

value is its interpretation and retrieval of Gregory Nazianzen and the New Testament data to build a robust Pneumatology. One extremely important implication of such a Pneumatology, which the author himself does not envisage, concerns the theology of religion. If the Spirit's "divine personhood is not constituted *merely* by virtue of either origination from the Father or commission by the Son" (139), then it is theologically possible, even necessary, to posit an "economy" of the Spirit in the history of salvation that is distinct from, independent of, and "alongside" that of the Son, and that this economy is active in non-Christian religions.

Georgetown University, Washington

PETER C. PHAN

THE EXPERIENCE OF GOD: ORTHODOX DOGMATIC THEOLOGY. Vol. 5, THE SANCTIFYING MYSTERIES. By Dumitru Stăniloae. Edited and translated from the Romanian by Ioan Ionita and Robert Barringer. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox, 2012. Pp. xii + 219. \$24.95.

Stăniloae (1903–1993) is the greatest Romanian theologian to date, and possibly the most important Orthodox theologian of the 20th century. He authored 1149 theological titles despite five years of Communist imprisonment and unrelenting censure. He wrote *Orthodox Dogmatic Theology* as part of a trilogy, together with a treatise on ascetical and mystical theology (translated as *Orthodox Spirituality*) and a liturgical commentary entitled *Spirituality and Communion in the Orthodox Liturgy*, not yet translated. The present volume is a wonderful English translation of an extremely difficult Romanian text.

While many aspects deserve attention, I focus on S.'s departure from the neo-Scholasticism of Orthodox manual theology characterized by Western form, over-systematization, unnecessary speculation, lack of spiritual concern, and juridical approach. S.'s recovery of the patristic spirit is similar to Georges Florovsky's neo-patristic synthesis and to Alexander Schmemmann's return to the liturgical tradition of the early church. S. does not completely abandon Western categories but engages constructively with the West—a risky endeavor, given his desire to depart from neo-Scholasticism. For example, he discusses the three offices of prophet, priest, and king—which became significant with Calvin—as an exercise in "open sobornicity" or the acceptance of Western elements in Eastern theology, an exercise justified by texts from the Bible, Macarius of Egypt, Cyril of Alexandria, and John Chrysostom. S. is ecumenically open, recognizing, for example, the ordinations of Roman Catholic, Oriental Orthodox, Old Catholic, and some Anglican churches. And yet, given his isolation during the Communist era, S. sometimes oversimplifies Protestant and Catholic theologies. Readers should make the effort to

understand his valid criticisms, many of which Western theologians today share.

S.'s theology is neo-patristic. Most often he quotes Cyril of Alexandria, Gregory Nazianzus, and Nicholas Cabasilas, and engages with contemporary Orthodox theologians such as Schmemann or Paul Evdokimov. This volume, particularly the chapter on baptism, provides a model for biblical engagement in systematic theology. S.'s other sources include canon law employed analytically, with pastoral realism and compassion; the liturgical rites of the sacraments, oftentimes reflected in S.'s doxological language; iconography; and his experience of marriage and rearing children, especially regarding marital relationships beyond the categories of procreation and remedy for concupiscence.

Of the six volumes of *Dogmatics*, the present volume could be characterized most easily as neo-Scholastic in form. Although S. understands baptism and chrismation as a single rite in two parts and elsewhere writes explicitly about the late (twelfth-century) designation of seven sacraments, he adopts this Western designation. Moreover, his affirmation of the dominical institution of all the sacraments is unconvincing but is marginal and opposed to his contention elsewhere that the Apostles instituted some of the sacraments based on their experience of Christ.

Another neo-Scholastic form is S.'s view of baptism as cleansing of original sin, but his understanding of "original sin" is Eastern: the separation between God and humankind that was stamped on our fallen nature.

S. replaces the Aristotelian distinction between accidents and substance with terminology borrowed from Maximus, but provides an explanation too similar to transubstantiation: in the Eucharist, the *logoi* of the bread and wine change into the *logoi* of the body and blood of Christ, which then become the *logoi* of our own bodies. S. does not develop this explanation elsewhere, but continues in clearly Orthodox terms, affirming that Christ's divine qualities are imprinted on us, such that his divine activities become ours. This is *theosis* from a sacramental perspective.

While the Greek practice of confession only mentions God's forgiveness, in the Slavonic tradition, under Catholic influence, the priest pardons. S.'s argument that God forgives and the priest only adds his pardon is a forceful way of coherently merging the two traditions. S. also writes about the "constitutive elements" of confession and pays undue attention to penance, yet his approach is pastoral and spiritual, resembling the writings of the Desert Fathers.

Thus, if certain forms of S.'s theology are still neo-Scholastic, the essence is certainly neo-patristic. The rest of the volume marks a clear departure from neo-Scholasticism. For example, baptism is primarily entrance into the church and rebirth to a new life of virtue, to a restored human nature; it is the beginning of *theosis*. Baptism/chrismation is also consecration

into the universal priesthood of the church, a topic treated only briefly in volume 4, but a significant topic in S.'s theology in general and in his *Dogmatics* in particular. On the contrary, priesthood toward creation—or the human role to transfigure, sanctify, and offer creation as a sacrifice—is only briefly treated here but extensively in volume 2.

S. marks a significant moment in Orthodoxy's liberation from its neo-Scholastic captivity. His work masterfully begins a journey on which Orthodox theologians should continue attentive to the past, conversant with the present, and oriented eschatologically.

Duquesne University, Pittsburgh

RADU BORDEIANU

KONKRETE DOGMATIK: DIE MARIOLOGIE KARL RAHNER'S. By Dominik Matuschek. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 2012. Pp. 500. €49.

English-speaking scholars have largely ignored Rahner's Mariology, with exceptions like Elizabeth Johnson and recently Brian Daley. The opposite has been the case in Germany, where the conversation on Rahner's Mariology has been ongoing and vigorous, especially since 2004. That year Rahner's *Maria, Mutter des Herrn* (*Sämtliche Werke* [SW] 9), was published. It compiles Rahner's extensive Marian writings from the late 1940s through the mid-1960s, and includes the hitherto unpublished manuscript on Mary's Assumption (the *Assumptio-Arbeit*) that occupied Rahner's interest throughout the 1950s. Matuschek's meticulous commentary on SW 9 in part 2 (31–230) valuably contributes to Rahner studies. But the book offers much more.

M.'s rich and comprehensive text argues that Mariology is central to Rahner's systematic and pastoral theologies. Rahner distinctively considers Mariology not as a separate "special dogmatic treatise," but as an integral part of theology as a whole (15). Mariology is "concrete dogmatics" (18); Mary is the nexus at which all Catholic dogmatic treatises meet (461). M.'s claims may surprise English-speaking readers, but his cogent and painstaking argument should convince even the most skeptical critic.

After a methodological introduction (11–30) and the commentary on SW 9, M. arrives at his study's heart, part 3, where he lays out his argument (231–395). Part 4 applies the previous part's dogmatics to everyday Christian life (397–458). The fifth and final part suggests several ways that Rahner's "concrete dogmatics" may spur future theological inquiry and pastoral practice (459–76). I will focus now on the systematic reflections in part 3, and the section from part 4 on Rahner's alleged abandonment of Mariology after Vatican II (438–58).

M. constructively reintroduces Rahner as a systematician, showing how he weaves together the classic topics of Trinity, Christology, grace, ecclesiology,