

which is foreign—a project that, at least in Jennings’ mind, invites an extravagance of language and form in writing. Such a process offers redemption, “to imagine new conversations that open up a shared exploration into the desire for communion that is intended to vivify theological education” (p. 157). Such practice is a “practice aimed at eternity,” one that longs for the beauty and multiplicity of God’s own eschaton (p. 157). Thus, there is something deeply pastoral in the wisdom and experiences Jennings offers as he reflects over his career.

After Whiteness is quite simply a ground-breaking text. While not a radical departure or invention from Jennings’ earlier work, it condenses and applies much of his previous work on theology, race, and colonialism into a short format, accessible, and thoroughly disturbing *tour de force*. While, as I have already mentioned, it deserves to be read alongside Jennings’ lengthier *Christian Imagination*, it is also sharper in focus than his previous *opus* and rid of the last vestiges of any sort of post-racial optimism present within the previous book’s Obama context. There is no-one involved in theological education today—scholars, students, administrators, and so on—who should not read *After Whiteness* and reflect on its urgent message. Though readable in an afternoon, it invites meditative attention and multiple re-readings. Jennings’ latest book is a profound, haunting examination of theological education as it is and yet theological education as it could be.

Viorel Coman, *Dumitru Stăniloae’s Trinitarian Ecclesiology: Orthodoxy and the Filioque*. (London: Lexington/Fortress Academic, 2019. (310 pp.) [ISBN 9781978703780]

Jordan Jones

Viorel Coman’s *Dumitru Stăniloae’s Trinitarian Ecclesiology: Orthodoxy and the Filioque* consists of six chapters with the goal of demonstrating Stăniloae’s relevance for Trinitarian theology for the debates about the *filioque* and the broader practical implications for the ecclesiology of Western and Eastern Trinitarian theologies. “The monograph,” Coman reveals, “[gives] priority to Stăniloae’s ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology” (p. 263). With the first chapter giving necessary background information to help contextualise the Orthodox Church and Stăniloae, including his influence on and the influence on him of the Neo-patristic movement, Western theology, and Trinitarian theology.

Chapter 2 is less bibliographical in its overview of “Stăniloae’s Early Approach (1964-1978) to the *Filioque*.” In it, Coman profitably appropriates Kallistos Ware’s labels of “hawks” and “doves” to differentiate those scholars who perceived the *filioque* to have severe repercussions on Western theology, namely in ecclesiology, and those who saw the debate as insignificant and speculative (p. 25). After analysing the hawks and doves of the East and the West, respectively, Coman explores Stăniloae’s engagement with the *filioque*. After initially indicating that Stăniloae’s scholarship was silent on the topic for over 20 years until 1964, Coman explores how Stăniloae’s subsequent reaction to the *filioque* was a reflection of his Orthodox influences, primarily Photius, the three Byzantine theologians—Gregory II of Cyprus, Gregory

Palamas, and Joseph Bryennios, and his contemporaries—Vladimir Lossky and Nikos Nissiotis (pp. 34-6). The chapter concludes with the three primary problems that Stăniloae accused the *filioque* of having on ecclesiology and soteriology. Coman critiques fairly both sides, with him perceptively noting that discourses on the Trinity being a model for the church logically entail Trinitarian doctrine having ecclesiological implications and him irenically challenging the “regrettable caricatures” of Christomonism and pneumatomonism (ibid., p. 51). His conclusion to the chapter helpfully specifies his “spectrum” of hawks and doves within Orthodoxy: Lossky—Stăniloae—Nissiotis—Zizioulas—Ware—Evdokimov—Bulgakov (p. 53). However, Coman claims that Stăniloae was the only hawk whose position on the issue changed over time (p. 54).

Chapter 3 concerns “Stăniloae’s Approach to the *Filioque* in an Ecumenical Context” which explores his “methodology of conversation” for the rest of his career (p. 62). Coman demonstrates that Stăniloae held in tension in his later years “Orthodoxy’s task of departing from the Western scholastic and neo-scholastic influences (the goal of the Neo-Patristic synthesis) ... with Orthodoxy’s task of letting itself be enriched by the spiritual and theological values of others Christian traditions (the goal of “open sobornicity”)” (p. 62). Coman offers in this chapter unique insight into how open sobornicity is both an idea within Stăniloae’s thought and an implemented methodology within his engagement in “the Trinitarian debates on the *filioque* and its subsidiary aspects ... [as witnessed by]: (i) the very positive evaluation of the role of cataphatic theology for the doctrine of the Trinity; (ii) the incorporation of Augustine’s motif of the Holy Spirit as the love between the Father and the Son; and (iii) Stăniloae’s willingness to read back from the economic Trinity into the immanent Trinity”(ps. 65, 76). The final section is devoted to Stăniloae’s approach to the *filioque* from 1978 to 1993 where dialogue on the *filioque* at numerous “ecumenical meetings and international theological conferences ... in a more cordial context” led to him becoming ecumenical over polemical (p. 76). Thus, Stăniloae’s later posture to Trinitarian dialogue is pithily summarised in Coman’s précis: “No longer a hawk[,] not yet a dove” (p. 87).

Chapter 4, “The “Holy Grail” of Twentieth-Century Christian Theology”, explores numerous ecclesiological syntheses between Christology and Pneumatology within the works of selected “influential Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians: [Florovsky, Lossky, and Zizioulas], on the Orthodox side; [Congar and Kasper], on the Roman Catholic side” (p. 96). The selection of these theologians was, Coman notes, “guided by the criterion of ethnic and cultural diversity” although he acknowledges that other significant theologians with their corresponding ecclesiological syntheses “[deserved] attention” too (p. 96). However, he does not specify why Roman Catholic scholars were selected over Protestant ones to represent the Western tradition, despite him mentioning relevant and reputable Roman Catholic *and* Protestant scholars in the previous chapters. Nonetheless, Coman’s choice of conversation partners is effective in situating Stăniloae in the contexts of Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism, and wider Trinitarian scholarship, including Spirit Christology. He also helpfully offers his parameters for ecclesiological syntheses between Christology and pneumatology, noting that such projects attempt to “harmonize Ignatius of Antioch’s statement, *ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia* (wherever Christ is, there is the church) with Irenaeus of Lyon’s assertion,

ubi Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia (wherever the Holy Spirit is, there is the Church,” to the extent that none of the two main pillars of the Church takes precedence over the other” (p. 95). Accordingly, Coman welcomes Congar and Kasper’s Trinitarian insight for ecclesiology that “Christology is conditioned by the Holy Spirit (pneumatological Christology) to the same extent that the Spirit is conditioned by Christ (Christological pneumatology)” (p. 123).

Chapter 5 covers “Stăniloae’s Early Ecclesiology (1938-1964): *A Christological Approach to the Church*.” In section one, Stăniloae identifies the Church as the extension of Christ (*Christus prolongatus*) or the Incarnation continued (*incarnatio continua*), “the closing act of Christ’s soteriological work,” the Body of Christ or “Mystical Body” and *totus Christus* in union with and under the authority of Christ, the Head (p. 145). Alongside these Christocentric tropes, Stăniloae also began describing “the Trinity [as] not only a model for the life of the Church but also its source and ultimate aim or climax” (p. 144). In section two, Coman contextualises the church’s sacramentality with commentary on Roman Catholicism before turning to Stăniloae’s sacramental theology of “*The Created World: The First Sacrament*” (pp. 151-2), “*Christ: The New Sacrament*” (pp. 152-3), and “*The Church of Christ: The Third Sacrament*” (pp. 153-6). After exploring the paradox of the Church as “*Condition of the Sacraments*” or “*Result of the Sacraments*”, Coman comments that for Stăniloae “the basis of the Church’s existence and its source of life remains Christ, for the Church is not a self-sufficient reality that exists in circularity (Church-sacraments; sacraments-Church); but its existence and vigour ultimately depend upon Christ” (p. 158). Coman concludes the chapter with criticism of the absent synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in Stăniloae’s early ecclesiology when he “drastically criticized Western theology for its forgetfulness of the role of the Holy Spirit while his own doctrine of the Church before 1964 was equally grounded in Christology. References to the Holy Spirit appear only sporadically in his early publications on the doctrine of the Church” (p. 159).

Chapter 6, which accounts for a third of the book’s pages, is titled “The Church in Light of the Mystery of the Trinity: *Stăniloae’s Late Ecclesiology (1964-1993)*.” It has four sections. In the first section on the topic of Stăniloae’s mature theology of “The Trinity: Structure of Supreme Love”, Coman identifies Stăniloae’s simultaneous apophatic and cataphatic attitudes, through acknowledging the “*The Trinity as a Mystery*” yet also constructively incorporating “the paradigm[s] of love and communion into his Trinitarian theology” of God immanently and economically (p. 171). After identifying Stăniloae’s appreciation for the fittingness of a loving God in three persons, Coman examines the “*Dynamics of the Trinitarian Loving Communion*” moving from Father to Son to Holy Spirit (pp. 173-6) and “The Mystery of Unity in Diversity” within the Trinity through treating the topics of “*The Monarchy of the Father*,” “*The Unity of Essence*,” “*Perichoresis and Intersubjectivity*,” and “*Divine Energies*” (pp. 176-83). Section 2 concerns “two definitions of the Church [that] could serve as a guide through Stăniloae’s Trinitarian ecclesiology”: the Church as an “icon” of the Trinity and the Church as participant in the *katabatic* and *anabatic* movements of the Triune God of love (p. 184). Although Coman acknowledges, and potentially overstates, the point that “both definitions are interrelated, for the Church as an icon of the Trinity implies the idea that it partakes of the Trinitarian communion and *vice-versa*” (ibid.).

The third section revolves around “Stăniloae’s concern to anchor the ecclesiological synthesis between Christology and pneumatology in the indissoluble union that eternally exists between the Son and the Holy Spirit” (p. 217). That is, his synthesis was characterised by beliefs in “(i) the irreducibility of the Spirit to the Son and the affirmation of his equal importance with the Logos; and (ii) the inseparability of the Son from the Spirit” economically (p. 197). Notably, Stăniloae’s synthesis relied on “*relations of reciprocity*” instead of “*relations of opposition*,” which distanced him from Lossky and Zizioulas and “placed him closer to ... Congar” (p. 197). Coman’s primary reservation about Stăniloae’s synthesis is that the indissoluble union marked by reciprocity “[risks] confusing the work of Christ with the work of the Spirit” (p. 197). The final section provides Stăniloae’s evaluation of two noteworthy ecclesiological models from recent Orthodox memory: the ecclesiology of *sobornost* associated with Khomiakov and Afanasiev’s Eucharistic ecclesiology. Stăniloae responded positively overall to Khomiakov, according to Coman, but was “more critical” of Afanasiev, i.e. critiquing his emphasis on the Eucharist while neglecting the church’s wider activities and identity as a “sacramental community” (p. 246).

I commend Coman for his thorough analysis of Stăniloae’s corpus and extensive engagement with Orthodox and Roman Catholic theologians in order to present systematically the relevance of Stăniloae’s contributions for robust contemporary Trinitarian ecclesiologies. However, I hope to see him develop in the future a “more critical approach to [Stăniloae’s] theology” that builds on his legacy (p. 267).

Michael J. Gorman, *Abide and Go: Missional Theosis in the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018. (258 pp.) [ISBN 9781532615450]

Kenneth M. Keyte

In his book *Abide and Go*, Michael Gorman proposes a theotic-missional reading of John by which the narrative pattern of abide and go is made obvious to the reader. Gorman explains what a theotic-missional reading involves (Ch. 1); identifies the narrative missional pattern of abide and go (Chs. 2-3); exegetes John’s gospel theotically and missionally (Chs. 3-6); then reflects hermeneutically on contemporary missional theosis (Ch. 7).

I began reading *Abide and Go* prior to the Covid pandemic but had to put it aside to concentrate on pastoring a church through these exceptional socially restrictive times. I completed the book after the initial restrictions had eased in New Zealand. Yet despite these restrictions, most churches found ways to continue patterns of abiding together and going into the world through innovative use of online social media. The church’s resilience in overcoming these barriers made clear to me the priority of the theotic-missional pattern of abide and go that Michael Gorman exegetes from John’s gospel.

Gorman offers three pairs of general and contextual questions for a missional reading of scripture.

- (1) What does the text say about the *missio Dei*? And what does the text say about the *missio Dei here and now*?
- (2) What does the text say about the condition of humanity and the world, about the need for God’s saving