

ironically this is practised by many of Brock's interlocutors. I mention this grumble not because I am against rereading (far from it!) but because Brock is dealing with an important subject matter and much in this book has the potential to reshape many of the tired debates about the relationship between ethics and the 'use' of Scripture.

Angus Paddison
University of Nottingham

Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen, *The Trinity: Global Perspectives*. Louisville and London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007, 408pp. \$39.95

While surveys of contemporary trinitarian theologies have previously been published by Ted Peters, John Thompson and Stanley Grenz, Veli-Matti Kärkkäinen's book is distinct in two ways. First, as the subtitle 'Global Perspectives' implies, he intentionally expands the discussion to include non-Western theologies. Thus, in addition to survey chapters of the usual suspects (e.g. Barth, Rahner, Pannenberg, Moltmann, Zizioulas and Jenson), his survey also includes trinitarian theologies from Latin America (Boff and Gonzalez), Africa (Nyamiti and Ogbonnaya) and Asia (Lee and Panikkar). The second way that Kärkkäinen's book differs from these earlier efforts is in sheer scope: in addition to the above mentioned theologians he surveys feminist (LaCugna and Johnson), pluralist (Heim, Smart and Konstantine) and evangelical (Erickson) voices: *seventeen* distinct trinitarian theologies in all. The result is very satisfying: while comprehensive, *The Trinity* is also highly readable and I would heartily recommend it as a textbook. That said, I do have a few quibbles.

To begin with, there are a number of errata including a misquotation of a Moltmann book title (p. 100), a confusion of author citations (pp. 121 and 232), a missing footnote (p. 157) and a few other typographical errors (e.g. pp. 207, 215). More importantly, Kärkkäinen makes some factual errors: for instance, he attributes the introduction of the term *ousia* into trinitarian theology to Tertullian (p. 28), mischaracterizes Oneness Pentecostalism (p. 55) and describes Radical Orthodoxy as a North American movement (p. 154). Nonetheless, given four hundred pages of text, the number of mistakes is not unreasonable.

On a more substantial note, I would like to take issue with aspects of Kärkkäinen's summary and critique of his chosen interlocutors. When it comes to summary exposition Kärkkäinen shoulders the task not only of accurately describing a given theologian's views, but of providing clarity for those views where it may be lacking. On this score, unfortunately, he tends to disappoint. For instance, rather than clarify Rahner's arcane expression, Kärkkäinen seems content to emulate it as when he says of Rahner's Rule: 'at least on this side of eternity, one can say that the economic trinity is the immanent Trinity but should be careful to not turn [*sic*] the equation too hastily the other way' (p. 86). While I have a vague sense of what Kärkkäinen is meaning, there can be no doubt that he could have expressed himself (and Rahner) with less obscurity. At times his enthusiasm seems overly generous

as when he describes Zizioulas's contribution to contemporary trinitarian theology as 'unsurpassed' (p. 96). And at other times, his summary is strangely muted, as when he flatly notes that 'Moltmann still seems to be imagining some kind of 'transcendent ground' for the Godhead' (p. 118). Shouldn't the reader be tipped off that without that transcendent ground which he 'seems to be imagining', Moltmann is little more than an obscure atheist?

When it comes to his critical interaction Kärkkäinen is generally astute and helpful. However, at times he is simply off the mark, as when he criticizes Millard Erickson's limitation of Jesus' ignorance to his humanity (p. 233) in favour of an alternative that appears blatantly subordinationist. Further, Kärkkäinen's rejection of Erickson's 'spirit-versus-matter distinction' as 'outdated' is just ill-informed, as a cursory reading of contemporary philosophy of mind would demonstrate. And if Kärkkäinen is unfair in some critiques, he is overly generous in others. For instance, while he vaguely calls Heim's pluralistic theory of religious ends 'logically less than convincing' (p. 242), a more precise charge would be that it is logically incoherent since it entails (to take one example) both that there will and will not be a universal/corporate resurrection. Kärkkäinen's analytic lassitude appears to arise from a devaluation of analytic approaches to theology with their emphasis upon concise conceptual definition and logical analysis. Not surprisingly, he ignores the whole contemporary logical discussion of the one/three problem while apparently finding it curious that Erickson would even bother to discuss an important philosophical theory like relative identity (p. 224, n. 60). While he warns against the 'tendency toward speculation and abstract philosophical fantasies' (p. 390) which accompanies a logically rigorous approach to theology, it would seem that the real danger for speculation and fantasy arises from the unchecked use of fuzzy terms like 'perichoresis' and 'immanent/economic Trinity' that is rife in contemporary theology.

Finally, Kärkkäinen's global survey raises but does not really grapple with a crucial and difficult question: to what extent are the early creeds and councils of the church normative for all subsequent theology? Clearly Kärkkäinen wants non-Western theologies granted a fully independent voice, and so he warns that 'One of the fallacies of traditional Western philosophy and theology is the confusion of the universal with the dominant' (p. 261). In addition, he quotes Lee: 'As long as Third World theologies continue to attempt to validate their work according to the views of Western theologies, they will continue to be supplementary to Western theologies . . .' (p. 262). But then even as Kärkkäinen jettisons classical theism, might the non-Western theologian not, as Lee opines, reject basic Western concepts like the *homoousion* as well? (More radically, might one follow Lee and Panikkar in rejecting the supposedly 'dualist' 'Western' logic bequeathed by Aristotle in the laws of non-contradiction and excluded middle?) And if, in deference to historic orthodoxy, we insist on certain inviolable historic parameters, then have we not in fact consigned non-Western theologies to be forever supplementary to the West?

Randall Rauser
Taylor Seminary