

faithful, which has led certain individuals to take themselves for what they were not, and which has undermined for many postconciliar priests the summary certitudes that they had been indoctrinated with as to the superiority of their state” (ix). Over the course of the ensuing chapters, T.’s recurrent gentle warnings that readers not be distressed by or dismissive of the historical findings and theological arguments he must stepwise advance are clearly meant more for those clinging to a fictitious “antiquity” and “oversimplified conception of priesthood” (17). T.’s thorough, yet admirably fluid, development of a properly biblical conception of Christian priesthood starts from treatment of the metaphorical character of the Letter to the Hebrews and other New Testament texts and then into the first two centuries so as to establish “spiritual sacrifices” (the ethical, quotidian lives of believers in community and wider society) as the fundamental priestly work of all the baptized. The priesthood of bishops and presbyters is for the building up of the entire community’s priestly character through ministry to word, sacrament, and governance. Such is what Vatican II’s documents seek to recover so as to reform and renew the church for its mission in the modern world.

T., a Dominican friar retired from the University of Fribourg, is a notable Thomistic scholar. This fact would seem to account, in part, for the Scholastic terminology he engages at the outset of the book. The reader should not, however, be deceived in those early pages into thinking that the entire text will follow suit. On the contrary, T. seems to use such terms as principal cause (*principium*), grace of union, habitual grace, production of grace, inflow of interior grace, and so forth, in order to meet scholastically oriented, conservative seminarians on their own terrain and thereby lead them into the authentic traditional sources for a reformed and renewed practical theology of ministerial priesthood. One can only hope that many seminary (and other graduate program) professors will assign this solid text.

Bruce T. Morrill, S.J.
Vanderbilt University, Nashville

Ever Ancient, Ever New: Structures of Communion in the Church. By John R. Quinn. New York: Paulist, 2013. Pp. vi + 57. \$9.95.

Pope John Paul II, in his encyclical on Christian unity, *Ut unum sint* (1995), invited bishops and theologians to suggest ways in which the exercise of the papal office might be adjusted to facilitate closer rapprochement between Roman Catholicism and other Christian churches. Quinn, Archbishop emeritus of San Francisco, accepted that challenge and published a major study entitled *The Reform of the Papacy: The Costly Call to Christian Unity* (1999). The brief study reviewed here is conceived as a follow-up companion piece, explaining for the nonspecialist how a reappropriation of conciliarity or synodality would provide a major step forward in such a reform. Q. correctly argues that during the emergence of the early church, doctrinal and pastoral problems were resolved in “conciliar fashion” by communing across a broad section of ministries in the church.

Q. offers a historical overview of various institutions used in the early church to foster this kind of communion (*koinonia*). He draws on the valuable research of the Jesuit Ludwig Hertling (1892–1980) whose publication *Communio und Primat* (1943), translated into English only in 1972 as *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity*, demonstrated how the institution of primacy was guided by other traditions.

Among the early structures of ecclesial communion were provincial synods held at least once a year, “meetings of the bishops of a region convened to deliberate about common concerns and problems (doctrinal, liturgical, and disciplinary)” (8). The terms “synod” and “council” (*synodos, concilium*) were often used interchangeably, one word rooted in Greek, one in Latin. These were held at provincial levels or more rarely, depending on need, as ecumenical councils (composed of “all” the world’s bishops, at least in theory). However, the ecumenical councils, especially in the first millennium, never achieved complete representation of all segments of national churches. And those held in the second millennium were basically limited to Western churches.

In modern times, under the leadership of Pope Paul VI, an important initiative of the See of Rome took place that unfortunately has gone largely unnoticed. Paul VI expressed the conviction that in fact there have been two kinds of councils in the church’s patrimony, the early ecumenical councils of the undivided church and then the later general synods of the West. In a letter dated October 5, 1974, addressed to Cardinal Johannes Willebrands on the occasion of the seventh centenary of Lyons II (1274), the pope wrote, “This Council of Lyons counted as the sixth of the general synods held in the West.” This terminology of “general synods” suggests that Catholic teaching is open to accept the notion of varying levels of councils, something that Yves Congar called a hierarchy or relative order of importance among councils and synods (*hierarchia conciliorum*). If this distinction were to be widely accepted, then the anathemas pronounced in the West against those who did not accept the canons of these general synods would be marginalized. This would have considerable import in the event of other churches reestablishing full visible communion with the See of Rome.

Despite what is commonly supposed in popular Roman Catholic listings of ecumenical councils, there is no definitive official list, and the current numbering system is a usage that dates back only to Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621).

Another early institution that Q. highlights as a source of shared authority and communion in the ancient church was the formation ultimately known as the patriarchates, that is, episcopal sees in several large cities that exercised governance and supervision over neighboring churches. Recognized as early as the Council of Nicaea, a “pentarchy” of patriarchates eventually was established: Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. (After the Crusades and later, Rome named additional patriarchates, a move criticized by the Orthodox.) Correctly in my view, Q. shares puzzlement with Michael Magee’s *The Patriarchal Institution in the Church* (2006) about why Pope Benedict XVI decided before his retirement to drop the title “Patriarch of the West.”

Other recent institutions, including national or regional episcopal conferences, as well as the International Synod of Bishops (both general or extraordinary) have generally had little impact, since they are regarded as purely advisory and do not of themselves share in the authoritative magisterium. One aspect of this first-rate study, which Q. could have developed, is the practice and desirability of laymen's and laywomen's participation in institutions associated with papal primacy.

Q.'s text was completed before the election of Pope Francis (27). Consequently it does not comment on any of the structural changes already realized by the current bishop of Rome (establishment of the "Group 8" of cardinals) or those changes under consideration (e.g., restructuring the Vatican Curia).

Regrettably, few Catholic churches have bookshops or lending libraries in their settings where excellent books such as Q.'s could be readily obtained by the faithful.

Michael A. Fahey, S.J.
Fairfield University, CT

Connecting Jesus to Social Justice: Classical Christology and Public Theology. By Thomas Hughson, S.J. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2013. Pp. xxv + 313. \$85.

Hughson's impressive and innovative study displays three obvious merits: it is a clearly defined project, it is original in many ways, and it is persuasive. The next paragraphs expand on each of these three claims.

Much can go awry when theologians attempt to connect the core contents of Christian faith with ethical stances in the public sphere. While it is not uncommon to witness overreach when claims about the scope of public theology exceed what is prudent, it is equally disturbing to see excessively modest Christian approaches to the ethical contours of public life. If a faith community is to develop a sound analysis of ethical issues in a pluralistic society, as well as to muster an appropriate level of prophetic denunciation of unjust social structures and practices, then that community's discourse must be grounded in the deepest sources of creedal conviction. This is precisely what H. provides in his careful construal of the messianic identity of Jesus Christ. Consulting the Chalcedonian affirmation and many of its interpreters through the centuries, this work provides the foundation for strong claims regarding the social dimension of Christian faith. Many extant works do attempt to draw some type of connection between the contents of Christian faith and its implications in the public sphere, but this volume surpasses most by making explicit the link between the divine identity of the Messiah and the imperative of a just social order. H. succeeds in his project of grounding public theology in christological dogma, which provides the resources for both justification and application. The ancient confession of Jesus as divine has obviously not completely fulfilled its great potential as a leaven for Christian social consciousness and solidarity. It is important to add that, by conducting a project in *ressourcement* and starting with the contents of classical Christology, H. is by no means rejecting more