death penalty. Demonstrating how mimetic theory enables a deconstruction of these institutions, C. deftly applies mimetic theory as a social-political critique of modernity. Chapter 5 offers an analysis of international affairs, in particular 9/11 and Islamic terrorism. Here C. unpacks the insights from Girard's last major work, *Battling to the End*, which, since its French publication in 2007, has been largely ignored (by, for instance, Michael Kirwan's otherwise excellent *Girard and Theology* [2009]). The modern narrative that only a nation-state can ensure peace and that religion is best kept private seems to belie the facts of nations going to war with greater frequency and for less convincing reasons. Mimetic theory, along with the recent political theology of William Cavanaugh, exposes the "myth" of religious violence powerfully and convincingly.

C.'s book deserves a place among the pantheon of works that show the importance of mimetic theory for Christian theology. It bears the closest resemblance to the above-mentioned works by Kirwan and Bailie. Other theologians (most notably James Alison, Robert M. Doran, Mark Heim, and Raymund Schwager) have used Girard to advance discussion of a particularly vexing question, and have thus demonstrated how mimetic theory can advance theological discussion of, say, original sin or atonement theory. C.'s book falls more in the former category and does not provide a comprehensive study of secularism or modernity.

There is no doubt, however, that C. has done Girardians a great favor in offering a readable introduction that incorporates the range of Girard's works and commentaries on them. The bibliography alone will help even seasoned Girardians. In addition, it will interest those keen to understand secularism theologically. As the "first generation" of students and scholars of mimetic theory begin to slow down, the emergence of "second generation" Girardians like C. offers tremendous promise for this profoundly fruitful avenue into Christian theology.

Grant Kaplan
Saint Louis University

The Memoirs of Jin Luxian, Volume One: Learning and Relearning, 1916–1982.
Translated from the Chinese by William Hanbury-Tenison. With an Introduction by Anthony E. Clark. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University, 2012. Pp. xxii + 296. $25.20.

Jin Luxian, who died last year at the age of 96, was arguably one of the most impressive churchmen in twentieth-century China. He was also one of its most controversial. J. himself witnessed some of the greatest glories of the church in China (more specifically, in Shanghai) as well as one of its most brutal persecutions. In fact, he would become one of the crucial figures who tried to shepherd the church during those unforgiving years.

The great strength of these *Memoirs*—elegantly translated and with a fine introduction—is that they are recounted by J. himself. Perhaps Philip Wickeri is correct: "No other religious leader in China has written in such detail about his own life" (endorsement, back cover).

In his introduction, J. gives the reason for writing these memoirs in the twilight of his life. He says that articles about him have "been widely disseminated," but they "do not accord with the facts, and certain accusations have been mischievously included" (3). Thus he wishes to set the record straight.

One cannot doubt that J. suffered tremendously for his faith. He entered the Jesuits in 1938 and was ordained in 1945. In 1948 he went to Europe for further formation and studies and finally returned to China in 1950, a year when many Christians were trying to get out of China. After several years of trying to strengthen the flock, he was sentenced on charges of being a counterrevolutionary and spent 27 years in prisons and labor camps. A few years after he was released, he was consecrated auxiliary bishop of Shanghai. But this was done without papal approbation because the legitimate bishop (later Cardinal) Gong (Kung) Pinmei was still in prison.

My own research has included searching archives in Shanghai. I also interviewed Bishop Jin three times in 2006 and published my findings in *Church Militant: Bishop Kung and Catholic Resistance in Communist Shanghai* (2011). So I am personally grateful to J. for including many previously unknown details that he could have simply taken with him to the grave.

I found the most fascinating parts of the book to be where J. sheds light on some obscure periods. The first period is the 1950s when the Catholic Church in Shanghai was actively opposing the restrictive policies of the Chinese government. We learn about how the church tried to negotiate a space for itself in those trying years, and found itself torn between the competing demands of church and state.

In discussing this period, J. speaks of his own relationship with Bishop Gong, whom he found to be a "very good priest who greatly loved the Lord and strictly followed discipline" (199). Yet, he also found Gong to be, under intense government pressure, a "tragic character" who had "assumed a burden for which he was both professionally and psychologically unprepared" (200). He revealed that Gong "mindlessly" executed "anti-communist orders" (200). Surely J. must have known that publishing these statements would only further infuriate his harshest critics.

The other fascinating period is recounted at the end of the book, where J. shares some intimate details about how he was wooed to becoming a bishop for Shanghai without approval from Rome. Such a move would surely never be seen as legitimate in the eyes of many. J. says he made this decision after being asked repeatedly by government officials over the space of two years. He was struck by their patience and moved by their "depth of feeling" (284). He finally acceded because, as he tells it, he had two options: either cooperate with the government in rebuilding the diocese, or watch Catholicism "die out in China" (284).

The book has considerable strengths, but it is uneven. J. devotes as much attention to the minutiae of his happy years in Europe as to some truly historic events of what transpired in his native land. Further, the book contains little scholarly apparatus; other than J.'s own memories, few other sources besides J.'s own memory are consulted, perhaps because the book is simply a memoir written by a busy bishop at the end of his life.

J. sums up his life in these words: "I am both a serpent and a dove. The government thinks I'm too close to the Vatican, and the Vatican thinks I'm too close to the government. I'm a slippery fish squashed between government control and Vatican demands" (xvi).

Paul P. Mariani, S.J.
Santa Clara University

Liberalism versus Postliberalism: The Great Divide in Twentieth-Century Theology. By John Allan Knight. New York: Oxford University, 2013. Pp. x + 313. $74.

We are starting to get enough distance from the twentieth century to begin proposing narratives of its theological unfolding. K.'s book is such a proposal, taking as its protagonists liberal and postliberal thinkers viewed through the lens of analytic philosophy. More specifically, he proposes that the "great divide" between liberal and postliberal theology is a matter of understanding the function of religious language, specifically around questions of validation and truth. His case for this proposal is an impressive one.

K. recounts the development of liberal theology from the nineteenth through the mid-twentieth centuries that was built on an apologetics directed at the Enlightenment and a shift to a focus on human subjectivity as the point of departure for theology. Taking an apologetic stance, liberal theology sought to validate religion's claims in the face of skepticism and objections from Enlightenment thinking. It sought to ground this validation in epistemology, in the relation of the knowing subject to the object of faith. Epistemology and truth claims, in turn, were to be constructed according to the descriptivist theories of language first proposed by Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell and then developed further by such figures as Anthony Flew and R. M. Hare. Flew's falsification hypothesis, developed elsewhere in the philosophy of language, became the touchstone for the validity of religious truth claims.

Theologians struggled with these problems in the 1950s and 1960s. Schubert Ogden effectively demolished the premise of the falsification hypothesis by showing that the hypothesis itself was unfalsifiable. He went on to develop a plausible response to this approach in his own theology. At the same time, the referential theory of truth proposed in this philosophy of language began to show its limitations.

One response to liberal directions in theology worked out of a different take on modernity and philosophy of language. It sought its theological point of departure in the work of Karl Barth, where ontology had priority over epistemology; in other words, an understanding of belief had to be derived from a theology of God, not from the religious believer. A philosophy of language amenable to giving priority to the circle of faith (rather than to the claims of the world) could be found in the later Wittgenstein's theory of language as the "language games" of the community that employed them, and in a theory of meaning not built on reference, but on meaning as used within those language games. This theory would be developed by Hans Frei,