

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_sbct-01.php

SCOTTISH BULLETIN OF EVANGELICAL THEOLOGY

The scope of the *Bulletin* is broadly defined as theology, especially Scottish and Reformed, whether biblical, systematic-dogmatic, historical or practical, and Scottish church history. Articles submitted for publication should be sent to the Editor, books for review to Rutherford House (see below).

Contributors are free to express their own views within the broad parameters of historic evangelicalism. The opinions of contributors may not be assumed to be those of Rutherford House or the Scottish Evangelical Theology Society.

EDITOR: THE REVD DR KENNETH B.E. ROXBURGH, Principal, Scottish Baptist College, 12 Aytoun Road, Glasgow, G41 5RN

ASSISTANT EDITOR: DR EDWARD ADAMS, Irvine, Ayrshire

REVIEW EDITOR: THE REVD DR DAVID GRAHAM, Abbey Manse, 20 Westgate, North Berwick EH39 4AF

EDITORIAL BOARD:

THE REVD DR GEOFFREY W. GROGAN, formerly Principal, Bible Training Institute, Glasgow

THE REVD IAN HAMILTON, Cambridge

THE REVD DAVID C. SEARLE, Warden, Rutherford House

THE REVD DR W. CAMPBELL CAMPBELL-JACK, Dumfries

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

PROFESSOR DAVID BEBBINGTON, Professor of History, University of Stirling

THE REVD DR SINCLAIR B. FERGUSON, Glasgow; formerly Professor of Systematic Theology, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, USA

THE REVD PROFESSOR DOUGLAS F. KELLY, Professor of Systematic Theology, Reformed Theological Seminary, Charlotte, South Carol., USA

THE REVD DAVID KINGDON, Gwasg Bryntirion Press, Bridgend, Mid Glamorgan

THE REVD PROFESSOR DONALD MACLEOD, Principal, Free Church of Scotland College, Edinburgh

PROFESSOR DONALD E. MEEK, Professor of Celtic, University of Aberdeen

DR KEVIN J. VANHOOZER, Professor of Theology, Trinity International University, Deerfield, Illin., USA

THE REVD PROFESSOR R. S. WALLACE, Formerly Professor of Systematic Theology, Columbia Theological Seminary, Decatur, Georgia, USA

The *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* is published twice yearly by Rutherford House in association with the Scottish Evangelical Theology Society, whose officers are:

President: Professor I. Howard Marshall, University of Aberdeen

Chairman: Professor David F. Wright, Professor of Patristic and Reformed Christianity, University of Edinburgh

Secretary: The Revd Peter Cook, Bel Abri, Leadgate, Alston, Cumbria CA9 3EL Tel. 01434 381873

The *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* is indexed in *Elenchus*, *Cerdic* and *IZBG*

Subscriptions should be addressed to: Rutherford House, 17 Claremont Park, Edinburgh EH6 7PJ. e-mail: info@rutherfordhouse.org.uk
Rates: £11.50, students £5.50 Overseas airmail £16.50

EDITORIAL:

Spiritual Formation

Ray Anderson defines the 'Soul of Ministry' as 'Forming Leaders for God's People'.¹ In our contemporary context, the training of leaders within the church has often stressed the issues of professionalism, management and organisation. Sometimes, not always, this has led to a neglect of spiritual formation, acquiring skills and expertise rather than developing grace and godliness. As vital as administration and techniques might be, pastoral leadership is never to be defined by their acquisition.

In a similar vein, David Fergusson has commented that 'The tendency [in theological education] to allow models of research excellence and professional training to dominate our curricula militates against the possibility that the study of theology might actually contribute to our sanctification.'² Even as evangelicals, we have not always emphasised the importance of both belief and behaviour. At various times, and in different contexts, we have stressed one over against the other. Yet, theology and spirituality, doctrine and life, belief and behaviour belong together. Thus those who are involved in theological education 'must think of themselves as spiritual directors',³ and reclaim the truth that theological education is much more than gaining intellectual knowledge and includes the 'skill of living well'.⁴

This model of theological education may presuppose a believing community of scholars and students who are not only learning together in lectures and tutorials but praying and worshipping together. As more and more theological education is taking place in the context of secular faculties, and within the structure of university validated courses, we must be careful not to lose the cutting edge of spiritual formation as the foundation of effective ministry.

¹ Ray S. Anderson, *The Soul of Ministry*, (Louisville, Kentucky, 1997).

² David Ferguson, 'Reclaiming the Doctrine of Sanctification', *Interpretation*, 53 (1999), p. 388.

³ Ellen T. Cherry, *By the Renewing of Your Minds: The Pastoral Function of Christian Doctrine* (Oxford, 1997), p. 239.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

There is no doubt that the Christian church desperately needs to discover a clear and cogent understanding of her faith, contextualising that message and communicating it clearly to our congregations and society. Yet, as Martin Luther pointed out in the 16th century, 'By living... doth a man become a theologian, not by knowing, reading or speculation.'⁵ Luther was not condemning study, learning or knowledge but he was indicating that the spiritual disciplines of prayer, meditation and the experiences of daily life enable us to be like Jacob and 'wrestle with God', emerging from the experience 'limping but blessed'.⁶

In his own inimitable way, Henri Nouwen speaks of the 'future of Christian leadership' and calls for 'seminaries and divinity schools... to become centres where people are trained in true discernment of the signs of the time. This cannot be just an intellectual training. It requires a deep spiritual formation involving the whole person – body, mind and heart.'⁷ When we recapture such a vision of theological education as the spiritual formation of mind and heart, we will truly be 'forming leaders for God's people' within the twenty-first century.

⁵ Cited by Jurgen Moltmann, 'What is a Theologian?' *Irish Theological Quarterly* 64 (1999), p. 193.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Henry Nouwen, *In the Name of Jesus: Reflections on Christian Leadership* (London, 1989), p. 69.

'Fact Not Dogma': George Adam Smith, Evangelicalism and Biblical Criticism

IAIN D. CAMPBELL

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND, BACK, ISLE OF LEWIS

The story of the rise of higher critical views of the Bible in nineteenth-century Scotland is well-known and has been told often.¹ What are still to be explored are the attempts made during the period to integrate such critical opinions within the prevailing evangelical ethos of the contexts in which they grew, most notably the nineteenth-century Free Church of Scotland.² Within the context of the Free Church of Scotland, the events surrounding the suspension and eventual deposition of William Robertson Smith, the brilliant Hebrew Professor in the Free Church College (later Christ's College), Aberdeen, have been subjected to scrutiny in a variety of academic disciplines. But the work of George Adam Smith, who, as Professor of Old Testament at the Free Church (Trinity) College, Glasgow from 1892-1910 was William Robertson Smith's natural successor in Scottish Semitic studies, has gone largely unnoticed.³

George Adam Smith's first major contribution to scholarship was a two-volume commentary on Isaiah, published in the Expositor's Bible series (under the editorship of W. Robertson Nicoll) in 1888 and 1892. These works grew out of a series of sermons preached at Queen's Cross Church in Aberdeen, Smith's first (and only) pastoral charge.⁴ Smith's

¹ For an overview of this subject, see A.C. Cheyne, *The Transforming of the Kirk* (Edinburgh, 1983) and his *Studies in Church History* (Edinburgh, 1999), especially chapter 6.

² The most scholarly work to date dealing with this theme has been Richard A. Riesen *Criticism and Faith in Late Victorian Scotland* (Lanham, 1985).

³ Riesen's work does deal at length with George Adam Smith and his concept of 'believing criticism'. Apart from a memoir written by Smith's widow after his death, no detailed study has yet been made of his life and work.

⁴ Smith was, successively, replacement tutor for William Robertson Smith in the Free Church College, Aberdeen, from 1880-82, first minister of Queen's Cross Church Free Church, Aberdeen from 1882-92, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature at the Free Church College, Glasgow, from 1892-1910, and Principal of Aberdeen University from 1910-35.

exposition of Isaiah betrays the influence of his New College teacher, A.B. Davidson, whom Smith described as 'the real author of the greatest theological change that had come over Scotland for centuries'.⁵ The change to which Smith refers is particularly the insights of biblical criticism into the life and ministry of the Old Testament prophets. In a rare piece of personal testimony, Smith recalls a rubicon-crossing moment in Davidson's classroom:

One morning – I at least date from that day my awakening to the reality of the prophets – he said 'The prophet always spoke first to his own time'. They had 'times', then! From the illimitable futures over which, as we had been taught, the prophet's word roved in search of its vague end, from the interminable doctrinal controversies about the fulfilment of prophecy, our thoughts were drawn in to a definite bit of real life.⁶

In all his subsequent work on the prophets (Smith wrote a further two volumes on the minor prophets in the same series, published in 1896 and 1897, as well as a volume of lectures on Jeremiah in 1923), Smith applied this principle of critical investigation. What were the times to which the prophets spoke? What were the circumstances that gave birth to their ministries? And how do these help us to understand the form in which the prophetic writings have come to us? Criticism, in such a context, Smith argues, is a necessary corollary of evangelical belief, and in particular, of belief in the Bible as the word of God. 'The critic,' he says, 'is but the patient student of Scripture, searching for the testimony of the sacred text about itself, and formulating that.'⁷ Far, therefore, from undermining the witness of the Bible to Christ, criticism affords the best method of evangelical interpretation of the biblical text. In this way Smith sought to integrate evangelical faith with critical science.

Recently, however, the idea that this is possible has received sustained attack both from evangelical and non-evangelical sources. Nigel M. de S. Cameron, formerly Dean of Students at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and previously warden of Rutherford House, Edinburgh, has written that Robertson Smith and his colleagues

⁵ George Adam Smith, 'Professor A.B. Davidson' in *The Union Magazine*, March 1902, p. 111.

⁶ George Adam Smith, 'Professor A.B. Davidson, in *The Union Magazine*, April 1902, p. 162.

⁷ George Adam Smith, *Isaiah*, Vol. 2 (London, 1895), p. 22.

leave the relation of critical, historical study and the unique, supernatural, revelatory nature of Scripture unresolved. In place of developing an integrated conception of critical study in the context of faith, they are satisfied to practise a dualistic compromise.⁸

This thesis is akin to that of Richard Riesen in his work on the Free Church fathers. According to Riesen, men like William Cunningham and Thomas Chalmers accepted the authority of the Bible but then raised questions for which they had no adequate answers, and they thereby anticipated the rise of criticism in the Free Church.⁹ Spirituality, Riesen argues, forced upon them a high and reverent attitude to Scripture, while rationality required that they ask hard questions. For them the Bible had to be read both as no other book, and also as any other book. Cameron’s assessment of Robertson Smith (and by implication, George Adam Smith) is similar. His argument is that *believing* criticism is a non-sequitur. Scottish nineteenth-century theology, in his view, represents the relationship between faith and criticism as an either/or, not a both/and.

A more refined version of this view has been published by Mark A. Noll, Professor of Church History at Wheaton College, Illinois, who suggests that the meaning of the term ‘criticism’ itself is at the nub of the issue. Despite the protestations of Robertson Smith and others that criticism could be pursued as an exercise of faith, Noll argues that

In Britain during these years a certain ambiguity clung to terms like ‘criticism’. It applied both to scholarly inquiry in itself and to the results of scholarship predicated on the new historical consciousness. In addition, a certain naiveté still attended the supposed ability to work on such issues with strict academic detachment.¹⁰

In Noll’s view, scholars such as George Adam Smith could apply criticism evangelically not because of a dualistic view of criticism and faith, but because of a dualistic notion of criticism itself. If compromised by evangelical presuppositions, scholarly interpretation of Scripture could

⁸ N.M. de S. Cameron, *Biblical Higher Criticism and the Defense of Infallibilism in Nineteenth Century Britain* (New York, 1987), p. 269.

⁹ See, for example, R.A. Riesen, ‘Higher Criticism in the Free Church Fathers’, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* XX (1980), pp. 119-42. For a different perspective see Nicholas R. Needham, *The Doctrine of Holy Scripture in the Free Church Fathers* (Edinburgh, 1991).

¹⁰ Mark A. Noll, *Between Faith and Criticism: Evangelicals, Scholarship and the Bible* (Leicester, 1976), p. 71.

never be completely objective; on the other hand, the more liberal theologians could exercise academic detachment, it is argued, because they approached the text of Scripture with no such presuppositional attitude.

Another approach is the radical one presented by Alistair G. Hunter of Glasgow University at a recent (1995) conference on William Robertson Smith. Hunter's thesis is that it simply is not possible to be both an evangelical and a critic, in spite of the Smiths' assertions to the contrary. The conclusions of criticism are so hostile and inimical to the presuppositions of evangelicalism that no reconciliation is possible:

Higher criticism and traditional doctrine are not in ready harmony. Until the churches recognise this uncomfortable fact, they will be condemned to an involuntary support of those Free Church doctrines of inspiration and authority which William Robertson Smith and George Adam Smith endorsed whole-heartedly.... The church today loses out to the conservatives because of its evident pusillanimity, its craven refusal to ask serious questions.¹¹

On this basis, Hunter can speak of Smith as a man 'whose devotion to evangelical religion regardless of his critical scholarship won him friends across the theological spectrum'.¹²

On Cameron's view, therefore, George Adam Smith lived comfortably with evangelicalism and criticism because he held the two in parallel, although they never intersected. In Noll's thesis, he could do it because criticism meant for him, and evangelicals like him, a scholarly, but not wholly objective, approach to Scripture. In Hunter's view, he holds his evangelicalism only by disregarding his critical insights. From each of these theses a different George Adam Smith emerges. In the first he is dualistic. In the second he is naive. In the third he is a coward.

It is doubtful whether Smith would have recognised himself in any of these caricatures. It was his contention, not only that his faith and his critical views cohered but that they supported one another. Riesen's work on Davidson and the two Smiths concludes that 'it was George Adam Smith, by all accounts the least theological of the three, who came closest to a kind of consistency between his faith and his criticism'.¹³

¹¹ A.G. Hunter, 'The Indemnity: William Robertson Smith and George Adam Smith', in W. Johnstone (ed.), *William Robertson Smith: Essays in Reassessment* (Sheffield, 1995), p. 65.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 61.

¹³ Riesen. R.A., 'Faith and Criticism in Post-Disruption Scotland, with particular reference to A.B. Davidson, W.R. Smith and G.A. Smith', Ph.D.

Even at this, however, Riesen qualifies his assessment by suggesting that ‘It is not so much that he had worked out the theological inter-connections as that his view of the Bible and his view of faith seemed to require less conciliation’.¹⁴ Riesen’s thesis is that as a preacher, George Adam Smith was more concerned to employ criticism to cast light for men on the meaning of Scripture than to pursue scientific criticism for its own sake. Arguably, that is precisely what made Smith an ‘evangelical’ critic – the fact that he regarded criticism as introductory, and not terminal; it was the first question, but not the last. Critical evaluations of the Old Testament were, in his view, preachable, and not simply the preserve of aimless scholarship. They served the purpose of the evangel.

The question is still pertinent, therefore, for Scottish theology and scholarship, a hundred years after Smith. Does an espousal of critical views of the Bible undercut or underpin evangelicalism? Can one be a believing critic without being open to the charge either of duplicity, naiveté or cowardice?

This article will examine this question with reference to George Adam Smith, by looking, first, at his evangelical inheritance, secondly at his critical approach to Scripture, and thirdly at his own methodology for achieving a synthesis, or at least a working relationship, between faith and criticism.

George Adam Smith’s Evangelicalism

Part of Smith’s apologetic for the role of criticism within the church was the fact that ‘In this country at the present day nearly every leader in Old Testament criticism... is a believer in evangelical Christianity.’¹⁵

This meant an affirming on their part of ‘the truths which must be the strength of all Christian preaching. The sovereign grace of God to sinful men, the Divinity of our Lord, His atoning death and resurrection, the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Church – these are held and held heartily by critics among us, the most learned, the most sane, the most free, the most advanced.’¹⁶ The affirmation of these distinctly evangelical elements appears at various points throughout Smith’s writings, both published and unpublished. Some of his letters reveal an extremely robust evangelicalism. To his brother-in-law, David Ross, he wrote in 1883:

thesis, Edinburgh, 1981, p. 471.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ George Adam Smith, *The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Age* (London, 1893), p. 33.

¹⁶ *Idem.*

...of course you can always say the atonement was a fact. It really took place – this sacrifice for sins, if we are to believe the Bible. So that I suspect it is new to most people, and so you can come down on them with the message of it. Thunder it out in big letters – ‘not a dogma but a FACT!’¹⁷

Such aggressive evangelicalism was the legacy of three relationships which involved Smith in his formative years.

Smith and his Father

The first was with his father, George Smith, with whom he was extraordinarily close. The closeness was unique if only because, for the formative period of Smith’s childhood and adolescence they were in different continents. Smith’s father had gone from Scotland to India in 1853 to work in a private school there. Eventually he became co-proprietor and editor of *The Friend of India* newspaper. Although strictly speaking a layman, he was to describe himself as ‘having a personal interest in the missionaries of the Free Church of Scotland’.¹⁸ Indeed, George Smith saw his educational work in India as a valid and necessary means of mission work in Calcutta. Later he would return to Scotland, holding a strategic post as Secretary to the Foreign Missions Board of the Free (and later the United Free) Church of Scotland.

For most of George Adam Smith’s childhood, however, his father was absent. For his health and safety, the child born to George and Janet Smith in Calcutta in 1856 was brought home to Scotland in 1859 to be brought up by two aunts in Leith. Smith senior did not return to Scotland permanently until 1875.

Despite the physical absence, however, George Adam Smith and his father kept in touch regularly by letter. The correspondence developed and deepened over the years so that there was fostered an intimate relationship more akin to friendship than to parental kinship. His father, on his part, sprinkled his correspondence with frequent evangelical references to the need for a relationship with God’s Son on the part of his own son: in 1866 he writes: ‘you are now old enough to understand me when I ask you if

¹⁷ George Adam Smith to David Ross, 1883 (no date), National Library of Scotland (NLS), Acc. 9446, No. 6.

¹⁸ George Smith, ‘Half a century’s growth of Protestant Missions in India’, *The Missionary Record of the United Free Church of Scotland*, No. 25 (January 1903), p. 8.

you feel that you love Jesus Christ...’¹⁹ and three years later: ‘It is my daily prayer that you and you all may be Christ’s’.²⁰

In his turn, George Adam Smith wrote to his father of life at home, of his developing interests and of his studies. After graduating in Arts at Edinburgh in 1875, when his father came to live in Scotland, the family were together for the first time.²¹ Smith entered New College from 1875 to 1878, studying in Leipzig and Tübingen during his course, and visiting Egypt and Palestine. His travels in the Orient were to develop into a deep interest in Palestine, and his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* was to be among his lasting achievements and contributions to Scottish theology and enquiry. His commitment to academic excellence was marked by the awarding of several honorary degrees from both sides of the Atlantic, and his being made a Fellow of the British Academy in 1916, his moderatorial year and the year in which he received a knighthood.

However, on the threshold of his ministerial career in 1880, Smith was unsure which way to turn. He did not wish to take up a full ministerial charge in Scotland, and the possibility of being a replacement tutor in Hebrew language during Robertson Smith’s suspension from Aberdeen College appealed to him. Two assistantships were offered him from Scotland, and eventually he accepted the post as assistant to the Revd John Fraser of Brechin West Free Church, where he served from June to November 1880 before being appointed to the tutorship in Aberdeen. He served in this post over the two sessions 1880-82.

Smith’s correspondence with his father in 1880 reveals his agitated and uncertain state of mind regarding his own career. One interesting aspect is his willingness to consider foreign missionary work. ‘Of course,’ he wrote to his mother, ‘I would go to no place but India if I went at all. Don’t let any one know that I am even thinking of it.’²² To his father he confided that ‘Foreign Missions... have a great attraction for me, an attraction that has grown the more I have seen of missions here [in Egypt]. But I am

¹⁹ George Smith to George Adam Smith, 6 January 1866, NLS, Acc. 9446, No. 3.

²⁰ George Smith to George Adam Smith, July 1869, NLS, Acc. 9446, No. 3.

²¹ George and Janet Smith had had eleven children, one of whom had died in infancy. Most had been brought to Scotland in their young days and were cared for by their aunts in Leith, whose interest in their young wards was as good and as wholesome as that of any parent.

²² George Adam Smith to mother from Cairo, 17 March 1880, NLS Acc. 9446, No. 16.

willing and indeed must leave the question open to prayer till I return.'²³ Similarly, he speaks of the possibility of working in Scotland. Of this possibility he says to his father, 'if I am to be at home I should like to be where there is some work to be done among our home heathen. I hate the prospect of returning to a big congregation.'²⁴

This correspondence with his father, therefore, reveals a mind predisposed to the claims and aims of evangelicalism, and a heart interested in the work, whether at home or abroad, of evangelism. What Smith knew of his father's work in India, as well as the little exposure he himself received of mission work, kindled within him a desire to see the Gospel spread and to see many lives influenced by it.

Smith and Henry Drummond

Second, there was his relationship with Henry Drummond, whose biography Smith would eventually write. Slightly older than Smith, Drummond's later work would be to engage in synthesising Darwinian evolution with biblical Christianity. He became Professor of Natural Science at the Free Church College in Glasgow from 1884-94, where he was for a little time a colleague of Smith's.

Drummond worked extensively with Dwight L. Moody and Ira D. Sankey when they came to Scotland in 1873 with their American-style evangelism and revivalism. Smith writes enthusiastically of the Moody and Sankey campaign, claiming that it helped 'to pour fresh power into the routine of Christian work'.²⁵ Of Moody's preaching, Smith claimed that 'His gospel, which had its centre in the Atonement, was the gospel of an Incarnate Saviour.'²⁶ Following the campaign, Drummond preached extensively in different parts of the country, as an itinerant evangelist whose preaching, says Smith

ranged over all the great doctrines and facts of Christianity: Sin and Salvation, Penitence, the Atonement, Regeneration, Conversion, Sanctification, the Power of the Spirit, Christ's Teaching about Himself and about a Future Life.... He stuck close to the Bible.... His theology was practically that of the leaders of the movement; and among crowds who were always more or less ready to mark the slightest defection from

²³ George Adam Smith to father from Cairo, 15 March 1880, NLS Acc. 9446, No. 16.

²⁴ *Idem.*

²⁵ George Adam Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond* (London, 1898), p. 56.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 57.

orthodoxy, there appears never to have arisen any suspicion of a difference between his teaching and the teaching of the authorities.²⁷

All this Smith quotes and recalls with great approval, especially commending Drummond for seeking ‘to win the reason of men for religion’.²⁸ He began, says Smith, with ‘the presentation of facts’, and ‘the unfolding of laws’, not attempting to rouse men’s emotions or affections without presenting them first with the concrete facts of the Evangel. When Drummond died in March 1897, Smith, who was Clerk of the Senate at Trinity College Glasgow, penned the following tribute in the Minutes of the Senate:

[Drummond] was the living embodiment of what many a thoughtful Christian in this age seems to be seeking for with almost passionate earnestness – a Christianity which has for its roots to know the personal God and Father, revealing himself sympathetically to the personal soul.²⁹

Writing his biography the following year, Smith described Drummond as ‘a young man, trained in an evangelical family and in the school of the older orthodoxy, who consecrated his youth to the service of Christ, and never all his life lost his faith in Christ as his Lord and Saviour, or in Christ’s Divinity or in the power of His Atonement; but who grew away from many of the doctrines which when he was young were still regarded by the Churches as equally well assured and indispensable to the creed of a Christian: such as, for instance, belief in the literal inspiration and equal divinity of all parts of the Bible’.³⁰ This statement sheds light as much on Smith’s evangelicalism as on Drummond’s. Smith could state with approval that Drummond had advanced, in line with critical thinking, on the older, dogmatic views of the Church on the nature of the Bible, while at the same time never jettisoning the facts of revelation as they centred

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 94. It is, perhaps, worth noting that Smith wrote this in defence of Drummond, whose orthodoxy, as Smith hints in the passage, was not always acknowledged. As David Bebbington has recently argued, Drummond re-formulated many favourite evangelical emphases, wishing ‘to remain within the evangelical movement, if necessary by stretching its boundaries’ (‘Henry Drummond, evangelicalism and science’, *Records of the Scottish Church History Society* 28 (1998), p. 131.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

²⁹ Trinity College Senate Minutes 12 March 1897, Archives of Trinity College, DC84, 1/1.

³⁰ Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond*, pp. 13-14.

upon Jesus Christ, both in his Person and Work, as the fundamental elements of the Evangel.

Smith and William Robertson Smith

A third relationship which was of importance for Smith's evangelicalism, was, ironically perhaps, that with William Robertson Smith. As a Free Church divinity student of the 1870s, George Adam Smith was acutely aware of the ecclesiastical controversies of the time, and in particular the controversies over Robertson Smith. If A.B. Davidson was the proponent of the new critical attitude to the Bible in Scotland, Robertson Smith was the propagator of it, taking as his basic assumption that

The higher criticism does not mean negative criticism. It means the fair and honest looking at the Bible as a historical record, and the effort everywhere to reach the real meaning and historical setting... of the Scripture records as a whole.... This process can be dangerous to faith only when it is begun without faith – when we forget that the Bible history is no profane history, but the story of God's saving self-manifestation.³¹

Robertson Smith argued that his attitude to the Bible was of a piece with that of the Reformers, who 'had got a new way of looking at the Bible, a way that enabled them to find in Scripture a living and powerful Gospel'.³² This was unlike the earlier allegorical approaches to Scripture which had done nothing either for the Gospel or for the church; both evangelistically and ecclesiastically the allegorical interpretation of the Bible meant that it was

impossible to interpret Scripture rightly so long as men sought in it for what it did not contain – for a system of abstract intellectual truth instead of a Divine history of God's workings among mankind, and in men's hearts, to set up on earth the kingdom of heaven.³³

George Adam Smith traces the influences of this approach in Scotland through A.B. Davidson and through Robertson Smith. Davidson he

³¹ William Robertson Smith 'What History Teaches us to seek in the Bible', in *Lectures and Essays* ed. J.S. Black and G. Chrystal, (London, 1912), p. 233.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 211.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 214.

describes as ‘one man against an ancient and an honoured system’,³⁴ who drove his students ‘to read all we could find in the historical conditions of the periods in question’.³⁵ Smith describes Henry Drummond as a man with a ‘keen sense for facts’, whose learning ‘engaged his sympathies for the great movement which was now rising in Scotland under the hands of Professor Robertson Smith’.³⁶

Less well known is Smith’s personal acquaintance with Robertson Smith himself. Whatever opportunities the two Smiths had to meet while George Adam Smith was a divinity student, an interesting encounter between them took place miles away from the scene of ecclesiastical controversy. In December 1879, George Adam Smith was visiting Egypt, which he eventually reached after a long and wearisome voyage. As he stepped off the SS Canara in Port Said, Robertson Smith came aboard. Smith’s correspondence takes up the story:

What was my surprise to see Robertson Smith step on board the ‘Canara’ and take possession of the bunk I had just vacated. He was on his way to Jeddah, and thence to Aden to go to the interior of Arabia.... I had time to have a chat with him.... He spoke freely of his case, but I had not better repeat all he said.³⁷

Their conversation focused upon the controversies at home, Robertson Smith’s sense of outrage at the behaviour of Principal Rainy, from whom he was becoming increasingly estranged, and his resigning himself to the inevitable outcome of the controversies. On his return home, he and George Adam Smith again had the opportunity to meet, at a time of importance and difficulty for Smith, on the threshold of his ministerial career, as he weighed up in his own mind the possibilities before him. The

³⁴ George Adam Smith, ‘A.B. Davidson’, *The Union Magazine*, May 1902, p. 205.

³⁵ George Adam Smith, ‘A.B. Davidson’, *The Union Magazine*, April 1902, p. 162.

³⁶ Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond*, p. 107.

³⁷ George Adam Smith to his mother from Cairo, 21 December 1879, NLS, Acc. 9446, No. 16. J.S. Black and G. Chrystal, Robertson Smith’s biographers, set this in context thus: ‘Smith left London for Egypt on November 5, 1879, and spent the next six months abroad, returning to England on May 4, 1880, greatly invigorated in health, and bringing back with him a rich accumulation of observations and experiences that greatly influenced all his subsequent thinking and writing’ (*The Life of William Robertson Smith*, p. 333).

following observation on the part of George Adam Smith is of interest for our present purposes:

I have had a talk with Smith, which confirms my fears as to the temper of next Assembly. He spoke very strongly against Rainy.... He is evidently not disposed to receive a rebuke.... *On the other hand I have been surprised with Smith's aggressive Evangelicalism. I wish everybody could know the missionary work he did in Arabia distributing Bibles etc.*³⁸

'Aggressive evangelicalism' is not something one would normally associate with William Robertson Smith, yet George Adam Smith saw it for himself, and was affected by what he saw. In Robertson Smith he found a confidant, one with whom, in somewhat unusual circumstances, he could discuss the church crises in Scotland which were to be so significant for both of them. But he also saw a living, powerful and practical evangelical faith. As the Moody and Sankey campaign had given impetus to the practical use of the Bible, so Robertson Smith and others had encouraged the critical study of it. According to George Adam Smith, the trial of Robertson Smith

was not so much the trial of one man... nor even the trial of one set of opinions, as the education of the whole Church in face of the facts which Biblical Criticism had recently presented to her.³⁹

Such criticism was not inimical to faith; indeed, it was defended 'on the highest grounds of faith in God and loyalty to Christ'.⁴⁰ George Adam Smith not only believed this, but had seen it in action in the evangelicalism of the critics of whom he spoke with the highest regard. He entered into critical studies himself as a believer in the concept of criticism as a service to Christ, and the uncovering of biblical facts and biblical history a corollary to evangelistic endeavour.

George Adam Smith's Views on Biblical Criticism

Smith's mature reflection on the nature of biblical criticism is to be found in his *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, a series of lectures delivered under the auspices of the Lyman Beecher Foundation at

³⁸ George Adam Smith to his father from Cairo, 7 April 1880, NLS, Acc. 9446, No. 16. Emphasis added.

³⁹ Smith, *The Life of Henry Drummond*, p. 129.

⁴⁰ *Idem.*

Yale in 1899. Smith’s visit to Yale was significant, among other things, for bringing together D.L. Moody and Smith, ‘conservatism and higher criticism’ who brought ‘from the same platform the message of Christ to Yale’.⁴¹ The subsequent publication of the lectures formed the basis of attempts by the more conservative party within the United Free Church to have Smith (unsuccessfully) tried for heresy at the United Free Church General Assembly of 1902.

However, in his previously published work, Smith had expressed his debt to critical scholarship generally and to critical conclusions about the prophets in particular. His commentaries on Isaiah build upon the premise that the unity of the Book is editorial, the first half predicting events that have clearly occurred in the second. Further, in dealing with chapters 1-39 he does not follow the canonical, but the chronological order of the chapters. This is an attempt to set the chapters within their historical context – their ‘times’ – for in Smith’s opinion, ‘No book of the Bible is less susceptible of treatment apart from the history out of which it sprang than the Book of Isaiah.’⁴² In a sense this is to echo what Smith understands to have been Isaiah’s purpose in his own day – to turn the people to a greater appreciation of the workings of God in history. In attacking vain religious formalism, Smith argues, Isaiah had but one remedy: ‘It is a new edition of his old gospel, that God speaks to us in facts, not forms.’⁴³ Critical thinking on Isaiah has been overtaken by Bernhard Duhm’s school of thought regarding a third Isaiah, and by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, which have thrown up textual questions unknown to Smith; but as an exegete of Isaiah his primary concern is to apply critical ideas in order to recover the historical situation – the facts – of the prophetic discourse. Similarly, his interpretation of the Cyrus oracles in deutero-Isaiah, and the apparent exilic nature of the later chapters colour his exegesis throughout. That Smith’s commentaries popularised the current critical views on Isaiah was acknowledged by as conservative a scholar as O.T. Allis, who took issue in his *The Unity of Isaiah* with many of Smith’s conclusions, yet conceded that he

probably did more to gain a hearing for, and to secure wide acceptance of multiple-authorship of Isaiah among English-speaking readers than any other single book.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Reynolds, J.B. *et. al* (eds.), *Two Centuries of Christian Activity at Yale* (Yale, 1901), p. 111.

⁴² G.A. Smith, *Isaiah*, Vol. 1, (London, 1888), p. ix.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 216.

⁴⁴ O.T. Allis, *The Unity of Isaiah* (Philadelphia, 1977), p. 15.

Having visited Palestine twice (in 1880 and 1891), Smith was in a position to publish his magnum opus in 1894, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. Despite Naomi Shepherd's assertion that 'the passion for the biblical geography of Palestine... was already on the wane by the 1880s',⁴⁵ Smith's work was a major contribution to the study of historical context. Quite apart from the exquisite and readable nature of his prose style, Smith's work was important not least because of its deference to biblical criticism. In the preface to the first edition he wrote:

We have had too many instances of the embarrassment and confusion into which archaeology and geography lead us, apart from the new methods of Biblical criticism.... In this volume I have felt forced by geographical evidence to contest some of the textual and historical conclusions of recent critics, both in this country and in Germany, but I have fully accepted the critical methods, and I believe this to be the first geography of the Holy Land in which they are employed.⁴⁶

The insights of criticism, as far as geographical context was concerned, were valuable for the establishing of the facts of the biblical narrative. Although he concedes that many people 'habitually exaggerate the evidential value of the geography and archaeology of Palestine',⁴⁷ nonetheless questions of geography confirm and support, in Smith's view, critical insights, such as 'in the analysis of the composite books of the Old Testament into their various documents'⁴⁸ and the story of the religion of Israel, in 'its origin and development,... the appearance of monotheism, and... the question of the supernatural'.⁴⁹

Smith's inaugural lecture as Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology, *The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Age*, was a passionate apologetic for the necessity of criticism. He emphatically denied that criticism was rationalism, for rationalism had 'emptied the Christian pulpit of faith and fire'.⁵⁰ Criticism, on the other hand, had both affirmed and confirmed the truths which constituted evangelical

⁴⁵ N. Shepherd, *The Zealous Intruders* (London, 1987), p. 198.

⁴⁶ George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, preface to the first edition (London, 1894).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 109-10.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 111.

⁵⁰ George Adam Smith, *The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Age*, (London, 1893), p. 33.

Christianity, and had made the Old Testament in particular 'habitable by modern men'.⁵¹

This he develops further in his important work *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*. For Smith, the supreme sanction of the Old Testament is that which it receives from Christ himself. But he argues that 'while we look to Christ as the chief Authority for our Old Testament, we must never forget that He was also its first Critic'.⁵² He therefore sees criticism of the Bible as an evangelical task in itself, and not simply as a means to an evangelical end. To look at the Bible critically is to follow Christ's example. The appeal to Christ – the *Christus Comprobatur* – is fundamental; in his lecture on 'the spirit of Christ in the Old Testament' he argues that allegorical interpretation does an injustice to the divine revelation in the historical development of Israel's religion, in which the presence of Christ is made manifest 'upon historical and ethical lines'.⁵³ To sense this requires an appreciation of the facts of historical development in order that the revelation of God in the Old Testament will be felt by those who would wish to preach it. So he counsels his readers:

Do not believe that the end of an accurate study of the Hebrew language is simply familiarity with a number of grammatical forms more or less obscure. Painstaking students are otherwise rewarded. It is they who lay their hands on the prophet's heart and feel it beat; it is they who across the ages see the very features on his face as he calls; it is they into whom his style and his music pass.⁵⁴

Smith's second lecture ends with the confident assertion that 'modern criticism has won its war against the Traditional Theories. It only remains to fix the amount of the indemnity'.⁵⁵ The war metaphor and the triumphalism of the assertion annoyed Robert Rainy, who said, 'I know nothing of indemnity. When I see evidence for facts, they are God's facts.'⁵⁶ For Rainy, it was enough that facts were established. To that extent he was willing to allow critical enquiry to continue. But for Smith,

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

⁵² George Adam Smith, *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (London, 1901), p. 11.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 281.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 72.

⁵⁶ P. Carnegie Simpson, *The Life of Principal Rainy* (London, 1909), Vol. 2, p. 273.

it was not criticism that was at stake, but the evangel itself. As Kenneth Ross summarises

Parts, at least, of the old orthodoxy were regarded by the New Evangelists as hostile and alien elements which they were called to uproot.... When they turned their guns on the old orthodoxy, it was holy warfare in which they were engaged.⁵⁷

George Adam Smith: Believing Critic?

In Smith's thought, two streams converge: a strong evangelical tradition, moulded and fashioned in the context of close personal relationships and church life, and a strong emphasis on approaching Scripture critically, with a view to recreating the historical context in which the religion of Israel developed. But were these held in tension? Or was a synthesis really possible?

An answer to this question has to concentrate upon the wedge which Smith drives between what is *factual* as distinct from what was *dogmatic*. For Smith, Scripture is to be believed because of the facts of the biblical narrative. *The British Weekly* newspaper commended his volumes on Isaiah because

Mr. Smith has learned to read the religion of Israel through their history; he has learned this in the free school of scientific study of the Old Testament, and he has done more than all his teachers to make this study popular and trusted. Criticism in Mr. Smith's hands appears not as the axe which breaks down the carved work of the Temple, but as the fine tool which clears away the incrustation of centuries, and lays bare the original design. In this most recent expositor's hands, 'the evangelical prophet' remains as evangelical as ever.⁵⁸

The Gospel, in his view, was built upon a basis of historical fact, and must be read as such. 'Not dogma, but fact'. Only because the Old Testament could be read 'not as the dogmas of a Church, but as the living experience of a great people and its greatest individuals'⁵⁹ could an evangelical faith be possible. In Smith's view, an entrenched dogmatism which closed the door to objective enquiry failed to do justice to the

⁵⁷ Kenneth R. Ross, *Church and Creed in Scotland: the Free Church Case 1900-1904 and its Origins*, (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 170-71.

⁵⁸ Quoted in *Testimonials in favour of the Rev. George Adam Smith MA* (1892), NLS, Acc. 9446, No. 322, p. 13.

⁵⁹ *The Life of Henry Drummond*, p. 105.

literature of Scripture. On the other hand, a free and scientific enquiry established *facts*, without which Scripture could have no meaning or purpose.

When Smith talks of facts, however, he is talking of a view both of history and Scripture which accords with the Wellhausen hypothesis of the development of Israel's religion. Unlike some conservative scholars who believed that Wellhausen's views 'sought only a secular, nonrevelatory model of Israel's history',⁶⁰ Smith believed that the evidence for the documentary hypothesis of the Pentateuch and a developmental theory of Israel's history was so clearly demonstrated by the co-ordinate and unified findings of the higher critics as to be conclusive.⁶¹ The facts, therefore, which are to Smith of greater significance than dogma are the facts as interpreted by the Wellhausian school.

In spite of his insistence on a critical approach to the Old Testament, there are questions criticism cannot answer. Regarding Isaiah 24, for example, Smith concedes that 'Criticism affords little help. It cannot clearly identify the chapter with any historical situation.'⁶² This is no barrier to interpretation, however, Smith argues, where the chapter has a universal application. The historical vision of the prophet blooms into an apocalyptic vision; sin is the cause of a nation's ruin, but 'The grace of God affects even the material results of sin; the Divine pardon that converts the sinner converts his circumstances also; Christ Jesus sanctifies even the flesh, and is the Physician of the body as well as the Saviour of the soul.'⁶³

Reviewing a working life of dealing both with the insights of criticism and the nature of biblical theology, Smith offered the following personal testimony:

Modern criticism has cleared up the confusion of the prophetic and legal elements in the Old Testament. It has helped us to separate dead tradition from living truth, and to feel a Spirit not their own working through and upon the ancestral institutions and practices of Israel.... I speak now upon over forty-five years' experience of the influence of modern criticism upon my faith, and I say that this movement, whatever individual aberrations within it may have been, has only confirmed and cleared up my belief that

⁶⁰ R.E. Clements 'Julius Wellhausen' in D.K. McKim, *Handbook of Biblical Interpreters* (Leicester, 1998) p. 383.

⁶¹ See, for example, his *Modern Preaching of the Old Testament*, pp. 39-41.

⁶² *Isaiah*, Vol. 1, p. 416.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, p. 426.

the Old Testament contains a genuine Revelation of God and of His will for mankind.⁶⁴

Yet this is precisely the difficulty. Why should the discovery of facts preclude the emergence of dogma? Indeed, if facts emerge, theories based upon them are bound to arise. It was a given of Smith's age, however, an age in which credal precision paid the price for critical insight, that 'fact, not dogma' was to be regarded as the nostrum of evangelicalism. Yet the question is not answered why the revelation of God and his will in the Old Testament cannot also be an article of credal belief. The glaring omission, therefore, in Smith's work, is not the lack of a harmony between fact and dogma, but the absence of an apologetic for introducing the distinction in the first place.

Smith saw himself not as an evangelical *and* a critic, holding these two in tandem, nor as an evangelical *regardless of* criticism, but as an evangelical *because a* critic, and a critic *because an* evangelical. Criticism he regarded as an evangelical task serving an evangelical and evangelistic end, making the Bible preachable, and focusing the attention of men more upon the historical facts of revelation than the dogmatic assertions of a creed. It was his preoccupation with *fact* which afforded him the opportunity to synthesise both his faith and his critical views of Scripture. While it will not be possible for evangelicals fully to work within the parameters of contemporary critical exposition of the Bible, there is a valuable lesson here nonetheless. What George Adam Smith could not accept was the thought that objective scholarship was necessarily inimical to faith. And to the extent that behind our credal formulation must be an understanding of God's self-disclosure based on sound historico-grammatical exegesis, we cannot accept it either.

⁶⁴ George Adam Smith, *The Teaching of the Old Testament in Schools*, (London, 1923), p. 4.

Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism: The Status of an Emerging Global Dialogue

BRADLEY NASSIF
ANTIOCHIAN HOUSE OF STUDIES, CALIFORNIA

Introduction

Last November the American Academy of Religion hosted its first Joint Dialogue between the 'Eastern Orthodox Studies Group' and the 'Evangelical Theology Group'. The respondent, Robert Jenson from Princeton University, summarised their relations by declaring, 'I know of no two groups of Christians who pose a greater challenge to ecumenical unity than the dialogue between Eastern Orthodox and Evangelical Christians. It boggles the mind to conceive just how two such different groups can ever bridge their differences. They have both a remarkable unity and remarkable divergences. But as Jesus said, "With God, all things are possible!"'

The purpose of this article is to identify and describe the most important dialogues and scholarly exchanges that have emerged around the world over the past decade between the Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Evangelical traditions. These include the work of academic societies, individual scholars, ecumenical agencies, seminaries, and mission organisations. The previous two hundred years of Orthodox-Evangelical history before 1990, and the increasing number of personal pilgrimages to Orthodoxy by Evangelical believers in recent days, will be touched upon in a general way below, but are too numerous and complex to trace in any detail here. As a result of this survey from 1990 to the present, readers hopefully will be given fresh and vitally important information on a potentially momentous turning point in Orthodox and Evangelical relations in modern church history.

Past Relations

The history of relations between the Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Evangelical traditions has never been written. One does not have to search very far, however, to see that their past relationships have been predominantly characterised by a long negative history of proselytism,

persecution, mutual suspicion, hostility, fear and ignorance. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the Middle East, Orthodox Christians were viewed as objects of conversion during a period of Presbyterian missions to the Arab lands. Thousands of Arab Christians left the Orthodox, Melkite and Syrian Jacobite churches and took up residence in newly founded Presbyterian communities. Less successful were Protestant missions to Russia and Greece. In Russia, prior to the Communist Revolution in 1917, 'Orthodoxy, nationalism, and autocracy' were the Slavic slogans of Orthodox nationalism which socially disadvantaged and oppressed Russian Protestants in the name of 'Holy Russia'. In Greece civil laws were passed outlawing 'proselytism' by Protestant missionaries, the violation of which was punishable by fines and/or imprisonment. Throughout the twentieth century, hundreds of Protestant missionaries suffered sporadic persecution and disgrace under the hands of Greek Orthodox law.

In America, thousands of Orthodox peoples arrived on American shores from Syria, Lebanon, Russia, Greece and parts of Europe during the immigration period of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Unlike the national unity some Orthodox once enjoyed in their homelands, America now presented a new external challenge of religious pluralism. During this time the church did not fare well. Second and third generation Orthodox immigrant children haemorrhaged out the doors of the church in large numbers due to the church's apparent irrelevance to their lives and their inability to pray the liturgy in the English language. A number of those parishioners (difficult to quantify) joined Protestant churches after being (re)converted to Christ through Evangelical outreach via the Billy Graham Crusades, Young Life, Campus Crusade for Christ and other parachurch organisations, as well as through the personal witness of individual believers. In some cases, former Orthodox believers became socially ostracised by their families after leaving the church. Such were the general conditions between Orthodox and Evangelical Christians.

Emerging Global Dialogue

In the last ten years a new paradigm of ecumenical relations has begun to emerge between Orthodox and Evangelical Christians on the popular and professional levels. On the popular level, more Evangelicals have begun to join the Orthodox Church in America than ever before. The same has been true to a lesser extent in the UK. Though no formal study has been done to document the exact reasons for these conversions, the growing number of defections has clearly caught the attention of both Orthodox and

EASTERN ORTHODOXY AND EVANGELICALISM

Evangelical leaders. From a cursory survey the most important reasons why Evangelicals are leaving their churches appear to be due to a growing hunger for liturgical worship, a desire for connectedness to historic Christianity and the search for an historic consensus of truth. One source estimates that approximately 80% of the people who are joining the Orthodox Church today come from Evangelical and Charismatic backgrounds such as Campus Crusade for Christ, Young Life, Youth for Christ, Vineyard fellowships, the Evangelical Free Church, Baptist denominations, the Christian and Missionary Alliance and other independent churches. The remaining 20% come from high churches such as Anglicanism, Episcopalianism, Lutheranism, Methodism and Presbyterianism.¹ Millard Erickson, a leading American Evangelical theologian, describes this phenomenon as a small but significant movement that has the potential of greatly impacting the future of Evangelicalism.

An increasing number of persons, especially college students, are turning to denominations emphasising Tradition, historical connection, and liturgy. I have in mind the movement of people like Robert Webber and Walter Dunnett into the Episcopal and Anglican Churches. An even more radical step is the movement of evangelicals into the Eastern Orthodox Church. Peter Gillquist, a major leader in this movement, has described the journey of two thousand evangelical Protestants toward Eastern Orthodoxy. One issue of his magazine *Again* featured the testimonies of recent evangelical converts to Eastern Orthodoxy. Among the more conspicuous is Franky Schaeffer, son of the late Francis Schaeffer. A few, such as Thomas Howard; have even been attracted to Roman Catholicism.

This movement is small, but it is real and of potentially great influence because it includes young people who could be the leaders of the evangelical movement in the years ahead. Unless mainstream evangelicalism finds ways to meet the needs of young people desiring some tie with the historic faith and with more formal worship, more of them will leave for denominations that offer real alternatives to popular experience-centred worship.²

Erickson's reference to Peter Gillquist describes the former Campus Crusade for Christ leader who led approximately 1700 followers into the

¹ Telephone conversation with Peter Gillquist, Chairman of the Department of Missions and Evangelism, Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America (July, 1999).

² Millard Erickson, *Where is Theology Going?* (Grand Rapids, 1994), pp. 41-2.

Antiochian Orthodox Church in 1987.³ The remaining 500 of his followers broke ranks with the group and remained a separate denomination called 'The Evangelical Orthodox Church'. A few years later, Franky Schaeffer, son of the late Francis Schaeffer, joined the Greek Orthodox Church. Though Gillquist and Schaeffer are quite serious in their call for discipleship,⁴ by their own admission neither possesses a substantial theological education as reflected in their educational histories and have often oversimplified interpretations of church history and theology. It is also worth noting that in the UK, Michael Harper recently converted to Orthodoxy in response to the doctrinal erosion of the Anglican Church.⁵

Alongside these popular trends, there are a variety of professional forums through which Evangelicals and Orthodox have begun to engage each other over the past decade. Most are aimed at establishing friendly relations with each other. A few have engaged in substantive discussions of theology. In the following paragraphs I will attempt to document and assess the work of academic societies and mission organisations, individual scholars, seminaries and universities. In so doing, I am certain that I will have left out important people and projects due to the weaknesses of my own limitations. What follows is my best effort to locate all the major players, insofar as I am able to see them.

³ 'Evangelical Denomination Gains Official Acceptance into the Orthodox Church', *Christianity Today* 31 (February 6, 1987), p. 40.

⁴ See Peter Gillquist, *Becoming Orthodox: A Journey to the Ancient Christian Faith* (Brentwood, TN, 1989); Frank Schaeffer, *Dancing Alone: The Quest for Orthodox Faith in the Age of False Religion* (Brookline, MA, 1994). However, Father Eusebius Stephanou, a reform-minded cradle Orthodox who has been promoting evangelical renewal since long before Gillquist entered the church, has criticised Gillquist and Schaeffer for preaching Orthodoxy rather than Christ, viewing 'everything in the Orthodox Church through rose-colored glasses'. 'Converts to Orthodoxy: A Grave Concern', *The Logos* 25 (Nov/Dec, 1992): 1-2, 4. A historical evaluation of Gillquist and his followers' move into the Antiochian Orthodox Church in 1987 has been done by Timothy Weber, 'Looking for Home: Evangelical Orthodoxy and the search for the Original Church', in *New Perspectives on Historical Theology: Essays in Memory of John Meyendorff*, ed. Bradley Nassif, foreword by Henry Chadwick (Grand Rapids, 1996), pp. 95-121. Gillquist's criticism of the way the Greek Archdiocese handled his group's trip to Constantinople (Weber, p. 113) should be balanced by the oral history of Fr Gregory Wingenbach, a priest of the Greek Archdiocese who oversaw their visit.

⁵ Michael Harper, *A Faith Fulfilled* (Ben Lomond, CA, 1998).

Academic Societies and Mission Organisations

Over the past decade there have been three leading organisations that have been working on Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue from different angles. There are no formal relations between the organisations since each was formed with its own purpose independently from the others. At times, however, each *de facto* compliments or overlaps the work of the others. As a primary focus the first organization deals with theological subjects, the second with church life, and the third with attitudes and practical relationships between the two groups. In addition to these organisations, I will also comment on situational dialogues that have been created for only a limited duration and purpose, as well as the work in Romania where the second largest population of Orthodox reside.

The most serious and sustained effort to understand the areas of theological convergence and divergence between the Orthodox and Evangelical traditions that is being undertaken today comes from the *Society for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism* (SSEOE), possibly soon to be renamed the *Institute for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism* pending funding. This is a learned group that was founded in the United States in 1990 by the present author along with six other Orthodox and Evangelical scholars. All had personal experience and academic training in both traditions in varying degrees. Through its annual meetings and unpublished papers,⁶ the SSEOE seeks to make the two traditions known and understood in relation to each other's history, doctrine, worship and spirituality. It thus serves both the academy and the church. Until 1999, the organization met annually at the Billy Graham Centre on the campus of Wheaton College, and now meets in different regions of the United States. Past themes of the annual meetings have been: 'Proselytism or Conversion? An Orthodox and Evangelical Exchange' (1991), 'Scripture, Tradition and Authority' (1992), 'Salvation by Grace' (1993), 'The Kingdom of God and the Role of the Church in Salvation' (1994), 'The Role of Theology in the Spiritual Life' (1995), and "'Outside the Church There is No Salvation": An Orthodox and Evangelical Exchange' (1999). Keynote speakers from North America have included, among others, Orthodox theologians Stanley Harakas, Leonid Kishkovsky, Theodore Stylianopoulos, Emmanuel Clapsis, George Liacopoulos, Michael Prokurat and Edward Rommen; Evangelical theologians have been J.I. Packer, Thomas Oden, Gerald Bray, Donald Bloesch, Grant Osborne, James Stamoolis, Kent Hill, Thomas Finger,

⁶ The papers are now being edited for possible publication in the next few years.

Harold O.J. Brown, Craig Blaising and Dale Allison. The format consists of a single annual theme that is addressed by two keynote speakers from each side, followed by audience participation and a summary of the conclusions that have been reached at the end of the conference.

The purpose of the SSEOE is not to convert people from one side to the other, though most members would view theological conversion as a legitimate consequence of the dialogue. Its main purpose is to enrich participants by removing false barriers which have divided them while also identifying continuing differences. In the words of the Constitution, the SSEOE seeks 'to promote fellowship and mutual enrichment among scholars engaged in these activities, and to co-ordinate the work of such theologians in North America and abroad'. Membership includes a wide cross-section of Evangelical denominations and Orthodox jurisdictions. Institutions represented by students and faculty include Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (IL), Wheaton College, Eastern Nazarene College, Eastern Mennonite Seminary, Southern Baptist Seminary (KY), Dallas Seminary, Fuller Seminary, St. Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary, Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Seminary, and others. Evangelical and Orthodox endorsements of the SSEOE have been conferred by Kenneth Kantzer, J.I. Packer, Ward Gasque, Kent Hill, Bill Bright, Bishop Kallistos (Timothy) Ware, Father Stanley Harakas, the late Father John Meyendorff and Metropolitan Philip Saliba of the Antiochian Orthodox Church of North America.⁷

The second organization that is dedicated to Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue is *Evangelicals for Middle East Understanding* (EMEU) based at North Park University in Chicago, Illinois. According to its mission statement, 'Evangelicals for Middle East Understanding is an informal fellowship of North American Evangelical Christians committed to dialogue which seeks mutual understanding, respect and friendship between Middle Eastern and Western Christians.'⁸ Much of their work seeks to raise the level of consciousness among Evangelicals of North America and to foster a sense of solidarity with Arab Christians of the Middle East. The churches which are involved in EMEU include Presbyterians and other Protestants in their relations with the Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox

⁷ For media accounts of the SSEOE see 'Peering Over the Orthodox-Evangelical Crevasse', *Christianity Today*, October 9, 1992; 'Scholars Hope for Thaw in Evangelical-Orthodox Relations', *Christianity Today*, October 25, 1993; 'A True Meaning of Church Service', *Chicago Tribune*, October 1, 1993; 'Orthodox and Evangelical Scholars Meet', *The Word* (Antiochian Archdiocese), February, 1995; 'Orthodox, Evangelical Scholars Meet', *The Orthodox Observer* (60) April, 1995.

⁸ *EMEU Journal* 4 (1999), p. 1.

Churches of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine, Jordan, Iraq, Southern Sudan and neighbouring Arab countries. By organizing educational travels for American Evangelicals to the Middle East, and hosting consultations in the Middle East and North America, EMEU is forging a vital link between East and West. Unlike the SSEOE, which centres primarily on theological issues, EMEU focuses on the practical, pastoral and regional realities of the Orthodox Churches in Islamic lands. The SSEOE and EMEU nevertheless compliment each other's ministries by exploring both the doctrinal and practical realities of contemporary church life.

The third organization is the *World Council of Churches* (WCC). It is widely known that the WCC has been in existence since the turn of the century, but only since 1993 has it made a concerted effort to create a series of dialogues between the Eastern Orthodox and Evangelical communities. There were two historic events which prompted this new ecumenical venue by the WCC. First, in 1991 at the WCC's Canberra Assembly, heretical Trinitarian prayers were offered during one of the plenary sessions in which a pagan female 'spirit-goddess' was evoked rather than the Holy Spirit of the Triune God. Similar syncretistic religious expressions occurred during the Assembly and this caused the Orthodox to voice their objections. Evangelical 'observers' responded similarly which, in turn, prompted the Orthodox and Evangelicals to take notice of each other for a potential defensive alliance. Two years later, a small handful of Evangelical leaders and church representatives from the Ecumenical Patriarchate (i.e. the Orthodox Church of Constantinople) convened in Stuttgart, Germany to discuss the possibility of holding a joint conference. The impetus for an Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue included the mutual reactionary discovery of each other in the Canberra Assembly of the WCC, but also the recent fall of communism and the ensuing flood of Western missionaries to the formerly Orthodox lands of Russia and Eastern Europe. Tensions and hostilities had been rapidly rising in those parts of the world between Orthodox nationalists and Protestant missionaries who had operated on the assumption that there were few true believers in those lands and thus set as part of their missionary task the conversion of Orthodox Christians. After Stuttgart, discussions and contacts continued, especially within the framework of the Central Committee of the WCC. Eventually, the WCC sponsored two international Orthodox-Evangelical dialogues. The first was hosted by the Coptic Orthodox Church in Alexandria, Egypt from July 10-15, 1995 where forty participants gathered from around the globe. Its

proceedings were published in the book *Proclaiming Christ Today*.⁹ The second dialogue was convened at the Missionsakademie an der Universität Hamburg, Germany, March 30-April 4, 1998 with proceedings published in the book *Turn to God, Rejoice in Hope! Orthodox-Evangelical Consultation*.¹⁰ The international composition of the meeting included representatives from Greece, Syria, Lebanon, Egypt, Romania, Russia, Bulgaria, Albania, Sweden, UK, United States and other countries. Neither of the consultations, however, engaged in what could be described as 'substantial theological dialogues'. Instead, they would more accurately be characterised as 'relational meetings' that were primarily designed to break the ice and foster good will between the two communities. Plans for a third consultation are now underway, which may be held in Moscow or Romania in A.D. 2000.

In addition to these efforts by organisations, other attempts at dialogue have been more occasional in nature. In the UK, dialogue between Evangelicals and Orthodox is currently being carried out by a study group under the aegis of ACUTE, the theological commission of the UK Evangelical Alliance (with input from other Evangelical bodies). ACUTE sponsors a number of such groups dealing with pertinent theological issues. The study group on Orthodoxy seeks to elucidate the extent of shared convictions and differences, with special reference to the concerns of Evangelical and Orthodox constituencies in the UK. The group is meeting during 1999-2000 for discussion of papers dealing with matters of doctrine and spirituality, which will be collected and edited as a published report. This report should serve as a stimulus to further contact between Evangelicals and Orthodox in the UK. The group's aim is to introduce Evangelicals and Orthodox to each other, clear away some of the misunderstanding and lack of awareness of one another's beliefs and practices. While they are aware that fundamental disagreements between each other will remain, they are convinced that the two constituencies have much to learn from each other.¹¹ A wider circle of readers drawn from

⁹ *Proclaiming Christ Today*, ed. Huibert van Beek and George Lemopoulos (WCC, Geneva, 1997).

¹⁰ *Turn to God, Rejoice in Hope! Orthodox-Evangelical Consultation*, ed. Huibert van Beek and George Lemopoulos (WCC, Geneva, 1998).

¹¹ Members of the group are Drs Tim Grass (Baptist and convenor of the group), John Briggs (Baptist), David Wright (Church of Scotland), Kevin Ellis (Anglican), David Hilborn (United Reformed Church), Fr John Jillions (Russian Orthodox), Mr Nigel Pocock (Ichthus, a UK 'House Church' movement), Dr Nick Needham (Baptist), and Professor Andrew Walker

Evangelical and Orthodox churches in the UK and beyond will be involved in commenting on the draft material this spring.

In the United States, in November 1999 the American Academy of Religion (AAR) held its first joint session between the *Eastern Orthodox Theology Group* (EOTG) and the *Evangelical Theology Group* (ETG). Serving as the co-chair of the EOTG with Anna Williams of Cambridge University, I proposed in 1998 that such a dialogue take place within the AAR at the next annual meeting. Dr Williams and the Steering Committee of the EOTG accepted the proposal and extended an invitation to the ETG which enthusiastically accepted. The joint session was titled, 'Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism in Dialogue'. The topics for discussion centred on Charismatic and Orthodox understandings of the spirit of tradition, Evangelical and Orthodox worship, and the sacramental notion of 'participation' in Karl Barth and St Gregory Palamas. A sizeable turnout of one hundred scholars attended the session. Students and professors from Duke Divinity School and Loyola University of Chicago presented papers followed by a response from Professor Robert Jensen of Princeton University. The very existence of such a session in the halls of the AAR demonstrates the growing relevance of Orthodox-Evangelical studies in North America and abroad, and adds further testimony to the fact that the subject has now grown to the point of being affirmed by religion scholars as a legitimate object of academic inquiry.

The country of Romania deserves special attention in this article given its religious history and strategic place among the Orthodox churches. Romania contains one of the largest populations of Orthodox Christians in the world today, second only to Russia. Although historic difficulties remain in the areas of communication and religious freedom between Orthodox and Evangelical believers in Romania, small steps of progress are slowly being made in the wake of the post-communist era. The country holds much promise for constructive relations. At present, however, the 'dialogue' in Romania remains weak and indirect, consisting mostly of a growing awareness of the need to explore the points of contact between each other. Academically speaking, there are more Evangelical students of Romanian Orthodoxy than there are Orthodox students of Romanian Evangelicalism. Some of the leading proponents on the Evangelical side of the Romanian dialogue include Silviu Eugen Rogobete who heads the *Areopagus Centre for Christian Studies and Contemporary Culture* located in Timisoara. Part of the Centre's mission is to build bridges with

(Russian Orthodox). For more information contact Tim Grass at Grass@tesco.net.

the local Romanian Orthodox Church through cultural and religious dialogue. The Centre is housed in a relatively small building with a library, classroom and office space.¹² Other Evangelical leaders who are attempting dialogue include Paul Negrut (Principal of Emanuel Bible Institute in Oradea), Emil Bartos (the Dean), and Danuet Manastireanu (World Vision). On the Orthodox side are Fr Ion Bria (now retired but an active participant in the WCC's Orthodox-Evangelical dialogues), Vasile Mihoc (Professor of New Testament at Sibi University and Director of World Vision Romania), and Stelian Tofana (Professor of New Testament at Cluj University). A truly exciting theological renaissance of theses and doctoral dissertations on Orthodox theology is now underway among Romanian Evangelical students of the Orthodox Church. The writings of the great Romanian Orthodox theologian, Fr Dumitru Staniloae, have become a special object of Evangelical interest due to Staniloae's popularity and enduring influence in Romania and abroad. Beyond Staniloae, wider Evangelical interests have begun to explore Orthodox approaches to Scripture, authority and soteriology.¹³ Although Evangelicals are in a distinct minority in Romania, the new and creative interest in Orthodoxy that is on the rise among the younger generation of scholars – coupled with the changing attitudes toward Evangelical theology by a small group of Orthodox leaders – makes Romania the most fertile soil in Eastern Europe for the growth of an emerging global dialogue.

¹² Email areopag@mail.dnttm.ro for further information.

¹³ A nearly exhaustive list of recent theses and dissertations are as follows: Paul Negrut, *The Development of the Concept of 'Authority' Within the Romanian Orthodox Church in the 20th Century* (Ph.D. dissertation, London Bible College/Brunel University, London, 1994), parts of which were recently published as *Revelation, Scripture, Communion. An Investigation of 'Authority' in Theological Knowledge* (Oradea, 1996); Silviu Eugen Rogobete, *Subject and Supreme Personal Reality in the Theological Thought of Fr Dumitru Staniloae: An Ontology of Love* (Ph.D. dissertation, London Bible College/Brunel University, London, 1998); Emil Bartos, *The Concept of Deification in Eastern Orthodox Theology With Detailed Reference to Dumitru Staniloae* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wales, Lampeter, 1997) revised as *The Concept of 'Theosis' in the Theology of Dumitru Staniloae* (Oradea, 1999); Gheorghe Verzea, *Salvation in the Church in the Theology of Dumitru Staniloae* (Ph.D. dissertation, Queens University Belfast, 1996); and Danut Manastireanu, *The Place of Scripture in the Orthodox Tradition* (M. A. thesis, London Bible College/Brunel University, London, 1994). Credit belongs to Mr Danut Manastireanu for most of the information provided in this footnote and the above paragraph.

What it needs to succeed and flourish is for the Orthodox to initiate a stronger public stance in reaching out to Evangelical institutions and churches at all levels – from the ecumenical department of the Romanian Patriarchate down to the grass roots levels of local Orthodox priests and laypeople. These initiatives may include setting up special ecumenical dialogue commissions, creating faculty exchanges in which Orthodox and Evangelical history and theology may be taught in each other's schools, the creation of theological journals in which both sides can participate in a shared forum, and personal visits to each other's local churches in an atmosphere of Christian love. Clearly the Orthodox are in a stronger position of influence than are Evangelicals and therefore they bear the heavier weight of responsibility for achieving Christian unity in Romania. Nothing less than courageous initiatives by Orthodox leaders, lay and ordained, can break the decades of hatred, fear and ignorance toward Evangelical Christianity which continue to dominate the perceptions of the Romanian Orthodox peoples. Similarly, nothing less than bold initiatives by Evangelical leaders, lay and ordained, that may risk offending their Protestant constituency will be able to move Evangelicals beyond the misconceptions and popular abuses of the Orthodox faith.

Scholars

There is a small but growing number of individual scholars who are slowly beginning to publish works on Orthodox and Evangelical theology. It appears that there is more activity on the side of Evangelical interest in Orthodoxy rather than vice versa.¹⁴ A surprising number of Evangelical converts to Orthodoxy in America over the past 15 years has caught the Evangelical community off guard and recently prompted a few well-known conservative writers to respond to the growing losses within their ranks. Representatives of this group would be R.C. Sproul,¹⁵ visiting professor of Systematic Theology and Apologetics at Knox Theological Seminary in

¹⁴ An exception can be found in the popular apologetic books and tracts against Evangelicals written by Orthodox priests and layworkers in America. Peter Gillquist and Frank Schaeffer would fall into this category. Much less apologetic literature has been published by Evangelicals against Orthodoxy, with the exception of older mission agencies such as Spiros Zodhiates' former 'American Mission to the Greeks'.

¹⁵ R.C. Sproul's Ligonier Ministry magazine, *Tabletalk* (June, 1999), with several articles devoted to attacking the 'heretical' teachings and practices of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and Hank Hannegraaff,¹⁶ also known as 'The Bible Answer Man', a popular radio apologist and cult-watcher who succeeded the late Walter Martin.

Beyond these reactions from the Evangelical right, more informed and balanced Evangelical theologians are aggressively widening their perspectives on Orthodoxy through a study of ancient and modern writers of the Christian East. Their motivation appears to be rooted in a healthy self-awareness of the deficiencies and gaps which are currently present in modern theology, and the laudable desire for growth. Some proceed in their studies with an awareness that patristic and Byzantine theology are foundational not only to historic Christianity in both East and West, but are especially formative to the contemporary identity of the Eastern Orthodox Church. A brief survey of selected scholars and their works will show the direction in which Evangelicals are charting their studies of the Christian East.

Gerald Bray, a British Evangelical now working in America, is one of the most knowledgeable and linguistically competent researchers in Eastern Orthodoxy today. The breadth of his linguistic skills puts Bray at the forefront of Evangelical scholarship. He is fluent not only in the biblical languages of Hebrew and Greek, but also in Latin, Byzantine Greek, modern Greek and Russian. A specialist in historical theology and Anglican canon law, Bray teaches courses (among many others) in Greek and Latin patristics and has written on theological topics which are central to Orthodoxy in the ancient and modern worlds. A selection of his writings include 'Eastern Orthodox Theology',¹⁷ 'Justification and the Eastern Orthodox Churches',¹⁸ 'The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology'¹⁹ and the books *The Doctrine of God*²⁰ (which deals extensively with Orthodoxy as well as early Christian thought), *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present*,²¹ and his patristic commentaries in the *Ancient*

¹⁶ Featuring 'Searching for the True Apostolic Church: What Evangelicals Should Know About Eastern Orthodoxy', Paul Negrut in *Christian Research Journal* 20:3 (1998).

¹⁷ Gerald Bray in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. Sinclair B. Ferguson, David F. Wright, J.I. Packer (Downers Grove, IL, 1998), pp. 215-18.

¹⁸ Gerald Bray in *Here We Stand*, ed. J.I. Packer (Downers Grove, IL, 1993), p. 83 ff..

¹⁹ Gerald Bray, 'The *Filioque* Clause in History and Theology', *Tyndale Bulletin* 34 (1983), pp. 91-144.

²⁰ Gerald Bray, *The Doctrine of God* (Downers Grove, IL 1993).

²¹ Gerald Bray, *Biblical Interpretation: Past and Present* (Downers Grove, IL 1998).

Christian Commentary on Scripture (ACW)²² (Romans, 1,2 Corinthians, and James to Jude, to be discussed below under the work of Thomas Oden). Bray characterizes his stance toward Orthodoxy as follows:

My stance vis-a-via Orthodoxy is sympathetic but not uncritical. I do not share the fascination with Orthodoxy which characterizes some people in the West (after living in both Greece and Russia it is hard to romanticise the Orthodox Church) but I am very sympathetic to the underlying theological concerns of Orthodoxy and believe that there is a lot of common ground with Evangelical Protestants (and others, of course) which we need to explore. I suppose you could say that I am in the C. S. Lewis tradition of 'mere Christianity' – looking for what unites us across the cultural and historical differences, and concentrating on that.²³

What sets Bray apart from other Evangelicals in the 'C. S. Lewis tradition', however, is his concentration on the Orthodox faith as vitally central to that tradition. While others, such as Lewis and G. K. Chesterton, have explored 'orthodoxy' through the Fathers, creeds and councils of 'historic Christianity', Bray has linked much of that 'historic Christianity' to the ongoing institutional and spiritual life of the Orthodox Church. In this way, Bray does not deal with a *disembodied* orthodoxy but an orthodoxy that has largely been the achievement of the *Byzantine Orthodox Church* and the theological legacy which it has bequeathed for much of Protestant and Catholic orthodoxy today.

Another important scholar working between the traditions is Thomas Oden. According to Oden,

In *Agenda for Theology* (1979) I proposed a program of post-modern paleo-orthodoxy which would seek to reground contemporary theology in the consensual classic Christian sources. Everything I have done since has sought to develop that premise. The three volumes of *Systematic Theology*, of course, have constant reference to patristic sources, as do *Pastoral Theology* and the four volume work on *Classical Pastoral Care*.²⁴

Oden utilises a theological method which proceeds from the conviction that the consensus of the Church Fathers during the first millennium of Christian history constitutes a normative status for defining Christian

²² *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, General Editor, Thomas Oden, Vol. VI, VII, XI edited by Gerald Bray (Downers Grove, IL 1998, 99, 2000 respectively).

²³ Email from Gerald Bray to the author (July 23, 1999).

²⁴ Email from Thomas Oden to the author (July 21, 1999).

orthodoxy. This doctrinal history includes the decisions of the Ecumenical Councils (A.D. 325-787), the *consensus patrum*, the church's *lex orandi*, pastoral theology and other expressions of 'catholic' Christianity. In addition to the works cited above, a recent project which reveals Oden's premise most decisively is his editorial work on a new 27-volume collection of patristic commentaries on the entire Bible. Titled the *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture*, this series is the first modern patristic commentary of its kind from the pen of a leading Evangelical theologian and leading Evangelical publishing house (Inter Varsity Press). Oden describes the nature and purpose of the project in the 'General Introduction':

The Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture has as its goal the revitalisation of Christian teaching based on classical Christian exegesis... This series provides the pastor, exegete, student and lay reader with convenient means to see what Athanasius or John Chrysostom or the desert fathers and mothers had to say about a particular text for preaching, for study and for meditation. There is an emerging awareness among Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox laity that vital biblical preaching and spiritual formation need deeper grounding beyond the scope of the historical-critical orientations that have governed biblical studies in our day. Hence this work is directed toward a much broader audience than the highly technical and specialised scholarly field of patristic studies.²⁵

Clearly this is an intentionally ecumenical project whose team of volume editors originates from Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox scholars and who, under Oden, designed the project to edify those audiences. The fact that the series is not being manufactured and sold by a Roman Catholic or Orthodox publishing house, but Inter Varsity Press, shows how remarkable a renaissance of patristic studies is now underway among Evangelicals the world over. The impact which this series will very likely have on future Orthodox and Evangelical dialogue is potentially enormous. Since the Church Fathers played a formative role in shaping the identity of the Eastern Orthodox Church, the series will naturally encourage readers to think beyond the ancient Christian commentators themselves to the church which has most deeply appropriated those sources. Inevitably, it will prompt Evangelicals to explore in much greater depth the Christological, Trinitarian, ecclesiological and sacramental themes of the early Church Fathers and that of the Orthodox Church, the Fathers' heir apparent. This does not mean that the Fathers gave us a single authoritative interpretation

²⁵ *Ibid.*, Vol. VI, p. xi.

of every verse of the Bible. As the series makes evident, there are varied patristic interpretations on any given text of Scripture. Oden is under no illusion of concocting a uniform exegetical tradition by all the Fathers on any given text of Scripture. He recognises that there are many varieties of interpretations within almost every pericope. Yet it is also evident that there are central exegetical motifs that correspond to the great themes of Eastern Orthodox theology. By letting the Fathers speak for themselves, the ACW series reflects the Fathers' wide differences in cultural expression and theological creativity while at the same time yielding a remarkable consensus on central themes of divine Revelation. Such a discovery can only lead Evangelicals into a deeper appreciation of Orthodoxy while at the same time accentuating its similarities to and differences from the Catholic and Protestant traditions.

By virtually all accounts, J.I. Packer is an Evangelical statesman. As he reaches the golden years of his career we notice that he has begun to take a serious interest in conservative Christian dialogue with the hopes of forming a common agenda for the church's unified witness in the modern world. His work in 'Evangelical ecumenics' (to coin a phrase) began most visibly in his dialogue with Catholics in 1995 which led to his signing the document 'Evangelicals and Catholics Together'. Although his interest in Orthodoxy began much earlier, it was not until 1995 that it took concrete expression at a conservative ecumenical gathering of Catholics, Orthodox and Evangelicals called the 'Rose Hill' conference. It was there that Dr Packer and the present author worked as formal dialogue partners. At Rose Hill, Packer delivered a paper titled, 'On from Orr: Cultural Crisis, Rational Realism and Incarnational Ontology', to which I responded with 'An Eastern Orthodox Response to J.I. Packer'.²⁶ The dialogue was followed up in 1997 when Packer and the author team-taught a course at Regent College, Vancouver entitled, 'Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism in Dialogue'.²⁷ This dialogical course was an historic first of its kind among Evangelical seminaries in North America. Given Packer's distinguished stature and the constructive theological purpose of the course, the class proved that such a dialogue between Orthodox and Evangelicals was not only possible, but that it could actually achieve a

²⁶ James Cutsinger, ed. *Reclaiming the Great Tradition: Evangelicals, Catholics and Orthodox in Dialogue* (Downers Grove, 1997), pp. 155-84. See also Packer's 'Christian Morality Adrift', delivered to the Faith and Renewal Conference with an Orthodox response by Fr Stanley Harakas in Kevin Perrota, ed. *A Society in Peril* (Ann Arbor, MI, 1989).

²⁷ Available on audio tape through Regent College bookstore.

common witness without requiring either to compromise the doctrinal integrity of his position. Then, in September 1999, Dr Packer advanced the Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue in America by being the featured Evangelical speaker at the annual meeting of the *Society for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism*.²⁸ The theme for the conference was, “‘Outside the Church There is No Salvation’: An Orthodox and Evangelical Exchange’. The conference turned out to be the largest gathering of Orthodox and Evangelical Christians to date with approximately two hundred people in attendance.

In addition to Bray, Oden and Packer, the work of other scholars should also be mentioned, if ever so briefly. They come from Calvinist, Anglican, Anabaptist, Free Church, Nazarene, Mennonite, Wesleyan, Pentecostal and other denominations. Included in this list would be Miroslav Volf,²⁹ Grant Osborne,³⁰ Harold O.J. Brown,³¹

²⁸ Dr Edward Rommen was the lead Orthodox speaker. Rommen is a former tenured professor in the Missions Department at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL. His conversion to the Orthodox Church was reported in *Christianity Today* (August 11, 1998).

²⁹ Volf offers the most penetrating Free Church critique of modern Orthodox and Catholic ‘communion’ ecclesiologies as developed by John Zizioulas and Cardinal Ratzinger respectively. Miroslav Volf, *After Our Likeness: The Church as the Image of the Trinity* (Grand Rapids, 1997). Volf is a Croatian Pentecostal formerly at Fuller Seminary and now at Yale. The trajectory of his career and theological interests witness to the growth of Evangelical scholarship in the direction of an ‘ecumenical orthodoxy’ which envisions the collegial model of ‘communion’ ecclesiology in Orthodoxy to be more compatible with Evangelical theology than does the papal model of ‘communion’ ecclesiology in Roman Catholicism.

³⁰ Osborne offers the finest hermeneutical comparison to date in ‘The Many and the One: The Interface Between Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Evangelical Hermeneutics’, *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 3 (1995), pp. 281-304. The paper was originally delivered to the SSEOE where Osborne is an active dialogue partner. He is Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, IL).

³¹ One of the few Evangelical students who did their doctoral work under the late Orthodox theologian George Florovsky at Princeton. Brown has been an effective interpreter of Florovsky for the Evangelical community, though at times he squeezes Florovsky into an uncomfortably tight pair of Evangelical shoes. His recent effort to apply Florovsky’s theological method for Evangelical systematics can be seen in ‘On Method and Means in Theology’, in *Doing Theology in Today’s World: Essays in Honour of Kenneth S. Kantzer*, ed. John D. Woodbridge and Thomas E. McComiskey

Daniel Clendenin,³² James Stamoolis,³³ Donald Bloesch,³⁴ Kent Hill,³⁵ Mark Noll,³⁶ Kenneth Kantzer,³⁷ Randy Maddox,³⁸ Thomas Finger,³⁹ T.F.

(Grand Rapids, 1991), pp. 147-69.

- ³² Clendenin's exposure to Orthodoxy came while living in Moscow for several years as a religion professor at Moscow State University. A widely read two-volume work introducing Orthodoxy to western readers resulted: *Eastern Orthodox Christianity: A Western Perspective* (Grand Rapids, 1994); *ibid.*, *Eastern Orthodox Theology: A Contemporary Reader* (Grand Rapids, 1995). Clendenin's chief contribution is his synthesis of the essential points of Orthodox writers in the secondary literature, and focused interpretation of those facts for a Protestant Evangelical audience.
- ³³ Stamoolis was one of the founding members of the SSEOE. He is a Baptist with a Greek Orthodox upbringing. Formerly the Dean of the Wheaton Graduate School, he now serves as the Executive Director of the Theological Commission of the World Evangelical Fellowship. Sympathetic, yet also constructively critical of the Eastern Church, his contribution to the dialogue to date has mainly been in the area of Orthodox missions. See James Stamoolis, *Eastern Orthodox Mission Theology* (Maryknoll, NY, 1986). For his reflections on why he became an Evangelical see 'Reflections on Becoming Evangelical' in the *Occasional Bulletin* of the Evangelical Missiological Society, 11:1 (1999), pp. 3-4.
- ³⁴ A participant in the SSEOE where he delivered a paper entitled, 'Salvation in Protestant Evangelicalism' (1993), from his monumental series on *Christian Foundations*, Vol. 2 (Downers Grove, 1997).
- ³⁵ Kent Hill, *The Puzzle of the Soviet Church: An Inside Look at Christianity and Glasnost* (Portland, 1991). Hill has also been an active participant and supporter of the SSEOE.
- ³⁶ Although he has not written much in the field, he is a member of the SSEOE, personal friend and faithful encourager of Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue. His use of the late Fr George Florovsky's views on the task of the Christian historian remains fundamental to his class lectures in the History of Western Civilisation course at Wheaton College.
- ³⁷ Expressed in his involvement with and endorsement of the SSEOE: 'Nothing but good could come from serious conversations between Eastern Orthodox thinkers and conservative Evangelicals. This society provides just such a forum.'
- ³⁸ Randy Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology* (Nashville, 1994). One of Maddox's goals is to find in Wesley an instructive integration of theological emphases that have traditionally separated Eastern and Western Christianity.
- ³⁹ Thomas Finger, 'Anabaptism and Eastern Orthodoxy: Some Unexpected Similarities?' *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (Fall, 1995), originally delivered to the SSEOE.

Torrance,⁴⁰ Elaine Storkey,⁴¹ Vinay Samuel,⁴² David Dockery⁴³ and others⁴⁴ whom no doubt I have missed. It would be claiming too much to say that each of these individuals is an expert on the Christian East, but each in his own way has begun to lead the Evangelical community into a more advanced level of academic dialogue than ever before. In fact, Zondervan, a leading Evangelical publishing house, has very recently acknowledged the study of Orthodoxy as a lacuna which needs to be filled in Evangelical scholarship today. In July 1999 it commissioned the

⁴⁰ Torrance pleads for space in the Evangelical establishment of North America, but less so in Europe. Concerns of North American Evangelicals have been partly due to his theological epistemology and de-emphasising of propositional revelation. Nevertheless his rare mastery of the language and literature of the Eastern Church (ancient and modern), coupled with his relatively conservative ecumenism from a Calvinist platform, makes it impossible to overlook his contributions. Evangelicals should interact with his proposals more thoroughly than they have to date. Among his writings, too numerous to list, see his recent work on the Reformed-Eastern Orthodox dialogue in *Trinitarian Perspectives: Toward Doctrinal Agreement* (Edinburgh, 1994).

⁴¹ Elaine Storkey, 'The WCC Statement on Mission: A Paper for Discussion' in *Turn to God, Rejoice in Hope! Orthodox-Evangelical Consultation, Hamburg, Germany, 1998* (WCC Publication, Geneva, 1998), pp. 75-9. Storkey has been John Stott's assistant of the Institute for Contemporary Christianity, London.

⁴² Notable more for his participation in the WCC's Orthodox-Evangelical consultation, Hamburg, Germany, 1998 than for his academic writing. He is Executive Director for the Oxford Centre for Mission Studies.

⁴³ David Dockery, *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the Light of the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, 1992). It demonstrates the recovery of the ancient exegetical tradition by a Baptist New Testament scholar. The Baptists Glen Hinson and Charles Scalesh do similarly except in the areas of evangelism, patristic ecclesiology, sacramental theology and theological hermeneutics.

⁴⁴ Craig Blaising, *Scripture, Tradition and Authority: A Response to Emmanuel Clapsis*, unpublished paper delivered to the SSEOE (1995), and Secretary-Treasurer of the SSEOE (1995-97); Robert Rakestraw, 'Becoming Like God: An Evangelical Doctrine of *Theosis*', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 2 (1994); Gabriel Fackre, *The Christian Story*, 3rd ed., 3 vols (Grand Rapids, 1995 ff.). Fackre grew up with a father from a Middle Eastern, Orthodox home; Walter Sawatsky, a Mennonite who has published numerous books and articles on Evangelicals in Russia; Cecil Robeck, a Pentecostal, has also worked in Cyprian's ecclesiology in light of contemporary ecumenical Catholic and Orthodox discussions.

publication of a new book in its 'Counterpoint Series' which will be devoted exclusively to this subject. It is tentatively entitled, *Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism: Conflict or Compatibility?*, edited by James Stamoolis (forthcoming, 2002?).

Theology is not the only field of Evangelical scholarship that is engaging the Orthodox Church today. Evangelical psychologists are also appropriating insights from the monastic Fathers of the Byzantine, Syrian and Coptic Orthodox Churches. Without minimising the essential role which theology must play in healing the wounds between Orthodox and Evangelical believers, there is also great practical value in enlisting the resources of Orthodox anthropology into the service of Christian psychology. The best scholar who has been working specially in this area is Dr Janice Strength, a professor of family therapy at Fuller Seminary's School of Psychology. She is also the co-founder of a graduate school of Christian psychology in Moscow whose leadership and student body is overwhelmingly Orthodox. In a chapter entitled 'From Conflict to Love: Suggestions for Healing the Christian Family', Strength offers the Orthodox and Evangelical communities a very sensitive analysis of the dynamics of human nature and conflict resolution along with guidelines for Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue in Russia from a family therapist's point of view.⁴⁵

When turning to the Orthodox side of the dialogue, we regret to report that with but a few notable exceptions,⁴⁶ theologians in Russia and Greece have little or no contact with Evangelicals and are even disdainful of them mainly because of Evangelical missions – which are frequently successful in Russia but often unsuccessful in Greece.

Outside Russia and Greece, Orthodox theologians are working to build bridges with Evangelicals at a variety of levels. I am reluctant to speak about myself, but I have been honoured to devote a portion of my

⁴⁵ Janice Strength, 'From Conflict to Love: Suggestions for Healing the Christian Family', in *God in Russia: The Challenge of Freedom*, eds S. Linzey and K. Kaisch (New York, forthcoming 1999 referenced by prepublication permission of the author), n. p.

⁴⁶ Such as the St Petersburg Evangelical Theological Academy which includes Russian Orthodox professors on its faculty (see further under 'Seminaries and Universities'). Other exceptions would be Russian Orthodox leaders Frs Alexander Borisov, the late Alexander Menn, and Metropolitan Kyrill. I know of no such counterparts in Greece, though Archbishop Demetrios Trakatellis would have qualified as a friend of Evangelicals in Athens before leaving Greece in 1999 to become the new Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese in North America.

scholarship to this area as an Orthodox theologian. I have already noted three contributions in the above paragraphs: the SSEOE, the rejoinder chapter 'An Eastern Orthodox Response to J.I. Packer', and a team-taught course at Regent College, Vancouver with Dr Packer on 'Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism in Dialogue'. In addition are the following chapters and essays: An introductory guide to the study of Eastern Orthodoxy written specially for Evangelical students of theology can be found in my chapter 'New Dimensions in Eastern Orthodox Theology'.⁴⁷ Though intended for a North American audience with little familiarity with European languages, it serves as an introduction to the principal features of Orthodox theology and the methodological pitfalls to avoid when studying it. A suggested missiological strategy for Evangelicals who are ministering in Orthodox lands such as Russia and Eastern Europe is outlined in the essay 'Evangelical Missions in Eastern Orthodox Lands'.⁴⁸ Also in the field of missiology see the brief article on 'Orthodox Mission Movements' in the *Evangelical Dictionary of World Missions*, ed. Charles van Engen *et al.* (Baker, forthcoming). In the area of comparative spirituality, the author delivered a public lecture at Regent College on 'Eastern Orthodox and Evangelical Spirituality: The Core of a Common Agenda'.⁴⁹ On the international scene, I was privileged to serve as a featured speaker for the Orthodox-Evangelical consultations sponsored by the World Council of Churches in Alexandria, Egypt and Hamburg, Germany,⁵⁰ as noted above. Currently I am compiling the past eight years of annual papers delivered to the 'Society for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism' which will hopefully be published as a book in the next few years. I am also preparing a chapter for the forthcoming book *Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism: Conflict or Compatibility?*, ed. James Stamoolis (Zondervan, as noted earlier). There I hope to set forth my past 30 years of theological study and experience in Orthodox and Evangelical theology by arguing why I believe they are compatible in key areas yet incompatible in others. These works are supplemented by several graduate courses on Orthodox history, theology and missions which I teach in both Orthodox

⁴⁷ *New Dimensions in Evangelical Thought: Essays in Honour of Millard Erickson*, ed. David Dockery (Downers Grove, IL, 1998), pp. 92-117.

⁴⁸ *Trinity World Forum* (Winter, 1996), published by Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, IL).

⁴⁹ Available on audio cassette at Regent College Bookstore, Vancouver, B. C., Canada.

⁵⁰ 'Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism in Dialogue', *Turn to God, Rejoice in Hope! Orthodox-Evangelical Consultation*, Hamburg, 30 March-4 April, 1998 (World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1998), pp. 69-74.

and Protestant Evangelical seminaries throughout North America (to be discussed below under 'Seminaries').

Other Orthodox theologians have contributed occasional papers or offered specific direction on the Church's relationship to Evangelical scholarship. Such publications are by no means abundant but the scholars themselves, and what they are calling for, is highly significant due to their strategic ecclesiastical positions within the Orthodox Church. These theologians are Frs Stanley Harakas,⁵¹ Theodore Stylianopoulos,⁵² Emmanuel Clapsis,⁵³ Bishop Kallistos Ware,⁵⁴ Archbishop Philip Saliba,⁵⁵ Edward Rommen,⁵⁶ Eusebius Stephanou,⁵⁷ and a small but growing number of local Orthodox priests⁵⁸ across North America. A

⁵¹ Stanley Harakas, *On Theological Method*, unpublished paper delivered to the SSEOE (1996).

⁵² Featured speaker on Orthodox spirituality at the SSEOE meeting, Billy Graham Centre, Wheaton College, 1995. See his further comments below.

⁵³ Emmanuel Clapsis, *Scripture, Tradition and Authority: An Eastern Orthodox View*, delivered to the SSEOE, 1995.

⁵⁴ Unpublished paper on 'The Holy Spirit in the Eastern Church Fathers' given at a Pentecostal-Orthodox dialogue in Prague, 1998, forthcoming in the SSEOE volume. Ware will also be the featured Orthodox speaker at the upcoming SSEOE meeting in 2001.

⁵⁵ Primate of the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of North America who admitted members of the Evangelical Orthodox Church into the Antiochian church in 1987.

⁵⁶ An Evangelical convert to Orthodoxy in 1997. See 'Reflections on Becoming Orthodox' in *The Occasional Bulletin* of the Evangelical Missiological Society 11 (1999), pp. 1-3.

⁵⁷ Stephanou is a cradle Greek Orthodox with five graduate degrees in theology from Greece and the US. He has promoted Orthodox renewal along evangelical lines for over three decades. Once highly controversial in the Greek Archdiocese – for perceptions of spiritual imbalance along charismatic lines, not dogmatic heresy – he was persecuted by Church authorities but never excommunicated. He now enjoys the blessing of the Church hierarchy on his organization, 'The Brotherhood of St. Symeon the New Theologian'. The brotherhood is a spiritual renewal group which holds quarterly renewal conferences at its headquarters in Destin, FL and publishes a bi-monthly periodical *The Orthodox Evangelist* (formerly *The Logos*). Much of his current work is devoted to Orthodox evangelism and physical and emotional healing of individuals and families. He has also been instrumental in promoting the ministry of a dynamic young Orthodox evangelist, Charles Omuroka, from Kenya, East Africa.

⁵⁸ The local Orthodox parishes have been the least affected by the dialogue. As so often happens in ecumenical discussions, the conclusions reached often

sample of Orthodox endorsements of the SSEOE will indicate the strength of Pan-Orthodox interest in Evangelical dialogue:

We are happy to endorse the good work you and your organization are doing to promote fellowship and mutual enrichment among those engaged in your activities. We hope that you will be fruitful and multiply in membership so that the message of Jesus Christ according to the biblical and apostolic teachings will be known to all.

*Archbishop Philip Saliba,
Primate of the Antiochian Archdiocese of North America*

The SSEOE is fulfilling a vital role.... How much we have to gain from listening to each other! May Jesus Christ, our common Lord and Saviour, bless your work.

*Bishop Kallistos (Timothy) Ware,
Oxford University*

In the post-Soviet world, with the opening of traditionally Orthodox nations to the potential for open proselytism, Evangelical and Orthodox relations can go in one of two directions: either return to the dangers of a pre-ecumenical era, or change the course of history. The SSEOE has already begun addressing this important theological and practical missiological question. Much good can come of such a scholarly dialogue.

*Fr Stanley Harakas, Professor of Theology and Ethics, Emeritus,
Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Seminary*

Of special importance are the remarks by Fr Theodore Stylianopoulos, a seasoned Professor of New Testament at Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Seminary (Brookline, MA). As Stylianopoulos has matured over the years, he has become openly bold and forthright in his desire to interface with Evangelical scholarship in the area of theology and biblical studies.

get stuck at the top and seldom filter down to practical church life. A notable exception, however, can be found at St Paul's Greek Orthodox Church (Irvine, CA). The pastor, Fr Steve Tschilis, hosted the annual SSEOE meeting at the church in September 1999 where Drs J.I. Packer and Edward Rommen spoke to a record audience. Fr Steve is a solid cradle Orthodox man who is also open to constructive dialogue with Evangelicals in the Southern California area. The church is a model Pan-Orthodox parish with an outstanding Sunday School program headed by Eve Tibbs, an Orthodox graduate student at Fuller Seminary, consisting of a comprehensive curriculum of Bible training, Orthodox history, liturgy, and spirituality.

Apparently this has been the result of years of interaction with Evangelicals in the Boston area, including co-operative work with Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary (an evangelical consortium school of Holy Cross), visits to Gordon McDonald's church in the Boston area (an active participant in the Society for the Study of Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism), and similar Orthodox-Evangelical contacts. He states,

Many Evangelical scholars such as Donald G. Bloesch, Gordon D. Fee, and James I. Packer, appear to have the closest affinities to Orthodox scholars, at least pertaining to Scripture. These and other Evangelicals form a kind of 'golden mean' between fundamentalism and liberal Protestantism, working out their own kind of 'neo-patristic synthesis' within the diverse world of Protestantism. To be sure, such Evangelicals need to rethink the 'ecclesial principle' as expressed by the Orthodox tradition, and some are doing so. However, pertaining to the 'scripture principle'... these Evangelical scholars... appear to be even more 'patristic' than many Orthodox who think of the patristic heritage as their own inheritance.

Again I would stress that, if the 'ecclesial principle' as well is brought into play, Orthodox and Evangelical scholars can support each other in substantive terms on the basis of their unanimity on classic Christian doctrine as a summary of abiding biblical truth. Their theological commitments and contemporary circumstances drive them together to work toward a common witness and common biblical hermeneutics.... [T]hose who affirm the authority of Scripture and seek to live and work with some balance between faith and reason, will continue to gravitate toward a consensus that is called either 'evangelical catholicity' or 'catholic evangelicalism' as the enduring Christian option of the third millennium.⁵⁹

These comments by a scholar of Stylianopoulos's stature should not be glossed over as ecumenical rhetoric. His call for mutual support is clear, specific and authoritative. If Stylianopoulos is correct, then Orthodox and Evangelical biblical scholars and churchmen have no other option but to take this invitation seriously and respond to it with specific and decisive action. Such action might include creating joint biblical consultations, exploring faculty exchange programs (which can break down caricatures and stereotypes), initiating collaborative writing projects in the areas of ecclesiology, canon formation, tradition, and scriptural hermeneutics, and other projects.

⁵⁹ Theodore G. Stylianopoulos, *The New Testament: An Orthodox Perspective*, Vol. 1 (Brookline, MA), 1997, pp. 227-8, 232, 212. This last quotation refers not only to Protestant Evangelicals but also to Roman Catholics and Orthodox.

From the perspective of the big picture, then, if one were to ask where, geographically, the Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue is being most fruitfully nurtured in the world, the answer would be found in the United States. This should come as no surprise to readers since North America is saturated with Evangelical Christianity and it is precisely because Evangelicals enjoy a position of religious dominance in American culture that the American Orthodox have been forced to respond to its influence. That response has contributed in part to the rise of what may be termed an 'American Orthodox theology'. By that I mean that Orthodox theologians in America have been forced to draw upon the rich theological resources of their own tradition in order to respond creatively to the challenges of American religion – including American Evangelicalism. Just as there are characteristic theological emphases in Greece, Romania, Bulgaria and elsewhere due to the political, historical, geographical, and religious questions which have faced the Orthodox Church and required it to address itself to the special challenges of those given contexts, so also have the Orthodox in America begun slowly to offer theological responses which are culturally and theologically relevant to them.

But here lies an interesting irony. Whereas in places like Russia and Eastern Europe, the Orthodox Church has occupied a position of religious dominance over Evangelical churches, in America the Evangelical community enjoys the position of dominance over the minority of Orthodox churches. These simple facts bear significantly on the question of why the Orthodox-Evangelical dialogue is fairing better in the US than anywhere else in the world. One could offer several explanations to account for it but perhaps the most significant reason is due to the American tolerance of religious pluralism. In America, Christians enjoy the constitutional privilege of 'freedom of religion'. Orthodox leaders in Russia and Eastern Europe should take note of this fact because it contradicts the cherished assumption that only a legally imposed protection of Orthodoxy can ensure the spiritual health of the Orthodox people. In fact just the opposite has been true in America. It is precisely because of our religious freedoms that an increasing number of Evangelicals want to explore the Orthodox Church independently from the cultural imposition of an offending legislation. Put simply, the only Orthodoxy worth joining is the one that has been freely explored and understood. Likewise, the few influential Orthodox theologians in America who have an informed knowledge of Evangelical scholarship understand that these believers are not at all to be lumped together with cults and sects as if they were part of one great sea of undifferentiated darkness. On the contrary, they see its

followers as true believers who live in dynamic Christian communities which possess a respectable intellectual heritage of scholarship.

What is happening in the American dialogue thus brings exciting possibilities for reconstruction and renewal in the mother Orthodox countries. This should not be construed, however, as a demeaning of the mother Orthodox Churches outside America since they will always remain highly valued by the American Orthodox people. Nevertheless it seems hardly debatable that the mantle is falling to their spiritual children in the United States to achieve the kind of constructive approach to Evangelicalism which the older lands have not been able to accomplish as effectively thus far. That being said, however, it would be quite misleading to paint an overly optimistic portrait of Orthodox-Evangelical relations in America. To be sure, not all is rosy in the United States. Major challenges and obstacles remain for both the academy and the church, challenges to which we shall now turn.

Seminaries and Universities

On the missiological front, walls of tension and hostility between Orthodox and Evangelicals have been rising in pockets of Russia and Eastern Europe since the fall of communism. A staggering number of approximately seven hundred Western missionary agencies have been documented as presently at work in these countries.⁶⁰ Very few missionaries, however, are prepared to operate with even a basic grasp of the countries' history, culture or language. There is almost a total lack of missionary preparation being given to Evangelical students who minister in those countries. It is no wonder that Orthodox believers are insulted that some Protestant missionaries have come into their country on the assumption that Russia (or other Eastern European block countries) is a heathen nation with no presence or history of the gospel. Some hold evangelistic meetings with only a superficial concern for discipling new believers. As a result Orthodox leaders have shown increasingly strong resentment toward missionaries who have attempted to convert or proselytise their parishioners. Yet Western Evangelicals are equally offended that some Russian Orthodox churchmen have confused them with a cult or sect. They are astonished and angry that the Orthodox would take such extreme measures as to outlaw their ministries in the country. They

⁶⁰ Sharon Linzey, Holt Ruffin and Mark Elliot, eds *East-West Christian Organisations: A Directory of Western Christian Organisations Working in East Central Europe and the Former Soviet Union* (Evanston, IL, 1993).

are bewildered by the behaviour of right wing nationalists who have burned the bridges for dialogue by doing such things as holding a literal bonfire to destroy the theological books of ecumenists John Meyendorff, Alexander Schmemmann and George Florovsky who by nearly all accounts are ranked among this century's greatest Orthodox theologians.

I am only skimming the surface of these problems which I trust are well known to the reader. For those on the mission field they are lively issues which sometimes impinge upon their very survival. What all this underscores is the fact that if Orthodox and Evangelicals want to 'preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' (Eph. 4:3) they must begin by widening their comprehension of each other's theological history. This means that there are no shortcuts, no easy ways out, no painless paths to follow, but only the cross of Christ. Each must study at each other's seminaries (or at least make friends with each other's faculties so a conversation can begin), share bibliographies, visit each other's churches, and spend time together in worship and fellowship. Two traditions which are so vastly different in some ways, yet so closely alike in others, cannot be understood from the inside apart from the sacrificial gifts of time and respect each can give to the other. The dialogue must be that important to people before any real progress can be made to heal the wounds of Christian division.

Given these pressing realities both sides must ask themselves the hard question, 'What is being done in our seminaries and Christian universities to address these vital issues in modern theology and missiology?' The answer is not very heartening. In general, Evangelical seminaries are doing more than the Orthodox seminaries to rectify the imbalance. But while some Evangelical seminaries are beginning to offer a small number of courses on the Orthodox Church, almost no Christian colleges or universities offer even a single introductory class in their history or religion departments. A survey of specific schools will document these general conclusions and give an up-to-date assessment of the current state of the field.

In American Evangelical seminaries we can happily report that over the past decade a small number of courses on the Orthodox Church have been introduced as a new part of the curricula. All such courses are noteworthy since, historically, Evangelical seminaries previously offered them on an 'on demand' basis only. A study of actual course offerings shows that at least one class on the Orthodox tradition has been taught at Fuller Seminary, Southern Baptist Seminary (Louisville, KY), Gordon Conwell Seminary, and Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (IL) to name only a few of the better known in the US. Fuller Seminary is especially to be

commended for offering several elective courses by Orthodox adjuncts on 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', 'Eastern Church Fathers', and 'Theology and Spirituality of Icons'. In fact Fuller hired Samuel Gantt who became a full-time Orthodox faculty member for many years. Fr Sam is an Antiochian priest who served as Fuller's Director of Biblical Language Instruction and Instructor in Biblical Languages and was one of the most revered professors among students for over fifteen years. Trinity Divinity School has also offered occasional elective courses in their Mission department on 'Evangelical Missions in Orthodox Lands', 'Eastern Orthodox Theology and Practice' and 'Introduction to the Orthodox Church'. In the UK, London Bible College also offers occasional courses in the field, as does a newly formed Evangelical college in Odessa in the Ukraine under President Sergei Sannikov.

Fuller Seminary has been regarded by some as the 'flagship' school of Evangelicalism as it travelled into the stormy winds of controversy throughout its history, so its relationship with the Orthodox Church deserves special attention for the purpose of this article. To contextualize this relationship an historical summary of key turning points in Fuller's history is in order. Fuller was born out of a controversy which centred in part on the relationship between the gospel and culture. The school was founded with the intention of engaging contemporary culture at all levels with the gospel of Christ, as opposed to the cultural isolationism of separatist Fundamentalists of the 1940s. The next major debate came in the 1970s concerning the inerrancy of the Bible with Fuller taking an essentially errantist position. Then in the 1980s Fuller entered into controversy over the role of women in the church and ended up concluding that the school would actively support the full inclusion of women in ministry. In the 1990s one of the key issues before Fuller now is its attitude toward ecumenism. To what extent will Fuller join itself with other Christian bodies in advancing the gospel of Jesus Christ? Over the course of Fuller's 50-year history the school was already practising a *de facto* type of ecumenism by openly welcoming students from all historic branches of the Christian church. It is this openness which has made it one of the largest interdenominational seminaries in the world today. But what is to be its posture towards the Orthodox? Can it embrace the full inclusion of Orthodox students and professors into its ranks as part of the Evangelical family?

There are three educational alliances which Fuller has attempted to achieve with the Orthodox over the past decade with varying degrees of success and commitment. First, in Fuller's School of Psychology, as noted earlier, family therapist Dr Janice Strength founded a counselling

school in Russia which is named the Moscow Christian School of Psychology. Most of its student body consists of Russian Orthodox Christians and its faculty permits both Orthodox and Evangelical professors.

A second educational ministry is Fuller's extension-type program based in St Petersburg, Russia. Dr James Bradley, the Faculty Co-ordinator for the program, describes its work.

St. Petersburg Theological Academy was founded in 1990 by Dr. Sergei Nikolaev with the support of Dr. Arthur DeKruyter, pastor of Christ Church of Oak Brook, Illinois and Trustee of Fuller Seminary. In consultation with the President and Dean of Fuller Seminary, it was agreed that Fuller would serve in an advisory capacity to the new institution, and that we would send four professors each year to teach intensive, two week courses. From the Spring of 1990 through September 1998, the School of Theology at Fuller has involved fourteen of its own faculty persons (one-third of the School of Theology Faculty) and three graduate students in this project and together they have taught a total of fifty-six courses. Professors normally teach two courses over a period of two weeks with thirty contact hours with students per week.

The experience for the Fuller faculty involved in this endeavour has been uniformly positive and enriching. Participation has enabled School of Theology faculty to experience the church in a cross cultural context.... While our faculty are used to the rich cultural and ethnic diversity of students in Los Angeles, the diversity of backgrounds represented by students from the Russian republics is, of course, even greater. *Good ecumenical relations with the Russian Orthodox Church have been maintained; currently two Orthodox priests serve as adjunct faculty and teach specialised courses at the academy* [emphasis mine].⁶¹

Under Dr Bradley's leadership, the St Petersburg project is a model for similar co-operative ventures between Orthodox and Evangelical faculties. One cannot help but think that if it can be done successfully in Russia, there is every reason to believe that it should be able to be done successfully anywhere else in the world. But such was not the case in Fuller's own home in America where a third and largest educational alliance with Orthodox regrettably failed.

Fuller's third venture with the Orthodox tested the seriousness of the school's stated mission of church renewal but it proved to require more

⁶¹ Taken from a report by Bradley addressed to Judith A. Berling, Director, Incarnating Globalization, The Association of Theological Schools, October 3, 1998, p. 1.

from Fuller than it was willing or able to give. It was a landmark proposal in the history of Orthodox-Evangelical relations. In 1995 the Antiochian Orthodox Church in North America (perhaps the most progressive of all Orthodox Churches) initiated contact with Fuller Seminary to propose a joint educational alliance for Orthodox and Evangelical seminarians. Never before in either the history of Evangelicalism or in the history of Orthodoxy had an ecumenical proposal of such magnitude ever been discussed, let alone proposed, by an Orthodox Church, especially one of such great historical distinction as the ancient Patriarchate of Antioch. Fr Michel Najim (a Syriac scholar, Dean of St Nicholas Orthodox Cathedral in Los Angeles and former Dean of St John of Damascus Seminary in Beirut, Lebanon) and myself were appointed as official representatives of the Antiochian Church to Fuller. We worked with and under the direction of Fr Joseph Allen, Chair of the Theological Commission which is overseen by Archbishop Philip Saliba and Bishop Demetri Khouri. The proposal sought to provide a Pan-Orthodox program of studies leading to the Master of Divinity (M. Div.) degree granted by Fuller Seminary in conjunction with the Antiochian House of Studies (a graduate program of St John of Damascus Seminary, Balamand University, Beirut, Lebanon). It was intended to be an ecumenical program with an Orthodox emphasis that would be based in Pasadena but made available to Orthodox and Evangelical students in America and throughout the world by using classical and contemporary methods of theological education (including media technologies over the Internet and Individualised Distance Learning courses). Greek and Russian bishops from the Greek Orthodox Church and Orthodox Church in America agreed to participate as Orthodox professors in the program, and the Coptic Orthodox Church in Los Angeles was in the early stages of discussing their involvement with the Antiochians as well.

As the engineer for the curriculum, I performed several revisions in consultations with both parties involved while seeking to achieve a balance between the theological demands of an authentically Orthodox curriculum and the Evangelical distinctives of Fuller Seminary. The final curriculum appeared to be a unique ecumenical achievement which created an authentic synthesis between our theological traditions without resulting in doctrinal compromise or a theological hybrid. It also offered Fuller's own students the opportunity to study with Orthodox professors at one of the world's largest and most progressive interdenominational Evangelical seminaries. Eastern Orthodox students would have been asked to grapple with the theological emphases of the Reformation, and Evangelical students would have been asked to do the same with Orthodox theology. Both would find

Fuller a safe place to learn each other's history and theology while actually witnessing Christian unity in action for the good of the body of Christ. In this way the joint program would fulfil Fuller's own stated 'Mission Beyond the Mission', a goal dedicated to the renewal of the entire Christian church including the historic 'catholic' traditions such as 'the Orthodox Church' among others.

Despite the numerous prior contacts with Fuller administrators, Fuller's faculty had been given only one introductory opportunity to listen to our proposal and respond. Fr Michel Najim and I presented a general overview of the reasons and goals of the program without reference to the specifics in the curriculum. A few did not feel they could do a responsible job in the area of Orthodox-Evangelical Cupertino since they were already over-committed to other projects. However, others (notably Miroslav Volf who has since moved to Yale) felt the proposal was of enormous significance, were eager to support it, and felt honoured to be involved in such an historic ecumenical moment. Afterwards the Dean and faculty felt they should turn it over to the higher levels of Fuller's administration to move the process forward. A very ambiguous stage in the dialogue ensued between the faculty and administration over whether and how to go ahead with the proposal. Despite many of the faculty's readiness to move ahead with advanced union negotiations, the Dean later provided a written statement to me in which he explained that the administration/Board of Trustees failed to provide the faculty with a clear signal to proceed. Thus an historic program of enormous ecumenical import tragically died.⁶² Should George Marsden's book on the history of Fuller Seminary (*Reforming Evangelicalism*) ever be revised in the future, the story of Fuller Seminary ought to include a detailed narrative of this missed opportunity in modern church history.

When turning to an evaluation of Orthodox seminaries that offer courses on Evangelicalism, it is obvious that they are behind their Evangelical counterparts. Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Seminary makes Evangelical courses available to its students through its sister consortium school Gordon-Conwell Seminary. In 1980 a dialogue on preaching was held at the campus of Holy Cross between its faculty and Gordon-Conwell's. The papers were published in the book *God's Living Word*:

⁶² Union negotiations between Fuller and the Antiochian Archdiocese was noted briefly in 'Universities Question Orthodox Conversions', *Christianity Today*, August 11, 1998.

Orthodox and Evangelical Essays on Preaching.⁶³ St Vladimir's Orthodox Seminary (Crestwood, NY) shows verbal signs of interest in Orthodoxy's relationship with Evangelicalism among several of its faculty and students but so far no concrete action has been taken to implement such courses or to engage Evangelicals in academic conversation. Saint Nersus, its sister school from the Armenian Orthodox Church, invited an Armenian Evangelical, Joseph Alexanian from Trinity International University (Deerfield, IL) to teach a course on evangelism in the book of Acts in the summer of 1994. In August 1995 Metropolitan Philip Saliba of the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese took a bold step forward to raise seminarians' level of knowledge by offering an annual comparative theology course for his Antiochian students on 'Orthodoxy and American Evangelicalism' in the Antiochian House of Studies (Ligonier, Pennsylvania) taught by the present author.

All of these attempts can only be regarded as progressive. Still, one must be honest enough to regard them only as a good beginning and that not nearly enough is being done to fill in the gaps in our respective curricula. Nevertheless, Evangelical schools are doing more to rectify the situation than are the Orthodox seminaries. And despite Fuller's disappointing setback from the Antiochian proposal noted above, its faculty and administrators remain very supportive in offering courses on the Christian East.

But not all Evangelical schools have had such a constructive relationship with the Orthodox. In the past two years, two schools in particular have gone through some very difficult times when trying to determine what to do with their Orthodox faculty. They are Biola University (La Mirada, California) and Columbia International University (Columbia, South Carolina).

Biola University is a very conservative Evangelical school with a denominationally diverse student body. In 1997-98 three Orthodox employees of the school endured the possibility of termination of contract as a result of a vocal minority of students who portrayed the Orthodox faculty as members of a heretical sect. One professor occupied the chair of a highly successful R. A. Torrey Honours Program, another professor was head of the Art Department and the third an ordained Orthodox priest who served as the Dean of Students. By all accounts, including Biola's students and administration, each performed their jobs with honourable distinction. In the name of academic freedom, the vocal minority of students were

⁶³ *God's Living Word: Orthodox and Evangelical Essays on Preaching*, ed. Theodore Stylianopoulos (Brookline, 1983).

allowed to express their views but took advantage of their privileges and soon became disruptive to the professors and institutional life of the school. The students increased the tension by posting anti-Orthodox messages throughout the school and, to put it lightly, generally demeaned the Orthodox Church. As a result, a theological commission of three was set up from the school's adjacent Talbot School of Theology to write a report on Eastern Orthodox theology and its compatibility with Biola's Statement of Faith. If the two were compatible the professors could remain at the school; if not, they would have to leave. To help facilitate the dialogue, two outside Orthodox theologians were invited to Biola for an evening's discussion with the members of Talbot's theological commission. After meeting for several hours the Provost, who moderated the discussion, concluded that there were no major breaches with Biola's Statement of Faith and that the Orthodox professors could remain in their jobs.⁶⁴ The face-to-face dialogue between Orthodox and Evangelical theologians which occurred at Biola University is a commendable model of true Christian understanding which should serve the rest of the Evangelical community with a standard to emulate.

A similar incident of an Evangelical backlash against Orthodoxy occurred at another conservative school but not with the same positive results. One of the mission professors at Columbia International University, Dr Edward Rommen, joined the faculty after serving as a tenured professor at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School (Deerfield, IL). Rommen grew up in the Evangelical Free Church and spent 14 years as a missionary and seminary professor of that denomination in Germany. He possesses a doctorate in Theology and Missions and studied with Wolfhart Pannenberg at Munich, Germany. His most recent book was co-authored with David Hesselgrave, and is entitled, *Contextualization: Meanings, Methods and Models*. After many years of studying and searching for a deeper church life, in 1997 Rommen left the Evangelical Free Church denomination and joined the Orthodox Church. As a result of his conversion, he was almost immediately asked to resign from his new teaching post at Columbia International University in 1998. While the majority of professors and administrators seemed to support Rommen, two or three top administrators appear to have engineered a quiet dismissal. He is now an ordained Orthodox Deacon working for a construction company while looking for another teaching post at a university or seminary.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ Reported in 'Universities Question Orthodox Conversions', *Christianity Today* (August 11, 1998), pp. 21-3.

⁶⁵ As reported in *Christianity Today*, *ibid.*

Another example of a more quiet form of an Evangelical reaction against Orthodoxy can be seen in the case of Wheaton College. Here one needs to distinguish between Wheaton's *public* Statement of Faith and its *private* stance against the Orthodox. There is nothing in Wheaton's Statement of Faith which any Orthodox theologian could not sign. What Wheaton hopes for, however, is that such theologians would object to what is not contained in it (e.g. the 'real presence' of Christ in the Eucharist). According to Robert Weber, Wheaton operates on a rule of thumb that only Protestants can speak in chapel or be hired as faculty members. However, this is only an 'oral' tradition among most (not all) of the faculty, not a 'written' prohibition.⁶⁶ Such a posture, however, is curious in light of the fact that Weber himself is an Episcopalian, which is nearly identical with the Orthodox tradition barring differences over the *filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed and a few other similar technicalities which are not vital for faculty signatures at Wheaton. Also there are more Episcopal students attending Wheaton College than at any other time in the school's history. Another irony lies in the contradictory message one hears when a renowned Orthodox speaker is asked to grace the christening of one of Evangelicalism's most distinguished institutions. During the 1980s the renowned Orthodox philosopher, educator and theologian, Charles Malik, was invited to give the prestigious dedication speech for the new Billy Graham Centre which is located on the campus of Wheaton College. The late Charles Malik was a theologian of the Antiochian Orthodox Church in Lebanon and the United States, a founding member in the United Nations, a member of the Board of Trustees of Harvard University, and personal friend of Carl Henry and Bill Bright. Though the Billy Graham Centre is functionally distinct from Wheaton College, Wheaton wholeheartedly embraced the honour of Malik's presence. One can only humbly pray for the day when Wheaton and other fine schools like it will welcome Orthodox theologians of the calibre of Charles Malik into their Evangelical ranks with full faculty status as valued brothers in Christ.

In sum, the presence or potential of Orthodox faculty in Evangelical schools has begun to challenge the adequacy of public Evangelical Statements of Faith and privately held faculty opinions. The Statements of Faith were often forged as an historical reaction against Tridentine Roman Catholicism and the once rising tide of Protestant liberalism. Orthodoxy was not even on the radar screen of Evangelical schools at the time of

⁶⁶ Phone conversation with Robert Weber, December 21, 1999. Weber referred me to Wheaton's President, Duane Litfin, for confirmation but he was unavailable for comment.

drafting their statements. Today, Evangelicals in America are having to re-evaluate their identity in light of their relationship with Orthodoxy on an 'as needed' basis. There is not a large movement in this direction but the problems outlined above reveal that the Orthodox Church in America is indeed having a discernible impact on Evangelical schools, and that such schools are struggling to understand the true identity of Orthodoxy as well as their own Evangelical identity in light of that discovery. Oftentimes their understanding of the Orthodox Church is mediated simply through introductory books which do not adequately deal with Evangelical questions, through conversations with theologically unsophisticated Orthodox leaders, or through fellow Evangelical professors who themselves have only a superficial knowledge of the Church's tradition. Few Orthodox or Evangelical scholars are able to speak each other's language fluently or build bridges based on an authentic grasp of each other's theological history. This adversely impacts the private opinions of Evangelical faculty members who are at the helm of the hiring process when reviewing job applicants of Orthodox scholars. Often Evangelical faculties do not currently possess the conceptual categories in which to fit the Orthodox as they appear as neither fish nor fowl. However as more of the younger generation of Evangelical scholars complete doctoral degrees in Greek patristics, liturgical studies and Byzantine/modern history the Evangelical institutions which hire them may become increasingly open to acquiring the rich intellectual resources of Orthodox faculty members in the coming decades.

Conclusion

The sum of these developments demonstrate that we are only at the start of an emerging global dialogue between the Eastern Orthodox and Evangelical communities. The Orthodox tradition is fast becoming a vital issue in modern theology and world missions. An unprecedented opportunity for growth, reconstruction and renewal now lies before us. Evangelical seminaries that have the foresight to develop curricular emphases in Eastern Christianity will be better able to offer a fuller perspective on global theology and thus will be on the cutting edge of the future of theological education. Orthodox seminaries must do the same with Evangelicalism. While the fledgling dialogue is fraught with potentially fatal hazards, it is my conviction that if our relationship is patiently nurtured with humility, courage, determination and the laying aside of personal and ecclesial pride it may well turn out to be one of the most

fruitful and significant ecumenical encounters of all at the beginning of the third millennium.

A renowned British Byzantinologist said that the twenty-first century will be the century of the Orthodox. This should not make the Orthodox boast but rather it should make us feel more strongly the immense responsibility placed on our weak shoulders to witness to the Church's faith with great humility. The theological treasures of Byzantium are just beginning to be discovered by Colin Gunton's re-appropriation of classical Byzantine Christology, and Miroslav Volf's and Thomas Torrance's work on Cappadocian Trinitarian theology, to name just a few of the better known Evangelicals. It must also be said as it so often happens in Protestant encounters with Orthodoxy, that Evangelicals may well end up feeling disappointed with the quality of their conversation with some contemporary Orthodox dialogue partners, many of whom have an unsophisticated lack of appreciation for the theological emphases of the Reformers and their children. But it is precisely at that moment of disillusionment, when Evangelicals will be tempted to turn away from the Orthodox, that Evangelicals must summon the intellectual courage to move beyond the sins and weaknesses of modern Orthodoxy and go back to the primary sources themselves which have formed the Church's faith, no matter how much or how little the modern Orthodox are able to help them with the journey. Evangelicals will need to develop a strategy for dealing with the poor external conditions of contemporary Orthodoxy – conditions which are partly due to a legacy of Islamic and Communist domination over the Orthodox as well as plain religious snobbery and the lack of desire to understand the Christian West. If Alister McGrath is correct in asserting that Evangelicalism will become the most viable theological option on the religious landscape in the coming years,⁶⁷ I humbly believe that Eastern Orthodoxy, despite its human frailties and current weaknesses, may very well end up as the dialogue partner which can offer Evangelicals the greatest abundance of fresh theological resources to nourish its ongoing maturity and creative relevance throughout the twenty-first century.

⁶⁷ Alister McGrath, *The Future of Evangelicalism* (Grand Rapids, 1997).

'Impassive He Suffers; Immortal He Dies': Rhetoric and Polemic in Charles Wesley's Portrayal of the Atonement

JAMES G. GORDON,
CROWN TERRACE BAPTIST CHURCH, ABERDEEN

'Wesley's themes... are the central paradoxes of the Christian faith. His favourite figure is oxymoron.'¹

This observation by one of Wesley's most sympathetic critics is important not only for Wesley's poetics but also for his theological style and concerns. The major themes of Christian doctrine, fall and redemption, incarnation and atonement, sin and sanctification, divine love and human renewal, of earth-bound existence and the hope of heaven, give Charles Wesley's hymns an emotional intensity directly derived from what is at stake in the issues he deals with. Wesley exploits the fact that the basic doctrines of Christian faith are paradoxical. Oxymoron allows Wesley to push paradox to the limit, and so to express truth in language stripped down to the bare essentials of radical contradiction: Jesus as the human face of God, the eternal Word becoming time-bound flesh, eternal life mediated through death, divine power revealed through suffering love, God's strength made perfect through weakness.

These and other aspects of Christian faith were encapsulated in phrases deliberately crafted to sharpen the focus of truth. 'T'is mystery all! Th' Immortal dies', begins a verse which is a theological defence of being content with not knowing, the glad agnosticism of those who cannot explain God's strange design, and who refuse to sound the depths of love divine since such a piece of sacred impertinence gives even the angels

¹ Donald Davie, *Purity of Diction in English Verse* (London, 1952), p. 79. Other still important treatments of Wesley's poetic style and use of vocabulary include, B.L. Manning, *The Hymns of Wesley and Watts* (London, 1948). O. Beckerlegge, 'Charles Wesley's Vocabulary', *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 193 (1968), pp. 152-61. F. Baker, *Charles Wesley's Verse. An Introduction* (London, Second ed. 1988), pp. 42-4. Davie returned to Wesley's hymns in *The Eighteenth-Century Hymn in England* (Cambridge 1993), pp. 57-70.

pause. ‘Th’ Immortal dies’ and what is required is not explanation but adoration. One of the Nativity Hymns demonstrates Wesley’s facility with these radical contrasts which give oxymoron rhetorical force. At Christ’s birth ‘God the invisible appears’, ‘Being’s source begins to be, And God himself is born!’

The self-abnegation of God, and the surrender of position and privilege for the sake of others, provide the driving thought. But it is the sense of wonder and awed astonishment that Wesley captures and conveys to the singer by expressing a truth that makes no human sense, and which defies all the normal canons of logic. Elsewhere Wesley muses on a less exalted doctrinal plane. ‘I want a calmly fervent zeal’. To be busy without being harassed, to be relaxed without being complacent, to have the adrenaline without the anxiety. Oxymoron communicates well the subtle precision of everyday spiritual yearnings held in a balanced tension. It is a device Wesley habitually used as a lens to sharpen the focus of theological reflection.

Wesley’s eucharistic hymn, ‘Victim Divine’, has several examples of oxymoron as sharpened focus, including the title itself.² Concentration on the ‘precious death’ of Christ on the cross is immediately forced on the reader by the non-sense of almighty God victimised. The concept of victim presupposes one who experiences weakness and on whom suffering or loss is inflicted. By contrast, the adjective ‘divine’ presupposes unprecedented power and an eternal self-sufficiency which transcends need. ‘Victim Divine’ becomes then a contradiction of reality as we know it. The rhetorical potency of Wesley’s phrase captures the tragedy and glory of the passion of God.

Victim Divine, thy grace we claim
While thus thy precious death we show;
Once offer’d up, a spotless Lamb,
In thy great temple here below,
Thou didst for all mankind atone,
And standest now before the throne.

The smoke of thy atonement here
Darkened the sun and rent the veil.
Made the new way to heaven appear,
And show the great Invisible;

² Frank Whaling (ed.), *John and Charles Wesley: Selected Writings and Hymns* (London, 1981), p. 265.

Well pleased in thee our God looked down,
And call'd his rebels to a crown.³

The incarnation of Christ is presented as an act of astounding condescension which Wesley often portrayed by impossible imagery, created by linking conflicting opposites. The death of Christ acts like a lens through which 'th' Invisible' is fully displayed. The Old Testament atmosphere of smoke, blood and sacrifice are applied in the hymn, not so much to the crucifixion of Jesus told as a story, but to the atonement as an historic event of eternal significance, the effects of which linger on in the created order with aromatic intensity. Smoke and perfume are detected by smell, one of the most powerful triggers of memory and recall. 'The offering smokes through earth and skies, / Diffusing life and joy and peace.' Earth is the temple where the altar is positioned and on which the sacrificial victim is laid, but the holy of holies is in heaven, and though Christ died here, the impact of his death is eternally felt there.

It is as if Wesley is constructing a cosmology shaped by the believer's experience of the cross, so that his universe takes on a crucicentric shape. The gulf between earth and heaven is emphasised, and Christ's descent is described, not as incarnation, but in the paradox of one whose descent is an offering up. Skipping the resurrection Wesley passes straight to the vision of Christ standing before the Father, having made for 'helpless man', 'a new way to heaven appear'. The effect of the once-for-all atonement on the inner realities of Godhead are shown to have eternal consequences for sinners. The new way to heaven is opened, God is pleased, and invites rebels to become not only loyal subjects but crown princes of the kingdom of God. The atonement permeates the universe as smoke that covers sin, as perfume that expresses life and joy and peace on earth. Bloody sacrifice has become cosmic blessing.

Thou standest in the holiest place,
As now for guilty sinners slain;
Thy blood of sprinkling speaks, and prays,
All-prevalent for helpless man;
Thy blood is still our ransom found,
And spreads salvation all around.⁴

The efficacy of the atonement is linked to the intercession of Christ, the advocate with the Father. But in this hymn there are no speeches for

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

the defence, no advocate’s carefully crafted sentences. What is all prevalent is not the advocate’s words, but the advocate’s person and presence, his personal suffering exhibited through the physical visible evidence of blood. The blood is not only a symbol for sacrifice but a God-persuading argument which is ‘all-prevalent for helpless man’.

The hymn rehearses the great moment of Christian salvation in Wesley’s atonement theology, leaving the incarnation and resurrection in the background for the sake of concentrating the reader on the central paradox of the Victim Divine, once crucified and now continually pleading an eternal argument in heaven. The argued atonement brings benediction to earth and wafts throughout a fallen world, giving hints of divine redemption, like lingering perfume which betrays a significant presence.

But Wesley is not content with a remote Saviour, or a merely transactional basis for fellowship with the divine. Christ is now available to every faith-full soul:

We need not now go up to heaven,
To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost even now thy banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And show thy real presence here!⁵

The real presence is not confined to heaven, nor even to the Eucharist. Christ in all the fullness of divine love is already given, transparently present to faithful souls, though never more apparent than in the banquet of the Lord’s Supper. Though Wesley confesses the once-for-all-ness of Christ’s sacrifice, his eucharistic theology is rich in sensual references, which are almost the equivalent of a spiritual empiricism. Appeals to taste, sight, hearing, touching and tasting re-present to the believing communicant the reality of the crucifixion. One example shows Wesley’s daring denial that the supper is primarily memorial. The speaker urges the singer to ‘behold’, to ‘see’, to ‘open faith’s interior eye’⁶:

In this authentic sign
Behold the stamp Divine:
Christ revives his suffering here,
Still exposes them to view;

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Whaling, *John and Charles Wesley*, p. 231.

See the Crucified appear,
Now believe he died for you.⁷

For all my Lord was crucified, For all, for all my Saviour died.

The line, 'Thou art to all already given' contains one of Wesley's most remarkably consistent rhetorical nudges. 'All' is one of Wesley's polemical icons. By his remorseless use of this absolutely inclusive word, Charles chipped away at the foundations of Calvinistic teaching, in particular the doctrines of predestination and limited atonement. The Wesleys quarrelled with Calvinists intermittently from 1739 when Wesley published his sermon 'Free Grace', to the controversy in the 1770s with Augustus Toplady and from 1778 onwards through the defiantly entitled *Arminian Magazine*. Wesley's 1739 sermon provoked a spirited and carefully measured reply from George Whitefield when he returned from the North American colonies in 1741. In Whitefield's letter to Wesley, preserved in his *Journals*, he dealt with some of Wesley's most damaging criticisms, and pointed out, rightly, that in his doctrine he followed the Thirty Nine Articles.⁸ While Whitefield tried to present a reasonable case for Calvinism, he satisfied neither Wesley nor the hyper-Calvinists who felt Whitefield came close to making crucial concessions and spoke with an 'Arminian accent'.⁹

The resulting split between the Wesleys and Whitefield was only one eruption of a theological controversy that rumbled on for decades, occasionally erupting in damaging personal attack and polemical caricature. 'The existential pressures of the experience of grace, as well as inherited or acquired theological tenets, ensured that the Calvinist controversy would be a running sore in the bowels of the Revival as well as a source of pain for individuals.'¹⁰ Some of Charles Wesley's hymns, published in the 1740s contributed considerably to Calvinists' experience of that pain, while at the same time articulating and developing emphases that would give decisive shape and distinctiveness to Wesleyan theology.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Iain Murray (ed.), *George Whitefield's Journals*, (Edinburgh 1960) pp. 569-88.

⁹ Henry D. Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast. John Wesley and the Rise of Methodists* (London, 1989) pp. 200-201.

¹⁰ Rack, *Reasonable Enthusiast*, p. 202.

'IMPASSIVE HE SUFFERS; IMMORTAL HE DIES'

Fundamental to that theology is the contention that universal salvation and a universal gospel presuppose a love without limits and thus an atonement without limits. The hymn 'Come sinners to the gospel feast', published in 1747 when some of the heat had died down, shows Charles appealing for a response of faith in Billy Graham mode:

Come sinners to the Gospel Feast;
Let every soul be Jesus' Guest;
Ye need not one be left behind,
For GOD hath bidden All Mankind.¹¹

'Every soul' – therefore there can be no predetermined exclusions. The negative possibilities are shown to have nothing inevitable about them since 'Ye need not one be left behind'. This is not theology out of control; it is theology redrawing the scope of Divine grace and the boundaries of Divine love, reminiscent of the Lucan parable of the Great Banquet.¹² By the time Wesley appeals to 'all the souls by sin oppressed' he has moved to a clear articulation of just what it is God is about in preparing the gospel feast.

Ye vagrant Souls, on You I call,
(O that my Voice could reach you all!)
Ye all are freely Justified,
Ye all may live – for God¹³ hath died.

His Love is mighty to compel;
His Conqu'ring Love consent to feel,
Yield to His Love's resistless power,
And fight against your God no more.¹⁴

That last stanza is a robust recasting of divine sovereignty in which the defining idea is love rather than power, and grace rather than judgement. Irresistible grace is no longer an expression of unconditional and eternally

¹¹ Whaling, *John and Charles Wesley*, p. 251.

¹² Teresa Berger, *Theology in Hymns*, (Nashville 1995), pp. 109-15, considers more fully Wesley's balance of the universal 'for all' with the particular 'for me' in Wesley's hymns.

¹³ Original Mss version. Changed to 'Christ hath died' in the 1747 and 1780 published versions.

¹⁴ Whaling, *John and Charles Wesley*, p. 251.

decreed election, but of infinitely costly love which, to Wesley's mind, is compellingly persuasive without being manipulatively coercive.¹⁵

By widespread and deliberately provocative use of 'all' Wesley makes the widest possible claims on behalf of the grace of God. He had no fears of the spiritual trades description officials censuring him for misleading the market. Christ died for *all*; the blood of Christ is sufficient to remove *all* sin; through Jesus believers can know *all* the blessings of God and in Jesus God gives *all* that renewed human nature can contain.

Great God of universal love

In a hymn of praise to God (and theological conversation with the singer), Wesley expounds the gospel without limits with vigorous wonder.

Come let us join our friends above,
The God of our salvation praise,
The God of everlasting love,
The God of universal grace.

Before long he is using that inclusive absolute again:

This is the ground of all our hope,
The fountain this of all our good,
Jesus for all was lifted up,
And shed for all His precious blood.

Thou drawest all men unto Thee,
Grace doth to every soul appear;
Preventing grace for all is free,
And brings to all salvation near.¹⁶

Grace is irresistible, but only in the sense that God's love is mercifully patient in judgement, (Thou wouldst not shut Thy mercy's door), endlessly inventive in strategy, (Thy grace suggests our first good thought/ thy only grace doth all inspire), and persistently patient in mercy:

¹⁵ 'Wesley's soteriological universalism is limited to God's invitation to salvation alone. Nowhere is it indicated that the acceptance of salvation is or will be universal.' Berger, *Theology in Hymns*, p. 112. This observation is crucial when considering Charles' polemical defence of a universal gospel.

¹⁶ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, pp. 306-9.

When twice ten thousand times we fell,
Thou gav'st us still a longer space,
Didst freely our backslidings heal,
And show'dst Thy more abundant grace.¹⁷

Only one letter distinguishes heal from Hell, and coming at the end of a line, in which we anticipate an obvious and frequent Wesleyan rhyme, it is slyly effective in forcing the reader into a theological and emotional re-orientation. The theme of the entire hymn is grace, and deserved judgement, yet Wesley manages to weave in thirty-five occurrences of 'all' as a code-word to show that God is determined, even pre-determined to be as patiently generous and merciful as human intransigence will allow.

Charles refused to allow Calvinists to make the sovereignty of God a registered trademark. In the verse that immediately follows, he does mention Hell, perhaps to suggest that God's preferred response to sin is not Hell¹⁸ but grace.

Twas grace from Hell that brought us up;
Lo! to Thy sovereign grace we bow,
Through sovereign grace we still have hope,
Thy sovereign grace supports us now.¹⁹

Wesley is unworried by the monotony of repetition. Grace restrains sin, raises from the death of sin, draws to salvation, so that the surrendered soul declares, 'The monuments of thy grace we stand, / Thy free, thine universal grace.' Within the scope of the divine grace, sovereign in generosity and in the freedom of love, the entire life of each human being is included:

By grace we draw our every breath;
By grace we live, and move and are;
By grace we 'scape the second death;
By grace we now thy grace declare.²⁰

¹⁷ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, pp. 307-8.

¹⁸ Not that Charles was an eighteenth-century annihilationist. He held a strong doctrine of Hell and eternal punishment. His quarrel was with a view of God which he believed made Hell an inevitable necessity for some, irrespective of human response, making human moral life an irrelevance.

¹⁹ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, p. 308

²⁰ *Ibid.*

By this time Wesley's point is made. Grace is sovereign and free, universal and entirely gift. But Charles was never one to stop fighting just because an opponent was beaten. He uses the hymn to celebrate free grace, and spell out the sufficiency of that grace because it is grace as eternal love bearing sin²¹ that is definitive in the eternal salvific purposes of God.

He promised all mankind to draw;
We feel Him draw us from above,
And preach with Him the gracious law,
And publish the DECREE OF LOVE.²²

There is probably both mischief and humour in that last line, where once again Wesley steals back some of the trade-mark terminology of his Calvinist opponents.

Everlasting love and free grace undergird a universal gospel. These convictions lay at the very heart of the Wesleyan understanding of the revival. For the Wesleys any limiting of the scope of the atonement to accommodate theological presuppositions, Calvinist or otherwise, was a subversion of their message, and a slander on the eternal purposes of God. The predestinarian decree as the basis for a limited atonement and unconditional election was in Wesley's view a perverse abstraction. It was misleading to preachers of the gospel, obstructive and offensive to hearers, and a misrepresentation of the fundamental truth about God as revealed in the crucified Christ.

We think that fury is in Thee, Horribly think, that God is hate.

Charles' passionate opposition to what he saw as Calvinist hard-line restrictiveness was voiced in sermons and hymns and is recorded in his journal for the 1740s. In June 1741, while Howel Harris the Welsh evangelist was preaching on irresistible grace, he was interrupted by Charles singing his own polemical variation on the doxology:

Praise God from whom pure blessings flow,
Whose bowels yearn on all below;
Who would not see one sinner lost;
Praise Father Son and Holy Ghost.²³

²¹ James Denney, quoted in J. Taylor, *God Loves Like That*, (London, 1962), p. 78.

²² Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, p. 309.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 294.

A month later, still in Wales 'contending against Calvinism', Charles varied his tactics. 'Preached to the society and a few others, chiefly predestinarians. Without touching the dispute, I simply declared the scriptural marks of election; whereby some, I believe, were cut off from their vain confidence. The sincere ones clave to me. Who can resist the power of love? A loving messenger of a loving God might drive reprobation out of Wales, without even naming it...' ²⁴

During that same year, 1741, a collection of Charles' hymns was published entitled, *Hymns on God's Everlasting Love, To Which is Added the 'Cry of a Reprobate', and 'The Horrible Decree'*.²⁵ These hymns, peppered with italics and words in capital letters, contain lines and phrases honed and set to cut and wound his opponents. Satire turned to scathing sarcasm and then to outright fury in a poem hard to classify as a hymn, so intense are the human emotions of anger, scorn and hatred, if not of others, then of their ideas. 'The Horrible Decree' is a complex product of Charles' psychological sensitivity, of eighteenth-century theological controversy, Augustan rhetorical style, Revivalist passion encountering ridicule and hostility and not least of religious experience redefining theology. Crude ridicule and relentless mockery are the weapons of a poem which is a tour de force, a *reductio ad absurdum*, a comprehensive hatchet-job, the premeditated murder of an idea.

Ah! Gentle, gracious Dove;
And art Thou grieved in me,
That sinners should restrain Thy love,
And say, 'It is not free:
It is not free for *all*;
The *most* Thou *passest* by,
And mockest with a fruitless call
Whom Thou hast doom'd to die.'

They think Thee *not sincere*
In giving each his day:
'*Thou only drawst the sinner near,*
To cast him quite away;
To aggravate his sin,
His sure damnation seal,
Thou show'st him heaven, and say'st Go in -
And thrusts him into hell.'

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ *Ibid.*, ch. 8. All quotations from this hymn are from Tyson, pp. 303-6.

O HORRIBLE DECREE ²⁶

Worthy of whence it came!
 Forgive their hellish blasphemy
 Who charge it on the Lamb.

Further couplets display the fertile hostility of an outraged Arminian:

*He offers grace to all,
 Which most cannot embrace,
 Mock'd with an ineffectual call
 And insufficient grace.*

These and further verses are liberally sprinkled with insults and caricature drawn from the full armoury of anti-Calvinist slogans about 'satanic sophistry', the damnation of infants outside God's elect, poor reprobates 'forced into hell', not damned just decreed 'never to be saved'. Finally the hymn changes tone following a prayer that envisages 'The devil and his doctrine cast / Into the burning pit.' Thereafter Wesley pleads with God, 'Defend Thy mercy's cause', and 'Vindicate Thy grace.' The last two verses express Wesley's personal prayer of commitment to the universal gospel, and are worth quoting in full for their combination of theological passion and rhetorical power:

My life I here present,
 My heart's last drop of blood:
 O let it all be freely spent
 In proof that Thou art good:
 Art good to all who breathe,
 Who all may pardon have;
 Thou wilt not the sinner's death,
 But all the world *wouldst* save.

O take me at my word;
 But arm me with Thy power,
 Then call me forth to suffer, Lord,
 To meet the fiery hour:
 In death I will proclaim
 That all *may* hear Thy call,

²⁶ See Horton Davies, 'Charles Wesley and the Calvinist Tradition', in S. T. Kimbrough, Jr (ed.), *Charles Wesley: Poet and Theologian*, (Nashville, 1992), for further examples of anti-Calvinist hymnology.

'IMPASSIVE HE SUFFERS; IMMORTAL HE DIES'

And clap my hands amidst the flame,
And shout – HE DIED FOR ALL.²⁷

Charles portrays himself a willing martyr for truth, and finishes with four words that represent the distilled essence of the universal gospel. So this hymn is a bit more than a theological temper tantrum. It is a carefully crafted assault weapon, polemic in the service of evangelism and rhetorical theology giving as good as it gets.

It is important to be aware that both Wesleys accepted the doctrine of election, but with significant qualifications. In the thought of the Wesleys election is conditional and subordinate to divine foreknowledge. God's election does not cause sin or faith, it recognizes it. 'If one really believed that: The elect shall be saved, do what they will: The reprobate shall be damned, do what they can, the vital connection between God's gracious initiative and [human] response is severed.'²⁸ The result, so Wesley contended, was to subvert gospel holiness by removing human moral responsibility from the question of human eternal destiny. In addition, the Wesleys were concerned about the impact of double predestination and limited atonement on the Christian rendering of the nature of God. These two theological principles of Calvinism seemed to be incompatible with a belief in the universality of God's love and goodness, a truth Wesley was convinced had central place in New Testament soteriology. It was these negative aspects of predestination and limited atonement that made Calvinism the target of their wrath.²⁹

Mercifully, 'The Horrible Decree' ends, not on notes of abusive sarcasm and wild caricature, but in a change of mood, as passionate opposition to perceived error gives way to a more constructive commitment to truth. Nevertheless, the last four words, capitalized of course, represent a shouted and defiant credo – 'HE DIED FOR ALL!' It is therefore a relief to find another hymn from the same collection expounding the sovereign everlasting love of God in less combative tones.

²⁷ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, p. 306.

²⁸ Randy Maddox, *Responsible Grace: John Wesley's Practical Theology*, (Nashville, 1994), p. 57.

²⁹ Maddox, *Responsible Grace*, pp. 55-8. This is a good brief and nuanced discussion of the issues. See also T. C. Oden, *John Wesley's Scriptural Christianity* (Grand Rapids, 1994), pp. 252-75. Oden examines the Wesleys' thought on grace and predestination using frequent primary quotations, and giving careful attention to the relationship between divine foreknowledge, election, grace and faith.

O all-redeeming Lord,
Thy kindness I record:
Me Thy kindness hath allured,
Call'd, and drawn me from above;
Sweetly I am thus assured
Of thy everlasting love.³⁰

Nevertheless ultimate questions about God's intentions remain:

But is thy grace less free
For others than for me?
Lord I have not learned thee so.
Good to every man thou art,
Free as air thy mercies flow;
So I feel it in my heart.³¹

In this fine hymn Wesley prefers raptures of praise directed to God, to mockery of human opponents; affirmation has silenced defamation, at least for now. The heat is generated by the sovereign love and generous grace of God rather than by the theological aberrations and spiritual shortcomings of his Calvinistic opponents:

The world's Desire and Hope
For this was lifted up;
Lord, Thou didst hereby engage
To draw all men to Thee,
All in every place and age:
Grace for all mankind is free!

The Spirit of Thy love
With every soul hath strove;
Every fallen soul of man
May recover from his fall,
See the Lamb for sinners slain,
Feel that He hath died for all.³²

The usual Wesleyan arguments are there: free grace, the Lamb slain, the Spirit of Divine Love, the universal call and of course the ubiquitous 'all'. The hymn then ends with a verse that jolts the reader out of any belief in

³⁰ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, pp. 302-3.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² *Ibid.*, p. 303.

divine love as indulgent cosiness. That it is still possible to be lost, Charles Wesley never doubted. Judas the betrayer, Esau who was not chosen, Cain the cursed murderer are all judged and rejected by God, but not through any prior decision of God. Hell is self-chosen, but the atonement is all-sufficient as is the grace of God to redeem even them... if they would.

Thou dost not mock our race
With insufficient grace;
Thou hast reprobated none,
Thou from *Pharaoh's* blood art free;
Thou didst once for all atone,
Judas, Esau, Cain and me.³³

The daring liberties Wesley takes with the biblical text can be breathtaking.³⁴ He includes himself in the gallery of hell-deserving sinners for whom the divine grace and Christ's atonement are sufficient, always providing the sinner's response is penitent faith. Wesley has chosen the worst-case scenarios from the Scriptures to illustrate the scope and extent of atonement. The eternal fate of Judas, Esau, and Cain is not known, but whatever their destiny, it was not fixed in eternity by divine decree irrespective of moral choice and action or individual response to Christ.

Wesley's use of paradox and oxymoron and the pervasive use of his favourite inclusive absolute 'all', provide many of his hymns with theological bite and polemical edge. His use of 'all' and its close synonym 'every', sometimes dictated the rhyming and content of entire stanzas so that poetic discipline and aesthetic judgement had to play second fiddle to theological effect. Applied positively to God's universal love, and negatively in denying any limit in the availability or sufficiency of the atonement, these inclusive absolutes became verbal icons, words through which something of the essential nature of God is glimpsed.

Many aspects of Wesley's theology of the divine love come together in a hymn, two verses of which illustrate neatly Wesley's use of oxymoron and the vocabulary of non-exclusion. Wesley paints a word picture of

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ See S.T. Kimbrough, 'Charles Wesley and Biblical Interpretation' in *Charles Wesley. Poet and Theologian*, pp. 106-36, for a full account of Wesley's unusual and productive approach to biblical hermeneutics. Some of his best verses are founded on 'powerful imagery [which] sometimes has little or nothing to do with the text'. p. 118.

Jesus' passion, and draws the reader into it as a bystander, but as a bystander personally addressed. Each is addressed because all are addressed:

All ye that pass by,
To Jesus draw nigh,
To you is it nothing that Jesus should die?
Your ransom and peace
Your surety He is,
Come see if there ever was sorrow like His.

He answer'd for all
O come at His call,
And low at His cross with astonishment fall.
But lift up your eyes
At Jesus' cries
Impassive He suffers, Immortal He dies.³⁵

This is the cross as theatre, the crucifixion as spectacle, the love of God enacted, the mystery that lies at the heart of God revealed, yet hidden in the secret counsels of God, where impossible truth is declared to be saving truth:

Impassive He suffers, Immortal He dies.

³⁵ Tyson, *Charles Wesley. A Reader*, p. 231.

Graham Scroggie And Evangelical Spirituality

IAN RANDALL, INTERNATIONAL BAPTIST SEMINARY, PRAGUE

The life of William Graham Scroggie (1877-1958) has never been the subject of a biography, yet he was someone who exercised a profound influence on evangelical spirituality in the first half of the twentieth century. In 1950 he was referred to as 'indisputably the foremost living Keswick teacher'.¹ This was at a time when for most conservative evangelicals in Britain and in many other parts of the world the teaching offered at the annual Keswick Convention, in the English Lakes, was of a quality not found on any other platform. The Keswick idiom, as David Bebbington argues, shaped the prevailing pattern of evangelical piety for much of the twentieth century.² Scroggie's roots were in Scotland, and his most famous local church ministry was at Charlotte Chapel, Edinburgh. William Whyte's book, *Revival in Rose Street*, gives important insights, from the perspective of someone who was greatly indebted to Scroggie, into this highly significant Edinburgh period. But Scroggie's influence spread much more widely than Scotland, through his writing as well as his preaching. A number of aspects of Scroggie's ministry could be examined. This article concentrates on the way in which he contributed to the shaping of evangelical spirituality and in particular looks at his attempts to engage with the currents that affected evangelicalism in the first half of the twentieth century.

The Life of Graham Scroggie

Graham's Scroggie's parents were married in Newburgh, near Aberdeen, in 1868. His mother was a native of Newburgh and his father had moved there in 1866 to undertake evangelistic work. The 1860s and '70s saw the emergence of growing numbers of evangelists who sat rather loosely to denominational structures, with Moody and Sankey providing a model from many from the 1870s. James Scroggie was engaged in evangelistic

¹ *The Keswick Week* (hereafter *KW*), 1950, p. 43.

² D.W. Bebbington, *Evangelicalism in Modern Britain: A History from the 1730s to the 1980s* (London, 1989), p. 151.

endeavour in Newburgh for five years but he was to move within Scotland and England a number of times. In 1871 the Scroggies moved south to Streatham, in London, where James became the resident evangelist at a mission hall run by Arthur (later Sir Arthur) Stevenson Blackwood, the senior executive of the Post Office from 1880 and chairman of the well-known Mildmay devotional conferences. After Streatham the Scroggies had a period in Buckinghamshire, then in the North of England, where James Scroggie worked in connection with another leading evangelical, James Carr, of Carlisle. The next move was back to Scotland, to Annan. Here the family suffered a shattering blow – in 1875 three children, all under the age of five, died of scarlet fever.

This story of joys and sorrows was told by Graham Scroggie's mother in a remarkably honest account. The title of her book, *The Story of a Life in the Love of God*, reflects her faith in divine care, but in the book she also speaks of the extent of her own depression when her children died.³ The family spent a time of recovery in the Isle of Wight and then returned to evangelistic activity, with the familiar territory of the North of Scotland offering them a more secure environment. Graham Scroggie wrote a preface to this account by his mother and clearly the influence of his parents, whose home life was one in which prayer was central, made a deep impression on him. At an early age Graham Scroggie felt an urge to preach and in 1896, in his twentieth year, he began training at the Pastors' College, later Spurgeon's College, London. He spoke of his two years at the Pastors' College as having had a 'creative and inspiring influence' on him,⁴ although he was also, as we will see later, critical of some omissions from his training, especially in the area of spirituality.

In 1900 Scroggie married Florence Hudson and the couple had one son, Marcus, who later became a deacon of Elm Road Baptist Church, Beckenham, Kent. Graham Scroggie's first ministry was in Leytonstone, in Essex. It was a ministry that came to a premature end after two years. Scroggie described a decisive period of inner conflict he had at that point when he felt personally broken. This paved the way for a new experience in which, as he was to say in different ways and on several occasions to hearers at the Keswick Convention, the Bible and Christ came alive to him.⁵ He felt that he had to give up his first pastorate and start afresh since

³ J.J. Scroggie, *The Story of a Life in the Love of God* (London, 1924), p. 71.

⁴ W. Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street: A History of Charlotte Baptist Chapel*, Edinburgh (Edinburgh, n.d.), p. 44.

⁵ *KW*, 1921, p. 168; *KW*, 1927, pp. 144-5; *The Keswick Convention*, 1930, pp. 128-9.

he had been 'a middleman between his books and his people but not of the Book... I was spiritually bankrupt, and I well nigh became a spiritual casualty'.⁶ His next pastorate, in Halifax, which began in 1902, was also short-lived.⁷ In this case it was his strong convictions about what was described as a 'questionable form of entertainment' in the church that led to his resignation.⁸ For the next two years Scroggie was without a pastorate.

After this rather uncertain start in pastoral ministry Scroggie went on to significant ministries in Sunderland and Edinburgh. In 1907 he accepted a call to the very active Bethesda Free Church in Sunderland, a church that claimed to have a hundred lay preachers, and in 1916 he moved to Charlotte Chapel. One memorable aspect of his call to Charlotte Chapel was that when two of the elders from the Chapel went to hear Scroggie preach in Sunderland – in order to assess his suitability for their vacant pulpit – he preached on the text 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' (Matthew 11:3). Scroggie's ministry at Charlotte Chapel attracted 1,000 people every Sunday and hundreds also came to his mid-week Bible School.⁹ During his ministry he baptised 650 people. He resigned on account of ill health in 1933, spent six months in New Zealand at the Auckland Tabernacle, and then had almost five years of itinerant ministry in the USA, Canada, Australia and South Africa. From 1938 to 1944 he was minister of Spurgeon's Metropolitan Tabernacle in London. When he moved to London he was an extra-mural lecturer at Spurgeon's College. His first wife died and in 1941 he married Joan Hooker, whose mother was the first principal of a missionary training college, Ridglands College, Wimbledon. Scroggie died in 1958.

Evangelical Experience

Graham Scroggie approached the question of spirituality as an evangelical. The training he received at the Pastors' College at the turn of the century was firmly in the Spurgeonic tradition of biblical and practical instruction. Archibald McCaig, a Scot, who was the College's principal until 1925, always maintained that the College stood by 'the Old Flag held so nobly and tenaciously to the last by its beloved Founder'.¹⁰ The emphasis was on producing those who could communicate the gospel to the 'masses' of the

⁶ Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street*, p. 44.

⁷ The ministry in Halifax lasted three years.

⁸ C.T. Cook, *The Baptist Times*, 8 January 1959.

⁹ Scroggie expressed his conviction that 'not a little preaching is much more imposition than exposition.' *Christianity Today*, 4 March, 1957, p. 10.

¹⁰ *Annual Paper* (Pastors' College), 1893-94, p. 308.

people. David Bebbington has described the College's training as 'practical rather than literary, a down-to-earth affair rather than an imitation of Oxford or Cambridge'.¹¹ The College saw itself as offering a distinctly evangelical spirituality. Charles Spurgeon, a son of the founder, spoke in 1902 about the 'high tone of spirituality' in the College, contrasting that with the experience of some in which 'gain in mental culture often means loss in soul growth'.¹² McCaig added that the priority as he viewed it was to produce 'Scriptural, Evangelical, Soul-winning preachers'.¹³

The emphasis on teaching which was both biblical and practical, often severely practical, was always to be a feature of Scroggie. His vision was of a ministry, whether in local churches or at large conventions, which offered solid biblical exposition and spiritual application. His ability to deliver this kind of material effectively at Keswick is evidenced by his popularity as a speaker at Keswick's Bible Readings. Scroggie delivered this series of convention addresses on no less than twelve occasions, beginning in 1914, and was determined that they should exemplify the highest standards of exposition. Thus Scroggie was far from satisfied in 1920 when Walter Sloan, as the convention secretary, writing to request that Scroggie undertake the Readings, stated that Keswick's council wanted his studies to have 'direct bearing on some aspect of consecration and faith rather than the analysis of a book'.¹⁴ Scroggie, who could be rather prickly, wrote back immediately to complain that the invitation seemed to reflect badly on his 1914 and 1915 expositions of the books of Philippians and Ephesians, which he claimed had been unusually well received. His conviction was that lack of such systematic biblical instruction was a weakness at Keswick.¹⁵

The same priorities were evident in Scroggie's local ministry at Bethesda, Sunderland, and later when he was called to Charlotte Chapel. While he was at Sunderland he told the office-bearers of the church that they could have either his head or his feet, but not both. Preaching, not visiting, was his priority. An important condition he made before he accepted the call to the Chapel was that he would not do 'social pastoral

¹¹ D.W. Bebbington, 'Spurgeon and British Evangelical Theological Education', in D.G. Hart and R.A. Mohler, Jr, eds., *Theological Education in the Evangelical Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 1996), pp. 219-20.

¹² *Annual Paper*, 1901-02, p. 304.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 306.

¹⁴ Walter Sloan to W.G. Scroggie, 5 November 1920, in the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall, Mattersey, Near Doncaster.

¹⁵ W.G. Scroggie to W. Sloan, 10 November 1920, in the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall, Mattersey.

visiting'. His pastoral work was directed to those who were sick, bereaved or similarly in special need. Also, his perception was that his call was not to be an evangelist or a pastor but a Bible teacher. Yet this was not the kind of teaching which simply imparted doctrinal information. In his letter of acceptance of the call to the Chapel, Scroggie wrote that he 'felt strongly that God had called him to the teaching of the Bible and calling the people of God to the consecration of life and service'.¹⁶ This represented a clear conviction about biblical spirituality.

Yet Scroggie was not someone who identified with the fundamentalist attitudes to the Bible, including battles over the term 'inerrancy', that marked some sections of evangelicalism in the 1920s. In 1924 *Evangelical Christendom*, for the Evangelical Alliance, carried a statement from Scroggie which stated that subscription to a particular definition of biblical inspiration was not, in his view, a true test of doctrinal orthodoxy. 'If you demand,' Scroggie said, 'that I subscribe to your theory of inspiration, I shall decline, but I am not on that account a Modernist.'¹⁷ Scroggie and other British evangelicals had been unimpressed by what they had seen of bellicose American fundamentalism.¹⁸ Speaking at the Keswick Convention in 1929 on the Apostles' Creed, Scroggie argued that given the conflicts over theological modernism – with fundamentalists calling for evangelicals to leave the existing denominations – it was preferable to have the Apostles' Creed as a widely accepted basis of faith than for small groups to construct their own bases and splinter from the wider church.¹⁹

Scroggie's commitment was, therefore, to evangelical orthodoxy. He believed that spiritual health came from right understanding of scripture and that such an understanding issued in spiritual health. There is no doubt that it was a formula which he could show to be successful. At Charlotte Chapel services were so crowded that the aisles were filled with people

¹⁶ Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street*, p. 44.

¹⁷ *Evangelical Christendom*, November-December 1924, p. 188. For Scroggie's nuanced view of revelation and of biblical inspiration see 'Living 55 years with the Bible', *Christianity Today*, 4 March, 1959, pp. 8-16.

¹⁸ For Fundamentalism in North America see G.M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism, 1870-1925* (New York, 1980). For British Fundamentalism see D.W. Bebbington, 'Baptists and Fundamentalism in Inter-War Britain', in K. Robbins, ed., *Studies in Church History*, Subsidia 7 (Oxford, 1990); D.W. Bebbington, 'Martyrs for the Truth: Fundamentalists in Britain', in D. Wood, ed., *Studies in Church History*, Vol. 30 (Oxford, 1993).

¹⁹ *The Keswick Convention* (London, 1929), p. 139.

seated on camp stools. More people filled the communion platform, the pulpit steps and even the pulpit itself. The attraction was not, however, Scroggie's personality or even his preaching style. Although he was known for his dry humour, his appearance in the pulpit at Charlotte Chapel was described as 'solemn, almost austere', and he hardly moved while preaching. Certainly his analytical mind offered his hearers a deeply satisfying biblical exposition, but what was more significant was that when he entered the pulpit the congregation seemed to sense, as William Whyte puts it, that Scroggie had 'come straight from the presence of God and bore in his heart and upon his lips the Word of the Living God'.²⁰

The Threat of False Experience

In Scroggie's mind a definite distinction was to be drawn between authentic evangelical experience and false claims to spirituality. For him the threat of spurious experience was posed in a particularly dangerous form in the early twentieth century by the growth of the Pentecostal movement. In 1912, when minister of Bethesda Free Church, Sunderland, Scroggie wrote three articles in his church magazine on the baptism of the Holy Spirit and tongues, in which he attempted a detailed study of the subject. In typical style the first article, on the baptism of the Spirit, looked at seven words associated with the mission and ministry of the Spirit – baptism, indwelling, gift, sealing, earnest, anointing and fullness. Scroggie argued that 'the truth on any given subject may be discovered by a close examination of the words which have fine differing shades of meaning'.²¹ In this period Sunderland was, through Alexander and Mary Boddy at All Saints', Monkwearmouth, a Pentecostal mecca for many evangelicals.²² Scroggie's approach to the subject – he later published a booklet – was applauded by Stuart Holden, the chairman of the Keswick Convention in the 1920s, who wrote: 'In these days when there is so much error produced about these things... yours is a message calculated to do real good.'²³

After considering all the texts relating to the baptism of the Spirit, Scroggie made 1 Corinthians 12:13 his focus. Every person who believed in Christ, he argued, was according to this text baptised into the body of

²⁰ Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street*, p. 45.

²¹ *Bethesda Record*, July 1912, p. 113.

²² I.M. Randall, 'Old Time Power: Relationships between Pentecostalism and Evangelical Spirituality in England', *Pneuma*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (1997), pp. 53-80.

²³ J.S. Holden to W.G. Scroggie, 15 February 1913, in the Donald Gee Centre, Mattersey Hall, Mattersey.

Christ. 'Incorporation into the Body of Christ,' he insisted, 'is by the Baptism of the Spirit, so that, if one has not received this Baptism he is not of the Body, that is he is not a Christian at all.' What, then, he asked, about the 'now widely current doctrine' that many Christians had never received the baptism of the Spirit and that they should therefore seek it? For Scroggie this was foreign to the New Testament and was 'bringing large numbers into bondage and darkness'.²⁴ Scroggie considered that errors over the baptism of the Spirit were partly due to confusion between 'Spirit-baptism' and the continuous 'filling' of the Spirit, but were especially due to the desire to associate the blessing of the Spirit with the gift of tongues. He quoted from the Fifth International Pentecostal Convention held at Sunderland in May 1912. A Consultative International Council had been formed which issued a Pentecostal statement of belief containing an affirmation that 'the Baptism of the Spirit... is always borne witness to be the fruit of the Spirit and the outward manifestation, so that we may receive the same gift as the disciples on the Day of Pentecost'.²⁵

In his critique of what he described as this 'thoroughly unscriptural' statement, Scroggie accepted that in a few cases in the book of Acts the Holy Spirit fell on believers and they immediately spoke in tongues. His response to this apparent support for the Pentecostal position was that such examples belonged to a transitional period in the life of the church. As he saw it, 'the spiritual happenings of the first ten or twelve years of the Church's history were irregular'. It is not clear why the irregularity was for that period alone, but Scroggie's logical and sometimes slightly rigid mind could not countenance a situation in which the Spirit might often work in irregular ways. The fact that in Pentecostalism there were also experiences of 'holy laughter', 'shakings', 'visions' and 'transportations' caused Scroggie even more concern. He saw these manifestations as having much more in common with the effects of hypnotism and spiritism than the Holy Spirit. There was also in such meetings a 'surrender of common sense'. The careful Scot was of the opinion that the church had no need for a message that played up the Spirit and played down the intelligence. Scroggie was to insist at Keswick that 'the man is in grave peril who is resting on emotion rather than upon intelligent understanding'.²⁶ It did not seem to him that the church was suffering from 'a superfluity of intelligence'.²⁷

²⁴ *Bethesda Record*, July 1912, pp. 117-18.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²⁶ *KW*, 1922, p. 107.

²⁷ *Bethesda Record*, July 1912, p. 115.

It was not, however, that Scroggie denied the possibility of speaking in tongues in the contemporary church. He saw the gifts of 1 Corinthians 12 as standing or falling together and he had no doubt that they remained.²⁸ What he opposed was a tendency, as he viewed it, for speaking in tongues to promote spiritual pride and to be associated with fanatical displays. His objections to the over-emphasis on tongues which he believed he saw in Pentecostalism led him to raise so many questions about this particular gift that, although he accepted it was not limited to the Apostolic age, in reality he did not expect to see it in operation. This view was to prevail in much evangelical thinking about pneumatology for several decades. Moreover, Scroggie's strong attacks on Pentecostalism – which he alleged was 'doing incalculable and irreparable damage in scores of lives'²⁹ – were to colour evangelical attitudes to those within Pentecostalism who (as they themselves often pointed out) shared many of the same core doctrinal convictions as other evangelicals.

The Keswick Message

In 1918 Handley Moule, who as Bishop of Durham was the leading ecclesiastical supporter of Keswick, described its essential message as 'holiness by faith'.³⁰ Evangelical conceptions of holy living achieved through sustained struggle had been replaced, in the spirituality purveyed at Keswick from 1875 onwards, by the idea that sanctification, like justification, was attained through faith, not works. D. S. Sceats suggests that the original Keswick emphasis upon immediate sanctification had given way, by the early twentieth century, to views which were more acceptable to other evangelicals.³¹ The degree of change should not be over-emphasised. For much of the first half of the twentieth century Keswick teachers still stressed the way of consecration and challenged their hearers to deeper experience. What was emerging, however, was a conception of the consecrated life as one that was entered into after careful consideration and was expressed in active obedience. The stress on a spiritual crisis followed by a process of sanctification was still present, but more emphasis was being given to the process. Speaking in 1922, Scroggie insisted that he and his hearers 'must think clearly if we are to act

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

²⁹ *Bethesda Record*, September 1912, pp. 140-41.

³⁰ *KW*, 1918, p. 20.

³¹ D.S. Sceats, 'Perfectionism and the Keswick Convention, 1875-1900', University of Bristol M.A. thesis (1970), p. 72.

soundly', and urged consecration which was undertaken 'intelligently, deliberately, definitely, thoughtfully, joyfully, immediately'.³²

A second change in emphasis was that instead of the experience of sanctification being associated with the filling of the Holy Spirit it was seen increasingly as submission to Christ as Lord. Here again the influence of Scroggie was crucial. There was, for Scroggie, as he made clear at Keswick in 1922, an insistent call to make Christ Lord of one's life.³³ Scroggie's aim was to replace an emphasis on the Holy Spirit with a focus on Christology. Writing in 1925 in *The Christian*, a widely-read evangelical weekly, on the theme of 'the Lordship of Christ', Scroggie argued that although Keswick spoke of the 'Spirit-filled' life this idea led back to Christ's Lordship, which in his view was Keswick's distinctive message.³⁴ Scroggie's thinking gained ground. 'The Lordship of Christ in Christian experience is the fullness of the Spirit,' Scroggie stated in 1927, 'and the fullness of the Spirit is the Lordship of Christ.'³⁵ In a message at Keswick in 1929 Scroggie stressed that although Christ had redeemed the world, only those were saved who accepted Christ as Saviour, and of these not all had accepted his Lordship. Such a step would bring what Frances Ridley Havergal termed, in a famous Keswick hymn, 'God's perfect peace'.³⁶ By 1931 Scroggie saw Keswick as engaged in a great mission to present this Christological theme to Christian people.³⁷ It is clear that Scroggie's determined teaching meant that Keswick thinking had, by the 1930s, undergone a paradigm shift.

A minority of Keswick leaders opposed this trend, most notably an Irishman, Charles Inwood, who travelled extensively across the world on behalf of Keswick. Charles Inwood was aware that calls to receive the baptism of the Spirit were falling out of favour among evangelicals and in 1927 he admitted to his Keswick audience that he would 'say things you do not much care to hear' in maintaining that Keswick needed a 'fresh touch of Pentecost'.³⁸ Later in the 1927 convention week, in the face of anxieties being expressed about his continued use of the term 'baptism' in relation to the work of the Spirit in believers, Inwood argued that Jesus employed the word and that Luke, writing in Acts, saw baptism and filling as

³² KW, 1922, pp. 107, 110.

³³ KW, 1922, p. 109.

³⁴ *The Christian*, 23 July 1925, p. 6.

³⁵ KW, 1927, p. 139.

³⁶ *The Keswick Convention*, 1929, pp. 29-31.

³⁷ The Keswick Convention, 1931, p. 155.

³⁸ KW, 1927, p. 2.

equivalent.³⁹ Scroggie, the speaker at the 1927 Bible Readings, repudiated Inwood's position. 'On the Day of Pentecost,' Scroggie stated, 'all believers were, by the baptism of the Spirit, constituted the body of Christ; and since then every separate believer, every soul accepting Christ in simple faith, has, in that moment, and by that act, been made partaker of the blessing of the baptism. It is not, therefore, a blessing which the believer is to seek.'⁴⁰

Yet Scroggie, despite his caution, did not want Keswick to lose the dimension of the Spirit's work. In 1933, when Scroggie was invited to give the first radio broadcast address from Keswick, he commented: 'The trouble and tragedy is that the Church has been content to live between Easter and Pentecost, on the right side of justification, but on the wrong side of sanctification; on the right side of pardon but on the wrong side of power.'⁴¹ A two-stage experience, justification followed by sanctification, was still being taught, although Scroggie's deliberate reference to 'the Church' rather than to the experience of Pentecost for individual believers, and his careful use of the framework of the Christian year, were calculated to militate against the kind of narrowness which he felt confronted him in Pentecostalism and other 'Holy Spirit movements'. At the same time, Scroggie had no sympathy with broader ideas about spirituality such as those expressed by Vernon Storr, a leading Anglican liberal evangelical, who spoke of the Spirit as 'a Spirit of Fellowship, of Progress and of Sharing'.⁴² During the First World War Scroggie had spoken of the war as widening Keswick's horizons;⁴³ in the 1930s, however, he rejected the broadening of Keswick's message to address popular social questions. For him the Holy Spirit's work was intended to transform individuals. Keswick, he averred, 'holds that spirituality is the key to every situation'.⁴⁴

³⁹ *KW*, 1927, p. 91.

⁴⁰ *KW*, 1927, p. 139.

⁴¹ *The Keswick Convention*, 1933, p. 80.

⁴² *The Record*, 1 July 1932, p. 421. See I. M. Randall, 'The Truth shall Make you Free: The Growth of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement', *Anglican and Episcopal History*, Vol. LXV, No.3 (1996).

⁴³ Quoted in W. B. Sloan, *These Sixty Years: The Story of the Keswick Convention* (London, 1935), p. 74.

⁴⁴ *The Keswick Convention*, 1935, pp. 62-3.

The Experience of Revival

This kind of outlook might have meant that Scroggie would have been eager to explore movements of revival such as that in Wales in 1904-05. His ministry at Charlotte Chapel followed that of Joseph Kemp, who had visited Wales in January 1905 and following his reports to the Chapel nightly and often lengthy prayer meetings took place during the whole of 1905. The membership of the church had already been growing, but following this new impetus it was reckoned that one thousand people were converted in one year alone. There were whole nights of prayer which included spontaneous outbursts of song. On the occasion of Kemp's departure – to Calvary Baptist Church, New York – in 1915 his period of ministry in Edinburgh was described as 12 years of miracles. He left behind a church which undoubtedly attracted Scroggie – he told the Chapel congregation that he was looking to them for 'spiritual inspiration' – and yet one which Scroggie would substantially remould. In particular Scroggie found the shouts of 'Hallelujah! Amen! Glory! Praise the Lord!', which were a feature of the Chapel's worship and had been welcomed by Kemp, to be disturbing and unhelpful.⁴⁵

Scroggie's method of dealing with what he did not favour within congregational life was characteristically forthright. The most prominent participant from the body of the church during worship was Edmund Trickett, who had been a soldier and who had a voice made for the parade ground. He had a cobbler's shop in Edinburgh where he displayed Bible verses in the window and he was also known for his effective leading of small prayer groups. This kind of witness and encouragement was much appreciated by Scroggie, who looked for active co-operation from church members. One Sunday morning in the Chapel, however, there was an especially enthusiastic outburst, which Trickett led, during a sermon, and Scroggie decided that enough was enough. He responded by stopping preaching and saying directly to Trickett: 'My dear brother, if you are going to speak I'll be silent but when I'm speaking you'll be silent.' The rebuke was apparently accepted – Scroggie's genuine concern for all the church members was well known – and the 'Hallelujah Chorus' was muted from then on.⁴⁶

In 1922, at Keswick, Scroggie encountered what he felt was a similar display of over-exuberance, and one which he saw as rather dangerous because it was on such a large scale. On 20 July 1921 Hugh Ferguson, minister of London Road Baptist Church, Lowestoft, and John Hayes,

⁴⁵ Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street*, p. 44.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 45-6.

Vicar of Christ Church, Lowestoft, reported at Keswick that an unexpected revival had come to East Anglia, starting in their town.⁴⁷ Hayes and Ferguson spoke by invitation to the Keswick council in October 1921, asking that the council 'take up the work of organisation connected with the revival Movement'. The council did not feel that this was possible, but it did appoint some leading Keswick figures – F.B. Meyer, E.L. Langston, Helen Bradshaw and Walter Sloan – to 'confer with the brethren... with the view of formulating such plans as may be desired'.⁴⁸ There was some concern at Keswick, based on experiences during the Welsh revival, that revivalism had the potential to cause rifts in the convention's ranks. But Douglas Brown, pastor of Ramsden Road Baptist Church, Balham, the East Anglian revival leader, was a sober Baptist minister whose after-meetings were characterised by quietness rather than noisy singing or praying. It was likely that Keswick would find such spirituality much more congenial.

At the Manchester 'Keswick' convention in October 1921, held in the same week as the Keswick council, John Hayes gave a further account of the East Anglian Revival. The principal speakers at that convention, Russell Howden, an Anglican clergyman, and Scroggie, vividly described by *The Life of Faith* as 'among the most capable and trusted men of the Keswick platform' and 'far removed from the realm of religious cranks or long-haired visionaries',⁴⁹ spoke in what was felt to be a revival atmosphere. Against this background Douglas Brown was booked to take the 1922 Keswick Bible Readings. It was soon clear at the Readings that he was going to make little attempt at the kind of scholarly addresses for which these Bible expositions, under Scroggie, were becoming known. *The Christian* reported that people flocked to the Keswick tent feeling that 'something' was going to happen. On the Thursday morning of the convention Brown preached on 'Defective Consecration' and at the conclusion of his address he invited those wishing to signify their consecration to meet him in the nearby Drill Hall. Observers felt that a flood burst. Only two–three hundred people could be accommodated in the

⁴⁷ For the East Anglian revival see S.C. Griffin, *A Forgotten Revival* (Bromley, Kent, 1992). See also I.M. Randall, 'Capturing Keswick: Baptists and the Changing Spirituality of the Keswick Convention in the 1920's', *The Baptist Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 7 (1996), and Donald E. Meek, 'Fishers of Men: The 1921 Religious Revival – It's Cause, Context and Transmission', *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 17 (1999), pp. 40-54.

⁴⁸ Minutes of the Keswick Council, 26 October 1921.

⁴⁹ *The Life of Faith* (hereafter *LF*), 19 October 1921, p. 1191.

hall and consecration meetings were conducted, by F. B. Meyer and others, for virtually the whole audience.⁵⁰ As the reporter for *The Christian* saw it, 'Pentecostal fire had fallen upon Keswick'.⁵¹

Reactions from the convention's opinion-makers to this explosion of spiritual energy were diverse. For some, Brown was exactly what Keswick required. Scroggie, however, was thoroughly unconvinced, and at the main evening meeting applied a corrective which could have resulted in a public polarisation of opinion over Brown's morning session. 'Faith', Scroggie warned Keswick-goers, 'is not credulity; faith is not ignorance; faith is intelligent; faith is open-eyed; faith has a reason as well as emotion'.⁵² At the end of this address Scroggie gave what one evangelical leader present, Herbert Lockyer, later recalled as an 'intelligent and deliberate appeal to crown Christ as King' and the audience rose.⁵³ The convention was clearly prepared to follow Scroggie. Brown was to become more involved in mission within the Baptist Union and had an impact on many Baptist churches. The East Anglian revival failed to spread, in the way many hoped it would, to other parts of England, although the movement among fishermen had considerable influence in parts of the North of Scotland. Keswick did not invite Brown to return as a speaker. Scroggie had steered Keswick away from what he regarded as a dangerous path.

The Continuing Significance of Scroggie

There are several areas in which Graham Scroggie has continuing significance for evangelical spirituality. The first is his pan-denominational outlook. In his mission statement to the Charlotte Chapel leaders in 1916 he wrote: 'This is a day of Catholic sympathies and widespread interfellowship among Christians of all Protestant Churches, and it has been my privilege for many years to have a not inconsiderable share in this.' When he left the Chapel in 1933 he touched again on the question of denominationalism in a farewell address at a meeting held in the Church of Scotland Assembly Hall on the Mound in Edinburgh. 'It has been said that my ministry has not been a denominational or sectarian ministry,' Scroggie observed, 'I hope that is true, but I also want to say... that I have never toyed with my convictions as a Baptist. We should all come to think... in terms of the Holy Catholic Church instead of a denomination,

⁵⁰ *LF*, 26 July 1922, p. 908.

⁵¹ *The Christian*, 27 July 1922, p. 11.

⁵² *KW*, 1922, p. 107.

⁵³ H. Lockyer, *Keswick: The Place and the Power* (London, 1937), p. 43.

and we can do so without being disloyal to our denomination and our convictions.'⁵⁴ In the second half of the twentieth century this pan-denominational outlook has become much more evident. Evangelical spirituality, as Scroggie saw clearly after his first visit to Keswick in 1900, to a significant extent transcends denominationalism.

A second contribution made by Scroggie was to the debate about Pentecostalism and about experiences of the Holy Spirit. Although the comments of Scroggie may now seem unduly negative, his questioning of the validity of a theology which insisted on a second experience of baptism of the Spirit accompanied by speaking in tongues continues to have relevance. At the same time, Scroggie shows the importance of a spirituality that is open to new experiences and encounters with God. In 1942 Scroggie told the Keswick Convention audience: 'I shall never forget days of despair in my first ministry in East London.' He had indicated to his wife during this period of spiritual anguish that he would pull out of ministry. 'I have no message,' he agonised, 'I have no power; I have no joy, and it will kill me.' But when he was out walking in the nearby Epping Forest, Scroggie 'met with God' and became convinced that God was telling him to make a fresh resolve to put the Bible at the centre of his ministry. He was grateful, he said on another occasion, that he had learned many things at Spurgeon's Pastors' College in London, but he stated that he had not learned at that time how to live the Christian life victoriously.⁵⁵

In the third place, Scroggie is an example of a scholarly spirituality. As we have seen, emotion-ridden forms of revivalism had no appeal for Scroggie. Nor was he obscurantist in his thinking. He had received an honorary degree from an American University, which he never used, but when he was awarded an honorary D.D. from Edinburgh University in 1927 he and the Charlotte Chapel congregation entered fully into the event. The Dean of the Faculty of Divinity of Edinburgh University, W. P. Paterson, spoke of Scroggie's 'unusual influence in the City as a preacher and missionary', his place as a 'prominent representative of the Keswick Movement, which has done so much to deepen the life and refine the ideals of Evangelicalism', and the work to which Scroggie had especially devoted himself, which was 'the study and teaching of the Bible in its twofold character of a Divine revelation and a great literature'.⁵⁶ In 1943, when London Bible College was formed and a principal was required, the LBC council issued an invitation to Scroggie. Although Scroggie accepted, the

⁵⁴ Whyte, *Revival in Rose Street*, pp. 44, 52.

⁵⁵ *The Keswick Week*, 1942, pp. 70-71; 1950, p. 192; 1954, pp. 5-6.

⁵⁶ White, *Revival in Rose Street*, pp. 48-9.

post required too much administrative work and he relinquished it after a few months.⁵⁷ As a mark of his long-term commitment to training, however, Scroggie guided thousands of students through his own four-year correspondence course.

Finally, Scroggie asked some hard questions about the question of revival, a subject that has remained of great interest to many evangelicals. It is not that Scroggie denied the historical existence of revivals, but his view was that the church needed to commit itself to the work of mission rather than waiting for revival to appear in some dramatic form. At Charlotte Chapel, Scroggie, together with his wife, who organised parcels of clothing to be sent overseas, advocated and supported both world mission and local evangelism. The Chapel's work in Edinburgh included outreach to homeless men who came together for a service on a Sunday afternoon and who were also helped with accommodation. Evangelistic teams from the Chapel, led by William Whyte, went to areas around Edinburgh. At Keswick there was a strong stress on overseas mission, particularly at the missionary meeting which came at the end of the convention week, but the anticipation was that only young people would volunteer themselves. On one occasion Scroggie asked fathers and mothers who were willing to release their young people for overseas mission to stand, and about two hundred, led by Mrs Scroggie, did so.⁵⁸ It was consistent with Scroggie's vision of a thinking Christian faith that he should challenge mature adults to be involved in mission.

Conclusion

Graham Scroggie was one of the best known evangelical figures of the first half of the twentieth century. His books, which numbered over thirty, were widely read by evangelicals. Although he was known as a biblical expositor, he had a deep concern for spirituality and was the most influential shaper, from the 1920s to the 1950s, of Keswick's thinking about spiritual experience. His local church ministries also affected the experience of many thousands of people. In 1938, when he commenced ministry at Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London, a church not previously associated with Keswick spirituality, he paved the way with a series of

⁵⁷ H.H. Rowdon, *London Bible College: The First Twenty-Five Years* (Worthing, 1968), pp. 22-3. See also I.M. Randall, *Educating Evangelicalism* (forthcoming).

⁵⁸ *KW*, 1922, p. 228.

messages on the deepening of the spiritual life.⁵⁹ For Scroggie spirituality had to be based on the Bible. Keswick's Bible Readings offered him an ideal platform. His approach to devotion was always practical, and sometimes a little legalistic, rather than subjective. He once suggested at Keswick that making Christ Lord would, for example, motivate domestic servants to clean under mats more thoroughly.⁶⁰ Yet he was also well aware of the inner struggles of the Christian life, struggles he had experienced himself. In 1951 Jean Rees, a popular evangelical writer, noted in *The Life of Faith* how at Keswick in that year Scroggie had opposed the idea of 'Let go - and let God' and had said that victory came through 'fighting and striving to make true in experience what is true for us positionally'.⁶¹ All of this affected Scroggie's attitude to prevalent evangelical movements and ideas of his time which, in some cases, continue to be influential. As a result of the thinking of Scroggie, perhaps more than anyone else, spirituality came to be seen by many mid-century evangelicals in Britain as obedience to the Lordship of Christ in everyday life.

⁵⁹ *LF*, 29 September 1937, p. 1020; *The Sword and the Trowel*, November 1937, p. 333.

⁶⁰ *KW*, 1927, p. 141.

⁶¹ *LF*, 11 July 1951, p. 479.

REVIEWS

Calvinus. Authentic Calvinism. A Clarification

Alan C. Clifford

Charenton Reformed Publishing, Norwich, 1996; 94pp., £5.95; ISBN 1 9526 716 03

This is an unusual book but it debates an all-too-familiar field. The main text is not from the author at all, but is a collection of extracts drawn from a wide range of writings by Calvin. The collection successfully aims to resource the ongoing discussion on the scope of the atonement in Reformed thought. The author claims that the anthology is full but not exhaustive. This is a modest disclaimer, since it is a most valuable selection and includes most texts cited by both main parties to the debate. Not all the passages bear directly on the question of whether Calvin may be cited for or against the 'high orthodoxy' view of definite atonement classically found in John Owen's *The Death of Christ*. Some quotations, for instance, may only illustrate that Calvin believed strongly in the 'free offer' of the gospel or that he held to the idea of common grace. But Clifford's claim that Calvin makes universal-sounding statements too strong to reconcile with Owen's approach seems formidable. Equally it suggests that whilst Calvin's work predates the classical differences between parties in the Reformed tradition, the subject was not quite as alien to the great Reformer as we might think. A surprising side benefit of the study also shows that Calvin was missionary in heart and advocated personal evangelism.

The author supplies a spirited introduction defending Amyraut and his successors, who challenged the seventeenth-century Calvinist 'high orthodoxy' with its belief in limited atonement. It is some time since Amyraut found an advocate, but the case presented here is more than worthy of such a distinguished figure. The argument will certainly rumble on yet, but all parties will have to take account of this little but forceful book. The resource value just about justifies the price.

Roy Kearsley, South Wales Baptist College

No Other Name. Can Only Christians Be Saved?

John Sanders

SPCK, London, 1994; 315pp., £12.99; ISBN 0 281 04744 8

Kicking and struggling, Evangelicals are at last being dragged into the cockpit of debate that our context of pluralism has prepared. Are we really

required to believe that only card-carrying, *bona fide*, self-aware Christians will find a place in heaven? You will not get a more interesting and passionate negative evangelical answer to this question than from John Sanders here. He has done his homework and come up with some interesting, mainly lost, facts. The most important of these is that we face a much richer variety of Christian approaches to the question than most Evangelicals realise. It is not, as many think, a straight head-to-head between 'exclusivism' (only conscious faith in Christ can save), 'inclusivism' (there is implicit as well as explicit faith which can save *because* of Christ) and 'universalism' (no problem, because all are saved anyway). The summaries in brackets are mine, not Sanders'. This is important, because his are much more nuanced, careful and thought out. The point is that besides these standard categories we also find strong arguments for the idea that God will communicate saving revelation to whatever person seeks him. The notion of a universally accessible revelation is found not only in Thomas Aquinas but also, more surprisingly, in such respected evangelical apologists as J. Oliver Buswell and Norman Geisler. But you could also decide for the 'final option' position that everyone encounters Christ in the moment of death, though it is easier to adopt this view if you are a Roman Catholic.

Then there is the position based on the 'middle knowledge' of God – the knowledge of what people would do *if* they had the gospel. On the grounds of such knowledge of individuals, God could rule people into salvation – but he might rule many more out (so we have two theories here, not just one). Or, if you prefer, you could opt for 'eschatological evangelization'. This is not the doctrine of purgatory, as Sanders rightly notes. The view holds that everyone has the opportunity of hearing the gospel even if this means hearing it after death. Paradoxically it draws on the spirit of both inclusivism (opportunity must be universal) and exclusivism (but it can only be through the preached gospel). The New Testament support may be stronger than you think!

There are other theories, but these are enough to make the point. Sanders states and evaluates the biblical support for all of them and lays out lists of distinguished advocates for all of them. He himself adopts an inclusivist position based on the notion of a universally accessible salvation. And you will go far to hear a better case. Granted, Sanders is driven by a sympathy for Arminian-Wesleyan theology carefully refined into a composite of foundation assumptions: (a) a universal, divine salvific will, (b) universal human ability and (c) universal opportunity. But he also has no difficulty at all in assembling a formidable galaxy of theologians and Christian thinkers from all traditions to support his

choice. He is able to cite Edward Pusey as saying that only the 'most rigid' Calvinists state with certainty that the majority of human beings will be damned. And amongst the advocates of inclusivism may be found Reformed writers such as W.G. Shedd and A.H. Strong.

There are many criticisms that one could make. For instance, allying inclusivism to Arminianism, and thus severing it from the Reformed doctrine of preservation and perseverance, may generate more doubt than hope concerning the ultimate salvation of billions of people. But weaknesses like this should not stand in the way of the reader. Anyone, of any persuasion, embarking on a study of this serious and vital subject could enormously profit by starting with Sanders.

By the way, his teaching post is at Oak Hills Bible College in Minnesota, not at a similar-sounding Anglican college in the UK.

Roy Kearsley, South Wales Baptist College

A Theology as Big as the City

Raymond J. Bakke

IVP, Downers Grove, IL, 1997; 221pp., n.p.; ISBN 0 8308 1890 1

As in all cities, there are in Rotterdam many places where canals flow under roads and motorways conduct traffic across metro-train routes. When one is going one direction by train or car it is a very different world to the one immediately below where boats and bicycles go by. In my city you can walk two streets and find a different world – whether of offices, commerce, or residential... Caribbean, Chinese, or Turkish and Moroccan.

The genius of Ray Bakke is that he understands these different worlds and through his worldwide ministry of teaching and consultancy can extend the biblical, ecclesiastical, historical and cultural maps with which we as pastors are operating. Whereas 'Urban Christian' successfully mapped out his understanding of urban mission, his latest book is about how to draw that map (page 11). This is a book of biblical theology on the city and it draws extensively upon his historical, ecclesiastical and cultural insights. The chapter notes (pp. 208-21) serve to amplify the text and point to other sources for enquiry, but it is a pity that there is no index.

The biblical tour begins with a personal history and special words of appreciation for his mentors, Charles Simeon, an English ecclesiastical evangelical, and Moses, an Egyptian-educated emissary! The following two chapters concentrate on Genesis and remind us of the corruption of the city. As we proceed, it is apparent how much the author is a pastor and has had to learn to preach through the whole Bible. In the process, he has

developed ideas on leadership, vision, the family, partnership, culture, missionary methods, spirituality and ethnicity. The final chapter takes the reader on an historical tour of his heroes who worked the boundaries of faith and culture.

This is not an academic text-book with specialised research and definitive conclusions. Instead, the author has set out to provide pastors and missionaries with a tool-kit that enables the Bible to inspire indigenous ideas in their own particular context, church and culture. I would challenge any reader to turn these pages and not to find something new, creative and inspiring. The main motive of this book is not to provide well-worked theological treatises but rather new frameworks for understanding the urban world, leaving the reader to fill them in.

The essential thesis is that the whole Bible (using the language of Lausanne) is God's gift to reach the whole city in the whole of God's world. However, migration and mobility and ever more rapid social revolutions threaten to leave the church theologically land-locked and pastorally unprepared to reach the new urban world as it is. The theological constructs of most churches tend towards definitive positions that either accept or reject. Dr Bakke has tried to keep 'very basic themes in balance' and recognises certain polarities in the Bible that we should be careful to hold in tension. For example, we need a healthy balance of creation/redemption, truth/love, individuality/community, unity/diversity and certainty/mystery. The real quest of this book is to seek a sustainable spirituality for urban ministry that will survive beyond a generation. He has provided us with a theological map that integrates the Bible, church, city (or context) and history (or tradition) through one's own experience.

Personally, I prefer to think of theological reflections as a 'trialogue' between the Bible, church and city / context integrated by experience (and the leading of the Holy Spirit). In this way, history/tradition belongs to a third dimension behind each of these three poles. The Bible is at the apex of the 'trialogue' as the supreme test of rule and conduct (something which Dr Bakke readily admits). In my previous ministry in a Glasgow housing estate, the story of Nehemiah building the walls with those left behind became an inspiration to many. Today in Rotterdam the mission of Paul in Acts and the image of Antioch with its multicultural leadership team (chapter 13) correlate better with our context.

This is a book for pastors and people who are thinking theologically about the urban world in which we live and it offers a map without which we cannot afford to travel.

Robert Calvert, Rotterdam

Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth

Jeffrey Satinover

Baker Books, Grand Rapids, 1996; 280pp., £17.99; ISBN 0 801 05625 X

Jeffrey Satinover is an American psychiatrist who has psychoanalytic training. In addition to having a distinguished psychiatric career he serves on the National Physicians Resource Council for Focus on the Family and on the Board of Governors of Towards Tradition, an organisation of Christians and Jews dedicated to re-establishing traditional standards of morality in America. His book is a significant contribution to the homosexual debate and deserves to be widely read. British readers, and perhaps particularly Scottish readers, should try to assess this book, taking into account the socio-cultural background of the author. In 1973 the American Psychiatric Association (APA) voted to delete homosexuality from its Diagnostic and Statistical Manual, a globally recognised classification of psychiatric disorders. Moreover, two of the American Psychiatric Association's committees, the committee on abuse and misuse of psychiatry, and the committee on gay, lesbian and bisexual issues, have attempted to create a climate in which psychiatrists endeavouring to offer treatment to (consenting) homosexuals wishing to become heterosexual are accused of unethical behaviour and of misusing psychiatry. When one combines this with the excessive and uncritical response of the American media to research suggesting a biological basis for homosexuality, Satinover's book, whatever one thinks of its validity, should certainly be seen as a courageous enterprise.

The book is divided into two sections. The first entitled 'Gay Science' reviews the background to the APA's decision and reviews recent biological research on the nature of homosexuality with considerable, some would say perhaps undue, emphasis on genetic research. Section two is entitled 'Straight Mores' and includes bold reaffirmation of the reality and the significance of sin, as well as accounts of both secular and Christian treatments on homosexuality and a chapter on homosexuality and Judaism. The final chapter puts the homosexuality debate in the context of what Satinover calls 'The Pagan Revolution', in which he contrasts a Christian monotheistic world view with the theology of paganism, *i.e.* gnosticism, which he views with good reason as having had an enormous influence on contemporary society.

This book has many strengths. For example on the causes of homosexuality Satinover unequivocally asserts that these are multi-factorial: 'it is neither exclusively biological nor exclusively psychological but results from an as yet difficult to quantitate mixture of genetic factors,

intra-uterine influences (some innate to the mother and thus present in every pregnancy, and others incidental to a given pregnancy), post-natal environment (such as parental, sibling and cultural behaviour), and the complex series of repeatedly reinforced choices occurring at critical phases in development'. In refuting the over-simplification of scientific and especially genetic reductionism he balances this by acknowledging that traditional Christian views can easily be over-simplified, for example in merely asserting that 'people choose to be homosexual'. Satinover's argument that the APA's change of stance on homosexuality was driven by politics rather than science is a compelling one, and indeed he ably succeeds with his own aim in the first section of his book which is to 'guard against the grossly over-blown claims of interest groups who misuse science for political ends'. In so doing he makes some telling points. One of these is the notion that in the last few decades people have usually resisted the idea that their behaviour is driven by unchangeable biological factors. This has been highlighted in feminist arguments over the differences between men and women and arguments over racial differences in IQ. Satinover points out, however, that, running counter to this trend, most gay activists, at least in the USA, are fiercely determined to prove a biological basis for their lifestyle, presumably in an effort to free themselves from any stigma. Satinover's response to this is to assert that science cannot contribute to the moral question, a view shared even by eminent secular scientists, e.g. J. Bancroft ('Homosexual orientation – the search for a biological basis', *British Journal of Psychiatry* 164, 1994, pp. 437-40). Other strengths include Satinover's emphasis on the importance of acknowledging the reality of sin, which he manages to do while still recognising the reality of forgiveness. His overview of Christian healing ministries is helpful and balanced and (of particular interest to the reviewer) shows how some of these embrace what is valuable in psychological world-views, whilst discarding what is unhelpful.

There are two main weaknesses of this book. The first concern is the chapter on secular treatments of homosexuality. Satinover claims that evidence for treatment aimed at changing sexual orientation from homosexual to heterosexual was 'more impressive than realised'. In the reviewer's view he singularly fails to make the case for this. The studies he cites as evidence for the efficacy of treatment are of dubious scientific value and are largely individual case studies and descriptive reports. The outcome studies he reports are largely uncontrolled case series which any critical scientific reviewer would tear to ribbons. The studies certainly *suggest* that some people's sexual orientation may be changeable, but do not provide compelling scientific evidence for this. This weakness is made all the more

noteworthy by the fact that Satinover uses his able critical faculties very effectively in his assessment of the biological literature on homosexuality, but seems to suspend them in his analysis of the psychotherapeutic and psychoanalytic literature and treatment. Some of his assertions are debatable. For example, cognitive behavioural psychotherapists would take great issue with his claim that the psychotherapeutic treatment of homosexuality is as successful as psychotherapeutic treatment of depression. In the reviewer's view this is simply not true. The second weakness of the book is the paucity of counsel on how to live as a Christian with homosexual orientation if one is not healed of it. Although the author emphasises the possibility, and indeed the joy of healing, it is the reviewer's experience that, in this area as in many others, some people simply do not experience healing and have to struggle with serious problems all their lives. It would have been helpful from someone as wise and as experienced in this area to have heard more on how to cope with and live with these struggles.

These criticisms notwithstanding, I have no hesitation in recommending this book. It deserves to be widely read, particularly by Christians wanting some understanding of the literature on the biology of homosexuality and how this has been misused, particularly by politically correct media groups and gay rights activists.

Tom M. Brown, St John's Hospital, Livingston

You Have Stept Out of Your Place. A History of Women and Religion in America

Susan Hill Lindley

Westminster / John Knox Press, Louisville, 1996; 384pp., \$35; ISBN 0 664 22081 9

In this first narrative history of women and religion in America, Susan Hill Lindley has tried to span a wide range of American women's religious experiences and contributions presenting the story from the colonial period through to the mid-1990s. She cites the Second Vatican Council of the Roman Catholic Church as the catalyst which urged men and women members of religious orders to return to the teaching of Christ and the gospel and to find their roots. This influenced American women, Protestants, Jews and Catholics, who, prompted also by the resurgence of the women's movement in the early 1960s and 1970s, set out on a path of liberation. The result was an explosion of research and publications about women and their roots. This work is an attempt to draw together some of the results of that scholarly explosion, highlighting the two-sidedness of

women's lives over four centuries. Lindley demonstrates sensitively how, just as religion in the traditional sense has influenced the lives of American women through its institutions, values and sanctions, so women themselves have significantly affected American religion. The experiences of feminist-minded pioneer women who led the way out of women's culturally subordinate roles are interweaved with those of 'ordinary' women, who in their roles in their homes, churches and social communities were equally important. We are given an account of ethnically diverse female experience in various geographic, racial and denominational backgrounds. *You Have Stept Out of Your Place* shows how twentieth-century feminist women have found a new freedom through gradual change but still encounter opposition about religious leadership. The book also shows how American women have come to appreciate what women through the centuries accomplished through traditional roles. Susan Lindley has depicted this changing role of women over four centuries with great thoroughness. This is a book which captures the imagination so that one looks forward to seeing how women's role will further metamorphosise, as Lindley forecasts.

Janet L. Watson, Worcestershire

Proper Confidence: Faith, Doubt & Certainty in Christian Discipleship

Lesslie Newbigin

SPCK, London, 1995; 105pp., £7.99; ISBN 0 281 04915 7

The Church between Gospel and Culture: The Emerging Mission in North America

Edited by George R. Hunsberger and Craig Van Gelder

Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1996; 369pp., n.p.; ISBN 0 8028 4109 0

Re-Visioning Mission: The Catholic Church and Culture in Postmodern America

Richard G. Cote

Paulist Press, Mahwah, NJ, 1996; 191pp., \$14.95; ISBN 0 8091 3645 7

Anthropology for Christian Witness

Charles H. Kraft

Orbis, Maryknoll, NY, 1996; 493pp., n.p.; ISBN 1 57075 085 8

At first glance, these four books may seem unlikely bedfellows. However they have a common underlying concern as they struggle with issues of effective contextualisation of the gospel in a variety of modern settings.

Proper Confidence is pure vintage Newbigin. Those familiar with his writings may find this volume more a variation on a theme than a totally new melody. Nonetheless, this is a spell-binding distillation of his work. I was fully engaged, mind and heart, from beginning to end, and was sorry to get to the last page. Not that I would endorse every sentence. But Newbigin combines a sure touch with the humility that invites the reader into dialogue and discussion, so that one emerges thoughtful, sometimes, disturbed, sometimes disagreeing, but always provoked to weigh up carefully what he has to say. Indeed, there are some typically insightful observations that are both especially urgent and especially painful for Evangelicals to ponder, particularly if we are among those Evangelicals who confuse form and meaning and pour energy into defending the indefensible. Newbigin incisively shows the unsustainability of both liberalism and literal fundamentalism, while insisting that 'to know Jesus must be the basis of all true knowledge'. Christians are gladly, in faith and obedience, to tell and live the gospel story of Jesus Christ. This is a book which deserves the very widest exposure.

The Church between Gospel and Culture is a collection of essays from sixteen different contributors. Like all such collections, there are some untidy bits, and some essays are outstanding while others did not strike me as quite so valuable. It is a measure of Lesslie Newbigin's importance as a seminal thinker in our generation that this book (along with a number of others) has flowed out of 'The Gospel and Our Culture' *Network*, which in its turn came as a response to Newbigin's earlier writing. While written for the North American setting, there were great stretches of this book that resonated for me with the British scene in general and the Scottish scene specifically. The authors struggle with the central questions how the gospel interfaces with contemporary culture, and how the church is to inculturate the gospel without becoming conformed to the world and hostage to a secular culture. How can we disentangle what is biblical from what is British (or seventeenth-century, or Enlightenment, or Victorian, or respectable middle class, or whatever)? How can the church live out its life and calling in a way that bears clear testimony to the Lord of the church and also be comprehensible and accessible to folk outside? These are, of course, questions of the greatest significance for us in Scotland today. Perhaps only foolish or blind Christians would deny that we are in a situation where the missionary nature of the church in its encounter with the world needs most urgently

to be recaptured. This is not light reading and sometimes raises more questions than it answers. But it is stimulating, thought provoking, and well worth reading.

Re-Visioning Mission may appeal to fewer of the *Bulletin's* readership than the previous two books. That may be inevitable in that Richard Cote is addressing the specific context of North American Roman Catholicism, and the particular needs of the Catholic Church, from within a Catholic understanding of the nature of the church and of its life and mission. The recent waves of Hispanic immigration into North America have had a deep impact on the church, at the same time as many traditionally Catholic communities have shed their loyalty to it. Perhaps for the first time in centuries, this Church must ask how all its life, its functions, its sacraments, its activities, can be harnessed to the missionary task of reaching those outside as well as succouring those within, all among those formerly confidently regarded as belonging already. Cote uses the concept of marriage as a paradigm for the relationship between faith and culture. He grapples with the problem of those who no longer follow traditional patterns of Catholic lifestyle and yet for whom he believes there must still be room within the Church. While I respect what he is trying to do, I do not think he succeeds very well, not least because of the way in which he uses Scripture. In attempting to shake loose from culturally-influenced formulations and traditions, he may unconsciously be shaped by new cultural influences in his espousal of mysticism and ambiguity.

The last of the four books, *Anthropology for Christian Witness*, is also profoundly concerned with understanding the cultures within which we must incarnate the gospel. Charles Kraft has written and taught steadily over many years. Many in the missionary community in particular have good reason to be immensely grateful for his contribution in his field, and I am sorry that rather few in the 'home ministry' have ransacked the insights of anthropologists such as Kraft, Hiebert and Hesselgrave. Perhaps in recognising today that 'the mission field' is no longer geographically determined but among the unchurched wherever they are to be found, including our doorstep, the valuable tools prepared by Kraft and others will be appreciated and utilised to great benefit. This particular volume is a comprehensive presentation of Kraft's approach to anthropology from the worldview of Scripture. He is a passionate practitioner, so his concern is not to stun with theory, but to facilitate effective gospel ministry. I believe he succeeds, and that this is a book which deserves to be widely read and widely applied.

Rose Dowsett, OMF International

BOOK REVIEWS

- Alan C. Clifford: *Calvinus. Authentic Calvinism. A Clarification* (Roy Kearsley)..... 87
- John Sanders: *No Other Name. Can Only Christians Be Saved?* (Roy Kearsley)..... 87
- Raymond J. Bakke: *A Theology as Big as the City* (Robert Calvert)..... 89
- Jeffrey Satinover: *Homosexuality and the Politics of Truth* (Tom M. Brown)..... 91
- Susan Hill Lindley: *You Have Stept Out of Your Place. A History of Women and Religion in America* (Janet L. Watson)..... 93
- Lesslie Newbiggin: *Proper Confidence: Faith, Doubt & Certainty in Christian Discipleship* (Rose Dowsett)..... 94
- George R. Hunsberger and Craig Van Gelder (eds): *The Church between Gospel and Culture: The Emerging Mission in North America* (Rose Dowsett)..... 94
- Richard G. Cote: *Re-Visioning Mission: The Catholic Church and Culture in Postmodern America* (Rose Dowsett)..... 94
- Charles H. Kraft: *Anthropology for Christian Witness* (Rose Dowsett)..... 94