on harming the other than on helping. In perfective marriages, though, conflict takes on the character of challenging the spouse to live out their Christian vocation ever more completely. In applying the principles of just war theory to marriage, particularly the necessity of informing all conflict by the goal of reconciliation, Kim provides a framework for turning destructive marriages into perfective, and supporting perfective marriages in their continuing task of sanctification of the spouses.

*Just Marriage* easily achieves its goal of demonstrating that the principles of just war theory can be illuminative when applied to moral questions beyond the context of armed conflict. Kim presents the book as representative of his own efforts in reflecting on just conflict in marriage, and as such is best described as an extended meditation. Yet the contribution of this book is by no means trivial. Kim has proven not only the applicability of just war theory to a wider range of moral questions, but especially to the insights which may be generated for considering conflict within marriage. To this latter point, *Just Marriage* is a promising first step in exploring an aspect of marriage too long left unconsidered by so much moral theology.

MEGHAN BOWEN

Regis College (Toronto)


Lisa D. Powell’s *The Disabled God Revisited: Trinity, Christology, and Liberation* takes both its name and inspiration from the late Nancy Eiesland’s landmark *The Disabled God: Toward a Liberatory Theology of Disability* (1994). In that book, Eiesland reflects on the wounds of the crucified Christ retained after the resurrection in order to present her memorable image of the disabled God. Since its publication, many readers and critics have found Eiesland’s image of the disabled God provocative but theologically under-developed, and so in this book Powell turns to recent debates in trinitarian theology to elaborate a doctrine of God that supports a liberation theology of disability.

To present her own account of the disabled God, Powell draws upon the “covenant ontology” defended most notably by Bruce McCormack. According to McCormack’s interpretation of the theology of Karl Barth, *election* has priority over *Trinity*. God’s decision to be a God of covenant has logical priority to and does not arise subsequently from God’s identity as triune. The consequence for Christology is that the second person of the Trinity simply is Jesus Christ. Rather than an abstract *logos asarkos* “behind” the person of
Jesus, God’s eternal self-determination includes Jesus Christ in all of his history. Powell takes this to be important for a theology of disability because it means that the need, suffering, and interdependence of Jesus are therefore part of the divine life. Thus, the revelation of God in Christ can be called the “disabled God.”

Chapters three and four elaborate this proposal and defend it against potential criticisms. Powell is well aware of how a trinitarian theology that emphasizes vulnerability might seem to promote heteropatriarchal and hierarchical social arrangements by suggesting the eternal subordination of the Son to the all-powerful Father. She argues that a covenant ontology does not necessarily lead to these hierarchical orderings of obedience; instead, the receptivity of Christ is better construed as a pattern of “call and response” rather than “command and obey.” She turns to theorists of queer and disability studies in order to identify how agency and receptivity might be reconfigured in ways consistent with her Christology. The book concludes with a vision of the resurrection where the earthly identity categories of “disabled” and “able-bodied” are transformed as all are engrafted into the body of Christ.

The emphasis on vulnerability and interdependence is commonplace in much existing disability theology literature. But Powell’s account of these dimensions of human life provides a challenge to and advance beyond theologies that emphasize vulnerability in the service of largely conservative, anti-liberationist theologies. She also frames her account as a corrective to feminist theologians who reject themes of kenoticism and vulnerability because of their connection to heteropatriarchal values. She argues that these thinkers end up returning to the autonomous subject of liberal modernity and a theology of sheer power. But there may be more to the feminist critique of vulnerability than unacknowledged ableism. Linn Tonstad, who comes under critique here, has raised challenging questions about whether theologies that embrace vulnerability are able to secure the social, political, and economic goals that projects like Powell’s hope to achieve.

Even as Powell complicates and reconfigures our understanding of binaries such as activity and receptivity, she suggests we must choose between a theology of power and a theology of vulnerability. Throughout the book, she makes a sharp distinction between her proposal and traditional doctrines of God—rejected as ableist—that affirm divine attributes such as omniscience and omnipotence. Like the work of McCormack upon which she draws, this proposal is likely to generate some debate. Some might still question whether it is necessary or desirable for a disability theology to locate something like disability within the being of God. Advocates of a non-contrastive theology might argue that God’s transcendence does not reinforce
ableist values of mastery and self-sufficiency, but rather provides an alternative that goes beyond finite worldly oppositions of power and vulnerability, possession, and need. A significant contribution of this book would be to inspire responses from rival Barthians, Roman Catholics, and scholars of other denominations and theological approaches who advocate alternative doctrines of God while sharing a commitment to the liberation and flourishing of persons with disabilities.

This book will be of interest not only to disability theologians, but also to those engaged in debates in trinitarian theology and theological anthropology. The brevity and clarity with which it is written make the book accessible to undergraduate students and refreshing to more advanced readers as well. *The Disabled God Revisited* is a thought-provoking and welcome addition to the growing literature on disability in Christian systematic theology.

KEVIN MCCABE
Seton Hall University


*Catholic Higher Education and Catholic Social Thought* explores how the riches of Catholic social teaching (CST) can inform the curriculum and institutional life of Catholic colleges and universities (CCUs). The contributors offer radical critiques of the current state of Catholic higher education while proposing practical steps administrators, faculty, and staff can take to implement CST on campus.

Editors Prusak and Reed-Bouley open the volume by introducing CST and its relevance for CCUs. Many of the essays consider themes related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Laura Nichols illustrates the historical shift in the student population served by CCUs; traditionally serving as a path to the middle class for low-income, immigrant families, CCUs have, since the 1960s, increasingly served students from more affluent backgrounds. At many higher-ranked CCUs, well over half of students come from families with incomes in the top quintile, while low-income students and first-generation college students make up small percentages. Michelle Gonzalez Maldonado notes the mismatch between the growing proportion of US Catholics who identify as Latina/o/x and the fact that the latter only make up 13.7 percent of students at CCUs. Maldonado outlines the factors contributing to this gap and suggests that CCUs transform their curricular and cocurricular offerings, offer scholarships for the recruitment and retention of Latina/o/x students, and make efforts to