

into the fold people who might not explicitly identify as prison abolitionists. Although they criticize prison reformers for having “absolutely no appreciation of just how massive the problem is,” they also seem to recognize that not everyone who eschews the prison abolitionist label is a mere reformer. They write, “Whether you call yourself an abolitionist or not matters little. So long as you are committed to ridding your community of systemic forms of state violence ... then you are already allied with the abolitionist struggle” (53). Writing as someone who has published my doubts about abolitionism, but also about mere reformism, this concession is a welcome invitation to collaboration.

Second, Dubler and Lloyd do not flesh out their own vision of justice because they want “to allow for the broadest possible coalition” (17). They are clear that identifying justice with the law or with criminal justice systems is a stunted conception of justice and that “the existence of something ‘beyond’ [legal justice] must be affirmed” (17). At times, Dubler and Lloyd refer to “divine justice” or a “higher moral law.” They provide some discussion of justice as understood by restorative justice advocates, especially covenant justice. But they never advance their own vision of justice. Although I appreciate wanting to generate grassroots theories and practices of justice that are inclusive of all possible coalition partners, I wonder whether vagueness about justice might work against their purpose of coalition building. A secularist activist on the political left might be skeptical because one does not have to look far in the culture wars to find people on the religious right appealing to “divine justice” to impose their standards on the personal lives of others. Because of this risk, Dubler and Lloyd ought to spell out their understanding of justice more fully.

Overall, *Break Every Yoke* makes important contributions by illuminating the religious dimensions of mass incarceration, by inviting especially its religious audiences to “riskier and more exacting, but also more comprehensive, movements toward justice” (16), and by clarifying the possibilities of religion in the work of justice. It is a suitable text for university libraries as well as for classroom use, particularly in graduate or seminary settings.

AMY LEVAD

University of St. Thomas, Minnesota

Deep Incarnation: God's Redemptive Suffering with Creatures. By Denis Edwards. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2019. xx + 140 pages. \$24.00 (paper). doi: 10.1017/hor.2020.75

Edwards, an Australian priest and theologian, died unexpectedly in 2019 before the appearance of this book, based on his 2018 Duffy Lectures at

Boston College. He was an important Roman Catholic voice in the religion and science dialogue.

The Danish Lutheran theologian Niels Henrik Gregersen introduced the term “deep incarnation” in 2001. The concept expresses Gregersen’s extension of Luther’s theology of the cross. Gregersen holds that God’s incarnation in Jesus Christ is not just into an individual human being, but also into the whole of creation. Because the incarnation is radically “deep” in this way, it has implications for understanding the redemptive nature of the cross. Gregersen argues that the death of Jesus Christ reveals or is an “icon” of God’s redemptive cosuffering with all sentient life. Deep incarnation means that God bears with creatures the costs of the suffering involved in evolution (xvii–xviii, 1–5).

In the first chapter, Edwards briefly surveys both Gregersen’s original statement of this analysis and how Elizabeth Johnson, Celia Deane-Drummond, Christopher Southgate, and Richard Bauckham have taken up and used this concept in their own theologies. He concludes with a summary of how Gregersen has developed his ideas in recent years, including Gregersen’s thought-provoking suggestions that one can speak of the incarnation in strict, broad, and soteriological senses and that the whole of creation is the “cosmic body of Christ” (22). Edwards then, in chapter-long studies, brings the notion of deep incarnation into dialogue with the incarnational theologies of Irenaeus, Athanasius, and Karl Rahner. These chapters are excellent short studies drawing out the connections among incarnation, creation, and salvation (deification) in the thought of the respective theologians. The final chapter sketches Edwards’ own understanding of deep incarnation developed in light of these studies.

In this final chapter, Edwards makes several important claims. The first is well summarized in this quotation: “By the divine intention, the flesh assumed in the incarnation is that of Jesus of Nazareth in all its internal relationality with other human beings, with the community of life on our planet, and with the universe itself in all its dynamic processes” (113). In other words, the incarnate Word made flesh is co-constituted by its internal relations to the whole of creation.

Edwards’ second claim concerns the apparent contradiction between the traditional divine attribute of impassibility and the claim that God suffers with suffering creatures. He notes that some theologians maintain the traditional idea of divine impassibility and reject the idea of divine suffering, whereas others abandon the attribute of impassibility. Edwards proposes a third alternative, that a deeper understanding of divine transcendence can alter the traditional notion of divine impassibility. In reliance on Irenaeus, Athanasius, and especially Rahner, Edwards proposes that “a God who can freely and lovingly enter into the pain of creation and feel with suffering creatures is

actually more truly and fully transcendent than a God who is unable to do this" (113–14). A deeper understanding of divine transcendence, in short, shows that God can transcend impassibility. Although I completely agree with Edwards on what he wants to claim about divine suffering, I must confess that his "third alternative" seems to me to be a convoluted way of saying that God is not really impassible. It seems cleaner simply to reject impassibility as a mistaken assumption of Greek metaphysics.

Finally, Edwards argues that the cross of Jesus can be understood as "the sacrament of God's redemptive suffering with creatures" (117). This is implied by the idea of "deep incarnation" as well as by ideas drawn from Irenaeus, Athanasius, and especially Rahner (117–23). In turn, this seems to imply what Edwards calls "deep Resurrection," the promise that God will take all of creation into the divine life (123–28). This is truly a lovely analysis and conclusion, though Edwards does not address any of the usual objections to universal salvation.

Edwards' final book is largely accessible to advanced undergraduates, but may need some supplemental explanation by professors. It expresses beautiful theological ideas and is a fitting last testament to the kind and gentle spirit of its author.

THOMAS E. HOSINSKI, CSC
University of Portland

A Pilgrimage to Eternity: From Canterbury to Rome in Search of Faith. By Timothy Egan. New York: Viking, 2019. xvi + 367 pages. \$28.00.

doi: 10.1017/hor.2020.95

In deciding to take a pilgrimage in search of faith and an authentic spirituality, Timothy Egan took the road less traveled, the Via Francigena ("the way through France") rather than the much more popular Camino de Santiago. The Via Francigena is a twelve-hundred-mile route from Canterbury to the Vatican through four European countries—England, France, Switzerland, and Italy. It was established by Sigeric the Serious, an archbishop of Canterbury, when he traveled to visit the pope in 990. The ground rules Egan sets for himself are to stay on the ground, mostly on foot, but train, bus, and car are allowed. This book is a delightful combination of memoir, travelogue, and history that is published by a secular press. Why, then, is it being reviewed in *Horizons*?

Most departments of theology and religious studies have a required introductory course. At Bellarmine University ours is called "Ultimate Questions." I think *A Pilgrimage to Eternity* would be an excellent text for such an introductory course.