

of comparative theology, including Francis X. Clooney and James Fredericks. N. illustrates his own proposal in a perceptive revisiting of Rudolf Otto's classic comparison of Shankara and Meister Eckhart. In this discussion N. demonstrates his detailed knowledge of both these figures, his awareness of the medieval Hindu and Christian contexts, as well as his skill in Sanskrit and his command of the secondary literature on both figures. Both Shankara and Eckhart pose major interpretative challenges and have been the subject of extensive hermeneutical debates; N.'s interpretation of these figures in terms of a Bakhtinian "double-voiced discourse" is persuasive and insightful.

Georgetown University, Washington

LEO D. LEFEBURE

THE CRISIS OF AUTHORITY IN CATHOLIC MODERNITY. Edited by Michael J. Lacey and Francis Oakley. New York: Oxford, 2011. Pp. x + 381. \$99.

The names of the editors and authors of this book attest to the solid scholarly worth and accessibility of their reflections on an urgent topic. For the most part, the authors published here specialize in disciplines other than history, yet the impact of historical changes dominate their analyses of the crisis of authority that the Catholic Church is experiencing. Since the Enlightenment, Catholicism set its face against "modernity" (Lacey), but that stance became increasingly hollow by mid-20th century. Then Pope John XXIII invited the Second Vatican Council to reconsider that stance. Vatican II accepted the challenge, and much of previous rhetoric and practice underwent undeniable change. Puzzlement followed as well as controversy over what could or should be changed. Some people experienced traumatic shock when some church leaders questioned customary notions about the solidity and scope of hierarchical church authority itself.

The twelve essays grapple seriously with many of the issues that arise from this epochal shift *intra ecclesiam*. The authors shed new light, even while treating disparate subjects, on well-worn topics: religious freedom (Francis Sullivan on tradition); sexual ethics (Lisa Cahill on moral theology and Cathleen Kaveny on the uses of casuistry); and clerical and lay practice (Leslie Tentler on the abandonment of confession, Dean Hoge et al. on what successive surveys could tell us about American Catholic attitudes toward episcopal authority, and Katarina Schuth on seminaries). A noncanonist such as myself finds valuable contributions to ecclesiological thinking in the wide-ranging and insightfully contextualized chapter by canonist John Beal. Throughout the book readers will find many references to stimulating bibliography.

To reconfigure and restore the ability to teach with authority challenges the reader to face the facts that authoritative church teachings in the past

have been, as the saying goes, consigned to history, or even explicitly reversed, and therefore might well prove wrong in the present (most glaring example: *Humanae vitae*). Cahill, however, observes that the young “millennial” crop of moral theologians do not seem particularly concerned with abusive or simply mistaken claims of doctrinal authority in the past, even the recent past. Her nuanced discussion (210–18) does not lead her to consider that the crisis of authority is fading, but rather shifting.

The editors, along with Joseph Komonchak, Gerard Mannion, and Charles Taylor, grapple directly with the intrinsic challenges to magisterial authority. One recurring theme has to do with the interpretation of Vatican II. For all the emphasis on discontinuities and change in the Church’s passage through history, the authors do not fall under Pope Benedict XVI’s strictures against a “hermeneutic of rupture” in interpreting Vatican II, as Komonchak shows in his contribution. Rather, the concern of the pope seems to be principally with the perspective of the brotherhood of St. Pius X, followers of Marcel Lefebvre (1905–1991), which rejects Vatican II as such a rupture. (An appendix offers key excerpts of Benedict’s 2005 address to the Roman Curia.) Nevertheless, the pope’s stress on continuity in a “hermeneutic of reform” rather veils the inconsistencies that remain unresolved in the conciliar documents and in the declarations of the postconciliar Church. The criticism of Benedict XVI and the Curia that surfaces in several places in the volume is respectful, if frank. It reflects the awareness that the contributors themselves do not yet have all the answers either but are convinced that greater openness to dialogue within Catholicism (including “dissent”) is needed. Perhaps a sort of inner-Catholic ecumenism, if you will, envisaged by *Lumen gentium* as episcopal collegiality, is a necessary condition of progress beyond the current impasse.

A related theme touched on several times is that of the ecclesiology of *communio*, a feature of the patristic tradition that found its way into Vatican II documents and has subsequently been widely adopted. Mannion makes a well-argued plea for dialogue across jurisdictional lines in the Church on the basis of the ecclesial communion that is prior to powers vested in particular offices. In his masterful epilogue (354), Oakley recalls how *Lumen gentium* simply juxtaposes Vatican I’s ecclesiology of *jurisdictio* side by side with the older ecclesiology of *communio*. In subsequent practice, *communio* seems to be more aspiration than reality in the binomium “hierarchical communion.” This, he thinks, may be the central dilemma of Catholic modernity.

With this judgment I am disposed to agree. Whether or not it may seem convincing to others, the book deserves high praise for the level of serious thought and the breadth of well-founded knowledge that it makes available. Readers with the continued vitality of the Christian tradition at heart will not be disappointed.