

*Preservation and Protest: Theological Foundations for an Eco-Eschatological Ethics.* By Ryan Patrick McLaughlin. Emerging Scholars. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014. Pp. xiii + 460. \$49.

McLaughlin makes an important contribution to the field of eco-theological ethics by engaging the main voices in eco-theological discourse and by offering a constructive and creative approach. With his volume, he achieves three goals. In the first part of the book, he delineates a novel taxonomy of four paradigms of nonhuman theological ethics. In particular, he explores the tensions between “anthropocentrism” and “cosmocentrism” as well as those between the teleological terms of “conservation” and “transfiguration.” These four terms define specific and paradigmatic theological approaches in eco-theological ethics. Here, McL.’s approach is “critically analytic.”

While for anthropocentrism only the human world has value, in cosmocentrism the nonhuman world possesses intrinsic value. Moreover, conservation is advocated by those aiming at preserving the current natural order, while transfiguration is stressed by those who propose to depart from the current state of affairs and aim at promoting an eschatological vision.

Second, by engaging these four paradigms, McL. articulates a new paradigm called “cosmocentric transfiguration,” which he frames in conversation with Jürgen Moltmann and Andrew Linzey who are accurately discussed in the second part of the volume. Cosmocentric transfiguration means that the entire cosmos shares in the eschatological hope of a harmonious participation in God’s triune life that entails the end of suffering, predation, and death.

Finally, in his third part, McL. shows how cosmocentric transfiguration shapes an ethic based upon a tension between preservation (i.e., the sustaining of nature, which requires suffering, predation, and death) and protest (i.e., the personal witness against suffering, predation, and death through nonviolent living).

Readers, scholars, and students interested in enriching their theological expertise in addressing ecological themes and concerns will enjoy McL.’s critical analysis and creative theological proposal.

Andrea Vicini, SJ  
Boston College

*Tolerance among the Virtues.* By John R. Bowlin. Princeton: Princeton University, 2016. Pp. 265. \$39.50.

Why the lack of appreciation, or even tolerance, for tolerance? In this volume Bowlin argues that a lack of clarity has stymied consideration of this important attribute, which critics associate with evils ranging from condescension to ethical indifference. Confusing *acts of toleration* (which can be performed from various motives, and under a variety of circumstances) with the character trait (*tolerance*) that enables one to act tolerantly for the right reasons and under appropriate circumstances, has, in B.’s view, contributed to

the disparagement of the latter, as has the assumption that tolerance is an early modern construct. In response, B. classifies tolerance as a moral virtue belonging to justice, drawing heavily upon Aquinas's theory of virtue, while acknowledging that Thomas's treatment of justice does not include tolerance explicitly. B. also rejects the suggestion that Christian ethics should promote forbearance rather than tolerance, maintaining instead that the two are related virtues with distinct spheres of application.

B.'s effort to construct a Thomistic-Wittgensteinian account of tolerance is intriguing. But even those with little interest in tolerance's taxonomy will find important points for reflection in this text. B. effectively demonstrates how murky our concepts of tolerance frequently are, so that we use the word when we really mean something else, from *self-restraint*—a semblance of tolerance, in B.'s view—to *acceptance*. B.'s illustrations of his arguments are both colorful and illuminating, including references to the Civil Rights Movement, a father's reaction to his son's taste in music, and an Oklahoma cockfighting referendum.

Perhaps because B. recognizes that some critics regard tolerance as a gateway to relativism, he says relatively little about possible connections between tolerance and humility, or the recognition of one's finitude. Nor does he consider how mercy might be related to tolerance. Expanding the argument in these directions might be fruitful. Yet graduate students and professionals in ethics, especially those interested in Thomistic virtue ethics, have much to gain from this volume's clear analysis.

Julia Fleming  
Creighton University, Omaha

*From Passion to Paschal Mystery: A Recent Magisterial Development concerning the Christological Foundation of the Sacraments.* By Dominic M. Langevin, OP. Studia Friburgensia 121. Fribourg: Academic Press, 2015. Pp. x + 397. \$68.

A doctoral dissertation (University of Fribourg), the principle value of the work (comprising nearly two-thirds of the whole) lies in its detailed commentary on three Roman documents: Pius XII's *Mediator Dei* (1947), Vatican II's *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963), and *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* (1997). Langevin traces an evolution in the official magisterial treatment of the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, from Pius's reliance on the Thomist interpretation of sacrament in terms of the virtue of religion—namely, Christ's passion as sacrifice—to the introduction and advancement of the christologically and soteriologically richer *ressourcement*-concept of the Paschal Mystery in the latter two documents. Perceiving a “debate” in the process, L.'s method in part 1 is simply to dive straight into each text, citing pertinent passages at length so as to deduce why and how the magisterial authors adopted key terminology. Lengthiest of the three chapters by far, not surprisingly, is the middle one on *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, since with it L. has documentary access to actual debate, rehearsing the arguments and interventions that advanced the drafts to the finally approved Constitution. In that way, and by demonstrating the originality of the Council's paschal-mystery