

conviction that Catholic ecclesiology cannot remain closed in on itself" (xv), and in that sense the "church with open doors" of the book's title may be all the work needs. But one also gets the impression that the authors have opened doors in a number of different directions at the same time; rather than ecclesiology *en conjunto*, a method of Latino/a theology highlighted by Imperatori-Lee, this is more ecclesiology *en paralelo*. In that sense one can see the limitations of the genre of the collected volume. While contemporary ecclesiology may, thankfully, have moved beyond the model of the single volume *De ecclesia* written from the limited viewpoint of a single theologian, we have not yet found the forms for a successful collaborative ecclesiology. Nevertheless, these essays, and the conference from which they arose, provide an excellent foundation for further development of such an ecclesiology, and perhaps it will be in the classroom use of the essays and of the work as a whole that a dialogical Catholic ecclesiology for the third millennium will continue to take shape.

BRIAN P. FLANAGAN
Marymount University

Did the Saviour See the Father? Christ, Salvation, and the Vision of God. By Simon Francis Gainé, OP. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015. viii + 232 pages. \$120.00
doi: 10.1017/hor.2016.75

In this new contribution to a classic debate, Simon Francis Gainé makes the case for the human Jesus experiencing the beatific vision (the sight of God enjoyed by the blessed in heaven) from the first moment of his earthly existence. To advance this position, famously endorsed by Thomas Aquinas, Gainé systematically tackles objections that have been voiced by its contemporary opponents, many of whom are Thomists themselves. These include a lack of biblical and patristic support, as well as theological objections concerning Jesus' faith, knowledge, freedom, and passibility. While the table of contents might not indicate it, this work is frequently quite technical. The primary intended audience seems to be other Catholic theologians, and by the end of his argumentation, Gainé declares, "For the Catholic theologian, the earthly Christ's possession of the beatific vision should be a moral certainty" (200).

Gainé's work will find a warmer reception among some theologians than others. The author indicates his own method and commitments in the first chapter, telling the story of this now-unpopular theory's predominance from Thomas' day up to the mid-twentieth century, and then calling for its

revival by arguing for a hermeneutic of “continuity” rather than “rupture” with the Catholic intellectual past. Gainé’s depiction of Thomism waning and then “collaps[ing] almost altogether” with the Second Vatican Council suggests that the true Thomism he wants retrieved is neo-Thomism, specifically (8). Although Gainé certainly engages with other Catholic scholars, his own method seems very much in “continuity” with this early twentieth-century school.

Perhaps not surprisingly, the work is notable for its rigor and clarity of presentation. Gainé’s meticulous research by itself makes this volume an important contribution to the field. The most effective of Gainé’s chapters are the penultimate two on Jesus’ knowledge and freedom, in which Gainé deftly wields Thomas’ principle of grace perfecting rather than destroying nature. He also makes a strong case for Jesus’ own beatific vision playing an important teleological role in our own (though why it should obtain from Jesus’ conception is often less clear). Other aspects of the volume are far less compelling.

While Gainé appeals to the Bible frequently, his engagement with contemporary Scripture scholarship is most often by way of suspicion. After expressing wariness about even the Pontifical Biblical Commission’s perception of a “post-resurrection perspective” in the gospels (20), Gainé seems to proceed throughout by presuming that the words placed on Jesus’ lips can consistently serve as windows into his mental state. By doing so, he shortchanges the role of the Evangelists’ theology. Gainé also insists on a strained reading of Mark 2:26 (in which Jesus names the wrong high priest), when even Ratzinger has recognized it simply as an error according to “a practically irrefutable consensus of historians” (Jared Wicks, SJ, “Six Texts by Prof. Joseph Ratzinger,” *Gregorianum* 89, no. 2 [2008]: 280).

As with Scripture, Gainé responsibly admits that there is at best “meagre” evidence for Jesus’ beatific vision in the Fathers, and thus makes the modest claim that the theory explains some theological puzzles contained therein. But elsewhere he makes startling leaps of logic, including the following head-scratcher that concludes chapter 3: “Though the Fathers are almost entirely silent about this vision, they were certainly not in the business of actively advocating an alternative account of the impact of his divine knowledge on his human mind. Thus, if the Fathers can be supposed to offer support to any theory at all, it can only be to the earthly Christ’s beatific vision” (70). And so, meagre evidence and all, he proceeds to refer to the theory subsequently as a “biblical and patristic doctrine” (74). Later chapters argue from what many readers will detect as an excessively dualistic anthropology as well.

The debate boils down to whether, in this respect, Christ became as we are *now* or as we are ordered *to be*. Gainé has done an impressive job of

compiling research and articulating the points of contention to set up his arguments for the latter and against the former. That said, the quality of the arguments themselves is troublingly broad, and the method employed will seriously restrict the number of Catholic theologians who end up “morally certain” about Gaine’s thesis.

BRANDON R. PETERSON
University of Utah

Resting on the Future: Catholic Theology for an Unfinished Universe. By John F. Haught. New York: Bloomsbury, 2015. viii + 232 pages. \$29.95 (paper).
doi: 10.1017/hor.2016.76

The discipline of theology prides itself on being a rigorous one, especially when it comes to systematic theology and its philosophical foundations. But those foundations, according to John Haught, are largely built on an outmoded cosmology and a prescientific understanding of matter and spirit. *Catholic Theology for an Unfinished Universe*, the subtitle of his latest book, *Resting on the Future*, indicates a need for theology to redefine itself in light of what science now tells us about our universe: it is unfinished. It is precisely the incomplete nature of the universe that challenges the future of systematic theology, because creation is not static and fixed. Since the universe is in the process of being created and thus open to the future, theology can never posit a complete systematic organization of the things of faith. Haught therefore describes his objective as “simply to acclimatize Catholic theological and spiritual concern to the new environment of a dramatic cosmos” (3).

There is perhaps no better scholar today to challenge the foundations of Catholic theology than John Haught. As someone engaged in the science and religion dialogue for over forty years, he is keenly aware that theologians have only marginally engaged the new science. His book is a concerted effort to initiate a “Copernican shift” in contemporary theology by turning our vision from the past and toward the future, that is, “toward the horizon of what is yet to come” (27). This new vision, he argues, is the basis by which the universe “can become intelligible to us” (27).

His principal mentor in this new vision is the Jesuit scientist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, whom Haught describes as “the most important religious thinker of the twentieth century” (38). Teilhard realized that the “world leans on the *future* as its true foundation” (27; emphasis in the original), thus challenging the static metaphysical foundations of the Judeo-Christian tradition. The author writes that no Catholic thinker has done more in the post-Darwinian period to integrate modern science and