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 RAHNERS. 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 It compiles Rahner's extensive Marian writings from the late 1940s through the mid-1960s, and includes the hitherto unpublished manuscript on Mary's Assumption (the *Assumptio-Arbeit*) that occupied Rahner's interest throughout the 1950s.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,

anthropology, and eschatology using Mariology as a common thread. Central to this proposal is Rahner's "Mariological principle," which he articulates in the *Assumptio-Arbeit*: Mary is the "most perfectly Redeemed one (*die vollkommenste Erlöste*)" (131).

This principle helps Rahner articulate the coherence of Catholic theology. It does so by expressing Mary's unique role in God's plan for salvation history. As the most perfectly redeemed human person, Mary stands at the crossroads of the Trinity's eternity and economic activity (248). She exemplifies firmly from the human side the goal of Christ's redemptive activity (260). Not only does Mary fully manifest the cooperation between human freedom and God's grace (281, 284), but she also embodies the hopes of the church, revealing it to be first and foremost the "community of the redeemed" (302). As immaculately conceived, Mary bears witness to Christ's victory over sin, the same victory that sustains all baptized Christians (325). As virgin and mother, she demonstrates how devotion to God occurs inseparably in spirit and flesh (348). In this connection, M. helpfully points out Rahner's serious attention to Christian womanhood (see also 424–30). And Mary's assumption shows the resurrection of the body in a concrete woman (388–89), who is first among the communion of the saints (392–93), and whose glorified flesh points to redemption of the material cosmos (394–95). With these points, M. persuasively demonstrates how Mariology is, indeed, Rahner's "concrete dogmatics."

One might object that Mariology may be important for Rahner's preconciliar work, but that he later loses interest in Mary. M. counters that there is "only an apparent marginalization of Mary" post-1965, and the "Rahnerian interest in Mary is unbroken" (398). Of course, Rahner was a major force behind considering Mary in *Lumen gentium* instead of granting her a separate document (440, 448–51). His theological strategy changed in the mid-1960s to focus on "atheism, interreligious encounter, and ecumenical dialogue," so that he deems direct "expansion" of Mariology less expedient than before (440). But M. points out—breaking new ground—that the way Rahner answers newer challenges relies heavily on his earlier Mariology. For example, his Christology, theology of creation, and view of human freedom's relation to grace in *Foundations of Christian Faith* (1978) all hearken back, if silently, to his *Assumptio-Arbeit* (454–55). Had this book not been censored, M. provocatively intimates, we may now know Rahner as an influential Mariologian (436). As it stands, his Mariology went underground, but to great effect. M.'s suggestion is, to my mind, absolutely correct and theologically fruitful.

With this book M. establishes himself as a voice that needs to be heard among a growing cohort of young Rahnerians who are attempting to carry on Rahner's legacy. He keenly recognizes that the way forward consists not in perpetuating the caricature of Rahner's postconciliar

liberalism, but in recovering Rahner's robust Catholicism in its broad—yet concrete—dimensions. Mariology is the perfect place to start.

College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, MA PETER JOSEPH FRITZ

BEYOND THE WALLS: ABRAHAM JOSHUA HESCHEL AND EDITH STEIN ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF EMPATHY FOR JEWISH-CHRISTIAN DIALOGUE. By Joseph Redfield Palmisano, S.J. New York: Oxford University, 2012. Pp. x + 186. $74.

It is a common view that the ignition of positive Jewish-Catholic relationships in the last 50 years is one of the great achievements of the Second Vatican Council and its document *Nostra aetate*. Scholars have enabled a greater understanding of many of the sources for that development. Certainly there are the roles played by the Jewish thinker Jules Isaac and by such Catholic leaders as Popes John XXIII and John Paul II, and Cardinal Augustin Bea. But there are also the contributions made by Jewish and Protestant converts to Catholicism who brought to the church a fundamental sympathy for the religious communities that had nurtured them (as John Connelly emphasizes in his *From Enemy to Brother* [2012]).

P.'s volume is a densely written and profoundly searching examination of empathy and the place it may and should occupy in Catholic-Jewish conversation in particular and in interreligious dialogue in general. Encountering Heschel and Stein from this perspective seems a privileged road into their generous minds and hearts. Such a theme is not, however, an artificial imposition on either Heschel or Stein because empathy was an important intellectual category and personal experience for both; Stein actually did her dissertation on the topic. Bringing Heschel and Stein into communication on this shared theme puts at the center of the improved relationships the experience of the Holocaust or Shoah, and that is as it should be for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that Stein herself became a victim of Nazi murder.

We Catholics also need to be reminded of the post-Holocaust clarity of mind that was exhibited by Jews such as Heschel when the debate about *Nostra aetate* was taking place during Vatican II. At the time Heschel asked: "Why is so much attention being paid to what Vatican II is going to say about the Jews? Are we Jews in need of recognition? God himself has recognized us as a people. Are we in need of a 'Chapter' acknowledging our right to exist as Jews? . . . It is not gratitude that we ask for: it is the cure of a disease affecting so many minds that we pray for" (144–45).

The diseases of anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism were not new, and both Heschel and Stein were acutely aware of those histories. that engaged learning and contributed to the prophetic force of their writings. In turn,