

both Ratzinger and his critics on issues like the nature of the reform undertaken after Vatican II: organic vs. radical rupture, eucharistic sacrifice as opposed to a mere banquet, the position of the priest at the altar, attitude toward liturgical translation, the proper posture for receiving communion, and appropriate forms of liturgical music. Moreover B. regularly underlines Ratzinger's insistence that the liturgy must be received as a gift from God rather than as something that humans construct by their own wits and is therefore easily changeable.

Chapter 6, which evaluates Ratzinger/Benedict's liturgical vision as well as his critics, will be the focus of the remainder of this review. Although B.'s sympathies are clearly with the liturgical vision of Ratzinger/Benedict, he has some reservations regarding some of the latter's ideas and actions, particularly when it comes to the way that the liberalization of the pre-Vatican II liturgy was introduced and the question of whether two forms of the Roman Rite can continue to coexist. The book was written during Benedict's pontificate, and it is unclear at this point what direction ongoing liturgical reform will take, though I would hazard a guess that it will not eventually be a melding of the pre- and post-Vatican II liturgies. B. also deals with the question of Ratzinger's apparent about-turn regarding Vatican II, especially the liturgy. He argues (rightly so, in my opinion) that Ratzinger's pre-Vatican II support of liturgical reform was colored by his experience of the post-Vatican II reform as it played out.

One of the most controversial issues that B. deals with is Ratzinger's claim that the post-Vatican II liturgical reform was a rupture. (Benedict modified that stance somewhat.) Following Ratzinger and Alcuin Reid, he outlines (295–97) five criteria for discerning whether a particular reform was organic according to the principle laid down in *Sacrosanctum concilium* no. 23: Does the principle represent a turning back to a golden age (antiquarianism)? Does it shed more light on the theological reality at stake? Does it contribute to the genuine good of the church and the glorification of God? Was introducing it genuinely and certainly necessary?

B. also proposes four more criteria that could be used to judge whether a reform was legitimate—for example, Does it promote active participation? On each issue B. judges reforms like Mass *versus populum*, receiving communion in the hand, and standing to be wanting and in need of further reform. B. concludes that Benedict did not so much initiate a liturgical reform of the reform as encourage an enriched attitude toward the liturgy. Whether that attitude is promoted or mitigated in the present pontificate and those that will succeed it is anyone's guess.

John F. Baldwin, S.J.  
Boston College School of Theology and Ministry

*Catholic High Schools: Facing the New Realities.* By James L. Heft, S.M. New York: Oxford University, 2011. Pp. ix + 254. \$24.95.

Heft's insightful and informative study is not limited to a historical and contemporary study of the challenges that Catholic high school educators, students, parents, and

administrators face today, but rather situates itself within a broader study of American culture. To this end, he believes that how Catholic educators respond to these challenges will determine the future of Catholic primary and secondary education in this country. For H., if Catholic high schools are to survive, they must remain relevant in a secular society that stresses individualism, religious pluralism, and “therapeutic deism” (47). Beyond confronting American culture in a thoughtful manner, H. maintains that Catholic schools must demonstrate that they have a distinctive mission and purpose, address religious illiteracy of some of its Catholic leaders, administrators, and educators, demonstrate financial viability, and witness to the gospel by their good character.

Although this may seem a daunting task, H. offers honest appraisals of the situation and pragmatic solutions. For example, after diagnosing the financial dilemma of many schools, he suggests that Catholic schools adopt the Catholic university model of creating lay boards to raise funds for their schools. Drawing on his own experiences as a Catholic educator/administrator and recent research, he stresses that members of a board should be carefully chosen, so that the board will reflect and understand the nature and mission of the school (128–29). He rightly admonishes his readers to avoid selecting board members solely on the basis of their business acumen, because “to focus on margin apart from the mission spells the end of any distinctive identity for the school” (128). In his epilogue H. notes that weak leadership, that is, the loss of mission and confidence in that mission, is one main reason for the decline in Catholic schools (228).

In the context of Catholic high schools that are associated with a religious order, H. offers important insights into the active role religious communities must have in forming the leaders of their schools, which include setting up an endowment with the sole purpose of forming lay leaders in the Catholic tradition.

In chapter 7, which all who work with teenagers should read, H. draws from sociological and neurological studies on adolescents to reach his conclusion that many adolescents suffer from a form of “moral therapeutic deism,” and offers suggestions on how Catholic educators can effectively redress this bland religiosity (155). The most important suggestions he offers is for educators, particularly religion teachers, to offer a substantive curriculum that clarifies “God-language” and opportunities for students to deepen their connection to the Catholic tradition through leadership opportunities.

Noticeably absent from H.’s monograph is a discussion of the US Conference of Catholic Bishop’s curriculum for religion/theology programs that all Catholic high schools have been required to adopt. This is an important oversight, since H. stresses the importance of the religion curriculum in the formation of the Catholic identity in a school. The bishops’ curriculum does not, however, include courses or serious dialogue with the moral tradition of the Catholic Church. For H., the ability of Catholic high schools “to join moral formation explicitly with a religious tradition” is one of their greatest strengths (71). Although H. interprets moral formation holistically, primarily through the good examples of teachers, the study of the Catholic moral tradition within the confines of a religion class is implied. Thus the bishops’ curriculum creates a problem for his thesis, namely, How can we expect a student’s formation in the moral

tradition of the Catholic Church to occur when that tradition is no longer taught? Thus an appraisal of this universal curriculum is warranted and necessary.

Moreover, although I praise H. for his pragmatism—which I believe will benefit his audience, namely, Catholic educators and parents—some of his advice is abstract and fails to take into account the facts on the ground. For instance, while H. correctly stresses the importance for Catholic educators to continually seek professional development and opportunities for education, he does not take into account the realities that most Catholic school teachers face such as having five or six class preparations each day in addition to being expected to serve the school community. These issues make substantial professional formation impossible or cumbersome.

Despite these shortcomings, H.'s book is a welcome addition to the study of Catholic education in the United States. It is well written, up to date, and informative. I highly recommend this book to anyone interested in the history and future of Catholic education at the primary and secondary levels in the United States. The book is both accessible to a nonspecialist audience and well suited as a supplemental text for a course on religious education or the history of Catholicism in America.

Walter N. Sisto  
D'Youville College, Buffalo, NY

*Theology and the Arts: Engaging Faith.* By Ruth Illman and W. Alan Smith. New York: Routledge, 2013. Pp. xiv + 215. \$125.

Coauthorship is not an easy task, particularly when one author lives in Finland and the other in the United States. But a chance meeting at the Oxford Round Table in 2008 along with the love of both theology and the arts provided a powerful attraction to draw two scholars together for a joint project with all the attendant challenges of working at a distance.

The book brings the emerging fields of practical theology and theology of the arts into a dialogue while avoiding the methodology of systematic and constructive proposals. Smith and Illman draw upon dialogical/dialectical, postmodern, postsecular, feminist, liberation philosophy and theology, including an epistemological critique of reason and the scientific method as the model for all knowledge. The method of practical theology of the arts focuses the work of theology on the actual practices of art-making that engage the arts in their various forms. Art becomes the means of interpreting and understanding the nature of the communities and their members, as well as the mechanisms through which these communities engage in transformative work. The authors outline some of the central theoretical reevaluations that have altered the way religion in general and theology in particular have been envisioned and carried out over the decades.

Four such approaches are worthy of note. The first is how postmodernism challenges the idea of a singular grand narrative as the basis for understanding religion and the self. A second approach is that of postsecularism, highlighting the changing role of religion in contemporary societies and rejecting the tradition of seeing the religious