

of monasticism. (In his defense, in discussing Ignatian spirituality he does discuss the *Spiritual Exercises*, Ignatian prayer, consciousness examen, and discernment of spirits.) The classroom is obviously not a novitiate, but recent scholarship affirms that engaging in practice can lead to forms of knowledge that cannot be known by simply reading about a topic. F.'s text would be strengthened by closer attention to spiritual practices and perhaps even an invitation to students to try some.

No one-semester textbook can cover all aspects of a subject. Yet there are a number of topics which F. decided not to cover. Despite the growing awareness of the dangers of climate change, the book contains no references to ecological spirituality. Similarly, there are no references to cosmology (despite recent advances in understanding the universe), feminist spirituality (though there are some references to feminine piety), or Latino/a or African American spirituality. F. does not discuss popular piety or the history of devotions, which have been important to the lived expression of the faith of many Catholics. Some of these topics would presumably be of interest to undergraduate students.

Teachers seeking a text for an undergraduate course in Christian spirituality are well served by this book, which could also function as a good introduction to the field for a general reader. *Christian Spirituality* could serve as a core text for such a course, especially if supplemented with other resources to give a fuller and richer experience to students.

Bruce H. Lescher
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University

Politics for a Pilgrim Church: A Thomistic Theory of Virtue. By Thomas J. Bushlack. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. viii + 271. \$35.

How are virtue ethics and Catholic social thought related? This question motivates Bushlack's engaging attempt to outline a Thomistic understanding of Christian civic virtue in the context of twenty-first-century liberal democracies.

The author situates his viewpoint relative to three schools of interpretation of Catholic social thought. B. criticizes neoconservative interpreters, such as Michael Novak and George Weigel, for attenuating the role of civic virtue: the former because of his reliance on neoclassical economic theory, and the latter due to a narrow focus on sexual moral issues. B. is more sympathetic to those who emphasize local communities and ecclesial identity, such as William Cavanaugh and Michael Baxter, but fears that their disdain for the higher-level institutions of the nation-state undermines positive Christian political engagement. Finally, there is the liberal political theology familiar from the work of David Hollenbach and others.

B. is closest to this latter school, and in its defense, he helpfully distinguishes the "doctrinaire liberalism," which advocates a purely secular political realm, from a "positive laicity" or moderate political liberalism that is consistent with Catholic social thinking and gives greater space for the civic engagement of the faithful. His careful

dialogue with thinkers such as John Rawls and William Galston goes a long way toward protecting just such a space for a Christian rhetoric of the common good in a liberal context. B.'s complaint about the school of theological political liberalism, however, is that it has not yet been theological enough: its overriding focus on the penultimate aims of the political community risks undermining the primacy of the transcendent aims of Christian commitment. How well does he succeed, therefore, in offering a more integral theological basis for Christian civic virtue?

B. sees civic virtue as oriented toward the common good. If, following Augustine, the common good is indeed a community's "common objects of love" (34), then Novak's assumption that it can be achieved without being directly intended by individuals and civic authorities must be rejected. B. skillfully steers a middle way between individualistic conceptions, which see the common good as the amalgamation of the good of individuals, or at most something instrumental to them, and more totalizing conceptions that tend to eclipse individual rights and autonomy. (B.'s argument that since the common good is the "object" of a distinct virtue such as general justice, it must be a "real, subsistent good," seems to fail, however: this reifying argument confuses "object" as the terminus of a virtue's intentionality, and "object" as an existing subject.) B. accepts the Thomistic claim that the virtue of "general" justice (the contributory justice of the engaged citizen) directly rectifies the *will* by orienting it to the common good, but goes on to develop some of Aquinas's comments in a helpful direction by integrating *passion* more fully into this virtue, focusing especially on the roles of compassion and well-directed anger. He also draws some illuminating connections between justice and the virtue of political prudence and public deliberation. Other virtues with civic significance, such as mercy, solidarity, or magnanimity, are less well developed here.

B.'s theological argument is that certain theological dualities justify a parallel duality in Christian commitment, both to the transcendent aim of supernatural beatitude, and to the temporal aim of a political community's common good. For example, he argues that the grace–nature distinction provides the "conceptual breathing room" for Christian political deliberation (129). Yet it is not clear that the theological duality maps onto the duality in Christian commitment that B. wants to justify. For does grace have nothing to do with Christian civic virtue or the political common good? B.'s own claim that there is such a thing as "infused civic virtue" would indicate that it has everything to do with them. It is therefore not clear that the distinction between the natural and supernatural does the work that B. wants. So while B. is to be commended for the wealth of theological motifs, ecclesial, systematic, and moral, that he brings to the discussion of the political engagement of the pilgrim church, there remain loose ends in how exactly the former map onto the latter. For those who wish to further the overall project of developing a more theological account of Christian civic virtue, this volume, with its sophisticated reading of liberal political philosophy, Thomistic ethics, and Catholic social thought, will nevertheless be an excellent place to start.

Nicholas Austin, SJ
Heythrop College, University of London