

However, the resolution to anti-Judaism cannot come from historical exegesis alone but from theologians who present alternative interpretations of the death of Jesus (175–76). New perspectives on Paul’s attitude toward Gentile Christians who should be neither Jews nor partakers of imperial religion, and the complications of the so-called “parting of the ways” offer additional and valuable avenues for reinterpreting our sacred story (the three considerations are summarized on 202–3).

The rest of the book (chaps. 9–10) exhorts us to take responsibility for the texts we use in our preaching and teaching, in our theological reflection, and in our living the texts as responsive and responsible readers/listeners. Eight guidelines (221–27) give a partial summary of the contents of the book. I highlight two: (1) “Connect the passion accounts to the ministry of Jesus.” Jesus died as a consequence of the way he lived, and the cross can only be understood in relation to his mission and vision of a renewed world. (2) “Connect the cross of Jesus to the crosses of history.” The power of our sacred story is a power of nonviolent love that can free all who are oppressed and suffering. The interpretation of the cross, then, must not be separated from the life of Jesus that precedes it, nor from the life of the people who have come after it. The final chapter explores “possibilities for letting the power in the story transform us, both personally and communally” (229). The chapter draws on two “tellings” of Jesus’ passion and death, the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius and the “Seven Last Words” as interpreted in the light of biblical scholarship and contemporary spirituality. The ultimate purpose is to let the wood of the cross become the tree of life “for the healing of the nations” (Rev 22:1–2).

In the epilogue, B. gives a personal reflection on why, given the history, we continue to read the passion narratives. She says that writing the book has been at once “challenging, disedifying, intriguing, and enriching” (258). It will be so as well for those readers willing to be accountable to history and to confront disturbing truths. Only so can we redeem our sacred story.

Michael L. Cook, S.J. (Emeritus)  
Gonzaga University, Spokane

*Redeeming History: Social Concern in Bernard Lonergan and Robert Doran.* By Gerard Whelan. *Analecta Gregoriana* 322. Rome: Gregorian University, 2013. Pp. 254. €27.

The book’s title offers a clear indication of its central argument. Whereas Bernard Lonergan is often seen as a dogmatic theologian who went back to philosophy to rethink the foundations of truth, he is less frequently perceived as having a passion about the drama of history and in particular about overcoming the realities of poverty, injustice, and unbalanced economic systems. Whelan wants to remind us that it was “social concern” that initially energized the intellectual commitment of the young Lonergan, even though it seemed later to retreat to being a minor theme in his symphony. W. also seeks to situate this core concern within Lonergan’s theology of culture as a battleground, with its complex story of progress, decline, and, potentially,

religious redemption. Thus after eight chapters directly on Lonergan, W. gives us three on Robert Doran's development and expansion of Lonergan's work, with particular reference to these social dimensions.

"Redemption in history" was a recurring expression in Lonergan's earlier writings, and in this light he read in some depth authors such as Arnold Toynbee, Christopher Dawson, and later Wilhelm Dilthey. W. leads us through the various stages of Lonergan's thought and the background research that led to his two key books, *Insight* (1957) and *Method in Theology* (1972). W. also stresses the centrality for Lonergan's soteriology and Christology of the "just and mysterious law of the cross," where love is shown to be "stronger than all negations of love" (131). Some of W.'s accounts can seem rather too dependent on summaries of other commentators on Lonergan (Richard Liddy, William Mathews, Frederick Crowe, Neil Ormerod, and others). Nevertheless the book's overall originality remains: while paraphrasing or reporting on much primary and secondary reading, its key argument is that what can be called Lonergan's option for the poor has not been sufficiently recognized, and indeed that he himself is partly responsible for this lack.

In this light W. agrees with Doran that Lonergan's publications after 1965 (the year of his major illness) can remain uneven. This is not to say that there are not crucially important new insights but rather that some are more developed than others. In particular the social perspective, W. argues, tends to lack detailed attention—even though as is mentioned in the conclusion, Lonergan's style in *Method in Theology* can soar into eloquence when touching on the suffering and healing of history. The key criticism is that Lonergan "drifted away from carrying an option for the poor into the heart of his account of theological method" (246). Or, less negatively, W. contends that although this core social preoccupation of the early Lonergan remained part of his horizon, its subdued presence can be easily missed. Thus W. aims to recover a crucial but underdeveloped aspect of Lonergan's overall vision, a worthwhile goal.

The chapters devoted to Doran's work offer a fine account of his corrective or at least additional interpretations of Lonergan. Doran has developed not only the possibility of a fourth or "psychic conversion" (in addition to the three explored by Lonergan: intellectual, moral, and religious), but he has deepened the notion of a "dialectic of culture" in the drama of history. By revisiting some sections of *Insight* that Lonergan surprisingly did not touch on in *Method*, Doran has deepened the agenda and pushed it in the direction of an option for the poor, seeing the world's situation as a source for systematic theology. Thus he gives more urgent and contemporary attention to "the transformative power of religious values" (221), exploring such topics as globalization.

W. aims to reread Lonergan's work with the help of Doran in order to highlight its original passion for the healing of history, retrieving the importance of this concern. Toward the end W. adds a more autobiographical grounding of all these ideas to a narrative and commentary on his own experience as pastor of a large parish on the periphery of Nairobi. In his final chapter W. finds support for this social emphasis in the early months of Pope Francis, with his famous off-the-cuff statement that he hoped for a

poor church for the poor. In short, *Redeeming History*, while drawing on various Lonergan experts, produces a welcome book on social and cultural horizons of his work, in ways that can be increasingly relevant for theology.

Michael Paul Gallagher, S.J.  
Gregorian University, Rome

*Just War: Authority, Tradition, and Practice*. Edited by Anthony F. Lang Jr., Cian O'Driscoll, and John Williams. Washington: Georgetown University, 2013. Pp. viii + 328. \$34.95.

The discourse surrounding proposed US military intervention in Syria in 2013 highlighted both the continued relevance and divergent interpretations of the just war tradition and its category of legitimate authority. What exactly is the role of authority in relation to just war? This is the underlying question considered by 17 scholars in this edited volume. The book originated with a 2010 interdisciplinary conference sponsored by the US Institute of Peace and organized with the stated goal of encouraging “scholars of the just war tradition to think a little bit more deeply about how they treat the principle of proper authority” (303).

As a whole, this project considers authority from several perspectives. First, what gives this (Western) tradition any authority in the present global context? Second, who ought to be considered an authority on the tradition? Should the legitimacy of war be open to broad public interpretation or limited to the elucidation of experts? Third, how should authority be understood as a category within the tradition? As the authors contend, the complexities surrounding the practice of authority are often reduced to “a technical or tick-box definition” (302) blinded by notions of sovereignty. Rather than offering clear-cut answers to these questions, this project presents multiple, and at times conflicting, perspectives to aid the reader in considering issues concerning authority that are often overlooked.

As with most edited volumes, some chapters are more engaging than others. Lang, for example, constructively considers the authoritative role of narrative in relation to war. Narratives, he argues, provide alternative sources of authority in our moral thinking. After engaging moral philosophers and political theorists, he claims that churches and other religious institutions, with their master narratives, trained pastoral staff, and political independence, are well suited to communicate constructive narratives and moral visions about war. Unfortunately, Lang does not fully examine the risks associated with religious narratives and their history of supporting prideful nationalistic accounts that blur historical reality in favor of the storyteller.

Drawing heavily on Aquinas, Gregory M. Reichberg’s chapter constructively examines the punitive nature of just war. Can war, he asks, be legitimately waged as a form of vengeance or punishment for an offense? This same question is addressed in a challenging submission by Brent J. Steele on the role of revenge in international politics.