

philosophize. In conclusion, Falque aims to break down the strict requirements of each discipline, allowing for a crossing between them. If this crossing is undertaken each discipline will be clearly delineated, while allowing the two disciplines to work in conjunction to offer solutions to experiential questions.

In conclusion, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Borderlands of Philosophy and Theology*, presents a strong argument for why philosophers should not hesitate to cross into theology. In reviewing this text, I asked myself the following question: who would benefit from reading this text? The answer that seemed to follow most naturally was: those philosophers who are struggling with the specialization of disciplines and are wary to venture beyond what is regarded as strictly philosophical. Unfortunately, it seems to me that the text will do little for the young student who may be debating between which path to take. In order to fully grasp the arguments presented by Falque, which often appear disjointed, one needs a thorough understanding of the history of philosophy as well as contemporary philosophical schools of thought, in addition to understanding Catholic theology. Starting with the question: "Is Hermeneutics Fundamental?" and arriving at "Finally Theology," the reader is left to her own devices in putting the pieces together along the way. Another question one might ask Falque is, why his reader ought to return back to philosophy? Surely Caesar did not cross the Rubicon in order to turn back and return to Gaul, his aim was Rome. This is not simply a criticism of Falque's choice of metaphor. If theology is the relief of philosophy, and that which provides philosophy answers to its questions, as Falque presents it, then why would the philosopher choose to return back to philosophy rather than becoming a theologian? Perhaps this has something to do with Falque's understanding of what philosophy is. At times he seems to make philosophy and phenomenology synonymous, and thereby relegates philosophy to the description of objects. While this may seem to be the contemporary character of philosophy, I could not help but think that if philosophy is understood as it once was, the loving pursuit of wisdom, then no philosopher should have any qualms about crossing into other fields of study, especially theology.

Jeffrey JAKUBEC

Graduate Studies - Philosophy
Dominican University College
Ottawa

Michel SASSEVILLE, **La pratique de la philosophie en communauté de recherche: entre rupture et continuité** (Dialoguer); avec la collaboration de Anda FURNEL, Caroline MCCARTHY, Samuel NEPTON. Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval, 2018, 15 × 22,8 cm, 270 p., ISBN 978-27637-3891-8.

In most North American schools children are not taught philosophy. Proponents of what is called "philosophy for children" have been trying to change the official school curricula since the nineteen-seventies so that philosophy may be included in children's education. Matthew Lipman and Ann Margaret Sharp, the two pioneers of the philosophy for children program, devised a unique pedagogical model to be imple-

mented in schools so children may develop basic reasoning skills. In *La pratique de la philosophie en communauté de recherche*, Michel Sasseville has gathered together thirty or so brief texts to demonstrate: i) the contemporary relevance of the philosophy for children program; and ii) why philosophy for children should be understood as complementary to the curriculum presently offered in most schools. Sasseville's main contention is that although the practice of philosophy for children *breaks* with the traditional model of education, it is nonetheless in *continuity* with the Liberal Arts program and should therefore be considered part of our educational tradition.

The book is organized according to three overarching themes – each theme corresponds to one part of the book: *The Practice of Philosophy in the Context of a Research Community* (Part One, Chapters 1 to 12); *The Practice of Philosophy with and for Children* (Part Two, Chapters 13 to 23); and *The Relation Between the Practice of Philosophy with Children and the Liberal Arts* (Part Three, Chapters 24 and 25). The texts which comprise each of the chapters of Part One and Two have been previously published on the blog of the Université Laval's *Philosophy for Children* web site. Part Three is from Sasseville's doctoral thesis (defended in 1993). Although the material is not new, Sasseville insists that when gathered together the many texts work as a whole to demonstrate that philosophy for children is not a passing fad but a veritable "copernican revolution" in education (p. 2).

Section one begins with a short text entitled *The Community of Philosophical Research: A New Paradigm for Teaching?* This first chapter presents the central idea of the book: *children must learn philosophy by thinking with others in a "research community."* What is a philosophical research community, or as it is also called, a "community of inquiry"? Sasseville suggests it be conceived in opposition to "the traditional model of education" (p. 8-9): whereas in the traditional model teachers transmit information to children, the model of the philosophical research community is one in which educators help children "to judge by and for themselves, in order to become reasonable individuals living in a democratic society" (ibid). How exactly do children learn to become reasonable individuals? In a community of inquiry, children learn to think rationally through "a process of collective negotiation and argumentation whereby the members of the community submit their solutions to the evaluation of their peers, who have the duty to appreciate the logical, ethical, aesthetic and experimental pertinence of the presented ideas according to knowledge we consider established, at least temporarily, according to criteria shared by the community" (ibid). If somewhat caricatural in its dichotomy, Sasseville's message is clear: because the community of inquiry involves children learning to dialogue rationally with one another, instead of passively receiving information given to them by an authority (i.e., a teacher), then philosophy for children represents a break with the traditional model of education.

Once the basic difference between the community of inquiry and the traditional model of education has been presented, the rest of the book is intended to explain how the philosophy for children program, while it clearly breaks with tradition, is also in some way in continuity with said tradition. It is impossible in this brief review to present the staggering range of topics covered in each of the 25 chapters. However, a quick glance at the main ideas found in the three parts of the book will suffice to explain Sasseville's principal contention.

In Chapter 5 (from Part One), entitled (*Se*) *Questionner et penser ensemble*, Anda Fournel offers an enlightening analysis of the communal links created between children who participate in a philosophical research community. She draws attention to the very interesting fact that when children think together, bonds are created between them through a process of rational dialogue. The philosophical research community thus fosters the ethical development of children through “inter-subjective cooperation and the co-elaboration of ideas” (p. 34). That the community of inquiry has the potential to create communal links between participants by means of rational dialogue is certainly one of the most worthwhile ideas presented in the book, and provides a refreshing picture of what constitutes an education in philosophy.

Chapter 19, entitled *Un exemple d'une enquête philosophique avec des enfants et des parents*, is also interesting. It is from Part Two and is the transcript of a philosophical research session involving children, parents and an “animator” – i.e. teacher (it should be noted that parents are normally not present during a research session). The transcript gives a good picture of what actually happens when philosophy is practiced in a research community. Most noteworthy is how the community of inquiry is modelled on the Platonic dialogues: individuals gather together, a theme is proposed, and a rational discussion ensues. During the philosophical research session the animator will occasionally make suggestions and guide the discussion – but children do most of the talking and thinking. Overall, the sample session shows that children seem to enjoy learning to use their reason and having rational discussions with their peers.

In the community of research the usual role of both the teacher and of the student is radically altered. The teacher does not teach but merely facilitates a dialogue; and the student no longer passively receives information, but is instead encouraged to initiate a respectful and rational discussion with his or her peers. This changed pedagogical situation helps the young students develop their ability to reason and their sense of ethical responsibility; and for this reason Sasseville claims that the community of inquiry differs radically from the traditional model of education.

Whereas sections one and two focus on how practicing philosophy with children breaks with tradition, the third section focuses on demonstrating a continuity with tradition. In this last part of the book, Sasseville analyses the connection between the philosophy for children program and the roots of the western tradition of education. In Sasseville's words, “the philosophy for children program of M. Lipman and A. M. Sharp, far from being a total break with what is taught in schools, is in fact the prolongation of what has been occurring since Antiquity” (p. 4). Through an interesting analysis of the *trivium* and *quadrivium* – focused especially on the importance of dialectics in the Liberal Arts – Sasseville argues that teaching children how to use their reasoning capacities is an integral part of the western intellectual heritage. The philosophy for children program, focused as it is on helping children acquire skills in argumentation, would thus fill a gap in the current curriculum, not by proposing something novel, but by being more deeply connected to the riches of the tradition of Liberal Arts education. The philosophical research community must therefore be conceived as being “between rupture and continuity” (*entre rupture et continuité*) – on the one hand, it breaks with the traditional educational model, while on the other hand, it is in continuity with ideals that go back to Antiquity.

There is no doubt that much of what Sasseville proposes is compelling. But unfortunately, the book has many flaws that are difficult to overlook. The chapters are simply too short and leave too many ideas undeveloped – and due to their cursory treatment the ideas often sound like clichés (especially in Chapter 12). The book would be significantly improved if the incessant lauding of the philosophical research community were replaced with a more substantial development of the key concepts presented in each chapter. Some of the texts lack an argumentative structure (Chapters 12, 18 and 23 include long lists of ideas and observations presented in point form). The book as a whole struggles to keep a modicum of internal cohesion amidst an overwhelming variety of topics. The first two parts of the book – rather than clearly demonstrating the difference between the traditional model of education and the community of inquiry – are bestrewn with pronouncements on the virtues of doing philosophy with children. Moreover, the texts from Parts One and Two are taken from blog entries (p. 1) and lack the careful scholarship displayed in Part Three, which is taken from Sasseville’s doctoral thesis from 1993; consequently, the book is uneven in the quality of its analyses: sometimes it offers the reader quality research (most of Part Three, for example) and at other times, it lacks scholarly rigour and development altogether (particularly, Chapters 12, 15, 18, 20 and 23). It is also very difficult for the reader to see a direct relation between Part Three (the more structured part of the book) and the multiplicity of topics found in Part One and Part Two.

But one flaw in particular deserves special attention. In Chapter 25, Sasseville warns against focusing too strongly on the cognitive aspect of doing philosophy with children, and thereby neglecting the affective dimension of the child’s philosophical education (p. 138). This is undoubtedly an insightful warning – but unfortunately, Sasseville has paid insufficient heed to his own advice; for what so disconcerts about his book is i) how it focuses almost solely on the development of the child’s cognitive abilities; and ii) how ignored the affective depth of philosophical thinking, in fact, is. Sasseville often reminds the reader that the main purpose of doing philosophy with children is to teach them to “reason, research, form concepts, and interpret” (p. 137); whereas comments on the affective dimension of the child’s philosophical education are made in passing, and sorely lack any genuine philosophical insight. The few remarks on the emotional aspects of the child’s philosophical education often sound like platitudes (Chapters 12, 15 and 16 [section 25] for example). Undoubtedly, giving children the tools which will allow them “to judge by and for themselves, in order to become reasonable individuals living in a democratic society” (p. 8) is an important part of their philosophical instruction. However, a philosophical education is not reducible to becoming proficient in the use of “rational operations” (p. 9); one would hope that philosophy is to help children become individuals who *want* to take part in philosophical thinking and dialogues, so that the discipline itself becomes integral to who they are. For philosophy, as its etymology indicates, is above all a form of love; and an education in philosophy will introduce the neophyte to the unique affective life proper to one who loves wisdom.

Sasseville’s book only succeeds in *suggesting* – whereas it ought to have succeeded in *demonstrating* – that the community of inquiry is i) the superior paradigm for educating children in philosophy; and ii) that it must be included in the standard curriculum of learning. Yet in spite of its failings, I would say that *La pratique de la*

philosophie en communauté de recherche remains a useful book. Many of the texts are written in an accessible style and contain interesting ideas to be further developed. And although it is meant for specialists in pedagogy and philosophy, it will also be of value to many non-specialists who want to know how and why philosophy should be practiced with children. In conclusion, even though Sasseville's book will not appeal to the more exacting scholar, a great deal of it should appeal to the general reader.

Joël-Émile DOUCET

Graduate Studies - Philosophy
Dominican University College
 Ottawa

THÉOLOGIE

Marie DE LOVINFOSSE, **La pédagogie de la «visite» (ἐπισκοπή) de Dieu chez Luc** (Études bibliques, nouvelle série, 76). Leuven – Paris – Bristol CT, Peeters, 2018, 16 × 24 cm, vi-431 p., ISBN 978-90-429-3745-1.

Mentionné à cinq reprises dans l'œuvre de Luc, en des passages qui correspondent à des moments clés de la vie de Jésus et des débuts de l'Église, mais encore peu étudié pour lui-même, le thème de la «visite» de Dieu a retenu l'attention de l'auteur, au titre de «trésor inexploré de la théologie lucanienne». L'hypothèse d'une recherche à mener en ce sens s'est révélée particulièrement féconde, puisqu'elle a conduit à montrer, de manière nouvelle et originale, l'unité littéraire et la cohérence théologique du troisième évangile et des Actes des Apôtres.

En effet, Marie de Lovinfosse propose, dans ce livre, une étude très approfondie de ce thème, dans une perspective à la fois exégétique, littéraire et théologique, motivée par un triple questionnement: quels sont le sens et la portée de ce thème chez Luc? La traduction du grec ἐπισκοπή par «visite» exprime-t-elle au mieux la pensée de l'évangéliste? En quoi la spécificité de cette «visite» de Dieu peut-elle entrer en résonance avec la quête spirituelle des hommes et des femmes d'aujourd'hui et contribuer à l'éclairer?

Fondée sur la prise en compte des relations d'intertextualité qui se jouent dans le texte lucanien avec l'ensemble de la Bible, ainsi qu'avec la littérature juive extra-biblique et la littérature gréco-romaine, la méthode d'analyse retenue vise à éclairer l'interprétation des passages où il est question de la «visite de Dieu» par «le contexte et le "pré-texte", c'est-à-dire l'ambiance culturelle, socio-politique et religieuse dans laquelle le texte a émergé» (p. 12).

Sont donc successivement étudiés: la rencontre de Jésus et de la veuve de Naïn (Lc 7,11-17), les pleurs de Jésus sur Jérusalem (Lc 19,41-44) et le discours de Jacques lors de l'Assemblée de Jérusalem (Ac 15,13-21). Pour chacune de ces péripécies, après la délimitation du texte, l'examen de ses variantes textuelles et de son contexte littéraire, et la présentation de sa structure et de son genre littéraire, vient l'analyse exégétique proprement dite. La mise en perspective de ces trois passages vise à

License and Permissible Use Notice

These materials are provided to you by the American Theological Library Association, operating as Atla, in accordance with the terms of Atla's agreements with the copyright holder or authorized distributor of the materials, as applicable. In some cases, Atla may be the copyright holder of these materials.

You may download, print, and share these materials for your individual use as may be permitted by the applicable agreements among the copyright holder, distributors, licensors, licensees, and users of these materials (including, for example, any agreements entered into by the institution or other organization from which you obtained these materials) and in accordance with the fair use principles of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. You may not, for example, copy or email these materials to multiple web sites or publicly post, distribute for commercial purposes, modify, or create derivative works of these materials without the copyright holder's express prior written permission.

Please contact the copyright holder if you would like to request permission to use these materials, or any part of these materials, in any manner or for any use not permitted by the agreements described above or the fair use provisions of United States and international copyright and other applicable laws. For information regarding the identity of the copyright holder, refer to the copyright information in these materials, if available, or contact Atla using the Contact Us link at www.atla.com.

Except as otherwise specified, Copyright © 2020 Atla.