Check for updates

academy than to the church. R. sees this as problematic for the faith development and pastoral needs of students and also for the mission and identity of the university.

In chapter 3 on faith and development, R. presents an excellent overview of the mission of the José Simeón Cañas University of Central America (UCA) in El Salvador. He profoundly admires the witness of the UCA Jesuits, but his admiration comes with the caveat that the situation of U.S. Catholic universities today is very different from UCA's. R. points to UCA theology courses that are taught within the context of poverty and that engage students in service and service learning as expressions of solidarity and as examples of UCA's influence on U.S. Catholic universities. In highlighting these, however, R. may be expecting so little of our universities that he could do a disservice to the witness of the UCA martyrs. It was not its service requirements that distinguished UCA's witness or that cost the Jesuits their lives. As R. correctly observes, UCA sought to be a critical conscience in Salvadoran society and set itself to the practical task of building the kingdom of God. Are our universities not to be held to the same standard? It would have been helpful if R. had entertained this question; this is a discussion that needs to take place in our universities.

Each essay in section 2 contributes solidly to the literature on experiential learning. I especially appreciate Stephen Pope's analysis of Boston College's eight-day immersion trip to El Salvador. His measured and nuanced case for immersion experiences is refreshing. Pope carefully and convincingly argues that the experiential paves the way for intellectual inquiry; is a stimulus to learning; provokes significant social, moral, and spiritual transformation; and is instrumental in generating solidarity. Yet, while each author here attests to the power of experiential learning, only a minority of students can or will take advantage of such immersion programs. The tougher issue, unaddressed here, is how to educate the vast majority more effectively.

This book is important for administrators concerned about questions of Catholic identity, for theology and religious studies faculty as they rethink the direction of their departments, and for faculty engaged in and in defense of experiential learning. While R. does not raise the critical questions for us here, by laying the ground so carefully he gives us a basis for discussion, analysis, and decision.

Villanova University, Pa. SUZANNE C. TOTON

SURNATUREL: A CONTROVERSY AT THE HEART OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY THOMISTIC THOUGHT. Edited by Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P. Translated from the French by Robert Williams. Translation revised by Matthew Levering. Faith and Reason. Ave Maria, Fla.: Sapientia, 2009. Pp. xiii + 349. $32.95.

This volume consists of Bonino's introduction and 15 essays by the editors of the *Revue thomiste* and members of the Dominican Institut

Saint-Thomas-d'Aquin, originally given at a 2000 symposium held at the Institut Catholique of Toulouse. Unfortunately, no biographical information about the authors is provided. The 15 essays are divided into four sections: (1) "On Henri de Lubac's *Surnaturel*," (2) "Nature and the Supernatural in Thomas Aquinas," (3) "Scholastic Developments," and (4) "The Question of the Supernatural Today."

In *Surnaturel* (1946), de Lubac exposed what he judged to be later historical obfuscations, most controversially in regard to Aquinas, as well as spiritual and doctrinal distortions generated by the modern Scholastic notion of a self-enclosed *status purae naturae humanae*. That notion de Lubac judged to be a deleterious efflorescence and systematization—in the wake of Baius (1513–1589)—of a medieval doctrine that, in its original context, was rightly formulated as a logical hypothesis necessary to guarantee the gratuity of man's supernatural end. Traditional Thomists, who may be identified as those who followed the Thomist commentators no less assiduously than Aquinas himself, as well as other neo-Scholastics, especially Jesuit Suarezians, strongly objected to de Lubac's polemical reassertion of the ancient and more authentic Catholic *theologoumenon.* De Lubac found in Aquinas that human nature is *capax Dei*, whether or not God has actually offered man the real possibility for divinization; as an intellectual nature intrinsically or constitutively open to the supernatural, no other end short of the beatific vision of the divine essence could satisfy the human spirit's *appetitus naturalis ad bonum universale*. The recent disappearance of the medieval doctrine of Limbo from the normative *Catechismus Catholicae Ecclesiae* (promulgated 1997) makes it easier to embrace de Lubac's version of the *appetitus naturalis vivendi Deum*.

Jean Torrell elucidates why Aquinas's doctrine of nature and grace cannot be proportioned, in procrustean fashion, to modern Scholastics' neat encapsulation of nature and supernature (155–88). Aquinas did not treat nature as a univocal concept: he distinguished (1) the original *natura integra* created in sanctifying grace; (2) the post-lapsarian *natura corrupta, laspa, et vulnerata*; and (3), after Christ, the redeemed *natura sanata et reparata*. Aquinas distinguished the *pura naturalia* from the *gratuita* of human nature in all its states, and thus allowed the hypothesis that, indeed, God could have created man solely *in puris naturalibus* (*Quaestiones quodlibetales* 1, q. 4, a. 3). But Aquinas never used the term *natura pura*, and the strictly hypothetical *status naturae purae* plays no systematic role in his treatment of how grace builds on nature both before and after Adam's fall. Contrary to the view regnant among his contemporaries, Aquinas argued that Adam was created immediately in the state of sanctifying grace; in other words, grace is "transmitted at the same instant as nature itself" (*II. Sent*. d. 20, q. 2, a. 3).

Why did modern Scholastics abandon Aquinas's point of view? Jacob Schmutz traces a "semantic revolution" from the 13th to 17th centuries regarding divine *influentia* in the causal paradigm as an important source of the modern notion of "pure nature" (203–50). Although Aquinas

maintained that God and the secondary cause (in dependence on and complete subordination to God) is each, in its own order, a total cause of the effect, God, as the primary source of being and form, is more causally intimate in a created thing than any secondary cause. However, post-Scotus and especially post-Ockham, the Thomistic *duplex ordo*, in which the created secondary causes were ontologically grounded in and subordinated to the divine First Cause, unraveled. By the end of the 14th century, God's *influentia generalis* or "merely mediate concurrence" (212) *with* secondary causes had largely replaced Aquinas's neo-Platonist conception of God's immanent *influentia* or causal influx *in* secondary causes. In the 16th century, the Jesuit theologians Suárez and Molina further weakened the *influentia generalis*, regarding the latter as a *concursus generalis* in which God and the secondary cause are each but a *partial* cause of the same effect, like two men simultaneously rowing a boat. Inevitably, within the modern Scholastic causal paradigm, the infusion of grace is assigned to God's special or extrinsic causality vis-à-vis human nature viewed "naturalistically" or as autonomous.

This collection is a Dominican, in-house work, written by Thomists in a style congenial to Thomists. Although the book is not focused precisely on de Lubac, he dominates it, even as his influence seems rather ambivalently acknowledged. Perhaps for in-house reasons, the book as a whole skirts rather than directly confronts de Lubac's issue: whether the Thomist commentators clarified or obfuscated Aquinas's nature-grace doctrine. But the issue has not gone away. To assess the plausibility of that extraordinarily global charge, we can learn important details from, but will also need to range beyond, the purview and sensibility of this book.

Georgetown University, Washington DENIS J. M. BRADLEY

IDENTITY, ETHICS, AND NONVIOLENCE IN POSTCOLONIAL THEORY: A RAHNERIAN THEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT. By Susan Abraham. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. Pp. xiv + 242. $80.

Susan Abraham's book highlights the importance and implications of postcolonial theory for contemporary Christian theology; it is an intervention into both discourses. Postcolonial theory, she argues, often neglects the varied and powerful roles that religion plays in the ongoing negotiations of culture and identity. Christian theology, in turn, often neglects the complex relations of power and culture in the process by which religious identity is negotiated. Embarking on a project of postcolonial theology, A. brings these two discourses into conversation so that each may critique and learn from the other. The central conversation partners from postcolonial theory are Homi Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, and Ashis Nandy. From theology, A. draws on Karl Rahner and supporting authors; she also appeals to the writings of Pope John Paul II and Pope Benedict XVI to engage Roman Catholic magisterial positions. A. displays an impressive