

## BOOK REVIEWS

*The Holy Bible, New King James Version.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982, 1236 pp., \$12.95.

In 1979 the NT portion of the *New King James Version (NKJV)* appeared. Now we have the entire Bible.

The purpose of the translation as stated in the preface is the "unlocking for today's readers of the spiritual treasures found especially in the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures." In order to do this the translators have preserved the underlying text (essentially the MT and the Textus Receptus) and wherever possible the language and syntax of the *KJV*. Theirs was a three-faceted task—namely, to try to be faithful to the Biblical languages, the old *KJV*, and contemporary usage—which entailed considerably more difficulties than the two-faceted task of going from original to contemporary language that faces most modern translators.

The principle of translation used is called "complete equivalence," which is contrasted in the preface with "dynamic equivalence," a procedure that "commonly results in paraphrasing where a more literal rendering is needed to reflect a specific and vital sense." "Complete equivalence" is an unfortunate term because it suggests an exactness of translation that is unachievable. C. H. Dodd has well said that "there is no such thing as exact equivalence of meaning between words in different languages," and Ronald Knox, no novice himself in the art of Bible translation, reminds us that in spite of our best efforts translations often end up looking like "the back side of a Turkish tapestry." In addition to skill and wisdom, a translator needs humility.

*KJV* doctrinal and theological terms have been retained, including "propitiation," based on the rather optimistic claim that they "are generally familiar to English-speaking peoples." This is certainly debatable. Subject headings are included, and paragraphs are indicated by printing the verse number at the beginning of each in bold type. This is a definite improvement over the old *KJV*. Another feature, which is probably governed by the demands of the marketplace, is the printing of Jesus' words in red.

As in the old *KJV*, words that do not occur in the original but are added for the sake of meaning are put in italics. Readers will inevitably think (despite the explanation in the preface—prefaces are seldom read) that the italicized words are to be emphasized. Furthermore, in the translation of a text it is not always clear what words should be italicized. For example, should the possessive pronoun "his" be put in italics (as in fact it is in the *NKJV*) when the Greek definite article (and not the Greek possessive pronoun) is used to indicate possession? Here the whole matter of equivalence is raised. It seems that "his" (in many instances) exists as really in the Greek definite article as it does in the Greek possessive pronoun. Or, on a slightly different issue, should forms of the copula "to be" really be italicized in Hebrew verbless clauses? Is not the copula fundamentally a part of this construction, even though not realized on the surface level? We fear this device will be more distracting and misleading than helpful.

The underlying Greek text is what came to be known as the Textus Receptus ("Received Text"). This text is consistently followed even when it disagrees (as in 1 John 5:7-8) with the Majority Text. (For a discussion of the issues involved see the relevant articles in *JETS*, March and June 1978.) When the NT portion of the *NKJV* originally appeared it

contained only one textual-critical note (1 John 5:7-8). In the current volume wherever the NU (Nestle-United Bible Society Text) differs from the traditional (Received) text, this is indicated in the footnotes. No evaluations are made of readings, however. The inclusion of these notes is a big improvement over the previously published *NKJV* NT. The reader at least knows where the differences occur, even though the preface tends to prejudice him against the NU readings. Also, wherever the Majority Text differs from the traditional text this is indicated in the footnotes. Of course such instances are relatively few.

At the back of the *NKJV* there is a brief "History of the King James Bible." This traces the translation down through the various revisions (*RV*, *ASV*, *RSV* [why no mention of the *NASB*?]) to the *NKJV*. One reason given for the decision to go ahead with the *NKJV* project is that "there appeared to be a growing concern over the fact that the revisions of 1881, 1901, and 1952 had used a Greek text that largely ignored the great majority of biblical manuscripts. Some were concerned that the words of men had begun to change the Word of God, even if only in subtle ways." This statement seems to have a rather hollow sound in view of the fact that in the *NKJV* 1 John 5:7-8 is printed as part of the sacred text in the face of overwhelming evidence against its inclusion. It is evident that, at least in this instance, there was more concern by those who were responsible for the *NKJV* to preserve tradition than truth ("To have followed a text other than this [Textus Receptus] would have been to produce something other than a King James Bible").

Since the NT portion of the *NKJV* has already been reviewed at length in this *Journal* (*JETS* 25/4 [December 1980] 346-348), the remainder of the review is devoted to the OT section.

The OT text is based on the MT as found in the 1967/1977 *BHS*, with frequent comparisons made with Jacob ben Chayyim's edition of 1524-25, published by Daniel Bomberg, which was the one used by the *KJV* translators. Significant versions (LXX, Targums, Syriac, DSS, Vg, and even "Jewish tradition") were also consulted and their readings noted in the footnotes. As with the NT, there is no evaluation of the variants.

There are less textual notes in the *NKJV* than in such versions as the *RSV*, *NASB* or *NIV*, and the feeling here is that there could have been more (e.g., there are only four references to the DSS in Isaiah). Rarely are the versions preferred over the MT, although at a crux such as Ps 22:16 (MT 17) the LXX ("pierced") is followed (but with no note). Incredibly, the old *KJV* can occasionally take precedence over the MT and DSS (at Isa 10:16 [cf. v 33!]) and 38:14, for example). *Kethib/Qere* readings are occasionally noted, and the *Qere* is even followed at times (e.g. at Job 33:28; Isa 49:5). These terms are not explained for the general reader, however, and the former is inconsistently spelled (*Kethib* and *Kethiv*). Textual emendations are rare (the corrupt text at 1 Sam 13:1 is left untouched, for instance), but they do occur. Perhaps the most notable example is at 2 Sam 12:31; 1 Chr 20:3, where David now enslaves, rather than tortures (as in the old *KJV*), the Ammonites, based on a slight emendation and also on light from Akkadian. The emendation is not noted, however. That the Hebrew text is uncertain is sometimes noted, as at Amos 3:12, but this too is rare (difficulties at the well-known Job 13:15; Ps 23:6; Ps 45:6 [MT 7]; Isa 53:11 are not mentioned).

On the stylistic level, the *NKJV* is much improved. The English is updated ("you" replaces "thee" and "thou") and verb forms modernized ("walketh" and "doth meditate" become "walks" and "meditates" in Psalm 1, for example). Certainly "a helper comparable to him" is better than "an help meet for him" (Gen 2:18, 20); "between" than "betwixt" (17:11); "Sarah had passed the age of childbearing" than "It had ceased to be with Sarah after the manner of women" (18:11); "grown old" than "waxed old" (18:12); "face to face" than "mouth to mouth" (Jer 32:4; 34:3); etc. "Comfort, yes, comfort My people" is a refreshing rendering of Isa 40:1. A few archaisms do survive, such as "come to pass," "be-got," "firmament"; but the overall stylistic impression is favorable (no worse than the *NASB* in most places, for instance, and better in many).

The new format is also improved. Paragraphing is mentioned above (although, unhappily, each verse still begins at the left margin), but the greatest improvement is in the printing of poetry in strophic form. Hebrew parallelism is clearly visible, and spaces are left between blocks of verses thought to be units. In Canticles the different speakers are labeled (although this is a mixed blessing, given the many uncertainties here). The subject headings are usually helpful (it is good to see Isa 52:13-53:12 grouped together, for instance), but occasionally they are not. For example, should Isa 14:12-21 really be titled "The Fall of Lucifer," especially sandwiched between headings mentioning Babylon and the king of Babylon? The headings in the Psalms cause a bit of a clutter, appearing as they do above the psalm titles.

Other improvements include greater precision or clarity in rendering Hebrew meanings. "Murder" is truer than "kill" at Ex 20:13; Deut 5:17; "anxieties" better than "thoughts" at Ps 139:23; "friend" (with a footnote, "literally *so and so*") clearer than "such a one" at Ruth 4:1; "Saul your grandfather" more precise than "Saul thy father" at 2 Sam 9:7; "Aramaic language" less anachronistic than "Syrian language" at 2 Kgs 18:26; Isa 36:11.

Archaeological and linguistic advances are often incorporated. Thus we have "terebinth tree(s)" for "plain(s)" at Gen 18:1; Judg 9:37; etc.; "on their mounds" (with a note, "Hebrew *tel*, a heap of successive city ruins") for "in their strength" at Josh 11:13; and "Keveh" for "linen yarn" at 1 Kgs 10:28; 2 Chr 1:16 (though "Que" would be even better). Ps 68:4 (MT 5), "Him who rides on the clouds," is a refinement based on Ugaritic phraseology. However, an insight from Ugaritic is missed at Prov 26:23, where "silver dross" should read "glaze." The particle *zû* is usually read correctly (as a relative, "who[m]") but is misread at least at Ex 15:13, 16; Hab 1:11, and possibly at Ps 12:7 (MT 8). The divine epithet *zeh sinay* "the one of Sinai" (Judg 5:5; Ps 68:8 [MT 9]) is also missed.

In the Psalms the titles are often translated, a real improvement. Some are even boldly read as tune titles (at Pss 9, 22, 45, 56-60, 69, 75, 80), although caution occasionally overrules (e.g. at Pss 46, 53, 88). Why *miktâm* is never translated or footnoted, and *maskil* and other terms are, is not clear. *Šiggāyôn* is translated "Meditation" at Ps 7:1, with no note, but left as "Shigionoth" at Hab 3:1. Acrostic poems are not pointed out in the Psalms and elsewhere, nor are differences in the Hebrew and English verse numberings.

The system of footnotes follows usual practice in modern translations and is not tied to the old *KJV*. Some are textual (see above). Others give literal renderings (such as at Deut 28:56, where the note on "will refuse" reads "Literally *her eye shall be evil toward*"). Still others are explanatory (at Job 12:19, the note to "princes" reads "Literally *priests*, but not in the technical sense"; at Esth 1:1, the note to "Ahasuerus" reads "Generally identified with Xerxes I [485-464 B.C.]"; the Tartan, Rabсарis, and Rabshakeh in 2 Kings and Isaiah are each identified in a note). A rudimentary set of cross-references is included (see, e.g., notes at 1 Kgs 18:31; Jer 49:10, 16, 27; 38:2; etc.), but it is very sparse.

Transliterated names are often translated, the Hebrew appearing in a footnote. We now have "Acacia Grove" for old *KJV* "Shittim" at Josh 2:1; 3:1; "Brook Misrephoth" for "Misrephoth-Maim" at Josh 11:8; 13:6; "Diviners" for "Meonenim" at Judg 9:37; "household idols" for "teraphim" at Judg 17:5. Conversely, the translations may appear in the notes. For example, the text at Judg 2:5 is "Bochim," and the note reads "Literally *Weeping*"; Judg 15:17 reads "Ramath Lehi," the note "Literally *Jawbone Heights*." Elsewhere the reader is less fortunate, being left to wrestle with such terms as "Millo" (2 Kgs 11:27) and "Parbar" (1 Chr 26:18).

The notes also point out differences in spellings in Samuel/Kings, Chronicles and elsewhere (e.g., Ishbosheth/Esh-baal, Toi/Tou, Araunah/Ornan, etc.), as well as differences in readings (cf. 700 vs. 7000 horsemen in 2 Sam 8:4 and 1 Chr 18:4; seven vs. three years in 2 Sam 24:13 and 1 Chr 21:12). There is no note, however, for the 2000 vs. 3000 baths of 1 Kgs 7:26 and 2 Chr 4:5 (!), nor any for the 70 vs. 75 people of Exod 1:5 and Acts 7:14, even

though the Acts reading is anticipated by noting the 75 of the LXX and DSS at Exod 1:5.

Complete consistency in translating is not a necessary mark of a good translation, and the *NKJV* recognizes this. Differing contexts require different English words for a single Hebrew term. One example (out of countless such ones) is in the rendering of *hesed*. Of some nine different nouns in the old *KJV* for the root, the *NKJV* makes no change in four: "favour" (3x), "good deed" (1x), "lovingkindness" (30x), or "merciful kindness" (2x). "Goodliness" becomes "loveliness" at its only occurrence (Isa 40:6). "Goodness" is retained 10 times and becomes "lovingkindness" at Ps 144:2 and "faithfulness" at Hos 6:4. "Kindness" remains 32 times and becomes "loyalty" at 2 Sam 3:8; 16:17, "favor" at Esth 2:9, and "lovingkindness" at Jon 4:2 (though the same prayer in Joel 2:13 has "kindness"). "Pity" becomes "kindness" at Job 6:14. "Mercy," the most common term for *hesed* (149x), is treated consistently: It is retained 147 times (but capitalized [!] at Jon 2:8; at Ps 59:10 (MT 11) "The God of my mercy" becomes "My merciful God" (but not at 59:17 [MT 18])). The consistency is broken only once, at Prov 20:28, probably for reasons of literary style (the second "mercy" of the old *KJV* is now "lovingkindness") rather than of textual criticism (the LXX variant is not being followed here).

On the other hand, random and accidental inconsistencies do occur, and rather frequently. For instance, the old *KJV* has "pit," "grave" and "hell" for Hebrew *šē'ōl*. The *NKJV* has these three but also has "death" and "Sheol." Often "hell" or "grave" will have a footnote, "Hebrew *sheol*" (or "Hebrew *Sheol*"), or "Sheol" may be explained as "the grave" in a note, but just as often there is no note. *Ōniyōt taršiš* appears four times as "merchant ships," thrice with a note ("Literally *ships of Tarshish* [deep-sea vessels]"), once without, and six times as "ships of Tarshish," all with no note. Ancient measurement terms are retained for the most part, so that "cubits," "baths," "homers" and "ephahs" abound (curiously, however, "ephah" is translated as "receptacles" at Zech 4:12). Unfortunately, these usually do not even rate an explanatory note (Isa 5:10, at least, cries out for one). *Rēpā'im* is rendered "giants" and "Rephaim," each with and without explanatory notes. The list could go on.

A review of traditionally Christological passages shows the *NKJV* staying with the traditions. One of its (distressing) innovations is clearly seen here, too: the capitalization of words taken to refer to Christ. Genesis 3:15 uses "her Seed" and "His heel"; Gen 49:10 retains the obscure "Until Shiloh comes"; Job 19:25 has "For I know *that* my Redeemer lives"; Ps 2:12 reads "Kiss the Son"; Isa 7:14 has "the virgin shall conceive and bear a Son"; Dan 7:13 reads "*One* like the Son of Man." Unfortunately, at not one of these cruxes is there a footnote to indicate difficulties or alternate readings. Furthermore the capitalization scheme wrenches Isa 7:14 ff. out of any connection with Ahaz' context at all. Elsewhere this convention is arbitrarily applied. We have "a Man" and "He" at Gen 33:24 ff., and "the Angel" and "the Man" at Judg 13:9 ff.—but why "the angel" at 1 Kgs 19:5, 7, 2 Kgs 19:35, or Isa 37:36? We have both "me" and "Me" in the Servant's mouth in succeeding verses (Isa 49:1-4). Certain Psalms are seen as messianic, depending on the capitalization given to "anointed" (*māšiah*) (cf., e.g., Pss 2:2; 132:10, 17 with 20:6 [MT 7]; 89:38, 51 [MT 39, 52]). Furthermore, why "Messiah" at Dan 9:25, 26, and nowhere else? Why not "Anointed One" or at least a footnote here? Daniel 3:25 has Nebuchadnezzar seeing "the Son of God," although certainly the reading in the note ("*a son of the gods*") is what the king meant. Significant words are also occasionally capitalized, so that we now have "Destruction" (Job 26:6), "Death" (28:22), "Scripture of Truth" (Dan 10:21), etc., where the old *KJV* had only lowercase. This "improvement" is marginal at best.

Nits could be picked *ad infinitum*, but (to paraphrase the Preacher) "of making many criticisms there is no end, and much reviewing is a weariness of the flesh." What is the value of this new version? The scholars involved are acknowledged experts in their specialties, and they have produced a version vastly improved over the old *KJV*. The OT portion affords some pleasant surprises and does not have nearly the textual problems that the NT

does. Even here, however, there are enough idiosyncrasies, and the translators still bound enough to the old *KJV*, that it is difficult to give it more than a lukewarm endorsement. Coupled with the mostly negative assessment of the NT portion, we feel that this complete offering leaves much to be desired. It certainly can (and will) be used with much profit, but its self-imposed limitations make it suffer in comparison with some other recent versions.

David M. Howard, Jr.

Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, MN

Walter W. Wessel

Bethel Seminary West, San Diego, CA

*Letters of John Calvin*. Edinburgh/Carlisle, PA: Banner of Truth Trust, 1980, 261 pp., £2.25 paper.

The misguided popular image of the Genevan Reformer as an austere exegete, stern disciplinarian and overly precise advocate of predestination has recently been softened by the appearance of F. L. Battles, *The Piety of John Calvin* (1978), and by his own previously unpublished *Concerning Scandals* (1978). However, the warm pastoral nature revealed in these works was always clearly evident in Calvin's immense personal correspondence, which has been largely unavailable to the Christian public.

The introduction to the collection of letters at hand mentions only that they have been selected from the 19th-century edition by Jules Bonnet. More specifically, however, it is of interest that a few days before his death Calvin himself requested that a selection of his private correspondence be made by some of his friends and be presented to the Reformed churches as a token of his affection for them. Under the supervision of Beza this request was eventually carried out by Jean de Bude, Laurent de Normandie (to whom *Concerning Scandals* was addressed) and Charles de Jonvillers. This collection of autographs now resides in the Library of Geneva, although a few specimens are preserved in Calvin's chapel under the shadow of St. Pierre's cathedral in that city. Bonnet, after five years of research, published in English a collection of six hundred letters translated from both Latin and French in four volumes (Edinburgh/Philadelphia, 1855-58). Readers may also want to be aware that the entire Bonnet edition was reprinted by Burt Franklin in New York, 1972-73, so that this corpus is not then "long-out-of-print" as the introduction claims, although it is fair to observe that it is not widely known.

We should like to be told who has assembled this present volume of seventy letters. The publishers kindly informed the reviewer that this task was rendered by Sinclair B. Ferguson (indeed modestly so), who we recognize as being one of the editorial advisers for *EvQ* from Glasgow. We are indebted to him for his labor, for not only has he assembled this handy collection but has prefaced his selection of letters by a very useful sixteen-page biography, "The Life of John Calvin." This mini-appraisal of the Reformer's life concludes with four verses of the only hymn attributed to Calvin, a hymn not commonly known or easily found, which sums up the devotion of his life.

The selection criteria used to compile the letters from the Bonnet edition were to illustrate the Spirit-motivated sustaining power of true friendship (e.g. with Farel, Melancthon and Bullinger) and to illustrate Calvin's deep feelings of compassion for those persecuted or afflicted. Various pastoral concerns are in evidence, such as advice to converts on reasons for the daily exercise of Scripture study (letters 26 and 64).

These letters are important occasional writings, not just as historical pieces but for the timely insights they still bring to those in adverse conditions. As such they deserve to be read first hand in that, as Jean Cadier has well said, "the student will find . . . that Calvin makes richer and more straightforward reading than any of his expositors." Yet Calvin's humanity and his love of those in need is easily detectable as the theme of this present little

collection. Calvin once noted that spatial distance did not prevent Christ from being present with his own (*Acts* I. 17). It seems that he draws on this idea here, reassuring and comforting the faithful in their various hardships. "To the Prisoners of Lyons" is surely a timeless exhortation for believers amid trials—e.g., "Acceptance of adversity with gentle and loving hearts is altogether right and profitable for our salvation . . . knowing that it is God who manifests Himself in time of need." Another letter that should have been included under this theme is "To the Family of Bude," a moving consolation upon the Christian death of a family member (II. 154-157, Bonnet). We are grateful that the collection is concluded with Calvin's last will and testament and his farewell to the ministers of Geneva.

When many Christians in Western civilization are comfortably set in their worship patterns, when repetitions often dull our senses, when many of our churches are not seriously engaged in sober and ongoing evangelism strategies and suffer little or no rejection, and when many of us are seldom faced with trials like those of Calvin's addressees, it might be tempting to put this material in the irrelevant category. Nevertheless a perusal of these personal thoughts will be a ministry for those committed to the advance of the gospel, albeit in vastly different circumstances. These miniature devotions to the courtesy, attention to detail, and duty of Christian correspondence represent a level of caring and a feeling about the needs of others that is seldom seen today.

Paul Elbert

132 Holgate Dr., Luton, Beds. LU4 OXD, England

*Invasion from the East.* By Howard A. Wilson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1978, 160 pp., \$3.95 paper.

Howard Wilson is well versed in his subject, being a specialist in Asian religions and a member of the Association for Asian Studies. Wilson gives a brief but comprehensive overview of Hinduism, Buddhism and Zen and its impact on Western civilization and theology. His book is divided into seven chapters with the thrust being the resurgence of Eastern religions among the Americans during the '60s and '70s.

Examples are shown of TM, a commune life and a Zen center and how members of our society live in such environments. He indicates that in order to escape from the materialism of the world many have sought the inner peace offered by the major religions in Asia. He explains and analyzes eleven features that cause the attraction to the Eastern modes of religion. They are (1) a unitary view of the world, (2) a mystical relationship with the world, (3) freedom from modern Western materialism, (4) many paths to the truth, (5) the promise of altering human consciousness, (6) direct rather than secondary experience, (7) a specific program of spiritual discipline, (8) prayer becoming meditative and contemplative, (9) cultivating the bodily dimension of life, (10) a guide to the realm of the spirit, and (11) living harmoniously with nature.

In setting forth these features he indicates the pantheism that exists in the East and, by taking each of the three major bodies, gives an in-depth study of each feature.

Following the exposition of the Eastern religions, Wilson indicates the concern of Christians in all eleven areas, stressing the shortcomings of the Eastern bodies in light of the gospel. His closing chapter admonishes the Christian of his criticism and shows how we, in Western civilization, can learn much and apply much of the Eastern philosophy in our Christian walk.

One of the major points stressed is the fact that in Protestant Christianity we have, in the main, a second-hand faith—that is, one that is based solely on what we have read in the Bible or have had expounded to us from the pulpit. In the East, on the other hand, there is the first-hand experience of the knowledge of God, primarily through mystical revelation. Again, Wilson points out the need of the Christian to consider the human roots in nature that have been lost in our technological society today.

Wilson, along with many theologians of today, feels that many evangelicals are quite bibliolatrous in their approach to Scripture, maintaining that only the Bible is the true Word of God, and that they are not familiar with the writings of the respective religions of the East. He has consequently written in such a vein as not to offend the reader of our culture nor the reader from the Eastern culture.

While the book is an excellent introduction into the realm of Oriental thinking and can be used for the enlightenment of the Christian community, it implies that we can use Eastern philosophy in our Christian walk. It may be a tool for one interested in comparative religion, but the Christian must not fall into the author's trap of believing that one can find salvation in the ways of non-Christian Asians.

Joseph O. Schwalb

54 Kalmia Street, East Northport, NY 11731

*Liberation Theology: An Evangelical View from the Third World.* By J. Andrew Kirk. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979, 226 pp.

Being man-made, theological systems display varying degrees of staying power. Liberation theology is one theology that gives evidence of considerable resilience, not by virtue of its faithful reflection of the timeless truth of Biblical Christianity but rather by virtue of its conscious grounding in the struggle of oppressed peoples in the Third World.

The theology of liberation lays claim to being *sui generis*. Its proponents maintain that it is different from the theologies of the Reformation and other traditional theologies. They insist that it is also to be differentiated from the theologies of revolution recently formulated in Europe. It springs not from a commitment to reflect on the faith but from a kind of faith in commitment. Rather than starting with the gospel and applying its principles to the world situation in general and to the political sphere in particular, liberation theologians "begin from a faith lived out in a commitment and reflect upon that" (p. 55). The themes of this theology, therefore, may or may not be new. But what is purportedly new is its theological methodology. Here is a new way of "doing theology." And that phraseology is particularly appropriate since liberation theology begins as a theology of praxis rather than as a theology of reflection.

J. Andrew Kirk served for twelve years as a theological educator in Argentina before returning to Britain at the end of 1979. The subtitle of his book—*An Evangelical View from the Third World*—will therefore be misleading to those who infer that the author is native to the Third World. Any misgivings they might entertain should be quickly dispelled, however, for Kirk proves himself to be thoroughly acquainted with the relevant literature and sympathetic with the struggles and aspirations of Latin America's poor.

Kirk begins with an explanation of the context out of which liberation theology has emerged and moves on to an examination of some of the principal characteristics of its methodology.

Part II is devoted to an analysis of the positions of five Roman Catholic writers whom he considers to be most influential among proponents of liberation theology: Hugo Assmann (the ideologist), Gustavo Gutierrez (the systematic theologian), J. L. Segundo (contributor of a pastoral dimension), and Severino Croatto and J. P. Miranda (contributors to its hermeneutical and exegetical bases).

Part III is concerned with the main Biblical themes employed by liberation theologians including the exodus, liberation itself, humanity, Christ as Liberator, and the kingdom.

In a final section encompassing some sixty-five pages, Kirk evaluates the methodology and conclusions of the liberation theologians and offers an alternative. Because he has done such a fair and masterful job in the first three sections of the book, his final analyses and proposals will prove to be convincing to those committed to an authoritative Bible and should prove to be a formidable challenge to liberation theologians who are at all serious

about doing theology "in the light of Scripture."

Briefly stated, Kirk disputes the notion that liberation theology is wholly new but he allows (1) that it has broken with the Catholic theocratic ideal and in so doing has evolved a new hermeneutic, and (2) that "it has correctly read the 'signs of the times' in modern Latin America" (p. 144). He says that liberation theologians are not unconcerned about determining the *sensus literalis* of the Biblical text, though they often fail to do justice to it. In accord with traditional Catholic theology, however, they do not believe that revelation ceased with the apostolic age. What becomes all-important for liberation theologians, therefore, is "meaning for today." Without referring to *sensus plenior* as such they employ such terms and phrases as "re-interpretation," "reserve-of-meaning," "donation-of-meaning," "word-significance" and "word-in-suspense" (p. 157). The meaning of the text stands in need of contemporary interpretation rather than application. However, the role of the Church's magisterium in that process is replaced by the "awakened conscience of oppressed humanity" (p. 159). The socio-political tools for interpretation and action (or, better, interpretation growing out of action) are provided by Marxism. A Marxist pre-understanding, therefore, is essential to the contemporary hermeneutical task.

As an alternative to the proposals of liberation theology, Kirk propounds the Reformers' appeal to *sola scriptura* as a theological methodology, Scripture's testimony to the kingdom of God as the central hermeneutical key, and an ultimate reference point for the hermeneutical task in the finality of revelation in Jesus Christ. The ultimate authority in interpretation cannot be claimed by either the Church or any contemporary ideology. And Christ (and the "Christ-event") cannot be relativized in such a way as to install contemporary Christ-symbols such as Camilio Torres or Che Guevara in his place.

In encouraging institutions of theological education in the Third World to "use Western theology more as a sounding board and limited point of reference for their own creative thought, than as the main content of their academic curriculum" (p. 205), Kirk would seem to be both justified and realistic. In encouraging liberation theologians to "pay more careful attention to its [liberation theology's] biblical hermeneutic" in order to "lay a more solid foundation for future reflection" (p. 207), he may be perceived by some as underestimating the egregious nature of the challenge they mount to evangelical Christianity and thereby as undercutting somewhat the force of his critique of liberation theology.

It must always be clear that no sensitivity to the plight of the poor and the oppressed, however justified and laudable, exonerates infidelity to Christ and the faith once for all delivered to the saints.

Kirk's incisive analysis will be a standard for years to come for all who inquire into the nature and methodology of liberation theology. This is a most worthy addition to the publications of the New Foundation Theological Library.

David J. Hesselgrave

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL

*Karl Barth: The Theology of Schleiermacher.* Dietrich Ritschl. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, xix + 287 pp., \$13.50.

Once again the English-reading theological world is indebted to Geoffrey Bromiley for his translation work. And once again he has made available to them a work by Karl Barth, his lectures on Schleiermacher at Göttingen, the winter semester of 1923-24. Barth never revised these lectures for publication, yet they form the basic core of his thought about Schleiermacher from which he drew material for his later essays on "the father of liberalism."

Since Barth and Schleiermacher are paradigmatic figures of neo-orthodoxy and classic liberalism respectively, the study of Barth's refutation and criticisms of Schleiermacher



makes for interesting reading. Almost three years before the Göttingen lectures, Barth wrote to Eduard Thurneysen that "he planned to declare war on this church father and religious virtuoso and that the muzzle of the gun was trained on him" (Ritschl, p. ix). These lectures comprise Barth's confessed "open war" on Schleiermacher, "the genius of the 19th century in the religious, ecclesiastical, and theological field" (p. xv). From beginning to end they are an unrelenting and scornful assault on Schleiermacher and the "almost incomparable influence that he had in the history of theology since the Reformation" (p. xvi).

Barth respected and admired Schleiermacher deeply. He cannot praise him highly enough for his exemplary piety, his theological genius, and the seriousness with which he undertook his task. This love-hate relationship is characterized in Barth's comment that "there was and is none to hold a candle to him. Protestantism has not in fact had any greater theologian since the days of the reformers. But this theologian has led us all into a *dead end!* This is an oppressive and almost intolerable thought" (p. 259, italics his).

Barth organized these lectures according to a threefold division, deliberately inverting the threefold scheme that Schleiermacher used in his *Brief Outline on the Study of Theology*. There Schleiermacher discussed—in order—philosophical, historical and practical theology. Barth examines Schleiermacher first as a preacher, then as a scholar, and third as a philosopher.

A key thesis of Barth's is that Schleiermacher was first and foremost a preacher, and for that reason, if we wish to discover his theology, we should look first to the pulpit and his sermons, not to the professor's lectern or the writing desk. It is in his sermons that we find the sum and substance of Schleiermacher's theology, contends Barth. He discusses (1) sermons from Schleiermacher's last years, especially six sermons from New Year's Day to February 2, 1834 (Schleiermacher died February 12, 1834); (2) the Christological Festival sermons, including those on Christmas, Good Friday and Easter, along with an excursus on Schleiermacher's *Christmas Eve*; (3) the "Household Sermons of 1818" on marriage, bringing up children, servants, hospitality and philanthropy.

Next Barth examines Schleiermacher the academician or scholar. These lectures include chapters on the *Encyclopedia*, hermeneutics, *The Christian Faith*, and the *Speeches*. Schleiermacher the scholar does not differ from Schleiermacher the preacher, says Barth, and in his scientific theology we see "the theater of the debate between Christianity and culture . . . the true theme of his theology" (p. 138)—that is, these theological works express Schleiermacher's desire to be at one and the same time both a modern man and a Christian.

The semester ended before Barth got to Schleiermacher the philosopher, but this omission makes little difference for the outcome of his verdict. Throughout the course of the lectures there is literally no major doctrine of the Christian faith that Barth feels that Schleiermacher has not disastrously perverted: sin, grace, Christology, anthropology, ecclesiology, Scripture, faith, miracles, and the absoluteness of Christianity. The lectures comprise Barth's comprehensive refutation of everything he was against.

Despite this unrelenting attack, Barth does see some positive things in Schleiermacher: (1) He is convinced that Schleiermacher was a genuine Christian: "For all my serious objections that I have against his theology, I regard Schleiermacher not just an outstandingly clever person but also as a sincerely devout Christian" (p. 106). "He had a personal relationship to Jesus which might be characterized by love" (p. 274). That is no small tribute to one accused of rank and consistent heresy on every major doctrine of the Christian faith. (2) Barth is captivated by Schleiermacher's intellectual brilliance, his genius for systematizing, and the manifold evidence of his being a scholar without peer. "He must certainly rank among the great names in Christian theology and be mentioned alongside Origen, Augustine, and Calvin. No one since can be compared to him, nor soon will be" (p. 137). (3) Barth also admired Schleiermacher's grappling with ethics, a prophetic function that he per-

formed that was otherwise "fatefully neglected in the Evangelical church until it was too late" (p. 39). For Barth, Schleiermacher "is at his best when thinking through the problem and problems of ethics on the assumption that Christianity is a present force which is at work in the sphere of history and nature as well as in the spiritual sphere" (p. 134).

Of special interest in *The Theology of Schleiermacher* is the inclusion of Barth's "Concluding Unscientific Postscript on Schleiermacher," a short (20 pages), separate publication and one of the last things that Barth wrote. In it he chronicles his lifelong encounter with Schleiermacher and then challenges us to determine if he has understood Schleiermacher correctly. The "Postscript" is tantalizing because of its irenic tone and because in it Barth expresses a willingness to be corrected. Although he can concur with Schleiermacher "in no fundamental sense whatsoever," this disagreement is only "*rebus sic stantibus*,—'for the present,' or 'until better instructed.' Something like a reservation, a genuine uncertainty, may rightly be detected here" (p. 274, italics his).

Did Barth understand and criticize Schleiermacher fairly? That is for present-day theologians to decide. We study Schleiermacher, says Barth, because his theology is still with us today (pp. xii-xv). That reason alone should encourage evangelicals to study Schleiermacher and to come to grips with contemporary theology, which was influenced so much by him. Barth's Göttingen lectures provide a valuable and comprehensive study of the issues from which this task might begin.

Daniel B. Clendenen

36 Madison Ave., Box 290, Drew University, Madison, NJ 07940

*Catholic Pentecostalism*. René Laurentin. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1977, 239 pp., £3.95.

Originally *Pentecotisme chez les Catholiques* (also copyrighted by Doubleday in 1977), this history and critique by Laurentin of the Catholic University of Angers attempts to document the world progress of the Catholic sector of the renewal movement. Laurentin estimates that Catholic Neo-Pentecostalism had somewhere between 2 and 4 million participants in one hundred countries as of May 1975. This movement is traced from its birth among Holy Ghost Fathers at Duquesne University in January 1967, noting the widespread and modest belief that there was no human founder: "The Holy Spirit is the only founder" (p. 185).

As an example of its growth Laurentin cites attendance figures for annual meetings at the University of Notre Dame: 90 in 1967, 30,000 in 1974. From contact with the movement in the United States, subsequent growth apparently occurred in Canada and South America and then spread to other countries. For example, Laurentin places the beginnings in France at the end of 1971 and records that since 1973 every important city in France has one or more groups. (This reviewer has learned from a reliable source he can not disclose, due to possible persecution of the participants, that there are at least 60 such fellowships in Poland.)

Since Catholic Pentecostalism was influenced ("inspired," p. 20) at its outset by the literature and testimony of classical pentecostalism, Laurentin is careful to review the history of its Protestant forerunner. He is sympathetic and once defends E. S. Williams from critics (p. 36). However, his stress throughout is on critiquing recent developments in the Catholic sector, which he does with objectivity as a participating (noncharismatic) observer. Despite the tension between the enthusiastic evangelical life of Protestant influence and the established tradition with its liturgical forms, the movement has by and large remained faithful to the Church. (Observers first thought that participants should withdraw from the Church, but had this been done in any systematic way the renovative force that the movement later exercised within the Church would have been lost.) Dangers are

neutralized by communal discernment, which Laurentin sees as being the most characteristic trait of the movement as a whole. Tensions between the new and old are resolvable by revising the relationship between believers and institution, specifically by revising "the relationship in keeping with the teaching of Christ, by putting the emphasis once again on the people, equating power once again with service, and rehabilitating the charisms" (p. 146).

Reactions from within Catholicism are mixed, as are the various exegetical strands regarding baptism in the Spirit and sacramental water baptism, but Laurentin is wise to point out that the Church was aware of such problems anyway. He includes a chapter on "Baptism in the Spirit and Charisms" to define his terms. (It is useful to have the historical background of the term "baptism in the Spirit" given by William Menzies in "The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology," *Perspectives on Evangelical Theology* [ed. K. Kantzer and S. Gundry; Baker, 1979] 67-79.) Laurentin believes baptism in the Spirit meets a pastoral need at the level of the common people "at a time when traditional means have proven inadequate or in need of supplementing" (p. 42). The reaction of Paul VI seems the most balanced as well as accurate and is worth quoting one more time in any fair review. Paul VI saw the common notes in the renewal as "the taste of deep prayer, personal and in groups, a return to contemplation and an emphasizing of praise of God, the desire to devote oneself completely to Christ, a great availability for the calls of the Holy Spirit, more assiduous reading of Scripture, generous brotherly devotion, the will to make a contribution to the service of the Church" (p. 25).

Regarding the reading of Scripture, it is straightforward with emphasis on getting food for the soul, it is a "reading of God's word that speaks to the real life of individuals and community" (p. 170). The fatal charm of obscure (and therefore more popular) exegetical theories, as opposed to more sober and well-grounded technical scholarship, to which the movement is open, is being replaced by faith in the historical reality of Scripture. The renewal appears to restore joy, confidence and fervor, and meets the need for authentic experience (cf. the similar observations on conversion and experience by the Catholic theologian and African missionary Donal Dorr, *Remove the Heart of Stone: Charismatic Renewal and the Experience of Grace* [Macmillan, 1978]).

There is a return to essential values due to an encounter with God through the Spirit, to Scripture as the word of life, and to "charity as not simply a commandment but a way, a life" (p. 181). The renewal aims at full holiness as being the vocation of every Christian, which may include fasting, sometimes poverty, and the completely evangelical life. It also aims at liberating new capacities for commitment and communication to and about Christ.

Some have felt that Laurentin paints too idyllic a picture. It can be noted that some within the movement who have sensed the call to the ministry have been hesitant about entering Catholic seminaries or universities for fear of liberalism being destructive to faith. Doctrinal difficulties generated by the movement as opposed to established positions are often a cause of frustration to participants. Nevertheless the situation is healthy insofar as there is a continuing willingness to discuss differences. The twelfth annual Roman Catholic/Pentecostal Dialogue concluded in Vienna in October 1981, and the dialogue papers are published at the end of each five-year cycle. Guidelines for handling issues have been suggested by Charles Farah, "Towards a Theology of Ecumenicity or Doctrinal Disagreements and Christian Fellowship," *Theological Renewal* (October 1981) 21-30, although much more remains to be done in this area. One popular organ of the movement in America, *New Covenant*, has established itself as a periodical of substance and responsibility. Overall, Laurentin's picture must be assessed as accurate and as reflecting a grass-roots phenomenon that is both spiritually healthy and dedicated to expanding its influence in an organized manner.

Laurentin includes documented chapters on tongues, healings, dangers, sources and meaning, importance and future, and lastly on Mary as a model of the charismatic. This last

chapter looks as if it dangles at the end mainly unrelated to the rest of the book. As the movement is not advancing based on veneration of Mary but on adoration of Christ, this material is of peripheral relevance at the grass-roots level in the movement as a whole. Phrases like "Mary's Spirit-animated presence in the communion of saints" (p. 194) need clarification before one can be assured that the Spirit is acting in this way. While Mary deserves our deepest respect, to assert that the renewal has rediscovered the Blessed Virgin is to miss the focus of the movement and is of questionable historical accuracy. Rather, it appears as a superposition of previous ideas on current experience. While specialist studies of Mary have been forthcoming (by Laurentin in particular), a ground swell of Mariological stress is not arising within the laity.

Laurentin has performed a most valuable and lasting service in his preparation of bibliography on Catholic Neo-Pentecostalism and in his footnotes, both of which constitute a rich worldwide source of information particularly in European materials. The American bibliography, which "we cannot recommend too highly" (p. 204), is authored by Faupel (not Paupel).

The volume carries a foreword by Bishop Langton Fox who, at the time of publication, was designated by the bishops' conference of England and Wales to be ecclesiastical assistant to the renewal. Bishop Fox compliments Laurentin on his service and hopes that he will, "if he has not already done so, soon complete the modification and share the joy" (p. 4). Fox, the former bishop of Menevia in Wales, has now retired from his official duties but still continues to contribute to the renewal. For the purpose of this review he has kindly prepared the following statement as an updated appraisal of the movement, which is quoted here with his permission: "In May 1981 I attended the Conference of Leaders of the Catholic Charismatic Renewal in Rome. Ninety-four countries were represented. My strongest impressions were three in number. First, covenantal communities are springing up all over the world. Second, the Renewal is beginning to concern itself actively with direct evangelization. Third, it is moving from the edges into the centre of the Church." These main perceptions must be judged as accurate.

Also for the purpose of this review Laurentin has generously studied new data available to him as to the numerical scene. He now can state that as of October 1979 the more recent figures are: 5 million occasional participants, 1 to 2 million regular participants, 1 million baptized in the Spirit. He notes also that the zone of influence is considerably beyond such numerical data. These new data are quoted here with his permission.

In conclusion, the reviewer thanks not only Fox and Laurentin for their professional and courteous collaboration but also a great many other individuals who must remain unnamed for their gracious tuition in the subject matter of this review.

Paul Elbert

University of London King's College

*Are Southern Baptists "Evangelicals"?* By James Leo Garrett, E. Glenn Hinson and James E. Tull. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983, 239 pp., \$14.95.

In this very fine study concerning the identity of Southern Baptists, Garrett and Hinson trace the history of Southern Baptists and of the evangelical movement, seeking to find the answers to the question "Are Southern Baptists 'Evangelicals'?" Garrett is professor of historical and systematic theology at Southwestern Baptist Seminary and Hinson is professor of Church history at Wake Forest University, formerly of Southern Baptist Seminary in Louisville. Tull, emeritus professor of theology at Southeastern Baptist Seminary, provides the introduction and conclusion, which in itself is quite useful.

Garrett begins his study reviewing the history of the evangelical movement and the various usages of the slippery term "evangelical." The insight into the many meanings of the term "evangelical" as it has been used in Germany, England, Latin America and the

United States is very helpful groundwork for the entire book. The review of the evangelical movement in the United States is generally what can be found in numerous works of this kind like those of Ramm, Shelley, Bloesch, Dayton and Quebedeaux. Garrett opts for Quebedeaux's definition of evangelical for the basis of his study. The three criteria are (1) the complete reliability and final authority of Scripture in matters of faith and practice, (2) the necessity of personal faith in Jesus Christ as Savior from sin and consequent commitment to him as Lord, and (3) the urgency of actively seeking the conversion of sinners to Christ. This is followed by a nice overview of what evangelicals believe and what they say and do (theology, ethics, evangelism and missions). The heart of the matter is addressed in the third chapter, which includes an analysis of Southern Baptist history as it relates to the above criteria. Garrett concludes that Southern Baptists are "denominational evangelicals." This is further defined by identifying Southern Baptists as (1) Calvinist rather than Arminian, but very moderately Calvinist, (2) missionary, not antimissionary, (3) denominational but not Landmarkists, (4) conservative rather than liberal in theology, and (5) advocates of the primacy of an historical method instead of a symbolic method in interpreting the Bible. Garrett thus places the largest protestant body in the United States within the evangelical camp, with the clarification that they are first of all committed to the Southern Baptist Convention and secondarily a part of the "evangelical" surge in this country in the past decades. In reaching this conclusion he chides Hinson for reaching a negative answer to the question. Garrett believes that Hinson has equivocated on the use of the terms "voluntarism" and "evangelical." At times Hinson uses the term voluntarism when he should use voluntaryism, confusing the concepts of freedom of the will in salvation matters and freedom of the individual conscience in Church-state matters. Hinson also makes no real differentiation between evangelicals and fundamentalists, except in title only. Hinson also uses the term evangelical only in reference to Quebedeaux's third point relating to evangelism. Garrett also disagrees with Harold Lindsell's attempt to make the term evangelical apply only to those who believe in the inerrancy of Scripture. Garrett opts for a view of Biblical authority similar to that of Berkouwer or the Rogers-McKim proposal. (At publishing time, Garrett would not have been able to see the work by John Woodbridge on *Biblical Authority*, which attempts to answer the Rogers-McKim thesis.) Garrett's chapters conclude with a stirring challenge to relate evangelicalism within the Southern Baptist Convention to the multiple needs of a changing, pluralistic society.

Hinson, representing the ecumenical wing within Southern Baptist life, takes a different approach. He claims that Southern Baptists are more than evangelicals, by which he means more than evangelistic. Hinson summarizes the evangelical position by allowing a long-time spokesperson of the movement and lifelong Baptist define evangelicalism. Hinson quotes Bernard Ramm and accurately identifies the evangelical movement in distinction from fundamentalism and liberalism. Yet when Hinson begins his discussion he makes little or no distinction between evangelicals and fundamentalists. What Hinson results in doing is refuting fundamentalism, not evangelicalism. For Hinson, the two words define the same movement (cf. James Barr, *Fundamentalism*). Garrett has described the four types of evangelicals (including fundamentalists) according to Quebedeaux's breakdown. Yet Hinson, seemingly unconscious of this oversight on his part, continues to ignore the distinctions that Ramm makes or those that Garrett has so well documented in the first part of the book. This lack of accuracy causes frustration for the reader. It seems that, documentation to the contrary, Hinson reached his conclusion prior to the completion of the research. Hinson has however made an important point. Southern Baptists do not trace their roots the same way that "establishment evangelicals" do. Southern Baptists were mostly exempt from the fundamentalist-modernist controversy of the 1920s. Thus the evangelicalism that has arisen out of the fundamentalist movement is not the same as that of Southern Baptists. He points to the differences between E. Y. Mullins and J. Frank Norris. Norris was a militant fundamentalist who pulled away from the Southern Baptists

for theological and personal reasons. It is the heritage of J. Frank Norris that places fear in the minds of many like Hinson who believe that the evangelical movement within the Southern Baptist Convention will attempt to become coercive. While Hinson has many fine points, especially relating to religious liberty in Baptist life, his overall thesis relating to the question at hand is found lacking.

Tull concludes the work, summarizing each author's point of view and calling for further dialogue on the subject. It is generally helpful, with the exception of labeling Harold Lindsell a militant fundamentalist (e.g. J. Frank Norris). Lindsell, though harsh in his writing style, was one of the key leaders in the neo-evangelical movement in its origin. It is doubtful that George Dollar, a true Baptist militant fundamentalist by his own designation, would accept Lindsell into his camp. A person who writes a study Bible using the *Living Bible* as a text can hardly be considered a militant fundamentalist. Lindsell is also chairman of the board of one of the most progressive evangelical seminaries (Gordon-Conwell). Statements of this nature cloud the issues and prevent clear understanding and further dialogue. With some minor exceptions, the book is free of this type of stereotyping. This must be alleviated if the identity question seeks further answers. The book is well documented, researched and outlined (especially the first half), which makes for easy reading. The book is irenic in spirit and generally an in-house debate, but its readership should be large. I would recommend the book to all Southern Baptists, all evangelicals and all interested in the movement known as evangelicalism. A salute is due to Mercer Press for this most helpful publishing effort.

David S. Dockery

Brooklyn, New York

*Evangelical Theological Education Today: An International Perspective.* Ed. Paul Bowers. Nairobi: Evangel Publishing House, 1982.

*Evangelical Theological Education Today: Agenda For Renewal.* Ed. Paul Bowers. Nairobi: Evangel Publishing House, 1982.

*The Theological Task of the Church in Africa:* Tite Tienou. Ghana: Africa Christian Press, 1982.

The first series of papers could prove to be very significant, given at the Consultation in England that gave birth to the International Council of Accrediting Agencies (ICAA) in March 1980. The papers are truly prophetic. These four papers coupled with the paper by Paul Bowers in the second volume, "Accreditation as a Catalyst for Renewal in Theological Education," could become, if followed, the most significant event/proclamation in recent missions history. They could also be extraordinarily significant for American theological education, but I doubt that any such outcome is possible.

Learning of the ICAA's formation, I assumed that I understood it as a typical North American type accrediting body. Nothing could be further from the truth. The people involved in the leadership of this organization are seeking to pull together all we always said we wanted in theological education but never achieved.

These educational prophets are committed to raise educational standards and to provide a network for establishing credibility in mutual recognition, to be sure. But this is only a small part of the purpose. The commitment is to all-important outcomes in theological education, not to any specific form traditionally associated with "excellence."

"For what vocations are you preparing your students and what hard evidence is there that they are entering and performing successfully in these vocations?" (ACTEA, McKinney, p. 40).

"All of us know very well that a London BD is an inadequate training for ministry . . . and yet evangelical theological education in the 1980's must be built on the foundation of a cognitive knowledge of the Bible as the Word of God. It is not a scholastic or secular knowledge, but one that begins with the fear of the Lord and obedience to the Law of God. It is a Hebrew understanding of knowledge and for this reason our secularized examining system is inadequate to test the quality of this knowledge" (Nicholls, p. 8).

"The present traditional pattern of the local church with its professionally trained and fully supported clergy will of course continue in countries where there is reasonable political stability. But I have observed two major trends taking place. One is the rapid growth of a few multi-ministry local churches and the other is the multiplication of small house groups. . . . These trends have implications for theological education. . . . If they don't, such churches will develop their own autonomous Bible schools for their church members. Similarly, the small house groups will look to extension types of training for their lay leadership rather than to the residential training program of theological schools" (Nicholls, p. 13).

Two key words in the papers seem to be "contextualization" and "integration." By saying that theological education must be contextualized, the idea of making the content of theology and other course work relevant to the specific culture is of course included. The much stronger emphasis in these papers, however, is bringing the training of church leaders into alignment with the realities of the church to which they will be ministering. Theological seminary education in the West, built on the university model, is viewed as inappropriate for much of the rest of the world. The implications of this viewpoint are profound and are described in some detail in these papers.

"The curriculum as a whole and the syllabus of each course does not appear merely to have been borrowed directly from elsewhere, or to have developed on an ad hoc basis. They should rather show signs of deliberate attentiveness to the specific Christian community being served, the specific vocations for which students are being prepared, and the specific cultural context in which the students will minister" (ACTEA, McKinney, p. 44).

"If we are serious in our determination to make theological education church centered and task-oriented to mission in the world, then we cannot allow a subject-oriented program to control the patterns of theological education" (Nicholls, p. 20).

"Accreditation requirements will vary considerably from one culture to another. The western model designed for one-cultured, middle or upper-class society will be inadequate for many other situations. There will need to be more flexibility on such issues as the number of textbooks in the library, the academic qualifications of the staff, the entrance standards of the students, the curriculum requirements, and patterns of practical training" (Nicholls, p. 22).

If anything, the idea of integration is even stronger than the idea of contextualization. With great insistence the writers come back repeatedly, with thorough Biblical and empirical documentation, to the theme that theological education must be spiritual and practical as much as academic. Upon graduation the crucial questions are whether the graduate of a particular program is godly in character and effective in ministry. Their conviction is that these outcomes can be—must be—measured just as certainly as the student would be expected to pass examinations on his knowledge of Scripture and theology.

"Integration, furthermore, is not an attempt to maintain a balance between the academic, the spiritual, and the practical, as though things were done one at a time. Integration means bringing these aspects together into a whole, and doing them at the same time. Integration also involves totality" (Chow, p. 51).

One recurring theme has to do with the concept of communal living in which student and teacher have a close association. Thus theological realities can be modeled and shared, growth toward Christlikeness can be the focal point, and ministry skills can be developed in community involvement. Such a model is very compatible with educational concepts in Asia and Africa, not to mention the NT Church. Yet this model seems more and more remote in

North American Bible colleges and seminaries.

This fledgling organization made up of the Accrediting Council for Theological Education in Africa (ACTEA), the Asia Theological Association (ATA), the Caribbean Association of Bible Colleges (CABC), the European Evangelical Accrediting Association (EEAA), and the American Association of Bible Colleges (AABC), is obviously international and evangelical. But another significant distinctive must be recognized: It embraces all levels of theological education. This includes the bush Bible school, Bible college, seminary, graduate education, and nontraditional modes of educational delivery such as theological extension education.

On reflection, this remarkable new breadth seems elementary for the success of a movement that is intended to provide leadership for the Church. At the same time it reveals a gaping hole in North American accreditation. We have no association for accrediting and mutually strengthening evangelical seminary programs. If the accreditation process is viewed narrowly as validating academic standards, such an association may not be needed. If, however, we intend to meet the rapidly changing needs of the North American Church for leadership that is theologically Biblical, models personal Christlikeness and is equipped for the new cultural realities that are so radically different from the Church and society for which we currently train theological students, this void in North American accreditation may be critical in consequences. For this reason, I would recommend vol. 1 and chaps. 2 and 3 of vol. 2 as must reading for all concerned with the quality of theological education at any level in the United States. Paul Bowers, Bruce Nicholls, Bong Ro, Lois McKinney and Wilson Chow have provided a prophetic profile of what theological education ought to be, radically shortening the distance between the NT and the churches and societies at the dawning of the 21st century. Let us listen to them and not condemn ourselves to mediocrity or failure by rigidly clinging to traditions that have served their time.

The third booklet will probably be of greater value to the Church in Africa than to the rest of the world. Its significance may lie in its authorship. Tite Tienou is executive secretary of the AEAM Theological Commission and a member of the World Evangelical Fellowship Theological Commission. It was not helpful to me in discerning an outline of the thinking of African Church leadership because it seemed to simply set the agenda of what this distinguished leader feels are important issues to be addressed. How they are being addressed or should be addressed is not clear.

One of his chief emphases is on contextualization, but I am not sure of his meaning. In one paper included in the second booklet he addresses this issue of contextualization in greater detail. However, I still was unable to discern his own position or what direction he advocates as the course of the Church.

I think—but am not sure—that he would advocate a dynamic-equivalence theologizing that seeks to determine the result intended by NT authors and then to reproduce that same result in contemporary, culturally relevant ways. He says that “contextualization is capturing the meaning of the gospel in such a way that a given society communicates with God. Therein theology is born” (p. 51). Yet “the basic assumption here is that contextualization, *regardless of definition*, is both a missiological and theological necessity” (p. 42, *italics mine*). Any variety of “contextualization” is to be preferred to thinking in rigid terms of any theologically given absolutes that are transcultural and unchanging. In this he seems to gently distance himself from his predecessor, the late Byang Kato.

Let me emphasize that I am not sure this is an accurate evaluation. After careful reading and several re-readings, I am not sure what the author intends us to do in contextualizing theology. This may be because I have not yet “walked in African shoes.” This apparent imprecision is not characteristic, however, of any of vol. 1 (above) nor of several papers in vol. 2 (above). They, whether Asian, North American, or African, are lucidly clear and, in my judgment, prophetic voices to which we must listen.

J. Robertson McQuilkin