

implications. The most provocative proposals in this vein emerge when, for example, B. suggests that authoritarian institutional arrangements—notably, the papacy—may need to be reconsidered under a neo-Whiteheadian/Christian synthesis model of reality. For B., it would stand to reason that “the pope would serve as the principle of coherence and order for the universal church but would not have the unilateral legislative power of the office of the papacy as it has developed from medieval times until the present day” (172). B. also finds this approach promising for interreligious dialogue. It may even offer “an effective remedy for the exaggerated emphasis on the individual . . . within Western civilization” (182).

For B., what is at stake is not just the veracity of language games but the complex, interdependent processes by which we cocreate reality. His process-oriented approach does not always resonate with aspects of classical theism; but that, perhaps, is precisely the point. “Given the complexity of modern life,” B. writes, “there is no one-size-fits-all solution to the never-ending tension between unity and plurality, identity and difference” (176)—and, one might add, constancy and change.

Fordham University, New York

CHRISTIANA Z. PEPPARD

PSYCHOLOGY AND CATHOLICISM: CONTESTED BOUNDARIES. By Robert Kugelmann. New York: Cambridge University, 2011. Pp. ix + 490. \$125.

Even in their own lifetimes, it had been said of the James brothers, that William was a psychologist who wrote like a novelist, and Henry was a novelist who wrote like a psychologist. In this historical study, professor of psychology Kugelmann combines three gifts: writing like a psychologist, novelist, and historian, he details the twists and turns in the often-conflictual tale of two traditions that strive to understand and guide the human “soul,” a term that itself is contested.

K. contributes to the ongoing, cross-disciplinary dialogues between various sciences and religion. He cites the trail-blazing book of C. Kevin Gillespie, *Psychology and American Catholicism: From Confession to Therapy?* (2001) that “pioneered this field after it lay fallow for decades” (viii). K.’s scope is broader, however, in that it delves deeply into European psychologies as well as Continental Catholic theological and spiritual movements. Nevertheless, K.’s focus is precise without being narrow: he starts with the origin of empirical/experimental psychology in the studies of perception by Wilhelm Wundt in his psychophysical laboratory of the University of Leipzig in 1879, when “psychology migrated from her ancient homeland among the philosophers into the camp of the scientists” (William J. Sneek, “Happy Birthday, Psychology,” *America* 139.8 [September 23, 1978] 177). K.’s terminus ad quem coincides with

the beginning of Vatican Council II in 1962. Thus, the larger issue of “science and religion” is concretized in a “case study” of a particular science, psychology, and a specific religion, Catholicism.

Returning to the analogy with novel-writing, I venture to compare the themes of the two authors, Gillespie and K. Recall (from above) that Gillespie had summarized his history as the movement from “Confession to Therapy,” while K.’s themes trace the development from “boundaries” to “trading zones” to *ressourcement*, a concept used by Henri de Lubac to describe theologians’ return to patristic and medieval sources to revitalize theological discourse after the long reign of neo-Scholasticism.

“The fact is that psychologists take positions on ground deemed sacred and protected by the Church” (2), like the long practice of *cura animarum*. The setting of the “novel” moves from Belgium, where experimental psychology began in a Catholic center; to France, where spiritualist and miraculous phenomena erupted (especially at Lourdes); to Switzerland and England, where Jung and Catholic Jungians are portrayed; to Ireland’s early response to psychoanalysis; and, of course, to the United States, where the uneasy and sometimes stormy efforts at integration were institutionalized in four major Catholic universities (St. Louis University, Loyola University Chicago, Fordham University, and the Catholic University of America), and three organizations (the Chicago Society of Catholic Psychologists, the American Catholic Psychological Association, and the Guild of Catholic Psychiatrists).

For Catholics, the conflict’s ultimate source derived from the Modernist crisis of a century ago. How were loyal Catholics to avoid ecclesial accusations of Modernism while enthusiastically embracing the “modern” science of psychology? One solution was proposed by the first of the “novel’s” heroes, Cardinal Désiré-Joseph Mercier, who embraced neo-Scholasticism at his Institute in the University of Louvain, and sought to integrate the natural sciences with Thomistic thought.

In treating his various heroes, K. portrays each with a novelist’s insight into their personalities and character, while providing an expert historian’s judicious amount of their quoted words, without his research ever degenerating into the plodding style of a dissertation’s literature review. Another hero (to name just one among many), who is treated with similar compassion and objectivity, is Victor White, the Blackfriars Dominican and dialogue partner of C. G. Jung, who struggled painfully to preserve his Catholic identity and intellectual convictions with his outreach to analytical psychology.

K. employs Peter Galison’s idea of a “trading zone” between different cultures to show where psychology and Catholicism worked together on common projects, especially in education and counseling.

K., the psychologist, suggests a *ressourcement* in psychology by recommending a “turn to premodern discourses on the mind, soul, and human

nature in philosophy, medicine, rhetoric, medicine, and theology” (409), a “crossing” of boundaries. An early criticism of psychology claimed that it had “lost its soul,” and K. concludes with a passionate plea to cross boundaries by rediscovering soul. One of the most favorable comments on K.’s text was offered by a Jesuit friend and colleague who observed that, unlike many authors who write about the church, K. “gets it,” and understands the culture of the institution and portrays it without distortion. I hope that K. will invest his considerable erudition and talents as a novelist, historian, and psychologist to extend the story from 1962 up to the present day.

Loyola University Maryland

WILLIAM J. SNECK, S.J.

LIGHT FROM LIGHT: SCIENTISTS AND THEOLOGIANS IN DIALOGUE. Edited by Gerald O’Collins, S.J., and Mary Ann Meyers. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmanns, 2012. Pp. vi + 250. \$35.

Light from Light is a fascinating collection of essays by seven well-known physicists and seven eminent biblical and patristic scholars presenting what we know about both the commonly known and the counterintuitive characteristics of light as a pervasive and fundamental physical phenomenon, and about its rich, profound, and varied symbolic role in Scripture, theology, and spirituality. As the fruit of their dialogue, each author in different ways and to varying degrees reflects on how our contemporary knowledge of physics might further reinforce or enrich the symbolic or metaphorical function of light in theological and religious discourse. Several authors also explore how the significance of light in Scripture and in theology might indirectly affect how we appreciate and experience light, physically, biologically, psychologically. The collection originates from a 2009 meeting of all 14 scholars in Istanbul, and a follow-up meeting a year later in Oxford, precisely to explore together the possible connections between what both physics and theology reveal to us about the mysteries and the transcendent significance of the reality and the concepts of light. The two organizers and editors, O’Collins and Meyers, have provided a very insightful and helpful introduction to the volume.

In Part One, which consists of the more scientifically oriented contributions, the authors carefully and very accessibly present the key features light manifests, in itself and in its interaction with matter. Its wave-particle character, some of its other quantum properties (e.g., entanglement, the observer as participant, deep interrelationality), the velocity of light as the limit of causal interactions, and its central role in early evolution of the universe from the Big Bang on are all lucidly treated. Several of the scientists, John Polkinghorne, Michael Heller, and Marco Bersanelli, who are all well-known interdisciplinary scholars and writers—in theology and science, philosophy and science, and culture and science, respectively—focus more