BOOK REVIEWS


Swedish scholars have pursued a longstanding, lively interest in the epistles of Jude and 2 Peter. In 1962, Carl Axel Albin presented a doctoral thesis then published as Judasbrevet: Traditionen, Texten, Tolkningen (Stockholm, 1962). The text-critical aspect of the book was criticized, but the presentation of manuscripts has been appreciated and used even by Wasserman. Tord Fornberg, in his An Early Church in a Pluralistic Society (Lund, 1977), then situated 2 Peter in its hypothetical milieu and considered Jude as its source. James Starr, on the other hand, concentrated on 2 Peter 1:4, published as Sharers in Divine Nature (Stockholm, 2000). With his Rethinking the Judaism-Hellenism Dichotomy (Stockholm, 2001), Anders Gerdmar presented a historical and philological study of Jude and 2 Peter. He judged that 2 Peter was the source of Jude. I, the reviewer, commented on the rhetorical aspects of Jude and 2 Peter in Filemonbrevet, Judasbrevet och Andra Petrusbrevet (Stockholm, 2001).

Wasserman’s thesis is unsurpassed in accuracy and completeness. Profiting from the manuscripts used by Albin, W. has added new manuscripts following his visits to the Alands’ Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster. His is now a complete collection of Judean manuscripts, even though time restraints prevented him from collating all available lectionary manuscripts. Still, W. has collated the lectionaries of Jude published in the Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior. While he was analyzing the lectionaries up to the 12th century, he discovered that MS 2866 is in fact the same as MS 2483. W. lists all the manuscripts of Jude on pages 106–17.

W.’s dissertation is well organized into three parts. In the “Prolegomena” of part 1 he surveys previous textual research on Jude, with an outline of current scholarship. Chapter 2 presents papyrus 72 and chapter 3, papyrus 78, both insightfully annotated by W. In chapter 4 W. claims Jude as the source of 2 Peter, arguing against Gerdmar’s thesis.

Part 2 is an edition of the text-critical aspects of Jude. First is a presentation of the manuscript witnesses, second a reconstruction of the initial text of Jude, and finally the apparatus itself. Here W. also provides a list of errors in the Greek manuscripts and in the Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior. Part 3 consists of a textual commentary, followed by a bibliography, three indexes, and 16 useful plates.

W. gives the reader the information necessary for checking the reliability of his text-critical presentation of Jude. In fact, he gives accurate and complete information about most text-critical problems. Yet I do find two weaknesses that prevent him from offering reliable historical and geo-
graphical information on the different readings. First, he quotes some passages from the church fathers without doing his own systematic, critical evaluation of those sources. Second, he has not critically studied the different translations of the Greek text. Still, even without these tools for historical and geographic evaluation, the reader can find much about the different readings. I can only congratulate the young doctor on a good piece of scholarship.

Uppsala University

RENE KIEFFER


At least one member of every dissertation committee poses the discomfiting question: “What is new and original about this thesis?” In secure expectation of that gambit, some doctoral students “reinvent the wheel” in mounting their arguments, alleging novelty and revolution where, to a jaded reviewer, things look fairly staid and familiar.

Such would appear the case with Shauf’s otherwise impressive work that began as a dissertation directed at Emory University (2004). It consists of a well-crafted, rigorously argued, frequently illuminating exegesis of Acts 19, addressing the three episodes and two important summary statements of the chapter; it is surrounded, however, by an overdrawn statement of the Acts question, which S.’s hermeneutic is supposed to transform.

In his attempt to address the Acts question, S. commits himself to exorcising the ghost of Hans Conzelmann from Lucan studies, fully a half-century after the publication of Die Mitte der Zeit (1954) and amid a conversation that has not been dominated by Conzelmann’s work, to my knowledge, for many years. Still, S. contends, Lucan studies have to be “loosed from the moorings” (31) of Conzelmann and his mentor, Rudolf Bultmann, since Lucan scholars have engaged the redaction-critical pioneer only in the arena of exegesis and have left unchallenged the Bultmannian premises and unspoken methodological assumptions of Conzelmann’s work. These include the definition of theology, the understanding of history, and the merger of these two categories in narrative historiography.

Luke’s historiography, thoroughly Hellenized, is not based on theology as “interpretation of the kerygma,” S. argues (contra Bultmann and Conzelmann), and so a broader definition must be framed to interpret Acts, namely, kerygma as “reflection about the gods or God” (41–42, 50). Chapter 19, since it includes no discourse of Paul, is a happy choice to illustrate this broader definition. Or is it? S. repeats many times that chapter 19 is all about the “fantastic,” “incredible,” “wild,” “grandiose” success of Paul in the most important Greco-Roman city of Asia. Considering the magnitude of the success and its venue, the chapter makes a fitting climax to Paul’s missions in Luke’s telling and highlights God’s action. Of course, the story
is not about Paul's prowess or heroism but about God's action with Paul as instrument (Acts 19:11–12); it is "reflection on God."

In these same verses, however, appear connections with the 
*kerygma* of the Acts speeches that "loosen the moorings" of S.'s thesis. Luke's theo-
centric perspective on the mission's thaumaturgy clearly expresses its con-
tinuity with Jesus' activity, as summarized in Peter's 
*kerygma* on Pentecost (2:22; cf. 10:38; 15:12; cf. pp. 171–72). Moreover, the three anecdotes of chapter 19 echo and apply three 
kerygmata of the apostles: the Spirit's outpouring (19:1–7, cf. 2:33); exorcism in Jesus' name (19:13–17, cf. 10:38); and the ontological fallacy of idol worship (19:23–40)—a keystone of Paul's 
kerygma to pagans (14:15–17; 17:29), which S. furtively acknowledges on page 281. Is this not as we should expect, that, as Christian theology, the theology of Acts should have the same source as Christian faith, namely, the 
*rhêma Christou* (Rom 10:17)? In any case, the continuity of Lucan narrative and Lucan kerygma discourages, in my opinion, the segregation of a "theology of Acts" from that of Luke-Acts (*pace* S., p. 53).

On history and the practice of historiography, S. posits differences not 
immediately perspicuous between his and the Bultmannian (= Conzel-
mannian) view. Surely the two titans would not gainsay that history is an imaginative construct tailored to the social context of the writing. As for the analysis of that social setting, S. speaks of situating Acts in its "histori-
cal context" (83), but he resists any profiling of the Lucan Sitz-im-Leben against the larger setting of early Christian history. He ought to take the further step, nevertheless, as others do, of discerning the pedigree of the Christian whose self-doubts provoked the declaration of this historian's argumentative purpose in Luke 1:4. There, in the prologue's purpose clause, the inference of continuity between the kerygma (*katêchêthês*) and the historiographic venture at hand is as clear as day. "Continuity" is, in fact, the key to allaying (Gentile-) Christians' doubts about their standing in sacred history, and it will take the two volumes to argue the case sufficiently.

Our differences aside, I applaud S. on his contributions to Lucan and NT exegesis. May he keep on writing, perhaps with a moratorium on the word "crucial"!

*Fordham University, New York*

**Richard J. Dillon**


Henderson's ground-breaking book addresses a long-standing difficulty in Marcan scholarship. The problem arose as a result of the success of William Wrede's "Messianic Secret" theory (1901) for understanding Mark's portrayal of Jesus' disciples. Based on that theory, Jesus' followers are always, and almost exclusively, judged by the correctness of their Christ-
tology, and thus they are seen as completely on the wrong track in the first
half of the Gospel and as rejecting Jesus’ suffering messiahship in the second. As a result, Mark’s more complex understanding of discipleship has been ignored. H. reclaims Mark’s manifold notion of discipleship and helps the reader understand the seeming incongruity between the two parts of the Gospel. The success of Jesus’ miraculous public ministry coupled with the early cooperation, enthusiasm, and success of his disciples seems to be inexplicably contradicted by Jesus’ fading popularity and his disciples’ growing incomprehension and final abandonment. H. addresses both difficulties and provides new and helpful directions for Marcan scholarship.

The genius of H.’s book, a revision of her doctoral dissertation done under Joel Marcus at Duke University, is her discovery that the central theme of the Gospel is not its Christology. Rather, “the unifying message of Mark’s story . . . the wider horizon within which Mark sketches his Christological portrait of Jesus” is that “the dominion of God has drawn near” (254). Thus Mark’s primary goal is not “to disclose Jesus’ messianic identity” but to “depict Jesus’ messianic mission . . . which is to focus attention on God’s apocalyptic rectification of the world” (256).

H.’s strategy is to “split Mark open” in order to erase long-standing dichotomies like pre- and post-Easter Christology and “Jesus’ office of wonder-worker and his foreboding destiny” (10). The body of the book presents a fine, close reading of six early Gospel passages in which the disciples appear. H. shows how in their call and commissioning (chaps. 2 and 3) Jesus’ relationship with his disciples is characterized by “presence and practice,” the empowering presence of Jesus and the apprenticeship Jesus offers them in witnessing to “God’s decisive victory over the powers of the present age” (4). Four chapters then trace many episodes of “discipleship in action,” the last of which is a brilliant explanation of the second crossing of the Sea of Galilee (Mk 6:45–52) as a test of discipleship. Here, H. opines, Jesus sends his disciples out “much as he sends them out on the missionary journey of Mk 6:7–13” (236). This time, however, the disciples fail their mission to withstand the demonic powers of the sea because they fail to trust “in God’s dominion, which would unleash the authority Jesus has given them” (224). Jesus gives them a second chance when he approaches the boat, but they fail again when they do not recognize his empowering presence, but think he is a ghost. They should have learned from their participation in the wilderness feeding that Jesus’ presence entails empowerment, that “God’s power is at work to reclaim the world from a present evil age,” and that God’s victory is assured (13).

There is little to criticize in this fine book. Although primarily a narratology, H.’s close reading of various passages is squarely based on her evident facility with critical methods of interpretation, including when helpful a modest allusion to Patristic exegesis. Her philological presentations in chapter 3, “The Commissioning of the Twelve in Mark 3:13–15,” are especially helpful. I would like to have read more of H.’s own thoughts in her concluding chapter on the “hardening of the hearts” of the disciples (250) and on the reason Mark narrates the disciples’ successful mission just
when Jesus’ ministry begins to fail at Nazareth (243). The typos in the few Hebrew words quoted in the book are distracting (e.g., 230–31), but overall this volume exhibits the highest level of scholarship. At the same time, for the non-specialist, the introductory sections at the beginning of each chapter precisely delineate H.’s goals. She concludes each chapter with creative analyses of each further step of her exegetical analysis rather than with simple summaries. Her concluding chapter sketches some fascinating hints for analyzing the rest of the Gospel. This is the best monograph on the Gospel of Mark that I have read in a decade. I cannot wait to hear more from this original thinker!

Saint Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Penn.  ELLIOTT C. MALONEY, O.S.B.


Throughout their religious histories, the occasional Israelite or Christian has claimed the mantel of the prophet, that is, they have spoken with a more-than-human authority, insisting that they were relaying God’s judgments and instructions to the people. On the people’s side, of course, lies the perennial challenge of discerning a self-proclaimed prophet’s truth or falsity. Building on his own past scholarship, and in dialogue with an impressive array of scholarly peers, Moberly searches for universally valid criteria for such discernment, gleaned from both the Hebrew and the Christian Scriptures. That this is a central concern for the Christian is undeniable, for Christianity is built on the belief that God is self-revelatory, and that this self-revelation is worked through human agency—ultimately through the Christ whose divinity is made manifest through his humanity. Yet too, history recounts many religious hoaxes and charlatans. How, then, do we judge which prophets speak with God’s voice? As 1 John puts it, we must “test the spirits to see whether they are from God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world” (4:1).

M. wants to develop an overarching theology of biblical prophecy. He attempts thereby to avoid two standard contemporary treatments of the topic: (1) psychological or sociological explorations of the phenomenon (e.g., reading “inner-prophetic” rivalries simply as political struggles) that abandon the questions of theological truth altogether; or (2), if they venture to make truth claims, a confined treatment of single prophets in isolated and unique historical contexts. In his theology M. seeks universal criteria equally valid for discerning biblical and subsequent, even contemporary, religious prophecy. He roots prophecy theologically in the divine initiative whereby God acts to reconfigure human priorities, both socially and personally, in accord with God’s unfolding plan (be this called the in-breaking Reign of God, salvation history, or whatever). The criteria for whether this in-breaking is truly happening are two, one social and one personal. (1) True prophetic denunciation of unjust social structures must
contain, besides possible if imprecise descriptions of future ruin, a corrective course of action, usually described as some form of collective conversion towards a holier communal path. Further, the true prophet (2) must display that this same call to integrity is at work in the prophet’s own life—that he or she is also undergoing conversion in a powerful and palpable manner. As M. describes them, true prophets are not perfect people. Rather, they are well advanced in the process of personal conversion toward a state of greater—and possibly even great—integrity before God.

To fill out his study, M. examines several figures, from the relatively obscure Micaiah ben Imlah (1 Kg. 22:1–38) to the well-studied Jeremiah and Paul of Tarsus. Relying on Jeremiah, he constructs the basic contours of his paradigm: God calls the prophet whose growing integrity of heart is a consequence of his or her having stood in the presence of the divine; God commissions the prophet to speak, calling the people to conversion and warning them of the consequences of failure to do so. In every case, human fallibility remains active. For fame, for gain, or simply out of mischief a false prophet tells the people what they want to hear; but even a true prophet can fall through complacency and corruption, becoming deaf to God’s words. The possibility exists of turning away from God in personal moral failure, and such turning is the root of all personal and social sin. Prophetic activity is corrective, for it is invitational, relational, and engaging, seeking collective conversion. M. masterfully lays out the criteria as found in the texts examined. Still, I would have appreciated a deeper examination of the communal discernment, that is, a deeper examination of communal as well as personal processes of turning around our collective living.

The conflict between Micaiah and King Ahab allows M. to observe that “God is the searching presence who seeks to penetrate human self-will and thereby transform human life through the purifying processes of grace and goodness” (127). Paul and John allow M. to name the implicit criterion of grace and goodness that he relies upon throughout—and especially to name Christ as the full measure of individual and collective human holiness. True prophets display in word and deed a purity of heart radically open to the Father, in the pattern of Christ, and for the good of all. Graduate students and academic theologians will profit from this theological exploration of ongoing prophetic in-breaking proclaimed to be of God.

Santa Clara University  
PAUL FITZGERALD, S.J.


This massive work, one of nine projected volumes, covers the Eastern Christian period from the late Middle Ages (ca. AD 1000) to the close of the second millennium. In all, 22 authors (15 men and 7 women), mostly British and American plus two from Greece and one each from France and Australia, contribute to this scholarly reference collection. The 24 chapters
are divided into four main sections: the Ecumenical Patriarchate (10 essays); the Russian Church (5); Eastern Christianities covering Melkites, Nestorians, Jacobites, as well as Armenians, Copts, Ethiopians, and Syriac Christians (6); and the Modern World (3). Each chapter extends to some 25 pages and provides convenient footnotes rather than endnotes. An especially valuable section is the specialized, multilingual, 79-page bibliography organized according to each chapter’s topic. Rowan Williams, the Archbishop of Canterbury, has written a foreword that bemoans the widespread lack of understanding throughout the Christian West of the “commonwealth of Byzantine Christianity.” The scope of the volume actually extends beyond Byzantium proper to include Eastern Christianity’s presence in Arabic and Armenian speaking regions, and of course its large presence in the diaspora.

The essays provide extensive accounts of the political, diplomatic, and social life in these vast regions, but also attend to theological, artistic, cultural, literary, and liturgical issues. The examples and discussions about how Muslims and Christians lived together in a generally harmonious relationship are instructive, especially in the face of present-day challenges. Close attention is given to the Fall of Constantinople in 1204, the Council of Lyons II in 1274, as well as to the failure of the Council of Florence to reunite Christianity of the East and West. As a systematic theologian with specialized interests in ecclesiology and ecumenism, I found the following chapters especially rich in their comprehensive discussion of doctrinal issues: “The Culture of Lay Piety in Medieval Byzantium” (Sharon Gerstel and Alice-Mary Talbot); “Art and Liturgy in the Later Byzantine Empire” (Nancy Sevencko); “Russian Piety and Culture from Peter the Great to 1917” (Chris Chulos); “Syriac Christianity in the Modern Middle East” (Anthony O’Mahony); and “Modern Spirituality and the Orthodox Church” (John Binns).

The complex origins and developments of the Ancient Oriental Orthodox churches and the Assyrian Church of the East are perhaps less successfully described (in section 3). Some contributors who are not sensitive to shifts in vocabulary in the light of recent consensus statements and official dialogues continue to use problematic descriptions such as Nestorian, Jacobite, Monophysite, and so on, that are now considered misleading.

One group receiving scant attention (except for O’Mahony’s coverage) is the Eastern Catholic Christians both in their countries of origin and in the diaspora. Although admittedly a smaller population and a source of annoyance to many Orthodox, they are an important piece of this historical quilt. The volume’s consistent reference to them as “Uniates” is somewhat contentious. (Readers wanting to supplement their knowledge of this rocky relationship could consult the splendid collection published by the Comité Mixte Catholique-Orthodoxe en France under the title: *Les Enjeux de l’Uniatisme* [2004]).

The book’s layout is generally first rate with a few exceptions. From such a distinguished publishing house I would have expected higher quality
reproductions of the various paintings, photos, and maps. The Greek type font has a makeshift look about it. But the editor and publisher are to be warmly congratulated for having enlisted such a stellar group of specialists to collaborate on describing the “second lung” of Christianity which is neglected at our own loss.

_Boston College_  
MICHAEL A. FAHEY, S.J.


Robert Kolb presents a fascinating study of the formation of Lutheran doctrine. He assesses the earliest influence and use of Luther’s _De servo arbitrio_ among what he calls the “Wittenberg circle, . . . the second set of receptors of Luther’s work, those who taught and wrote in the third quarter of the sixteenth century” (275). K. carefully observes the “continuing experiments” of these theologians “in the search for the appropriate ways of delivering God’s Word in their ever changing contexts” (ibid.)—verbal and conceptual “experiments” that sparked fierce controversy.

First, K. offers an excellent analysis of _De servo arbitrio_ by placing it in the context of Luther’s theology as a whole, generating an interpretation in ten principles that helpfully summarizes Luther’s theology. He follows with an account of Melanchthon’s theological development, especially on the topic of the freedom of the will. Luther’s and Melanchton’s models constitute the two contrasting points of reference for the subsequent controversies. Appealing to his ten principles, K. analyzes carefully how “Luther’s students use _De servo arbitrio_ in teaching on the freedom of the will” (135). Astonishingly enough, Luther “had not developed the topic of God’s predestination of his chosen people in detail in his writings” (170). K. traces how controversy emerged within the Wittenberg discussions and how the “formulation of the Lutheran doctrine of predestination” took place. Finally, he draws on his analysis of the preceding debates to show how the _Formula of Concord_ is able to offer a Lutheran consensus on questions of bound choice and election, and he concludes with a summary of the study’s aim, perspectives, and major results.

K.’s work deserves the highest praise. Drawing on a stupendous _Gelehrsamkeit_, his many sources shed light on the thinking of Luther’s and Melanchthon’s students, sources often difficult to access and little known. K. describes the complex and contentious reception of both Luther’s and Melanchthon’s teachings in a refreshingly nonpolemical manner. He shows the opponents’ commonalities, both in convictions and in concerns, but he also clearly explains their differences: different presuppositions of which they were unaware, different tasks, situations, and contexts. As a result, K. is able to describe the theological practice of these thinkers in a way that emphasizes the basic unity of Wittenberg theology.
K.’s excellent book will surely stimulate further discussion. Three open issues stand out. (1) It is a pity that K. did not consider medieval discussions on free will, election, predestination, God’s omnipotence, future contingents, and so on, since some of those theories shaped Luther’s position even as he strictly rejects them (29–31), and also since those discussions led to highly sophisticated theories and concepts from which one might more adequately analyze problems with Luther’s own concepts.

(2) One may wonder whether the modern concept of “responsibility” (e.g., 273) is applicable to the problem under discussion, as K. does when speaking of “two ‘total’ responsibilities, God’s and the human creature’s” (6). When applied to the Creator, the word does not have the same meaning as when related to human creatures, and, regarding the latter, the meaning will differ depending on the respective use of the “law” (civil or theological). One might further ask whether it is fitting for K. to describe one concern of the Wittenberg theologians as caring for “the integrity of the human being” even while all agree that human beings are deeply infected by sin. I suggest that it might be better to state that they wished to clarify what it means to say “I believe” (I!, and not: the Holy Spirit believes in me).

(3) K. maintains that medieval theologians harmonized and homogenized the “indissoluble tension between God’s total responsibility and total human responsibility” (59), while Luther fittingly kept the two in tension. But, having said this, K. immediately acknowledges that Wittenberg theologians put varying emphases on each of the two sides. Thus it would appear that describing the relationship between the human and the divine simply as being “in tension” remains both conceptually and practically inadequate. We clearly need to define the relationship more precisely, particularly in concrete situations of preaching, pastoral counseling, or in the classroom. K.’s study of the Wittenberg debates itself shows that keeping the two sides in tension only describes a problem requiring further clarification.

These issues raised, readers will benefit enormously both from the many insights and the stimulus to further discussion K.’s impressive study of this formative phase of Lutheran doctrine offers.

Institute for Ecumenical Research, Strasbourg, France

THEODOR DIETER


Furey imaginatively examines epistolary interactions between Desiderius Erasmus, Thomas More, Margaret More Roper, Gasparo Contarini, Reginald Pole, and Vittoria Colonna, finding among them shared religious and literary interests that formed them into a religious community. She insists that they guided, supported, and advised one another in their pursuit of a spiritualized scholarship, forming a religious life that sidestepped con-
temporary ecclesiastical institutions, gender roles, social norms, devotional conventions, and doctrinal definitions. This religious life among them, she argues, contradicts conventional notions about 16th-century spiritual community.

The chapters are organized mainly around individuals, pairs, or subsets of these scholars as they exemplified trends of the larger group. Chapter 1 focuses on the development of religious ideals about scholarship—specifically the notion that scholarship can be redemptive and salvific for individuals and for Christianity at large—through the writings of Erasmus and More. In chapter 2 F. brings Pole to center stage—in particular, his denunciation of his cousin and patron, Henry VIII—to indicate that the rejection of things secular was part of the religious ideology of the community. She then permits Vittoria Colonna and Gasparo Contarini in chapter 3 to display their many ambivalent reactions to reading and writing: the anxiety or peace such activity produced; the higher and lower nature—in their view—of various kinds of literature; their unease with devoting themselves wholly to a life of either scholarly withdrawal or public action. Chapter 4 highlights the relationships formed within the broader community including Michelangelo Buonarrotti and Marguerite de Navarre. Here F. analyzes written expressions of desire for God and for each other, especially using the letters of Michelangelo, Contarini, and Colonna. In the final chapter, she appeals to writings about two other community members—Roper and Colonna—to argue that the community rejected 16th-century ideals of what bishops, martyrs, and women should be. Here again F. marshals evidence from a portion of the group, mainly letters by Pole and Contarini.

While the subjects of F.’s individual chapters exemplify one or another trait, when she claims that the six—and by implication considerably more—formed a community bound by these various common commitments, her argument is less than convincing. Her title does suggest that she has in mind an analogue to the “republic of letters” that Jürgen Habermas described as emerging from within the absolutist state. Habermas’s men of letters create a public sphere, aside from many key intellectual institutions of the time, within which they can begin what many consider to be “modern” political discourse. F. found among her authors the construction of a religious republic of letters and, thus by implication, modern religious discourse. This latter phrase seems to refer to a discourse that emphasized individual devotional life, mainly without commitment to existing religious institutions and authorities, or at least as sidestepping the demands of those existing institutions and authorities. Still, I am not convinced that there is anything especially “modern” about such a social space. Is this not rather an example of reform discourse that has characterized individuals and groups across the entire history of Christianity, from the age of Jesus to our present?

Further, F. insists that we will be collectively unable to notice this religious version of the republic of letters (and, hence, the reason for her study) if we expect to find in the early modern period an emergence of
compelling secularism. That a faulty presupposition about secularism can distort our view of early modernity might well be the case. However, the current explosive popularity of anything with religion in its title suggests we may have passed beyond the expectation she assumes. No doubt F.’s work challenges the notion that early modern intellectuals led the charge away from a religious middle ages toward a godless modernity. But that notion has been under assault since the insights of Jacob Burckhardt began to be questioned. In our post-everything age, are we not also profoundly post-Burckhardtian? Is not the conventional chronology of Western intellectual development that F. assumes passé?

Finally, F. leaves unchallenged other questionable assumptions. For example, she retains spirituali as a useful concept, and she reiterates the idea that zealous conservative forces had seized control of the Roman Church by the 1550s. Both notions have been attacked, and consideration of the archival documentation about the lives of characters here studied reveals, in my view, the legitimacy of those attacks. Still, with these limitations, this is a thought-provoking work for specialists in the history of religion.

Bloomsburg University, Penn. 

WILLIAM V. HUDON


Giuseppe Alberigo, the Italian editor of the acclaimed five volume history of Vatican II, has produced an insightful narrative that is both a history of the council and personal memoir. His direct contact with the council came through his collaboration at the Bologna center for religious studies with Giuseppe Dossetti, a progressive politician turned priest who served as a peritus for Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro. A. makes their perspective his own as he provides in five chapters an informative overview of Vatican II from its preparatory stages through its conclusion in 1965. A final chapter evaluates the “new Pentecost” that John XXIII hoped to launch. Overall A. offers an optimistic reading of the council as an “event” in the church’s life, though he admits disappointments in enacting the progressive agenda he favored.

These issues and the confusion that followed the council receive full attention in a superb collection of essays edited by William Madges of Xavier University in Cincinnati. The 16 contributors include established as well as promising younger theologians. The editor deserves much credit for producing a book whose essays are remarkably consistent in their high
quality. Taking up some of the most important themes from Vatican II, they trace their development, in some cases into the 21st century.

The first seven essays examine various ecclesiological implications of Vatican II. For example, under the rubric of reception/subversion, Peter Phan points out how the Asian bishops moved after the council to place “the kingdom of God rather than the church at the center of Christian life” (37) and to present Jesus Christ to Asia through dialogue with its poor (liberation), its cultures (inculturation), and its religions (interreligious dialogue). Even before the 1998 Asian Synod, the bishops rejected the Roman Curia’s proposed discussion of Christology. Focusing instead on the way to “carry out the mission of Jesus today” (44), they insisted on the legitimate autonomy of the local church.

Other essays in this first section include Philip Franco’s examination of Joseph Ratzinger’s communion ecclesiology before his election as Benedict XVI, Christopher Denny’s analysis of John Courtney Murray’s advanced understanding of the lay apostolate through Catholic Action, and Harriet Luckman’s critique of the position of women in the church since Vatican II. Jason King argues persuasively for applying the Vatican II model of the pilgrim church to the contemporary sexual abuse scandal. Two pieces deal specifically with Scripture. Francis Holland provides a comprehensive evaluation of Dei Verbum: its history, a commentary, and subsequent interpretation, while Alice Laffey makes a strong case for literary criticism’s support for faith and urges the need “to reclaim scripture as a theological discipline” (109).

Part 2 includes four essays that focus on the church’s engagement with the modern world. Two of them deal explicitly with Gaudium et spes. Christine Firer Hinze argues persuasively that the document enunciates an incarnational solidarity that can contextualize social ethics and Christian mission, while William French pushes the text beyond the boundaries of personalism toward an ecologically sensitive framework that embraces creation. Victor Lee Austin examines John Paul II’s development of the relationship between Christ and the state; and John Sniegocki explains the growth of magisterial teaching on war, peace, and non-violence since Vatican II.

The five essays in part 3 treat ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. Elaine Catherine MacMillan situates Vatican II within a century of conciliar activity by Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox churches and points out the severe limitations within which the post-Vatican II synods have operated. Clearly the intentions of the council continue to be frustrated by a powerful Curia. Alberigo would agree. In a particularly fine essay Paul Knitter explores the possibilities for interreligious dialogue set forth by theologians since the council, for a “pneumatological theology of religions,” and for a dialogical Christology capable of constructively engaging other religions. At the same time, Reid Locklin reaches back to Peter Lombard’s Sentences in the 12th century to support that exchange. Elena Procario-Foley carefully delineates the issues raised in Nostra aetate and explores Catholic-Jewish relations since its passage. The final piece by
Phillip Luke Sinitiere examines the relatively recent phenomenon of Catholic Evangelicals—that is, evangelical Protestants who have expanded their theological framework so long contained by “sola scriptura” to examine Christian history and patristic scholarship in the first five centuries after Christ.

This is an exceptional collection of well written, cogent essays. In both books we have fine and helpful discussions of Vatican II and contemporary theological issues.


As his _Festschrift_’s 30-page bibliography demonstrates, church historian Justo González is one of the most prolific of contemporary theologians (Latino/a or otherwise). And this dazzling son of Cuba has parlayed this Herculean productivity with remarkable leadership and entrepreneurial skills. This fitting tribute was produced on the occasion of his 67th birthday by three editors who themselves have benefited from González’s leadership, having participated in programs and organizations founded by González: the Hispanic Summer Program; the Hispanic Theological Initiative (at Princeton University); and the Asociación para la Educación Teológica Hispana (AETH). The editors and the contents of this volume reflect the fact that González’s accomplishments have often been ecumenical and have broadly embraced many expressions of U.S. Latino theology—mainline Protestant, evangelical/Pentecostal, and Roman Catholic.

The collection holds together quite well. Using John Wesley’s quadrilateral of Scripture, tradition, reason, and experience to group 23 articles by a cross-section of Latino/a theologians, the editors have produced a worthy collection that builds upon González’s multiple contributions, sharpens the profile of U.S. Latino theology, and points the way ahead. The collection’s coherence stems from the fact that the articles are inspired by approaches and concepts that González has pioneered for over half a century.

Here I touch on select essays. In “Toward a Hermeneutics of the Diaspora” Fernando Segovia, following González’s seminal concepts on reading the Bible through Hispanic eyes, shares a brief but cogent reflection on how Latino/a social locations/contexts shape their reading of Scripture. In the section on tradition, Edwin David Aponte’s “View from the Margins” develops the topic of Latino Protestant church history. He picks up on González’s contention that Latino theology is not postmodern but “metamodern.” González uses this term to make the point that both Latino Protestants and Catholics are together in rejecting postmodernity’s denial of metanarrative. Aponte sees Latino/a theologies as defending “a stan-
dard of salvation, liberation and justice.” In “The State of U.S. Latino/a Theology,” Orlando Espín, a key player in the development of Latino/a theologies since its late-1980s boom, provides one of the more comprehensive and insightful overviews of that theology found anywhere in print.

In section 3, on theology and reason, Roberto Goizueta’s brilliant essay “Beyond the Frontier Myth” is republished. His seminal contrast between “frontier” and “border,” and his description of how those metaphors have shaped consciousness in the U.S., is more relevant than ever in an age of hyper-globalization. In the same section, E. Villafañe applies Harvey Cox’s notion of “primal spirituality” to the contemporary growth of Pentecostalism (in which the Hispanic world is a key player), providing original insights into this most earthshaking development that the academic community continues to downplay.

In section 4, on practical implications of theology, David Maldonado’s “Hispanic Protestant Conversions” tackles the delicate issue of Latino/a conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism. Few if any have had the courage to candidly look at this growing reality. Maldonado does an excellent job and those in Hispanic ministries would be well advised to ponder his analysis. In this same section, Elizabeth Conde-Frazier synthesizes many helpful literary findings and adds useful, challenging perceptions of her own in “Religious Education in an Immigrant Community.” The contributions to the fourth section are my favorites; they are uniformly good if not excellent, providing helpful views on everyday issues that affect Hispanic ministry such as catechesis, the movement toward evangelicalism/Pentecostalism, and the Latino/a struggle for general as well as graduate theological education. Only one or two essays are lacking in substance. This volume, it should also be noted, is indebted to the ecumenical journal Apuntes published at the Perkins School of Theology. González founded and edited Apuntes, the first U.S. Latino/a theological journal, and several of the contributors to this Festschrift have published there.

While the volume is a credible, worthy example of a Festschrift, nothing could ever live up to the excellence and vitality of González’s stunning theological vocation. Given the unique role González has played these past 50 years, his ecumenical credentials, productivity, and personal influence on countless theological and church leaders, this volume deserves wide recognition and more attention than it has received so far.

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


On the occasion of the great Dominican’s centenary, this collection examines and assesses Congar’s contribution as historian, theologian, and ecumenist for post-Vatican II Catholicism. By sending the reader back to
Congar’s principal works, the 21 articles let the French cardinal “speak again to the Church and the world” (461). A bibliography of Congar’s most important texts and of significant secondary literature will also prove invaluable for readers who want to know better his vast *oeuvre*. The editor’s detailed presentation of the contributors and contents helps readers quickly find the articles of personal interest. Several of the contributions constitute significant, and sometimes critical, theological engagements with Congar’s thought.

Several articles set up a running ecumenical discussion on God’s and the Word’s presence in, and confrontation with, the Church. John Webster’s respectful, fair, and penetrating account of the central themes in Congar’s *La tradition et les traditions* (1960) ends with a bracing Barthian response of equal penetration. The conversation Webster hopes to begin (58) continues in Gabriel Flynn’s clear and accurate account of Congar’s theory on church reform and of its importance for his thought after Vatican II. In particular, Flynn’s discussion here of Congar’s 1967 article on reform and Luther’s reformation (115–16) addresses some of Webster’s concern to see the Bible as a force that confronts the Church and not just as the possession of the Church’s tradition. Jean-Pierre Jossua joins the discussion by masterfully presenting Congar’s fundamental positions on Protestantism and Orthodoxy, as well as the main ways in which he changed his mind on ecumenical matters. Bruno Bürki provides a Reformed viewpoint that contrasts somewhat with Webster’s. Bürki proves convincingly that Congar’s emphasis on the liturgy’s mediation of God’s presence and on the role of the whole assembly as celebrant helps to confirm many insights guiding the liturgical renewal in French- and German-speaking Reformed churches.

As befits Congar’s own approach, several articles shine as judicious combinations of history and theology. A. N. Williams successfully demonstrates the increasing theological depth attained by Congar’s theology of the laity as it developed over three decades of books and articles. John O’Malley provides a well-argued, even-handedly positive review of Congar’s histories of ecclesiology, defending these works ably against their chief critics. J. J. Scarisbrick and Alberto Melloni offer skillful and illuminating reflections on Congar the diarist and on the diaries themselves, although some of Scarisbrick’s assessments of the French cardinal seem to say more about the author’s evaluation of the post-Vatican II situation than they do about Congar. Fergus Kerr’s fine study of Congar’s relationship with 20th-century Thomism also deserves praise. Thomas O’Meara, Stephen Fields, and Terrence Merrigan provide three high-quality, historically grounded reflections on Congar’s evolving views regarding salvation outside the Church and through other religions. Their varying and sometimes contrasting interpretations demonstrate admirably the ambiguity of his thought on a matter that has taken on a greater urgency today than it had in Congar’s prime.

Although a literary crown of honor, this book contains some stones cut more roughly than others. By failing to trace the historical development of Congar’s theology of the Holy Spirit, Richard McBrien can hardly attain
his goal of reflecting on the Dominican’s “evolving understanding” of pneumatology (303). Consequently, his assessment of Congar’s thought in this area lacks some cogency. Jonathan Robinson’s study criticizes Congar for having defined tradition as action and transmission that result in an excessive abstraction from the contents transmitted. He cites this alleged fault as partly responsible for post-Vatican II aberrations such as ruptures in liturgical tradition, inflation of dependence on the ordinary magisterium, and depreciation of tradition. However, Robinson’s case needs a more complete, nuanced, and balanced presentation of Congar’s thought, as well as more effort to make explicit the logic of some steps in his argument. Gabriel Flynn’s essay on “ecumenical ethics” forgoes the easy task of defending Congar’s reconciled diversity model against the charge of “inevitably weakening...orthodoxy” (219). Flynn’s supposed contrast between reconciling diversities and respecting them will appear, to those who see no necessary conflict here, to need further justification (222). Numerous incorrect, awkward, or ungrammatical renderings in some of the translated articles make them inaccessible at times.

Despite some imperfections and nettlesome editorial slips, researchers new to Congar’s thought can find in this international collection an illuminating entry point into the most important themes treated in this great theologian’s dizzyingly extensive output. For their part, connoisseurs of his theology will meet here a stimulus to further their efforts toward its reception.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee*  
JOSEPH G. MUELLER, S.J.


America first met Vorgrimler through his cooperative writings with Karl Rahner for the *Theological Dictionary* (1965) and the well-received five-volume *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II* (1967–1969). He also wrote a widely read study of the Jesuit’s theology and life, “Understanding Karl Rahner: An Introduction to His Life and Thought” (1963). As Rahner’s student at Innsbruck and successor at Münster, V. assisted in the editing of the new edition of the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, in producing *Diaconia in Christo* (1962) that led to the restoration of the permanent diaconate, and in overseeing the previously mentioned Commentary. He aided in the production of Rahner *Festschriften*, the two-volume *Gott in Welt* (1964), and a volume for Rahner’s 75th year, *Wagnis Theologie* (1979). His own writings range from the relationship of exegesis to systematic theology (*Exegese und Dogmatick* [1962]) to a historical analysis of the idea of hell (*Geschichte der Hölle* [1993]).

V.’s autobiography features four dramatic segments: a youth in Hitler’s Germany; the emergence of the young theologian around Vatican II; a professorship at Münster from 1972 to 1994; and his current retirement. Americans will find particularly interesting the narrative of growing up in
Nazi Germany within a family and milieu that was markedly anti-Hitler. He saw friends and relatives suffer political oppression, and in the last months of World War II, at the age of 16, he went into hiding to avoid the draft.

V.’s education for the priesthood and his doctorate in theology brought him into contact with important theological currents leading to Vatican II. Concerning his future education for the priesthood, a Jesuit spiritual director at his Gymnasium advised: “Don’t go to Rome; they’ll make you subservient, change your personality. Innsbruck too has a papal faculty and the famous liturgical theologian Jungmann is there. So too are the brothers Hugo and Karl Rahner. I tell you, Karl Rahner is a rising star!” (91).

V. remained a professor at Münster for over 20 years. It was an era of excitement and expansion—the university attracted three thousand students to its theology courses, but also, later, a time of tense conflicts with bishops and Rome over discrimination against laity and women and the suppression of theological discussion, and conflicts with the government over limiting or redirecting theological education for teachers. V. worked against attempts, arising in the 1980s, to block the dynamics of the Council and against the reduction of moral theology to neo-scholastic axioms. He worked to support the new liturgy while others sought to substitute past devotions; he supported theological thought and research, but also new pastoral methods, against an ecclesiastical atmosphere wary of theological and pastoral vitality. Münster itself remained a place of free discussion, with the marked support of the local bishop. In that environment, V. contributed to many ecclesial and theological celebrations—concerts, publications, symposia—honoring Rahner, Bishop Lettmann of Münster, Johann Baptist Metz, and others, reaching, for V., a satisfying 1994 climax in a multi-day recognition of Cardinal König of Vienna on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

After retirement, V. traveled to Israel and Greece and visited biblical sites and the world of the Coptic Church. Now he finds himself drawn to health care institutions having few resources for pastoral care. That demanding ministry along with theological writing fashions the present stage in his life.

The book is filled with interesting information about European theology and theologians: Michael Schmaus’s growing hostility to a theology unlike his own historical positivism; Hans Urs von Balthasar’s time as a publishing magnate; and turns in the careers of other theologians of V.’s generation. V. describes an evening dinner with Joseph Ratzinger and his sister in 1963 to discuss V.’s possibly writing a Habilitation with Ratzinger on Maximus the Confessor or Rupert of Deutz. V. did not pursue this because his then professorship in Switzerland did not require that credential. This narrative is vibrant and wide ranging. It situates theologians and their ideas into the history over recent decades of the Catholic Church and European culture.

St. Thomas Aquinas Priory, River Forest, Ill. Thomas F. O’Meara, O.P.
Lacoste is a philosophical theologian in continuity with the phenomenology of Husserl and Heidegger. He is often anthologized with those who express varied forms of post-modernism. Here I will restrict myself to a reflection on his description of theology and theology’s bases.

L. asserts that we begin with Christianity as it fully is: an engagement with God as personal, anchored in the faith that God has taken the initiative to address us with his word, based upon witness, and lived within eschatological time directed toward the end times. L. claims that most post-modern theological reflections on Christianity do not accept Christianity as it is. For example, reflections based on Richard Rorty’s epistemic commitments treat dialogue too restrictedly as conversation that despairs of common reference (95). Another reflection based on Wittgenstein’s interpretation of language as a game does not account for a language that takes seriously God’s intervention (98–101). L.’s own epistemology begins with human experience as fully corporeal, mediated by affect as well as by knowledge, and as engaged. Christianity’s first language is that of the Bible and liturgy. For example, in the liturgy we engage mystery through common embodied things and gestures. Yet, at the same time and contrary to some post-modern theologies, L. continues, the embodied things we encounter exist only within a rupture; that is, embodied as they are, they simultaneously manifest what is beyond us and the world. For L., all other religious languages are secondary. They are meta-languages, distant in different degrees from Christianity’s embodied core.

Scriptural language is largely like that of liturgy—a proclamation and praxis by an engaged, believing community. It is fragmentary and expressed in metaphors, poetry, and other literary genres or devices. A theology that advances a grand narrative is not faithful to its origins in these fragmentary expressions. Tatian in the Diatesseron mistakenly tried to harmonize the Gospels into a single whole. The Greek Fathers continued this mistake and later theologians forgot the primacy of scriptural language and forgot that their accounts were based on metaphors. Theology, as Kierkegaard rightly showed, has to be fragmentary. Knowing when to be silent liberates the theologian. L. commends Barth (and the above account reminds us of Barth).

There is a genuine richness in L.’s reflections that I hope the above partial description suggests. Yet problems do emerge. L.’s interpretation of Scripture is conflicted. He recognizes that it witnesses to God’s irruption into this world. Yet he does not acknowledge that scriptural metaphors and poetry frequently express God’s real symbols—for example, the appearances of the resurrected Jesus—beyond what can be expressed by simple declarative sentences. Theology must recognize the primacy of Scripture and liturgy, but their realistic basis and meaning cannot be defended without acknowledging their ontological content. Similarly, Scripture as a whole includes communication with Greeks, implying an acceptance of
implicitly metaphysical knowledge, although L. simply overemphasizes differences between the Word made flesh and the Greek *logos* (see 82, 182–84). Scripture itself does not justify a fideism to which L.’s theology is open. And if we recognize the place of hermeneutics in any and all communication, grand narratives (e.g., those of Augustine or Aquinas, let alone those of Paul or John), seem called for, even if from a later perspective we may partially modify them.

L. cannot accept this possibility because he invalidly claims that phenomenology, which does in fact have much to offer today, undermines metaphysics. I and others have written on this theme extensively elsewhere; here I can simply suggest several bases for an alternate grounding for theology and epistemology. A phenomenology based in part on cognitive developmental psychologists (e.g., Jean Piaget and James and Eleanor Gibson) can help us gain common ground in contemporary experience that diverse epistemologies must account for, and help us evaluate Aquinas’s teaching that we know reality as being. Such studies can both validate Aquinas’s claim and enlarge his epistemology to account for forms of knowledge he did not directly study (e.g., mathematical physics), and to relate this knowledge to time and to man’s search for being (rather than simply his knowledge of being). (Perhaps the failure to use a contemporary phenomenology on the part of some Thomists contributes to a chasm between much contemporary philosophical and theological reflection and a classical reflection.)

Issues I have with L.’s position recur in his further attempt to base his ethics simply on phenomenology. Does not one who makes a moral judgment profess that what is at issue is the well-being or not of human beings? And does this not imply a metaphysics? Pope John Paul II in *Fides et Ratio* (nos. 82, 83) certainly thinks it does.

*St. Anselm’s Abbey, Washington*

M. John Farrellly, O.S.B.


Many today agree that, just as the message of Jesus was transformed through its movement from a Jewish into a Greek cultural matrix, so too entry into the scientific framework of our cosmic and planetary story requires significant theological adjustment. This work of Gordon Kaufman, Professor Emeritus of Harvard Divinity School, makes a proposal for that shift that merits far more commentary than a short appraisal can provide. Nevertheless, I offer seven pairs of observations.

I begin with two suppositions. First, the work forms an integral part of a broader theological vision developed in the course of K.’s impressive theological career, including works on method, a major constructive statement on the Christian vision, and an essay on God and creation (*In the Beginning . . . Creativity* [2004], a companion to *Jesus and Creativity*). Within this context, K. presents a Christology from below, beginning with Jesus of
Nazareth. Second, the broad structure of this work can be summarized in terms of its method and goals: it uses a method of correlation to interpret Christian attachment to Jesus Christ in terms that make sense within the framework of contemporary cosmology and a history of our planet and race (88). His work intends a credible account of the Jesus story “in relation to this world-picture” (83, xiii).

The two fundamental and constructive concepts of the work are announced in its title, and each one has an antithesis. The first is “creativity,” or more fully “serendipitous creativity,” that functions as a synonym for “God.” Creativity or God is the transcendent, dynamic ground of the universe, as contrasted with a personal agent who exercises oversight in an anthropomorphic way. The other is Jesus (of Nazareth). But Jesus can be construed in two very different ways. Traditionally Christianity focused on understanding Jesus himself following the line of the development of Christian doctrine about his person. In place of this, K. concentrates on the story of the creative energy that faith in Jesus has released into history, beginning most intensely after the Easter experience of the disciples.

This second story has two acts. The first act stretches from Jesus to the present. The effects of Christian faith have been momentous for both good and evil, but its self-correcting potential, linked to Jesus himself, is positive. Jesus embodied creativity, and it spread through the movement that is Christianity itself. The second act begins at any given present and stretches into the future: it is the faith journey held out to each person today and the Christian community as a whole.

K., however, makes two major adjustments to the traditional Christian story. One is that, by keeping his analysis to the naturalistic level, he cannot affirm that God, as creativity, is personal (14–18). He also believes that a consistent non-dualist view of reality does not allow an afterlife awaiting humanity (57–58).

Yet he retains two fundamental elements of a deep Christian life: the one is a meditation by which one finds centeredness through a connection to the source of the awesome creativity of reality (60–61); the other is a deep motivation to participate, through the commitment of one’s freedom, to the movements of personal healing, social justice, peace, and reconciliation in the pattern of Jesus (52–54).

This book left me with two questions. (1) Why cannot “serendipitous creativity,” which actually becomes personal in the human embodiment of it where human freedom and creativity coalesce (86), be itself personal? I do not understand the implicit metaphysics of a generating force that is claimed to be transcendent to what it creates (28), nonetheless creating something larger and higher than itself and/or being unequal to what it actually creates. Second, why cannot one hope for eternal life, if one can hope for a better human future on the basis of “creativity’s” record (53–54)? Barring such a hope, the preliminary optimism of this work turns to ultimate despair, at least relative to the many whose life and death entailed little more than suffering and for those today who face nothing else.

These are big questions, but many ask them today. This book contributes
significantly to discussing those questions and cannot be bypassed by anyone interested in the questions in a professional way.

*Union Theological Seminary, New York*  
**ROGER HAIGHT, S.J.**


Participating in the contemporary retrieval of the mystery of Trinity in Christian praxis, Farrelly traces the development of trinitarian doctrine from its vestiges in the Scriptures to its various interpretations in contemporary theology. He engages an impressive, broad range of theological and philosophical insights from East and West and from Catholic and Protestant traditions. As a self-proclaimed “disciple,” his conversation partner is Thomas Aquinas. His balanced, foundational engagement with Aquinas results in both agreement and disagreement with Thomas’s perspectives. This balance is noticeable in his discussion of Aquinas’s often-criticized statement that God has no real relation to creation and thus remains unchanged and unaffected by the events of history. Insisting that “our primary analogue for God should not be being but *personal* being,” (132–33, italics F.’s), F. argues convincingly that “God’s free and loving decision to create and redeem” entails personal relationships with human beings. These relationships “make a difference to God” (133), involve change in God, but do not contradict God’s perfection or simplicity. Not only does this understanding of God as personal being result in “a kind of history of the trinitarian relations with human beings” (138), but also “a kind of history in the relationships among the persons of the Trinity themselves” (130). F. concludes that we can and must speak of the Father’s compassion for the suffering Son, which, in turn, “indicates . . . some change” in the mutual relation of the Father to the Son.

F. tackles, with varied degrees of success, several topics of particular significance to a contemporary retrieval of Trinity. In his discussion of the Trinity’s relation to salvation and creation, F. presents a judicious and enlightened examination of evolutionary cosmology in dialogue with divine creativity. Without the benefit of a panentheistic paradigm, which F. associates primarily with Hegelian and process thought, he affirms God’s continuous creation and the evolutionary process as “a participation in the process immanent in God himself” (153). He deftly handles such cosmological dimensions as natural selection and chance, the anthropic principle and downward causation, and teleology and randomness with skill and insight. His treatment of these dimensions offers a viable analysis of cosmic creativity that in the main preserves the integrity of both theology and science as each engages the other in the pursuit of truth.

F. also responds, though insufficiently, to the contemporary critique of the Trinity as patriarchal and thus oppressive of women. Critical of faulty interpretations of divine paternity that translate into practices adverse to
women, F. opts nonetheless for a theologically uncritical response. F.’s contention that “God chose a male to symbolize the second person of the Holy Trinity in the economy of salvation,” coupled with his claim that “maleness is constitutive of Jesus’ humanity” (179), comes dangerously close to implying that maleness is constitutive of salvation—an implication that feminist Christology and soteriology have summarily rejected. He also proposes employing female-gendered pronouns for the Holy Spirit since “the major symbols of the Holy Spirit in Scripture are feminine” (178). However, this corrective—already deemed inadequate by most feminist theologians—simply reinforces gender stereotypes that are products of the patriarchal imagination itself. Moreover, in view of the underdeveloped pneumatology rampant in Christianity, this hardly seems to promise equality for divine or human persons.

Despite the shaky gender ground upon which F. reconstructs his pneumatology, he nonetheless presents a fine discussion of the Holy Spirit within the Trinity. He carefully explores and develops the activities of the Spirit in Scripture and proposes that one consider the Holy Spirit as “a dynamism, [in] an empowering of persons” and “in an active self-emergence of matter at each level of evolution” (196–97). Terming this dynamism eros, F. preserves the understanding of the Holy Spirit as Love, the Love, in Dante’s words, “that moves the sun and others stars” as well as human beings. Finally, F. is to be commended for his attempt to work out a spirituality consistent with the trinitarian theology he has unfolded. Communal, ecclesial, and Eucharistic, his proposals for a trinitarian spirituality are rich and thought-provoking, as are his insights on trinitarian theology throughout. The intricacies and intellectual rigor of his arguments are well worth the effort. They enrich one’s vision of the central Christian mystery through lenses both ancient and new.

Barry University, Miami Shores, Fla.

GLORIA L. SCHAAB


While this study, through the use of postcolonial theory, poststructuralist psychoanalysis, and political-liberationist-feminist hermeneutics, provides insight into the theology of the cross, it achieves its distinctiveness as a narrative theology by its appeal to Asian/Korean American experience. Using Korean notions of jeong (agape, eros, filial love, compassion, empathy, solidarity, relationality) and han (ruptured heart, original wound, world sorrow, personal and collective experience of alienation), Joh establishes categories (and stories) with which she engages in a debate with traditional and contemporary theologies of the cross.

Following Moltmann, J. wants to reclaim the cross as a “signifier of redemptive agency” (118), a claim she finds wanting in the writings of feminist scholars (100). At the same time, she stands with the feminist critique of “traditional interpretations of the cross” (118), a critique from
which Moltmann’s “hierarchical” trinitarian Christology is not immune (81). A new theology of the cross beckons.

J. interprets the cross as performing a double-gesture: it pays homage to patriarchal concepts of power and obedience while it simultaneously subverts these very same powers (76). Postcolonial theories—focusing on the politics of identity and difference, along with notions of “hybridity,” “mimicry,” and “interstitial third space,”—provide contours for presenting this double-gesture of the cross, an action that is profoundly subversive. Especially productive in this discussion is Julia Kristeva’s notion of the “abject” (Powers of Horror [1982]) for analyzing the dynamics of oppression. J. argues that “abjection on the cross has been haunting the edges of doctrinal theology” (92). For Kristeva, abjection and love belong together just as, for J., han and jeong are “two different sides of the same heart” (111). The subversive power of the cross is then found not in the obliteration of the abject (as in traditional theology), but in its return, mimicking and symbolizing “the confrontation between the logic of love and the logic of violence” (114).

If readers are left wondering where the redemptive power of the cross resides, J.’s final chapter seeks to answer this in terms of a Christology of jeong that is both personal and political. Jesus’ own praxis of jeong is outlined with reference to the Buddhist concept of the no-self; indeed, “Jesus is awakened to no-self through jeong” (123). There is here, no doubt, a basis for developing a genuinely Asian Christology that juxtaposes rather than opposes han and love, or the cross and resurrection.

This creative scholarship provides a Christology especially relevant to a world in which oppressed and oppressor, love and hate, self and other, are interpreted in oppositional categories that privilege patriarchal dominance in its various forms. As J. informs us, “jeong never collapses the space between the I and the other” (127). It retrieves the cross as a subversive power through which our modes of solidarity and relationality can be critiqued and even transformed. Although privileging the subversive power of the cross, J. also wishes to establish its postcolonial redemptive potential. To this end, conversation with contemporary theologians writing on the cross and redemption—such as René Girard, James Alison, Stephen Finlan, and S. Mark Heim—would provide deeper grounding for her tantalizing, if somewhat technical, thesis.

Australian Catholic University, Brisbane

Gerard Hall, S.M.


This commentary on Ignatius of Loyola’s Spiritual Exercises in the light of Bernard Lonergan’s philosophical theology and complemented by outstanding
literary illustrations. The whole is Ignatian in inspiration, Lonerganian in explanation, and literary/artistic in execution.

The volume first traces Ignatius’s spiritual development from Pamplona to Rome, from romantic warrior to disciple of Christ, and highlights those graces Ignatius desired to share with others. For example, his mystical experience at Manresa gave him an understanding of the Trinity that he likened to hearing music so powerful and lovely that he broke down in tears. The *Exercises* flow from such experiences and are meant to evoke similar experiences.

There follows a commentary on the four weeks of the *Exercises* and its various meditations. The authors insist that “the retreat invites you to an encounter between you and the living Christ and his message. Meet the Risen Lord in prayer, and in all likelihood you face a showdown” (124). Or, as Lonergan described the process of conversion, “Once such options are taken and built upon, they have to be maintained or else one must go back, tear down, reconstruct. So radical a procedure is not easily undertaken; it is not comfortably performed; it is not quickly completed. It can be comparable to major surgery, and most of us grasp the knife gingerly and wield it clumsily” (125).

This book evokes the experience of the *Exercises* themselves. Sections could easily be used on retreat. Throughout, it is a call for conversion, for the purification of human desire by Ignatian “indifference,” an indifference that is itself desire as it reaches a level where ardor and charity prevail. The book evokes the “point blank” call for openness, repentance, and conversion mediated by the *Exercises*.

Ignatius’s text—as the Scriptures themselves—needs to be interpreted anew in each age. The authors frequently evoke the long tradition of commentaries on the *Exercises*. The task is facilitated by Lonergan’s analyses of the structure of human consciousness, of the biases to self-transcendence, and of the experience of grace as the Lord replaces our hearts of stone with hearts of flesh. Readers somewhat familiar with Lonergan’s work will certainly be surprised by the many parallels traced here between the *Exercises* and Lonergan’s analyses of consciousness. Amid what Lonergan calls the “polyphony” of voices in consciousness, the *Exercises* help one to discern and elect to follow the voice of the Good Shepherd.

Such analyses of consciousness are pushed to their full existential import. The authors quote Jerome Miller: “To be fully intelligent, fully rational, we must side with wonder and against the self-evidence of the present-at-hand, with horror and against the recoil that wants to flee from nothingness, with awe and against the self-importance that refuses to acknowledge the possibility of there being a reality greater than ourselves” (70). Lonergan emphasizes that the Augustinian restlessness of the human spirit is rooted in the human “capacity for holiness, a capacity for love that, in its immediacy, regards not the ever-passing shape of this world but the mysterious reality, immanent and transcendent that we name God” (30).

The authors marshal literary examples to compliment Lonergan’s theo-
retical analysis. For example, when illustrating the magnanimous desire that Ignatius sought in his retreatants, they adduce Dorothea from George Eliot’s *Middlemarch*, a woman of a “passionate, ideal nature” who experienced “the rapturous consciousness of life beyond self.” Or, when illustrating inflated egoism, they point to John D. MacDonald’s novels and one of his characters, Elmo Bliss, the small-town Florida business man and county commissioner: “I want the most people possible saying ‘Here comes Elmo’ and ‘there goes Elmo.’ I want people anxious to make sure I’m comfortable.” Whether it is Hopkins’s or Rilke’s poetry, John Keegan’s military history, Jonathan Raban’s social analysis, or Abraham Maslow’s psychological analyses, the illustrations bring the text alive.

Above all else, this book is a manual of prayer and a holy text. It demands slow, attentive, heart-felt religious reading. You get the point—and the point is you. Ignatius’s *Exercises* do not leave you room to escape from the heart-breaking experience of being loved.

Seton Hall University, South Orange, N. J. Richard M. Liddy

**ALONE IN THE WORLD? HUMAN UNIQUENESS IN SCIENCE AND THEOLOGY.**

Following on his *Duet or Duel?* (1998) and *The Shaping of Rationality* (1999), van Huyssteen here avoids generalizations about “science” and “theology” by tackling a single problem for both disciplines—namely, the question of human uniqueness—from the perspectives especially of paleoanthropology and of his own liberal Protestant tradition. Rejecting narcissistic anti-foundationalism and universalizing foundationalism (10), he offers a case study in “post-foundationalist,” “transversal” (boundary-crossing) inquiry into “those interdisciplinary spaces where the relevance of scientific knowledge can be translated into the domain of Christian theology, and vice versa” (xv, 12, 18).

Following remarks about earlier conceptions of natural theology, the first two chapters make the important point that the Darwinian canon in evolutionary theory includes a pragmatic research tradition of revision and division that influences later appraisals of interpreted experience in ways similar to what we find in histories of Christian hermeneutics (25, 46, 108). H. calls for a public theology that explores complementary “resonances” across disciplines (14, 41), not one that pursues *a priori* proofs concerning lessons from “cultural evolution” about embodied humanity and embedded traditions (40–41, 99–103, 115).

Chapter 2 reviews how Christian apologists turn the tables on socio-biologists by asking: Why assume that our brains only deceive us in responses to environmental changes when they come to religion? (59). Historically, “evolution by natural selection passed into something else as nature transcended itself into culture” (38, 48). Evolutionary epistemology identifies human cognition “as a mediator between biology and culture,”
linking “the question of human uniqueness directly to embodied consciousness, aesthetic imagination, moral awareness, and the propensity for religious belief” (49). Throughout, H. stresses the “naturalness” of religion (94–97, 204, 261).

A “comprehensive, holistic approach to the problem of embodied cognition by definition takes us beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries” (108). Taking biology seriously entails, for theology, the recovery of biblical conceptions of human beings as gendered, praying animals (relying here on Robert Jenson: 146, 316). Ultra-evolutionists, such as Pascal Boyer, explain why we are “wired” to respond as we do, but biology as such cannot validate or invalidate the cognitive contents of different cultures (57–60, 260–62).

Chapter 3 reviews substantive (Augustine, Aquinas), functionalist (von Rad), relational (Barth, Berkouwer), and eschatological interpretations of the notion of the imago Dei. Among the last, Pannenberg’s “exocentric” theological anthropology (139) best points to the “interdisciplinarity” that avoids “decontextualized abstraction” (113). Proleptically even “vegetating” human bodies image the “non-visible” triune God (141, n. 15). On this reading, neither image nor likeness is destroyed by primal sin.

 Chapters 4 and 5 marshal archeological, paleoanthropological, and neuropsychological data suggesting that minds are not so much learning machines as a “series of specialized cognitive domains,” analogous to Swiss army knives and medieval cathedrals (Steven Mithen: 194–97). Whether gradually or suddenly, Upper Paleolithic hominids developed uniquely “hardwired” brains with “cognitive fluidity” that accounts for the creativity and imagination resulting in religion and culture. Brain expansion was a consequence rather than a cause of uniquely human linguistic and symbolic competencies (234).

The centerpiece of H.’s argument is a study of Upper Paleolithic cave art in southern France. We can never know exactly what the images originally meant, but they are evidence of a uniquely human culture (242). H. is persuaded by readings of them as shamanistic interpretations of altered states of consciousness, universally characteristic of hunter-gatherer religious praxis (238–43, 250).

Chapter 6 recapitulates H.’s purpose, namely, both to indicate “the epistemic range of interdisciplinarity” for research regarding human uniqueness and to develop a cumulative argument for “radically rethinking the theological notion of imago Dei as a move away from sterile abstractions toward radical embodiment and ethically responsible action, a move that should resonate transversally with disciplines of both theology and paleoanthropology” (273, 307).

In his concluding chapter, H. upholds theological appropriations of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of the body (276), Heschel’s mindfulness of the Holocaust (but not Hiroshima?), and Edward Farley’s underscoring of human vulnerability and moral accountability (294–98, 300). We are not made “in” God’s image; being human as such images God’s action by the imitation of divine holiness (274, 296). H. criticizes Farley’s theology as too
free floating (306) and Kaufman’s as too crypto-scientistic (282). His criticizing others for their being too abstract is slightly ironic, since H. shares the view that thinking abstractly is part of what makes human beings unique (225). Emphasizing concreteness for him entails honoring the full historical, theological tradition.

Scientists will continue to ask about non-human animal communication and artificial intelligence, theologians about radical evil, and readers will eventually tire of “post-foundational” mantras. But H. makes a strong case for rethinking traditional notions in a contemporary interdisciplinary context, not abandoning them altogether (see 106, 281).

Trinity College, University of Toronto

Peter Slater


Stoltzfus claims that the theological potential of music has yet to receive the attention it deserves. Joining a contemporary search for esthetic analogies for use in theological reflection, he begins by sketching the musicology, philosophy, and theology of both the Pythagorean and the Orphic/Dionysian traditions—the former more associated with form/objectivity; the latter with feeling/subjectivity. Throughout, S. seeks to avoid the simplistic dichotomies often typical of esthetic studies. For example, he points out both the Pythagorean and Orphic streams in the Platonic dialogues and in the writings of Augustine.

S. then launches into a study of what he calls Friedrich Schleiermacher’s Orphic expressivism and Karl Barth’s Pythagorean turn—their focuses, respectively, on subjectivity and objectivity—viewed through musical lenses. He outlines their musical biographies (whether and how they were trained in musical theory and performance), the major musical theorists of their times and possible influence, their texts in which notions of the theological relevance of music appear, and critiques and commentaries that touch on musical imagery. The primary materials S. identifies are extensive, and he gathers them, along with secondary sources, into helpful synthetic wholes. He avoids the simplifications he dreads far better in his interpretation of Schleiermacher (and his presentation of Barth’s admittedly dualistic reading of Schleiermacher) than he does in his reading of Barth himself. For example, he misses the fact that the objectivist stress of the second edition of Barth’s Commentary on Romans was considerably modified in the later Church Dogmatics, where one comes upon significant and sustained appreciations of the expressivist, experiential, and participatory dimension of faith (albeit in a secondary, responsive mode to objectivity). Nonetheless, S. impressively makes the case that musical theory and/or performance influenced the theology of both thinkers.

S. states early on, however, that “although I treat them with sympathy, Schleiermacher and Barth ultimately function to help us articulate the need
for Wittgenstein’s approach” (17). Thus his penultimate chapter features Ludwig Wittgenstein’s views on what and how theology might learn from musical esthetics, a preferred alternative approach that incorporates Orphic and Pythagorean elements but also moves those elements into a transposed register. “Performance” is the central feature here, alerting the reader to S.’s preference for the focus on performance among many musical theorists. S. reads Wittgenstein as deliberately participating in this trend and as working out his views of language games in its light. Here his reading of Wittgenstein is nuanced and appealing. In fact, the animating core of S.’s study is the “postmodern” intuition that we must overcome in performance the object-subject split (and its correspondence model of truth), especially with regard to the question of God. Further, S. invokes Wittgenstein’s notion of the nonrepresentationalist nature of music, suggesting that performance theory is congenial to it, and that both are congenial to the doing of theology.

This notion of the congeniality of nonrepresentationalism, performance, and the doing of theology figures even more prominently in S.’s concluding chapter, as he supplements the notion with a liberationist notion of praxis (also found in Wittgenstein). Further, he transposes Gordon Kaufman’s methodological criteria of relativization and humanization into the musical-esthetic criteria of authenticity and responsibility, insisting that the theologian-performer must strive for performative authenticity through “a continual process of conceptual and metaphysical purgation” (257). Authenticity will help the performance, it is claimed, come across as not “false,” while responsibility opens up a dimension of ethical commitment needed within the actual natural and social world within which we live. Here S. “invokes” (rather than “makes the case for”) a rather vague commitment to critical action and discernment in the “Beloved Community” (257).

This final chapter is S.’s least developed, remaining largely in a rough, programmatic outline. Unfortunately representationalism is never defined; neither is the case for the nonrepresentationalist nature of music explored in any sustained way. Metaphysics is dismissed without much analysis. The key animating and grammatical influences guiding S.’s methodology remain intuitive and subterranean, in need of more elucidation to be convincing. This rough closing chapter, however, ought not detract from the impressive and provocative analysis throughout this study. All in all, S.’s view of Wittgenstein is nicely differentiated and usable by theologians.

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

WILLIAM THOMPSON-UBERUAGA


The last two decades have witnessed the emergence of comparative theology as a branch of Christian theology, distinct from related disciplines like the history of religions, comparative religion, and theologies of reli-
gions. Comparative theology is characterized by both concrete and sustained engagement with one or more religious traditions followed by a reflective return to one’s own tradition. Comparative theologians seek to contribute creatively to Christian faith and life first by remaining vulnerable to the truth encountered in the other and then by exploring the inevitable tension between that vulnerability and fidelity to their home tradition. Francis Clooney captures this tension well when he wonders whether some Christian readers of the *Gītā* “may never be able to hear the voice of Jesus without an echo of *Gītā* 18:66” (207). Cornille underscores this same tension by insisting that a “Christian reading of the *Bhagavad Gītā* can no more consist in merely superimposing Christian beliefs and presuppositions on a non-Christian text, than it can involve simply taking the text wholesale into the Christian tradition. It rather involves a real dialogue in an atmosphere of respect for the radical irreducibility of the ‘other’ text” (6).

The present volume inaugurates Peeters’s/Eerdmans’s new series of Christian Commentaries on Non-Christian Sacred Texts; at present at least three other volumes are in process. The series promises to provide a forum for Christian reflection on the sacred scriptures and classic texts of other religious traditions and to attest the meaningfulness of comparative theology as a form of constructive Christian theology.

*Song Divine* exemplifies the two-fold contribution for which comparative theology strives. First, the contributors offer nuanced readings of both the *Gītā* and its rich commentary traditions stemming from classical thinkers such as Sankara (8th c. CE), Rāmānuja (12th c. CE), Madhva (13th c. CE), and Vedānta Desika (14th c. CE). Indologists and scholars of Hindu religious traditions will recognize and endorse the sophisticated and deep treatments of original Indian source material. Two examples are illustrative. First, Gavin Flood’s nuanced presentation of detachment (*asakti*) in the *Gītā* stands well on its own and, in the context, helps situate the theme when it resurfaces in the other essays. Second, Michael Barnes’s rehearsal of the *Gītā*’s development of the Upanishadic Absolute Brahman into a more theistic, personal, and gracious Lord Krishna recommends in the reader a practical shift from ritual “sacrifice” to devotion to and participation in Krishna (*bhakti*), devotion and participation that—Barnes *qua* comparativist is keen to point out—implies a theology of grace in which Christians may encounter familiar resonance. The contributors’ proficiency in the *Gītā* and their detailed study of classical material exemplify C.’s concern to take the textual “other” seriously in its non-reducible otherness, since domestication into “more of the same” distorts both the other and the learning opportunity it occasions.

The volume’s second major contribution arises from the fact that the authors—Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican—draw from a wide spectrum of ancient and contemporary Christian source material to marshal points of contact with the *Gītā*. Examples include the writings of St. Paul (Bart Bruehler, Reid Locklin, Clooney), Evagrius Ponticus (Gavin Flood), St. Ignatius of Loyola (Barnes, Jacques Scheuer), The Book of Common
Prayer (Rachel McDermott), and Simone Weil (Maria Clara Bingemer). Whether these comparisons suggest convergence, divergence, or both, Christian source material and the Gītā become reading guides generating what Arvind Sharma elsewhere has called “reciprocal illumination” (Religious Studies and Comparative Methodology [2005]). Each essay is unique in its chosen theme and genre in that it may focus “on a particular verse, a paragraph or central philosophical concept or spiritual category within the text” (8). The result is a far-reaching fecundity of interpretation, suggestive of yet further comparisons to be drawn.

The volume’s breadth of voice, source material, and genre represents its strength and weakness: the former in that the commentary is really a set of ten distinct commentaries; the latter in that the plurality of voices, comparisons, and genres squelches any hope for a single, unified commentary. Readers with systematic proclivities may be frustrated by the table of contents’ lack of thematic organization or topical foci, which absence may, however, be viewed as a product both of the Gītā’s fecundity and of the volume’s goal of provoking and augmenting the Christian theological imagination rather than of serving as the Christian commentary on the Gītā, (a finality that no classic text will grant, whether read comparatively or not).

While perhaps too technical for use in undergraduate courses, the volume will interest graduate students and scholars in fields ranging from NT studies (Paul and John especially), spirituality (especially Ignatian), political theology, Indology, Srivaisnavism, and all those interested in the possible ways the Bhagavad Gītā addresses Christians.

Gonzaga University, Spokane

John N. Sheveland


Farley’s eagerly anticipated book delivers exactly what it ambitiously promises: a framework for Christian sexual ethics. Its first five chapters comprise the prolegomena to an adequate ethic of sexuality, an outline of critical approaches and phenomena that must be taken seriously in order to undertake sexual ethics without dishonest shortcuts. F. follows this outline with a dense, constructive chapter that develops concrete criteria for sexual ethics within a framework of justice and virtue, and ends by demonstrating how her method illuminates the ethics of marriage and family, gay and lesbian relationships, and divorce. The book is not only Catholic in outlook but also catholic in method, drawing (in an idiom coherent with contemporary versions of both natural law and the Wesleyan Quadrilateral) upon Christian and other religious traditions and cultures, Christian Scripture, recent secular reinterpretations of sexuality and culture, and social sciences, all critically interpreted.

F.’s argument is self-consciously consistent with her earlier works, such as Personal Commitments (1986) and “An Ethic for Same-Sex Relations”
(in *A Challenge to Love* [1983]). Through them all she is developing tools by which we can thoroughly and thoughtfully evaluate practices within their particular situations and cultural contexts, rather than laying out permanent norms (which she believes often function as taboos, short-circuiting moral reflection). New here is her careful demonstration of means for employing diverse contemporary, global, and cumulative Western thinking on sexuality. For the benefit of students and informed general readers F. efficiently surveys the important primary and secondary sources, but she also performs a subtle service for specialists. For example, chapter 3’s succinct cross-cultural survey of religious beliefs and practices around sexuality escapes superficiality by using examples from global religious cultures to issue a series of methodological corrections to typical Western hegemonic missteps: avoiding the reification of “primitive” cultures; attending to a culture’s internal critiques rather than only to its dominant discourse; and undertaking careful rereadings of “exotic” texts to discern nuances in the relationship between pleasure and asceticism. Likewise, chapters 2 and 4 go beyond describing and evaluating the content of various historical Western beliefs about sex to point out that Western (and therefore, as a matter of intellectual heritage, Christian) reflection on sexuality inevitably returns again and again to the questions of body, desire, and gender—implying that any workable Christian ethic must handle all three well.

If the heart of the method appears in chapters 1–5, the heart of the ethic—the foundational, theologically-inspired commitments that ground the method’s application—appear late in chapter 5 and in chapter 6. Here F. develops her anthropology with an emphasis on freedom, relationality, and active receptivity. Here too F. introduces a crucial distinction between “minimal” justice (what is absolutely required) and “maximal” justice (what would be ideal—in the sense of perfectly fitting—for this person, relationship, and situation) (215–16). All the while she carefully avoids the idea that justice can be measured on a single axis that runs from abjection to a singular flawlessness. The solid, compelling, and familiar norms outlined here are implicit in all of F.’s ethical writing and resonant with the work of Karen Lebaqcz, Marie Fortune, Mary Pellauer, Christine Gudorf, Mary E. Hunt, Lisa Sowle Cahill, Patricia Beattie Jung, and many other recent feminist authors who address sex and sexuality; still, in this context, I would have appreciated F.’s more extensively developing the theological grounding of these norms and their connection to the methodological chapters. Similarly, their application to specific issues in chapter 7 is an intriguing sampling, rather than an exhaustive exploration, of how norms, sources, and cultural/religious habits of thinking converge on each topic.

As the foregoing comments suggest, the most likely objection to the book—simultaneously salient and silly—will be that it is too short. It is salient because even after the extensive prolegomenon one wants clearer connections, deeper justifications, and more comprehensive applications—yet the subject is too large for one volume. It is silly because F. argues precisely that the kinds of derivations of one-size-fits-all rules that could
have swelled the work to two volumes would run counter to an honest method. For F., to do sexual ethics is to outfit her readers with a framework applicable to all questions of sexuality and to point them toward the important primary and secondary literature in the field that will enrich their own reflection on particular cases. In this, she succeeds marvelously. Her broad norms and caveats are clear and convincing; copious footnotes guide the reader to all the major sources and controversies in the Western history and ethics of sexuality, and to many global ones. The book is highly recommended for scholars in the field and for graduate students as an introduction to ethical method generally.

Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.  
Cristina L. H. Traina


Originally delivered at a conference in November 2002 at the College of Holy Cross (Worcester, Mass.), Practicing Catholic represents an ambitious interdisciplinary project that engages cultural anthropologists, liturgical scholars, and medievalists in a conversation about Catholicism as an embodied, performative faith, and Christian liturgy as “an engagement in the human pathos and divine ethos of life” (9). The book’s structure itself models that interdisciplinary dialogue as the various contributions are interspersed with commentaries by scholars from different fields. This methodology is one of the book’s greatest strengths. Too often, divergent academic paths fail to intersect with emerging scholarship in other disciplines, and scientific explorations remain in safe isolation. These essays challenge such myopia.

The book is divided into six parts, each introduced by an editor. All three contribute from the unique perspectives of their respective disciplines to the very helpful introduction in part 1. In part 2, Gary Macy’s foundational essay, “The Future of the Past,” establishes the historical framework for what follows, emphasizing the importance of reading “beyond the text.” Macy raises important questions about how scholars interpret historical data while he insists that the historical interpretation of ritual practice depends largely on the particular historian’s view of the past.

A broad historical period is represented—from medieval Europe through colonial Peru to the modern Philippines and, closer to home, to the Church in central Massachusetts as it responds ritually to the clergy sex abuse scandals. Despite such diverse histories, cultures, ethnicities, and complex social contexts, the editors succeed extraordinarily well in presenting a text that is cohesive and accessible. The book is also balanced. Joanne Pierce’s essay, “Marginal Bodies: Liturgical Structures of Pain and Deliverance in the Middle Ages,” confirms that embodiment has not always been constitutive of Catholicism. Indeed, history offers numerous examples of the Catholic Church’s fear of the body. P. notes that the
Canons of Hippolytus (ca. 340 CE) directed new mothers to stay outside the church for 40 days if the baby was male and 80 days if the baby was a female. And when they did enter church for one reason or another, they were to be seated with the catechumens (60).

Part 3 examines contemporary healing rituals. Here, Morrill presents a case study from his time at the College of the Holy Cross in which he applied the four stages within the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults (RCIA) to the sacrament of anointing. He writes: “My (theological) theory was that, just as the asethetically elaborate celebration of the Sacraments of Initiation at the Easter Vigil constitutes a ritual climax that is nonetheless dependent for its pastoral effectiveness on the other three stages of the Rite, so too our elaborate communal celebration of the Sacrament of Anointing within Mass at Holy Cross could be significantly enhanced by similar stages of formative pastoral engagement” (105). Subsequent parts of the book bring the discussion full circle in treating “Catholic Ritual as Political Practice” (part 4), “Contemporary Mass Media as a Domain for Catholic Ritual Practice” (5), while it concludes with an interdisciplinary discussion on theory and practice (6).

My one reservation concerns the book’s capacity to be read along ecumenical lines. While its fundamental contention that Catholicism “valorizes the human body as a sanctified site molded by God, and as a place in the world for experiencing and representing the divine” (4) cannot be contested, I suspect that Anglicans, Orthodox, and Lutherans would recognize their own churches in those words. The extraordinary amount of movement within the Orthodox Divine Liturgy, for example, the repetitive processions, the kissing of icons and relics, makes Orthodoxy one of the most embodied Christian churches. Daniel Goldstein’s fascinating essay, “The Customs of the Faithful Evangelicals and the Politics of Catholic Fiesta in Bolivia” (chap. 10), does consider the subject of embodiment across confessional lines, but notes the Evangelical disdain for dance and bodily movement in contrast to the Catholic use of ritual dance in Bolivian popular piety.

That said, however, the book leads the reader imaginatively through uncharted waters and invites scholars to widen the interdisciplinary circle, continuing the conversation.

Gregorian University, Rome
KEITH F. PECKLERS, S.J.


Pablo de Greiff, Director of Research at the International Center for Transitional Justice (ICTJ), has edited a magisterial volume dedicated to the central and most pressing issue of transitional justice, namely, the practice of compensating victims within transitional societies for harms endured primarily at governmental hands. Twenty-seven scholars from 14 different countries incisively analyze countries that, in part by means of
reparation programs, have emerged from conflicts or have undergone transitions to democratic governance. *The Handbook of Reparations* provides a broad range of critically important information about past experiences with major reparations programs as well as valuable normative proposals for future reparations policies. The fact that such compensation often falls short of what proportionate justice requires does not make it irrelevant. While the communications media habitually focus more on the criminal prosecution of human rights violators and even on civil lawsuits brought against them, the international community is increasingly turning its attention to reparations for victims. The church has often noted that justice includes both prosecutorial and reparative dimensions. This volume offers a valuable resource for theologians who want to think systematically and more comprehensively about the latter.

Those who work in Catholic social ethics and in liberation and political theologies often insist on the importance of viewing history “from below,” from the standpoint of the oppressed. The *Handbook* concentrates attention on the needs and rights of these victims. Reparations are both symbolic (monuments, museums, memorial events, etc.) and financial. Both represent tangible ways the state fulfills its commitment to remedy the massive harms it perpetrated under previous regimes. Criminal justice is valuable, but in many cases it is restricted by practical constraints to focusing on a few paradigmatic offenders. More importantly, criminal justice addresses perpetrators rather than victims and strives to rectify the damage done to society rather than to specific victims. In the long run, criminal justice must be promoted by institutional reforms and the rule of law. But pursuit of this goal most often does not address the specific restorative needs of particular victims.

The *Handbook* examines the key factors and theories involved in the design and implementation of large-scale programs geared for delivering material compensation to victims of atrocities and other human rights abuses. Part 1 presents a series of detailed case studies that illustrate lessons learned from international experience with reparations programs (e.g., Chile, Argentina, El Salvador, and Haiti), and discusses some of the empirical data relevant to reparations studies. Part 2 examines the various challenges faced by those who design or administer specific reparations programs, particularly those aimed at large scale application. A critical issue here concerns the meaning of fairness and justice when full restitution is unobtainable (e.g., how can one provide reparations for rape or torture, let alone the murder of a loved one?). The groundbreaking chapters of this section would by themselves have constituted a major contribution to our understanding of reparations. Part 3 reproduces some critical primary documents, including important legislation from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, for the first time translated into English, again making this a key volume for understanding the issue of reparation.

The *Handbook* does not include contributions from theologians but its topics are critically important for anyone concerned with Christian social ethics or moral theology. Many of the case studies have been deeply in-
fluenced by religious movements and the churches, for example, in South Africa, Brazil, and Chile. In some cases, human rights advocates continue to seek restitution for harm done to the church and individual Christians, such as the Jesuits at the University of Central America, by repressive states. As the church continues to struggle with the suffering caused by the clergy sexual abuse scandal, the church itself would benefit from greater knowledge of the ethical (and not only the legal) obligations regarding reparation. This volume is thus an essential work that ought to be in every college or seminary library.

*Boston College*  

*Stephen J. Pope*
SHORTER NOTICES


Schuller’s volume began as lectures given in 2002 at the University of Victoria, marking 50 years since the discovery of Cave 4 at Qumran. Unlike many previous treatments of the scrolls that focus on laws, community rules, the messiah, and the end of days, S.’s four chapters offer a concise history of qumranic discovery and research. Chapter 1 surveys the different concerns that guided research each decade since 1947. Chapter 2 turns to what we have learned about Scripture from Qumran, synthesizes the vast scope of biblical texts discovered there, and shows how these discoveries illuminate our understanding of scriptural development. S. then present topics hardly covered elsewhere, namely, prayer and worship (chap. 3) and women (chap. 4). Previously S. had written a dissertation on prayer texts (4Q 380–81), and she has continued her study of, and collaboration on, similar texts. Offering an excellent survey of prayer texts from Qumran, she spells out how the texts witness to the practice of communal prayer and locates the texts in the history of Jewish prayer. This chapter establishes prayer and worship as a central topic for further Qumran studies.

Much the same can be said of chapter 4 on women at Qumran. S. demonstrates a different perspective, made possible if one assumes a community that includes women rather than one comprised only of male celibates. Texts that mention women specifically also suggest that many other texts assume a mixed population even though they are written from androcentric viewpoints. S.’s careful study offers rare glimpses into the world of marriage, divorce, sexuality, and position in the community. Judicious clarity marks her presentation, and a wealth of information finds its way into the footnote documentation. This book is the place to begin for an overview of Dead Sea Scrolls studies, clear presentations of new topics, and hints about future directions of research.

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


Those accustomed to historical critical methods will find here a fresh reading of Jonah proposed by a specialist in Romance philology and comparative literature. Perry has benefited from ongoing association with permanent and visiting Israeli scholars at the New Haven Shabbat Study group. Their methods and viewpoints, those of classical rabbinic commentators and even some non-Jewish interpreters, are represented in P.’s study, while his own specialist perspective controls and integrates the investigation. He broadens the text’s imaginative context so that his book can serve as a prolegomenon to a personal reading of Jonah. His first two
sections present selective commentaries on each chapter of Jonah, highlighting Jonah’s suicide, prayers, and near death experience, the Ninevites, and the *ki-kayon* episode. (This uncertain Hebrew word is usually translated “gourd,” though the JPS Tanakh translation glosses it as “ricinus [castor oil] plant.” Augustine, who favored “gourd,” and Jerome, who considered “ivy” more honest, intensely debated the issue). P. then offers a theology of Jonah (part 3) and suggests new literary perspectives on the book (part 4). Four excursuses, a bibliography, and three indexes (names and subjects, ancient sources, and Hebrew words) complete the study.

Reading the present into the past (hermeneutics by way of eisegesis) is dramatically different from bridging the past to the present (exegetical hermeneutics). Jewish biblical interpretation has always focused on finding contemporary meaning of ancient texts for each era (recall the *pesharim* appropriation of the past for the present at Qumran). This book splendidly represents Jewish hermeneutics by way of eisegesis. Historical critical readings of ancient texts are always concerned to uncover what the ancient author wrote and intended for his or her time and immediate audience. While that method may be more respectful of the mind of the sacred author who had a message from God for a particular audience, some may find it less interesting than the Jewish interpretative methods well represented here.

John J. Pilch
Georgetown University, Washington


Cox assesses the literary quality of the NT by identifying patterns and combinations of ideas, what he calls the NT’s “DNA,” that give the NT its distinctiveness and coherence. In the first of three parts, he identifies literary patterns (i.e., DNA) and their effects on
four major types of NT literature (gospel, epistle, church history, and apocalypse) for which Luke, John, Acts, Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, and Revelation stand as examples. Part 2 examines the influence of these patterns on a broad range of English and American literature that includes works by Rudyard Kipling, John Donne, George Herbert, T. S. Eliot, Sinclair Lewis, William Blake, Emily Dickinson, William Faulkner, and various revivalist hymns. Part 3 reproduces some of the works discussed in part 2.

The notion of literary DNA is pedagogically appealing and C.’s classifications do correspond to genuine literary features such as journey, reversal, paradox, symbolism, irony, and repetition. He walks the reader through a vast body of English and American literature—convincingly showing how they replicate some NT patterns even when they take a critical stance toward Christianity. However, his exposition suffers from many limitations, four examples of which I mention here. (1) C.’s analysis does not encompass the full scope of NT literature; conspicuously absent are the Pastoral and the Catholic letters. (2) He assumes Protestant evangelical Christianity as normative when describing Christian faith. (3) When discussing the NT authors, he simply assumes Luke to be a physician, John to be the beloved disciple, and Paul to be a Roman citizen educated in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel—details mentioned solely in Acts. (4) He advances some conjectures without much foundation, for example, he explains the repetitive features of the Cornelius story by supposing that the author may have died before revising the work. Despite these problems, though, some sections can be useful for a course on the NT’s influence on other forms of literature.

JEAN-FRANÇOIS RACINE
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


Dungan argues that the fourth-century cooperation between bishops and the Roman government enabled the forced definition of the NT canon and ended a debate over what constituted normative writings. Crucial for D. is the distinction between Scripture (an unofficial, but normative collection of sacred writings) and canon (a group of sacred writings, limited by the force of an authority). The book thus contains a strong undercurrent about power dynamics between free, scholarly inquiry and the force of church authority.

Providing a helpful comparison of criteria used in Greek philosophical schools to evaluate and interpret the founder’s writings with the criteria used by pre-Nicene Christians to determine and interpret their sacred writings, D. roots the notion of canon in the desire for certitude characteristic of the Greek polis. The hero of D.’s account is Eusebius of Caesarea for his scholarly and graded treatment (in Ecclesiastical History) of the writings that constitute Scripture. Following Constantine’s involvement in church matters at Nicaea, the bishops and the emperor worked to suppress debate and difference by authoritarian assertion and legal decree rather than by honest discussion, ending public debate until the Reformation. D. concludes by discussing (and approving) contemporary acceptance of so-called noncanonical sources and endorsements of academic evaluation processes as exemplified by Eusebius.

D. covers much historical material in a small space, and many of his particular claims are problematic. He sees Nicaea as a watershed for subsequent authoritarian suppression of dissident theological positions by edict. Yet he does not consider the action of councils prior to Nicaea, such as Antioch that condemned Paul of Samosata in 268. Nor does he explore the benefit that may come from rejecting the canon, aside from leaving the question of what constitutes Scripture to scholars rather than to ecclesiastical officials. The book, however, makes a valuable contribution to discussions of the NT canon by highlighting the influence of philosophical schools and various social and political factors on the evaluation of scriptural writings.

WILLIAM M. WRIGHT IV
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Believing that pagan Celtic culture heavily impacted Christianity, most scholars of early Irish Christianity will endorse the central premise of this book. Yet, given that pagan Celts were nonliterate and, thus, can be retrieved only through archeological evidence and late Christian sources, most of the same scholars will back away from asserting strong links between the early Celts and Christian monks. Thom, however, insists that enough is known of Celtic culture to make the link(s), especially to the monks.

“The intentionality of the Irish monks of the sixth to eight centuries [was] love of God and neighbour as oneself...it is...intrinsic to the radicality [of the gospel]” (xxiii). T. views Celtic-Christian monks as ascetics who accepted the gospel in a transforming way that eluded bishops. She provides a brilliant instance of this elusiveness by interpreting their rigorous penitentials as hope-filled guides to spirituality. Or, again, she reads the clan dominance of monasteries (often viewed as the Irish version of aristocratic craving for church property) as a practice that emerged from Celtic roots, for “in the clan the person received and developed a sense of identity” (20). Following the pioneering work of the late John Ryan, S.J., T. emphasizes the monks’ passion for learning, even to the point of withholding obedience “if a bishop is ignorant” (118), a passion for learning she considers to be derived from Celtic pagan druids and filid (legal scholars). While arguing that this culture supported radical gospel praxis, she acknowledges that not every pagan remnant benefited Christianity. Some monasteries prohibited—unsuccessfully—“dirge singing or keening...druidic practices deeply embedded in the pre-Christian society” (68).

Relying on an impressive bibliography, T. persuasively supports her claims, but she sometimes chooses her sources too selectively. On the debated royal ancestry of Saint Columcille, she cites no dissenters. Neil O’Donoghue, a spirituality specialist, is construed as a church historian to support her arguments.

T. has provided an important, innovative study, portraying Irish monasticism against its Celtic background. Scholars will quibble over pushing the evidence, but overall she has put the Celtic back into Celtic monasticism. But how ironic that a book about ascetics should be so expensive!

JOSEPH F. KELLY
John Carroll University, Cincinnati


Relying on papal, political, and civic documents, Joan Mueller provides a “case study” (6) of how Clare of Assisi, Agnes of Prague, and their companions attempted, in response to Scripture, to establish an economy of sustenance for religious women living in medieval society. M.’s book traces this pursuit of poverty from the beginnings of Clare’s connection with the brothers and her establishment at San Damiano, through the founding and development of Agnes’s monastery in Prague, to the approval of Clare’s form of life on her deathbed in 1253.

Largely preserved as correspondence between the sisters and other officials, charters, and letters of advice, and usually preserved only from the male side, the sources preserve an ongoing conversation about the nature of the sisters’ life, issues of fasting and discipline that affected the economic stability of the monastery, and questions about patronage and income. Placing this information within the broader medieval context, M. demonstrates that the women’s desire to live in absolute poverty was never easily achieved, but was effectively pursued.

While affirming her dissatisfaction with existing historical accounts, M. nevertheless relies on these same accounts, as indicated in the bibliography
and footnotes. One problem with her reading of the sources is that, at times, she assumes a univocal understanding of Franciscan life at this period that the sources themselves do not support (e.g., 68–69). In addition, she sometimes uses Franciscan hagiographical texts too uncritically as historical narratives. While providing ample support for her affirmations in the Latin sources provided in the footnotes, the method of citation is not specific and leaves one searching at times for the name of the document and/or its location. Given these caveats, M.’s study does advance scholarship on a complicated historical and religious issue.

Michael W. Blastic
St. Bonaventure University, N.Y.


Sidenvall here enlivens Newman studies as well as current discussions about pluralism and religious liberties. The book follows a familiar but interesting question: What really happened after Newman’s 1845 conversion? In his Apologia Newman himself claimed that no further changes in his core commitments occurred once he joined the Catholic Church. The rest of his life and writings, however, seem to indicate otherwise. England still wrestled with its compulsive anti-Catholicism, while Newman’s younger associates brazenly embraced Catholicism’s foreign character. Only later did Newman receive widespread admiration from England, or so we have been led to believe. S. notes that several prominent English cultural and ecclesial figures maintained cordial relations with Newman throughout his Catholic years despite their public, often harsh, anti-Catholic sentiments. How Newman, after he became Catholic, continued to interact civilly if not warmly with much of Protestant Britain, S. finds an interesting story in itself, but he also makes of it a case study on the limits of religious liberty.

Along with his study of Newman’s postconversion life, S. explores the very contemporary theological issue of whether the limits of religious pluralism exclude antpluralist perspectives? Five tight chapters follow a chronological approach, targeting the Anglican upheavals of the 1860s and the publication of Newman’s Apologia as the turning point. For some, Newman’s faith journey became a metaphor for England’s own spiritual fluctuations, while others remained emphatic in denouncing his conversion. Even the liberals who took Newman’s autobiography as an opportunity to react against British anti-Catholicism struggled with their own attitudes toward Newman’s decision. S. concludes that this history challenges the customary “progressive” paradigm where toleration always wins out. Newman’s postconversion experiences indicate that pluralism and extremist exclusivism often coexist quite handily. Throughout this study, S. argues succinctly and cautiously, making his book a welcome and provocative contribution to Newman and 19th-century studies.

Jeffrey Marlett
College of Saint Rose, Albany, N.Y.


Thomas King offers another excellent instance of his Teilhardian scholarship, in this case particularly valuable because of the broad interest in Teilhard’s “Mass.” Teilhard’s scientific and philosophical works, while they remain of keen interest to specialists, now show their age—how could they not? His devotional works, such as the “Mass” and The Divine Milieu, however, have a more timeless quality and, indeed, ring with a startling applicability to our current concerns for a spirituality that includes ecojustice. K. has provided an essential volume for anyone with those interests, clearly written and with plenty of background for the general reader, but also with a good bit of sufficiently new “meat” for the scholar.

The opening chapters lay out the biographical, philosophical/theological,
and scientific background of the “Mass.” Then follow deeper chapters on the salvation of the world, a detailed commentary on specific passages, and essay-length reflections on the “Mass,” adoration, and apostolate. Usefully, an English translation of the “Mass” is included as an appendix, along with two bonuses: a prayer service based on the “Mass” and a reflection on the implications for contemporary spiritual practice. There is a helpful bibliography, but no index.

The clarity with which K. presents Teilhard’s thought and its contemporary relevance, together with the bonuses, make this an ideal book for introducing the great paleontologist/theologian to a new generation of readers. It would serve as an excellent book for a parish educational program on science, theology, and the environment, and the central analytical chapters make it indispensable for the theological scholar in the fields it touches. Teilhard’s vision, passion, and spirituality bid to become part of the church’s permanent treasure, and K.’s book helps greatly to keep them alive.

ROBERT D. HUGHES III
University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn.


This volume brings together diverse Protestant theologians who nevertheless share a broad commitment to “the absolute uniqueness of Jesus Christ as the only Lord and Savior of humanity” (x). Alister McGrath introduces their writings as both vigorous protests against “cultural accommodationism” (xvii) and as not shying away from the theological challenge of pluralism. Elias Dantas’s opening chapter rehearses the missiological implications of the Incarnation and strongly emphasizes the distinctive character of Christianity (18–19). Three following chapters by Clark Pinnock, Graham Tomlin, and Gabriel Fackre offer vigorous reaffirmations of traditional christological doctrine, while they emphasize the centrality of the cross in line with Luther’s rejection of theologia gloriae. Mark Thompson’s rendition of Christian uniqueness appears to question the very legitimacy of interfaith conversation, although Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen claims that his trinitarian considerations enable him to encounter the religious other without compromising his own faith (127–28).

The collection truly finds an original voice when it turns to discuss the uniqueness of Christ in relation to different religious traditions. Ellen Charr-y’s reflections on the enduring theological relevance of Judaism address, with honesty and integrity, the issue of the latter’s rejection of Christ, while Paul Chung outlines a stimulating comparison between Lutheran and Buddhist approaches to justification, and Ng Kam Weng reminds Christians of the special role played by Jesus in the eschatological vision of Islam. K.K. Yeo’s essay on Confucianism and the Pauline reading of the cross treads territory that may be unfamiliar to most Western readers, while he comments on how familiarity with different traditions can deepen our understanding of the Incarnation. Sung Wook Chung’s conclusion takes up again the thread of Buddhist-Christian dialogue, ending with reflections on the irreducible tension between mission and dialogue (238–39).

This valuable collection will interest students and teachers of systematic and comparative theology, with a particular appeal to those from the Lutheran and Reformed traditions.

THOMAS CATTOI
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


Adams advances well beyond most previous discussions of Habermas and theology, both in his analytic comprehensiveness and in his focus on that which attracts theologians to Habermas and, in particular, to his theory of communicative action. A. argues, rightly,
that most contemporary theologians seek in Habermas’s work a level playing field on which people of many different religions, or none at all, can converse, while they avoid the fideism or a rationalism that Habermas ascribes to them. His theory of communicative action supplies such a playing field, though it means that normative claims must be left at the door, since for Habermas the tradition-bound framework of religious discourse is inimical to discourse ethics. If theologians engage in this discourse, he judges, they inevitably do and must abandon, at least temporarily, that which is specific to theological discourse. And their thirst for dialogue sometimes blinds them to these implications and requirements.

A. sets out this description of theologians’ appropriations of Habermas and much more in nine of his eleven chapters, but in the final two he turns to actual theological debates. Chapter 10 adjudicates between postliberal theology and the mediating theologies of Reinhold Niebuhr and David Tracy. A. traces surprising and illuminating correspondences between the Augustinianism of Milbank’s “peaceable kingdom” and Habermas’s grounding assumption that concord rather than dissonance is the basis of communicative action. The recognition that a particular tradition’s scripture is authoritative for that tradition offers some basis for dialogue, though A. thinks it “bleaker” than Habermas’s theory. Habermas wants more, but theologians go along with him at their own peril; A. settles for less, much less, but without sacrificing the normativity of each tradition. Still, while A. gives Habermas a thorough and insightful analysis, his solution of scriptural reasoning is itself surely too bleak; respectful attendance to the integrity of the other is not much of a dialogue. Again, interestingly, his notion of scriptural reasoning is constrained by limits that would appeal to good Augustinians like John Milbank and Joseph Ratzinger.

PAUL LAKELAND
Fairfield University, Conn.

Writing from many perspectives (physician, Anglican priest, chaplain, and theology tutor at St. John’s, Oxford), Carmichael offers a uniquely comprehensive study of friendship in philosophy and Christian theology. Her analyses—detailed and critical when appropriate—open up the varied dimensions of this rich topic. She presents this work as a historical prelude to a more thorough systematic analysis to come.

C. is sympathetic to Aquinas’s view (albeit informed by recent liberation and feminist thought) that agape and friendship intrinsically implicate one another; agape reaches its potential for intimacy in friendship, while friendship is stretched beyond narrow exclusivity in agape. In fact, friendship is agape in its mode of “open” intimacy. One does something for another and with another in Christian love. Agape, as unconditional service potentially open to all, stresses the former; agape as friendship, the latter, thus recognizing the other as a partner. These themes apply not only to human practitioners of love, but also to God (a special merit of Aquinas’s thought). C. gives the stars in friendship’s galaxy the attention they merit: Aristotle, Cicero, Augustine, Aelred of Rievaulx, and Aquinas. But the galaxy is still moving, and the thoughtful suggestions and critiques of later thinkers are noted and analyzed.

I hope C. will write the complete systematics she has planned, as it could make a more sustained case for her view that love is concerned with relationship, that friendship is relationship’s central form, and that such friendship entails elements that are ontological (grounded in shared being), deontological (goodness expressing itself in action), and teleological (other-directed to God and to creatures, with a view to mutual joy) (199). C. includes thoughtful suggestions as to why writings on friendship have waxed and waned; we are in a waxing phase, she thinks. I would like to see more on friendship and marital love, however, since some have argued for
the latter as the central form of relationship. But C. knows this, and even here makes some interesting suggestions.

WILLIAM THOMPSON-UBERUAGA
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh


This aptly titled collection joins three major dialogue partners: theologians and biblical scholars from the so-called mainline churches; theologians and historians from the Pentecostal and charismatic movements; and scientifically and philosophically trained scholars. The interdisciplinary dialogue in and among the twelve essays unfolds in three parts: (1) a reconception of the traditional notions of the Holy Spirit—the Spirit’s personhood and works; (2) the Spirit in Pentecostal theology; and (3) a connecting of theological, scientific, and philosophical notions of the Spirit.

The international composition of scholars (previously gathered for a consultation entitled “Pneumatology: Exploring the Work of the Spirit from Contemporary Perspectives”) makes the book an invaluable theological and ecumenical resource. The Pentecostal scholarly contributions are particularly of interest, although the volume as a whole is less focused on the relationship of Pentecostalism and pneumatology than is promised by the subtitle. The essays are well argued and documented, and reveal that both Pneumatology and Pentecostal scholarship are coming of age. The collection is woven together by a shared foundation in trinitarian thought, by a common desire to advance the theological dimensions of our understandings of the biblical and the modern, the scientific and the cosmological, and by the multidimensional framework represented by global Pentecostalism.

Welker’s solid introduction and concluding essay hold together the collection. He points to an inherent conflict of interests in the personhood of the Spirit, on the one hand, and the wide-ranging dimensions of what is meant by “spirit,” on the other. W. credibly demonstrates that a contemporary theology of the Spirit poses mutual challenges and opportunities to all dialogue partners who are joined together by a shared desire for truth. This endeavor suggests that the unfolding of a biblically based, interdisciplinary, and ecumenical theology of the Spirit may be synonymous with the emergence of a global Pentecostal theology.

WOLFGANG VONDEY
Regent University, Virginia Beach, Va.


Thompson-Uberuaga’s book is neither a typical work on Christology nor a typical investigation into the historical Jesus. Rather, it interestingly entails both, while its true contribution falls more in the field of practical theology. Applying the insights of Eric Voegelin (the book appears in a series dedicated to Voegelin’s thought), T.-U. explores the implications of relationships in Jesus’ ministry and among his followers in the aftermath of Easter. The focus falls on participation, as seen in what is described as Jesus’ “alternative community of inclusiveness.”

The book is highly theoretical, yet practical and pastoral. Herein lie both its strengths and vulnerabilities. Those dissatisfied with the abstractions of Christology and with the critical hairsplitting of historical Jesus research, those wanting to explore questions relating to the dynamics of church life and spirituality, and students of Voegelin will be impressed by T.-U.’s insights. Nevertheless, some theologians and critical exegetes will fault aspects of the book. Some will think Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God is a bit forced. In places T.-U. seems to equate the kingdom and the community, as though kingdom entails population. This antiquated idea stands somewhat in tension with T.-U.’s references to the kingdom of God as the “reign of God.” Or, claiming that participation in Jesus’
movement comprises “faith, hope, and love” will strike some as gratuitous. Other issues could be raised. Still, given its exploratory, heuristic nature, the study is successful.

Several supplementary documents can be downloaded online as material “for further study,” thus enhancing the usefulness of the book. A bibliography and an index comprising names and subjects are also provided.

Craig A. Evans
Acadia Divinity College, Wolfville, Nova Scotia


This is a wonderful book, an excellent introduction for beginning students to the study of Islam. Its ten chapters deal with subjects such as the Prophet Muhammad, the Qur’an, the basic beliefs and practices of Islam, and interfaith dialogue. One highlight is eight pages of color photographs illustrating Muslim life (unusual for introductory texts on Islam).

Two of the book’s many strengths are its respectful tone and variety of viewpoints. I am impressed with the care Hewer takes throughout; though an “outsider” to Islam, he presents as sympathetic and understanding a portrayal as any Muslim “insider” (including myself) could hope for. Again, in a world where even scholars narrowly focus on controversial views of Muslims (views often at odds with the self-understanding of the majority of the world’s Muslims), H. proceeds with sympathetic nuance. He presents different perspectives and interpretations of events found in the Muslim tradition in a way that avoids the trap of perceiving Islam as a monolithic entity.

The book is written for a British audience; thus colloquial terms such as a “football match” and “making tea” may puzzle some American readers. Minor weaknesses include the misspelling of T. B. Irving’s name throughout as “Irvine,” and the odd placement of the table of Shi’a imams facing the opening of the chapter on the Qur’an. I would have hoped for more coverage of Muslim life post 9/11, as well as of issues such as women’s roles or the wearing of hijab (the veil). These are barely discussed but are among the issues that routinely arise in courses for which this book is best suited. The book deserves wide readership.

Amir Hussain
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles


This book began as two lecture series on “Jesus and Buddha” presented in Bern and Heidelberg. Given that Ulrich Luz is a Lutheran theologian and Axel Michaels is a scholar of Buddhism, though not a Buddhist, the exchanges are self-consciously in the realm of religious studies rather than interreligious dialogue. Lectures alternate between Jesus and Shakyamuni Buddha, exploring issues of historicity and social context, central teachings, values, and religious practices. After each presentation, the other scholar offers a thoughtful response. Overall, the discussions are thorough, accurate, and helpful. The reader learns much about the original contexts of the two religious leaders, the difficulties of establishing the exact contours of their lives and teachings, and the similarities and differences between the two teachers’ perspectives.

There are, nonetheless, some questionable judgments along the way. M. tells us that Rudolf Bultmann “rejected every attempt to perceive the historical Jesus behind the kerygmatic (proclaimed Jesus)” (14), when in fact Bultmann wrote a book on the historical Jesus. L. tells us that Christianity and Buddhism are religions of the book (19). In so doing, he takes an Islamic term that would not apply in its original sense to either Jesus or Shakyamuni Buddha because neither figure is presented as receiving a textual revelation from a divine source. L. tells us that nirvana is the “extinction of life” (44) and
that it “draws the Buddhist away from this world” (45), claims with which many socially engaged Buddhists would disagree. M. compares the three bodies of the Buddha to the Christian Trinity; I would suggest that the closer analogy is to Christology, with dharmakaya analogous to the divine nature, sambhogakaya analogous to the human nature of the Risen Jesus, and nirmanakaya analogous to Jesus’ pre-resurrection human nature. M. argues that Christian prayer “requires words” (150) and L. agrees that Christian prayer “is not to enter into silence” (153). This effectively excludes much of the monastic and mystical tradition that does value silence, certainly a valuing that can and should inform and deepen interfaith understanding.

LEO D. LEFEBURE
Georgetown University, Washington


Ress provides an invaluable and engaging analysis of the ecofeminism movement in Latin America. A North American by birth, she has lived and worked in Latin America since 1970 in a variety of capacities, including as a founding member of Con-spirando, a women’s collective in Santiago, Chile, that works in the areas of ecofeminism, theology, and spirituality. R.’s methodology is shaped by women’s narratives in conversation with the diverse intellectual streams informing the current shift to ecofeminist consciousness. We quickly gain a comprehensive view of the ecofeminist landscape and an understanding of the schemas of its two most influential theologians, Elsa Tamez and Ivone Gebara. And we learn about the current conflicted status of Liberation Theology and its relationship to emerging ecofeminist thought.

Ecofeminism is defined as a radical remembering of who we are as earthlings in a universe constituted by the interdependence of all things. R. effectively draws the reader into this “remembering” by juxtaposing diverse sources such as ancient wisdom traditions, the new cosmology, indigenous cosmologies, deep ecology, feminist anthropologies, Jungian feminism, and North American ecofeminism. This background reveals the roots of the diversity that constitutes Latin American ecofeminist theology.

The book culminates in interviews with twelve Latin American women theologians, documenting their shifts in self-understanding, understanding of the divine, and beliefs about life and death. These shifts, rooted in the epistemological shift to the body as locus of understanding, raise profound doctrinal questions, especially in the areas of Christology and eschatology. The book’s main weakness is R.’s failure to probe the latent ecofeminist potentialities of precisely these doctrines reworked in a postpatriarchal paradigm. That reworking, however, may be left to others who read this eminently worthwhile study.

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


On the tenth anniversary of Veritatis splendor, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) arranged a symposium in Rome, the purpose of which was, as then CDF Prefect Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger expressed it, not just to celebrate the document but to research and deepen the teaching of Pope John Paul II. In particular, the major task was to deepen the theological anthropology that serves as the foundation for moral theology. The CDF then edited the resulting collection.

Theological anthropology is a reflection on human life from a theological perspective. It is not the social science (anthropology) that studies human cultures and identifies similarities, differences, and changes over time. As ex-
plained by Ratzinger and John Paul II in a letter included in the volume, theological anthropology is rooted in Christ incarnate, “the true light that enlightens every person” (Jn 1:9). For a more complete exploration of the link between the christological event and theological anthropology, participants (from Europe—mainly Italy—and North America) included not only moral theologians but also philosophers, dogmatic theologians, and ecclesiologists. Ratzinger highlighted sonship (filiazione) as a foundational concept in these discussions with profound consequences for the moral life.

The symposium comprised eight sessions, each of which featured a presentation (in Italian, English, or German) followed by a response and a discussion (in Italian) involving 16 additional participants. Topics included an explanation of theological anthropology, Christian personalism and adoptive sonship, the relationship between nature and the supernatural in Christian anthropology, and the competence of the magisterium, among other topics. Seven conclusions written by the steering committee/editors complete the report.

The essays are rich in theological insight sharpened by the responses and subsequent discussion of each topic. It is disappointing that the participants did not seem to seek a more inclusive word than “sonship” for the important concept under discussion. Had a more inclusive term been found, broader implications could have been drawn from their conclusions.

JOHN J. PILCH
Georgetown University, Washington

JOHN J. PILCH
Georgetown University, Washington

and work. In this volume, he begins with the astute observation that industrialization has demoralized labor, detaching it from our humanity and leaving it to be no more than a marketable service, an instrumentalized good with which we barter for economic profit. Like the rest of our humanity, our work has also been commodified.

Against this objectification of our humanity, M. turns to the Catholic tradition to characterize work as the realization of person and society. His resources are the biblical texts and the papal social encyclicals. If there is one criticism of this otherwise significant work, it is that he limits his theological resources, employing no patristic, Scholastic, or casuistic writings to sustain his argument.

While M. does not romanticize labor (he does recognize, for instance, the alienation of labor that results from sin), he offers a very positive foundation for understanding labor as good, virtuous, gift, and serving the common good. M. gives each of these descriptives a robust and well-referenced discussion and offers a spirituality of labor as well. He then applies this proposal to such diverse topics as unions and the ‘postmodern’ strike, the bullying practice of ‘mobbing’ (colleagues intimidating and humiliating another so as to force him or her out of work), and the role of women in the work force. He concludes by suggesting that the Church could help dignify the laborer even more by valorizing manual labor, praising leisure, and working toward a well-educated work force. The bibliography of M.’s well-honed argument makes clear that Italian theologians and ethicists have been engaging this topic with the theological acumen it deserves.

JAMES F. KEENAN, S.J.
Boston College


What light can a gathering of mainstream American Catholics, clergy, religious, and laity, with both pastoral and academic expertise, shed on the chal-
The challenge of being a priest in today’s Church? The Catholic Common Ground Initiative addressed this subject at its Seventh Annual Cardinal Bernardin Conference, held at the Oblate School of Theology in San Antonio early in 2003. Ruddy’s book is both a report and a reflection on that conference.

Held under the shadow of the clergy sexual abuse crisis, the conference addressed priestly identity in terms of its encompassing relationships with Christ, with the bishop and other priests, and with the faithful. Broader issues such as the ordination of women and married men were not in its focus. While papers by Scott Appleby, Cyprian Davis, Gerald Fogarty, Enda McDonagh, Katarina Schütz, Susan Wood, and Dean Hogy provide background for discussion, the book’s most valuable contribution is R.’s exploring the issues that emerged in the conference’s give and take. The liveliest as well as most controversial discussion addressed the priest’s relationship to Christ. Though some disagreed about seeing the priest as an “icon” of Christ, most saw the priest’s genuine encounter with Christ as crucial to priestly identity. Other issues included celibacy, clerical competition, reconciling baptismal equality with priestly distinctiveness, and the priest as a “man of communion.” One area of common ground between liberals and conservatives was dissatisfaction with the process for choosing bishops.

R.’s presentation is remarkably balanced and insightful. In his closing reflections he argues that any authentic priestly renewal must begin with Christ, that neither the “servant leader” nor “cultic” model adequately frames priestly identity, which is best understood as Eucharist-centered, and that the present movement of the Church “from being predominantly white and northern to being predominantly brown and southern” (154) will challenge both formation and ministry. The book, more spiritual treatment than theological analysis, would be excellent for retreat or spiritual reading.

Thomas P. Rausch, S.J.
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles


This beautifully written and insightful book makes a sustained case for the role of language in orienting the believer toward the fullness and beauty of God in the world. Five treatises are developed in five chapters: (1) “The Un-Heard Of” establishes the priority of speech, divine and human, in the protection of all creation; (2) “Wounded Speech” phenomenologically establishes the confessing of one’s brokenness as the grounds for vocal prayer; (3) “The Hospitality of Silence” argues that self-emptying provides the opening for the arrival of God in the life of the believer; (4) “Does Beauty Say Adieu?” maintains that contemplating the “horrible beauty” of the cross is the basis for life in Christ; and (5) “The Offering of the World” reprises the book’s opening theme to show how speech gathers the fragments of existence into a christo-cosmic totality. It is speech, finally, that “completes” all that is, including the natural world.

While sympathetic to the thrust of Chrétien’s project, I object to the book’s thesis, namely, that human speech is the “ark” or safeguard that gathers together and shelters all beings within creation (so the book’s title). The Bible and the Christian heritage that I read are shaped differently: the first ark, like Noah’s ark, is not speech but the gift of the natural world itself. It is the created order, not the human capacity (albeit God-given) for speech, that first shelters and nurtures animals, human and nonhuman. In Genesis, the earth, as gift and as divinized by God’s presence, is the benevolent power that ensures the health and vitality of all living things. Earth makes possible the vital energy cycles and the sustaining food webs that render human existence and the existence of all other beings, pulsing with life and potent with new possibilities. Nature with its bounty, prior to and beyond speech, is the all-sustaining support that constitutes the “ark” in the Adamic-Noahic creation hymn of the Bible. Nature is a given that is anterior.
to human speech, to which even speech must be attentive.

Mark Wallace
Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Penn.


Michael Polanyi (1891–1976) was an important scientist-intellectual-humanist who defended religious faith by claiming that all human knowledge of reality—scientific, moral, cultural, and religious—is sustained by faith in a community of faith. He was of Hungarian Jewish descent, baptized in a Catholic church, but in his early years was religiously agnostic. In later life he felt close to the Anglican community. He became a renowned physical chemist and crystallographer, but eventually came to reject the notion of "scientific objectivity" that made religious arguments, such as arguments for the existence of God, impossible. Reflecting on his personal experience as an experimenter, he found that the process of coming to know scientific reality—particularly, coming to know it for the first time—was a matter of faith and community. He called it "tacit knowing," a mysterious process that guided the human mind to generate new knowledge grasped by faith and sustained by a discourse with others who had come to share the same process. Such knowledge is not acquired by argument but rather by participation in a social knowledge enterprise that explores, exposes, names, and relates the knower to the realities with which his society lives. Polanyi came to see that we can no more prove the existence of atomic interactions, than we can prove the existence of God, and vice versa. He concluded that we make the acquaintance of science and religion in the same way through human culture and by faith.

Scott’s and Moleski’s writing is excellent. The text is well documented, quoting from Polanyi’s private papers and from his published works, with special reference to his major publications: Personal Knowledge (1958) based on his 1952 Gifford lectures, The Tacit Dimension (1968), Faith, Science, and Society (1946), Scientific Thought and Social Reality (1974). This is a fine introduction to a profound student of human knowing.

Patrick A. Heelan, S.J.
Georgetown University, Washington


Opening with the love command from John’s Gospel and with a Buddhist imperative to extend an unlimited heart to all beings, Perry’s study in American constitutional theory lives up to its promise to be provocative. P. contends that a comprehensive theory of human rights must confront three major questions (to each he gives a chapter): (1) Is there a nonreligious ground for the morality of human rights—the claim that every (born) human being has inherent dignity and is inviolable? (2) How should we understand the relationship between the morality of human rights and the law of human rights—what laws should we who affirm the morality of human rights press our governments to enact, and what laws should we press our governments to avoid? (3) What is the proper role for courts in a liberal democracy in protecting constitutionally entrenched human rights? In addressing these questions, P. focuses on three notoriously controversial human rights issues: capital punishment, abortion, and same-sex unions. He acknowledges that controversies cannot be avoided; instead, “the challenge is to deal with them in a way that advances the conversation and thereby invites and facilitates further productive conversation” (142).

P. succeeds admirably in meeting that challenge by presenting a model of stimulating intellectual conversation. He engages both philosophers suspicious of a religious foundation for the idea of human rights (which P. affirms)
and religious authorities who publicly teach on contested moral issues. He presents his conversation partners’ arguments with nuanced fairness, while subjecting those arguments to the rigorous critical analysis that intellectual respect demands. This conversational ideal extends to his discussion of the proper role of courts. He fittingly concludes that judges should exercise their crucial role in protecting human rights in a manner that will promote a moral conversation about the meaning of indeterminate human rights within democratic society, rather than imposing solutions in a way that subverts the citizens’ role as the ultimate community of political-moral judgment.

GREGORY A. KALSCHEUR, S.J.
Boston College Law School


For understanding our world, Clayton proposes that the perspective of emergence is the best choice when compared to the two more common options of physicalism and dualism. As he explains them, physicalists hold that only purely physical entities exist, whereas dualists believe that at least humans (and possibly other organisms) consist of both physical compounds and souls or spirits. C. believes an option for emergence makes a great difference to how one understands the world and the place of human beings, and is truer to our awareness of ourselves and our world.

Emergence is “the theory that cosmic evolution repeatedly includes unpredictable, irreducible, and novel appearances” (39). Chapter 1 describes the rise and fall of reductionism, and the prehistory of the concept of emergence; both reductionism and emergence have become common in the scientific community and have been appropriated by philosophers and theologians of nature. Subsequent chapters describe contemporary interpretations of emergence, how emergence is found at various levels of scientific investigation, and the transition from a philosophy of biology to the supervenience and emergence of mental properties. A final chapter tackles “Emergence and Transcendence.” The length of the last two chapters attests to C.’s particular interest, as a philosopher of religion, in probing the meaning of mind and transcendence within the concept of emergence.

Although C. accepts a metaphysical naturalism, he does not subscribe to a complete reduction of reality to microphysics. He is of the school of strong emergence that observes that “the natural world increasingly reveals distinct levels of organization, with each level characterized by its own irreducible types of causal influence and explanation” (204). And he continues to wonder: “when one follows the line from the emergent mind to transcendent mind, does the reach of the questions exceed the grasp of discussable answers?” When the boundaries of physics and biology are reached, C. insists, the “really big questions” (206) are still open for discussion. His contribution is a valuable addition to the ongoing dialogue between science and the humanities, including theology.
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