

sheer movement, is impossible to circumscribe: “God is a nothin-ing, neither this nor that, neither here nor there, neither something nor nothing, neither substance nor subject” (85). Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are collectively shorter than their predecessors, marking a “shift” from theory to “lived enactment” (107). That is to say, they maintain that, for Kierkegaard, the so-called theological virtues of faith, hope, and love are actions of giving away, of becoming nothing—“over again, always again” (176).

The above synopsis may imply that Kline’s book is a fairly typical scholarly exercise, but it is nothing of the sort. Recognizing that the very nature of his project precludes hard and fast “conclusions” about Kierkegaard’s thinking, Kline attempts to personalize and, in a certain sense, to delegitimize his scholarly bona fides. *Passion for Nothing* not only incorporates his own (expressionistic, perhaps Rothko-esque) artwork, but it also includes a handful of informal written sections such as an opening “Attunement” and closing “In-Conclusion,” not to mention a general impishness with language (e.g., terms such as “(un)ground” and “in-completion”). Whether or not these features are attractive or off-putting (or even both simultaneously) will depend on the reader. Indeed, I found myself wanting fewer rhetorical flourishes and, at times, more scholarly gravitas (Kline does not provide cross-references to Kierkegaard’s writings in Danish, and he occasionally smooths over hermeneutical-cum-historical problems). And yet, I sympathized with Kline’s desire to harmonize form and content, and I appreciated the fact that, despite being a young academic, he was willing to take risks. *Passion for Nothing* is a puzzling yet intriguing text—one that advances an important thesis with one hand and erases it with the other. As Kline writes in the Preface, “Let all that follows be un-said into the gap—” (x).

CHRISTOPHER B. BARNETT  
Villanova University

*Authentic Liturgical Renewal in Contemporary Perspective*. Edited by Uwe Michael Lang. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017. x + 197 pages. \$26.95. doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.92

This collection of papers given at the 2016 Sacra Liturgia Conference offers an important glimpse into the thinking of those who support a “reform of the reform” for the Roman Catholic liturgy. Evident in each contribution is care about and reverence for the liturgy of the church. Contributors raise good questions about excessive verbalization in the current liturgy (Charbal Pizat de Lys 43) and about how the principles enunciated in *Sacrosanctum*

*Concilium* §1 themselves support the idea that the reformed liturgy should not be regarded as eternally written in stone (Stephen Bullivant 104).

In other places, however, writers offer claims that run counter to the facts. For example, in his essay Cardinal Robert Sarah (as of this writing the prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments) avers, regarding liturgical translations in the 1970s, that “we know that some of this work was done too quickly, meaning that today we have to revise the translations to render them more faithful to the original Latin” (13). Sarah says nothing about the well-known fact that these translations were never intended to be permanent, nor does he say anything about the ill-fated 1998 ICEL Sacramentary, which was more than a decade in the making and which was rejected by the Vatican prior to the promulgation of *Liturgiam Authenticam*. As an aside, it is worth noting that on the subject of translation of the Liturgy of the Hours, Alan Hopes writes that “complicated, convoluted phrases should, whenever possible, be avoided” (149). One wonders why convoluted or awkward translations should ever be deemed acceptable.

In places, writers offer claims that are not well substantiated. Pazat de Lys writes approvingly of a directive issued by the president of the Philippines Bishops’ Conference reminding Catholics to kneel after the *Sanctus*; Pazat de Lys contends that this directive promotes piety in the hearts of the faithful (50). This may well be true, but standing can also connote and express piety and reverence. Helmut Hoping argues that celebrating the liturgy *ad orientem* highlights the sense of eschatological expectation (30). This may or may not be true but, in any case, just three pages earlier Hoping writes that the memorial acclamations of the reformed Mass draw attention to the Parousia. That observation clashes with the general tenor of this volume in favor of the unreformed liturgy. There are problems as well concerning the question of liturgical inculturation. Sarah downplays the use of the vernacular in inculturation (8), and Pazat de Lys writes about the “preoccupation” with inculturation (41–42).

David Fagerberg provides a fine essay on liturgy and social justice, but the essay by Michael Cullinan (“The Ethical Character of the Mysteries: Observations of a Moral Theologian”) directs attention to the sacrament of marriage in a way that sidesteps any treatment of poverty, social justice, or racism. Curiously, Cullinan states that it is in this sacrament that one sees “the main intersection between the moral and the liturgical” (60). He also states that there are only a few Catholic ethicists addressing liturgical concerns (63), but he names none and seems only somewhat familiar with the fact that the Society of Christian Ethics has a “Liturgy and Ethics” group.

Alcuin Reid provides a careful reading of the original intentions of those who approved *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, but his analysis fails to mention the papal endorsement of the work of the commission that subsequently

interpreted and implemented the liturgy constitution in an address by Paul VI on November 19, 1969.

Finally, there is the matter of ecumenism. Sarah writes that the fathers at the Second Vatican Council were not intent on “authorizing the protestantization of the sacred liturgy” (7), and in a homily included in this volume, Keith Newton speaks quite disparagingly of Anglicanism (196). Neither of these writers expresses sentiments conducive to church unity.

I recommend this work to those who are interested in learning about the reform of the reform. I also recommend that this book be read in tandem with a work such as John Baldovin’s *Reforming the Liturgy: A Response to the Critics* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2008).

TIMOTHY BRUNK  
Villanova University

*Black Madonna: A Womanist Look at Mary of Nazareth.* By Courtney Hall Lee. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2017. xiv + 125 pages. \$20.00 (paper). doi: 10.1017/hor.2018.124

In *Black Madonna: A Womanist Look at Mary of Nazareth*, Lee lays the groundwork for a womanist Mariology that speaks to the everyday lived experiences of black mothers in the United States. Written in a prose style that is easily accessible, Lee’s work invites readers across the spectrum of Christian traditions to take on some of the most pressing concerns of our time, including the systemic racial and cultural biases that have contributed to the social, economic, and political disregard for black lives.

Lee’s book is divided into three parts. The first part sketches the history of black motherhood and black womanhood, focusing in particular on the time of American slavery, Jim Crow-era domestic work, and the enduring stereotypes of black women as the Mammy, the Sapphire, and the Jezebel. Throughout this section, Lee highlights the ways in which the experiences of black women have been laden with suffering and oppression.

Part 2 offers an overview of Mariology within the European Christian tradition, beginning with the biblical Mary and concluding with contemporary feminist theological considerations of Mary. This section also includes a unique chapter on Maryam, which gives an account of Mary as an honored figure in Islam.

In part 3, Lee begins to fashion a womanist version of Mary as the Black Madonna. The section’s first chapter, “*Stabat Mater Dolorosa: Black Mothers, Slain Children*,” is among the most provocative. Here, Lee compares and contrasts the experience of Mary mourning her son Jesus’ death on the