

appropriation of Christ's work in the consciousness of Christian believers (Luther, Schleiermacher, and Lonergan).

Although this book has few flaws, none are serious. While it deserves a wide readership in the theological academy and among intellectually ambitious clergy and other ecclesial leaders, the density of L.'s presentation of Lonergan's work may prove too much for some. That critique is no indictment of L., though, and L.'s work represents a robust performative demonstration of the enduring value of Lonergan's thought for both historical and systematic theology.

As I noted above, L. provides a thorough and penetrating exposition of Lonergan's position on stages of meaning, and he returns, again and again, to elements of that heuristic in his treatments of each historical figure. While L. ends strongly with an excellent treatment of Lonergan's little-known writings on Christ's work, *Lex Crucis* lacks a conclusion and left me with a sense of incompleteness. A brief conclusion would have provided L. the opportunity to restate the cumulative case which he takes over 300 dense pages to develop. It would also have provided L. an opportunity to address the exigencies of responsible and faithful systematic reflection on Christ's atoning work in the present. Others may find, as I did, that a reread of the introduction will provide more closure. The book also lacks an index.

These faults are slight blemishes, though, in what is a rich, well-written, theologically astute, and ultimately—in my estimation—compelling treatment of the history of reflection on Christ's atoning work. It is timely, too, given the imminent publication of the Collected Works edition of Lonergan's *The Redemption* (vol. 9). We are in L.'s debt, and my hope is that he will continue to build on this work, perhaps in the form of a contemporary systematic theology of the atonement. He is assuredly well equipped for that job.

Joseph K. Gordon
Johnson University, Kissimmee, FL

Purification of Memory: A Study of Modern Orthodox Theologians from a Catholic Perspective. By Ambrose Mong. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke, 2015. Pp. xviii + 214. \$30.

This agile introduction to contemporary Orthodox theology is the work of a Chinese Dominican priest who is visiting professor at the University of St. Joseph, Macau, and research associate at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. For obvious historical and cultural reasons, Christian scholars working outside the European and North American academy seldom choose to focus on the legacy of Eastern Orthodox Christianity, whose presence in what is increasingly called "the global South" is often still limited to small expatriate communities. It is thus refreshing to find an introduction to the main figures and themes of 20th-century Orthodoxy penned by a Chinese Catholic priest writing mainly for a Catholic audience. Andrew Louth's recent work *Modern Orthodox Thinkers: From the Philokalia to the Present* (2015) covers much of the

same ground, but where Louth addresses an Orthodox audience, or at least an educated readership that is familiar with the main currents in Orthodox thought, the purpose of Mong's volume is to bring about a theological, and ultimately ecclesial rapprochement between Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Christians. To this end, M. sets out to dispel the aura of exoticism that often surrounds Orthodox theology in the minds of many Western Christians, foregrounding the points of contact between Orthodox authors such as John Meyendorff or Nicolas Berdyaev, and Catholic thinkers such as Joseph Ratzinger and Gustavo Gutiérrez. These interdenominational reflections constitute the most original contribution of this work, highlighting the extent to which thinkers from the two great branches of historical Christianity addressed analogous challenges in distinct ways by retrieving the resources of their respective traditions.

The title of M.'s volume comes from John Paul II's 1995 encyclical letter *Ut Unum Sint*, where the Polish pope underscored the urgent need of Roman Catholics and Orthodox to acknowledge their historical responsibilities in bringing about and perpetuating the schism between the two churches (ix). Addressing Archbishop Christodoulos of Athens during his visit to Greece in 2002, the same pontiff used the expression "purification of memory" one more time, calling for mutual forgiveness of past errors in a spirit of charity (xiv). M. situates his work as responding to the call of the Apostolic Letter *Orientalis Lumen* (1995), which stresses that the theological legacy of the Christian East is an integral part of the tradition of the universal church (xv).

The main body of the volume comprises eight chapters, each exploring the life and work of a 20th-century Orthodox thinker. After exploring John Meyendorff's understanding of catholicity (17–21) and the role of the Petrine office (21–23), M. examines the eucharistic ecclesiology of Nicholas Afanasiev and compares it with the ecclesiology of Joseph Ratzinger, that emphasized the ontological priority of the universal church (36–43). Chapter 3 broadens this conversation by introducing John Zizioulas's critique of Afanasiev and the analogous debate between Ratzinger and Kasper on the priority of the universal or the local church (68–71). Ratzinger's conviction that the encounter between Christianity and Hellenism was a providential event whose doctrinal legacy remained normative for the contemporary church is then compared with George Florovsky's neo-patristic synthesis and his impassioned defense of Hellenistic Christianity (79–81). Chapter 5 touches on Sergei Bulgakov's theory of God's wisdom ("Sophia"), drawing a parallel between his ecclesiology and the teachings of Vatican II's dogmatic constitution *Lumen Gentium* (113–19), while also exploring his life-long fascination with Catholicism as well as his criticisms of its institutional structure. Chapter 6 introduces the readers to the work of Vladimir Lossky, who pursued a life-long academic interest in the work of Meister Eckhardt, but who was nonetheless an ardent supporter of the unique apophatic character of Orthodox theology that he found expressed in the works of the Pseudo-Denys and of Gregory Palamas (135–38). Chapter 7 brings together the work of Nicolas Berdyaev—which for M. constitutes an example of "contextual theology"—and the liberationist theology of Gustavo Gutiérrez (161–64), explaining also why the experience of communism in traditional Orthodox countries has made Orthodox theologians extremely reluctant to embrace the insights of liberation theology. The last chapter introduces the reader to the work of Jaroslav

Pelikan, arguably one of the most influential church historians of the 20th century, who came from a Slovak Lutheran background and eventually embraced the Eastern Orthodox faith at the age of seventy-five (170).

This study will be of special interest to Roman Catholic scholars and students of theology looking for an introduction to Eastern Orthodox thought that positions the latter in the broader context of the main theological trends of the 20th century.

Thomas Cattoi
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University

Canon Law and Episcopal Authority: The Canons of Antioch and Sardica. By Christopher W. B. Stephens. Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs. New York: Oxford University, 2015. Pp. xi + 288. \$105.

Stephens provides an in-depth analysis of two early church councils held in Antioch and Sardica from the perspective of canon law, an “important and critical aspect of the development of the imperial Church” (4). To achieve this purpose, the text is divided into three distinct parts: the Canons of Antioch and Sardica, canon law, and episcopal authority.

In dealing with the two councils, S. necessarily addresses the vexed and disputed questions concerning their chronology/dating; specific content; and the author’s position that the “Council of Antioch” was a circumlocution for a series of synodal assemblies, each of which was considered to have the authority of a full episcopal synod. From his analysis S. concludes that the Council of Antioch was “explicitly pro-Nicene” (118) and the dispute rather focused upon “the place of authority within the episcopal structures of the Church” (155). Given the more common perspective that the Councils of Antioch and Sardica primarily concerned doctrinal teaching and to an extent were anti-Nicene, S.’s position is thought-provoking but he importantly highlights the issues of synodality and episcopal authority as these influence contemporary church debate.

For S., the Councils of Antioch and Sardica express a fundamental confrontation between differing concepts of synodality: for the Eastern Church and in general, no appeal from one synod to another was possible, thus guaranteeing the autonomy of each church. For the Western Church, rather, a hierarchy of synods existed and the decisions of a lesser synod could be annulled by a greater synod, involving the entire church which could be called after an appeal to the bishop of Rome.

From the perspective of canon law, for S., the Canons of Sardica highlight the growing importance of canon law which nonetheless “was an unfixed entity and remained extremely subjective. Indeed canon law was both limited and, at times, infelicitous” (151). The Council of Sardica could determine that the Antiochene canons were null and void but obtaining the agreement of the Eastern bishops on this was a separate issue.

In part 3, S. intends to “shed light on the nature of canon law in the fourth century, the authority it could claim and the power it could command” (169); the “bishops at