BOOK REVIEWS


Scholarship on Matthew is proving the gospel adage: new wine needs new wineskins. Not long ago Donald Senior ably summarized Matthean research in seven chapters: the Gospel’s setting, its sources and structure, view of salvation history, use of the Old Testament, attitude to the Law, Christology, and the church (What Are They Saying about Matthew? [1983]). While a 1996 edition added “discipleship” to “the church,” newer scholarship is bursting the bonds of historical-critical research and such topical approaches to Matthew. Three areas especially call for attention: (1) the ethical demands of Matthew’s Gospel, particularly in communal or socio-political dimensions; (2) the contributions of women scholars writing on Matthew and the Bible in general; and (3) the work of scholars outside Western Europe and the United States—African, Asian, Australian, Latin American, and, most recently, Eastern European. Whether commentaries include these fresh perspectives and new voices is worth noting.

Recognized for his three volumes on Luke for the World Biblical Commentary (1989–1993), John Nolland opens his Matthean commentary admitting that the transition to Matthew was initially jarring, but that he soon came to admire “Matthew’s idiom for articulating the faith.” N. identifies his method as “redaction-critical” and as sensitive to narrative criticism. He describes himself as “modestly touched” by structuralist approaches and finds social scientific approaches “interesting” but the results “predetermined” by the model used. He is “quite interested” in “Reader Response” issues, but not the theory. And, he acknowledges, he has “less time for ideological readings or for the hermeneutics of suspicion. I care about many of the things that feminists care about, but I do not have feminist priorities” (xvii–xviii)—although he uses gender-inclusive language as he deems fit. He welcomes “the postmodern critique of the objectivity of Enlightenment rationalism, and the flexibility that postmodernism has brought to scholarship, but not its deconstructionist priorities or its radical hostility to all meta-narratives” (xviii).

N. provides extensive bibliographies throughout the commentary but acknowledges that “the scholarship has been more a backdrop for attention to the Gospel itself than something I set out to provide comment on as such” (xvii). By design, in fact, his reading of Matthew owes remarkably little to Matthean scholarship in general and virtually nothing to new ethical, feminist, or global concerns. Justifying his lack of attention to com-
mentaries is his contention, contrary to most scholars, that Matthew was composed before the Jewish war with Rome (66–74 CE, placing Mark and Q even earlier). Understanding the time lapse between the historical Jesus and Matthew’s Gospel to be short allows N. to be confident about Matthew’s historical reliability—“we may have considerable confidence that the Jesus with whom the Gospels connects us is, and is in detail, the Jesus who actually operated in Palestine in the first century and not some mythical construct” (13)—and apparently permits his unsupported readings of Matthew.

Without question, N.’s strength lies in his expertise on, and his close attention to, the Greek text. But against those who read Matthew as addressed to a mixed community of Jewish and Gentile Christians, N. finds Matthew exclusively oriented toward a Jewish audience. Thus, for example, in his interpretation of Matthew’s story of the Canaanite woman, N. concludes: “Though not a Jew, this woman exhibits a proper Jewish faith.” A footnote warns off other interpretations: “Though occasionally construed so, this is not a story of Jesus reaching out to the marginalized” (635). In equally strong terms N. insists that “despite the popularity of the view that this is a story about how Jesus changes his mind, the present episode can in no way be represented as this breakthrough. Jesus does not change his mind at all (vv. 24, 26 are in no way retracted, even by implication): what becomes clear to [Jesus] is what is appropriate in the case of this particular woman” (636).

So, N. has read scholarly works that speak to social justice, feminist, and global concerns, but he does not agree with them, giving them little or no space. He believes old wine is best. As a result, N. views Matthew so narrowly and so precisely at times that his commentary threatens to be all notes, but no melody—all light, but no warmth.

By contrast, Ulrich Luz’s final volume of the three-volume Hermeneia commentary on Matthew strikes all the right notes, holds the melody, and projects both brilliance and warmth. It is a joy to read, even fun, with seasoned Matthean scholars finding something to ponder on every page. Unlike N., L. begins by identifying his “social location” as an interpreter of Matthew, describing himself as a liberal Swiss Protestant, white male, German-speaking, Western European academic who draws from a wide range of perspectives including Jewish, Greek Orthodox, Roman Catholic, feminist, postcolonial, postmodern, and secular. Also, unlike N., L. insists on the importance of finding meaning for today. He argues that “authentic interpretation is new interpretation that makes the text one’s own.... It must bring one’s own person into the conversation with the text and may not simply repeat the text” (19). What serves to substantiate and demonstrate L.’s hermeneutical claims is the history of interpretation—interpretations gathered from the early, medieval, Reformation, and modern church—that accompanies his impressive commentary. Into the unfolding of this richly illustrated history, L. weaves examples of art interpreting texts—reprinted, unfortunately, only in black-and-white. Nevertheless, the effect is transformative and illuminating.
Typically L. begins his treatment of a passage with bibliography followed by an analysis of structure, sources, and motifs. The analysis prefaces a verse-by-verse interpretation that includes notes of historical interpretation, some lengthy, others brief. A closing summary is offered along with a section designated “meaning for today.” For example, L. titles the final scene of Matthew 28:16–20 as “The Commission of the Lord of the World for All Nations,” but in the section on “Meaning for Missions Today” he acknowledges that missions have “become controversial today after our eyes have been opened to the reality that there is something ambivalent about modern Christian missions” (636). Yet he accepts Matthew’s text as presenting mission as essential to its message. For L., the key to interpretation is how Christian churches carry out that essential mission to the world. On his reading, the final mission commandment is a mandate essentially to practice love as the greatest commandment and to be not a ruler, but a servant to others.

In the preface to this final volume, L. confesses that his work on Matthew took much longer than foreseen, amounting to “half a lifetime.” This is no surprise, given the unusually rich tapestry of his text. Yet the tone of this final volume remains strikingly modest. Were only one commentary on Matthew allowed, the obvious choice would be L.’s. He has put new wine into new wineskins. Yet N.’s own meticulous work on Matthew’s Greek text, the fruit of a decade of research, is also significant, and no theological library should be without it. Sometimes old wine is best.

---

**Seattle University**

**Karen A. Barta**


Harrill continues his fascinating study of slavery in early Christianity, this time studying how early Christian texts employed ancient literary material to buttress the Roman ideology of auctoritas. More specifically, H.’s book (consisting of previously published but reworked and some unpublished materials) argues that early Christians appealed to slave tropes and stock slave characters to support Roman slavery and its master ideology—rather than to undermine or liberate the marginal, as others have argued.

H. pursues his thesis in roughly chronological fashion, each chapter progressing in time but also pressing toward contemporary relevance. He seeks to disprove the notion that early Christians drew strength from Scripture as they set out to undermine slavery. He challenges both parts of the notion, arguing that “what the Bible says” cannot and did not serve as a foundation for Christian morality and that early Christians exhibited no discomfort with Roman slavery. Thus H. describes a tension between modern biblical criticism and Christian moral practice. The first six chapters examine NT texts in detail; in each case H. seeks to show just how conventional were early Christian views on slavery. For instance, in chapter 1
he expands the typical analysis of Romans 7:7–25 by seeing it as an example of *prosopoeia* (personification). Why Paul would choose to adopt the stance of an invented slave is unintelligible from Greek Platonic and Aristotelian viewpoints, but not, H. contends, from other available, “different social constructions of the slave in classical culture” (20). Specifically Roman constructions of slavery illuminate Paul’s choice of the image to explain the conflict that existed between his inner and outer selves. And because Paul drew on a stock literary character familiar to his Roman audience, the import of his choice was readily apparent: “The apostle’s speech-in-character uses such stereotyping to influence congregations, which would have only strengthened prejudices that his Gentile readers already held about the morality of control, domination, and abuse of human chattel” (33).

H. goes on to investigate another Pauline fragment (2 Cor 10:10), Acts 12:12–17, Luke 16:1–8, and other texts. Throughout these chapters he provides the fresh analysis needed to shatter tired clichés in NT criticism. The breadth of his learning and his facility with the material is clear throughout. Overall, however, his claim is extraordinary, requiring more than ordinary proof—a proof that, in the few pages allowed, he does not provide.

In his seventh and final chapter, H. examines how the “slavery question” influenced 19th- and 20th-century American biblical criticism. Here he finds again a tension between biblical criticism and morality. The Bible proved unreliable if not utterly useless (166) to abolitionists, while proslavery Christians retreated to a “plain sense” approach. This tension, which could not be resolved by simple biblical appeal, H. argues, led to an “interpretive approach that found conscience to be a more reliable guide to Christian morality than Biblical authority” (165). Nineteenth-century tensions cleared new paths for biblical interpretation and thus freed the liberating potential of Christianity by cutting the brush necessary to make way for German higher criticism.

H.’s case for the separation of “conscience” from biblical authority claims too much and illustrates the difficulty in covering so much in one essay. As he himself recounts, “conscience” equally drove Southerners and Northerners to their opposed positions on slavery. While both sides were contending over differing scriptural interpretations, they were equally employing conflicting conscientious stances, informed, as H. shows, by a variety of literary and social sources, including Scripture. In fact, separating “conscience” from the formation provided it by biblical authority is as difficult, if not impossible, as separating the historical development of a Western conception of conscience from its contact with biblical authority. H. clearly shows how proslavery advocates and abolitionists adopted the duality between conscience, or reason, and biblical fidelity; why we today should accept that duality is much less evident.

The book is jargon-heavy and, as H. moves more quickly to conclusions than his evidence permits, occasionally frustrating. Nonetheless, this provocative collection merits a wide reading beyond scholars in early Christian
theology and history, including those interested in hermeneutical, historical, and moral questions.

_Catholic University of America, Washington_ JOSEPH E. CAPIZZI


Das’s goal is to provide “a solution to the ‘Romans Debate’ that not only builds on prior work in favor of a gentile audience for Romans but also advances the position further” (6). Although referring broadly to the “Romans Debate,” D. focuses on only one dimension of it: the composition of the letter’s audience. His argument heavily depends on Stanley Stowers’s urging (_A Rereading of Romans_ [1994]) that Romans is addressed to “a predominantly gentile audience” (26).

Building on the consensus achieved as a result of, and expressed in, _The Romans Debate_ (1991) (which I edited), D. agrees that Romans is addressed to a concrete historical situation in Rome, but he calls “into question the entire consensus” that favors “a mixed audience” of Jewish and Gentile believers; on the contrary, the audience is exclusively Gentile. When, though, D. insists that “Romans 15:15–16 offers further evidence that the audience is gentile” (64), how fundamentally does he actually diverge from the assertion that “the vast majority of the believers in the Roman church were Gentiles” (_The Romans Debate_ liii)? Not willing to recognize the presence of Jews or Jewish Christians in the Roman church (see his critique of Hays on 87–88), but needing to explain “the Jewish influence,” D. uses the category “God-fearers” (Gentiles who “found the Jewish Scriptures and customs attractive” [70]) to account for the Jewish elements in this Pauline letter. Yet, this was already recognized by Peter Lampe in 1987 (“most people in the Roman church were of Gentile origin but had lived as sympathizers on the margins of the synagogues before they became Christians” _The Romans Debate_ 225).

D. dismisses the inclusion of Jewish believers in Romans 16 by translating _syngeneis_ literally as “relatives” rather then “kinsmen,” a dubious exegetical move. The “weak” and the “strong” are identified not as Jewish and Gentile believers in Christ but rather as “God-fearers” and “non-God-fearers.” D.’s chapter “Former God-Fearers or Synagogue Subgroup?” continues this thread with an unfocused review of the work of Mark Nanos along with Robert Gagnon’s critique of the same, in which D. concludes that the believers in Rome were no longer meeting in the synagogues, a conclusion already reached by Wiefel in 1970 (_The Romans Debate_, liii and 94).

The well-known text from Suetonius, “Iudaios impulsore Chresto . . .” (_Diuus Claudius_ 25) underpins D.’s penultimate chapter, “Claudius: Edict of Expulsion,” a chapter marked by methodological ambiguity and a failure to deal critically with the relevant chronological issues. Beyond these problems, conjectures such as “synagogues would have marked Christ-believing
Jews and proselytes for Claudius’s expulsion” (201) remain unconvincing. If, in fact, the Jews in Rome represent “a diverse community of individually structured congregations” (Wiefel 92) lacking a single, controlling organizational head as, for example, the ethnarch in Alexandria, how could synagogues have had the role D. gives them? The entire chapter appears to be a collection of miscellaneous items that have little direct connection to Claudius’s edict.

The final chapter, “Reading Romans with the Encoded Audience,” concentrates on Romans 7:7–25 and 11:25–26. Again reflecting a significant indebtedness to Stowers, D. promotes the perspective that the “I” of Romans 7 reflects both Gentile experience and, more specifically, that the “I” refers to “a gentile God-fearer” (232). The absence of a critical discussion centering on the dialectic between law and sin is striking. With regard to Romans 11:25–26, B. argues with the majority of interpreters and against N. T. Wright that the phrase “all Israel” in 11:26 does not include Gentiles. Not persuasive, however, is the conclusion that the “situation at Rome in many ways is the mirror image of the situation in Galatia” (244), which he grounds by contending that “Israel of God” in Galatians 6:16 does not contain reference to the church. Surprising is the neglect of reference to Louis Martyn’s analysis in D.’s comments on Galatians.

D. concludes that “the time has come for a paradigm shift in the interpretation of the Roman situation” (264). Perhaps, but a study this vague, speculative, and ambiguous reminds me of the assertion by Jacob Jervell that “attempts to understand Romans primarily on the basis of our knowledge of the Roman congregation lead us into a dead end” (54–55, italics mine). If Jervell is to be proved wrong, then the burden is on D. to demonstrate in a compelling and systematic manner the methodological and exegetical accuracy of his proposal; this, however, will require far more elaborate analysis of the complex situation in Rome and far greater historical and textual evidence than we are given here. Further, D. will need to disclose in what ways this paradigm shift away from Christ-believing Jews to God-fearers fundamentally affects the understanding of Paul’s theology in Romans in ways different from those proposed by Stowers. Solving the Romans Debate vividly demonstrates that the Romans debate is far from resolution.

Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

KARL P. DONFRIED


This revision of Lee’s University of Notre Dame dissertation (2001, under Harold Attridge and Mary Rose D’Angelo) is a model of the effective use of materials from the NT’s Greco-Roman milieu for understanding rhetorical strategies and images in the Pauline letters. While Stoic parallels to the body metaphor in 1 Corinthians 12 have long been noted, this study
quotes, in full, translations of Stoic “body” passages, thus providing a useful, ready-at-hand compendium. Further, L.’s analysis explores the philosophical background of the idea of the body as a political organism, and she convincingly describes its sociopolitical function. This tactic enables her to clarify how Paul uses the image to resocialize the community and lays the ground of self-understanding for specific ethical actions.

In discussing the body image in Stoic texts, L. finds a pattern of references to diverse body parts as they cooperate as a single unit for the common good and thus constitute a whole. Furthermore, she retrieves an understanding of the universe itself as a body, held together by the divine mind (nous), which functions in the same way as the soul (pneuma) in the individual body. Further, the start of social ethics is a people’s recognition of their commonality (oikeiōsis) with other humans, such that they see themselves as individual parts of universal humanity. Reasoning in this manner, humans are like the gods and can live according to law and justice, provided their reasoning faculty is trained. Analogous to the physical body, people under the guidance of reason would want all parts to be well, and they would care for the body out of self-love. These are the principles necessary for moral development, and they lead to a complete philosophy of moral conduct. Until these principles are learned and become an internal guide, precepts must fill the gap. At the same time, the precepts serve to provide instruction in moral development.

As L. discusses the texts of Cicero, Seneca, and Epictetus, while allowing each author to speak independently, she finds common themes as well as individual differences in application. She turns this approach to her advantage when she describes Paul’s own variation on and use of the body image. Again, L. notes the non-Stoic Plutarch’s appeal to Stoic ideas and suggests the pervasive influence of Stoic thought in the first century, although she might have better substantiated this fact to ground her presumption of Stoic thinking behind the body image in 1 Corinthians.

L.’s exegesis of 1 Corinthians 12 notes its structural divisions (1–3, 4–11, 12–26), draws reasonable connections with her prior analysis of Stoics, and demonstrates how interpretive cruces are resolved by this perspective. Thus, the opening comments proclaiming Jesus as Lord in 1–3 are seen as an affirmation that the Spirit (pneuma) enables a similar proclamation among the faithful. The principle in 4–11 of acting for one’s “profit” or “advantage” (pro to sympheron), commonly mistranslated as “for the common good,” fits the Stoic notion of the unity of humans as the basis of social behavior; people act for their own well-being in the human commonality. L. associates the Spirit’s differentiation of gifts with the spirit’s similar function in Stoicism. In the final section, 12–26, L. notes that Paul still refrains from precepts while he highlights the new ontological reality of the Corinthians as members of one body with functions important for the whole. Here Paul reverses the status expectations of Corinthians, already begun in the first chapter, where the honor and weakness categories are reversed in the eschatological body. Knowledge of this new order is
necessary for virtuous action among the Corinthians just as Stoics rely on knowledge of the natural order as a prerequisite for virtuous action.

L. rightly calls attention to Paul’s emphasis on the new existence in Christ, as developed earlier in 1 Corinthians, but also in the rest of the Pauline correspondence, especially in Christ’s and Paul’s paradigmatic renunciation of personal status. She also carefully ties these ideas into her exposition of 1 Corinthians 13 and the precepts in 1 Corinthians 14.

With a comprehensive bibliography and indexes to Scripture, Greco-Roman sources, modern authors, and subjects, the book rewards the reader with fresh insights into a Pauline image that has been widely commented on and used frequently in church communities.

*Campion College, Regina, Sask.*

**Benjamin Fiore, S.J.**


If Scripture is “the soul of theology” (see Vatican II’s *Dei verbum*), a knowledge of Pauline Christology is indispensable for the systematic study of Christology. This monograph, then, should interest systematic theologians as well as exegetes. Following the format employed for his earlier study of the Spirit in Paul’s theology (*God’s Empowering Presence* [1994]), Fee divides his work into two parts: an exegetical study of the significant christological passages in the Pauline corpus, and a synthesis of Pauline Christology. Sympathetic to the recent works of Larry Hurtado and Richard Bauckham, and critical of the work of James Dunn (who tends to dismiss the notion of preexistence in the Pauline writings), F. investigates “the Pauline data regarding the person of Christ in terms of whom [sic] Paul understood him to be and how he viewed the relationship between Christ, as the Son of God and Lord, and the one God, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is therefore now revealed as our Father as well” (9).

The exegetical portion of this study deals with all the Pauline letters in the following order: 1 & 2 Thessalonians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, and the Pastoral Epistles. For each letter, F. presents preliminary observations and statistics as to how each refers to Christ, then a detailed exegesis of the letter’s principal christological texts, arranged under a variety of thematic categories that vary from letter to letter. Each chapter concludes with two helpful appendices: one reproduces the christological passages of the letter; the other summarizes how the letter uses the titles and names applied to Christ.

Although at times somewhat tedious, F.’s detailed exegesis is rewarding. First, he effectively shows that Paul was deeply indebted to the Septuagint, regularly applying the title that the Septuagint reserved for God (*Kyrios*) to Jesus. Second, he demonstrates that the Pauline writings have a rich understanding of Christ’s pre-existence and incarnation. Third, he reveals that Paul does not need to argue for his Christology because he can presuppose that he and his readers share a common understanding of Christ.
Fourth, he highlights how prayer and devotion to Christ play a significant role in Pauline Christology. Fifth, he maintains that all of the Pauline letters, even those whose authorship is disputed, manifest a similar Christology. Sixth, although he shows that there is a high Christology in the Pauline letters, he argues that in Romans 9:5 and Titus 2:11–14 theos does not refer to Christ but to the Father. Finally, in one of his most significant conclusions, F. rightly insists that the concept of personified wisdom does not play a role in Pauline Christology, despite what many have claimed.

The systematic portion of this work is easier to read, and it is probably the better place to start. It synthesizes Pauline Christology under five headings: (1) Christ, the Divine Savior; (2) Christ: Preexistent and Incarnate Savior; (3) Jesus as a Second Adam; (4) The Jewish Messiah and Son of God; and (5) Jesus: Jewish Messiah and Exalted Lord. According to F., the most significant christological motif is the lordship of Jesus. The Kyrios title, which occurs throughout the Septuagint in place of the divine name, is now granted to the exalted Christ. This is not to say that Christ is given the name YHWH. But many of the roles traditionally assigned to YHWH in Israel’s worldview are now predicated of Christ. Thus, Christ is the eschatological Judge, the one invoked in prayer, the sharer of God’s divine prerogatives. Paul remains a monotheist, but the identity of the one God now includes the one Lord, Jesus Christ, and the one Spirit. F. concludes with a discussion of Paul’s use of “Christ” and “the Spirit,” suggesting that Paul was a proto-Trinitarian. In an important appendix, F. summarizes his argument against those who maintain that the concept of personified wisdom played a role in the development of Pauline Christology.

This is a conservative yet innovative work. It is conservative inasmuch as it rejects any attempt to minimize the centrality of preexistence and incarnation in Pauline Christology. It is innovative in its understanding of the role that the Septuagint and its Kyrios title play in Pauline Christology. F.’s work is the most complete and thorough presentation of Pauline Christology presently available.

The Catholic University of America, Washington

FRANK J. MATERA


Hellerman (Talbot School of Theology and Oceanside Christian Fellowship) has found something new to say about Philippians 2:6–11: Paul “intentionally structured his portrayal of Jesus with Roman social values and practices in view” (1). The Carmen Christi in verses 6–8 has turned the Roman cursus honorum ideology “on its head,” so that Christ’s descent from equality with God to slave status and death amounts to a cursus pudorum (“a succession or race of ignominies” [2]).

The first four chapters lay groundwork on Roman social organization, the cursus honorum, and on Philippi with its honor and status. Materials
are mustered from social historians like Ramsey MacMullen, Richard Saller, and Peter Garnsey, and for Philippi from Peter Pilhofer and Lukas Bormann, including a useful survey of the Romanitas of the Roman colònia. Philippi is dominated by the imperial cult with its honors and social status.

According to H., Acts 16 shows not only reflections of Romanness in Luke’s account, like stratègoi (16:20, etc.) and rhabdouchoi (16:35, 38) (110–16), but it also suggests that Paul had been “reconstructing honor in Philippi more than a decade before his letter to Christians in the colony” (116). The missionaries achieved reconstruction by not invoking their Roman citizenship until after they had suffered publicly (16:19–22, 37).

As for Philippians, H. argues that Paul’s omission of apostolos for himself, his use of douloi for himself and Timothy, and his inclusion of episkopoi and diakonoi (1:1) “model the kinds of behavior that he deems appropriate for his reconstruction of Roman cultural values related to honor and social status” (118, see 162). In the Greco-Roman background for douloi (119–20), it should be noted how “slave of Christ Jesus” was a title of honor and power, functioning in that Christian society much as did the title “slave of Caesar” generally (so Dale Martin). The function of the terms episkopoi and diakonoi, however, is much more complicated than H. suggests on pages 120–21.

Philippians 3:5–6 shows Paul’s Jewish cursus honorum. Here space allows the case to be made more impressively (121–27). However, when Paul declares such things “rubbish” (3:8), is he simply challenging “the social responsibilities of those steeped in the values of the dominant culture of Roman Philippi” (127), or is a theological judgment at work (as H. elsewhere recognizes [122])?

Chapter 6 on verses 2:6–11 is the heart of the book. Structurally, it follows Lohmeyer’s analysis, yielding in verses 6 to 8 three status levels: equality with God, assuming the form of a slave, and death on a cross in public humiliation. The structure vanishes when we come to 2:9–11 (see 203 n. 2). In general H. follows the reading in many recent English commentaries: Paul wrote it all (including thanatou de staurou, 2:8c) to inculcate imitation of humility ( = cursus pudorum). The argument requires reading as many details as possible in light of social background in Roman Philippi.

Verses 2:9–11 become God’s way of reconstituting honor for Jesus. Yet H. takes the name Kyrios at 2:11 too easily as Yahweh (152 and n. 79), though opposition to the Caesar cult is suggested. And he could have given more attention to the problems and details of 2:6–11. It is a surprise to find that the central concerns of these verses are not soteriological (contra Käsemann?) but ecclesiological (one would have expected “ethical”), that is, “to encourage an alternative way of living together for the members of the Christian community at Philippi” (156). A concluding chapter summarizes and adds that, in service of others, Christians can function like Jesus (166).
H.’s basic thesis is plausible and attractive. For the odd theology of 2:6–11 (apotheosis, not resurrection), it is worth examining whether the Philippians could have written it (W. Schenk).

Lutheran Theological Seminary at Philadelphia

JOHN REUMANN


Contemporary theology is separated into multiple, nearly autonomous disciplines such as systematics, ethics, and spirituality. Cambridge’s Anna Williams, the author of The Ground of Union (1999), convincingly shows that there was no proper differentiation between these subjects in the early church. Early Christians had a holistic view of theology because they thought of the mind as the single faculty of the soul that (1) produces discourse about God (what we term today theology or systematics), (2) controls the will to follow the divine precepts (ethics), and (3) contemplates God in prayer and union with him after being purified from the passions (spirituality). W.’s argument is based on a thorough analysis of the intellect from different perspectives: East and West, Christianity in the world and in the desert, concentrating especially on the apostolic fathers, Origen, Clement, the Cappadocians, Augustine, Evagrius, Cassian, and Anthony.

Patristic authors did not separate theology and spirituality, because they considered the proper telos of the human person to be intelligent adoration, rendering their theologies quintessentially contemplative. They regarded contemplation as both an intellectual and spiritual activity, with these two aspects merging into one transformative act: we become what we contemplate. Here, knowledge is equally the unitive force between the knower and the known, and the result of Christ’s indwelling in the mind. At the same time, knowledge of God is epecstatic, conceived as a never-ending process that moves us to wonder. Consequently, patristic theology is both apophatic (understood as doxological and experiential knowledge in love that emphasizes the ontological distinction between created and Uncreated) and kataphatic (which makes catechesis and worship possible, and acknowledges rationality as a divine gift).

Nor do the fathers separate theology and ethics, since to abandon reason would cause one to sink into licentiousness, while knowledge produces needed impassibility. Purity of heart is the prerequisite of knowledge, so intellectual activity is hampered without control of the emotions and bodily desires. Hence one must train the mind through the study of Scripture, achieving undisturbed prayer or complete absorption in the things of God (theology) while also achieving a passionless life (ethics). Clearly, for the patristic mind, theology has a spiritual character, and prayer is a form of theological reflection corroborated with liberation from passions.

W. rightly observes that the contemplative, apophatic character of patristic theology contrasts with our contemporary theology, which is deeply “intellectual” and lacks a profound sense of mystery. Furthermore, her
criticism that today’s theology dismisses figurative language is not simply esthetic; it is also methodologically relevant: dry style and supposedly comprehensive formulations result in lifeless statements that ignore the spiritual and ethical implications of theology. Hence, W. calls for the rediscovery of the notions of *theoria* and *contemplatio* in both academic theology and prayer, and for the reevaluation of the function of mind as the nexus between divinity and humanity, or what Origen calls “the divine sense.”

Throughout this captivating book, W. successfully integrates highly technical terminology with elegant writing while conversing with a wide array of current scholarship. Against a prominent contemporary trend to affirm the Hellenization of Christianity in the patristic period, W. admits only to terminological similarities between theology and philosophy. She argues that theology was not an uncritical adoption of philosophical ideas, but primarily an exercise conducted within the rich biblical, catechetical, liturgical, and spiritual context of the church. There was no intrinsic opposition between theology and philosophy nor, one could add today, between revelation and reason/culture/science, since humans are made to be knowers of both God and creation, and the study of philosophy can augment wisdom.

Three further aspects could strengthen W.’s work. First, closer inspection of the transmission of doctrine, *regula fidei*, catechesis, or other concepts would show that theology has a pronounced ecclesial character in the early church. Second, a more explicit elaboration on the relevance of her historical analysis for contemporary theological method, which is left largely implicit, could help clarify her argument. Third, the omission of Basil from the chapter on Cappadocian theology, although intentional, is regrettable, especially in the light of Basil’s account of contemplation and the relationship between body and soul.

This book will be useful particularly in graduate classes on faith and reason, theological method, and in the (unfortunately still separated) disciplines of anthropology, spirituality, and ethics. W. makes a vital contribution to a contemporary theology in search of proper method by redirecting attention to the holistic patristic approach that sees knowledge of God as a synergistic act consisting in the contemplation of divine revelation and the world, corroborated with bodily and spiritual discipline, and aided by grace.

*Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Penn.*

**Radu Bordeianu**


Hinnells has collected eleven essays, each of about 20,000 words, on Paleolithic art and religion, ancient Egypt, Ugarit, Mesopotamia, ancient Israel to the fall of the Second Temple, Greece, the Roman Empire, ancient Europe, the Indus civilization, ancient China, and Aztec and Inca civilizations. His own introduction is not a reassuring beginning. We
encounter a reference to the difficulty of interpreting “fragmentary stone tablets” from Ugarit and Mesopotamia (they of course wrote on clay) and “we have mostly texts with relatively few material remains (as in ancient Israel),” an observation that would cause some bewilderment for Near Eastern archaeologists! After saying that “the term ‘ancient’ is necessarily loose” (3), H. comments that “palaeolithic art dates back over three millennia,” a computation that places Paleolithic art at the time of David and misses the mark by at least ten millennia.

Once into the essays, however, the studies are of the highest quality. Although each provides enough introductory material in a clear and succinct fashion to satisfy the nonspecialist, in almost every instance the authors bring unexpected and stimulating insights derived from their own recent research. In this respect the monographs are not just “encyclopedia entries”; they also provide new material with fresh perspectives that will please the specialist.

In their study of the possible religious significance of Paleolithic cave paintings, Jean Clottes and David Lewis-Williams critique earlier efforts to understand ur-religion as sympathetic magic, totemism, structuralism, and shamanism, and opt for the last, emphasizing that the significance of the cave art is not the art itself, but the act of producing it. The artist was mediating between the human and the supernatural. Their nuanced explanations give a satisfactory explanation of the unusual placement of the depicted animals and human beings and of the deep-cave context of the drawings.

The Egyptian section by Rosalie David is one of the best one-place introductions available not only to Egyptian religion in particular, but to Egyptology in general. It surveys the archeology, literature, and special topics (e.g., mummification, the Amarna revolution, animal cults) and ends with a valuable section on “Egypt’s religious legacy” to the Bible, Hellenistic culture, Christianity, and Islam. The syncretistic nature of Egyptian religion is notoriously complex, but this essay nicely sorts it out. David also notes that the emphasis on death and afterlife should not be exaggerated, since most of the archeological evidence is from tombs rather than from everyday life, and such evidence can be misleading.

Nicolas Wyatt’s “Religion in ancient Ugarit,” a very accessible and up-to-date treatment of the Ras Shamra materials, not only neatly catalogs and characterizes the complicated pantheon and the major facets of the Ugaritic cult but also relates them to their broader Mediterranean context: biblical, classical, Anatolian. Of particular interest is the treatment of Ugaritic cosmology centered at Mount Saphon, and a section entitled “Death, funerals and kispum rites.”

Of special value in Benjamin Foster’s well-organized monograph on Mesopotamian religion is an introductory section describing the history of pioneering research, starting around the turn of the last century, in which the philosophical or religious bent of the scholars heavily influenced their individual reading of Sumerian and Akkadian religion: from Jastrow’s thesis that Mesopotamian religion derived from local animistic cults that
merged into more complex belief systems, to the cynicism of Oppenheim, who disdained any historical approach. Unlike many others who have tried to characterize the religion of ancient Iraq, Foster begins his study with the prewriting (ca. 3300 BC) archeological evidence such as burials and apparent houses of cult.

The chapter on ancient Israel is not bad, but in the light of the almost countless treatments of Israel’s religion that are readily available, the only reason for including the chapter here appears to be a desire for comprehensiveness. Something similar might be observed about the studies of Greek and Roman religion, although both articles would provide a single source for a reader who wanted a broad survey.

Of the remaining chapters, I would single out Hilda Ellis Davidson’s study of ancient Europe, since it brings together in one place and in a clear style a wealth of disparate and rather difficult material, from the Neolithic to the gradual spread of Christianity. Gregory Possehl’s monograph on the Indus Civilization is also very useful; while it is not too difficult to find archeological studies of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa, studies of the indigenous religion are harder to come by.

*Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles*  
*William J. Fulco, S.J.*


In a project begun as a doctoral dissertation at the Gregorian University, José Granados examines the full Christology of Justin. The title is in fact somewhat misleading, as G. spends not an insignificant amount of time dealing with the preexistence of the Logos (27–61) and its role and activity prior to the incarnation (63–111), as well as with the subject and term of the act itself (113–78). At the same time, he claims that too little emphasis has been given to the earthly life, death, and resurrection of Christ—perhaps due largely to the influence of Harnack’s reading of Justin and subsequent scholarly curiosity about the preexistent Logos (one thinks, for example, of Carl Andresen’s influential *Logos und Nomos* [1955] and Knut Ragner Holte’s article “Logos Spermatikos” [1958]). G. hopes to remedy this by examining these mysteries in Justin’s two principal extant works, the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*. He aims to demonstrate a coherence in Justin’s Christology between the Son’s eternal relation to the Father and the particular account offered in the scriptural text of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, to “bridge the gap” presumed in some scholarly accounts between the preexistent Logos and the earthly Jesus in Justin’s thought: “el vínculo entre la teología de la preexistencia y la historia de la salvación ocupa el lugar principal” (523). The distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith is, after all, a very modern contrivance.

Following the insights of Antonio Orbé, G. emphasizes the baptism in the Jordan as a messianic anointing, and this provides a critical link between the mysteries of Christ’s life and the history of salvation—the
story of the people of Israel—the meaning of which Christ simultaneously proleptically adumbrates and ultimately perfects. For Justin, *caro* is the *cardo* (anticipating his slightly later Latin contemporary Tertullian, though perhaps for different reasons), as the Incarnate Word is pivotal in understanding the coherence of salvation history. For moderns like Karl Rahner and John Paul II, pondering the mysteries of Christ’s life has a strongly anthropological telos, in that they provide a demonstration of what it means to be human. For Justin, these mysteries demonstrate the continuity between old and new, Israel and the Church, a coherence that is most fully manifest in the person of the incarnate Christ. Given what can be known about the competing varieties of Christianity in the second century (regardless of whether one is relying on the perspective of, for example, Bart Ehrman, Rodney Stark, or John Behr), G.’s instincts in regard to Justin’s purpose and project make sense, as the precise relation between the history of Israel (and its sacred texts) and the Church was often hardly settled and, in fact, very much in play.

Although developed in a different direction, G.’s argument echoes the trenchant suggestion made a decade ago by Mark Edwards (Journal of Early Christian Studies 3 [1995] 261–80) that scholars have overhunted the terrain looking for Justin’s inspiration in the world of Hellenistic philosophy, and that Justin is more a biblical theologian than is often assumed. While not ignoring the various philosophical ideas that Justin undoubtedly both encountered and engaged (as recounted at the beginning of his *Dialogue*—whether the account is historical or literary or a conflation of both is another issue), G. also demonstrates Justin’s genuine intellectual engagement with Christ’s life, death, and resurrection both as prefigured in the Old Testament and as proclaimed in (what was soon to become) the New.

This study is thorough, well organized, and meticulously argued, and is a worthy library acquisition. It makes a significant contribution to understanding Justin’s Christology and offers insight into a particular (to use an anachronism) theological method at work in the second century. The book includes an extensive bibliography, indexes of scriptural texts and ancient and modern authors, but unfortunately lacks a subject index.

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

MICHAEL HEINTZ


Norton begins provocatively with John Chrysostom’s opinion that all the ills of the church “are due to the ill-considered and random manner in which bishops are chosen” (*De sacerdotibus* III.10). Whether readers think this cause applies in their own dioceses or not, they will find ample evidence of problems with episcopal elections in late Antiquity (for example, when, in a contested area, the choice of a particular candidate was crucial to the maintenance of orthodoxy).
N.’s book is a series of interrelated studies on the topic of episcopal elections rather than a sustained argument. The first chapter situates the rest against the backdrop of late Antiquity, when offices were routinely bought and sold among the elite. Chapter 2 lays out ecclesiastical regulations regarding elections, warning readers how each piece of general legislation had its roots in particular circumstances, and how they needed and received particular interpretations by bishops and civil rulers. Then comes a chapter on the role of the Christian populace and imperial officials in elections. Yvette Duval’s *Les chrétientés d’occident et leur évêque au IIIe siècle* (2005) has already covered some of this ground. N. differentiates the role of those who elect and those who acclaim, but, like Duval, he defends the idea that local groups had a role in elections well beyond the subapostolic era. Chapter 4 deals with imperial interventions. As one might expect, N. finds more interventions in large cities than small towns, and most often in periods of doctrinal crisis, so that, by the fifth and sixth centuries, “court politics and theological debate had been inextricably intertwined” (89). But imperial intervention was tempered by popular opinion and by the need to find suitable replacements before deposing uncooperative patriarchs. Chapter 5, “Provinces and patriarchs: organizational structures,” helpfully explores the ways in which the jurisdictional divisions of the Christian church sometimes did and at other times did not follow the administrative areas of the Roman Empire. Sometimes the lack of coincidence was a matter of shifting political boundaries, and at other times it was due simply to the fact that cities important in the history of the development of the church were not provincial administrative centers. While this chapter may be very useful for some readers, it provides little support for the original and main focus of the book, the development of the system of metropolitans.

However, the next two chapters delve into metropolitan systems in detail in the West and in the East respectively. These are the best researched and most valuable portions of the book. Focusing on the metropolitan system allows N. to draw on material from the earlier chapters. The metropolitans, more active in the East than the West, did not always control elections directly, but they did preside over the consecration of bishops in their regions, giving the metropolitans a sort of veto power. Thereby they insured orthodoxy and the moral character of the bishops under them, at least when the system worked well and no rogue heretical bishops traveled about also consecrating clergy (164). Chapter 8 is simply a list of issues and examples associated with simony and corruption, occasionally reflecting on the role of metropolitans. Chapter 9 provides three cases of disputed elections. A summary and concluding chapter round out the volume.

N.’s book is a revised dissertation begun under G. E. M. de Ste. Croix in the early 1980s and finished only recently under Mark Edwards at Christ Church. Despite or perhaps because of long gestation, the character of the chapters vary considerably; some are simply catalogues and case studies while others, especially chapters 6 and 7, make some attempt at an argument. On the plus side, N. covers a broad span of time and geography but is careful to make sure that his comments avoid sweeping generalities. He
also carefully notes problems dealing with various genres of literature, for
example, legal codes, letters, and hagiography.

There are indications of copious research—in N.’s treatment of metro-
politans, on the origins of the *terna*, and in the appendix—of often difficult-
to-find documents (in translation). It is a pity that the brief index does not
allow the researcher to find important material on other issues strewn
throughout the book. I recommend it for research libraries but not for
classroom use.

*Fordham University, New York*  

**MAUREEN A. TILLEY**


Aaron Stalnaker’s first book makes an important contribution to the
comparative study of spiritual practice by engaging in a clear, constructive
comparison of the moral psychologies of Augustine and Xunzi. S. adopts a
method similar to that of Robert Cummings Neville’s vague comparative
categories, here termed “bridge concepts,” that serve as the basic cross-
cultural tools for making the comparison. Like Neville, S. does not rest with
comparison as a historical-interpretive inquiry but ventures into construc-
tive philosophical theology. While the majority of the book is thus devoted
to using comparison to understand more sharply what is at stake in the two
theories of human nature, this comparison also serves the deeper philo-
sophical goal of meditating on the value and effect of spiritual exercises for
human moral self-development. S. stops short, however, of giving us his
own answer to this normative question, turning at the end to a discussion
of “global neighborliness” as an ethic of comparison.

To answer the fundamental question of moral and spiritual development
immediately requires an inquiry into theories of human nature. Much of
the book is thus devoted to considering Augustine and Xunzi’s theories
about the nature of the person, what distinguishes humans from other
animals, the nature of will, and the development of the capacity for moral
reasoning. S. argues against reducing Augustine to the “doctor of grace,”
seeing his views solely in terms of the Pelagian controversy, but instead
shows how Augustine developed a rich theological language focused on the
stage after baptism in which the Christian develops virtue through a variety
of disciplines or “exercises of the soul.” Augustine resorts frequently to
medical tropes to describe this process in which the mortal wound of sin
“often requires dramatic curative action, not fumbling counterfeit tend-
erness” (207). Cauterizing the wound involves the intellectual practice of
learning from scriptures and sermons, subjecting the self to the disciplines
and rituals of God and church, and, more actively, mastering one’s own
body though fasting, abstinence, and other disciplines of the flesh. Mind,
spirit, and body are thus reordered by active cooperation with divine grace
in a process of crucifixion and resurrection.
Xunzi shares with Augustine the view that some process of reordering is necessary and that, without the active disciplining of the self, the human project would be in much worse shape. Xunzi and Augustine are also similar in their belief that the biological stuff with which humans are endowed is, in and of itself, insufficient to permit the full flourishing of the human being. For Augustine, this is because we are born with a sexually transmitted terminal disease: sin. But for Xunzi, the situation is, in a way, more serious. It is not that our heavenly endowed natures have been vitiated by some mythic fall (thus heralding the prospect of some divine redemption) but rather that our innate biological nature, even at its very best, could not of its own accord produce the goodness that comes with the social processes of education and civilization.

Despite this enormous theological chasm, Xunzi and Augustine agree on much of the middle ground. Agency is not fulfilled when humans simply do what they want. Rather, agency is perfected, paradoxically, by subjection: “Clearly both Augustine and Xunzi require individually chosen subordination to just authorities as the necessary precondition for true human agency, although they conceive the particulars rather differently” (249).

The fact that the two thinkers shared something of the middle ground but disagreed on the micro and the macro levels suggests that both were perspicacious students of human psychology. Were Xunzi and Augustine alive today, they would not simply be talking to each other, but would be avidly devouring scientific papers done by cognitive scientists and evolutionary psychologists. Questions of human nature are now scientific as well as spiritual, and this leads me to disagree with S.’s conclusion about the nature of comparative inquiry. In my view, “global neighborliness” is insufficient as a regulatory framework for comparative inquiry; knowledge thus generated could never hope to cut through the politics and particularities of local traditions. Comparative inquiry should not simply help us to become better neighbors, but should also engage self and other in a mutually transformative process of scientific inquiry. This book makes an excellent start along this road. It deepens our knowledge of Xunzi and Augustine and does not shy away from raising fundamental questions. I hope that the author will, in his next book, offer us an even fuller answer to the intriguing question he set himself at the beginning: “Does anyone ever really change?” (xi).

Queen’s University, Kingston, Ont. 

JAMES MILLER


This collection of primary sources and interpretative essays focuses on the Scholastic discussion of “whether theology is a science,” as the discussion became a standard exercise in the Sentences commentaries of the 13th century. Together with their graduate students, Niederbacher and Leibold
examine seven introductory treatises dating ca. 1220 to ca. 1268. Each medieval author receives one chapter; each chapter includes the Latin text, a German translation, and commentary. The authors studied are William of Auxerre (by Leibold), Hugh of St. Cher (Paul Bertagnolli), Alexander of Hales (Niederbacher), Richard Fishacre (Christoph Amor), Bonaventure (Georg Gasser), Thomas Aquinas (Niederbacher), and William de la Mare (Hans Kraml). A carefully crafted glossary of technical terms concludes the volume.

The selection of the medieval authors is as justified as it is unusual. William of Auxerre (who did not write a Sentences commentary) was among the first to respond to the Aristotelian requirements for a theological science in his discussion of the role of faith as an *argumentum* of theology. Hugh of St. Cher, on the other hand, wrote a Sentences commentary, but did not discuss the typical introductory questions, as they were defined about the same time by Alexander of Hales. Instead of asking for the scientific nature of theology, Hugh started by discussing the terms and properties of trinitarian language (*De modis praedicationis in divinis*). One can wonder why the editors chose to include this text and skipped more important authors such as Albert the Great or Odo Rigaldi. William de la Mare, the latest author, set a different tone by qualifying theology as a “law” rather than a “science.” His solution was clearly a new one, echoing the Franciscan school’s uneasiness with a strictly Aristotelian understanding of theology. The epistemological status of theology became even more debated (and more sophisticated) after the condemnation of 1277, which, however, is beyond the scope of this collection.

The editors do not pretend to cover the entire century, but offer a selection of texts representing the first generation of the discussion. Among them are texts that have often been overlooked, such as Aquinas’s preface to his *Scriptum super Sententias*. While the first question of Aquinas’s *Summa theologiae* has been interpreted countless times and is available in many translations, this earlier text had not yet received the attention it deserves. It would have been better, though, if the commentary had highlighted the differences between the prologues of both *summae* and of the *Sentences* commentary, especially since research on the first question of the *Summa theologiae* has produced a rich literature on the meaning of *sacra doctrina*, a concept not discussed in this volume. The same could be said in regard to Bonaventure, who wrote a quite different introductory treatise in his Breviloquium as compared to his *Sentences* commentary.

These small criticisms notwithstanding, this book is a helpful tool for graduate classes in medieval theology. Its greatest asset is the Latin texts, taken from the most recent critical editions. The German translations are very reliable and close to the Latin originals. The setup of text and translation facing each other invites further examination of terminology and ideas. One misses, however, a comprehensive introduction to the larger historical and systematical context of these medieval attempts to describe the nature of theology. The short introduction (5–11) offers only a few
remarks on medieval Scholasticism and does not take into account previous research. From M. D. Chenu’s famous “La théologie comme science au 13e siècle” (1930) to Christian Trottmann’s recent “Théologie et noétique au 13e siècle” (1999), the discussion on medieval theological epistemology has broadened considerably. These two standard studies are surprisingly absent; the main reference works for the larger discussion in nearly every chapter is Ulrich Köpf’s monograph, “Die Anfänge der theologischen Wissenschaftstheorie im 13. Jahrhundert” (1974), and Ulrich Leinsle’s “Einführung in die scholastische Theologie” (1995). Another important aspect of the introductory treatises that ought to be taken into account is their origin in the Accessus ad auctores and in the exegetical commentary tradition. Alasdair Minnis has highlighted the importance of this tradition for the notion of theology in the 12th and 13th century; unfortunately, his studies escaped the authors as well. The individual commentaries offer brief biographical and bibliographical information and paraphrasing summaries of the main ideas. Occasionally the authors attempt interpretations, which, not surprisingly, vary in scope and quality.

University of Notre Dame, Ind. THOMAS PRÜGL


A translation of Die syro-aramäische Lesart des Koran (2000), this study consists of an introduction, 18 chapters, and an appendix. The first ten chapters deal with reference works, methodology, the Arabic script, the oral tradition, Koranic exegesis, the language of the Koran, and the Syro-Aramaic that is found in the Koran. These chapters lay the groundwork for the close textual study and analysis that follow.

The meaning of certain Koranic passages have been—and are today—disputed among translators and commentators. As Luxenberg indicates, an estimated 25 percent of the Koran is still considered unexplained (108). To this discussion L. brings new linguistic and cultural dimensions, lexica, and grammars, his awareness of the Syro-Aramaic linguistic matrix within which the Koran emerged, and his further awareness of the overall clarity these sources can lend to the interpretation of contentious Koranic terms, when assiduously applied.

L. selects his sources and research tools well, narrowing in on specific commentaries and translations. These are basically three: an English version by Richard Bell (1937–1939), French by Régis Blachère (1957), and German by Rudi Paret (1962). For Arabic, L. works from the tenth-century, magisterial commentary of Al-Ṭabar. Of lexica and grammars, he uses Līsān ?al-Ṭabar for classical Arabic, and for the Syro-Aramaic he relies on Payne Smith’s Thesaurus Syriacus and Eugene Manna’s Vocabulaire Chaldéen-Arabe (well ahead of other commentators). Among the
Syriac grammars are those of Carl Brockelmann and Theodor Nöldeke. Since his arguments are primarily linguistic, these tools are essential. In search of its original meaning, L. delivers not a compendium of opinions but a fresh look at the text.

Since the original text of the Koran was written without dots, and considering how similar the letters of Arabic are without these distinguishing dots (31), mistaking one letter for another was likely. L. further claims that the original versions of the Koran were written in Garshûni, that is, in Arabic but written in Syriac letters. This adds confusable Syriac letters to the mix, especially when not written with appropriate dots. Awareness of the possibility of confusing one letter with another, in both Arabic and Syriac, is the basis for emendations suggested for the current Arabic text. There is no sample of an extant Garshûni text included here. Three samples of the unmarked Arabic text are included (348–49).

L.’s procedure is to locate an obscure passage, consult the commentary of Al-Ṭabarî, move to the three translations for an initial reading, then proceed to the lexica and grammars. In the process one looks for possible interchanges of similar letters or Syro-Aramaic cognates. Of the Koran’s 114 Sūras, 69 Sūras contain at least one, but frequently several, terms that are obscure. L. offers a list of such verses on pages seven and eight. Touching on the linguistic substance of the Koran, the study also reaches into many of the Sūras; all such passages are listed in an appendix (340–49).

Apart from individual passages, L. makes larger claims about the Koranic text. For him, the Koran is an Arabic lectionary on the model of the Syro-Aramaic lectionaries of the time. Even the word “Koran” is a reflex of the Syro-Aramaic word qāyānā (70). The original Koranic text was written in Garshûni, and the misunderstandings and misinterpretations of terms are largely due to misunderstanding their Syro-Aramaic originals. Not all of L.’s readers will readily accept these claims. L. concludes with a completely new translation of the earliest two Sūras (Sūras 108 and 96) with the Syro-Aramaic taken into account.

The book is demanding. One needs to be familiar at least with Arabic and Syriac, in addition to being at ease with phonetic transcriptions. Unfortunately, the book has no index; neither does the Arabic or Syriac include all the pointing and diacritics. Also, the text is not free of typos. These are serious matters when the whole endeavor is to correct precisely such errors. The bibliography is primarily attentive to the German scholarship without paying much attention to other languages. It does not even mention the new Encyclopedia of the Qur’an edited by McAuliffe (2001). Still, the work is a meticulous, philological, and cultural study of the Koran that clarifies many textual obscurities. L. proceeds with the extreme care and reverence that a sacred text deserves. Though one may not agree with some or much of the work, one may not ignore it.

Georgetown University, Washington

Solomon I. Sara, S.J.

These three volumes, covering Newman’s last years as an Anglican, complete the originally planned 31 volumes inaugurated by Charles Stephen Dessain, C.O. Publication began in 1961 with volume 11, the first covering Newman’s Catholic years. Dessain died in 1976 when volume 21 was in press. Volume 1, the first covering Newman’s Anglican years, appeared in 1978. The untimely death of the expert archivist, Gerard Tracey (editor of volume 8), was a blow to publication plans. Fortunately, the enterprise was saved by the equally expert editing of Francis J. McGrath, F.M.S., who brought volumes 9 and 10 to completion. The years covered in these three volumes were previously available only in the earlier two-volume work of Newman’s sister-in-law, Anne Mozley.

Newman influenced religious and theological thinkers in his own time—an influence that continues in the present. These volumes reveal the man and his thought, in the last five years of his life in the Anglican Church, in a most intimate, personal way. Insights into Christology, ecclesiology, patrology, and, indirectly, ecumenism are apparent, but the pride of place goes to the development of doctrine. The volumes also offer detailed insights into Newman’s spirituality, his delicacy of conscience, his confidence in God’s providence, his surrender to God’s will, and his tender concern for others.

Materials from these volumes, however, should be read as collateral (literally) with Newman’s other writings. I suggest that, in conjunction with volume 8 and the events of 1841, one read his Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism (although it was published in 1837). This could be followed by his “Catholicity of the English Church” and his famous letters to the Times, signed under the pseudonym “Catholicus,” which brought both attention and wrath against the Puseyites. Also helpful would be his Tracts for the Times, especially Tract 90, in which he attempted to demonstrate that the 39 Articles might be more broadly interpreted than the narrow hermeneutic of Reformation Protestantism allowed. And also helpful would be selections from Newman’s sermons, for example, “The Three Offices of Christ” (number 5 of Sermons Bearing on the Subjects of the Day, underlying a theology of the laity), Sermon 26, “The Parting of Friends, September 25, 1843,” and the famous University sermon on the “Theory of Developments in Religious Doctrine,” preached in Saint Mary’s on February 2, 1843 (of which Newman complained in January of 1843, “won’t
write”). Finally, the center portion of the *Apologia* that covers these months deserves attention. The purchase of the property at Littlemore figured prominently in these years leading up to his becoming a Roman Catholic, for it was there that the seed of the Oratory was sown.

An additional volume, 32, containing previously unpublished letters and documents, is to be added to the series and has gone to the printer. It will be followed by a general index, a treasure for those doing research in Newman studies. I fervently hope that the total published record will stimulate others’ interest in Newman’s thought and also accelerate the process now in the Congregation of the Causes of Saints for an eventual declaration that Newman is worthy of being both confessor and doctor of the Catholic Church.

*Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.*

**WILLIAM J. KELLY, S.J.**


This is the final volume in Dorrien’s admirable three-volume history of American liberal theology (the previous two covered 1805 to 1900 and 1900 to 1950, respectively). Here D.’s task is especially difficult, first, because the jury is still out on whether the latter half of the 20th century produced an American theologian or philosopher of religion of enduring influence. Certainly there are some who did valuable work. But it remains to be seen whether their theological writings will remain formative beyond their own era.

D.’s second difficulty emerges from the “kaleidoscopic” nature of the pluralistic theologies and philosophies of religion that emerged in this period, as they not only contended with one another but also often intermixed. The most vital “movements” were the varieties of liberationist theology and, as D. makes clear, process theology, which was growing in influence. D.’s earlier definition of liberal American theology, in volumes 1 and 2, encounters complications here, due, he recognizes, to “fluid boundaries and hybrid identities.”

A further boundary difficulty arises from challenges presented by black and feminist liberationists as well as by advocates of postmodernist perspectives. These latter theologies, while progressive, no longer identify with the rationalism, universalism, or bourgeois values alleged of earlier liberal theology. On this singular point these 20th-century theologies join with the neo-liberals (the Niebuhrs and Tillich) who also offered trenchant judgments on liberalism’s naïve rationalism and “soft-utopianism.” The new perspective, however, brought to liberalism’s attention the reality of “difference,” a pluralism of perspectives, and the ecological fact of our human, earthly, even cosmic interdependence. Other related contributions to liberal theology are genuine interests in comparative theology and interreligious dialogue as well as the growing, highly informed engagements with
modern scientific developments. “Kaleidoscopically” liberal theologians incorporated, even synchronized, elements of process, liberationist, environmentalist, scientific, and comparativist perspectives into their major work. As D. correctly points out, the final four decades of the 20th century reveal an amazing renaissance of American liberal theology.

D.’s authoritative and discerning account raises a crucial question about liberal theology’s possible direction. It is worth noting that these three volumes are devoted, with few exceptions (e.g., Transcendentalism and some in the Chicago school), to Christian theologians. Today, however, some American theologians—identified with Chicago naturalism, liberation and process theologies, the environmentalist movement, and comparative theology—do not see their theological work as necessarily entailing any Christian prepossessions. Critics now ask, Does the contemporary trajectory of liberal theology show signs of moving away from, even positively discounting, normative Christian ideas and beliefs? Other critics find some of these theologies to be “short on intelligibility” in that they speak only to their own small coterie of professionals, professing a theology devoid of an audience, a community of believers, a church. D. is concerned about these charges, and he acknowledges that these contemporary liberals do not exhibit the “spiritual depth” of the earlier Ritschlian, personalist, and realist neoliberals of the first half of the 20th century.

D. gives considerable attention to what he contends is a misperception, namely, that contemporary liberal theology is caught in a “double bind” between, on the one hand, the secular world, especially the academy, that regards even the most intelligent and academically austere liberal theology as inherently tied to discredited foundational beliefs and methodologies, and, on the other hand, the churches that charge these same theologians with unbelief, as witnessed by Peter Berger’s lament that liberals have turned theology “into a recipe for self-liquidation of the Christian community...without having the least attraction to those who have been so secularized” (517). D. demonstrates that this depiction is a caricature, and charges contemporary critics with underestimating the current influence of liberal theological ideas. In my view, however, judgments concerning the positive influence of current liberal theology, in contrast to, for example, the American public’s interest in what some biblical scholars, ethicists, and historians say about Christian origins and current moral issues, require closer examination. As D. himself points out, liberals largely remain aloof to building bridges with more conservative Protestants, Catholics, and Orthodox, perhaps a sign of its insularity. D. nevertheless is surely correct that many late-20th-century liberal theologians here examined possess real imagination, intellect, and courage in their attempts at genuine engagement with contemporary culture, while more conservative theologies often retreat from these engagements with the threatening shibboleth of “secularization.”

D. has taken on an enormous task. The result is, in my judgment, the finest available explication, analysis, and critique of the American liberal theology’s 200 year history. The scholarship is impeccable, revealing not
only broad but thorough reading, archival research in unpublished materials, and, where possible, personal interviews with thinkers and friends of the theologians. What stands out is not only D.’s acuity of judgment and his clear and appealing style but, in many cases, a limpid conjoining of a writer’s complex ideas with insights into the liberal theologian’s lives and struggles. These volumes are required reading for scholars of modern theology and of American intellectual history.

*College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va.*  
JAMES C. LIVINGSTON


American Catholic historical scholarship has exploded in recent years. Beginning in the 1960s, Catholics trained in American history, led by Philip Gleason, Jay P. Dolan, and Christopher Kauffman, opened up Catholicism as an American specialty. Their work is now supplemented by scholars alert to new currents of research, particularly in American cultural history. Earlier work centered on Americanization, the complicated ways in which immigrant Catholics transformed their understanding and practice of the faith as they confronted American people, ideas, and institutions. The story is now told best in terms of accommodation and resistance, integration into American society and the formation of distinctive Catholic institutions and subcultures. More recent historians, including John McGreevy and the late Peter D’Agostino, have reminded us that Catholicism is a transnational institution (as are the Jesuits)—a transnationalism often characterized by a drive to strengthen papal authority and promote more uniform, boundary-defining doctrines, disciplines, and devotions. Yet, place 19th-century priests and religious, formed as Roman-oriented ultramontanes, in the American West, with Indians in the Pacific Northwest and Spanish-speaking peoples in the Southwest, or amid the polyglot populations of California, and the story bursts entrenched categories in complicated but immensely interesting ways. It is this shift in the historical question of how Catholics remained simultaneously accommodating and resistant, simultaneously Catholic and American, that Gerald McKevitt has captured in his superb study of 400 remarkable Italian Jesuits who played a critical role in American Catholic history.

McK.’s is an exemplary work of historical scholarship on these Italian expatriates. Forced from their homes in Italy by national revolution, many traveled through France or Spain before arriving in the United States. Settling in the American East, some led in reforming American Jesuit provinces and dramatically upgrading their system of seminary education. Some brought energetic leadership to east coast Jesuit colleges. Others, as rectors and provincials, brought renewed discipline to Jesuit life. And large numbers traveled west. They evangelized Indians, at first with respect for native traditions but later as agents of government policies of assimilation.
In the Southwest they ministered to exploited Hispanic communities, all but controlling education within the territories. In cities they won the support of immigrants and “Americans” whose ever expanding numbers and needs would eventually dominate Jesuit ministries. They founded Indian boarding schools, parishes, devotional societies, and newspapers for the Spanish-speaking and urban parishes. Most amazingly, the Italian Jesuits founded colleges in Seattle and Tacoma, Denver, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

Pastoral accommodation, Americanization, and Roman-oriented resistance were very real requirements for McK.’s Jesuits. The tension born of those requirements was embedded in commitments to communities of diverse language, experience, and history. These Jesuits were in some ways agents of a transnational church as they encouraged European-based devotions, including reverence for the pope; yet they were also active promoters of emergent American opportunities and disciplines for Indians and impoverished Hispanics. In still other ways they were supporters of separatist traditions, even languages, among the people to whom they were committed. Exiles from their homeland, the Church had become their transcultural home. As they mastered their new multicultural experiences, they became “brokers of culture” for Catholics caught up in multiple historical changes. At their best they were missionary pastors, sharing the life of the people they served, a long way from home.

The Italian Jesuits were ultramontanes (especially at the Jesuit training center of Woodstock), but they welcomed American freedom and even managed to fall in love with America and its people. In their desire to integrate their Catholic people into a better organized, transnational church, they also helped them find a distinctly American way of living out their faith. These Italian Jesuits were not Americans in the making, nor ultramontane outsiders in democratic America, but Americans and Catholics and brokers of culture all at once.

*Brokers of Culture* is a wonderful example of mature American Catholic historical scholarship. Always fully informed and scrupulously fair, McK. admires his Jesuit subjects but offers well-argued criticism when appropriate. He has a wonderful story, he tells it well, and he has enriched our understanding of American Catholic history.

*College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.*

David J. O’Brien


The republication in 2006 of Henri Bremond’s monumental *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis les guerres de religion jusqu’à nos jours* (orig. 11 vols., 1916–1933) provided the occasion for this collection of essays by Émile Goichot (1925–2003). Like Bremond, whose life and work formed the principal subject of his research, G. engaged
issues that occupied those notable for their involvement in the Modernist crisis in Roman Catholicism, but ranged forward to debates over the nature and extent of mysticism that emerged in the postwar years, and backward to the spirituality of 17th-century France, notably the French School and Madame Guyon. That breadth of interest is represented in these essays on Bremond, all but one of them previously in print.

While the order of their appearance is chronological, the reader less familiar with Bremond might well begin with “Henri Bremond. Aux frontières de l’hagiographie,” as this essay traces the development of Bremond’s intellectual interests, from his early essays on often nontraditional and non-Catholic “saints,” through his publications on Newman, to his books on Fénélon (1910) and Jeanne de Chantal (1913) that surface themes reappearing throughout the Histoire littéraire. At his death, G. was working on a biography of Bremond, to appear in the same series as his study of Alfred Loisy (2003). While only in its beginning stages, enough usable material survives to appear here as “Henri Bremond: Un chemin dans la nuit.” As such it forms a complement to the essay previously cited.

The majority of the remaining essays deal with various aspects of the Histoire littéraire. “Henri Bremond et l’histoire de la spiritualité” notes the effect of his “pan mysticisme”—his search for the core of mystical experience beneath individual, cultural, and religious diversity—on the dominant conception of spirituality of the time. “La poésie pure ou Emmaüs? L’enjeu d’une querelle littéraire” explores at greater length another characteristic of Bremond’s understanding of mysticism: its continuity with other areas of human experience and his claim that it is not confined to a small elite. “Sentiment religieux, pietà, vissuto religioso” sharpens these dimensions through comparison and contrast with the work of two Italian scholars influenced by Bremond, Giuseppe De Luca and Gabriele De Rosa, while “L’Humanisme dévot de l’abbé Bremond” examines the internal development of the initial guiding idea grounded in humanism over successive volumes of the Histoire. “Un historien dans son histoire: Le cas Bremond” reflects upon the impact of the Modernist crisis on Bremond personally and on his ability to present his ideas in an atmosphere where the term “sentiment” was suspect. From these essays Bremond’s personal stake in the study of spirituality emerges. In a time when the authenticity of religious experience was gauged by the sensible fervor it excited, his own experience of spiritual aridity seemed to him an idiosyncratic burden. The study of 17th-century mystics in that regard was both a revelation and a consolation.

Two additional studies round out this volume. “Deux historiens à l’Académie” sheds light on the complex character of Louis Duchesne, Bremond’s predecessor at the Académie française, and more broadly on the condition of Catholic historians of the time, especially the constraints they experienced. A final contribution gives two short texts by Bremond, one on unbelief under the Ancien Régime, the other on Molinism, both prefaced by G.’s commentary.
Beyond the obvious importance of this collection to those interested in the nature of mysticism and in current exchanges between “essentialists” and “constructivists,” and those working on 17th-century France, especially its religious dimensions, these essays are important, as they impinge on historical debates over the scope of mysticism—province of the elite or more widely dispersed—that reemerged in the early 20th century. Not least significant, however, is G.’s connection of the Modernist context with the formation and development of Bremond’s interests in spirituality. When the “notional” side of Modernism is privileged (critical history, critical philosophy), it may seem distinct from the “real” concerns central to Bremond. However, G.’s research complements that of Lawrence Barmann on Friedrich von Hügel in establishing an intimate connection between Modernist concerns and mystical concerns, providing a rationale for further inquiry along these lines. While the book indeed serves as an excellent introduction to the Histoire littéraire, it transcends that modest aim.

University of Saint Thomas, Houston


By providing not only a survey of the history of Latinas and Latinos in the United States but also a cogent argument for attending to the power of their churches in urban society, Badillo’s book fills an important niche. He succeeds beautifully in debunking the myth that these various Latino communities are monolithic, and he incorporates well their popular piety in a way few before him have done. Drawing extensively from the archives of various dioceses and religious congregations, government reports, newspaper articles, and personal examples, he strikes a delicate balance between a social-history perspective and a more official, hierarchical one. It is in the parish, as he points out, that these two critical elements—laity and hierarchy—often came together. To relate the religious history of three main Latino groups: Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans (and, to a lesser degree, of more recent arrivals such as Central Americans), B. focuses on four large U.S. cities: San Antonio, New York, Miami, and Chicago. He compares and contrasts different aspects of these various groups, showing how their time of arrival, their contact with the homeland, and their interaction with local institutions all helped shape the manner and extent to which they integrated into U.S. culture, church, and society.

Most helpfully, the book follows immigrants from their countries of origin, including, in the case of U.S.-appropriated territories, from the Southwest and Puerto Rico to their present urban realities, tracing how European, Caribbean, Mexican, and North American histories converge to form modern day Latino identity. The early chapters describe the shaping influences from the Spanish conquest, the religious contours surrounding the emergence of Latin America, its colonial period, and the effect of
Anglo-American occupation on what is now U.S. soil. I have been surprised that many students are unaware especially of these latter, internal-colonial dilemmas that fly in the face of the stereotype being perpetuated particularly by sensationalist media today, that all Latinos are recent immigrants.

The book’s flow, initially difficult to follow, covers much temporal and geographic territory. It moves from early Catholic religious traditions in Spain and Latin America to Mexico’s Revolution and its impact on San Antonio, then to the Puerto Ricans and the U.S. Catholic Church up to more recent times. The focus then shifts to Miami and exiled Catholicism, then to suburbanization and mobility in Catholic Chicago, then finally to new urban opportunities for church leadership experienced in Texas and New York City. The work’s closing reflections center on globalization and the new immigrant church. B.’s dual concentration on both social history and the Church’s hierarchical leadership makes for some difficult reading. He nevertheless succeeds in making his case, namely, that to understand Latinos one must take into account their religion, but also that this religion consists of both official religious participation and popular practices. Aided by Latino and Latina Catholic theologians who speak of the liberative aspects of the “faith of the people” (such as Virgilio Elizondo, Allan Figueroa Deck, Ada María Isasi-Díaz, and Orlando Espín), B. gives examples of the liberative potential of faith, particularly its ability to reinforce ethnic bonds and enhance the leadership of women.

This work is very much needed. One major criticism of some histories, such as Moises Sandoval’s On the Move (1990), has been their overemphasis on Mexicans and the Southwest. By giving equal coverage to Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and the recent-arriving Central Americans, and also by bringing in the histories of Latinos in New York, Chicago, and Miami, the author has succeeded in presenting a larger, more adequate picture. Moreover, he demonstrates how the earlier presence and activism of one group, such as Puerto Rican Catholics in New York, eventually paved the way for others, in this case, recent Mexican arrivals. Because of his sensitivity to how Latinos interacted with local institutions such as their new dioceses and political entities, his reflections on the differences between Anglo-European Catholicism and Latino Catholicism remain extremely relevant, given changing parish demographics.

I have used this book as an introductory text for a course on “Latino Religious Expressions.” Not only was I more than satisfied with its “teachability,” I also found its extensive bibliography to be a gold mine for further research, its illustrations quite helpful, and its general style balanced and informative. For these reasons, B.’s book will be a classic for a long time.

Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, California

Eduardo C. Fernández, S.J.
As Routhier outlines, Vatican II (1962–1965) has been variously described as marking the end of the Counter-Reformation or the termination of the Constantinian era, the death knell of Tridentine Catholicism or the end of European Christendom, the Catholic emergence from the Baroque or a “Big Bang” marking the creation of a new world church. Whatever one’s preferred description of the conciliar “event,” R. continues, the subsequent four decades have witnessed considerable change for the Roman Catholic Church (along with most other Christian churches)—change that has often been directionally uncertain, geographically uneven, progressively promising but often painfully problematic, and enthusiastically celebrated or emphatically castigated. R.’s dozen essays—all but one previously published, all appearing here in French—deal with the council’s ongoing reception and interpretation.

R. tracks the reception of the council beginning at its announcement and the ensuing preparatory period, continuing through the conciliar discussions—sometimes charismatic and sometimes convoluted, and culminating in an ongoing process that has already advanced through several stages and presumably will undergo more. R. identifies multiple meanings for the term “reception”: for some, “reception” means “interpretation” or “application”; for others, “reformation” or “renewal”; still others understand it in terms of “assimilation” or “inculturation.” All definitions include both “change” in the way things are done and “conversion” in those who are implementing changes—sometimes enthusiastically, sometimes legalistically, and sometimes reluctantly. On the whole, the world-wide process of “reception” has proved to be both varied and complex, as R. illustrates by separate and detailed examinations of liturgical innovations, Marian devotions, the synods of bishops, and ecumenical dialogue.

Fascinating, particularly for North American readers, is R.’s description of Vatican II’s reception in Canada—especially in the Province of Québec, where postconciliar aggiornamento and the crisis fomented by Humanae vitae (1968) melded with both cultural revolution and governmental realignment, affecting every level of Canadian society in seemingly more pervasive ways than in the United States. This religious, cultural, social, and political crisis, R. points out, was abetted in part by the fact that many Canadian bishops who were participants at the council retired shortly after returning from its adjournment, and so did not lead the implementation of the programs that they had approved.

R.’s discussion of the different interpretations of Vatican II is the most theologically challenging yet most useful part of the book. The wide variety of interpretations that arose in response to the quick publication of the conciliar documents resulted in still unresolved dichotomies between those who insist on the “letter” of the council and those who appeal to its “spirit,” between those for whom the council provides a boundary that is to be canonically delineated but not transgressed and those for whom Vatican II
inaugurates a new orientation that is to be continually and creatively developed according to the “signs of the times.” Not surprisingly both “literalists” and “spiritualists” appeal to the same texts—an incongruity encouraged by the fact that the council’s documents are instances of collegial decision-making that incorporated different, if not always contradictory, opinions. Accordingly, the interpretation of Vatican II, like its reception, has shown itself to be a process that has been inconsistent, if not uncontrollable.

As with many such collections, R.’s contains noticeable repetition in both the text and references. The volume also lacks an index or a separate bibliography (although extensive multilingual references can be mined from the footnotes), and there are a few typographical errors—the most surprising being a reference to “the second conclave of 1979” (261). Such peccadilloes aside, this volume is an enjoyable, indeed exciting, read; while an English translation would be a huge project, an English condensation would be advantageous for theology students interested in Vatican II. In sum, R. has provided an excellent resource on Vatican II, its reception, and its interpretation.

_Catholic University of America, Washington_  
JOHN T. FORD, C.S.C.


Horvath intends this to be the first of a three-volume _Summa_ based on the virtues of love, faith, and hope, in that order. Arranged in a Scholastic question-and-answer format, the volume opens with a section on the origin of Christian faith, followed by a synthetic overview of the 21 ecumenical councils. The bulk, however, is dedicated to an in-depth analysis of each of the seven sacraments. The unifying theme running throughout is love as the origin of faith in Jesus Christ.

H. believes that the driving force behind the faith of the early Christian community was “a falling into a deep love with Jesus Christ and through him with every human being” (14); indeed, he asserts, love is the primary factor underlying every human aspiration, Christian or otherwise. The innate yearning to accept and to be accepted is the ultimate _telos_ of human life. H. describes this relationship in terms suggestive of a personalist aggiornamento of classic Aristotelian eudaemonism, but he fails to expand on it with elucidative distinctions. War, for example, “is caused by loves misguided by fear and hatred” and “by fear of losing what one loves” (37). In offering an all-encompassing theory of love, it becomes difficult to discern just what its opposite is and whether there are different types. Drawing this universal theory in such broad strokes risks blurring the distinctiveness of Christian faith as animated by a radically new and supernatural love made possible in Jesus Christ.
H. suggests that because Christian love reaches its zenith in accepting one another’s differences, religious plurality is somehow mysteriously rooted in the divine will. Different religions should allow one another to celebrate their identity and otherness “so long as this has to be so.” “It is by love that I become one of them (i.e., a Protestant or a member of the Salvation Army) and dare to say, ‘One can be a Catholic, Protestant, or a member of the Salvation Army,’ and so on, even though, in respect and honesty, one is not going to participate in others’ most characteristic celebrations” (46). He concludes that “love respects diversity. . . . It is very much aware that ‘it is God’s doing’” (46).

H.’s systematic treatment of the sacraments revolves around the Eucharist as a center point that is “the source and end of all other sacraments. All are ordered to the Eucharist and culminate in it” (94). H. draws attention to the personal presence of Jesus as the most unique and important characteristic distinguishing the Eucharist from other sacraments. His discussion of the NT background is synthetic and well crafted in the way he relates the Eucharist not only to Jesus’ feeding the crowds, partaking in table fellowship, and breaking bread at the Last Supper, but particularly in the way that he refers the Eucharist to Christ’s death, resurrection, and ascension. Still, the overarching paradigm of love once more introduces confusion rather than clarity as he addresses the issue of ecumenism and intercommunion.

H. prefers to understand marriage in light of the notion of community over contract or even covenant. He acknowledges the complexity of matrimony and attempts to sharpen his focus by viewing it through a Eucharistic lens. He does not shy away from the slippery questions of allowance for divorce and admittance of divorced and remarried persons to communion. Once again, though, his all-embracing category of love cannot resolve the ambiguity between his desire to preserve the “never-ending” (138) quality of marital love and its predisposition to fallibleness as an imperfect reflection of divine love. He concludes, “It is possible that after years this love has progressively been quenched and has terminated in divorce, a painful, unforgettable experience” (158), and advocates that, “instead of denying [divorced persons] years of love, we should take the way of penance and ask for forgiveness in truth and mercy” (158).

H.’s both/and approach, which he considers constitutive of a systematic theology established on the archetype of love, causes moments of vacillation in his elaboration of the other sacraments. Although his reasons for placing the Eucharist first are coherent, less clear is his rationale for treating the sacraments of “order,” “forgiveness,” and anointing of the sick before baptism and confirmation. The breadth of his analysis is impressive, but the interrelatedness of the sacraments remains undeveloped.

It is hard to disagree that love readily lends itself as an organizing principle for constructing a systematic theology. H. has striven to remain faithful to his motto “Caritas est in ratione” throughout a long and distinguished career. One can only hope that his efforts might inspire others to tie the
loose ends of his logic and extend his innovative vision "iuxta Ecclesiae mentem."

Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit  


Inspired by John Paul II’s messages on evolution, Polish Archbishop Józef Życinski tries to present “evolutionism in light of the dialogue between philosophy and the natural sciences” (5). Ż. senses that theologians have not progressed much beyond the work of Teilhard de Chardin in developing a truly Christian interpretation of evolution. Most theological interpretations propose variants of either Augustine’s rationes seminales or notions of extraordinary interventions by God. Ż.’s method involves in part a teasing out of the polarized oppositions advanced by an anti-science “fundamentalism” and an anti-Christian “scientism,” in search of a tertium datur.

The first major opposition Ż. uncovers is between methodological and ontological naturalisms. Methodological naturalism is committed to the principle that the “particular state of a physical system must be explained by reference to other physical states of the same system” (80). As such, it does not deny other explanations, such as the esthetic or moral, but only establishes the epistemological conditions on which scientific research can be based. Ontological naturalism, on the other hand, excludes any explanations that do not “submit to being deciphered exclusively in terms of a temporally prior series of mechanical causes” (63). Rejecting ontological naturalism, Ż. affirms methodological naturalism, but finds the latter wanting in its ability to treat those aspects of nature that we value most, such as our lives involving moral and esthetic values. The rest of the book is an attempt to found an alternative interpretation that, Ż. believes, can accounts for these aspects.

To do so Ż. draws on new insights in physics and philosophy. He appeals to the philosophical notion of supervenience, the claim that the whole cannot be explained in terms of the parts. Supervenience challenges ontological naturalism, demanding an epistemology not founded solely on causal principles. Yet, Ż. admits, it would be too much to propose a kind of absolute “purposiveness” or teleology in nature. He therefore examines, in the field of nonequilibrium thermodynamics, the relationship between natural deterministic and teleological tendencies. The chaos characteristic of the nonlinear processes in nonequilibrium thermodynamics tends toward a state of order determined by what is known as an “attractor.” The fact that chaos can lead to order questions not only the opposition between necessity and chance but also the opposition between determinism and teleology. Ż. proposes, as a third alternative, the notion of structured
directionality. Structural directionality acknowledges directedness in natural process without positing a mind or divinity behind such direction. It allows Z. to then advance a modified panentheistic view of divine immanence.

Z. includes the possibility of human suffering, an element rarely found in theologies of evolution. In doing so he opens the possibility of a profound, new, and fruitful insight, a notion that there is a dramatic reality immanent in nature that issues forth a mysterious beauty. Unfortunately, Z. does not here fully exploit this theme. Taking a cue from J. V. Taylor’s *The Go-Between God* (1973), he seizes on the notion that God is “the foundation of our meetings” (178), on which he develops a panentheistic view of divine immanence where God is immanent in all cosmic process and reality, but at the same time transcends them. Such a panentheism allows for a kenosis of the Holy Spirit, a kenosis that “appears in the painful gap between experienced reality and our dreams inspired by the spirit of the Upper Room” (188). In a Christian evolutionary context, suffering means attempting to find that “difficult harmony” between our dreams and our experience. It calls for a “practical unification of nature and grace,” for an attempt to “connect natural factors with the Divine Reality surrounding us” (190–91). Thus, “the immanent God of evolution acts not through a determinism that would force an inevitable necessity of consequences, but in a yearning for difficult ideals, in the appreciation of beauty, and in the undertaking of actions which, despite the logic of losses and gains, makes of our lives a gift for others” (244).

Z. offers a genuine alternative to contemporary theologies of nature and evolution. It is grounded in a real engagement with science, while it challenges the philosophical assumptions of science. By taking into account human suffering, Z. may have actually achieved a truly new direction for a theology of evolution, a notion of a divinely immanent drama that issues forth a mysterious beauty. Z. did not exploit this tantalizing direction; he does, though, offer a profound insight in a field awash with simplistic and tired interpretations.

*Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley, Calif.*

**Alejandro Garcia-Rivera**


The past decade has witnessed a spate of monographs treating the topic of Christian divinization. Among the more general approaches should be mentioned Stephan Finlan and Vladimir Kharlamov’s (ed.) *Theosis* (2006) and the Finnish studies, led by Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen (ed.), published as *One with God* (2004). These monographs generally survey figures from the
time of St. Paul up through the 20th century. There have also appeared several important, focused studies, such as Norman Russell’s *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* (2005), which has become the latest standard on the Fathers, and Carl Braaten and Robert Jenson’s *Union with Christ* (ed.) (1998), that trace the theme within Luther and Reformed theology.

Christensen and Wittung’s collection is conventional. Mostly presented at a 2004 conference at Drew University, it will prove helpful to those new to the field, given the range of figures and issues the authors span. The essays are divided into five groups. The first, with articles by Michael Christensen and Andrew Louth, introduces the context of divinization within Christianity. The understanding of *theōsis* in classical and late antiquity is the topic of the second section; it includes John Lenz’s look at *theōsis* and *apotheōsis* in paganism, Stephan Finlan’s examination of divinization in Paul’s letters, and James Starr’s handling of the *locus classicus* of Christian participation in the divine life, 2 Peter 1:4.

The next two sections are dedicated to patristic, medieval, and Reformation thought. Here each essay shows how *theōsis* is central to theologians’ thought: in the Cappadocians (John McGuckin), in the rhetorical strategies of other Greek speakers (Vladimir Kharlamov), in Maximus the Confessor (Elena Vishnevskaya), and in Ephrem the Syrian (Thomas Buchan). Covering later centuries is a fine article by Stephen Davis on human godliness in the Coptic-Arabic tradition, followed by essays on Anselm (Nathan Kerr), Luther (Jonathan Linman), Calvin (Todd Billings), and Wesley (Christensen).

The final section turns to the moderns, beginning with a more encompassing piece by Jeffrey Finch on how neo-Palamism shapes the divide between Eastern and Western soteriologies. Boris Jakim is excellent on *theōsis* in Bulgakov, followed by Francis Caponi’s equally illuminating essay on Karl Rahner. The volume closes with broader pieces: Gösta Hallonsten’s survey of recent works on divinization—including his call to greater precision in divinization studies, and Wittung’s cataloging of possible resources for further study. These final studies are especially welcome as the theme of Christian *theōsis* becomes increasingly a matter of study, taxonomy, and academic rigor.

Again, this volume’s treatment is general. Most of the figures and themes covered here can be found elsewhere. Those familiar with the field may be disappointed by the quite traditional selection of figures and the traditional treatments they receive. While the collection is worthwhile overall, the authors and editors have covered familiar ground and unfortunately missed an opportunity to trace deification in other, less-studied theologians (e.g., not one Latin Father is treated) and methods now needed for our understanding of deification.

*Saint Louis University*  
**David Meconi, S.J.**
Beginning as conference papers marking the first year of Cambridge University’s Centre for the Study of Jewish-Christian Relations, this collection is a welcome contribution to current and future substantive discussion between Christians and Jews. The editors are connected to the Centre; Aitken is an honorary fellow and Kessler is the founder and executive director. Kessler in particular has become an important voice in the world of Jewish-Christian relations.

The volume contains 14 essays, including the editors’ introduction. While the latter highlights European and American voices in Jewish-Christian relations, most of the contributions are European in perspective. Especially noteworthy is the jointly-written article by Peter Ochs (University of Virginia) and David Ford (Cambridge University), “A Third Epoch: The Future of Discourse in Jewish-Christian Relations.” Both hold out significant hope that university contexts can further Jewish-Christian dialogue, a dialogue that should move increasingly from tolerance and civility toward friendship. Several articles address particular Christian faith traditions in relation to Judaism: Nicholas de Lange’s “The Orthodox Churches in Dialogue with Judaism,” Irina Levinskaya’s consideration of “Jewish-Russian Orthodox Christian Dialogue,” and Remi Hoeckman’s analysis of “Catholic-Jewish Agendas.” Each notes both progress (particularly in Catholic-Jewish relations) and continuing difficulties (especially in Orthodox and Russian Orthodox relations—or lack thereof—with Jews and Judaism).

John Sawyer’s “The Bible in Future Jewish-Christian Relations” calls attention to three significant shifts in biblical studies that should significantly impact Jewish-Christian relations: (1) recognition that texts have more than one meaning; (2) a move away from historical-critical quests for an original meaning of a text toward analysis of reception history, the Wirkungsgeschichte, of the biblical texts; and (3) a greater awareness of the ideological implications of biblical interpretation in modern contexts.

Political contexts also receive attention, ranging from the dynamics of ecclesial politics in Friedhelm Pieper’s “Institutional Relations in Jewish-Christian Relations” to new political contexts discussed by David Weigall’s “The New Europe, Nationalism, and Jewish-Christian Relations.” Especially important is the role of “Israel within Jewish-Christian Relations,” addressed by Andrew White (formerly the Archbishop of Canterbury’s special representative to the Middle East). White reviews three primary Christian theologies of Israel: replacement, remnant, and recognition theologies. As White notes, it is impossible to address any aspect of Jewish-Christian relations without the status of Israel emerging as the dominant theme.

Marc Saperstein’s “Jews Facing Christians: The Burdens and Blinders from the Past” argues for a new paradigm in the historic portrayal of Jews in relation to Christians. Rather than viewing Jews as insular and with-
drawn from Christian society and Christian persecution, Saperstein calls attention to ways Jews were in fact open to positive influences of external Christian culture. Along similar lines Martin Forward (“Jewish-Christian Relations in the Interfaith Encounter”) argues that, for Jewish-Christian relations to progress, they must move beyond making the Holocaust the center of all discussion. Such a focus results in insufficient attention paid to the covenant relations with God that unite them. By contrast, Stephen Smith’s “The Effect of the Holocaust on Jewish-Christian Relations” suggests that the Holocaust must remain central to dialogue, and that Christians must be willing to face radical reformation of Christian faith and practice precisely in light of the Holocaust. Otherwise, there can be no meaningful Jewish-Christian relationship.

Welsh Quaker Christine Trevett, in her “Women’s Voices in Jewish-Christian Relations,” reflects on ways women have challenged the status quo of both Jewish and Christian traditions. Both Jewish and Christian women have experienced a significant role in offering prophetic critique while also providing mending and healing within their respective communities.

Finally, Kessler and Aitken, in “Considering a Jewish Statement on Christianity,” provide both the text and commentary on the landmark Jewish statement “Dabru Emet: A Jewish Statement on Christians and Christianity” (2000). The four authors of Dabru Emet (Tikva Frymer-Kensky, David Novak, Peter Ochs, and Michael Signer) also were central contributors to Christianity in Jewish Terms (2000). The goal of the Westview volume was in many ways to unpack the brief statement of Dabru Emet, in which the authors sought to heal a divide within Judaism that separates critical inquiry from faith and tradition and, in the process, to address the divide between Judaism and Christianity from a Jewish perspective.

The uniformly well-written and informative articles of this volume should contribute significantly to engaging the ongoing challenges of Jewish-Christian dialogue.

Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles

JEFFREY S. SIKER


Wright lays out his agenda clearly: “My major concern has been to develop an approach to biblical hermeneutics that sees the mission of God (and the participation in it of God’s people) as a framework within which we can read the whole Bible. Mission is, in my view, a major key that unlock[s] the whole grand narrative of the canon of Scripture” (17). Currently serving as director of International Ministries for the Langham Partnership and already an accomplished OT scholar, teacher, and writer, W. is well positioned to make this argument.

Formally this book will be familiar to those who have worked through standard OT and/or biblical theologies. In this genre, an author proposes a
key or theme or a matrix that is then used to organize a great variety of scriptural materials. The NT (if included, as here) is treated primarily as the confirmation and continuation of the themes used to organize the OT. True to the best of this genre, W.’s resulting volume presents a clear, vigorous, and scriptural account of God’s mission. This mission is driven by God’s desire to draw all creation to Godself. To accomplish this mission, God calls Abraham, forms and sustains the people of Israel, redeems Israel and thus the world through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and calls the church to bear Christ’s redemption in word and deed.

Most Christians know the rough contours of this story; W.’s volume is one (often compelling) way to fill in the details. W. extends the argument by including a rich and sophisticated account of contemporary Christian mission, suggesting ways in which he would reform and reshape various aspects of evangelical missionary efforts.

The volume is divided into four parts. Part 1, The Bible and Mission, argues that mission (and God’s mission in particular) is the central concern of Scripture. Here W. also discusses his hermeneutical concerns. Part 2, The God of Mission, addresses three central themes: God’s self revelation to Israel, God’s self revelation in Christ, and God’s confrontation with idolatry. On this last, W. seems more concerned with the idolatry of the nations than with Israel’s and the church’s idolatrous proclivities. Part 3, The People of Mission, looks at the participation of the people of God in God’s mission. The central chapters here focus on Exodus and Jubilee. Part 4, The Arena of Mission, addresses the scope of missionary activity and various ways of engaging the wider culture in God’s mission. Throughout the volume, the OT is given pride of place, although W. quite intentionally carries specific themes and issues into the NT materials. This way of tracing themes, however, often makes it difficult to account for those ways in which the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus demands a radical rethinking and renarrating of certain OT elements, such as the giving and purpose of the law, and the notion of covenant.

The volume provides much to admire and to learn from, especially from its treatment of the Jubilee. It also provides points to argue with and questions that ought to be addressed: for example, are holiness and cleanliness really the “preconditions of the presence of God” (337)? And does creation deserve the limited place allowed in W.’s account? Rather, the starting point of thinking about God and creation would seem to be God’s desires for the world initially revealed in creation, and the impossibility of their ultimately being thwarted.

I and others have frequently raised questions about the theological need, coherence, utility, and viability of this typically modern Protestant practice of biblical theology—concerns that W. does not address. At the same time I appreciate his discrete examples of exegetical brilliance and edification. He has produced one of the best examples of this genre currently available.

*Loyola College in Maryland, Baltimore*

*STEPHEN FOWL*
This anthology of 19 articles concerns discourse on bioethical issues in a European context. It is not a comprehensive manual but rather offers insight into the thinking and acting of European Catholic ethicists in five distinct bioethical areas: (1) philosophical and theological categories; (2) theological interpretations of embryonic life; (3) possible social-ethical perspectives on human life; (4) the bioethical culture of discourse; and (5) bioethics and biopolitics. The authors are moral theologians from Austria, Germany, and Switzerland, and two physicians. While most are male, a few women present unique perspectives on bioethical issues during pregnancy.

In section 1, seven authors reflect on categories such as life, sanctity, and liberty. Peter Kunzmann addresses the question, is potentiality relevant for the moral status of the human embryo? Thomas Laubach characterizes current discussions about human “life” as fundamentally confused or ignorant. For him life has to be understood as a fundamental ethical notion—as a horizon, a field of experience, and a realm of meaning. Ludger Honnefelder works with the issue of the unity of the human person. Friedo Ricken argues philosophically that the human being, as person, is simultaneously an authority and object of responsibility. Heike Baranzke examines the notion of “the sanctity of life” as this has been qualified and altered by considerations of the “quality of life.” Appealing to biblical perspectives, Bernhard Fraling considers notions of life and liberty in the horizon of contingency. Dietmar Mieth offers an overview about suffering in the context of life, asking if there is a right to avoid suffering, insisting that suffering is an integral component of life.

In section 2, physicians Ricardo Felberbaum and Wolfgang Küpker present newly discovered scientific facts about the beginning of human life. Then Adrian Holderegger examines the notion of the infusion of the soul and Eberhard Schockenhoff the beginning of life and human dignity. In the context of the Catholic Church’s concern with stem cell research and abortion, Holderegger considers the ethical position of “tutiorism,” but finds categories like potentiality, identity, and continuity more helpful. Finally, Schockenhoff evaluates and systematizes the categories discussed in the foregoing article.

The third section, “Solidarity That Is Not Wished For?,” offers perspectives beyond individual ethics. Andreas Lob-Hüdepohl presents a very critical but constructive view on the social concerns of handicapped persons. He argues that the prevention of genetically caused handicaps facilitates a devaluation of handicapped persons to the status of subnormal humans. Hille Haker shows the link between preimplantation diagnosis (PID) and changes in the public understanding of parenthood, the latter as no longer socially significant, rather simply a matter of private choice. The problems of patents’ reliance on biological products is discussed by
Christoph Baumgartner and Dietmar Mieth: Is the expansion of patenting in the field of biotechnology an ethically adequate and correct instrument, given the possibilities of commercializing the human and eroding human personal dignity?

Section 4 concerns the culture of bioethical discourse, caught between legal-ethical prudence and moral coherence. Josef Römlt compares different international moral and theological responses when facing the biomedical challenges. Stephan Ernst examines the culture of the bioethical discourse as manifest in the paper “Starre Fronten überwinden” (2002) by nine Protestant ethicists. Johannes Reiter, working with the image and language of genetics that affect the bioethical discourse, analyzes the hermeneutics of speech and argumentation in natural sciences.

Section 5 is on bioethics and biopolitics. In his discussion of the influence of commissions for the ethical debate, Konrad Hilpert reflects on “the institutionalizing of the bioethical reflection as a crossing point between scientific and public discourse.” Günter Virt reflects on the range of different codices and declarations in the internationalizing of ethical and legal standards. Hans Halter ends with considerations on how to implement biopolitical discourse and thereby raise consciousness in the public discussion. He insists that bioethical problems require the critical participation of the entire community.

The book closes with a summary by Konrad Hilpert and two interesting appendices. One appendix is an “intervention” (by many leading moral theologians) titled “Women in the Acting of Reproductive Medicine and in the Bioethical Discourse.” They insist that, for example, in dealing with IVF or PID, woman should be seen as subjects, and not as objects. The second appendix lists helpful bioethics Internet addresses and bibliographies on ecclesial and governmental statements from different countries.

As this review suggests, the book is wide ranging, to the point of being disparate, although Hilpert’s summary provides some systematizing and highlighting. As a source of further information in Catholic European bioethics, the book is excellent. It even provides a discussion of the implications of historical and biblical criteria for biomedical ethics.

Lehrstuhl für Moraltheologie, Universität Regensburg

Kerstin Schögl-Flierl

In her first book, God Dwells with Us (2001), Coloe explored John’s temple symbolism as a vehicle of John’s Christology; she found that John interpreted Jesus as the new place of God’s dwelling among his people (understood as the post-Easter community), while she also hinted that this new temple has another dimension as oikos/oikia tou Patros mou, “my Father’s house/hold” (Jn 2: 16; 14:2). Building on that theme, the present volume explores what C. calls the household scenes, namely Jesus’ initial invitation to come and stay with him (Jn 1), the wedding at Cana (Jn 2), birth (Jn 3), the household of Bethany (Jn 11 and 12), the last discourse, when Jesus gathers with his own (Jn 13–17), and the Jerusalem household where disciples first experience the risen Lord (Jn 20).

C. posits that the infrastructure that holds together the early narrative sequence is the complex of customs entailed in a Middle Eastern marriage. Thus, John the Baptist truly functions as best man introducing the groom (Jesus) to his future bride (the disciples); a wedding (Cana) precedes the Groom’s taking the bride to his father’s house (the temple action). Talk of birthing and new life (Nicodemus) follows naturally. Death in the household (Lazarus) occasions new teaching about “eternity life” that transcends biological life, and Jesus’ welcoming service (foot washing) shows him as a Kyrios whose loving act transforms students into friends and, ultimately, into his siblings in the household of their Father.

This book demonstrates that the spelling out of a spirituality while working from a NT document can involve not simply a pastoral application of the text but also the explication of the implied spirituality of the author’s community as encoded in the symbolism of the text itself. Together with her first book, this volume ensures that C.’s elaboration of the Christology and ecclesiology conveyed in John’s Temple and household symbolism will have an enduring impact on the study of the Fourth Gospel.

DENNIS HAMM, S.J.
Creighton University, Omaha


Parsons defines his book as neither a commentary on, nor an introduction to, Luke-Acts, but as a “series of forays in the Lukan terrain from three different angles: Luke as storyteller, Luke as an interpreter, and Luke as an evangelist” (xi). Luke’s talents as storyteller are illuminated by reference to the canons of ancient rhetorical criticism, as practiced in the Hellenistic tradition. The section on Luke as an interpreter of pagan, Jewish, and Christian traditions describes how he dealt with traditional material and social conventions. For example, P. shows how Luke both endorsed and challenged some Hellenistic notions of physiognomy (how the body reflects the soul) and friendship, how he treated the Jewish perspective on Jerusalem and the collection of parables he had at hand, and, finally, how he built a portrait of Paul that would be well received by an audience already familiar with the Paul of the letters.

The last chapter, on the reconstitution of the people of God, I found particularly interesting in its exploration of the case of Peter and Cornelius in Acts 10. P.’s interpretation of this passage is balanced, and is sensitive both to details—such as the usage of conjunctions—and to the overall literary context of Acts. P.’s analysis demonstrates well how Peter undergoes a progressive conversion in this passage.

Each chapter similarly uses specific passages of Luke-Acts as test cases to illustrate P.’s contentions. These are mostly about the ways in which the authorial audience would have understood the various features of Luke-Acts. The book is intended for college students, seminarians, and graduate students, whose understanding of the social and
literary context of Luke-Acts will no
doubt be enhanced by reading P.’s
work.

Jean-François Racine
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley

Poverty in the Roman World. Edited
by Margaret Atkins and Robin Os-
borne. New York: Cambridge Univer-

These eleven essays derive from a
2003 conference held by students of the
distinguished Roman historian Peter
Garnsey in his honor. In different ways
the authors struggle diligently with the
topic of Roman poverty in full recogni-
tion of four factors that have bedeviled
it: (1) the slipperiness of the concept of
“poverty”; (2) the paucity of hard eco-
nomic data with which to work; (3) the
ideological tendencies of ancient elite
sources (our main source of informa-
tion); and (4) the ideological tendencies
of modern interpreters interested in us-
ing the Roman empire as a positive or
negative moral foil.

Robin Osborne’s framing essay on
Roman poverty in context is followed
by five essays on the republic and early
principate: Neville Morley on the city’s
poor; Walter Scheidel on economic stratification; Anneliese Parkin on pa-
gan attitudes toward almsgiving; Greg
Woolf on literary representations; and
Dominic Rathbone on Egypt. Five
other essays focus on the Christian era:
Sophie Lunn-Radcliffe on Ambrosi-
aster; Richard Finn on Christian de-
scriptions of poverty; Lucy Grig on
“parties for the poor”; Cam Grey on
Salvian’s depiction of the poor; and
Caroline Humphress on later Roman
law.

The use of appropriate cross-cultural
studies and, even more, an apprecia-
tion for the rhetorical functions of ancient
discourse concerning poverty make
these essays required reading for any-
one studying ancient Christianity with
respect to riches and poverty. They
have the effect of cautioning historians
of early Christianity against two com-
mon errors: the first is taking rhetori-
cally fraught depictions (such as Juve-
nal, Satire 3) as though they were fac-
tually accurate; the second is working
with an economic model for the empire
that exaggerates the wealth of the few
and the destitution of the many. The
facts we do have, as both Scheidel and
Rathbone make clear, require us to con-
struct a view of that world in which
there was a substantial middle popula-
tion, perhaps not a “middle class,” but
a substantial element that had both eco-
nomic resources and mobility.

Luke Timothy Johnson
Emory University, Atlanta

Jesuit Writings of the Early Mod-
ern Period, 1540–1640. Edited and
translated from the Latin by John
Patrick Donnelly, S.J. Indianapolis:
Hackett, 2006. Pp. xix + 263. $37.95;
$12.95.

While the Jesuits are famous for
maintaining prodigious archives and
publishing much of their correspon-
dence and related documentation, Don-
nelly’s collection makes some key pri-
mary source material easily available to
undergraduates and others with little
background in Jesuit history. Its focus is
on the activities and philosophy of the
Jesuits during the first century of their
existence.

The book offers brief introductions
for each of its eight chapters, headnotes
for each document, and occasional foot-
notes. Most chapters contain just four
documents, but each is substantial
enough to provide a solid basis for dis-
cussion and analysis. After the opening
chapter on Ignatius Loyola’s writings,
the chapters reflect areas in which the
Jesuits were most active and successful:
education, overseas missions, opposi-
tion to Protestantism, spirituality, pasto-
ral ministry, and service to political
leaders as confessors, court preachers,
or royal tutors. D. maintains a neutral
tone throughout the introductions and
notes, but there is no doubt that the
sources selected are often those that re-
fect well upon the order. Perhaps to re-
dress any charge of favoritism, the final
chapter includes several critiques of
the Jesuits by early-modern French and
English opponents.

Most authors will be familiar: Ignatius
Loyola, Francis Xavier, Matteo Ricci,
Robert Bellarmine, Claudio Acquaviva, as well as the long-serving secretary, Juan Polanco. There is a healthy balance between theological treatises, administrative decrees, narrative histories, polemical attacks, and even scenes from a Jesuit-authored play. As D. admits (xv), a more comprehensive approach would include numerous other topics and materials. The letters by Ignatius or Polanco, for example, run to thousands of pages and offer extraordinary detail about the Jesuit “way of proceeding,” but only two could be included here. In sum, this is a useful collection of sources for undergraduate courses in the history of Christianity or the history of early modern Europe.

CHRISTOPHER CARLSMITH
University of Massachusetts, Lowell


Books of hours, in both manuscript and printed versions, provide valuable clues to the beliefs and devotional habits of medieval people. Their illustrations, ranging from modest to lavish, are the regular subject of art historians. Duffy considers the books, however, for what they teach us about the history of prayer. The book of hours was the most intimate and important book of the late Middle Ages and that intimacy has left its physical trace in the margins, fly-leaves, and blank spaces of those that survive. Tracing “a history written, literally, in the margins” (ix), D. successfully takes the reader “on a journey through the odd but revealing things people write in, on, or outside their books, hoping in the process, to catch a glimpse of the inner lives of people who lived in an age even more turbulent than our own” (x).

One notable example is the book of hours that Sir Thomas More took with him to the Tower of London. In this modestly printed book he wrote a moving prayer in English. Certainly it was written by a man in isolation, but D. picks out the prayer’s connection with similar compositions that emerged from the contemporary culture of devotion. “If we go to the prayers of the late-medieval laity,” D. concludes, “we find not growing individualism, social anomy, and alienation, but the signs of individual participation in a varied but coherent public religious culture related to the public practice of religion” (118).

Mindful of the subjective nature of the material under consideration, D. places these volumes in the context of religious and social change, above all, the Reformation. He discusses their significance to Catholics and Protestants, and describes the controversy they inspired under successive Tudor regimes. D.’s work offers rich insights into personal prayer before, during, and after the Reformation, and gives us a convincing picture of a misunderstood period of religious practice. Students of Christian worship, spirituality, and history will both enjoy and benefit from this work.

JOSEPH E. WEISS, S.J.
Church of St. Luke, St. Paul, Minn.


In his analysis of an allegedly backward, early modern Catholic culture (ca. 1560–1780), Hersche does not follow the conventional path of looking at the heroes of the Catholic reform, the Council of Trent, or Catholic sovereigns. Instead he provides a synthetic history of Catholic social life. This refreshing approach highlights the fact that Catholic European countries were almost completely agricultural, generating a lifestyle within which Catholics were less interested in “progress” and more content with a “comfortable mediocrity”—a lifestyle that stood in sharp contrast to the predominantly trade- and later industry-based “Protestant ethics,” as described by Max Weber. H. is aware that Weber’s attempt to trace modern capitalism back to Protestantism failed, but he judges that Weber’s insights are helpful for understanding confessional differences in early modern Europe.
H.’s critical view of recent historiography and methodology deserves praise. He has gathered enough materials to challenge a theory of confessionalization that examines only normative texts and ignores their effect on the people. Thereby he arrives at the conclusion that it was the Enlightenment, and not the Counter-Reformation, that perfected social discipline, persecuted moral transgressions with merciless zeal, diminished the role of women in the church, and put an end to the Baroque culture of “ostentatious leisure and exuberance.”

H. concludes with a look toward the 19th and 20th centuries. Of interest here is his evaluation of the current church crisis; H. regards the era from 1846 to 1958, in which one can find a strong coherence between the magisterium and the faithful, as an extraordinary event in church history. After Vatican II, this coherence was lost and the church became again as “diverse” as in the 17th century. For H., as a historian, things finally are back to normal.

As a well-written masterpiece of ecclesiastical and social historiography, this two-volume work is a pleasure to read; I hope it will soon be available in English translation.

Ulrich L. Lehner
Marquette University, Milwaukee


This is an excellent collection of 162 primary documents (in English) from 16th to the 21st centuries on religion and society in Latin America. Penyak and Petry explain that “many of our documents are not found in standard anthologies because they focus on marginalized members of society” and on “closely relat[ing] religion to the themes of race, class, and, whenever possible, gender” (xix). Reading of Indians, African Latinos, Jews, and women, along with clergy, theologians, and public officials highlights the great plurality of religious views prevalent in Latin America from the beginning of colonization. One also encounters longstanding, adamant Catholic clerical rejection and persecution of non-Catholic religious expression (still active today regarding Pentecostal Christianity).

Also present are Catholic counter voices (Bartolomé de las Casas, Francisco de Vitoria, Alonso de Sandoval) that spoke on behalf of those mistreated by conquistadors. More recent prophetic voices from liberation theology (Gustavo Gutiérrez, Leonardo Boff, Jon Sobrino) are also included. One sees changes in Protestantism, from a 19th-century focus on the middle classes by foreign pastors to more recent voices of Pentecostal indigenous leaders working among some of the poorest sectors of contemporary society.

Lacking among the documents (surprisingly) are some of the official milestones issued by the Latin American Episcopal Conference (CELAM) at Medellín in 1968 and Puebla in 1992—documents that put the church’s official endorsement behind a preferential option for the poor. The editors do include recent statements by some bishops who criticize liberation theology while emphasizing a more spiritual role for the current church, leaving the impression that Catholicism has turned its back on social justice. They also omit statements by CELAM and several individual bishops that strongly criticize the neoliberal capitalist economic strategies of most Latin American governments, strategies that subvert economic justice for the vast majority. Nor do they include any documentary evidence of the vast and ever increasing network of social services supported by contemporary Catholicism.

Despite these omissions the collection is useful for general readers and for those teaching courses on religion in Latin America.

Brian H. Smith
Ripon College, Wis.


In ten chapters, Lakeland revisits themes of his earlier Liberation of the Laity (2003), especially the need for ac-
countability and adult behavior on the part of all church members. He challenges an “infantilization” that is carried in church structures, though often not recognized by its members. Missing are adult relationships and transactions, a lack arising, L. maintains, from a mandatory celibacy that fosters an unhealthy exclusivity, with clerics clinging to authority based on ordination but not on proven competence, leading in turn to the clergy’s overlooking or dismissing the laity’s authoritative competencies that have been honed in the secular sphere. While the author’s provocative ideas and style might suggest that he is against institutional structures in any form, a careful reading uncovers his deep love for the church’s ongoing task of doctrinal development and his hope for the reform of church structures. His love and hope are grounded in a faith in the efficacy of sacramental baptism, empowering all equally in the Lord.

L. urges the laity (and clergy) to become knowledgeable about church history, particularly regarding the role culture plays in church practice. His last chapters extend to the 21st-century issue of globalization, where his claims for Catholic laity are strong: “there are many resources within our ethical and spiritual tradition that arm us to be in the forefront of efforts to humanize the world. This task is above all one for the Catholic laity” (135). Ignatian spirituality, with its emphasis on prayer and discernment, frames the book. An annotated bibliography and probing discussion questions make this an excellent resource for study groups.

DOLORES R. LECKEY
Woodstock Theological Center, Washington


O’Meara’s book is a brief, engaging, and insightful guide to Rahner’s thought, useful and attractive to beginners. He tells us he wants to present “what is basic and original” in Rahner’s thought, with little theological and philosophical jargon, as “something fresh and helpful” that “speaks to the future” (7–8). He delivers on that promise.

To encounter Rahner the theologian, O’M. is convinced, we need to enter into his vision and feel its energy. The first two chapters draw from O’M.’s reflections on his own days as a student of Rahner at Munich. He reproduces some narratives from his A THEOLOGIAN’S JOURNEY (2002), but significantly augments them with references to secondary literature—especially German sources inaccessible to the general reader and unfamiliar to nonspecialists. O’M. insists that Rahner’s own comments provide an excellent guide to his thought. When he cites Rahner, it is Rahner at his best and least technical; the citations illustrate how his writings can illuminate each other.

O’M. highlights the Ignatian inspiration of Rahner’s thought. He warns that overemphasis on Rahner’s philosophical and technical apparatus can obscure his theology and its roots in Jesus’ message and Catholic tradition. O’M. clearly distinguishes Rahner’s project to recover the supernatural and sacramental from the effort of Protestant Liberal Theology to attract people to Christianity by reducing those realities to human self-transcendence, psychological growth, or esthetics. Another chapter outlines five issues that influenced and challenged Rahner and five orientations that characterize Rahner’s distinct way of thinking about and describing Christianity. For O’M., these constitute a kind of “code” at the heart of Rahner’s new perspective about the human and the divine: a broader incarnational and sacramental view of grace. Four chapters elaborate further on notions of the human person, God’s mysterious but real presence, God’s self communication to humanity in history, and the future. The appendixes include a brief chronology and biographical guides.

The book is a fine introduction to Rahner’s thought, and can serve as a model and valuable resource for teachers.

ROBERT MASSON
Marquette University, Milwaukee

Rego’s study of Schillebeeckx’s later theology treats the salvific nature of suffering, God’s relationship to suffering, and the distinction between what Schillebeeckx calls “meaningful” and “meaningless” experiences of suffering. The initial chapters, which carefully detail the historical and philosophical influences on Schillebeeckx’s work, will benefit readers new to Schillebeeckx. R.’s chapter on Christology, the book’s strongest feature, most illuminates Schillebeeckx’s theology of suffering, powerfully articulating a theologia crucis that insists on the inseparability of Jesus’ death from his life and resurrection.

A middle chapter, “Suffering in Schillebeeckx’s Theological Method,” analyzes and critiques Schillebeeckx’s understanding of experience. While R. positively renders Schillebeeckx’s insights concerning the authority and salvific import of the “refractory experiences” of negativity and suffering, he critiques Schillebeeckx’s overall analysis of experience for its lack of criteria for judgments of truth or falsity. R. flatly and uncritically appropriates Donald Gelpi’s negative assessment of Schillebeeckx in this regard. Nevertheless, R. goes on to discuss the mediation of revelation in and through human experience in terms that would seem to affirm Schillebeeckx’s epistemological position, especially with regard to what is revealed in suffering.

R.’s final chapters are the most critically engaging, even as they perpetuate the fundamental contradiction noted above. He doubts that Schillebeeckx’s distinction between “meaningful” and “meaningless” suffering is “helpful for developing a public, objective theology of suffering.” Clearly desiring such objectivity, R. asks: “What are the minimum requirements for human living and wellbeing? Who decides?” (325). A signal feature of Schillebeeckx’s anthropology, which R. does not engage and which would seem to negate his question, is the impossibility and undesirability of defining the humanum. Instead, Schillebeeckx provides a system of anthropological coordinates, the irreducible synthesis of which creates the essential conditions for human flourishing.

While R.’s lucid treatment of negative-contrast experience seems undermined by his persistent questioning of Schillebeeckx’s use of experience in general, his book is to be commended for the challenge it presents and for its crisp, synthetic presentation of Schillebeeckx’s major theological themes, especially his Christology.

Kathleen McManus, O.P. University of Portland, Oreg.


Hayes has edited lectures delivered by representatives of recent Catholic ecclesial movements—movements generally animated by lay persons. Some of the resulting essays describe the movements, while some develop their theological rationales. All respond to the question, how best do I live the gospel today? Each is informative, and some deepen our understanding of the theology, anthropology, and sociology implied in each movement.

One essay on the role of ecclesial movements deals with the tension always involved in new movements between organization and spirit. Another discusses more specifically the tension between work for faith and work for justice. One elaborates a theology of consecrated families, while another develops at length a sacramental approach to evangelization, and yet another emphasizes the “orthodox Catholic vision” of the church as sacrament and mystery. Of particular interest is an essay discussing “the organism of attachments” in the work of evangelization, especially the felt experience of kerygma, koinonia, and diakonia. This theme finds further substance in essays on L’Arche
communities of developmentally disabled persons and their companions, and on various works for the poor. An especially sobering essay describes the dramatic decay of faith life in Europe and calls for the new evangelization along the lines of the Neocatechumenate.

I recommend the collection for its information on developments in ecclesial life and for some creditable theological reflection. Significantly the book attempts to transcend the usual categories of “liberal” and “conservative,” while it adheres to an exacting loyalty to the Catholic tradition and to the needs of the abandoned and marginalized. If it misses anything, it would be in its appeal to the term “New Religious Movements,” a term that has been used for several decades now to describe movements that live beyond the boundaries of the established churches and “Western” culture. A chapter on that problem would have added to an otherwise helpful collection.

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


Stone’s thesis is that Christian evangelism’s attempt to be culturally relevant has rendered it timid. This timidity must be overcome by reclaiming evangelism’s narrative of “worship, forgiveness, hospitality and economic sharing” that constitutes the church “as a distinctive people in the world” (15). The church’s effort at relevance has cost it the power and independence of its narrative and ceded its social agenda to the world. Effective evangelism, rather, is a lived social practice, characteristically pacifist, in which the church presents itself as an alternate public, not as a diffident reformist subculture. What is the Christian narrative? “It is performative speech” that centers on an inner conversion and transforms the individual, not an institutional or individual “makeover” for the sake of extrinsic social advantage. Yet this latter strategy too often marks both individual’s and the church’s efforts.

S. highlights narrative rather than doctrine, virtue rather than rationality, and this is critically important. But we must ask whether his understanding of the complexities of sin and grace, of the dualism of sacred and secular (arising from a particular reading of Augustine) may need more careful attention. Reinhold Niebuhr’s appreciation of the reality of sin in our history and in our narratives suggests some aspects of that needed attention. We can further ask: How does S.’s thesis apply to Christians, let alone others, with narratives different from his own? Is there really a single Christian narrative? If evangelism is revelatory, can it ignore questions of relevance? What would a passionate, pacifist narrative, driven exclusively by its own agenda, reveal to the nonbeliever?

S. brings contemporary theoretical and practical perspectives to the subject of evangelism. Still, his offered choices are too narrow, suggesting that his stimulating and challenging book should be read along with other, evangelically sympathetic works such as Stark’s Cities of God (2006). One might find that John XXIII’s pragmatic and less dualistic perspective may be evangelically preferred to an uncompromising, if fetching, pacifist evangelism (which seems difficult even for the author to sustain).

LOU MCNEIL
Georgian Court University, Lakewood, N.J.


This helpful work offers a theological reflection on the status and authority of the parish—the parish understood as the community that localizes the universal church in a particular place and historical context. Clarke pursues an ecclesiology “from below,” employing a method of “juxtaposition” that brings theological debates (e.g., local and universal church, authority and intimacy, mission) into relationship with lived, local Catholic experience, the latter grounded in case studies of three diverse parishes.
C.’s notion of “authority” is multifaceted. The authority of the local community is portrayed not simply in terms of its tension with the hierarchy. C. seeks to describe theologically the experience of authority by everyday believers in concrete communities. He brings philosophical, psychological, and sociological scholarship into dialogue with biblical and theological conceptions of authority.

Two major insights result. First, although faith always comes as a gift from God through the church, this graciousness is mediated not only through episcopal apostolicity but also through the faithful generations in parishes where believers are raised and received into the faith. “When asked about the origin of their own faith, parishioners...speak of their parents or grandparents, of the rituals of their childhood, of influential mentors, companions, and friends” (183).

Second, the local community has authority in the church as an essential point of contact between God and history, as the place where the church becomes truly Catholic through “the concrete realities of its local communities” (184). The local parish is where the gospel encounters the full breadth of human history and culture.

The book sheds theological light on lacunae concerning the parish in canon law and theology. Its juxtaposition of theology and social science also yields insights into ecclesiological challenges posed by contemporary social change. And, in addition to its synthetic contributions, it serves as a useful introduction to the ecclesiology of some major thinkers, especially Walter Kasper, Karl Rahner, Joseph Ratzinger, and Jean-Marie-Roger Tillard.

Vincent J. Miller
Georgetown University, Washington


This book explores several issues raised by the doctrine of the Incarnation. Early on, Crisp discusses “perichoresis” or Christ’s divinity “interpenetrating” his humanity. Here the key difficulty is that the hypostatically united “partners” (the uncreated divine nature of Christ and his created human nature) are infinitely different, whereas trinitarian “perichoresis” involves divine Persons of the same nature. Further chapters are concerned with the humanity of Christ, and they end with a convincing case against Christ’s having assumed a fallen human nature. C. also goes on to challenge “kenotic” views, whether they claim that at the incarnation the Word gave up his divine properties or merely temporarily ceased to exercise them. C. closes by rejecting the nonincarnational view of Christ developed by John Hick. From start to finish, this work maintains that the Chalcedonian definition clarifies what the NT taught about Christ in the face of heresies that undermined scriptural teaching.

There are some weaknesses to C.’s argument. He is ambiguous about the “communication of idioms,” allowing readers to think it means attributing the properties of one of Christ’s natures to the other. Rather it involves naming Christ with reference to one nature and attributing to his person properties that belong to the other nature, for example, “the Son of God died on the cross.”

Again, sometimes “nature” and “person” are used imprecisely. Instead of saying that “the divine nature of Christ” is necessarily “a member of the divine Trinity” (10 n. 20), one should say: Since he shares in the one divine nature, Christ is necessarily a member of the Trinity. As regards impeccability: instead of asking whether Christ’s human nature was or was not able to sin in and of itself (96), one should put the question in terms of the person: Was Christ, through his human nature, able or not able to sin?

This welcome book shows how mainstream incarnational Christology, far from being unfaithful to the Scriptures and suppressing thought, is thoroughly biblical and gives rise to exciting challenges and fresh insights.

Gerald O’Collins, S.J.
St. Mary’s University College, Twickenham, U.K.
The Rublev Trinity. By Gabriel Bunge. Translated from the German by Andrew Louth. Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary, 2007. Pp. 120. $27.

Bunge reviews and classifies in three types the iconography of Genesis 18 and credits Rublev with creating a fourth type expressive of the distinctive trinitarian mysticism of Sergii of Radonezh and of Hesychasm generally. Rublev distinguished, for the first time, all three Persons, shifting the focus to the Spirit and illustrating the Johannine Pentecost in its trinitarian, christological, soteriological, sacramental, and spiritual dimensions.

While one might dispute details in B.'s interpretation of various images, he models a clear method for reading icons exegetically, theologically, and, above all, in the context of liturgical time and space. Insisting on the polyvalence of iconographic expression, B. distinguishes complementary levels of interpretation parallel to the classic senses of Scripture. He integrates technical and art-historical insights but remains critical of any approach that treats the icon as a mere sociocultural artifact.

B.'s contextualization of Rublev's Trinity is itself a work of profound theological assimilation in miniature. Building on succinct sequences of biblical phrases and, notably, on extensive citation of the Byzantine liturgical texts that were Rublev's daily prayer and his image's natural environment, B. expounds Orthodox dogmatic, liturgical, and ascetical theology, and insists that all of these, like Rublev's icon, are ordered toward believer's personal appropriation of and by the Holy Spirit.
The Catholic author and his Orthodox subject share the perspective of monastic life so that B.’s exposition unself-consciously transcends jurisdictional and dogmatic rifts by addressing deeper levels of common spiritual experience. B.’s scholarship is meticulously footnoted; his matter-of-fact references to manifestations of the Spirit in the lives of the devout speak for themselves. This is theology that speaks from faith to faith. The book concludes by guiding the reader through contemplation of Rublev’s Trinity toward what, for B. and for Orthodoxy, remains “the meaning and end of Christian life: . . . communion with the All-Holy Trinity in and through the Holy Spirit” (77).

J. S. CUSTER
Byzantine Catholic Seminary, Pittsburgh


A systematic theologian at Göttin gen, Mainz, and Bonn (where he directed the Ecumenical Institute), Sauter promotes a style of dogmatic theology that draws on Lutheran and Reformed traditions but strives to avoid “being merely traditionalist, confessionalist, and anti-ecumenical” (171). Originally presented as lectures in Europe and America between 1989 and 2003, his ten essays examine the topics of Christian hope, Christian-Jewish dialogue, and scriptural authority, and affirm the need for dogmatics, explore the doctrine of justification, and criticize contextual, political, and public theologies. S. also delves into American self-understanding after September 11, 2001, and the task of Reformed theology in the 21st century.

Foundationally grounding the book (although mostly implicitly) is the argument that dogmatic reflection—a mode of reasoning that explicates the intrinsic rationality of biblical and creedal claims about “who God is, what God has done, and what God has promised to accomplish” (64)—offers the appropriate al- ternative to both a church-bound theology that isolates itself from cultural dialogue and a public theology that permits secular culture to impose norms on the theologian. At the heart of dogmatics is the self-revelation of a triune God who, in sovereign freedom, has given promises that find their fulfillment in unpredictable ways, confounding both fundamentalist and radically contextual ways of thinking.

S. is one of the few German theologians deeply knowledgeable about American theological traditions, from 17th-century Puritanism to the revisionist and liberation theologians of the present, and the book exemplifies a thoughtful engagement with theological options that are prevalent in both the American academy and American popular culture.

E. BROOKS HOLIFIELD
Emory University, Atlanta


True to its name, this book sparkles with both insight and inspiration. It started as a project that Gispert-Sauch organized with graduate students to gather foundational beliefs and insights from Indian spiritualities (mainly Hindu) that might be used in Christian catechesis in India. Now in one collection, these gems shine and inspire well beyond India.

The Western reader will find familiar Indian concepts (like Atman, Dharma, Bhakti) as well as notions new and beyond pronunciation (like Daridranarayana, Lokasamgraha). Each word or expression is first explained in clear, scholarly fashion and then explored to discover how it reflects, perhaps contrasts with, or illumines Christian doctrine.

No more than three pages each, these 60 reflections work on different levels, especially for the Western reader. They can provide deeper understandings of Hinduism by, for instance, showing that Advaita draws us beyond both dualism and monism. Occasionally they might correct misunderstandings: belief in avatar is not as docetic as some experts
have claimed; Hinduism calls us to “maintain” and change this world (lokasamgraha); it even advocates a preferential concern for the poor in holding that “the welfare of the least is the way to the welfare of all” (Sarvodaya/Antyodaya) (185).

But the most significant gift among these gems is the way they deliver India’s call to enter into the mystical content of Christian experience: calls to be “in touch with the One basic Subjectivity of all personal life, the ‘I’ of God reflected in the depth of my being” (7); and to find in God “the refuge who is not ‘another’ but the very root of ourselves” (162) by suggesting that “perhaps the Spirit does not ‘come’, because the Atman is always in us, as the Self, the divine Subject” (9).

This is comparative theology at its basic and best.

PAUL F. KNITTER
Union Theological Seminary, New York


Following his three introductions to Balthasar’s theological esthetics, theodrama, and theologic, respectively, Nichols offers a volume on Balthasar’s early philosophical writings. The book is unique in its evaluation and in-depth coverage of the early, largely unknown Balthasarian corpus, while it also excels at highlighting the continuity and development between the literary scholar and later theologian. Masterfully done, it encourages contemporary theologians to imitate Balthasar in appropriating a rich diversity of human knowledge in order to articulate more eloquently and persuasively divine revelation in our times.

Balthasar’s earliest writings comprise his first book (a short treatise on music—his first love) and articles on art and religion. Here his passion for the esthetic is palpable and, as N. accurately remarks, almost threatens to “absorb the religious” (9). Balthasar’s theological interests, however, emerge clearly in his programmatic “Patristics, Scholasticism and Ourselves” as he traces and analyzes carefully the strengths and weaknesses of each theological age. N. interprets this analysis as setting the stage for Balthasar’s later, first major project, the three-volume Apocalypse of the German Soul—a massive study of 18th- to 20th-century German poetry, literature, and philosophy, from which emerged Balthasar’s emphasis on the concretely historical and the personal, these latter as modernist correctives to patristic and Scholastic theology. In this work, “apocalypse” is understood widely as the unveiling of reality as interpreted by the age of idealism and its collapse into Lebensphilosophie and existentialism. Balthasar criticizes these “secular theologies” as embodying the sinful marks of Prometheus and Dionysius, or self-deification through “self-mastery” and “ecstatic transport” (37), tendencies that gave birth to the “two monstrosities” of modernity: the Nietzschean “superman” and the “subhuman” clone of mass production and consumption (253).

While perhaps indirectly so, therefore, this book also models a critique of culture and stresses the need for a contemporary theological anthropology grounded in the crucified Christ who is the final truth, goodness, and beauty of human becoming.

NADIA DELICATA
Regis College, Toronto


Dostert engages a central question in contemporary political theory, namely, how should we “conceive of political life in light of the challenges posed by moral diversity?” (1). His concern throughout is with political liberalism’s response to pluralism, a response he characterizes as an effort to “manage” (12) political discourse in order to avoid a fractured body politic. He especially challenges
John Rawls’s notion of discourse as restricted to “public reason,” restrictions Rawls claims necessary for maintaining respect among those holding reasonable but incommensurable comprehensive doctrines. D. counters that no respect is shown by demanding that those with deep faith commitments speak publicly in a language that is alien to those commitments.

As a constructive alternative to political liberalism D. offers a “politics of engagement” as exemplified by Martin Luther King and the black churches of the South. Interpreting the struggle for freedom primarily through their faith tradition, Southern blacks engaged the body politic with language and actions that reflected their comprehensive, densely religious ideals. It is because of their rich languages, D. argues, that they were able “to confront the limits of prevailing political reality and to gesture toward new political possibilities” (159). D. argues that, as was the case in the civil rights movement, robust engagement by individuals and communities holding comprehensive doctrines can achieve more desirable and just outcomes than the restrictive strategies recommended by political liberalism.

While D.’s critical and constructive sections are generally clear and insightful, his analysis of *Mozert v. Hawkins* raises questions about what he means by “engagement.” The plaintiffs argued that their children should be permitted to opt out of a public school reading curriculum because, they believed, its content was at odds with their Christian fundamentalist beliefs. D. sides with the plaintiffs because he believes that to do otherwise denigrates the parents’ faith. But one wonders how this judgment is consistent with his project; in what way does securing the option for disengagement reflect a politics of engagement?

JAMES P. BAILEY
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

**NATURAL LAW, RELIGION, AND RIGHTS.**

In this revision of a doctoral dissertation, Syse argues that a robust natural law theory cannot be constructed successfully except on a “Christian, or at least a religious, basis” (xvi). Employing a “mixed” systematic/historical methodology, he analyzes the tension between objective moral norms and individual liberty. After first setting up the positions of Scotus and Ockham as foils, S. presents, as the book’s centerpiece, a comprehensive summary of an Aristotelian-Thomistic resolution of this tension. Then, on that basis, he critically examines the concept of “natural rights,” with particular attention to Hobbes and Locke.

To his credit, S. offers a more balanced and nuanced treatment of late 13th- and early 14th-century debates on natural law than do many neo-Scholastics. He is honest about the complexities involved in melding “natural rights” into a Thomistic framework. However, he relies heavily on generalizations that occasionally cross the line into oversimplifications. His discussion often goes no deeper than a simple contrast between varying historical emphases on obligations and rights, eternal and natural law, intellectualism and voluntarism, and realism and nominalism, without sufficient comment.

In his preface, S. notes that his dissertation committee faulted his mixture of historical and systematic approaches. Though such mixing may not be erroneous in principle, S.’s implementation did not result in any significantly new systematic insights. Indeed, in his concluding remarks he claims that his “aim has been systematic more than historical” (235), yet he then launches immediately into a summary that is clearly more historical than systematic.

Those interested in the relation between natural law theory and theology will find several stimulating if noncontroversial chapters. For example, S. is less ready than other contemporary scholars, such as Stephen Grabill, to concede that the Reformed tradition preserved considerable traces of the natural law (see the latter’s *Rediscovering the Natural Law in Reformed Theological Ethics* [2006]). Despite its weaknesses, this book effectively draws attention to the outstanding issues and
apparent paradoxes running throughout the natural law tradition.

DANIEL B. GALLAGHER
Sacred Heart Major Seminary, Detroit


For the past 20 years, “ritual,” or more accurately “ritualization,” has received increasing popular and scholarly attention. Once denigrated as superstitious, magical, pathological, or simply weird, rituals are now recognized as powerful and empowering, dynamically central to human affairs, capable of creating and renewing communities, remaking our senses of being in the cosmos, and creating and constructing human identities. Magida’s study exemplifies this recent lively respect and seeks to answer the persistent question of how rituals actually work, even while his argument remains unclear on the resources he has actually brought to the question of how they work.

His study is less naïve than either the title or the dust jacket suggests. Methodologically he bases his study on interviews of “influential thinkers” who have undergone various “rites of passage” including Jewish bar and bat mitzvahs, Christian confirmations, Hindu sacred thread ceremonies, Muslim shahadas, and Zen jukai ceremonies. M. “wanted to see who isn’t disappointed, who is changed, how they’re changed, why they’re changed—who, if anyone, is rescued from a probable familiarity with the crushing hand of fate, who is blessed with an exciting and extravagant psychic change” (6). The interviews structure the book’s five parts: “Christianity: Soldiers for Christ,” “Judaism: Would Anne Frank Sing Karaoke?,” “Hinduism: Coming to Brahma, Knowing Nirvana,” “Buddhism: Original Perfection versus Original Sin,” and “Islam: Seven Essential Words.” M.’s epilogue nicely summarizes what went before, even while its title, “Would Anyone Riding By on a Horse Even Notice?,” partakes in the mood of the dust jacket. Note-worthy is M.’s warning that these rites of passage do not always deliver the great and promised transformation—something to remember as we now tend to overromanticize both ritual and religion.

MICHAEL B. AUNE
Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Berkeley


Dorr proposes a “spirituality” of leadership, as distinct from a theory or a manual on how to lead. D. has witnessed how leadership works, himself having extensively worked with leaders, community organizers, and would-be organizers in both religious and nonreligious settings. Here he focuses on those offering leadership in religious communities or organizations with an explicit religious base. He gives pointers for operating in what one author calls the “gap” that constitutes the context of religious leadership. The gap is created by the gospel ethos—the mystery of God working in and among us—that can not always be “managed.” D. demonstrates the need for discernment at every level—demanding as it is, both personally and communally.

D. is a good synthesizer. Many will remember his work on Catholic social teaching in Option for the Poor (1983). There he presented not only what the church’s social teachings say, but clarified their contexts, and so was able to show how developments were taking place. This work on leadership does much the same. Leadership in religious congregations (and elsewhere) has been affected by the environments in which leaders operate. Ours is an age when democracy, management tools, and cultural awareness have become crucial for the proper functioning of organizations, including religious ones. But the tools do not suffice in the gap created by the gospel. With the growing professionalism that comes from managing institutions efficiently, leaders in religious institutions need grounding in a spiritual-
ity that operates in all their dealings. D. offers practical suggestions for continuous education and skill-building in using the tools, but also suggests methods by which leaders can become ever more self-aware, compassionate, and empathetic, as well as challenging others to do the same. For these changes to take place, discernment is crucial. The primer on discernment near the end of the book most usefully summarizes the complexity of the process, but leaves the mystery.

BARBARA LINEN, S.H.C.J.
Society of the Holy Child Jesus, Rome


Mitchell finds the starting point of liturgical theology within the sober recognition that we do not know what we are doing. This marvelous book reads like a parable, that is, a story that raises troubling questions without providing comforting answers (112). M. addresses two polarizing groups within the church: one would focus exclusively on the transcendent deity while the other attends only to the experience of the community. Along the way M. draws from the works of several contemporary theologians, notably Louis-Marie Chauvet, Jean-Luc Marion, and Catherine Pickstock. Pickstock’s analysis of liturgy (a bane to some liturgical theologians for her opposing certain Vatican II reforms) is nuanced by M. as he gleans an opportunity to “transcribe” the sacramental principle within a diverse culture.

For M., Christian ritual occurs at the confluence of three distinct liturgies: the liturgy of the world, of the church, and of the neighbor. Thus, the Christian community never celebrates liturgy for itself, but for the world. We also read of the language of the liturgy that includes all the basic patterns of communication, most especially that of the human body. Again, M. understands liturgy to be primarily a matter of the body at prayer interacting with other bodies. Included within the discussion of the corporate body at worship, M. discusses the relationship of ordained and lay ministry, carefully rooting both in a common baptism, replacing a notion of “power over” with empowerment.

This book deserves to be required reading for students of the liturgy. M. also intends it to be accessible to all who take an active part in worship. Those readers of Worship magazine, familiar with his column, “The Amen Corner,” will recognize his thought-provoking insight clothed in a poetic style.

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


This work is an academic study of the liturgies surrounding the feast of Corpus Christi. Walters offers a general introduction to the historical, sociological, political, spiritual, and theological forces that inspired and shaped the feast. She then briefly introduces the sections by the other two authors. Corrigan and Ricketts present carefully studied primary texts and excellent translations. C. establishes a critical edition of the liturgical manuscripts that served as sources for the office of the feast, while R. focuses on the poems of the Mosan Psalters. The three contributions are smoothly linked, although each could stand alone. Together they will enable historical and liturgical scholars to continue research on the origins of this feast, and especially on its liturgical theology and ecclesiology.

The text is valuable beyond its primary intent of crafting critical editions. First, it illustrates the importance of interdisciplinary work in liturgical-historical inquiry. Liturgy is truly the work of the people and as such flows from their complex dynamics and dimensions, the understanding of which require contributions from other fields. Second, it highlights that liturgical development is usually an expression of ecclesiological developments. Third, by noting the roles of Juliana of Mont Cor-
nillon, Jacques Panaléon, the archdeacon of Liège who later became Pope Urban IV, and Thomas Aquinas in establishing and forming this feast, it suggests the significance of the individual person in liturgical development.

The text suggests theological issues and debates surrounding eucharistic theology and piety in the 12th through 14th centuries, and points to the Beguines’ role, social place, and spirituality. It also alludes to the style and ways that “the faithful” participated in the medieval liturgy. It suggests other themes for later development, such as how the Feast of Corpus Christi brought God out of the church and into the streets. Other authors need to more fully and completely address these crucial phenomena, but now they have the critical and bibliographical resources needed for the task. This is an invaluable resource for understanding the texts and for further studies.

GEORGE S. WORGUL, JR.
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

Corrigendum: In Craig Baron’s review (TS 68/4) of William Johnston, Mystical Journey, the sentence spanning pp. 966–67 should read: “He benefited from John of the Cross, Cloud of Unknowing, from such spiritual mentors as Thomas Merton, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, and Bede Griffiths, and even from psychotherapy.” Editors’ apology.
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