

belonging” characterizes religious, ethnic, and national communities today (145–147). Traditions, too, evolve, as H. shows with examples from allegedly timeless Roman Catholic moral theology. Nor is culture deterministic for individual behavior and beliefs, as H. deploys political scientist Anne Phillips to show. Philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah reminds us that change in religious traditions often comes from within. When culture(s) and human rights discourse(s) are correctly understood as internally dynamic and evolving, “culture can be repositioned as a site of emancipatory politics rather than a bulwark against social change” (162).

H. says that even, perhaps especially, when communities believe their foundational values are at stake, they should cultivate practices of civility and respect and virtues of love and justice in their discourse. Here I wish she had elaborated further, since those values are not immune from contested cultural interpretation. H.’s example of the treatment of LGBT persons within the Catholic Church rather illustrates than resolves this issue.

H. closes by evoking the potential of the arts in a robust discourse of human rights. Having illustrated points with Seamus Heaney’s poetry throughout, she here delves into his theoretical work. The arts can contribute to “the expansion of moral concern” which is critical to any understanding of human rights as universal (179). Art can contribute in two key ways: establishing a baseline threshold for universal human dignity and confronting viewers with the true horror of violence. Torture is used as a test case, convincingly with respect to the role of art, but those who disagree with H. on torture might wish for a longer hearing than they get.

For H., human rights discourse has three purposes. It makes normative claims about what human dignity requires; it represents dialogue among members of different traditions; and effects political change through persuasion. It does not ultimately rest on static notions of persons, communities, or reason, but can be a dynamic dialogue open to multiple ways of knowing and speaking. While not immune to epistemologies which value some humans over others, it has been, and can still be, a crucial tool in addressing the horror and violence such epistemologies too often inspire.

I hope this book finds readers from fields as diverse as those it cites. Scholars of law, philosophy, politics, and theology will find much to admire in H.’s effort to keep faith with human rights.

Kate Ward
Marquette University, Milwaukee

Idol and Grace: On Traditioning and Subversive Hope. By Orlando Espín. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2014. Pp. ix + 201. \$34.

“How have Christians traditioned their hope?” (xv). Orlando Espín addresses this question in what deceptively reads like an introductory volume on theological method. E. would like the reader to continually ask the questions: what it is that we “tradition,” with what authority, in which sociocultural context, and for what purpose. By making a verb out of the term “tradition,” E. unbinds it from the perception that it remains a static deposit of universal truths guarded by an ecclesial elite class. Instead,

“traditioning” is that contextual and cultural work that every generation of the faithful carries out in their quest to witness to “the reasonable hope that God, as Jesus said, is really intervening in this world, transforming it according to God’s compassionate will” (6). This radical claim, which requires verification throughout the generations, is the heart of Christian living, experienced by a majority who, throughout history, have been mainly illiterate, marginalized, and considered disposable. These experiences, claims, and traditions are contextual, historically bound, limited to expressing truth as one group experiences it in its cultural context, with universal validity only in its modest stance before other groups’ claims of the same experience of a compassionate God.

E. gifts the reader with an elegant exposition of theological method grounded on the awareness of the contextual, cultural, and historical limitations of all our theological claims. In doing so he links method *to* the claim itself, as the context of the life of this Jesus, whose bet on the God of compassion active in history becomes crucially important. E.’s own method unfolds in 51 pages of endnotes, an invaluable rich trove of resources on Latin American philosophy and theology, cultural theory, and historical criticism, that should be required reading for any theologian wanting to consider the truly global nature of the faith.

The volume begins with “Clarifications,” an exposition of the central Christian claim with which E. engages throughout the volume, as well as laying out the process of traditioning. The reader will find the discussions on doctrine, revelation, *sensus fidelium*, ecclesiology, and liturgy clear and refreshingly grounded. In “Contexts,” E. presents the cultural philosophy that drives his understanding of the historicity of the Christian faith. Here are echoes of E.’s *The Faith of the People: Theological Reflections on Popular Catholicism* (1997), where he first addresses the questions of religious authority and the lived faith of the majority of Christians. The discussion of cultural contexts includes the ways that asymmetries of power impact which cultural expressions of faith get reproduced and doctrinified as part of the global reproduction of dynamics of power and marginalization of the majority of the world’s faithful.

In “Theological Elements,” E. dives into the heart of the central claim of the Christian story while detailing the idolatrous tendency of doctrinification of faith claims. To be a Christian community is to be anti-idolatrous because it is to witness to a God who is all-compassionate, without exceptions—over and above ritual or doctrine. Here E. emphasizes a claim he makes throughout the volume: “Anti-idolatry requires inter-culturality” (82). E.’s appreciation for Latin American philosophies of inter-culturality and its thinkers are woven throughout the volume, highlighting the ways “Western Christianity,” is, in reality, many visions of the Christian faith lived in diverse contexts of suffering and hope. These must “modestly” engage each other in the task of ascertaining the *verisimilitude* (affinity to the truth) of our claims. Doctrine is understood as the internal conversation of the faithful, advancing understanding of the claim of subversive hope, and its expressions in ritual and Christian life, but never to be mistaken as revelation, or co-extensive with it. Finally, in “Traditioning: a Theological Proposal,” E. returns to the claim that the *kairos* of theology is the *cotidiano* of the faithful as their radical stance in the face of everyday suffering and hope, crucifixion and resurrection, in relationship to the “crucified peasant” (122). “A crucified peasant is an understandable analog” for the contextual experiences of *lo cotidiano*, so often marked by unjust suffering.

E.'s work is de- and re-centering with respect to essential faith claims and the cultural contingency of all faith expressions, but especially with respect to the masses of faithful whose experiences of the radical hope in a God of compassion remain tangential to many ecclesial and liturgical authorities—the exclusive claim to which is also contextualized in the volume. Not only is the volume needed with respect to resetting the compass of Catholic theology—or clarifying the process of the traditioning of this story. It is also needed because Christians of every generation are always desperate for restating the central message of compassion to which Christianity witnesses and on which it wagers its entire existence.

María Teresa Dávila
Andover Newton Theological School

A Ministry of Discernment: The Bishop and the Sense of the Faithful. By Amanda C. Osheim. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2016. Pp. xxii + 221. \$24.95.

In the opening pages of this thoughtful volume, Osheim acknowledges that getting at the *concept* of the *sensus fidelium* is not nearly as difficult as getting at the *content*. And yet, O. argues, without some way of knowing the substance of the sense of the faithful, we risk reducing it to “a platitude about God’s presence in the church” rather than “a way of more deeply cooperating with the Holy Spirit for the church’s life and mission” (xi).

In order to move the discussion forward, O. turns from objective criteria to subjective processes of spiritual growth. The book “explores spirituality as a means of forming persons of discernment who may better know the *sensus fidelium*” (xv). In this account, the spirituality is Ignatian. The person of discernment is the bishop.

After an ecclesiological orientation that presents the bishop within the context of an “apostolic communion” originating in the reception of God’s self-revelation (Ch. 1), O. surveys the vision of episcopal ministry found in four conciliar and post-conciliar documents: *Lumen Gentium*, *Christus Dominus*, *Apostolorum Successores* (Directory for the Pastoral Ministry of Bishops, 2004), and the 1983 *Code of Canon Law* (Ch. 2). Displaying a generous hermeneutic of charity, O. culls from these texts “opportunities” and “potential structures” for assisting the bishop’s discernment of the *sensus fidelium*, but ultimately she concludes that such support is frustrated by three “absences” in the texts. First, episcopal learning is narrowed to pastoral application rather than pastoral reception. Second, little attention is given to how the faith of the local church is received by the universal church. And finally, these documents do not adequately envision how the bishop is formed in holiness through his reception of the *sensus fidelium* (82–83). In sum, these official texts fall short because they perpetuate a top-down institutional model of church that imagines reception as unidirectional—always describing the bishop as teacher, rarely as learner (92).

For O., the bishop *has* to be a learner if there is going to be any meaningful way of affirming the *sensus fidelium* as “an authoritative source of the church’s knowledge of