BOOK REVIEWS


Not long ago, according to Allan Bloom, the world got turned upside down. The many moral absolutes upon which our civilization was reared were exchanged for a weak substitute: the belief that everything is relative. Bloom’s book is devoted to tracing the consequences of that exchange. His is a graphic delineation of how the “Peter principle” operates in the realm of ideology: The worst ideas and the worst thinkers seem to rise to the top.

Bloom shows that relativism, like a strong presidential candidate, has long coattails. Its ascent brought with it the sad substitution of “relationships” for love, of “opinion” for reason, and of “feeling” for thinking. The distressing result of this superficial intellectual openness is actually what Bloom describes in his title: the closing of the American mind. When one believes no answers exist, one ceases to be open to them or to search for them. We now live in a more mindless world than we used to, one where “commitment” seems to weigh more than truth. If freedom is choice, as Milton taught us, then our mindlessness and relativism have meant a loss of freedom. We have lost our options because we have lost sight of issues that pertain to truth. Real choices are possible only for those who face real questions. In a world where all answers are equal, real choices no longer exist. Any choice will do because no choice (except traditional hierarchicalism) is considered wrong.

The university has failed us, Bloom contends, because it succumbed to cultural pressures. In the Soviet Union, for example, historians must rewrite the history books every time a new regime comes to power—eliminating this item, adding that. While we rightly deplore the intellectual prostitution that such academic practices reveal, we fail to see that American scholars and universities have done the same thing and still are doing it. In our case, however, it is not the government but contemporary culture that plays the tune to which we dance. We too have rewritten our textbooks, even our Bibles. We recently have put women, blacks, gays, and evangelicals in places of historical or theological prominence they never occupied. But the liberal democratizing of people and ideas (“no one is better than anybody else, and no idea is better than any other”) is so pervasive and so deeply rooted in our society—and hence in our universities—that to question this sacred democratizing cow (much less to denounce it) inevitably is considered fascism, bigotry, chauvinism, or homophobia. Other constructions, I dare say, could be and ought to be put on such challenges to the status quo. As Bloom points out: “Professors of the humanities have long been desperate to make their subjects accord with modernity instead of a challenge to it” (p. 375).

Bloom also correctly identifies one of the sources of our current intellectual plight as the mindless eclecticism that Americanized Nietzsche without first understanding him. That is, much of the value relativity in our society stems from our “peculiarly American way of digesting Continental despair.” We have a “nihilism with a happy ending” (p. 147). That the intellectuals among us could surrender so passively (indeed so eagerly) to the likes of Freud and Weber was made possible only by ignoring “the darker side” of
German thought. We have forgotten, apparently, that the pre-war German view of reality was but one interpretation of life— one that could be challenged, perhaps overturned, at nearly every point.

Relativism has proven to be a tyrant. Tyrants, we all (should) know, come to power by imprisoning their opponents and by exiling them or murdering them (the ultimate form of exile). In American higher education the exile is truth and the prisoner is western civilization, whose languishing body is starving slowly and painfully away on the unopened pages of all those great books that stand untouched and unnoticed on university library shelves, often for years at a time. In that light, Bloom’s account of the fall of the university, as traced from Socrates’ Apology to Heidegger’s Rektoratsrede, is much more than a tour de force. It is an example of intellectual virtuosity, one that serves as an impetus for repeated fruitful reflection not only on why Johnny can’t think but on why Johnny’s professors can’t teach. Bloom shows how being subservient to the spirit of the age is indeed the death of learning. Academic freedom, if we need to be reminded, is freedom from that also. For readers of this Journal the point can be made more clear: The academic freedom necessary to make our Christian colleges worthy of their name must include a freedom from the intellectual tyranny of the evangelical subculture and its pietized version of public opinion. As Bloom rightly observes: “Contemplation of Socrates is our most urgent task” (p. 312).

What Bloom says about the university’s intellectual morality in the 1960s is so good that I dare not summarize it here for fear of defacing it by reducing it.

Like Bloom, E. D. Hirsch also takes aim at the failures of American education. Unlike him, however, Hirsch aims at the public schools, not the universities. Known to evangelicals primarily as one of the ablest defenders of intentionalist hermeneutics, Hirsch has in recent years focused his considerable talents upon defining and promoting cultural literacy, which is the possession of “the basic information needed to thrive in the modern world” (p. xiii). Cultural literacy is “the only sure avenue of opportunity for disadvantaged children, the only way of combating the social determinism that now condemns them to remain in the same social and educational condition as their parents” (p. xiii). But that, according to Hirsch, is precisely what is not taught. Indeed, he argues, it has been systematically eliminated from American education, the curriculum of which, while it is more skills-oriented, is less effective than in the past because it is much more content-neutral. Students lack the necessary information required to function effectively. Though some of their procedural mechanisms are in place, students nevertheless lack the fundamental data. Little comes out of them because little goes in. As Hirsch repeatedly demonstrates from his own study and from the study of others (his documentation on this problem and its cure is truly impressive), “the more you know, the more you can learn” (p. 111). The reverse, sad to say, is true as well: The less you know, the less likely you are to learn. As it is in entrepreneurship, where money generates wealth, so it is in learning, where information helps to generate knowledge.

To illustrate his premise that procedural skills do not equal literacy, Hirsch employs the words of the well-known Australian folk tune, “Waltzing Matilda”:

Once a jolly swagman camped by a billy-bong,
Under the shade of a kulubar tree,
And he sang as he sat and waited for his billy-boil,
“You’ll come a-waltzing, Matilda, with me.”

Readers of this Journal, well-educated, well-read, well-intentioned as they are, nevertheless lack the knowledge (i.e. cultural literacy) required to understand something so simple as this song. “Waltzing Matilda,” Hirsch explains, “doesn’t mean dancing with a girl: it means walking with a kind of knapsack. A swagman is a hobo, a billy-bong is a brook or pond, a kulubar is a eucalyptus, and billy-boil is coffee” (p. 17). Sadly, Hirsch maintains, most American teenagers are as ignorant about their own culture as we are
about Australia's. Our teenagers can read, but they cannot understand what they read because they lack the basic information needed for comprehension. All they have is the empty skill. They do not know the years when the Civil War or World War II were fought, they do not know how many senators their own state has, and they do not know where Chicago is. One USC pre-law student actually thought Washington, D.C., was in the state of Washington (p. 6).

In addition to identifying one of the most pressing deficiencies in American education Hirsch also has identified, very specifically, just what an American high-school graduate needs to know—and should be taught—in order to be culturally literate. In more than 60 double-column pages Hirsch identifies the necessary educational elements, listing them alphabetically from "abbreviate" to "Zurich." That leaves us with little excuse, does it not?

In a review of three very good books I have saved the best for last, and considering that I began with Bloom's virtuoso performance I am praising very highly. Only quite rarely can a reviewer say of a book that it changed his life, but about this book I say it. Its equal for challenge and enlightenment I have seen only once, and that was the best book I ever read. Mitchell's volume is a summons to beauty, to truth, to goodness, and to the self-reflection and illumination that pursuing them engenders. What bothers Mitchell about those of us in higher education, however, is that we "not only fail to claim, but refuse to claim, and would be ashamed to claim that our proper business was with the Good, the True, and the Beautiful, and that this business can be conducted not through arousing pleasant feelings, but through working the mind" (p. 26). Far from pursuing them with our minds, we cannot even define them. To us they all are in the eye of the beholder. That they might exist apart from us, or even stand in judgment over us, we moderns seldom consider. And without knowing them we cannot know ourselves. In their light we discover who we are, what we are, and why life is worth living. But because we teachers have lost sight of our true quest our students never learn that such a quest is not only possible but valuable. "They seem not to have dreamed of even the possibility of actually judging the life that they live" (p. 125).

What Mitchell writes, then, is a manual on child-rearing. His is a guidebook on how to raise the one child we all have been given to raise: ourselves. If we can but awaken the Petronilla that slumbers within each of us, we might be of use in waking those around us—but not until then. Education (not degrees) is the alarm clock of the mind, and education, according to Mitchell, is comprised of three things, all of which are as valuable as they are rare: (1) the ability to tell rubbish from reason (p. 135); (2) the ability to know and judge the self (p. 136); and (3) the ability to do good (p. 137). Unfortunately "education is exceedingly rare in schooling," and "when it breaks out, it is as the result of a happy accident, an accident that might have befallen a prepared mind, or maybe any mind at all, just as readily in the streets as in the schools" (p. 26). Mitchell's book is the best thing I know of to make these happy accidents more intentional, more predictable, and more frequent.

Michael Bauman

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


The first of a three-volume set, this text treats methodology, revelation, bibliography, theology proper and the decrees. It contains 335 pages of text plus general and Scripture indices. Unhappily for the reader's sake, footnotes are not included. Instead endnotes
are sandwiched between the final chapter and the indices. Scripture quotations are from the NIV.

The unique feature of this text is the title’s implied methodology. Six topics are regularly treated in each chapter: (1) The problem is identified, (2) various solutions are put forth (historical theology), (3) Biblical texts are explored (Biblical theology), (4) doctrines are formulated (systematic theology), (5) doctrines are defended (apologetics), and (6) doctrines are applied (practical theology). Review questions and ministry projects follow. Discussions are fairly current, largely depend on primary sources, often interact with modern philosophies, religious movements and cults, and offer excellent suggestions as to the practical uses of the particular doctrine under consideration. Definitions and explanations are generally crisp and perceptive—though the Fry Readability Scale could only suggest use at graduate and postgraduate levels.

In general Demarest and Lewis have produced a well-researched, well-written, interesting, logical, accurate and informative text. Interaction with and evaluation of opposing viewpoints is thorough and evenhanded, and the apologetic sections are particularly stimulating.

Apparent haste, carelessness, and inattention to detail, however, characterize the volume’s documentation. In cases too numerous to list, quotations had words and whole phrases either added, omitted or changed. Each of Ramm’s three quotations on p. 122, for example, is flawed. These could be typesetting errors. But on the same page a quotation is attributed to Griffith Thomas in Hastings’ Dictionary of the Bible. Such is not to be found, however—and in fact no record of Griffith Thomas can be found at all in HDB. Tozer’s block quotation on p. 208 has “are of” instead of “art or” in its final line. Gruenler’s lengthy quotation on p. 210 has words added, omitted, changed freely, and an ellipsis added where one does not exist. Pittenger’s 15-line quotation on pp. 204–205 is hopelessly confused. There is a similarity to what he wrote, but that is all. On p. 277 “a superiority” becomes “priority,” and on p. 357 “pre-incarnate” is changed to “pre-existent.” Problems of this type are found throughout.

In addition, secondary citations are used all too frequently (e.g. Lessing and Herbert on p. 97; Calvin on p. 279); no references are given for some detailed reports (e.g. Irenaeus, p. 99; Rauschenbush, p. 217; Hegel and others, pp. 252–253; Gottschalk, p. 295); original copyright dates are replaced with reprint dates (Vos, p. 273, etc.); Moulton’s name is misspelled (p. 356) and incorrect page numbers are cited several times. There is occasional inconsistency in capitalization (“Crucifixion,” p. 305 versus p. 309) and in the use of personal pronouns: “I” (p. 240) versus the usual “we” (pp. 7 ff.).

Whether pursuing happiness is a realistic or valuable goal for everyone (p. 83) raised serious questions in my mind, as did the concept that Genesis 18 teaches a truine theophany rather than an appearance of a single member of the Godhead (pp. 101, 259). The documentation for this is incomplete and onesided, and it differs from Demarest and Lewis’ own teaching on the distinctive roles of the Father and Son on p. 277.

On p. 135 all Protestant fundamentalists should not be lumped under Rice’s dictation view, because many if not most modern fundamentalists would place themselves under the traditional heading of the fathers on the subject of inspiration. I understand the authors’ concern, but I believe the castigation of such fundamentalists as Warfield, Torrey and others for not teaching more directly on the doctrine of the Trinity is artificial.

I particularly liked the statement on p. 197 about the equality of each of God’s attributes and why the Holy Spirit is called holy on p. 279. Many other passages stretched, challenged and stimulated my thinking through this integrative approach to theology, and the authors should be applauded for seeking to break new ground in this discipline.

James A. Borland

Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, Lynchburg, VA

"This book is about the Christian's need to know" (p. 11). Written on a popular level, Miethe's 10 chapters cover but 85 pages and seek to show "that faith is preeminently reasonable" (back cover). Three appendices (one by Miethe and two by Liberty University colleagues) and a bibliography add another 50 pages of text. According to Miethe the image of God resides primarily in our ability to reason, and although faith might sometimes go beyond reason it never goes against reason. "Knowledge is needed to regulate and restrain doubting and to prevent the Christian from stagnating because of unresolved questionings" (p. 52). The doubter's unresolved questionings result from "complacency with ignorance" (p. 52). The bulk of the book tries to show how and why this "need to know" works itself out in the various areas of Christian living, such as soul-winning, loving the unlovely, the ministry of the Spirit, and renewing our minds.

My own perspective takes great exception with Miethe's entire agenda for at least four reasons. First, he fails to grapple with Biblical texts that complicate his simplistic presentation (e.g. 1 Cor 1:18–31 or Genesis 22). Second, important theological themes such as the noetic effects of the fall, our finitude and our earthbound perspective are overlooked. Third, from a pastoral perspective the required goal of epistemological certainty oversimplifies life's complexities and places an unbearable burden on the believer who might have very good reasons to struggle with unresolved perplexity. Fourth, and most important, Miethe misconstrues the nature of assurance of faith. Real assurance of faith, to use Barth's words, does not seek "a guarantee of the guarantee"—that is, something that goes beyond "the guarantee which is identical with God Himself" (Christian Dogmatics I.1.12). The quest for epistemological clairvoyance is a poor tradeoff for the security of God's promises.

Daniel B. Clendenin

William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI


We evangelicals are not as well versed in the beliefs and practices of Roman Catholicism as we should be. This is a lingering effect of the Reformation and applies equally to Catholic understanding of Protestantism in general and evangelicalism in particular. Marthaler has written an introduction to Catholicism intended to overcome ignorance of his faith on the part of Catholics and non-Catholics alike. He has addressed the book to specialists interested in the creeds and to general readers who want to know more about Roman Catholicism. He uses the Apostles' and Nicene creeds as the framework for his book.

The contents reflect accurately the preponderance of Catholic thinking today. Marthaler's use of the creeds establishes a common ground with conservative Protestants, but his views in other areas (especially Biblical criticism) are to the left of American evangelicalism. Like too many of his fellow Catholic theologians, Marthaler evidences an ignorance of evangelical thinking. He does, however, adopt an irenic approach, avoiding controversy and polemic in favor of explanation and ecumenicity. His desire to reach a wide audience often leads him to avoid applying his teaching, particularly in the area of ethics.

Marthaler introduces his subject by examining the place of the creeds in the early Church and in modern ecumenical dialogue. He stresses their contextual origin and their development from personal confession into guarantees of orthodoxy. He points to the difference between the context of the creeds and the language used to express their
content. He notes further that the creeds are but partial and abstract expressions of the Biblical witness. None of this, however, is reason to discard the creeds, but it is reason to reinterpret them.

Marthaler concludes the book with a discussion of belief and faith, noting that we understand these terms differently from the early Church. Recognizing on the one hand the ecumenical desire for a common confession of faith, he also notes the multiplication today of individual confessions, most of which focus on the human predicament. No creed is a complete statement of doctrine, so none may be considered normative for all of life. New statements are constantly needed. These are common themes in Catholic thinking today, but different theologians have drawn different conclusions about their impact on Catholic doctrine.

Between these introductory and concluding discussions about the nature and purpose of creeds, Marthaler summarizes Catholic thinking under the heads of Father and Creator, Son and Redeemer, and Spirit and Sanctifier. In each area he seeks to relate traditional language to modern concerns in a way designed to make Catholic faith understandable, even attractive, to modern people. In the process he also does an excellent job of explaining how liturgy relates to conduct and belief, helping us to appreciate better why Catholics act as they do.

Marthaler’s attempt to be contemporary in his teaching results in presentations that evangelicals must find unsatisfactory, however. The most troublesome areas include Biblical inspiration and criticism, miracles, hell and judgment, and world religions. In each of these areas Marthaler mirrors the centrist Roman Catholic views of such theologians as Dulles, Kasper and Rahner. In one way this is a value of the book, because these are the views that are emanating from Rome today. They are not necessarily the views of a majority of American Catholics, however. In presenting Catholicism in conversation with modernity Marthaler has also shown the nature of modern thinking and its impact on Christian faith. It is unfortunate that the position he represents has been less than successful in its response to the challenges and corrosive effect of modernity.

Marthaler has given us a well-written and organized statement of Catholic faith today. The book includes name and subject indices, a brief list of reference works, and notes. Though this would be a good introductory text on Roman Catholicism, it should be supplemented by a volume of Vatican II documents and a presentation by one of the liberal Catholics such as Küng, Schillebeeckx, Curran, or the Latin American liberation theologians in order to provide context and balance.

Douglas McCready

Temple University, Philadelphia, PA


Craig has produced a book worthy of serious theological digestion. He believes that the philosopher of religion can help the theologian by deepening and clarifying the issues involved in discussions of divine omniscience. Further, he affirms, one need not cower before rational attacks against the Biblical doctrine of foreknowledge. The book is intended to aid in a resolution of the divine-foreknowledge/human-freedom dilemma.

At the outset Craig distinguishes fatalism from determinism. While the former denies human freedom and insists that “shall do” means “must do,” the latter insists that all our choices or actions are determined by prior causes (something that fatalism does not necessarily hold). He develops his inquiry in three parts.
Part 1 argues that the Bible teaches divine foreknowledge of human free acts. The implications of this position are far-reaching. Theologically it affirms that God knows all future events but that he is not the author of these free events or acts of human beings, or he would be the author of sin.

Part 2, the longest section of the book, lays out the arguments for and against theological fatalism. Craig distinguishes what will happen (related to God’s foreknowledge and human choice) and what must happen (the view of fatalism). “From God’s foreknowledge of a free action, one may infer only that that action will occur, not that it must occur. The agent performing the action has the power to refrain, and were the agent to do so, God’s foreknowledge would have been different” (p. 74).

The heart of Craig’s position appears in part 3. He affirms “innate knowledge” and “middle knowledge” as the basis for his argument that God’s foreknowledge and human freedom are compatible. The former asserts that “God never learned or acquired his knowledge but has eternally known an innate store of only and all true statements. Since future-tense statements are either true or false, God in knowing all true statements knows the future” (p. 123).

Based on the idea of logical moments (as opposed to chronological moments) in God’s thought, Craig develops the concept of middle knowledge. This means that God knows what every possible free creature would do in any circumstance. Thus he possesses knowledge of all possible worlds that he could make actual. This was followed (logically) by his free decision to create a certain kind of world. Biblical grounds for middle knowledge can be found in such texts as 1 Sam 23:6-13; Matt 11:20-24. Theological grounds include foreknowledge being based on this middle knowledge and God’s free decision to create. By his infinite understanding he knows a creature’s free decision under any circumstances. Yet he does not compel anyone to act in a certain way.

The author sees his theory of middle knowledge useful in dealing with such concepts as providence and predestination. The former is regarded as God’s plan for all events so as to bring about his design achieved by creatures acting freely, the latter as God’s choice of a certain kind of world including persons who make free choices.

Craig has written with both insight and excitement, and the interested reader will find much convincing. Probably chaps. 7-10—on various rejections of fatalism (backward causation, time travel, precognition, and Newcomb’s paradox)—are the most difficult to read, but the book as a whole is lucid and helpful. It is a salutary thing to see such a healthy interaction between philosophy and theology.

Walter M. Dunnett
Northwestern College, St. Paul, MN


The publication of this volume presents us with the first of Oden’s three-volume systematic theology. Following a trinitarian sequence, volumes two (due in about two years) and three (two years later) will address The Word of Life and Life in the Spirit. Thus he begins to fulfill the “agenda for theology” that he prescribed in 1979, which requires a reformation in the direction of antiquity, a “postmodern orthodoxy” that leapfrogs the recent past of modernity in favor of a normative patristic era. Key to understanding Oden is his chief methodological premise, which takes with great seriousness the Vincentian canon that Christian theology today must affirm that which the Church has believed everywhere, always and by all. Readers are treated, then, to an encyclopedic synthesis of the early fathers. Like the fathers Oden fully intends to be “self-consciously unoriginal in desiring not to add anything to an already sufficient
apostolic faith but only to receive and reappropriate that faith creatively in their particular historical setting and language” (p. xi). No doubt, he writes, “some may think it mildly amusing that the only claim I make is that there is nothing whatever original in these pages” (p. xiii).

Oden divides his work into four major parts and in the process makes two significant methodological reversals, both of which follow patristic sequencing. First, he subordinates the study of theological method to the study of theology proper. Thus part 1 (chaps. 1–3) explores the nature and attributes of God, while the study of method waits until part 4. Likewise Oden treats the attributes of God in part 1 before the existence of God in part 2. Dividing God’s attributes into four levels, chap. 2 looks at his essential/incommunicable (uncreated, unity, infinite, living) and relational/communicable (omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent) attributes, while chap. 3 examines his interpersonal (personal, spiritual, free) and moral (holy, good, compassionate) attributes.

Part 2 then turns to the question of God’s existence (chap. 4) and to his triune nature (chap. 5). Although God’s existence has been a Christian assumption, one that the Bible never seeks to prove, nevertheless proofs are not without meaning. In their cumulative impact, says Oden, the “five ways” confirm faith and so serve a “modest but important function.” Orthodox trinitarian teaching is not “a belated Hellenistic invention of the post-Nicene fathers” but a teaching that developed from OT “preindications” through the explicit teachings of the NT (see esp. pp. 194–208) to the patristic formulation, perhaps best symbolized in the medieval “shield of the Holy Trinity” (p. 220), which rightly rejected the challenges of adoptionism, modalism and Arianism.

Part 3 turns to the work of God in creation (chap. 6) and providence (chap. 7). While the created order was made ex nihilo (Heb 11:3), Oden observes that “humanity is not made ‘out of nothing’ but ‘out of the dust of the ground’ (Genesis 2:19),” as were the wild animals and birds. While he thus hints at theistic evolution (see esp. pp. 265–267), his real emphasis is that “the Christian doctrine of creation is not focused primarily upon scientific description of what happened perhaps thirty thousands of millions of years ago. Christian faith in creation is compatible with accurate scientific description, but not identical” (p. 231).

Only in part 4 (chaps. 8–9) does Oden address theological method. Most important here is his explanation of the quadrilateral of Scripture, tradition, experience and reason, hinted at throughout the book (pp. 26, 54, 130 and 179) but only now formally explained (pp. 330–339). All four of these sources for theology are interdependent and “depend upon and exist as a response to their necessary premise: revelation” in the history of Israel and Jesus Christ (p. 330). He describes Scripture as the “primary” source, whereas the other three follow temporally and dependently as “secondary” sources: the Word remembered, experienced, and made intelligible. Oden’s full discussion of the nature and function of Scripture will appear in one of the following volumes (p. 335).

Because Oden’s entire method intends to affirm consensus orthodoxy it is hard to take exception to him, especially since his own theological trajectory has moved steadily to the right in the past ten to fifteen years. He obviously will face criticisms (1) that he has romanticized the patristic past as a normative period and (2) that he simply restates that past instead of reinterpreting it for the twentieth century. He could soften the first charge by tapping into the more recent orthodox consensus of the Reformers, Pietists and Puritans, as for example D. Bloesch has done. In other words there is indeed a classical consensus akin to the Vincentian canon, but, let us hope, it continues far beyond the patristic age. As to the second charge, Oden does offer a warning that we must guard against both excessive conservatism, which would overvalue the past, and excessive progressivism, which would undervalue it (p. 362). In the end he approaches his task not only by reminding us of the requisite theological dispositions (humility,
reverence, patience, prayer, obedience, integrity, willingness to suffer for the truth: pp. 355–356). He also brackets his effort with reminders of the need for a theo-comic sensibility (pp. 1, 405–406) that "sees through sobriety to the unexpected reversal of human pride" and therefore "laughs a little at its own somber efforts" to understand our gracious, living God.

Daniel B. Clendenin

William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI


Firmly but courteously Calvinistic, the book under review will be welcomed as a first reader for the student as well as for the critic of unconditional election. Storms clearly and concisely sets the agenda in the first twenty pages. This includes a fair statement of the Arminian position (with quotations from Arminius himself as well as contemporary partisans of corporate or conditional election). The four key points he makes to expand upon his position summary are (1) total depravity (bondage of the human will), (2) faith and repentance as God's gift to the elect only, (3) grace by definition as unconditional, (4) election itself as unconditional in the passages where it is mentioned. This fourth topic is treated at greatest length (37 pp.) by expounding not only the epistolary texts (Rom 8:29–30; 9:6–23; Eph 1:3–6; 1 Pet 1:1–2) but also the gospels and Acts (Matt 11:25–27; 13:10–17; John 6:37–44; chap. 10 passim; chap. 17 passim; Acts 13:44–48). Exposition continues as he exegetically (John 1:11–13; 2:2–8) discusses the order of salvation: effectual call, then regeneration. The Arminian alternative is referred to throughout, but in a final chapter comprising over 15 percent of his book he directly deals with objections, including 1 Tim 2:3–4 and 2 Pet 3:9. His exegesis here is the weakest part of the book ("all" means those addressed, not the world's full population).

It is unlikely that Storms will convince a non-Calvinist, but even those who differ will find his presentation helpful and informative. There is no condescension or rancor toward the other view, though he clearly betrays every partisan's suspicion that those who disagree have overlooked the obvious and the necessary. His calm courtesy will gain his presentation of the Calvinist viewpoint an equally calm hearing even from those disposed to resist it. That is essential for any aid to learning. Those wishing to persuade inquirers of the fittingness of unconditional election to soteriology will also have an effective handbook here.

If anything it is too short, and like any abbreviation it leaves one feeling that the issues cannot be that simple. On the other hand, Storms introduces the reader to the larger discussions of past and present. Among the Calvinists he treats Calvin, the Hodges, Warfield, Jewett, Piper and others (but not Augustine), and among the Arminians he discusses Arminius, Wiley, Thiessen, Pinnock, Cottrell and others. As a starter, therefore, the book points beyond itself to the literature available. Quickly leafing back for a name or idea, I wished for an index (though they are unreasonably expensive to produce, publishers keep telling us). An easy addition, though, would have been a parenthetical identification of the hymnwriters he aptly quotes several times. Only in his conclusion, by a lengthy quotation from Warfield, does he explain his title: There at last we learn that election is "to works of grace" (p. 142), a life of service now.

For a church, pastor's, or college library, *Chosen for Life* will provide a handy introduction to an awkward truth. One wishes that part of that awkwardness had been relieved by the cogent insight of D. Steinmetz: "Calvin does not view the doctrine speculatively, but confessionally. It springs out of the surprise of the elect that they
believe when many fine people do not" (Reformers in the Wings, Baker, 1981, p. 168). But Storms’ concluding quotation from Warfield and his valuable addendum on hyper-Calvinism (pp. 116–118) should disabuse its critics of the perception that unconditional election is a mere speculation, irrelevant and arid.

And we should pray for more pastors like Storms to make our teaching easier.

David T. Priestley
North American Baptist Divinity School, Edmonton, Alberta


This volume, which was a series of lectures by the author at Wake Forest University in 1984, is a neo-orthodox presentation of the concepts of revelation and faith. It is divided into three sections: "The Meaning of Revelation," "The Nature of Faith," and "Theology and Religion(s)." The author has been heavily influenced by K. Barth and H. R. Niebuhr, as is clear from his frequent references to and quotes from their works. There is only a very limited reference to or discussion of Biblical passages, and this discussion is very cursory.

For Price, revelation is primarily what God has done and is doing. It is "closer kin to acts than to ideas," and it is recognized "more readily by experience or intuition than by discursive reason alone" (p. 25). Revelation is not "primarily doctrinal in content: it never requires assent to true words" (pp. 26–27). It is only secondarily verbal in character, and therefore it can only be "associated with but not identified with a book" (p. 27). Revelation happens between persons. Scripture merely witnesses to that event and points the way to our recovering or renewing the experience in which the event was and is apprehended. Of course our understanding and interpretation of revelation are conditioned by our time and setting, and we have no access to universal knowledge of things as they are in themselves. Thus the interpretation of revelation is a continuous, never-ending project through history. Truth is not contained, nor is it containable, in any book of words. We cannot know God as he is in himself. We can only describe him as he is known through human experience.

In the discussion on the nature of faith, Price has a good emphasis on the personal character and the dynamic involved. He calls faith "trustful relatedness" with God and others. It is essentially relational in character. And Price helpfully stresses the active nature of our faith: Faith works if it is genuine. Love is doing, and this is essential to Christian faith. Genuine faith loves and ministers to one’s neighbor whoever he or she is. Of course Price’s approach to all of this is not really evangelical in character. He sees Jesus as the greatest example of love and service, as is demonstrated by his giving his life on the cross out of love for all without distinction (there is no judgment of sin in Christ’s death). Anyone can love with Christ-faith in the Christ-way if he serves his fellowman, even a Hindu or an atheist.

This leads to the final section of the book, in which Price discusses Christianity and other religions. God is love, and his love extends equally to all men everywhere who can in turn respond to that love in their own way according to their own history, culture and religion. Serving mankind’s needs in love is the evidence of the same kind of faith Jesus had in God, so anyone of any religious tradition can serve in love and demonstrate saving faith. Price becomes very universalistic in tone in this section and thinks a "world theology" is something worth pursuing. All people are one, and God’s love covers all. Much of this seems clearly to contradict such Scripture verses as John 3:36; 14:6.
I cannot recommend this volume highly. I do not think much of it will benefit the ETS readership in general. Those interested in a neo-orthodox analysis of revelation and faith might find it helpful.

Paul C. Boling

Anchor Foundation, Inc., Knoxville, TN


In this important and unique book, representatives of the Wesleyan, Reformed, pentecostal, Keswick and Augustinian-dispensational positions state their own views on sanctification and then respond to one another. The publisher’s foreword helps the reader by noting areas of unity and disagreement, the importance of defining key terms, and important issues. Each essay is approximately 30 pages long and includes a brief bibliography. The book closes with notes, subject index and Scripture index.

The authors are well qualified and experienced. The papers are primarily theological, but Dieter, Horton and McQuilkin offer some historical background. As the foreword states: “The authors outline their own understanding of the doctrine” rather than breaking new ground or giving a systematic definition of sanctification.

Dieter’s presentation of the Wesleyan view is clearly written and well organized. The main issue addressed is that of Christian perfection or “entire sanctification.” He defines the concept thoroughly. In a later response to Hoekema he says, “Wesleyanism is not perfectionism . . . , and it certainly does not imply sinless perfection” (p. 91). Nevertheless the responses contested “entire sanctification” and called for greater precision in defining theological terms.

Hoekema’s excellent essay from his Reformed perspective defined sanctification and holiness and went on to discuss issues such as the believer’s nature and the role of the law in sanctification. Readers will note his revised view of Romans 7, which views that passage as indicative of an unregenerate person trying to fight sin through the law (pp. 232, 243 n. 25). Some responses to Hoekema noted his “variations from the traditional historic reformed perspective” as well as a lack of emphasis on the Holy Spirit and the “carnal” Christian. Others disagreed with his understanding of the place of the law and his view of election.

After an extensive historical section and a discussion of sanctification in the Assemblies of God, Horton presents his view of Spirit baptism “as an experience distinct from regeneration” (p. 128). While not a part of his initial essay, Horton’s response to McQuilkin notes “that Christians who continue to sin are in danger of losing their salvation” (p. 192). While praising the historical section and emphasizing major areas of similarity, most of the responses disagreed with the pentecostal doctrine of Spirit baptism.

McQuilkin does an admirable job of presenting the view of a transdenominational group with no official theological statement. He says that “the so-called Keswick approach . . . seeks to provide a mediating and biblically balanced solution to the problem of subnormal Christian experience” (p. 152). The responses confirmed Keswick’s broad appeal by observing many similarities among the other views and Keswick. Sources of disagreement were McQuilkin’s emphasis on a postconversion crisis experience, the “carnal” Christian, and his understanding of being filled with the Spirit.

The concept of the believer’s nature was given careful treatment in Walvoord’s well-argued presentation of the Augustinian-dispensational view. This is due to the central
problem of accounting for "the extent and power of sin in Christians" (p. 201). Following this are lucid treatments of Spirit baptism, indwelling and filling. The responses centered on Walvoord's discussion of the believer's two natures and his interpretations of the Holy Spirit's baptism and filling.

This book provides five well-written, adequately presented views of sanctification by men whose positions are worth considering. The tone throughout is irenic. Though the responses usually include areas of disagreement and objection, they also contain ample commendation and references to broad areas of unity. The most debated subjects are the baptism and filling of the Spirit, the means of sanctification, and the presence of sin in the believer.

Finally, while more exegetical validation would improve some of the presentations, this book is an encouraging and enlightening contribution to the doctrine of sanctification.

John K. Ottley III

Bethany Chapel, Augusta, GA


According to many social theorists, secularization is an important concept for understanding the Church's place in contemporary society. Lyon articulately explores current secularization theories, historically and contemporarily, for their inherent weaknesses and the insights they have provided about the Church and her relationship to society.

Drawing on D. Martin's criticisms of secularization theories, Lyon isolates four faulty assumptions that plague modern accounts of secularization: (1) a faulty understanding of history, stressing discontinuity between periods rather than continuity; (2) the belief that religion is irrational, while the secularization position is held to be the rational alternative; (3) an acceptance of biological evolution as the paradigm for understanding the course of religion in society, including its inevitable fate; (4) a reduction of religion to the level of a social phenomenon, a means of social control (pp. 138-140). The result of these faulty assumptions, he concludes, is that secularization theories in and of themselves offer no explanatory power.

Lyon goes beyond current studies by combining the secularization concept with other tools in order to demonstrate how society has relocated religion from the public to the private realm. The tools he uses are built around the concept of sacralization, the study of what is sacred in society. By combining these two approaches—secularization and sacralization—Lyon offers a penetrating analysis of society, raising issues the evangelical Church must address if it is going to be relevant. These issues involve society's understanding of truth and virtue, the relationship between the Church and the "powers that be," the boundaries constructed between the sacred and secular, and the temporal preoccupations of society. The Church has not, in Lyon's opinion, responded in a consistent manner to these concerns. He believes that the evangelical Church has become so closely linked with middle-class values that it is rejected right along with them. In developing this further he explores how the Church has adapted and/or assimilated the standards and messages of contemporary secular culture into the gospel message. In essence he feels that the Church is facing an identity crisis in contemporary society, a crisis that can only be rectified by the Church assuming a proactive rather than reactive stance within society.

Lyon's book is an insightful analysis of society. It challenges the evangelical Church to examine how secular thinking and ideology have made inroads into its understanding of Christianity. The author has done an excellent job in documenting his work. For the Christian who is striving to address the needs of contemporary society this work will
assist him in clarifying his thinking and in penetrating society, in a Biblically and timely manner, "with the essential Christian gospel of forgiveness through Christ and hope in the act of 'remembering your creator'" (p. 151).

Darwin K. Glassford

Waukesha, WI


Few of us who teach at the college or graduate levels have had formal instruction in teaching method and duties. We learned our professional behavior from our professors. This process of imprinting suffers in two ways: Professors can be bad role models, and students do not see all aspects of teaching (particularly those aspects outside the classroom).

Cahn provides a listing of faculty responsibilities as a corrective. His treatment begins with the teaching process itself and the obligations the professor has toward the student—e.g., mastery of the field of study, use of correct instructional methods, and conscientiousness in grading and examinations.

Less visible to the student's eye are a professor's duties to the world of scholarship and to the department. A person given over to the study of a discipline should share ideas with colleagues at large in order to receive critical evaluation and perhaps contribute to the understanding of that area of learning. There are duties among colleagues at home as well, and Cahn offers an etiquette for the process of advising students and for participation in faculty duties.

Perhaps the most mysterious of the academic processes is the selection of faculty and, should it become necessary, dismissal. The author's suggestions regarding the process of selection and voting will help to ensure a balanced and strong department. This section offered me the most new insights into an area of academia.

Finally this book covers the special responsibilities that a school and faculty have regarding graduate students. All of us have heard horror stories concerning the ill treatment of friends in graduate programs. Cahn's rebukes of shoddy work are followed by correctives that are realistic and helpful.

Some of the words above—e.g., "responsibilities," "obligations" and "etiquette"—might suggest that this is a catalogue of do's and don'ts in teaching. Well, it is. Cahn illustrates these points, however, with true images that we have seen before in our educational experiences or, more pointedly, inside our own classrooms.

I think this book should be read by every administrator, professor and prospective professor in our evangelical academic community. Cahn's suggestions are good not only because they work but because they are right. They remind those of us who teach that there are ethical standards required of us for the privileges we enjoy.

Ferris L. McDaniel

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


The first edition (1978) of Melton's landmark compilation was the stunning product of independent research. Most reference works done on a grand scale, such as D. B.
Barrett's *World Christian Encyclopedia* (1982), represent not only the herculean efforts of a general editor but the combined labors of many people supported by major institutions. Melton's encyclopedia disclosed whole new worlds and was impressive by any measure. But it staggered the imagination to think it was largely (if not quite entirely) the fruit of solitary, avocational scholarship over fifteen years by a United Methodist minister with evangelical sympathies. Dr. Johnson's *Dictionary* and T. Besterman's *World Bibliography of Bibliographies* come to mind, or perhaps the bibliomaniacal studies of the holiness and pentecostal movements by C. E. Jones. But one is hard pressed for comparisons that would begin to convey the magnitude of Melton's all-but-singlehanded achievement. Criticisms of the second edition and its supplement in the present review should be read in the context of my sincerest praise for Melton's ongoing project: the attempt to provide a complete descriptive taxonomy of primary religious bodies in the United States (and now Canada).

The second edition is no longer a solo effort in quite the same sense that the first was. Gale Research Company, a leading publisher of reference works, has brought its considerable resources to the enterprise. For the most part the results represent a significant improvement over the first edition. But Gale has contributed a few problems too, one of them all but inexcusable (especially given the hefty price tag any Gale book is sure to bear). First, however, some of the virtues.

The new edition boasts better typography and much sharper visual presentation. Thus the text is easier to read while allowing the former edition's two fat volumes and supplement to be expanded in content but physically compressed into a single, well-bound volume. Likewise the judicious use of bold headings, a more systematic demarcation of categories within entries, a clearer display of crucial data, and a generally enhanced format all add measurably to the utility of the encyclopedia. The separate dictionary indices at the end of each earlier volume have been replaced by six new ones: religious organizations and institutions, educational institutions, personal names, publications (but not those listed in the bibliographies), geographical location, and subject. On the whole, all of the above is highly commendable.

In addition a good many entries have been revised, augmented, updated, or otherwise improved. Well over one hundred new or previously unlisted religious bodies have been added to the work, with still more (two hundred plus) appearing in the supplement to the second edition, bringing the grand total to slightly more than 1,550 primary religious bodies (denominations, sects, or cults, to use the more familiar terminology—which Melton discourages). The scope has wisely been expanded to include defunct bodies (not to be confused with those that have merged, taken on new names, or the like), though future editions should greatly increase the number here since the retrospective aspect of the project has just begun. Also in the supplement to the second edition Canadian groups not represented in the United States are now added, such as the United Church of Canada and the various Doukhobor communities. The only major segments of primary religious bodies not yet represented are native American (Indian) religions and the religions of American gypsies.

Some changes in the new edition are debatable but understandable. Extensive bibliographical notations have been replaced by selective bibliographies. The broad essays that survey each "family" of religious bodies have been separated from the specific sections they introduce and pulled together to form the first part of the encyclopedia. Other changes are genuine losses. The analytic table of contents in the first edition offered a mind-boggling overview of American religions. (It made such great browsing it was even reprinted in *Good Housekeeping*.) It also facilitated use of the encyclopedia. But the only way to trace through the classified entries in the new edition would be to page through the entire encyclopedia, far too cumbersome a task for those who want merely to skim through the typological list of names. The new alphabetical
index of religious organizations, however useful in its own right, does not replace the older table of contents with its classified arrangement. The acknowledgments in the first edition gave brief information about the genesis of the project and showed that even the most isolated and unrecognized researchers may accrue many debts. But instead of bringing this fascinating story up to date the acknowledgments were inexplicably dropped altogether. Moreover, though the general format is greatly improved the computer program used to edit and typeset the work produced fairly frequent spacing irregularities. They are not too irksome at first, but after awhile they take their toll. More serious is the occasional garbling or outright omission of material, apparently a further consequence of program bugs.

By far the worst decision—and it should probably be blamed on the publisher—was to meet a publication deadline by omitting the last chapter of the first edition: "New Unaffiliated Religious Bodies." Such groups are clearly among the most interesting in the whole work. Furthermore no warning is given concerning their exclusion. Instead the preface to the second edition belabor's the fact that there are 22 "families" in each edition, glossing over the reclassification that should have resulted in more. This approaches outright deception. There is some consolation in the fact that this last "family" is later subdivided and appears in the supplement as "Unclassified Christian Groups" and "Unclassified Religious Groups." But librarians and other book buyers are going to resent paying an extra eighty dollars for a slim paperback giving basic coverage that by all rights should have been included in the second edition proper. There was, after all, only a few months' delay between the second edition and its supplement. As a final insult there is no introductory essay for either of the "unclassified" families. Nevertheless, despite my harsh words Gale's sponsorship as a publisher bodes well for the future and opens the possibility of whole new dimensions of coverage and analysis in forthcoming editions.

One need not agree down the line with Melton's conceptual scheme to recognize its originality, strengths and utility. He first divides religious institutions into primary, secondary and tertiary organizations. Melton is concerned with primary groups: denominations, sects, or cults consisting of two or more communities, assemblies, or congregations. He will include single, independent bodies if they are large enough (2,000 members) and have a widely recognized impact, or if he deems them sufficiently at odds with prevailing American culture—this latter criterion leading to the inclusion of numerous rather tiny but very strange groups. He does not consider secondary groups (which serve primary ones), except insofar as the latter are included in descriptions of primary groups. The same is true of tertiary groups (which seek to change or renew primary ones; for secondary and tertiary groups one should consult such resources as The Directory of Religious Organizations in the United States [2d ed., 1982]).

In many cases the lines are very hard to draw. Jews for Jesus were included in the first edition, but it was then decided that they are not really a primary body and so they were dropped. The supplement to the second edition, however, does include the Union of Messianic Jewish Congregations under the questionable rubric of "Independent Fundamentalist Family." In some ways it is refreshing to see a contemporary analysis of American religion that lists J. Falwell's name but once, and that in a minor bibliographical reference to a book he coauthored. The explanation is simple if one has grasped Melton's basic divisions. Thomas Road Baptist Church is a part of the larger Baptist Bible Fellowship, so it does not merit special attention in and of itself. The Old Time Gospel Hour, Liberty Broadcasting Network, and Liberty University are all secondary bodies, not primary ones, while the Liberty Federation is not even strictly religious, but political. The well-known Sojourners community in Washington, D.C., does not qualify either because Melton considers it to be a renewal movement, hence tertiary. One wonders if some device should be created to include a larger percentage of borderline
cases. Perhaps a definitive edition would simply list secondary and tertiary groups too. As a bare minimum, Melton might include some discussion of sources for secondary and tertiary bodies.

Melton's typology of 22 (actually 24 given the supplement, with major subdivisions creating a grand total of 26) "families" is thoughtful, daring and instructive—but open to endless debate. The practical results sometimes seem like *reductio ad absurdum* proofs that something has gone wildly awry. Are mail-order churches really stepchildren of theological liberalism? How is it possible that Rastifarians are Jews while Messianic Jews and Hebrew Christians are not? Melton's introductory essays usually indicate why he develops the categories he does, but quite a few individual classifications remain unconvincing at best. The criteria for defining a family vary from family to family. Some are grouped together because of history, some doctrine, some behavior, some geography, some for a variety of characteristics reminiscent of Wittgenstein's "family resemblances." Obviously one could write a major critical review essay on just this one aspect of the encyclopedia. But since that is not possible, a few limited examples of problems will have to suffice. It is at least fair to say, however, that the weakest cases are those individual families that incorporate several major religions on the basis of geographical origin.

Numerous groups represent the confluence of several traditions, so any single family designation will appear somewhat arbitrary. One way to solve this sort of problem would be through cross-references to main entries. Cross-references of a slightly different sort, from one body to another, could also tie together much information that is now lost to all but the most careful and discerning readers. This is especially true when closely related groups have been placed in different families. To take but one illustration, persons looking up the entry on the Missionary Church would never guess the old Missionary Church Association's Amish origins via the Defenseless Mennonites unless they also stumbled onto the entry for the Conference of the Evangelical Mennonite Church. Nor would they know of the split within the old United Missionary Church that gave rise to the Bible Fellowship Church unless they saw the entry for the latter, and even then they would miss some critical issues (such as the alleged Calvinism of the Bible Fellowship Church). While it is true that the organizational index usually supplies the information that could be used to accomplish this second form of cross-referencing, readers may forget to keep turning back to the index, or simply grow weary of always having to read all the entries that mention a body in order to make sure one has the basic facts about it. Nor are the different indices wholly reliable or sufficiently analytic to be uniformly helpful. Sometimes no clue is given anywhere of important organic connections. To extend the foregoing example, the second edition supplement lists Duane Peterson Ministries as a separate body without mentioning that he is a minister in the Missionary Church and that his work is subject to the oversight of its western district. Appendices that listed various and sundry umbrella organizations, alliances, fellowships and ecumenical bodies and their respective members would also help readers understand important ties that, as often as not, cut across Melton's families.

Melton's special genius is for locating and identifying the marginal, the obscure, the hitherto overlooked or unknown body. There is often an inverse relationship between a group's actual size and recognition as a part of mainstream American religious life and the attention Melton devotes to it. This is wonderful. The major bodies can fend for themselves and are more than adequately documented elsewhere. But it is the gloriously rich descriptions of hundreds of otherwise hidden, neglected, secretive, and often bizarre religious communities that bring Melton's real gifts to the fore. It is concerning these families that Melton writes with the most obvious relish, occasionally indulging the reader with brief anecdotes or snatches of humor. And it is in such entries that Melton is most likely to append a separate section of critical (but not necessarily unfavorable) "Remarks." What makes matters even more interesting is that he so often writes with
the authority of personal experience (though he never lapses into an offensively self-referential style). It is here that Melton utterly transcends the considerable accomplishments of the more notable among his precursors: M. Bach, E. T. Clark, J. V. Geisendorfer, F. E. Mayer, F. S. Mead, A. C. Piepkorn, and generations of editors for the Yearbook of American and Canadian Churches. This is so both because of the sophistication of his analysis and because of the enormous number of additional groups he has discovered.

As remarkable as Melton’s abilities are, anyone with an eye for such bodies will likely turn up some missing groups. For example there is no entry for the New Covenant Fellowship assemblies in east central Illinois, which combine anabaptist, charismatic, evangelical and restoration concerns. There is none for the Great Commission Church International headquartered in Washington, D.C., with various churches and its B.A.S.I.C. (Brothers and Sisters in Christ) student organization on university campuses. Nor is there any entry for the (now defunct?) Apostolic Christian Temple of Jesus Christ, an indirect offshoot of A. A. Allen’s ministries led by the late E. P. Nauman (a practicing osteopathic surgeon in the Fort Wayne area whose medical credentials were exposed as fraudulent only after a long career had come to an end), or for the Calvary Deliverance Center, which split from the aforementioned Apostolic Christian Temple under the leadership of Mrs. E. Nauman and especially the Rev. M. Foster, daughter of the Naumans. The latter two groups later remerged and moved their semicommunal fellowship to Springfield, Missouri, then moved once more to the east coast to join PTL. Neither did I notice an entry for the secretive flying-saucer cult run by “Bo” (M. H. Applewhite) and “Peep” (B. Nettles; see “Flying Saucery in the Wilderness,” Time [August 27, 1979] 58). The reduction of various Afro-Hispanic religions to Santeria, and especially of the plethora of distinct Afro-Brazilian groups to Macumba, is quite misleading (see p. 137). Nor is there mention, for example, of the Umbanda centers (centros) in Newark, New Jersey. But an extensive account of unlisted groups would rapidly become a lengthy digression. Melton himself welcomes such information and provides an address where it may be forwarded.

There are hundreds of minor problems and factual errors in the encyclopedia as it now stands. There is no point in trying to itemize them in any systematic fashion, but a preliminary checklist of examples may give some indication of the work’s limitations. Many times colloquial names for groups are not given, so that someone looking up “Blackstockings” or “Duckponders” would quickly come to a dead end rather than being directed to the German Apostolic Christian Church. The reference to the two largest pentecostal congregations in the world (p. 37) is rather off the mark, both numerically and geographically: the Full Gospel Central Church in Seoul, Korea, now boasts over one-half million members. Dates are too often wrong, though generally because of what are surely typographical errors (e.g. “1920’s” for “1820’s” on p. 105, or the founding date of “1984” for the Christian Union given in the supplement, p. 1014). The innumerable misspellings begin already in the preface (“dissemanating,” p. xi).

There are endless items that need correction in the lists of educational institutions. The names given for Christian and Missionary Alliance colleges are decades out of date. Some, such as Alliance Theological Seminary, are not there at all. Dallas Christian College, Minnesota Bible College and Pacific Christian College should be listed under North American Christian Convention (NACC), not Churches of Christ (Non-Instrumental). In addition the list for the NACC contains several errors and is also missing over two dozen schools, including Atlanta Christian College, Florida Christian College, Johnson Bible College and Kentucky Christian College. (Nor is the periodical Lookout noted for the NACC, though some consider it more important than Christian Standard.) Neither of the Reformed Church in America’s seminaries is given (though one might think so since Western Evangelical Seminary appears twice, once under the misnomer of Western Theological Seminary, the latter actually the name of the RCA seminary adjacent to Hope College in Holland, Michigan). There are at least four Bethel colleges in four states
sponsored by four different churches, but the index lumps them together under a single heading. With patience one can check out the references and determine the above, but not from the index alone. An analogous situation exists with Central Baptist Theological Seminary. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School and Trinity Theological Seminary are separately indexed with no recognition in either the text or the index that they refer to the same school (albeit one whose name changed in the early 1960s). There is also a third reference to the same institution under yet another name (Trinity Seminary, p. 417) that is not in the index. This point may be picayune, but there are many schools with "Trinity" in their name, including several seminars not listed in the encyclopedia, one a fairly notorious "Wesleyan-Armenian" [sic] diploma mill also bearing the name of Trinity Theological Seminary. Because Melton has a talent for noting and keeping such distinctions, it is disconcerting when they are not reflected in the encyclopedia.

The bibliographical references reflect the treasures in the Institute for the Study of American Religion (ISAR) that Melton founded and directs, though its holdings have now been integrated with the special collections of the University of California at Santa Barbara library. While the books, files and primary documents under the care of the ISAR are probably unique in their scope and comprehensiveness, they are not exhaustive. Because the work’s bibliographical references are limited almost entirely to the physical holdings of the ISAR, that is at times a severe restriction. Too many editions are sadly dated (see the volume by C. H. Smith on p. 55). One looks in vain for many seminal studies (to cite two very different sorts of omissions, where are the names of G. Marsden or L. Garrett?). The paper by D. Dayton (p. 44) is surely eclipsed by his University of Chicago doctoral dissertation (1983), which has now also been published as The Theological Roots of Pentecostalism (Scarecrow, 1987). And why can Melton not supply at least an approximate date for one of his own papers (p. 102)?

While some might object because Melton does not provide a theological assessment of the groups he describes (unlike Pieckorn’s Profiles in Belief), there is an enormous amount of raw material in condensed form that should prove invaluable to those engaged in serious theological and missiological reflection. But the work’s chief virtues are its sweeping scope and its shaping of the massive agglomeration of descriptive details into a comprehensive working taxonomy. I cannot think of a better, more instructive introduction to the bewildering chaos of religious groups that flourish in contemporary America. No other tool so clearly delineates the extent of religious pluralism in modern North American society. It is difficult to imagine someone who would not be enriched by perusing Melton’s encyclopedia. Whatever its present imperfections—and some are quite serious—they all fade in the face of Melton’s incredible, pioneering achievement.

Timothy Paul Erdel

Caribbean Graduate School of Theology, Kingston, Jamaica


The self-proclaimed purpose of Marshall in the writing of this book is that of "popularizing and making attractively accessible the character and features of one of the great saints in Christian history" (p. 8). In that endeavor he has been grandly successful. The freshness of the text, enhanced with 24 pages of colorful illustrations, would cause even the most casual reader to experience at least a little of the enthusiasm of the author for the life and work of Augustine. The historical data supplied is standard fare, incorporating details from both the religious and political settings. The author’s primary source is P. Brown’s definitive biography, Augustine of Hippo.
As an interpretive biography this volume provides numerous captivating insights into the various stages of Augustine's life and the forces that shaped them. The thematic structure employed by the author is reflected in the title as Augustine's travels through such places as Thagaste, Djemila, Carthage, Rome, Milan and Hippo are used to reflect not only his restlessness in the outer world but also in the inner world of heart and mind. As convenient as this theme may be, one wonders if it has been slightly overstated. The following passage leaves one with the impression of a saint who found no peace of heart until he was delivered from this life: "So, still searching, still seeking in the innermost corners of that restless heart, Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, at last found rest in his death on August 28, A.D. 430" (p. 144). In view of such Scriptures as John 14:27, and in light of the tranquillity of heart reflected in many passages of Augustine's writings, one might question whether his heart was quite that restless.

The chief strength of the book is that it portrays Augustine not as an otherworldly saint but as a colorful human being whose life was shaped in the providence of God by powerful relationships with other people (such as his mother Monica and Bishop Ambrose of Milan), by strenuous conflicts with the likes of the Manichees, the Donatists and the Pelagians, and by a deep devotion to God in Christ and a profound faith purified through the struggles of his life. Furthermore no attempt is made to conceal the less laudatory aspects of his life, such as his questionable marital practices and his sometimes unnecessarily harsh attitudes toward those with whom he differed.

In spite of the fact that Marshall has written this book not as an expert but as an "unapologetic enthusiast," the text is still spiced with frequent insightful editorial comments on such topics as faith and reason, authority and reason, and human passion, all of which the scholar should find stimulating. The detailed descriptions of the fourth-century baptismal service (when the Christian faith "still made demands upon its adherents," p. 76) and of the "dialogue sermon" are most interesting to the reader with pastoral interests.

To ensure that his book not become too ponderous, however, the author has supplied a sprinkling of refreshingly earthy humor, from Monica's irritation at Licentius' insistence on singing Ambrosian chants while seated on the lavatory to a description of metaphysical debates sparked by "the boys' chopping up a centipede and watching its parts wiggle independently of one another."

This volume definitely has something for everyone. Its most appreciative audience, however, will likely be those with a casual interest in the history of the early Church and the personalities who gave it direction. One might wish that the book under review be followed by a series of attractively-produced, popular biographies of other early-Church fathers.

Victor K. Downing

Drew University, Madison, NJ


The middle ages have always held a special interest for theological scholars. It seems that almost everything that happened then had a role to play in the development of the Christian tradition, and that tradition was given rich and varied expression in almost every medium. It is a period for which the usual boundaries between the disciplines of Church history, historical theology, philosophy of religion, and literature—always fluid—are especially impossible to maintain. To enter one of these fields is to be led inexorably
into all the rest. These two recent books from the bailiwick of medieval literature should be of more than passing interest to students of theology.

*The Mirour of Mans Saluacioune* is a fascinating specimen of late medieval piety and doctrinal lore. Forty-two chapters of a hundred lines each trace the history of salvation from the fall of Lucifer to the glorification of the redeemed in heaven. Each chapter treats an event from that story—mostly from the life of Christ—developing it typologically in terms of three analogues from OT or classical history or mythology. Intended for use either as a handbook for devotional meditation for laymen or a compendium of *exempla* for clergy, it falls prey to all the pitfalls of fanciful exegetics to which the allegorical method is prone. But it also contains some of the felicitous flashes of insight it makes possible, as when the deceitfulness of earthly riches is compared to the kiss of Judas (line 433). But perhaps this fourteenth-century *Our Daily Bread* is most valuable for the way it enables us to get inside the experience of Christian devotion for the pre-Reformation people for whom it was written. The usually rather wooden poetry rises to a level of warmth, sincerity and fervor in its evocation of the sorrows of Mary that it never reaches in the discussion of, say, Christ’s passion. And experiencing that fact in the poetry not only speaks volumes about the sadness of the tragedy of Mariolatry but also stimulates a wealth of insight into the sympathy for its victims that will be required if we are to reach them today.

Kinney’s study of Skelton is not as entertaining as *The Mirour*, and his addiction to the jargon of modern literary criticism makes his prose at times almost as laborious to read as *The Mirour*’s middle-English distichs, Chaucerian in language if not in elegance. But *John Skelton, Priest as Poet* is after all merely scholarship, not literature. Still it says some things worth reading. Skelton is usually considered as something of a maverick precursor of the Renaissance, but Kinney labors to show that his eccentricities are all rooted solidly in the middle ages. His thesis is that Skelton’s vocation as a priest is the key that opens up his poetry, which should be read in the light of the Sarum missal that Skelton used. Kinney attempts just such a reading. While on occasion he succumbs to the common temptation of modern literary critics to read too subtly between the lines, the main outlines of his interpretation are sound. He shows how echoes of the once-familiar services of the Sarum missal turn even a seemingly secular poem like “The Tunnyng of Elinor Rummyng” into a profound theological commentary on the sin of gluttony and its effects on the spiritual life, and his interpretation of “Phyllyp Sparrowe” is especially enlightening. Thus Kinney demonstrates the pervasiveness of theological and ecclesiastical ideas and imagery in Skelton’s time.

These two books are not perhaps ones that in the normal course of things are likely to come to the notice of theologians. That is a shame, for they can help to keep us from becoming like the priests Skelton castigates, whose “Lernynge is so small/Theyr pryymes and houres falle/And lepe out of theyrr lyppes/Lyke sawdust or drye chyppes.” They can help us rather to come forth “Lyke lanternes of lyght/In the peoples syght/In pulpyttes autentyke/For the wele publyke.”

Donald T. Williams

*The First Evangelical Free Church, Marietta, GA*

---


In what is easily one of the most ambitious projects of scholarly publication in our century, the University of Toronto Press is bringing the works of Erasmus to English
readers. This project will extend well beyond 70 volumes when complete. Of those 70 the first several will be given over to that great humanist's correspondence. In the present volume approximately 130 letters to and from Erasmus, all from the years 1519 and 1520, are introduced, translated and annotated.

These letters reveal an Erasmus troubled by his critics, the anti-humanists, who opposed the introduction of the new Renaissance curricula into the universities. As such these letters recount the quarrels surrounding his role in the founding of the Collegium Trilingue. They also reveal the animosity unleashed by those who continued to oppose his Greek NT even now, years later, after it had gone through its second edition. That anti-Erasman opposition was intensified by the spread of the Lutherana tragodia, arising as it did from an effort to get back to the Bible. Erasmus' detractors accused him of being "the champion and mainstay of Luther's ideas" (p. 3), a charge he flatly denied. Though he respected the Reformer and though he agreed with him on a few key points, these letters make it clear that Erasmus did not lay the egg Luther hatched and that while he was a protesting Catholic he was never a Protestant. To Erasmus, even when Luther was right he was too bombastic, too intemperate, too combative.

The list of correspondents in this portion of the Erasmus mailbag reads like a veritable Who's Who of the sixteenth century. Letters to and/or from such notables as Philip Melanchthon, Henry VIII, Sir Thomas More, Cardinal Wolsey, Guillaume Bude, Bonifacius Amerbach, and Pope Leo X make this among the most interesting and useful books about that age. It also gives ample evidence of the public function of such private letters that in those days were not merely the vehicle of personal correspondence but were also specimens of the highest stylistic caliber and a distinct literary genre in their own right. Many of these letters were not meant to be read by their addressees only (many of the addressees, in fact, saw these letters for the first time only after they appeared in print) but also by the whole body of the scholarly community. Happily for English readers these letters retain their native wit and eloquence even in translation.

They show that Erasmus was a man who deplored the entrance of disputatiousness into theology, making it more a dialectical skill than a form of divine wisdom. He rued the day when "the crystal springs of the old gospel were choked with sawdust by the Philistines, and the undeviating rule of the Holy Scriptures, bent this way and that, became the slave of our appetites rather than the glory of Christ" (p. 197). Toward that end Erasmus became something of a theological peacemaker. He wanted to put a quick and lasting end to the bitter combat that had turned the study of doctrine into a battlefield. He did so because he was persuaded that "nothing in human affairs is so flourishing that discord cannot turn in into disaster" (p. 198). "Where is the sweet reasonableness of scholarship?" he lamented. "Where is that cheerful exercise in the field of Scripture without risk of hurt?" (p. 170). His solution to this problem, as he explained to Wolsey, was to promote "Christian humility in the discussion, not devilish spite; let argument be the weapon used, and not seditious clamour, so that the winner may leave the field with more credit and the loser with more understanding" (p. 170). But this must not be understood to imply that Erasmus had no backbone or that he would seek peace at all costs. This book also contains Erasmus' rather startling letter to J. Hoogstraten, the inquisitor, publicly admonishing him to moderation and fairness.

To read Erasmus is to grow in wisdom. His was a mind and spirit that would not be pigeonholed. He struggled tirelessly to free himself from the labels people were habitually attaching to him. He was a Reuchlinist, they said, and a Lutheran, and a crypto-Protestant. But he despised those sectarian and judgmental attitudes that saw other believers only in light of the theological banners under which they traveled. He was utterly nonsectarian. "I belong to no man's party," he said, "and detest these factious labels" (p. 129). If he allowed himself to stand under any banner or label at all, it would be that of "Christian." In that sense he was the very essence of catholicity.
If personal experience is a gauge, the time one spends with Erasmus is almost always profitable. I say of him what he once said of John Colet. There never was a time when "I did not leave him a better man, or at least a less bad one" (p. 163).

Michael Bauman

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


Saxby has written a timely study of the Christian witness to life in community throughout the centuries. He brings a twofold qualification to this study. His 1984 Oxford doctoral dissertation was on the Labadists, a seventeenth-century Dutch community. He has also experienced community living, having been a member of the New Creation Christian Community in Northamptonshire, England, since 1969. The book grew out of this community's desire to discover something of its communitarian roots in the Christian past. Saxby also aims at a wider evangelical readership to alert them to the "well-founded pedigree" of Christian communitarian groups.

The book's strength is that it offers a kind of working-paper pastiche of quotes and names that must be reckoned with in undertaking any analysis of the case for Christian community. What is unfortunate is that the book contributes so little to that analysis. It may be useful as an appeal that launches discussion of life in community. It fails, however, to offer the careful historical evidence that might sustain that appeal.

This volume is obviously intended as a tract for our time, offering an ostensibly historical account of the ideal of Christian community, an account seasoned by Saxby's vigorous evangelistic appeal to join the communitarian approach to the Christian life. His thesis is a bold one: "All Christians ought to look fairly and squarely at the common life of sharing as an alternative to materialism and greed." Community living is "God's will for today" (pp. 13–14). Indeed throughout the book Saxby is critical of the "compromise" view that says "it is permissible to have possessions so long as we do not let them possess us" (p. 73). He traces his story chronologically through the early Church, the early and late middle ages, the Reformation, and succeeding centuries in both Europe and North America.

In presenting the "Scriptural Position," Saxby argues that Jesus proclaimed the renunciation of all things and, in words reminiscent of J. Ellul (whom he fails to cite anywhere in the book), the "demonic power" of possessions (pp. 43, 46). Unfortunately Saxby's discussion indicates no appreciation for the varying redactional perspectives of the evangelists on issues such as wealth and poverty and even appeals to Pauline texts in explaining Jesus' concept of neighbor (p. 43). On the basis of Acts 2 and 4 he insists that "spiritually and even theologicially the Pentecostal community of goods was fully the mind of God and an integral part of his redemptive plan" (p. 57).

Saxby, then, is at pains to argue that the NT model was "full sharing," not just stewardship of possessions and liberal giving to those in need. "As each new member joined, he or she would sell, deposit, and share" (p. 55). He admits that Paul's stance was different from that of Christ and the Jerusalem community because Paul promoted stewardship and liberal giving. But he interprets this stance as accommodation on Paul's part, "tolerating a system already in being."

Also surprising is Saxby's argument that this system of "individually retained purses" arose as an emergency norm in the face of persecution. Historically, one could argue, persecution has more often been an incentive to community, not the reverse. Witness the Hutterite tradition.
Even more problematic are concerns such as the following. First is the sense of bias that frequently leaks through these historical accounts. For a book that claims to have made objectivity its norm, Saxby’s historical and theological proclivities are distressingly present. This is most obvious in his rather shoddy treatment of monasticism and his distinct anti-Catholic mindset. Saxby implies that Rome opposed all communitarian efforts (p. 24), which was by no means the case. And instead of being the heroes of his story the monks appear more as a prelude to the higher road of the medieval “nonconforming separatists” and later Protestant groups. Saxby often appears to be unsure as to whether he is writing a history of the sectarian believer’s church or of the impulse to community living. These two stories are related but by no means the same, as Saxby’s bias prevents him from seeing clearly.

Joined to this is the author’s failure to interact with viable interpretations of the historical data other than his own. At least the endnotes should be used to indicate the literature on both sides of an issue for readers who desire to do further study. Simply to state, for example, that Constantine’s favors to the Church were politically motivated and not backed up by his life is unfair. (See the recent study of Constantine by P. Keresztes.)

A third concern is the inadequate use of sources. In many cases the classic secondary treatments of groups being considered are simply not in evidence. How can one treat Catholic communal spirituality and not include L. Bouyer? How can one consider the economics of the anabaptists and the Hutterites (in a book published by Herald Press) and not cite C. Clasen, J. Stayer or R. Friedmann? How can one write a chapter in the history of Christian economic thought and not cite even one of the great Christian sociologists such as M. Weber, E. Troeltsh, Richard Niebuhr or J. Ellul? Indeed the sociological dimension is missing almost entirely from this study.

A final concern is the lack of analysis that would yield insight into differences among these communitarian groups in terms of size, theology or social composition. Dozens of movements and groups are highlighted side by side, often with little or no indication as to their impact on their own day and on later Christians. The Benedictine order, which dominated European piety for centuries (“the Benedictine centuries,” Newman called them), receives less than a page of coverage, while the “Cokelers” who really thrived for only about 80 years receive three times this attention.

While Saxby must be credited with bringing forward a timely issue, his book continually raises more questions in the curious reader’s mind than it answers.

Douglas H. Shantz

Trinity Western University, Langley, BC


Nichol presents a brief, popular overview of the backgrounds of the three Lutheran denominations merging into the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (ELCA): the Lutheran Church in America, the American Lutheran Church, and the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches.

The complications of the history of Lutheranism in America makes Nichol’s task far more complicated than it might seem. He has done an excellent job of summarizing and simplifying a complex and convoluted history in a way the average reader will find enlightening. The book is intended for the laity of the merging denominations and serves admirably in that task.
Throughout his book Nichol's tone is upbeat. He is obviously convinced the merger is a good thing for Lutheranism, and he happily describes the history through which the merging churches each came about. Behind the Lutheran Church in America (the largest of the three bodies now merging) lies a history in which early eastern Lutherans of eight different synods or churches came to achieve unity in 1962. The American Lutheran Church (the second of the three merging bodies) was formed by a merger process that began in 1917 and came to completion in 1963. Only the smallest of the three merging churches, the Association of Evangelical Lutherans (AELC), is not itself a result of mergers. It is actually the result of a division within the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (LCMS) over the issues of Biblical interpretation and control of seminary faculties. The AELC is made up of congregations that left the LCMS in protest.

Nichol's positive attitude about the merger process tends to overlook the reality of the obstacles that stood in the way of previous mergers and of the present merger.

Some note is made of the fact that the second largest Lutheran denomination, the LCMS, is not included in the merger because of theological issues. It will be of interest to the readers of this Journal that the primary reason for the LCMS's unwillingness to merge is the issue of inerrancy. The merging churches have steadfastly refused to endorse the notion that the Bible is inerrant.

Very little attention is given to the fact that the merger has involved some serious struggles. Major disagreements occurred over whether to institute quotas of women and ethnic minority representatives on boards and committees, over whether to abandon male terms for God, and over whether the denomination or congregation would control local property.

One may detect in Nichol a bias against theological strictness. In his survey of eighteenth-century Lutheran orthodoxy he patronizingly dismisses the movement as "too warlike and too academic to do what theology is supposed to do: help the church tell the gospel" (p. 27). Although he is more positive in his assessment of the confessional revival of the nineteenth century, his brief survey of the election controversy of the latter nineteenth century makes it evident that he thinks little of those who thought such a doctrine was worth fighting over. Finally his assessment of the division in the LCMS shows him plainly to favor the AELC in its refusal to accept the strict understanding of the truthfulness of Scripture held by the LCMS.

An outside observer might wonder whether such an attitude is not indicative of the whole Lutheran merger process. Is this merger the result of people coming to share the same understandings of the Church and its doctrines, or is it the result of a process in which the authority of the Word of God has gradually diminished, thereby making differences in Biblical teaching seem utterly insignificant?

Larry M. Vogel

English Lutheran Church of the Redeemer (LCMS), Jamaica, NY


Reading the lives of notable Christians has long proven to be both an entertaining and an edifying exercise for many. Mercer University Press must therefore be commended for its publication of the biographies of two notable nineteenth-century theologians.

Shriver's volume on Philip Schaff is a biography commissioned by the American Society of Church History for its hundredth anniversary. That society was founded a century ago in the New York home of Schaff, its first president. Schaff's life is a story
that Shriver narrates around the themes of “Roots,” “Body,” and “Crown,” themes that refer to the three main periods and places of Schaff’s life: his education in Europe and his service first in Mercersburg and then in New York City.

Put differently, Shriver’s book is a fine story, finely told. It recounts the life of the greatest Church historian of the last century, a man who described himself as Swiss by birth, German by education, and American by choice. Shriver’s narrative moves steadily along from Schaff’s humble Alpine roots in eastern Switzerland, to his student days in Halle and Berlin, to his American years in Pennsylvania and New York. Along the way the great figures of German theological conservatism emerge: Tholuck, Hengstenberg, Dorner, Muller, Neander. Schaff’s students were no less notable than his teachers, among whom were Godet and Monod. His friends and acquaintances, furthermore, were a veritable Who’s Who of the nineteenth century. Among them are Maurice, Carlyle and Pusey. Shriver’s book treats us to charming vignettes that show Schaff’s winsome and humbly religious character in the most interesting light, such as his meeting with Abraham Lincoln, or the time in Princeton that he “could be seen walking arm in arm with Henry Ward Beecher and Charles Hodge,” or his attendance at the Moody-Sankey revival in New York City.

The Schaff who emerges from these pages is always the Christian scholar (with emphasis on both words). He was a man convinced that Church history could be done best by a committed Christian. As he himself said, a theologian without faith is like a sky without a star, a heart without a pulse, and light without heat.

Especially revealing is Shriver’s account of Schaff’s pedagogy. His students’ notebooks show a man of scholarship, piety, humor, and even eccentricity. Most classes began with a brief prayer: “Sanctify us by Thy truth; Thy Word is truth.” From there they proceeded on in eloquence, enthusiasm and humor, something not altogether lacking in his History of the Christian Church, where Schaff describes John Eck, Luther’s opponent, as “brassy,” “gassy” and “sassy,” and where he observes that those anabaptists who were executed by drowning were given the “full benefit of immersion.”

If this attractively bound and printed book has a weakness, it is that it does not show us enough of the mind and thought of Schaff. We are told little more than that Schaff’s theology was one of “evangelical catholicism” and that it proceeded via ecumenical concern and encyclopedic eclecticism. This omission, however, is not without some justification. To exhibit anything like the full range of Schaff’s work and thought could easily have swelled this book to three or four times its present size. Schaff, after all, held seminary chairs in Church history, in Biblical literature, in theological encyclopedia and in Christian symbolism. As Shriver points out: “He often played the part of ‘utility man’ during his teaching career. He was an excellent generalist, a genuine renaissance man.”

Griffin’s biography of John Keble takes a quite different approach. Much more of this book is taken up with a delineation of the growth of Keble’s mind and in describing his role in the Oxford movement. Furthermore Griffin’s is a revisionist work, one that recasts Keble and sets him forth in a new light. Thus whereas Shriver’s book is largely a retelling of Schaff’s life, Griffin’s is largely a revision of our understanding of Keble’s thought: Only one of the book’s five chapters deals with biography as such.

Griffin’s book is an admirable specimen of brevity and lucidity, one that exhibits many fine examples of precise and concise summary, as his description of Keble’s Lectures on Poetry demonstrates. It is also a sympathetic treatment, a fact that Griffin does not try to conceal: Keble’s The Christian Year, he says, “is not only great poetry—it is true.”

Griffin’s Keble is a remarkable man who was both a spiritual and a theological leader. (The combination was lamentably rare, then as now.) Like Schaff, Keble was a many-sided man with friends who were among the most notable people of the age—that is, Keble was not only an Anglican controversialist and pastor but also a poet and literary critic of more than average merit. Enlisted among his friends were some of the
most important names in nineteenth-century English religion and literature: Newman, Froude, Pattison, Arnold, Pusey and Liddon, to mention but a few.

In short, Griffin's book is a study of the pious growth of Keble's mind, from the convinced Anglicanism he inherited from his father, to his brief and not very thorough-going flirtation with Roman Catholicism, to his sincere but somewhat uneasy return to Anglican principles. From this book we learn why Keble, unlike Schaff, was not an ecumenist while yet remaining, like Schaff, a tolerationist. The lesson is an important one.

Michael Bauman
Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


Garrett and Melick offer Southern Baptists a collection of articles defining the nature of Biblical authority and describing how that authority is interpreted in the life and ministry of the Church (p. 8). The editors call for faith rather than political action on this subject, which is so vigorously debated among Southern Baptists.

Part 1, "A Doctrinal Foundation," defines inerrancy and discusses the hermeneutical implications. D. S. Dockery defines inerrancy: "When all the facts are known, the Bible (in its autographs) properly interpreted in the light of which culture and communication means had developed by the time of its composition will be shown to be completely true (and therefore not false) in all that it affirms, to the degree of precision intended by the author, in all matters relating to God and his creation (including matters of history, geography, science, and other disciplines addressed in Scripture)" (pp. 38–39). Thus inerrancy begins as an affirmation of faith.

Making inerrancy a faith issue places the burden on hermeneutics to vindicate that faith. For Garrett, hermeneutics seeks to resolve problems in the text because one error would invalidate the Bible. L. R. Bush associates literal interpretation with the grammatical-historical method while treating the historical-critical method with ambivalence (p. 85; cf. pp. 90–91). Melick refutes subjective approaches to Scripture and appeals to objective verification through correspondence, coherence, and experiential criteria. Finally, Nettles traces the history of inerrancy by showing how the truthfulness of the Bible has been affirmed throughout Church history and by Baptists in particular.

Part 2, "Some Practical Implications," develops the distinctively Baptist concerns relating to inerrancy. D. Allen and J. Vines assert that, epistemologically, inerrancy shifts authority from the subjectivity of the pastor to the objectivity of the Scriptures. Methodologically, expository preaching becomes the appropriate means of expressing inerrancy because the preacher has more authority by staying closer to the original text. But this methodology is too narrow because it eliminates many valid forms of preaching. Because Scripture displays a diversity of literature and interpretive methods, a diversity of preaching methods can also remain true to the spirit of Scripture.

W. Wagner demonstrates the need for Biblical authority in missionary endeavors. Historically, churches with a more liberal approach to Scripture have declined in missionary outreach. Once Biblical authority erodes, doubts emerge and the church loses its impact. Wagner proposes a commitment to Biblical infallibility in the face of the demise of liberal European churches, Muslim appeals to authority, and the need to fulfill the great commission.

C. F. H. Henry concludes by describing a Biblical social ethic based upon the Christian view of creation, fall and redemption. Social reformation must be seen in terms of individual salvation instead of inadequate alternatives like liberation theology,
Islamic revolution, communism and revolutionary theology. Henry concludes by proposing thirteen evangelical principles for social involvement, but he cautions that no one political program can claim to espouse a Christian conscience.

The contributors to this book have correctly assessed the key issues of the inerrancy debate in terms of authority, hermeneutics and ecclesiological implications. Moderates, however, will question whether inerrancy as a faith position is more defensible than the "subjective" views they themselves represent. What is the difference in authority between subjective faith and subjective interpretation? The issue is not Biblical authority but interpretation. In addition, a careful definition of Biblical authority can broaden hermeneutics to include more extensive use of the historical-critical interpretations than some contributors currently allow. Finally, while Baptists accept Biblical authority, allowances must be made for diversity in homiletical, missiological and social applications.

Terry G. Hiebert

Baylor University, Waco, TX


This annotated bibliography, focusing on the relationship between the postwar eastern European Church and the Marxist state, offers a wealth of literature documenting the Church's struggle to find its role in Marxist society. Because of the complexity of this association Mojzes provides two introductory chapters that are essential reading. One outlines the various philosophies of ministry being employed by the Church in its search for social identity, and the other describes the impact of communism on the Church.

The bibliographical section of the book is well designed. It first presents books and articles dealing with the entire region, then country by country. The sources on the Soviet Union, being more numerous, are listed according to the Christian denomination they discuss. Many of the bibliographies are annotated and include indexes to other pertinent sources in the bibliography. The book is indexed according to author, title and subject. It also lists twenty journals that frequently have material on religion in eastern Europe. The bibliography, though not exhaustive, appears to be comprehensive.

There are two major drawbacks to the book: the price and the type. It seems quite expensive, especially because it was reproduced from a dot-matrix printer. The dot-matrix type is difficult to read at times.

This bibliography is a must for anyone doing research in Soviet and eastern European Church-state relations. Every research library and mission agency operating in eastern Europe should have a copy.

Jim Wunder

The International Leadership Council, San Bernardino, CA


In this volume Yamamori develops a new concept in mission. It is a refinement of J. Christy Wilson's "tentmaker" principle, and it represents an advance on the evangelical synthesis of social work and evangelistic proclamation. This synthesis owes its resurrection to the 1974 International Congress on World Evangelization at Lausanne.
Yamamori's thesis is also an advance on the concept of reaching unreached peoples. Given the probability that traditional, vocational missionaries cannot reach the 17,000 yet-unreached people groups, a massive alternative is needed. One such solution is Yamamori's corps of "new envoys," who are described in chaps. 4 and 5 as people in the pre-career, mid-career or post-career stages of life. They are motivated by an awareness of the wonder of serving the Lord, by a love for people, by adaptability and by patience.

Yamamori has developed an "openness index" to indicate the receptivity of any given people group to the Christian mission. The index includes four major elements: the hospitality of national leaders, identifiable conversions, receptivity to the gospel, and the need for socio-economic development.

In chaps. 7 and 8 Yamamori establishes the link between relief of refugees and Christian evangelism, a symbiosis described further in chap. 8, where Yamamori speaks of the "contextual symbiosis model." The new envoys will combine relief and evangelism for four basic reasons: (1) it is Biblical, (2) it works better in "enemy territories," (3) it avoids the parasitism of pure social relief, and (4) it obviates the parallelism and false dichotomy between evangelism and social action.

In the final three chapters Yamamori gives practical advice to the new envoys. They need spiritual support from a praying group of people. They also need cross-cultural training and experience before leaving the homeland. The author even gives helpful lists of training facilities and journals.

Yamamori not only blazes new trails in his exposition of the new-envoy concept but also displays excellent statistical research, which he presents in lucid, graphic figures. This book's documentation is exemplary and intriguing. In order to facilitate further research and reflection, study questions have been placed at the end of each chapter.

Wayne A. Detzler

Castleview Baptist Church, Indianapolis, IN


Although he was trained at Fuller's School of World Mission, Pomerville identifies mainly with the pentecostal movement. As A. Glasser notes: "Pentecostals are often described as evangelicals with a plus" (p. vii). This description is personified in Pomerville, who served in Indonesia as a missionary with the Assemblies of God. In this volume he relates pentecostalism to the disciplines both of theology and of missiology.

In his introduction Pomerville introduces the "third force" in missions, a title applied by H. Van Dusen to the pentecostals in 1958 (p. 20). They are to be distinguished from both historical Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. It is Pomerville's purpose to relate the third force to world missions.

When calculating the dimensions of the pentecostal movement, Pomerville quotes V. Synan and D. Barrett, who estimate that there are more than 75 million pentecostals in the world today (pp. 9, 38).

In the eyes of the author the pentecostals are a renewal movement. Indeed, they have brought about a reenactment of the original pentecost experience (p. 54) and are on the cutting edge of God's kingdom in today's world. They are an apocalyptic movement. As C. Pinnock said, "The new Pentecostalism seems to this observer to be a genuine movement of the Spirit of God renewing His church" (p. 54).

One of Pomerville's most intriguing theses is that western theological thought has succumbed to a neo-scholasticism. The result is a "pneumatological hiatus," an ignoring of the Holy Spirit, who is excluded from theological thought and imprisoned within the
Bible. He is not free to work in the Church at large. This, according to Pomerville, has led to an essentially rationalistic worldview (p. 75).

The Holy Spirit’s work is not restricted to conversion, according to the author. The Spirit also must be active subsequent to conversion, and subsequence becomes a key concept. An experience of the Holy Spirit subsequent to conversion is, in Pomerville’s thinking, “normative for contemporary Christian experience” (pp. 85–86). Indeed, Pomerville would go so far as to say that revelation is part of the Spirit’s work in the world today and that it is wrong to limit the Spirit’s revelatory work to the Scriptures. The author goes out of his way to refute the Reformation dictum sola Scriptura (pp. 97–99).

When applied to missiology, Pomerville’s views show the Spirit as the main motivator of mission. He calls the Holy Spirit the “executive of the Godhead” (p. 163). Only he can contextualize theology.

In conclusion, Pomerville tackles two issues in mission today. First, he discusses the concept of missio Dei, the idea that mission is all God is doing in the world through the Church. Pomerville sees pentecostals as a refutation of the blurred boundary between God’s social activity and his salvific work (p. 143).

The second issue is the emphasis on the kingdom of God. He claims that pentecostals have never limited their ministry to the poor, and he regards this “bias to the poor” as a weakness in the kingdom theology of many (p. 143). Indeed, only the Holy Spirit working through the Church can usher in the kingdom of God.

In an interesting appendix Pomerville compares and contrasts the original Reformed formulations with the scholastic statements in effect today. This serves to buttress his thesis that contemporary evangelicalism has been captured by scholasticism.

Given the author’s pentecostal frame of reference, this is an excellent statement of pentecostal theology and missiology. He sets out to be nonpolemical, and he succeeds to a large degree. His work is honest, informed and well written. The bibliography and index enhance the value of Pomerville’s work as a tool for theologians and missiologists.

Wayne A. Detzler

Castleview Baptist Church, Indianapolis, IN


Schaller’s book considers the context in which Peterson’s description of pastoral ministry must be exercised. In discussing the differences that make matters more difficult for pastors today, Schaller uses imagination (a mythical gathering of clergy from colonial times discussing the changes that have taken place) and statistics (a Niagara cascading over the reader but quickly channeled to corroborate his observations regarding trends). He indicates the mobility of membership, impermanence of relationships, distrust of institutions, family breakdown, alienation between laity and ecclesiastical bureaucracy, and shift from mission to social activism, as contributing to the decline of most traditional, mainline denominations. Such groupings, generally liberal in their leadership, have shown an intolerance of dissidence and so accelerated the exodus. All this, along with the growing feminization of the Church and the aging of the nation, provides the context in which pastors will have to preach and counsel. They also should reck with the reality of the charismatic renewal movement and the “migration of millions . . . to theologically more conservative churches” (p. 71). Schaller analyzes the factors that seem to draw people back into congregational life in substantial numbers, as
well as the features that characterize church growth. Among these are singing, preaching, praying, personal religious experience, and an openness to share one’s faith with others. There is also a greater concern with evangelism and church planting than with structural preoccupations and denominational mergers. Pastors, whether liberal or conservative, will be increasingly confronted with divorce, abortion on demand, infanticide of the defective, euthanasia for the terminally ill, and the escalating cost of prolonging the lives of those seriously ill but mentally alert. How does one cope with the demands of such rapidly changing social and religious situations?

Peterson’s book gives us some clues to resolve the question just posed. Written with intensity, replete with references to Prometheus, Wellhausen, Barth, Buber, Calvin, Luther, Marx, McLuhan, Gunkel and Mowinckel, this volume urges the recovery of three basic pastoral acts: praying, reading Scripture, and providing spiritual direction. These acts of ministry are widely neglected by contemporary clerics, and congregations seem part of the grand conspiracy to eliminate them from our lives. If we would restore integrity to pastoral work, we must achieve disciplined excellence in each of these areas.

Prayer, exemplified in the Psalms, is our response to the God who first speaks to us in creation and redemption. Prayer requires periodic retreat from meeting people’s demands and expectations, with a “necessity-defying insouciance” (p. 55). In reading the Scriptures we are to remember the orality of God’s word: spoken before written, and read only to be heard. When the apostles preached and taught, says Peterson, “they did not expound texts, they preached ‘Jesus,’ a living person with a living voice” (p. 75). (This should be qualified, however, in view of what is actually found in Acts.) We are encouraged to practice contemplative exegesis so that we hear the living God rather than simply receive impersonal information or abstract ideas from the printed page. Contrary to W. Kaiser’s emphasis in his stimulating study, Toward an Exegetical Theology, Peterson warns: “What pastors must not do is extract principles from Scripture, or distill truths from the gospel” (p. 92). The provision of spiritual direction involves spontaneous interaction rather than theological inquiry, with due sensitivity as to timing. It calls for dialogue, the avoidance of superficial advice, the keeping of confidentiality, and the willingness to take another’s pilgrimage seriously. Pastors not only are called to be spiritual directors but also should themselves benefit from the guidance given by a fellow servant. In view of the temptations facing church and parachurch leadership these days, this is good counsel of the wisest sort.

Mariano Di Gangi

Ontario Theological Seminary, Willowdale, Ontario


“These are exciting times for philosophical theology,” writes Morris in his introduction. “Little more than a decade or two ago the number of professional philosophers actively working and publishing on theological topics was relatively small. The number of such topics... was small indeed. In just the last few years, however, all this has changed dramatically. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that we are in the midst of an explosion of activity in philosophical theology” (p. 1).

Morris, author of *The Logic of God Incarnate*, has been one of the pioneers in bringing the method of analytic philosophy to bear on what are normally thought to be purely theological topics. An evangelical Christian, he believes that the God of revelation and religious experience is identical with the God of the philosophers and that both perspectives are necessary if we are to have an adequate concept of God. For the most part *Anselmian Explorations* is a collection of previously published journal articles by
Morris in which he, proceeding from St. Anselm's starting point of the conception of God as the greatest possible or absolutely perfect being, analyzes the implications of such a conception for God's goodness, immutability, simplicity, creation of the world *ex nihilo*, incarnation in Christ, and so forth, ever mindful of being faithful to the Biblical conception of God as living and active.

Morris' defense of the compatibility of God's *de re* essential goodness and his freedom is masterful and displays his method at its best. Arguing against those who maintain that God is only contingently good, Morris contends that God acts necessarily in accordance with principles that are for us moral duties but that for him are not duties but mere descriptions of his behavior. Moral praise is due to God for his supererogatory acts, this moral goodness being part of his wider axiological goodness (and, I think Morris might have added, adoration is due to God even for his nonsupererogatory behavior). Morris then proceeds to show how the range of possible worlds is restricted by God's necessary goodness such that some worlds, while conceivable, are not strictly speaking possible because they are incompatible with God's goodness. Undoubtedly one of the most interesting features of Anselmianism is the way our modal intuitions must be altered in light of it.

The essay on divine immutability presents some very intriguing distinctions concerning God's essential attributes/properties and his stable properties. Morris argues that if God is essentially omnipotent and omniscient, then even if he is only contingently good it can be proven that he cannot in the future cease to be good. It seems to me, however, that Morris' argument is subtly misleading. What is broadly logically impossible is that if God is necessarily omnipotent and omniscient he should fall from goodness. But this does not entail that if God is essentially omnipotent and omniscient and contingently good, then it is impossible for him to sin at some future time. Morris' argument shows only that if God were to sin, then he would not have been good all along. God's goodness would be a soft fact about the past, counterfactually dependent on his future behavior. What Morris shows is that it is impossible for God to commit a first sin, that if God, who is in fact good, were to sin, then it would be the case that he was never good, and that the sin was not therefore a fall from goodness. But from that it does not follow that God, who is good, cannot commit some act of sin in the future. Thus on such a conception of God it would be impossible for God to lapse or cease to be good, as Morris correctly says, but not impossible for him to sin or fail to be good, as one might infer. This would not, fortunately, alter our conception of God's dependability because from his contingent goodness we could infer with certainty that God will not in fact sin even though he could.

Morris then interacts with W. Mann's defense of divine simplicity, and it is hard to imagine a more decimating critique of that doctrine than Morris'. He shows, however, that the doctrine serves no purposes that are essential to Biblical theism or may not be served from analyses of other divine attributes.

Morris' essay, co-authored with C. Menzel, on absolute creation *ex nihilo* is almost breathtaking in its metaphysical daring (Luther would have been aghast at this *theologia gloriae*) and constitutes, in my mind, the climax of the book. In an effort to unite Platonic realism with Judeo-Christian theism, Morris presents a contemporary version of the theory of divine ideas. He rightly sees that Platonism with regard to its ontology is squarely set against the Biblical concept of God because Platonism compromises God's aseity by postulating infinite realms of reality independent of God, thus resulting in a profoundly un-Biblical metaphysical pluralism. This constitutes, I think, the most important objection to so-called "serious actualism" concerning possible worlds, and it is gratifying to find a corrective to the views presented, for example, in Plantinga's *Does God Have a Nature?* What Morris presents is really no longer Platonism but a sort of conceptualism according to which possible worlds, properties, propositions and other abstract objects are reducible to or dependent upon God's thoughts. On the analogy of
his analysis of the necessity of God's goodness Morris maintains that God's creation of these entities is both eternal and necessary and therefore dependent upon God without being under his control. But now it strikes me as misleading to characterize God's relation to these entities as one of creation. Such language leads Morris to propound the view that God creates his own properties and therefore his own nature. This sounds utterly bizarre unless one forces himself to evacuate the notion of creation of almost all its usual connotations and to reduce it to mere ontological dependence. "Creation" ought to be reserved for God's relation to the space-time universe, and his relation to abstract entities should be characterized as "ontological ground" or some such similar location. This is an area that needs much more work by philosophers of religion, and I hope that some theist will explore a conceptualist model further.

I have already commented on Morris' material on the incarnation in my review of his Logic of God Incarnate in this Journal. But one issue he raises that deserves comment is on what grounds a person is rational to believe Jesus to be God. It seems to me that an inductive argument can provide such grounds. What I have in mind is some sort of argument based on the radical claims of Jesus to divine status (such as claiming to forgive sins) and the resurrection of Jesus as a miraculous event that can be most plausibly interpreted as a divine vindication of those claims. Morris does not refute inductive arguments for the incarnation but simply passes over them, because such arguments are not necessary to rational religious belief nor typically relied upon by religious believers.

Morris' book illustrates well the vitality and importance of philosophy of religion for Christian theology today. "Christian philosophical theology," he asserts, is "a necessary component in any comprehensive, broadly orthodox theology." Of course theology is not just apologetics, "yet, especially in our time, it must prominently involve apologetics. And this is something we need not regret. For in attempting to answer our critics, we very often come to see features of our beliefs we otherwise might have overlooked" (p. 215). It is my profound hope that evangelical seminaries will heed these wise words and make training in philosophy of religion an integral part of their theological curricula.

William Craig
Westmont College, Santa Barbara, CA


Ranging in time between the nonjuring crisis on one end and the death of John Wesley on the other, and ranging along a theological spectrum that includes Quakers, Moravians, deists and Anglicans, Rupp's book is a wealth of information concerning eighteenth-century English religion. The author proceeds calmly and methodically through an interesting and detailed account of the way religion, inside and outside the Church of England, regained its strength and equilibrium after the Puritan interlude and the Restoration. Rupp shows how the English communities of faith struggled, in many ways, to discharge their duty concerning the cure of souls. He also shows how they were not quite up to the task of ministering effectively to an increasingly urban population, a population that was living through the birth and development of the Age of Reason. In that light his book not only paints the face of that age; it also provides a very full and useful intellectual backdrop for studying the coming Romantic Age in England and the Oxford movement.

Reading Rupp's book is much like walking through the National Portrait Gallery in London: One is repeatedly confronted with pictures of the greatest men and women in
English ecclesiastical history. His is a portrait gallery of great divines, one that includes Sancroft, Tillotson, Doddridge, Stillingfleet, and the Wesleys, among others. Though the book is quite long, while reading it one wishes it were longer yet. Each of the pictures he paints is in reality a portrait in miniature. Because they are not full-length portraits, they are tantalizing but not satisfying—which should not be taken to mean they are unsatisfactory. One simply wishes for more of this good thing. It may seem odd to say that in a large book like this the author is limited by space and needs to be brief, but it is true. A century of religious history, even one that is nearly 600 pages in the telling, requires great skills of compression. Rupp has them. He works in miniature as well as any historian of religion I have read.

Some of Rupp’s pictures are quite surprising. The revealing look we get at William Law, for example, is proof that some men are not as good as their books, for Law himself is proof (if proof be needed) that sincerity is not beauty. Rupp does us service by tracing the unfortunate way J. Boehme’s spiritual and theological eccentricities infected Law, an infection and infatuation aptly described as “the last infirmity of his noble mind.”

Rupp paints group portraits as well as those of individuals. Chap. 4, for instance, is an especially useful summary of the High Church party and its theology, intentions and motivation. Rupp explains their existence as a self-conscious “via media between Puritanism and Rome” (pp. 53-54). He nicely balances the scale with his equally useful rehearsal of the Dissenting tradition, especially his account of Congregationalism, which is both compelling and edifying.

In short, this book is a fine retelling of the faith and the folly of English religion in the eighteenth century, being a plain and honest account not only of the wise and the exemplary but also of “that dismal undercurrent of church history in which good men strain at gnats and swallow camels, and tithe mint, anise, and cummin, oblivious of the more serious needs of a world distraught for lack of charity” (p. 554).

Some things about the Church, it seems, never change.

Michael Bauman

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


Somewhere between Jerusalem and Athens lies the border between the scholarly realms of theology and literature. One would expect much traffic across it in both directions, especially given that evangelicals at any rate tend to view the primary task of theologians as that of expounding a text. But a general unfamiliarity with literary genres among evangelicals and a curious inability to discern the essence of historical Christian doctrine among literary critics betrays a lack of much real cultural exchange. A case in point: It hardly seems possible that any knowledgeable and unbiased reader could peruse John Milton’s treatise De Doctrina Christiana without coming to the conclusion that the great Christian poet of Paradise Lost was, to put it bluntly, an Arian heretic. Yet a major enterprise of Milton scholarship in recent years has been a concerted effort to deny—or at least to blur—the obvious. In Milton’s Arianism a seasoned traveler on both sides of the border has arisen to set the record straight.

The relevance of Bauman’s topic can hardly be overestimated. Milton’s epic is the source of more theological ideas and assumptions than most people realize, even for people who have not read it. It is not easy to separate the Miltonic coloring from the Scriptural outline in our concepts of creation, Eden and the fall. Consequently it is of utmost importance that we understand clearly Milton’s theology and see its strengths and weaknesses for what they are. Bauman’s exposition is clear and his argumentation
thorough and persuasive. In demolishing the case for Milton’s orthodoxy he leaves not one stone left upon another. In the process he makes some sound observations about the hermeneutical enterprise and the need for holding to traditional, grammatico-historical exegesis: Subjective methods of interpretation are not only critically but also theologically unsound. “I simply cannot ascribe to any creature of a creature (i.e. the poem) the self-sufficiency that I as well as theology and biology deny to the creature itself (i.e. the poet)” (p. 339).

The weaknesses of the book are more a matter of style than substance. It was photographed directly from a typescript—not an esthetically pleasing method of production. And it reads too much like an unreviewed doctoral dissertation, with heavyhanded announcements from the author about what he is about to prove (and then, at the end of each chapter, repetitively, what he has just proved). The excellent concluding section on the implications of Milton’s theology for understanding his poetry might have been expanded profitably to consider its implications for the appreciation of his poetry. But all in all Milton’s Arianism is a much-needed and well-executed study. Its exposition of the original Arian controversies and the Nicene deliberations and formulae they provoked is one of the most clear and succinct summaries in print. I hope it will find the “fit audience, though few” that Milton himself longed to reach.

Donald T. Williams

The First Evangelical Free Church, Marietta, GA


Geffré demonstrates the dilemma of a devout scholar faced with the difficult task of synthesizing modern hermeneutics with the post-Vatican-II Catholic Church. The result is a fascinating look at the primary opponents facing evangelical theology in this decade.

The work consists of a number of previous addresses or essays that have been compiled and edited into three divisions. The first, “Theology as Hermeneutics,” is an attempt to “resituate the hermeneutical process of theology historically” by addressing the current state of theological epistemology. The second part, “The Interpretative Testimony to Faith,” consists of theological statements concerning more “fundamental realities” such as the resurrection, the atheistic hermeneutics of “the Son of Man” in E. Bloch and the use of “Father” as the proper name for God. Part 3 confronts the practice of the Church as it faces changing historical, social and cultural conditions. Discussed at length are secularization, the challenge of non-Christian religions, and liberation theology.

The first section is of primary importance for evangelicals interested in the state of current hermeneutical debate. Recognizing first that the Word of God “cannot be literally identified either with Scripture or with dogmatic pronouncements,” the author attempts to synthesize earlier historical-critical methodology with more modern structural options via an emphasis on hermeneutics as Christian praxis. The task confronting Christianity is “to work out a new form of theological epistemology” that will agree with the “genealogical model” of Nietzsche (p. 40). This means that the Church must maintain the concept of a “first origin” (p. 43) while at the same time recognizing the nature of dogma as “creative interpretation” (p. 43). The result is a theology of “action” in which the believing community actually “becomes” theology as it interprets and applies the truth of its divine origin within contemporary cultural perspectives. Geffré feels that this emphasis on the dynamic community surmounts both the closed nexus of grammatology and the relativity of historical interpretation.
This attempt to reconcile history and structuralism presents a difficult challenge to the modern Catholic Church. Geffré contends that dogma cannot be merely the result of council or proclamation (what was true yesterday but false today, p. 69), but rather must consist of “resituating a particular dogma within the whole of Christian faith and understanding that it can have a function today that is different from the function that it had when it was originally formulated” (p. 69). Those who identify the rule of faith with the magisterium have forgotten that the gospel is an “object of faith” rather than a “Body of doctrine” (p. 71). The path to religious truth thus is found in interaction between the three authorities of the believing people of God, the pastors, and the “community of theologians” (p. 71). In other words, the believing community itself validates dogma through its decision either to accept or reject directives from above: “Today, the active non-reception by believers at the grass roots of the Church of a teaching or a law promulgated by those officially in authority undoubtedly has the value of a sign. It is just not enough to condemn as illegal new praxis of this kind in the Church” (p. 72).

Focusing on the dynamic of the community thus allows for a greater freedom not only for the congregations but also for scholars: “Theologians have a right to an area of freedom in order to devote themselves to demanding and painstaking research, the only pre-condition for which is a love of the truth and the certainty that the mystery of Christ transcends all the statements that the Church can ever make about it” (pp. 73-74).

Part 2 consists of a number of essays dealing with the “fundamental realities” of Christianity. These perhaps can best be viewed as a practical application of the principles established in part 1. The author’s interpretation of “testimony” as it relates to the resurrection attempts to deal with the (necessary?) ambiguity of the event by maintaining that even though historical testimony is not sufficient, the occurrence becomes “objectified” when it is “united in faith” of the believing community (p. 82). Thus the resurrection of Christ “is both a real event that in fact occurred and an event of the language of faith, a word event” (p. 83). The atheistic hermeneutics of E. Bloch are necessarily treated to preempt any corporate secularization. Even though the community is primary it must not cut the link with Christian origins. The remaining chapters of the section then affirm the “future quest” of a Church that continually applies its sacred origin in the flux of modernity.

Part 3, “The Practice of Christians Reinterprets Christianity,” faces the vagaries of aggiornamento with respect to the post-Vatican-II Church. The author boldly suggests that Christian witness be truly encountered in the context of an inculturation that recognizes that Christian faith must always become incarnate within varying cultures. As to whether it is possible to be both a Buddhist (or a Muslim) and a Christian, Geffré observes: “What is the most important element in Christianity? Is it a set of rites, representations and practices, which are also the structural elements that are common to all religions, or is it the unforeseeable power of the Gospel?” (p. 171).

This willingness to find true faith in other religions is perfectly consistent with Vatican II (Lumen Gentium 16). The author notes that Christianity has “no monopoly of God’s saving action” (p. 173). Grace is offered to many in ways unknown to us. In the final analysis “God is greater than the historical signs by which he has manifested his presence” (p. 173).

For those societies that have suffered greater secularization the option is, not surprisingly, liberation theology. Defining the Church’s theology of mission in the context of a new consciousness demonstrated in Evangelii Nuntiandi and the Vancouver document Mission and Evangelism, Geffré observes that the “Catholic Church has become, in the last quarter of the twentieth century, the foremost champion of human rights. Human rights—including the right to religious freedom—are not simply tolerated by the Church. They have become, according to Paul VI, a ‘demand made by the Gospel’ ” (p. 246).
The final chapter of the work is a most profitable vignette concerning the "Silence and Promises of French Theology." The historical fortunes of French scholarship are treated in an illuminating manner, one that leaves the reader with a fresh challenge to explore the extremely creative contributions of French theologians.

The most critical component of this volume is its sobering reminder of the Copernican revolution that has recently taken place in hermeneutics through linguistic analysis and its derivatives. The battle is no longer over historical-critical methodology. Instead Scripture has been breached with a Kantian wedge, which simply sidesteps the question of the text by addressing the (necessary!) ambiguity or subjectivity present in any historical statement. Because meaning cannot be found in the history or environs of the text, understanding can come only from the text itself. The element of interpretation thus becomes imprisoned in the present, in how the text is understood by the community socially, economically and politically.

There is a certain benefit in all this. Faulty theologies, for example, need no longer fear falsification. History ceases to be an embarrassment. Churches that have ignored sound Biblical exegesis need no longer fear disruption. The fact that the community has understood and applied Scripture in its own way is the true meaning of the text. It is even possible to do one's own theology.

Obviously the conclusions of this work will not be consistent with the demands of Reformation theology. Those who hold to a high view of Scripture will have little taste for the dethelogizing that must accompany any severance of doctrine from history. With respect to structuralism and its derivatives, orthodox Lutheran theology would seem capable of making a special contribution with its concept of the dynamic Word. As long ago as 1753 J. G. Hamann presented what would seem to be a perfectly acceptable theory of the origin of language. In The Last Will and Testament of the Knight of the Rose-Cross concerning the Divine and Human Origin of Language Hamann suggests that language be explained by a communicatio of divine and human idiomatum: "Everything divine...is also human, because man can neither act nor suffer otherwise than according to the analogy of his nature, however simple or complicated a machine it is" (J. C. O'Flaherty, Johann Georg Hamann [Boston: Twayne, 1979] 127). By applying a Christological dogma to the question of epistemology Hamann seems to provide an answer to the never-ending quest for verification.

A final and most sobering challenge provided by Geffré is the reminder that simple statements concerning the integrity of Scripture are no longer sufficient. Because the opposition chooses to forsake the field of history for the ambiguities of the Knower, any evangelical statement about Scripture must be reductive as well as constructive. The doctrinal basis statement of the Evangelical Theological Society, for example, no longer functions as a safeguard. One suspects that there are more than a few members who blithely sign it knowing full well that their deemphasis of historicity and intentionality allows them to sidestep the issue completely. In other words, we cannot have a sound view of Scripture and sleep in the same bed with Immanuel Kant. He hogs all the covers.

James F. Breckenridge


Two recent works add to the growing literature by evangelicals on Christology (see Stott, Wells, Ramm, McDonald, Bruce and Morris). Webster makes a marvelous and creative contribution, writing with passion about passion: costly devotion to Jesus Christ as historic orthodoxy has understood him.
Specifically he intends to dispel the ever-present temptation of the false dichotomy that divorces ethics from theology, “well-reasoned, heartfelt confession and a radical, costly commitment” (p. 7). Thus Webster works on two fronts at once. He wants to reaffirm the objective, orthodox understanding of the person and work of Christ, a task made necessary by modern critical denials of the same. That, however, is only half of the task. He also intends to catalyze a subjective appropriation of the objective message, a task made necessary by nominal evangelicism, which is “high on verbal output and low on obedience and spiritual vitality” (p. 16).

After surveying “social trends and religious pressures [that] scale down what it means to follow Christ,” Webster establishes the “Scripture principle” as the starting point for Christological formulation as opposed to the “modernity principle” that results in creative license and gospel reconstruction. The conservative response, however, must not simply “parrot ancient creeds,” for “cold, doctrinaire orthodoxy,” if not made contemporary and relevant, “is rightfully unappealing” (p. 45). Fidelity to the Biblical text must always issue forth in a concrete demonstration of the practical consequences of those same texts. Truly knowing Christ, then, does not involve simple “mental assent” to propositions (see pp. 161, 166). Rather, cognitive affirmation of the propositions must always be joined by the affective demonstration of pietas or Christlikeness. “We cannot critique the modernity principle for undermining the historic confession of Christ without acknowledging that conservative Christians have often been guilty of a heretical divorce between confession and commitment” (p. 48). Chap. 4, on the imitation of Christ, drives home this simple truth that “knowing Christ means becoming like Jesus” (p. 47).

Webster develops the heart of his Christology in chaps. 5–10. There he examines the name of Jesus, his human spirituality, his God-centeredness and absolute dependence on the Father, his messianic self-consciousness, his personal identity as God incarnate, and the “unyielding radical quality” (p. 136) of his teaching on kingdom righteousness. The final two chapters “illustrate the strategy I have attempted to follow throughout the book” (p. 7) with treatments of the cross (chap. 11) and resurrection (chap. 12). Once again: “If the cross remains an external transaction between the Father and the Son without affecting our daily lives, we are as guilty of heresy as one who denies the doctrine of the atonement. . . . A biblical theology of the cross unites its soteriological and ethical dimensions” (p. 160). This passion for Christ comes only through the grace and power of the resurrected Lord. A succinct 4-page summary in 12 points (one for each chapter) concludes the book, which on all counts must be counted as a wonderful success.

McGrath writes on a simpler level and with crystalline clarity. Understanding Jesus makes no attempt to forge new scholarly frontiers. Rather, the author takes pains to simplify the subject matter by illustrating theological concepts with examples from everyday life, avoiding technical language, and explaining basic terms like synoptic gospels (p. 41), Christology (p. 59), Tetragrammaton (p. 87) and functional and ontological methods (p. 93). The book contains no footnotes, bibliography or indices.

Part 1 (chaps. 1–3) is entitled “Getting Started.” McGrath notes the unique relationship between Jesus Christ and Christianity, that “Jesus is the whole gospel message.” In him the message and the messenger are inextricably united. We must go beyond establishing the mere historical facticity of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus to the interpretive significance of those events. Such doctrinal inquiry is neither an idle waste of time nor a substitute for a practical experience. Rather, we must steer a middle course between rationalism and emotionalism, preserving both the “subjective and objective aspects of faith” (p. 34). In his third chapter McGrath examines the nature of the gospel sources.

Part 2 (chaps. 4–7) focuses on the person of Christ. In chap. 4 McGrath establishes the historical facticity of the resurrection in seven points, then goes on to outline its
twofold significance. Subsequent chapters explore titles of Christ (Messiah, Lord, Son of God) and the significance of what Jesus did for who he is. Here McGrath contends that the NT itself moves from a functional to an ontological approach, a point some will contest, although he is careful to state that the two approaches are complementary rather than contrasting. The significance of the incarnation is that by it alone we come to know God. McGrath's presentation suffers from oversimplification at this point. Without explanation he suggests that "God doesn't just reveal things about himself—he reveals himself in Jesus Christ. Revelation is personal. It is not given in a set of propositions, a list of statements which we are meant to accept, but in a person. . . . God does not encounter us as an idea, but as a person" (p. 113).

Part 3 (chaps. 8–11) moves on to examine the work of Christ. Chap. 8 devotes about one page each to seven key words (ransom, redemption, justification, salvation, reconciliation, adoption, forgiveness) while the last three chapters cover three theories of the atonement (moral/exemplarist, Christ as victor, Anselm’s forensic theory). A final chap. 12 comprises McGrath’s part 4 and concludes the book.

McGrath's text would serve a college-level forum well, but even here it will need to be complemented by other resources. Its total lack of bibliographical information stands out as a real weakness for students who want further help. Seminary students will need something more substantive, and here Webster's tome deserves a wide readership. He brings to the text both scholarly ability and pastoral concern, moving the reader through the necessary paces of discovering who Jesus is to the goal of submission to his lordship.

Daniel B. Clendenin

William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI


The first couple of decades of this century witnessed the demise of nineteenth-century liberalism, with its mistrust of supernatural events as well as of most revealed theology. The middle decades proved to be the heyday of existential theologies of various types, manifested primarily in the dialectical thought of Barth and in the more radical tendencies of Bultmann. But while taking distinctly different views on the issue of Jesus’ resurrection, both of these scholars exhibited little toleration for attempts to apply the findings of historical studies to the life of Jesus. In contrast, scholarship in the last twenty years has produced a distinct upsurge of interest in historical aspects of Jesus’ resurrection.

This massive volume begins with the assertion that few scholars are aware of the dialogue concerning Jesus’ resurrection that has occurred over the centuries prior to the present. Craig believes that the period of the Deist controversy, in particular, provides some especially insightful historical precedent for portions of the twentieth-century discussion. Accordingly Craig explains that his chief purpose in this work is not only to discuss various aspects of the Deist controversy over the resurrection as an historical phenomenon in itself but also to assess the arguments that were utilized at that time in order to ascertain what may be relevant for today’s studies (p. XV).

The book is divided into three sections, the first consisting of what the author terms “Pre-Modern Anticipations” of what will later become the multifaceted historical case for Jesus’ resurrection. It concentrates on the various forms of argumentation found in the NT itself, in the writings of the early-Church theologians through Eusebius, and in the middle ages through Thomas.
The portion on the NT, though brief, uncovers a number of worthwhile points. The endnotes in particular provide many insightful comments for the serious student. One of the few disappointments in the entire volume, perhaps, is that this section is presented too briefly and is even somewhat sketchy. The material on all four gospels plus Acts, for instance, occupies only about 16 pages (pp. 3–19), necessitating some picking and choosing of topics. Yet a developed NT apologetic is not the purpose of this volume, and several pithy points seldom found in the relevant literature are still made. The treatment of Paul’s major text in 1 Cor 15:3–8, though it also is short (pp. 19–26), is exceptionally helpful, especially because evangelicals so seldom treat this passage in terms of recent critical discussions. And here the endnotes are perhaps the strongest element in this section.

The second portion of section 1 is concerned with several authors of the second and third centuries who treat the resurrection in their writings, both defending it and utilizing it as part of an apologetic for Christianity. Defenses of the resurrection of the body and Origen’s debate with Celsus formulate the key portions of this topic, which is an historical period so frequently ignored by Protestants.

Lastly, in section 1, Craig discusses the time period that he laments as the downfall of historical reasoning. Few scholars of the middle ages pursued this methodology very rigorously, and only two are discussed in much detail: Augustine and Thomas.

Section 2, “The Modern Period,” formulates by far the bulk of the volume. It is subdivided into two parts: the upturn in the historical argument for the resurrection that occurred in the eighteenth century, and the decline of similar argumentation later that century and afterwards due to trends in higher criticism and to the philosophical subjectivism then emerging in Europe. The former part contains much of the deist-orthodox debate, including discussions of the nature of Deism, its variety of attacks on the resurrection, and orthodox defenses of the integrity of Scripture and the historical nature of Jesus’ bodily resurrection. Here the reader is confronted by some of the major scholars of this period, such as Locke, Blount, Tindal, Toland, Woolston, Sherlock, Voltaire and Rousseau. Claim is set forth and confronted by counterclaim with the principal participants sometimes being placed head-to-head.

In part 2 the decline of historical argumentation for the Christian faith is traced to such causes as Lessing’s radical attack on reasons of any evidential sort (especially historical ones) serving as the basis for faith, the continuing surge of naturalistic explanations being proposed to account for belief in the resurrection, and the popularity of an inward, sentimental romanticism. Even conservative theology experienced a shift to such subjective interests (p. 476).

Section 3 provides an assessment of the eighteenth-century debate surrounding the resurrection of Jesus. Subjects discussed include the philosophical issue of the possibility of miracles and the higher-critical methods of Biblical studies. Craig’s chief purpose is to ascertain those facets of the past discussion that are relevant to a contemporary study of the resurrection. And here modern critical scholarship has witnessed that the Deists were right on some issues while the orthodox scholars were correct on others.

Craig asserts that the orthodox apologists presented a better overall case in favor of the resurrection, however, than the Deists did against it (p. 542), partially because some of the deistic victories are on what many scholars today would consider important but nearly moot points in terms of the issue of Jesus’ resurrection (pp. 540–541), while contemporary defenses of this event frequently utilize some arguments that are very similar to those of the orthodox scholars (esp. pp. 528–535). Craig concludes by making a brief case for the resurrection as understood in a contemporary context.

Yet this last apologetic section (pp. 528–546) is basically only an outline. It certainly needs to be expanded further if it is to stand on its own as a developed case for the resurrection of Jesus. In fact Craig recently has completed a companion volume so that a detailed apologetic can be given for this event.
I recommend this book for those careful students of apologetics who are interested in the subject of Jesus' resurrection and who wish to pursue some of the history of argumentation surrounding it. Such a study would help us not only to understand our past but also to see where our current apologetic approaches are similar to those utilized by others throughout history. Further, such comparisons can assist us in avoiding approaches that are likely to fail even today. Finally, the more than 1300 endnotes provide both additional commentary and sufficient sources (especially original ones) for those who would be interested in a further study of any of a number of important related topics.

Gary R. Habermas

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA


Toon has written an "explorative" study of the doctrine of regeneration in order "to stimulate interest and further study" (p. 10). He surveys the Biblical teaching on regeneration (pp. 11-68) and the history of the doctrine (pp. 69-182) before summarizing his own views (pp. 185-189).

The real contribution of this work to the current literature is its lengthy treatment of historical theology. Toon lays out the interpretations of regeneration that historically have been most influential in the various branches of Christianity. It is good to have all this information gathered together in one place. More effort could have been made, however, to explain how the various positions arose and to criticize them in the light of Scripture. Still, Toon's historical survey should prove useful to students and theologians alike.

Of lesser value is Toon's treatment of the Biblical passages that pertain to regeneration. He covers the relevant material, though rather superficially. There is a lack of in-depth exegesis, thorough discussion of difficult questions, and wrestling with alternative positions. For example, on pp. 47-48 he outlines an alternative (pentecostal/charismatic) line of interpretation but does not interact with it. On pp. 27-29 he accepts (practically on the authority of Church tradition) without exegetical argument that "born/begotten of water" in John 3:5 refers to water baptism, but he does not even mention any other interpretation (cf. pp. 127-128) except for the curious view that "water" refers to semen. More needs to be said.

Another problem is that the details of Toon's exposition are too often inadequate. For example, in discussing John 1:11-13 he builds an elaborate argument on the erroneous assertion that *tiktein* means "to beget" (p. 25; also p. 33). He goes on to "presume" that *gennethē anōthen* in John 3:3 means "is begotten from above" rather than "is born again" simply because "the ancients put the greater stress on the male's role in generation" (p. 27). His argument for the translation "from above" is merely the observation that Jesus "may have been ... providing a strong hint to Nicodemus that he was speaking of a special kind of birth" (p. 27). (Despite his exegetical decision, Toon throughout the book speaks of birth and begettal, from above and again, as if it were all there in John 3:3.)

In his final chapter Toon briefly sets forth his own views, drawing upon both Scripture and historical theology. He understands regeneration (inward spiritual renewal) as the gift of the risen Lord that places one in the new age (pp. 185-186). Regeneration occurs when the Holy Spirit indwells the soul (pp. 186-187), which probably takes place, in the case of adults, after "the Spirit first empowers the soul to engage in faith and repentance" (pp. 187-188). Regeneration probably then produces conversion
("a change in attitude and behavior, thinking and lifestyle," p. 188). Finally, baptism is
"God's appointed way of his either bestowing or confirming the gift of the Holy Spirit
(i.e., the grace of regeneration)" (especially in infants, presumably), and in adults "it is
also the means by which the new Christian testifies to having been born from above and
converted to the Lord Jesus Christ" (pp. 188–189, italics omitted).

These conclusions could have been better integrated with and supported by the rest of
the book. Many readers will wonder where some of Toon's conclusions are coming from.

Furthermore Toon's conclusions do not form a very neat package. The faith and
repentance that precede regeneration appear to be identical with the conversion that
follows it. And while Toon rightly discerns an eschatological gift of the Spirit, the
empowering of the soul prior to faith looks much like the inward spiritual renewal that
follows it. Finally, it is unpersuasive to see baptismal regeneration operative in infant
baptism but not adult baptism: There is but "one baptism" (Eph 4:5). Despite these
weaknesses Toon offers insights that go beyond the standard soteriological schematiza-
tions and warrant careful consideration.

J. W. Scott

Willow Grove, PA


From Neusner's prolific pen comes another book on Judaism—or rather Judaism, as
he would have it.

For those interested in the history of Judaism this is a significant book. It is not,
however, a book for the casually interested or the beginner. Only those with considerable
background will be able to navigate the waters charted by Neusner. For those having a
grasp of the salient issues the book is a model of lucid exposition and thoughtful
reflection.

Let us come right to the heart of Neusner's thesis. He adamantly rejects any
treatment of the history of Judaism that assumes a unilinear or evolutionary theory that
can comprehend the whole by a developmental or incremental approach. (See, for
example, his scathing review of P. Johnson's The History of the Jews in National
Review, August 14, 1987.) Rather, Neusner adopts a field theory spelled out in the
introduction and first chapter. Essentially the field-theory approach seeks to ascertain
religious systems. A religious system provides self-evident answers to the questions of
reality (worldview), behavior (way of life), and self-identity (a social group who define
themselves in terms of the answers to the first two questions).

Utilizing such an approach Neusner identifies four Judaic systems (species) that
constitute, nonetheless, a recognizable religion: Judaism (genus). These four Judaisms
are surveyed historically and analytically in chaps. 3–7: (1) the age of diversity (586 B.C.
to A.D. 70), (2) the formative age of Judaism (70–640), (3) the classical period of Judaism
(640–1787), and (4) the modern age—the second age of diversity (1787 to present). Along
the way Neusner offers some fascinating insights and some provocative analyses. In
particular his observations on the relationship and interaction between Judaism and
Christianity provide much food for thought.

In Neusner's opinion the four Judaisms that he has delineated are still a single
Judaism because each is absorbed in an all-important quest for self-definition. Indeed
this perpetual preoccupation with self-identity vis-à-vis the surrounding peoples and
cultures is really the genius of Judaism as a religion, according to Neusner. This
unifying idea does not, however, constitute each succeeding Judaism (species) a deriva-
tive of its predecessor because it does not recapitulate the former. Rather, each Judaism
creates its own unique answer to the question: Who is Israel?
Note that the Judaic systems create their own answers. Neusner's field theory operates on the premise that, in the case of Judaism (here understand "genus"), religion has formed its own world and framed its own realities and not vice versa. This turns on its head the prevailing assumption of most scientific study of religion today. Needless to say, we have the ingredients for a controversial book. Previous offerings by Neusner have elicited strong criticism from various scholars of Judaica, and this one will not be an exception.

This reviewer learned much in reading the book. Neusner's mind seems especially adept at discovering the unifying threads that weave themselves through complex phenomena. He deserves high praise for enabling readers to be aware of and to appreciate the patterns inherent in a sizable corpus of religious literature and in the experiences out of which this literature developed.

Still, I must confess to a sense of disappointment. In the concluding chapter Neusner speaks eloquently of his confidence that there will be Judaisms in the future. Why is he so optimistic? He is convinced that there will always be the indomitable Jewish spirit, which says that to despair is a sin. Judaisms have always pointed toward recovery. Apparently that is the enduring contribution of Judaism: its ability to enable a social group who call themselves Israel to deal with adversity. But is that a sufficient basis for a commitment of one's entire being? Can an anthropologically based system provide ultimate answers? Is a pragmatic survival system the best we have yet devised? The problem I have with Neusner's book is epitomized in the title: self-fulfilling prophecy. A scientific approach to the study of religion all too often banishes the supernatural and the truly transcendent from the arena of investigation. For my part a religion worthy of one's commitment needs to affirm something about the God who both originates and fulfills prophecy.

Larry R. Helyer
Taylor University, Upland, IN


Both of these books are anthologies on their respective topics. Both are intended to relate religion or Christianity to the contemporary world and its problems. On that count it can be said at the outset that both books succeed. The reader is forced to consider many important issues and possibly to reconsider some of his attitudes about them. Whether the answers provided in the books turn out to be the most appropriate ones remains an open question.

The volume edited by Fu and Spiegler consists of 21 essays grouped into five units: Interreligious Conflicts; Religion and Politics in Developing Nations; Religion and Politics in Developed Nations; Marxism, Religion and Politics; and The Holocaust: Christian/Jewish Reflections. The contributors come from a number of different academic institutions but there is a preponderance of past or present Temple University faculty, including the editors. This book, however, represents no single viewpoint either ideologically or theologically (though none of the contributors appear to be evangelicals).

The book has two important purposes: to present the reader with the facts on issues surrounding religion in the modern world, and to respond to them from the viewpoint of the author of each particular article. The success of bringing this about fairly, objectively and convincingly varies from article to article. Some of the articles, such as one by G. Sloyan on Northern Ireland, turn out to be essentially recitals of the factual
history of the issues. Though this makes for very dry reading, it also turns the book into a very useful reference tool—a quality that will probably be its greatest value in the long run.

It goes without saying that the viewpoint of each author influences how he presents his factual material. Usually the reader is alerted to the writer's bias soon enough that he can accommodate himself without a problem. I found, however, two places where the data are slanted to an uncomfortable degree. This happened in the very first essay by T. Sonn on the Arab-Israeli conflict, where historical material is revised to suit an Arab understanding. It also occurs in the essay on religion in eastern Europe by H. L. Parsons. His attempts to whitewash oppression in Soviet satellite countries are blatant. Only a very uninformed reader will be convinced by his assertions of religious tolerance in East Germany, a state that shoots to kill persons trying to escape. (And does Parsons not wonder why so many people continue to risk their lives to leave that country?)

There are many good and some mediocre articles in the volume. The best ones are those that inform rather than pontificate. A standout to me is the essay on religion and politics in Japan by C. Becker. Also very enlightening is the treatment of Buddhism and politics in Sri Lanka by N. Katz. A quick response to the article on tradition versus modernization in the context of African religions by L. Barrett: This is a good statement of a point of view that needs to be heard, but one wishes that writers who on the one hand want to assert the superiority of traditional cultures over western technological cultures but who on the other hand want to chastise the west for withholding the benefits of technology from the third world would at least do so in separate essays.

This book belongs in scholarly libraries and in the bibliographies of relevant courses. Students of comparative religions need to understand to what extent religion is a force in its own right in the world. Classes in world missions may benefit from the factual information. Unfortunately the enormous price makes adoption of this book as a required text virtually impossible.

The volume edited by Ferm contains 33 essays, mostly selections from various books published by Orbis. These are grouped geographically: Latin America, Africa, Asia. Each group addresses issues thought to be crucial for theology in those regions according to the viewpoint of liberation theology.

The section on Latin America includes essays by such well-known liberation theologians as G. Gutierrez and J. L. Segundo. It begins by reprinting the famous Medellin document and provides various interpretations of the theology espoused therein. Some writers are more careful with their theological categories than others, and there are also varying degrees of overt Marxism. But the essential message of liberation for the poor and oppressed remains constant—so much so, in fact, that the reader may feel this section of the book to be too repetitious. It would be superfluous here to rehearse once again the reasons why, from an evangelical perspective, this theology is deficient. Nevertheless the fact of large masses of people living in subhuman conditions in Latin America will not go away on the basis of theological argument. Evangelicals, too, need to respond to that problem.

The section on Africa is mostly concerned with the problem of developing a truly African theology. At the heart of the issue is the claim that much theology done in Africa today is the western theology of European missionaries. This theology is believed to be inappropriate to the African context. The contributors are not of one mind as to how to remedy this situation. But they all agree that African culture and religious heritage must become an integral part of African Christianity. In this discussion the evangelical misses the normativeness of Scripture. But once again the problem of how to express the teachings of Scripture in a manner relevant to Africa is not thereby solved.

The section on Asia is most complex. In fact it becomes clear that Asia is far too diverse a continent to be grouped under just one interpretive umbrella. The two main concerns are with the adaptation of Christianity to Asian thought forms and the socio-
political problems existing in countries such as the Philippines. This section boasts some of the more outrageously syncretistic statements in the book. Particular mention here must be made of C. S. Song and his essay on the cross and the lotus, which manages to make OT passages against idolatry to be not really opposed to idolatry after all.

No one intends the content of this book to be acceptable to evangelicals. But evangelicals will want to use this book as a text in courses treating liberation and third-world theologies. It would be hard to find a collection of primary sources that could give the student a better first-hand exposure.

Winfried Corduan

Taylor University, Upland, IN


Barber is to be commended for undertaking the gargantuan task of reviewing current books pertinent to pastoral ministry. This volume provides bibliography with short annotations for the fifteen years noted. Each of the eleven sections begins with a pithy evaluation of modern trends. The range of coverage is fairly comprehensive with regard to English-language works. One of the book's strongest points is the number of recent reprints that are included. It is especially helpful in the areas of pastoral theology, leadership and administration.

I have three criticisms. (1) At times the line between liberal and conservative seems to be drawn in the wrong place. A. Thiselton's The Two Horizons is said to be written from a theologically liberal persuasion, as is Stuart's Old Testament Exegesis. This is debatable. Gundry on Matthew is called liberal while Hanson on the pastorals is not. The author's perspective on this issue seems to be that of old fundamentalism. Very few "liberal" books are recommended for pastors' libraries. It seems to me that it does pastors good to read outside of their own particular confessional system. (2) Many of the titles seem to be misplaced with regard to their categories. For example, Kugel on Hebrew poetry is listed under "Bible Versions." This might prove a detriment to those looking for studies on the Psalms. I often found these misplaced titles and fuzzy categories frustrating. (3) A number of significant titles are missing. The most glaring omission is Erickson's Christian Theology. In future editions I would suggest an expanded table of contents. I also think the number of pages for each entry should be included in the bibliographical information. This would give the reader a general idea of the cost of the book.

David H. Johnson

Faribault Evangelical Free Church, Faribault, MN


Time was when no self-respecting theologian could afford not to be a fluent Latinist. For better or worse those days are gone. But the fact that they once occurred (and constitute the largest chunk of Church history in the bargain) makes Latin still a language of particular relevance and interest for theological scholars. As a result they ought to take at least a passing interest in the publication of the book under review, which documents the decline and recent partial renascence of classical studies in general and Latin in particular in American secondary education. Well over a dozen essays by
people deeply involved in Latin pedagogy discuss the sad decline of learning in the schools and the resulting shortage of qualified instructors that thwarts efforts to turn the situation around. Various projects in different states that have been put together to combat the shortage are minutely described as well.

Those of us in theological education should be deeply concerned for these efforts of our secular colleagues. At the very least, the more Latin a student learns in high school the better prepared he will be to profit from his study of Greek and Hebrew in college and seminary. And a good case could be made that no discipline has a better track record than classics as a preparation for theological study in general. Part of that case is implied by many of the essays in this book.

A limited number of copies are available gratis upon written request. Letters should specify the requester's particular interest in the teacher shortage and commitment to an effective response. Write to R. A. LaFleur, Editor, The Teaching of Latin, Department of Classics, Park Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602.

Donald T. Williams

Smyrna Christian Academy, Smyrna, GA


The authors write from the academic atmosphere at Fuller School of World Mission, and thus they have produced one of the finest academic tools I have seen. Both Hieberts have academic training in addition to their missionary experience and to their specialized training in the case-study method of teaching.

Pioneered by Harvard Business and Law Schools the case-study method of training has many advantages. It forces students to deal with real-life situations. It is non-directive, and it leaves the analysis and solution to the student.

The Hieberts group case studies into ten large categories. In dealing with “Idols and Ancestors” they raise the knotty question: “May Christians in good conscience put flowers on a grave? If so, why not food?” (p. 24). Thus they introduce the thorny issue of ancestor veneration.

When they discuss the problems of men and women they enumerate the problems facing missionaries worldwide—e.g. “polygamy, common-law marriages, trial marriages, premarital intercourse, and other sexual customs found around the world” (p. 44). The cross-cultural implications of these problems are not so simple as we might wish.

Traditional customs form another category of cases. For instance, drums are often prohibited in African churches because they are associated with paganism (p. 81). The quandary of Christians using alcoholic beverages is also aired from a European standpoint (pp. 97-99).

The whole issue of “power encounter” also receives a helpful airing in this book. One frequently occurring incident is the “failure” of prayer for the sick. The question is raised: “If God is good and great, why can’t he heal the sick?” (p. 117).

In discussing finances and bribery the Hieberts refer to the universal rules and the particularist rules of ethics (pp. 133-134). The most telling case is that of a young ordinand who was expected to bribe the ordination council.

When discussing conversion the cases turn to the results of conversion. Another aspect is that of group conversion or so-called people movements (pp. 158-160).

Walls that divide Christians are also considered. These include such tensions as war and peace, unity and diversity, the caste question, and church-mission conflict. The responsibility of Christian social action is explored (pp. 167 ff.).
In considering church-mission relationships a fourth "self" (self-theologizing) is added to the old self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating. Each church is responsible to develop its own theology from the Bible (p. 183).

Christians are compelled to express loyalty not only to the Lord but also to government. Sometimes these loyalties conflict as they did in the Vietnam era, in guerrilla war zones, and in incidents of kidnapping (pp. 209 ff.).

Finally, the cases exemplify some of the day-to-day problems of missionaries. These include cross-cultural marriages, the education of missionary children, and the management of servants (pp. 233-259).

Two helpful appendices give the ground rules for teaching by case study. The first speaks of the techniques and pitfalls of teaching case studies, and the second gives assistance in writing them. Scattered throughout the book are helpful bibliographical hints on the subject of teaching with case studies.

The principles of case-study teaching can be used in many ways. In systematic theology they can be used to illustrate pastoral dilemmas. In homiletics they can be used to teach practical preaching. They can also be applied in exegetical courses. There is no area of theological education that cannot profit from the case-study method.

The case-study book is not written to be read. It is rather written to be done.

Wayne Detzler

Castleview Baptist Church, Indianapolis, IN


"God don't make no wimps!" says the author. A "sic 'em" book for believers, this text addresses the problems of wimpishness, false humility, and the reluctance ever to say "no" to volunteering for Christian service.

Endorsed by such Christian leaders as C. Colson, R. C. Sproul, S. Briscoe, C. Miller and H. Robinson, the book challenges the believer to stand up to a world that merely tolerates Christians (as long as they stay within the four walls of the church and sing hymns to one another). "If you Christians ever get over your fear of speaking God's truth in the world," Brown says, "you are going to be dangerous!" Our task is to transcend not simply the stereotypes that the world places on us but to recognize and reject the stereotypes of our own creation (such as our fear of boldness; bland, insipid Christian living; being strangled by Christian legalism; etc.).

Personal anecdotes enhance the readability of this volume, and illustrations from Church history demonstrate the breadth of the author's scholarship. Brown's evangelistic fervor is akin to that of Peter Cartwright, an early American Methodist pioneer preacher. Cartwright would stand on a hilltop when he approached a town and say, "I smell hell!" Brown has the same sense of man's lostness.

The author of "Developing a Christian Mean Streak" (Leadership, Spring 1987), Brown says, "Don't be afraid of some people (even Christians) not liking you!" In the words of J. Witherspoon: "It is only the fear of God that can deliver us from the fear of man." Do not fear risk and vulnerability in your service for Christ.

C. H. Spurgeon's challenge to his students—"Learn to say no. It will do you more good than Latin!"—introduces chap. 5, which is appropriately entitled "'No' Is Not a Dirty Word!" Brown discusses three lies that lead to "yes"—i.e., to overcommitting oneself to too many Christian activities—and offers practical advice in dealing with illegitimate guilt.

Although characterized by its jacket as a text on Christian living, I would recommend No More Mr. Nice Guy especially to aspiring pastors and professional Christian
workers. Brown’s work spurs us to bid farewell practically to dormant, doormat Christianity so that we can get on with the work.

Larry E. Dixon
Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


Bloesch here writes “to present an evangelical alternative” (p. xvii) to the multitude of current ethical options. His own “evangelical contextualism” seeks to avoid the twin dangers lurking on the left and right. On the one hand we have naturalistic and philosophic ethics that begin by assuming an inborn moral capacity in people (“precisely what Christian faith denies”), while on the other hand we see legalism, rigorism and status-quo religiosity.

Bloesch traces his ethical roots to four thinkers, all of whom were influenced by Kierkegaard and who placed a premium on Christian practice over nominal adherence to creedal orthodoxy: Barth, Ellul, Reinhold Niebuhr and Bonhoeffer (p. 10). His proposed ethic is evangelical in that it is rooted in God’s definitive self-revelation in Jesus Christ as witnessed in the Scriptures and illuminated by the Holy Spirit. Ethical decisions must be made within the community of faith and be relevant (not relative) to the cultural context, and in this sense the ethic is contextual.

Bloesch also describes his ethic as that of a divine-command theory: “In the divine commandment law and promise are united so that God’s word is seen as an empowering to obey and not simply a command to obey” (p. 3). This divine command requires a “morality beyond morality,” which “contravenes rather than ratifies and confirms social wisdom” (p. 4). This is true, Bloesch acknowledges, even though natural moralities have a limited and secondary validity for the purpose of social preservation. Christ serves as the source and goal of Christian living; gratitude to God for his grace as its motivation, and lifelong repentance as its chief temperament, for even our best decisions have mixed motives and sometimes uncertain consequences.

Throughout his 14 chapters Bloesch seeks to capitalize on holding dualistic motifs in critical tension. For example, in considering the two kingdoms we learn that to the kingdom of God we owe absolute obedience, to the kingdom of the world a relative obedience. Law and gospel are distinct but inseparable so that, with Calvin, Bloesch suggests that the rigor of the law is met but its abiding demand is always with us. Likewise love and justice are discontinuous but related, for the former fulfills the latter as its source and goal, even though in another sense it negates or surpasses it. The Church has two mandates, one evangelical and one cultural. The two are both critical but nevertheless not equal. A final example, taken from his last chapter (“The Folly of War”): War is never just but always an abominable evil to God, rooted as it is in a sinful will to power. Nevertheless we also know that it is sometimes inevitable and, in Scripture, even sanctioned by God.

The key in all of this, then, is to develop an agonistic style of life whereby faith struggles between the ideal of God’s command as promise and the reality of a fallen world (Niebuhr). Examples of this agony abound. How can the Christian both resist totalitarianism and yet condemn the proliferation of nuclear arms? This life of faith refuses to knuckle under to any and all ideologies (the subject of what I thought was his best chapter, “The Ideological Temptation”), which ideologies come from the left, right and center and tend toward a black-white reductionism of complex issues. Ideologies absolutize the relative and overlook the “ambiguous and uncertain character of human
enterprises." Christians must rather heed the Spirit of God as he speaks through the written Word of God and, trusting in God's grace that goes before us, seek to glorify the risen Christ through humble obedience. In Barth's words: "Our return to obedience is indeed the aim of free grace. It is for this that it makes us free" (p. xx).

For the past several decades Bloesch has enriched the evangelical community by his writings, which tap into the rich resources of the broader, "catholic" evangelical heritage. *Freedom for Obedience* follows in this tradition. Those who have enjoyed Bloesch in the past will benefit once again, while those new to him have a treat in store.

Daniel B. Clendenin

William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI


The core of this volume was delivered as Fuller Theological Seminary's 1985 Payton Lectures. Augsburger here makes an anabaptist attempt to articulate an ethic of peace and to justify it on Biblical and theological grounds. I consider it a well-intentioned but pernicious failure, and that for five reasons.

1. In his *Metaphysics* Aristotle correctly observed that those who wished to succeed must ask the right preliminary questions. In the case of formulating theories of governance and public policy the right preliminary questions are not those that ask, as does Augsburger, "What are the ethics of the eschaton?" One should rather ask, "What sort of a being is fallen man, and how can we protect ourselves from the evil within us and without?" I say of Augsburger what R. Southey once said of W. Godwin: "He theorizes for another state, not for the rule of conduct in the present." That is, he theorizes for the next age rather than for the age that is. Any theory of public policy or of private ethics that is based upon our speculations about the nature of things in the coming kingdom rather than on a close observation of what human beings have done (or tried to do) to one another in the past will be misguided. To introduce speculations about the ethics of the future kingdom and then to try to make those speculations relevant by transplanting them foursquare into the arena of public policy formulation is a practice sure to mislead. It crowds off the stage what J. J. Kirkpatrick has called the only useful guide to political theorizing available to us: our own past. For such theorists as Augsburger the world that was is traded for a world that might never be. Historical pragmatism is exchanged for eschatological theorizings about millennial ethics and conditions that often are unconvincing even to other eschatologists.

To Augsburger the universal nature of the kingdom of God is a theological basis for peace among the world's peoples (pp. 40-41). But the kingdom of God is no such thing. It may in fact be a wedge of division between them. We have Christ's word for it that the world will not be Christianized, that the kingdom of God will not enter without eschatological conflict (perhaps even universal conflict) and that, far from being a common denominator, Christ and the Christian gospel are often a source for alienation and division. Christ did not come to bring peace, after all, but a sword. The coming kingdom does not and will not reconcile all peoples. It makes the separation of sheep and goats, wheat and tares, possible—perhaps even necessary. There is no ultimate political reconciliation between good and evil (or even between the less good and less evil). One must not translate the reconciliation between God and (some) sinners into a basis for political or ethical theory. Only by ignoring much of what it says can we assert that "the Bible is a book of peace" (p. 75).

2. Although Augsburger wants an ethic that is Christ-centered, one that takes Christ seriously (p. 30), the Christ upon whom he centers his theory is not (I believe) the
Christ of the gospels. Augsburger misconstrues the fact that Christ is the Prince of peace into the idea that Christ is the Prince of pacifism. He does this by failing to take sufficient notice of the historical context and intention of Christ's teachings. He writes as if the command Christ gave to love one's enemies was not given to his disciples as a standard for personal conduct and spirituality (and applicable by them in that arena) but as if it were given to parliaments, politburos and congresses for the formulation of international policy and national defense. Jesus was not directing his words to Caesar, or even to future Christians who were to stand in Caesar's stead and who were responsible for public policy. He gave them to his disciples. Put differently, Augsburger has misidentified the standard of Christian conduct (which is based on the principle of mercy and grace) with the standard of governmental policy (which is based on the principle of justice).

Augsburger uses the fact that Christ's death was a means for reconciling God and sinners to establish the political ethic that Christians are to be reconcilers by means of peace. But by doing so Augsburger has reshaped the death of Christ from an act of peace into a peaceful act, which it was not. Jesus did not "live and die by the way of peace" (p. 31). His death was a bloody, mortal combat between the forces of good and the forces of evil, one wherein both Satan and the Son of God himself were dealt a death blow. The protevangelium characterizes it as the crushing of heads and the bruising of heels. When Christ set his face toward Jerusalem like a flint, it was no peace march leading to the cessation of conflict. It was a death march that would lead (for the redeemed) to peace and (for the lost) to Armageddon and worse. Those who do not sign the peace treaty of faith will die. Peace was an end in view, not a means to that end.

(3) Augsburger's "shalom" principle mistranslates the condition of peace into an ethic of peace. "Shalom" is not a policy; it is an end. We may actually have to fight for peace. We may have to employ deadly force to push back the powers of evil in a fallen world. But Augsburger makes peace a policy rather than a goal, forgetting that we proceed to peace and not by peace. We must not make the mistake of thinking that a theology of salvation by reconciliation leads to pacifism as a public policy (or even to peace as private ethic). These errors arise whenever a theologian handles the NT as if it were a political manifesto, treating the sayings of Jesus as if they were the Christian equivalent of the sayings of Chairman Mao.

(4) Augsburger repeatedly moves too quickly and too confidently between modernist and anabaptist theology on the one hand and a Christian's view of public policy formulation on the other. When one is constructing a policy for national defense, one is more well advised to quote Burke, not Brunner; Buckley, not Barth; Kirk, not Kierkegaard; Mill, not Moltmann. These four conservative political theorists, and all others of a similar stripe, are completely absent from this book. Their omission is as startling as if one were to write about Protestant theology and omit all reference to Luther, Calvin and Wesley. Yet Augsburger theorizes as if Aristotle, Dante, Machiavelli, Locke and Hume never existed. He writes on the relationship between Christianity and economic theory without reference to C. Gilder, M. Novak. T. Sowell, C. Murray, or even A. Smith. Had he read those economists carefully he never could have quoted J. C. Bennett's four proposals (p. 154), which have been demonstrated to be ineffective, even counterproductive.

(5) Augsburger's book contains numerous illogical conclusions drawn from faulty premises. I will mention only a few. First, he writes: "One of the sad facts of our day is that the world spends $750 billion annually for military armaments while millions of people are starving. The evident contradiction here is that the military armaments are justified to defend what we have against other persons who are in need" (pp. 148-149). This sounds as if Augsburger believes that American nuclear arms are actually aimed at Ethiopia. It also sounds as if he did not understand the peace-keeping role of nuclear weapons. In the more than 40 years since World War II three generations of nuclear missiles have been designed, assembled, tested, deployed and disassembled without use
and without nuclear war (or indeed war of any sort) with our most formidable enemy. We know what has happened at the hands of that enemy to countries who do not have our defensive capabilities. Second, Augsburger trots out Lord Acton’s old saw that “power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely” (p. 171) as if political and ethical abuses arose from power and not from human nature and as if Ronald Reagan, arguably the single most powerful man on earth, were at all likely to be the most corrupt. But Augsburger’s book is sprinkled throughout with misguided aphorisms and half-true truisms that cannot sustain critical analysis. Nor, despite his claims, does “history demonstrate that people win” and that “tyranny fails” (pp. 172-173). As an historian myself I can assure you that history teaches no such thing. You cannot tell history’s winners by their white hats. Third, Augsburger apparently has not seen the contradiction of values inherent in R. Sider’s remark that “I am willing to die to protect democratic freedom, but I am not willing to kill for it” (p. 121). Because he does not, Augsburger believes that “we need to rediscover that to ‘love your neighbor as yourself’ is a strategy that can change the world” (p. 116). Indeed it is, but it is not necessarily a pacifist strategy. Loving myself sometimes requires me to cut off my own right hand and to pluck out my own right eye. If translated into a political strategy (and I am not sure Christian personal ethics can be or ought to be so translated) I might be called upon to eliminate the dangerous “right hands” of society or even of the world. He argues as if love does not—indeed, could not—entail retribution, retaliation, punishment, or beligerence. Loyalty to Christ is not to be equated with pacifism. Nor are a concern for personal and national defense and a willingness to fight for liberty incompatible with Christian love.

Augsburger characterizes the position I am advocating in this review as an attempt “to polarize privatistic piety and social ethics” (p. 91). It is no such thing. It simply takes the words of Christ for what they are—instructions to his disciples—and refuses to remake them into what they are not—directions for the formulation and/or evaluation of a government’s foreign policy and national defense strategy. Rather than characterizing his opponents’ position as a polarization he ought to consider again whether his own position is a misidentification of one thing as another.

In a country where the Augsburgers of the world formulate national policy, the only ones who will be safe will be the enemy.

Michael Bauman

Northeastern Bible College, Essex Fells, NJ


The publication of these three books signals the renewed interest in the morality of war and the growing strength of the pacifist movement in theological circles.

The work by Arnold (1883-1935) is a new translation of the introduction and first three chapters of the original Innenland completed by Arnold in the 1930s against the backdrop of the rise of Nazi Germany. Arnold, founder of the Bruderhof movement in Nazi Germany, wrote this work to capture what he took to be the "spirit" of the NT as it relates to what the behavior of the committed Christian should be. As such it is not a work in philosophy or exegetical theology. Rather, it is a devotional theology of the inner life of the believer, centering on the anthropological categories of the heart, soul and spirit as these relate to a life of Christ-centered community, inner strength, and a pacifist alternative to war.
In chap. 1 Arnold argues that, instead of yielding their wills to political leaders who attempt to improve a nation’s material existence through self-assertion and ruthless power, members of God’s kingdom should seek the cultivation of the inner life. The inner life is the seat of one’s self, especially in its spiritual dimension. It must be cultivated, says Arnold, by detachment from the power-hungry ways of the world and attachment to a life of solitude and quiet rooted in conversion and nourished by the Holy Spirit. War is rooted in people who do not seek unity of life in Christ but in greed, inordinate nationalism, and fear for existence.

In chap. 2 Arnold argues that the key to national peace lies in the individual heart of people. The heart is man’s “inmost being,” “the seat of strength for his spiritual and physical capacities,” “the seat of his feelings, intentions, thoughts, and will.” The state of one’s heart is revealed in one’s deeds of speech and action, which for the believer are deeds of individual and corporate reconciliation, unity and peace. War is grounded in a divided and deceptive heart.

In the final chapter Arnold argues that the human soul is the source of life in man, and as such it is immortal and death is its main enemy. The spirit is the distinctively human, higher aspect of the soul—the religious, ethical and intellectual. The goal of life is to allow the spirit to rule the soul under Christ’s lordship. War results from denying spiritual motives and living on a lower plane, which in turn enslaves people to their economic, racial and national peculiarities.

Arnold’s work is well worth reading. It breathes with authenticity, it is itself a devotional guide to inner unity and solitude, and it reminds us that war does indeed have its roots in alienated hearts that seek to find unity of life and vision apart from the Creator. But those looking for a serious, theological or philosophical treatment of pacifism will have to look elsewhere. Arnold’s treatment of anthropology, though helpful, is too simplistic and does not really deal with the various nuances of Biblical anthropological terms. Further, Arnold merely assumes and does not defend the view that an integrated Christian life will be pacifist in orientation—a view that the present reviewer rejects. Finally, Arnold seems to assume that social wholes are mere heaps of persons. But societies and their modes of existence—war included—cannot be exhaustively treated by focusing on individual psychology.

Facing the Nuclear Heresy is divided into three parts. In part 1 Chapman seeks to show that nuclearism (with its central doctrine of deterrence) is really a religion that must be regarded as a heresy. He offers a standard phenomenological or functional definition of religion: that which offers a total vision of reality and claims to be ultimate objectively (the final or most important thing) and subjectively (that which engenders a sense of awe). Nuclearism is a religious vision of reality wherein the mythology, eschatology and jargon of nuclear weaponry make nuclear capabilities an awesome threat of total destruction (totalism) that become our final objects of trust to safeguard our power over evil, our dread of death, and our hunger for transcendence and immortality. Thus nuclearism must be treated theologially, and such a treatment can only regard nuclearism as a heresy. Orthodoxy is not a set of timeless truths, says Chapman, but an unceasing struggle to be true to the gospel—a view I see as self-refuting. Heresy is what the Church disavows when it confesses its faith anew. Nuclearism is a secular ideology alien to God as Creator, Savior and Sovereign, and its presence signals a special time of confessing for the Church where we fight the ideology of nuclearism and offer a different vision of reality.

In part 2 Chapman treats nuclearism as a heresy by offering a theological critique of the ontology, social expressions, and interpersonal aspects of nuclearism in order to clear the way for a “paradigm shift” replacing nuclearism with a Christian vision of reality. Roughly, nuclearism’s ontology is mechanistic, atomistic and materialistic. Matter is the ultimate force, and power is essentially violence because the universe is conceived of as a jumble of isolated particles in collision. Society is conceived of as a
place of violent confrontation between enemies, and interpersonal relationships are essentially competitive. All of this is out of step with a Christian paradigm wherein reality is ultimately personal, power should express itself in society as nonviolent love, and persons should not dehumanize one another.

In part 3 Chapman offers a strategy for a new pacifist revolution. Our orthodoxy should include right thinking and right praxis. The former is pacifism. The latter involves setting up a network of various kinds of support groups where pacifist ideology can be nurtured and spread.

Chapman's book is to be applauded for attempting a theological treatment of nuclearism. This surely is needed. The work also contains helpful sociological information (pp. 146-147), psychological insights (pp. 157-159) and practical advice (pp. 213-217). Chapman is right to warn us not to put all our eggs in the nuclear basket. A Christian will do everything possible to avoid nuclear war. But in spite of these valuable features the work is flawed by several serious problems central to Chapman's thesis.

First, its treatment of religion and theology is ultimately inadequate. Phenomenological definitions of religion are inadequate, and Chapman is too quick in his identification of nuclearism as a religion. Is the "totalism," "ultimacy" or "awe" associated with nuclear weapons really the same as that which constitutes religion? If not, Chapman's entire thesis collapses. Further, Chapman's conceptual relativism is evident by his use of Kuhnian terminology, his constant assertion that religion is nonrational, and his denial of doctrine as timeless truth. But if conceptual relativism is "true," why argue for pacifism?

Finally, Chapman's philosophical analyses are too hasty and imprecise to do the work he requires of them. For example, a Biblical vision of reality does not necessarily imply pacifism, nor does atomism imply nuclearism as he asserts. Further, even if one grants the main thesis of this work all that follows is that nuclear weapons are not sufficient for peace and well-being. It does not follow that they are not necessary.

Nuclear Arms is the best of the three works for clear, concise argumentation. Augsburger and Curry present cases for pacifism and just war, respectively, and each critiques the case of the opposite position.

Because Christians have a higher calling and standard, Augsburger presents his pacifism for the believer and not society in general. Church and state are separate and under different mandates. The believer sees the progressive revelation of the Bible implying a kingdom ethic that is pacifist and shalom-seeking—i.e., it seeks the well-being of persons and society. The Church is the soul of the nation that seeks a free state, not a Christian one. Christians promote love, not war, and especially offensive is nuclear war. Such a war does not satisfy the criteria for a just war because it does not discriminate between military and nonmilitary targets and it brings total destruction, which is disproportionate to the end sought in a war.

Augsburger's presentation is similar to the one he gave in War: Four Christian Views, and it has the same strengths and weaknesses. His obvious sincerity, his respect for peace and love, and his warning against an inappropriate nationalism are helpful. But three main flaws permeate his case. First, the doctrine of progressive revelation must do full justice to OT teaching on just war, something Augsburger fails to do. Second, he seems to advocate a double-standard theory of morality and overstate the separation of Church and state. Natural-law theorists and those who emphasize the Reformed doctrine of vocation will not find Augsburger convincing here. Third, love is a formal principle. There is little material content in a plea to love someone, and such a plea leaves entirely open the question of the means of accomplishing such an action. Holy-war and just-war advocates agree that we should seek love. This is not at issue. What is at issue is what constitutes love, how it should be attained, and how it should be balanced with the need for an ordered peace.
Curry defends a just-war view that seeks to avoid war as well as the enslavement of the world by totalitarianism. Christians are citizens of two kingdoms, and they have a vocational calling to penetrate the state. This involves, among other things, a just-war framework even in a world of nuclear weapons. Curry traces the history of just-war theory in the Church and shows that three things are necessary for a just war: right authority, right cause, and right intention. War is permissible only to reestablish the peace necessary for a right ordering of society.

Curry considers two modern criticisms of just-war theory: the lack of a clear, Christian state, and the concomitant difficulty of identifying which state is the just one in a conflict and which is merely following inappropriate, national self-interest—the problem of discrimination and proportionality in nuclear war. Regarding the former, Curry argues that not all national self-interests are morally equal. Totalitarian states reflect the values of the elite, whereas democracies reflect the values of the people. In particular the United States and Russia are not morally equal in their attitudes toward war, expansionism, peace and freedom. Regarding the latter, Curry argues that nuclear weapons can be limited in their extent and finality, and they have a nonexplosive use—their very presence can deter and can threaten an aggressor into submission without conflict if they exist in sufficient quantity. A Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) deterrence strategy is wrong, but a counterforce strategy is within the proportionality and discrimination boundaries set by just-war theory. Such a strategy targets only military or military-related areas. In building his case Curry offers a critique of the main doctrines of contemporary pacifism.

It seems to me that Curry’s case is strong and that his position is headed in the right direction. However, three areas of discussion need more elaboration. First, Curry treats too lightly the dangers of inordinate nationalism and the sociological tendency to dehumanize other nations as enemies. Nationalism can be quite appropriate, and a foreign nation can be an immoral enemy, but this can be abused. We need more help in protecting the Christian community from adopting a “my country right or wrong” attitude. Second, Curry does not give enough weight to the irrational aspects of man or the demonic involvement in governments. Both factors reduce the value of nuclear weapons as deterrents because such a role presupposes rational appraisal on the part of the other side. Third, it is very difficult to define what constitutes a “sufficient” quantity of weapons and to ensure that civilian targets are not involved in conflict, especially in light of the escalatory tendencies in war. More attention needs to be given to these aspects of the proportionality and discrimination doctrines of just-war theory.

In sum, these three books are all worthwhile. Nuclear Arms, however, is the best of the lot.

J. P. Moreland

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA


In this book Stackhouse eloquently contends that, above all else, Christian people are to be stewards of the Word. Because theological ideas of any type play a decisive role in social life, Stackhouse believes Christians should actively work out the implications of the reality of God’s existence for this world. He wishes to develop a public theology—not a “biblical politics” or “civil religion,” but a normative statement capable of providing guidance to modernity’s ethical malaise.
The author observes that modern civilizations have largely severed their political economies from religious conviction. In the name of a perverse form of pluralism, a universal normlessness has arisen within capitalist and socialist cultures leading eventually, Stackhouse fears, to little more than Nietzschean nihilism. Christians must step into this gap. They must help society reestablish the idea that there is a moral law of God.

Stackhouse bases his understanding of public theology on an ecumenical interpretation of the “quadrilateral”: Scripture, tradition, reason, experience. A constructive metaphysical-moral vision may be developed from the quadrilateral for what he believes is an ecumenical, global, interreligious and pluralistic age. Stackhouse also prefers to rediscover the insights of turn-of-the-century “Christian sociology.” By rethinking the profound sociotheological questions raised by Christian sociology he believes Christians may provide ethical guidance in present-day public affairs.

The author acknowledges that a stalwart public theology capable of surviving in an open marketplace of ideas must work indirectly through persuasion. He therefore defends separation of Church and state but encourages an intimate relationship between religion and politics. He carefully distinguishes sin and crime, and he argues for a Christian international perspective while still respecting patriotism. He lobbies for a public theology that is more cognizant of the Christian trinitarian doctrine of diversity within unity, and in this he believes Christianity may help maintain pluralism within a coherent order.

Speaking normatively while at the same time esteeming a pluralistic culture is not an easy task. Stackhouse, however, provides the reader with a principled approach. The moral dissension he observes in modern society is a topic of concern for many contemporary intellectuals including R. Bellah, P. Berger and R. Nisbet. Stackhouse’s unique contribution is the tolerant sensitivity of his evaluative expression. Unlike many of the writings of Stackhouse’s peers in ecumene, his writing offers bold affirmative convictions. And unlike many of the writings of theological conservatives, Stackhouse’s writing reveals an informed grasp of the nuances and complexities of modern political and social debate.

The author must be challenged on one count: an overstatement of the saving potential of reason. Stackhouse observes that reason—apart from a knowledge of the gospel—can result in regeneration. In this he makes a classic statement for liberal theology. He fails, however, to comprehend that mankind’s intellect, as well as spirit, is deadened by the fall. He does not recognize that human reason will save no one. This section of the text should be reconsidered.

Excellent discussion questions are supplied at the end of each chapter. For those interested in the broader concerns of religion and society this book is necessary reading.

Rex M. Rogers

Cedarville College, Cedarville, OH