

on the subject" (24). Kaveny focuses on issues of rhetoric and style, noting that because Vatican II said so little about moral theology, Catholic moralists have to look at all the conciliar documents and turn to "the spirit of the council" rather than any one particular text. Robin Darling Young examines the underexplored issue of Henri de Lubac's influence on the council, including the ways in which his efforts at *ressourcement* shaped the council's development as well as its eventual reception. Her essay touches on the dynamic between center and periphery as she traces the theologian's move from exile to embrace. Finally, contributions by O'Malley, Joseph Komonchak, and Massimo Faggioli all provide key insights for understanding the council holistically and for moving toward what Karl Rahner called "a fundamental theological interpretation of Vatican II."

*After Vatican II* is an excellent resource for those who wish to engage this new phase of Vatican II study. It introduces readers to the council's main themes and orientations and shows how each of its teachings can best be understood as an expression of those themes and orientations. Students and scholars alike will benefit from examining these trajectories, which continue to shape the church today.

KRISTIN COLBERG

*St. John's University/College of St. Benedict*

*Law's Virtues: Fostering Autonomy and Solidarity in American Society.* By Cathleen Kaveny. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2012. xii + 292 pages. \$29.95 (paper).  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2013.61

In this wonderfully engaging work, Kaveny, professor of law and theology at the University of Notre Dame, draws on broad and deep knowledge of both American jurisprudence and Catholic moral theology to produce one of the most insightful and important discussions of Catholic perspectives on civic life, and especially on the role of law, since John Courtney Murray's 1960 *We Hold These Truths*.

Starting from a nuanced pro-life stance, Kaveny views law as neither "fire-wall" (protecting individual freedoms above all) nor "enforcer" (ever ready to ban immoral practices). These prevalent but conflicting views, when dogmatically held, exacerbate current, sometimes bitter rifts in the public square, especially when church and civic engagement intersect. Inspired by Aquinas's (and, before him, Isidore of Seville's) multidimensional and realistic definition of law, Kaveny opts for a third approach: law as "teacher." That

is, law can foster virtue and possesses virtues of its own. Kaveny singles out as “law’s virtues” “autonomy” (as articulated especially by legal philosopher Joseph Raz) and “solidarity” (espoused by John Paul II), and she links these virtues to Aquinas’s emphases on prudence and justice, respectively.

This “third way” is, in my view, intellectually compelling. But it is also challenging. The reader will quickly find that law may be a great teacher, but, following Kaveny’s own example, clearly the students—the citizenry, including church leaders concerned with conscience formation—must “do the reading,” as teachers are wont to say, and think things through. With sustained attention to the American political and ecclesial landscape, Kaveny relates (without confusing) the legal and the moral dimensions of abortion, genetic testing, and euthanasia—three neuralgic but also complex issues. While Kaveny’s discussion of abortion and voting for “pro-choice” candidates may receive the most scrutiny from many readers, her informed observations on genetic mapping and testing in relation to probabilistic reasoning should not be overlooked. Not only have promises about genetics often been inflated or premature, but studies show that citizens are not very adept at probabilistic reasoning in relation to moral decisions—a point that should concern both teachers of ethics and, indeed, any educator trying to stress and situate for students the need for quantitative literacy, statistical reasoning, and the like.

Engagement of these life issues leads the reader to consider in particular two topics in Catholic moral theology that have entered into the fabric of political discourse: the category of intrinsic evil and the notion of cooperation, with its various moral qualifiers (“material,” “formal,” “immediate,” “remote,” etc.). Mindful of the need for careful distinctions and attention to context, Kaveny argues that recourse to these terms and concepts—for instance in the US Catholic Bishops’ 2007/2011 “Forming Consciences for Faithful Citizenship,” which she subjects to a masterful critique—is not nearly as helpful, much less definitive, for decision making as some would want American Catholics and others to believe.

*Law’s Virtues* discusses polemics and jeremiads but is itself not polemical. Kaveny is at once candid in her judgments on particular issues, and open to respectful dialogue and disagreement on what are clearly “disputed questions” in our day. Her sophisticated argument about law’s virtues and law’s limits might have been strengthened, for instance by an enhanced discussion of “autonomy” as a virtue (perhaps recalling Aquinas’s understanding of “love of self” in the order of charity), or by more attention to the plurality of theologies among Christians and others in the United States. But such suggestions are simply further reasons as to why anyone who cares about Catholic and other perspectives on law, morality, and religion in a democratic, pluralistic society can benefit greatly from this book. Lamenting the extremes of the

“culture wars,” and recalling law’s pedagogical function, Kaveny closes with the hope that “more Americans will try to be teachers rather than warriors” (276). I hope that more will try to be learners as well. *Law’s Virtues* can surely aid that sorely needed process.

WILLIAM P. GEORGE

*Dominican University, River Forest, Illinois*

*Peter Singer and Christian Ethics: Beyond Polarization.* By Charles C. Camosy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. vii + 278 pages. \$29.99. doi: 10.1017/hor.2013.62

Charles Camosy’s lucid new book on the controversial philosopher and ethicist Peter Singer delivers on its promise to chart a path for Singer and Christians to move “beyond polarization,” and, even more, Camosy demonstrates a remarkable facility to hew close to his theological commitments as a Christian while engaging the Other with both respect and attentiveness to difference. *Peter Singer and Christian Ethics: Beyond Polarization* contributes to a range of debates around abortion, euthanasia, nonhuman animals, and duties to the poor—the four issues at the center of the text—with well-reasoned, fair, carefully cited, and incisive argumentation. Since this reviewer has often found interfaith dialogue limited by a hyperfocus on points of agreement, Camosy’s approach to difference is particularly welcome. Camosy provides reliable and even robust descriptions of views with which he disagrees, as is evident in the sensitivity he shows throughout the text to the significance of Singer’s Jewishness.

The first four chapters of Camosy’s book each focus on a major ethical issue: abortion (chap. 1), euthanasia and the end of life (chap. 2), nonhuman animals (chap. 3), and duties to the poor (chap. 4). Each of these well-structured chapters outlines the issue at hand and then systematically proceeds to show where Christian ethics and Singer agree, where they disagree, and the precise issues on which those disagreements hinge. Camosy effectively represents Singer’s views in a compelling and persuasive fashion before detailing the inadequacies he finds in them.

The fifth chapter follows the same form but considers ethical theory as such instead of a single issue; this reviewer found Camosy’s defense of the doctrine of double effect particularly noteworthy. Like the previous chapters, the fifth chapter concludes by describing the unexpected scope of agreement—“both Singer and the Church value consequence-based reasoning while at the same time having an important place for moral rules”—but concedes that