

edge of a more acute interpretive point that she might have turned to better advantage.

Costley King'oo's argument strengthens, however, in chapters 2 through 5, where she considers the exegeses and paraphrases of the Psalms and parodies of figures as diverse as John Fisher, Luther, Erasmus, Wyatt, and Gascoigne. She is at her most erudite while arguing for the persistent centrality of the Penitential Psalms to Protestantism, despite its turn away from the sacrament of penance toward a doctrine of justification by grace. Her trenchant analysis of Luther's exploration of *metanoia* or radical spiritual conversion in *Die sieben Bußpsalmen* (1517) enlivens what has become a cliché of Davidic mimesis, organized around the psalmist's status as archetypal penitent, in some recent studies of the Psalms. Her revisionist account of Wyatt's English adaptation of Aretino's Italian meditation on the Penitential Psalms clarifies that, "whereas in the ritualized paraphrases [of the Middle Ages] the Penitential Psalms require identification and self-effacement on the part of those who read or hear them, in Wyatt's fiction they beg for interpretation and analysis instead" (119). An appendix (193–97) resolves, definitively, a bibliographical conundrum surrounding the publication circumstances of Wyatt's paraphrase.

MICHAEL P. KUCZYNSKI  
Tulane University

*Jacques Dupuis Faces the Inquisition: Two Essays by Jacques Dupuis on "Dominus Iesus" and the Roman Investigation of His Work.* By William R. Burrows. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012. xi + 197 pages. \$25.00 (paper).  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2013.56

This theologically engaging and provocative book is described by the author, William Burrows, as "a posthumous chance [for Jacques Dupuis] to answer his critics in a way that he was denied during his lifetime" (xi). While the book consists of four chapters, chapters 2 and 3 are the heart of the book. According to Burrows, these two chapters were originally "composed by Dupuis as epilogues to his last book, *Christianity and the Religions: From Confrontation to Dialogue*" (xiv), but in obedience to his religious and ecclesiastical superiors he did not publish them. The other two chapters were written by Burrows.

In the first chapter, Burrows provides concise historical information about his experiences with Dupuis as well as the process through which he produced this book. In the final chapter, Burrows articulates his own theological

assumptions and propositions relative to the issues discussed by Dupuis, as well as how he understands Dupuis, whom he considers a “conservative revisionist” (116).

Dupuis makes it clear in chapters 2 and 3 that *Dominus Iesus* (DI) was crafted to attack his [Dupuis’s] theological assumptions (30, 41, 74, etc.). In his response, Dupuis poignantly addresses the question, who is a better interpreter or is more authentically interpreting the theological developments in the church? Dupuis identifies two theological groups. The first includes those represented by DI, and the second is comprised of those represented by the documents of Vatican II, *Redemptoris Missio*, the International Theological Commission, and John Paul II. Dupuis conclusively argues that the second group more authentically and faithfully interprets the theological developments in the church. Burrows identifies DI and its antiprogressive stance as the primary project of the “Renewal in Continuity” school represented by then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, now pope emeritus Benedict XIV (105).

Chapter 3 contains Dupuis’s response to the inquisitorial notification of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF). He refused to sign the first draft of the notification on the grounds that the errors alleged by the notification did not reflect the content of his book. Therefore, about a year later, the CDF presented Dupuis with a second version of the notification. Dupuis hesitantly signed the second notification, because although he believed its interpretation of his work remained incorrect and failed to reflect the content of his work (78), it did not accuse his work of doctrinal error (77). Rather, the second version of the notification accused his book of “notable ambiguities and difficulties on important doctrinal points” (165).

In his rebuttal of this notification as well as the content of DI, Dupuis argued that the theological propositions of his book are more authentically Christian and in better keeping with theological developments in the Catholic Church on the questions of the global influence of the Spirit, the salvation of non-Christians through Christ, and the salvific value of other religious traditions to their adherents than are the content of both DI and the notification. Burrows unequivocally states that the critics of Dupuis, including the CDF, “have not fully grasped what he [Dupuis] was about” (104).

The courage and fidelity to truth of William Burrows must also be appreciated. To my mind, Burrows’s commitment to clarifying Dupuis’s prophetic theological contribution and to enriching Catholic and Christian theology of religions with this book is a courageous manifestation of academic freedom and of the mission to theological truth, truth that might have been lost because Dupuis was obliged to an ecclesiastical silence sustained by a paradigm of emasculating obedience.

Wherever the truth of what Dupuis says in this book is appreciated, Burrows's courage and commitment to upholding truth as certified in one's conscience will vociferously resonate. This book is a must-read for all who advocate or wish to understand the theology of inclusive pluralism made popular by Jacques Dupuis.

MARINUS C. IWUCHUKWU  
*Duquesne University*

*Kierkegaard's Kenotic Christology*. By David R. Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. xi + 315 pages. \$125.00.  
doi: 10.1017/hor.2013.57

The year 2013 marks the two-hundredth anniversary of Søren Kierkegaard's birth, and the array of bicentennial events being held across the world—from Japan and Australia to Denmark and the United States—underscores Kierkegaard's ongoing importance as a thinker. What draws people to Kierkegaard has always varied. For some it has been his critique of Hegelian *Wissenschaft*, for others his vigorous refusal to conflate Christianity and culture; still others have admired his literary flair and enigmatic use of pseudonyms. This complexity may account for the wave of introductions to Kierkegaard that have emerged in recent years: the survey has become the preferred *commentaire* on the Dane's work, providing a bird's-eye view of its unique problems and themes.

Into this situation steps David R. Law's new book, *Kierkegaard's Kenotic Christology*. By no means a précis, it homes in on a particular aspect of Kierkegaard's work, namely, his Christology and its relation to the kenotic Christology of the nineteenth century. The result is a distinct (and welcome) contribution to the secondary literature on Kierkegaard.

Law announces his thesis at the outset: "My contention is that Kierkegaard offers an original and significant contribution to kenotic Christology. ... Like many of the kenotic theologians of the nineteenth century Kierkegaard argues that Christ undergoes a limitation on becoming a human being. Where he differs from his contemporaries is in emphasizing the radical nature of this limitation and in bringing out its existential consequences" (1). This argument is borne out over six chapters. The first two chapters—which, indeed, could be profitably read on their own, since they respectively serve as synopses of Kierkegaard's relation to Christian doctrine and of the development of kenotic Christology in general—lay the groundwork for an in-depth investigation of Kierkegaard's Christology. Chapter 3 examines