

I cannot disagree with that point, but I do not want to open the door to the kind of continuing revelation that we find in Mormonism and elsewhere. O’C. says, “To deny revelation in the present is to doubt the active power here and now of the Holy Spirit . . .”. (114). And that is exactly the point that Mormon and some other apologists make. Now in O’C.’s defense, he does emphasize that the biblical canon is closed, which forestalls attempts to add later revelations to the status of Scripture. And he does make it clear that “the ongoing revelation *does not add to* the essential ‘content’ of what was fully disclosed through Christ’s life, death, resurrection, and the sending of the Holy Spirit” (115).

Second, as a Protestant I find most of what O’C. says about Scripture and tradition to be sensible and helpful, but not quite all of it. Of course, Scripture needs to be interpreted, and of course tradition, including what the Fathers called “the rule of faith,” shows us how to do that (144). I even agree that some sort of magisterium that recognizes, interprets, preserves, and formulates the message of Scripture is called for. But in my view the magisterium is not anything like a person or a committee of some sort sitting around a table. The Christian magisterium is the voice of the entirety of the people of God, past and present. My most serious worry is this: can we hold as *de fide* items from tradition that are not part of Scripture (e.g. the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary)?

Throughout the book, O’C. personalizes the issues in attractive ways by speaking of how revelation has affected the lives of various Christians. An Appendix to the book is dedicated particularly to St. Antony of Egypt (the founder of the monastic movement), Augustine of Hippo (the early church’s greatest theologian and churchman), and Girolamo Savonarola (the pre-Reformation Florentine reformer and martyr). The lives of all three were powerfully influenced by God’s revelation in the Scriptures.

Revelation is a wonderful book. It is orthodox, incisive, and well written. It deserves a wide reading by scholars and laypeople alike.

Stephen T. Davis
Claremont McKenna College, Claremont, CA

Jesus and Salvation: Soundings in the Christian Tradition and Contemporary Theology. By Robin Ryan. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 2015. Pp. xxiv + 248. \$24.95

The theologian Karl Rahner famously noted that human beings do not apprehend God’s mystery but rather God’s mystery “apprehends” human beings. This insight can likewise be applied to illustrate Christian salvation, since humans do not apprehend salvation but salvation apprehends them. In this widely accessible book, the Passionist priest and theologian, Robin Ryan, introduces us to the mystery of Christ’s gratuitous saving work, which permeates Christian existence and grounds its hope. R. engages the Christian Catholic soteriological tradition with admirable expertise and traces its historical development in order to examine “the ways in which the saving work of Jesus Christ has been conceived and articulated” (xiv).

This nine-chapter book can be roughly divided into three parts: the biblical foundations of salvation; the historical unfolding of the Catholic tradition from the patristic period to the twentieth century; and the most relevant issues in contemporary soteriological discourse. R. begins by offering a concise discussion of the key soteriological terms and images found in the Scriptures and reminds us of the wealth of metaphors and testimonies about salvation found therein. One of the strengths of these early chapters is R.'s ability to identify the central questions that must be addressed in order to better grasp the salvation that Jesus effects. In contrast to the tendency of some pre-Vatican II Christologies to reduce Jesus's salvific work to a single moment of his life, R. rightly insists that one must attend to the entirety of the Christ event—incarnation, ministry, cross, and resurrection—in considering salvation. Here, he relies largely on the work of Gerald O'Collins, Edward Schillebeeckx, and Arland J. Hultgren to offer a generally sound examination of Jesus's salvific mission. I wonder, however, about the historicity of R.'s assertion that one of the reasons that Jesus was not accepted in his native country was because the Spirit impelled him "to extend his mission beyond his own people" (27).

Just as the early church does not reveal a unified systematic understanding of salvation, the patristic period evinces a multiplicity of metaphors to illuminate, at least partially, the different dimensions of God's salvific mystery. R. carefully sketches the intellectual context that shapes the metaphors advanced by the early Church Fathers—victory, recapitulation, illumination, divinization, sacrifice, ransom—without attempting to artificially harmonize the different soteriological positions that these convey. In his treatment of Medieval and Reformation soteriologies, R. reminds us of the distinction between the images that seek to show God's redeeming action and the theories that seek to explain it. Here, R. focuses on the work of Anselm, Abelard, and Aquinas, and all but glosses over Luther and Calvin. While such limitation is common for a survey-like study, it signals that the book is aimed primarily to a Catholic audience. Hence, it is reasonable that in engaging modern soteriologies, the influential works of Rahner, Schillebeeckx, and von Balthasar are more carefully attended to. R. offers a concise but dependable treatment of these soteriologies and his assessment of them shows that his own perspective is closer to Rahner and Schillebeeckx than to von Balthasar. For R., von Balthasar's substitutional soteriology is problematic, since its "dramatic account gives the reader the impression that the Father is cruel in the way he relates to the Son" (125).

R. finally turns to the soteriological issues that challenge contemporary faith and existence: the aspirations of oppressed women and the crucified poor; our evolutionary view of the cosmos; and the Christian claim of Christ's universal salvation in a religiously pluralistic world. R. highlights the contributions of liberationist and feminist theologians, such as Gustavo Gutiérrez and Elizabeth Johnson, who insist on a comprehensive understanding of salvation that is personal, social, and spiritual. They see salvation as a process initiated by God that begins in history, confronts the reality of sin, and seeks the redemptive communion of all of creation with God. R. acknowledges the influence of Jacques Dupuis in contemporary discussion of Christ's universal

salvific role, but prefers Rahner's generous vision of grace and Christology over Dupuis's trinitarian soteriology (185).

R. not only offers a lucid and reliable survey on how Christian thinkers have and continue to reflect on the mystery of salvation, but also engages their work in a critical manner and offers the reader new insights and perspectives to assess their proposals and respond to the invitation of grace. The very richness of these theological themes and works exposes the book's necessary limitation, in that the material treated asks for yet further treatment. I do recommend this book to educated Christian readers, most particularly to theology teachers, seminarians, and graduate students.

O. Ernesto Valiente
Boston College

Resurrection: A Guide for the Perplexed. By Lidija Novakovic. New York, NY: Bloomsbury T. & T. Clark, 2016. Pp. 208. \$28.

Despite the generic title, this book devotes five of its six chapters to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Its longest (opening) chapter draws on Novakovic's strengths to expound resurrection hope in Second-Temple Judaism. N. sets out the language and conceptual-ity available for the first Christians when they made the unprecedented claim that one individual had been raised from the dead in anticipation of the general resurrection to take place on the last day.

N. generally handles well the texts dealing with the proclamation of Jesus's resurrection, his appearances, the discovery of the empty tomb, and (more briefly) the theology shaped by his resurrection. In dialogue with those who recognize the primitive character of Mark 16: 1–8, N. does not, however, recognize the full force of their argument. For instance, she fails to notice the significance of "you seek Jesus the Nazarene who has been crucified." He is not given any Christological title but simply his historical name; unlike 1 Corinthians 15: 3 and other examples of early proclamation, it is not said that he died "for our sins." Likewise, in discussing the fear and silence of the women who flee from the empty tomb of Jesus, N. does not advert to the work of Timothy Dwyer and others: in Mark's Gospel and elsewhere divine activity and revelation can appropriately prompt such a reaction.

When expounding John 20: 2–10, N. speaks of Peter showing himself "more courageous" because he entered the tomb first (91). This implausible remark about Peter's courage at that point in his history ignores the rich significance of the whole interplay between Peter and the beloved disciple in John 13–21. Like Augustine and many others, N. writes of Jesus "passing through closed doors" when he appeared to his disciples. Yet John 20: 19 does not say this, but simply that such a barrier cannot prevent the risen Jesus from showing himself to the disciples.

Yet, all in all, N. demonstrates a sharp exegetical eye for the Easter texts. My main concerns are more of a philosophical and historical nature. To present "the third day" motif as *either* a theological *or* a chronological claim raises the question: why not