

the quotidian, through address. It is as a result of this that the notion of faith becomes the important aspect of our *created* existence (rather than *reconciled* existence) as we respond to the address of God within the proximate contexts in which we find ourselves. Any deferral or distortion of this faith in God in both ultimate and proximate contexts is the root of evil and sin.

The second part of the volume, focusing on the eschatological consummation of creation, is far more conventional than part one. The ultimate context into which we are born is not simply determined by our creative relating to the triune God but is also determined by 'a second aspect, by God drawing all creation, and with it humankind, to the blessing of final consummation' (442). Whilst God relates creatively in the Father, God relates eschatologically through the Spirit. Proximately, this works itself out in a 'certain goal-oriented overall direction to changes across time in our social and cultural proximate contexts' (499). If faith is the attitude of the proximate context of creation, hope is the attitude of the proximate context of consummation. In this sense, the notion of the quotidian developed in the first part is used beneficially to suggest that the church should not lose its focus upon the everydayness of existence between the times. We should never be in danger of prompting the question, 'Why do you stand here looking into the sky?' Instead, God's relating to us by eschatological consummation leads us to proclaim, 'We are finite creatures empowered by God's call to be and to act, to give and receive in our own places and times.' (525)

In conclusion, Kelsey's work almost defies a simple depiction. Much like the author of the epistle of Hebrews I do not have time to tell about the exploration of subjectivity, election, sin and evil, biological issues, death, ethics and so the list continues. There is no substitute for the reading of a book and, if any book of the last ten years deserves to be read it is this one. If there are to be any overall criticisms of the work they are few and fastidious: the bibliographical material is all found in the second volume; there are too many typographical errors; Kelsey neglects to talk about the recent postmodern criticisms of 'gift giving' and those theological responses, even so far as not referencing the debates in footnotes; there is also an annoying tendency by Kelsey to use 'intentionality' in a phenomenological manner and yet misapplying the term. Nevertheless, such criticisms do little to diminish the importance of such an impressively thought out and well-argued book.

Jon Mackenzie,
University of Cambridge

*Eccentric Existence: a Theological Anthropology –
Volume Two*

David H. Kelsey

Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press,
2009, pp. 605-1092, £53.99 (incl. volume one), hb.

ISBN: 978-0-664-22052-5

* * * *

Within the first volume of his theological anthropology (reviewed above), David Kelsey was concerned to develop a structural account of anthropology which took into account not simply the importance of the relation of the human to the divine, but more particularly the relation of the human to the Trinitarian God of Christian theology. Once such a methodological move is made, one is not faced with a unidimensional narrative against which to relate the human person, but rather there appear three asymmetrical accounts of the ways in which God relates to his creation: 'as One who creates, grounding our reality, and its value and well being; as One who promises us an eschatological consummation and draws us to it; as One who reconciles us in our multiple estrangements.' (Vol. 1, 159) In exploring each of these relations as a separate (yet absolutely interrelated) scriptural narratives, Kelsey implies that previous theological anthropologies have been overly reliant upon a universal description of the *ordo salutis*, an approach which undoubtedly leads to reduction in one of his three areas of focus: creation, consummation or reconciliation. In this final volume, Kelsey turns his attention to the canonical narrative of reconciliation.

As before, Kelsey carefully delineates between those aspects of human existence which face all humans ('ultimate contexts') and those aspects of human existence which face us individually ('proximate context'). With respect to the narrative of God's relationship of reconciliation, the ultimate context of the human person is defined in light of the Incarnation: 'In the third mode of divine relating, the triune God's immanence is nothing other than God's being one among us as the incarnate Son to share with us his relationship with the Father.' (624) In light of this relating, the ultimate context of human existence is defined by God's response to the pervasive self-destructive, self-estrangement of the human person. Our ultimate context is, therefore, defined as *agape* and grace. It is because God relates to us in reconciliation by the Father sending the Son in the power of the Spirit that the destructive tendencies of sinful humanity are not our ultimate context but rather love and grace.

Consequently, in shifting to explore the proximate contexts in which we live, move and have our being, any account of anthropological flourishing will be in response to this ultimate context, a context circumscribed by *agape* and grace. 'The flourishing of human personal bodies' identities lies in their responding appropriately to the ways in which the triune God actively relates to them. The appropriate human response to God relating

to reconcile is a specific type of love to God and to fellow creatures.' (703). The remainder of the volume follows this schema, asking the questions, 'How we are to be in love to God' (Chap. 21A) and 'how we are to be in love-as-neighbour' (Chap. 22). Following these explorations, Kelsey goes on to define human freedom in terms of these relations: Christian freedom is 'not contradicted by also affirming that they are conditioned, dependent, and limited – finite – in multiple ways.' (846) It is here that we see 'eccentric existence' in its essence; it is only by recourse to the triune God of grace and love that the human person can 'be' at all in love to God and in love-as-neighbour. The remaining chapters of the volume explore the distortive effect of sin upon human ultimate and proximate contexts.

In making concluding remarks on such a *tour de force* in theological writing, it is hard to know exactly where to locate the real bearing of this work. It is undeniable that Kelsey's work is an example of a novel (and much needed) approach to theological anthropology. With his emphasis upon the 'quotidian' and the 'proximate contexts' of human existence, Kelsey has gone a long way towards righting the wrongs of previous theological approaches to anthropology. In light of this, the importance of his doctrine of creation in protecting finitude against its slow erosion into something like a reprimed doctrine of original sin cannot be overplayed. Nevertheless, there is something about Kelsey's offering which holds this reader back from unqualified eulogy. The work is long; too long, for it to have the impact it should have. In many senses, *Eccentric Existence* loses its way in the minutiae, falling into the temptation of becoming a systematic theology, and may die the death of a thousand qualifications. The author does not give the reader the dignity of being able to make 'mental leaps' on their own accord and so feels pressured to dot the i's and cross the t's in every chapter. Nonetheless, time will tell whether or not Kelsey's writing will have the effect it deserves within the contemporary theological milieu.

Jon Mackenzie,
University of Cambridge

*Martin Bucer's Doctrine of Justification:
Reformation Theology and Early Modern
Irenicism*

Oxford Studies in Historical Theology

Brian Lugioyo

Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, 256 pp.,
\$74.00, hb. ISBN 978-0-19-538736-0

SUMMARY

Brian Lugioyo portrays Bucer as a pragmatic negotiator of the Reformation who engaged openly (and secretly) with his Catholic colleagues without denying his strong and consistent theological convictions, especially on the doctrine of justification by faith alone. Lugioyo shows that the agreement on justification, as reached at the Diet of Regensburg, not only bears Bucer's signature but also reflects his earlier position as outlined in his *Romans Commentary*. Martin Bucer was, argues Lugioyo, therefore not a weak mediating theologian, as some say, but a consistent theologian with an irenic approach to reform. With his careful and comprehensive study, Lugioyo not only provides an illuminating account of the past but also a helpful interpretative framework for the understanding of the present ecumenical dialogue.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Brian Lugioyo präsentiert Bucer als einen pragmatischen Verhandlungsführer der Reformation, der sich öffentlich (und im Verborgenen) mit seinen katholischen Kollegen auseinandersetzte, ohne seine starken und stimmigen theologischen Überzeugungen zu verleugnen, insbesondere die Lehre über die Rechtfertigung allein aus Glauben. Lugioyo zeigt auf, dass die Übereinstimmung bei der Rechtfertigung, wie sie in Regensburg erzielt wurde, nicht nur Bucers Handschrift trägt, sondern auch seine frühere Position reflektiert, wie sie in seinem *Römerkommentar* dargelegt ist. Martin Bucer war daher, so Lugioyo, kein schwacher theologischer Mediator, wie einige behaupten, sondern ein beständiger Theologe mit einem friedfertigen Ansatz zur Reform. Mit seiner sorgfältigen und umfassenden Studie liefert Lugioyo nicht nur einen informativen Bericht über die Vergangenheit, sondern auch einen hilfreichen Deutungsrahmen für das Verständnis des gegenwärtigen ökumenischen Dialogs.

RÉSUMÉ

Dans cet ouvrage, Brian Lugioyo décrit Bucer comme un négociateur pragmatique du mouvement de la Réforme qui a dialogué ouvertement (et parfois secrètement) avec ses collègues catholiques, sans renier ses fortes convictions théologiques mais en les maintenant de manière conséquente, notamment sur la doctrine de la justification par la foi seule. Lugioyo relève que l'accord sur la justification atteint à la Diète de Regensburg, non seulement porte la signature de Bucer, mais reflète sa position antérieure telle qu'il l'avait exposée dans son commentaire sur l'épître aux Romains. Martin Bucer n'a donc pas fait preuve de