

# 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 *Theological Students Fellowship (TSF) Bulletin (US)* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_tsfbulletin-us.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_tsfbulletin-us.php)



# BULLETIN

THEOLOGICAL STUDENTS FELLOWSHIP

SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER 1984

Vol. 8, No. 1

\$3.50

**EDITORS**

Mark Lau Branson  
Thomas H. McAlpine

**ADVISORY EDITORS**

Clark H. Pinnock, McMaster Divinity College  
Paul A. Mickey, Duke Divinity School

**ASSOCIATE EDITORS**

Ray S. Anderson, *Systematic Theology*  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
Stephen T. Davis, *Philosophy*  
Claremont McKenna College  
Donald Dayton, *News Analysis*  
Northern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Roberta Hestenes, *Christian Formation*  
Fuller Theological Seminary  
Robert L. Hubbard, *Old Testament*  
Denver Seminary

Stephen C. Mott, *Ethics*  
Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary  
Mark Noll, *Wheaton College*  
Church History

Grant R. Osborne, *New Testament*  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School  
David Lowes Watson, *Evangelism & Missions*  
UMC Board of Discipleship

**PERSPECTIVES EDITORS**

Keith Bolton, Fuller Theological Seminary  
Luis Cortes, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Atlanta, GA  
Nancy A. Hardesty, Mt. Paul Novitiate  
Thomas F. Stransky, Harvard University  
Sze-kar Wan, Harvard University

**FACULTY CONTRIBUTORS**

Bernard Adeney, New College, Berkeley  
Donald Bloesch, University of Dubuque Theological Seminary  
Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Fuller Theological Seminary  
Harvie M. Conn, Westminster Theological Seminary  
Charles Ellenbaum, College of DuPage  
Vernard Eller, University of LaVerne  
Elouise Renich Fraser, Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
David Gill, New College, Berkeley  
Larry Hurtado, University of Manitoba  
Susanne Johnson, Perkins School of Theology  
Richard Mouw, Calvin College  
Richard Lovelace, Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary  
PHEME PERKINS, Boston College  
Bernard Ramm, American Baptist Seminary of the West  
Gerald Sheppard, Union Theological Seminary  
Charles R. Taber, Emmanuel School of Religion  
Keith Yandell, University of Wisconsin

Letters to the Editor	2
Linking the Gospel and the Human Predicament: An Interview with Emilio Castro	2
Biblical Authority and Interpretation Randy Maddox	5
Women's Realities: A Theological View Linda Mercadante	8
From Knowledge to Wisdom: The Seminary as Dining Hall Hal Miller	10
How Ellul Transcends Liberation Theologies Thomas Hanks	13
The Politics of Biblical Eschatology: Ronald Reagan and Impending Nuclear Armageddon Larry Jones and Gerald T. Sheppard	16
Introduction to Francis Schaeffer's Jeremiad Ronald A. Wells	19
Francis Schaeffer's Jeremiad: A Review Article Ronald A. Wells	20
Early Christian Attitudes to War and Military Service: A Selective Bibliography David M. Scholer	23
News Articles A New Mission Agency in the United Methodist Church James Pyke	24
The Challenge of Missions History Richard Pierard	27
Sixth Evangelical Women's Conference Linda Mercadante	27
Review Article: A Christian Critique of the New Consciousness Douglas Groothuis	28
Book Reviews and Comments (Itemized on Back Cover)	31

for apologetic purposes. Throughout his many books, Mr. Schaeffer repeatedly used the term "the Reformation Base." To him the Reformation was the reference point from which modern society ought to be evaluated. In it he finds socio-religious propositions which are re said to be "true," and it is the abandonment of those "true" propositions which account for the malaise of our own time. In short, he asked, if we do not have an ahistorical and propositional basis to judge modern culture, the cause is lost. As he wrote in *Evangelical Disaster*, if one follows my views, "Everything the Reformation stood for is swallowed up in a morass of synthesis and relativity" (p. 118).

I need not remake the points in the above article, but would add a few points of clarification on the relationship of Renaissance humanism to the Reformation. Humanism in the Renaissance was not so much a philosophy as a methodology by which a number of philosophies—both sacred and profane—were possible. At its most basic, humanism was about the right of private conscience to govern action. Some humanists asserted this right individually and contemporaneously, others corporately and historically (what Crane Brinton called, respectively, "exuberant" and "spare" humanisms, in his classic book, *The Shaping of Modern Thought*). Exuberant humanists are clearly forerunners of the democratic individualists of modern times. Most humanists, however, and especially those religiously inclined in Northern Europe, should come under the rubric of "spare." From them, their rebellion was not against authority itself, but "wrong" authority, in their view. But, how was one to know "wrong" authority? Herein is the basis of the humanist methodology—i.e., in its insistence that a better prescription for "right" authority can be found in antique sources, hence the insistence that scholars learn Greek, Latin and Hebrew. The majority of intellectuals in the Renaissance employed the humanist methodology insofar as they judged then-contemporary culture by the standards of the past, to which they had access to the writings of past wisdom (the "classics").

In the Reformation the Protestants employed the "humanist methodology" insofar as they objected to then-current religious doctrine and practice. For most of them, their protest was not against religious authority itself, but against "wrong" authority, in their view. For them, the antique source to which they repaired, via the ancient languages, was the Christian scriptures. This led to the Protestant slogan "scripture alone," by which it was meant that the Bible was the source for Christian believing and behaving. So, most Protestants conformed, methodologically, to the spare tradition of humanism. Let it be restated that humanism was not so much a philosophy but a method by which

a number of philosophies were possible. Let it also be said that, while the methodology of referring to antique sources united the users, it is of fundamental difference that one referred to the "wisdom" of Greece and Rome and the other to the Christian scriptures as authoritative. But like any movement based on free choice and selective reading of texts, they could not agree on much more than the Bible was "authoritative" and they were no longer content to remain within the historical church. Moreover, even though Lutherans and Mennonites both were Protestants they shared very little; indeed, if Lutherans had to choose, they would find much more in common with the Roman pontiff than Menno Simons.

Much more could be said on the subject, but suffice limitations of space to say that this extremely complex and paradoxical movement known as Protestantism simply cannot be wrenched out of its time and made a repository of timeless truth. Indeed, which "truth" of the various Protestantisms (singular won't do here) can one cite if a "base" is looked for?

The pity of Schaeffer's work is that his notion of "the antithesis" blinded him to the possibilities of creative interpretations. If one cannot accept the Reformation as a propositional "base," then, in his view, one must be a relativist who accommodates to modernity. This is the unfortunate mind of fundamentalism; in its predisposition to regard things as all-or nothing—either one is "reformational" or one has accommodated to modernity. This is a false antithesis. The Christian message *does* provide an alternative hope for a fallen world, but that message is not the sole province of one expression of the Christian tradition. The Reformation *is* part of the Christian tradition and I am glad to count myself as standing in that expression. But the majority of Christians, after all, stand in other expressions of the faith, and our main evangelical writers must allow them to stand with us, as we accept them and respect their expressions of the faith. The key to understanding Christian history is its continuity, not its change. There has always been a paradoxical relationship between Christianity and culture, and—Calvinist triumphalism to the contrary notwithstanding—that was also true in the sixteenth century. To believe as I do that the Reformation was an important revitalization movement in the history of the church—but not a "base"—is to open possibilities for the gospel, not to close them. It is in that task of bringing the claims of a fully-orbed gospel to bear on modern culture that I would join with all Christians in the various expressions of the faith. The question remains, however, if Schaefferites and other sectarian neo-fundamentalists can leave aside their triumphalism and join the rest of us.

## Francis Schaeffer's Jeremiad: A Review Article

by Ronald A. Wells

Social commentators from all ideological persuasions seem agreed on a central proposition: There is something very wrong indeed with modern society, especially American society. Whether it be Robert Heilbroner, speaking for the liberal humanist tradition in *The Inquiry in the Human Prospect*, or Christopher Lasch, speaking for the radical tradition in *The Culture of Narcissism*, intellectuals of note are agreed we are adrift in a sea of indecision in modern culture, that the malaise of the human spirit has nearly reached its nadir. It is no longer necessary for intellectuals to demonstrate that something is fundamentally wrong with Western culture; they assume a reader already knows that, so that the critic may merely illustrate the difficulty on the way to offering a way out.

In Francis A. Schaeffer's *A Christian Manifesto* (Westchester, Ill.: Crossway Books, 1981), we have a best-selling book which is another example of this, but in this instance speaking from an evangelical Christian perspective. Thoughtful Christians, such as readers of this journal, must be immediately interested in the contribution offered by Schaeffer in his latest essay.

Schaeffer's work over the past fifteen years has become a *cause celebre* in evangelical Christianity. He is hailed far and wide as the leading intellectual of the evangelical movement, and his various books, pamphlets, and films have been widely appreciated and commercially successful. Since his work arises out of the Reformed tradition of Protestantism, his latest book should be of considerable interest to people who found their religious lives in the Calvinist tradition.

Schaeffer is a Reformed Presbyterian clergyman who has lived in Switzerland for more than thirty years. With his wife Edith, he founded *L'Abri* (the shelter), a place in the Swiss Alps to which many of us have gone. During the first half of his ministry at *L'Abri*, Schaeffer was little known. His first essay, *Escape from Reason*, was not published until the late 1960s. *The God who Is There* quickly made Schaeffer a force to be reckoned with in the evangelical movement, an intellectual with an increasingly large popular following. *A Christian Manifesto* rounds out a score of Schaeffer publications over the past fifteen years on a variety of subjects, ranging from biblical criticism to art history to social comment.

I first heard Francis Schaeffer lecture while I was a graduate student in Boston in the mid-1960s. He had not yet published any-

---

*This article reprinted from The Reformed Journal, May 1982, vol. 32, issue 5. Reprinted by permission.*

thing of note, and I saw him plot his now-famous "line of despair" on the chalkboard. Hearing *Escape from Reason* in lecture form was a marvelously stimulating experience for those of us (perhaps pretentiously) styling ourselves as "a new generation of evangelicals" (what Richard Quebedeaux would later call "young evangelicals").

Schaeffer had been brought to Harvard and Boston by Harold O. J. Brown, then minister to students at Park Street Church, now professor of theology at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. Brown had persuaded some well-to-do New England evangelicals to fund a "Christian Contemporary Thought" lecture series, in which a leading Christian intellectual of evangelical commitment would be brought in for a week of lectures once a year. The first year was launched by the American university debut of Herman Dooyeweerd. Francis Schaeffer was the second year's lecturer. Now, nearly twenty years later, I see a significance in that juxtaposition: Dooyeweerd the leader and pathbreaker, Schaeffer the follower and popularizer.

What Schaeffer popularized and published abroad in his successful publication campaign (nearly a million copies of his various books have now been sold, one hears) is a notion that at first hearing would seem like an academic nuance: *the antithesis*. It, like beauty, has meaning in the eye of the beholder. A crude characterization of it would suggest an entire separation between Christian patterns of thinking and "modern" thinking. In the various versions of this, "the modern mind" can either be "secular scientific humanism" that is, the world-view emanating from the rationalism of the Enlightenment, or can even be "humanism," a world-view emanating from the Renaissance. But whether one finds the origins of modern thought in the seventeenth or fourteenth century, the main line is said to be man's displacement of God as central to the meaning of human existence. Christian thinking, it is said, proceeds from an entirely different basis from modern thinking.

The implications of this are manifold, and Christian intellectuals, especially in the Calvinist tradition, have spent a great deal of time and energy exploring the depth and breadth of this insight. Christians outside the Calvinist tradition will immediately recognize this by a less precise name, noting that since Augustine and Tertullian, Christians have been asking what the city of man has to do with the city of God, or what Athens has to do with Jerusalem.

*A Christian Manifesto* should be seen in this context. The book is of interest because in it the leading intellectual popularizer of evangelically motivated "antithesis" has laid down the gauntlet to modern American culture and states flatly that things have gone too far. He invites Christians into a headlong confrontation with the institutions of contemporary society. In the remainder of this essay I want to offer a description of Schaeffer's main argument and then a critical analysis of it.

Schaeffer's main point is to encourage Christians to see the relationship between ideas and behavior in modern culture. He suggests that for too long Christians have lost sight of the forest while dealing with the trees. In doing a form of intellectual history in this way, Schaeffer asks the Christian community to relate selected matters of particular concern to the "world-view" of our time, to what Carl Becker called "the climate of opinion."

Those readers familiar with Schaeffer's earlier works already know the outline: Humanism has become the dominant mode of thinking and acting in modern society; in founding institutions on an anthropocentric world-view, society has effectively abolished truth. On this view, Schaeffer says the theocentric world-view of Christianity has been totally obliterated in nations like the USSR, where "humanism" is said to reign supreme. The United States is almost a similarly totalitarian state because the basis for behavior and belief is similarly founded on a world-view that systematically excludes God-consciousness and upholds the "secular religion" that the world is "in reality" only material plus energy, shaped by impersonal chance. As Schaeffer said in one of his earlier books, "the gulf is fixed" between these two world-views, and therefore between the types of social and political institutions required by Christians and non-Christians. While Schaeffer realizes that most Christians already understand this in their purely "religious" lives, he encourages them to extend that understanding to all aspects of life.

Within this framework Schaeffer illustrates the depth to which modern society has fallen because of the "humanist religion." Given

his prior interest in abortion it is not surprising that many of the examples given have to do with the Supreme Court and "right to life" issues. But there are other areas of concern as well, most notably the place of Christian schools in secular society, and especially the teaching of evolution or creation in them, and in the public schools. Readers might wonder if, in Schaeffer's view, the cause is not already lost. The answer is that it is *almost* lost to the dominance of humanism, but that victory might be snatched from the jaws of defeat if Christians were to *act now*. It is in this context that he lays out the Calvinist-Reformational notions of God-given law, and the responsibility of Christians to resist the state, to reform it, even to overthrow it if society diverges too far from the requirements set down in God's law.

Shifting now from description to analysis, we must ask if Schaeffer's characterizations of modern society and his remedies are to be accepted and followed. My answer to both is a qualified no. While I laud Schaeffer's attempt to encourage Christians to realize that ideas have consequences, and that religion is related to life, he has offered his work with such sophomoric bombast and careless simplicity that it is very difficult to endorse his characterizations of modern society, much less the remedies he offers.

Readers must realize the difficulty from here on in this essay: I am an academic intellectual, Schaeffer is a popularizer who, by his own testimony, is not a philosopher but an "evangelist." While academic and evangelical work are both honorable callings, they are not the same thing, I take it that Schaeffer, in *A Christian Manifesto*, believes himself to be offering a serious critique of modern society, and I intend to take him seriously and critically. If a reader might wonder what "side" I am on ideologically, I affirm that I am on the Christian side, but a side which does its work with care and honesty, which values truth above ideological solidarity. What follows, therefore, is not mere academic condescension but an utterly serious look at some of the main points of Schaeffer's argument. My critique will question Schaeffer on the meaning of humanism and on the meaning of America.

If humanism be the enemy, it would be helpful to delineate just what humanism is. Yet here is exactly the point: no historian will accept an ahistorical, propositional definition. This has been Schaeffer's difficulty throughout his work, although most notable in *How Should We Then Live?* When "humanism" arose in the context of the Renaissance, it offered a methodology by which persons could challenge "authority" in any realm of life. First artists, then literary critics, then historians, then theologians, and finally political thinkers used a method whereby they could rebel against the authority of the "medieval synthesis." Whether in art, literature, history, theology, or statecraft, persons acted "humanistically" if they asserted the right of private conscience over an authority that prescribed a way of doing things. (Schaefferites would do well to read Crane Brinton's *The Shaping of Modern Thought* on this point.)

The religious authorities in the sacred medieval society of Christendom realized what a threat "humanism" was. The church saw the potential danger of the freedom of conscience, and wondered where it would all lead. I suppose it has led to the sorry state of things Schaeffer illustrates. So, what is my critique of Schaeffer? His confusion rests on his inability to see Protestantism as the religious form of Renaissance humanism. To be sure, Protestants *said* that their consciences were informed by the Bible, on which authority alone rested ("*sola scriptura*"). Yet we all know of Protestant inability to agree on what the Bible said, or even on what kind of book it is.

In his triumphalism, Schaeffer cannot see the ironic and tragic in the Protestant movement, because he refuses to see it as an aspect of the humanist movement itself. In his various works Schaeffer repeatedly invokes the Reformation as the answer to the problem of humanism, when in reality it is part of the problem. I do not say that these religious humanists were "wrong" in invoking the primacy of private conscience, but I accept that when they did so they, among others, loosed a methodology on the world that resulted in modernity.

Schaeffer is half-right, but half-truths are sometimes more dangerous than falsehoods. What Schaeffer must come to grips with some time is the tragic and ironic entrapment of Protestantism's development at a time when a new methodology was developing

for other reasons in other aspects of culture. He cannot have it both ways: He cannot lament the excesses of a methodology and at the same time offer critique on the basis of the religious formulation of that methodology.

Throughout *A Christian Manifesto* Schaeffer implicitly endorses what historiographers call "the Whig theory of history." This view of history has had several incarnations, and the details vary, but in general it means that right religion and liberty are on the same side against wrong religion and tyranny. The Anglo-Saxon peoples are especially blessed in this regard, and it is the Protestant nations of northwest Europe and their overseas extensions that are cited as the righteous nations. (At one point Schaeffer becomes explicit, and invokes Northern Europe in this context, and goes on to name the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.) But it is for

revolutionary party, advocating quite different visions of society. As John Adams said in writing the Massachusetts state constitution, the question was whether or not the government would be "a government of law or of men." While Adams clearly advocated "law," for Jefferson the meaning of America and of its revolution was that it would be "a government of men."

It will come as no surprise to readers that the one main sign of hope Schaeffer sees (an "open window," in his terms) is the present-day conservative successes in American politics. One of the founding principles of the neo-conservative faith is the doctrine of return to the principles of the Founding Fathers. What this simplistic view of past reality cannot accept is that the same divisions which bedevil our society were there then as well. Nostalgia will not help us out of our present malaise, nor will rewriting American history.

---

---

### ***Schaeffer's confusion rests on his inability to see Protestantism as the religious form of Renaissance humanism.***

---

---

the United States that the superlatives are reserved in this view of history, and Schaeffer seems to have swallowed the theory whole.

It has been said that the discovery of America was the cause of the greatest liberation of the European imagination. As the Renaissance-humanist world-view drove the voyagers west to go east (they defied the "biblical" authority of a flat earth), the discovery of the Western hemisphere was, as C. S. Lewis wrote, a great disappointment. But, soon that disappointment changed to anticipation, and Thomas More's *Utopia* was the first mature reflection in the Old World on the potential of the New. The general idealism in Europe that mankind could begin over again was widely shared, in both secular and religious circles.

Once again the Protestant movement was not immune from the impulses of its time, and, as is well known, Calvinists came to the New World early in the seventeenth century. Winthrop's sermon, "The Model of Christian Charity," offers the interpretative paradigm for American history: The meaning of America was to consist in "building the city on the hill," in which the light to the Gentiles would shine, and in respect of which, all would one day turn and be converted.

With this model of early American development clearly in mind, Schaeffer turns to the American Revolution. True to Whig theory, right religion and liberty were arrayed against wrong religion and tyranny. Schaeffer correctly notes the evangelical impetus behind the Revolution, and he endorses it. But should it be endorsed? As Nathan Hatch has written in *The Sacred Cause of Liberty*, many evangelicals did believe that there was a British conspiracy against liberty, especially after the passage of the Quebec Act in 1774. While we might have empathy for these evangelical revolutionaries in their context, surely they were deluded if they believed that an "absolute tyranny" was about to be imposed. (Here the Whig theory argues against itself. It was supposed to be the Anglo-Saxon peoples who were on the side of right religion and liberty. How do the British suddenly become "absolute-tyrants?") Surely they acted on a pretentious view of themselves and their cause if they believed they alone were protecting the right of society.

As to the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, Schaeffer is similarly muddled. The Declaration of Independence is an Enlightenment document, whereas the constitution opposes the spirit of both the Enlightenment and the Declaration in requiring liberty to be ordered by law. Once again, Schaeffer is half-right. Jefferson was thoroughly baptized in the Enlightenment faith, but John Adams was not. Of the several books on this subject, Schaefferites would do well to consult Merrill Peterson, *Adams and Jefferson: A Revolutionary Dialogue*. As Richard Hofstadter once said, "The Constitution of the United States was based on the philosophy of Hobbes and the religion of Calvin." Schaeffer is on to something fundamental in suggesting the unique character of the constitution. But his argument is substantially flawed by suggesting a moral-legal consensus among "the Founding Fathers." There were two sets of Founding Fathers, because there were two factions in the

In fact, Schaeffer's book stands in a long tradition of American history, and is a good example of a literary form which Sacvan Bercovitch calls "the jeremiad," in his brilliant book, *American Jeremiad*. There is a long history of Calvinists preaching the doctrine of return to the vision of Winthrop. In the seventeenth century this form was well developed. The theme is familiar: The people had betrayed the faith, had fallen from grace, but there was still time to return and re-capture the vision. This theme was reasserted in the Revolution, and at regular intervals throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Schaeffer conforms to one important aspect of the genre of the latter-day jeremiad: the enemy within. All the vision that Schaeffer sees as "the base" of American society was founded by immigrants from Protestant countries. The story begins to turn wrong when substantial Catholic immigration begins in the 1840s. While he does not name the Irish specifically, he suggests that 1848 is a turning year, a year in which (of course) migration from famine-ridden Ireland began. He returns to this theme in the conclusion.

Here we have a vestigial remain of that virulent Protestant disease: Anglo-Saxon anti-Catholicism. I am appalled to see Francis Schaeffer appearing to endorse this. Surely a person like Schaeffer, who knows that ideas have consequences, must know that in endorsing such views he is endorsing by extension some of the most undemocratic acts of intolerance in American history, acts of which Protestants must be ashamed. It is too late to be nostalgic about an Anglo-Saxon America.

In the 1950s, when political and religious conservatism had its last revival, several scholars took note of it; and some important books were written which give an analytical perspective on such conservatism in America. Richard Hofstadter wrote of "the paranoid style" in American history (neither Hofstadter, nor I mentioning it, mean to accuse anyone of the clinical phenomenon called paranoia). One nevertheless observes that there have been many movements—ideologically centered on evangelical Protestantism—which fit the typology of social paranoia. The argument proceeds as follows: The precious heritage is about to be lost, both because of the indifference of the brethren but also because of enemies within. While happily falling short of an accusation of "conspiracy" (which would have fit the paranoid style perfectly), Schaeffer nevertheless believes that institutions which specialize in the collection and dissemination of information (universities and the media) are an informal league with the courts to foist the secular-humanist mind onto the American people.

I do not endorse American social behavior and belief as it is. As a committed Christian, I believe my religious principles require me to assert that there is something quite wrong with American society. I share Francis Schaeffer's sense of urgency about matters as diverse as "right to life" and "the battle for the mind." Yet Schaeffer's outrage does not mention much at all about what I believe to be equally important questions—the arms race, institutional racism, the inequities of industrial capitalism. Schaeffer's outrage, and his will-

ingness to be civilly disobedient, seem to be rather shallow in not taking these important matters into account.

Rather than "A Christian Manifesto," Schaeffer's book should have been called "A Fundamentalist Manifesto," because it bears all the marks of that unfortunate movement. Writing in this journal on the "new fundamentalism" (*RJ*, February 1982), George Marsden suggested, in a memorable phrase, that "the Moral Majority turns out to be something of Dooyeweerdianism gone to seed." If that be true, a reading of evangelical fundamentalism's leading thinker will help us understand why. It is cruelly ironic that evangelicalism's philosopher, who spent so much time on "the antithesis," winds

up a synthesizer after all. In this book we have a vintage blend of evangelical orthodoxy and the lore of one version of American history. This is a bitter recognition for some of us who, fifteen years ago, thought Francis Schaeffer was a leading light of a new movement in evangelicalism. With his atrophied view of "the antithesis" and his chauvinistic Americanism, Francis Schaeffer becomes less appealing the more he writes.

EDITOR'S NOTE: In a subsequent article (*Reformed Journal* 5/83) Ronald A. Wells responded to some critiques and misunderstandings of this article. Interested readers may wish to consult this piece.

## Early Christian Attitudes to War and Military Service: A Selective Bibliography

David M. Scholer

- Bainton, R. H. "The Early Church and War," *HThR* 39 (1946), 189–212; reprinted in *The Church, the Gospel and War* (ed. R. M. Jones; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), 75–92, and as "The Pacifism of the Early Church," Chapter 5 in *Christian Attitudes Toward War and Peace: A Historical Survey and Critical Re-evaluation* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1960), 66–84. One of the first of modern (Post World War 2) attempts to deal with the question. A basic article by a prominent church historian.
- Birley, E. "The Religion of the Roman Army: 1895–1977," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt—ANRW II*, 16.2 (1978), 1506–41. While Birley does not deal directly with the question of early Christian attitudes, he deals indirectly with the question since part of the debate is the level of religious obligations assumed by soldiers. Best recent treatment of subject; written at a very technical, advanced level.
- Cadbury, H. J. "The Basis of Early Christian Antimilitarism," *JBL* 37 (1918), 66–94. A Quaker, early 20th century work. The arguments from many older articles (such as this one) have been picked up and refined, so in that sense they are primarily of historical interest.
- Cadoux, C. J. *The Early Christian Attitude to War* (London: Headley, 1919; reprinted New York: Gordon, 1975; reprinted New York: Seabury, 1982). Classic, but still important as a particular expression. For the sake of appreciating the early form of the argument, Cadoux and Harnack are the major tomes on the question, both fairly technical. Cadoux presents a very scholarly approach, but is operating somewhat out of pacifist assumptions (he has a commitment to argue that the church not be involved in military service).
- Campanhausen, H. F. von. "Christians and Military Service in the Early Church," *Tradition and Life in the Church: Essays and Lectures in Church History* (trans. A. V. Littledale; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 160–170. Good basic survey article, position closer to Cadoux than Harnack.
- Case, S. J. "Religion and War in the Graeco-Roman World," *American Journal of Theology* 19 (1915), 179–99. By major scholar in early church history at Chicago. Of historical interest due to the date of publication and prominence of the author.
- Crossan, J. D. "Jesus and Pacifism," *No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie* (ed. J. W. Flanagan and A. W. Robinson; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 195–208. Important essay because written by a modern gospel scholar.
- Ferguson, J. "Christianity," Chapter 7 in *War and Peace in the World's Religions* (London: Sheldon Press, 1977), 99–123 [99–106 through Constantine].
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Judaism," Chapter 6 in *War and Peace in the World's Religions* (London: Sheldons Press, 1977), 78–98.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Nature of Early Christian Pacifism" *Hibbert Journal* 55 (1956–57), 340–49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Pacifism of the Early Church," Chapter 3 in *The Politics of Love: The New Testament and Non-Violent Revolution* (Cambridge: James Clarke/Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, n.d. [ca. 1974]), 53–67. Ferguson is clearly, polemically a pacifist. A scholar of the Greco-Roman empire, he writes in Greco-Roman religion and is trying to expose some of the data that the church was pacifistic. Of his articles listed here, this is the most important.
- Fontaine, J. "Christians and Military Service in the Early church," *Concilium* 7 (1965), 107–19. Fontaine attempts to provide survey of evidence. That is helpful because there is dispute over what the basic evidence is.
- Gabris, K. "The Question of Militarism at the Time of the Apostolic Fathers," *Communio Viatorum* 20 (1977), 227–32. Gabris deals with very limited fund of passages.
- Gero, S. "Miles Gloriosus: The Christian and Military Service According to Tertullian," *Church History* 39 (1970), 285–98. Gero, an early church historian, attempts a rereading of Tertullian, whose evidence is essential in the discussion. Very technical article, which critiques both pacifist and non-pacifist sides.
- Grant, R. M. "War—Just, Holy, Unjust—in Hellenistic and Early Christian Thought," *Augustinianum* 20 (1980), 173–89. This article summarizes pagan and patristic literature on the theory and actual conduct of war. One implication of the article is that Christians often opposed the way in which war was conducted more than the concept of war itself. The article does not deal with the "pacifist" issue in the early Church.
- Harnack, A. *Militia Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries* (trans. and intro. D. M. Gracie; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981 [1905]). Harnack isn't afraid to acknowledge that the church got into the military, even though he thinks it wasn't a good thing. First major collection of the evidence in modern times. Harnack leans in a non-pacifist direction. Pacifists think Harnack has overstated his case.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Spread of Christianity in the Army," Book IV, Chapter 3, sec. 3 in *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the first Three Centuries, Vol. II* (2nd ed.; trans. and ed. J. Moffatt; London: Williams and Northgate/New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 52–64. This entry covers only one particular point from the previous entry.
- Helgeland, J. "Christians and the Roman Army A.D. 173–337," *Church History* 43 (1974), 149–63, 200. This is the most sophisticated collection of evidence for Christians in the Roman army. Helgeland's position, that Christians didn't like the army not out of pacifism but because of the religious practices of the Roman army, is key in the modern discussion.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine," *ANRW II*, 23.1 (1979), 724–834.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Roman Army Religion," *ANRW II*, 16.2 (1978), 1470–1505. This entry is like Birley in terms of content.