

theological commitments, students of the Catholic tradition would certainly benefit from its perspective on the discussion of God's trinity.

Fairfield University, CT

NANCY DALLAVALLE

L'ALBA DELL'UNITÀ: IN DIALOGO CON J.-M. R. TILLARD. By Riccardo Bollati. Rome: Città nuova, 2012. Pp. 536. \$54.14.

Bollati, a Roman Catholic priest and research assistant at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, has written a comprehensive study of the theology of Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, the late Dominican theologian and ecumenist. While pointing out what he considers the "shadows" of Tillard's methodology and theological positions, B. is a perceptive and appreciative reader of Tillard. The book will be of service to theologians in evaluating and building on Tillard's ecclesiology of communion.

The study consists of a thorough exposition of Tillard's ecclesiology, followed by a critical analysis of it. The descriptive half of the book is impressive in its thoroughness: in 250 pages, B. provides chapter-by-chapter synopses of each of Tillard's books, followed by broader summaries. Given his critiques of Tillard, these synopses are notably attentive to detail and objective. The ordering of this treatment is somewhat troublesome: to provide a "systematic" overview of Tillard, a sometimes less than systematic thinker, B. discusses the books in a topical rather than chronological order. This is the opposite approach of other Tillard scholarship, such as that of Pascale Watine Christory, which traces the development of Tillard's thought within his ecumenical contexts. B. reads Tillard independently of this context and chronology. This choice allows him to present Tillard's thought as a unified whole, moving from Eucharist, through basic ecclesiology, to the papacy. Nevertheless, as he recognizes in some places, Tillard's thought is resistant to this approach, and he has some difficulty addressing development in Tillard's theology.

In the second part, comprising an additional 200 pages of substantive analysis, B. presents what he considers the "lights and shadows" of Tillard's ecclesiology. In the former category, he places the origins of Tillard's thought in the Scriptures, the Fathers, and the Eucharist. He commends Tillard's ecumenical perspective, as well as his promotion of locality as a fundamental category for ecclesiology. Finally, despite his concerns, B.'s appreciative presentation of so much of Tillard's work is, in itself, an argument for its value and consonant with B.'s concluding judgment of Tillard's thought as "fundamentally Catholic" (494).

B.'s significant criticisms are helpful in understanding Tillard better and in clearly distinguishing his thought from other ecclesiologies. Although B. raises perceptive questions regarding Tillard's methodology,

he recognizes the ecumenical value of Tillard's appeal to the "undivided church" as a privileged source. But he then raises the difficulty for Roman Catholicism of privileging earlier tradition over that of the second millennium, particularly in relation to the papacy. B. also questions Tillard's derivation of ecclesiological principles from his sometimes idiosyncratic reading of history. While B. might be overly confident in the potential of an ecclesiology derived from dogmatic first principles, his critique perceptively points out the difficulty for any ecclesiology constructed "from below" to avoid predetermining its conclusions through its selection of historical sources.

B.'s criticisms also provide a helpful contrast between Tillard's communion ecclesiology with those of Joseph Ratzinger, Angelo Scola, and the CDF letter *Communio in notio* (1992). One fundamental critique is that Tillard insufficiently underlines the independent subjectivity of the church vis-à-vis Christ; here B. follows Scola in promoting the church as a "Who" or a "She," namely, the Bride of Christ, rather than as an "it" through which Christ is active. B. faults Tillard for consistently avoiding spousal and mariological ecclesial metaphors, and for insufficiently emphasizing the church's subjectivity in relation to Christ. Similarly, he considers Tillard to have overly privileged the local church and neglected the ontological priority of the universal church. He accurately reports Tillard's position that one belongs to the universal church only through belonging to a given local church, but judges these aspects of his fundamental ecclesiology to be incorrect.

In regard to ecclesial structures, it follows that B. faults Tillard for neglecting the "hierarchical principle" of the church. Ecclesial ministries, in B.'s opinion, ought to be modeled on the spousal relation between Christ and the church, such that ministry is exercised not only *with* but *over* others. This is especially the case with regard to the pope—B. judges Tillard's understanding of papal primacy to be in conflict with Vatican I's *Pastor aeternus* and Vatican II's *Lumen gentium* in underemphasizing the asymmetric relationship between the pope and the college of bishops. In these differences between B. and Tillard, one can clearly see the ecclesiological tensions between primacy and collegiality, and universality and locality, left unresolved in the documents of Vatican II. To his credit, B. maintains an appreciative tone throughout, reports Tillard's positions accurately, and never questions Tillard's intentions or commitment to the church. B. thereby provides a model of charitable scholarly disagreement. In presenting so clearly the differences between his own thought and Tillard's, B. has advanced understanding of Tillard's ecclesiology, and his work will further ecclesiological scholarship within and without the Roman Catholic Church.