

castration, eunuchs, holy transvestites, pederasty, and gender equality, thereby weaving into his work a contrasting thread that enriches our understanding of gender in the Mediterranean world. Eunuchs, for example, were as much an alternative to deeply rooted gender expectations as the discourse about them was an expression of deeply felt male anxieties. Castration and visions of a genderless community (the latter most pronounced in the Christian East) opened up a "possibility of gender ambiguity" (230), yet, at the end, proponents of these ideas were "not sufficiently strong in numbers" (291) to redirect the course of the Christian householder church. The new masculine ideal survived even the eventual collapse of the Roman empire. "Medieval Christian writers," Kuefler suggests in his conclusion, "continued to depict themselves in the images invented for men in late antiquity" (296).

What makes *The Manly Eunuch* such a welcome addition to the burgeoning literature that investigates notions of masculinity in the history of Christianity is the author's insistence on religious ideology as a force that grows out of and, in turn, shapes social reality. In this regard, Kuefler differs from Virginia Burrus's equally excellent publication, *"Begotten, Not Made": Conceiving Manhood in Late Antiquity* (Stanford University Press, 2000). Whereas Burrus's intertextual and playfully theological reading of patristic sources argues for a new conception of Christian masculinity increasingly divorced from materiality, Kuefler directs our attention to the interplay of ideological *and* material forces that shape theological debates about gender.

Björn H. Krondorfer  
St. Mary's College of Maryland

*Divine Economy: Theology and the Market.* By D. Stephen Long. Routledge, 2000. 321 pages. \$25.99.

Despite the embarrassing stretch of its advertisement's claim that this "is the first book to directly address the need for an active dialogue between" theology and economics, Stephen Long's book is an important contribution to what is becoming an increasingly pressing theological preoccupation. The subtitle, *Theology and the Market*, is also a bit misleading in that the book is not so much a sustained dialogue between theology and economics or a study of how the church can live faithfully in the market reality but rather a sophisticated methodological treatise on what would be required for Christian theology to maintain its own integrity in relation to economics. In order to be credible in relation to economics, theology must have something to say about economic exchanges. This goes against much of the tradition of Christian theology, which has denied the ancient Roman definition: "Religion is commerce with the gods." The notion that theology can exist in a zone free from exchanges is utopian. Life is exchanges. Therefore, theology must encounter directly the logic of exchange. There is no question as to *whether* theology is related to economics. The only question is, What con-

stitutes “a credible articulation of this relationship” (261)? Long’s primary concern is whether theology can construe this relationship in a way that does not destroy its own soul. Modern economics has gained exclusive rights to exchange. At issue is an undermining of these rights and a theological definition of exchange that can portray all economics as ruled by a participation in the divine exchange of love. Because Long is after the rehabilitation of theology as “the queen of the sciences” (270), not only must the autonomy of economics and other social sciences be denied, but they must also be ruled in the end by the logic of theology. Long regards a good theological performance of the relationship between theology and economy as one that will afford both church and market their appropriate roles. In the end, however, “the Church is the social formation that renders intelligible all other formations” (262).

This is not to say that one cannot learn here something about economic theory. There are sprinkled throughout the book unusually helpful disquisitions about classical, Marxist, and marginalist economic theory and very good insights about the historical conditionedness and development of economic theory. Long shows that in spite of its pretension to be grounded in nature, scientific precision, and mathematical exactitude, economics proceeds according to narratives. The burden of his argument is that capitalist narratives inevitably put in jeopardy the Christian narrative. Following the “radical orthodoxy” claim that theology cannot “outrason” but only “outnarrate” modernity and modernity’s child, economics, Long sets out to derive a Christian economics from the Christian narrative. The questionableness of his argument is whether his formal plea for the Christian narrative obscures a more poetic and concrete account of this narrative that conceivably would have been much more persuasive.

Alerted from the beginning that this work is aimed at the habilitation of theology in face of the threat of economics, the patient reader is presented a theological map of various ways to conceive this binary. Long proffers three primary approaches: the dominant tradition, the emergent tradition, and the residual tradition. These traditions are better known by the tags “liberal,” “liberation,” and “orthodox,” and in Long’s account they are respectively bad, better, and best. Their various accounts of the relation of theology to economics center around values, protest, and virtues. The criticism of the first two traditions derives from the standpoint of the last.

According to Long the “dominant” approach to theology and economics is wedded to the liberative traditions of modernity and does not fundamentally call modernity into question. It integrates theology and economics through an *analogia libertatis*. Although Michael Novak is the most extreme offender in this camp, Long includes other liberal theologians here with what, in the end, is an inadequate attempt to differentiate them. He argues that Max Stackhouse and Dennis McCann give a more prominent role to the market, whereas Philip Wogaman and Ronald Preston maintain the state as the central player. A careful treatment of these authors, however, would have to point out other more crucial differences in this assembly.

In the perspective of the “dominant” anthropology, the human being is fundamentally free to create. This shared understanding of liberty, it is claimed, as-

sumes a univocal account of human freedom and God's freedom. Once God is identified based on this univocal freedom, theology becomes too easily subordinated to a more certain metaphysics that Long takes to be the Weberian fact-value distinction lurking behind the modern social sciences. The dominant thinkers seek a universal ethics by eschewing the particularity of the Christian tradition. They construe theology as evaluating facts that are not contested or influenced by theology, except insofar as the doctrines of creation and original sin offer some modest limits to the market view of reality. The dominant thinkers, according to Long, problematize and downgrade Christology and ecclesiology because of their historical contingency. The result is a loss of traditional Christian orthodoxy.

The "emergent" approach is represented by Gustavo Gutiérrez, Jon Sobrino, Rosemary Ruether, and James Cone. All of these theologians are valued by Long for their criticism of capitalism but not for their failure to surpass the autonomy of the social scientific portrayal of reality. The liberationists draw on emancipatory praxis in seeking a cosmopolitan ethical protest against economics and church, often in the name of social facts devoid of theological reading. Gutiérrez and Sobrino diminish the role of the market and bring out some other institution wedded to justice. Ruether demotes both state and market in favor of the household and women's labor as central to the proper theological performance. Cone does the same with the black church and the black power movement.

By appealing to the "residual" tradition, Long wants to reestablish theology as a full partner in the discussion of economic matters on theology's own terms. The best chance of this, Long maintains, lies in theology returning to its traditional concern with economy, especially the functional economy of the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition in which everything about economy had a clear telos according to which nature had to be completed by grace and according to which daily exchanges were governed by the sacred and secular virtues. The three most important resources for Long's retrieval and reconstruction of a "residual" Thomistic theological economics are the thought of the Catholic economist Bernard Dempsey (Long's argument seems particularly strained here), the "aretological" philosophy of Alasdair MacIntyre, and the radical orthodoxy of John Milbank. The key is inheriting those traditions that (1) integrate nature and grace, (2) remain indebted to virtue, and (3) maintain the primacy of ecclesiology. Christology and the Trinity play the primary roles.

From MacIntyre and Milbank comes the well-known argument that modernity leads inevitably to nihilism. The modern market "produces a 'critical frame of mind' that reduces everything which is good, true and beautiful to a formal value based on usefulness and substitutability, flattening all hierarchies to formal equivalences. In contrast to this the church holds forth the possibility of an infallibly true, good and beautiful presentation of human action, incapable of reduction to the usefulness of its formal value" (262).

There is much learning in this book and much to learn by those who persevere to the end. Precisely because it does not fit the terms of the current debate, it will help clarify and enrich the disputation. But exactly at those points most crucial to Long's position there is surprising fuzziness, and often Long is satis-

fied with stating the *aporias* rather than arguing his own well-considered position. Several puzzles threaten the edifice of Long's argument. MacIntyre and Milbank do not fit so well together, and when push comes to shove, Long is closer to MacIntyre and indeed, in my view, makes the most important contribution in the MacIntyre section. Long tries to muffle the MacIntyre–Milbank disagreement on virtue because, if Milbank is right, then much of Long's position is undermined. Long is also troubled by Milbank's near collapse of nature into grace and by his Christology that so little emphasizes Jesus that it approximates Bultmann's Christology. This is problematic because the overcoming of the nature–grace split depends for Long on the incarnation. Long does well in pointing out the deficiencies of Milbank's poetic Christology but does not sufficiently repair the gaps. Would we not have to know Jesus fully in order to discern which "daily exchanges" promote the "charity which is a participation in God" (269)? Long rightfully understands Milbank's most important contribution to be his extensive treatment of gift and exchange. But in a book that so much stresses the distinctive economy of the church in its practices of virtue and gift we get surprisingly little description of these practices. Several times Long repeats Milbank's claim that we should revive pre-1848 socialism but without carefully describing what this was and why it ceased to exist and how it could help the church revive its traditional concern for just wage and just price and its condemnation of usury. Long offers only one instance of a mission beyond the congregation that might look something like Christian socialism. Long's aversion to eschatology (for fear of a theology of providence) may be one reason there is such a paucity of biblical reflection in the book, which, in turn, may contribute to the formal (nonnarrative in the simple sense) character of Long's argument.

Long quite rightly says that although economics begins with the church, "constant alliances" must be sought for the construction of "alternative economic formations" (269). But wouldn't the search for such alliances require a less antagonistic mode of doing theology than Long employs? Must there be such an agonistic way of arguing against agonistic culture? Much of radical orthodoxy is still at the proposal stage as regards economics, and toward the end of the book Long admits that Milbank's propositions are just a step in the right direction. Could there have been a bit more of this tentativeness in the earlier criticism of other options?

M. Douglas Meeks  
Vanderbilt University

*Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters.* Edited by Catherine M. Mooney. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. 276 pages. \$19.95.

In this volume from Penn's "Middle Ages" series, Catherine Mooney has assembled essays about eight of the medieval women saints who have attracted intense scholarly attention during the past several decades. Hildegard of Bingen, Elisabeth of Schönau, Clare of Assisi, Beatrice of Nazareth, Christine of Stommeln,