

The last part of the book asks constructively whether Hindus and Jews worship the same God. Because G. thinks that there is no substantive bar to thinking that Hindus do worship one God, albeit in myriad forms and by many names, he answers in the affirmative. Here, I think, more can be said. A good complement to his study might then be a more nuanced appreciation of some Hindus' adamant polytheism. Of course too, granting that Hindus do not merely or mindlessly worship many deities, even those who glimpse a divine oneness behind the plurality may still not be worshipping one God in the way Jews or Christians do.

G. is seeking a clearer and less fraught relations with Hindus, and he is appealing to his Jewish colleagues, to honor and extend the categories of his own tradition to new situations. He is also exemplifying how deeper and better informed fidelity to a tradition's own categories may facilitate rather than hamper deeper interreligious relations. For those of us unfamiliar with rabbinic ways of thinking, G.'s book is eye-opening, as new ways of engaging the religions of Asia suddenly emerge. Christian theologians of religions can be grateful too, relieved of the burden of thinking that all the intellectual work of understanding pluralism is ours to do.

Francis X. Clooney, SJ
Harvard University

Heidegger's Pauline and Lutheran Roots. By Duane Armitage. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. Pp. xii + 199. €96.26.

This book delivers more than the title promises, because so much of it is devoted to Heidegger's overall theology; but it also delivers less, because so little of it is focused on Heidegger's discussions of Paul and Luther. Armitage maintains that his book has two major parts; the first part is devoted to some of Heidegger's earlier lectures and to *Sein und Zeit* while the second part is focused on his later writings: particularly on the *Beiträge zur Philosophie: Vom Ereignis*. And actually, it has a third part: the final chapter entitled "Heidegger and Postmodern Philosophy of Religion." Whether A. is successful in his defense of Heidegger here against some of the more recent critics remains questionable.

The second part will appeal the most to people interested in Heidegger's later thinking. While A. mostly overlooks Heidegger's writings from the beginning of the 1940s, he concentrates primarily on some unpublished writings from the thirties. A. suggests that many scholars contend that the *Beiträge zur Philosophie* equals *Sein und Zeit* in importance, yet he does not provide a list of these scholars nor does he offer a fully convincing account for this claim. Furthermore, A. admits that the *Beiträge* has a peculiar structure and is written in an "enigmatic language," and thus is extremely difficult to comprehend (129, 133). Nonetheless, A. intends to offer a clear and "jargon-free" introduction to this work because he contends that it contains some of the crucial features of Heidegger's later philosophy: his call for a new beginning and a new way of thinking. But, A. contends that these are also important for Heidegger's later

theology and he focuses particularly on the final section which is devoted to the “The Last God.” “Last” does not mean “end” or “final” but does mean the “deepest beginning” (131). What we have is not so much an “end” of traditional theology, but rather a new “beginning” of a radical way of doing philosophy.

Chapter 2 is supposed to treat Paul but much of it is concerned with methodological questions in general and with the philosophies of Ernst Troeltsch and Wilhelm Dilthey in particular. While A.’s understanding of Dilthey is taken largely from S. J. MacGrath and is essentially correct, he offers his own interpretation of Troeltsch that is somewhat superficial and only marginally accurate. Only eleven of the thirty-eight pages of this chapter are devoted specifically to the “detailed exegesis” of Heidegger’s discussion of Paul which he gave in his 1920–1921 lecture course. Entitled “*Einleitung in die Phänomenologie der Religion*,” Heidegger was more concerned with “introduction” and “phenomenology” than with religion, as A. correctly observes. He also notes that Heidegger’s religious focus was on Paul’s notions of “calling” and “announcement.” However, Heidegger’s Paul does not “announce good news”; rather Heidegger insists that Pauline theology is “anxious,” “anguishing,” and “distressing” (54–60; see *Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens*, 1995).

Chapter 1 is ostensibly devoted to Heidegger’s consideration of Luther. A. notes that Luther had two types of objections to Aristotle: first, to Aristotle’s ethics and the claim that one can become good by habitually practicing good deeds, because that contradicts Christian teachings; and second to Aristotle’s metaphysics, because the insistence on the primacy of reason is contrary to faith. While Heidegger did not share Luther’s notion of “the whore reason,” he believed that Luther was totally justified in denying all Scholastic metaphysics. A. devotes much of his book to a consideration of Heidegger’s responses to other philosophers and he specifically focuses on Plato for his unfortunate ontological influence on Christian faith and on Nietzsche for his (ultimately unsuccessful) attempt at “twisting free” from the Platonic/Christian metaphysics (67, 95–96, 138). A. admits that other scholars have examined the roles that Paul and Luther played in Heidegger’s development but he maintains that he is the only one to show the link between Heidegger’s early lectures on the philosophy of religion and the later contributions to philosophy. He may well be correct in this claim; unfortunately, he does not succeed in his larger goal of explaining how Paul and Luther were the sources for Heidegger’s philosophy of religion. The most he does is to insist that Heidegger shared Paul’s “structure” and Luther’s “aim,” but it is not always clear what A. means by “structure” and it is not really certain that Luther would agree that his own use of theological *distruccio* is the same as Heidegger’s philosophical *Destruktion*. Those hoping for a book devoted to the Pauline and Lutheran roots of Heidegger’s early theology may be rather disappointed, but those seeking a solid introduction into Heidegger’s philosophy will likely find this book is more than satisfactory.

Christopher Adair-Toteff
University of South Florida