

toward the future; one can do so more coherently and effectively as a Roman Catholic articulating the best of Roman Catholic tradition. The only book that comes close to what M. is doing is Bernard Prusak's *The Church Unfinished: Ecclesiology through the Centuries* (2004), which is similarly organized historically, though without the simultaneous systematic breadth.

M.'s Catholic instincts lead him to emphasize that Christianity in its origins has ecclesial dimensions that are liturgical, authoritative, and dogmatic. Throughout the volume, his ideological opponents, beginning with the gnostics, represent for him some form of what he consistently labels "sectarianism." In one long footnote (387–88), he uses this label to engage in a dismissive assessment of the work of Stanley Hauerwas and his students, especially Hauerwas's Catholic students. This attack stands in contrast to the even-handed tone generally maintained throughout the book, with the only other notable exception being a harangue launched against Avery Dulles for a 2000 article in *America* arguing that the modern centralization of authority in the papacy has had its good sides (307–12).

M. presents his own positions as "critical" and "rational," and the positions of those who disagree with him as "pre-critical" and "pre-Vatican II." He portrays the founding editorial board of *Communio* as having an affinity with the defeated minority at Vatican II without acknowledging their own claim that they embrace the council while they offer alternative interpretations of its teaching and significance. Those whom M. dismisses as sectarian or retrograde are often those who take a different approach concerning the engagement of the Church with the world. He might do better to engage in respectful conversation the voices of those who take a critical stance attentive to the dialectic of Enlightenment thought or those who see the rapid disappearance of Christian subcultures as calling for new strategies of community formation and cultural resistance.

Despite what I consider to be this one flaw in his treatment of those with whom he disagrees, the book stands as the only current single-volume, comprehensive text in Catholic ecclesiology. With its intricate organization, clear exposition, and consistently argued narrative, it makes a serious and valuable contribution such as could only have been produced by one of the leading experts in the field.

*University of Dayton, Ohio*

DENNIS M. DOYLE

THE TRINITY AND AN ENTANGLED WORLD. Edited by John C. Polkinghorne. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010. Pp. xi + 215. \$30.

Thirteen authors contribute to this attempt to connect science with metascience, more specifically physics with a version of trinitarian theology. Three are especially seminal for the direction the volume takes. John Polkinghorne (the reason for the book's unique confection) is interested in connecting the intrinsic relationality that physicists are uncovering in the material universe with the relational ontology theologians are seeing in the intratrinitarian relations between Father, Son, and Spirit. John Zizioulas,

the source of this trinitarian insight, claims its basis in the fourth-century Cappadocians. Not so fast, says Lewis Ayres, the third seminal voice, who wants more philosophical depth about relationality. The other authors clarify the book's subject matter from their respective competences in physics or theology or philosophy.

Zizioulas's position integrates not only the disputes about trinitarian ontology but also, if subscribed to, a way of connecting science and theology. He does this by staring straight into the Aristotelian insight about being or substance as primary and relation as accident. Then, reversing that insight, he counters—consistent with the Cappadocians—that relation stands ontologically primary to substance. Consequently, the substance of the fatherhood of God must be explained by relation to the Son and, though more complexly, to the Spirit.

This reversal helps the science/theology dialectic because it meets the dilemma to which sciences inevitably come. So, for example, the data probed by physicists come up against an indeterminacy that does not allow further intelligibility. And physicists develop subsequent technologies that profoundly affect the universe without commensurate ethical theories. For Christian theists the reasoning that has enabled them to have a dialogue with science is analogical thinking, allowing for both a likeness and an unlikeness between the reality of God and the reality of finite things. Zizioulas goes out onto a higher, thinner limb beyond analogy by claiming that the very nature of Trinity is ontologically relational as is nature in all its biota and abiota. If consolation is any criterion for the claim that at base ontology is relational, Zizioulas wins the day.

The other authors in effect complement these insights from their own strengths without explicit attention to Zizioulas's contribution. Michael Heller's is about noncommutative geometry as a recent example of why theories, whether mathematical or physical, of a self-contained universe never satisfy. Wesley Wildman delves into the literature on the various ways the causality of relation have been understood. Panos Ligomenides sees a connection with Spinoza's insight into the structure of the universe and the divine. (Einstein had a fondness for Spinoza's God.) Sociologist David Martin implies some linkages with both the charismatic element in human relations and eschatology.

The volume also engages the question of the connection between relation and causality. A relational ontology needs clarity about what the ontology of a relation is and what causality explains about relations. So one can ask a question about the Father's causality of the Son and of the Spirit. It also inquires into quantum thought and its understanding of indeterminacy or relationality between the particles and waves, which that body of thought finds in physical reality.

Sarah Coakley concludes the volume by locating Zizioulas's insight within the second phase of a three-stage process of reflections on Trinity. In the first phase, authors such as Lossky, Barth, and Rahner were defending the idea of a theological metaphysics. The second has Zizioulas

combating an atomistic individualism that has science take all the pieces apart and not see how to put them together. The third, which she only hints at and hopes for, would be more pneumatological than the first two. It would see a little more deeply into the interconnectivity between the physical universe and the Trinity.

The hope that has fueled this book, as Polkinghorne says, is that “just as physicists in their own domain have found relationality to be more extensive and more surprising in its character than prior expectation would have led them to anticipate, so philosophers and theologians should be open to the possibility of unexpected discovery and counterintuitive insight” (x). For theologians and physicists seeking a connection, this book will unveil it.

*Woodstock Theological Center, Washington*

JOHN HAUGHEY, S.J.

RESHAPING ECUMENICAL THEOLOGY: THE CHURCH MADE WHOLE? Paul Avis. London: T. & T. Clark, 2010. Pp. x + 209. \$34.95.

“Our primary obligation to our fellow Christians is to be in communion with them” (142). This is the bold claim at the heart of Avis’s study. A. is General Secretary of the Council of Christian Unity of the Church of England as well as an experienced and skilled ecclesialogist. In this collection he revises ten previous papers and presentations into a coherent whole that revolves around three major concerns: a passionate commitment to the ecumenical movement and the restoration of the unity of the church; a methodological concern for an adequate theology of the church; and the particular concerns of a theologian and pastor working the current context of the fragile Anglican communion. To address these concerns, A. outlines a robust yet mature communion ecclesiology that harvests the achievements of the past 50 years of that discourse’s development, and exhorts the churches to receive this wisdom and put it into practice. After all, he writes, “if our unity does not hit people between the eyes it is not the unity for which Christ prayed” (193).

The greatest strength of the work is A.’s careful exposition of the utility of communion language in conceptualizing the ecclesial constants of diversity and unity, of apostolicity and catholicity, of centripetal and centrifugal tendencies, without hawking *koinonia* as a panacea for all that ill the church, or ecclesiological discourse itself as the solution to all ecumenical impasses. A. draws attention to the ecclesiological and ecumenical consensus that “taking diversity seriously” is crucial both to understanding the reality of the church and to developing responses to the divisions between and within the churches. While this idea has a longer intellectual pedigree, A.’s exposition of diversity as a recurring fact of Christian experience is clear and engaging; he connects ecclesial unity with mission, and proceeds to explore the working out of this understanding of ecclesial unity in relation to issues like episcopacy, ethics, and confessionalism that divide or threaten to divide the churches.