

almost fifty times, but the authors evidently believe that he needs no introduction; more importantly, given that ten authors cite Bultmann's "πίστις κτλ" it would have been informative to have an account devoted to that writing.

All of these essays are investigations into difficult theological issues, so all are not easy to understand; nonetheless, all are thought-provoking and rewarding to read. The two most informative essays in English are Benjamin Schliesser's "Faith in Early Christianity" and Dennis R. Linsay's "πίστις in Flavius Josephus and the New Testament"; the two in German are Michael Wolter's "Die Wirklichkeit des Glaubens" and Johanna Rahner's "Glaube. Katholische Thesen zu einem scheinbar protestantischen Thema." Each one of these essays in the collection is impressive, and anyone interested in learning about the early conceptions of faith should seriously consider reading this book.

Christopher Adair-Toteff
University of South Florida

God and Difference: The Trinity, Sexuality, and the Transformation of Finitude. By Linn Marie Tonstad. *Gender, Theology and Spirituality.* New York: Routledge, 2016. Pp. x + 302. \$148.

Karl Rahner's axiom, "the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity," responded to modernity's restrictions on the legitimacy of systematic theology with an argument that identified the God who is "for us" in history with "God as God is" (8–9). Tonstad now warns that trinitarian theology has since been put to work solving problems of gender, sexuality, and power to which it never should have been applied, often exacerbating these very problems. The book addresses what T. sees as four unhealthy trends in contemporary trinitarian thought: lip-service to divine simplicity and divine-personal equality that masks a cryptic subordinationism; excessively tight connections among the cross, obedience, and the triune processions; "corrective projectionism," or, a reading of idealized human relations into the Trinity in order to "find" a critique of oppressive earthly human relations; and the unavoidably gendered and sexual aspects of these aforementioned characteristics (17). T. lays out a path towards "unlearning" such habits of thought, in pursuit of which she provides overliteral, gender-bending readings of trinitarian theology in a queer theory strategy that points to incoherence in standard trinitarian language. Her results are often fascinating, even if potentially shocking to many of her readers. These readers would be graduate students and scholars, for whom the book provides a valuable service, at the very least, as a summary and bibliography of current leading authors.

T. is most critical of Hans Urs von Balthasar, Graham Ward, and Sarah Coakley, each of whom occupies a chapter in the first part of the book. Allowing for the exclusive focus on Balthasar's controversial *Theo-Drama* series, her critique of his tendencies to "multiply pairs and assign the opposed elements to different trinitarian persons" is understandable (34–36). One could question whether Balthasar's trinitarian

theology is reducible to such “over-againstness,” given the vast scope of his material that T. does not treat. Coakley, whose *oeuvre* T. covers much more exhaustively, falls into “corrective projections” of idealized sexual relations onto God in ways similar to what she finds problematic in Ward. While T. also does not believe that Coakley successfully retrieves kenosis-as-vulnerability for feminism, doubtless there are students of Coakley (and of Balthasar, for that matter) who would come to different conclusions regarding the potentials of kenosis as “self-giving” for trinitarian theology.

T. goes on to find a lack of coherence in Jürgen Moltmann, despite his efforts to distinguish between the economic and immanent Trinity, an importation of “kenotic” death into the Trinity (much like Balthasar’s) in Wolfhart Pannenberg, and a vagueness in Kathryn Tanner’s presentation of an analogical inner-triune grounding for Jesus’ obedience to the Father. T. approves of how Tanner reorients trinitarian theology to its most profound meanings “for us” based on the life of the incarnate Jesus, and of Tanner’s positing of a “disanalogy” between God and creation within their intimate union that takes place in Jesus. But it is difficult to see how the latter proposal would be substantially different from what Balthasar and many others mean by “analogy.”

The focus of much of T.’s criticism falls on triune *perichoresis*, or space-making, for which kenosis serves as a conceptual condition. Space-making sets up an economy of competition and deprivation that opens the door to violence and nihilism. The kind of trinitarian personhood involved in such an understanding of kenosis and *perichoresis* is constituted too exclusively by penetrating and being invaded rather than by touching and being touched. Far from shoring up defenses against subordinationism, T. believes the language of “begetting” and “procession” only reinforces it. She does stress the provisionality of her call for a new trinitarian theology “without relations of origin” (222–23). She also calls for a more appropriately “apocalyptic” ecclesiology that stands vigilantly outside the systems that the world “reproduces” (245). These systems include the institution of marriage, which would infect gay marriage, even marriage between two women, with a patriarchy that always seeks the next group to exclude for its own legitimation. The idea of an “abortive” ecclesiology that says “no” to the reproduction of rapacious, phallo-centric narcissism in church and society is perhaps the purest example of T.’s application of queer criticism—namely, the application of the purposefully over-the-top “indecent” in order to flush out the tragically egregious. She pushes for a “negative sacramentality” of the church “in the free distribution of the sign of what it neither is nor has: the Body of Christ and, by extension, the goods that body symbolizes and grants” (271–72). Such an ecclesiology presumes a sense of “sacrament” that is purposely left somewhat undefined, but this omission seems to be bound up with her questionable critique of analogy. While I would consider this a substantial systemic flaw of the book, there are many who would find T.’s impassioned call for a new trinitarian theology rooted in a radical trust in the Jesus who is to come a very worthwhile read.

Christopher Hadley, SJ
Jesuit School of Theology of Santa Clara University