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of the Eucharist. He chooses to use the texts of a single Sunday, and these texts serve as the focal point of his commentary: there are just too many texts in the Missal (both prayers and readings) to offer a complete commentary, so a single parish Sunday celebration offers the basis for his comments. As he walks through the celebration, he deftly weaves theological insight with historical and ritual observations that offer a cohesive view of the Eucharist. The chapter on the Liturgy of the Word is particularly welcome, as it is rare that treatments of eucharistic theology study it within the context of the word of God proclaimed during it.

Laurance reveals his years in the classroom by his clear organization of the material, his use of images from poetry and art, and his use of brief conclusions for the first three chapters. This reviewer would have liked to have seen these conclusions at the end of each chapter. The book includes indexes of documents, Scripture, proper names, and subjects. As has been usual in the Lex Orandi series, there is no bibliography. The notes found at the end of each chapter give a sense of the sources and collaborators that Laurance uses.

The volume offers a good overview of current eucharistic theology, through the lens of a commentary on the celebration. It will be helpful in college courses and may serve adult-education gatherings as well. There are times when Laurance uses technical vocabulary, but he is careful to offer contextual definitions (see, e.g., “entelechy” above). The book is a good contribution to the literature on the Eucharist.

MICHAEL G. WITCZAK, SLD
The Catholic University of America
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It is safe to say that the work of the Nonconformist British theologian P. T. Forsyth (1848–1921) is mostly unknown to many theologians—especially Roman Catholic theologians—in North America and beyond. It is also safe to say that Jason Goroncy’s study may help to remedy this problem. For those who have the wherewithal to engage Goroncy’s painstaking exposition of Forsyth’s body of work, a reward awaits: an excellent discussion of a brilliant thinker on a topic often conspicuous by its absence in contemporary soteriology—namely, holiness.
Goroncy’s primary achievement is a meticulous dissection and exposition of Forsyth’s body of work to highlight the theme of holiness, heretofore overlooked in studies of Forsyth’s writing. Goroncy contends that sanctification—the “hallowing of God’s name” that is the first petition of the Lord’s Prayer—is not simply a gap within the literature. Rather, Goroncy argues that sanctification is the theological key to understanding the large corpus of Forsyth’s writings. Thus, Goroncy’s study can assist the scholarly community to approach Forsyth as a thinker whose body of work holds together as a whole rather than as a thinker whose writings, although brilliant, are disparate, fragmentary, and without a common thread. Goroncy explains: “For Forsyth, holiness is a moral power which constitutes and directs all being, binding a coherent universe in such a way as all remigrates to its source in God. . . . [Forsyth] consistently exposit[s] the claim that holiness is not merely a religious idea, but the religious idea, and one of utmost practical import” (53).

Goroncy makes his case in five chapters. Chapter 1 places this study within the landscape of the literature on Forsyth and then introduces Forsyth as a Nonconformist British theologian, who, like Paul, locates the cross at the center of Christian faith. Goroncy makes it clear that for Forsyth there is no understanding of salvation and sanctification apart from God’s self-sacrifice to destroy sin. Chapter 2 situates Forsyth within his context of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Scotland and England, and discusses his theological and ministerial training and maturing protest against the theological liberalism of the day. Chapter 3 examines Forsyth’s understanding of Jesus Christ as “holiness incarnate,” whose “confessing holiness to the Father ‘from sin’s side’ bears its judgment against sin and creates a new humanity” (5). Chapter 4 focuses on what Goroncy calls Forsyth’s “moral anthropology”—that is, the connection between sin, atonement, and moral living in which the human conscience is the privileged location for understanding what it means to be human, and where holiness is apprehended, divinely judged, and embodied. Chapter 5 concludes the study by examining Forsyth’s conflicted views on universal salvation.

Among these fine chapters, chapter 5 is the strongest. Here, Goroncy moves from a somewhat glowing appreciation of Forsyth’s thought of the previous four chapters to a more critical assessment of his theology. He astutely shows how the logic of Forsyth’s eschatology of sanctification demands universal salvation, even though Forsyth did not wish to affirm a doctrine of universal salvation. Goroncy makes a convincing argument that Forsyth’s thick theology of sanctification requires such an affirmation.

This is a book for scholars, upper-level graduate students, and those interested in an excellent technical treatment of a figure often ignored and a topic often swept under the rug. It is based on Goroncy’s doctoral dissertation and
as such is carefully researched and highly informative. It is also written in dense prose that occasionally becomes opaque with theological jargon, and the hardcover edition is so expensive it seems to be marketed only toward university and seminary libraries (both of which should add this to their collections).

It is an open question whether there will be a revival of interest in Forsyth that has a lasting impact on Christian thought, or whether he will remain an obscure figure consigned to the realm of specialists and historians. In the meantime, Goroncy’s thorough exposition of Forsyth’s soteriology on the theme of sanctification has paid off. This is an excellent study that will be of great value to the academy and (perhaps) beyond.

KEVIN P. CONSIDINE
Calumet College of St. Joseph
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This is the translation of an important book in metaphysics by Erich Przywara that joins philosophy and theology together in a systematic outlook on the whole of created being as it relates to the Creator. The original German appeared in the first half of the twentieth century, at a time when phenomenology was challenging the validity of metaphysics regarding questions of theology of any kind, whether rational or faith-based. It defends not only the validity of a systematic metaphysics of being as being for transcending phenomenology, but also the necessity of it for attaining a truly theological discourse regarding God as both Creator and Redeemer of humankind and of the universe.

The book focuses on a properly metaphysical *analogia entis*, and not any other loose analogy one might think of, as the only way of introducing an authentically theological turn in philosophy that is comprehensive of what can only remain incomprehensible to any rational inquiry, even as God intervenes in what the author refers to as the “original structure and universal rhythm” of created being. The analogy of being has long been the centerpiece for the philosophy of being where it joins with theology, rational or faith-based, and conversely where theology, again both rational or faith-based, joins with philosophy in its exploration, not only of what is comprehensible to us in our rational inquiry about God as Creator, or as First Most Universal Cause, but also of what remains strictly incomprehensible to rational inquiry about