The author's historical analysis does not explicitly consider the post-Scholastic evolution of the doctrine of conscience. For example, he does not discuss the theme of conscience in the humanistic tradition of the Renaissance, nor of the Protestant Reformation, and above all does not consider the importance of the dialogue between theology and philosophy of modern thought, as in Kant and his concept of autonomous subject. This lack of openness to the Renaissance and modern thought is also detected in the systematic section of the volume (chaps. 4–6) where the author elaborates on the nature and function of conscience in connection with the concept of virtue and the human call to holiness.

Regarding the function of conscience the author insists on the cognitive function in the sense of a deductive operation. He refers to the concept of truth in a problematic relationship between the ontological and practical level (citing particularly Josef Pieper and Joseph Ratzinger). The theme of virtue also plays a role in this relationship. Conscience is connected to the order of virtues, and, according to the author, comes into play especially with prudence "in its cognitive functions of seeing and judging the truth and in its prescriptive function of directing what is chosen to be done" (296).

The final chapter of the book provides an outline of theological readings regarding the gift of the Holy Spirit and the role of conscience in the *imitatio et sequela Christi*, in the formation of conscience, and to the dimension of *communio* as the key context for Christian conscience. The pneumatological, christological, and ecclesiological dimensions thus become elements of a theology of conscience. The stamp of this section of the book is marked by a strong spiritual and pedagogical inspiration that clearly has an important value for the Christian vision of conscience.

The author concludes his work with some summary insights in a retrospective look on the itinerary taken in the book. Reading this book is beneficial for the historical and systematic information it provides. The work must be framed mainly in a theological-ethical context in the sense of fundamental morality. Its title, *Conscience in Context*, arouses great and stimulating expectations, especially in relation to the category of context. However, the work does not add sufficient hermeneutic, methodological relevance to this category. The vision of conscience is insufficiently related to the historical condition of the moral subject. And, above all, the lack of consideration of an anthropology of conscience (where is the reference to *Gaudium et Spes* 16?) creates an unbalanced relationship between the ontological approach and consideration of context as a manifestation of human subjectivity and creativity of conscience.

The desire for deeper study of these aspects remains open.

Antonio Autiero
University of Münster (emeritus)

University Ethics: How Colleges Can Build and Benefit from a Culture of Ethics. By James F. Keenan. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015. Pp. vii + 281. $34.

James Keenan's latest book compellingly argues that American universities (including Catholic universities) are failing to take ethics seriously within the confines of their

own institutions. The problem, he emphasizes, is not that universities do not or cannot teach ethics as a field of both theoretical and applied inquiry; he notes that most institutions of higher learning already offer a vast array of ethics courses, including in the professional fields of medicine, law, business, and social services. The problem is that universities seem unconcerned with either learning or applying ethics within their own profession, a fault that particularly pertains to administrators who have not been trained in ethics, though, he notes, faculty also share some of the responsibility.

K.'s work seeks to serve as a kind of introductory textbook to fill this ethical lacuna (his book, he notes, appears to be the first written exclusively on university ethics—something he thinks is part of the problem). The body of the text examines specific problems that have emerged from what K. describes as an overarching absence of ethical reflection and accountability in the academy, problems including the treatment of adjunct faculty (chap. 4), cheating (chap. 6), bad undergraduate behavior, particularly related to partying and fraternity life (chap. 7), gender inequity (chap. 8), ethnic and racial inequity (chap. 9), the commodification of higher education (chap. 10), and the role of athletics (chap. 11).

Taken together, these chapters effectively paint a damning picture of the moral state of the contemporary university. Although K. often problematically draws on anecdotal and journalistic accounts (including blogs) to support his claims of university wrongdoing without independently verifying their full veracity, the evidence he presents remains sufficient to support his central thesis: universities are failing to create and maintain a robust culture of ethics, which is undermining student, staff, and faculty well-being alike, especially the most vulnerable.

It is one thing to identify problems, however; it is another to redress them, and here K.'s solutions seem more theoretical than practical. Though the issues are diverse, he tends to propose four general fixes: (1) solidarity with those who are not benefiting from the current environment (here he emphasizes the role that tenure-line faculty must play in advancing what he calls "social justice" on campus); (2) the raising of "awareness"; (3) greater transparency and oversight; and (4) a leveling out of vertical leadership structures and the creation of bridges among the various "fiefdoms," as K. calls them, of administration. These approaches will, in his view, ultimately lead to the creation of a "culture of ethics" that will help fix and prevent the abuses he catalogues.

To use an academic cliché, this may sound good in theory, but how will it work in practice? It is certainly not fair to critique K. for the generality of his solutions; this is a book for all university-related audiences, not an institution-specific report for internal review. But it is fair, I believe, to think through the general implications of his general solutions.

For example, K. laments the ongoing swelling of the administration in his chapter on the commodification of higher education, noting that "the university's shift in hiring business managers over faculty continues unabated" (199). Most faculty members will nod in agreement. Yet it is important to ask whether some of the proposals K. suggests will only lead to greater administrative bloat. Who, after all, will be responsible for collecting information, and conducting student surveys, and generating

reports, and designing brochures, and implementing recommendations, and overseeing compliance, and so on—all of which is necessary for increased awareness, transparency, and oversight—if not administrators? The implication is that either the current batch of administrators will have to add to their job descriptions (unlikely), or more will have to be hired (likely), which risks the creation of yet another fiefdom and yet another level of complexity to an increasingly byzantine organization, not to mention increased cost. Likewise, leveling out hierarchical structures sounds attractive; but who will take on the additional responsibilities? If faculty is the answer, then that could diminish the quality of teaching, which, after all, is, or used to be, the primary reason for the university's existence.

In the end, few readers will likely doubt that the university needs and will benefit from a greater culture of ethics. But many will likely have questions, especially those already tasked with administration, who are generally negatively portrayed in the book, on how to build that culture effectively and, yes, efficiently. Perhaps that is a perfect discussion topic for *University Ethics 101*, coming soon, K. hopes, to a course catalogue—or, better yet, employee-orientation seminar—near you.

Matthew R. Petrusek
Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles

Catholic Theology of Marriage in the Era of HIV and AIDS. By Emily Reimer-Barry. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2015. Pp. viii + 229. $90.

In a new book on marriage, Emily Reimer-Barry does what the Extraordinary Synod on the Family of 2014–15 set out to do but did not quite achieve. In *Evangelii Gaudium* (*EG*) Pope Francis characterizes evangelization as a process in which "the first step is personal dialogue, when the other person speaks and shares his or her joys, hopes and concerns" (*EG* 28), and stresses that people need to "find in their Church a spirituality which can offer healing and liberation" (*EG* 89). The synod responded to the pope's challenge by beginning a process of open dialogue and pastoral response, but found it difficult to move Catholic theology forward. In this book, R-B. engages in ethnographic research, listening closely to what lay Catholic women living with HIV and AIDS say about the joys and challenges of being married, and responds with a theology of marriage marked by mercy.

R-B.'s constructive contribution is contrasted to a traditional Catholic theology of marriage, exemplified by the USCCB's 2009 pastoral letter, *Marriage: Love and Life in the Divine Plan*. According to R-B., contemporary Catholic theological thinking on marriage stresses procreation, indissolubility, and self-giving. R-B. allows that Catholic theology of marriage has become less patriarchal and more attentive to the loving partnership, but stresses that this theology still "privileges the procreative over the unitive" meanings of marriage and has no allowance for divorce.

What R-B. finds in her ethnographic research leads her to challenge this vision. Central to book are R-B.'s conversations with eight women living with HIV or AIDS