

Then in the second part of the book he reviews the work of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus with special attention to the way in which these authors prepared the path for classical theism and at the same time provided the intellectual basis for neoclassical theism in the work of Henri Bergson and Whitehead, the authors featured in the third and last part of the book. Yet it is worth noting that there is no chapter dedicated to the review and critique of Hartshorne's position on the God—world relationship, given D.'s reliance on it for critique and evaluation of all the other authors, even Bergson and Whitehead.

My comments on this notable contribution to contemporary philosophical theology are limited to two points. First, the interpretation of Whitehead's philosophy put forth by Hartshorne and his disciples represents only one possible interpretation of Whitehead's philosophy. Others would be the more empirical approach to Whitehead's thought by Bernard Loomer and Bernard Meland; the recent open theism school of theology within Evangelical Protestantism; various trinitarian process-oriented theologies; and finally the non-theistic interpretation of Whitehead's cosmology by Donald Sherburne, George Allan, and others. Second, D.'s book might be more favorably received by non-Whiteheadians if process thought were seen as a creative alternative to classical theism rather than its historical successor. For all philosophical cosmologies without exception are a conscious (or unconscious) abstraction from the full reality of the God—world relationship; to think otherwise is to commit what Whitehead called the fallacy of misplaced concreteness.

Joseph A. Bracken, SJ Xavier University, Cincinnati, OH

The God We Worship: An Exploration of Liturgical Theology. By Nicholas Wolterstorff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015. Pp. x + 180. \$20.

Revising his Kantzer Lectures originally given at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Wolterstorff offers a different kind of theological essay under the mantle of "liturgical theology." Rather than explore liturgics, W. aims to midwife the church's "self-understanding of the theology implicit and explicit in its liturgy" (3). In the first half of the book, W. largely derives qualities of God inherent in liturgical language and action. In the second half, W. puts his formidable analytic philosophical acuity to work explicating and theologizing those characteristics of the God we worship. W. is admirably successful at these tasks. He offers valuable insights, particularly with respect to God as one who listens, hears, and can be offended—insights that challenge philosophical givens, such as divine immutability and simplicity, that were postulated of the "God of Athens" and adopted by Christian theology. Those familiar with W.'s work will not be surprised at his reliance on speech-act theory, which he employs to make sense of the claim that God listens, arguing that to listen is to perceive an illocutionary act and is therefore not a bodily endeavor (90). That insight, along with W.'s novel use of "analogical extension," is one of the exciting payoffs of chapter 6, the most philosophically demanding in a very clear and readable book.

Shorter Notices 1007

References to particular prayers and rites are ecumenical in scope, with an explicit preference for "traditional liturgies," which, he argues, have stood the test of time, have a consistency in practice, and a deep aesthetic value. W.'s analysis is centered on Episcopalian liturgical texts, with several references to the Lutheran and the Catholic traditions, and many to the Orthodox. However, the book's heavy emphasis on word and proclamation, even when drawing upon eucharistic prayers, is a bit discordant with the emphases of the latter traditions. Explicit eucharistic reflection makes up only the final chapter of the book.

W. is to be commended for bringing together liturgical analysis and philosophical theology, subfields not often enough in dialogue. The book is suitable for advanced undergraduates and graduate students and should have a home in every university library.

Timothy R. Gabrielli Seton Hill University, Greensburg, PA

Crucified and Resurrected: Restructuring the Grammar of Christology. By Ingolf U. Dalferth. Translated by Jo Bennet. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015. Pp. xxxvi + 325. \$45.

After a distinguished career in Europe, Dalferth, prolific author and specialist in hermeneutics and philosophy of religion, moved to Claremont in 2008, which might explain the first English translation of a text, dedicated to his mentor, Eberhard Jüngel, which had originally appeared in German in 1994. It had been provoked—a polemical tone runs through the book—by the appearance, two decades earlier, of John Hick's edited volume, *The Myth of the God Incarnate*. D. locates the history of European Christian theology as the creation of a hybrid, third linguistic world, between an otherwise binary matrix of *Mythos* and *Logos*. His contribution is to demonstrate that articulation of the belief that God has raised Jesus from the dead led to a new grammar, "a Christological thought form" (52) for doing theology.

This polished translation contains a new preface by the author, in which he refers to his more recent christological writings, primarily essays and articles from 1998 to 2006, but the text remains unchanged. The subject index, however, has been reduced from 25 pages to 5. The work is, throughout, a conversation with other Protestant, mainly German, theologians.

Using analytic philosophy, grammar, and logic, D. exhaustively construes various meanings of traditional categories, and argues brilliantly for the theological centrality of the Resurrection as manifestation of the eschatological inbreaking of the inexhaustibly creative power of God: "Christian faith stands or falls with the confession that Jesus has been raised by God" (12). All theology requires a clear and careful exposition of this confession. The Resurrection, rather than the Incarnation, is the starting point for understanding Christology, the Trinity, and Pneumatology. The focus is soteriological throughout.