BASIL OF CAESAREA'S ANTI-EUNOMIAN THEORY OF NAMES: CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY AND LATE-ANTIQUE PHILOSOPHY IN THE FOURTH CENTURY TRINITARIAN CONTROVERSY. By Mark DelCogliano. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 103. Boston: Brill, 2010. Pp. xiv + 300. $153.

Basil of Caesarea is well known as one of the Eastern Church's earliest pioneers of monasticism, as a fourth-century ecclesiastical power broker, and as a moralist. The received scholarly tradition, however, tends to compare him negatively to his younger brother, Gregory of Nyssa, in original dogmatic contributions in the fourth-century theological debates. This unwarranted modern judgment may have resulted from the way the controversy between Eunomius and his opponents unfolded: Eunomius's *Apology* was first opposed by Basil, to be followed with lengthier criticisms by Gregory. It might thus seem that the more "advanced" arguments against Eunomius came from Gregory's pen. But a later criticism does not necessarily mean a better one. In the spirit of reevaluating Basil's role in the late fourth-century controversy over the divinity of the Son, DelCogliano's monograph situates a key dimension of Basil's thought at an early stage in this important debate: how names function in theological discourse.

D. spells out the positions of Aetius, Eunomius, and Basil. He situates the Heteroousians (Aetius and Eunomius) within the philosophical and theological traditions that preceded them. D. revises the standard narrative, taken primarily from Daniélou, which presumes Eunomius's promotion of a "general theory of names" based on Neoplatonism. Instead, D. argues, Eunomius advocated a more limited theory of divine names in his *Apology* and only later, in response to Basil's *Against Eunomius*, did he elaborate a general theory of names. Furthermore, D. critiques Daniélou's assumption that Eunomius's *Apology* depended on Platonism. If Eunomius relied on the Platonist naturalist theory of names, it was only in his *Apologia Apologiae*, or Second Apology, that he selectively appropriated Philo of Alexandria's already mediated Platonism. D. shows that Eunomius did not draw on Eusebius of Caesarea's appropriation of the *Cratylus* (*pace* Michel Barnes and others).

D., however, upends the ancient characterization of Eunomius by his opponents as a "logic chopper": the Heteroousian theological project was a natural, though problematic, development of mid-fourth-century Christian thought. The tendency to privilege the "One unbegotten" by Aetius and Eunomius is "both anticipated by and in line with Eusebian usage" (114). What sets the Heteroousians apart from their Eusebian forebears is the move to *reduce* divine substance to unbegottenness. In D.'s words, whereas earlier theologians like Eusebius of Caesarea and Asterius could "employ other names for God like 'Father' alongside of 'unbegotten,'" Aetius and Eunomius "focus exclusively upon 'unbegotten'" (114).

Athanasius's opposition of an earlier form of the Heteroousian project frames the theology of Eunomius. In fact, Eunomius bases his version of a theory of names on Athanasius's claim that divine simplicity entails signification of divine substance by divine names. However, the Heteroousians drew upon this theory without employing Athanasius's subtle, but crucial, distinction between the sense of names and their reference.

To put it simply, Heteroousian theology is problematic insofar as it hardens the relationship between names and referents in theological discourse. This is seen, for instance, when Basil's "notionalist" theory of names reintroduces mental space between divine names, the notions or characteristic marks they signify, and the divine essence. Likewise homoiousian theologians George of Laodicea and Basil of Ancyra provide Basil of Caesarea with a precedent for intellectual creativity in the face of the Heteroousian project. George and Basil prioritized the names "Father" and "Son" over the name "unbegotten" by inserting "a notional level between names and things" (181). Against the Heteroousians' epistemological optimism (humans can comprehend both earthly and divine substance completely), Basil maintains a more chastened epistemology: not even earthly substances are knowable in and of themselves, much less can humans comprehend the divine essence. D. carefully and astutely spells out the relationship between Basil's theory of names, that of Origen, and that of various pagan theorists. D.'s account of Basil's thought includes a painstaking, but rewarding, account of Basil's terminology—proper names, absolute names, relative names, and derived names (chap. 6). In each case D. demonstrates that, for Basil, names refer to distinctive features or marks, but *not* to substance. D.'s treatment here is unstintingly nuanced, never overstating the case. It is hard to imagine a more balanced intellectual portrait.

This meticulously argued monograph will not only be of interest to the historical specialist, but it may also catch the eye of modern theologians. The contested return of "metaphysics" to the modern theological scene ought to be conducted carefully. D.'s meticulous and thorough treatment of the complicated relationship between philosophy and fourth-century Christian theology on such an important issue as divine naming is enviable. Both historians and modern theologians would do well to imitate his example.

Marquette University, Milwaukee KELLEN PLAXCO

THE SOCIAL MISSION OF THE U.S. CATHOLIC CHURCH: A THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE. By Charles E. Curran. Washington: Georgetown University, 2011. Pp. xi + 196. $26.95.

This book is invaluable for readers interested in engaging more deeply with the Catholic social tradition. By exploring the theological underpinnings