

between two people, which is founded upon God's grace. Luther again stressed the importance of children and emphasized that the parental duty was their education and well-being.

The sixth chapter is comparatively brief and it is where W. discusses Luther's lectures on Genesis. W. stresses that Luther understood marriage to be a replication of the original creation in paradise and that husband and wife were equals in marriage. Rather than believing that marriage was a means to avoid many sins, Luther contended that it was what God had commanded: that the two should live in harmony and to thrive together. W. acknowledges that his investigation can be continued by discussing the Catholic Church's reactions to Luther, but he prefers to end his book without any further discussion.

This book was written primarily for a rather small group of specialists. The reader is expected to have considerable expertise in theology, to have a specialist's understanding of both Luther and Augustine, and to have a significant grasp of the theology of marriage ("Ehethologie"). Furthermore, the reader is expected to read not only German and Latin but also Luther's original German. The reader is unlikely to be familiar with Luther's spelling (three short examples: "als eyne brawt mit yhrem breudgam"; "Drey ursachen weyß ich, die man und weyb scheydet."; and "Was aber von eym Heydnischen gemahl hie S. Pauli redet, ist auch zuverstehen von eym falschen Christen" [1, 30, 276]). And, W. quotes from Luther's works on more than a hundred pages. Obviously, a non-specialist will not be able to make full use of this book; nonetheless, a non-specialist will gain a fuller understanding of one of the most contentious issues in the history of theology. Although this book was intended for a small group of specialists, W.'s expert grasp of the theological complexities, his ability to set out the arguments clearly, and his genuine respect for Augustine as well as for Luther will be welcomed by every type of reader.

Christopher Adair-Toteff
University of South Florida

God's Human Future: The Struggle to Define Theology Today. By David Galston. Salem, OR: Polebridge, 2016. Pp. v + 198. \$28.

Galston challenges Christians to get over "belief." Consequent to the Enlightenment, God was understood as supernaturally predisposed and incredulous, the necessary Being behind nature, something that had not been recognized through the Middle Ages. While God, folded into the cosmological order, gave medieval persons a sense of social place and purpose, "this God"—G. asserts—"does not exist anymore" (4). G.'s conclusion is echoed in the dispersion of progressives from Christian communities. That diaspora leaves Christianity to the closed orthodoxy of belief. That psychic affection for a transcendental elsewhere couples, even in liberal orthodoxy, with the elaboration of revealed truth, divine norms, and a slate of final aims uncoordinated with contemporary cosmology. G. refuses to bless such resentment of the world:

“Theology betrays itself when it holds on to the old version of God and thereby a closed vision of religion” (4).

G. consequently invites readers to shoulder the challenge of thinking religion through the critical insights loosed during the Enlightenment: Modernity has taught Christians to hold the Bible not as a “policy manual,” but as a “record of the human struggle for wisdom” (22). Science simultaneously opened teleological horizons beyond the yea of the peaceable kin-dom, and philosophers deduced that God was but a human projection. Given such jolts to the metrics of belief, G.’s compelling question comes into focus: “Does religion”—even more specifically, “God”—“as a human creation have a value for humanity and for our collective future” (22, 5)? G. argues in the affirmative, asserting that “the task of theology is to re-imagine, re-create, and even permanently re-cast the world with engaging hope” (5)—something he deems a more poetic than propositional work.

Yet this volume is not necessarily a constructive enterprise. Rather G. writes towards his central question by composing a progressive history of ideas (without admitting historical entanglements like misogyny and colonialism). After a primer on biblical criticism, he analyzes parties in the Aryan controversy, then moves the reader through the Middle Ages in which God was a linchpin until modernity. “God stops being necessary to the social order” (131). This radical event—commonly, “the death of God”—does not lay swathe to an entire culture en masse, but moves by ripples and tidal swells. Given contemporary cultural anxieties, this is not a convenient time for releasing “God” and thereby an intimate metaphysical meaning-map for human life. And yet that, suggests G., is unsurprisingly where we find ourselves still and yet again: when the times change, so do the gods (4).

At each juncture in his ideational history, G. sorts, using two religious typologies: the covenant tradition solidifies community, while the enlightenment trajectory of religious wisdom focuses on self-actualization. G. also analytically delineates a closed religious posture identified with the definitive revelation of truths from an open religious posture which considers religion as wisdom by which to stay awake to potentialities enfolded in the present. These two analytic axes help him arrive at the question of the hour: Can we live religiously—with reverence—and thereby keep faith with life—in an open universe? Can “God” help us formulate such a human future?

G. values religion as a collective force for “living intentionally in community with vision” (178)—appreciating, but not yielding to the individualistic, enlightenment posture. It remains unclear, however, how G. proposes that progressives, now dispersed, reach each other. Indeed, G.’s philosophical treatise, analytically parsing the history of how Christianity arrived at this moment when God proves dysfunctional, appears directed toward “insiders”—namely, those who identify as Christians, are trained practitioners or are religious studies students. That traditioned, even patriarchally tinged, lineage also prevents G. from recognizing others who have worked on his central question—for example, feminists like Grace Jantzen in *Becoming Divine* (1999); process theology’s “theopoetic” artery; even sociologist of science Bruno Latour, who embraces religious discourse as amorous speech (*Rejoicing: Or the Torments of Religious Speech*, 2013).

G. would have humans shoulder responsibility for the construction of religion. Yet G. himself seems caught between the Enlightenment's denouement of God and longing for God. G.'s most constructive thought—"We experience God in the yearning for God"—sits like a pearl still in its oyster (147). Such yearning—humanly conditioned, but nurtured over generations—may be no more ephemeral than the circuits of desire—bee to flower and flower to fruit—which fructifies the garden. The loosing of such yearning might even be commensurate with Teilhard's botanical vision of Christianity as "a phylum of love" rooted in the planet. If religion will be a human value and if God will have a human future (here these as two distinct possibilities, since "God" has tended to consolidate absolutist power and suppress elemental liveliness), progressives may need to release the aching groan from behind clenched teeth.

Sharon V. Betcher
Independent Scholar

Veröhnung und Kirche: Theologische Ansätze zur Realisierung des Friedens mit Gott in der Welt. By Bernhard Knorn. Frankfurter Theologische Studien 74. Münster: Aschendorff, 2016. Pp. xi + 363. €49.

This theological study of the relationship between reconciliation with God and working for reconciliation among peoples in the world is a dissertation by a Jesuit, Bernhard Knorn, directed by Leonhard Hell at the University of Mainz. The main theme arose for K. during a year spent with Jesuit Refugee Services in South Sudan. Tensions in the work of reconciliation arose not only from political and social challenges but also from within the Catholic Church.

K. points out that the task of reconciliation stands as one of the most important and pressing concerns in the world of today. It is a key concept in anthropology, psychology, sociology, and political science. As a human reality, both individually and collectively, reconciliation functions as a powerful sign of hope and meaning. Yet many who appreciate reconciliation also interpret Christianity as being historically part of the problem. Further difficulties arise among Christians themselves when they divide theologically and institutionally regarding the saving work of Christ, the mission of the church, and the relationship between the church and the world.

K. embarks on a journey through philosophy, Scripture, tradition, and theology in search of ways to connect the dots between various forms of divine and human reconciliation. He identifies 2 Corinthians 1:17–21, where Paul speaks of God reconciling the world to himself through Christ and entrusting Christians with the message of reconciliation, as an important but theologically underappreciated passage.

Throughout K. maintains a perspective that is both Catholic and ecumenical. In Germany, Protestant theology has paid significantly more attention to reconciliation than has Catholic theology. Luther connected reconciliation closely with justification and sorrow for sin. Hegel emphasized reconciliation as a key element in the dialectal unfolding of Being through the reconciliation of opposites. There developed in German