians such as Karl Barth and Karl Rahner who grappled with problematic uses of the term “person” in modern trinitarian theology. Some readers may be relieved that C. has intentionally avoided technical terms such as “subsistence” and “appropriation,” but without the benefit of such terminology others may be left wondering what it means to affirm that the Spirit is a distinct person, or how to distinguish trinitarianism from tritheism.

The book is a call for the Church—situated deeply within a European culture of religious indifference, an erosion of dominical practice, and a loss of a sense of sin and a sense of God—to become more alive in the Spirit. The Church, writes C., must take the Western cultural crisis as an opportunity for purification and renewal, facing the challenge with the light and creativity of the Spirit. As C. claims, the Charismatic Renewal has taken up that challenge. Similarly C. might have said more about other possible avenues of the Spirit’s activity for those not inclined to this form of spirituality. As he notes, there are different ways to access the infinite mystery of the Spirit.

C.’s fine work could also be enriched with some autobiographical reflection. The introduction promises that he will share his quest of faith and spiritual adventure (33). Yet, in pages filled with long citations from classic scriptural and traditional texts, there is little indication of C.’s past work as
president of Pax Christi–France and as consultant to the Pontifical Council on Justice and Peace and to the Council on Dialogue with Non-Believers, aside from his strong emphasis on the Church’s mission of peace, justice, and dialogue. I, at least, would welcome C.’s reflection on his own experience of the gospel of the Spirit.

*Xavier University, Cincinnati*  
*Elizabeth T. Groppe*
SHORTER NOTICES


The book’s subtitle states its main thesis: “For the authors of the New Testament, the death of Jesus of Nazareth was the ‘anomaly’ that threatened allegiance to whatever language- and thought-forms they may have inherited, and that required a new model, or ‘paradigm’, by which to see themselves, to see others, and to see God” (271). Accordingly, Harrisville contends that each NT writer had a previous worldview, but that “for each the cross meant the abandonment of that view” (278). In particular this abandonment, or “fracture,” entailed that the NT writers made their language- and thought-forms “fit the gospel of the cross” (279). Yet, while this thesis may apply to Paul, given his autobiographical remarks (e.g., Phil 3), it is unclear how we are to test it for many other NT writers, particularly the writer of the epistle of James, who makes no mention of the cross or death of Jesus. Aside from Paul, we have at most very modest firm evidence about the intellectual biography of the NT writers.

In one sense, H.’s thesis is automatically true of all Christians who accept the gospel of the cross; they make room in their beliefs for coherently accepting this gospel. This claim seems largely uncontroversial. However, it is difficult to state precisely what more H. has in mind, at least in a way that can be applied convincingly to all NT writers. At one point, he suggests that Jews and pagans “could not believe... that a messiah or kyrios could die” (277). However, we simply do not know enough about the beliefs of first-century Jews and pagans to confirm this conclusively. The cross was indeed a scandal to various Jews and pagans, as Paul suggested, but we lack the needed evidence to generalize to all Jews and pagans at the turn of the eras. Even so, H. has provided a helpful exposition of how the scandal of the cross powerfully occupied a number of NT writers.

PAUL K. MOSER
Loyola University of Chicago


Lehner’s edition of Knutzen’s Philosophischer Beweis marks a significant contribution to scholarship in 18th-century German philosophy and theology. K., who at age 21 had his own academic chair, is today known mostly as the one-time teacher of Immanuel Kant and Johann Georg Hamann. Still, traces of K. do surface. When Kant refers to the “physico-theological” proof in his Critique of Pure Reason, he had in mind K. who in 1748 formed a “physico-theological society,” to which Kant himself for a time belonged.

K.’s primary significance in the history of ideas was his attempted mediation between the rationalism of Christian Wolff and the pietism of such figures as Joachim Lange and August Hermann Francke. Philosophischer Beweis, K.’s most important work, makes a very reasoned, almost mathematical argument for the need of special revela-
tion—a need that happens to be met in Christianity, and in Christianity alone. Whether or not one finds K.’s work as convincing as its title suggests, it is impressive as Christian apologetics, providing arguments, among other things, for the credibility of the resurrection and the writings of the NT.

Also included here are K.’s Vertheidigte Warheit der Christlichen Religion gegen den Einwurf: Daß die christliche Offenbarung nicht allgemein sey (a 1742, shorter work originally appended to Philosophischer Beweis) and Betrachtung über die Schreibart der Heiligen Schrift (1747). The first was composed directly in response to the German translation of Matthew Tindal’s Christianity as Old as the Creation (1730), and the second to advance K.’s understanding of the style of Scripture in terms of divine humility (Herunterlassung). In this respect K.’s theology may have had a greater influence on Hamann than Hamann scholarship has hitherto observed, since Hamann’s own hermeneutics of Scripture and creation is defined by precisely this notion of divine humility qua self-emptying. It is good and helpful to have these well-edited texts at hand.

JOHN BETZ
Loyola College, Baltimore


After being expelled in 1594 from France for collusion with a murder attempt on King Henri IV, the Jesuits returned in 1603 by order of the same king. They were then able to survive a later successful attempt on Henri’s life (1610), and through their excellent relations with the monarchy they exerted considerable influence on French Catholicism until their more thorough expulsion in the late-18th century.

This excellent book, concise, scholarly, and articulate, examines how this singular achievement was accomplished. In four brisk chapters (“Expulsion,” “Recall,” “Expansion,” “Regicide”) Nelson examines the stages of the Jesuit monarchy development, and in chapter 5 (“Accommodation”) he offers a convincing analysis and interpretation of their success. According to N., Henri IV used the Jesuit issue to define a modern conception of royal authority. By granting them a royal pardon in exchange for future obedience, Henri asserted his absolute power and secured the support of this dynamic order. Once reestablished, the Society rapidly expanded its presence in the kingdom, primarily as part of Henri’s wider effort to expand royal patronage over the French Church. As royal chaplains, confessors, advisers, and, above all, educators, the Jesuits became the primary supporters and disseminators of this absolutist monarchy, a conception that fit their own hierarchical style of governance even while it contradicted their transnational character. Their alliance with the monarchy protected the Jesuits and allowed them to carry on their religious objectives, but at a cost: they were forced to accommodate with Gallican principles. In N.’s judgment, this “flexibility” explains the Jesuits’ great successes in France. However, the close association between the Jesuits and the monarchy also suggests why their 1760s expulsion was the first sign of the eventual full rejection of absolutist monarchy.

JACQUES M. GRES-GAYER
Catholic University of America, Washington


Reformation historian Olson here offers a historical survey of Christianity’s diaconal offices and social welfare/service ministries (“both deacons and diakonia” [19]), a significant expansion of her One Ministry, Many Roles (1992). She includes recent major developments: the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America adding rostered diaconal ministers; the United Methodist Church dropping transitional deacons
and adding ordained deacons; the Catholic and Anglican Churches continuing their revival of the permanent diaconate. She also provides more detail on pivotal earlier periods, especially the first five centuries, with analyses of recent research (such as that of Susanna Elm). There is also more discussion of the relationship between church offices and the roles of women as widows, deaconesses, and leaders of ascetic communities. Unorthodox Christians, such as Montanists and Arians, also receive expanded attention. Medieval coverage remains relatively brief, though O. adds material on the rise of hospitals. (No survey can include everything, but it is surprising that the Beguines are omitted.)

O.’s section on Reformation social welfare ministries includes an analysis of regional differences among Europe’s Calvinist communities, and a comparison of Lutheran and Calvinist positions and practices. Chapters on the 19th and 20th centuries are the most detailed, with greatly expanded coverage of deaconess movements. Guiding readers through complex terminology (“deacon,” “deaconess,” “diaconal minister,” “consecration,” “ordination”), O. analyzes the relationship of deaconess work to women’s ordination. Interviews with leaders of contemporary deaconess programs and other diaconal ministries, and analysis of denominational publications demonstrate the continuing attraction of these services and describe the range of educational and training paths to such ministries. O.’s conclusion identifies “at least four models alive” today: deacons elected by local congregations, “transitional” deacons, “permanent” deacons, and deacon/deaconess communities of 19th-century origins (477).

While little is offered on modern Eastern Orthodoxy, Pentecostalism, or Third World denominations outside the Anglican communion, I still highly recommend this book for those interested in the diaconate, social welfare ministries, and women’s ministries.

NANCY WEATHERWAX
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks


Two 1972 studies of glossolalia launched a three decade or more exploration of the phenomenon. William Samarin, in Tongues of Men and Angels (1972), concluded that linguistically tongues speech was not a language and that it was a learned experience. In her Speaking in Tongues, Felicitas Goodman approached glossolalia psychologically and argued that it involved a trance or spirit possession. Cartledge has brought together four British and three American authors, all speakers in tongues or sympathetic to the phenomenon, from seven different disciplines who review the literature in their fields and offer their own conclusions.

Max Turner reviews the exegesis of Acts and 1 Corinthians, noting that Luke and Paul appear to describe two different kinds of glossolalia. Frank Macchia argues that speaking in tongues is a sign that Pentecost is not only the reversal of Babel but also its fulfillment in terms of unity. Neil Hudson’s historical study of British and continental Pentecostalism in the early 20th century reveals that many leaders such as Alexander Boddy did not insist on tongues as a sign of having been baptized in the Spirit. James K. A. Smith views tongues speech, especially in the early 20th century, as the language of the urban poor resisting the unjust structures of global capitalism. From a linguistics point of view, David Hilborn ascribes to ecclesial tongues speaking a kind of sacramentality since it depends on shared assumptions about its propriety, frequency, and divine origin. Writing as a sociologist, Margaret Poloma recognizes a ritual value to glossolalia and describes how the Blood and Fire Church in Atlanta uses it as a weapon in spiritual warfare between good and evil. Psychologist William Kay notes that continuing studies have disproved the hostile assessments of tongues and tongues speakers that were characteristic of earlier studies. Cartledge’s con-
cluding essay applies many of these insights to a study of the New Wine Movement in Britain.

Regardless of whatever predispositions the reader brings to this book, its great strength is the review of relevant literature in his or her field over a period of more than 40 years by each of the contributors.

James T. Connelly, C.S.C.
University of Portland


This biography of Jewish philosopher and Carmelite nun Edith Stein (1891–1942) is a rich, multilayered text. The original German account was written by Teresia Renata Posselt, O.C.D., Stein’s novice mistress in Cologne’s Carmel and, later, her prioress. Writing in 1947, P. could not access Stein’s records in Echt’s Carmel and hence made some factual errors in the biography that, between 1948 and 1963, reached nine German editions. Each edition expanded on the previous ones by including more letters and reminiscences by Stein’s friends, colleagues, and students. The fifth edition of P.’s text (1950) was translated into English in 1952 by Cecily Hastings and Donald Nicholl.

Susanne M. Batzdorff (Stein’s niece), Josephine Koeppel, O.C.D., and John Sullivan, O.C.D., are experts on Edith Stein, each having published significant works on her. Working with P.’s fifth edition and its 1952 English translation, they have corrected factual errors, revised the translation, and provided numerous, short commentaries and notes with bibliographic information and clarifications concerning Stein’s life and thought. Moreover, they have added a foreword by Maria Amata Neyer, O.C.D., of Cologne’s Carmel, supplemented P.’s account with selections from Stein’s memoir, _Life in a Jewish Family: 1891–1916_ (1965), and included photographs, indexes, a detailed chronology, and a map of the places where Stein lived.

This is an invaluable work on the holy Jewish scholar and (from April 15, 1934 as Teresa Benedicta of the Cross) Carmelite nun whom Pope John Paul II canonized on October 11, 1998.

Robert A. Krieg
University of Notre Dame


Although Karl Rahner (1904–1984) held that the details of his life were unremarkable, these portraits help clarify key aspects of the Jesuit’s thought and shed light on personal, cultural, and institutional factors that shaped his ideas and writings. Mostly interviews conducted from 2001 to 2005 with 31 of his family, friends, and colleagues, the collection’s significance becomes immediately evident from only a few entries.

Rahner’s sister Elisabeth Kremer (1909–2004) recalls her brother’s faithfulness to his family, his brilliant mind, his strong emotions, his silence, and his daily routine of writing (225). In a letter that Hugo Rahner, S.J., (1900–1968) sent to Karl in 1955, after Jesuit censors refused to permit publication of Karl’s manuscript on “Problems of Contemporary Mariology,” we read of Hugo’s deep affection and respect for his brother, as Hugo also urged him to appreciate that his superiors wanted “to help him” and “to defend him” (338).

Cardinal Franz König (1905–2004) observes that Rahner was introduced in the 1920s to new theological “starting points and beginnings” by Romano Guardini (d. 1968), the latter having set a “liberal orientation” (24) for Quickborn, a Catholic youth movement. And König discusses how Rahner, as König’s _peritus_, contributed to Vatican II, especially with his emphasis on “God’s universal salvific will” (31).

Cardinal Karl Lehmann recommends that Rahner’s spiritual writings, such as _Encounters with Silence_ (1938), are the best entry into his theology (102). Con-
cerning the theologian’s life, Lehmann explains that Rahner moved from Munich to Münster in 1967 because, as the holder of Munich’s Romano-Guardini chair, he—like Guardini before him—was not permitted to direct doctoral dissertations. Lehmann also recalls that, beginning in 1970, Rahner felt increasingly frustrated with church officials and was downcast after his 1979 audience with Pope John Paul II.

This book is a helpful resource for understanding Rahner’s theology and its context. Each interview is enriched by numerous endnotes packed with bibliographical and biographical data.

ROBERT A. KRIEG
University of Notre Dame


As Drew Christiansen has remarked, the influence of the late John Howard Yoder “on [our] generation of Catholic moral theologians has been profound.” Yet, too often we have assumed that Yoder’s significance is exhausted when he is typed as the 20th-century’s leading Mennonite or pacifist thinker. This is especially misleading when he is situated simplistically next to Stanley Hauerwas.

Mark Nation is well placed to correct our caricatures with Yoder’s own nuance. He has read virtually everything Yoder wrote—no mean feat, given that Yoder’s commitment to doing theology in the mode of a consultative “believers church” often left his key essays in academic backwaters. N.’s book, besides working well as a how-to primer for reading Yoder aright, offers much more. It is a sustained argument that, throughout his career, Yoder was animated by a vocation for ecumenical conversation and Christian unity. The Yoder that N. presents was complex enough a thinker that one can start from any thread—from his recovery of Jesus for normative Christian ethics, of the church for social ethics, of nonviolent peacemaking as central to the gospel, and of “social responsibility” from the jaws of Niebuhrianism—and connect those threads, as N. does, in more systematic ways than did Yoder himself. In the tracing of these interwoven threads, it is clear that Yoder was hardly “sectarian” in either an ecclesial or social-ethical sense.

N. offers just enough background to Yoder’s Mennonite formation and intra-Mennonite debates to be helpful to the general reader, and just enough references to secondary literature to situate Yoder within wider scholarly and ecumenical conversations. N. focuses well on those works that are especially key to understanding Yoder. And though no reader will miss N.’s advocacy, he voices his own critiques of his theological mentor. Clearly designed for the college or seminary classroom, this book should be required reading for all scholars who are tempted to write as though they have Yoder pegged.

GERALD W. SCHLABACH
University of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.


Opposite Hemming’s first page is a still from Sam Taylor-Wood’s ten minute film Brontosaurus. The still presents a frontally nude male in dancing pose. For H., Brontosaurus captures the fluidity and plasticity of postmodernity as a cultural and social phenomenon. We, the postmodernists, can give this man, this artwork, the meaning we wish in an exercise of bricolage, with no metanarrative governing us or the film. The meaning transcends Brontosaurus horizontally as our achievement, but in no sense lifts us toward any vertical transcendent, toward any sublime. H. argues that the whole of Western philosophy, of Western culture, has already worked such a devaluation by placing the sublime—by placing God—at the terminus of our experience of being. He begins with the pseudonymous Longinus’s 200 AD treatise on rhetorical uplift, turns back to Plato and Aristotle,
then forward to Aquinas, Descartes, Kant, and Hegel, finishing with Nietzsche and Heidegger. Nietzsche serves as the key figure in stating and manifesting “postmodernity’s transcending” and thus its devaluing of God and, with God, devaluing of humanity. If we ourselves are to find God at the end of this trajectory, it will be not through a gap in being, but as pure gift appearing among us.

The book is thematically rich and philosophically erudite with intricate discussions of themes and authors. However, it is also complicated, elusive, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing. H. addresses it to specialists, and not just those strongly conversant with the authors presented, but mostly to those strongly conversant with the authors presented, and even perplexing.

MICHAEL J. KERLIN
La Salle University, Philadelphia, Pa.


Houlden argues that contemporary historical inquiry into Christian belief displaces former notions of Jesus’ identity. Working within contemporary methods, he highlights four linguistic forms of faith and resulting image of Jesus that flows from each. The biblical form (the NT), draws primarily on OT images and ideas, and presents Jesus as God’s unique agent of salvation. The “classic pattern” (Nicaea and Chalcedon) relies on Platonic thought, and views Jesus as the divine word made flesh. The devotional mode, born of medieval romanticism (e.g., Julian of Norwich) conceives Jesus as the lover to whom hearts are drawn by the Holy Spirit. The historical approach (emerging with the Enlightenment) depicts Jesus as a first-century Palestinian Jew who proclaimed the coming of God’s kingdom and initiated a communal way of life among his followers.

For a number of reasons H. asserts that the “base line” for contemporary imaging of Jesus is historical reconstruction. We cannot avoid the fact that biblical testimony is problematic because of its “mythological schemes” (114). Further, Chalcedonian-type doctrines cannot be normative because “it is odd, to say the least, to assert the unique importance of this particular punctuation mark in history” (123). Consistent with his historical method, H. holds that the focal point for Christian faith must be “Jesus,” the “charismatic leader” (52) who is significant because of “his practical effects for life and action” (127). H. leaves no room for scholarship such as that by Wolfhart Pannenberg (52), because the resurrection is “that most obscure of episodes from the historian’s point of view” (117). Again, H. dismisses the work of “the Chalcedon-preservers (and adapters)” such as Karl Rahner and Adrian Thatcher (121). In sum, standing in the tradition of Adolf von Harnack, H. has produced a succinct, well-written, and erudite historical account of Christian belief that stays focused on the historical “Jesus” but remains silent about “Jesus Christ,” the risen “Lord,” as known in the church.

ROBERT A. KRIEG
University of Notre Dame


This brief but dense book argues that it is time to retire the Christian tradition of a nonphysical soul and speak again of the inner self as an aspect of a whole person, as was common among Jews of Jesus’ time and is probably the more common notion in the New Testament. We have learned to explain the life processes of plants and animals through our knowledge of biochemical activities, without invoking souls. Advances in neuroscience make it plausible that a nonphysical soul will also become an unnecessary hypothesis, says Murphy.

476 THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
The first two chapters set up the basic case. M. analyzes theological and, especially, biblical sources. She then looks at major scientific lines of evidence concerning the inner self and its activities. She concludes that a “physicalist” idea of the soul is more consistent with both scripture and science—mind and moral sense are products of the physical brain. The remaining two chapters address various possible objections and seek to establish in particular that mind can exert a top-down influence on the rest of the body. This contention established, M. can reject reductionism, defend free will, maintain a sense of human distinctiveness, and conceive of divine action in the world as also “top-down.”

M. was a major contributor, with other Fuller Theological Seminary faculty, to Whatever Happened to the Soul (1998), and to In Search of the Soul (2005). Her new monograph shows the result of her continued effort to address as many major aspects about the soul as possible. My critiques are two: the book would be better argued if it were twice as long, and it ignores some conciliar statements that Catholic theologians would have to address. It is nonetheless an excellent source for becoming familiar with the many issues involved and with ingenious attempts by M. and others to resolve them.

MICHAEL H. BARNES
University of Dayton


Fulvio Di Blasi here meets the best arguments of “the new natural law” theorists and criticizes their theoretical foundations. With sophistication and accuracy he recounts the main arguments used by contemporary ethicists who, in an analytic, post-Kantian world, have tried to preserve their credibility by constructing a natural law theory independent of God and human nature. Pinpointing the weaknesses of this approach, D. turns to Aquinas for the metaphysical underpinnings indispensable for any authentic natural law theory, namely, certain facts about human nature by which we come to know both the moral law and God as the legislative source of moral obligation.

D. appreciates the reasons behind some of the positions he criticizes. He traces the emphasis on the autonomy of practical reason back to a reaction against the tendency of modern voluntarism to reduce obligation to the will of an external legislator. Again, he finds the stress on the originality of practical reason to have arisen in response to the excessive claims of rationalist theories to quasi-geometrically deduce moral truths. Without deprecating these concerns, D. demonstrates the unintelligibility of any ethics that fails to have explicit dependence on God as its ultimate source or that fails to anchor our moral knowledge in human nature.

D. argues that the “new natural law” eliminates the only point of view from which reliable knowledge of the objective hierarchy among the various human goods can be derived; it does this by rejecting any connection between the goods known by practical reason and the facts of nature. Constructively, he offers a Thomistic understanding of reason as genuinely capable of knowing God’s existence and discerning the intrinsic ordering of human nature to God as the ultimate end.

This book is an important corrective to certain trends in contemporary thinking about natural law, and is a fine account of a philosopher’s personal discovery of the need to reverse what seems attractive, in order to recover insights imperiled by a mistaken turn.

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


This collection resulted from a project, sponsored by the Emory University’s Center for the Study of Law and Religion, that aimed to “take stock of the dramatic transformation in marriage and family life in the world today, and
to craft enduring solutions to the many new problems it has occasioned." (ix). The editors opt for a broad interdisciplinary range: "No one discipline can monopolize the study of the family. No one logic can master its full complexity." (9). Thus we find the familiar intriguingly situated alongside material not normally encountered in one’s own specialization. The volume has historical breadth, attending to continuity and development in family dynamics. For instance, monogamy and gendered division of labor are traced back to our primate ancestors, while internet-based mate selection is also explored.

Only a few chapters focus on religion, and most of those trace the history of Christian marriage. Nonetheless, the collection’s provocative reflection on “traditional family values,” natural law, and “objective” sexual body language (themes one might encounter in John Paul II’s theology of the body) adds strength and depth to the study. It asks about the timeless personal and social human needs that are served by marriage and family, about how interdisciplinary, historical study can help us understand human nature as dynamic and evolutionary—as claimed by Gaudium et spes no. 5. Social ethicists will find food for thought in documentation on the correlation between disparities in family welfare and class, race, and gender, and also in discussions of social institutions that empower families. The book proposes general initiatives to redress family breakdown (e.g., an international, interreligious dialogue to highlight the crisis for the global community; preventing divorce by increasing its financial cost; and prioritizing universal access to healthcare and steady employment). While helpful, these initiatives need consideration of more specific remedies, perhaps via interdisciplinary, international documentation of “best practices.”

Florence Caffrey Bourg
Academy of the Sacred Heart and Loyola University, New Orleans


This multidisciplinary collection develops various sophisticated and nuanced responses to the sexual abuse crisis, and should be required reading for anyone interested in the complex renewal facing the Catholic Church. The collection helpfully illustrates two paths to organizational reform: the paths of a professional code and of collaborative and participatory structures. The idea of a code receives the most attention, and various contributors are cautious about this path because of the difficulties that exist when we try to regard the clergy as “professionals.” The hurdles include unstable ecclesiological accounts of priest and bishop, canonical difficulties involved in a “professional” code, and the fact that most professional codes presume self-policing and interest only in “public” lives. Particularly valuable contributions include Richard Gaillardet’s use of magisterial teaching to urge ecclesiological reform, Daniel Coquillette’s and Judith McMorrow’s illustration of the differences and limitations of ethical codes between the legal profession and ministry, and John Beal’s outline of canonical difficulties with codes.

The collection provides a wealth of insight into the Church’s organizational dysfunction, while it mostly avoids shrill tones and oversimplification. Its patient and careful assessments of the organizational needs and failings make it clear that the crisis is not primarily a matter of incompetent or malicious individuals; all authors agree that we must look ultimately for “cultural reform, not technical or legal” (166). Still, the collection would be strengthened by more attention to versions of organizational ethics that are grounded in Scripture. The authors tend to read the Church through either church documents or modern organizational lenses. While these are extremely helpful diagnostic tools, they fall short (as many authors recognize) of the peculiar nature and mission of the
Church. Attention to neglected matters such as fraternal correction, eucharistic inclusion, and even the issue of lawsuits among Christians (issues with clear NT precedent) would expand the conversation very effectively initiated in this volume.

DAVID CLOUTIER
Mount Saint Mary’s University, Emmitsburg, Md.


Mark Cherry concludes this excellently documented, profound, and philosophically rooted study with: “If this public health crisis [the shortage of organs for transplantation] is to be adequately addressed and remedied, any future policy maker’s assessment must honestly recognize the possibility that the market is the most efficient and effective—and morally justified—means of procuring and allocating organs for transplantation.” Such a judgment runs counter to the current consensus (essentially European but also global) against the commercialization of the human body and/or of human body parts. The author critically reassesses the moral arguments and philosophical assumptions that underlie that consensus, and the political and moral rhetorics that support it, including issues such as the ways a market in human organs might undermine consent, exploit the poor, violate human dignity, create greater inequality between rich and poor, and lead to worse health care outcomes than does the current system of donation. Most impressive is C.’s “rewriting” of the history of philosophy in order to substantiate his conclusions.

While I am not convinced by C.’s argument (not least of all by his treatment of the principles of consent and personal integrity) and strongly disagree with his conclusions, I do admit that the work is of value and helpfully challenging. Especially for those who wish to clarify their own ethical intuitions in this area, C.’s argument is worth consideration. His book can help promote a deepening of our global philosophical, ethical, and policy debates that are often dominated by assertions rather than dialogue.

PAUL SCHOTSMANS
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven


The sin of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism has a monstrous history in the Christian tradition and is still unwittingly perpetuated through some Christian preaching. Salmon insightfully offers a stinging analysis of the common ways some preachers blithely proclaim biased stereotypes of Judaism as hypocritical, legalistic, purity-obsessed, xenophobic, and guilty of deicide. She effectively demonstrates how some theologians and preachers often make Judaism appear antiquated, deficient, and even oppressive, so that Christianity can, in contrast, appear morally advanced, superior, and liberating. Condemning such rhetorical devices, she insists that “the best preaching does not need to create an ‘us’ and ‘them’ to be effective. Christianity does not need an inferior Judaism to support the truth of the gospel” (xi).

Through biblical scholarship and samples of sermons, Salmon offers preachers effective remedies for overcoming deeply ingrained anti-Judaism, remedies for healing the divinely established, ongoing relationship between Judaism and Christianity. She challenges preachers to portray Jesus within his Jewish context, grounded in Israel’s experience of God as loving, just, and merciful. She offers numerous helpful recommendations on how to preach about Jesus’ ministry. For example: (1) portray the Gospels as Jewish literature; (2) state that the anti-Jewish polemics in the Gospels represent an intra-Jewish debate about the identity and future of Israel; (3) describe the Pharisees in a positive light as those who were in many ways closest to Jesus; (4) attribute Je-
sus’ crucifixion to the Roman imperialist administration that had appointed Jewish collaborators, such as Caiaphas, to help eliminate any threat to Roman rule; (5) describe the cruelty of Pilate and the threat Jesus posed to Rome in his preaching of the kingdom and criticism of Temple leaders; (6) especially during Holy Week, emphasize the commonalities in the traditions of Judaism and Christianity. Impressed by the importance of her topic and finding no notable weaknesses, I strongly recommend this book for any introductory class in homiletics.

SARAH FAIRANKS, O.P.
Barry University, Miami, Fla.


Wiseman’s text offers a biblical, historical, and ecumenical introduction to the study of Christian spirituality, presenting an engaging mix of the usual figures and texts, along with other less frequently encountered topics, (e.g., the Odes of Solomon, the Frankish laywoman Dhuoda, and the 13th-century Byzantine monk Nicephorus). W. begins with a fine treatment of the various issues surrounding definitions of terms (Christian spirituality and mysticism), as well as a presentation of a Lonergan-inspired theological methodology for interpreting and understanding his subject. He also includes a brief chapter on Biblical spirituality—another extensive topic he tries valiantly to summarize. Given the many challenges of postmodernity, interdisciplinarity, and particularity in the academic field of Christian spirituality, offering a traditional history of this sort is risky. However, when combined with primary texts of historical figures and current studies on inculturation (as the introduction suggests), W.’s book serves as a useful guide to seeing Christian spirituality from a contemporary global perspective.

Particularly notable are W.’s occasional pairings of historical figures, for example, treating Lutheran spirituality through the writings of both Luther and Bonhoeffer, and treating Ignatian spirituality through the writings of Ignatius and Rahner. Also of note are W.’s treatments of recent Christian spiritual expressions in Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Not surprisingly, in his Asian chapter, he focuses on Indian, Japanese, and Filipino figures. In the African section, however, his focus is thematic: liturgical inculturations, social justice, and the current rise of the independent churches. In his section on the Americas, W. focuses on liberation, feminist, Pentecostal, and contemplative spiritualities.

The text’s greatest strength is also its most glaring limitation: so much material and so little space. In this instance, though, greater breadth at the price of lesser depth is an acceptable trade-off because each chapter concludes with stimulating discussion questions and helpful, if necessarily limited, bibliographies.

FRANCIS X. McALOON, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


This is a study of the liturgy from below. An ordained minister in the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America and already the author of several books on liturgy, Frank Senn adopts the method of a “social history of the liturgy,” that is, he focuses on how people lived, on how they structured and integrated their daily living and worshiping. His survey moves through four periods: the early church, the Carolingian Renaissance, the Middle Ages and the Reformation, and the current age of liturgical renewal. While typical liturgical studies concentrate on liturgical structures—orders, texts, and rubrics—S. is more concerned with what these structures meant to the people who used them, trying to imagine what was actually happening within the liturgical assembly. Four themes—preaching, music, the use of the vernacular, and the calendar—direct the discussion through the consideration of each age. S. builds
on the work of Wayne Meeks in Scripture and John Baldovin in liturgical history.

The book has ecumenical breadth that includes, along with mainline Protestant churches and the Roman Catholic Church, the Free Church and mega-church movements. While there is growing interest in the liturgy of these new movements, that interest is usually on the part of sociologists rather than theologians (perhaps because theologians lean towards the prescriptive—what the church ought to be doing, while sociologists focus on the descriptive—what people are actually doing). S. is able to blend these approaches.

S. deftly nuances some standard discussions of liturgical theology, shedding new light on topics such as the participation of the laity in the Mass of the Middle Ages and the relationship of actual worship to its study as forms of primary and secondary theology. The prose is clear and vibrant; this is history as narrative. The book will be a valuable resource for the liturgical scholar and all students of liturgy.

THOMAS J. SCIRGHI, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
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