

Moreover, this structure permits K. to demonstrate that though Latino and liberation theologies have a great deal of affinity, they are also strikingly different and so must not be conflated.

Elizondo's great contribution has been the theological treatment of *mestizaje*, that blending of cultures that produced the Mexican-American people. K. shows how Elizondo does not bless or gloss over the cruelty and history of conquest implicit in the term. At the same time, Elizondo sees the product of *mestizaje* as graced and dynamic. Biculturality becomes a source of hope, even though one may experience the "double rejection" of not belonging entirely to either culture.

The notion of double rejection signals a key biblical move: reflection on Jesus as Galilean to reveal the theological notion that God loves what humans reject. K. provides a balanced presentation that identifies the importance of the Galilean insight and the way that Elizondo has nuanced his position in response to critics who see in it a latent anti-Judaism.

In the case of Gutiérrez, K. insightfully uses the threefold understanding of poverty as material, spiritual, and commitment as a lens through which we can view and understand Gutiérrez's theological approach, particularly in analyzing the works on Job and Bartolomé de Las Casas. Though a bit mechanical in its application, K. indicates the rich biblical and theological content that saturates Gutiérrez's articulation of the preferential option for the poor.

The difficulty in discussing figures who cross borders is that the analysis itself needs to be able to make those crossings as well. K.'s differentiation of cultures of "content" and cultures of "context" is too brittle to suggest how reflections on them can be universally applied. The suggestion that Latin American and Latino cultures, as cultures of context, do not rely on rational argument smacks of stereotyping. Moreover, the central point of *mestizaje* demands that the US Latinos/as share a culture of content as their own. Absent as well is reference to the rich contribution US Latino/a and Latin American liberation scholars have made.

K. provides a solid introduction to the theology of these two pioneering figures that is well suited for the classroom. Its conclusion provides a tantalizing glimpse into what one hopes will be his next project, a Korean-American theology of context.

Fordham University, New York

MICHAEL E. LEE

GOD WITHOUT BEING: HORS-TEXTE. By Jean-Luc Marion. 2nd ed. Translated from the French by Thomas A. Carlson. Religion and Postmodernism Series. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2012. Pp. xxx + 313. \$27.50.

Philosopher Marion is no one-hit wonder in theology, and the second edition English translation of his groundbreaking *God without Being* is

more than a reprise. His crystalline and yet oceanic declaration that God gives God (*agape*) without recourse to Being still marvels. While this book remains unaltered from the 1991 translation, except for a new introduction and conclusion, the latest iteration punctuates the force of M.'s argument for God against Heidegger's *Seinsfrage* by situating M.'s claim within the lineage of Thomas Aquinas (xxvi, xxix, 199). The Thomistic vanishing point aligning M.'s insistence that God is free from categories and conditions of Being will surely redirect or surprise long-accepted perspectives concerning metaphysics à la Heidegger and Thomas alike (234). It receives focused attention here.

For readers seeking swift, trustworthy guides to key concepts in the unrevised chapters—M.'s icon/idol heuristic and the phenomenological, philological, exegetical, and sacramental dimensions of his central assertion that the gift of love crosses out comprehension of God according to ontological difference—the jaw-dropping efficiency of Graham Ward and William Richardson remains unmatched (*New Blackfriars* [January 1993]; *Theological Studies*, [September 1993]). Or, one could simply look to the elegant forward by David Tracy, who cogently shows how M. thoughtfully interprets Pseudo-Dionysius, Bonaventure, Balthasar, Barth, Kant, Nietzsche, Heidegger (naturally), Wittgenstein, Gilson, and Aquinas to lead humanity toward revelation and prayer (xiv, xvi, 182). The portrait is, in short, stunning.

The new introduction to *God without Being* reports a change in M.'s thinking since the original 1982 publication of *Dieu sans l'être*, namely, "that Thomas Aquinas *did not* identify the question of God, nor that of his names, with Being, or at least with Being as metaphysics understands it within its 'concept of Being'" (xxx, italics original). If it were not daunting enough that the first installment of the book demanded familiarity with Heidegger, now readers will need to brush up on Aquinas too. Fortunately Thomas Carlson's expert translation raises no concern.

The latest conclusion, "Thomas Aquinas and Onto-Theo-Logy," appended from a lecture first delivered at the Institute Catholique de Toulouse (June 3–4, 1994) and subsequently published as "Saint Thomas d'Aquin et l'onto-théo-logie" in *Revue thomiste* (January 1995), details M.'s introductory concession by dissociating Aquinas from the onto-theo-logical custom of metaphysics with three dizzying historiographical moves. (*Onto-theo-logy* here refers to Heidegger's uncovering within metaphysics an active ontology—concern for beings-in-general—and theology—concern for Being as a supreme entity; hence, *onto-theo-logy*.) First, when Aquinas designates God as *esse*, he does not reduce God to entity. M. explains that *esse* remains outside *metaphysica*, a term Aquinas sparingly uses to describe the science of entities. *Metaphysica* refers to divine things only with regard to divine effects as they appear in entities of creation, and not to the divine things themselves. *Metaphysica* anticipates, for M., the advent of metaphysics brought to

completion by Heidegger and the onto-theo-logical misunderstanding of God with reduction to Being. Second, *esse* and *ens* (entity) establish their relationship in creation. The *esse* Aquinas assigns to God creates all entities and therefore all beings. In effect *esse* causes the essences of all entities as created beings (*esse commune*). Yet as creator, *esse* remains separate from creation and being and “all what we understand and know under the title of being” (229, 233–36). Third, though the link between *esse* and *ens* depends on a created causality, *esse* as God is neither caused nor self-caused and therefore stands outside *causa sui*. Only theological determination suffices for considering what Thomas means by *esse*. For M., the designator of *esse* floats away from all concepts and operates like a negative identifier for God, ultimately reminding humans that knowledge about God requires beginning with God, i.e., revelation.

Ironically, the combination of “continental” philosophical *rigueur* and theological surrender in *God without Being* may tempt some to roll their eyes at yet another encore from a European male in theological curricula, or wonder what gives M. the swagger to write as confidently as he does about God. Christianity does arrive rather suddenly, and his vanguard approach to redefining the question of God through figures like Descartes, Pascal, Kant, Nietzsche, Lévinas, and Derrida shifts very quickly to an almost dogmatic appeal to the Eucharist and the Bible, not to mention M.’s strident fidelity to Catholic authority (67, 155). Dismissing the latest version of *God without Being* too hastily, however, overlooks another ingenious paradox pervading the text, that in his own line of argumentation M. faithfully submits to self-effacing, self-erasure, and refinement too.

*Andover Newton Theological School,
Newton Centre, MA*

GERALD C. LIU

CHRIST MEETS ME EVERYWHERE: AUGUSTINE’S EARLY FIGURATIVE EXEGESIS. By Michael Cameron. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. New York: Oxford University, 2012. Pp. xviii + 410. \$74.

This is a superb study of Augustine’s use of Scripture, capturing the developments and nuances of the great theologian’s engagement with the Bible and his hermeneutical approaches that led him to see himself as a Christian believer throughout the Scriptures. His goal was to enable all Christian believers to find themselves in the biblical texts, as he did.

Cameron has produced a masterful exposition of the dynamics of Augustine’s reading of the Bible. Augustine’s hermeneutical key was figuration. Scripture is a book of divine rhetoric, which Augustine the rhetorician read as the history of salvation. God’s divine strategy in Scripture is rhetorical “accommodation” (39), whereby all the “figures” of