BOOK REVIEWS


Blenkinsopp recently completed Anchor Bible’s three-volume commentary on the Book of Isaiah. His work there not only resulted in detailed analysis of the shape and purpose of the Isaian text, but also led B. to realize the influence of the interpretive process, already begun in the final redaction of the book, on a variety of works and movements in the following centuries. Here B. explores three models of Isaiah drawn from the book itself: (1) the prophet who announces judgment as God’s critic of society and defender of the marginal; (2) the prophet as apocalyptic seer who announces imminent final judgment; and (3) the prophet as “man of God” who (in general a hero of the past) heals, intercedes, works miracles, and the like. Each model played a role among different groups, but the most important trajectory for B. is that of the apocalyptic seer, given Isaiah’s heavy influence on the Book of Daniel, the Qumran sectarians, and the earliest Palestinian Christianity. Two themes are key: the penitent remnant that survives the Exile, and the sealed book hiding Isaiah’s words until a future completion (Isa. 8:16; 29:11–12). B. concludes that both Qumran and Christianity likely emphasized these themes because each of their founders, the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus, applied them to himself. Studies of their respective uses of Isaian texts can help exegetes reach better comparative understandings of the first Christians and the Qumran community, and see more clearly how Jesus and Christianity stood within the orbit of sectarian Judaism.

B. devotes chapter 1 to the historically early and growing tendency to see Isaiah as a sealed book and to read it in an increasingly apocalyptic manner. The effects are best seen in the production of the Book of Daniel by a second-century BCE sectarian group. Chapter 2 treats the double development of Isaiah’s persona as author and prophet. In his oracles Isaiah played the role of traditional spokesperson for God’s justice, but in the narratives he was more a healing, intercessory man of God who predicted the future and worked miracles. Much of this latter emphasis was due to Deuteronomic redefinition of the prophetic role away from social criticism of injustice toward living in faithfulness to God. This development significantly influenced Chronicles, Sirach, and the late development of servant theology.

Chapter 3 explores the meaning of “sectarian” for the fifth to the first centuries BCE. The concept appeared already in Ezra-Nehemiah and can be traced down to the Qumran documents and the Gospels. Chapters 4 and 5 explore the specific readings of Isaian texts found in the Qumran documents and in Matthew’s Gospel. Isaiah enjoyed special popularity in both
communities, and in both the reading of the Isaian passages moved in an increasingly apocalyptic direction. B. confirms these conclusions by devoting the last three chapters to specific themes that highlight the apocalyptic reading of Isaiah: (1) community titles adopted by the Qumran and Christian communities for themselves; (2) the significance of being exilic remnants in their self-identities; and (3) the growing importance of the servant figure in defining the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus.

B.'s study is impressive and compelling. As in his previous works, he closely reads texts and carefully analyzes the connections between them. He makes sense of the structure and purpose of Daniel—composed in light of an apocalyptic reading of Isaiah. He also illuminates the Jewish setting of the Book of Wisdom in light of its Isaian interpretation of the servant. And, although he does not claim to find new material, he provides a sharp portrait of the close links among the Qumran sectaries, the John the Baptist movement, and Jesus and his followers. His treatment of the many uses of Isaiah 42 and 53 by various groups is masterful. And he provides a convincing picture of Jesus' personal appropriation of the role of the servant in his own self-understanding.

Several of B.'s conclusions, here and elsewhere, might be challenged: (1) his late dating of the final forms of the biblical books; (2) his allowance for additions even after a book was widely accepted as "canonical"; (3) his Deuteronomic maximalism in dating the redaction of the historical and prophetic books; and (4) his slight attention to the role of the official priesthood and religious authorities (instead of sectarian groups) on controlling the interpretation and meaning of canonical books. In most instances I find B.'s arguments convincing, though not regarding his judgments on (1) the lateness of passages such as Isaiah 24–27, (2) the insertion of apocalyptic servant passages in Isaiah 56–66, and (3) the strong intra-textual development he proposes for the book late into the Second Temple period. But we can never again simply assume that by about 400 BCE Isaiah was a fixed text, or read Isaiah without first closely consulting B.'s rigorous study.

Washington Theological Union (Emeritus) LAWRENCE BOADT, C.S.P.


Janzen's book is both a substantive, methodological study of biblical sacrifice and a carefully argued treatment of the several social meanings of sacrifice found in the priestly narrative (P), the Deuteronomic history (Dtr), Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. More limited in its focus than recent studies of biblical sacrifice by Alfred Marx (Les systèmes sacrifciels de l'Ancien Testament [2005]) and Jonathan Klawans (Purity, Sacrifice, and
the Temple (2006)), J.'s study nonetheless makes a distinctive and important contribution to the literature, particularly in the area of methodology.

J. argues along two lines that rituals are a kind of language or, more specifically, a kind of rhetoric, a language intended to persuade. First, rituals such as sacrifice communicate a worldview and indicate moral actions that members of a group should adopt. Second, since different social groups hold different worldviews and moral programs, apparently similar sacrifices can communicate different social meanings. Sacrifices bearing the same name in the Hebrew Bible communicated different social meanings to different groups of ancient Israelites in the biblical period. Like languages, sacrifices are diverse and subject to diachronic change. If these two arguments are accepted, J. continues, theories that seek to explain all sacrifice with generalities (e.g., sacrifice is always a gift, or always scapegoating) are fundamentally flawed. In fact, J.'s book is particularly useful in identifying and offering a cogent and persuasive critique of several varieties of such theories. René Girard merits special attention due to the persistent appeal his theories hold for those concerned about connections between ritual sacrifice and contemporary violence. Girard's theories have been the subject of penetrating critiques by anthropologists and biblical scholars for more than two decades. J. both summarizes and constructively adds to the earlier critiques.

The five introductory chapters review anthropological, sociological, and theological studies of ritual and sacrifice, forming the methodological foundation for the second half of the book that studies sacrifice in P, Dtr, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. A substantive conclusion broadens the study by contrasting the social meanings of sacrifice in Ur-III Mesopotamia and in Israel. J. deftly summarizes his findings while briefly indicating their significance for understanding Christ's sacrifice in the Epistle to the Hebrews. These final reflections are suggestive but not developed; they offer but one of several ways this study might shed light on subsequent Christian theology.

In his analysis of specific texts, J. gives due attention to the particularity of the various kinds of biblical sacrifice, but he is primarily concerned to read the surrounding narrative contexts for what they can reveal about what the sacrificial rites communicate to the participants. J.'s summary of the social meanings of sacrifice in P, which he holds to be a continuous narrative rather than a redactional layer, provides a good example of the results his study attains: "P links worldview and morality by: signaling a complete act of obeisance to the worldview and its moral system; warning of social destruction if Israel abandons this worldview and ethos; marking out the difference between Israel and YHWH and forcing Israel to pay attention to its true being and the moral actions that this demands; and refusing to recognize the authority of any other social group, even within Israel, that might demand allegiance of Israelites" (117). In Dtr, by way of contrast, "there is nothing to suggest that sacrifice acts to maintain distance between YHWH and Israel" (151). J. argues rather that, in Dtr, right sacrifice is a litmus test of obedience, indicating submission to both God
and to the law, while also serving as both a promise of God’s protection if it is rightly performed and a warning of destruction if the moral law is abandoned. J.’s conclusions are consistent with the traditional profiles of P, Dtr, Ezra-Nehemiah, and the Chronicler but are nonetheless helpful in providing a particular lens through which to read these four writings.

While the bulk of J.’s study is devoted to distinguishing the varying social meanings of sacrifice, he also summarizes what his sources have in common. For all the writings, J. argues, sacrifice promotes right relation between Israel and YHWH rather than between the king and YHWH. The book concludes with an extensive bibliography and indexes of authors and scriptural citations.

With its methodological rigor, precisely focused inquiry, and persuasive argumentation, this study makes a strong case that biblical sacrifice cannot be reduced to a single meaning. The various sacrificial languages of the Hebrew Bible are best understood by attending closely to their particularity and context.

Dominican House of Studies, Washington


Focused on Galatians, Ukwuegbu wants to shift the “close relation between contemporary historical and social situations to textual interpretation,” as found in contemporary Pauline scholarship, away from “Eurocentric” concerns (e.g., the Holocaust and Jewish-Christian dialogue), in order “to discover . . . information relevant to some of the social and cultural questions facing the church today” (37, 2). His special concern resides with the relationship between the “domineering” European and American churches and the churches in the “once upon a time mission lands” of Africa (37, 41, 413–21). To effect the shift, he places Galatians (“the most Pauline of the Pauline writings” [9]), at the center of Pauline theology and early Christian history. In the process, however, he ends up “galatianizing” both that theology and history, despite his counterclaims (see 400, 407, 3).

To establish his argument, U. reconstructs a “common Judaism” (chap. 3), characterized by ethnic-defining “ancestral customs”: monotheism, election, Torah, and Temple, together with circumcision and the “purity law prohibiting table fellowship between Jews and Gentiles” (112–13, 139–49). He proposes that Judaism’s flaw was in its exclusion of Gentiles and thus in the “spatial limits it sets to the presence of God” (342). The “qualitatively-otherness” of Paul’s gospel (109), U. claims, consists in his rejection of this “common Judaism,” its ethnic identity markers and symbolic universe, as constitutive of the Christian gospel and identity. At his conversion Paul broke with other “zealous Israelites” who fought to preserve “the
purity and holiness of Israel’s ethnic identity” (232, 202) because he came to believe that the messianic age had arrived and that God had fundamentally changed the structure of salvation: salvation occurs through the supernatural intervention of God’s grace by faith in Christ, excluding “any practices of law that differentiates Jews and Gentiles” (203–6). Paul, in other words, was converted to the “Paulinism” of Galatians.

Paul’s universalist gospel of freedom and emancipation from ethnocentric Judaism constituted a singular and “innovative break” from Judaism and from Jewish Christianity. He considered faith in the Christ event to be both necessary and sufficient for salvation and for Christian identity. Jews and Jewish Christians preached a non-gospel (223, 287, 172–73) in that they continued to affirm the validity of the law and the Jewish “symbolic universe,” and sought to restrain salvation “within the larger context of ethnocentric covenantal theology” (168, 202, 222, 400–403).

In chapters 4 through 6, U. works out his thesis, reading Galatians as Paul’s attempt to “legitimize” his gospel (Gal 1:6–2:14) and to construct and legitimize an alternative Christian “symbolic universe” (2:15–3:29) with an alternative ethic (4:1–6:16). Here U.’s analysis is detailed and well documented, challenging those who seek in Paul’s polemical writings a Christian gospel allegedly going back to “the historical Jesus and his radical interpretation of the law” (162)—a reading in which Paul is both the paradigmatic Jew and, anachronistically, the paradigmatic Christian. Although U. struggles with the problem of the “anti-Jewishness” of Galatians, he insists that Paul’s theology was supersessionist: Paul preached a “new-age” universalist gospel of freedom against the slavery of Judaism’s old and “outmoded” ethnic covenantal theology.

Being also Nigerian and Catholic, I share U.’s frustration with an African (Catholic) Church dominated by the “protectoral service” of Western hegemony, and I look for tolerance and mutual respect. However, U.’s search in Galatians for a pristine gospel raises unanswered questions. He brilliantly demonstrates that Galatians is a sectarian document. The stridency of Galatians, in fact, derives from Paul’s insistence, not that Gentiles must not be Judaized, but that Jews must be “Gentilized”; in Galatians one cannot be fully Jewish and Christian. If covenantal Judaism is the Jews’ “God-given cultural milieu,” it cannot be argued, as U. does, that in Galatians “Paul provided ground . . . for mutual tolerance and respect between Jews and Gentile Christian” (sic; 37). It is, therefore, hard to see how Galatians can serve as “valuable resources in the struggle to fashion harmonious but multicultural society” (37, 415).

Again, U. argues that Paul was not expunging ethnic, social, and gender differences; he relativized them by locating salvation at the level of personal choice. Yet, one may ask, does the Christ event ever exist without being already incarnated in and expressed through the particularities of a culture? If, on the Galatians model, the acceptance of the Christ event must lead to a qualitatively different self-understanding and a new community with an independent social identity, is Christianity bound to be a series of “sectarian” movements?
Finally, this book could have used an editor capable of transforming it from a German dissertation to a monograph for an English-speaking readership. Redundant material, typographical errors, chaotic use of quotation marks, and bibliographical references and citations in German where English was possible, make the book tedious to read and difficult to understand.

South Bend, Ind. 

FABIAN E. UDOH


A revision of Hägg’s 1997 dissertation at the University of Bergen, this book is a valuable contribution to the study of Clement of Alexandria’s theological thought. After an introduction to the cultural, religious, social, and political milieu of imperial Alexandria and a presentation of Clement’s life and writings (15–51), the reader is treated to a robust study of Clementine apophaticism as reflected in the Alexandrian’s theological metaphysics, epistemology, cosmology, and theory of language. For every topic under discussion, H. offers a careful presentation of relevant middle Platonist sources (Alcinous, Numenius, and Atticus) that then illumines her interpretation of Clementine texts. Her reading of Clement against this background is impressive both in its mastery of sources and relevant scholarly literature and in the clarity and persuasiveness of the arguments. Clement emerges as an informed but independent and creative thinker, thoroughly Christian, yet perfectly at home in the philosophical traditions of his time.

As the title indicates, the work also discusses Clement’s place in the history of Christian thought. In H.’s estimation Clement’s importance lies in his anticipation of the complex conjunction of apophaticism, ascetical epistemology, and the distinction between divine transcendence and immanence. She argues convincingly that Clement’s apophaticism contrasts with the lack thereof in Origen (255–58) and shows clear affinities with that of the Cappadocians. Clement’s influence over the latter, possibly mediated by Evagrius, is greater than usually assumed (259–60).

Compared with her reading of Clement against the background of middle Platonism, H.’s presentation of Clement’s inheritance of earlier Jewish and Christian traditions is less detailed and substantial. It would have been possible, for instance, to complement the otherwise excellent treatment of Clement’s Logos-theology (197–206; 227–37) with a discussion of the mediation of the vision and knowledge of God from the Logos as “Face” through the various angelic “powers” down to the human world. This emendation would have called for more serious consideration of the apocalyptic elements in Clement’s Excerpta ex Theodoto, Eclogae propheticae, and Adumbrationes.

According to H., “Clement even claims co-substantiality for the Spirit,
the third person of the Trinity” (201). Some readers will certainly disagree, especially since H.’s discussion of Clementine Pneumatology takes up no more than one paragraph, by contrast to the solid 50 pages dedicated to Clement’s reflections on God and the Logos (153–206). Other writers (Johannes Frangoulis, Wolf-Dieter Hauschild, Christian Oeyen, Luis Ladaria, Henning Ziebritzki) have conducted much more extensive and detailed research, and come to conclusions very different from H.’s.

Another criticism concerns the overall argument of the book, an argument governed by two different principles. On the one hand, H. offers a study of Clement’s apophaticism in light of middle Platonic sources, selecting Alcinous, Numenius, and Atticus on the basis of “their relevance for the study of Clement that follows” (71). On the other hand, she is at pains to show that Clement’s apophaticism and distinction between ousia and dynamis “anticipates a later dogma of the Orthodox church” (238, 261)—presumably the Palamite essence/energy distinction. From this perspective, the study seems designed as a corrective to “the scepticism that Clement is still being met within Orthodox theological circles” (256). H.’s thesis of Clement as a precursor of the Cappadocians and of later developments in Byzantine theology (127) does indeed fill a gap in scholarship. However, the scattered considerations of Clement’s influence “through the Cappadocians . . . further into the Eastern Orthodox tradition and into our own time” (267) are insufficiently documented (H. refers to Vladimir Lossky [264 n. 23] yet seems unaware of the substantial treatment of Clement in Lossky’s Vision of God) and seem out of place in a work of patristic scholarship.

The above-mentioned shortcomings do not diminish the value of this study, which resides primarily in the excellent treatment of Clement’s apophaticism against its middle Platonic background. This book belongs in every serious university and research library, as it is indispensable for research on Clement of Alexandria and very useful, more generally, for the study of philosophy and theology in late antiquity. It should also be of interest to students of the Eastern Orthodox theological tradition. Readers of this book would also benefit from two other recent studies of Clement: Eric Osborn, Clement of Alexandria (2005) and Rüdiger Feulner, Clemens von Alexandrien (2006).

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Bogdan G. Bucur


Demacopoulos opens his interesting study by clearly defining spiritual direction as “the modus operandi by which religious authorities (in both lay and monastic communities) sought to advance the spiritual condition of those under their care” (1). The definition serves as D.’s tool for examining developments within the one church shaped by different ways of life and
different sources of authority. In the post-Constantinian years, the division between lay and monastic Christians widened, driven by dedication to ascetic disciplines that differed in degree and kind. D. notes two trajectories in the development of spiritual direction. Clergy guidance of the lay community emphasized doctrinal instruction, sacraments, and the distribution of charity. In the monastic setting, guidance was shaped and defined in context of the spiritual-father/disciple relationship, and stressed specific activities relevant to monastic renunciation. In each setting, the source of authority differed. For the clergy, authority was rooted in apostolic succession and transmitted through ordination. Because of the clergy’s teaching role, education was a valuable prerequisite for ordination, while the bishop’s role as judge in the episcopal courts made a background in the curiales helpful. For the spiritual father, experience in the ascetic way of life was a key but not the sole criterion of authority. To lead, one also should have practiced obedience, developed a strong prayer life, and demonstrated discernment.

Not surprisingly, tensions arose when ascetics became bishops. Although that problem has been well studied (and D. demonstrates good command of the scholarship), D. is the first to examine the impact of ascetic bishops on pastoral practice. To address his concerns he presents literary studies of five figures: Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, Cassian, and Pope Gregory I. They are well chosen: all five had some experience of ascetic life; all were clergy; all but Cassian were bishops; all were writers. Among them they shaped the medieval church’s pastoral traditions, both East and West. All offered different solutions to the tension they faced, differences that enable the reader to see both the difficulty and the multiple approaches that coexisted in the early church.

The chapter on Athanasius, who strongly recruited monks to become bishops, highlights well the fruit of D.’s method. In a letter to the reluctant monk-bishop Dracontius, Athanasius stressed the tie binding church, sacraments, and clergy, and argued that if good men refused the episcopacy, people would lack the sacraments. Dracontius gave in, but in fact he lacked direct preparation for the new work. Athanasius remained unclear about his criteria for pastoral leadership, while he likewise remained ambivalent about the leader’s source of authority. In the Life of Antony he saw ascetic experience as giving Antony authority, but elsewhere he argued that his own authority was rooted in the grace of priesthood. He himself did not differentiate between the ascetic and nonascetic ideals of Christian leadership. In monastic communities neither ordination nor theological orthodoxy had the kind of importance that he attached to both. Having conscripted the monks to the Nicene cause and persuaded their best leaders to serve the church at large, he may never have realized the depth of the divide between the two approaches to pastoral care.

In comparing Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine, D. highlights the impact of circumstances on the way each exercised pastoral care. In Augustine’s case, D. comments: “His own polemic impeded any desire he may have had to combine ascetic discipline and spiritual direction” (96). Also,
D.’s study of word usage has interesting consequences in his understanding of Gregory’s *Pastoral Rule*, where the terms used for the pastoral leader include *sacerdos*, *rector*, *praedicator*, and *pastor*, but not *episcopus*. Here also the pastoral leader (priest or bishop) is presented as a spiritual father who uses the pastoral techniques of an abbot. In the process, D. enables the reader to see that Gregory I completed the merger of the ascetical and clerical strands and, in the process, redefined Christian leadership.

Mastery of a wide variety of sources is evident throughout D.’s study. Some may argue with single interpretations (e.g., did Orange II really bless all Augustine’s positions? [110]). However, on the whole, D.’s judgments are sound. There are a very few errors of fact, the most significant being the attribution of *homoiousios* to Nicea (21) rather than the key word *homoousios*. That said, this book is solid and will be quite valuable to historical theologians, church historians, students of Christian spirituality and of the priesthood.

*Mary Ann Donovan, S.C.*


This collection completes a series that surveys the development of Judaism in the ancient world. Covering the period from the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE to the rise of Islam in the seventh century, it offers exhaustive and excellent studies of the scholarship of this formative period in Judaism. As with many other subjects related to the discipline of history, revisionist scholarship over the past several decades has fundamentally enhanced and diversified our understanding of the development of rabbinic Judaism and other manifestations of Jewish life and culture in late antiquity. Written by leading scholars of Judaism, the chapters are clear and accessible to the nonspecialist. Those working in the fields of Christian studies, historical theology, liturgical studies, comparative theology, and a variety of other areas who find it necessary to research elements of Judaism in the late Roman and rabbinic periods will find useful starting points for a general orientation to content, issues of scholarly debate, and thorough bibliographical information.

The volume offers a helpful synthesis of major shifts in understanding of rabbinic development in chapters covering Jewish life in Roman Palestine, the Mediterranean diaspora, and the Persian Empire, along with other chapters directly on the rabbinic movement and its literature. The authors outline scholarly trends that emphasize the gradual and diffused growth of rabbinic Judaism from 70 CE to the fourth century and treat the rhetorical gaps between authoritative claims in rabbinic literature and social reality. As part of understanding the diversity of Jewish thought, other chapters present new scholarly directions in studies of folk literature, magic, mysticism, and liturgy. This approach corrects earlier conceptions of the rab-
binic movement as immediate and sole successors to the temple priesthood and situates Jewish life within its broader social context. Later chapters explore the theological dimensions of rabbinic Jewish thought. These chapters—covering the rabbinic understanding of the nature of Torah, both written and oral, surveying the rabbinic “theology of the physical,” and reviewing Jewish theological anthropology—are rich in detail and will reward anyone researching parallel topics in other traditions. Other chapters, employing social scientific and material culture methodologies, reveal the continuity of the life of Jews with non-Jewish neighbors, thus revealing rich worlds of cultural contact during which a distinctively rabbinic interpretation of Jewish identity developed.

Three chapters also examine Jewish-Christian relations: two dealing with Christian sources and one with Jewish materials. Of interest in Peter Richardson’s chapter on the development of Christian anti-Judaism up to 235 CE is the geographic diversity of anti-Jewish rhetoric and the correlation of such rhetoric with the Jewish origins of particular Christian communities. Steven Katz’s chapter on Jewish views of Christianity argues that early rabbinic Judaism largely was not concerned with Jewish Christians and that texts interpreted as such, notably the Birkhat ha-Minim, ought to be read as addressing a broad array of Jewish belief not deemed normative by a rabbinic minority. Another chapter on anti-Jewish Christian thought in the third to fifth centuries by Paula Fredriksen and Oded Irshai speaks to the development of supersessionist theology and its social implications, and to the importance of the Augustinian understanding of the Jew as witness to the truth of Christianity.

Readers interested also in topics as diverse as the history of the Jewish revolts, the development of Hebrew and Aramaic, Jewish liturgy and holy days, art and architecture, and messianism will profit from this volume. The editor and individual authors have not only masterfully illustrated the importance of the individual subjects on their own terms but also presented key debates and methodological approaches in such a way as to profit those studying related topics. The chapters should be consulted by those initiating research in these areas and allied areas, and will aid established and beginning scholars alike.

Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Berkeley

Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski


Hurtado demonstrates that the physical and visual characteristics of second- and third-century Christian manuscripts provide much information about Christian origins, particularly regarding early Christian attitudes toward the texts about, and the person of, Jesus. Each of his five chapters highlights specific aspects of Christian manuscripts.
Chapter 1 surveys the contents of second- and third-century Christian manuscripts found in Egypt, particularly at Oxyrhynchus, and conveys the breadth of texts read by early Christians. Writings then available in Egypt contained canonical literature (the Gospels, Pauline letters, etc.) and writings that originated from locations out of Egypt (e.g., Asia Minor [Melito of Sardis], Gaul [Irenaeus of Lyon], and Rome [Shepherd of Hermas]). From this broad study, H. infers the existence of an important network of communication between the Egyptian-based Christians and the Christians in other places distant from middle Egypt. (However, because he provides evidence only from Egypt, he may go too far by positing a near-universal reciprocity, suggesting that “early Christian circles, whatever their geographical or religious particularities, also seem to have been keen on exchange of texts and ideas with other Christian circles” [41].)

Chapter 2 examines early Christians’ preference for the codex rather than the scroll—the latter is the dominant format of that era. H. quantitatively documents, via the Leuven Database of Ancient Books, the Christian preference in each century, in contrast to the preference for the scroll in then-current literary, Jewish, and gnostic circles. H. appeals to Harry Gamble’s hypothesis to explain Christian second-century preferences: an “early edition of Paul’s epistles in codex form could have provided the influential precedent that helped a subsequent appropriation of the codex by early Christians” (80).

Chapter 3, on the *nomina sacra*, is particularly refreshing in its originality. H. suggests that “IH,” an early abbreviation of “Jesus,” could have been the origin of the formation of *nomina sacra*. He pays particular attention to the horizontal stroke placed above *nomina sacra* that normally indicated numbers. The numerical value of the abbreviation “IH” would have been “18” as the Letter of Barnabas 9:7–8 and Clement of Alexandria’s Stromateis 6:278–80 acknowledge. That number also corresponded to the numerical value of the Hebrew word for “life,” *ych*. H. further suggests that, in early Christian views, Jesus could be thought of as the embodiment of resurrection life, even the life-giving Lord (e.g., 1 Cor 15:20–23; and Jn 1:3–4; 11:25). The meaning of this abbreviated form of Jesus’ name was soon lost and was replaced by contractions, especially considering that none of the other *nomina sacra* (God, Lord, Christ, Spirit) lent themselves to such gematric possibilities. H.’s hypothesis is compelling, as it addresses not only the aspect of abbreviations of the *nomina sacra*, but also the horizontal stroke found above them. Unfortunately, he does not provide evidence of a correlation between the name of Jesus and the Hebrew word for “life,” so there is no way to validate his suggestion. He also observes that the *nomina sacra* can be seen as a visual expression of religious devotion.

Chapter 4 explores another written expression of devotion called the “staurogram,” formed by superimposing the Greek letter *rho* upon the *tau*. Later on, the staurogram will be used as a “Christogram” to refer to Jesus. The *tau-rho* is found in manuscripts dated around 175–225 CE and stands for the words “cross” (*stauros*) and “crucify” (*staurod*). It plays the double
function of a monogram and of a pictogram as the combination of these letters appears to be a body on a cross. Its understanding as a pictogram forces one to revise the common assumption according to which Jesus’ crucifixion was not represented during the pre-Constantinian period.

The last chapter examines the significance of the physical aspects of early Christian manuscripts: size, columns, margins, readers’ aids, and corrections. One also finds two appendixes, the first listing Christian literary texts in second- and third-century manuscripts, and the other displaying photographic plates of manuscripts.

This book, loaded with information about early Christian manuscripts, is for serious students of Christian origins. H. has gathered in a single work much information previously difficult to access. He also documents with new evidence a previous hypothesis, namely, the popularity of the “codex” format among early Christians. H. is to be commended for producing a stimulating scholarly work that documents early Christian attitudes toward texts.

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


Fiona Griffiths has produced a careful, nuanced study of the twelfth-century manuscript Hortus deliciarum, a work produced by Herrad, Abbess of Hohenbourg, for the theological education of her nuns. This manuscript, destroyed in 1870, was meticulously reconstructed by scholars directed by Rosalie Green and published in 1979. G.’s is the first book-length attempt at a coherent interpretation of the whole, situated in the concrete historical circumstances of its composition.

The introduction deserves especially careful reading. Here G. situates the Hortus manuscript within a number of specific twelfth-century movements, all of them of interest to contemporary scholarship: monastic reform and proliferation, the roles and status of women, female literacy, and the development of Scholastic theology. She also exposes her thesis and outlines her proposed demonstration. G. challenges what she calls “long-accepted models” that have shaped previous scholarship, especially on gender and geographical issues, and offers the Hortus as evidence that such models or scholarly assumptions must be significantly modified. Even standing alone, G.’s introduction, together with the notes, can well serve as a course for someone who wishes to “get up to speed” on women, monasticism, and literacy, not quickly, to be sure, but with less danger of getting lost in the voluminous literature.

Each subsequent chapter constitutes a close, careful study of the manuscript, text and images. G. first situates the Hortus within the specific history of Hohenbourg, the reform of which is directly linked to Frederick Barbarossa’s intent to make amends for his father’s near-destruction of the
monastery. She shows how the early renewal, directed by Herrad’s predecessor, Relinde, led to clarity about the resources needed for the cura monialium, provision of pastoral care for the nuns. G. then exposes the genesis of the Hortus as a response to this need and the general structure of the text, undertaken and conceived by the second reforming abbess, Herrad. In this context G. analyzes the various theological and literary sources that Herrad included and exposes how these sources both influenced her and revealed her pastoral and theological intentions. The very careful reasoning of this section (chap. 2) demonstrates G.’s excellent understanding of twelfth-century theological literature.

In chapter 3, G. investigates Herrad’s self-understanding as author and wise woman by a careful interpretation of the bee metaphor Herrad appropriates. Again, G. studies Herrad’s usage against the horizon of writers, classical and Christian, who preceded her in applying the practices of the bee to that of human seekers of wisdom. She extends the metaphor into her next chapter wherein she shows how Herrad transforms the material she selects for her text—both images and literary selections—into a cohesive whole. Here she is not guided by any stated intentions of Herrad but must build on her own assumptions of Herrad’s purposes. She brings a wide knowledge of other medieval writers to bear and is particularly acute when she exegeses the relationship between texts and images as a set of mutual glosses. Her demonstration that Herrad’s theological focus is on the sweep of salvation history is persuasive, and in chapter 5 she carefully and thoroughly analyzes Herrad’s title in light of this theme.

The last two chapters return to Herrad’s pastoral purposes. In chapter 6, G. mines the book’s structure and the nuanced quality of its theology to deduce both Herrad’s pedagogical intent and the educational level of the nuns for which it was produced. In chapter 7 she examines the reforming themes that thread together the various elements of the Hortus manuscript. This examination leads her, finally, to raise (in the conclusion) the question of whether the manuscript was intended exclusively for a female audience. She notes all the ways in which the book is made especially pertinent for women, yet affirms that both its message and its methods are mainstream, assuming that women’s concerns and intellectual abilities are universal.

The book left me with a small, but persistent, question: Was the Hortus deliciarum an anomaly among texts from women’s circles, or was it part of a larger trend that has been heretofore unexplored? G. suggests that the manuscript does not fit into the generalizations offered by contemporary feminist thought: that medieval women’s texts are primarily prophetic and/or mystical, for instance, or that female education declined in the advent of Scholasticism. Each time G. cites a parallel text to suggest that Herrad’s concerns and methods are echoed in others, she carefully points out the differences as well, differences that reinforce the possibility that Herrad’s text is anomalous. This possibility does not vitiate G.’s solid scholarship but reinforces it. She does not force the complex evidence of this manuscript into any easy conclusions. Rather, her notes and bibliography (one-third of the volume) raise complex questions and implicitly invite her readers to
join the search for a more complete picture of women’s intellectual and political activities in the twelfth century.

*Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles*  
*Marie Anne Mayeski*


In 1729, soon after he began his Northampton pastorate, Jonathan Edwards sketched an outline for a treatise that he ambitiously entitled “A Rational Account of the Main Doctrines of the Christian Religion Attempted.” Although Edwards continued for some years to make notes for this project, he abandoned it after 1740, choosing instead to devote himself to the debate over revivalism raging in the colonies. This uncompleted summa, to use Perry Miller’s phrase, has fascinated Edwards scholars and has provoked much debate over its intended design. What attracts Danaher’s attention is the place Edwards appears to assign to the Trinity. “Not only does the Trinity precede all discussion of the work of redemption” in the proposed treatise, “but all reflection on the work of redemption culminates in a reconsideration of the Trinity. In short,” D. concludes, “Edwards envisioned the doctrine of the Trinity as the alpha and omega of the ‘Rational Account’” (5).

While it would be an exaggeration to assert that he has produced the systematic theology that Edwards himself never wrote, D. does analyze Edwards’s theological ethics from the trinitarian perspective that the Northampton pastor proposed for the “Rational Account.” Because his “Trinitarian reflection is essential for understanding his theological ethics,” D. argues, Edwards’s failure to emphasize the doctrine is an “internal weakness” that runs throughout all his writings (251, 250). D. attempts to correct this flaw, first, by constructing a coherent statement of Edwards’s doctrine of the Trinity and, second, by offering a trinitarian interpretation of each of his major treatises. This trinitarian reconstruction “provides a way to integrate Edwards’s major writings into a coherent whole,” thereby transforming his polemical and apologetic texts into a more systematic account of the Christian moral life (9).

Because Edwards never published a treatise on the Trinity, D. must pull together a unified statement of Edwards’s trinitarian doctrine from sporadic, occasional, and at times seemingly contradictory writings on the topic found in his private manuscripts. In the book’s first main section, D. shows that while Edwards employs both the psychological and the social analogies in unique and creative ways, neither is a wholly adequate image of the inner life of the Godhead. Together, however, they provide models “of what it means to be unified and complete persons and communities in God” (16). The psychological analogy offers a vision of personhood as participation in God that forms the foundation of the moral life, while the social analogy views personhood in terms of communion, harmony, and diffusive love. These two analogies are, therefore, in Edwards’s thought
“complementary, rather than alternative, accounts of the Trinity,” accounts that constitute the core of his theological ethics (108).

D. devotes his book’s second half to a trinitarian interpretation of Edwards’s major writings. He admits that “the doctrine of the Trinity is not explicit as a governing logic” in these writings (117), and he recognizes that by foregrounding the doctrine he produces a reading that contradicts Edwards’s own intentions as an author. Nevertheless, D. convincingly shows that Edwards’s full contribution to theological ethics can be viewed clearly only through the lens of the Trinity. From this perspective, Edwards’s *Religious Affections* provides a “complete theological anthropology” that emphasizes that “Christian ethics proceeds from the character of God” (128, 139); *Freedom of the Will* and *Original Sin* contain a “theological ethics of sufficient richness and explanatory power” to address the complex topics of volition, sin, and evil (199), and the *Two Dissertations* offer an “ethics of love” in which “spiritual participation in the triune life of God is essential for human flourishing” (201, 216). Only in *Charity and Its Fruits* does Edwards make explicit the trinitarian foundation of his theological ethics by developing the Christian spirit of love within its “wider Trinitarian matrix” (233).

Throughout his discussion D. places Edwards in conversation with a wide-ranging selection of contemporary voices in theological ethics, conversations that are possible, according to D., only through a retrieval of the Trinitarianism that lies behind Edwards’s theological ethics. But once the retrieval has been made, D. uses comparisons between Edwards and such prominent ethicists as Alasdair MacIntyre, Richard Swinburne, Gene Outka, and Stanley Hauerwas to argue that human participation in the triune life of God through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit must form the foundation of any “recognizably Christian” system of ethics (252). By constructing “a synthesis of Edwards’s theological ethics that Edwards himself never attempted,” D. aims to add a unique perspective to the modern debate on the nature of the moral life, that human morality is inseparable from the inner trinitarian life of God (250).

*Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio*  

**Ava Chamberlain**


These two books provide excellent complementary accounts of Western religious responses to modern science. O’Leary traces specifically Catholic reactions to developments in scientific theory and practice, starting with Galileo, then quickly moving to early 19th-century challenges posed to biblical literalism by the geological sciences. Evolutionary theory’s implications for classical notions of human nature and original sin are handled
well. Pius IX’s eventual antiliberalism is carefully qualified and discussed further in footnotes. O’L. extensively treats the troubled career of the British Catholic naturalist St. George Mivart (concerning his arguments over evolution) and examines Rome’s rejection of John Zahm’s *Evolution and Dogma* (1896), as well as similar responses to other well-meaning Catholic apologists. Particularly poignant are the accounts of these and other faithful 19th- and early 20th-century Catholics who wrote that the Church was not antagonistic to science but were then told by Rome to withdraw their books from publication because of the science in them. With the exception of Mivart, all complied.

O’L. highlights those parts of anti-Modernism that reacted to various scientific findings. He goes on to describe *nouvelle théologie* and the surprises of Vatican II, including the council’s concern over agnostic appropriations of the scientific mantel. He describes links made between the big bang theory and divine creation, analyzes attempts to deal with science more constructively during the papacy of John Paul II, and discusses recent challenges in areas such as artificial contraception, intravenous feeding, cloning, and stem cell research. He rounds off with praise for the positive approach to science in recent joint publications from the Vatican Observatory and the Center for Theology and the Natural Sciences.

Relying heavily on primary sources (letters to editors, journal articles, censured and noncensured books, and various official and unofficial statements from the Vatican, often taken from *Civiltà Cattolica*), O’L. has delivered an excellent study, fulfilling a significant need. I am aware of no other overall critical history of relations of the Catholic Church to modern science. Sharing Langford’s opinion that the church always lags behind scientific developments, O’L. claims that “The Church’s response to disturbing ideas tended to be one of ‘prudential condemnation’ followed by gradual assimilation” (256).

O’L.’s editorial comments are sometimes more acerbic than pious, particularly in his final “Reflections.” The history he tells is a bit unbalanced, in that we hear mostly a story of British (and Irish and American) Catholics, and less about continental thinkers. Concerning *Humani generis* I missed any references to later explorations about original sin, such as A.-M. Dubarle’s *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin* (1964) or Karl Rahner’s parallel speculations, but the history is detailed and sound.

McCalla’s history of the many tactical shifts in interpreting Scripture in the face of scientific ideas emphasizes Protestant activity. That history tends to parallel the Roman Catholic pattern of first resisting the new science and then finding ways to live with it, at least until the fundamentalist and creationist rebellion of the past few decades. M.’s rendition is exacting, perceptive, and lucid.

M. traces multiple significant Protestant responses to historical-critical methods, to the discovery of deep geological time, fossils indicating major and minor extinctions, Darwinian evolution, and to evidence of a sequence of hominids preceding current humans. Each of these in turn, beginning in the 16th century, undercut one or more previous tactics marshaled to de-
fend literal or at least traditionalist readings of Scripture. By the time M.’s story reaches the 20th century, it is clear how current conflicts between Bible-based theologies and science arose.

M.’s thoroughness is revealed in his rendering of the effect of pivotal though sometimes obscure figures. The 17th-century historical-critical dissection of Scripture by the Oratorian Richard Simon, for example, intended to show Calvinists that an authoritative Catholic Church was needed to guide scriptural interpretation, alarmed Catholics also. In the 18th century the Comte de Buffon bravely proposed that the earth was up to half a million years old, opening the way for the Scot geologist James Hutton to establish truly “deep time.” M. nicely portrays the context and the resources available for Princeton theologian Charles Hodge’s opposition to Darwinism on scientific grounds. The book is replete with such clear and specific analyses.

U.S. readers will profit from M.’s telling of the U.S. Protestant experience from the Great Awakening to the present, and from his discussion of various forms of creationism. He tracks nicely, for example, the impact of the Baconian “common sense” method for interpreting the Bible (though I would quibble with his quick description of Bacon’s inductive method). He makes clear distinctions, for example, between William Jennings Bryan’s antipathy to social Darwinism and Bryan’s often unspoken acceptance of God-given evolutionary development. M. succinctly describes the sequence of court decisions about creationism in U.S. schools, and he summarizes accurately the convoluted Intelligent Design arguments of William Dembski, a significant achievement in itself.

Readers may find M.’s conclusion excessive, as the subtitle of the book becomes fully clear. He himself wishes to historicize Christianity (and all religion), to proclaim them entirely “subject to the same standards of empirical evidence and reasoned judgment as any other area of human knowledge” (199). But it remains a wonderfully thorough, accurate, and clear history. Read this one first for larger context and then O’L.’s book for Anglo-Catholic history.

University of Dayton, Ohio

Michael H. Barnes


For María Pilar Aquino, Ignacio Ellacuría “offers one of the most critical and rigorous articulations of liberation theology” (210, her emphasis). The other contributors to this collection share this enthusiasm, like writers announcing freshly discovered treasures. They expound and develop exceptionally well the thought of the Jesuit rector of the Universidad Centroamericana (UCA), murdered by the Salvadoran military in 1989.

Until recently few people could appreciate the scope of Ellacuría’s work. His theological essays appeared only sporadically, and few of his nontheo-
logical reflections have appeared in English. Fortunately the UCA’s press has now published most of them, including his major philosophical synthesis *Filosofía de la realidad histórica* (for which an English translation is in preparation), three additional volumes of philosophical writings, one on the mission of the university, four of theological writings, and three of political analysis. (The political writings are not covered in this book.)

While Kevin Burke’s *The Ground Beneath the Cross* (2000) provided an overview of Ellacuría’s theology, the present collection broadens and deepens our understanding of Ellacuría’s overall vision. It introduces us to the human being and the Christian—as well as to the dramatic social and ecclesial context—behind the writings. With the help of 21 photos, this introduction is masterfully carried out by Robert Lassalle-Klein’s essay, Gustavo Gutiérrez’s brief reflection, and Jon Sobrino’s extraordinary intimate portrait of Ellacuría, the last of which demonstrates, perhaps half-consciously, the powerful synergy of Sobrino’s and Ellacuría’s friendship and intellectual collaboration.

These introductory essays transition smoothly to reflections on the principal sources that inspired Ellacuría’s work: the Basque philosopher Xavier Zubiri, Karl Rahner, and Ignatian spirituality. Ellacuría was Zubiri’s closest collaborator. Essays by Antonio González and Lassalle-Klein throw a bright light on Zubiri’s rich, dense philosophy, the influence of which is growing in Latin America, especially in the ongoing development of liberation theology. As these essays explain, Zubiri’s principal achievement is his constructive critique of the ancient dualisms and modern idealisms that have afflicted Western philosophy. He traces these to the “logification” of intelligence and the correlative “entification” of reality. Intelligence, split from sensibility, is reduced to conceptualization; reality is reduced to entities. For Zubiri, rather, human intelligence in all its forms is “sentient intelligence” to which reality, with its own consistency (“*de suyo*”) prior to our knowing, becomes “actualized” in experience. From this he draws the conclusion that we grow in truth and humanity the more we face up to concrete reality. This is also the path to the ultimate reality, God. Two examples from the collection can illustrate the enormous implications of this orientation for practice and theory, including theology and spirituality. First, this vision supports the Ignatian idea of contemplation in action. Matthew Ashley’s illuminating essay shows where Ellacuría’s understanding of contemplation in action for justice fits in the history of Christian spirituality. Second, developing Zubiri’s thought, Ellacuría stressed that reality is historical. Therefore, writes Martin Maier, just as individuals need to discern their interior movements, facing up to historical reality requires that we read the signs of the times.

The second half of this collection consists of reflections on Ellacuría’s theology: on soteriology by Burke, ecclesiology by Roger Haight and Aquino, Catholic social teaching by Gregory Baum, human rights in Africa by Aquiline Tarimo and William O’Neill, and Christian compassion by Johannes Baptist Metz. They develop key themes: for Ellacuría, theology is the theoretical moment of ecclesial praxis. However, it is necessary to
“historicize” concepts and symbols (e.g., human rights, the reign of God) by recognizing how they are historically conditioned and by making them effective for today. Since the principal sign of our times is the “crucified peoples,” the poor constitute a privileged place for understanding revelation, and justice must be central to the church’s mission. Prophecy and utopian imagination are indispensable to that mission. Those who live as Jesus did and by his Spirit share in God’s salvific work. (The book closes with Burke’s invaluable 25-page comprehensive bibliography of Ellacuría’s writings.)

Some essays need streamlining for clarity, to reduce repetition, and to correct orthography. Lassalle-Klein’s and Burke’s exposition and amplifications of Ellacuría’s threefold demand to “realize,” “shoulder,” and “take charge” of the “weight of reality” strike me as rather freewheeling and lacking clear warrants from Ellacuría’s texts (see 113–16, 171–72, 184 n. 6). The English rendering of these same three expressions, admittedly difficult, is also questionable. Even with these limitations, though, this is in an outstanding collection of essays on a theologian whose work, as Ashley says, “will continue to grow in stature as a classic and a source for future theologies” (160).

_universidad centroamericana “José Simeón Cañas,”__
San Salvador, El Salvador

**Dean Brackley**


Pierre Johanns was born in Luxembourg in 1882 and entered the South Belgian Province of the Society of Jesus in 1903. After ordination, supplementary philosophical study (in Kant and German idealism) at Louvain, and Sanskrit studies at Oxford, he arrived in Calcutta in 1921. He became a lecturer at St. Xavier’s College, with particular interest in Indian philosophy, especially the Vedanta schools growing out of the ancient Upanisads. He soon began working closely with George Dandoy, S.J., who in 1922 founded a monthly, titled _Light of the East_, dedicated to the dialogue of Catholic and classical Hindu thought. In monthly articles, Johanns and Dandoy argued that Christianity fulfilled rather than destroyed the Indian intellectual tradition, particularly Vedanta. Johanns’s own major contribution, from 1922 to 1934, was a series of 137 articles titled “To Christ through the Vedanta.” These offered a meticulous, systematic examination of major Vedanta thinkers, assessed sympathetically, from a Thomistic perspective. Judged incomplete in themselves, various Vedanta views could, corrected from a higher viewpoint, be woven into an integral theological system of benefit to both Hindus and Christians. Returning to Belgium in 1939 for health reasons, Johanns joined the Facultés Universitaires Notre-Dame de la Paix in Namur, where he devoted himself to preparing missionaries for India, and continued writing on the intersections of Chris-
tian theology and Vedanta. Disabled by a stroke in 1948, he died in 1955. Although the intellectual interests of the Church and Jesuits in India have today shifted to liberation concerns and cultural interactions less focused on classical traditions, Johanns remains highly respected for his erudite engagement with the Indian philosophical traditions from a progressive Christian perspective.

Scholars such as Joseph Mattam, S.J., have given attention to Johanns (e.g., in *Land of the Trinity* [1975]), but Doyle’s is the first book devoted to him, and a welcome study of this important figure near the end of the long era of Jesuit missionary scholarship. D. first sketches the context of Johanns’s thought: his determination to continue earlier efforts to bring Catholic and Hindu culture together and his indebtedness to the church fathers, Aquinas (as theologian and practitioner of interreligious conversation), and neo-Thomism. D. also shows Johanns’s indebtedness to the work of the famed convert and intellectual pioneer Brahmabandhab Upadhyay, and the inculturation efforts of Brahmachari Animananda and William Wallace, S.J.

Section 2 of the book examines Johanns’s understanding of Vedanta, particularly his *Light of the East* essays on the great theologians Sankara, Ramanuja, and Vallabha, with reference to their positions on God, world, self, and the path to liberation. D. shows Johanns to be an excellent theologian, erudite and discriminating in his assessment of Vedanta, appreciative, for example, of Sankara’s sense of the liberative identification with God, Ramanuja’s recognition of the full personhood of God, and Vallabha’s exposition of devotion and the way to God by intense love—even if Johanns also ventured to correct their doctrines on creation, the immateriality of God, and the manner of divine participation in the world. D. is fair to, and occasionally critical of, Johanns and the Vedanta thinkers themselves. For example, Johanns enfolded Sankara too smoothly into a Christian theological worldview and (as was perhaps unsurprising in his time) reads him with inadequate attention to the contextual details of Sankara’s actual positions; he insufficiently appreciates Ramanuja as a (mono)theistic Vedanta theologian. D. honors Johanns by the same kind of intellectual honesty to which Johanns was committed.

D. also reflects on Johanns’s contribution to neo-Thomism and assesses the value of his synthesis of Indian and Western thought. Of great interest is Johanns’s fulfillment theology, a theology that saw Hinduism as “the most searching quest in the natural order of the Divine that the world has known,” a true preparatio evangelica. This confidence, rooted in the tradition of earlier Jesuits such as Roberto de Nobili and Jean Calmette, was harmonized with the 19th- and 20th-century fulfillment theologies of Protestant scholars such as Monier Monier-Williams, William Miller, and, most famously, John N. Farquhar, in *The Crown of Hinduism* (1913). Johanns’s thorough study of Vedanta would for several generations strongly influence Catholic reflection on India. Well-known later proponents of inculturation such as Jules Monchanin, Henri Le Saux, and Bede Griffiths all acknowledged his importance, while Jacques Dupuis, S.J., seems inspired
by Johanns in crafting his own distinctive theology of religions. Though largely unknown in Western theological circles today, Johanns’s work marks a high point in the Western Catholic encounter with India. As Cardinal Lepicier, the apostolic visitor to India, wrote to Johanns in 1925, “What Justinus was for Rome, Irenaeus for Gaul, Augustine for Africa, that you are, dear Father Johanns, for India” (30).

*Harvard Divinity School*  
FRANCIS X. CLOONEY, S.J.


Here Christian theology is congenially linked with the postmodernism it so feared throughout the 1980s and 1990s. Vanhoozer tames a potentially unwieldy topic by arranging the material into two parts. The first presents theological methods “that either call themselves postmodern or have been described as such,” while the second deals with doctrinal issues and thus approaches “postmodernity from the vantage point of theology” (xiv).

The editor’s introduction, echoing Lyotard’s now-classic move, is a report on the knowledge of God in the postmodern “condition.” It offers a credible survey of the contested ways “postmodern” can be described (as esthetic attitude, cultural movement, or philosophical style) and the implications for theology. Part 1 continues with chapters on “Anglo-American postmodernity” (Nancey Murphy and Brad Kallenberg), postliberal theology (George Hunsinger), postmetaphysical theology (Thomas Carlson’s discussion of Jean-Luc Marion), deconstructive theology (Graham Ward), “reconstructive theology” (David Ray Griffin once again advocating for process theology as postmodern), feminist theology (Mary McClintock Fulkerson arguing for a fusion of liberation-focused theology with postmodern themes of instability and otherness), and radical orthodoxy (Stephen Long). Part 2 includes chapters on Scripture and tradition (Vanhoozer), theological method (Dan Stiver), the Trinity (David Cunningham), God and world (Philip Clayton, rather unconvincingly advocating a panentheist approach), the human person (John Webster, strongly critical of deconstructive anthropology), Christ and salvation (Walter Lowe emphasizing apocalyptic Christology via Paul), ecclesiology (Stanley Grenz), and Pneumatology and spirituality (David Ford).

There are several fine chapters here. Hunsinger, arguing that there is no “Yale School” while demonstrating the opposite, offers a detailed analysis of postliberalism’s debt to Hans Frei and George Lindbeck. Carlson, one of Marion’s most astute commentators, provides one of the best available summaries of Marion’s major themes; however, it shortchanges the Catholic aspect of Marion’s thought and is marred by what has become the inevitable invocation of Jacques Derrida as a “corrective.” Ward incisively analyzes the impact of Derrida’s thought on philosophical theology; his concluding pages are an object lesson in how to be theologically appreciative yet critical of Derrida’s claims. Long’s solid chapter, although almost
drowning in its own jargon and self-assurance, is shrewd and insightful; it links radical orthodoxy and the continental critique of ontotheology more clearly than I have seen before. Cunningham insightfully juxtaposes postmodern themes of relationality, difference, and rhetoric with trinitarian themes of procession, personhood, and practice. Ford develops a theme he has discussed elsewhere regarding “the shape of our living” in Christ. He crafts a postmodern spirituality using key elements of Bonhoeffer’s Ethics, Jewish “postmodern wisdom,” and the Christian practice of hospitality to suggest how the Spirit shapes the “eucharistic” self, whose stability comes from living “before the face of Jesus Christ” in the interplay between the given present and the eschatological future (284). Ford’s chapter is perhaps the most successful in terms of the volume’s stated task.

However, this volume, particularly part 1, suffers from several problems. First, it carries a prevailing attitude that postmodernism or postmodernity is something “other” than theology, a strange and intriguing entity that “we” should probe for anything that “we” can use. The editor legitimately wonders whether theology can provide an “alternative genealogy” and “counter-narrative” about modernity and postmodernity (5). But he gives away the game when he discusses “the encounter of Christian faith and the ‘other’ of postmodernity” (22) as if the Christian task of fides quaerens intellectum were not already historically situated and culturally inflected.

Second, Barth’s spirit hangs heavy over the proceedings, determining how faith’s relationship to reason and ontology gets construed. Readers interested in this crucial issue might be forgiven if they come away from part 1 believing that the foremost resources for dealing with postmodernity are Frei and Lindbeck. The volume is thus not a wide-ranging “companion” but an explicitly Protestant reaction to postmodernism construed mainly along epistemological lines. This approach rightly underscores postmodernism’s critique of modern rationality (a critique with demonstrable Protestant roots), but consequently ignores both the continental philosophical critique of metaphysics (running from Kierkegaard and Nietzsche up through Heidegger, Derrida, and Lyotard) that made “postmodernism” a theological concern to begin with, as well as the influential arguments of Frederic Jameson and others that postmodernism is the further development of consumer capitalism.

Third, some authors assert that their modern philosophical presuppositions had already anticipated postmodern themes, but this Jacques-come-lately approach leads to an unresolved tension: While the doctrinal chapters acknowledge the inevitable presence of postmodernity and work from there, the methodology section appears to theologize in spite of postmodernity in an effort to overcome it.

Lastly, it is disappointing that contemporary Catholic theology is almost totally ignored here. There is no acknowledgment of prominent Catholic efforts influenced by phenomenology, hermeneutics, critical theory, and even Thomistic traditions to do constructive theology in a postmodern context (e.g. Louis-Marie Chauvet, David Power, Jean-Yves Lacoste, Jo-
This useful volume, then, is a mixed bag. Interested readers should supplement their explorations with Kevin Hart’s clear and insightful Postmodernism: A Beginner’s Guide (2004), Graham Ward’s The Postmodern God: A Theological Reader (1997), and Lieven Boeve’s Interrupting Tradition (2003).

Villanova University, Villanova, Penn.

ANTHONY J. GODZIEBA


Several authors in this interesting volume, the product of an international conference held at the University of Southern California in 2004, stress that many young Jews and Christians in the United States are wholly ignorant of the religious traditions they have inherited. Many have no notion that there might be socioeconomic or political implications to their faith, nor, even more important, that basic and distinctive theological and moral themes characterize each of their particular religious traditions. Sociologist Christian Smith suggests in the most provocative contribution that the prevailing religion of teenagers in the United States is a bland “Moralistic Therapeutic Deism.” The central themes of Judaism and Christianity are bleached out in this version of what the great German sociologist of religion, Thomas Luckmann, characterized 40 years ago (The Invisible Religion [1967]) as a distinctly American phenomenon of “internal secularization”: “Whereas religious ideas originally played an important part in the shaping of the American Dream, today the secular ideas of the American Dream pervade church religion” (Luckmann as quoted on 68). Anyone who has listened to the pious teenage blather of George W. Bush knows that much. Smith himself did not always accept Luckmann’s ideas about secularization, but his surveys of American teenagers’ religious thought (the National Study of Youth and Religion) have convinced him that for many Americans today religion has little more than a “public-health justification”: “it produces healthy, good, ‘prosocial’ citizens” (61).

As Smith and others suggest, the notion that the covenant between God and the chosen people, or the saving death and resurrection of Jesus, might be important in the religious belonging of young people, Jewish or Christian, seems rather passé among American teenagers. What journalists used to abbreviate, when taking notes on the end of any speech by the late Nelson Rockefeller, as BOMFOG—“the brotherhood of man and the Fatherhood of God”—has been sanitized of its gender-specific bias and marketed as a feel-good nostrum covering whatever will sell religiously among young Americans. All too many “youth ministers” have cooperated in this religious fraud among Jews and Christians. The Muslim minority in the United States may be the exception to this rule, but much of this exception may be due to their closeness, for the most part, to their immigrant roots.
and their consequent estrangement from the cultural mainstream. The authors writing on American Muslims seem to know few younger Muslims, especially those with mixed Muslim and non-Muslim parents, who are closer to “Moralistic Therapeutic Deism” than they are to the social and religious vision of the Qur’an and Muhammad.

But neither Smith nor the other authors limit their song to the lachrymose mode. Sections 3, 4, and 5 feature studies of Jewish, Christian, and Muslim communities that have managed to communicate many specifics of their religious traditions to younger congregants. Would that Vatican enthusiasts, who restored (supposedly in response to popular clamor) the more general use of the Eucharistic Liturgy of Pius V, would study these chapters, and especially the contributions by Rabbi J. Rolando Matalon of Congregation B‘nai Jeshurun in New York City and by Brother John of Taizé. They would learn that returning to the traditional in worship does not necessitate becoming a museum for antiques.

Concluding essays by Jack Miles and Diane Winston survey all that went before in the conference and offer sage observations. Totally inaccurate, however, is Miles’s passing assertion that the words polite and political “come from the same Greek root” (260). The former derives from the past participle of the Latin polire (to polish); the latter comes, of course, from the Greek polis (city-state). He is particularly accurate, however, in underlining how much consumerism has corrupted the American religious imagination, and not only among teenagers. Again, this volume is a substantial contribution to the discussion of the faith of the young in contemporary society.

*Fordham University, New York*

**Patrick J. Ryan, S.J.**


A member of the International Theological Commission and professor of theology at the Australian Catholic University, Kelly has produced a systematic study of eschatology that is richly informed by other areas he has published on, such as Trinity, Scripture, Eucharist, and ecology. One of the book’s strengths is how its account of hope connects with other major areas of theological reflection. Something of that interconnectedness can be seen in its structure. Beginning with the felt experience of Christian hope from which the classical themes of eschatology emerge (chaps. 1 and 2), K. sketches the trinitarian context (chap. 3) of the fundamental “parable of hope, the paschal mystery” (chap. 4) that provides the controlling lens through which the notions of death, purgatory, hell, and heaven (chaps. 5–8) make sense. The final chapters “return to earth” to explore how the eucharistic reenactment of the paschal mystery (chap. 9) grounds the living hope of a church that continually promotes conversion (chap. 10).

Following Rahner, K. understands eschatological statements not as previews of things to come, but as extrapolations from the incomplete yet promise-filled experience of grace. He thus conveys the modest, yet exis-
tentially significant, nature of eschatological claims. Following Aquinas, K. defines hope as the movement toward a future, difficult, yet possible good. He can thus contrast a christologically grounded hope with blithe optimism. Whereas the former arises precisely through encounters with suffering, the latter withers. And the more hope realistically faces suffering yet nonetheless desires a future good, the more it can participate in Christ’s cross and resurrection. The book also attractively explores the novel slogan “inter-hope dialogue,” for example, in comparing Christian views on eternal life with Hindu views on reincarnation.

K.’s exploration of hope/eschatology is particularly strong in the context of individual psychology (drawing on Ernst Becker, Gabriel Marcel, James Alison, et al.). Also strong is K.’s presentation of the ecological and cosmic dimensions of hope, which is more helpful than, say, Katherine Tanner’s negative treatment in her *Jesus, Humanity, Trinity* (2001). In this area, some consideration of Teilhard de Chardin and a Scotistic/Rahnerian view of the Incarnation might advance his presentation and also question his peremptory claim that an adequate account of hope presupposes God’s immediate creation of the soul (44). On what lies between the individual and the cosmos, K. is less convincing; I note, for example, the very brisk treatment of the history of eschatological reflection and the somewhat facile contrast of the “psychotic mind-set . . . of ‘economic rationalism’ . . . with . . . the divine economy of gift and giving” (213). Such comments may be true as far as they go, but they do not go very far in helping us understand how Christian hope might include economic realities.

Two substantial criticisms might be made. First, given his interest in ecology, in the systematic connections between doctrines, and in Aquinas, K. is curiously silent about creation. According to Josef Pieper, Aquinas’s theology manifests a profound connection between the experience of hope and the state of createdness. That connection lies in the sense of radical incompleteness that results in an utter dependence on God. Furthermore, some discussion of creation would call to mind the crucial distinction between, yet radical participation of, the world and God. This distinction-in-participation could fruitfully be compared to the central “already/not-yet” theme of eschatology, thereby bolstering the claim that while hope primarily intends God, it does not therefore ignore the world.

A second criticism concerns the need for a clearer distinction between hope and charity (K. briefly flags the differences among the three theological virtues [17–18]). For Aquinas, hope desires something for oneself, whereas charity enjoys something in its own right. Thus hope desires God as one’s salvation, whereas charity loves God in Godself. Keeping this distinction in mind would avoid the shortcomings of the suggestive yet loose final chapter, which so generalizes the range of hope that the virtue loses its specificity and, with its consequent imprecision, colonizes the function of other virtues and thus becomes the form of the virtues. Perhaps one could capture the undeniable pervasiveness of hope while retaining its distinction from charity by appealing to Rahner’s contention (in “On the Theology of Hope,” *Theological Investigations*, vol. 10) that hope is the
shared modality of faith’s and charity’s self-giving of, respectively, mind and heart to absolute mystery.

A few concluding comparative remarks with Zachary Hayes’s 1989 Visions of a Future are in order. K. gives less OT and historical context and conveys less of the difficulty and ongoing nature of debates in eschatology. But while Hayes’s treatment is more orderly and methodical, K.’s is more systematic and creative, and probably more inviting to less specialized readers. K.’s work does not displace Hayes’s, but provides a helpful, stimulating, and highly recommended complement.

Weston Jesuit School of Theology, Cambridge, Mass. DOMINIC DOYLE


In an attempt to form a properly theological response to our current ecological crisis, Boss asks how we might transform our inadequate understanding of nature, given that our understanding of God is necessarily shaped within an anthropological perspective (15). He claims to be asking this question equally of Karl Rahner and Wolfhart Pannenberg, although his treatment of the two is uneven. Rahner gets 104 pages while Pannenberg gets 209. Further, qualitatively B.’s treatment of Rahner is mostly descriptive and general, with only seven pages on his understanding of nature, rendering this dissertation less than a fully comparative study. (B. acknowledges that Pannenberg’s understanding of nature is more comprehensive than is Rahner’s [129].)

B.’s treatment of Pannenberg, especially his analysis and criticism of Pannenberg’s theological anthropology (see 232), is more thorough. He raises the important distinction between revelation as history or as nature (143). Relying mostly on Pannenberg’s Beiträge zur systematischen Theologie (1999) and Systematische Theologie, vol.1 (1991) (169), he describes Pannenberg’s development of the notion of revelation as history into his system of “philosophy–religion–revelation.” From this and other important studies, B. presents a clear picture of Pannenberg’s theological anthropology and concludes that Pannenberg offers no direct path from cosmology to theology. The reason for the lack, as B. understands it, is that Pannenberg bases his considerations on experience of the world rather than on the world in its own right—thus nature remains a function of his anthropology (224). The notions of the world and nature in Pannenberg’s theological system remain undeveloped.

Given these limitations in Pannenberg’s own work, B. himself tries to develop a Pannenbergian understanding of nature and a theology of nature. Under the perspective of theological anthropology, B. mentions three potentially helpful notions, namely, those of natural revelation, the religious nature of humanity, and the secularization of nature (245). He then tries to link these notions, and particularly the religious dimension of humanity, to the role of the Spirit in Pannenberg’s anthropology (255).
B. also tries to expand Pannenberg’s theology of nature by noting that his theology focuses not on substance but on event (282); theologically, the world and nature are the products of God’s action (300). Pannenberg’s notion of nature is shaped by his trinitarian theology—not by natural science theory (326)—and especially by the trinitarian doctrine of creation (224). B. also searches for some grounds in Pannenberg for taking up an eschatological dimension of nature and the end of the world (322) without himself moving Pannenberg’s theology of nature much beyond a grounding in the doctrine of creation (326) to a deeper grounding in a notion of eschatological consummation (323). Thus B. has not yet completed a comprehensive theological evaluation and transposition of Pannenberg’s understanding of nature.

Several other potentially helpful theological threads are mentioned but left unexplored. B. mentions Pannenberg’s criticism of the two-natures doctrine (17) and describes separately Rahner’s and Pannenberg’s understanding of God–man–nature, without offering any further comparison. B. also describes Rahner’s preference for existential hermeneutics and Pannenberg’s preference for a universal historical hermeneutics (129), without further elaboration or comparison. Again, B. mentions differences in theological method: Rahner’s theological method as grounded in a transcendental anthropology; Pannenberg’s is hermeneutical and phenomenological (138). Again B. states but does not exploit the fact that Rahner formulates the question of being in terms of a metaphysical ontology, while Pannenberg builds his theology on a notion of the totality of reality and eschatological ontology (138). B. does helpfully appeal to Pannenberg’s understanding of God in two dimensions, namely, the world experience and self-consciousness (226). However, each of these other distinctions would need to be exploited to arrive fully at B.’s stated goal: the transformation of our understanding of nature from a theological anthropological perspective, the remedying of the loss of the dimension of nature in Rahner and Pannenberg’s theologies.

Alliance Theological Seminary, Hong Kong

Benedict Hung-biu Kwok


In the tradition of Chung Hyun Kyung’s Struggle to Be the Sun Again (1990) and Kwok Pui-lan’s Introducing Asian Feminist Theology (2000), Orevillo-Montenegro’s book offers a substantive overview of Christologies emerging from the women of Asia. Although colonialism and Western Christian imperialism have marginalized Asian insights, O.-M. argues that Asian women’s voices continue to emerge on the margins of the marginalized, and she seeks to amplify those voices. After moving quickly over centuries of Christian presence in Asia, the theologies that have emerged, and the responses of indigenous peoples (chap. 1), O.-M. then introduces the women who are “dalits among the dalits” and “minjung of the minjung,” women who seek in Jesus Christ both meaning and healing.
The book helpfully distinguishes the voices of Asian women as they emerge from India, Korea, the Philippines, and Hong Kong (chaps. 2–5). The regional approach allows the reader to enter the particular lives of women in specific cultural contexts as O.-M. skillfully sketches the distinctive religious and cultural histories of each location. She gives texture to “women’s oppression” in its materially distinct forms: from dowry practices and the eat-less ideology that sees husbands and children fed first and women malnourished, to the sex trade that traps more than a half-million women in exploitative local and global systems, to women pressed by economic necessity to leave their families and children to work transnationally as domestic helpers. Compellingly, O.-M. charts the ways Christian women have sought in Christ a symbolic and living response to these realities.

In a fresh way, M. asks what Christian sacrifice and salvation, cross and resurrection, can and do mean for the oppressed women of Asia. Among the book’s most engaging invitations is the call to seek together, as a Christian community, the “Gospel of Prostituted Women.” Only then, O.-M. argues, will liberationist theology truly be tested in praxis. Expanding this insight (gleaned from Rose Wu), each chapter brings to light the real injustices toward women that occur both outside and inside the churches and calls for Christian responsibility from all Christians in our globalized world.

Asian contextual theology emerges out of Asia’s widespread poverty and its plurality of religions. O.-M. boldly engages religious diversity as she seeks theologies that can alleviate suffering. With a refreshing openness to finding God’s liberating work in the many spiritual and secular traditions, she presents a Christian theology that crosses religious boundaries. A Shakti Christology gives voice to the empowerment of women in India. Christ Shaman enacts the ritual han-pur-ri through the sacrifice of the cross (99). And Filipino goddess traditions stand submerged, ready to be explored and reclaimed “in order to understand the feminine face of the Sacred” (155). In the blending of women’s voices from Asia and the West, Jesus is not only sage but Sophia, “Wisdom Incarnate in the image of Kuan-yin, the Prajna Paramita, the Supreme Wisdom who cannot be imprisoned in one form” (180).

While the book focuses on theologies that emerge from women in Asia, it delivers something more comprehensive. O.-M. also discusses Asian male theologians’ engagement with Western theological traditions, providing a broad overview of the variety of theologies that have found currency in Asia. And she converses with Western feminist theologians, demonstrating the transnational movement of theological discourse. But in all these interchanges, she allows Asian women to set the agenda, even while she seeks in the conversation to identify liberating strands from wherever they may have come. Surveying both prominent women theologians and the voices of everyday women and men, O.-M.’s contextual approach allows not only for a rich texture, but also, importantly, for critique and competing views. Most intriguing is the exchange of differing postcolonial perspectives...
as they have been articulated in Hong Kong (168–75). O.-M. is willing to recognize and give respectful hearing to theologies that present obvious challenges to the consistent liberationist approach of her own work. Her voice guides the volume while allowing diversity to ring.

_The Jesus of Asian Women_ continues the vibrant tradition of recognizing the distinctive impulses of theologies in diverse parts of the world. More important, it enacts a new methodology for theology under globalization; it is liberationist, intercultural, and interreligious, breaking new ground in carrying on our ancient traditions.

_Fordham University, New York_  
_JEANNINE HILL FLETCHER_


It may be too early to nominate the theological classics of the 20th century, but _Christus Victor_ (1930; E.T. 1931), Gustaf Aulén’s lectures on “the three main types of the idea of the atonement,” will surely make the short list. His approach, based on distinguishing and comparing “motifs,” and the _Christus Victor_ theme he championed have both left their mark on later discussion. Beilby and Eddy’s _The Nature of the Atonement_ is a case in point. It too brings different views into confrontation, one of which is Aulén’s favorite in name and substance. The difference is that each of the contested views is presented on its own by one of the four contributing authors, with comments from each of the other three following each presentation.

Gregory Boyd leads off with an update of _Christus Victor_, the idea that by his passion and death Christ conquered the devil, demonic forces, “the powers.” Next is penal substitution, akin to Aulén’s “Latin” type, here defended in its full rigor by Thomas Schreiner. Bruce Reichenbach argues for what he calls the “healing” view (“therapeutic” would be quite the wrong word), and Joel Green for the “kaleidoscopic” view that no single view can capture the multifaceted richness of what has to be said about atonement. It is worth noting that one of Aulén’s types, which he called “subjective,” is scarcely mentioned, let alone defended.

All four authors agree with the kaleidoscopic view to the extent of allowing that the Bible expresses the significance of Christ’s work in many different ways. Everyone except Green, however, seems committed to the notion that there must be _some_ “intrinsic logic to the variety of the New Testament atonement metaphors” (187), and that _the_ atonement “can best be defined by a single, dominant theme” (143), namely the one for which he has himself made a case. Not surprisingly, the responses tend to
take the form of polite demurral: “Yes, there is much to be said for your argument, but mine is better.” Consequently, no matter what one thinks of the four presentations individually, as an ensemble they cannot help but raise the question of what “better” means. What is an atonement theory (or motif or model or paradigm) supposed to do, and what are the criteria by which to judge how well competing theories do it? Second-order, methodological reflection that addresses such questions becomes explicit now and then, mainly in the comments, but the book’s neat architecture gives the impression that in making a case for his own position each author is doing the same kind of thing as the others. In fact, they are engaged in somewhat different projects that take their bearings from somewhat different logical, exegetical, philosophical, practical, hermeneutical, and dogmatic standards. What is at issue turns out to be not just the adequacy of this or that position, but how it was arrived at in preference to alternatives.

In that regard, none of the four contributors to *The Nature of the Atonement* has much in common with Stephen Finlan. Perhaps Green comes closest, in that he shares with F. an approach to Scripture that is historically minded, and an approach to theology that does not aspire to timeless certainties. But “closest” is not all that close. F. would agree that atonement is a kaleidoscopic idea, but he is not content simply to acknowledge the multiplicity, much less to reaffirm it. The components that make up the idea are themselves problematic. Whereas Schreiner would have it that penal substitution is “the anchor and heart of the atonement” (93) and that consequently its inherent difficulties just have to be surmounted somehow, F. thinks they are insurmountable. That, on the negative side, is F.’s thesis.

On the positive side, F.’s aim is in some sense to undo what Aulén did. It has been said that *Christus Victor* brought an end to more than a century of theology that had the Incarnation at its center, shifting the focus to redemption, the cross, and atonement. F. would reverse the shift. Not that he advocates the sort of Christ-metaphysic espoused by 19th-century Christian Hegelians. He does, however, find the religious and theological significance of Christ in the whole “drawing-near” of God that included Christ’s life as well as his death, rather than in Paul’s miscellaneous atonement images. “The Incarnation is an essential Christian idea; the Atonement . . . is not” (120)—not, that is, if affirming it entails conceiving God as demanding sacrifice and Jesus as being punished.

So stated, this is not an especially novel position. Penal substitution, as Schreiner insists, “reminds us that God himself is central in the universe” (*Nature of the Atonement* 93). But the reminder almost inevitably raises a question: What *kind* of God? That is where “problems with atonement” have generally had their origin. Every explanation of atonement has theoretical corollaries, and if they are irreconcilable with ideas of God that come from elsewhere, which alternative trumps the other? That depends in part on whether the NT is taken as testimony to context-independent verities, or as evidence for early Christian beliefs. The authors of *The Nature of the Atonement* tend toward the first view. F.’s is the second. Much of his book is therefore devoted to careful and convincing analysis of what
Paul was doing when he wrote those passages on which everyone agrees that the notion of atonement, as Christians came to understand it, is almost entirely based. The argument is to the effect that these passages are “kaleidoscopic” already. “Paul creates ulcers for academics” (74) by blending, sometimes in just a verse or two, images and metaphors that carry disparate meanings in the traditions he drew on. Sacrifice is not the same as “expulsion” or “scapegoat” rituals, any more than Yahweh is the same as Azazel (37); nor is either of them necessarily connected with punishment. But then, Paul was not writing academic theology. His letters are deliberately rhetorical and homiletic. Accordingly, their imagery is adapted for Gentiles as well as Jews.

F. is at his best when he shows how different strands of tradition exemplify a complex process of “spiritualization.” The further he moves from biblical texts, the more sweeping his judgments become and the less consistently persuasive. On René Girard and “non-violent atonement” his observations are incisive and relevant. When he strays into psychology and politics he does his argument no service. The last chapter, which sets out his constructive position, is suggestive but perhaps not adequate to the role it has to play. Given all that precedes it, the argument has the appearance of a rabbit pulled out of a hat. If the second half of the book measured up to the first, it would be a very valuable book indeed. It is valuable as it stands, but one could wish it were twice as long.

*Boston College*

Charles Hefling


Like most of Metz’s books, this volume is a collection of essays and lectures, most from the last 15 years but some from as early as 1977. Unlike his relatively unedited *Zum Begriff der neuen politischen Theologie* (1997), however, these chapters have undergone extensive reworking, often combining earlier essays, at times working in previously unpublished lectures, particularly from M.’s time as visiting professor at the University of Vienna. This refinement appears to be the contribution of his collaborator, Johann Reikerstorfer, professor of fundamental theology at the University of Vienna. While *Zum Begriff* attempted an overview of the development from 1967 to 1997 of M.’s “new political theology,” this volume focuses more on the way M. has applied his theology to the challenges that the church and the world face today.

Readers of M.’s earlier works will recognize much in what they find here. He continues to work from the early Frankfurt School’s diagnosis of the “dialectic of Enlightenment”: The particular kind of reason (“instrumental” or “technical”) that has taken hold in late modernity threatens the very values (autonomy, inalienable human dignity, justice, etc.) for which the Enlightenment originally advocated a public sphere under the ultimate
authority of reason. He adds that globalization has meant that what was originally a problem for Europe (and North America) has now infected the rest of the world. M.'s focus shifts in this later work to Nietzsche, rather than Marx, as the “master of suspicion” who most deserves our attention. M. continues to argue that the fundamental time-horizon appropriate to Judaism and Christianity is an apocalyptic one rather than the horizon of “time without end”—the latter represented by Nietzsche’s thought and, for M., that of Nietzsche’s postmodern followers. Against Nietzsche’s “blessed are the forgetful,” M. insists on the beatitude “blessed are those who mourn,” those who remember the suffering of the ones who did not “make it” to enjoy the fruits of our “enlightened” technological society (139, see 75, 124). Only this sort of remembering, and a reason that takes its starting point from this remembering and from the narratives that communicate it, corresponds to the biblical roots of Christianity and Judaism and offers a solution to a Europe mired in cultural amnesia. If M. agrees with a Gadamerian insistence that reason always and unavoidably operates within a Wirkungsgeschichte of past traditions, he adds a quasi-apophatic amendment: for Christianity and Judaism there is always also the interruptive, disturbing, but still constitutive presence to reason of the past. That past, because it was annihilated unjustly and then covered over by the victors, has its impact, its Wirkungen, only negatively, through a perception, even a knowing, that senses what is absent, what is lacking (he calls it a Vermissenswissen—inter alia: 10, 28, 33, 220–22, 233ff.). The paradigmatic and constitutive instance of this perception is the remembering of the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. As always with M., however, the memory of the resurrection is quite muted, perhaps because European and North American theology too quickly jumps to cheap consolation and, therefore, must resolutely be called to pass through (without leaving behind) the suffering of others on its way to resurrection. By this route M. comes to a fundamental assertion that reminds one strongly of Levinas: that the final authority not only for the human heart, but for human reason, is the claim made on us by the other, particularly the other who suffers (and has suffered).

This volume offers all the pleasures and frustrations that come with reading M. It offers a rich menu of Metzian themes and arguments, often applied to new situations. Space prevents an overview of many of the offerings: his treatment of religious and cultural pluralism; his continuing insistence on the need to recover Christianity’s relationship to Judaism with the profound theological reformulations this will require; a fascinating (and illuminating) discussion of the kind of spirituality he has in mind with his talk of a mysticism of Leiden an Gott, in which he elaborates on his heretofore rather cryptic references to Luke 11:9–13 (93–102). M. continues to rely often on aphorism and sweeping (albeit provocative) generalization. If one is unfamiliar with the positions he claims to correct—Karl Rahner’s theology, the philosophy of Jürgen Habermas and other less well-known German thinkers—then the book is heavy going indeed. In the
end, though, for anyone interested in M.’s work and in the future of political theology, this volume is indispensable.

*University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.*

J. Matthew Ashley


Matheson has given us a much-needed history of Reformation Christianity that focuses on the ordinary people of the church, rather than simply another recitation of the usual names, dates, and schisms. The chapters from eleven historians are arranged in three sections: “The Life of Faith,” “From Cradle to Grave,” and “Finding Their Voice.” While using the best of recent scholarship, the authors maintain a clear, readable, even pleasant style.

The volume clarifies the fact that there were many reformations (not just one), highlights their complexity, and affirms that even humble villagers had a stake in retrieving the integrity of the church. The authors demonstrate that previous historical approaches tend toward static, dualistic interpretations of Reformation life, with stark divisions between commoners and the elite, rural and urban, corporate and individual religious life, and so on (50). These rigid depictions fail to take into account the actual dynamism of the Reformations as well as the theological vitality of ordinary people. The doctrinal disputes that caused Christians to burn one another at the stake were often set aside by ordinary Christians living in the same village. That is, in some ways the average illiterate Christian demonstrated greater generosity of spirit than those at the ecclesiastic helm.

By honoring the previously minimized experiences and perspectives of lay Reformation Christians, this book retrieves theological voices from the margins. In humanizing and dignifying the experiences and religious commitments of ordinary Christians, the authors also demonstrate some (unfortunate) continuities over these four centuries. In 1700, for example, the village of Rülzheim complained about their priest, longing to get rid of him because of his verbal harangues from the pulpit, his “spies” who reported on parishioners behind their backs, and his inappropriately complaining about specific people from the pulpit (51). Anyone who has been a member of a small church in America has heard such complaints. Or, again, anyone involved in current so-called “worship wars” (that split congregations over issues of worship music and liturgy) will perhaps find amusement, if not comfort, in the story of the 17th-century people and bishop of Brechin. The bishop’s introduction in 1637 of a formal liturgy to the antipapal Scots resulted in outrage among the people of Brechin. Fearing for his safety, the bishop read the liturgy to his angry congregation over a pair of loaded pistols (86).

The authors lead readers through subjects left out of most church histories, such as how 17th-century women experienced pregnancy and childbirth, and how their faith shaped their interpretation of infant mortality (95–119). Readers learn how religion influenced the lives of children, who
went to school and how they were educated, how parents related to their children, and how orphans and abandoned children survived. Particularly in discussion around women's and children's experiences, the authors have vivified the era, correcting former historians' assumptions about life in the early modern period—for example, the erroneous notion that parents were not as emotionally attached to their children then as now, thus parents allegedly did not grieve over the deaths of their children the way we do today.

This book is a welcome supplement to seminary classes in church history, providing students with an engaging view of ordinary Christian life during the Reformations. It is also an accessible, enjoyable read for ordinary Christians today.


Following the deeply shocking events of September 11, 2001, in New York and then July 7, 2005, in London, some theologians (perhaps still a minority) are beginning to realize that we do need to question the monopolistic truth claims made all too often by faith communities and, instead, help them to discover that they might actually have something to learn from each other. In today's world particularist forms of religious and even secular faith have become just too dangerous. Communities of faith or ideology—confident that they alone possess the truth and convinced it is their duty or right to impose this truth across the globe—pose a serious threat to peace. For much of the West today this threat is militant Islam. For much of the Muslim world it is Western secular liberalism. In the 20th century the threat was German National Socialism or Soviet Marxism. In earlier centuries it was crusading Christianity and so on.

The Jewish, Christian, and Muslim scholars contributing to this important collection are all deeply concerned with these issues. The book is the product of a conference hosted by the theologians at the University of Chicago in the autumn of 2003 whose purpose was “to examine anew the shared ways in which the three monotheistic faiths in the Abrahamic tradition conceive the idea of humanity before God and how each contributes to contemporary understandings of fundamental claims about the inalienable worth of human life . . . to specify unique perspectives on a shared moral and religious concern” (1). Those familiar with William Schweiker’s work, especially his *Theological Ethics and Global Dynamics* (2004) and his *Responsibility and Christian Ethics* (1995), will hardly be surprised at this examination. He has long been convinced that the dynamics of a global world make such theological exploration imperative.

Hilary Putnam lucidly sets out the theological challenge in the first chapter, taking Jonathan Sacks’s brilliant but tragic book *The Dignity of Difference* (2002) as a paradigm. She recalls that, in the first edition, Sacks, the
Chief Rabbi in Britain, claimed that “God has spoken to mankind in many languages: through Judaism to Jews, Christianity to Christians, through Islam to Muslims.” However, a small group of ultra-orthodox Jews in Britain forced him to withdraw this claim, to pulp the first edition, and to publish a “revised” edition claiming little more than that “God values diversity.” Putnam asks sharply why anyone should “concede epistemic authority to any religion” when so few are able to abandon their all-too-human claims to “privileged access to the truth” (23).

The theme of the first and largest section of this book is “The Distinctiveness of Human Being” viewed from different and sometimes complementary perspectives in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic scholarship. For example, the Muslim scholar Abdulaziz Sachedina sets out carefully the Islamic doctrine of human vicegerency, that Adam in the Qur’an is created not in the “image” of God as in the Jewish Bible, but as God’s representative. In the following chapter the liberal Catholic feminist Lisa Sowle Cahill argues that a more dynamic understanding of “image” can help Christians to learn from this doctrine of vicegerency, enhancing our sense of responsibility to each other and to ecology. Schweiker, in turn, explores the love commands within the Christian faith, arguing that they articulate “a way in the world moved by gratitude for life . . . this kind of love is the important, even distinctive, contribution that Christian teaching can make to ethics in an age riddled with hatred and war, driven by wanton consumption, hopeless and ungrateful” (116).

The theme of part 2 is “Humanity in Creation.” Here David Little’s very important chapter, “Religion, Human Rights and Secularism,” argues that “it is important to establish a set of limits or outside constraints with regard to human rights and secularism in order that various public manifestations of religious thought and practice be effectively restrained” (282). Lawrence Vogel examines the neoconservative theological influence of Leon Kass as chair of the President Bush’s Council on Bioethics. Kevin Jung provides a useful typology for different theological/ethical positions apparent in the public forum. And John Kelsay examines the debate within Islam about the use of force by al-Qaeda.

Theological purists, whether Jewish, Christian, or Muslim, will disapprove of this book’s hope and expectation, anchored as it is in the premise that at least the Abrahamic faiths actually can learn from each other. For me, especially since 9/11, this premise is an article of faith. To others similarly convinced—and those who can entertain such hope—I recommend this book whole-heartedly.

University of Kent, Canterbury

ROBIN GILL


Hing is professor of law and Asian American studies and director of law clinical programs at the University of California, Davis. I note this for two
reasons. First, the book’s discussions of law, policy, and legal practice are far more extensive and sophisticated than the treatment of values and morality. Second, overall the book can best be understood as a moral cry from the heart by a progressive professor and expert practitioner of immigration law. In the face of the xenophobia influencing much of the American debate on immigration, H. persuasively invokes George Washington in calling for the creation of a “policy of humanity” to govern how the United States welcomes strangers from around the world.

The book proceeds through five chapters on the most vexing legal and policy aspects of the contemporary American immigration debate: illegal immigration, deportation, family-based immigration, national security, and integration. In the face of twelve million undocumented immigrants in the United States, H. favors a guest worker program with firm legal protections and the possibility of citizenship. He grounds such a policy on the argument by moral philosopher Michael Walzer that guest workers, as participants in the economy and as subject to the host country’s laws, must have the possibility of citizenship open to them as a requirement of self-determination and political justice. H. decries the increasing use of automatic deportation on the basis of what seems an ever-expanding list of aggravated felonies. A perjury conviction with a one-year sentence can get a person automatically deported. The law all but forbids any second chance or discretion by a judge. For H., this draconian practice represents an ill-fated triumph in American society of a rationalized and individualistic view of justice at the expense of justice tempered with compassion and attentive to ties of particularity.

H. deftly unpacks how, in the past decades, attacks began on the family-reunification aspects of U.S. immigration policy, in response to the growing ability of Latino and Asian immigrants to take advantage of such provisions for bringing family members to the United States. Opponents of family reunification have argued that U.S. policy should be more jobs based. But, H. notes, such a view undermines the importance of families for their own sake and for the public order and well-being of the nation. He also catalogues how, in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, U.S. concerns over national security created an exclusionary policy that linked government profiling of noncitizens with a preexisting nativist agenda. For those like H. who favor more open borders and a much greater acceptance of all immigrants, there are few bright spots in current U.S. law and policy. But the book’s chapter on integration spells out some signs of hope. First, the chapter nicely articulates the mutual responsibility for integration of both host country and immigrant. Then it follows the powerful example of how the state of North Carolina, which in the 1990s saw its Latino population increase by 394 percent, has organized trips to Mexico by state policy makers and educators in order to develop a better understanding of the new inhabitants of the state.

The American people, H. argues, are facing a stark moral choice. On the one hand, they can continue to follow what H. calls the process of demonizing, dehumanizing, and criminalizing. In this process, first some over-
whelming fault is affixed to the immigrant (they are bad for the economy or illegal, etc.); then, on account of that fault, the motives and hopes of the immigrant fade from view; finally, the immigrant becomes all-but-synonymous with a criminal or terrorist. Or, on the other hand, the American people can choose a “policy of humanity” in which they try to imagine themselves in the shoes of the new arrivals to these cities and shores. Of course, these are shoes very similar to the ones worn by the ancestors of most contemporary residents of an immigrant-nation like the United States. Perhaps the choice for this “policy of humanity” could be encouraged by a reminder from Catholic pulpits that the second-most-repeated commandment in the Hebrew Scriptures is: “The alien who resides with you shall be to you as the citizen among you; you shall love the alien as yourself, for you were aliens in the land of Egypt: I am the Lord your God” (Lev 19:34).

The book will be of special interest to theologians hoping to develop a practical, hands-on sense of the key issues in contemporary U.S. immigration law and policy.

Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University

DAVID E. DE COSSE


Maclean’s book concentrates on the churches’ role in the truth and reconciliation commissions of Latin America, an area until now too infrequently examined, and offers carefully crafted studies of specific cases such as Peru and Chile as well as more general discussions of the key principles—particularly justice and forgiveness—involves in the resolution of attempts at social reconstruction.

The volume is divided into three parts. After a helpful introductory analysis and overview by the editor, the first part examines the role of the churches in the truth commissions of Chile, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Brazil. Part 2 focuses on the contribution of specifically Christian theological themes of forgiveness, truth, and reconciliation for the ecclesial, social, and political spheres. This section helpfully shows the relevance of religious, theological, and ethical resources from the Christian tradition to the complexities of national reconciliation. The final part applies lessons from previous commissions to the future in both church and state.

M. has provided a valuable introductory resource for beginners to the field, but also some in-depth readings of the role of religion in efforts to promote social reconciliation. He solicited articles from distinguished scholars such as Charles Villa-Vicencio and David Tombs, as well as from younger scholars such as Margaret Pfeil of Notre Dame. The collection makes it abundantly clear that the promotion of social reconciliation after violent civil conflict typically proceeds through political compromises and the subtle balancing of the claims of perpetrators, bystanders, and victims.
While theologies of reconciliation generate ideal goals, M. and his authors attend as well to the limitations that restrict actual reconciliation. The limitations include insistence on amnesty provisions by former dictators, practical difficulties in effective prosecution of perpetrators, popular emotional and moral exhaustion, and scant economic resources for the payment of reparations.

The authors capture well the salient, particular points of each situation; particularities make each national case distinct. But this volume allows some cautious generalizations about the church in Latin America to emerge. Local churches are often caught between diverging political options both during and after conflict. Like many of the postconflict political powers, church hierarchies tend to promote peace, national unity, and forgiveness for all. In some cases church institutions have acted to preserve the memories of victims, provided legal and other forms of aid to survivors, and functioned as a “voice for the voiceless.” They also have come to function in postconflict contexts in a way that provided space for opposing parties to meet and discuss their common interests in peace. Finally, the churches’ support for intermediary associations during years of repression, and their advocacy for the poor have contributed to the strengthening of civil society.

The authors also highlight four remaining challenges to the churches. They must: (1) be more uniformly committed to knowing the truth about repression; (2) make it clear that the act of granting forgiveness cannot be forced on victims and survivors, particularly in the absence of visible signs of contrition and remorse from their tormentors; (3) be more consistently committed to facing the ongoing suffering of the poor and to calling attention to the structural causes of their deprivation—political and legal reforms must be accompanied by economic reforms; and (4) acknowledge their own complicity, and sometimes active cooperation, in various regimes of repression. Ecclesial amnesia must be addressed if the church is to live up to its professed moral commitments to peace and social justice.

By bringing the complexities of specifically Latin American reconciliation activities to our attention, M. has served us well. His collection should be read by all students and scholars of peace studies, conflict resolution, or Christian social ethics.

Boston College

Stephen Pope


With this work David Jensen joins a historically rare but growing group of theologians writing directly about children. “To address this neglect of childhood and children’s lives,” J. claims, entails considering “whose [the children] are and what they are” (xii, xi). They are God’s, and their vulnerability proves both a chief feature of their existence and a means of insight into God.
Married and a father, J.’s theological perspective is shaped by experiences different from that of those celibate males who theologically appropriated and Christianized negative, patriarchal views of women and children. J. identifies caring for children with Christian discipleship and not, as in the tradition, with women’s function in creation. Taking vulnerability rather than reason as his chief anthropological category, he finds this dimension of human experience a helpful means for rethinking the meaning of key Christian doctrines. “The center of my theological analysis explores childhood under the headings of vulnerability and difference” (xv). Difference makes possible our being-in-relation. We seek the other, as does God in creation. God’s triune identity signals that “difference” is fundamental to God’s life (29). Human relationality is grounded in God’s vulnerable love for creation.

J. finds care for the vulnerable at the center of Israel’s covenant and Jesus’ ministry, and he describes his work as a constructive, advocative theology that “grounds its portrayal of children in the self-giving, self-disclosing God of covenant, incarnation, crucifixion, and resurrection” (xii). Attending to children, he argues, we are better able to configure some basic claims of Christian faith, including the imago Dei, church, and sin (xiii). In treating the tragic dimension of childhood (sexual abuse, violence against children, neglect), J. reinterprets sin from the perspective of the “sinned against.” He prefers John Wesley’s image of sin as disease to the more Augustinian understanding of sin as depravity (99). Sin distorts relations. “If sin is the woundedness of a relational creation—both the wounds we inflict on others and the wounds we receive—then sin is the aberration of creation” (98).

J.’s theology is meant to lead to a transformed ecclesiology and to actual benefits for children. The ekklesia is “called to welcome all children and embody an alternative vision for the world, witnessed in practices of vulnerability central to its sacramental and prophetic life: baptism, peacemaking, sanctuary, and prayer” (102). Through these acts, the church witnesses to God’s love for children expressed in Jesus through “an ethic of care for children” (102) and illumines Christian discipleship generally.

While J.’s book is a significant contribution to a contemporary theological anthropology and ecclesiology, two topics invite further comment and elaboration. The first concerns “practices of vulnerability.” For J.’s four ecclesial practices (baptism, peacemaking, sanctuary, and prayer) to be real and their contribution actual, an ecclesiology must illuminate and grasp the actual vulnerabilities that are embodied in these practices. For example, for most of us baptism is a ten-minute ritual slipped into the Sunday liturgy. What moral or gospel imperative does baptizing a child give to the witnessing community? What specific vulnerability is witnessed to and lived by those standing around this font in this community? How are these practices framed for the good of children? J.’s somewhat abstract “practices of vulnerability” might better be replaced with more concrete imperatives, understandings, and practices.

A second topic requiring further discussion is “care for the vulnerable.”
It is, of course, a thematic dimension of the covenant language of the Hebrew Bible, as J. notes. Yet whether this religious commitment can be called the “center” of Israel’s covenant is open to question. One must ask: Whose conception of covenant? The Deuteronomist’s? The Priestly? Others’? Biblical scholars stress not only the multiplicity but the diversity of voices and agenda in both testaments. J. should exercise more caution in stretching biblical themes beyond their historical warrant. J. (and we) might also acknowledge that some biblical themes are theologically positive only when their contexts are ignored. Covenant, for example, is not simply a relational term but carries in its history patriarchal, androcentric, and ethnocentric leanings that we now judge as contrary to the news that is good. Granted that covenant is a primary symbol of Israel’s social, political, and religious identity, it is nonetheless distorted by the division between persons and nonpersons. The same texts that call for the care of women and children also shape a world in which they themselves suffer systematic discrimination and economic vulnerability. This ambiguity is not restricted to the ancient world or biblical texts. The ecclesiology I would encourage J. to develop would include a study of how this ambiguity operates in churches today. With these qualifications, however, his book remains a valuable resource for undergraduate, graduate, and seminary courses in systematic and moral theology, and it certainly invites further work on behalf of children.

Metropolitan State University, St. Paul, Minn.

TATHA WILEY
SHORTER NOTICES


In this user-friendly yet surprisingly in-depth treatment of biblical texts, Okoye (1) highlights and traces the development of the theological foundations for mission in the OT, and (2) explores the different faces of mission—other than proselytizing—that are evident in the OT. He is far more successful with his first objective than the second.

O. convincingly argues that there were three developmental stages of a mission theology in the OT, taking shape (1) as Israel and Judah had to interact with the surrounding nations during the eighth century BCE, (2) as Israel became a confessional community formed by free choice during the Exile, and (3) when apocalyptic sentiments pushed previously Israel-specific traditions into more universal and cosmic perspectives. O. examines passages one would expect when dealing with this topic, for example, Jonah and key passages from Deutero-Isaiah and Trito-Isaiah. A surprising omission is Ruth, who appears with Naomi on the book’s cover. He also deals with passages one would not normally expect, for example, the Priestly writers’ creation story in Genesis. O.’s interpretive method pays attention to the literary and historical contexts of the passages as well as to intertextual and content linkages within the OT and also with the NT, contexts and linkages that help him trace the development of Israel’s mission consciousness.

O. also argues that mission is not limited to direct evangelism, that there are four different modes of mission in the OT—four mission types that in fact structure his book. His description of
types, however, remains unclear and inadequate. Occasional appeals to contemporary examples of mission types would have clarified O.’s presentation of the different OT forms. Despite this weakness with his second objective, however, I recommend this volume to anyone interested in mission as well as in OT studies.

Uriah Y. Kim
Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Conn.


Eschewing thematic discussions of prophetic ethics, Jensen believes that “the prophets deserve to be heard in their own terms, as they address their contemporaries” (xi). The resulting prophet-by-prophet survey has historical value, including acknowledgement of the sometimes dramatic differences especially between the “early” and “classical” or “exilic” prophets. However, in adopting this approach, J.’s driving conviction is that we will hear our own situations addressed as we listen to each prophet confront his own circumstances.

J. asserts that what prophets “say in the area of what we call ‘social justice’” is often applicable to our situation “without ‘translation’” (174)—meaning that the analogies dealing with their poor and socially powerless and our own are straightforward. Even when he does acknowledge more need for “translation” or the deriving of “principles,” he clearly expects us readily to hear our situations addressed. For example, he insists that Isaiah’s and Micah’s images of a future universal peace can sustain our hope and give us goals.

J.’s efforts are satisfying, helped from the beginning by his noting that OT ethics do not allow neat separations between ethics and virtue, or ethics and spirituality, or morality and religion. Similarly, he rightly asserts that understanding prophetic ethics must include recognizing that those ethics are deeply rooted in concrete images of Israel’s relationship with God and the kind of Lord they understood God to be. J.’s refusal to impose false separations/dichotomies on the texts refreshingly allows the text to speak more directly. That refusal should inform contemporary discussions about the relationship between ethics and Scripture, liturgy, or community.

J. is less successful concerning “the progressive nature of revelation, most especially in the area of ethics” (44). This notion allows him to honestly report on troubling prophetic messages or actions. But it remains unclear what we are to learn from this “progress,” including whether there is a discernible trajectory or telos to that progress and whether the same need for progress might apply to our own moral standards.

Joseph J. Kotva Jr.
Elkhart, Ind.


Kelly’s introduction provides substantial information about each book of the NT, including organization, summary, author, audience, and ways Catholics have interpreted some passages. He intends it for students (likely undergraduate) and general readers. The first chapters give an overview of various exegetical approaches to the NT and relevant historical background. The final chapter provides a short annotated bibliography. The style is lively and clear. The contents are well balanced, and the Gospels receive much attention due to their importance for Catholics. The volume shows awareness of disputed issues in NT scholarship and K. does not refrain from pointing these out.

Weaknesses occur in K.’s treatment of the Pauline Epistles and Acts. For instance, when explaining Romans 7–8, a more adequate reading might have offered something about the “new perspective on Paul” instead of merely reproducing the conventional interpretation of these chapters as “a surprisingly personal passage” (73). Similarly, in reading 1 Corinthians 11:2–16, a passage that has had much importance for
Catholics, K. does not seem to be aware that Paul may not be exhorting women to wear a veil (as this word is absent from these verses). In Acts, it might be appropriate finally to send Paul’s horse back to the stable to keep company with the ox and the donkey of the nativity story instead of referring to “his conversion [resulting from his] being knocked from his horse on the road to Damascus” (32). The text mentions no horse, nor is it represented in ancient iconography of the scene. Paul first became a horseman in medieval iconography and his horse grew bigger during the Renaissance.

None of these flaws detract from the overall quality of the book, however, which fulfills the need for a gentle introduction to the NT for those Catholics who may feel intimidated by Raymond Brown’s more comprehensive Introduction to the New Testament (1997).

JEAN-FRANÇOIS RACINE
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


The 15 essays of this book are grouped into three parts: before, during, and after the writing of the four Gospels. Following the editors’ introduction, William Horbury revisits the problem of the usage and meaning of the word euangelion in Herodian Judea. Klyne Snodgrass follows with an essay (the weakest of the collection) on the content of Jesus’ gospel. Martin Hengel criticizes form criticism’s simple opposition between authentic Jesus tradition versus Gemeindebildung (77) and asserts the historical trustworthiness of the Gospel material, concluding that the Jesus tradition they contain derives from eye-witness memory secured by many witnesses. Taken together, the Snodgrass and Hengel essays signal the shift by some scholars to the “historic Jesus,” Jesus as remembered in the tradition. James Dunn, a proponent of the “historic Jesus,” argues that the sayings material attributed to “Q” should be traced back to oral tradition, rather than to a written source.

In part 2, Richard Burridge’s survey of the scholarship on the authorship, date, and audience of the Gospels is noteworthy for its return to his (and Richard Bauckham’s) view that the Gospels were written “for all Christians.” Four other essays explore the distinctive features and factors that affected the compositions of Matthew (Richard Beaton), Mark (Craig Evans), Luke-Acts (David Moessner), and John (Judith Lieu). Finally, Morna Hooker examines the significance of the beginnings and endings of each Gospel.

For part 3, James Paget and Loveday Alexander separately look for evidence that the Gospels were known to Jews and “pagans” in the first two centuries. Christopher Tuckett’s study of the relationship between the four canonical Gospels and numerous “other gospels” is complemented by Ronald Piper’s essay on the emergence of the four Gospels as the authoritative expression of the one apostolic gospel. Bockmuehl’s study of early Christian commentaries on the Gospels closes the volume.

This collection underscores the continuing important debates on the origins of the Gospels. The articles are accessible to general readers.

FABIAN E. UDHOH
South Bend, Ind.


Stapert’s book distills much scholarship on the musical thought of the early church and makes it available for discussion of the role of music in today’s church. He asks what we can learn about music appropriate for worship from the first three or four centuries of the church and offers a helpful strategy for answering this question, taking one century at a time. After introductory chapters on NT and pagan backgrounds, S. presents and discusses the writings on music of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Ambrose, and John Chrysostom (two representatives each from the Greek and Latin patristic tra-
ditions) and closes his survey with an entire chapter on the musical thought of Saint Augustine, the only church father who wrote an entire book (De musica) on the subject. S. then moves on to an enlightening and fascinating discussion of the early church’s struggle to find a musical esthetic dignified enough for worship yet passionate enough for religious fervor.

S. reveals an initial cultural milieu that was a cacophony of refined and popular musical styles. From the Pythagorean and Platonic equation of cosmic order and musical form to the cultural belief in the evocative epiclesis of music’s power within the lascivious and raunchy Roman games, Christian music had to carve out its own distinctive place. S. persuasively argues that this was a “new song for an old world,” that is, “a joyful response to the works of God, stimulated by the Word and Spirit” (28). Today, S. believes, we face a similar struggle to carve a fitting musical esthetic out of our own cultural cacophony. While I find S.’s case strong and persuasive, I judge his stark distinction between church music and the music of our culture to be overdrawn. Nonetheless, liturgists of all persuasions ought to read this book. It is both engaging and solidly researched, with an important case to make.

ALEJANDRO GARCIA-RIVERA
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


In light of one, simplified model of utopia, Beavis sequentially considers: utopias in ancient, classical, and Hellenistic writings; biblical utopias from Eden to the kingdom of God; ideal communities in early Judaism (the Essenes, the Therapeutai, and Pharisaic groups [Havurot]); recent biblical scholarship on Jesus and the kingdom of God; and Jesus’ preaching (proclamation) of the kingdom of God. She then concludes that the group that emerged from Jesus’ basileia movement was grounded in an effort, like that of Phari-
saic small groups, to realize divine rule in ordinary society (unlike the self-isolated Essenes and Therapeutai) and to live in a manner consistent with the apprehension of God’s cosmic reign.

The book succeeds in presenting a unified reading of ancient documents through the utopian model she proposes. Yet the model would benefit from a broader treatment of biblically and Hellenistically grounded notions of utopia, such as that presented by Steven Schweizer (Reading Utopia in Chronicles [2007; also online]). By not working with more complex notions, B. runs into several problems. For example, she labels the typical ethnocentrism of ancient peoples, including Israel’s, as nationalism, a label thoroughly anachronistic in this context (see M. Liverani, “Nationality etc.” in Anchor Bible Dictionary 4:1031–37). Again B. misses the fact that biblical authors (as well as Thomas More) located their utopian society somewhere on this planet, making time, not place, the important question. For Jesus, the kingdom of heaven was forthcoming (not future), to be experienced by “this generation” (Mk 13:30; Mt 24:34; Lk 21:32; see also Q 11:29–32). B.’s model directs her away from the category of the “forthcoming” typical of ancient agrarian societies, leaving her with only the modern ethnocentric and anachronistic category of “future.” Thus the ancient view might properly be seen in terms of “uchronia/euchronia” (no time/good times) rather than utopia/eutopia (no place/good place). Finally, B. gives no notice to the common ancient belief in devolution (usually mislabeled “apocalyptic eschatology”).

BRUCE J. MALINA
Creighton University, Omaha


This is a well-organized and comprehensive survey of the human, social, and natural images employed by Saint John
Chrysostom to describe the totality of the church. Through these images, Christo arrives at Chrysostom’s conception of the church: its origins, relationship to the triune God, and connections with the saints of both covenants, the world, and history in general. The analysis is based more on the Greek texts than on secondary sources and treats all references to *ekklesia* in the writings of Saint John Chrysostom. As Protopresbyter George D. Dragas writes in the foreword, this book is a fitting prelude to the 1600th anniversary of the death of Saint John Chrysostom (Sept. 14, 407).

The book’s scientific methodology and systematic structure are aided by the fact that Chrysostom’s doctrine of the church does not appear to have evolved or responded to the historical exigencies of his life. Some consistent themes emerge, especially the Christocentric, Pauline conception of the church as the body of Christ. Chrysostom emphasized Christ’s manifestation and action upon the church through the eucharistic celebration. In this sense Christology is the foundation of his ecclesiology. Other important topics are the church’s unity and indestructibility, the liturgy as heavenly gathering, and the church as the army of God. Besides the scriptural, poetical, and philosophical imagery, the priestly system and apostolic tradition of the institutional church are also set forth.

Within this formidable array of images and themes, the great church father teaches both what the church may be and what it should be—he entwines the ideal with the real. The well-translated quotations and paraphrases of Chrysostom’s writings add verve to this scholarly monograph. C. writes from the Orthodox point of view and presupposes some knowledge of Orthodox theology. The volume is attractive, has an excellent index of subjects (though no Scripture index), and is free of typographical errors. It constitutes a substantial and useful contribution to ecclesiology and Chrysostom scholarship.

MARGARET A. SCHATKIN
Boston College


Pentcheva offers a compelling and detailed examination of two major issues: the chronological development of public and “official” veneration of the Virgin Mary in the Byzantine empire; and the political “use” of the theological meanings and liturgical experiences of images of Mary the Mother of God by Byzantine emperors and their families. Throughout her analysis, P. breaks new ground, especially by using a variety of artistic sources (images on icons, coins, and official seals) while incorporating other political and religious primary sources.

Using this broader base of evidence, P. successfully supports a late-tenth-century origin for public processions (*litaneia*) with icons of the Virgin in Constantinople, and presents a more nuanced account of the earlier development of the cult of the Virgin. Particularly interesting is her discussion of the connections, expressed visually in images on coins and seals, between the classical figures of Victoria and Tyche and the Christian figure of the Virgin. Eventually Mary’s “power” was understood as that of the virgin-mother “warrior” who fought without weapons on behalf of the city (65).

Next, P. focuses on three major cultic centers in Constantinople and their Marian icons: the oldest, the church of the Blachernai (and the “Icon of the Usual Miracle”); the later monastery of Hodegon (and the Hodegetria icon); and the youngest, the “funerary monastery” (166) of the Pantocrater (and the Eleousa icon). By incorporating the already-extant icon processions of the earlier two foundations, the emperor John II Komnenos connected the intercessory “power” and protection of the Virgin with memorial rites for his own dynasty, making this new imperial monastery-cum-mausoleum a fresh center for the intersection of religious and political interests. Here P. also offers a lucid and remarkable discussion of the icon (the Blachernai icon) as *empsychos*
graphe, “inspired” by the presence of the Holy Spirit (150) and as offering a critical link between the material and the spiritual.

The book suffers from a few minor flaws. Certain information is unnecessarily repeated, and a few errors in typography or translation surface. An occasional reproduction of coin or seal is a bit muddy, obscuring visual details. P. relies on to make her case. Still, this is a rich volume, both in sources and illustrations. The book’s conclusion is a particularly clear summary of the main lines of argument, a very helpful feature in such a complex work. Notes and a lengthy bibliography round off the book. P.’s volume will be of interest to students of Byzantium and is recommended for medievalists and specialists in Mariology, liturgical studies, art history, political history, and women’s/gender studies.

JOANNE M. PIERCE


This collection provides a very useful overview of Calvin’s commentaries and lectures, highlighting both the common characteristics of Calvin’s biblical study and the distinctive emphases of particular groups of Calvin writings. It maintains a balance of coherence and variety. Two essays deserve special mention.

Susan Schreiner’s essay on the Job sermons focuses on Calvin’s wrestling with this challenging text—challenging because it was so difficult to fit into his own perception of providence—and introduces her extensive research on the topic. Her treatment will be particularly appreciated since no single commentary on that book exists. (Schreiner’s fine treatment would have been complemented by the inclusion of a study on Calvin’s analogous sermons on 1–2 Samuel.)

Ward Holder’s discussion of the Pauline Epistles gives appropriate attention to their centrality in Calvin’s theology, and then focuses on Romans and Corinthians, with brief references to the other books. Understandably Holder’s focus is on Paul’s most significant books. It is regrettable, however, that he mentions only in passing Calvin’s treatment of the Pastoral Epistles (230), considering the latter’s enormous importance in Calvin’s own day when the church was seriously concerned with reshaping its ministry. Perhaps separate sections on Pauline treatment of theology and of church order would have given each theme its due.

Other contributors and topics include Randall Zachman (Genesis), Raymond Blacketer (Mosaic harmony and Joshua), Wulfert de Greef (Psalms), Pete Wilcox (Prophets), Darlene Flann (Synoptics), Barbara Pitkin (John), Wilhelmus Moehn (Acts), and Gary Hansen (Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles). David Steinmetz, dean of the American school of Reformation historical exegesis, provides the concluding general essay. Overall this collection is a fine introduction to Calvin’s approach to his biblical sources, even as it leaves open many areas for future research.

ELSIE MCKEEK
Princeton Theological Seminary


Stories of the servant Hagar in Genesis 16:1–16 and 21:8–21—her bearing a son, Ishmael, for Abraham, when his wife Sarah was barren, and the crises that followed—have seen a wide variety of interpretation over the centuries. Sellin explores how Hagar fared in the Dutch 17th century and finds exceptionally positive and sympathetic images of Hagar. She first traces the history of negative views of Hagar, from Saint Paul to John Calvin. To Paul’s allegorical exegesis of Hagar as representing law and bondage, Calvin added an analogy between Hagar and the papists: Both were arrogant and villainous. Interestingly, S. also shows how Martin Luther, by contrast, was very approving
of Hagar and provided “the most sympathetic, heartfelt account of the story of Hagar and Ishmael in the early modern period” (16). Luther identified with Hagar the victim and saw similarity between his own excommunication and exile and Hagar’s rough treatment by Sarah. Luther even called Hagar a saint.

The most original part of this book is its examination of Hagar in 17th-century Dutch painting. Thirty-nine high-quality illustrations—some in color—help make the book a pleasure to read and ponder. Artists included Jan Steen, Nicolaes Maes, and Rembrandt; these and other Dutch painters most often depicted Hagar sympathetically. They focused on one of four biblical scenes: Sarah presenting Hagar to Abraham, a runaway Hagar encountering an angel, Abraham’s expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, or Hagar and Ishmael saved in the wilderness by an angel.

While S.’s treatment and the art itself is fascinating, she neglects a major question that emerges. How did a positive view of Hagar develop in a nation dominated by the Reformed Church? Does S. offer an intriguing example of Calvin’s waning influence in the 17th century? Or, more simply, were the Dutch quite selective in their appropriation of the Genevan reformer and exegete?

THOMAS WORCESTER, S.J.


Beginning with Kant and Schleiermacher in the 19th century and ending with Hick and Knitter in the 20th, Schwarz provides a comprehensive survey of theologians, philosophers, historians, and phenomenologists of religion who were influential beyond their own denominational or geographic boundaries. Although intending a chronological story, S. pours a vast amount of material into 15 chapters with topical headings such as “Romanticism and the Pietistic Awakening,” “Cultural Protestantism,” and “The Challenge of Religion,” leading to some confusing chronological oddities such as treating John Courtney Murray in a chapter titled “The Challenge of the Industrial Revolution” that deals mainly with the 19th century. Each chapter concludes with recommendations for further reading.

For each theologian, S. gives some brief biographical data and a clear, concise, and accurate summary of the major themes in his or her theology, along with well-chosen primary quotations. In many cases—though less than the book’s title suggests—S. provides the historical and cultural context for the theologians. Still, S. demonstrates that, in the 19th century, “there was an astounding international cross-fertilization, especially between Germany, Great Britain, and North America” (xiv), and that, in the 21st century, this interconnectedness extends to include Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

Not surprisingly S.’s focus is on Protestant and European theologians. Only after 400 pages does he offer a chapter, tellingly titled “Theology Is More Than Protestant,” which deals with Roman Catholic and Orthodox theologians. Even here he discusses Catholic theologians who were on the fringes or condemned by the Vatican more than he does mainstream Catholic theologians. There is no mention of the Roman School that (unfortunately) dominated 19th- and early 20th-century Catholic theology. In general, S. could have been more balanced and discriminating in his choice of whom to include or omit. Nonetheless, I would recommend this to graduate students for a good overview of these two centuries of theology.

T. HOWLAND SANKS, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley


Kärkkäinen provides another helpful text for students and teachers of trinitarian theology at undergraduate levels and a worthy resource for theological libraries. A wide canvass of contemporary trinitarian theology is surveyed: (1) Western Theologies distinguished as
European and North American traditions, and (2) non-Western Views distinguished as Latin American and Hispanic, Asian, and African perspectives. The chapters, each comprising an overview together with critical reflections, will be most useful if studied in tandem with selected primary sources. A bibliography would have enhanced the accessibility of the material treated.

K. attempts to rectify some of the caricatures found in contemporary accounts of trinitarian theology, such as the sharp juxtaposition of Eastern and Western approaches to the Trinity. In any such broad-ranging study, omissions are inevitable. Notably absent are reference to Hans Urs von Balthasar (on the Trinity as revealed in the paschal mystery) and to Australian Denis Edwards (who attends to the Trinity in relation to creation/ecology/evolution). Similarly, Larry Hurtado’s groundbreaking work on the emergence of devotion to Jesus as Lord (Lord Jesus Christ [2003] and How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God? [2005], touching on the source of trinitarian faith) is not treated.

Lecturers and students seeking to develop a sound grasp of the classical tradition of trinitarian theology will need to augment the relatively superficial treatment of the Augustinian-Thomistic explication of the mystery in order to do justice to the classical approach with which many contemporary approaches are, in effect, directly or indirectly in dialogue. Attention to the contributions of contemporary theologians working on a constructive retrieval of the classical Thomistic approach (e.g., Bernard Lonergan, Tony Kelly, David Burrell, Joseph Wawrykow, Rudi te Velde, Gilles Emery) would also provide a valuable complement to K.’s studies.

Anne Hunt
Australian Catholic University,
Ballarat, Victoria


Adams has sought to understand Jesus Christ as Savior in relation to the obvious horror/evil that surrounds us. Although a specialist in medieval philosophy, she intends her study to be a systematic theology that can complement her earlier philosophical inquiry, Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God (1999).

According to A., evil is the result of “metaphysical mismatches” that God has built into creation. The mismatches occur because God creates us “as embodied persons, personal animals, enmattered [sic] spirits in a material world of real or apparent scarcity” (37). On the one hand, and motivated by love, God desires that creation be other than God (hence, material). On the other hand, and again motivated by love, God creates us as simultaneously open to union with God (hence, spiritual). In these mismatches between otherness and desire, God is ultimately responsible for the ills that afflict us. But then, A. asks, has God remedied these “horrors” by means of the divine Word’s incarnation, death, and resurrection? Jesus Christ is “the horror-defeater,” she affirms, the One who has saved human beings from “life-ruining powers.” By believing in Jesus Christ and viewing the world, especially its dark forces, in relation to Christ, we can discover the “Inner Teacher,” the risen Lord “in our hearts.” Moreover, this belief in Christ with the promise of resurrection can bring “coherence” to our sense of life, even as we undergo “horrendous evils.”

This study conveys, and relies on, a high Christology, appealing to John Duns Scotus, Bonaventure, and William of Ockham, and to late 19th- and early 20th-century Anglican theologians such as Charles Gore and Eric Mascall. At some points the book inspires (e.g., when drawing on Julian of Norwich); at others it is problematic (e.g., concerning treatment of the origins of evil). It would have benefited from a sustained engagement with contemporary Christology (e.g., that of N. T. Wright).

Robert A. Krieg
University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.

This work is long overdue. Gonzalez critically addresses the marginalization of Latinos/as of African descent in Black and Latino/a theology—even though Afro-Latinos/as have existed in the U.S. and throughout Latin America and the Caribbean since the beginning of Spain’s incursions in the Americas. G. explores especially the location and identity of Afro-Cubans, raising questions of Cuban/Cuban-American cultural formation both before and after the Cuban Revolution. She develops the question of identity, especially one influenced by Africa, through her study of mestizo/multitez and the meaning of “blackness,” especially in the U.S. context with its binary (black/white) reduction of race, and she provides an overview of Black and Latino/a theologies. Her study is quite good, even though her argument is weakened by her failure to acknowledge that Protestant Blacks as well as non-Black Catholic Latinos/as, rightly or wrongly, often have little or no experience of Afro-Latinos/as upon which to draw. Yet, as she also correctly notes, the fact of little exposure does not free them of the responsibility to explore other cultures that parallel or overlap their own.

G. expands our understanding of the impact that Cuban/Cuban-American religious life has on their self-awareness through her discussions of La Caridad del Cobre (Mariology), popular religion (eclesiology), and literature and narrative (theological anthropology). The foundational theme throughout, however, is that of race, its construction and impact, both positive and negative, on Latino/a sensibilities, and its significance in developing a collaborative theology, beyond dialogue, among Black and Latino/a theologians. The work is path-breaking in its attention to the significance of race in Latino/a culture, especially in Cuban/Cuban-American culture, and the failure of contemporary theologies to address or incorporate this issue. The work is accessible and a welcome addition and should be recognized as foundational for courses in theology, Black and Latino/a studies, and cultural or ethnic studies.

DIANA L. HAYES
Georgetown University, Washington


Francis Oborji, a Nigerian diocesan priest, is professor of missiology at the Pontifical Urban University in Rome. The volume, written with African sensitivities as well as academic competence, is a U.S. reprint, with some revisions, of a 2005 edition published in Lagos and Rome.

The work is divided into three parts: (1) Basic Issues, (2) Historical Perspectives, and (3) New Perspectives. Part 1 (2 chaps.) describes the growth of missiology, particularly in the Vatican II era. Part 2 (5 chaps.) describes “mission” in terms of “models” or perspectives (conversion, church planting and church growth, adaptation and inculturation, dialogue with religions, missio Dei, and service of God’s reign). Part 3 (3 chaps.) discusses ecumenical dialogue and contextual theologies. There is a final integrating chapter.

O. competently presents various authors from Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox traditions who have contributed to thought on mission in past decades. However, the citations of contemporary missiologists are few, making the book’s historical presentation its strength. O.’s presentation of the papal magisterium on mission is adequate.

The material in part 3 (New Perspectives) is drawn mainly from Western and African authors; Latin American and especially Asian perspectives are inadequately represented. For example, the creative thinking of the Federation of Asian Bishops’ Conferences (FABC) is never mentioned. Perspectives on dialogue emerging from Asia are grounded in a distinct life experience—85 percent of the followers of living faiths other than Christianity live in Asia. O. misses themes emerging within FABC missiology—for example, its understanding of
the local church and interfaith dialogue—that could be most helpful for the global church and world Christianity. Even while O. states that “missiology today should not ignore the emerging theological reflections in the global South” (209), his book would have profited from a prepublication scrutiny by Latin American and Asian missiologists. Even with these limitations, however, I commend O.’s clear presentation of concepts and authors, the quality of the Orbis production, and the extensive bibliography and index.

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


Since its creation under sponsorship of the German Catholic Church in 1971, the lay discussion group “Jews and Christians” has generated important documents—here collected with commentaries—that provide a powerful, persuasive argument for ongoing Jewish-Christian dialogue in Germany, the United States, and elsewhere. The collection chronicles developments from 1979 to 2005 in Roman Catholic ecclesial relations to Judaism.

The collection’s unique importance derives from the fact that the group’s Christian dialogue partners feel keenly the weight of their country’s history at the same time that their Jewish counterparts have committed themselves to life as Jews in Germany. Such being the case, both parties are willing to speak directly and frankly to those theological issues that both unite and divide their respective traditions. John Pawlikowski correctly asserts that “these papers are uncompromising in their insistence on the centrality of theology in the dialogue” (143). The documents and their authors serve as singularly important models for those desiring to engage in a similar enterprise.

Given their theological focus, it is of special interest that these documents do not gloss over the painful realities that have alienated Jews from Christians throughout the centuries. They also offer unvarnished assessments of more recent developments that are problematic, and doubly so from a Jewish perspective: the Carmelite convent and cross at Auschwitz, lapses in the Catechism of the Catholic Church in relation to Christianity’s history with Judaism, the deficiencies of “We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah,” and the beatification of Pius IX, given the notorious “Mortara affair.” All Christians are called to confront the church’s current and historical treatment of Judaism and Jews so that genuine forgiveness and reconciliation can become possible. The importance of the collection is highlighted by Martin Stoehr’s closing reminder that “theology is never without consequences” (159).

MARIE BAIRD
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh


Catholic ecclesiologists have long been fascinated by late medieval conciliarist theories, often hoping to find in them correctives to ultramontane tendencies still present in their church. Avis, a noted Anglican ecumenist, suggests that this late 14th- and early 15th-century movement in fact paved the way for the Reformation. Although Anglicanism, in A.’s judgment, represented a more balanced incorporation of such important conciliarist concepts as the principle of distributed authority, the ecclesiologies of the Protestant Reformation were also influenced by conciliarist themes, particularly in their reliance on systems of interlocking synods, their incorporation of natural law theory, and their concern for the common good of the church. Yet, A. continues, Anglican, Protestant, and Orthodox ecclesiological traditions have suffered from an inability to balance their own conciliarist inclinations with the need for a principle of primacy. If “the
right combination of conciliarity, collegiality and primacy is the Holy Grail of modern ecumenical dialogue” (184), then perhaps that Holy Grail can be found in a critical appropriation of a conciliarist vision that emerged as an alternative to a monarchical model of authority that was developed in the wake of the Western schism and enshrined in the teachings of Vatican I. A. surveys both the monarchical and conciliarist models of authority. While his account of monarchical Catholicism occasionally flirts with caricature, particularly with regard to the lay investiture controversy and the teaching of Vatican I, he offers an informed and careful reading of the various strands of conciliarist thought.

According to A. the central insight informing conciliarism is the ancient principle that ultimate responsibility for the welfare of the whole church resides in the whole church. However, not all will be persuaded by his claim that the Reformers were in substantial continuity with the conciliarist program. A. concludes with an informed assessment of the current state of ecumenical dialogue and proposes conciliarism as a valuable and largely untapped ecumenical resource for achieving the unity that is so vital to the church’s effective witness.

Richard R. Gaillardetz
University of Toledo, Ohio


Osborne provides a dense, dissertation-like read of an important topic, the natural love of God over self. Starting with Augustine’s legacy that one loves oneself more by loving God more than oneself, O. focuses on high Scholasticism’s engagement with this claim, particularly in the writings of Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus. O.’s investigation helps us to rethink our understanding of the ancient philosophers, the eudaemonism of their teleology and that of the Scholastics, the essence of human nature, the notion of natural inclinations, the description of the common good, and the nature of God. All these points come together as O. explores in what way Aquinas and Scotus are alike and different in explaining that we ought to love God more than ourselves and that in doing so we find our happiness.

For Aquinas, all creatures are naturally inclined to not only their own particular good, but even more so to the good of the whole. In one especially interesting exploration, O., following Charles de Koninck, claims that for Aquinas God is truly a common good (89). Later he argues that this observation is what protects Aquinas’s notion of common good from totalitarian arguments in which the state’s claim to absolute authority implicitly or explicitly subverts God as the supreme expression of the common good.

Scotus bases his ethics not on nature’s inclination to God but on the will’s own inclination to what is just. This view of the will’s inclination differentiates Scotus from Ockham who sees freedom based on a “liberty of indifference between alternatives” (206). It also distinguishes Scotus from Aquinas, for whom all creatures have a natural inclination to the good. Aquinas’s humanity has more in common with nonrational creatures than does Scotus’s.

What does O. leave us with? A thesis worth considering again: Our own good is inseparable from the common good and in fact the latter is preferable to the former.

James F. Keenan, S.J.
Boston College


In 1996 Sorge, former editor of La Civiltà Cattolica, published a collection titled For a Civilization of Love: The Proposal of Catholic Social Teaching. Ten years later, he returns to that project and offers a much more comprehensive and compelling work for adult Catholics seeking to better understand the Church in the 21st century.

S.’s work of 26 chapters is divided into four parts. Part 1, on the social dis-
course of the Church, is a historical account of the different teaching stances of the papacies from 1891 to 2005. Part 2, on the Church’s social proposals, treats the concepts of solidarity, subsidiarity, personalism, and the common good, as well as civil religion, mature democracy, and ethical relativism. Part 3 is vintage S., commenting on the Church’s social presence in the political world. Finally, the loquacious and experienced S. turns to contemporary debates where he covers ten topics, including biotechnology, scientific research, globalization, war, terrorism, the death penalty, the democratic state and Islam, and Christianity in a new Europe.

Aside from part 4, S. companions almost each of his claims in each section of each chapter with relevant citations from the Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church [2004], published by the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace. The result is a superb handbook for adult Catholics wanting to learn from a master teacher and editor the nature of Catholic social teaching. Every local church should have such a Sorge!

JAMES F. KEENAN, S.J.
Boston College


After two decades of clinical experience treating persons with addictions, Anglican theologian and consultant psychiatrist Christopher Cook seeks, by reintroducing the contributions of Christian theology and ethics, to reinvigorate the contemporary scientific and medical conversation about the nature and treatment of alcohol dependency. As C. understands it, a helpful conversation between medicine and theology was sidetracked by the rejection of a moralistic model that blamed and alienated alcoholics.

Reviewing the treatment of drunkenness in the NT and by Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, and George Whitefield, C. argues persuasively that until the 19th century Christian theology saw excessive drinking as a form of intemperance, a vice that produced other ills and left persons unprepared for the reign of God. This tradition was reversed by the Christian temperance movement’s redefinition of even moderate drinking as intemperate and then displaced by 20th-century medical and scientific models of addiction that left no room for ethical or theological concerns.

Arguing that the Christian theology underpinning twelve-step recovery programs could enrich contemporary medical and theological models of addiction, C. shows how Paul’s notion of the divided self and Augustine’s notion of the divided will parallel the experience not just of struggling addicts but also of the industries and nations profiting from addictive consumption of drink, suggesting that all persons and communities suffer from sinful or addictive disorders that require God’s healing grace and our neighbor’s compassion. Thus C. effectively proposes a Christian model of addiction that takes sin and grace seriously, without succumbing to moralizing.

PATRICK T. MCCORMICK
Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.


William Johnston, S.J., presents a candid and thought-provoking account of his remarkable pilgrimage from bigotry and triumphalism to peace and dialogue. As he describes his journey, a mystical strain has repeatedly carried him beyond his immediate surroundings to a deeper level of reality (27); or, more specifically, this tendency and a love of prayer drew him beyond Scholasticism and the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola into a profound silence, particularly before the Blessed Sacrament. He discovered the presence of a great mystery at the depths of his being, while God became an all-pervasive presence to him. He benefited from John of the Cross’s Cloud of Unknowing, from such spiritual mentors as Tho-
mas Merton, Pierre Teilhard de Char- din, and Bede Griffiths, and even from psychotherapy. This “vertical prayer” pulled him into deeper levels of the unconscious where one can be silently in love with God (87). Through dialogue with Zen Buddhism he learned to deepen this journey through the purification of meditation and the “coincidence of opposites,” where God and the universe are one but not one. Finally, his celibate love of friends rounds out the “ways to God” J. discovered over his 80 years.

This book is a wonderful model for interreligious dialogue that avoids advocating notions of “double belonging” or that all religions are fundamentally the same (117–18). Because of his total commitment to Christ, J. advocates learning from Buddhism only as an aid to deepening prayer, dialogue, and peace, without abandoning one’s religious commitments. Admirably he practices a Vatican II respect for other religions and for individual conscience. And yet his described search for a “new mystical theology” in collaboration with other religious traditions remains methodologically vague (163), not addressing how we can build a Christian theology on the experience of nothingness. Still, J.’s text offers many helpful insights and orientations for “global meditation,” the promotion of peace, and interreligious dialogue. He emerges as a worthy intellectual and spiritual model.

CRAIG A. BARON
St. John’s University, New York


Martin Stringer presents the history of the liturgy through the lens of social anthropology. According to S. (a lecturer in sociology and anthropology of religion at the University of Birmingham), two principles define the contours of the historical study of liturgy. The first is the emphasis on the texts that provide the most complete and direct evidence of past liturgical forms. Here the textual scholar studies the minutiae of written words and phrases. Recently, however, a second principle has emerged. With the growth of social history, it is now possible to assess the history of actual liturgical practice. Here the anthropologist explores the performance of worship.

S.’s historical survey moves through seven chapters of equal length, each covering three hundred years, from early Christian worship to the current globalization of the church. Borrowing from Foucault, S. analyzes the “discourse” of each period, focusing on the dominant set of social ideas in each, that is, on the “discourse” expressed in real utterances and actual events rather than on an ideal set of statements. Christian discourse, according to S., is distinguished from other discourses by four elements: time, intimacy and devotion, charity, and truth. Along this path of historical analysis we find the influence of political theory and technological advancement on the practice of worship. Conversely, we learn of the influence of Christianity on its surrounding culture. With such a broad historical sweep, S.’s pace can be dizzying. Nevertheless, the journey is worthwhile.

S. has provided a thorough review of the history of the liturgy in an accessible manner. The numerous notes and extensive bibliography will prove helpful to his intended audience, students of liturgy and the scholars of the field.

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


Wakefield provides a practical, helpfully concrete directory of the Ignatian Exercises, an effort that dates back to Ignatius’s earliest disciples. The volume follows the tradition of contemporary directories such as Joseph Tetlow’s Choosing Christ in the World (1989) and Cornell Bradley’s The 19th Annotation in 24 weeks, for the 21st Century (2002), with the following differences and special features.
First, most authors of directories are Roman Catholic women or Jesuits; W. is a founder and professor of a Protestant theological seminary in Utah whose personal roots are in the Mormon, Episcopal, Baptist, and Lutheran faiths. He wrote his manual for, and field-tested it among, Protestants.

Second, most directories presume one-on-one contact between a director and a directee. *Sacred Listening* "is an adaptation of the... Exercises... for contemporary people with little or no formal training in spiritual disciplines" (16). Explicit guidelines are provided for groups of three or more. Like Ignatius himself who sent out Jesuit novices to give the Exercises having only just made their first 30-day retreats, W. expects that his text could be "used by Protestant Christians with minimal supervision from a trained spiritual director" (9). This claim is nuanced by W.'s recommendation that one "not listening to these Exercises in an established discipleship program... seek supervision from a pastor or mature Christian friend" (50). W. clearly realizes the importance of apprenticeship before "listening" to another making the Exercises.

Third, W. includes useful advice to mitigate problems that Protestants might have with a specifically Catholic document. For example, he tries to remove worries that praying with the imagination risks becoming idolatrous.

Two final observations. W.'s inclusion of various scriptural passages for prayer over familiar Ignatian themes can enrich Roman Catholic prayer as well. Finally, one drawback of the volume is that, curiously, W. does not include Ignatius's final, powerful "Contemplation to Attain the Love of God."

**WILLIAM J. SNECK**

Jesuit Center for Spiritual Growth, Wernersville, Penn.

---


Cunningham's book is difficult to categorize. It is neither a systematic treatise nor a series of independent essays. In many respects it is a retreat built around the three Christian holy days of Good Friday, Holy Saturday, and Easter Sunday, yet there is also profound philosophical and theological content interwoven in the text. The subtitle describes the enterprise well. C. expertly and seamlessly blends theological and pastoral insights, often offering fresh interpretations of familiar biblical passages. His intriguing literary illustrations come from a broad array of sources, ancient and modern, such as Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Shakespeare, Dostoyevsky, C. S. Lewis, Flannery O'Connor, Gerard Manley Hopkins, and T. S. Eliot.

The book's three parts are titled "Suffering Rightly," "Descending Deeply," and "Rising Graciously." The annual *triduum*, C. insists, should deeply impact the rest of our year. Properly understood, the annual Christian celebration of Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection can help us cope with modern life and orient us better toward an appreciation of community. One of the book's strengths is its emphasis on the communal dimension of Christian faith that all too often is eclipsed by an over-emphasis on individual salvation, especially in the United States.

As interesting and well written as the book is, there is a limitation, most apparent from a Catholic perspective. C.'s definition of the "triduum" ignores the ancient sequence of Holy Thursday to Holy Saturday, beginning with the Mass of the Lord's Supper (Holy Thursday) and culminating in the Easter Vigil (Holy Saturday). C.'s analysis lacks a critical eucharistic perspective that Roman Catholics assume to be central to the mystery of Christ's suffering, death, and resurrection, and critical to contemporary faith. Nonetheless, anyone who engages this creative and original book will deepen her or his perspective on the paschal mystery, and preachers may find useful illustrations and stories for their ministry.

**RONALD D. WITHERUP, S.S.**

Sulpician Provincial House, Baltimore, Md.
In this dense, challenging, and well-referenced—yet ultimately distressing—study, Batnitzky argues for a “formal philosophical similarity” between Levinas and Strauss (xviii). In the aftermath of the Holocaust and in conversation with Heidegger, Husserl, Plato, Maimonides, Spinoza, Cohen, and Rosenzweig (Hegel is neglected), the similarity centers on Levinas’s and Strauss’s shared preoccupation with the relation between Athens and Jerusalem, Greek and Hebrew, philosophy and Judaism, and ultimately between philosophy, revelation, and politics. The book’s three parts are devoted to philosophy, revelation, and politics (the longest section). At its end, Levinas puzzlingly emerges as “a defender of a particular modern philosophical project that endows philosophy with social and political capabilities, while Strauss is a critic of this project” (xx). B. openly charges Levinas’s endeavor with “not merely philosophical incoherence, but a weakening of the critical potential to speak meaningfully about concrete political realities and also the lived realities of religious life” (xxi); she sides with Strauss in maintaining that “the possibility of philosophical, religious, and political rationalism depends on the analytic separation and subsequent practical coordination of philosophy and revelation” (xxi). She concludes that Strauss, and not Levinas, should be “the starting point for Jewish philosophical thinking in the late twentieth century” (xxiii).

B.’s philosophical preferences are legitimate, yet her reading of Levinas not only “go[es] against the grain of some of Levinas’s own self-presentation and the interpretations of his followers” (xx), as she admits, but is also clearly erroneous at several points, mainly because she construes Levinas in an overly philosophical, rationalistic, Cartesian, modernist, even “post-Christian” (58) fashion. Examples are her questionable claims regarding Levinas’s alleged insistence on a separable and independent self, the coincidence of philosophy and Judaism, the possibility of revelation through philosophy, and his “fear and rejection of skepticism” (118). A more balanced, sympathetic, and accurate reading of Levinas might lead instead to the recognition of a closer proximity between two thinkers whom B.’s book has nevertheless the merit of bringing into meaningful conversation.

SILVIA BENSO
Siena College, Loudonville, N.Y.
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