

Despite the interest which belongs to the subject in the earnest thought and aspirations and common friendships of its followers, and in what it shows about wider confessional loyalties, the ecumenical movement which Dr Chapman describes fell between two stools, the Protestantism of the greater part of the Church of England with its rejection of Anglo-Catholicism, and the exclusive Ultramontaniam of Roman Catholicism, which agreed in repudiating each other. In this sense ecumenism was a 'fantasy'. A still more pessimistic conclusion might be that religious renewal and revivalism tend to promote inter-denominational conflict, as in the nineteenth century, and that successful ecumenism is the product of religious decline. The Anglo-Catholic movement operated at the margins of the mainstream, and neither a vigorous Protestantism nor a renewed Roman Catholicism felt any need to forge a union with each other or to heed a third party which claimed to be Catholic but was neither properly Roman nor reformed.

doi:10.1093/jts/flw007

SHERIDAN GILLEY  
 Durham University  
 sheridan.gilley@talktalk.net

*The Resurrected God: Karl Barth's Trinitarian Theology of Easter.* By JOHN L. DRURY. Pp. x + 194. (Emerging Scholars.) Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014. ISBN 978 1 4514 8280 5 and 8437 3. Paper \$39/£25.99; e-book n.p.

IN this book, which began as a doctoral dissertation at Princeton Theological Seminary, John Drury of Indiana Wesleyan University proposes to explain exactly how Barth's mature doctrine of the Trinity explicated in *CD IV* led him to a view of the Trinity which did not divide 'the persons of the Trinity' but explained how Father, Son, and Spirit 'participate in each aspect of the Easter event in a mode that corresponds to their eternal relations' (p. 7). This leads to Drury's constructive thesis, namely that 'the doctrine of the Trinity attempts to make sense of *the resurrected God*' (p. 175). In this regard Drury asks: 'In what does God's readiness for resurrection consist?' and 'What does it mean to say that God is eternally fit for resurrection?' His main constructive thesis 'is that God's readiness for resurrection consists in his triune life' (p. 175). And that of course raises a deep theological issue. If God's readiness for resurrection is

simply God's triune life, is it possible that God could have been God without the resurrection? And if that is not possible, is God's trinity the result of God's aim to relate with us in history?

In the intervening pages readers are treated to various close readings of important texts from *CD IV/1–IV/3* that shed great light on just how, and with what effect, Barth held that 'the subject and basis of Christ's resurrection is the triune God' (p. 9). Drury considers just why Barth insists in *CD IV/1* that it is God the Father who raises Jesus from the dead as an act of grace for us such that the Son's receiving the Father's grace is itself grounded in 'the eternal movement of grace given by the Father to the Son in the Spirit' (pp. 11, 52). Drury then considers Jesus' own arising based on the Father's act of grace in the power of the Spirit, and his transition to us as the 'exalted Son of man', and explains Barth's emphasis on the Holy Spirit as the power of his own arising and as the power in which the risen Christ encounters us in a way that dispels criticisms of Barth for not having a sufficient doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Next he explores the 'teleological' movement of the Trinity in Jesus' presence as the glorious mediator in *CD IV/3*. Finally, Drury helpfully and skilfully considers how Barth's threefold view of Christ's *parousia* corresponds to the threefold being and act of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is said to be analogous to the *perichoresis* of the persons within the immanent Trinity. It is a shame that the word *perichoresis* was misspelled in the title of chapter 4 and in each header. But this does not detract from the point of the chapter, which is that this analogy 'bears witness to the purposive movement of the triune God through history' (p. 151). 'Christ's presence with others' we are told 'is the outworking of God's own fellowship' (*ibid.*). In this connection it must be said, however, that there are a number of imprecise remarks made throughout this work that raise questions both about the title of the book and the relation of the Trinity, election, and resurrection.

For example, while Drury frequently and rightly notes that Barth never collapsed the immanent into the economic Trinity and never held that God's eternal being and act were dependent on history, we are nonetheless told that 'The Son's eternal majesty is fulfilled precisely in his humble obedience as a human being' (p. 114). Yet it is unclear exactly how this can be reconciled with Barth's belief that the Son's being needed no actualization (no incarnation in order to be who he is within the eternal Trinity [*CD IV/2*, 113]). In *CD I/2* Barth argued that 'the content of the doctrine of the Trinity... is not that God in His

relation to man is Creator, Mediator, and Redeemer, but that God in Himself is eternally God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit...[God acting as Emmanuel] cannot be dissolved into His work and activity' (CD I/2, 878–9). Perhaps one of the more problematic statements that oddly appears in Drury's constructive thesis, which seems to be in conflict with these remarks by Barth, is his statement that 'God is the source, event, and result of Christ's resurrection' (p. 178). God is the result of Christ's resurrection? A God who can be considered the result of the resurrection is a God who only becomes triune in and through the resurrection and is not the God Barth had in mind when he asserted the eternal perfection of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as the basis of his actions *ad extra*. Such a statement explains why one might be a bit uneasy with the title of the book itself: *The Resurrected God*. I suspect this characterization of God stems from the imprecision of claiming that God's readiness for resurrection is grounded simply in the fact that God is triune. Isn't that readiness grounded in the free grace of God's movement towards us in electing us in Jesus Christ as the beginning of his ways and works *ad extra*? The difficulty here is further illustrated by Drury's remarks that 'Barth does not intend to diminish the significance of Easter for God by identifying its basis in a primary and pure movement in the triune God. Rather this movement and action of God is *aimed toward* its historical fulfillment' (p. 52). Where is the distinction between God's eternal triune being and action and his free eternal but contingent decision to act for us? Isn't the fulfilment the fulfilment of God's covenant promises and not the fulfilment of God's 'primary and pure movement' within the immanent Trinity? This difficulty is also captured in Drury's remark that 'God's trinity is logically but not ontologically prior to God's covenantal decision, for both occur in eternity' (p. 53). Yes, both occur in eternity. But one is necessary (God's trinity), for God cannot not be God, while the other (the covenant) is contingent, since God could well have been God without the covenant and still would have suffered no lack. Does it make sense to speak 'of the second person of the Trinity as the "resurrection"', as Drury does, based on John 11:25, where Jesus is said to be the resurrection and the life? That statement refers to the incarnate Son and not simply to the second person of the Trinity. All of this raises the key question one is left with after reading this book: could God have been the triune God without the resurrection? Drury says God could have been God without

us. But, as noted, there are a number of statements scattered throughout the book that suggest that he could not.

Many other important questions are raised and intelligently discussed in this book. One in particular arises in connection with Barth's emphasis on the grace of the Father in relation to the Son in the resurrection, which is grounded in the Son's receptivity in eternity and calls for further consideration. Was Barth overly anxious in describing the relation of the Son to the Father as one of pure obedience, subordination, and submission, and did this justify him in playing down the idea that Jesus actively rose from the dead since that activity too is essential to the unity of his person as the Mediator? This was a question that T. F. Torrance raised long ago to Barth (see Thomas F. Torrance, *Space, Time and Resurrection* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998], p. 32, n. 7 and pp. 67–8). And this important book sets that question before us once again. Indeed, if the resurrection corresponds to 'the grace the Father gives to the Son in eternity' (p. 52), then in what sense can we also say, with Barth, that grace is God turning towards his sinful creatures in condescension? Another question that arises more in relation to Barth than to Drury concerns how one is to interpret Barth's claim that God 'possesses Himself as Father, i.e. pure Giver, as Son, i.e. Receiver and Giver, and as Spirit, i.e. pure Receiver... This is the unique divine trinity in the unique divine unity' (*CD I/1*, 365) in relation to his other claim that in 'God Himself... there is a pure obedience, subordination and subjection' (*CD IV/1*, 304). Is it necessary to read pure obedience and subordination into the eternal Trinity to maintain the grace of God in connection with the resurrection of Jesus Christ?

This is certainly a thought-provoking book that deserves to be widely read and discussed. Drury has done a great service by carefully presenting just how Barth's understanding of the Trinity enabled him to understand the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an act of the triune God for us within history in a way that shows the continuing power of Barth's emphasis on the fact that Jesus lives as the risen and ascended Lord who is coming again, and therefore the strength of our faith and hope is tied to him as we now live in union with him through his Holy Spirit.

doi:10.1093/jts/flw049

Advance Access publication 24 March 2016

PAUL D. MOLNAR  
 St. John's University,  
 Queens, NY  
 molnarp@stjohns.edu