JETS 36/4 (December 1993) 531–563

BOOK REVIEWS

The Monastic Way. By M. Basil Pennington. New York: Crossroad, 1990, 144 pp., $19.95.

A refreshing, pious and, for the most part, traditionalist exposition of Cistercian monasticism, the volume under review is accompanied by black-and-white photographs, which perfectly fit the mood of what is being described. While Pennington is most noted for his works on the centering prayer, very little of that questionable practice is found in this work.

Emphasizing the radical break with the world that monasticism entails, the author perceptively analyzes the reason for the break—namely, in order to more fully serve and commune with mankind on a higher plane. Indeed the monastery is called "a school of love" (p. 118).

The volume is characterized by balance. For instance, speaking of both the ideal and the real Pennington writes: "The danger is that either we cling to the ideal, not accepting the real . . . or we let go of the ideal and settle for the present 'real,' going nowhere. . . . The exciting challenge is to cling to the ideal, letting it ever call us forth, even as we embrace the real and bring it lovingly and gently toward the ideal" (p. 17).

Love, obedience, worship, prayer and work are presented as the central part of the monastic life. All of them aid the monk in bringing himself closer to "the rhythms of nature" (p. 39) and uniting him to a "vast assembly that reaches from their humble monastic church up into the highest heavens" (p. 44). Additionally, through the worship service sacred history, and especially the mysteries of Christ, are recapitulated in the life of the monk.

The virtue and necessity of silence, especially for monastics, is recognized. Describing a statue of St. Benedict, Pennington writes: "The holy Legislator holds a finger to his lips, inviting us to abide in a continual silence. Hearts filled with worship need to pray continually" (p. 47). But again this is not a silence that retreats from a very real responsibility to their brothers in the world. "As his prayer reaches for heaven, he takes all with him. . . . The monk is leaven. . . . The monk's time in the cell has cosmic import" (p. 56).

A problem does, however, arise in Pennington's explanation of how the monk achieves this. "The purer he is, the more empty he is, the more the mercy of God can flow through him to this needy world" (p. 56). While a monk is to empty himself of all sin and misplaced passion, the call to totally empty himself seems to be almost a denial of his unique personhood. Monks are called to fulfill their personhood in a manner unique to each of them, as are we all. To deny the importance of the humanity of the Christian is to deny the importance of the humanity of Christ, and eventually of all free will, even of the free will of God. St. Maximus explained this in his controversy with the Monothelites and Monophysites. In the rest of the book Pennington shows that he does not consciously deny this. Still one must note the problematic passage, for it is indicative of a general tendency in western Christianity, which seems to arise from an unconscious and uncritical acceptance of certain neo-Platonic tenets, especially that of divine simplicity. Indeed this problem is seen in a different context when, while speaking eschatologically, Pennington states that "in the end there will be but one Christ, loving himself—all will be one in him in perfect love" (p. 115).

In emphasizing the rule of St. Benedict and the writings of other pre-schism fathers, Pennington, perhaps unintentionally, is preparing the way for future ecumenical dialogue. For it is only by returning to traditional, truly catholic theology, of which monasticism is an essential component, that we can enable dialogue to become fruitful.

Cyril David Quatrone
Russian Orthodox Seminary of St. Tikhon of Zadonsk, South Canaan, PA

Confessing the Faith: Reformers Define the Church, 1530–1580. By Robert Kolb. St. Louis: Concordia, 1991, 181 pp., n.p.

Kolb provides a splendid introduction to the understanding of confession that developed among the Lutherans during the sixteenth century as well as an overview of the historical contexts leading to the emergence of various confessional documents from the Augsburg Confession to the Formula of Concord.

At the outset Kolb defines a confession of faith as that which comprehends the essential content of faith and provides a line of demarcation in relation to other faiths. In addition it provides the functions of "establishing and preserving the community of faith, of proclaiming and sharing its message, of praising God, and of instructing the faithful" (p. 16). Attention is then focused on the historical forces that led to and shaped the Augsburg Confession of 1530. Kolb succinctly sets forth the major concerns prompting Luther and his followers to formulate a public confession, such as attempting to make Luther's insights more accessible for preaching and teaching, and providing an explanation and defense to political authorities who might be wary of the rapid expansion of the movement. Kolb includes a helpful discussion of the purpose and use of the confession and its status as a secondary authority in the Church.

But the establishment of the Augsburg Confession was not the end of the struggle for definition. It was merely the beginning as changing circumstances raised not only new questions but also old questions in new contexts. In 1548 Emperor Charles V imposed the Augsburg interim in an effort to bring religious uniformity to his realm. The struggle among the Lutherans over the proper response to the interim led to the development of two parties in the church: the Philippists, who followed Melanchthon in supporting the compromise policies of Moritz (elector of Saxony) in order to promote peace with the emperor, and the Gnesio-Lutherans, who opposed those policies. Kolb helpfully outlines the basic differences between the parties and traces the various replies and confessional statements forged during the interim. Although the issuance of the Religious Peace of Augsburg in 1555 ended the interim, the need for confession remained as the Lutheran church faced challenges to its teaching from Tridentine Catholicism, the Reformed tradition and the anabaptists. Kolb rounds out his historical narrative with a description of the events and processes that led to the development of the Formula of Concord in 1577 and ultimately to the Book of Concord in 1580.

The final chapter contains a brief synopsis of the function and purpose of the Lutheran confessions. Kolb states that they supply the church with a secondary authority to Scripture that is a useful and necessary aid to interpretation. He rightly points out that all Christians make use of such secondary authorities in one form or another. His summary of the intent of the Lutheran confessional tradition, as epitomized by Augsburg, to confess the gospel of Christ in an ecumenical context with evangelistic fervor and eschatological awareness provides a fitting and relevant conclusion. Two appendices give a brief chronology of the Lutheran confessions and a listing of the articles of faith included in twelve of the confessions.

As with any work attempting to cover so much ground in an abbreviated fashion there are, of necessity, omissions and points at which various historical and theological complexities must be simplified. Having said this, I must add that Kolb has performed his task with exceptional dexterity. The text is both accessible to the generally interested reader as well as serviceable to the specialist (due to the inclusion of extensive notes). The book is highly recommended for anyone interested in Church history or historical theology and is especially valuable to teachers and students of the Reformation as an excellent introduction to the meaning, development and significance of the confessions and confessionalism of the Lutheran church and the continuing relevance of both to the contemporary Church.

John R. Franke
University of Oxford, Oxford, England

Mutual Accusation: Seventeenth-Century Body and Soul Dialogues in Their Literary and Theological Context. By Rosalie Osmond. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1990, xiii + 284 pp., $50.00.

The potential interest of the book under review for evangelical theologians is far greater than may be indicated by its title or its ostensible subject matter, a rather obscure branch of seventeenth-century literature. When Osmond promises to put the seventeenth-century body-soul dialogues in their theological context she delivers a full survey of the development and interaction of ideas about the nature of body and soul and their relationship from classical philosophy, both Testaments, the Church fathers, the middle ages, and the renaissance. Fully half of the book is intellectual history of a sort that has great relevance not only for historical theology but for current discussion as well. Osmond handles Biblical and traditional Christian sources and ideas with admirable respect, objectivity and accuracy, producing a gem of an interdisciplinary study, one that is a model of what literary scholarship ought to be.

Theological debates on the relationship of body and soul manifested themselves in popular literature in the medieval dialogues or debates between Body and Soul. In their classic form they are set at the moment of death, with Body and Soul engaging in mutual recrimination about their respective roles in leading one another into sin. Soul argues that without the sensual temptations that came through the body she would have remained pure and heavenly. Body counters that he is mere dust and could do nothing without the soul's animation and consent. Soul blames Body for rebelling against her authority. Body blames Soul for not maintaining control. Neither wins the debate, for of course both are guilty. The argument is terminated by the arrival of demons who drag Soul off to hell. Such debates were popular in the middle ages and all but disappeared in the renaissance, although the issues, metaphors and motifs continued in other contexts. But the dialogues themselves experienced a revival in the seventeenth century, right on the brink of the modern world. The background, sources, nature and results of that revival are Osmond's subject.

Osmond's work on her book spanned three decades. The product is quite evidently a lifetime labor of love. Solidity and maturity characterize every page. It will undoubtedly be the definitive treatment of its limited literary subject for many years to come. Its deep roots in theology, philosophy and history make it a fruitful literary study, and the same roots make it useful to people who do not normally glean in that garden. Bible college and seminary libraries that do not normally invest heavily in recent studies of English literature should make an exception for this book.

Donald T. Williams
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

Herbert's Prayerful Art. by Terry G. Sherwood. Toronto: University of Toronto, 1989, 190 pp., $45.00.

Widely recognized as the greatest Protestant devotional poet in the history of the English language, George Herbert has attracted a good deal of attention from literary historians attempting to relate him to the classical Protestant orthodoxy of the seventeenth century that nurtured his spirituality. Lewalski (*Protestant Poetics and the Seventeenth-Century Religious Lyric*, 1979), Strier (*Love Known: Theology and Experience in George Herbert's Poetry*, 1983) and Veith (*Reformation Spirituality: The Religion of George Herbert*, 1985) are among those who have admirably succeeded in showing how the richness of Herbert's art finds its roots in the fertile soil of that heritage. Sherwood tries to offer a corrective to their account by showing ways in which Herbert transcended the limitations of that heritage. But while he does offer some positive insights into Herbert's achievement, his efforts to nuance Herbert's relationship to orthodox theology stumble over forced readings of the texts in which that orthodoxy is expressed.

In the standard Pauline/Protestant paradigm, as Sherwood would have it, God reaches out to man in love, and man responds to God in faith. There is no room in this scheme for man to respond to God with love. His radically depraved and impotent soul is capable only of faith or trust in God's work. But Herbert emphasizes the human soul returning God's love, reaching out to communion with him in prayer, thus radically personalizing the more sterile and abstract model for the divine-human relationship set forth by Calvin. In Calvin "love is expressed to God only in an undeveloped way, since *sola fides* encouraged it to atrophy" (p. 34). Herbert, then, along with his contemporary R. Sibbes, explores "developed notions of loving God" that are "absent in Calvin and Perkins" (p. 44). Herbert feels more clearly than Sibbes the tensions inherent in the idea of loving God in a Protestant framework and thus struggles to find the right way of expressing it, finally emphasizing friendship love rather than the embrace of heterosexual love as his model for man's response to God.

As a reading of Herbert, Sherwood's approach is not without merit, highlighting certain aspects of his work that might otherwise be neglected. But his reading of the history of doctrine is highly questionable, and his errors there also cause problems in his interpretation of Herbert at points. The alleged Pauline paradigm becomes a Procrustean bed into which the Reformers are forced to fit. When Calvin protests that we are united to Christ "by a faith which is not feigned, but which springs from sincere affection, which [Christ] describes by the name of *love*," and concludes that "no man believes purely in Christ who does not cordially embrace him," he is not allowed to speak for himself. Despite his clear statement that faith entails love and demands it rather than opposes it, Sherwood replies that "Calvin here reveals his true colors, . . . telling us that 'love' really means 'faith.'" Hence, as usual, "the importance of faith simply crowds out direct love of God" (p. 36). The hermeneutic by which we get from "springs from" to "crowds out" is a strange one, and it is hard to escape the feeling that Calvin would have had difficulty recognizing himself in the portrait Sherwood draws of him.

Sherwood's book illustrates how easy it is for a secular critic to become quite knowledgeable about theological texts while remaining incapable of appreciating the spirit in which they were written. While he usually confines his use of the hermeneutic of the preconceived notion to the theological treatises and commentaries he cites as background, his wooden caricatures of the Protestant paradigm can also cause him to miss the point of the Herbertian language with which he is more familiar. He refers with approval to readers who have "noted that Herbert does not regard man as depraved" (p. 149), totally ignoring the fact that Herbert is describing the regenerate rather than the natural man in the passage in question—which is rather like attributing to someone the opinion that corpses are not dead on the grounds that he thinks living men can walk.

What we have here, in short, is a phenomenon all too common in literary scholarship today: a critic who recognizes the importance of theological background for understanding older literature and who duly masters the data of it but lacks the framework of understanding that could tell him what it means or how to apply it. He then writes an authoritative-sounding account buttressed by scores of footnotes that is nevertheless obtuse at points and that will mainly be read by scholars who are equally incapable of telling whether and when they have been led astray. That the rebuilding of that framework is a critical need to which evangelical scholars must address themselves is one thing Sherwood's book demonstrates beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Donald T. Williams
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

The Oxford Movement and Its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources. By Lawrence N. Crumb. Metuchen: American Theological Library Association/Scarecrow, 1988, xxviii + 706 pp., $62.50. *Religious Seminaries in America: A Selected Bibliography.* Edited by Thomas C. Hunt and James C. Carper. New York: Garland, 1989, ix + 231 pp., $32.00. *A Primer on Theological Research Tools.* By R. A. Krupp. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990, viii + 71 pp., $17.50.

Crumb opens his magnificent bibliography by carefully defining his project and the Oxford movement itself. He denies the latter was originally either a shift toward Rome (Newman being an exception) or toward ritualism (at least not in the first generation) but rather was toward a thoroughly Christocentric and Christological catholicity, toward apostolicity, toward holiness. He makes a winsome case, though too brief to be fully persuasive. His stance may offend contemporary Anglo-Catholics and tweak evangelicals, whom he dismisses with Vidler's words as "narrow and naive."

The work is graced by several helpful features, including a chronology of the Oxford movement, appendices on bibliographic ghosts and Newman's *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, and extensive author, periodical and subject indices. The bibliography is a technical masterpiece, though too lengthy for detailed review here, containing substantially more than the 5432 numbered entries since late discoveries were interposed to bring the total to 5688. The arrangement is chronological with occasional annotations, providing a useful instrument to gauge the growth and spread of the movement. The original major works of Keble, Newman and Pusey are omitted, but relatively little else. Coverage outside the United Kingdom does seem weaker, however. As an example, while over 400 periodicals are included I saw no reference to the *New Oxford Review*.

The bibliography on religious seminaries in the United States contains many hundreds of useful references but is uneven in coverage, inconsistent in format, and occasionally unreliable in detail. Though intentionally selective, the book contains no clear guiding principles that emerge from one chapter to the next, so the overall effect is checkered. But several individual chapters are superb in conception and presentation. For example, the one on Episcopal seminaries by D. S. Armentrout points to both primary and secondary sources and encompasses both general studies of Episcopal education for ministry and items focused on individual schools, which are divided into currently accredited seminaries, defunct ones, and diocesan training schools. Presbyterians, the Reformed tradition, the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), the United Church of Christ, and United Methodists are particularly well served, though most chapters are merely adequate. The scope includes Hellenic and Jewish seminaries. But the bibliography as a whole misses a great deal.

Mennonite and pentecostal seminaries might as well not exist, while charismatics must content themselves with one passing reference to Oral Roberts University. The Scandinavian free-church tradition apparently does not count either, so one will look in vain for mention of Bethel Theological Seminary, North Park Theological Seminary, or Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. While there is a chapter on the Baptist tradition (which inexplicably overlaps with a notable one on the Brethren), the chapter's compiler is generally blind to Baptist schools outside the Southern Baptist Convention (Northern Baptist is an exception). The chapter on Catholic seminaries really covers patterns of Catholic education rather than specific schools. The chapter on independent institutions, potentially one of the most interesting and instructive, omits reference to Wheaton College or Winona Lake School of Theology/Chicago Graduate School of Theology, or to substantial literatures on experimental schools, marginal ones, and theological diploma mills.

Though there is an opening chapter on government relationships to seminaries, similar consideration of relationships to churches, to universities, to accrediting agencies, to Bible colleges, and the like is incidental at best. Most major studies of theological education as a whole are not noted, nor are significant analyses of specific aspects, such as N. Kansfield's histories of seminary libraries, though here or there a stray study turns up. All in all it remains an essential resource for reference but a curiously flawed and disappointing one in many respects. It frequently manages to overlook the obvious as well as the little known.

Krupp's work consists of questions designed to acquaint beginning students with some seventy basic reference tools for theological study. I can see no justification for publishing elementary homework exercises from a course in library research methods as an expensive academic title. With different typeset and spacing the material could have been arranged in twenty or thirty pages and then photocopied—or, at most, printed as a pamphlet.

Timothy Paul Erdel
Jamaica Theological Seminary/Caribbean Graduate School of Theology
Kingston, Jamaica

Christian Faith and Historical Understanding. By Ronald Nash. Dallas: Probe, 1990 (1984), 169 pp., n.p.

The second edition of Nash's work continues to serve as an important textbook for the beginning student in the area of the historicity of the Christian faith. Nash focuses on historical interpretations of the resurrection of Christ. He interacts with the most significant secondary literature on the subject beginning with the historical positivists of the nineteenth century. His avowed purpose is to defend the truth of the resurrection and thereby to protect the core of the Christian faith.

Nash begins by defining history as "the attempt to reconstruct in a significant narrative the important events of the human past through a study of the relevant data available in the historian's own present experience" (p. 14). He then interacts with the historical positivists of the nineteenth century, such as L. von Ranke, who desired to set up an historical methodology that was as scientific as possible. Their method was to gather data, evaluate and explain. The primary characteristic of a good historian, according to the positivists, was to be as detached and objective as possible. In their interpretation of the resurrection, however, the positivists displayed an antisupernatural bias that made the resurrection historically impossible. Their Christ was therefore quite compatible with nineteenth-century liberal thought, which focused on his ethical teachings.

By contrast, historical existentialism overreacted to the positivists by arguing that history has no objective meaning but is valuable primarily for its impact on the mind of the contemporary reader. Such historians as W. Dilthey and R. G. Collingwood argued that the proper methodology was not to look at the events of history but to "discern the thoughts behind them." The problem here lies in how to discern the thoughts of historical figures.

After dealing with R. Bultmann's interpretation of the resurrection, Nash constructs a basis for a distinctly Christian objectivity in historical analysis. He opts for a theory that he calls "soft objectivism," in which the historian admits the limits of his/her sources. Nash comments: "Our approach to the past can never be direct; our theory of historical truth can never be one of correspondence, since there is, strictly speaking, nothing to which it can correspond" (p. 108). The historian therefore seeks a view of the past that is as coherent as possible with all available data.

Having established a framework for interpreting the past, Nash applies it to the resurrection by examining four representative theologians (Bultmann, Barth, Pannenberg, Ladd). He sides with Ladd, who is closest of the four to the contemporary evangelical interpretation of the resurrection. The key point of Ladd's discussion is the apostolic witness to the resurrection. According to Nash, that witness must be evaluated using the proper methods of historical investigation.

In summary, Nash effectively analyzes the major historical interpretations of the most important event in Christian history from a distinctly evangelical perspective. His work is by no means a pioneering effort but serves as an apologetic tool that complements such important books as J. McDowell's *Evidence That Demands a Verdict*. Nash's text will continue to serve as an important introduction to the views of theologians that have shaped contemporary views of the historicity of the resurrection.

Martin I. Klauber
College of Lake County, Grayslake, IL

Modern Faith and Thought. By Helmut Thielicke. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990, 582 pp., $35.00.

I had always thought this was one of Thielicke's best works, so I was delighted to see it appear in a fine translation. It is a theological dialogue with modern thought from Descartes to the present, arranged in an historical format in a manner that helps enable a clear and accurate understanding of the history of ideas and the theological evaluation of those ideas. This puts the work in the same genre as K. Barth's *Protestant*

Theology in the Nineteenth Century, A. Schlatter's *Die philosophische Arbeit seit Cartesius* and C. Brown's *Philosophy and the Christian Faith*. Though Thielicke's work stands on its own, it can also be read as the historical background for the issues addressed systematically by him in the first volume of *The Evangelical Faith: Prolegomena: The Relation of Theology to Modern Thought-Forms*, with neither volume replacing the other.

Thielicke addresses primarily seven topics: the relation of revelation and reason, the relation of God's commands to the human conscience, the general relation of philosophy to theology, the historico-critical study of Scripture, the relation of revelation to history, the relation of the gospel and the world's religions, and the secular criticism of religion. This strikes me as slightly wider than Barth's focus on reason and revelation. The major figures covered include Descartes, Reimarus, Lessing, Semler, Schleiermacher, von Hofmann, A. Schweizer, Kant, Ritschl, Herrmann, Hegel, Biedermann, Barth, Rothe, Strauss, Feuerbach, Marx, Kierkegaard and Troeltsch. There are also short discussions of Freud, Bloch, Sartre and K. Heim. Some of the material is not otherwise widely available in English. The format is to explain and discuss the views of a major thinker, followed by those thinkers who were heavily influenced by the major thinker. Thus Ritschl and Herrmann are treated immediately after Kant, and von Hofmann comes after Schleiermacher. This contrasts sharply with Barth's format of first treating all the philosophical background and then all the theological history.

Thielicke's method is to explain a thinker's ideas and place him in the flow of western thought. He then enters into dialogue with him, answering questions, asking questions, and criticizing ideas. The dialogue between Thielicke and modern philosophy is similar to the dialogue he initiates between the Christian faith and all of modern culture in his multivolume *Theological Ethics*. His pattern of discussion might lead one to classify Thielicke, in Niebuhrian terms, as one who set Christ and culture in paradox. But that would not be fair to Thielicke, who said that the believer should have a flexible relation to culture.

Thielicke's dialogical method makes his work read very differently from Barth's treatment of the same material. Barth's treatment of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century thought reads like a rejection letter—very refined, exceedingly well researched, very friendly, yet a rejection letter. Thielicke gets far more involved in a person-to-person, evangelist-to-prodigal dialogue with the great thinkers of the recent past. And Thielicke seems truly to enjoy the dialogue and love his partners, whom he sees as typical of modern men and women. (One sees a similar evangelistic dialogue in some of his sermons.) In his memoirs he says he particularly enjoyed teaching this material for many years at Tübingen and Hamburg. It makes for good reading.

Two recurring concerns in the dialogue are the personal appropriation of the Christian faith and whether a given system of thought serves as a filter to screen out (and prevent appropriation/believing) elements of the Christian faith. The first concern is voiced in a recurring allusion to a statement of Schweizer: The fathers once confessed their faith, and now we try to believe their confessions. Thielicke sees the problem of appropriation as recurring from Lessing's distinction between the accidental truths of history and the necessary truths of reason (the latter meaning what can be personally appropriated, not just what is logically rational) all the way to Kierkegaard's concern for existential certainty. In *The Evangelical Faith* Thielicke continues his study of appropriation in discussion with mid-twentieth-century interpreters. Thielicke's answer to the question has to do with the work of the Holy Spirit.

Thielicke's concern with a system of thought screening out parts of the gospel can be illustrated by comparing his treatments of Schleiermacher and Schweizer. Schleiermacher's system of thought, based on self-consciousness, the feeling of absolute dependence, should not allow him to accept certain Christian doctrines (e.g. personal immortality). Yet in his writing and especially his preaching Schleiermacher's personal faith repeatedly breaks through the grid imposed by his system of thought. His system was in tension with the faith, but the system remained open. Schweizer took over Schleiermacher's system of thought, but the system closed up and more effectively screened out important doctrines of the faith without exegetical or homiletical correctives.

In *The Evangelical Faith* Thielicke continues the discussion by contrasting theologians who start with a system of thought (whether philosophy or anthropology) and those who begin with the gospel. The first are labeled "Cartesian" after Descartes' beginning point in the self, the second "non-Cartesian." Obviously Thielicke advocates a non-Cartesian theology, but a system of thought that has been cracked open to or by the Biblical message is better than a closed system.

Though I am obviously enthusiastic about Thielicke's work and recommend it to intermediate or advanced theology students, I have some criticisms. The first is editorial: There are more typos and editorial mistakes than we would expect from Eerdmans. One paragraph was unintelligible without reference to the German original.

The second is cultural: Thielicke ignores non-European thinkers, even those of great influence who were influenced by German thinkers. For example, after treating Troeltsch's historicism he failed to mention H. R. Niebuhr, who adapted Troeltsch's church/sect typology into his fivefold typology of Christ and culture and also brought a lot of Troeltsch's historicism into American theology and ethics.

The third is methodological: In his apologetic works Thielicke effectively demonstrated that the idolatry of different portions of creation leads to different types of secular worldviews. Such analysis is strangely lacking in the present work, even when it would contribute.

The final is theological: There is a docetic element in Thielicke's Christology that does allow what is truly and sinlessly divine to be truly incarnated. This connects with other problems in his thought: an undeveloped doctrine of creation, difficulty in thinking any ethical act in a fallen world could be truly good, and no place for an inerrant Bible. This theological problem leaves him far too open to the higher criticism of Scripture and may exaggerate the problem of appropriation. His undeveloped doctrine of creation in the areas of common grace and general revelation leaves him without a theological explanation for why it is suitable to dialogue with secular thought.

So read Thielicke's book and profit from it, but debate with him while he debates with some great thinkers of the recent past.

Thomas K. Johnson
Hope Presbyterian Church (PCA), Iowa City, IA

The Autonomy Theme in the Church Dogmatics: Karl Barth and His Critics. By John Macken. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1990, 232 pp., n.p.

Since Kant's epistemological revolution, philosophical theologians have struggled with the role of the knowing subject in understanding reality. As theology advances into the postmodern period and the individual is again being given primary importance in epistemology, how Barth reconciled the fact-value dichotomy of Kantianism and related the knowing subject to his theology of revelation is of instrumental importance. Macken here offers a comprehensive and commendable study that contributes to understanding Barth's position in the Kantian tradition.

Macken presents his investigation in three chapters, preceded by an introduction into the problem of autonomy that includes an historical sketch of the use of the term. Macken carefully defines "heteronomy" as the opposite of autonomy, establishing the categories he uses to develop his argument throughout the study. Included in the introduction are summaries of the philosophies of Kant, Fichte and Feuerbach.

In the first chapter Macken submits that Barth's understanding of autonomy, as exhibited in several themes that run throughout the *Church Dogmatics*, grew in contrast to his emphasis on theonomy and in reaction to the liberal Protestantism of his day. Barth adamantly opposed the elevating of the individual consciousness above the Christian revelation. He viewed God as the subject and man as the object. Macken explains that "it is exclusively in terms of Revelation that Barth wishes to understand human freedom and subjectivity and with that the being of man himself" (p. 56). Freedom, then, is humanity's responsibility before God.

In the second chapter Macken examines the autonomy theme in the work of Barth's critics from 1950 to the present. While Macken utilizes a dialectical, comparative approach in the first chapter, in the second he is especially adept at bringing Barth into discussion with his peers. He begins with a lengthy assessment of Pannenberg's position, which Macken characterizes as "the most comprehensive attempt to develop an alternative" to the autonomy theme in Barth's theology (p. 89). In the context of reality as history, Pannenberg understands God as the absolute future of freedom.

Macken proceeds from Pannenberg to consider other theologians and their appraisals of Barth's position, such as Rendtorff, Steck and Jüngel. Although each discussion is fruitful, the reader is left wanting more on Jüngel. Also, although H. U. von Balthasar, an extraordinary Roman Catholic theologian and Barthian scholar, is mentioned in several places, it is puzzling that Macken does not offer an in-depth comparison of von Balthasar and Barth. It would have been beneficial, for instance, to include von Balthasar in the examination of the analogy theme in the *Dogmatics* and Pannenberg's critique of that position. Analogy holds a central place in the ontologies of all three thinkers.

The final chapter is an excellent conclusion and evaluation. It renews the reader's appreciation for Barth's role as a champion of revelation in the face of self-concerned theologies. At the close of each section in the previous chapters Macken summarizes his discussion, but this final evaluation makes the preceding summaries unnecessary.

No scholar with an interest in Barth or the manner in which theology has dealt with Kantian problems should miss this work. The index and the bibliography, both of which give prominence to European sources, add potency to the book. But Macken's claim that the book "is not intended exclusively for the Barth specialist" (p. vii) is ambiguous and even made meaningless by the technical nature of the work.

Robert A. Weathers
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Ft. Worth, TX

The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Karl Barth. By John Thompson. Allison Park: Pickwick, 1991, 211 pp., n.p. paper.

Thompson's carefully written book intends to critique the thesis of P. J. Rosato who, in *The Spirit as Lord: The Pneumatology of Karl Barth*, argues that pneumatology is the primary motive in Barth's doctrine of the immanent Trinity and that the Spirit is also dominant in God's revelation to and redemption of humanity. Thompson instead declares: "Pneumatology is a very important aspect of theology but not the whole of it. It is integrated into and integral to the whole content of the *Church Dogmatics* but is never its primary thrust" (p. 8).

A well-ordered argument, the book has chapters devoted to the Holy Spirit and revelation, incarnation, Scripture, resurrection, the Church, baptism, creation, ethics, and eschatology. Notably absent is a treatment of the Holy Spirit and the eucharist. Noting that Barth's theology is unintelligible unless we grant him his *donneé* (which is that it is God who, by the Spirit, creates in man the awareness of the bond between God and humanity in creation and redemption—*analogia fides*), Thompson goes on to expound quite comprehensively and correctly Barth's view that "the Holy Spirit is the bond of union between God and humanity in Jesus Christ and between Christ and humanity and these unions in turn reflect how God is in himself" (p. 26).

Thompson also persuasively develops Barth's view that redemption is objectively achieved in history through Jesus Christ (exit pietists, existentialists and mystics) but it is also effectuated subjectively in our hearts by the Holy Spirit (exit rationalists, creedalists and antinomians): "Now while all this has been done for us in our humanity as Christ died for our sins and rose for our justification, it is only objectively real. The question is, how does it become ours, how do we as humans participate in this subjectively? Barth's answer is that this takes place by the Holy Spirit" (p. 78). There is nothing new or especially insightful here except for Thompson's emphasis that the inward act of the Holy Spirit is itself objective—that is, an act of the eternal and external God who freely becomes for us in Christ and generously lives in us by the Spirit. Thus the Holy Spirit not only unites the Father and the Son ontologically in the eternal communion of the Trinity but also unites all humanity through Christ historically into an eternal salvific bond of redemption through God's electing love.

The book is an informed exposition of Barth's theology that rebuts critics who have called his theology Christomonism or a unitarianism of the Second Person. Regrettably there are several typographical errors, no index or bibliography, and in two places significant portions of the script are placed unaccountably in indented paragraph form with smaller type.

John S. Reist, Jr.
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

Gilkey on Tillich. By Langdon Gilkey. New York: Crossroad, 1990, 215 pp., $24.95.

Gilkey's estimable study of the thought of his mentor P. Tillich appears a quarter of a century after the master's death. Because Tillich's is an ontological theology his work would seem out of step with much of the theological upheaval of the past two decades, especially themes of liberation, ecological sensitivity and radical egalitarianism. Yet Gilkey's deft unpacking of central Tillichean themes gives the lie to this assumption: Tillich is as relevant today as ever.

Among the many reasons why American evangelicals have been slow to warm up to Tillich, his insistence that theology must engage the sociopolitical order is perhaps uppermost. Gilkey summarizes: "Thus is theology essentially political if it is to be theology at all." An avowed religious socialist in 1920s Germany, intent on discovering the *kairos* in "the religious situation," Tillich made political pronouncements that were somewhat muted upon entering the United States in 1933. In time he declared himself a "triboro bridge" linking theology, philosophy and culture. From first to last Paul Tillich was a theologian of culture.

For claiming that God does not exist as a singular, isolatable entity but rather is Being Itself and the Ground of Being, Tillich has occasionally been labeled an atheist.

Gilkey does not address that charge, maybe for its triviality, but in the excellent part 2 of his volume he surveys in five tight chapters the center of Tillich's mature thought. As a dialectical theologian (and so at least in one way united with K. Barth in the *krisis* theology), Tillich's thought moved between polarities, a dynamic borrowed from J. Boehme and F. Schelling.

Tillich was thus a "fifty-fifty" theologian, for essentialism and existentialism belonged together. His essentialism sprang from German idealism and romanticism, and probably ultimately from Plato. Gilkey rightly says that Tillich was an astute philosopher (he had doctorates in both philosophy and theology) and shows how Tillich's ontological thought has more in common with process theology (he cites Whitehead several times) than might customarily be grasped. If ontology represents the essentialist pole, then, as Gilkey asserts, "courage is . . . the existential or religious 'anchor' of Tillich's system of symbolism or analogy."

The "courage to be," of course, links ontology with the existentialism for which Tillich was justly renowned. He was the one theologian who could best address the concerns of "modern man." Depth psychology and contemporary art were second nature for Tillich. A truly courageous God, one worthy of worship, takes nonbeing into the divine self and overcomes it. Indeed Tillich seems to say that, as Ground of Being, God necessarily contains the dynamic of nonbeing within the divine self. Gilkey's analysis here, as perhaps at no other point in his book, wavers. Nonbeing is the abstraction that trumps all abstractions. That there are two forms of nonbeing in Tillich's thought reduces the confusion to understandable proportions. Relative (*mē ōn*) nonbeing is finite and is the occasion for God's courage. Nonbeing itself (*ouk ōn*) remains "negative nihility" and is thus diametrically opposed to God.

Since he was a dialectical theologian, Tillich's famous "method of correlation" provides theological answers to philosophical questions arising from existential concerns. This simplistic view of Tillich's method of correlation is clarified and deepened in Gilkey's lucid commentary. True dialectics assumes interpenetration from both sides; true correlation means that "philosophical and theological elements lie on *both* sides." That is, philosophical/theological questions seek theological/philosophical answers.

Gilkey on Tillich is for the most part service well rendered. Gilkey is not the self-appointed keeper of the flame, because for those who like their theology heavily flavored with philosophy Tillich has always been vital. But in Gilkey's understanding, compellingly argued and expansively presented, Tillich's flame not only burns as brightly as ever but is more encompassing than mere philosophical theology. Because Tillich's cultural categories—heteronomy, autonomy, theonomy—are plastic, events of the past quarter of a century have invested them with new meaning. Gilkey believes, for example, that the rise of fundamentalist religion and its attendant incursion into politics is a new heteronomy.

The book will not introduce a whole new generation of inquirers to Tillich's labyrinthine thought. It assumes too much prior knowledge of Tillich for that. The best primer in Tillich will likely remain *Dynamics of Faith* or *The Courage to Be.* Having mastered those two lecture series, one could move on to *Systematic Theology* armed with *Gilkey on Tillich.*

Roderick T. Leupp
Warner Southern College, Lake Wales, FL

The Whole Counsel of God: A Tribute to E. Herbert Nygren. Edited by Paul R. House and William A. Heth. Upland: Taylor University, 1991, 171 pp., n.p.

This thought-provoking manuscript contains three main sections with seven chapters and authors. "Biblical Studies" comprises chaps. 1–4, "Christian Education" only chap. 5, and "Theology and Philosophy" chaps. 6–7. I will attempt to summarize the seven chapters in order.

In "The Old Testament and the Undergraduate" L. R. Helyer states: "The Old Testament is the most neglected treasure the Church possesses" (p. 3). The purpose of his article is to offer a rationale for requiring the study of the OT (p. 3). He believes that "the theological integrity of Christianity is at stake" (p. 4) and that "the plan of salvation in the Old and New Testaments is essentially one" (p. 5), though most Christians are unfamiliar with the OT. Helyer shows how understanding the OT is not only beneficial to the understanding and application of the NT but is essential. This is an excellent article that fulfills the claims of its stated thesis, the demonstration that the OT and its study is essential to evangelicalism.

P. R. House demonstrates in "Jeremiah One and the Unity of Jeremiah" that chap. 1 of Jeremiah not only introduces but also outlines the entire prophecy (p. 29). I found his discourse to be interesting and informative, though also a bit repetitive.

In "Ancient Sources and Modern Theories of Pharisaic Origin" R. D. Pitts presents "a report of *twentieth century theories* of the origin of the Pharisees . . . then suggest[s] what is reasonable . . . from that scholarship" (p. 49). He accomplishes his goal admirably. The survey is completed without producing boredom and yet without being superficial.

W. A. Heth shows in "Paul the Widower and the Spiritual Gift with Reference to Singleness in 1 Corinthians 7:7" that Paul was a widower and not a lifelong bachelor. The author then indicates what some of the implications of his study are for modern Christians. His treatise is the longest of the seven. The author completes his task commendably.

G. C. Newton attempts to show in "The Motivation of the Saints and the Interpersonal Competencies of Their Leaders" the direct correlation between leaders' communications with others and the number of volunteers recruited and the work performed by them. His point is that if leaders learn how to motivate others properly, they not only will get more volunteers but also will get more quality work from each.

In "Thus Saith the Lord?: Study Papers, Church Pronouncements and the Concept of Divine Revelation in Mainline Protestantism" T. M. Dorman uses the Presbyterian Church USA as his example and describes how many churches tend to equate their published views with the very word of God. Since, as he says, "our pluralistic church has for sometime been unable to reach any consensus as to what constitutes divine revelation . . . this in turn has led to confusion in the areas of biblical interpretation and theological authority. . . . For if almost everything can be called 'revelation,' then in reality nothing is revelation. It all becomes a matter of subjective experience, a series of judgment calls based on individual intuition" (pp. 141–145). His suggestions to his readers include a reaffirmation of *sola Scriptura.*

W. Corduan writes on "Meister Eckhart and the Paradox of Good Works." Corduan favorably quotes the heretical M. Fox (among others) while supporting another individual who many if not most evangelicals would also consider heretical. Corduan's contention is that Eckhart is not in the same vein as most other mystics or as most categorize him. Yet Corduan fails to show that Eckhart is orthodox in any sense of the word.

Apart from but one chapter the book is very stimulating, a real tribute to a man who is loved and appreciated by his students and peers.

Dean Bruce
Hopewell First Church of God, Tiffin, OH

The Reformation and Liberation Theology. By Richard Shaull. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991, 136 pp., n.p.

Shaull has extended the debate over the validity of liberation theology into the context of the Protestant Reformation. Drawing support from both the magisterial and anabaptist traditions, the author argues that a second Reformation has already started in Latin America. The first Reformation can serve as an inspiration for those fighting for the spiritual and physical liberation of the oppressed in the third world.

By no means an academic treatise on the Reformation, the book is an apologetic in favor of the liberation movement. The author argues that the institutional Church has been stagnant with its emphasis on dead creeds and has been unfaithful to its Reformation heritage. What is needed is a radical transformation by the community of the faithful by a return to its roots. As God acts redemptively to liberate the oppressed and as God's reign is reestablished, the oppressed and downtrodden people of the third world will be freed. Truly the last shall become first.

Shaull covers four major themes: (1) Luther's spiritual pilgrimage and his discovery of justification by faith; (2) the Bible as a liberating, life-saving source of revelation; (3) the Church as always reforming itself; (4) the anabaptist rejection of the close relationship between Church and state and the concomitant call to radical discipleship. On the latter score, Shaull argues that the new model of liberation theology rightly calls for the rejection of materialism that has plagued the Church for centuries. He also states that the Church should be for believers only. This is an obvious jibe against the magisterial Reformation in which citizenship in a certain state was the equivalent of membership in the Church regardless of one's personal beliefs. Shaull also calls on believers to avoid conformity to the world and its value system.

In his discussion of the magisterial Reformation, Shaull draws from Luther's strong sense of God's presence as a source of life and hope. He also points out that the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers provides a new sense of self-worth for impoverished Christians. Those who are suffering from physical deprivation can take comfort in their own reading of Scripture. Luther made this possible by freeing the Bible from the exclusive domain of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. In addition Luther's description of the Christian magistrate provided a sense of calling for believers in public office, which raised the status of civil servants and gave them a sense of Christian responsibility. Shaull is, however, critical of Luther for his close association with the state and for his disavowal of the peasants in their famous revolt of 1525.

Shaull is also critical of the second- and third-generation Lutheran and Protestant scholastics who supposedly moved away from Calvin's sense of the witness of the Holy Spirit to confirm the authority and truth of Scripture. He argues that the scholastics worshiped the Bible more than they did Christ by setting up the doctrine of verbal inspiration and establishing the faith as a set of dogmas to be believed rather than as a Person to be worshiped and followed. He argues that the Lutheran Reformation did not go far enough because it became institutionalized and set up its own traditions, thus becoming as stagnant as the medieval Roman Catholic Church.

The author takes a neo-orthodox approach in his criticism of the scholastics and fails to take into account the vast amount of recent literature by R. A. Muller and others who have shown that the Protestant scholastics by no means abandoned the theology of Luther and Calvin.

Shaull elevates the Radical Reformation as the major example liberationists should follow. He sees the magisterial alliance between Church and state as a stumbling block to true spirituality. He writes: "The struggle for the separation of church and state continues in our time when the church becomes a church of the poor and orders its life by the gospel over against the established order of exploitation and domination" (p. 122). Shaull also points to the anabaptists' community of goods, nonconformity, and the willingness to suffer as important examples for the liberation movement.

The book is interesting reading because of its use of the Reformation as a basis for a contemporary theological movement. The lessons Shaull draws from the Reformation can be applied virtually to any theological group. His attempts to validate liberation theology from Reformation principles, however, are not convincing.

Martin I. Klauber
College of Lake County, Grayslake, IL

An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Transcendent. By John Hick. New Haven: Yale University, 1989, 409 pp., $35.00/$18.95.

This is one of those rare books that serves as a comprehensive summation of an author's lifetime of thinking and writing.

The significance of Hick as a philosopher of religion is evident from his having been chosen to deliver the 1986–87 Gifford Lectures, arguably the most prestigious lectureship on religion in the English-speaking world.

On balance the book is tightly written and exhaustively noted with a complete bibliography. Perhaps its most valuable feature is the impressive breadth of scholarship it demonstrates, making it a practical study tool for disciplines including theology, history of religions, comparative religious studies and philosophy of religion.

The book is arranged into five parts. The first part, which Hick labels "phenomenological," focuses on post-axial religion—the great faiths of today (Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, Christianity). Setting the stage for his later discussions of religious pluralism and universalism, Hick here argues that *homo religiosus*, always and everywhere, is engaged in essentially the same project—namely, the transformation from self-centeredness to divine- or "Reality-centeredness." The various faiths simply have different but equally effective ways of accomplishing the task.

For those familiar with Hick, his sweeping reduction of religious data will not be anything new. What they will find new and exceedingly odd is Hick's panegyric excursions into feminist religious studies. That he speaks of them in laudatory ways is not surprising, but what is astounding is his conclusion that, for men and women, salvation is utterly different. It is gender-specific. Men, as self-centered oppressors, need to become less selfish and more divine-centered. Women, because their "characteristic . . . sin is not self-assertion but self-abnegation and failure to achieve authentic selfhood," find their salvation in becoming more selfish. Thus the conclusion: "For half the human race salvation will not bring a change from, but on the contrary a change to, self-centeredness." To this way of thinking Mother Teresa, and women like her, are among the most benighted.

The second section of the book is devoted to arguing that the universe is religiously ambiguous. To Hick it is unanswerable whether or not the universe has a natural or supernatural origin. Because the physical, experiential and philosophical evidence is inconclusive, all are justified in holding to their private opinion on the world's true character.

In part 3 Hick makes explicit his epistemological method. Its most important element is his wholesale co-opting of Kant's model of human perception, the famous distinction between something as it appears to us and as it actually is in itself. For Hick the Real (or God) is so utterly beyond our ken that we cannot speak of it as it truly is but only as it appears to us. Throughout the book, especially in his articulation of his influential philosophy of religious pluralism, this sharp bifurcation, which is susceptible to all the same criticisms leveled at Kant's epistemology, enables Hick to remain officially agnostic as to God's true character and essence. I stress "officially" because he does sneak in truth claims, both metaphysical and ethical, about the supposedly epistemically inaccessible Reality.

Section 4 expounds the doctrine that has occupied Hick's latter years: religious pluralism. Hick's pluralistic thesis is that the various religious traditions, as well as secular ideologies such as Marxism and humanism, are "different conceptions and perceptions of, and responses to, the Real from within the different cultural ways of being human." The cryptic language used here is intentional—indeed, necessary—as Hick is engaged in the daunting task of unifying into one concept the whole range of human religious thinking and practice.

In part 5 Hick confronts the obvious problems for his theory posed by variant soteriologies and conflicting truth-claims across world religions. The former problem he deals with by asserting that because the great faiths are engaged in a similar process (salvation, as each system understands it) they must therefore have similar goals. This assumption he never justifies. The latter problem is disposed of by what strikes me as a massive exercise in Procrusteanization. Religious truth claims, it turns out, are not really cognitive assertions about the character and nature of ultimate reality. Those who thought they were making claims about historical truth (e.g. the resurrection and imminent return of Christ) were really not doing that at all. Their contentions should instead be understood as only mythic pictures, culturally idiosyncratic constructions in response to the human aspiration for a better life.

Hick's ideas, though they long ago departed from their early evangelical flavor, must be closely studied by those who seek to articulate and defend the Biblical understanding of God. His philosophy of religion is one of the most influential in this century, and because it has many affinities with our relativistic age it will remain fashionable. *An Interpretation of Religion* is a very convenient collection of much of his thinking.

Brad Stetson
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

Understanding Fundamentalism and Evangelicalism. By George M. Marsden. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991, 208 pp., $12.95.

Marsden has once again produced a volume that students of American fundamentalism will find interesting reading. Let the reader beware, however, that this is not a new work but rather a compilation of some of Marsden's previously published material. I do not wish to belabor the point here, but the way the book has been advertised one could easily get the impression that it is a first-time publication.

Marsden begins by attempting to define fundamentalism and evangelicalism. An American fundamentalist is best described as "an evangelical who is militant in opposition to liberal theology in the Churches or to changes in cultural values or mores, such as those associated with 'secular humanism'" (p. 1). Evangelicals and fundamentalists are, according to Marsden, family relatives, which explains some of the intense feuding that has gone on between them. Fundamentalists in the early years of the movement often thought of themselves as "true" evangelicals insofar as the term referred to someone who loved the gospel and was committed to soulwinning. After 1930 fundamentalists began to regroup and redefine the boundaries of the fundamentalist agenda.

The book is divided into two sections. The first section, "Historical Overview," surveys the development of fundamentalism between 1870 and 1930 and of evangelicalism since 1930. The second part, "Interpretations," puts into perspective some of the concerns of the fundamentalist movement such as creation science and politics, along with an interesting analysis of the contributions of the scholarly fundamentalist J. G. Machen.

Marsden's analysis of the period between 1870 and 1930 certainly leaves few stones unturned. His scope of understanding paints for us a panorama of variables necessary for a proper understanding of early fundamentalism. His approach to the period is general rather than detailed, thus giving us glimpses of such key players as D. L. Moody, H. W. Beecher, J. Strong and P. Brooks. The prefundamentalist years (pre-1910) were important years for evangelical social movements like the Volunteers of America, the YMCA and YWCA, the Salvation Army and the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which demonstrate the social concern among evangelicals at that time. Fundamentalists would later abandon many of these organizations to concern themselves with the influx of modernism in the major fundamentalist denominations.

Marsden's analysis includes the development of dispensational premillennialism among fundamentalists. Dispensationalism, in particular, took fundamentalist minds off the problems of this world and gave them the assurance of the soon-to-return Savior, Jesus Christ. Fundamentalists also took seriously the mandate to win lost souls to Christ, which overshadowed the needs of society as well as scholarship.

Because any overview of American evangelicalism would be incomplete without a study of the influence of the Holiness-pentecostal tradition, Marsden stresses the similarities between dispensationalism and the Holiness-pentecostal traditions in their approach to separation and general antiliberal convictions. They are interconnected movements that contributed significantly to the development of twentieth-century evangelicalism, particularly in its standards of holy living.

After 1930, fundamentalism began slowly to regroup and redefine its agenda. By the 1940s a new generation of evangelicals came forth from the fundamentalist ranks. It was unique because of its desire to develop an evangelicalism that was socially and intellectually relevant. Some of its key players included E. J. Carnell, C. F. H. Henry, H. J. Ockenga, B. Ramm and G. E. Ladd. These scholars were in many ways the intellectual essence of the new evangelicalism, the name by which they chose to identify themselves. Many of the new evangelicals maintained a desire to embrace the fundamentals of the faith but repudiated the separatistic mentality that had dominated the evangelical movement. Included in their criticism was a questioning, if not a rejection, of dispensationalism. This comes as no surprise: Many of the new evangelicals were influenced by Reformed scholars such as G. Clark and C. Van Til. The new evangelicals wanted to reverse the antisocial and anti-intellectual aspects of fundamentalism.

This would include an attempt to handle modern Biblical criticism, creation science, and sociopolitical questions on a more relevant intellectual level. The fundamentalists, who had regrouped into numerous separatist factions, began a new round of fighting against what they perceived to be a falling away of the saints into gross apostasy. The new evangelicals found themselves entangled with the fundamentalists in a war to gain evangelical loyalty. By the 1960s the new evangelicals realized that their vision for a socially and intellectually relevant movement was not going to be what they expected it to be, especially in light of the fact that the term "evangelical" was becoming even more difficult to define.

Marsden's book is an excellent outline of the development of evangelicalism and fundamentalism since 1870, though elements have not been sufficiently developed. First, I think that Marsden could have more thoroughly developed the section on the contributions of the Wesleyan-Holiness-pentecostal connection with evangelicalism (pp. 41–44). What appears to be Marsden's overriding emphasis is the intellectual structure of American evangelicalism, which certainly has its roots in the Reformed tradition but also tends to exclude some of the diversity of the Holiness tradition. The second thing that could have been developed further is the existence of the powerful fundamentalist denominations that evolved after World War II. This close-knit community of separatists has become the reference point of identity in terms of what most of us understand about fundamentalism.

Marsden, in my opinion, is a first-class historian of American fundamentalism who has yet to be fully challenged. One challenger to be contended with is the Holiness-pentecostal scholar D. Dayton, who has articulated a good case in favor of the inclusion of his tradition in our understanding of American evangelicalism.

David L. Russell
William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI

The Variety of American Evangelicalism. By Donald W. Dayton and Robert K. Johnston. Knoxville/Downers Grove: University of Tennessee/InterVarsity, 1991, 285 pp., $39.95.

Defining the term "evangelical" has become almost as difficult as stapling Jello to a wall. More difficult, perhaps, is the task of determining just who qualifies as an evangelical. Directly related to this question is the current debate going on between Reformed and Holiness scholars over the question of which tradition best defines evangelicalism. Dayton, one of the key players in this debate and co-editor of the book under review, argues that the current understanding of evangelicalism tends to exclude the Wesleyan-Holiness (pentecostalism included) tradition in favor of the Reformed tradition. "If we maintain the Presbyterian paradigm," says Dayton, "then pentecostalism is best understood as a major alternative to evangelicalism, with a distinctive logic all its own that cuts across the distinctive claims of Protestant orthodoxy" (p. 51). The volume under review makes a timely and appropriate contribution to the ongoing debate. In light of the current dialogue over what truly defines evangelicalism, the book appears to be structured in such a way as to reflect the same debate.

While the volume makes every attempt to articulate the wide variety of religious traditions associated with the term "evangelical" it also includes a number of traditions not so easily related. These include restorationists (chap. 7), Mennonites (chap. 11), black religion (chap. 8), pentecostalism (chap. 4), the Holiness movement (chap. 6), Adventism (chap. 5), pietism (chap. 10) and Lutheranism (chap. 13).

The traditions mentioned above each have some similarities to evangelicalism. Adventism, for example, is similar to evangelicalism in many areas of theology (i.e. many evangelicals are as premillennial and excited about Christ's second advent as are Adventists). Adventists and evangelicals are both committed to the gospel and to world evangelization and to seeing through to the ultimate triumph of the truth of God on this earth. They differ greatly on the question of inerrancy (evangelicals themselves differ on the issue) and the question of whether extra-Biblical revelation (namely, the writings of E. G. White) is possible.

Restorationists, like evangelicals, resisted modernism and held to the doctrine of inerrancy. They also "advocated the complete restoration of apostolic Christianity, a goal shared by many in evangelical traditions and one that seems intensely evangelical at first blush" (p. 127). Restorationism differs from the proposed *reformatio* model of evangelicalism, which accepts the sovereignty of God in all matters rather than the efforts of self, in favor of the *restitutio* model. If we accept the Reformed paradigm for understanding evangelicalism, then the restorationists do not fit.

In the case of black religion we see a propensity toward noninclusivism. Sernett points out that if the hallmark of evangelicalism were "salvation, revival, holiness, and biblical literalism . . . then it might be assumed that black religion, which frequently has been thought of as a religion of the disinherited, would fit the profile" (p. 143). The vast majority of black Christians can be considered evangelical in the broad sense of the term but are often not considered participants in the evangelical subculture. One major proof of this point is the absence of predominantly black denominations on the membership list of the National Association of Evangelicals.

Differences between Lutherans and evangelicals are highly visible in areas such as eschatology and inerrancy. Evangelicals tend to be more receptive to premillennialism and inerrancy than do Lutherans. Lutherans and evangelicals are also at odds over the issue of justification by grace. Evangelicals tend to endorse a weaker view, which emphasizes holiness and Christian conduct (p. 238).

Other chapters cover religious traditions that have been accepted without question as part of the evangelical tradition. T. P. Weber's chapter on premillennialism, while not a discussion of a particular denomination, attempts to bring forward a proper definition of the term evangelicalism. Weber does not offer us a one-sentence definition but rather concludes, along with T. Smith, that evangelicalism is a large extended family consisting of four branches: (1) classical evangelicalism, (2) pietistic evangelicalism, (3) fundamentalism, and (4) progressive evangelicalism (pp. 12–13).

G. Marsden, the other key player in the Holiness-Reformed debate, accepts without question the Reformed paradigm for understanding and defining evangelicalism. Fundamentalism, according to Marsden, is to be considered "as one of the subtypes of evangelicalism" (chap. 3). Evangelicalism in the post-World-War-II era was commonly known as neo-evangelicalism (separatist fundamentalists often used this term in a derogatory fashion). Since the early days of the neo-evangelical movement fundamentalists and evangelicals have parted paths. But, as Marsden points out, they often remain in conflict with each other because they are two very closely related subtypes from the same extended family (p. 33).

The book is not successful in giving us an improved definition of the term "evangelicalism," but it does point out that the diversity is wider than ever. Dayton's article, "Some Doubts about the Usefulness of the Category 'Evangelical'" (chap. 14), argues that attempts to define the movement are nearly pointless.

The continuing struggle to define the term "evangelicalism" reveals, I think, the greater problem evangelicals have had in their relationship to life in general. It has been said that evangelicals are often unable to determine where their Biblical convictions end and their subcultural perspectives begin. Relating this to the issue of defining evangelicalism we can see (based on the vast number of definitions) that evangelicals cannot determine where their evangelical essentials end and their nonessential evangelical additives begin. To call a moratorium on the use of the term "evangelical," as Dayton suggests (p. 251), is asking for the impossible at this point in time. But perhaps it is not too much to ask the community of scholars associated with the evangelical movement to make every effort to embrace as part of their tradition all those who have confessed faith in Christ and obey the gospel.

David L. Russell
William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI

Defenders of God: The Fundamentalist Revolt Against the Modern Age. By Bruce B. Lawrence. San Francisco: Harper, 1989, $24.95.

What is fundamentalism? More important, perhaps, to the theme of the volume under review is the question, "What is a fundamentalist?" For the longest time a fundamentalist was understood almost exclusively in terms of a Bible-toting Protestant revivalist (p. 3). But, as Lawrence points out, an even broader definition of fundamentalism is necessary because the categories for its understanding have become international. Lawrence contends that Christian, Jewish and Islamic fundamentalists hold common convictions. The most pronounced conviction, according to him, is the fundamentalist suspicion of and discontent with the modern age. Lawrence acknowledges the fact that fundamentalist tendencies can be seen in religious sects beyond the three in question, including Buddhism, Baha'i and Hinduism. But he justifies his limitation to Islam, Christianity and Judaism because of their explicit protests against modernism.

In the context of these three religious traditions Lawrence defines fundamentalism as "the affirmation of religious authority as holistic and absolute, admitting of neither criticism nor reduction; it is expressed through the collective demand that specific creedal and ethical dictates derived from scripture be publicly recognized and legally enforced" (p. 27). His definition is not intended to reflect the typical dictionary definition, which Lawrence says is an exercise in futility. The dictionary definition limits the scope of fundamentalism usually to the realm of Protestant fundamentalism (p. 93).

Lawrence is careful to point out that fundamentalists do not deny or disregard the modern age but are nonetheless distraught by the violations committed therein. Fundamentalists are, according to Lawrence, children of modernism in that they utilize many facets of modernity such as technology, the mass media and science. They dislike modernity for its suppression of orthodox standards and questioning of perceived absolutes. By way of comparison B. Ramm, in *After Fundamentalism: The Future of Evangelical Theology* (1983), argues that fundamentalists (of the Protestant variety) may utilize the fruits of the Enlightenment (computers, technology, etc.) but still manage to believe that modernity made no real impact on the Church.

Fundamentalism, a term that is historically verifiable and empirically observed in the Protestant Christian tradition, has rarely been a term used by Jews and Muslims to describe themselves (p. 92). Lawrence points out the flaw in the thinking of those who argue that because the Jews and the Muslims did not originate the concept of fundamentalism they have no right to claim its title. Those who argue this point are, as the author observes, "originists."

Beliefs among Jews, Muslims and Christians obviously differ. But what are the conditions that put them in a relational mode? According to Lawrence there are five distinguishing characteristics of fundamentalists: (1) Fundamentalists consider themselves, to varying degrees, a defensive, embattled minority fighting against modernistic forces seeking to suppress them; (2) fundamentalists oppose all perceived enemies, including those from within who may have gone astray; (3) fundamentalists tend to rely on a male-dominated environment that makes all decisions and handles all matters of interpretation; (4) fundamentalists use an insider language that tends to bind them together in a common understanding; and (5) as movements, Jewish, Christian and Islamic fundamentalism can point to historical antecedents but not to any preceding ideology.

The book is unique for one major reason: It attempts to show that fundamentalism can no longer be defined in terms of Protestant evangelical standards. While it involves different theological perspectives, fundamentalism cannot be exclusively a doctrinal issue. Fundamentalism, as Lawrence shows, is best understood as a way of believing rather than a specific set of doctrines. The Muslim embraces his doctrine with a passion similar to that of the Jew and the Christian. The issue is not the belief but rather the way the belief is embraced.

Lawrence's book has few shortcomings. It is a work that hopefully will inspire scholars to investigate the fundamentalist tendencies of other groups, including some groups that have little association with religious institutions. Studies on the fundamentalist tendencies in the gay, lesbian and feminist associations would be interesting comparative studies, as would a study of the fundamentalist tendencies of deconstructionism and its philosophical right arm, political correctness. *Defenders of God* would be a relevant addition for anyone attempting to understand the nature of fundamentalism and how the movement is perceived in the modern world.

David L. Russell
William Tyndale College, Farmington Hills, MI

Why Do We Suffer? New Ways of Understanding. Daniel Liderbach. New York/ Mahwah: Paulist, 1992, 146 pp., $11.95.

The author recounts traditional responses to evil and suffering by drawing upon such writers as Irenaeus, Dostoevski, Einstein, T. S. Eliot, Kafka, Wiesel, Frankl, Camus, and especially K. Rahner and C. S. Lewis. Liderbach then opts for an existential response to suffering, rejecting all attempts to rationally explain theodicy. He repeatedly insists that while suffering lies beyond the reach of reason, one may find meaning in suffering. This is possible if one draws upon the grace of God. Liderbach invokes Rahner's "supernatural existential" whereby all may respond to the grace of God existing universally within humanity. A Job-like, Hebraic-existential response based on a myth-model enables one to find strength and hope in suffering. Developing an imaginative myth-model is the key.

Chapter 7 is the pivotal chapter in which Liderbach does indeed present a "new way of understanding" suffering, as the book's subtitle suggests. The chapter is titled "The Lewis-Chesterton Myth." The author compares C. S. Lewis' earlier work, *The Problem of Pain*, with his later book, *A Grief Observed.* He points out that

Lewis' earlier rational comprehension of suffering dissolves into irrationality in his later work, which was Lewis' response to the suffering and death of his beloved wife Joy. Many readers have pondered this seeming contradiction in Lewis.

Liderbach, in a hypothetical conversation between Lewis and G. K. Chesterton, elicits from Lewis an admission that his earlier rational approach needed to be augmented by a more imaginative approach. This is where the author draws upon Einstein's imaginative modeling to make reality intelligible. So also Liderbach reasons that theologians need to make use of imaginative myth-models such as the numinous presence of God, as in Job, to respond to suffering. The "Lewis-Chesterton Myth" of chap. 7 is an example of what Liderbach proposes. It is innovative.

There are several theological issues the reader will need to scrutinize in the volume. These include the author's concept of myth and Scripture, Rahner's "supernatural existential," and the use of imaginative paradigms in physics.

In sum, Liderbach adopts a helpful perspective on suffering with a Hebraic-existential understanding creatively modeled in his "Lewis-Chesterton" dialogue. Few books break new ground on the problem of suffering. This one does.

Alfred A. Glenn
Bethel Theological Seminary West, San Diego, CA

Televangelism and American Culture. By Quentin J. Schultze. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991, 264 pp., n.p.

Schultze's hard-hitting book is at pains to show that American televangelism was not born in a vacuum. Rather, televangelism exists in a context of American culture and values, the interaction between modern American marketing and religion having produced the offspring of televangelism. This interaction provides the hub of the wheel to which Schultze returns again and again with kaleidoscopic insight.

Schultze begins by identifying the place of televangelists in American culture. He draws a distinction between televangelism and general religious broadcasting, particularly distinguishing audience-supported *versus* denominational- or church-federational-supported programing. In his view Christians place a naive faith and optimistic hope in the technology used by the televangelists, which is a problem both frequent and American. Following J. Ellul, Schultze reminds us that the use of technology demands the application of values, be they God-honoring or God-rejecting. Schultze argues that the content as well as the form or style of televangelism distorts the gospel. More technology does not equal better Biblical teaching or evangelism. If anything, televangelism's excitement over the means (technology) has caused the sacrifice of Biblical ends.

Religious personality cults arise, nurtured by trends deeply rooted in our culture. Televangelists begin to resemble entertainers, offering vibrant sources of authority in a constant cycle of simplistic morality plays enhanced by the cheap drama of emotion and action. The drive for funds to maintain the broadcasts usually conforms the programing into forms that are attractive but are not necessarily reflective of Scripture. Schultze concludes that many televangelists prosper because of Americans' natural superstition and desire for special power. Schultze sees Biblical illiteracy as a widespread problem in American churches, so much so that the popular yet superficial anti-Biblical nature of many of the televangelists' teachings are rarely called into question. He uses the "health-and-wealth" gospel as an example of how televangelism often reflects the dominant themes in American culture, baptizing them in a popular religion. He notes the irony of having Christians who are loudly aware of the messages within secular television programing but at the same time are oblivious to the messages inherent in the material of much televangelism. Concepts such as self-centered obsession *versus* God-centered beliefs, consumerism, materialism and hedonism are made acceptable—even desirable—by many televangelists. Pragmatically motivated, with more of an emphasis upon marketing techniques that sell a product than upon effective ministry, size becomes synonymous with quality. The result is a new, market-generated gospel. Religion is a product to be passively consumed, void of Biblical confrontation or comparison. 2 Tim 4:3–4 is particularly appropriate here.

Schultze notes that because televangelists are primarily watched by Christians (to affirm their own beliefs) and not by unbelievers, serious questions arise about the tremendous evangelism that is alleged to take place. The questions are especially serious because these televangelists are the so-called experts believed by many middle-class, self-centered people to be responsible for fulfilling the great commission. As a product of mass society, the spectator-oriented "worship" fostered by televangelism produces audiences, not congregations, and is carried over into the local churches, particularly the megachurches.

Redemption of televangelism, however, is possible. The Church, along with journalists and TV stations, ought to be involved. The answers cannot be simplistic, and Schultze lists insightful proposals for correcting the contemporary scene.

Alan J. Maben
California State University, Long Beach, CA

Praises for the King of Kings. By Walter Chantry. Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1991, 114 pp., n.p. *The Christian: Following Christ as Lord.* By William Webster. Carlisle: Banner of Truth, 1990, 159 pp., n.p.

While Chantry is a Baptist and his book consists of three sermons on Christ in the Psalms, and Webster is a Presbyterian who seeks to write a systematic work on discipleship, the two books under review deserve to be considered together. They are identical in confessional commitments, theological perspective, method of argumentation, and literary style. Both come from the neo-Puritan movement and bear its earmarks at every turn.

Grammatico-historical exegesis is nowhere in evidence in Chantry's Christological exposition of Psalms 2, 110 and 45. By way of a *sensus plenior* backreading of the NT into the OT he finds only Christ in the Psalms. The psalmist, his historical context and his immediate audience are all but forgotten. Webster develops the theme of Christian discipleship in terms of ten small chapters covering such topics as the Holy Spirit, Jesus Christ as "the Perfect Man," the nature of "true conversion," worship, holiness, mystical union, and service.

What makes the two books so similar? In his introduction Chantry quotes the Puritan S. Rutherford as having written: "Black sun, black moon, black stars, but, O bright, infinitely bright Lord Jesus!" (p. 7). The pietistic quasi-gnosticism that comes through in that quotation forms the environment of both books. The neo-Platonism of the neo-Puritan movement all but demands that humanity and earthly existence be downplayed or even denigrated in order to elevate God and redemption. The agenda of both books is to pit the greatness, goodness, majesty and holiness of God over against the sinfulness of man and the ruin of his world.

A Biblical understanding of man as the image-bearer and thus representative of God within the created order—a good created order—is completely lost. For example Webster proclaims: "The Bible begins with God and his glory, and with man as a bankrupt sinner who must repent of his sin by bowing to the feet of Jesus Christ to live for the glory of God" (p. 50). While the word "begins" may be taken to indicate a logical rather than a temporal starting point, I see no reason to suppose that the two are different Biblically. The Bible begins with the story of God's creation of a universe that he himself calls very good and the creation of human beings as God's stewards within the world. It then moves on to mankind's rebellion from that estate, a rebellion that necessitates God's acting graciously in Jesus Christ to return humanity to its original status and mandate. God is not the enemy of creation but its Creator and Lord. He is not the antithesis of man, even in man's sin, but the Redeemer, the God of redemption who calls the lost sheep back into fealty and relationship.

The estrangement of fallen man from God is too stark, too unrelenting, in both Chantry and Webster. Wrath, judgment and divine indignation all but push grace out of the picture. Both writers want to emphasize the majesty and holiness of God and the unworthiness of fallen human beings in the sight of such a God. I applaud them in that emphasis. We need to stress the sinfulness of human beings and their need for grace. But we must beware of doing injustice to creation in the process. Sin cannot be equated with creatureliness. The misdirection of sin cannot be taken as synonymous with the structure of creation.

The denuding of humanity within its proper creational context requires Webster and Chantry to think of redemption in semimystical terms. The sole purpose of redemption here is a mystical union, a beatific vision. In the two books all mediation is gone. One does not meditate on God's works and his law but rather on the immediate being of God. Man and his immanent environment have been painted in hues so muted and so dark that the only possible point of contact between man and God lies within the transcendent realm of God's existence. The goal is that we fix "the eye of our souls upon Jesus" so that we might see him in our "inmost being" (Chantry, pp. 9–11) rather than see God's world and norms for human existence aright.

The elevation of Jesus over against the world of phenomenal reality is often articulated in the romantic, almost sexual, terms of Victorian romanticism. Again using his Christological hermeneutic, Chantry speaks of the soul enjoying a "secret rendezvous with Christ," a rendezvous in which the worshiper sings to Jesus from the Song of Solomon: "My lover is mine and I am his. . . . I found the one my heart loves. I held him and would not let him go. . . . My lover is radiant . . . outstanding among ten thousand. . . . He is altogether lovely" (pp. 8–9).

Both Webster and Chantry properly stress the need for holiness and obedience in the Christian life. And they both offer lively criticisms of popular evangelicalism's trivialization and commercialization of redemption. Unfortunately these healthy themes are buried within a questionable, neo-Platonic dichotomy between heaven and earth, and under a syrupy pietism. They are developed by way of the arcane language of Puritanism. Flowery, Puritan verbosity is no replacement for clear articulation. Webster spends fourteen pages talking about the glory of God but never defines or explains the term (pp. 37–51). One comes away from the discussion wondering what it was all about. When elucidation is attempted it is done by use of cliches that only obscure the issue even more. Thus to glorify God is to "live for Jesus" or to "live for God's sake." While the phrases sound suitably pious they are less then precise.

Much of the problem of these two books is one of style. As in so much of neo-Puritan literature, Chantry and Webster both come across as prooftextish, condescending, heavy-handed, preachy, and simply obscure. Some of that is forgivable. But redemption without creation, sovereignty without covenant, and Christ without a kingdom are not. We ought to be theocentric. But we must not forget that God is an unabashed anthropocentrist and cosmocentrist. And the two come together in the kingdom of God.

Michael Williams
Dordt College, Sioux Center, IA

Peace and Certainty: A Theological Essay on Deterrence. By Oliver O'Donovan. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989, 125 pp., n.p. paper.

If you are not a pacifist but are uncomfortable with the rhetoric of nuclear deterrence, this is the book for you. O'Donovan is a just-war theorist. Following his teacher, the late P. Ramsey, he even argues that nuclear weapons could be used in a just war. Yet he claims there is something profoundly immoral about the deterrence posture of the west.

Deterrence differs from traditional defense notions by assuming that efforts to preserve peace "*can be rendered entirely effective when menaces are infinitely enhanced.*" This is coupled with the thought that "*threats may exceed the limits of what it would make sense to do*" (pp. 6–7, italics his). There are several problems with this.

First, it does not meet the main just-war criteria: discrimination and proportion. Discrimination says a justifiable act of war must not intend to take innocent lives, while recognizing that unintended casualties will occur. Discrimination allows the use of nuclear weapons to destroy a hardened military site, though it would collaterally destroy a nearby city. But deterrence threatens intentionally to destroy civilian centers. That threat is the intent to commit mass murder.

Proportionality says the evil inflicted, in destruction and casualties, must be less than the evil avoided, in terms of casualties or politics. Deterrence threatens "the explosion of 6.33 megatons simultaneously in two hundred Soviet cities" (p. 17). This is hardly a proportioned military response.

The rhetoric of deterrence is also utopian, showing its strong similarity to pacifism. By making the effects of war so terrible it hopes to abolish war entirely. This is romantic historicism. Christian realism recognizes that evil and efforts to restrain evil (such as war) will continue till the *parousia.* Utopian rhetoric is not only naive about history but also about the need to restrain evil in oneself, which is the point of just-war theory.

The hope of totally abolishing war exalts human politics to divinity. It bears marks of the antichrist in its challenge to God's throne. It does so by introducing ultimate and unlimited disproportionality into history to bring absolute and perfect peace.

O'Donovan also points out that deterrence does not work. In his role as pastor he does not lay out alternate military strategies. But it is clear that he desires an increased non-nuclear military preparedness coupled with nuclear reductions and a big change in our way of discussing defense.

I wish O'Donovan had noted that deterrence theory makes the state an order of special grace, of redemption, which brings the millennium, rather than letting the state be an order of common grace, of preservation. Deterrence is part of the "political illusion" (J. Ellul) that thinks government can totally solve all our problems. But

O'Donovan's analysis is superb. In light of international changes in recent years it seems possible for our military strategy to be reshaped by just-war theory. O'Donovan's essay contributes to this end.

Thomas K. Johnson
Hope Presbyterian Church (PCA), Iowa City, IA

Reading Between the Lines: A Christian Guide to Literature. By Gene Edward Veith, Jr. Wheaton: Crossway, 1990, 254 pp., n.p. paper.

It is highly ironic that conservative Protestants—who ought supremely to be a people of the Book—have always manifested ambivalent attitudes toward literature. Since Sir Philip Sidney's profoundly Christian *Apology for Poesy* defended imaginative literature from halfcocked Puritan moralizing in the sixteenth century, our movement has flirted with philistinism. Now even the secular academic pursuit of letters is in a state of serious disarray, struggling to justify humane learning to a jaded culture. Increasingly the field is so dominated by Marxist and feminist hermeneutics, deconstruction, political correctness, and other forms of fad exegesis that the few who still believe that literature can be a powerful instrument for the preservation and transmission of the central western Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian traditions begin to seem like quaint and archaic anachronisms. Indeed, most of the current trends involve an implicit (and sometimes explicit) denial that those traditions are worth preserving and transmitting in the first place. In such times the temptation to doubt that Athens has anything to do with Jerusalem grows even stronger than usual. The temptation to withdraw from culture rather than confront it may be one we yield to out of sheer frustration.

In short, the time is ripe for a reinfusion of sanity and common sense. And that is precisely what Veith offers in the volume under review. The book is both an eloquent apology for quality reading and an introduction to how to do it. In a manageable paperback he succeeds with amazing completeness and clarity in surveying the importance of reading, the forms of literature (nonfiction, fiction and poetry, with the purpose, value and distinctives of each), the modes of literature (tragic *versus* comic, realist *versus* fantasy), and the major literary periods in the western tradition, with a tourist's guide to the main attractions found in each.

The issues Veith addresses ought to be of concern to more than just teachers and students of literature. He argues persuasively that the whole nature of our civilization and Christianity's role in it may be at stake. "Words and images promote two totally different mind-sets. Christians must be people of the Word, although the old temptation to succumb to 'graven images' is present in a new form in the television age. . . . As television turns our society into an increasingly image-dominated culture, Christians must continue to be people of the Word. When we read, we cultivate a sustained attention span, an active imagination, a capacity for logical analysis and critical thinking, and a rich inner life. Each of these qualities, which have proven themselves essential to a free people, is under assault in our TV-dominated culture" (pp. xiv–xv). To the extent that we cease to be intelligent and discerning readers we forfeit the unique contact we have with God himself through the Bible. "Whereas other religions may stress visions, experiences, or even the silence of meditation as the way to achieve contact with the divine, Christianity insists on the role of language" (p. 17). Those who read only the Bible, though, cannot hope to read even the

Bible very well, and they also lose the rich heritage of vicarious experience stored up in the literature that has survived the ravages of time.

The "how-to" section contains both an excellent introduction to the main types of literature and how they work and good, balanced treatments of many of the corollary issues, such as censorship, that are implicit in the topic. There are details one could quibble over: The definition of postmodernism is perhaps a bit too broad, Donne's *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* is cited as having been on "divergent" occasions, etc. But this is a book that deserves a wide readership among evangelical scholars and laymen alike, who ought to ponder carefully the exhortation with which Veith leaves us, remembering that when "the Vandals trashed a civilization based on law and learning" it was the Church that cherished and preserved books—the Bible supremely, but others as well. "The Vandal aesthetic may be coming back in the anti-intellectualism of the mass culture and in the Postmodern nihilism of the high culture. Christians may be the last readers. If so, they need to be in training" (p. 224).

Donald T. Williams
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

Recovering the Lost Tools of Learning: An Approach to Distinctively Christian Education. By Douglas Wilson. Wheaton: Crossway, 1991, 215 pp., n.p.

Public education is not only a dismal failure; its very nature as a state-run bureaucracy insures that it must be. As long as it is public it is inherently unreformable. Christian private education is not simply an option for concerned parents but a Biblical mandate. Such an education should be both Christian and classical, rooting the student in an integrated Biblical worldview and in the Greco-Roman tradition of the west. These conclusions sound radical but Wilson makes a strong case for them, one that deserves a careful hearing.

Public education, he argues, cannot succeed in being true education on the whole or in the long run. In a pluralistic society it must of necessity be based on a lowest-common-denominator worldview that has no place for ultimate truth commitments. "In a world without truth, skill in thinking is a useless skill" (p. 61). Philosophically, then, public schools can train but not educate. Practically, they cannot even train very well. "All bureaucracies tend to replace their original task with the goal of self-perpetuation" (p. 133). This truth applies to educational bureaucracies too. The only force strong enough to bring real change is the accountability of the free market, which is of course incompatible with the whole concept of state-run schools.

Private education, then, which is directly accountable to its consumers, is the only kind that can consistently produce quality. Private education is also free to teach all knowledge from a Christian perspective. Because Christian parents are responsible for the nurture of their children, they cannot turn them over to the state. Home schooling is an option of last resort, but the division of labor makes a good Christian school the best option.

Classical education—including language study—develops the mind and puts the student in touch with the wisdom of the past. He must know both the Bible and history to understand the present. Education is not merely the accumulation of a mass of unrelated data but an integrated understanding of the world from a Biblical perspective.

The case for these conclusions is well documented and carefully thought out. Wilson's experience as the founder of the Logos School in Moscow, Idaho, keeps him from straying into merely theoretical discussion. His book is a practical blueprint for organizing a Christian school, complete with appendices containing sample philosophy statements and curriculum guides. It is also a ringing challenge to those who continue to support public education. He leaves some issues unaddressed. For example, if public education were abolished, could private education really reach everyone? What would be the consequences of Christians totally abandoning the public schools? Can we afford them?

Not everyone will be convinced by all his arguments. He sometimes lapses into sarcasm and cuteness, which will put some readers off. But Wilson is more willing than most to look straight at sacred cows and naked emperors and to call a spade a spade. He includes D. L. Sayers' classic essay "The Lost Tools of Learning" as an appendix, and he has learned its lessons well. He deserves to be heard.

Donald T. Williams
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

The Rights of Religious Persons in Public Education. By John W. Whitehead. Wheaton: Crossway, 1991, 336 pp., $12.95 paper.

Today many Americans believe that any religious expression in the public schools is unconstitutional. Whitehead seeks not only to dispel that myth but also to clear up the confusion about the rights of religious believers in public education that afflicts modern constitutional law.

Whitehead is the author of fourteen books and is president of the Rutherford Institute, a national organization offering legal aid in religious freedom-of-expression cases. In the volume under review he begins with the premise that the courts must decide how to treat all views, including religious ones, fairly. But fairly is hardly the way to characterize how religion is actually treated in numerous cases. Increasingly the sole burden of proof has shifted to religious believers, and the argument is widely accepted by jurists that the exercise of believers' rights tends to infringe on the rights of nonbelievers. (Needless to say, in our secular age nonbelievers' rights are not considered to be as threatening.)

Whitehead attempts to explain why and how this double standard has evolved in the last two hundred years, with some brief but interesting observations about the founding fathers' views and about more contemporary figures like liberal Supreme Court Justice W. Brennan who, in his zeal to preserve "a multitude of tongues" in the public schools, has helped to erect a wall of separation between Church and state that has simply no constitutional foundation. Although the Supreme Court and Congress have over the years frequently acknowledged that it is necessary to inculcate certain moral values like honesty, diligence and compassion among students, they want them promoted through wholly secular means that "equally protect all students' viewpoints." That there are no value-free means to teaching values, and indeed that there is no such thing as value-free education, has apparently been lost upon the Court and Congress.

There are several options for religious believers in public education who feel that their constitutional rights have been violated. They can argue their legal case on the grounds of free speech and the equal-protection clause of the Constitution. Whitehead cites notable instances where these kinds of cases have been won and lost. But clearly he favors action that lies outside the courts and that relies on established policies of accommodation: release time for off-campus religious instruction, excusal from objectionable courses through written parental request, use of school facilities for religious functions only during after-school hours. The majority of religious freedom-of-expression cases can be successfully resolved by these three options.

But there are other dilemmas, from the use of creationist textbooks to prayers at official school functions, from students' distribution of religious literature to singing Christmas carols in the classroom. Inevitably these cases end up in the courts. Whitehead gives a detailed account of how some of these cases have been settled in recent years and offers invaluable advice for lawyers, teachers, parents and students who believe that religious liberty is fundamental not only to America's founding but to its future.

Lissa Roche
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, MI

La iglesia y los dioses modernos: Historia del Protestantismo en el Ecuador. By Washington Padilla J. Quito: Corporación Editora Nacional; Buenos Aires: Fraternidad Teológica Latinoamericana, 1989, 455 pp., n.p. paper. *Is Latin America Turning Protestant? The Politics of Evangelical Growth.* By David Stoll. Berkeley: University of California, 1990, xxi, 424 pp., $24.95.

Stoll's book won immediate acclaim; Padilla's deserves closer scrutiny than it will likely receive. Together they reveal a great deal about the current status and mindset of evangelicals in Latin America, though theirs is by no means the whole story.

The late Padilla (his book appeared shortly before his untimely death from cancer) writes as a dissenting evangelical who stands on a solid, if somewhat clumsily crafted, historical platform and hurls occasional jeremiads at North America and its missionaries, a habit that goes back at least to the 1960s when he helped launch the polemical paper *¡Despertar!* (*Awake!*). The dual roles of prophet and historian signaled by the title and subtitle never fully converge. Padilla first assumes the prophet's mantle in the prologue, where he decries the "established order" (liberal democracy): "worldwide imperialisms that extend their tentacles to the ends of the earth, to oppress, to starve, and to inflict pain on millions of men, women and children in a daily holocaust of Dantean dimensions. And they do this making use of a deceitful ideology that hides the horrible reality . . . the so-called 'democracy,' the supposed 'liberty,' 'the market economy,' power, success, happiness." The problem is that there is no convincing historical connection made between the origins and spread of the Protestant Church, a recent and rather marginal development within Ecuador, and the nation's pervasive, enduring problems with poverty, injustice and exploitation. Greedy *conquistadores* introduced Roman Catholicism by the sword, and the state Church linked itself tightly to an oppressive feudal order that continued well into the 1960s. Evangelicals were among the few critics of that order. Thus many of Padilla's attacks seem somewhat strained or anachronistic given the total context, even in cases where missionary ethnocentrisms were most offensive. But Padilla's hostile asides are a useful reminder of how North America's economic might grates on those who feel trapped by its unwelcome economic embrace and how easily the message of the gospel is marred by uncritical sociopolitical alliances (whether right or left)—a message underscored by Stoll, who makes shrewd use of Ecuadorian examples in his writings.

Padilla's *magnum opus* is the history proper. He recounts the long, slow, painful process by which Protestantism gained a foothold in Ecuador. A bastion of a rabid and syncretistic Roman Catholicism, it has in this century also hosted many hundreds of evangelical missionaries, most huddled in Quito. The bulk of the study is quite evenhanded and may never again be done in such detail. No one with eyes to see can fail to recognize the achievement it represents.

But I have a few observations. There are far too many unassimilated block quotations throughout the text. The book also seems unbalanced in focus and emphasis. After probing at great length the generally barren years between the coming of the Spaniards and the mid-twentieth century, only a few pages are devoted to the dramatic church growth of recent decades, and these soon give way to a rehearsal of quarrels between a minority of younger evangelicals and the mission-church establishment. The ideologically tinged reflections at times usurp rigorous historical analysis. There are unfortunate omissions from the bibliography. But the work remains an essential resource for Latin American scholars.

Stoll first gained notoriety among evangelicals for *Fishers of Men or Founders of Empire?* (1982), an assault on Wycliffe Bible Translators in Latin America. There he revealed, as an avowed unbeliever, open prejudices against Wycliffe and conservative Protestants. But a careful reading of that early effort demonstrates that, however biased his leftist analysis and tendentious his charges of conspiracy, Stoll's riveting reportage was often on target. In his new work Stoll retains his penchant for vivid narratives and telling case studies and his ability to skewer evangelical behemoths, this time television evangelists (predictably) and World Vision (ironically). But Stoll's sympathies have shifted dramatically in some respects, though he still writes as an outsider. He now champions the largely indigenous pentecostal church of the poor and reserves his most biting sarcasms for liberation theology, which option he even labels "suicidal." As he notes: "Liberation theology may be better at filling faculties, bookshelves, and graves than churches" (p. 310). He now suspects liberation theology is an activity of middle-class professionals who try to foist their ideology on resistant masses, calling for the poor to make sacrifices the theologians themselves are unwilling to make.

While exonerating Latin American evangelicals from unfounded charges that they are merely the products of North American dollars and evangelists, Stoll issues at least two important warnings to evangelicals. First, North American missionaries continue to invite misunderstanding by failing to distance themselves from supporters with right-wing political agendas and from "militaristic and immoral policies emanating from Washington" (p. 308). Second, religious successes should not blind evangelicals to the depth of Latin America's socio-economic problems. "The Protestant heritage of a Caribbean island like Jamaica has not saved it from the consequences of dependent capitalism" (p. 310). There is much more—all interesting, often instructive.

Timothy Paul Erdel
Jamaica Theological Seminary/Caribbean Graduate School of Theology
Kingston, Jamaica

The Revised English Bible. Oxford/Cambridge: Oxford University/Cambridge University, 1989, xviii + 828 pp. (OT), iv + 236 pp. (NT), $19.95.

"Even the best translation," said R. Ascham in *The Schoolmaster*, "is, for mere necessity, but an evil-imped wing to fly withal, or a heavy stump-leg of wood to go withal. Such, the higher they fly, the sooner they falter and fail; the faster they run, the sooner they stumble and sorer they fall." But what must be to scholars a necessary evil is to Wycliffe's plowboy a positive good. Better to stump along on a wooden leg than to lie immobile. And now we can choose from a whole catalog of crutches of various shapes, sizes and styles. One of the newest is the *Revised English Bible*, an updated version of the well-known *New English Bible*, first completed in 1970.

The NEB had a reputation as the most literary of modern translations, with elegant prose sometimes betraying its British provenance and a tendency toward bold and sometimes rather loose paraphrase. These qualities made it interesting and fun to read, but not as reliable as the RSV or NASB. The revisers set out to bring the scholarship up to date, increase the version's appropriateness for use in public worship, remove the remaining uses of "thou," etc., and increase the use of gender-inclusive language where that could be done without violence to the original (pp. viii–ix). The result is frequently a thorough revision of the earlier work, not just a mere fine-tuning to bring it up to date. In general the REB shows a tendency to back away somewhat from the NEB's predilection for bold periphrasis in favor of safer, more traditional renderings. There are also a number of changes that are hard to account for on any general principles.

From the very beginning REB signals its intentions of extensive reworking. Where NEB read "In the beginning of creation when God made heaven and earth," REB returns to the traditional "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth" (Gen 1:1). In v. 2, NEB's "mighty wind" that "swept" over the surface of the waters has been replaced in REB by the spirit of God who had been there in most other versions all along. It is easy to find other examples of the same kind of change. The promised Son of Isa 9:6 was described by NEB as "in purpose wonderful, in battle God-like." REB returns to the rhythms if not the diction of KJV with "Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty Hero." In the beatitudes NEB's "How blest are those who know their need of God" becomes REB's "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (Matt 5:3). But though such seems to be the general tendency, the current sometimes flows in the opposite direction. In Gen 1:2 NEB's traditional "without form and void" becomes "a vast waste" in the revision.

It is hard to find a rationale for some of the changes. In Matt 3:1, for example, NEB's "About that time" is a perfectly accurate and idiomatic rendering of *en de tais hēmerais ekeinais*. What possible reason could there be for substituting the wordier and more imprecise "In the course of time" in REB? It is easy in any translation to find verses to quibble over, but in spot-checking REB against the Greek text I found my eyebrows rising fairly often. Nothing is gained, for example, by flattening out Paul's provocative *tois hagiois* ("to the saints") to the unnecessarily abstract and interpretive "to God's people" of REB's Eph 1:1. Of course Paul is talking about God's people there, but that is not what he calls them. The helpless reader has no way of knowing he has just lost one of the nuances of Paul's theology, and it is hard to see that Paul's own term would have been hopelessly obscure if it had been used.

In sum the REB is, like its predecessor the NEB, a fluid and interesting rendering and a delight to read from a stylistic point of view. But it is not among the most reliable translations from the standpoint of accuracy. Its revisions create an impression of movement in a conservative direction from the NEB that is not always borne out in detail. Less daring than NEB, less willing to depart from time-hallowed KJV patterns in phraseology, REB loses some of the distinctiveness of the earlier version. You might call it NEB homogenized. The result seems more to blunt the virtues of the earlier volume rather than to ameliorate its vices. It remains worth having on the shelves for comparative purposes but would unfortunately be inappropriate as a primary study Bible.

Elegance versus accuracy should not be a trade-off we accept as inevitable: KJV was both as accurate as its time could have made it and unsurpassable in elegance.

But perhaps once in a language is the most we can ask for a miracle like that. For now we must choose between such versions as NASB, accurate but stiff and wooden at times; NIV, fairly accurate but bland; and NEB, elegant and exciting but really too loose. Ascham would not have been surprised.

Donald T. Williams
Toccoa Falls College, Toccoa Falls, GA

Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation. By Peter Cotterell and Max Turner. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1989, 332 pp., $19.95 paper.

Cotterell and Turner wrote the volume under review to introduce students "in a non-technical way to some aspects of linguistics which are relevant to biblical studies" (p. 9). They have succeeded, although much of their densely-packed discussion far exceeds the normal expectations of introductions. Carefully balancing their approach the authors advocate linguistics as a handmaid to exegesis, not as a panacea and certainly not as a magic key to Scripture.

The topics and concepts discussed are well chosen and are usually introduced and defined with care. Most are supported with helpful and appropriate examples (linguistic economy [pp. 135–136] would fit better under "Universals of Language" [pp. 19–25]).

Since this is "not an introduction to [the field of] linguistics" (p. 9) there is no discussion of such basics as phonology and morphology or aspects of verbal form and function (e.g. tense, voice, mood). Cotterell and Turner concentrate instead on the locus and nature of meaning, chap. 2; the meaning of words (lexical semantics), chaps. 3–5; and the "significance of the recognition of the role of the discourse as a whole in determining meaning" (discourse analysis), chaps. 6–8 (outlined on p. 10).

Chapter 1 ("Language, Linguistics, and Biblical Interpretation") introduces basic concepts of language and linguistics as well as some immediate benefits of applying linguistics to Biblical studies.

Cotterell and Turner conclude that meaning resides in the author's intention, akin to the approach of E. D. Hirsch. Their discussion (chap. 2), which demolishes the pretensions of today's reader-centered hermeneutics, could stand alone as an assignment in a class on hermeneutics, although as a first exposure to linguistics it may be rather heavy going (e.g. their close distinctions between "utterance," "text," "cotext," "context" and "discourse," although familiar to linguists, will be *terra incognita* to most students).

Chapter 4 is the best discussion of Barr's *The Semantics of Biblical Language* that I have seen. Its synopsis of Barr will be familiar ground but is necessary since students will recognize these principles in the breach rather than the observance, if at all.

Chapters 5–6 provide an excellent foundation for and introduction to lexical semantics but will probably prove difficult for readers without some introduction to semantics. Teachers using the book as a text would do well to provide a handout (study guide or outline) or a summary or introductory lecture.

It is disappointing that their discussion of discourse analysis ignores R. Longacre's work on the Hebrew verbal system, especially since his theory of verbal hierarchies and clines provides an excellent illustration of their emphasis on the role of verbal forms in e.g. narrative texts.

Their discussion of the rape of Tamar (2 Samuel 13; pp. 248–253), although stimulating, offers no real additional insight into the meaning of the text despite the amount of labor expended (this may be their point; if so, they should tell us). Especially lacking here was a sense of closure—i.e. that we had by their method come to a more definite conclusion on what the story was about (beyond a comment that it anticipates the conflict between David and Absalom). Despite these lacks this discussion of discourse, and especially of semantic structure analysis, is a good introduction to the methods and potential of discourse analysis.

Chapter 9 ("Non-Literal Language") is both too short and too general. Their treatment of metaphor is rather simplistic (cf. Ryken, *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible*, pp. 166–169; Howard, *Chance or the Dance?*, chap. 2), and the concept of affective language could be more effective if tied to their earlier discussion of paradigmatic choice (pp. 156–159, 188–190).

Most students will find the volume much more helpful after studying e.g. J. Lyons, *Language and Linguistics* (Cambridge, 1981), which Cotterell and Turner themselves recommend as a general introduction to linguistics. Although they have not written a comprehensive introduction to the field of linguistics, Cotterell and Turner have made their points with clarity, subtlety, and even elegance.

The title is somewhat misleading, since OT references account for only about twenty percent of the total. The imbalance should probably be expected from the collaboration of authors in the fields of linguistics and NT. Those wanting to use it for OT studies will probably want to supplement both its discussions and examples.

Although a paperback, the volume is well bound and clearly printed, making it both durable and (physically) easy to read. Without checking every reference I found the citations and indices accurate, although the Scripture index does not appear to list texts merely cited in passing.

The book should be in the hands of any who purpose to deal carefully with the text of Scripture. Used wisely, it will impart much wisdom.

Frederic Clarke Putnam
Biblical Theological Seminary, Hatfield, PA