

of the field Negro” remains implicit. But I suspect that this is intentional. We cannot know now, and should not presume to speculate, what this revolutionary religion might be were it cultivated and allowed to grow freely. Lloyd exhorts Black theologians to reclaim their radical roots and resume the intellectual labor needed to prepare the field for planning, for planting and, perhaps one distant day, for harvesting.

KAREN TEEL

*University of San Diego*

*The Church of God and Its Human Face: The Contribution of Joseph A. Komonchak to Ecclesiology.* By Martin Madar. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2019. xviii + 199 pages. \$27.00 (paper).

doi: 10.1017/hor.2020.67

Though a giant of North American ecclesiology, Joseph Komonchak has never written a monograph that definitively outlines his ecclesial vision. Martin Madar, who wrote his dissertation on Komonchak after taking a class with him, hopes to fill that lacuna. As the author recounts, although ecclesiology often appeared strangely abstract to him, “Not until I encountered the writings of Joseph Komonchak did the strangeness of ecclesiology begin to fade away” (164). For Madar, Komonchak’s ecclesial realism, his ability to balance a church of *God* and its *human* face, stands as his chief theological achievement.

To capture this achievement, Madar charts Komonchak’s thought with both nuance and depth. The book’s second chapter outlines influences on him: the Second Vatican Council, his study under Bernard Lonergan, American Protestant theologians such as James Gustafson interested in balancing the church’s human and divine character, and social theorists such as Peter Berger who furnished helpful categories for understanding the church. The third chapter summarizes incisively the foundations that Komonchak has attempted to supply postconciliar ecclesiology. Lonergan has made Komonchak sensitive to the need for a *systematic* ecclesiology that integrates first-order images and “models” of the church. In approximating that aim, Komonchak warns against false dichotomies between the *gift* of the church and our active *task* to enact it. So too, relatedly, Komonchak dismisses a “theological reductionism” that would abstract ecclesiology from a concrete set of Christian believers. For Komonchak, the “central challenge of ecclesiology is ... how to understand the church as one reality comprising two dimensions: human and divine” (75). As Madar’s first chapter illustrates, this question has plagued ecclesiology

throughout the second millennium, especially after the Second Vatican Council.

The rest of the third chapter rehearses Komonchak's solution. Beneath all descriptive images of the church, Komonchak's foundational appellation for the church is a "*congregatio* or *convocatio fidelium*" (77). As a gathering, the church can be understood as a social reality, an "us." And yet, the *fidelium* that enflames this *congregatio* distinguishes the church as an "us" gathered through the common gift of a divine grace that precedes us. Thus, the church takes on an "event" character as we actively and collectively realize this gift throughout our daily lives. Because of the ongoing, and so incomplete, character of this task, Komonchak believes that, rather than understanding it as incarnational (as does *Lumen Gentium* §8), the church is sacramental. Madar proffers that this claim strikes a balance between a church of God and its human face most effectively (88). Methodological implications follow: because the church is inescapably human, any responsible systematic ecclesiology must incorporate categories from the social sciences and history. The book's final two chapters demonstrate how Komonchak's ecclesiology informs his studies on the local church and ecclesial authority.

Madar achieves a difficult task in synthesizing the work of one he rightly calls "a visionary, deserving a distinguished place" (164) and "a master of balance" (165). Given Komonchak's legacy, this book deserves study in graduate seminars in ecclesiology; after all, no ecclesiology class worth its salt can leave his work untouched. One wonders, however, why Madar devotes only two paragraphs to Komonchak's understanding of the church as a "redemptive community" (87). Komonchak's wedding of ecclesiology with soteriology through Lonergan's theology of history stands as a breakthrough achievement; indeed, Komonchak spends a sizeable portion of his *Foundations of Ecclesiology* spelling out the implications of this claim for understanding ecclesial mission. Here, Madar could have also integrated Komonchak's penetrating analysis of the tensions during the drafting of *Gaudium et Spes* that have shaped the church's mission since the Second Vatican Council; this work receives no mention in the book. To have made room for it, perhaps Madar might have shortened his first chapter, which occupies almost a third of the book to relay a standard historical narrative of ecclesiology. So too might have Madar further discussed the relevance of Komonchak's insights for our current ecclesiological landscape. Although his book is largely expository, Madar does occasionally provide such commentary; in particular, he believes that Komonchak can provide significant foundations for Pope Francis' retrieval of ecclesial synodality (102, 139, 151). Readers are left wanting for more contemporary applications like these. We can

only hope that people like Madar continue to carry Komonchak's torch into the future.

LUCAS BRIOLA  
*Saint Vincent College*

*To Be Perfect Is to Have Changed Often: The Development of John Henry Newman's Ecclesiological Outlook, 1845–1877.* By Ryan J. Marr. New York: Lexington Books, 2018. xxxviii + 195 pages. \$100.00.

doi: 10.1017/hor.2020.81

Let the phrase *De Ecclesia* represent a treatment of the nature of the Catholic Church. Since the Middle Ages, *De Ecclesia* manuals (seminary textbooks) proliferated. The toughest struggle at Vatican II was between the original schema on the church sent to the arriving bishops, drafted largely by Jesuit professor Sebastian Tromp, reflecting the Roman manuals of the 1950s, and what became the final Dogmatic Constitution on the church, *Lumen Gentium*, reflecting the wishes of the majority of the bishops and the important work of theologians, especially Yves Congar, OP, and Gérard Philips of Louvain. St. Thomas Aquinas never wrote a *De Ecclesia*, nor did Cardinal Newman in the nineteenth century, even though in the vast writings of both theologians the nature of the church is operative, especially in Newman. Extended treatments of Newman's ecclesiology, as opposed to studies of this or that aspect of it, have been rare. Willem van de Pol's 1936 *De Kerk in het Leven en Denken van Newman (The Church in Newman's Life and Thought)* seems to be the first, but not many treatments have followed. We welcome Ryan Marr's book to this short list.

Marr brings a distinctive thesis to Newman's *De Ecclesia*. His is not just a single, somewhat static ecclesiology but several ecclesiologies because Newman's thinking changed during his years as a Roman Catholic. During Newman's Anglican years, such a thesis is not surprising. Newman took with him a very evangelical view of the church when he went up to Oxford in December 1816, but when he wrote *Tract 90* in 1841 his view was distinctly Roman Catholic, and between these two periods he underwent significant changes in conceiving the nature of the church. Marr argues that the same reality operates in Newman after 1845, hence the title of his book, *To Be Perfect Is to Have Changed Often*, the famous line from Newman book on *Development of Doctrine*.

To elaborate his thesis depicting Newman's thought, Marr takes the familiar word "ultramontanism" (a defense of papal prerogatives against those minimizing them) and coins two phrases to portray Newman: *moderate*