

Humans in their dignity are an intimate part of the greater whole of the cosmos, which on this planet includes a wider community of life. Ethical implications abound.

S. then deepens the ethical vision by tracing sources for a cosmic common good in classical thinkers Augustine and Aquinas and the contemporary Thomas Berry, and by working out meanings in two related terms that promote the common good, namely, solidarity and rights, now developed as Earth solidarity and Earth rights. If, buttressed by extensive scientific and theological research, this work had just powerfully rethought the common good in an ecological direction, it would have been enough. But the book's move into comparative theology gives its argument yet greater relevance. Marked by self-critical, sensitive use of sources, S. constructs theoretical grounds for the cosmic common good accessible to religious traditions despite their differences.

I read this book in light of an experience last spring at a conference celebrating the 125th anniversary of *Rerum Novarum* (1891), which initiated the modern version of Catholic social teaching. Multiple references by the excellent plenary speakers to the common good were relentlessly focused on human beings in our political, economic, and social conditions. My audience-member query about imperiled ecological elements in each of these arrangements received the response that this was an important question that needed to be considered. Then the discussion flowed back to humans only. It is evident that our theological imaginations need to be reoriented from the ground up so that without strain Catholic social teaching positions human beings within the community of creation, to practical and critical effect. Toward that end this book makes a superb contribution.

Elizabeth A. Johnson
Fordham University, New York City

The Sensus Fidelium and Moral Theology. Eds. Charles Curran and Lisa Fullam. New York: Paulist, 2017. vii + 300. \$26.75

Two-thirds of this volume is more ecclesiology and systematic theology than moral theology. *Sensus Fidelium* refers to the faith of the whole church. The faithful have an instinct for the truth of the faith. There is an infallibility in what the faithful see, by instinct and deep faith, as core to the faith. As Newman saw, the faithful had a truer sense of the faith than the hierarchy at the time of the Arian heresy, and Jerome appealed to the *sensus fidelium* for approval of the veneration of relics and the defense of the perpetual virginity of Mary. Both Pius IX and Pius XII asked for a careful appraisal of the faithful's faith before defining the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption. The belief of the faithful proved decisive for arriving at the canon of Scripture, baptismal theology and practice, and, as Newman demonstrated, belief in the full and unquestioned divinity of Christ.

Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium* 12 insists that *sensus fidelium* is a gift of the Spirit given to *all* the faithful in the church—a gift that helps the faithful adhere to the truth of the Gospel, penetrate it more deeply, and apply it more fully in daily life. We need to avoid

an overly strong distinction between *ecclesia docens*, the hierarchical teaching church, and *ecclesia discens*, the listening church. The whole church must and can be a teaching and a listening church. This raises issues about institutions and morality. The 1983 code of canon law makes no explicit mention of institutions needed so that the laity can make known their opinions on matters of faith and morals, and nothing about the obligation of pastors to listen. The failure to practice *sensus fidelium* isolates the magisterium. In moral teaching, there is not enough attention given to experience. Over time, experience taught that allowing slavery was morally wrong, as was rejection of religious liberty. In questions about church teaching on marriage and the family, substantial reflection on the sense of the faithful has largely been missing.

John A. Coleman, SJ
Saint Ignatius Parish, San Francisco

When Mary Becomes Cosmic: A Jungian and Mystical Path to the Divine Feminine. By David Richo. New York: Paulist, 2016. Pp. xii + 153. \$16.95.

“This book is a Jungian contemplation of Mary as archetype of the divine feminine” (9). The author works primarily from a retreat context rather than an explicit theological one. The book contains a rich array of reflections, images, titles, and prayers. How do we understand Mary as an archetype and how is she related to the divine feminine? Jung was a brilliant depth psychologist and advocate for religion to be taken seriously by the science of psychology. However, he was not a theologian, and so his suggestions that God has a dark side or that Mary is a fourth person of the Trinity reflect these limitations.

The problem of raising these theological questions in the context of meditative reflections is that it does not give the author enough time to nuance his reflections. Moreover, given the wide distribution and readership of Paulist Press, it will undoubtedly raise the theological issues, which are pertinent to our contemporary situation.

Although the author admits that Mary is not a goddess (20), it is unclear what he means by archetype and its relation to the divine feminine. For example, one can speak of Mary as a psychological archetype, perhaps as archetypal mother. In an ecclesial context, however, she can be considered to be an archetype of the church. His suggestion that we read “a dark side” into Mary in order to obtain a fuller account of her as archetype (28–29) echoes the same mistake made by Jung. Although I am sympathetic with the author’s desire to probe the nature of the divine feminine in a deeper way, I believe this calls for more of a rigorous systematic account, more than a psychological approach can provide.

I am also sympathetic to the author’s approach insofar as he seeks to recover an image of Mary from a more classical ecclesial era. However, the reader of this book would be well to keep in mind, on the one hand, the distinction between the psychological archetype of Mother, of which Mary is one expression, and on the other hand, the privileged role she plays in salvation history for Christians.