BOOK REVIEWS

OLD TESTAMENT
- Imperialism and Religion (M. Cogan)
- Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow (S. J. DeVries)
- Myth in Old Testament Interpretation (J. W. Rogerson)
- Psalms 73-150 (D. Kidner)

NEW TESTAMENT
- Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur (P. Vielhauer)

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
- Götzendammerung in den Wissenschaften (H. W. Beck)
- Church Dogmatics III (K. Barth)
- A Second Collection (B. J. F. Lonergan)
- A Theology of Love (M. B. Wynkoop)

HISTORICAL THEOLOGY
- Keswick: A Bibliographic Introduction (D. D. Bundy)
- Our Common History as Christians (J. Deschner et al., eds.)
- The Problem of Original Sin in American Presbyterian Theology (G. P. Hutchinson)
- The Shape of the Puritan Mind (E. B. Lowrie)

CHURCH HISTORY
- A Self-Portrait (J. C. Ryle)
- The Church of England in South Africa (A. Ive)
- The Great Trek of the Russian Mennonites to Central Asia (F. R. Belk)
- The Franciscan Concept of Mission in the High Middle Ages (E. R. Daniel)

HOMILETICS
- Preaching for Today (C. E. Fant)

BOOKS RECEIVED
Cogan's thesis is that the Neo-assyrian western expansion in the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. was primarily military and political in intent and had little or no stress upon imposition of the Assyrian religion on conquered peoples. In particular, he is highly critical of the view advocated by Olmstead, Ostreicher, Noth, and others, that Israel, as well as other conquered nations, was coerced into following the cultic faith of Neo-assyria. Cogan's argument is based on an analysis of the Scripture, Neo-assyrian texts, and other relevant material.

Two significant questions are raised in the monograph. First, in what way did Assyrian conquest affect the indigenous religion of conquered territories? Second, did the imperial policy of Neo-assyria uniformly include imposition of the worship of Ashur and other Assyrian deities? Cogan also attempts to assess, in light of the Biblical account, the influence and pertinence of Assyrian religion on Israel and Judah.

On the whole, the monograph is a healthy corrective to the excesses that were indicative of earlier attempts to analyze the significance of Neo-assyrian cultic practices on the religion of Israel. Olmstead, for example, held that Assyria, like later Roman policy, routinely enforced the worship of Ashur upon conquered territories (see his History of Assyria and History of Palestine and Syria). More recently Robinson, Noth, Bright, and Gray have advocated the same view.

Extensive study by Cogan of the Neo-assyrian texts of the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. demonstrates that insistence on religious conformity was not a basic Assyrian policy. That the Assyrian inscriptions show the superiority of the god(s) of the conquerors is evident, but there is no clear assertion that the conquered peoples were obligated to worship Ashur. In fact, at times the inscriptions indicate that the local deities were working in favor of the Assyrian conquest. Sennacherib, on one occasion, asserts that "their gods abandoned them, rendering them helpless" (The Inscriptions of Sargon II, King of Assyria, Part I—The Annals, lines 267-273). Curiously, the military conquests of Neo-assyria were often seen as a judgment on a territory brought about by the displeasure of the local deity. This point is made in the inscriptions of Esarhaddon, where the king declares that the conquest of Babylon was due to the anger of Marduk. The problem, of course, is in assessing how much such assertions are due to religious fervor and how much the statements are rationalizations to justify conquest.

Cogan's book has many valuable features. He presents a convincing argument that the Neo-assyrian texts do not support the view that the Assyrians imposed their own religion on Israel or other conquered nations. Often the gods of a particular territory were removed to Nineveh, not apparently as an act of irreverence but rather as a means of maintaining a favorable relationship with the deities of the conquered areas. Such spoliation was not vindictive in intent, since the gods were often returned and their sanctuaries rebuilt. Refreshingly, Cogan tends to be willing to deal directly with the Biblical text when assessing the import of Assyrian influence on Yahwistic faith. A case in point is the discussion on Manasseh (pp. 88 ff.), where he correctly contends that the king's imposition of idolatry was done against the opposition of the rank and file in Judah. The translations from the Assyrian texts add strength to the main thrust of the book because primary sources are being utilized.
On the negative side of the ledger, several problems are evident. With the exception of the discussion on Manasseh, the author tends to see the Biblical writings as tendentious. Such an assumption is rarely made of the Neo-assyrian texts. For the most part, the inscriptions are taken as straightforward objective evidence of Neo-assyrian policy. This methodology fails to deal with the fact that the Assyrian kings were anxious to display their conquests in the most favorable light. It would hardly be probable that Assyrian inscriptions were objective, unbiased reporting. Thus any attempt to reconstruct Assyrian policy is, at most, only tentative. That the Assyrian monarchs were not particularly evangelistic for their religion is obvious from their militaristic designs. But to assume that religious influence and conformity was non-existent is not realistic. Assyrian policy may not have been one of coercion, yet it is hardly probable that it was one of indifference.

Obviously Biblical writers were biased in their presentation since the basic intent of their writing is religious. Such an admission, however, does not necessitate the assumption that the Biblical material is totally biased. Within the context of their purpose, Biblical writers should be given at least as much credit for objectivity as is given to the Neo-assyrian texts.

The value of the book would have been enhanced if an index of key people, events, and subjects had been included. The dissertation style makes reading difficult since many of the footnotes are not crucial to the discussion. Cogan's work should be compared with John McKay's monograph, Religion in Judah under the Assyrians (Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, No. 26), which covers the same ground but is much more readable.

John E. Eggleton

Eastern New Mexico University, Portales, New Mexico 88130


The subject of time and history in the Old Testament has been much discussed in recent years—by von Rad, Barr, Rendtorff, and others. DeVries contributes to the discussion by means of a detailed scholarly study of the Hebrew language relative to time. Since a thorough study of this language in general would be too vast a task, he limits himself to an intensive and comprehensive investigation of one group of related time expressions.

Previous linguistic studies have been woefully inadequate, according to DeVries (cf. his scathing comments in JBL 1970 on Wilch's Time and Event [1969], a work highly commended by Driver in the SOTS Book List, 1970). Recent analyses of event, history, revelation, and eschatology have not overcome much basic misunderstanding and error, he argues, and only detailed exegesis can deal with this. DeVries sets himself the task of clarifying exegetically the Biblical concept of time by means of an inductive study of some adverbial expressions which contain the Hebrew word yôm ("day"). It is this word, rather than 'êl ("a time"), which DeVries takes to be the primary Hebrew time word and therefore makes the basis of his work.

The first major section is devoted to a study of "The Day Past: bə'yôm había". This Hebrew expression occurs 88 (p. 57) or 89 (p. 51) times with reference to the past, and DeVries not only examines every occurrence but sets out the results of his examination in more than seventy pages of form-critical and traditio-historical detail. He concludes that the expression is used most often simply as a synchronism, sometimes as an indicator of sequence, twice as a "time-identifier," and, surprisingly frequently, in an epitome ("a summarizing
characterization concerning a particular day in which Israel's God was in some way seen to be active in crucial confrontation with his people," p. 156).

"The Day Present: hayyôm and Its Equivalents" is the subject of DeVries' second and longest major section. He does not discuss the more common 'atô, which refers most often to a logical rather than a temporal relationship (p. 42), but examines almost all of the 217 present occurrences of hayyôm (or b'te'ézm hayyôm) kazzek and hayyôm (hazež). The result of this marathon he characterizes in the expression "the day present as a moment of crucial decision." Apart from a not inconsiderable number of "time-identifications," these Hebrew expressions are used for epitome and the closely related "appeal for decisive action" and "identifying characterization."

To conclude the study of hayyôm hahûy begun in his first major section, DeVries turns to consider "The Day Future." The 112 occurrences of this expression with reference to the future are dealt with comparatively briefly, leading to the conclusion that four-fifths of them are synchronisms and that virtually all of the others form part of an epitome. As before, DeVries' interest in this seems largely limited to analysis of forms and traditions. Only in his last paragraph does he engage in theological reflection, and then in a rather generalized way, declaring 'that day' future' to be "God's or man's new opportunity for decisive action" (p. 351). No doubt this is true, but it is scarcely original.

Eight conclusions draw the work to a close. The study has proved the necessity of a comprehensive methodology (p. 335). It has clarified the nature of Hebrew time language (p. 336), enriched exegetical and critical discussion (p. 337), and enabled insight into the functions of the time words (p. 338). It has shown the parenetic concern of revelatory interpretation of the past and the future (p. 340) and the close temporal relationship between word and event (p. 342). It has distinguished the quantitative conception of time (which provides a framework of continuity) from the qualitative (which gives historical event its revelatory significance) (p. 345) and related these in Hebrew thought respectively to the cultic/gnomic/sacramental and the historical/charismatic/parenetic approaches to life (p. 346). These two conceptions are held in dynamic tension in the Old Testament with the parenetic central and the sacramental instrumental.

This volume is attractively and accurately printed, and it is very reasonably priced. It should not be thought, however, that this is a popular work or one suitable for a wide readership, in spite of the blurb on the dust cover. DeVries' careful scholarship has produced a worthwhile reference work, but its whole conception as an intensive and comprehensive study makes it difficult to read, even for a scholar. The subtitle, "Time and History in the Old Testament," is an exaggeration of the book's scope, which might be better summed up as "A form-critical and tradition-historical study of 'today' and 'in that day' in the Old Testament." Nevertheless, within this inevitably narrow scope DeVries has given us a work of quality which makes its own contribution to understanding Hebrew ideas of time and history.

D. L. Baker
Tyndale House, Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge CB3 9BA, England


The aim of this study is "to describe how the concept of myth has been used
in Old Testament interpretation since the end of the late 18th century" (p. v.). Beginning with Lowth’s lectures on Hebrew poetry, Rogerson traces the development of mythical OT interpretation in Germany from Heyne through Herder to Gunkel and the rather different approaches of Hooke and G. E. Wright in English and of Ricoeur and Lévi-Strauss in French.

Lowth (1753) made a distinction between poetry derived from nature, which was man’s earliest speech, and poetry as a conscious art; and Heyne (1777) called this earliest speech “myth,” by which he meant the attempt to understand and express experience by means of analogies from nature. Eichhorn and Gabler (1790) interpreted Genesis 2 f. as an historical/philosophical myth about the loss of paradise and the origin of evil; and Bauer (1802) applied the method more extensively to the OT, classifying passages into philosophical, historical, poetic, and mixed myths. Herder’s interpretation of the Old Testament narratives (1827) was closely related to that of the “mythical school,” though he had a broader view of truth and was more cautious about using myth to explain away difficulties. A stronger reaction to the mythical school occurred in the works of de Wette (1807, 1815), George (1837) and Ewald (1843), who distinguished myth from saga (pre-history) and valued it positively as an expression of religious experience, the truth of which was independent of the formal accuracy of the narratives concerned. The second half of the 19th century saw the development of comparative mythology (Müller, 1856; Goldziher, 1876), astral mythology (Winckler, 1893-1903) and anthropological mythology (Lang, 1875-1897), although these methods had little lasting effect on OT interpretation. It was Gunkel’s literary classificatory work (1895-1930) that was especially formative for 20th-century German views of myth, though Rogerson argues that it has been overrated and draws attention to many inconsistencies.

Gunkel’s understanding of myth as “stories about gods,” with the corollary that the OT contains little myth, has been commonly accepted in 20th-century German scholarship; and there has been little significant development from that view. Outside Germany, however, there have been four major new approaches, which Rogerson subjects to detailed examination. Hooke’s myth-and-ritual theory (1920-1960), which suggested that the OT had taken over a pattern of Babylonian religion in which myth was the “spoken correlative” of the “acted rite,” was based on the diffusionist anthropology of the 1920s and for that reason has been widely attacked. Cassirer’s view of myth (1925) as an independent kind of thought distinct from empirical consciousness was used in the symposium Before Philosophy (1946) to contrast the OT to the mythopoetic thought of the ancient Near East, a position popularized by G. E. Wright (1950). Lévi-Strauss (1958+) applied some of the procedures of structural linguistics to the study of myth, stressing the importance of the syntagmatic axis of language (i. e., the influences of context on meaning) in myth interpretation. Ricoeur (1950+) introduced a symbolic interpretation of myth, in which it was understood to be an expression of primary existential symbols.

Rogerson concludes his historical study by summarising twelve main uses of the term “myth” in OT interpretation and briefly discusses the way the concept has been used to solve OT problems. The idea of “primitive mentality” must now be abandoned: The difference between OT and modern thought is not in quality but in social institutions such as language. It can no longer be assumed that there is a gulf between the OT and modern belief which has to be bridged by rationalization or romanticization of the OT. Rogerson proposes a literary and functional definition of myth as “stories or literature which expressed the faith and world view of a people” (p. 188), distinct from Märchen (stories for entertainment) and saga (folk traditions). On this definition the OT contains myth, Märchen and saga, as also does modern non-literary thought. He mentions
the need for a detailed study of the importance of Icelandic saga for understanding OT traditions (p. 180): Miskotte has in fact made such a study in *Edda en Thora* (1939, 1970).

This is a first-rate study in historical theology. The volume has a few printing errors, but in general it is well presented and maintains the high standard (and high price!) of the series to which it belongs. Although he modestly points out that the complexity of the idea of myth has led him into areas in which he is no specialist, and justifies his neglect of Scandinavian work on the topic by suggesting that the latter does not make an original contribution to the debate, Rogerson's work is nevertheless an extremely competent and thorough history of "myth in OT interpretation" and will be a valuable reference tool for many years to come.

D. L. Baker
Overseas Missionary Fellowship, 2 Cluny Rd., Singapore 10


This little volume in the Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries completes Kidner's work on the Psalms. Conveniently and sensibly the pages are numbered in sequence to the first volume. As a consequence, *Psalms* 73-150 has no separate introduction nor indices (the latter in conformity to the policy for this series).

Kidner continues the practice of giving each Psalm a short, concise heading—a help to the preacher who needs to place such a heading in the newspaper or church bulletin but a somewhat dissatisfying practice with regard to many Psalms that express more than one central theme. As one examines this worthwhile contribution, it is essential to keep in mind the General Editor's cautioning remark: "The length and variety ... preclude an exhaustive treatment within the number of pages allocated" (p. v). Hence one must not expect detailed arguments on specific problems. It is nevertheless necessary to point out that Kidner has wrestled with the problems and attempted scholarly solutions and that his commentary reflects his considered conclusions.

His approach may be exemplified by his treatment of Psalm 127:2. It seems that J. A. Emerton's article was published after the completion of his comments on this Psalm, so that an "additional note" became necessary. The note mentions Dahood's ("prosperity") and Emerton's ("honour") suggestions to replace the word "sleep." But then Kidner states in conclusion: "To me, however, it seems probable that the psalmist did speak of *sleep*, content merely to sketch the contrast to the picture of frantic activity, in the simplest and most graceful terms, whatever logical objections a minute scrutiny might uncover."

This is a helpful suggestion for those who dislike any form of textual criticism (though the author himself does not belong in this category, as his references to the readings for *ken* indicate). But it seems to the reviewer that the word "sleep" raises logical objections not principally on the basis of "minute scrutiny" but of context: Verses 1 and 2 contain a very close stylistic structure (perhaps *priamel*—certainly *anaphora* in v. 1) which finds its climax in the last part of verse 2. Even a superficial reader may ask the question: What is the relationship of verse 2 to verse 1? Should not the two activities of verse 1 match the activity of verse 2 (i.e., building—guarding—toiling)? If the poet had maintained (rather boringly) the anaphoric pattern, should not the third part read: "Unless the Lord gives to his beloved honour/prosperity, those who rise up early and go late to rest, eat the bread of (gained by) toils in vain"? Hence, is the third activity for which men rise up early and go to bed late "sleeping"? To
refuse to accept a well-based linguistic case for the adoption of either “honour” or “prosperity” appears to be just a little stubborn. And whereas in the light of the modern-day problem of insomnia, not only for unbelievers, both “honour” and “prosperity” can be spiritualized, it is out of the question for “sleep.” But if Kidner’s question with regard to a parallel “in the incident of the sleeping Christ in the storm” was answered in the affirmative, why were not all the beloved in the boat asleep? These general considerations together with the specific details would make the reviewer opt for one of the two suggestions above.

That the author is careful not to accept too quickly changes suggested by Ugaritologists (proposed in abundance) commends this volume. But some inconsistencies exist: The suggestion of a typical Ugaritic parallelism in Psalm 80:17 (“hand” parallel to “right hand”) by O’Callaghan (VT IV, p. 172) is ignored, but for Psalms 74:14 and 92:9 the Ugaritic material is extensively used (though the reviewer has doubts about Ps. 92:9 as Yahwistic polemic, since it merely employs the well-known poetic device of anaphora; cf. Ps. 29:1 f.; 93:4; 96:7 f.; et al.).

This volume, read together with the first (where the Introduction is of specific value to the student), is an elegant and eloquent scholarly contribution that will be most welcome to preachers and students alike.

Harold H. P. Dressler
Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary, 3358 S. E. Marine Dr.,
Vancouver, B. C.

NEW TESTAMENT


There never seems to be any shortage of introductions to the NT, and older works are continually being revised or completely rewritten. From Germany we have had quite recently a revision of W. G. Kümmel’s introduction (available in English translation) and a revision by J. Schmid of A. Wikenhauser’s introduction from a much more radical standpoint than that of its original author. Now we have available what is in fact a new work intended to replace the section on NT introduction in R. Knopf, H. Lietzmann and H. Weinel, Einführung in das Neue Testament, originally published in 1919 (5th ed., 1949); the section on the history of early Christianity in this volume is to be replaced by a separate book by H. Köster.

The present work has unusual features compared with the typical NT introduction. The author has regarded it as his task to follow M. Dibelius’ conception of the history of early Christian literature as an explanation of how the Christian message came to literary expression. His interest, therefore, is confined to providing a literary history of the material, although naturally he has to describe the pre-literary stages of the process. His aim is to express the literary character of early Christian literature, and therefore he is not interested in the historical situations of the writings or their effects for their own sake. He is not concerned, for example, with the historical value of the gospels as testimonies to the ministry of Jesus, except insofar as this point is relevant to their historical character. As a result, the book is much more an introduction to early Christian literature as such than a set of individual discussions of the separate items; it is more of a connected narrative than is the case with other works on introduction.
In addition, the author recognizes that the books which were canonized formed part of a broader stream of literary activity, and thus he is concerned with the whole corpus of literature that can be reckoned as belonging to the primitive Church (as distinct from the ecclesiastical writings of the early [2nd-century and later] Church). This means that the NT Apocrypha and the Apostolic Fathers are included, greatly increasing its value, for here the student will find quickly and easily the relevant information about these works. In this way the NT writings are seen in their wider context. The author concludes his discussion with a brief treatment of how the NT writings came to be regarded as canonical over against other works that failed to achieve canonicity.

After a brief discussion of pre-literary forms, Vielhauer discusses the Pauline corpus, including writings attributed to Paul (such as Hebrews); second, he discusses the synoptic gospels and Acts, handling first the general questions of character, sources and forms, and then each gospel in turn; the third section is devoted to the Johannine circle; fourth come the apocalypses (Rev.; Apoc. Peter; Hermas; Asc. Is.); fifth, the later epistles (1 Clem.; Ign.; Poly.); sixth, fictitious or literary epistles (Jas.; 1 Pet.; Jude; 2 Pet.; Barn.); seventh, the apocryphal gospels; eighth, the apocryphal Acts; ninth, Church orders and liturgical material (Did.; 2 Clem.; G. Truth; Od. Sol.); and, finally, the end of this primitive literature, Papias and Hegesippus.

The author is a professor in Bonn, well known for his dissertation on the word Ὀικοδομή, his contributions to Hennecke and Schneemelcher's New Testament Apocrypha on Jewish Christian gospels and the apocalyptic literature, and his Neuestamentliche Aufsätze, a collection of essays that includes his two essays denying that Jesus used the term "Son of man," his lengthy criticisms of F. Hahn's work on Christology, and his famous essay "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." It is through this last volume that he has become known as an extremely radical scholar, remarkably clear and logical in his reasoning, and a devastating critic of weakly-founded arguments. These characteristics are all to be found in this carefully organized and clearly and interestingly written book, succinct and yet full of information, and competently argued. This, therefore, is a book with which conservative scholars will have to grapple.

It is impossible to discuss the book in detail in a short review, but we may glance briefly at some items of interest. The author gives an excellent summary of the literary characteristics of the Pauline epistles. He accepts the use in Acts of an itinerary of Paul's journeys, but he dismisses the historicity of Paul's "second" visit to Jerusalem (Acts 11:30; 12:25) and places the missionary campaign in Acts 13-14 after the apostolic council (Gal. 2:1-10). He adopts the unusual course of dating the council as early as AD 44 since he interprets Mark 10:39 as implying that James and John were both martyred under Agrippa I. As he himself has to admit, this chronology is by no means free of problems. 1 Thessalonians is regarded as the earliest letter of Paul, and Vielhauer sees no need to regard it as a secondary composition from fragments; but he regards 2 Thessalonians as a pseudonymous production, largely because it presents itself as having been written directly after 1 Thessalonians and yet adopts a different eschatological attitude. Here Vielhauer does not take sufficiently seriously the fact that 2 Thessalonians was deliberately intended to curb the false apocalyptic enthusiasm that had been unintentionally stimulated by 1 Thessalonians.

Galatians is regarded as being directed to North Galatia, but the arguments remain unconvincing. (At a recent meeting of the Tyndale Fellowship NT study group, C. J. Hemer discussed the phrase "O foolish Galatians" and produced evidence that it could be used to address "South" Galatians; we await the publication of his essay with interest.) Vielhauer rightly argues against the view that Paul's opponents in Galatia were other than Judaizers. With regard to
Corinth, Vielhauer denies the existence of a “Christ party” and does his best to get rid of the embarrassing formula in 1 Corinthians 1:12 as a phrase used by Paul to demonstrate the incompatibility of those who claim to belong to Christ also affirming allegiance to some human figure. He thinks that Peter himself had visited Corinth and that he was regarded by some there as the “foundation” of the Church—hence Paul’s polemic in 1 Corinthians 3:11. The letter is a unity, with the exception of chapter 11 which seems to presuppose a different party situation. By contrast, Vielhauer accepts a division of 2 Corinthians into three letters, and he argues that the same Gnostic opposition is reflected in both 1 and 2 Corinthians.

Philippians is also divided into three parts, and the background is decisively found in Paul’s hypothetical Ephesian imprisonment; but the arguments offered against Rome are far from convincing. Philemon is also assigned to Ephesus, but at a different time from Philippians; Vielhauer correctly recognizes (against Kümmel) that Paul wished for Philemon to set Onesimus free. Romans is regarded as Paul’s last letter, with chapter 16 forming part of a copy meant for Ephesus. Vielhauer was writing before M. D. Hooker placed the existence of a Colossian “heresy” under a question mark, and he accepts the fact of a Gnostic mystery cult threatening the Church. He claims that the language and style of the letter are not exactly favorable to Pauline authorship—an overstatement—and argues that the theology is un-pauline; I find his claims unconvincing. It goes without saying that the authenticity of Ephesians and the pastorals is denied for much the usual reasons.

In his treatment of the synoptic gospels, Vielhauer offers an interesting discussion of the origin of the use of the term “gospel.” He dismisses at the outset the early Church tradition regarding the authorship of the gospels, though he has to admit that the traditions regarding Mark and Matthew are older than Papias. There is a good summary of the two-source theory and of form criticism, and a particularly useful section is devoted to “Q,” in which some of the more recent speculation on its nature is effectively criticized. None of the gospels is by its reputed author, and all are dated after AD 70. Vielhauer is concerned largely with their literary and theological character and, as noted earlier, does not discuss directly their relationship to the historical Jesus. This approach has the merit of bringing out the character of the gospels as proclamation and of relating them to the contexts in which they were written, but it is obviously one-sided and produces a tendency to ignore the force of tradition in shaping the gospels.

The book contains useful basic bibliographies, largely reflecting its German origin; nevertheless, attention is paid to important works in English. Although the author refers to some conservative works, it is alarming to see that he does not consider the standard volumes of F. F. Bruce on Acts to be worthy of mention; the work of D. Guthrie on the pastorals is overlooked, although curiously E. K. Simpson’s commentary is listed. Here W. G. Kümmel is a more satisfactory guide.

The value of this work lies in its comprehensiveness, lucidity and careful argumentation. It represents a standpoint very different from that of the clientele of JETS, and there is much here with which one would want to disagree. It is, however, free from the one-sidedness and lack of attention to opposing arguments that characterize such a work as N. Perrin’s recent introduction. Like the work of Bultmann and Dibelius it is highly stimulating even for those who disagree with its radical outlook. It is a work to be used with profit, not least when it challenges conservative readers to ground their own view of things more firmly and to argue them more convincingly against its careful presentation of a different point of view.

I. Howard Marshall
University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland AB9 2UB
Karl Heim, for many years professor of systematic theology at Tübingen University, died August 30, 1958. Heim had tried to deal with the problems and doubts of his time: the many unsolved problems in the areas of social ethics, modern natural science, and the study of comparative religion. He was sad that the German Church and theologians did not deal more seriously with these acute issues. He was a loner in his field. While theology was focusing on man's feelings and moral values Heim accepted the challenge of natural science and its findings. He entered into direct dialogue with them. He asked questions of the implications of these findings for the Christian proclamation which, like the task of theology, should deal with the whole man.

Heim was not a member of a particular confessional movement, nor did he belong to the liberal or kerygmatic tradition. He came from the tradition of "Schwabian Pietism" and from the speculative philosophy of religion school (Schelling and Hegel). Theology should always be concerned with the convergence or relationship between Biblical revelation, philosophy, and modern natural science. Only if such a dialogue occurred could theology be freed from being only an esoteric discipline and become again the "science of sciences," of all of reality ("Wissenschaft vom Ganzen").

But Heim was not only a highly respected university professor. He saw theology intimately related to life. He was a pastor to innumerable students who sought his counsel. He was known as a preacher of the whole gospel for the whole man (body and soul), who had a clear confession of Christ as Lord. The Tübingen Stiftskirche was always crowded with students and faculty who eagerly listened to his timely message to modern man. However, soon after his death he was forgotten.

Today we are experiencing a Heim-renaissance. Responsible for this new interest in Heim's thought is primarily the newly-founded Karl Heim Society. It sees its task as that of (1) examining and relating the new discoveries and insights of scientific-technological nature about man in his world, as well as noting the changes that are brought about for man's life and his survival, and how this influences the proclamation of the Biblical view of man and the world; (2) encouraging new editions of Heim's writings; (3) encouraging research in this area of interdisciplinary dialogue; and (4) at the same time encouraging and being actively involved in missionary and pastoral objectives. As a theological perspective the Society accepts Christ's lordship over its life and existence; no one can stand before Christ and remain in a neutral position. The Society is convinced that the Holy Spirit will lead the Christian into all truth and considers Scripture as the helpful guide and orientation in their research. Man is God's steward of creation. This has placed on modern man a heavy responsibility. Especially the Christian should know himself as being responsible for his fellow man in our scientific and technological world, responsible before God and man for this world.

A new edition of Heim's main work (Der evangelische Glaube und das Denken der Gegenwart) has been issued in Germany. Much of the secondary literature on Heim has been written before 1933 and as a response to Heim's Glaubensgewissheit (Certainty of Faith; 3rd edition, 1923) and his Glauben und Denken (Faith and Reason, 1931). Important among secondary literature are W. Ruttenbeck, Die apologetisch-theologische Methode Karl Heims (1925); H. E. Eisenhuth, Die Entwicklung des Problems der Glaubensgewissheit bei Karl Heim (1928);
and E. Schott, *Das Problem der Glaubensgewissheit in Auseinandersetzung mit Karl Heim erörtert* (1931). After 1945 appeared C. Michelson, "The Task of Apologetics in the Future" (a summary of this dissertation was published in *SJT* 6/4); the Dutch dissertation by F. Burger, *Karl Heim as Apologist* (1954); and the Erlangen dissertation dealing with miracles by H. Schwarz, *Das Verständnis des Wunders bei Heim und Bultmann* (1966). In 1968 Hermann Timm examined the relationship of faith and science in Heim’s theology in his important work *Glaube und Naturwissenschaft in der Theologie Karl Heims* (Witten/Berlin: Eckart Verlag, 1968). A most excellent introduction to Heim as a person and theologian was published by the well-known member of the Heim Society, the retired Prof. A. Köberle (Munich): *Karl Heim: Denker und Vermünder aus evangelischem Glauben* (Hamburg: Furcher Verlag, 1973). This work includes also seven important essays by Heim which here for the first time are made available to a larger audience, previously being hidden in journals and other works.

H. W. Beck presents Heim as a prophet in our century whose theology has again become of interest to a young generation of theology students and faculty members. Heim was a pioneer in the field of apologetics. He encouraged dialogue between theology and the other disciplines. Heim’s presuppositions and his interpretation of the times are dealt with in the first chapter. Heim saw two forces always opposing each other: dialectical materialism, and the Christian faith (p. 5). These two forces are spiritual powers with which the masses have to wrestle. Only a very small number of intellectuals is involved with Heideggerian existentialism or Sartrean nihilism. Man is always placed before the either/or decision. He either pays homage to the nihilistic introversion of the self, in whatever ideological dimension it might appear; or he will turn for his salvation to the Christ of the Biblical revelation. Even though Heim knew nothing of the revival of the occult in our day, he was convinced that materialism was to receive its death blow not from modern science but through a new interest in the occult, a “spiritual” dimension. He pleaded and hoped that all experiences be oriented around and by Christ as Lord. Even in our time of rapid change he was confident that the Christian could await Christ’s coming in calmness. Christ was central in his proclamation to technological society.

Beck provides a well-done introduction to Heim’s dialogue with natural science (evolution, process theology, physics, and secularism; ch. 2). Chapter 3 deals with Heim’s academic life and underscores his interest to have theology intimately related to the reality of life. His criticisms of the often technologized and mechanized world that worships science as its sacred cow (ch. 4) called for a demythology of science. He outdoes the scientists in being radical and revolutionary as he places modern man before the ultimate either/or, the decision for nihilism or for God.

Beck also deals with Heim’s valuable contributions for our age (ch. 5). The idols might have different faces, but our present age can learn from Heim. Theology needs to call for decision in a time when the Christian faith is challenged and attacked by pseudo-religious world views. Heim’s apologetic perspective requires of theology to enter into dialogue with at least seven different areas: (1) evolutionary biology; (2) the problem of time in physics and cosmology; (3) historical-critical research (presuppositions and understanding of history); (4) sociology and its ideological presuppositions; (5) futurology and ecology in relationship to Biblical eschatology; (6) cybernetics; and (7) psychology, parapsychology and group dynamics. Heim was not interested in defending the established Church, but he desired to witness of Christ, the Lord of all existence. Christ is the one who calls us into costly discipleship, leaving no realm of life to the enemy. The Biblical witness is itself a demythology of all powers, because Christ has been victorious over them. The reality of the Easter
victory demands of the Christian that he be in continuous dialogue with the world, with his world. Beck's excellent introduction is a challenge to us as we live as Christians in this world.

Manfred Kwiran
Seminar für Evangelische Theologie, Würzburg, Germany


Barth's *Church Dogmatics* is one of the great seminal works of our time, and volume I, part 1 is the seminal part of this work which was to extend to twelve such parts and still remained unfinished when Barth died in 1968. It contains Barth's magisterial statement of what for many is the characteristic Barthian theme—revelation. But to Barth it was not simply a treatment of revelation, for the subject of revelation is set in the wider context of theological method, and theological method is determined by nothing less than the doctrine of the Trinity.

The first section deals with the Word of God as the criterion for dogmatics. To Barth dogmatics is not simply a matter of putting Biblical texts together in a systematic way, as if the Bible were like a jigsaw puzzle all jumbled up in a box, and what we have to do is to make a single coherent picture out of it. For one thing, the Bible is not the subject matter of theology. It is God himself who is the subject. But we do not have direct access to God as he is in himself. We know him only as he reveals himself, and he does so in a threelfold form. In the strictest sense of the term Jesus Christ is the Word of God (John 1:1). As such, he is the one who reveals the Father. But we do not have direct access to him. We know him only through the witness of the prophets and apostles as the authors of Scripture. They are witnesses in the sense of "he who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me" (Matthew 10:40). In receiving their witness—now in its written form—we receive the Son, and through him the Father.

Revelation also comes to us in the form of preaching and proclamation. But how do we know that such proclamation is true? Barth replies that we must compare it with the witness of Scripture. Thus revelation comes to us in the three interrelated forms of Christ himself, Scripture, and the ongoing proclamation of the Church. Dogmatics comes into the picture at the point at which we correlate the witness of Scripture with the questions that concern our life and existence. Because of its divinely-appointed role of witness to the revelation of God, Scripture is the normative criterion for dogmatics.

The result of all this is a view of revelation that is at once dynamic and Christ-centered. In the second half of the work it leads to a restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity as the fundamental principle of all theology, for the latter is none other than God himself. Basic for Barth is the contention that only God can reveal God. But when we examine the witness of Scripture we find that the Son reveals the Father in the power of the Holy Spirit. Thus revelation is the root of the doctrine of the Trinity.

It is now forty years since this volume appeared in English. The first translation was the work of Professor G. T. Thomson and marked the beginning of a new era. But it has long been felt to lack the precision and lucidity that characterize the later volumes of the *Dogmatics*, which were translated under the editorship of Geoffrey Bromiley and T. F. Torrance. What we have now is a completely fresh translation that is both readable and exact. It has been done by the doyen of translators of theological German. To read it is like seeing
something for the first time in sharp focus. It is not that every word has been changed; but there is a sharpness and clarity that was not there before. In terms of pages the new translation is appreciably shorter, though of course nothing has been left out. Those who have based their previous study of Barth on the old translation will have to go through their work revising the quotations and matching up the new page numbers.

One feature that the new translation lacks which the old one had is the emphasis given to certain propositions that Barth would repeat, laying the emphasis on different words or phrases each time he repeated the formulation. In the old version it was done by spacing out the words with ugly gaps between the letters. This reflected the German practice of doing this for Gothic script. It would have been easy to have set out the emphatic portions in italics. A feature of Barth’s original that has been kept by both English versions is the retention of quotations from the Fathers and Reformers in Latin (not to mention the occasional Greek). For many readers these days German is a much more accessible language than Latin. It would have been helpful, therefore, if the Latin and Greek phrases had been translated as well. Perhaps they were not because this would have made the book different from the remaining volumes in the work.

In the past twenty years Barth has suffered something of an eclipse. He has been too radical for the conservatives and too conservative for the radicals. The questions that concerned him were not the questions that many people wanted to have answered. Perhaps in all this Barth was ahead of his time. Despite his former popularity it is questionable how deeply he was understood. With this new translation our contemporary generation has a unique opportunity to think through the most basic questions of the Christian faith by coming to grips with a thinker who remains without equal in modern theology.

Colin Brown
Trinity College, Stoke Hill, Bristol, BS9 1JP, England


Westminster Press is to be congratulated for publishing another book by Lonergan (following his _Philosophy of God and Theology_, 1974). It can be unreservedly recommended as an introduction to the work of this eminent Jesuit philosopher and theologian. Covering the period 1966-1972, these 18 papers and lectures (two previously unpublished) set out very clearly the main elements of Lonergan’s thought. The recurrence of major emphases, and even expressions, is not so frequent as to be irritating, yet the work sets them out in connection with a variety of related problems so as to give the reader hitherto unacquainted with them a clear and pregnant conception of their significance. There are, in addition, very helpful and complete indices, a brief introduction by the editors, complete bibliographical notices and a short biographical sketch. The presentation is marked throughout by a lucidity characteristic of the author and commendable in the editors.

It is impossible here to subject Lonergan’s work to detailed analysis, let alone criticism. _A Second Collection_ itself does not intend a complete presentation of his thought. One is immediately driven to pick up his earlier _Insight_ and the later _Method in Theology_ to follow through details of many of the strands in these essays. The present work adds important material for understanding the development of Lonergan’s thought between the publication of _Insight_ and that
of Method. Particularly valuable in this connection is the final paper, "Insight Revisited."

The value of Lonergan's work lies in its purpose: "to effect a baptism of key elements in modern culture"—culture being "the meaning of a way of life" expressed as the appropriateness, value, significance of that life in whole and in part. Lonergan is quick to insist on a properly critical stance toward modern culture, but he is equally insistent that there is no other culture in which the Christian Church can live.

In the important papers "The Future of Thomism" and "The Subject," he reveals both the mainsprings and the historical roots of his work. He is consciously a Thomist, in that as Aquinas sought to display "how great might be the implications of the Gospel" in terms of the culture of his own day, Lonergan seeks to do the same today. The centerpiece is cognitional theory, the articulation of the "structural invariants of the concrete human subject." Answering the three questions, "What am I doing when I am knowing?", "Why is doing that knowing?", and "What do I know when I do it?" gives rise to a structure which is invariant in that any revision of it or of its products necessarily requires use of the same structure. This is what the late C. S. Lewis called the absolute validity of reasoning. It is upon this basis that Lonergan erects a most carefully argued superstructure of ethics and metaphysics. Distinguishing in the process four levels of consciousness—experiential, intellectual, reflective and deliberative—he determines that it is on the fourth level that we encounter God. Here he is fond of quoting Romans 5:5 and 2 Corinthians 5:17. It is in Insight that this characteristic development of the existential element of modern culture is most carefully carried through.

A second element which Lonergan seeks to baptize is the historical consciousness of modern man: his awareness that there have been many cultures in human history, his critical reflection on the contexts in which all propositions occur and on the change and development of contexts. The papers of Second Collection make one constantly aware of this element and of its special significance for Roman Catholic theology, for which such a perspective has become viable only since Vatican II. Method in Theology attempts a critical reflection on this second element in full detail.

For the individual reader, Lonergan's work serves a double function. On the one hand, it enables one to answer the three questions mentioned above and thus to appropriate for himself a critical awareness of his own reasoning—critical in that the same awareness reveals at once the flights from understanding characteristic of faulty reasoning. On the other hand, Lonergan may serve, within his own context as a Catholic believer and a Thomist, as an example of how one can critically assess modern culture and engage in communicating Christian faith to men immersed in it.

R. T. McClelland
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, CB3 9BL, England


The work should be thought of in terms of Church renewal literature and not simply or primarily a speculative discussion of the Wesleyan doctrinal peculiarities. Mrs. Wynkoop recognizes the contemporary charge that "the church has not demonstrated ... the kind of love it professes" as the problem faced by John Wesley, who "proclaimed holiness, the highest possible spiritual value, in terms of love, in the face of love's lowest possible connotation" (p. 10).
Thus she sets her subsequent discussion in the context of a call to Christian renewal.

There are two avenues that Church renewal may take: through the recovery of a denominational tradition, or through a reconsideration of the Biblical text itself. The authoress takes both routes, pressing for a better grasp of the Wesleyan perspective and interacting with the Scriptural material from which it draws.

There are also two ways whereby we may focus in on some theological tradition: by showing how it means to recover its Biblical basis, and by considering the ways it interrelates with the historical concerns of the time. This work deals almost exclusively with the first of these interests, with the Wesleyan hermeneutic. Thus: “The summarizing word—Wesley’s ultimate hermeneutic—is love. Every strand of his thought, the warm heart of every doctrine, the passion of every sermon, the test of every claim to Christian grace, was love” (p. 101). The effort to recast Wesley’s approach to Scripture is an important contribution to the reader.

The historical framework to which Wesley addressed himself is characteristically lacking. We do not have any indication of his relationship to pietism generally, the tension with rationalism (peculiarly as it developed in England or the contrast in Germany), or the critical connection to 17th-century Protestant scholasticism. These considerations would have been a valuable addition. The result of emphasizing the Wesleyan tradition in the light of its Biblical antecedents and generally without regard to its historical framework is to trans-historicize the message. One has difficulty in making concrete either its relevancy for the 18th century or our own. The message stands apart from the incidents that sharpen its meaning.

Wynkoop provides the reader with an encyclopaedic adventure into such subjects as the theology of love, Wesleyanism, hermeneutics, the Imago Dei, man, sin, holiness, morality, psychology of holiness, divine-human interaction, faith, cleansing, perfection, and sanctification, leaving us with a valuable reference volume concerning the Wesleyan understanding of such matters.

One of the more helpful aspects of the book has to do with its emphasis on theology as a life science. “The Hebrew man found his dynamism,” the authoress elucidates, “not in static beingness, but in his social relatedness” (p. 123). So also, “faith is a living, dynamic exercise” (p. 222). Here we enjoy the predictable pietistic emphasis on the need for each of us to experience for himself the richness and responsibilities of the Christian life: not doctrine alone, nor piety in the hands of a religious elite, but a living faith for all. We need such works as this to persuade us against relegating theology to the classroom and away from the marketplace.

The focus of the book may be appreciated in connection with what the author terms “rotunda theology.” “Wesley’s thought is like a great rotunda with archway entrances all around it. No matter which one is entered, it always leads to the central hall of love, where, looking upward toward the dome one gazes into the endless, invited sky. There is no ceiling to love. The return flow of love back through each doctrine in preaching and life serves to link every doctrine together into one dynamic architectonic and to show the theological stature and integrity of John Wesley” (p. 16). This is an invitation to Wesleyan renewal and to Christian renewal, as well as to worthwhile reading.

Morris A. Inch

Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois 60187
HISTORICAL THEOLOGY


This is the third monograph in the series "Occasional Bibliographic Papers of the B. L. Fisher Library," following Donald W. Dayton’s The American Holiness Movement: A Bibliographic Introduction and David W. Faupel’s The American Pentecostal Movement: A Bibliographical Essay. This volume, like its predecessors, is multitum in parvo. What we actually have is an immensely knowledgeable running commentary which, when added to the expertise of bibliographic exactitude and comprehension, provides us with an invaluable history of Keswick. The origin, story and influence of the movement is presented, as is the theological, Biblical and devotional literature it has produced, along with an account of its hymnody and periodicals. Keswick, as is pointed out in the introduction, albeit "often ignored by church historians, has had monumental influence." And here we have the place to begin for anyone who wishes to have his ignorance dispelled.

First, a few comments about the respective sections. "Setting the Stage" is probably the weakest section, particularly where it deals with the indispensable 19th-century English ecclesiastical background, especially Anglicanism, and most important of all, evangelical Anglicanism. Here the magisterial two volumes of Owen Chadwick on The Victorian Church (London: A. and C. Black, 1966 and 1970) should be included to give the whole picture from an Anglican point of view, with particular competence in the High- and Broad-Church areas. In dealing with evangelical Anglicanism the old stand-by is curiously omitted—G. R. Ballerine, A History of the Evangelical Party in the Church of England, in either its 1908 edition or that by G. W. Bromiley of 1951. All who are interested in this subject will be glad to know that a new edition by J. S. Reynolds is promised for this year by the Church Book Room Press. Eugene Stock’s three-volume History of the Church Missionary Society (1899) is mentioned on p. 32 in relation to missions, but it should be included in this section as probably still the ablest discussion of 19th-century Anglican evangelicalism as a whole. The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, edited by J. D. Douglas, although referred to on p. 57 should also be noted here, since it contains otherwise virtually unobtainable material about English evangelical Anglican and Keswick "greats." In connection with the proto-Keswick held in 1874 at Broadlands, the home of W. Cowper-Temple (later Lord Mount Temple), a reference to the article in the Dictionary of National Biography XXII on Cowper-Temple would be instructive, for there we are reminded that he was the nephew of one prime minister and stepson of another. The social class of its members has an effect on any movement, and English Keswick and Anglican evangelicalism will never be understood without an awareness of their upper-class orientation. This cultural situation helps to explain Bundy’s observation (p. 23, n. 20) on the social conservatism of Keswick.

In the section on the "Histories of Keswick" I would note that Canon T. D. Harford Battersby, the convenor of the first actual Keswick, had not only passed from High Church to Broad Church to evangelical (p. 24, n. 21) but had actually come full circle; he was part of an old and well-to-do west-country Quaker family that had moved into evangelical Anglicanism in the early 19th century and, together with others such as the Barclays, Buxtons and Gurneys, was designed to occupy a position of remarkable influence. It is interesting that Robert Wilson, Harford Battersby’s coadjutor, was also a Quaker. Does this provide one of the roots—together with the great influence of the American Quakeress Hannah Whitall Smith—of the quietism of Keswick contrasted with the activism of the
American holiness movement?

The next and longest section deals with the "Influence of Keswick." Here the impact on the Welsh revival, the German holiness movement, Foreign Missions, Conventions Abroad, the American holiness movement, the American Pentecostal movement, and the Christian and Missionary Alliance are all dealt with in a most illuminating fashion. The only lack is that the influence of Keswick on fundamentalism, as hinted at in the introduction, is not specifically dealt with. In this connection, as far as American fundamentalism is concerned, a good starting place would be B. Shelley, "Sources of Pietistic Fundamentalism," in *Fides et Historia* 5 (1973), pp. 68-78. Then, of course, there is the even more impressive influence on English fundamentalism or conservative evangelicalism as it is more usually called. The Inter-Varsity Fellowship has been of singular importance in this field, and its interrelation with Keswick can readily be seen in F. D. Coggan, ed., *Christ and the Colleges* (London: I. V. F. E. U., 1934) and J. C. Pollock, *A Cambridge Movement* (London: John Murray, 1953). Another instance of this influence comes from the controversies of the twenties. The Ruanda General and Medical Mission was founded in 1926, in typically English fashion as an auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society but as independent and separate so it could assert its own theological distinctives. Among the principles enunciated in its constitution was one that the mission would "stand for the complete inspiration of the whole Bible as being, and not merely containing, the Word of God," and another that it would be conducted "on Bible, Protestant and Keswick lines" (Patricia St. John, *Breath of Life: The Story of the Ruanda Mission* [London: Norfolk Press, 1971], p. 55). This of course leads to the influence of Keswick on missions, for here we have the source of the great East African revival. In the sub-section on the Christian and Missionary Alliance, where healing is discussed, it would be useful to include R. J. Cunningham, "From Holiness to Healing: The Faith Cure in America 1872-1892," in *Church History* 43 (1974), pp. 499-513.

In dealing with the theology of Keswick, it would have been helpful to have had references to literature dealing with the contribution of Christian mysticism as well as the holiness movement, since part of the Keswick distinctive appears to lie in this direction. The Calvinistic injection into Keswick might have been highlighted by noting that Alexander Smellie was a minister of the Original Secession, one of the strictest forms of Scottish Presbyterianism, and that he is best known for his eulogy of Scottish Puritanism in *Men of the Covenant*. In this section and the next there are also several misleading entries. The great Birmingham Congregationalist, R. W. Dale, is included as part of the movement, although his son, in the biography listed, expressly states that his father did not associate himself with Keswick. It is also highly doubtful that John Laidlaw of New College, Edinburgh, had any significant involvement. It is assumed that Bishop J. C. Ryle's well-known volume on *Holiness* is part of the Keswick tradition, whereas in actuality its catena of Puritan quotations was compiled as a polite rebuttal to Keswick, stressing what Ryle conceived to be a much more Biblical and adequate view of sanctification. D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones' re-editing of the book in 1956 had exactly the same polemical purpose in view. To round out the bibliography and indicate the reaction of a consistently Calvinistic contemporary Anglican evangelical, there is J. I. Packer, "Keswick and the Reformed Doctrine of Sanctification," *Evangelical Quarterly* 27 (1955), pp. 153-167. Finally, in recounting the Biblical studies that Keswick men have produced, we come to the strangest gaffe of all, where on p. 73 we have the inclusion of A. Q. Morton and G. H. C. MacGregor, *The Structure of Luke and Acts*, which pioneered the use of the computer in Biblical criticism. Could anything be further from Keswick! Actually, what has happened (as reference to p. 59, n. 50, readily
suggests) is that the pious Scottish pastor who died in 1900 has been confused
with his namesake, the late eminent NT scholar of Glasgow.

But these criticisms are only minor matters that may be rectified in
subsequent editions, of which we are certain there will be need, since the whole is
such an invaluable contribution.

Ian S. Rennie
Regent College, 2130 Wesbrook Cr., Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1W6

Our Common History as Christians: Essays in Honor of Albert C. Outler. Edited by John
Deschner, Leroy T. Howe and Klaus Penzel. New York: Oxford University

This Festschrift for the Methodist Church historian and ecumenical
theologian of Perkins School of Theology reflects the varied interests and work
of Outler. It contains contributions by Roman Catholic writers, Methodist
leaders, ecumenists, Church historians, and Biblical theologians.

K. E. Skysgaard opens with the “Flaming Center,” a study of “tradition” in
light of developments within the Conferences on Faith and Order of the World
Council. This quest for a common tradition among churches has been an interest
of Outler who participated in the conferences and first introduced the
expression “our common history” in the context. Skysgaard calls the
“historical-biblical Jesus ... the flaming center ..., the hermeneutic principle of
every later Christian tradition” and goes on to give the main features of this
“biblical figure.” He thus offers an important starting point, but he does not give
indications of how this “hermeneutic principle” should function as the Church
seeks to understand its faith.

George A. Lindbeck makes a significant contribution in “The Crisis in
American Catholicism.” He observes that at the time of Vatican II American
Catholicism was at its peak with the Hollywood-priest type as the
“quintessentially American religious figure.” Protestant observers such as Outler
praised Vatican II and gave a forecast that it would bring even a further vitality
into the Roman Catholic communion. “What has happened, however, is in many
ways the reverse of this. The aftermath of Vatican II can be read as disastrous.”
Almost every activity in the Roman Catholic Church has declined except the
revolutionary groups, the Catholic charismatics and the critics of the Church.
The decline is so drastic that there is the danger of the “collapse of traditional
institutional forms.” Lindbeck states that the council brought a “constitutational
crisis” by authorizing rival and contradictory positions without establishing a
means to resolve the controversies. It also removed the sources of piety and the
authorized catechetical statements. He sees no solution; there is a storm that the
Church must ride out.

The observations and analysis of Lindbeck are important not only for
understanding the crisis now in American Catholicism, but also for assessing the
problem of authority in the whole Christian Church. The present development
in the Roman Catholic Church is an accelerated version of the decline that came
in the mainline Protestant churches with their removal of the authority of the
Bible.

“The Pattern of the Past: Augustine’s Debate with Eusebius and Sallust” by
G. F. Chesnut is an analysis of Augustine’s ideas about history in the City of God
as a reaction against the views of Sallust, the classical Roman historian, and
Eusebius, the Church historian in the East. The author makes a good case for the
debate of Augustine with Sallust and gives a valid study of the “rationalistic
optimism” of Eusebius, who with a progressive view of history saw a divine plan
fulfilled in the Christian emperors. His thesis that Augustine was consciously opposing Eusebius is rather less convincing. This thesis is based on the theories that Augustine had read Rufinus' Latin translation of the Church History by Eusebius before writing the City of God and that "Eusebius' theology of history had become enshrined as the official theology of the Christian Empire."

From a letter written from Paulinus to Alypius (Bishop of Tagaste) in A.D. 394, it is evident that there was a copy of this translation available in North Africa some ten years before the City of God was written. Yet it is only known definitely that Augustine read it by A.D. 421 near the mid-point of his work on the City of God (413-427). Even then the work does not seem to be important to him. Again and again he refers by name to the Chronology by Eusebius, but he never once refers to the Church History in his City of God, even when he could have, for example, in such points as his discussion of the care of the remains of the martyrs (1, 12-13. Augustine does not quote the work either here in support for his views (as he does in his Care for the Dead [421]) or elsewhere as a view of history to be attacked. This silence would be out of character for Augustine, who quotes his opponents at length both in polemical and apologetical writings.

The Eusebian view of history, which certainly became enshrined in the East, had difficulties in the West because of the Arian emperors. Chesnut says nothing about this difficulty. Ambrose, who preceded Augustine as a figure of great influence in the West, had a mixed view concerning the relationship between political success and the state religion. When attacking the pagan senators, he denied such a relationship; but when supporting the orthodox Theodosius, he affirmed that protection of the orthodox faith would sustain the empire. (Here see The Fathers of the Latin Church by H. von Campenhausen [London: Black, 1964], pp. 107-125.) In spite of his later views Ambrose had developed a strong position of the Church as independent from the State during the rule by the Arian emperors in Milan. It was this independent strength of the Church that was witnessed by Augustine in his younger years when he sat under the preaching of Ambrose. Thus Augustine follows this tradition when he sees the Christian believers as a spiritual city of God, and from here he goes beyond Ambrose in understanding history from a Biblical perspective. But he does not seem to have a conscious debate with an enshrined Eusebian theology of history.

In "Church History in Context: The Case of Philip Schaff," Klaus Penzel finds this great Church historian to have an uneasy mixture of romanticism, idealism and pietism. According to Penzel, Schaff made the Awakening's "religious experience" the prerequisite for the Church historian's understanding of the nature of Christianity itself. Penzel rejects this as a "mythical approach" and follows the critical scientific method of the Tübingen school, suggesting that the task of the Church historian be defined by Gerhard Ebeling's phrase: "Church history is the history of the exposition of Scripture."

It is true that in Schaff there are influences that the Church historian should avoid; the Tübingen method, however, is not without problems. A purely scientific critical history, even as academic physics, has no valid criteria for dealing with a phenomenon from beyond nature. If such an event in history were so examined it must be described or explained from physical or social terms, because science so limits itself. The limitations expressed by Ebeling have this same direction and would probably limit content in the same way as philosophy defined by linguistic analysis. In contrast to Penzel, it must be the task of Church history to record and seek origins of the beliefs and actions of the Church. It must then examine these in light of the once-for-all word and history found in Scripture.

John T. Newton, Jr.
Montreat-Anderson College, Montreat, N. C. 28757

This volume is substantially a thesis submitted to Westminster Seminary for the Master of Theology degree. Concentrating on the more conservative side of the 19th century, it seeks to deal with the major interpretations of the relation between primal and subsequent sin, with the debates that ensued, and to point out some of the guidelines that emerge.

Few master's theses see the light of publication, and thus its present format indicates considerable merit. It deals with orthodox theologians who do not normally pierce the historical barrier. The ubiquitous Princeton school is naturally in evidence, but it does not steal the show. In addition, we are introduced to H. B. Smith and W. G. T. Shedd representing the increasingly conservative wing of the New School's New York Union Seminary, Thornwell and Dabney of the Southern Church, and Landis of Danville. Here the Whig interpretation of historical theology, which sees value only in the study of those movements that have contributed to liberalism in some form or other, is effectively challenged. Another helpful element is that the book contributes to the laying to rest of the myth of a thoroughly monolithic theology among conservative 19th-century American Presbyterian theologians. In addition, particularly remembering Shedd's warning that the subject under consideration is "one of the darkest points of speculative theology," Hutchinson must be applauded for his facility of exposition and felicity of phrase.

On the demerit side, the obvious question revolves around whether master's theses should be published. The author seems at times a little uncertain whether he is writing a historical or a theological work, and while the interrelationship of the two disciplines is essential, one is not certain that a master's student possesses the required capabilities. There is also an unfortunate narrowness of historical interpretation. It is assumed that all professing Calvinists who do not fall within the confines of the views expounded are exponents of "humanistic American optimism." The New-School radicals with their post-millennialism, revivalism and benevolent empire were certainly optimists; but to describe them as humanists is to evacuate language of meaning and to canonize a domino theory of historical theology. Finally, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the way in which modern thinkers are seeking to grapple with similar issues. As a result, one at times has the unfortunate feeling that he is reading about an outworn debate, whereas the issues that are being dealt with are, in their profoundest form, being grappled with by everyone from Marxists to Skinnereans. Could we just let the light of the modern debate play on the scene for even a moment so that we could realize afresh how contemporary the great theological debates always are? But this may be expecting too much at the master's level!

The bibliography of secondary literature is perforce limited, and thus it is unfortunate that two books which cover a good deal of the same material were omitted: W. T. Bruner, Children of the Devil, and G. C. Berkouwer, Sin, which was published a year before this volume appeared.

Hutchinson has gone on to Oxford and Tübingen and has been teaching for some years at the Free Evangelical Academy, Seeheim, Germany. With this background and the positive qualities demonstrated in this work, we shall look for many good things to come.

Ian Rennie
Regent College, 2130 Wesbrook Cr., Vancouver, B. C., V6T 1W6

The Shape of the Puritan Mind: The Thought of Samuel Willard. By Ernest Benson

The system of theology of Samuel Willard (1640-1707), the "teacher" (pastor) of South (Congregational) Church, Boston, for some three decades, and for a time acting president of Harvard College, is summarized in this well-written volume. It bears all the marks of a Yale doctoral dissertation. Willard, recognized as the most comprehensive American Puritan theologian, was the subject of a recent biography by Seymour Van Dyken (Samuel Willard, 1640-1707: Preacher of Orthodoxy in an Era of Change; Grand Rapids, 1972); therefore, Lowrie concentrates on distilling Willard's thought on the basis of his numerous theological writings, especially his magnum opus, A Compleat Body of Divinity, published posthumously in 1726, originally monthly lectures delivered on the Westminster Shorter Catechism between 1688 and 1707. Lowrie believes this work to be "the fullest statement of the Puritan synthesis in American colonial history" (p. 19).

In addition to a brief introductory biographical chapter and an epilogue discussing Willard's relationship to the Enlightenment (e. g., Benjamin Franklin, whom he baptized!) and the Great Awakening, Lowrie's work is devoted to Willard's treatment of general and special revelation (including faith and reason); God; creation and providence; "man, the reasonable creature"; "the natural moral law"; "the rebel"; the creation of Adam, the covenant of works, and the fall; the covenant of grace; "the life of faith, love, and hope"; "Jesus Christ: The God-Man Mediator." I wonder whether Lowrie correctly reflects the emphasis of Willard and the Puritans when he highlights the topics associated with natural theology, apart from special revelation and divine grace in Jesus Christ. For instance, the Westminster symbols were heavier on the Christian life (e. g., ordo salutis) than is Lowrie's Willard.

The major contribution of Lowrie's work is its sketch of the main contours of Willard's theological thinking for those unable or unwilling to read the South Church's teacher's treatises themselves. The present reviewer is unqualified to fully judge the accuracy with which Lowrie has done his summarizing, since he is not an expert in the area. The author's prose is eminently clear and succinct. He rarely intrudes his own opinions, and one can only guess how much he may or may not identify himself with Willard's theology. In general, Lowrie is very restrained—restrained in his use of words, restrained in injecting his own viewpoint, restrained in providing the theological and life context for Willard's thought. And this brings me to what seems to me a major defect in the book.

The presentation of Willard's system is markedly and deliberately docetic—i.e., it lacks the flesh and blood of the historical and intellectual setting in which it appeared. At the very beginning Lowrie announces this self-imposed limitation: "No attempt is made to trace the various ideas to their origins. Neither is it the intent to seize upon one or two organizing motifs to differentiate Willard's theology from other positions" (p. 6). To do so would make the book too long and, more importantly, "it would also upset the proportion and progression of the exposition" (p. 6). Even the most obvious—and, to me, necessary—references to the influence of William Ames, the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms, Peter Ramus, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, inter alia are omitted (unless the "Bibliographical Essay," pp. 235-238, can be said to fill this lacuna).

Furthermore, Willard's thought is cleanly severed from his life (his life being confined to the biographical sketch in the first chapter), and no consideration is given to the possible development of his thinking over the years in dialogue with other positions. On only a very few refreshing occasions does Lowrie's restraint slip, showing us something of the matrix of Willard's ideas (e. g., pp. 128 and 173 on his life; pp. 38 and 47 f. on the theological context; incidentally, Gisbertus
Voetius is incorrectly called "Gilbertus Voetius" both on p. 47 and in the index.

This docetic approach renders the title of the book somewhat problematical, since little evidence is given as to the place of Willard in New England Puritan thought as a whole. Just how representative or unrepresentative was he? Put otherwise, how uniform was New England Puritan theology? How typical was, for example, Willard's stress on man's reason and free will even after the fall, or on the donum superadditum? A final limitation concerning Lowrie's "objective" approach is that there seems to be little sense of what is significant and what is not significant in Willard's thought. Thus a great deal of rather commonplace Reformed scholastic material (e.g., p. 176 on circumcision and infant baptism) is given meticulous attention.

There are two typographical errors on p. 198; otherwise the proofreading seems to have been quite good. All in all, this is a well-written, worthwhile book, whose usefulness could have been enhanced if it had been more interpretative and contextual in its approach.

Earl William Kennedy
Northwestern College, Orange City, Iowa 51041

CHURCH HISTORY


One of life's delightful ironies was being handed by a "tight" Plymouth Brother a copy of the tract, The True Church, by J. C. Ryle, whom the rigid sectarian did not seem to know had been a bishop of the Church of England. Ryle, however, deserves not only to be remembered for his pithy treatises or his Expository Thoughts on the Gospels. As I remember Prof. O. Chadwick of Cambridge saying on one occasion—and he was no partisan of Ryle's theology or churchmanship—"Ryle was the most important Anglican evangelical of the later Victorian period, and we desperately need a serious biography of him."

This little autobiography provides some of the essential source material, and it is encouraging to know that its editor is already making use of it in preparation of the full-scale biography now underway and which will hopefully be published by 1980, the centenary year of the founding of the diocese of Liverpool, over which Ryle presided for its first twenty years. The vigor of Anglican evangelicalism is proving something of a marvel in the contemporary international evangelical world, and as we seek to understand our transatlantic brethren it is obviously necessary that we know something of the evangelical succession in the Church of England. There are few links in the chain more significant than the life and work of John Charles Ryle (1816-1900).

At the same time, the work before us is not entirely designed to meet our needs. It is domestic autobiography and was not even intended for publication. Its purpose was to impress upon Ryle's children the Christian experience and principles that were the foundation of his life, and to encourage them to be conscious of their responsibilities to maintain their position as members of the upper class. Ryle's literary style was developed for exposition and exhortation. While it was most efficient for its purpose, it is not suited to biography. As a result Ryle, his views and his ministry seem unconscionably dull. It is only when he comes to his religious principles that the living style emerges. His description of them is pure Ryliana: "The extreme sinfulness of sin, and my own personal
sinfulness, helplessness and spiritual need: the utter suitableness of the Lord Jesus Christ by His sacrifice, substitution, and intercession to be the Saviour of a sinner's soul: the absolute necessity of anybody who would be saved being born again or converted by the Holy Ghost ... the absolute need of coming out from the world and being separate from its vain customs, recreation, and standards of what is right, as well as from its sins ... the enormous values of what are called Protestant principles as compared to Romanism: the unspeakable excellence and beauty of the doctrine of the Second Advent ... the unutterable folly of supposing that baptism is regeneration...."

We are also left wondering what influences led Ryle to find his theological storehouse, as did his contemporary, Spurgeon, in the writings of the Puritans. We also are impressed with the class consciousness of Englishmen, which perhaps helps to explain why, as democratization proceeded apace in the United States, the transatlantic evangelical empire began to come apart around the turn of the century, virtually came to an end in the inter-war period, and is only now being rebuilt. One also wishes to know how much the Protestantism of Liverpool Anglicanism was a backlash of bigotry against the waves of poverty-stricken Irish Catholic immigrants, for many of whom Liverpool was the port of entry and in which many of them stayed. Of such things the autobiography tells us virtually nothing. But it does whet our appetite for the full story.

An esteemed friend to whom I showed the book, and who knows 19th-century British history and the English evangelical scene, added the following:

"I am dismayed by the book and doubt whether it was right to publish it. It has antiquarian interest for those who know Ryle's books or something about the period, but I think it raises serious questions as to the propriety of publishing what are meant to be purely private documents (and it is a good lesson to those living to be careful what they leave behind them).

"I think it shows Ryle in a bad light. It has lowered my opinion of him. The theological pride, the self-pity and the unpleasant class attitude suggest to me the reasons why English evangelicalism reached such a low ebb at the beginning of this century.

"Ryle seems wedded to social and religious attitudes that were already behind the times in his day. He seems to me painfully out of touch with the currents of thought of his time. I now picture him as a sort of rhinoceros—quite able to throw his weight about and charge full tilt at his opponents—but doomed, a relic from an earlier geological age, quite out of place in the changing environment. Natural selection being what it is (if it is!), he and his kind inevitably died out as the world evolved into the 20th century. (Not being a social Darwinist I wouldn't defend any of the previous sentence—I simply enjoy the thought.)

"This does explain one reason why I regret the publication. I imagine a book from this publisher will be bought by many people who already share many of Ryle's social and religious attitudes (albeit in 20th-century garb). To read this will confirm them in their opinion. I think we have enough difficulty with Christian rhinoceroses as it is (they are notoriously ill-tempered, shortsighted, aggressive beasts, with a keen sense of smell); and if they read this book I fear it will only toughen their hide.

"But I am allowing myself to be carried away on a flight of fancy."

Ian S. Rennie
Regent College, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W6

This sad little booklet is the story of an ecclesiastical quarrel between the "Church of England in South Africa" (C. E. S. A.) and the "Church of the Province of South Africa" (C. P. S. A.). The author tries to show that the C. E. S. A. is the true heir of the Anglican tradition in South Africa while the C. P. S. A. is the result of a Tractarian Anglo-Catholic conspiracy to impose "Romanism" on South Africans. The argument is a complex one in which the C. E. S. A. is depicted as a faithful evangelical Church assaulted by the guiles of Anglo-Catholics bent on its destruction. Inevitably the story is full of broken promises, lawsuits and betrayals by the Anglican community at large.

Unfortunately, the author is less than convincing when he attempts to argue the case for the C. E. S. A., for which this work is an apologetic. From the text of his booklet three major objections stand out against his defence of the C. E. S. A. Firstly, it is very difficult to prove that a Church founded by Bishop Colenso can claim to have always stood for Biblical Christianity. Its present ministers may consider themselves to be "conservative evangelicals" but Bishop Colenso certainly was not. The author defends the Bishop and excuses his denials of Biblical infallibility, "sacrificial atonement" and other traditional evangelical doctrines. Colenso, we are told, regarded the sacrifice of Christ as "a sacrifice of faith and obedience"; and we are assured that "there is no doubt that Colenso blundered in allowing his first volume of negative criticism to appear by itself rather than with the following volumes of more constructive approach" (p. 23). These arguments are somehow supposed to make him an evangelical hero. I wonder.

The second objection is the author's own admission that a commission appointed by "evangelical churchmen" (p. 49) in England in 1930, to attempt to reconcile the two Churches, sided with the allegedly anti-evangelical C. P. S. A. The third objection is a similar one. In 1953 J. P. Hickinbottom was asked by the Archbishop of Canterbury to attempt to unite the two Churches. Professor Hickinbottom was a well-known evangelical and, in Ives's own words, "an intermediary capable of understanding the position of the C. E. S. A. from the spiritual point of view as well as from the legal aspect" (p. 71). But after a series of negotiations Hickinbottom was unable to convince all the members of the C. E. S. A. of the value of his compromise proposals. The result was that, while the majority of C. E. S. A. clergy and church members joined the C. P. S. A., in accordance with Hickinbottom's proposals, a small number refused to accept the compromise and have continued as a schismatic body in South Africa ever since. The booklet is written by a member of this hardcore "Church of England" group which, in fact, is no longer in full communion with the Church of England in England but which nevertheless claims to represent true Anglicanism in South Africa.

The booklet is a curious one and a classic example of a certain type of anti-Catholic Protestant propaganda. The author concentrates on a narrow range of theological issues concerned with the sacraments and justification by faith; but, because of the role of Colenso in the creation of the C. E. S. A., he excludes what most evangelicals regard as the fundamentals of the faith. As an historical work its concentration on theology gives the reader a distorted image of South Africa. An underlying political struggle between different areas within South Africa during the latter half of the 19th century can be seen from hints that emerge in the text. It is in the clues that the booklet contains to the relations between the Eastern Cape, Natal, and the government in Cape Town that the
real value of this booklet may lie. Here is an opportunity for an enterprising researcher to blend Church history with the study of politics.

Irving Hexham

Bishop Lonsdale College, Derby, England


This fascinating account of the emigration of some 600 Mennonites from European Russia and their attempts to find religious freedom in the border states of the Russian empire in central Asia constitutes an important chapter in the eventful history of Mennonite migrations. But it is more than that. As C. J. Dyck points out in the introduction, it "is a unique contribution to our understanding of the long history of millennialism and the church in the wilderness" (p. 9). What motivated this group to seek a place of refuge in the East, when the vast majority of their co-religionists (ca. 18,000) were looking for the promised land in the West? This book is an attempt by Belk to answer that question, and he has answered it well.

In the introductory chapters the author presents a generally adequate account of the spiritual heritage and earlier pilgrimage of this group which had established itself in the so-called "Trakt" settlement on the Volga in order to escape Russian militarism. When the same fate threatened them in Russia after the imperial decree of 1870, they were looking for a new haven of refuge. It was at this point that their eschatology, more specifically their millennialism, played a decisive role in determining the course of their subsequent history.

The prophetic writings of J. H. Jung-Stilling (1740-1817) were well known among European Mennonites of that day. According to Jung-Stilling, the ultimate place of refuge for the "elect" would be in the East. Among those strongly influenced by his writings was Claas Epp, Jr., the instigator of the Great Trek to central Asia. He added impetus to the eastward adventure through a book of his own, published in 1877, in which he explained to his own satisfaction the prophecies of Daniel and the mysteries of Revelation. The exodus-church was composed of those members of the community who shared the views of Jung-Stilling and Epp. The story that follows is one of tears and tragedies. The author vividly describes the indomitable courage of these pilgrims in the face of incredible hardship and suffering, and the ultimate disillusionment of most of them with their religious leadership.

In commenting on the chiliastic movement among some Dutch Anabaptists in the 16th century, C. H. Smith makes the following observation: "Even knowledge of the Bible, if not backed up by a sane and well-balanced world view, may not be a safeguard against religious fanaticism and spiritual anarchy" (_The Story of the Mennonites_, p. 75). It would have been helpful, in the judgment of this reviewer, if the author would have evaluated this particular manifestation of millennialism against the background of earlier chiliastic movements in Anabaptism and in Church history in general. Does history repeat itself for those who know little or nothing of their own history? Is there a correlation between limited education and extreme chiliastism? It would appear that the union of intense enthusiasm with ignorance usually leads to disastrous consequences.

In the author's treatment of early Anabaptism there appear to be a few misconceptions. For instance, it would be very difficult to prove that Zwingli was a believer in "believers' baptism" (p. 25) on the basis of documentary evidence. Moreover, the opposition to the radical reformers did not come from the Roman Catholic Church in Zurich, but from the Protestant city council (cf. p. 26). In
general, however, the author presents an objective and sympathetic account of these pilgrims in search of utopia.

An exhaustive bibliography, a good index, and a number of charts illustrating Mennonite migrations provide excellent aids to the reader. The historian as well as the theologist will find this book stimulating and profitable.

J. A. Toews

2625 James Street, Clearbrook, B. C., V2T 3L6


Scholars who pursue Franciscan thought of the Middle Ages must work through (and around) a corpus of secondary critical and interpretative literature which is large, diverse, repetitive and often intimidating. E. Randolph Daniel, in preparing his study on the Franciscan concept of mission, has clearly sorted through a great deal of this secondary material, as well as the more important medieval documents, en route to a review of medieval Franciscan attitudes toward missionary enterprise. If Daniel has risked the humdrum of reformulating and repeating material from some existing bibliographical studies, a compensating virtue of his volume is that it isolates for special focus Franciscan thought on mission in a way that allows for some interesting specific observations and reflections, as well as confirmation concerning applications in their sphere of the most dominant characteristics of Franciscan spirituality.

After setting the Franciscan movement in the context of the social and political maturation of the European societas christianorum about 1200, Daniel briefly traces medieval attitudes toward evangelization and missionary enterprise beginning in the Irish monks like St. Columban, who were peregrinari pro Christi volens and whose desire for missionary suffering and martyrdom was linked with a contemplative asceticism. He observes a second historical approach characterized by greater religious tolerance and a confidence in philosophical method and the power of reason, such as (sometimes) characterized the Dominicans. The third category of medieval attitude toward mission he finds to be motivated by eschatological traditions reaching back to Augustine and forward through Joachim of Fiori to the Franciscans, especially those influenced by Joachite thought and early spiritual writings in the Order (e. g., the Fioretti).

After identifying the Franciscans' spirituality with that venerable Christian tradition attracted to the vita apostolica, Daniel reviews major Franciscan thinkers from the founder of the order through St. Anthony to Bonaventure, Bacon and Llull with specific reference to missions. It is here that the book makes some of its best contributions, in highlighting differences as well as similarities among these writers. Thus while Daniel portrays a Franciscan eschatology that sought to unite spiritual reform or renewal of the apostolic life with an Augustinian view of history (see p. 28) and that worked toward an appreciation that Franciscan exemplarist spirituality created a missionary desire for martyrdom which "is clearly a desire for conformity with the passion of Christ" (p. 48), he will nevertheless in these basic points have aided fewer fellow students of medieval spirituality than with his helpful relationship and comparisons of the approaches of Bonaventure, Bacon and Llull in Chapter IV. Hence, while he rightly concludes that Bacon's philosophical influence was overshadowed by a Bonaventuran spirituality that moved "from evangelical renovatio to develop a spirituality proclaimed primarily by example," it is his appreciation of Bacon's relation of philosophical and scientific understanding to eschatological exegesis which points, along with his parallel treatment of the nearly incredible Ramon Llull, to a more interesting point of departure for further study.
Daniel’s commentary is not without sympathetic touches of subtle humor. Of Llull, who dedicated himself to the necessities of translation and the mastery of necessary languages, he writes: “These then, were the three goals which dominated the remainder of Llull’s life: to be martyred as a missionary; to write a book against the errors of the infidels; and to urge the establishment of missionary colleges” (p. 67). In that order. But happily for Llull, as well as for the principles at issue, the orders of time and desire did not here prove more correlative than in any other area of life.

The book is not without its disappointments. One wishes, for example, in a study of this sort, for some characteristic historical insights into the practice of the order as it related to concept—especially for the Franciscans this would seem to have been helpful. The interest and commitment to translation on the part of the O. F. M. has, indeed, deep connections with their concept of mission, but it needs to be related to basic theological emphases on the incarnation on the one hand as well as to practical missionary exercises in vernacular translation and the recomposition of popular literature on the other (where, for example, the Franciscans had more impact than any other in the 12th and 13th centuries). And though the book end limits itself to the 15th century, it would have been helpful, for perspective, to have some minimal projections and connections to 16th-century and 17th-century Franciscan missionary enterprise—e. g., in the Orient and the Americas—in which certain of the developments that Daniel identifies would seem to come to some of their most interesting realizations.

Nevertheless, within its relatively brief compass, Daniel’s essay will afford the reader a valuable introduction to the logic of missionary enterprise as it was conceived by one of the most successful evangelical movements in the history of the Christian West.

D. J. Jeffrey
Department of English, University of Victoria, Victoria, B. C.

HOMILETICS


Another book on preaching! But not warmed-over hash, either of traditional or innovative flavor. Fant proves that the subject of preaching, however extensive its bibliography, is not yet threadbare. There is still more to be said about it. And the dialectic of these pages could galvanize the pulpit with new life and power.

Steering a cautious course between the prophets of doom who chant their dirges ’round the pulpit and doctrinaire optimists for whom preaching is everything, Fant insists that preaching is authentically, inherently Christian. The roots of the gospel lie deep in Hebrew soil where, in contrast to the Greek world, the word held supremacy over imagery and visual expression. Theologians, therefore, who even today remain more enthusiastic about preaching than preachers command the deeper insight.

What lies behind the preacher’s frustration? Why the communication crisis in the pulpit? Fant traces the problem to the divorce between theology and practical homiletics. Theologians stress the what of preaching, but neglect the how. Some even suggest that the technique of preaching cannot be taught at all. Teachers of homiletics, on the other hand, tend to regard their discipline as a
branch of rhetoric. The result is a schizoid pulpit: Its personality is half Hebrew-Christian and half Greek-pagan. If the pulpit is to ring with a meaningful sound, the wholeness of preaching must be recovered. Homiletical theory must be wedded to a theology of proclamation.

Fant finds the key to this challenge in the incarnation. Here is the theological model for the preaching event, in which the historical given of the divine Word encounters and is united to the existential given of the contemporary situation in a living act of communication. The preacher then becomes the communications bridge between the Word and contemporary culture. The effectiveness of his proclamation depends on his familiarity with both. Without the Word he has no message. Without the world he has no ministry. Preachers have often been counseled to prepare their sermons with one eye on the Bible and the other on the daily newspaper. But Fant has found in the incarnation, the central fact in the Christian revelation, the theological justification for the counsel.

Although the book can hardly be labeled a trade manual, serious attention is given to basic principles of sermon construction and delivery. These, too, are controlled by the incarnation. So, for example, homiletical forms must not be employed like cookie cutters to impress their own shape on the text. The reviewer recalls a professor who gave his students copies of a homiletical wheel featuring a dozen or so sermon plans. He told them that after choosing a text he would turn the wheel around and decide which plan he wanted to use to structure his sermon. Incarnational preaching allows “as much as possible, the shape of the reality encountered in the gospel (to) determine the shape of the sermon” (p. 110).

Incarnational preaching also demands dynamic encounter between the preacher and his audience. Preaching is not merely a verbal event but is essentially an oral event. If the sermon is to communicate, it must be prepared to fit the oral medium. Written manuscripts, in the very nature of the case, violate this principle. When a written sermon sounds good, it is because the preacher has made concessions in writing to the oral medium. Fant combines a vigorous plea for oral, instead of written, preparation of sermons with helpful suggestions on how to do it. His advice, if followed, will not only insure greater dynamic in delivery, but will also—preacher, hear this!—reduce sermon preparation time enormously.

If anyone imagines that this constitutes an endorsement of slipshod, effortless pulpit preparation, he could not be more mistaken. Fant is committed to preaching of the highest order. Such preaching alone is of a piece with the gospel and deserving of an audience. But assuming the preacher has a message worthy of being heard, his success is to be measured not by his rhetorical brilliance but by his ability to communicate.

No self-styled homiletical iconoclast, Fant nevertheless sends some of the proudest homiletical images tumbling from their niches. He replaces them with an authentically Biblical ideal. And just as the incarnation of the living Word brought divine life to the world, so incarnational preaching can bring divine life to any pulpit.

Richard Allen Bodey
317 South Chester Street, Gastonia, North Carolina 28052
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