Check for updates

all—the almost 100 pages of notes including many gems and showing enormous erudition. But I also have a few quibbles. Is it really appropriate in discussing the influences on Vatican II to give two paragraphs to Congar, Chenu, de Lubac, and Schillebeeckx, but six pages to Teilhard de Chardin? Could not C. distinguish between the negative and ahistorical Thomism of the establishment and the flexible and historically sophisticated use of Thomas by such as Chenu and Congar? And if you are going to dismiss the English hierarchy as a bunch of upper-class patriarchs, would it not make sense to attend to more than just Cardinal Heenan? Long lists of names are of little value to the reader unless they are identified, and often this does not happen (e.g., p. 224). And surely it is a mistake to suggest that liberation theology owes something to the *Slant* group. The reason the Latin American movement succeeded where *Slant* did not is precisely that it began as a grassroots movement, and the theorizing, as Gustavo Gutiérrez has said, was "the second act."

In the final pages of the book the author makes some interesting comparisons between *Slant*, Radical Orthodoxy, and the thought of Stanley Hauerwas. Curiously, C. does not make the point that all three approaches to modern Catholicism are less effective than they might be because none of them has a concrete ecclesial structure in which its ideas are worked out. It is all so theoretical. If you are not going to be orthodox, then you had better have a vigorous commitment to orthopraxis. *Slant* failed not so much because its ideas were bad, but because it had no solid ground under its feet in the English church of the time. If its intellectually snobbish leaders had been interested in establishing base Christian communities under the leadership of the common people, who knows what might have happened?

Paul Lakeland
Fairfield University, CT

Christ in the Life and Teaching of Gregory of Nazianzus. By Andrew Hofer, O.P. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University, 2013. Pp. x + 270. $99.

This book, we are told, is the first one dedicated to an overview of the Christology of Gregory Nazianzen. Since "theologians as diverse as Cyril and Nestorius, Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians, Maximus the Confessor and Monothelites all claimed Gregory's authority for their own doctrinal ends" (227), Hofer is more than doubtful about the adequacy of the *Dogmengeschichte* approach for the different Christologies before Chalcedon, and especially for Gregory's very distinctive account of Christ.

Instead, H. enters into what Gregory holds most dear, namely, the *Logos* in his life, by studying the subtle weave of Gregory's attitude to *logoi*, examining how Gregory blends all the senses of *logos* so that they converge on salvation by the *Logos*. The first of six chapters lays the groundwork in Gregory's life as a rhetor, a master of words and persuasion, and their bearing on his theology of the *Logos*, "the Word of God who comes to guide him and his audience to the light of the Trinity" (9). Especially

important is the preparation of the true theologian: “Gregory’s philosophy is a life of clinging to Christ the Word” (28). Chapter 2 concerns Gregory’s personal involvement with Christ as expressed in his extensive autobiographical writings, what H. styles as his “Christomorphic autobiography,” with its characteristic blend of *Logos, logos*, and *bios*. H. proposes here that “the practice of dividing preachers and commentators between Alexandria and Antioch, as the most telling distinction for understanding patristic exegesis, has outlived its usefulness” (36). Only in chapter 3 does he turn to texts more commonly thought christological. He elucidates at length Gregory’s incarnational theology of “mingling” and “*crasis*,” terms later condemned at Chalcedon. In the many autobiographical poems, Gregory has a pastoral intent: to communicate the negotiations of his difficulties and sufferings before Christ as exemplary and therapeutic for his intended readers. He wishes to draw us too into a life of boundless intimacy with the Word. A chapter on Gregory’s vastly influential *Epistola* 101 follows, and then a wider survey of his approach to the “mysteries” of Christ. That famous acclamation in *Oratio* 1, “Yesterday I was crucified with Christ, today I am glorified with him, yesterday I died with him, today I am made alive with him, yesterday I was buried with him, today I rise with him” (154), exemplifies everything H. tries to articulate of Gregory’s autobiographical Christology. Chapter 6 turns to Gregory’s account of the “exemplary Christomorphic ministry” of priests and bishops (205), and the capital importance of interior conformation to the Word for its effectiveness. Gregory is very generous, from his own painful experience, with “anti-examples” of bishops and clergy who exemplify what authentic ministry is not.

Extensive footnotes attest to H.’s mastery of the secondary studies up to most recent times. The works of certain authors stand out as contributing positively to the development of his thesis: Christopher Beeley, Jovan Milanović, and Brian Daley. Controversy is dealt with respectfully, yet with express dissent when necessary. The book concludes with an index of Gregory’s works cited, and a comprehensive bibliography.

Some claims are questionable, such as that Basil had no autobiographical character (59). Simply not true! The choice to transliterate all Greek terms in the author’s discourse, while retaining the original Greek when cited in Gregory’s discourse is not quite coherent; the English style is occasionally difficult; some sentences trip over themselves and beg to be straightened out; frequently they cry out for a better use of prepositions. The author has some way to go to acquire Gregory’s art of concise and beautiful language.

I highly recommend this volume to all students of Gregory the Theologian, of pre-Chalcedonian Christology, and to all interested in exploring the inner quality of the theological, priestly, and pastoral praxis of the Church Fathers. None of them is so generous in self-disclosure as Gregory (barring Augustine). H. makes a valuable contribution to the field, even to reframing the task through his original approach to Gregory’s “autobiographical Christology,” tracked with close attention throughout this book. These words from the epilogue seem a fitting conclusion: “A recovery of Gregory’s blending of his life with the life of Christ can help us understand not only this fascinating fourth-century theologian, but something of the closeness of God to human life” (228).

Anna M. Silvas
University of New England, Armidale, Australia

Inspired: The Holy Spirit and the Mind of Faith. By Jack Levison. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013. Pp. xiii + 246. $24.

This is an engaging text about a little-known area of information that is essential to deepening comprehension of the NT. The milieu with which the author is familiar is the Judaism within which the NT was constructed as well as the Greco-Roman literature contemporary with that era. Both cultures had an understanding of Spirit that the author sees as essential to appreciate early Christian Pneumatology's emergence and development. For example, Josephus and Philo were Hellenistic Jewish authors, and Diogenes Laertius, Seneca, and Cicero were Stoics. Stoicism was the regnant philosophy of the Greco-Roman culture at the time of the NT's compilation.

Levison has authored several books on the Spirit, one scholarly, the other more popular. The plus of this book is the above-mentioned area of the author's knowledge. The minus of the book is the absence of any attention to the development of the tradition of Pneumatology beyond the early NT era such as, for example, the Cappodocians in the fourth century. Theology is a discipline that takes account of both Scripture and tradition. If the reader's need is for knowledge of the first of these two components, the author's work is invaluable. If readers are looking for a theology of Spirit, they will have to look elsewhere, since L. does not include the history of its development after the Scriptures are written.

L.'s main interest is in emphasizing the connection between learning and the Spirit. His irritation is the mistake of uncoupling learning (or study or comprehension or communal discernment) from ecstatic claims about the experience of the Spirit. He therefore spends much time on the question of what ecstasy is and how it is essential for religious knowledge. Surprisingly, he claims that there is "much more about the character of ecstasy from Greek, Roman and Jewish literature" than there is in the Bible wherein it is virtually "suppressed" (73).

Looming in the back of L.'s mind is a worry that, on the one hand, "Christians in historic Protestant, Catholic and Orthodox traditions may lose the penchant for ecstatic experiences" and try to function "in a sort of spiritless void." On the other hand, Pentecostals "may be drawn to the transport of ecstatic experiences without the counterbalance of virtue and learning" (185). The result of the growing distance between the two groups is the strong possibility of "a global dichotomy in the Church" (226). Accordingly he believes that there must be a balance, because "ecstasy without intellect is impermissible and intellect without ecstasy is inconceivable" (117).

How L. understands ecstasy is perhaps clearer to him than is his explanation in the book. He claims it has been better "defined" by several who are not among the inspired authors of the NT such as Plutarch and Philo. Philo, the first-century Jewish philosopher from Alexandria, describes ecstasy as an inspiration that puts one momentarily out of his or her mind. "The mind is evicted at the arrival of the divine Spirit, but when