

and Hauerwas are excellent representatives of liberal and communitarian ethical positions, even if neither of them encompasses all that is entailed by either position.

The bulk of Horrell's study is taken up with a description and analysis of the central elements of Pauline ethics. He argues that the 'meta-norms' of Paul's ethics are most concisely described as the imperative of corporate solidarity and regard for the other. Within his discussion he offers a useful critique of other attempts to synthesize Pauline ethics, as well as comparing his analysis at all stages with Habermas's and Hauerwas's approaches to ethical discourse. It will come as no surprise for the reader to discover that Horrell concludes that Hauerwas's approach is much closer to Paul's than Habermas's.

Perhaps the main strength of Horrell's work is the fact that he is not overly dogmatic in finding correspondence between Paul and the contemporary ethical theories he is engaging with. Thus, in Horrell's view, Paul's injunction to 'do good' to outsiders and his recognition of the divinely ordained nature of non-Christian governing authorities challenges Hauerwas's exclusive focus on ethics as internal to the Church. Furthermore he notes that in Romans 14–15 and 1 Corinthians 8–10, when Paul most fully constructs a moral argument, his main concern is not to resolve the substantive ethical issue under dispute but rather to construct a moral framework of other-regard in a context of communal solidarity, within which a degree of diversity and difference can remain. Horrell contrasts this with Hauerwas's polemic against liberalism and insistence on his readers taking a particular ethical stance. Horrell argues that in this stress on an individual's right to choose their own vision of good life within certain absolute limits, Paul's ethics are similar to Habermas's, since both allow for tolerance within a framework of intolerance. Where they differ is in their intolerance: Paul insists on Christ alone as the basis for corporate-solidarity, but within Habermas's Discourse Ethics mutual agreement and discourse are required to determine the boundaries of tolerance. Thus Horrell finds points of solidarity and difference between Pauline ethics and both Habermas's and Hauerwas's ethics.

Solidarity and Difference is a stimulating read that is slightly let down by its forgone conclusion that Paul is closer to Hauerwas than Habermas. Horrell provides an masterful analysis of Pauline ethics and successfully elucidates many of the key themes. Within his discussion of corporate solidarity, it is striking that he does not engage much with the Pauline idea of being 'in Christ', a somewhat surprising omission. Although Horrell does engage with all the undisputed Pauline material he inevitably focuses mainly on Romans and 1 Corinthians, a move which although probably necessary is slightly disappointing. But overall *Solidarity and Difference* is an excellent survey of Pauline ethics that successfully engages Pauline thought with contemporary ethical theory, and as such Horrell has achieved his stated aim in writing this book.

TOM WILSON

DOSTOEVSKY AND THE DYNAMICS OF RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE by Malcolm Jones, *Anthem Press*, London, 2005, Pp. xiv + 154, £16.99 pbk.

There is no shortage of books exploring Dostoevsky's religious dimension. Classic studies by critics (Bakhtin, Murry, Girard), poets and novelists (Gide, Ivanov, Milosz), philosophers (Boyce Gibson, Sutherland) and noted theologians (Berdyayev, Thurneysen, Zander, Guardini, de Lubac) abound, with more being published every year. Why, then, do we need yet another?

There are two reasons. The first is its author, Malcolm Jones. An authority on Slavonic literature, Jones has written and edited several highly-regarded studies of Dostoevskian poetics and reception, one of which – *Dostoyevsky After Bakhtin*

(1990) – is among only a handful of Anglophone monographs to have been translated into Russian. Furthermore, his interest in the specifically *religious* aspects of Dostoevsky's work is longstanding.

The second is the difficult nature of Dostoevsky interpretation. The Russian pioneered what Bakhtin refers to as the *polyphonic novel*; in Dostoevsky's fiction – in contrast to his journalism – a 'genuine polyphony of full-valued voices' is played out. His characters incarnate points-of-view, and are granted full freedom of expression. Thus, e.g., in *The Brothers Karamazov* – a work intended (in the author's own words) 'to depict [. . .] along with the blasphemy and anarchism, the refutation of them' – the nihilist Ivan is given a tirade against 'God' persuasive enough to convince several of its commentators that its creator *must* have agreed. Elsewhere a drunken buffoon has an ecstatic epiphany of universal salvation (*Crime and Punishment*), a self-confessed 'ridiculous man' visits a prelapsarian paradise orbiting Sirius (*Dream of a Ridiculous Man*), and two epileptics – one a Christlike idiot (*The Idiot*), the other a suicidal engineer 'gone crazy over atheism' (*Demons*) – have presentiments of the beatific vision. Ambiguities such as these pervade Dostoevsky's *oeuvre*, prompting myriad interpretations; often as many as there are interpreters.

Terrains like these need expert cartographers, and Jones is well-suited to the task. His book is arranged as a series of six 'essays', the first of which serves as a biographical introduction to 'Dostoevsky's Journey of Religious Discovery'. We are guided through the formative religious experiences of the author's life before surveying the literary works most relevant to Jones' theme. As a means of easing the reader into perhaps unfamiliar territory this opening chapter is well-aimed and engaging, although one might question his assertion that 'the notion of *sobornost*', which was later to be so important to Dostoevsky' plays no significant part in *Crime and Punishment* (p. 13). The concept of *sobornost*, even on Jones's own definitions of 'the Church as fellowship under God' (p. 9) and 'togetherness or conciliarity' (p. 182), can be viewed as *the* guiding-principle of a novel in which the hero Raskolnikov (whose name is also a technical term for a member of the *Old Believers*, a schismatic group split off from mainstream Orthodoxy) struggles to reconcile the two halves of his divided self, succeeding only once he has confessed his crime and become acquainted to 'a new, hitherto completely unknown reality'.

The second essay is also introductory, giving an overview of 'the current debate'. Taking his cue from the essays collected in Pattison and Thompson's *Dostoevsky and the Christian Tradition* (2001) – 'a microcosm of recent critical literature on the subject' (p. 28) – Jones gives a concise and illuminating account of the field (most helpfully with regard to significant Russian texts, e.g. those by Zhakarov and Florovsky, which have yet to find an English translator).

One highlight – of many – in the next two essays is the speculation (after Mikhail Epstein) that the Orthodox apophatic and hesychastic traditions prepared the way for the forms of atheism rife in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Russia: a 'God' with neither attributes nor 'existence' is but a small step away from no God at all (an interesting analogue to Buckley's work on modern Western unbelief). This allows for an engaging interpretation of 'the notable examples of repressed spirituality expressing itself in distorted form' (p. 68). Jones proffers Kirillov's 'messianic delusions' (*Demons*) as 'a striking example'; we may also add Ippolit's hymn to Christ in *The Idiot*, and Ivan Karamazov's conversation with the Devil. Another major highlight is the discussion of Dostoevsky's frequent lack of *authorial authority*. As Jones puts it, he 'compulsively distances himself as author from his narrative voices in ways that almost always raise questions about the trustworthiness of the narrative itself' (p. 95). This fact, which has not gone unnoticed by theologians, has obvious and important ramifications for those concerned with his treatment of religious experience.

Essay V is given over to a lengthy examination of *The Brothers Karamazov*. Perhaps the greatest of Dostoevsky's novels, it is certainly the one in which 'the

dynamics of religious experience' come most obviously to the fore. It therefore serves as a fitting case-study for Jones' wide-ranging insights. Moreover, while theological attention has tended to focus on Ivan's 'Rebellion' and 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor', Dostoevsky himself regarded 'A Russian Monk' (detailing the life and teachings of the *starets* Zosima) as the book's theological and moral centrepiece. Jones's discussion, while by no means neglecting Ivan, restores this text to its rightful place.

Dostoevsky and the Dynamics of Religious Experience strikes the right balance between accessibility and analytical rigour. It is a very fine book, bridging the often gaping chasm between what literary critics have to say about Dostoevsky and what theologians do. It will, I am sure, be widely read and digested by both.

STEPHEN BULLIVANT

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS AND THEIR COMPLEMENTARY NORMS: A COMPLETE ENGLISH TRANSLATION OF THE OFFICIAL LATIN TEXTS translated by Carl J. Moell, S.J [Number 15 in Series I: Jesuit Primary Sources in English Translation], The Institute of Jesuit Sources, St. Louis, Missouri, 1996, Pp. 502, \$35.95 cloth

The year 2005 marked the 465th anniversary of the first pontifical approval of the Formula of the Institute of the Society of Jesus by Pope Paul III in 1540. It also anticipated the Jesuit Jubilee Year in 2006 commemorating the death of St. Ignatius (1556) and the births of both St. Francis Xavier (1506) and Blessed Peter Faber (1506).

This translation of the *Constitutions* of the Society of Jesus in 502 pages, including the index, probably escaped the notice of many in the Church when it first came out. Most literate Catholics do not know it is available to them as easily as the Rule of St. Benedict or the documents of Vatican II. It is an English version of the official Latin text entitled *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu et Normae Complementariae*.

Historically, Catholic institutes were protective of their internal documents, and such documents were kept secret from their enemies, thus indirectly hiding them from their friends. Vernacular translations were mistrusted and restricted in the remote past. Jesuit readers were familiar with the 1970 translation of their *Constitutions* published by Father George E. Ganss, S.J., but it was circulated almost privately. The current translation bases itself on this one, with revisions. Here under the general editorship of John W. Padberg, S.J., we have every minute particle of Jesuit legislation made available for the entire world to read.

A General Congregation is the supreme legislative body of the Society of Jesus. These Congregations are called periodically for specific purposes, similar to what monastics and others call their 'Chapter' meeting. The last Jesuit General Congregation met in Rome in early 1995. It was the thirty-fourth since the first one of 1558 which originally approved the *Constitutions*. Because newer particular law can modify the *Constitutions*, this General Congregation mandated certain precise revisions of the particular law of the Society, conforming it to the requirements of universal ecclesiastical law as well as other additions decreed in 1995. The next Congregation is scheduled for January, 2008, and it will elect a new superior general.

At the conclusion of the task of revising the *Constitutions*, the results were published in an official Latin version in two sections. In the first is given the 'original Ignatian text' of the *Constitutions* of the Society along with notes that have been appended to that text by authority of the various General Congregations. These notes indicate which parts of the *Constitutions* the general law of the Church or decisions of General Congregations of the Society have abrogated, modified, augmented, refined, or clarified over the course of time. The second section of the Latin text contains the 'norms complementary to the *Constitutions*,' expressions of