resurrection (cf. John 1:19–12:50). Hence it is not beyond reason to view Jesus in the Spiritual Gospel as an innocent righteous sufferer victimized by the politics of first-century Palestine, not a divine sacrifice as is widely thought (pp. 85–90). Thus Callahan is not having a hangover when he says: “The post-resurrection appearances of Jesus in chapters 20 and 21 are the narrative scar tissue covering the multiple wounds of the crucifixion” (pp. 91–92).

And the yields of Callahan’s reading of the Johannine tradition are more. Driven as they are by the seminal thoughts of such persons as Hendricks, Fiorenza, and Boyarin (see p. ix), we are able to see clearer the hands of collectors, editors, and guarantors in the preservation and appropriation of the Johannine story. We are able to see what is and what is not Johannine and why. We can see why a love supreme is exhibited in something more tangible than “appropriate talk” about God and hearty feelings (cf. 1 John 3:18–22). We can envision the nonperipheral role of women in the creation and survival of the Johannine tradition (pp. 94–97). We can see why Callahan’s “sanctified carnality” language (p. 41) is a proper language for the message Johannine writers wanted readers to embrace as the Johannine tradition. Finally, readers will have to take Richard A. Horsley’s endorsement query—a proper Johannine question it seems—quite seriously as due respect for Callahan’s illuminating contribution to Johannine studies: “Why didn’t anyone open our eyes to the Gospel of John like this before?” It is because Callahan is as nonconventional in his reading of the Johannine tradition as the Beloved Community was to traditional practitioners who knew all the right words about God and God’s love but were unwilling to practice what they mouthed.
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When focusing on the theme of humanity, Christian theological anthropology asks questions about the nature of human creation, fallenness, and redemption: What does it mean to be made in the image of God? How can we, as finite creatures, know an infinite God? What happened to humanity to require the redemption experienced in Jesus Christ? Subsequent questions merge with Christology to posit Jesus as the model for ideal human behavior. We then ask: How can humanity best emulate the model of Christ? What are we called to be and do in the world? And, for the eschatologically focused, what should humanity be and do to make it into the next world?

In Being Human: Race, Culture, and Religion, Dwight Hopkins constructs a theological anthropology from a black theological perspective. As he articulates humanity’s constitution and role in a world of spirit and materiality, he situates
these questions not amidst concepts of the fall, Christology, redemption, or creation narratives, but among the experiences and values of people of African descent. Drawing from the sociopolitical and economic situation of African Americans, Hopkins states that working to end the oppression of the poorest of the poor will serve to liberate all of humanity into its true vocation. That is, he focuses on *missio dei* over *imago dei* to conclude that “all human beings are created with a spiritual purpose . . . to share in the material resources of the earth” (168). Thus, Hopkins constructs a theological anthropology that calls us to dismantle American capitalism, and its supporting politics, by a radical commitment to “the least of these”—the bottom of society.

Hopkins’s journey from the traditional questions of theological anthropology to a bold critique of American capitalism is rooted in both his commitment to African-American culture and his desire to address the shortcomings he identifies in contemporary theological anthropologies. In the introduction, Hopkins reveals his initial interest in using themes from African-American folklore to discuss black theological perspectives on being human. In doing so, he realized that he needed to give a prolonged discussion to contemporary theological anthropology.

True to his identification as a liberation theologian, Hopkins notes the privilege that informs contemporary models of theological anthropology. He identifies two major traditions, progressive liberal and postliberal, represented by David Tracy and George Lindbeck, respectively. He summarizes their major points and reveals how they are based on assumptions about class (bourgeois values and commitments), European Enlightenment culture, individualism, monolithic Christian identity, and a silence about issues of race that accompanies white male privilege. These models omit three “requisite conditions of possibility” (164) that Hopkins believes must be addressed for a current and relevant theological anthropology: culture, self and community (which he refers to as “selves and self”), and race.

To his credit, Hopkins also describes the ways that liberation theologies have constructed theological anthropology—in particular, he looks at feminist theology, black theology, womanist theology, Latino/Hispanic and mujerista theology, and Native American theologies. While generally applauding the work of liberation theologians, in *Being Human*, Hopkins offers a full discussion of what the aforementioned theologies only address in the midst of larger discussions.

In the chapter on culture, Hopkins takes us beyond the traditional emphasis on the artistic and argues, quite persuasively, for including labor and spirituality under the rubric of culture. Although Hopkins argues for such a rubric through a discussion of capitalist assumptions, the experiences of the working-poor, and cultural and political maintenance of wealth, the formation of the particular African-American experience under the condition of enslavement serves as an incredibly poignant example. Hopkins does not, however, rely solely on descriptions of African-American experiences to assert that “whatever fosters the freedom of the individual self and the interests of those structurally occupying the bottom of community . . . is good culture” (79). He reiterates the liberationist position that in Jesus Christ, God is revealed, received, and expressed in the marginalized of human society and connects this with an indigenous spirituality.
gleaned from the writings of several African theologians, philosophers, and theorists. In so doing, Hopkins models his thesis on both method and context. He often brings overlooked voices into the conversation which, he argues, has been dominated by reliance on European Enlightenment sources and bourgeois American values.

In addition, these African resources allow Hopkins to redefine the aesthetic dimension of culture. In his construction, morality and ethics are critical to the valuation of beauty, and an aesthetic product must be, among other things, life-giving and community building. Hopkins concludes, both here and in the section on self and selves, that humanity is called to interdependence and individual flourishing in the midst of community solidarity and a distribution of resources that leaves no one in need. In the chapter on self and selves, Hopkins is careful to discuss the ways in which individuals and selves are oppressed by gender, and/or limited by inherited conditions. Although attentive to the ways in which gender influences the experience of humanity, particularly as a basis for oppression, Hopkins does not note the ways in which self and selves are oppressed based on who and how we love. Nor does he note the critical ways that disability theologies have addressed themes of wholeness and redemption in their discussion of the human being. Although these absences do not distract from the overall point, their inclusion may have augmented or enriched Hopkins’s argument about who constitutes this bottom strata of society and the role of embodiment in his theological anthropology.

The chapter on race deftly covers biological, psychological, and historical theories on race and how the social construction has, over several centuries, produced the white privilege on which the United States are founded. Hopkins includes biblical narrative and forensic findings to demonstrate how the documented African origin of humanity relates to the ways that social sciences, evolutionary theology, philosophy, and theology repeatedly assert white superiority. Hopkins concludes that race in the United States is a combination of phenotype and sociology. While integrated into his argument for a reconstructive theological anthropology, this chapter could also serve as a stand-alone for a concise summary of critical race theory.

Although Hopkins’s argument is solidly liberationist in its orientation and highlights the work and values of indigenous and current African spiritualities, there is nothing particularly “black theology” about the central thesis until the last chapter. That is, many of the same conclusions could have been reached through other liberationist approaches. Ultimately, Hopkins comes to African-American folktales, viewing them as texts that emerge from the American confluence of culture, self and selves, race, and religion. He well acknowledges that the folklore represents and emerges from Christian and non-Christian contexts and demonstrates how they can be helpful for a constructive Christian theology. In the final chapter, Hopkins describes four archetypes from African-American folklore and how they inform a constructive theological anthropology. The trickster, conjurer, outlaw, and Christian witness reveal themes that offer a normative spirituality of “human flourishing, awareness of all creation, individual desire and compassion for
the poor” (184). In some ways, this is where the book becomes the most interesting, and yet our appetite is barely whetted. There is some satisfaction because, as promised in the introduction, there will be forthcoming book that will give us a more in-depth investigation of these folklore-derived archetypes and their relevance for black theology.

This book is a unique contribution to black theology. Much of black theology has focused on the doctrine of God with particular emphasis on God’s preferential option for the poor and blacks and discusses God’s position on the side of the oppressed. In the midst of these conversations, various liberation theologians have insisted that their communities, despite historical and current socio-economic and political disenfranchisement, are created by God, made in the image of God, and valued equally by God to share the world’s resources to ensure freedom for, at the least, the oppressed communities and, at the most, all of the world’s people. No black theologian has, however, given sustained attention to this concept of theological anthropology. In this work, Hopkins so well engages the topic of theological anthropology that one wants to see this as part of a multivolume set of a black systematic theology.

This work also adds to the trajectory of Hopkins’s long-held interest in black folklore, narrative and slave culture, and the ways they reveal and shape African-American Christianity. Here Hopkins combines the subject matter from his early work, Cut Loose Our Stammering Tongue: Black Theology in the Slave Narratives (1991) and Shoes That Fit our Feet: Sources for a Constructive Black Theology (1993), with the scholarship of African philosophers and theologians, and a sharp critique of United States economics and politics. Yet it is Hopkins’s unique blend of sources and approach to the topic of theological anthropology that makes Being Human a critical contribution not only to black theology but all systematic theologians and anyone investigating the normative role of humanity within the Christian faith.

doi:10.1093/jaarel/lfj095
Advance Access publication July 6, 2006

Monica A. Coleman
Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago


The mutually reinforcing link between religious faith and social reform has a rich history in American life—the abolitionist and temperance movements of the nineteenth century being two prominent examples. Charles Marsh affirms as well that the Civil Rights movement of the twentieth century cannot be fully understood apart from the theological moorings and presuppositions that gave it life and vitality. He regards this movement, manifested in many permutations—Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Clarence Jordan’s Koinonia Farm, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee