

17-03-2021

Assessment of the manuscript of Petr Gallus, *The Perspective of Resurrection: A Trinitarian Theology*

His extensive study project has resulted into an enriching book of high quality. The author is dealing with a lot of items on the level of biblical exegesis, the history of doctrine, philosophy and systematic theology. His description of the quest for the historical Jesus and the history of the reception of Chalcedon manifests that he is able to summarize complicated debates in an adequate way. Especially his chapter on the impact of Chalcedon is a fine piece of work. His analysis of the benefits and disadvantages of the Chalcedonian solutions are clarifying.

Chapter 4, 6, 7 and 8 can be considered as the center of this study. Here, the author elaborates his main theses on the necessity to interpret the resurrection within a trinitarian framework, on accommodation, on the impact of Jesus' death and on Jesus' vicarious bearing of our fate. In these chapters his own original approach becomes quite clear.

In some other chapters, like 10 and 11, the author has some difficulties to find his own approach. In particular in chapter 11 that difficulty becomes evident. Because of his intention, expressed in the Preface (page VII), to present 'an outline of a contemporary Christology which could stand the challenge of the current postmodern situation', I can understand the addition of a chapter in which he deals with postmodernism. In reality, however, he deals in this chapter just with the presuppositions of the interreligious dialogue and not really with postmodernism as a broad modern philosophical way of thinking.

In a certain sense the author presents in one volume three books: one in the main text, one in the paragraphs with a smaller letter and one in the footnotes. That is not problematic provided that the main text can be read without the other two texts. That is indeed often the case.

This study lacks an extended description of its starting point and of the aporia's it will deal with. It misses a detailed *status quaestionis*. More or less as compensation of this lack the author opens most of the chapters with a concise description of the thesis he will defend. Generally spoken he keeps up clearly his

line of argument throughout the chapters and arrives at understandable conclusions.

In most of the cases the author uses his sources in an independent way, but sometimes, like in chapter 10 he doesn't do more than evaluate the points of views of others.

The extended (more than 25 pages!) bibliography shows a strong focus upon the Protestant and Roman Catholic German theology from the last quarter of the nineteenth century onwards. Dalferth, Jüngel and Pannenberg are his main spokesmen. It indicates also his acquaintance with early Christian doctrine, the theology of the Reformers and the German nineteenth century philosophical classics. The main current systematical works out of the English speaking world, especially the UK and the USA, are also digested. So, it is an adequate and comprehensive bibliography, sometimes even a bit too exhaustive. That focus upon German theology gives this study, especially in chapter 7.2 and 10, a slightly speculative flavor, but its down-to-earth style of reasoning offers often in a pleasant way a healthy counterbalance.

This assessment is not a review. I shall not critically bring forward my own opinions on the items dealt with, although in many cases I also fully agree with the position taken by the author. As can be observed above, I limit myself mainly to formal points.

Although I would be inclined to suggest to skip the last chapter (11) and to integrate chapter 5 and 10 into one comprehensive chapter, the study as a whole is an impressive one. It has a well thought out composition. The author often knows the details of the discussion as well. The manuscript is an outstanding proof of the author's capacity to participate in the discussion on exegetical and historical controversies and to take an own position in the current Christological debate. In a convincing way it indicates his extended knowledge and his talent to untangle complex discussions.

Therefore, my final conclusion is that this study is more than acceptable as *Habilitationsschrift*.

Martien E. Brinkman
Em. professor of ecumenical theology
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam