The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America (review)

Jeffrey D. Marlett

Journal of the American Academy of Religion, Volume 74, Number 1, March 2006 , pp. 238-241 (Review)

Published by Oxford University Press

might be parochial and self-righteous means that such imagining does not foster pluralism as much as Segal thinks.

It is a shame that Segal framed the book as he did. It is a thorough and thought-provoking study that stands well on its own.

doi:10.1093/jaarel/lfj040
Advance Access publication January 10, 2006

Gregory D. Alles
McDaniel College

The Lion and the Lamb: Evangelicals and Catholics in America. By William M. Shea. Oxford University Press, 2004. 402 pages. $35.00

The divide between Roman Catholics and evangelical Protestants in America surprises nobody. Imagining each other as demonic and politically subversive, the two communities have generated animosities that are well known and well researched. Surely, it seems, these two shall never meet peacefully until the Last Judgment clarifies precisely which side God favors. William Shea (Center for Religion, Ethics and Politics, College of the Holy Cross) contributes another study of this dichotomy and its conflicts. While this is familiar territory in American religious studies, Shea's approach and conclusions prevent this work from being a rehash of the usual suspects.

Shea juggles both historical and theological arguments, so the book offers neither a straight historical account nor solely theological reflection. He attempts an honest "historical-theological" study wherein the historical reconstruction of the past proceeds uninhibited and then yields its fruits for quite specific theological speculation. For him the two disciplines are simultaneously independent and intertwined. This methodological through media alone makes the book unique. Shea also asserts that the positive contributions each side makes to the broader Christian community suffer needlessly from the constant fixation on the opponent's diabolical otherness. So, far from being mortal enemies, Catholics and Evangelicals might benefit from listening to, not attacking, each other. Additionally, Shea asserts the necessity of considering the modern perspectives inspired by the Enlightenment since both Christian groups responded to its presence.

Shea considers these three "tribes" inspired by mythological understandings of their own past. He launches his inquiry with reflection on the 1993 meeting "Evangelicals and Catholics Together." The event's participants' willingness to look beyond the history of mutual condemnations inspired Shea to review that very past. Both made absolute claims about Christian truth, its sources, and the true community confessing it. Both sides rejected modernity for its corrosive attitude toward revealed truth: evangelicals enthusiastically supported the prosecution in the Scopes Trial, and the Catholic Church weeded out modernist clerics until the 1950s. Shea notes some differences, but concludes both reactions were mistaken. Instead, he thinks, the "best instinct of Catholicism and American evangelical Protestantism has been to embrace, support, expand on,

challenge, correct, and bless human culture – with all the possibilities of confusion and sin attendant on this" (p. 51). It is far better to embrace and learn than to condemn, despite the inclination to do so. After all, even Calvin and Trent admitted God's grace extended, on very rare occasions, beyond the limits they had demarcated.

Shea employs familiar biblical language to organize the book's contents. The first, much larger, section "Paul looks at Peter" expectably addresses the ways in which evangelical Americans have viewed Roman Catholicism. Shea considers political nativism a separate phenomenon from evangelical theological criticisms. Some of the best known anti-Catholic writers in American life—for example, Samuel Morse, Lyman Beecher, Josiah Strong, Paul Blanshard—certainly shared with evangelicals their cultural and political antipathy of Catholicism. Shea argues that some like Blanshard also appealed to secular modernists who likewise distrusted the burgeoning Catholic church (p. 80). American evangelicalism's roots in British Protestantism set the context for viewing the Catholic Church as both anti-Christ and a threat to the political order. New England Puritans' fear of both authoritarianism and anarchy influenced the no-popery flurry before the Civil War. William Nevins and Alexander Campbell, the Disciples of Christ organizer, both assailed Catholicism for being unbiblical. Shea also addresses the arguments of three Presbyterians (Nicholas Murray, Robert Breckinridge, and James Henry Thornwell) and three Congregationalists (Theodore Parker, Horace Bushnell, and Noah Porter) who assailed the Church's traditions, idolatry of Mary, and the Jesuits. In the twentieth century evangelicals drifted into two camps concerning anti-Catholicism. Following the most strident Reformation arguments a "hard" group represented by Loraine Boettner and Cornelius Van Til, who judge Catholics guilty of apostasy and thus not Christian at all. Meanwhile a "soft" group represented by theologians diverse as William Ellery Channing, Charles Hodge, and Gerrit Berkouwer think Catholics instead only commit heresy by rejecting the Bible for ecclesial authority (p. 141–85).

A shorter "Peter looks at Paul" includes three instances of nineteenth-century Catholic anti-evangelical polemic and a broad overview of twentieth-century Catholic assessments of Protestant theology. Bishops traditionally led the defense of Roman Catholicism; they generated ten pastoral letters during the nineteenth century that included addressing "attacks on the faith." Charleston's John England and Cincinnati's John Purcell responded to the attacks of Campbell, Nevins, and others in two ways. They argued, foreshadowing the work of Jesuit theologian John Courtney Murray, that the Catholic tradition could endorse the constitutional separation of church and state (p. 200). The bishops also denied that Roman authority extended directly to American soil, despite some embarrassing antidemocratic statements made by popes (p. 205). In 1876 Cardinal James Gibbons of Baltimore produced the popular Faith of Our Fathers, a stark refutation of Protestant polemics and an apologetic restatement of Catholic ecclesiology (p. 225–39). In the late twentieth century, following Vatican II's reconsideration of Protestantism, American Catholics realized that evangelical and fundamentalist Protestants still regarded them as apostates or heretics. This

stridency of "biblical Christianity" challenged the new openness just embraced by the Council. Only a handful of Catholic apologists, some of whom were converted evangelicals like Karl Keating, responded with similar vigor (p. 263–266).

Given the explosive material, simpler treatments might have involved partisanship or blanket condemnations. Shea attempts a nobler, and more intricate, project. Despite an occasional wandering, he reads these exchanges with discernment and imagination. He ably illuminates the emotional component generating passionate theological controversies. He amasses a formidable amount of research. Shea's work on nineteenth-century Calvinist criticisms are particularly strong. Shea's unmistakable Catholicism makes his efforts to take seriously these Protestant theologians all the more laudable. A former priest and faculty member at Catholic University, Shea's personal asides often aid his argument. The sections on mid-twentieth century Catholicism are thus expectedly quite good.

On the other hand, the shift in American religious history from grand narrative to bricolage rarely receives notice here. Captivated by a dualistic view of American religion divided between Catholics and evangelicals Shea sees only these groups. His sense of "evangelical" seems limited to Calvinism and its descendents. The Holiness and Pentecostal traditions find themselves—much like in mainstream narratives—along the margins. The Menace, a rabidly anti-Catholic publication that generated interest in the early 1900s, goes unnoticed. The role played by regional identity rarely factors significantly. Shea overlooks the ways in which stereotypes representing Catholics as debauched urban slum dwellers and evangelicals as naïve rural bumpkins influenced the theologies he considers.

While Shea clearly recognizes postmodernity's appreciation of location, he also wants to celebrate, and seems more comfortable with, the Enlightenment pursuit of universal and objective truth. Consequently the book's strong intellectual history sections are counterbalanced by perplexing personal comments. Perhaps, trying to imitate the evangelicals he finds so mystifying, Shea offers unsolicited testimonies to the grace present in his own life. At times he succeeds admirably, for example, his experiences teaching evangelicals (p. 189, 282). Elsewhere his facile dismissals of Republicans (p. 260) and Catholic theology as both ecclesial and ecclesiastical (p. 279) come close to casting his entire endeavor as merely unfiltered opinion. Conservative Catholics remain, much like Pentecostals, uncharted territory. Shea's construction of Catholicism thus suffers from the same problems confronting his treatment of evangelicals.

Shea enlivens his work by taking seriously both sides of America's strident theological polemics. At the same time, though, he wants to remain above the fray as modernity requires. Doing so, of course, precludes walking a mile in either Catholic or Evangelical shoes. This third "tribe" receives little attention, but exerts considerable influence. The work of Massa, Jenkins, and McGreevy, all of which Shea notes appeared after his book went to press (p. viii), recount much of the same American anti-Catholic material without the methodological baggage. On the other hand, Shea includes theologians the other studies do not.

That aside, this book should spark considerable discussion among both scholars and members of these two Christian communities. The work represents

the culmination of Shea's career. His work on Catholic anti-evangelicalism provides some crucial space for overlooked Catholic voices. Shea clearly relishes a spirited theological exchange. The book will certainly generate such events when used in the classroom.

doi:10.1093/jaarel/lfj041
Advance Access publication January 10, 2006

Jeffrey Marlett
College of Saint Rose

Loss: The Politics of Mourning. Edited by David L. Eng and David Kazanjian. University of California Press, 2003. 488 pages. $24.95.

Walter Benjamin observed that modern historicism is rooted in acedia or indolence of the heart before the losses of the past. Historicism, on this account, is positioned as a kind of melancholia, a pathological empathy with victors and rulers that impedes the ability to mourn victims and the oppressed. In *Loss*, David Eng and David Kazanjian gather eighteen essays to explore how loss has been "animated for hopeful and hopeless politics" (2). Alongside Benjamin's "*Theses on the Philosophy of History*," Freud's "*Mourning and Melancholia*" provides major theoretical stimulus to the collection. But whereas Freud considered normal mourning to involve progressive disinvestment from a lost object, Eng and Kazanjian argue that sustained engagement with the remains of loss may be necessary to creative engagement with the future. The essays are divided into three sections, inspired by Freud's sense of overlapping possibilities of loss: bodily, spatial, and ideal. In this division, the editors hope to explore psychic and historical modes of mourning that enable new objects, places, and ideals to emerge. In the introduction to the volume, each section is correlated with a cue: black bile with melancholic temper and racialized complexion; acedia with unattainable ideals that are yet experienced as lost, and finally melancholy with mathematical imagination and Cartesian objectivity. In my view, these suggestive images do not adumbrate the intellectual history of loss as successfully as the editors would like to do. But they work as mnemonics to the different "remains" the book addresses, highlighting loss in relation to ideological, religious, and national formations.

The individual essays are more successful because they deal concretely with the aversiveness and fecundity of remains. The collection encompasses diverse approaches that vary in scale and granularity. It includes histories from Thailand, the United States, South Africa, Armenia, Ireland, Viet Nam, and Cuba. Three essays focus on loss and reconciliation in postapartheid South Africa. Many of them treat wrenching texts and images, and they do so with critical attention that intentionally allows the past to flame up—searingly—to revivify wounds of loss as openings onto the future. For readers who are allergic to psychoanalytic theory, one or two of the essays, such as Vilashini Cooppan's study of Severo Sarduy's expatriate fiction, may be heavy going—although the play between fiction and Lacanian theory in that particular essay is deft. But