the title; even the chapters that focus on nations with global empires, the subject is Europe. However, the new material and fresh perspectives here enrich our understanding of the subjects considerably, and I recommend it.

Kathleen M. Comerford

Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, USA

kcomerfo@georgiasouthern.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00703008-01

Peter H. Sedgwick

The Origins of Anglican Moral Theology. Anglican–Episcopal Theology History Series, 3. Leiden: Brill, 2019. Pp. x + 427. Hb, \$179.00. Pb, \$79.00.

In *Some Principles of Moral Theology* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1920) and *Conscience and Its Problems* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927), Bishop Kenneth Kirk described Anglican moral theology in the key of conscience and casuistry and prompted considerable attention among English-speaking Anglican and Roman Catholics. Kirk argued that Anglican moral theology was a pastorally sensitive, personally oriented, more virtue than action-based ethics, deeply connected to the right realization of the dedicated Christian and at the same time dependent on a form of moral reasoning called “casuistry” or “the case method” that aims to determine a specific course of action when faced with a fairly challenging situation. Kirk’s proposal was noteworthy inasmuch as his contemporary Roman Catholic moralists, like Fritz Tillman and Dom Odon Lottin, were calling for a new morality that would repudiate most of the casuistry that Roman Catholics had been doing. Ironically, an Anglican was suggesting that casuistry was redeemable and could work just fine in a more personalist context particularly when Roman Catholics had neither a viable casuistry nor as yet a personalist ethics.

Kirk’s works prompted scholars like Henry McAdoo, Elliot Rose, and Kevin Kelly to investigate how early Anglican moral theology developed, and after their works, others like Albert Jonsen, Stephen Toulmin, Thomas Shannon, Edmund Leites, Robert Maryks, Nigel Biggar, and myself began giving casuistry a second look, and in particular, at the ways that Roman and Anglican Catholics used it.

Now with Peter H. Sedgwick’s foundational text, we have not only the genealogy of Anglican moral theology but also the emerging developments that assured a very distinctive Anglican one that made possible a more integrated and fairly contemporary ethics that Roman Catholicism has been struggling to

express for the past forty years. Through his investigations we have a narrative that by looking to the past helps us approximate where we need to go in the present if we are to have a model ethics for the future. In fact, one could say that Sedgwick's proposals line up nicely with the recent contributions of Pope Francis in his apostolic exhortation *Amoris laetitia*, on discernment and accompaniment.

In his investigations, Sedgwick rightly acknowledges the deep Thomistic foundations of Anglican moral theology, after he briefly nods to the priority of intentionality in Abelard, an insight robustly developed by Thomas, whose interest in a virtue-based natural law makes the development of conscience and an intention guided by prudence an integrated, lived reality. Then Sedgwick turns to the shifts accomplished by the Franciscans, Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, who are more interested in the particular than the universal, which naturally leads to the Scotsman, John Mair, whose nominalism affected many, but in a particular way, the first founders of the Society of Jesus who studied with Mair in Paris.

Mair helps Jesuits and others who later develop casuistry to attend to the particular, considering how one singular circumstance as opposed to another affects the morality of a course of action. Specificities and not generalities are the stuff of the moral landscape of the sixteenth century: challenges regarding trade with the Far East and explorations and conquests in the Americas raise a host of challenges that existing moral rules never considered. At the same time the Protestant Reformation, in its many manifestations, unsettles many dedicated Christians who, in a time of persecution, try to determine legitimate moral compromise through safe but labyrinthine pathways.

Within Roman Catholicism, Jesuit casuists and others provided moral guidance to the clergy who in turn guided penitents in the confessional, where most problematic moral matters were resolved. The confessor helped the laity develop their conscientious courses of action.

At the same time, Jesuits and other orders (Dominicans and Theatines in particular), wrote ascetical and devotional manuals for Christians seeking to realize their Christian vocation by drawing closer to God. I call these texts Christian directories after the title used by Robert Persons, because they are developed to direct the Christian into ways of self-understanding, discernment, and decision-making. These texts were extraordinarily popular and helpful and crossed confessional boundaries: for instance, Robert Persons's *Christian Directory* was a "best-seller" among Roman Catholics as well as Puritans and Anglicans and later even among Lutherans.

While Roman Catholic laity read the directories and confessors their cases of consciences, the genius of the Anglicans, according to Sedgwick, was that

they did not separate the two manuals. Rather with the directories as foundational they guided their readers from spiritual discernment into a moral context by eventually giving them the ethical cases directly and not through the mediation of a confessor. Here too the Christian became more active in developing her/his conscience, not through the confessional screen but by an accompanying pastoral presence who encouraged the individual's formation of conscience through the practices of these integrated directories and casuistries.

Moreover, inasmuch as the directories often enjoyed biblical foundations, these more integrated texts of the Anglicans eventually developed a moral guidance much more rooted in Scripture than that by the Jesuit casuists.

Sedgwick could have finished his work with the achievement of William Perkins, as the first English Reformed moralist; indeed, his is a great chapter. But Sedgwick takes us into the life of Anglican theology, first, through the writings of Richard Hooker who as a Reformed and a Renaissance theologian revived the tradition of moral theology. Then he treats us to the Carolingian moralists, William Ames, Joseph Hall, and Robert Sanderson. He concludes with the enormously robust and versatile Jeremy Taylor who wrote casuistries and directories complete with his notions of probabiliorism and exemplarism, concluding with his *Ars moriendi* work, *Holy Dying*.

Sedgwick closes his generous work noting the death of casuistry that was eventually precipitated by Blaise Pascal, but he reminds us that contemporary ecumenical engagements could well examine their differing, but at times, overlapping pasts, so as to forge a singular tradition that integrates the spiritual and the moral. This very satisfying work rightly reminds us how beholden the future is to the past.

James F. Keenan, S.J.

Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, USA

James.keenan.2@bc.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-00703008-02

Rudolf Schuessler

The Debate on Probable Opinions in the Scholastic Tradition. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Pp. xii + 526. Hb, \$179.00.

Rudolf Schuessler's monograph is a wide-ranging and richly detailed exploration of the theoretical contours of different scholarly methods for managing the plurality of probable (or approvable) opinions. Much of the volume is about one such method in particular: probabilism, traditionally understood as