

Book Reviews

Ressourcement Thomism: Sacred Doctrine, the Sacraments, and the Moral Life: Essays in Honor of Romanus Cessario, O.P., edited by Reinhard Hütter and Matthew Levering (*Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010*), xviii + 409 pp.

“RESSOURCEMENT” is a dangerous word. In its original twentieth-century theological use, it referred to the return to theological sources, principally in the early Church. In this is reflected the wisdom of the Church in her regular return to the sources of her doctrinal life for nourishment and sustenance. But for some, it took on other colors. It was a chance to settle scores, against scholasticism in particular and the oppressive accretions of the Middle Ages in general. Even worse, it was an opportunity to use the Fathers of the Church against each other and even against the Church herself in her magisterium. Much mischief came to shelter under the wings of an abused ressourcement.

Professors Hütter and Levering have boldly entitled their collection of essays honoring Fr. Romanus Cessario on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday *Ressourcement Thomism*. Ressourcement purists of a certain stripe may take offense at the term applied to Thomism. For those who thought the whole point of ressourcement was an end run around Thomism, the juxtaposition is surely appalling. Nonetheless, here in the early years of the third millennium, the universal doctor is worthy of just such a return to the sources. We could surely benefit from a renewed study of his thought in his own words, attentive to their intellectual context and frame. But yet one might well worry about dangers lurking in the species of ressourcement Thomism that lurk in the genus of ressourcement itself. St. Thomas might be used against the very traditions of thought that have so organically flowed from him and, even more seriously, used against the magisterium of the Church—and such use is, in fact, afoot. Happily, it is not afoot in this volume, which provides any number of examples of the fruitful return to and reflection upon the thought of St. Thomas that can provide nourishment and sustenance for the Church in the new millennium.

Apart from appreciations of Fr. Cessario by J. A. Di Noia, Mary Ann Glendon, Guy Bedouelle, a Postscript by Alasdair MacIntyre, a substantial introduction by the editors, and a bibliography of the works of Fr. Cessario, the volume consists of fourteen essays collected into three parts: part 1, *Sapientia Dei*: Sacred Scripture and Sacred Doctrine; part 2: *Mysterium Fidei*: Sacraments and Metaphysics; and part 3: *Bonum—Lex—Virtus*: Moral Theology. It is a remarkable collection of essays reflecting not only a wide range of topics but also a wide range of ways of returning to St. Thomas. They are models of ressourcement Thomism. The reader will please indulge me if I speak briefly to each in this context.

Reinhard Hütter's opening essay, "Transubstantiation Revisited: *Sacra Doctrina*, Dogma, and Metaphysics," directly addresses the theme of the volume. He begins, as many authors in this volume do, with a contemporary problem; Professor Hütter calls it a sense of insecurity. It is an insecurity pertaining to the very task of theology as the *intellectus fidei* in its relation to sacred Scripture, tradition, and the living magisterium. A second sense of insecurity is also noted, and this one surrounds the teachings of the Church about the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, specifically, that Vatican II "had given license to jettison the conceptual apparatus of the definition decreed by the Council of Trent." How to address this? "In this somewhat precarious theological situation, I regard it as salutary to move forward by first moving backward, 'upstream, and listening to the sources.' The particular source overdue to be listened to again intently is Thomas Aquinas." Professor Hütter's remarkable essay thus turns to St. Thomas on the nature and task of theology as well as to St. Thomas on Christ's real presence in the Eucharist. This alone would make the essay worth one's attention. What gives it its particular value is Professor Hütter's profound insight that "Thomas paradigmatically shows how the nature and task of theology bear immediately upon the mystery of Christ's Eucharistic presence, and it is in discursively contemplating the mystery of Christ's Eucharistic presence that the nature and task of theology come to a surpassing fruition." In the course of this long essay, the longest in this volume, Professor Hütter provides salutary insight into St. Thomas's understanding of *sacra doctrina* as the fruitful unity of the reception in faith of what has been revealed and the discursive activity of the *intellectus fidei*. He carefully presents this specifically in the case of the doctrine of transubstantiation, both in the decrees of Trent and in modern papal teaching as part of the living magisterium. Professor Hütter gives sustained attention to St. Thomas's metaphysics of substance and quantity as they illumine his teaching on transubstantiation. Here Professor Hütter draws upon the commentatorial tradition, especially

John of St. Thomas and Sylvester of Ferrara, in which we not only see more deeply into St. Thomas's thought but also see the ever deepening penetration of St. Thomas's insights into the Church's own understanding of the revelation she proclaims. At the heart of Professor Hütter's unified consideration of the two insecurities is the understanding of the human intellect as that which is made to know substance. In Professor Hütter's words, "The intellect beholds the truth of the doctrine of faith by way of its own proper and primordial channel of beholding and understanding reality, that is, by way of the intellect's own proper object, substance." The doctrine of transubstantiation is most fittingly an object of the human intellect. In not only articulating St. Thomas on *sacra doctrina* and on transubstantiation but also showing the deep underlying unity at work, Professor Hütter has provided a substantive answer to two modern insecurities and has at the same time provided an explicit model of *ressourcement* Thomism.

If the other authors are not so explicit, they nonetheless each contribute in various ways to such a project.

That St. Thomas can help us in the doctrine of faith is also brought out by Matthew Levering, in his "Ordering Wisdom: Aquinas, the Old Testament, and *Sacra Doctrina*." Professor Levering provides a close reading of the understudied principal lectures of St. Thomas on Sacred Scripture. Specifically, he considers the way in which St. Thomas's understanding of the Old Testament in these unique and sweeping views of Sacred Scripture brings out the divine pedagogy at work in salvation history by which the Old Testament leads to Christ. Professor Levering shows how this in turn illumines the teachings of the Church in both *Dei Verbum* and the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*.

Other authors confront specific contemporary theological challenges by a return to St. Thomas.

Thomas Joseph White, O.P.'s "The Precarity of Wisdom: Modern Dominican Theology, Perspectivalism, and the Tasks of Reconstruction" addresses the modern challenge to perennial truth by historical perspectivalism. He sets it up in an illuminating way through the juxtaposition of the two Dominican theologians Marie-Dominique Chenu and Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange. Fr. White moves the conversation beyond simply an intra-conventual slugfest to the essential modern need of what he calls a "sapiential unification." It is precisely this which St. Thomas himself has to offer and which Fr. White considers in the three areas of science and the classical metaphysics of creation, history and dogma with regard to the incarnate life of God, and the teleological character of the human self in relation to the historical self.

The problem of a modern loss of the sapiential in theology is also the concern of Matthew L. Lamb in "*Contemplata Tradere*: Embodied Interiority in Cessario, Pinckaers, and Lonergan." Fr. Lamb puts his dear friend, Fr. Romanus Cessario, in conversation with his beloved teacher, Fr. Bernard Lonergan, on the important contemporary task of "integrating science and scholarship with wisdom and holiness." Beginning with Frs. Pinckaers and Cessario on wisdom and interiority in St. Thomas, Fr. Lamb then turns to Lonergan on embodied interiority as a richly complementary understanding of what St. Thomas was doing. Some may be surprised that such a conversation might bear fruit; but then many will no doubt be surprised as well at the intellectual portrait of Lonergan that Fr. Lamb so carefully, and lovingly, sketches.

The return to St. Thomas is not always irenic. In some cases, it appears that St. Thomas himself is the problem. Bernard Blankenhorn, O.P.'s "The Place of Romans 6 in Aquinas's Doctrine of Sacramental Causality: A Balance of History and Metaphysics" addresses critics of St. Thomas who hold that his teaching on sacramental causality is too metaphysical. Through a careful reading of St. Thomas's commentary on Romans 6 as well as a consideration of its use in the *Summa theologiae*, Fr. Blankenhorn argues for a complementary and integrated place for salvation history and biblical narrative in St. Thomas's understanding of sacramental causality. We thus find that St. Thomas is not the problem; indeed, he provides a way of uniting a scriptural narrative understanding with the metaphysical. The dichotomy may be real, but it is not St. Thomas's.

In "Moral Development and Connecting the Virtues: Aquinas, Porter, and the Flawed Saint," Craig Steven Titus addresses a modern critique of St. Thomas's moral theology. Professor Jean Porter has raised the question of what she calls the "flawed saint," that is, a person who is a subject of perfect virtue but also a subject of true and persistent vice. It would seem such a person is not possible for St. Thomas, and thus her conclusion "that Aquinas was wrong to say that the life of charity is inconsistent with serious sin." Her example is the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. Without wading into the debates over King's moral life, Professor Titus addresses the problem proposed by Professor Porter. Professor Titus's reading of St. Thomas, especially with regard to continence and incontinence, helps put the situation of Professor Porter's flawed saint in more rightly Thomistic perspective. His careful delineations of St. Thomas's moral theology in relation to moral development permit a substantive response to Professor Porter's critique of St. Thomas. At the same time, through the language of moral development, he is able to place St. Thomas in conversation with contemporary psychology.

Sometimes there are serious disputes on how to read St. Thomas among those who would have recourse to him. In "The Human Acts of Christ and the Acts that Are the Sacraments," Thomas G. Weinandy, O.F.M., Cap., offers an instance of returning to St. Thomas but also articulating an incompleteness in the angelic doctor. We have here an extension, of sorts, of the earlier debate in *The Thomist* between Fr. Weinandy and Fr. White on the beatific vision in Christ. Fr. Weinandy argues that the categories of conjoined and separated instrumental causality are insufficient to account for the causal efficacy of the sacraments as St. Thomas himself understands them, given the primacy of act in St. Thomas's sacramental theology and especially the place of the priestly human acts of the divine Son in the Eucharist. Fr. Weinandy posits a third type of instrumental causality, which he calls mystical instrumental efficient causality. Fr. Weinandy thus proposes to develop St. Thomas's metaphysics to give a fuller account of the priestly activity of Christ.

Steven A. Long's "Natural Law, the Moral Object, and *Humanae Vitae*" is part of a very important contemporary debate about the reading of St. Thomas's moral theology. This essay was prompted by the exchange between Professor Janet Smith and Fr. Martin Rhonheimer in the pages of the *National Catholic Bioethics Quarterly* over condom use within marriage to prevent the transmission of AIDS. Professor Long directly addresses the question of the debate, specifically Fr. Rhonheimer's rejection of the distinction of *finis operis* and *finis operantis*. Fr. Rhonheimer rejects the distinction as a misguided and misleading creation of later Thomists, arguing that the language of the distinction is not found in St. Thomas himself. Professor Long concedes that the language of the distinction is not found in St. Thomas, but insists that the idea articulated by the terms is. The substance of the essay is Professor Long's presentation of the teleological grammar (as he calls it) of the moral object. He presents it and addresses five potent objections to his position in which he carefully attends to the analysis of the *per se* ordering of acts. In addition to the careful exposition of St. Thomas's thought in the midst of controversy, we also have in Professor Long a fine example of how to read the commentatorial tradition in relation to St. Thomas himself.

Some work on St. Thomas appreciates how his own historical circumstance sheds light on contemporary concerns. Two such essays are present in this volume.

In "The Importance of the Definition of Sacraments as Signs," Fr. Benoît-Dominique de la Soujeole, O.P., begins with the historical reality of St. Thomas's clarifying precision in his definition of a sacrament as a sign and not principally a cause of what is efficacious. He shows how the

insights that are at work in this development in St. Thomas have particular implications both for the way in which St. Thomas understands salvation and for our understanding of the modern question of the relation of non-Christian religions to the Church.

Richard Schenk, O.P., in his "*Verum sacrificium* as the Fullness and Limit of Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Sacramental Theology of Thomas Aquinas: Historical Context and Current Significance," is interested in the sacrifice of Christ and its relation to the sacramental theology of St. Thomas, especially with regard to the Eucharist. With his typically stunning breadth of scope, Fr. Schenk shows how St. Thomas is able to assist the Church in her modern reflections (here he especially considers the work of John Paul II) in relation to ongoing Protestant dialogue (especially the critique of Eberhard Jüngel) as well as the influential theories of sacrifice associated with the thought of René Girard. To do this, Fr. Schenk shows how St. Thomas had already navigated the difficult medieval shoals on sacrifice as represented by the competing views of Richard Fishacre and Robert Kilwardby. It is, in part, from this historical situation of St. Thomas that Fr. Schenk draws out the theological value of St. Thomas for the parallel intra-Catholic division between Karl Rahner and Hans Urs von Balthasar. In showing the contemporary value of St. Thomas with regard to the Catholic debates, Fr. Schenk is able to situate him as well with regard to the larger ecumenical and theoretical contexts with which he began the essay.

Much good contemporary work entails careful reading of the texts of St. Thomas with an eye to speculative precision in understanding his thought. Such is essential for any sustained Thomistic ressourcement. Again, we find two outstanding examples in this collection.

Lawrence Dewan, O.P. speaks of his "St. Thomas and the Divinity of the Common Good" as a meditation, but it has all the rigor and care in reading the texts of St. Thomas that one expects from Fr. Dewan. He here argues for the divine status of the common good as the key to the metaphysical contemplation of the common good. He writes, "My understanding is, then, that Thomas presents the existence of God as *naturally* known to all, even though *naturally reasoned to*. . . . I would say that this natural knowledge would fill out the picture of the commandment of love as known by virtue of itself to all. Given that one has knowledge of God as the author of being, one has knowledge of him as lovable by us, indeed as more lovable than ourselves."

The common good is also the central topic of Stephen Brock's "The Primacy of the Common Good and the Foundations of Natural Law in St. Thomas." Fr. Brock begins by noting that for St. Thomas one of the essential features of any true law is that it is ordered to the common

good. So how then, he asks, is one to understand the natural law as ordered to the common good? More precisely, Fr. Brock sets out to understand how the primacy of the common good is a precept of the natural law in its own right. He undertakes a careful reading of *Summa theologiae* I, q. 5, a. 4, on whether the good has the ratio of final cause; from this analysis, Fr. Brock proposes an analogical universality of the common good that serves as the first precept of the natural law.

Sometimes it is helpful to have a broad historical and speculative view of the landscape in which St. Thomas is located. Joseph W. Koterski, S.J. has provided this view in his "A Reading Guide for Natural Law Ethics." This is far more than a book list or even an annotated reading guide. Fr. Koterski surveys the current state of philosophical and theological debate over natural law ethics and especially the prominent critiques of it. The critiques and the responses to them (clearly articulated by Fr. Koterski) provide the backbone of the essay and the context for the carefully selected readings proposed. Fr. Koterski gives particular attention to the place of St. Thomas's natural law ethics within the contemporary development of Catholic social thought.

A more narrowly conceived consideration of St. Thomas in relation to Catholic social thought is found in Graham J. McAleer's "Vanity and Commerce: How *De malo* Supports Whig Thomism." Professor McAleer argues that "Catholic social thought can safely adopt the Scottish school's theory of commercial motivation—vanity." Noting a number of contemporary reflections upon and magisterial teachings on modern economic life, Professor McAleer wants to argue not just to the fact of vanity as a motive for modern commerce, but for the good of vanity as a motive for modern commerce. He notes, quite simply, that Catholic social thought has given scant attention to the question of commercial motivation, and he would like to begin that conversation. To this end, he brings to bear some remarks of St. Thomas on vanity in the disputed questions *De malo*.

All said and done, this is an outstanding collection of essays. How fitting that this volume is in honor of Fr. Romanus Cessario, O.P., who has done so much in the past thirty plus years to help the Church understand afresh the essential place of St. Thomas. As Alasdair MacIntyre puts it so pointedly in his Postscript to this volume, "What we are particularly in debt to Cessario for is not primarily that his answers differ from those of that unfortunate generation of Catholic moral theologians who prospered in the wake of the Second Vatican Council, but that he asked different questions." That he could do so arose not simply from a reading of St. Thomas but from the reading of St. Thomas within a tradition, specifically within the enduring tradition of Dominican Thomism. In this, it seems to me, one appreciates

not only his outstanding work in moral theology, noted throughout this volume, but also his little volume of 1999, *Le thomisme et les thomistes* (subsequently published in English as *A Short History of Thomism*) in which Fr. Cessario so exquisitely articulates Thomism precisely as a living intellectual tradition at the service of the truth and the Church, bringing out that most vital line that is the Dominican tradition of Thomism. Fr. Cessario's timing at the beginning of the new millennium was impeccable.

But, as is also clear at several points in the volume, this is not merely a tribute to a scholar who has helped shape a new direction in Catholic theology for the new millennium. It is a tribute to a friend, colleague, and guide. So many theologians have experienced the intellectual care of Fr. Cessario. If I may conclude on a personal note, it was more than twenty years ago that Fr. Cessario served as the external reader of my doctoral dissertation on the Christology of St. Thomas. Although we had never met before, he took a remarkable amount of time to speak with me and encourage me in my study of and work in the angelic doctor. He initiated a friendship. It is a story repeated, *mutatis mutandis*, time and time again. The volume here reviewed testifies to his enormous influence for good not only in his writings, but in his generosity and warmth, in his life as a faithful student of St. Thomas and, like St. Thomas, as a faithful son of St. Dominic. N V

John F. Boyle
University of St. Thomas
St. Paul, MN

The Temple in the Gospel of Mark: A Study in Its Narrative Role

by Timothy C. Gray (*Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2010*), xi + 223 pp.

STUDENTS of the Gospel according to Mark have long noticed that the temple plays a central thematic role from the moment Jesus "cleanses" it until his death. Few, however, have attempted the sustained reflection necessary to tease out the complexities of Mark's temple theology. This book by Timothy C. Gray is the most significant attempt at this task to date. The book began as Gray's doctoral dissertation written under Francis Moloney at The Catholic University of America. It was first published in 2008 by Mohr Siebeck, and in 2010 Baker issued this reprint, mercifully making the volume available at a much lower cost.

Gray describes his method as narrative criticism, which he defines as an attempt "to discern the plot of a given story by examining the parts of the story in relation to the entire narrative world depicted in the story" (2). To understand the significance of the temple motif, therefore, one must "examine the role of the temple within Mark's larger plot" (2).

This narrative critical approach is a self-conscious corrective to the excesses of redaction critics, who have tended to fixate on how authors shaped their sources to the exclusion of the story itself. The approach pays off: Gray's careful analysis of chapters 11 to 15 as a whole, including Mark's use of the Old Testament, illuminates the temple motif which is woven throughout the narrative in ways that frequently elude interpreters who take a more piecemeal approach. Over the course of the book, however, it becomes clear that the difference between Gray's brand of narrative criticism and redaction criticism is only a difference of emphasis, as Gray frequently appeals to Mark's editorial activity and *Sitz im Leben*, and occasionally reads Jesus' words as if they were addressed not to the characters in the story but to "the [Markan] community" (see his treatment of 11:24 on p. 54). It would not be inaccurate, therefore, to call Gray's method a chastened redaction criticism.

Gray provides a close reading of Mark beginning with the entry into Jerusalem in 11:1 until the death of Jesus. Jesus enters the temple and condemns it as a den of thieves that has failed to summon the Gentiles to worship God (11:17). Yet, this was not only a "cleansing" of a few corrupt elements but a prophetic demonstration enacting the temple's permanent demise, as the cursing of the fig tree shows (11:12–14, 20–21). Jesus then goes on to describe the community gathered around him as the new locus of faith, prayer, and forgiveness (11:22–25). When the chief priests, scribes, and elders ask Jesus by what authority he is doing these things (11:27–33), he tells them the parable of the wicked tenants (12:1–12), which condemns their leadership and intimates that Jesus himself is the rejected stone that will be the cornerstone of the new temple. The eschatological discourse which follows in chapter 13 is frequently read as a loose collection of traditions, but Gray shows that the language of the discourse is drawn from prophetic oracles against Jerusalem and its temple. The Last Supper and trial narrative present Jesus' offering of his body and blood as the sacrifice of the new temple. At his trial Jesus is accused of threatening to destroy "this temple made with hands (τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον)" and in three days replace it with "another, not made with hands (ἄλλον ἀχειροποίητον)" (14:58). Though Mark describes this accusation as false, Gray argues convincingly that it is false only in that Jesus never said that he would personally destroy the temple. Finally, the destruction of the temple becomes a *fait accompli* when Jesus dies and the temple veil is torn. The events of A.D. 70 are the "inevitable 'aftershock' of the real eschatological event—the death of Jesus" (192–93).

Many exegetical insights emerge over the course of the book, but there are at least two major dividends that deserve special consideration.

First, Gray's attention to Mark's use of the Old Testament reveals the Evangelist to be an expert conductor of a scriptural symphony, drawing on texts with rich thematic affinities with the narrative of the Gospel. Mark weaves the biblical narratives into his own in order to portray Jesus' judgment of the temple as emerging from deep within Israel's own prophetic tradition. This point is of no small significance for understanding how the new, eschatological temple embodied in Jesus relates to the faith of Israel. One is reminded of the dictum *Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus in Novo patet*. Though he never reflects on this question explicitly, Gray's exegesis shows that Jesus' replacement of the temple is in continuity with the Old Testament, despite the fact that this continuity can only be seen retrospectively, from this side of the cross. (See, however, his treatment of the centurion's confession, 194–96.)

Second, the most richly suggestive point of the book is perhaps Gray's convincing argument that in Mark's Gospel, Jesus not only foretells the destruction of the existing temple and cult but institutes a new temple and cult at the Last Supper. This conclusion seems obvious in retrospect but is quite unusual in contemporary biblical scholarship. Mark portrays Jesus hinting that the temple will be destroyed and that a new edifice, of which Jesus is the cornerstone, will be put in its place. Then, on the night he is betrayed Jesus takes bread and wine and gives them to the disciples as his body and blood. The words "this is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many" (14:24) are clearly sacrificial, indicating that Jesus' death is the new locus of atonement. And though Mark lacks the words "do this in memory of me" (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24), the Eucharistic practice of Mark's own day is surely presupposed. This raises a host of issues for further reflection, including the question of whether and to what extent the pervasive temple imagery in early Christianity is linked to the belief that the Church was the locus of Jesus' new sacrifice.

It is perhaps inevitable that a monograph characterized by fresh insights would include some arguments that are less persuasive than others. Gray's treatment of the biblical quotations in Mark 11:17 offers an example. ("Is it not written, 'My house will be called a house of prayer for all peoples'? But you have made it a 'den of robbers.'") The phrase "house of prayer" comes from Isaiah 56:7 and "den of robbers" appears to come from Jeremiah 7:11. Following Tom Holmén, Gray claims that in Isaiah the words "My house will be called a house of prayer for all peoples" is an assertion that Mark has rewritten as a question. Similarly, in Jeremiah the phrase "den of robbers" appears in the midst of a question but Mark makes it an assertion. By changing Isaiah's assertion to a question and Jeremiah's question to an assertion, Mark "highlights how

the temple establishment has likewise reversed the order of things that God, according to Isaiah 56, has set down . . . and [intensifies] the tone of judgment against the temple" (30–31). In other words, Mark intended for his readers to notice the flip-flop of question and assertion and for this "reversal" to make them think of the "reversal" of the temple leaders' wicked behavior. This is an extraordinarily subtle line of reasoning. Moreover, it is not clear that Mark does in fact rewrite the quotation from Isaiah as a question. To be sure, Jesus asks a question, but the assertion from Isaiah remains unaltered within it ("Is it not written, 'My house will be called a house of prayer for all peoples'?").

In sum: Gray's overarching case is convincing. Moreover, the book raises a number of pressing issues for further consideration and contains a treasure trove of neglected Old Testament intertexts that illuminate the Markan narrative. N-V

Nathan Eubank
Notre Dame Seminary
New Orleans, LA

The Dyophysite Christology of Cyril of Alexandria by Hans Van Loon (*Leiden: Brill, 2009*), xvi + 626 pp.

THE provocative title of this study is not accidental. The author, Hans Van Loon, is attempting to shake up a majority consensus regarding Cyril of Alexandria's own preferred Christological terminology. Van Loon registers his concern that the Eastern Orthodox–Oriental Orthodox dialogue is basing its consensus on a mistaken judgment regarding Cyril's Christology. In particular, Van Loon challenges the view that the *mia physis* ("one nature") language is Cyril's own preferred terminology, and that Cyril allowed a two-natures formulation only as a concession to the Antiochenes following the 433 reunion.

To correct what he believes is an incorrect understanding of Cyril, the author embarks on a study of Cyril's writings from the opening period of the Nestorian controversy (429–30). This methodological limitation is very much to the point: the claim is often made that Cyril shifted to allow a two-natures approach only as a concession to the sharp critique of the Antiochenes, a critique that was initiated only after Cyril published his *Third Letter to Nestorius* with the Twelve Anathemas attached. Van Loon, then, proposes to study in depth all the works up to and including the *Third Letter* in order to determine Cyril's own preferred terminology.

The depth of the analysis of these documents is impressive and the command of secondary scholarship is astonishing. In his first chapter Van

Loon maps out the trajectory of Cyril scholarship on this issue from the early twentieth century until today, identifying two main trajectories. The first (and majority) view, initiated by Joseph Lebon, argues that “nature” equals “person” in Cyril’s thought, and considers the *mia physis* formula the best rendition of what Cyril really thinks. Further, this view holds that Cyril is willing to identify the two natures only abstractly, “in contemplation only,” not in reality. The second view, proposed by M. Jugie, argues that “nature” equals a concrete *ousia* in Cyril, and that it is *not* equivalent to “person.” Further, this view holds that “in contemplation only” in Cyril applies not to the *distinction* of the natures, but only to their *separation*. Van Loon’s study is one long extended argument in favor of the second (minority) view.

To put this more positively, Van Loon argues that Cyril is by no means the staunch defender of the *mia physis* formula that he is made out to be, but rather that his own preferred terminology much more frequently turns to *dyophysite* (two-nature) language, compatible with Chalcedon. Second, he attempts to show that Cyril’s phrase, “in contemplation only,” only applies to the act of *separating* the natures. Cyril does not deny the reality of two real natures in Christ, but only rejects their separation—and precisely the kind of separation that he finds in the writings of Nestorius.

Before turning to the early Christological writings, Van Loon undertakes a long and impressive background study on metaphysics and metaphysical terms in Cyril’s anti-Arian writings. He concludes that Cyril is most at home with the logical categories of Aristotle and the neo-Platonists, but that “logic . . . is a set of tools for Cyril,” not the heart of his thought (94). His study of the term *physis* in Cyril’s pre-Nestorian, anti-Arian writings yields the conclusion that “in the vast majority of cases in Cyril of Alexandria’s trinitarian writings” the term *physis* has a meaning that approximates “secondary substance,” that is, *ousia* (and not the individual or person).

Recognizing that ambiguity about the use of terms has bedeviled the debate from the fifth century until today, Van Loon attempts to define with significant precision key terms that can be used to make accurate comparisons. He defines eighteen terms in all (found on pp. 200–202), placing them in small caps in order to indicate to the reader the precise and stable meaning of the given term (some examples are: ABSTRACT NATURE, COMMON NATURE, INDIVIDUAL NATURE, COMMON SUBSTANCE, GRAMMATICAL PERSON, ONTOLOGICAL PERSON, METAPHYSICAL PERSON). By mapping out the various and conflicting views on these terms in the scholarly literature, Van Loon sets the stage for his own investigation.

In three lengthy chapters, the author offers a close reading and analysis of twenty-three works of Cyril (listed on p. 262). For each work he

sums up the meaning of the key terms in play—*ousia*, *hypostasis*, *physis*, *prosopon*, and *idios*—and then draws provisional conclusions. In a concluding chapter he presents the main results of his investigation. First, he observes that dyophysite language predominates in these writings: “Thus, Cyril’s two-nature language is his own, and he has not borrowed it from his Antiochene opponents” (531). Second, Van Loon finds only three uses of the *mia physis* language in these works, two of them embedded in a quotation that Cyril believed to be from Athanasius. He concludes that “in contrast with the many examples of dyophysite language, miaphysite terminology hardly plays a role in Cyril’s Christology before the reunion of 433” and so “is certainly not typical of his own Christological vocabulary” (524). Third, he argues that the phrase “in contemplation only” refers not to the reality of the two natures in Christ, but to their *separation* into two sons, and he concludes that “Cyril’s dyophysitism is not just notional, but real” (540).

Importantly, Van Loon proposes that when Cyril speaks of “one nature” in Christ, he really means something like “separate reality which is the composition of two natures” (390). “Nature” here is not the equivalent of “person,” but rather points to one separate reality that itself is composed of two parts (or natures), the divine and the human. It is no coincidence, Van Loon argues, that in the few instances where Cyril employs the *mia physis* language, he immediately illustrates this by recourse to the soul-body analogy of the human being. Crucially, the soul and body each retain their own individual natures but come together to express one new nature or separate reality, the human being.

While agreeing with the main conclusions of this study, I would offer two minor caveats. First, when Van Loon claims that “by assuming the common human nature, the Word of God became an individual human being” (169) in Cyril’s thought, this could be misleading, as if there were a “common human nature” existing on its own that the Word somehow assumed, *and only then* became an individual human. Rather, it seems better to say that for Cyril, the Word, by becoming a man in Mary’s womb through the power of the Spirit, assumed as the New Adam our nature such that by his saving work he could affect and transform the whole of our nature.

Second, Van Loon helpfully shows that the phrase “united according to hypostasis” was Cyril’s favorite phrase in this early period. He further argues that by “hypostasis” Cyril did *not* yet reach the meaning of a “metaphysical person,” that is, a person at a distinct metaphysical level from the natures who is the bearer of those natures. He concludes that for Cyril this meaning is “totally absent from the term hypostasis” (484).

It can be acknowledged that Cyril did not yet have the finely honed terminology that later obtained, but I find Van Loon making too much of this distinction. Later in the study he actually concedes that Cyril's view "comes close to a divine bearer of the two natures, a divine and a human nature" (547), and that this idea of a metaphysical person is already present implicitly and "in embryonic form" in Cyril (566). The fact that Cyril consistently refers to the "Word" as the one who acts both "as man" and "as God" indicates this notion of the hypostasis of the Word acting as the bearer and (in a sense) agent of the two natures. Cyril may not have worked out the metaphysics of this, but he clearly has a grip on the hypostasis of the Word as the single person and agent who can act in both of his two natures.

Van Loon's case is impressive, the more so because of the close and thorough analysis he has done of all the relevant texts of this period. Even if readers are not persuaded by every argument he makes, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Cyril was much more at home with a two-nature view of Christ than he is made out to be, and that the *mia physis* formula simply was not at the center of his thought. Cyril scholarship—and contemporary ecumenical dialogues—will have to reckon with the findings of this study. N-V

Daniel Keating
Sacred Heart Major Seminary
Detroit, MI

God's Many-Splendored Image: Theological Anthropology for Christian Formation by Nonna Verna Harrison (*Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010*), xi + 207 pp.

IN the caricatures of Christian theological anthropology often encountered in popular culture, the Christian perspective on human nature is portrayed as repressive and depressive. "Do not handle! Do not taste! Do not touch!" (Col 2:21). These words are thought to be at the heart of the Christian message. In the context of Paul's argument in Colossians 2, of course, these words are used for the opposite purpose—to liberate Christian spiritual formation from the grip of religious worldliness. In *God's Many-Splendored Image*, Sister Nonna Verna Harrison endeavors to recover a Christian theological anthropology that rightly describes the nature and shape of the Christian life and serves to motivate its pursuit. Harrison's expertise in patristic theology and experience in communicating the virtues of the patristic literature facilitate her articulation of a coherent and compelling theological anthropology that is drawn from a wide array

of sources. The most prominent sources upon which Harrison draws are the theological reflections of the desert monks and the Cappadocians.

Two virtues of Harrison's book should be noted immediately. First, Harrison's reading of the patristic literature is doubly generous; it is both thorough and charitable. She draws upon many of the lesser-known works of the theologians whom she engages, demonstrating a patient reading of the patristic corpus. Her interpretations of the patristic literature are always sympathetic and positive. Second—and this is the best aspect of the book—Harrison's triple emphasis upon "what we are, what we can and should do, and what we are called to become" (5) appropriately binds together ontology, Christian ethics, and teleology. Humanity is directed toward God, and the various aspects of human existence are given integrity by the *telos* of the *visio Dei*. This has important political implications, since all humans share the same *telos*.

The book's chapters are well organized. Each chapter includes an introductory scene from Harrison's own experience or an observation she has made about humanity which raises the questions addressed by the chapter. These questions are followed by an extended engagement with relevant texts from the Christian tradition. She then draws together the various strands of the chapter, often concluding with a few comments explaining how the thought and piety of the theologians encountered in the chapter can help us answer the questions posed at the beginning. The prose is written clearly and compellingly. These factors make the book usable as a supplementary textbook for undergraduate courses in spiritual formation, theological anthropology, or perhaps historical theology, where it could be used to illustrate the ways in which ancient theology can help us construct answers to contemporary theological questions. But university use does not circumscribe the audience that would benefit from this book. Harrison always has the spiritual formation of her readers in view, and it is an enriching read.

Theologically, Harrison eschews the more parochial debates encountered in theological anthropology, focusing rather on the larger issues related to human orientations toward God, oneself, other humans, and non-human creation established by God's creative and redemptive action. As *ressourcement* Thomists have shown, the differences between Eastern and Western patristic theological anthropologies have been overemphasized. Thomas Aquinas, at least, freely draws together many of their diverse emphases into a coherent vision. Nevertheless, because of Harrison's predominant engagement with Eastern theological literature, her book could also be used to complement the traditional questions of theological anthropology in the Western theological tradition. The book

introduces readers to important theological emphases in the catholic tradition; her text invites further exploration of the relevant theological issues and more careful reading of the ancient texts.

Despite the book's many virtues, I have a few reservations about aspects of the book's argument if it is read as an effort to articulate the meaning and implications of humanity's identity as God's image or as a theological anthropology more broadly conceived. For example, the first chapter of the book takes up the issue of human freedom. Harrison emphasizes the importance of human choice in the Christian life, explaining that God's grace and human freedom are complementary. Human willingness to obey God is necessary for successful Christian discipleship, and God's grace "brings our freedom to fullness of life, creativity, and activity" (26). Harrison's observations here are useful. However, further analysis of Harrison's concept of freedom is required. She defines freedom as self-determination; humans become what they choose to become, with God's help. What is missing from the chapter is careful theological attention to divine freedom as expressed in the divine economy. Freedom belongs first, and perfectly, to God. Human freedom makes sense only in light of, and beneath divine freedom. Therefore, the nature of dependent creaturely freedom is also given short shrift. In other words, Harrison rightly affirms the fact of human freedom and its role in Christian formation, but she does not give due theological consideration to the nature of freedom in light of the ontological distinction between the Creator God and God's creatures. While Harrison does affirm the metaphysical implications of the Creator-creature distinction advocated in the patristic literature and recognizes humanity's dependence upon God for its existence and identity, she does not often consider how our understanding of humanity is informed by God's particular existence and identity, how the doctrine of God affects theological anthropology.

This move is characteristic of a theological instinct found throughout the book. Harrison affirms that knowledge of God leads to clearer knowledge of humanity and that knowledge of humanity leads to clearer knowledge of God. But the force of most of her examples is intended to underscore the latter, and sometimes it appears that it is difficult for Harrison to nail down the explanatory force of the former. Consider another example. On pp. 57–58, Harrison has an important discussion under the title "Seeing People Truly." She rightly argues that "[o]nce we come to know God, we will perceive his character, that is, his gentleness, patience, generosity, wisdom, justice, and love. Then we will slowly begin to recognize the divine character in people we meet . . ." (57). Contemplation of God leads to more truthful recognition of God's image in the

world. Harrison does not expand on or explore the nature of this contemplation of God or how one would embark upon it, however. Rather, she immediately turns to a movement in the other direction: "On the other hand, we may perceive gentleness, patience, generosity, wisdom, justice, or love in people first and so find the courage to believe that God is like such people, only even better" (58). This quote is followed by several illustrations that seek to show how God is seen through humanity. Of course, Christian theologians have recognized the value of thinking from God to humanity and from humanity to God. But theological precedence, in both East and West, has been given to contemplating God through the divine economy, and understanding creation in light of God.

To put it another way, Harrison advocates the contemplation of God, but she seldom engages in the contemplation of God. To explain this impulse, Harrison might point out that this book is intended to be a theological *anthropology*; it is focused on humanity. But I wonder if we can contemplate the human creature without extended contemplation of humanity's Creator. The best chapter in this regard is chapter nine, "Community." Time and again Harrison returns to the discussion of the Trinity in order to illuminate various aspects of human social relations. She does not collapse the intra-Trinitarian relations into creaturely ones; rather, she explores the analogies suggested by Scripture. The other chapters would have benefited from the use of a similar theological method.

I would also like to raise a question about Harrison's description of grace. Throughout, Harrison recounts stories about the wise counsel given by abbots and monks to people known to be living sinfully. In nearly every case cited, the wisdom of the counselor deflects attention from the sin so that those counseled may be set free from the negative stereotypes others have placed upon them. I believe these accounts do indeed display profound wisdom. But I wonder if Harrison has told only part of the story of Christian formation. At times it seems necessary to address sin directly and to demand repentance, not so that human conceptions of justice or vengeance are satisfied, but because the sinner needs to learn the virtues involved in repentance in order to be properly formed as a person.

One final observation: occasionally, it appears that there are dueling purposes for the book. On the one hand, the title and structure of the book seem to point to this being Harrison's own synthesis of a Christian anthropology. On the other hand, the chapters themselves often give the impression that Harrison is simply reporting what the theologians believed anthropologically.

Perhaps the primary intention for the book would have been clearer had the subtitle, "Theological Anthropology for Christian Formation," been

exchanged with what appears to be an alternative subtitle on the back cover: "Early Christian Insights concerning What It Means to Be Human." This is exactly what this book provides. It is not a stand-alone text that provides a full explanation of Christian anthropology, but it does provide a wonderful set of Christian insights into what it means to be a human being before God and with one another. In this way, Harrison's book is a helpful addition to the current literature on theological anthropology. She reminds us of the positive Christian vision of human life that overthrows mere religious worldliness and sets us moving toward the *visio Dei*. N V

Ryan S. Peterson
Cedarville University
Cedarville, OH

Light & Glory: The Transfiguration of Christ in Early Franciscan and Dominican Theology by Aaron Canty (*Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011*), xi + 266 pp.

IF Benedict XVI is right when he introduces the second volume of his *Jesus of Nazareth* by suggesting that the historical-critical method has "already yielded its essential fruit" and that scriptural exegesis needs to recover itself as a "theological discipline," then it won't be long before both scholars and Christians in general find a new appreciation for the depth and reverence with which the scholastic theologians treated the sacred Scriptures as the foundation of their theological enterprise. In this regard we are fortunate to have studies like Aaron Canty's *Light & Glory: The Transfiguration of Christ in Early Franciscan and Dominican Theology*, which not only ably treats its particular subject, but illustrates the richness of thirteenth-century theology as a project founded in the Scriptures.

The mysterious event of the transfiguration of Jesus, as reported in the synoptic gospels and referenced by 2 Peter, raised an array of questions for the scholastics across several areas of theology. If the transfiguration revealed the heavenly glory of the resurrected Christ, how did the disciples see it with their bodily eyes? Did they only "see" in their minds? Was it really this glory that appeared or just a vision of it? Did this glorious revelation compromise the mortality of the incarnate Son, so necessary for Christian soteriology? The appearance of Moses and Elijah with Jesus presents its own questions. Presumably the disciples had never met either of them, so how did they know the two men were Moses and Elijah? How were they able to appear in the first place? As it turns out, these are themselves different questions, since Moses was dead but Elijah was alive. How does the transfiguration relate to the beatific vision for which

Christians hope, or the ascent of the mind to God, which is its foretaste even now?

Canty's study examines the work of seven mendicant theologians writing on these sorts of questions between 1230 and 1280 or so: the Dominicans Hugh of St. Cher, Guerric of St. Quentin, Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas, and the Franciscans Alexander of Hales, John of La Rochelle, and Bonaventure. Presenting a helpful model for scholarship across scholastic genres, Canty includes *postillae*, *enarrationes*, and commentaries on the gospels, as well as sermons, disputed questions, commentaries on the *Sentences*, *summae*, and treatises on particular topics, such as Albert's *De Resurrectione*. Working through both edited and unedited texts, Canty presents the work of these theologians in a way that reveals the flowering complexity of scholastic theology over the course of the thirteenth century.

After a clear introduction and a quick chapter that helpfully rehearses the biblical and theological traditions on the transfiguration to which the thirteenth century was heir, Canty turns to the mendicant theologians.

Hugh of St. Cher's *postillae* on the synoptic gospels begin the study and exercise a great influence on the theologies of the transfiguration that follow. For Hugh, the transfiguration of Jesus signifies the transfiguration of the Church as his mystical body, and thus reveals the human possibilities of ascent, transformation, and contemplation. For Alexander of Hales, the transfiguration reveals Christian hope; the glorified Christ makes visible the clarity of the glorified body of heavenly destiny. Already in the first two theologians Canty presents, we see the scriptural accounts of the transfiguration developed into rich reflections on ecclesiology and eschatology.

With Guerric of St. Quentin, some of the questions at hand become more technical. How was it that Jesus' human body had the capacity or disposition to express the clarity of his divine nature? Though the chapter on Guerric is brief, the questions he raises, especially with regard to the natures of Christ and their hypostatic union, seem to be an important influence on later discussions.

The chapter on John of La Rochelle is the longest in the book. John discusses a variety of questions on the transfiguration, such as whether it was an anticipation or proof of the resurrection, and whether it was only his clothes or Jesus himself who was radiant. Most interesting, as Canty points out, is the way John's discussions reveal the rapid development of complex theological questions that was accomplished over the 1230s. Indeed, the method of the whole book, proceeding through different figures and across genres of their theological writings, makes *Light & Glory* a useful study of this remarkable scholastic flowering.

The discussion continues with Albert the Great, who sees the transfiguration as an explicit theophany of the Trinity and asks how it was that the transfigured Christ was still mortal and passible. Albert's treatment also shows advancement in the complexity of the *divisio textus* of the Scripture on which the exegesis is theologically framed. The chapter on Bonaventure is surprisingly short, but this is hardly a fault of the study; Bonaventure discussed the transfiguration only in sermons and in his commentary on Luke. Touching among Bonaventure's spiritual reflections is his apology for Peter's wrongful enthusiasm after the transfiguration; for Bonaventure, Peter spoke only from an ecstasy of desire.

Canty reserves his greatest praise for Thomas, whose theology of the transfiguration develops through sustained treatment over the course of his career, beginning with his commentary on the *Sentences*, continuing through the *Catena aurea* and the commentary on Matthew, and finding its fullest and most mature discussion in the *Summa theologiae*. For Canty, Thomas's accomplishment is a comprehensive view of the transfiguration and its place within "the whole economy of salvation." The transfiguration is not only a revelation of a future glory to come, but is a living exhortation and encouragement for Christian disciples of all times. Thomas makes fruitful use of arguments from fittingness to account for the simple and comprehensive purpose of the transfiguration: that Christ "could show His glory to men, and arouse them to desire it."

Light & Glory succeeds in its expressed purpose of making a contribution to the study of medieval Christology. The book is also a valuable scholarly example of how issues and topics in scholastic theology can be examined across the great variety of genres in which the medieval authors wrote. Finally, *Light & Glory* is a fine illustration of the remarkable flowering of exegesis and theological reflection produced by the mendicant schools of the thirteenth century. N.V

Charles Sammons, O.F.M. Cap.
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MA