As the ninety-seventh volume in the prestigious Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, Balabanski’s University of Melbourne (1993) thesis will be approached by most with high expectations. Her goal is to undermine the widespread notion of a uniform waning of eschatological hope in the early church (‘progressive des-eschatolization’) on account of the increasing problem of parousia delay. She argues rather that the reality was more complex, with different communities displaying a notable variation of Naherwarten. Balabanski arrives at this conclusion on the basis of a selective series of exegetical studies of Matt. 25:1-13 (specifically vv. 5-7a), Mark 13, Matthew 24 and Didache 16. According to her, the evidence suggests that imminentist expectation both increased and decreased and that parousia delay did not evoke the kind of crisis that many suppose it did. She contends that the deaths of community members, internal and external distresses, the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem were all more important factors shaping the early church’s eschatological expectation than parousia delay.

After a brief but adequate introduction, we find six chapters and a summary conclusion. Chapter 1 provides a helpful survey of scholarship relating to the problem of parousia delay over the last century (since J. Weiss), with due special attention given to the important, more recent contributions of D.E. Aune, R.J. Bauckham and B.J. Malina.

In chapter 2 Balabanski maintains that Matt. 25:5-7a are a pre-Matthean interpolation (probably to be dated to the 40s or 50s) and perceives in it proof that at an earlier stage eschatological expectation had been reworked in the light of the deaths of Christians and the delay of the parousia. Specifically she claims the text reveals that the problem of the parousia’s delay had been experienced and indeed grappled with on a theological level well before Matthew was written (imminence and delay had both been synthesized and the possibility that all first-generation Christians might die had been taken on board).

In the third chapter Balabanski propounds a situational hypothesis for Mark 13: the Markan community had undergone a significant heightening of eschatological expectation and consequent destabilizing, fueled by the destruction of the Jerusalem temple...
and the influx of Judean Christians, accompanied by their enthusiastic prophets. She maintains that the present for Mark and his community is represented in vv. 5b-23, with vv. 24ff. being still future. According to Balabanski, Mark, writing shortly after AD 70, seeks to call the community back from enthusiastic eschatological imminentism to the way of the cross, warning against the prophets who had accompanied the immigrant Judean Christians. She judges that Mark includes the Judean flight oracle (vv. 14-16 and 18), which arose in very particular, local historical circumstances in Judea, because he wanted to ‘humour the Judean Christians and because he interpreted the destruction of the Temple as calling Christians back to the cross.

Chapter 4 is essentially an excursus on the Judean flight oracle and the Pella flight tradition (as found in Eusebius and Epiphanius), in which it is concluded that the idea of a single, unified flight to Pella is ‘a piece of systematising fiction’ behind which lies a kernel of truth, namely that a significant group of Jerusalem Christians had some kind of exodus, some going to Pella and some to Syria. Balabanski, building on Sowers, proposes that the circumstances leading to the flight were the assumption of the Zealots to power and specifically the appointment of Phanias as puppet high priest in 67, which was, for the Jewish-Christian prophet who formulated it, the ‘abomination of desolation.’

In chapter 5, Balabanski moves on to Matthew 24. She deduces that Matt. 24:4-31 consists of two parallel sequences: vv. 4ff. and vv. 15ff. Matthew writes after the Jewish War and destruction of Jerusalem to his community in Syrian Antioch at a time of false prophets, intracommunal conflict (what Matthew regards as the tribulation) and cold love, with the purpose of heightening eschatological expectation on the grounds that the eschaton is the next event in the divine schema. Matthew 24 is, she concludes, more imminentist than Mark 13.

Chapter 6 deals with Didache 16, which, Balabanski claims, was dependent on Matthew and indeed attempted to clarify Matthean eschatology. According to Balabanski, Didache 16 functions as parenesis and preserves an eschatological hope, but with a lessened imminentism, perceiving its era as lying before the last days, partly because of the lack of contemporary persecution.

Balabanski’s conclusion summarises the content of the chapters, before deducing that parousia delay had been dealt with quite early on in the first century of church history. Persecutions, the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem were more pressing influences on the early Christians’ eschatology. The diversity of community situations gave rise to a diversity of responses to the expectation of Christ’s return.

So what are we to make of Balabanski’s work? Positively, Balabanski’s thesis is admirably well written and lucid, concise, and clearly connects the parts to the whole throughout. Her work is, for the most part, free of typographical errors (although note, for example, that εξορυσσω on page 43 lacks its circumflex accent). Moreover, her attempt to debunk the oversimplistic notion that parousia delay led to a progressive de-eschatologization in the early church is certainly to be applauded as worthy. And her proposal that the eschatological expectation of early Christians may have varied according to circumstances is well taken.

However, certain aspects of Balabanski’s work leave us dissatisfied. Concerning her ‘selective’ choice of texts, why did she include Didache 16, which seems to contribute so little to her overarching case, and yet exclude Luke 21 (and 17:20-37), which would have been
particularly interesting in light of its explicit references to the destruction of Jerusalem and which would have been a natural and relevant concomitant of Mark 13 and Matthew 24.

More seriously, Balabanski’s work suffers from her presupposition that the precise details of each Synoptic eschatological discourse corresponded with the contemporary *Sitz im Leben* of the Synoptic authors and their communities. Hengel, in his review of Sanders’ *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah and Judaism: Practice and Belief* (TS 46 11951, 7), wrote: ‘The widespread superstition that the Gospels deal primarily with problems of their immediate present frequently leads ad absurdum.’ Balabanski’s assumption leads her to what most will regard as extremely dubious conclusions. For example, regarding Matthew 24, how plausible is it that the tribulations of Dan. 12:1 would have been understood as referring to intracommunal strife, false prophets and lawlessness? And, with regard to Mark 13, how convincing is it to suggest that the repeated use of ἐν ἡμείς in vv. 5b-23 reveals that these verses represent the present for the evangelist and his community, and then to deduce from the absence of ἐν ἡμείς in vv. 14-18 that the flight from Judea is already past? Moreover, is it not easier to believe that vv. 14-18 are rooted in authentic Jesus tradition than building an unwieldy and somewhat bizarre hypothesis, proposing that Judean Christians had only recently emigrated to Mark’s community, bringing with them an oracle which identified the abomination of desolation with the installation of Phanias as puppet high priest? Furthermore, how convincing is Balabanski’s logic when, from the warnings to beware of false prophets in Mk. 13:22-23, she deduces that charismatic prophets had accompanied these Judean Christians?

Finally, a few more criticisms of Balabanski’s treatment of Matthew are in order. First, her decision to give more weight to Matthew 24 than Matthew 25 in determining the nature of eschatological expectation at the time of Matthew’s writing is questionable; Matthew 25 leaves no doubt that delay was as important an element of Matthew’s message to his readers as was imminence. Second, Balabanski’s argument that the addition of ἐν ἡμείς in Matt. 24:29 and the mention of the ‘coming of the Son of Man’ in 16:28 constitute sufficient grounds for deciding that Matthew has a more imminent eschatology than Mark is extremely tenuous. Third, she fails to substantiate adequately her somewhat surprising claim that Matthew 24 has two parallel sequences, but that Mark 13 does not.

In conclusion, we find Balabanski’s ultimate objective to be a worthy one, the undermining of the widespread simplistic notion that parousia delay led to progressive de-eschatologization in the early church. Sadly, however, the particular case which she has developed is unconvincing and, quite frankly, disappointing.

C.R. NICHOLL
Corpus Christi College
Cambridge University


Bruce Chilton’s thesis is captured in his title. In Jesus’ teaching about the kingdom, as in the Old Testament and in early Judaism, ‘the emphasis is on the dynamic, personal
presence of God" (11). "The kingdom of God fundamentally is God, as he manifests himself for his people" (12). For Jesus the kingdom is not merely the goal of social reform (Albrecht Ritschl), nor is it purely eschatological (Albert Schweitzer); nor are Jesus' words about the kingdom mere symbols for supra-temporal realities or mystical experiences (certain members of the Jesus Seminar). No single concept is adequate to express the strength, scope and splendor of God's rule.

The author discerns five dimensions of the kingdom "in Jesus' authentic sayings" (97), all five rooted in the Psalms, all consistent with early Judaism, and all closely joined together. (1) Eschatology. God's heavenly rule is already invading the world ("The kingdom of God has drawn near"), anticipating its ultimate disclosure ("Thy kingdom come"). (2) Transcendence. God's rule, already immanent (e.g. in Jesus' exorcisms, Matt. 12:28), is destined to supersede all boundaries and to exert its power throughout the world (the parable of the leaven). (3) Judgment. The nearness of the kingdom both temporally and spatially calls for decisive action—abandoning routines (parables of the banquet, Matt. 22 & Luke 14), renouncing wealth (the eye of the needle), and seizing the true riches (parables of the hidden treasure and the pearl). (4) Purity. The worst of sinners, whether harlots or Gentiles, need not become ceremonially clean before eating with Jesus. It is their very response—that of an eager child—that makes them pure (85). By table fellowship with Jesus they are drawn to the holy God, and share a foretaste of celebrations at the kingdom's consummation. (5) Radiance. Through the preaching of John and Jesus, the kingdom forcefully goes forth, calling for an equally forceful response (Matt. 11:12, Luke 16:16), and radiating outward until God's power is universally acknowledged ("The kingdom is as ordinary and miraculous as a mustard seed," 99).

Jesus' total activity is "a parable of the kingdom" (101); Chilton focuses on two especially. (1) Jesus' commissioning of the twelve. The first four co-ordinates named above are all clearly represented in his charge—eschatology ("The kingdom of heaven is near," Matt. 10:7), transcendence ("heal the sick," 10:8), judgment ("shake the dust off your feet," 10:14), and purity ("take no bag...or sandals or a staff," 10:10). Items that pilgrims were not allowed to take into the temple: the twelve tread the land of Israel "as on holy ground, shoeless, without staff or purse," and treat offers of hospitality as themselves signs of purity, 112. But what of radiance? To be sure, the preaching itself is a "radiating center" (Matt. 11:12 & Luke 16:16); but what "reliable place or institution" is there in Jesus' commission (114) to correspond to Zion and the temple in the Psalter? (2) Jesus' occupation of the temple offers a partial answer to that question. By this action Jesus asserts his authority over the place (so Chilton prefers "occupation" to "cleansing"), and denies the priesthood's failure to safeguard "the link between worshiper and offering in the sacrificial action" (122; see 118.23). Jesus goes further: he creates an alternative cultus. "Jesus made his meals into a rival altar" (125)—a new radiating center. In his words over the bread and cup at the Last Supper, "Jesus' point was...that, in the absence of a Temple that permitted his view of purity to be practiced, wine was his blood of sacrifice and bread was his flesh of sacrifice" (125).

The heart of Chilton's discussion—chapters 3-5, summarized above—is rewarding. I especially appreciate his stress on the Hebraic, theocentric and richly diverse character of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom. Yet questions may be raised, especially at two points.

1. Jesus and the Evangelists. In Chilton's judgment some of the sayings placed on Jesus'
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lips are "authentic" (97), others have been contributed by the evangelists or their communities. For example, Jesus taught his disciples to pray, "Your kingdom come" (Luke 11:2); "your will be done" (Matt. 6:10) was a later expansion (58). Sometimes a word or work of Jesus "has been significantly changed" in the course of transmission (51); in their accounts of the cleansing of the temple, "the Gospels' picture of Jesus is distorted" (116). The Synoptic Gospels "are designed to awaken and inform faith, not to provide historical data" (50). But why should awakening faith be put at odds with providing historical data? Was it not precisely in the service of evangelism and theology that the writers determined to be responsible and trustworthy historians? See Luke 1:1-4; John 20:30-31; 21:24-25; Craig Blomberg, The Historical Reliability of the Gospels (1987); J. Howard Marshall, Luke, Historian and Theologian (new ed., 1998). Moreover, would we not expect the evangelists—guided as they are by the Holy Spirit (John 14:26), and seeking as they do to make Jesus known to their readers—to unfold rather than to alter his teachings? And to honor rather than to obscure his intentions? And why may Jesus himself not be responsible for both versions of the Lord's Prayer (as for variations on a theme in a pair or a triad of parables)? Would not the variety serve in part to discourage a magical use of the prayer?

2. Jesus and the Kingdom. Chilton discerns a shift of emphasis between Jesus' preaching and the writing of the Gospels. Whereas Jesus preached the kingdom (Mark 1:14-15) the evangelists preached Christ (Mark 1:1)—or so joined the two as to make allegiance to Jesus essential for entering the kingdom. "He who had at first preached the kingdom was now at the forefront, explicitly and without compromise, as the means—and the only means—of access to the kingdom" (140). In "the Synoptic transformation...Jesus' preaching of the kingdom becomes the seal of the divine mission, not the principle point at issue" (136). Chilton speaks of "the elaborate, largely secondary developments that the Gospels represent," and suggests that "Jesus' gospel of the kingdom may claim a hearing on religious grounds within its own terms of reference, quite aside from whether the bulk of the interpretations in the New Testament are accepted" (144). I would rather say (i) that Jesus' own understanding of the kingdom is thoroughly Christological, and that the establishing of God's rule is inseparable from his person; and (ii) that the evangelists rightly represent Jesus' own understanding, and that we perceive Jesus' view of the kingdom not by avoiding but precisely by heeding the evangelists. Their focus on Jesus as herald and guarantor of the kingdom is not "innovative," as Chilton thinks (136), but traditional. He rightly says that "at the end of a generation of development, the kingdom remained God's realm: ultimate, transcendent, perfect, holy, inclusive" (140). He would do well to stress also that each dimension of the kingdom, in Jesus' own understanding, shines with a Christological luster. Eschatology. The kingdom is inaugurated because Jesus has come (Mark 1:14-15; Luke 4:16-21, 43). It is his work—not that of contemporary exorcists—that manifests the kingdom (Matt. 12:28; Luke 11:20). It is at his return that the kingdom is consummated (Matt. 16:28). Transcendence. It is by his incarnation that the glory of the transcendent God is disclosed (John 1:14). It is the Son of God who announces the kingdom (Mark 1:1-15). "The virgin's sweet son is the Lord of the earth" (Luke 2:9-11). Judgment. Persons are being judged in accord with their responses to Jesus (Luke 7:22-23; 10:13-16). It is he who will judge them at the End (Matt 25:31-46). Purity. A person does not become pure merely by receiving the kingdom (cf. 142). Only at great cost does God
embrace people "in the purity of forgiveness" (144); it is far easier for him to cure paralysis than to forgive sins (cf. Mark 2:9). The Cross is not only the inevitable penalty for Jesus' view of the temple (123-26); it is a redemptive sacrifice, voluntarily and deliberately offered by Christ himself (Mark 10:45; 14:22, 24). For Jesus, no less than for the evangelists, "Jesus' death and the kingdom are...mutually explicating" (136). Radiance: The kingdom spreads abroad under the authority, and in the company, of the exalted King (Matt. 28:18-20). He is himself "a light for revelation to the Gentiles," he the embodiment of the salvation offered to them (Luke 2:25-32; John 8:12).

My thanks to Dr. Chilton for a stimulating and provocative study, and to Eerdmans for a volume almost entirely free of printing errors.

KNOX CHAMBLIN
Reformed Theological Seminary
Jackson, Mississippi

This volume, along with Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels (1992) and Dictionary of Paul and His Letters (1993) by the same publisher, is the most recent installment in a major Bible dictionary project showcasing English-language evangelical scholarship of the 1990s. (One more similar volume, on New Testament backgrounds, and four volumes on the Old Testament are envisioned for the future.) It treats primarily the Hebrews-Revelation portion of the New Testament. But its purview stretches beyond canonical parameters. Therein lies its particular value. There are significant treatments of the apostolic fathers (D.A. Hagner), textual criticism (P.W. Comfort), and topics like hospitality, Diaspora Judaism, and worship and liturgy; and each of these is treated not only in first-century terms but also in light of subsequent developments down to about AD 150. The New Testament did not appear in a vacuum, and its first-century importance must be gauged in part by its second-century effects. So a systematic foray into the early patristic period by most contributors is much to be welcomed.

This is an excellent reference volume for scholars, pastors, and students alike. I am using it as required collateral reading for a seminary course covering the general epistles.) Among commendable pieces may be mentioned "Death of Christ" (M.A. Seifrid), "Mission, Early Non-Pauline" (E.J. Schnabel), and "New Testament Theology" (D.A. Carson), the last of which is eighteen pages long and contains three full double-columned pages of bibliography. S. Motyer ("Cross, Theology of the") rings the changes on the old but still influential view that Luke minimizes Jesus' death and crucifixion (p. 260; cf. important discussion by Seifrid on pp. 268-271). Many more exemplary studies could be cited. This is only to be expected in a work whose list of contributors reads like a Who's Who of evangelical biblical scholars: Clinton Arnold, Richard Bauckham, Craig Evans, William Lane, Scot McKnight, David Scholer, Graham Stanton, Ben Witherington.

Technical miscues crop up here and there, as with type sizes on p. xxx and spelling on...
More problematic is the uneven theological stance reflected in various writers. Of course lockstep conformity would be neither expected nor desirable. And we are not speaking here of occasional paragraphs with no apparent place in such a work: why the Homiletics 101 lesson in a dictionary of New Testament and patristic scholarship (see “Shaping the Sermon,” pp. 954f.)? Yet one is surprised to read that after the New Testament the orthodox churches, just like the gnostics, “distort the fine balance in Paul’s thought about the resurrection” (p. 1020). This seems to blur the rather drastic distinction between those who upheld Christ’s bodily resurrection and those who did not. There is evenness between the views expressed in “Woman and Man” and “Women in the Early Church,” but at the cost of hearing from a pair of partisan voices (C.S. Keener and C.C. Kroeger, respectively) rather than a more balanced combination of scholars.

Another article asserts that Peter did not write 2 Peter (pp. 924f.). Elsewhere we are told that the New Testament contains a large number of pseudepigraphic writings; J.D.G. Dunn argues that “the most appropriate analogy” for understanding this sizable non-apostolic corpus is “the paintings that come from the studio of a great master, where the brush-strokes may not have been made by the master himself, but the character and quality and inspiration of the work can properly be said to be his, even when the work was conceived and executed after his death” (p. 984). To my knowledge, however, a signed Rembrandt discovered to have been produced by a Rembrandt disciple would still be adjudged a forgery, so the force of the analogy is limited unless one is convinced by Dunn’s arguments that false attribution does not involve “an intent to deceive and mislead” (p. 977).

A.G. Padgett avers that “Marcion’s influence on the canon of the NT...is beyond doubt” (p. 708), though it has long been argued (e.g. by Harry Y. Gamble) that Marcion chose the writings he did in part because they already held authority for pre-Marcionite churches. L.M. McDonald outstrips Padgett and states that even against Marcion in the second century the church did not respond with a canon of Scripture; the canon was rather the product of moves first decisively underway in the fourth century (p. 135). We see then that the Dictionary of the Later New Testament at times reflects scholarship considerably removed from that of e.g. B.F. Westcott on this point, who wrote: “It is a very significant fact that the first quotation of a book of the New Testament as Scripture, the first Commentary on an Apostolic writing, and the first known Canon of the New Testament, come from heretical authors. It is impossible to suppose that in these respects they suggested the Catholic [i.e. universal; orthodox] view of the whole Bible instead of following it” (A General History of the Canon of the New Testament, 6th ed., p. 312 n. 1; emphasis added).

Of course scholarship does move on, and some old views are proven inadequate. But the reader of this dictionary does well to be alert to the disparity of tones and outlooks represented. While some contributors are intelligently discriminating regarding contemporary scholarship and appropriate it positively but cautiously, others seem largely to assume the findings of the current critical hegemony and then try to articulate an evangelical perspective within this contemporary given. The composite effect of the work as a whole is
salutary, but discerning readers will find not only a gold mine of information on the topics treated but also much to provoke thought on the future of a house in some ways remarkably divided against itself.

ROBERT W. YARBROUGH
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
Deerfield, Illinois


In *No Condemnation: A New Theology of Assurance*, Michael Eaton addresses one of the key stumbling blocks that keep modern Christians from having full assurance of salvation. Eaton’s writing is driven by experience: his own experience as a Christian and as a pastor. He describes a crisis period in his life as follows: “My preaching seemed to be producing converts who were narrow-minded, introspective and pharisaical... I went to various ‘Reformed’ churches, some of them famous for their preaching. I found them cold, formal and legalistic... Worst of all I knew that some of that hard legalism was present in my own life and I possessed neither the assurance nor the spiritual power that I had had as a teenager” (6-7). Though Eaton writes from the perspective of the Calvinist tradition, those of a Wesleyan bent will find their Arminian tradition addressed here as well. Calvinists have no doubt that salvation is eternal and that the elect will persevere but have trouble knowing whether they are indeed elect. Arminians, on the other hand, can have assurance of present salvation, but no guarantee that it will last.

The negative side of Eaton’s thesis is that both the Calvinist and Arminian branches of evangelical Christianity have failed to understand properly the relationship of the Mosaic law and salvation, resulting in an inability to have true assurance of salvation. He argues, against tendencies in both, that “the Christian is totally free from the Mosaic covenant, that it is a mistake in theology to take the law as recorded in the Decalogue as a ‘rule of life,’ or as a needful tool in bringing about conviction of sin, that the Sinai covenant is in radical antithesis to the movement in history that began with Abraham, that it was an intrusion into the history of redemption...exclusively an interim measure and therefore is now of no direct relevance to the Christian.”

The first section of the book is about the “mistake in theology” made by both the Reformed and Arminian traditions. More central to his argument, however, is the detailed analysis of the biblical materials (both Old and New Testaments) that makes up the bulk of the book. Key to his discussion of the Old Testament is the nature of covenant. Eaton differentiates strongly between “covenants of grant” and “covenants of imposed obligation.” In the former, God is the oath-maker, in the latter the human participants. He notes another distinction (which I will investigate below), that the former are offered to individuals and the latter to the nation of Israel.

If the law has nothing to do with justification, and here I think Eaton is quite right, what about holiness? What is the role of Christian behavior? Dealing with this issue, Eaton distin-
guishes between salvation and "inheritance." Salvation refers to the Christian's eternal destiny and standing with God, while "inheritance" refers to the Christian's experience of God's blessings in this life and the next. Salvation is by faith, but rewards come through persistence in the faith (Eaton notes Paul's reference to Abraham in Romans 4 as an example of such persistence). As long as the Christian walks in obedience to God, he or she will enjoy these blessings. The many warning passages in Scripture (taken by Arminians to be warnings to the Christian lest salvation be lost) are, in fact, warnings about losing blessings.

It is a mistake, I believe, to focus solely (as Eaton does) on theological and hermeneutical reasons for the decline of assurance. With the rise of modern philosophy roughly paralleling the development of Calvinism (and the rise and development of Arminianism as well), it seems natural to see if there is any connection between the modern Christian's elusive search for assurance of salvation and the modern person's equally elusive search for certain knowledge in other areas. How much of the desire for certainty on salvation is an outgrowth of the larger Cartesian quest? How often has certainty been sought in the place of assurance?

Obviously there are biblical and theological reasons for speaking of assurance of salvation that antedate modernity. My guess is, however, that the proximity of the two searches for types of certainty has produced at least some philosophical influence on the doctrine of assurance. The similarity in ways assurance can go wrong in both areas seems instructive. Theologians (especially in the reformed tradition) speak of the capacity of the individual for self-delusion. Descartes speaks of the quest for knowledge being impeded by the possibility that all our empirical data is the result of a "lying devil." The place to go for certainty, says Descartes, is inward: exactly the same place Eaton shows the later Calvinists pointed. Eaton is right to point to the role introspection plays in preventing assurance of salvation (23ff). The same kind of introspection reigned in modern philosophy from the time of Descartes, leading ultimately to the "problem of other minds" being taken seriously in this century.

I find a related echo of modern thought in Eaton's account of individualism. While he rightly critiques the traditional connection between Law and salvation, he nowhere questions the traditional assumption that salvation (at least for the Christian) is an individual phenomenon, comprehended under the terms of acceptance by God. In the Old Testament salvation clearly has a communal dimension, even outside the Mosaic covenant. God's saving work for the people of Israel (as described in Exod. 19:3-6) seems to fit as an outgrowth of God's prior promises to Abraham (Gen. 12:1-3). A significant part of what salvation is about in the Old Testament is inclusion in the people of God. This element carries over into the New Testament, most explicitly in Ephesians and 1 Peter 2.

Accepting an inescapable communal dimension of salvation would require three reconsiderations of Eaton's work. First, is the hard distinction between the "covenant of grant" and the "covenant of imposed obligation." I think Eaton is close to the right track here, but must reevaluate the role of individuals and communities in each kind of covenant. Second, and more importantly, Eaton must move beyond the parameters of this work and reconsider his underlying commitment to a theory of the work of Christ that focuses solely on the cross. If salvation has a corporate dimension, there is new reason to include the life and ministry of Jesus (which includes the gathering of a band of disciples) in any understanding of the nature of salvation. This will in turn require a third reconsideration. If inclusion in the
people of God and life in the Body of Christ is part of what salvation is all about, the dividing line between salvation and "inheritance" becomes less clear. Eaton qualifies his work as a "beginning" of the answer to the problem of assurance. I look forward to his future contributions to the study of salvation.

RICHARD HEYDUCK
Houston, TX


Ninety-one profiles were culled from a list of more than two hundred prospects by two editors working with nearly two dozen scholars of American religion offering comment and criticism in order to select the data for this volume. Then seventy-five scholars served as the writers of the final product which undoubtedly deserves to be listed as an important new reference work presenting critical, analytical, and interpretive essays as a superb introduction to America's theologians for the beginning and specialist student.

This volume is a response to the blossoming of serious interest in American theology in the 1960s, and represents a more inclusive and even-handed selection of those individuals who have contributed to this discipline than previous attempts have achieved. A wider definition of what constitutes theology in America is embodied in the selections made in the book. Brite Divinity School and Texas Christian University are to be commended for supporting and funding this venture. It is probably unfair to single out names of contributors, but the following cannot escape mention (for various reasons) as representative of the full list: Martin E. Marty, Mark A. Noll, E. Brooks Hollifield, Jerald C. Brauer, Nancy A. Hardesty, Susie C. Stanley, Russell E. Richey, Robert T. Handy, W. Creighton Peden, James H. Cone, Delores E. Rogers, George M. Marsden, Dennis P. McCann, and Roger E. Olson.

Makers of Christian Theology in America offers students of religion a resource for understanding the unfolding story of Christian theology in America. It provides orientation to the field rather than persuasion for a particular orientation in theology. This is an intellectual history of all the important themes and theologians in American history. One notes the absence of Douglas John Hall, a Canadian, as well as Enrique Dussell, an Argentinian who now works in Mexico: these are probably not included in the definition 'American', but what about Justo L. Gonzalez (albeit Dussell and Gonzalez are church historians).

The essays include basic biographical data on the life, work, and writings of each theologian, analyses of the key theological issues or concerns in their careers, critical reflection on these major themes, and assessments of their influence and significance for subsequent developments. Brief bibliographies at the end of each essay guide readers to the most useful primary and secondary sources. This is one of the book's key features: it awakens interest in direct access to the primary sources. Something of the depth and breadth of the riches of American theology are proffered to the reader.

Specialists and non-specialists will find it needful to consult this volume. Ideal as an
introduction to the field of theology in America, it also provides strong resources for students of the history of Christian thought and historical theology. Students of ecclesiology too will find this a necessary resource. The work calls for another volume in the style of editor David Lotz’s *Altered Landscapes: Christianity in America, 1935-1985* (Essays in Honor of Robert T. Handy, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989. Such an analysis of the shifts in the theological landscape over the period in question would be invaluable. Have the shifts been from the mainstream to the margins? From christological to pneumatological symbols and language? From denominational and institutional structures to the growth of small groups and private and personal fulfillment? (for example, see Robert Wuthnow, John Wilson, and other commentators).

DAVID P. WHITELAW, D.T.H.
Point Loma Nazarene University
San Diego, California


Glenn Miller’s new book on modern church history is a contribution to what is in reality a three-volume series on the history of the church from the early church (Glenn Hinson) through the Medieval church (Carl Volz) to Miller’s volume. Though each volume can stand on its own, the authors have been careful to avoid undue overlap and clearly have intended all three to be read as a set. Moreover this set is one of the relatively few works, considered as a whole, in recent years which has attempted the grand sweep of church history. For this, each author individually and all three as a group are to be commended, as this task is fraught with historiographical “land mines” at every turn—what to select and what to omit in a modest sized book intended to appeal to the layperson without insulting the intelligence of the scholar. Miller, in particular, faces a formidable selection process for several reasons. First it is not altogether clear that the late Medieval church should be considered along with Volz’s volume instead of Miller’s work. In addition, so much has happened in church history in the last 200 years that the selection process can become nightmarish. In a book of its size and with its apparent intent, how much detail should be given to the Reformation versus the Ecumenical Movement, how much to Catholic versus Protestant traditions? With these issues in mind, below I will point out some of the strengths of Miller’s book along with its weaknesses, knowing that in the process my own criticisms are subject to question and the demand for justification.

The greatest strength of this book is its inclusion of clear and readable historical context in “secular” history as a backdrop for the history of the church. For example, Miller ties his discussions of the greater and lesser individual writers and theological currents to movements and events such as the scientific revolution (if it can be denominated as such), the Enlightenment and its 17th-century background in the general intellectual milieu, the American and French Revolutions, the Industrial Revolution, the major philosophical developments which affected the history of the church and its theology, the American
Civil War, and the 20th-century dictatorships and the cold war. In doing so, Miller provides a valuable service to his general readers and even to those scholars outside the church who might use the text for a general background in the religious realm.

In addition Miller has not succumbed to the temptation to treat only the major individual theologians and movements. In other words, he does not adopt the "great man" theory of history writing to an inordinate extent, though it is inevitable to a certain degree. Many more obscure, interesting and influential (despite their relative obscurity) figures are treated with clarity (for example, the Dutch mystics, the so-called "popular enlightenment" which Miller argues "forced the churches to become a 'popular' movement" [p. 89], and the Dutch Precisionists [pp. 72ff]). Clearly Miller's work attempts to draw upon the best of social historical methods while at the same time not ignoring intellectual currents. Such a balance is difficult to achieve but Miller in my estimation has achieved it with reasonable success.

However, the book does contain a few flaws and one particularly glaring omission. To take the latter first, nowhere in the book (nor did I find any reference to it in the index) was I able to find any discussion of the origins and rise of Arminianism in the 17th century and on. He does of course, as expected, treat Wesley and related movements, but it seems that to leave out Arminius and the movement which followed him (and modified his own views) is to commit a cardinal sin in the writing of church history. The Arminian tradition has continued to exert a tremendous and virtually incalculable influence upon the church and as such it deserves at least some treatment. In addition, though less crucial but yet important, Miller has no discussion of the development of Protestant Lutheran and Reformed Orthodoxy of the 17th and early 18th centuries, though he does mention the related, but also very different because of its use of Ramist logic versus Aristotelian logic, Puritan movement, thereby touching to a small degree on theological rationalism (which however was only one aspect of the Puritan movement). Miller does mention briefly American Presbyterianism which by and large carried on the banner of the continental Reformation and even the Post-Reformation period (students of Hodge at Princeton Seminary for many years read Turretin's massive Latin theological, and Aristotelian, tome), but even here he gives but short shrift to the Presbyterian and Reformed traditions which were so influential until the mid-19th century and even today have many, at least partial, adherents (for example the Particular Baptists). Beyond those faults, I have enjoyed my forays into Miller's book immensely, as he writes quite clearly and succinctly.

In summary, this work is especially recommended, subject to the limitations mentioned, for the lay reader and for the history scholar who needs an easy and short work on the place of the modern church and its relation to the broader historical contexts of its day. Nevertheless, I would like to see the author expand his work to include the important Reformed traditions after the Reformation period itself, including and especially Arminianism. Finally, Miller's suggestions for further reading, while adequate, could have been a bit more comprehensive, though again, I am aware that his audience will probably not be found among scholars. Nonetheless, nothing would have been lost had Miller included a lengthier list of works related directly to church history at a more advanced level. In addition, since the author was concerned to give the reader the social and historical contexts of the various movements in church history in the modern period, he might
have included in his bibliography some mention of one or two good texts dealing with intellectual history generally of this period, for example, Franklin Lee van Baumer, *Modern European Thought: Continuity and Change in Ideas, 1600-1950* (somewhat dated but still a sort of traditional classic) or Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America* or the same author’s *The New England Mind*. The above mentioned works do not, to be sure, represent the latest scholarship in intellectual history, but they and others like them would serve usefully for further and more advanced reading for those wishing to pursue the background of church history in greater depth.

MARC A. CLAUSON
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky


David Rightmire is uniquely qualified to write this biography of Gunpei Yamamuro (1872-1940), the leading Salvation Army officer in the establishment of The Salvation Army in Japan. David Rightmire has written extensively on The Salvation Army, including his previous significant work for The Scarecrow Press entitled *Sacraments and The Salvation Army: Pneumatological Foundations*. The son of Salvation Army officer parents whose overseas appointments included Japan, David lived in Japan for many years and therefore was able to write this biography with insights into Japanese life and culture which would be impossible for another author.

Rightmire places the rise of The Salvation Army within the context of the rise of Protestant Christianity in Japan, and the concerns of missiological methods and goals of the nineteenth century. But more important to the subject matter, the author places the rise of The Salvation Army in the context of the Wesleyan-holiness mission to Japan, the Army being one of the earliest expressions of that aspect of Protestant missions to arrive, in 1895, in Japan. The young Yamamuro was attracted to the ministry of The Salvation Army, moved by both its holiness message of sanctification for the believer and the natural expression of Christianity in caring for the poor.

This book provides an excellent and enlightening analysis of how Yamamuro adapted the measures of this militaristic and disciplined branch of the Christian church to Japanese life and culture, and demonstrates precisely how invaluable Yamamuro was to the establishment of The Salvation Army in Japan through his tireless ministry, which included both the spoken and the written word as well as various administrative responsibilities and work for social justice. His *Heimin no Fuhuin [Common People’s Gospel*, written in colloquial Japanese and published in 1899, “was to become a classic in Japanese Christian Literature” (p. 57). It went through approximately 330 printings and sold up to three million copies. Also, Yamamuro well represented the work of the Army to the general public and to the Emperor. The Emperor would grant an audience to General William Booth, the founder of
The Salvation Army, as well as to two of his children and successors.

The author provides invaluable insight into the relationship of The Salvation Army to the state, and deals sensitively with the issue of Yamamuro's cultural adaptation of the mission of the Army in Japan while at the same time maintaining a firm commitment to biblical Christianity. Likewise, he does not ignore the difficult days of Yamamuro's ministry when a spirit of ultranationalism leading up to World War II infected The Salvation Army, and called into question the British governance of this international movement. Yamamuro would not live to see the day when the Army was disbanded by the state. However, it was undoubtedly largely through the work of Yamamuro that The Salvation Army in Japan survived any ultimate recriminations and is at work in Japan today.

David Righi-mire has done a service in remembering that man whom the Japanese government proclaimed in 1956 as "one of the greatest social workers in Japanese history" (p. 164). He has well portrayed a man within his religious and cultural contexts, but has not ignored the question of precisely how to relate the message of the gospel to national purpose and national identity. Especially critical in this book is the reminder of the influence and leadership of non-Westerners in the life and ministry of the Church, and therefore the book is a timely reminder that when we look at the body of Christ on earth we look at an international community of believers.

ROGER J. GREEN
Gordon College
Wenham, Massachusetts


A renewed interest in Christian ethics and ethical theory has produced a number of recent works that attempt to identify proper foundations and methods for a distinctively Christian ethic. In the revised edition of his book, What Are They Saying about Scripture and Ethics? William C. Spohn explores how leading theologians are using Scripture in writing about ethics (p. 5). Spohn's purpose is to examine the use of Scripture in modern ethical theories that have a distinctively Christian content, and offer a constructive argument in favor of the model of Scripture as a basis for responding love. In order to accomplish this Spohn first examines and evaluates four different ways in which Scripture has been used as a basis for moral guidance: Scripture as the command of God, as moral reminder, as call to liberation, and as call to discipleship. Spohn then explores and argues in favor of a fifth model, which understands Scripture as the basis for responding love.

Spohn uses four theoretical and methodological presuppositions that serve as premises for his exploration of how Scripture is used in ethics. The first presupposition is the need for a sound hermeneutical method for applying Scripture to ethics. "In order to discover what transforming truth and promise Scripture has for us we turn to hermeneutics, that is, engaged interpretation of authoritative texts" (p. 8). Spohn focuses on three stages of reflection that originate from Thomas Ogletree. First, one must recognize one's own point
of view by acknowledging "biases that stem from race, class, gender, and the like" (p. 9).
Second, one must discern the points of view of the biblical authors by understanding their
socio-historical contexts. Third, one must bring these two points of view into a dialogue
that results in a discovery of "shared meanings and critical disagreements in a creative
interpretation which expands the world of meaning of the reader" (p. 10).

The second presupposition maintains that, because the rhetorical setting of Scripture is
dominated by a community orientation, Scripture cannot be approached by an isolated
individual (p. 11). Therefore, since social ethics is also communal in nature, the "connec-
tion between what the text meant morally in its setting and what it means today" must be
made in community (p. 12).
The third presupposition is a set of four sources from which a Christian ethic may be
drawn. The first source is Scripture from which is drawn the mandates that must charac-
terize a Christian ethic. The second source is tradition, which provides ethics the accumu-
lated wisdom of one community's presentation of the gospel. The third source is moral
philosophy, which "incorporates the best rational accounts of human value and obliga-
tion" (p. 12). Spohn identifies the fourth source as empirical data, which is gathered from
the social, biological, and personality sciences. This source provides "the descriptive foun-
dation for normative reflection guided by Scripture, tradition, and ethics" (pp. 12-13).

The fourth presupposition concerns three stages that are necessary to analyze properly
the use of Scripture in ethics. The first stage concerns the selection of texts. This involves
questions such as, which authors, eras, and literary genres are to be given greater impor-
tance in selecting the texts to be used in developing a Christian ethic? The second stage
involves the process of interpretation, which focuses on the why? question. Because "any
consistent theology hangs together around particular theological symbols and doctrines,"
Spohn maintains that sound interpretive methodologies must be practiced for developing
a sound ethic (p. 16). The third stage, application, focuses on the how? question, such as
how are texts to be interpreted and applied to the ethical mandates of Scripture?

Spohn considers this final stage particularly essential because many past ethical theories
have suffered from either weak or assumed applications to the needs of the community.

The first model Spohn examines is Scripture as the command of God. As examples of
this approach Spohn engages the writings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Karl Barth. For
Bonhoeffer Jesus "demands that the individual leave behind ordinary life and pursue an
uncharted path of fellowship with him" (p. 22). As a result, Bonhoeffer focuses on those
passages of Scripture that illustrate this understanding, such as the calling of the rich
young man (p. 25). As a result of this model, Bonhoeffer views the message of the cross
as a moral standard for the believer.

Barth, on the other hand, had a different approach. Spohn asserts that Barth offers the
most theologically thorough approach to Scripture as the command of God. For Barth,
according to Spohn, divine commands are direct and absolute. Hence, "the important
moral virtues for Barth are attitudes that lead to prompt and wholehearted obedience" (p.
29). Spohn identifies in Barth two criteria for discerning a command of God. First, since a
divine command is permission prior to it being a command, it must correspond to the
"central quality that God has manifested in history, namely, graciousness" (p. 33). Second, a
divine command always directs one towards imitating the example of Jesus Christ, because
"he is the pre-eminent and definitive manifestation of God's grace" (p. 33). For Spohn this model is incomplete and inadequate because it often leaves the moral agent underdeveloped (p. 37). However, Spohn believes this model continues to have a positive influence.

The second model is Scripture as moral reminder, and is based largely on the concept of natural law, and uses moral philosophy as the starting point for Christian ethics. Spohn examines the writings of Josef Fuchs and Bruno Schuller in order to explore this model. However, because of this model's naturalistic approach to ethics, Spohn criticizes those Catholic moral theologians who question whether Scripture adds any significant information to ethics. These theologians, known as the autonomy school, deny that there is any specific Christian ethic. Spohn rejects this approach based partly on challenges to it by Vincent McNamara. Spohn believes that McNamara argues "convincingly that there is considerable confusion in the distinction between religious motivation and autonomous moral content" (p. 49). Christian moral practices, such as voluntary poverty and self-sacrifice, are difficult to "fully establish" on purely natural grounds (p. 50). Other theologians, such as Pope John Paul II, who maintain that Scripture does teach a Christian ethic, propose an approach called the faith-ethics school. Spohn finds this approach more helpful, but still insufficient because, like the autonomous school, it appears to give priority to the biblical material that will reinforce its application based on natural law.

The third model is Scripture as call to liberation. "Liberation theologians," writes Spohn, "use Scripture to underwrite a commitment to the oppressed" (p. 56). Spohn identifies two main veins of this approach, the liberation theology that emerged from Latin America and feminist theology. Gustavo Gutierrez pioneered understanding Scripture and ethics from the perspective of social and economic oppression. Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, on the other hand, seeks to "reclaim the biblical heritage for the emancipation of women" (p. 69). Spohn recognizes that this model "highlights the attitudes necessary for social transformation" (p. 76). However, there are some disadvantages to this model. One major drawback of the liberation approach for the use of Scripture in ethics is the limited scope of some liberation theologies (p. 62). For instance, Jon Sobrino does not develop an adequate theory of justice. Consequently, it is difficult to prevent his idea of social transformation from becoming corrupted by "retribution and vindictive violence" (p. 67). A second liability is the tendency of feminist theology to disregard the authority of Scripture based on the gender biases of its authors (p. 75). As a result, Scripture often becomes separated from ethics in this model. Therefore, Spohn considers this an unacceptable model for using Scripture in ethics.

The fourth model is Scripture as call to discipleship. "Christian discipleship," writes Spohn, "approaches the moral life with the conviction that the most appropriate path is the one already blazed by Jesus and that the Christian must creatively embody that way of life in all situations" (p. 77). Stanley Hauerwas, whose narrative theology has championed this approach, interprets the biblical narratives in a particular ecclesiastical manner that emphasizes the church's responsibility to shape "its members' stand against the dominant liberal culture of secular society" (p. 79).

Spohn finds several advantages to this model. First, it emphasizes the community aspect of the role of ethics in the church. Second, it critically challenges the rationalistic ethical theories from the Enlightenment period (p. 87). Third, it "broadens the definition of ethics to include the normative guidance that symbolic material brings to disposition
and character" (p. 93). However, one major problem resulting from this model is that truth often becomes what is claimed to be truth by the community (p. 87). As a result, it is difficult to understand how this model "makes its conclusions intelligible to those who have different stories" or traditions (p. 93).

The fifth model is Scripture as a basis for responding love. This model "answers the moral question, 'What ought I to do?' by replying, 'Love others as God has loved you in Jesus Christ' " (p. 96). In this model Christ plays a normative role in Christian moral reflection through the "analogy of experience" (p. 95). Spohn believes this model is the most effective of the five. He proposes that Jesus should be understood as a concrete universal, in that his story "embodies a paradigmatic pattern which has universal moral applicability" (p. 102). Hence, a Christian is able to move from Christ's story to his own by analogical reasoning. In this manner, the concrete universal (Christ) guides the Christian in three main phases of moral experience (perception, motivation, and identity) by answering three questions. First, it discerns which patterns of a particular situation are religiously or morally significant. Second, it indicates how one is to act even when it is unclear what should be done. Third, it indicates what type of person a believer is to become as an individual moral agent and as a member of a community (p. 102). Though advocating this approach, Spohn is careful to maintain that Scripture as a basis for responding love is not to be understood as the definitive model for using Scripture in ethics. Rather, it is "a constructive account which spells out the implications of character and virtue ethics, which is emerging as an important way of doing ethics today" (p. 123).

There are two main ways in which this book is deficient. First, a thorough analysis of other leading Christian ethical thinkers, such as Thomas Aquinas, James Gustafson, Gene Outka, and Oliver O'Donovan would have benefited Spohn's work. Outka's recent work on love as equal regard, self-sacrifice, and mutuality, and O'Donovan's theory regarding the relationship between the resurrection and moral order would have fit well into the scope of this book, and would have given Spohn's argument a more comprehensive foundation. Second, Spohn does not fully examine the role of virtue in natural law ethics. A more thorough analysis of the main elements of Thomas Aquinas' biblical and philosophical theory of ethics would have accomplished this and strengthened chapter two.

Despite these difficulties, Spohn's book has several valuable characteristics. First, Spohn thoroughly and critically engages the work of those who represent the models he examined. He also is careful to disregard the results he finds inadequate, while at the same time embracing those he believes are useful. Second, Spohn's treatise is comprehensive in scope. He examines ethical theories from a wide variety of Christian communities and traditions, such as Roman Catholic, Methodist, Reformed, Mennonite, and Lutheran, based on both liberal and conservative positions. Third, Spohn's work illustrates that he understands the difficulty in dealing with Christian ethics in a pluralistic world. Yet, despite this, he succeeds in presenting a balanced, thoughtful, critical, and compassionate appraisal of five leading models of how Scripture should be used in ethical theory and practice.

Overall, Spohn's book is both unique and instrumental in understanding and evaluating the state of how Scripture is being used in Christian ethics today. Through strong critical thinking Spohn provides an excellent resource for researching the dominant models of using Scripture in ethics today: Scripture as divine command, as moral reminder, as call to
liberation, as call to discipleship, and as a basis for responding love. Spohn also provides a superb example of how one may biblically, philosophically, theologically, and socially critique and learn from each theory.

DAVID ALAN REED
Princeton Theological Seminary
Princeton, New Jersey


Understanding the context of any theological enterprise is absolutely essential, and the context of the development of Luther's theology is no exception. David Steinmetz has provided an invaluable guide for the study of Luther with this work. As mentioned in the preface, this work "began as a series of lectures marking the five hundredth anniversary of the birth of Martin Luther" (p. ix), and the author noted further study in Luther which these lectures afforded him. This book is the result of a diligent study not only of Martin Luther, but of those who preceded him and those who were contemporary with him in the work of the Church and in the development of theology.

The book is divided into ten well-written and concise chapters. Some of the chapters reflect the context of Luther's theology against others equally well known for their views. This is the case, for example, in the chapter dealing with Luther and Calvin on Church and tradition, or the chapter dealing with Luther's view of the Lord's Supper in contrast with Zwingli. In these chapters the major players of reformation thinking will be known to the reader. However, there are other chapters which are rich for their dealing with people perhaps not so well known to the reader but important for understanding the formation of Luther's theology. This is the case, for example in the chapter dealing with Luther among the anti-Thomists where Steinmetz spends time explaining the writing of John Pupper of Goch, or in the chapter focusing on Luther's hermeneutics where he compares Luther's exegesis of Genesis 9 with that of Denis the Carthusian.

The reader's possible lack of familiarity with some of the people mentioned in the book should not, however, be seen as a deterrent to reading this work. Steinmetz provides enough information on these people and their historical and theological contributions to easily identify their importance, especially in relationship to Luther. In fact, the thinking of all those mentioned in the book, whether theological friend or foe of Luther, is readily available to the reader precisely because of the clear, concise writing of the author. This is a well-written text, made accessible because some of the otherwise difficult philosophical or theological concepts are made understandable with clear explanations.

The subjects for the chapters are well chosen and demonstrate the wide range of Luther's thinking as well as the reasons for his theological convictions. The personality of Luther also shines forth in the disputations that he has with friends and enemies alike, and occasionally Steinmetz will make an observation about that personality. For example, in the chapter on Luther and Calvin on Church and tradition, Steinmetz noted that Calvin
"could not agree with the ferocity of Luther’s attacks on other Protestant reformers—even reformers with whom Calvin disagreed—or overlook the self-indulgent character of Luther’s piques and rages" (pp. 85-86).

Steinmetz well noted in his preface that “Luther was born to theology as Bach was born to music or Dürer to color and light. Theological talk, disputation, and writing were meat and drink for him. It is therefore not possible to capture his full human reality without giving serious attention to his consuming theological vocation” (pp. ix-x). Steinmetz has done a masterful job of giving such attention to that vocation, but has done so by comparison and contrast rather than by merely outlining Luther’s theology. It is the context of Luther’s theological vocation which is so important to understand and which is provided with insight in this work.

This book can be helpful to many who are attempting to understand the theology of Luther—to the college or seminary student, the pastor, or the layperson interested in further theological exploration. It is not only a tribute to Martin Luther and to his enduring contributions these hundreds of years after his birth, but it is a witness as well to how a scholar like Steinmetz can make those contributions readily available and accessible to the broader Christian world and to the interested reader.

ROGER J. GREEN
Gordon College
Wenham, Massachusetts


Through an engaging and thought-provoking discussion of spiritual formation, Catherine Stonehouse invites her readers to join children on their spiritual journey. For Stonehouse, “The goal of spiritual formation is a maturing faith and a deepening relationship with Jesus Christ, through which we become more like Christ in the living of our everyday lives in the world.” (p. 21) In her discussion, the author proposes an “integrated approach” to spiritual formation that takes into account Scripture, theological foundations, the tradition of the church, and social science theory. Since the truth of God is revealed in all of creation, the mutually critical interaction between the various parts of God’s creation teaches us more about God’s truth and God’s will for humanity. In addition, Stonehouse clearly demonstrates how parents, teachers, and the faith community itself can use these sources for the benefit of the spiritual journeys of children.

This book makes three major contributions to students of spiritual formation. The first is the author’s passion for children, and this work adds a needed perspective to the literature on ministry with children. Stonehouse clearly values children and their spiritual growth as she draws on her own work with children to illustrate her proposals. The discussion of “Children in the Bible” (chapter 2) examines Scripture passages in order to draw helpful insights about nurturing children’s spiritual journeys.

A second strength of this book lies in the author’s attention to a shared role between
parents and the faith community in nurturing a child’s spiritual journey. But the author is quick to note that both rely on God’s agency and initiative at work in the spiritual formation process and in the participants. Suggestions of specific tasks and responsibilities of parents and the faith community provide helpful guidance for those who seek to respond to God’s truth in their work with children.

Stonehouse’s work with the developmental theorists is the third and major strength that particularly commends this book for church school teachers and seminary students. She represents these theories with integrity and creativity so that the theory is accessible to students, parents, and professionals alike. Stonehouse implicitly demonstrates how developmental theory informs the church’s work with children and Scripture. Bringing developmental theory into dialogue with the process of spiritual formation demonstrates how church education is enriched by the work of the social sciences. Stonehouse notes that Scripture, in turn, raises theological questions for developmental theory.

A major problem of the book is the lack of explicit connection between the first two chapters dealing with theological foundations and children and the Bible and the rest of the text. Stonehouse indicates that the goal of her work is an “integrated approach” when she asks, “Might it be possible that tradition, human experience, social science research, and Scripture all provide insights for understanding a child’s formation?” (p. 14) and affirms that this indeed is her goal.

The unmodified utilization of the Ward and Dieter models in Stonehouse’s discussion of theological foundations (chapter 1) creates a sacred/secular split that she overcomes in practice, but not in her argument for an integrated approach. Ward’s model is represented in a two-sided diagram with God revealed in creation and science as creator on one side and God revealed in Scripture and theology as author on the other. Revelation of God’s truth through creation and Scripture, as well as the human search for truth, unites the two sides. Modifying Ward’s diagram to add two-way arrows between Creator and Author, Creation and Scripture, and Science and Theology would more clearly represent the integrated goal and outcome of the author’s work.

A similar problem exists in the use of the Dieter model of theological reflection that Stonehouse adopts. Dieter diagrams two-way relationships between Tradition and Scripture, Reason and Scripture, and Experience and Scripture. This series of bilateral relationships ignores the importance of the dynamic interaction between each of these sources for theological reflection. Noting the interaction between the other three sources does add complexity to the model, but it would more accurately reflect what Stonehouse does in her work. For example, she describes a worship experience using the Good Shepherd story that brings into play all four sources for theological reflection interacting with each other, e.g., use of reason and experience in the “work time” as children interact with the Scripture story. In this modification, Scripture would still hold “special authority,” but the importance of the interaction between tradition and experience, for example, would then be viewed through the lens of Scripture for the purpose of accountability in faithful discipleship.

Stonehouse’s final two chapters bring her work together in a helpful discussion of religious language, the dangers that await those who are on the journey, and the hope that comes from a master story that guides the journey. The author describes a worship experience with children so the reader gets a visual picture of how all of the elements come
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together. However, an explicit review of the components of an integrated approach and a model developed out of Stonehouse's own constructive work would have added strength to her conclusion. But for parents and teachers of children, as well as the faith community as a whole, Stonehouse has provided new insights into the foundations and nature of spiritual formation. She challenges her readers and the church to accept their calling to join children on the spiritual journey.

SONDRA MATTHAEI
Saint Paul School of Theology
Kansas City, Missouri


Doug Strong has set out to offer an olive branch to American Christians, asking them to stop bickering at the Christian family reunion long enough to listen to some stories at the knees of their aunts and uncles, grandmothers and grandfathers in the faith. Addressing the late twentieth century split in American Protestantism between liberal social activists and conservative evangelical pietists, Strong suggests that a far more richly textured legacy is available for Christians today if we will only look hard enough at our own history.

To both the church and the academy he offers the stories of eight unsung heroes, Christians who embody the integration of these two impulses, pietism and activism, inward faith and outward action, private religion and public transformation. If we have never heard of some of these witnesses to the faith, no wonder, argues Strong, given the virtual hegemony of this “two-party system” mentality (a phrase coined by Martin Marty) within American Protestantism. In the struggle over who is right or who will win, we have lost our eyes to see “holistic spirituality” that “combines social witnesses and evangelical faith.” So much so, that the church historians have been unwitting accomplices, lifting up figures who fall easily into one camp or the other and leaving untouched Christians whose lives reflect a deeper integration of the two. At the same time, the church, in almost every denominational form, has found in itself polarized into the camps of each party, squaring off for dominance at the end of the twentieth century. It is time, then, to remind both church and academy of the strong tradition of Christians in America who have “nurtured a profoundly deep relationship with Christ and simultaneously worked for the transformation of society, thereby transcending the public/private split in American Protestantism” (xv). In eight chapters Strong offers the life stories of each of eight figures who represent the best of an integrated Christianity: William Goodell (1702-1878), Julia A.J. Foote (1823-1900), William Seymour (1870-1922), Charles Stelzle (1869-1941), Via Scudder (1862-1954), E. Stanley Jones (1884-1973), Clarence Jordan (1912-1969), and Orlando E. Costas (1942-1987). In each case, the basic outlines of biography provide the framework for showing the theme of the person’s ministry and showing how he or she successfully embodied both the evangelical and social activist impulses of Protestant Christianity.

Especially nice is the use of primary source material in the last portion of each chapter.
They are indeed “neglected gems,” as Strong calls them and offer, in some cases, the first opportunity for scholars to encounter these writings. Including excerpts from the pens of these exemplars adds depth and richness to the picture we are given. While their biographical vignettes are impressive and inspirational, it is in their own voices that these figures come alive. In their writings we can hear the “holistic spirituality” that Strong wants to present. It comes across as natural not forced, adding to the power of the witness each life makes.

Before the first chapter Strong has included a twenty-page “Introduction” which chronicles the historical developments of American Christianity beginning in the colonial period. In it he identifies the dynamics at work which have pushed the two strands of American Protestantism toward the two poles, creating this “two-party system.” In an amazingly compact space he covers a lot of ground. It is very useful as a quick survey that avoids the tedium of a blow-by-blow account giving instead a broad map to the landmarks that have defined the landscape in which Christianity finds itself at the end of the twentieth century. Strong is a careful writer, avoiding gross generalizations in the context of setting the stage for the figures he will introduce in the succeeding chapters. In the process Strong provides a mild corrective to church historians and social scientists who have treated these developments. For example, he challenges the reductionism of scholars who conclude that the primary motive of benevolent societies in the nineteenth century was social control. It is this one-lens scholarship, whether the lens is economic, social or political, that has blinded us to the historical actors who operate with multiple motives and integrate multiple lenses.

For academic settings, this book would be useful and usable in either the college or seminary classroom. It is careful, well-documented and readable. Its use of primary source material in each chapter would be especially important for students to encounter. As a supplement to an American church history survey, it may challenge some paradigms often used by offering the real lives of real Christians who defy traditional divisions.

For church settings, this book would be a great read for an adult Sunday School class, albeit a fairly committed one. While this is a scholarly book, it is not a book for other scholars only. With each chapter at about fourteen pages, it could easily be a quarter’s curriculum. Students would find models of comprehensive Christianity that challenge readers to think more comprehensively about their own spirituality. In addition, these witnesses push readers to think beyond the boxes we often use to mentally organize other Christians.

Strong has made an important contribution not only to our understanding of the history of Christianity in America, but also to ongoing conversations within American Christianity.

AMY G. ODEN
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma


In recent years the form of worship has become a point of contention. No matter the tone of the discussion, the primary question in these discussions has been, "How
As Christians have attempted to answer this question, much attention has been directed to the acts of worship employed in the worship service. Christians have considered styles of music, experimented with liturgical dance, tested drama, and have examined ancient forms of Christian worship. The question noticeably missing from the discussion of worship has been, “Why do Christians worship?” Or, “What is the objective of Christian worship?” In other words, many Christians have overlooked the theology of worship in their rush to determine the way in which they are to worship.

According to James Torrance, Christians cannot accurately determine how they are to worship without first understanding the theology of worship. Torrance is convinced that how Christians worship God must reflect who God is—the triune God of grace, and what God has done and is doing for humanity through Jesus Christ and by the Holy Spirit (p. 10). Only as Christians know who God is and what God has done and is doing can they determine how to worship (p. 70).

Torrance warns Christians that they cannot allow the contemporary quest for relevance to influence the way they understand worship. The contemporary quest for relevance, the modern preoccupation with “how,” draws attention to human experience and distracts attention from the true object of worship. The result is a form of worship that centers on human experience, rather than on the triune God of Grace. Torrance identifies this form of worship as “unitarian.”

The unitarian form of worship conflicts with the New Testament form of worship, according to Torrance. The writers of the New Testament recognized Jesus Christ as the “true agent” of worship. He is the true worshiper. Even as Jesus Christ is a Christian’s salvation, so is Jesus Christ the Christian’s worship. Proponents of the unitarian form of worship emphasize what participants do in worship. This form of worship excludes essential theological truth, and centers attention on human experience. Torrance condemns this form of worship as Arian or Pelagian. It is not evangelical, not truly Catholic, and not Trinitarian.

Torrance defines worship as Christians’ “participation through the Spirit in the Son’s communion with the Father, in his vicarious life of worship and intercession.” It is a response to what God has done for humanity in Jesus Christ. “It is our self-offering in body, mind, and spirit, in response to the one true offering made for us in Christ, our response of gratitude (eucharistia) to God’s grace (charis), our sharing by grace in the heavenly intercession of Christ” (p. 15).

Worship, Torrance explains, is Trinitarian in character. The Trinitarian form of worship contrasts with the unitarian form of worship in that its proponents emphasize the person and work of Jesus Christ, who is the basis for Christian experience. Furthermore, the Trinitarian form of worship incorporates essential theological truth, it is Trinitarian and incarnational, evangelical, and it unifies the body of Jesus Christ. This form of worship is represented in the Nicene Creed, and in the writings of John Calvin, John McLeod Campbell, and Karl Barth.

In Worship, Community and the Triune God of Grace, Torrance makes a legitimate statement against the pragmatism that so often governs the way Christians, especially Protestant Christians, understand worship. He repeatedly reminds the Christian commu-
Anyone who is interested in worship, either as a worship leader or as a participant, will benefit from Torrance’s instruction. Torrance’s devotion to Barth and his pejorative comments will cause readers to react negatively at certain points, but in spite of these weaknesses he exposes truth from which all will benefit.

ROY WILLIAMS
Grand Rapids, MI


The ten essays in this volume originated in 1993 at a theology conference held in Edinburgh, Scotland. The “pluralistic age” in the title means that the focus, scope, intent, and boundaries of these articles are wide and far ranging. The contributors, however, are not particularly global in provenance, coming mostly from the United Kingdom, with two from France. Most American readers will likely recognize only two or three of the essayists: Colin Gunton, of the group the only trinitarian theologian of true eminence, and the late Lesslie Newbigin, in what may be one of his last published works, “The Trinity as Public Truth.” Newbigin’s essay does not so much explore the intricate depths of trinitarian theology in and of itself as it assumes the apologetic and proclamatory value of orthodox trinitarian theology in the arena of public discourse.

Culture and religion, as noted in the subtitle, are themselves very big ideas, hard to shackle within any one definition. The essays correspondingly cover a great deal of territory when taken as a whole—everything from Roland Poupin’s musings on Sufism to Gerald Bray’s essay on the second century apologists—although are scholarly and disciplined when taken essay by essay.

The longest paper by volume editor Kevin Vanhoozer, is arguably the best. Raimundo Panikkar, the Indian Christian theologian with strong Hindu affinities, is often overlooked and is not here. Vanhoozer also examines the reductive thinking of pluralist John Hick, and ably demonstrates that his approach may well contain the seeds of its own destruction. Rightly seen, God as triune is both exclusivistic and pluralistic, and is “the transcendental condition for interreligious dialogue” (p. 71).

The essayists may be largely British, but the trinitarian heavyweights most often invoked are from the German orbit: Karl Barth, Karl Rahner, Jurgen Moltmann and, less decisively, Wolfhart Pannenberg. The final three essays are about, respectively, Barth, Rahner, and Moltmann’s work The Trinity and the Kingdom. Gary Badcock’s treatment of Rahner is the most eye-opening, claiming that Rahner is not really interested in the immanent Trinity and that the links between Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are underdeveloped in his theology.

Two other recent collections on the Trinity are of interest, but neither covers the precise ground of this book. Speaking the Christian God: The Holy Trinity and the Challenge of Feminism (Eerdmans, 1992) addresses the specific complex of issues pressed by feminists,
that is, how to name God properly. The general outlook of process theology dominates *Trinity in Process: A Relational Theology of God* (Continuum, 1997).

There is therefore room for *The Trinity in a Pluralistic Age*. Pluralism continues to assert itself not just in Christian theology, but across the entire academic spectrum. Indeed, every six to eight years a similar volume to this one could well appear, with new themes, fresh approaches, refined angles of vision.

Perhaps its main weakness is that its subtitle is not represented significantly in the essays themselves, at least not at the point of cultural analysis. The book promises but does not deliver a theology of culture. Robert W. Jenson's *Essays in Theology of Culture* (Eerdmans, 1995) is a better place to turn. Jenson engages cultural realities at greater penetration than the ten essayists in Vanhoozer's book, and jenson at crucial points argues trinitarianly also.

*The Trinity in a Pluralistic Age* would be well served by an index, especially considering the book's expense. *Speaking the Christian God* and *Trinity in Process* both contain indexes. Since the essays were first conference speeches, they are not overly technical but in the main "listener and reader friendly." The essays' greatest appeal may well be to professional theologians with a strong interest in the doctrine of the Trinity. However, given the pluralistic world we all inhabit, no thinking Christian can afford to remain unreflective on the very points these timely, and in some ways timeless, essays raise.

RODERICK T. LEUPP
Asia-Pacific Nazarene Theological Seminary
Metro Manila, The Philippines


*Worship with One Accord* offers us an insightful commentary, progress report, and analysis of the Christian ecumenical movement today. The book is primarily a collection of essays and lectures that Wainwright has written and delivered on aspects of Christian unity. And who could better give us the analysis, progress, and hazards of this noble venture? Wainwright's credentials include not only the magisterial (to use Don Saliers' term) *Doxology,* but nearly three decades of earnest work in behalf of ecumenism. *Worship with One Accord* draws specifically on Wainwright's work with the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches (Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry) and his experiences as the chairman of the Methodist side of the Joint Commission of the Roman Catholic Church and the World Methodist Council.

In this work Wainwright puts before us the WCC Lima Text as the best available document around which Christians are called to unite. "The division of the churches is a counter-testimony to the Gospel of reconciliation...the reality of the Gospel itself is called into question by disunity among Christians.... Can the church proclaim and transmit a gift it shows no sign of possessing?" (164).

Wainwright and Lima call us back to Patristic worship, that period before Medieval Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, as the classic practices and content around which we may
"arrive at an agreed reading of the Gospel, a unified confession of Christian faith, and a shared participation in the benefits of redemption." (p. 8) Wainwright and the Lima text cite 10 worship essentials around which they call Christians to unite.

1. The Eucharist as the Central Act of Worship.
2. Kerygmatic Preaching.
3. The Scriptures: as internal norm and instrument of transmission.
4. Prayer, particularly the Lord's Prayer.
5. Trinitarian Creeds.
7. Icons.
10. Ordination.

Each of the 10 "essentials" suggests possibilities and problems. For example, number 1. Can Protestants who formed the Church of the Word become the Church of the Table? Again, can Pentecostals, Quakers, and Charismatics who believe they encounter God directly in worship make a symbolic encounter with God the central event in worship? Wainwright does not deal with these questions.

The Trinitarian creeds Wainwright sees as absolutely essential. To these we must hold or be the victims of a militant syncretism that will emasculate the Christian faith. Wainwright sees threats of a one-world, non-trinitarian faith among many of the members of the WCC. He cites a number of examples, but the most powerful one is the "kerfuffle at Canberra." In this 1991 meeting Chung Hyun-Kyung, a woman theologian from Korea, declared that she sees the Holy Spirit as coming from Kwan-In, a bodhisattva, and goddess of compassion and the first female image of Christ. Wainwright noted that the "speech was favorably received by the bureaucratically entrenched Liberal Left" but offensive to Evangelicals and Eastern Orthodox members. (pp. 254-258).

Wainwright is realistic about the problems that face the cause of Christian unity. The challenges of trinitarianism, of the papacy, of the warring Christians in Ireland will not be solved in a fortnight. Wainwright knows this, but still chooses to give himself to the cause. "I am a systematic theologian," he says, "who holds that the Christian faith begins and ends in worship, which is therefore a constant reference point for theology... For all my adult theological life I have been engaged for the cause of Christian unity.... To the realization of that vision I devote my theological energies." (pp. 230, 273).

WESLEY D. TRACY
formerly editor of the Herald of Holiness and past president of the Wesleyan Theological Society

The strength and weakness of this book is its simplicity. It is lucid, easy to read, and plainly organized into seven bite-sized chapters, all beginning with the word "Rethinking." Yet at points readers may wish for more depth.

White focuses in turn on "Foundational Questions," evangelism, discipleship, ministry, worship, structure, and community. If you are familiar with the ideas of George Barna, Bill Hybels, Leith Anderson, and Rick Warren, you've already read this book, or at least can quickly intuit where it's going. If you're not familiar with these writers, White's book is an excellent introduction to the "seeker sensitive" approach to church life. Though the book is largely derivative, its material is packaged in a useful, accessible way.

James Emery White is the founding pastor of Mecklenberg Community Church in Charlotte, North Carolina. A Southern Baptist with a Ph.D. from Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, he has written previous books on the church, including Opening the Front Door: Worship and Church Growth. According to the author blurb at the back of the book, Mecklenberg Community Church is "one of the fastest growing church starts in the United States, experiencing over 80 percent of its growth from the unchurched."

This book is not the story of the Mecklenberg church, though it is grounded in White's pastoral experience there. White describes his congregation as "seeker targeted" (a step beyond "seeker sensitive") "targeted on facilitating the process of evangelizing seekers"—adding that the "best-known example" of this type of church is Willow Creek Community Church (located in South Barrington, Illinois, well west of Chicago).

Four kinds of churches (in terms of congregational style and structure, not necessarily doctrine) are common today. We might call these traditional, megachurch, metachurch and microchurch. Mecklenberg, Willow Creek, and a growing network of similar churches fit what Carl George calls the "metachurch model." One of the watchwords of these churches is "Growing smaller while growing bigger"; multiplying small-group units as the church increases in size. Because of their growth, media savvy, flexible organization, and laserlike focus, these are the churches that currently get the most public notice. They exist in conscious distinction from traditional churches and are really something different from megachurches, whose chief characteristic is size. ("Microchurch" is essentially the house church model.) Rethinking the Church is a good exposition of the concept, rationale, and to some degree methodology of the metachurch approach.

In content, the book is a blending of insights from Scripture, pastoral experience, and cutting-edge business practice. Its strengths include its affirmation of spiritual gifts, the ministry of all believers, and the importance of small groups and intentional discipling. It also makes the case for more contemporary styles of worship. This could be a very useful study book (together with other resources) for a leadership group in a local church that wants to rethink its role and strategies.

Throughout the book, White makes good use of illustrations and apt quotations. Personally, I found his most pungent citation this one from the book Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies: "If you add enough branches to a tree and intelligently prune the deadwood, then you'll likely evolve into a collection of healthy branches..."
well positioned to prosper in an ever-changing environment.” White uses this to illustrate that effective organizations (churches or businesses) make “their most creative developments through trial and error.” It is certainly true that one of the marks of creative, growing churches is their openness to venture, adapt, and learn from mistakes.

I found the book’s first chapter, “Rethinking Foundational Questions,” to be the weakest. White’s questions are probing and apt, but the answers don’t go deep enough. Citing Acts 2:42-47 and Matthew 28:18-20, White says “the mission of the church is to reach out to nonbelievers and develop them, along with existing believers, into committed followers of Christ.” Later he says, more simply, “The purpose of the church is to fulfill the Great Commission.” Certainly these are central to the church’s role and mission, but bibli-
cally the definition is too narrow. White simply assumes (apparently) that Acts 2 and Matthew 28:18-20 are the key biblical passages on the church’s mission. He doesn’t give his reasons for selecting them. There is no reference to the “Great Commandment,” social justice, or ministry to and among the poor; no mention of Luke 4, for instance. These are not denied; just ignored. Consequently the later chapter on discipleship is fairly shallow—
extcellent on process, but fuzzy on cost. Because of the narrowness of the initial focus, throughout the book the “success” of the church seems to be equated almost exclusively with its numerical growth. Thus, despite the focus on evangelism and discipleship, the book is more about the church for the church than the church for the kingdom of God.

One of the most intriguing things in this book is a comment in Leighton Ford’s foreword. Recalling his early days in Youth for Christ when “a visionary group of young pioneers” started many new outreach ministries, Ford detects a shift now from “parachurch” organizations to church planting: “Many of those who might have gone into parachurch ministries forty or fifty years ago are selecting church planting” today, he says. A perceptive comment.

Rethinking the Church covers a lot of material in the brief compass of 120 pages. Fairly extensive endnotes guide the reader to useful additional resources, adding some depth. The book has a select bibliography of recent books on church life and growth, but no index.

HOWARD A. SNYDER
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky