heaven? Why did the church in New Zealand need to be so inhospitable to John Stott, with his last visit to our shores being *forty* years ago? It shows up in the paucity of our traditions of saintly scholarship, authoritative and relevant biblical exposition, and the best in a clear, yet spacious, evangelicalism. And what about those 250 young adults in church the other night? When asked for "a show of hands" on how many had heard of John Stott, a generous estimate was that three people raised their hands. While the reasons can be offered, it was still a sad sight ... and this "portrait by his friends" would serve well as a place where this new antipodean generation might meet the most influential leader in the worldwide evangelical church for a generation or three.

Towards the end of the book is recorded Stott's response to the doctor when asked for an explanation of his wishes should he become incapacitated or unconscious. He does so before concluding with: "... the reason that I do not wish to cling to life is that I have a living hope of a yet more glorious life beyond death, and I do not wish to be unnecessarily hindered from inheriting it" (p. 211). In God's goodness, he did inherited it. As with his sermons, so also in his death can there be found clarity and symmetry for the year within the decade and the date within the month are the same: John Stott, 27 April 1921–27 July 2011.

While John Stott has been my hero and my inspiration throughout my working life, it is also true, as Chris Wright expresses it, that "the key thing is not to try to imitate him, but to imitate the Christ who so demonstrably lived within him" (p. 216). He lived for Christ and his greater glory and our response should be "above all, to cling to the cross" (p. 198).

ANALYTIC THEOLOGY: NEW ESSAYS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGY. EDITED BY OLIVER D. CRISP AND MICHAEL C. REA. NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 2009. (316 PP.) [ISBN: 978-0-19-920356-7]

BOBBY GROW
VANCOUVER

The editors of *Analytic Theology,* Oliver D. Crisp, formerly reader in theology at the University of Bristol and now at Fuller Theological Seminary; and Michael C. Rea, professor of philosophy at the University of Notre Dame, have brought together a prestigious cast of philosopher-theologians to engage an issue of Christian theology that has become, for many, a beach-head too foreboding to breach; *viz.* the interdisciplinary relation between so called 'Analytic Theologians' and 'Continental' and/or 'Dialectic Theologians.' On this relation, Rea writes in his introduction to the volume:

> The methodological divide between systematic theologians and analytic philosophers of religion is ripe for exploration. It is of obvious theoretical importance to both disciplines, but it also has practical import. The climate in theology departments for analytic theologians is muck like the climate in English-speaking philosophy departments for continental philosophers: often chilly. Moreover, the methodological divide is surely the most significant obstacle to fruitful interdisciplinary dialogue. The problem isn't just that academics with different methodological perspectives have trouble conversing with one another. Rather, it is that, by and large, the established figures in both disciplines don't even view mutual conversation as worth pursuing. They ignore one another. They (implicitly or explicitly)

> encourage their students to ignore one another. They allow their methodological preferences to play a very large role in their judgments about hiring and about the quality of papers they referee for professional journals. And the divide only grows deeper. No doubt many (on both sides) will think that all of this is perfectly legitimate. Maybe it is, but that is beside the point; its legitimacy shouldn't just be taken for granted. It is an open and interesting question whether theology can sensibly be done in the analytic mode. (p. 2.)

The rest of the volume, from one degree to another; seeks to provide some points of constructive contact between Rea's 'systematic theologian' (which I label above 'dialectic theologian') and his 'analytic theologian'.

This volume is segregated into four sections; the section breakdown is as follows. *I. In Defense of Analytic Theology,* which is made up of three chapters. Chapter 1 is written by Crisp and is entitled: *On Analytic Theology;* Chapter 2 is penned by William J. Abraham, named: *Systematic Theology as Analytic Theology;* and Chapter 3 is inked by Randal Rauser, and his chapter is presented as: *Theology as a Bull Session.* Rea writes of these three chapters, "The first three chapters are aimed explicitly at the defense of analytic theology" (p. 26). Crisp and Abraham have similar aims in their respective approaches; they both seek to dispel either, the misconceptions (the negative side, and the burden of Crisp's chapter p. 33) that have accrued around the language of 'analytic theology', and/or they seek to provide a positive conception of what in fact analytic theology offers the broader enterprise of theological articulation for the Christian church (this is Abraham's more 'positive' offering). Rea observes, "On Crisp's view, concerns about analytic theology are likely to arise out of misconceptions about its commitments…Much of his chapter is devoted to dispelling these misconceptions" (p. 26). Rea notes further, in regards to Abraham's chapter: "Abraham also addresses objections against analytic theology, but more of his contribution is devoted to exploring what analytic theology might actually look like" (p. 26). Randal Rauser's chapter serves to be a little more provocative and polemical to finish this section off; he offers a critique of Sallie McFague's "persuasive metaphor" model of theology, and Jürgen Moltmann's "perpetual conversation" model (*pace* Rea, p. 26)—Rauser penetrates and seeks to deconstruct these models of theological discourse through engaging the concept of *bullshit* (see the provocative section pp. 70–84).

The next section of the book is titled: *II. Historical Perspectives,* and it unfolds in this way. Chapter 4, entitled *A Conception of Faith in the Greek Fathers* is authored by John Lamont; Chapter 5 is intriguingly named *'As Kant has Shown …' Analytic Theology and the Critical Philosophy;* Chapter 6 comes with the title *Schleiermacher's Theological Anti-Realism,* this chapter is given life by Andrew Dole; and last in this section, Chapter 7 is titled *How Philosophical Theology Became Possible within the Analytic Tradition,* which took its form through the pen of Nicholas Wolterstorff. Lamont's chapter offers a genealogy of how the concept of testimony took form as the basic belief through which Christian reflection has taken shape through the centuries. Rea underscores, "… Lamont does not discuss analytic theology directly..." (p. 27), instead, as Rea continues, "Lamont is identifying a view of faith and theological reflection that rejects the traditional rationalist/empiricist dichotomy…and yet leaves substantive knowledge of God by way of reason" (p. 27). The next two chapters, from Chignell and Dole, both seek to recast Kant (*pace* Chignell) and Schleiermacher (*pace* Dole) in ways that make both of these figures more open to the analytic theological tradition than heretofore most would

conceive of as a viable consideration. Rea notes, "The next two chapters, by Andrew Chignell and Andrew Dole, focus on a pair of figures who might well be thought to be driving forces behind a great deal of contemporary opposition to analytic theology: Kant and Schleiermacher" (p. 27). The last chapter, which closes this section, is Wolterstorff's; he offers a shorter chapter which seeks to correct the misconceptions of what has come to be known as analytic theology throughout her variegated history. His chapter is a fitting close to this section as it synthesizes the preceding historical reflection, and segues the reader, most naturally into the next more constructive section. To which this review now turns.

Section three of the volume is entitled: *III. On The Data For Theology: Scripture, Reason, And Experience.* The lineaments of the section come to the reader in this shape: Chapter 8 is named *On Understanding Scripture as the Word of God* by Thomas McCall; Chapter 9 is titled *On Believing that the Scriptures are Divinely Inspired* by Thomas M. Crisp; Chapter 10 is *The Contribution of Religious Experience to Dogmatic Theology* by Michael Sudduth; and the closing chapter for this section is called *Science and Religion in Constructive Engagement* by Michael J. Murray. McCall, in his chapter, takes up the challenge of constructively engaging Karl Barth's ontology of scripture and theory of revelation. He argues that the theological exegete can appropriate Barth's unique conception of revelation, and at the same time continue to hold to the classic analytic mode of theological discourse. McCall writes: "I seek to show how Barth's own concerns might be addressed by the use of analytic tools. Making use of recent developments in analytical philosophy of language, I argue throughout that the theologian who shares Barth's fundamental theological commitments can—and indeed should—hold to the classical view" (p. 172). Crisp's and Sudduth's chapters, respectively, both argue, in their own ways, how it is that components other than reason and empirical datum can serve to ground rational inquiry; note Rea,

> Thomas Crisp and Michael Sudduth…explore the ways in which sources other than reason and sense perception function in the formulation and rational grounding of important theological beliefs….Sudduth argues that religious experience plays a vital role in *natural* theology…and Crisp argues against the idea that natural theology warrants belief in the inspiration of scripture. Together, these two chapters help to provide a corrective to the idea that analytic theology is wedded to an overly optimistic view about the power of pure reason to provide grounds for theological beliefs (p. 28).

Crisp resources a kind of calculus for his argument; this reviewer found his offering to be quite intriguing, to say the least. And the last chapter for the section is provided by Murray; his offering is what some analytic theologians/philosophers (like J. P. Moreland and/or William Lane Craig) have called *complimentarianism* (although Murray himself does not use this nomenclature). This is the procedure that engages in methodology that looks to place the various disciplines in cordial, if not mutually informing conversation. For this reviewer, Murray offers one of the better illustrations of how in fact analytic theology operates as an interdisciplinary movement. Rea muses on Murray's chapter in this way: "Theology and science might thus be seen (by religious believers, at least) as working cooperatively toward a unified explanatory theory. Here too, then, we find a model for understanding theology that retains analytic ambitions without either embracing an objectionable rationalism or forcing theology somehow to accommodate the strictures of empiricism" (p. 29).

To close the volume, we enter section four; entitled: *IV. Analytic Approaches Reconsidered.* The line-up for this section is made up of three chapters: Chapter 12 named *The Problem of Evil: Analytic Philosophy and Narrative* by Eleonore Stump; Chapter 13 titled *Hermeneutics and Holiness* by Merold Westphal; and Chapter 14, and the last chapter of the book is called *Dark Contemplation and Epistemic Transformation: The Analytic Theologian Re-Meets Teresa of Ávila* by Sarah Coakley (quite the title to end the volume). Eleonore Stump offers an interesting proposal which helps provide some corrective to what she calls *hemianopia* (p. 253), or the problem of being too narrowly left brained focus. She believes that this has presented analytic theology with a *lacuna,* leading to the neglect, for analytic theologians, of engaging narrative literature as a resource for theological discourse. Westphal's chapter, as Rea underscores, "… will think of the primary theological task as one of interpretation, and as one whose goal isn't so much theoretical understanding as practical wisdom—right living or, as Westphal puts it, holiness" (p. 29). So Westphal's approach is to move analytic theology beyond its usual playground, which is to consider theoretical understandings; and to move it into the arena of concrete, lived, sanctified understanding, as that is related to the theological task. In conclusion Coakley offers a way forward for both the analytic theologian and the systematic (or my 'dialectic') theologian by lifting up Teresa of Ávila as an exemplar of someone who provides a more feminine source for the theological task. Coakley's proposal leaves the door open for either the analytic theologian or the dialectic theologian to speak up first; this seems to be a laudable way to end a volume whose aim was to start a dialogue between theologians who rarely will speak with each other, except maybe in the faculty lounge.

Here I offer a few points of reflection. First, the editors of this volume are to be commended for offering a volume that has been structured in a coherent fashion; for assembling a cadre of preeminent scholars in their field; and for seeing the need for this schism to be addressed in a way that, for this reviewer, was done in a collegial and respectful way. Second, each of the chapters offered in the volume are resources in themselves as independent pieces of work that could stand alone; but the genius of the editors has been exemplified by ordering these essays in a way that they organically build upon each other so as to provide the reader with a healthy dose of synthetic thought in regards to the issue at hand; *viz.* understanding the contribution that so called analytic theology has to offer the broader theological task. Third, and this dovetails with the last point, this volume will introduce the uninitiated into the analytic waters in a way that should keep them open to the alternative side of this theological coin which this book has sought to achieve; in other words, this review believes that if the goal for this volume was to open doors for dialogical interaction to ensue between the analytic theologian and the dialectic/continental theologian, then this reviewer believes the editors have met that goal.

With the above said; here I offer a bit of critique. Since I am of the alternative mood (to the analytic tradition), it is this reviewers belief that while this volume might foster dialogue amongst theologians in general; unfortunately, this book (with all of its strengths noted) will probably only reinforce the continued schism between the analytic and dialectic theologian. What this book does well, also will illustrate for the dialectic theologian that their misgivings about analytic theological methodology is justified; and thus this reviewer fears that a volume like this, ultimately, could lead to a further entrenchment of either side.

With all of the above considered I still highly recommend this volume to all of those who are interested in what has become an unfortunate impasse amongst theologians. The intended audience, I would suggest, for this volume will be the scholar, theologian, and specialist; it might serve some remedial force for the non-specialist, but this book is mostly for the academic, and maybe for an advanced graduate course on the topic.

KEVIN J. BIDWELL, *THE CHURCH AS THE IMAGE OF THE TRINITY: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF MIROSLAV VOLF'S ECCLESIAL MODEL*. EUGENE, OR.: WIPF & STOCK, 2011. (270 PP.) [ISBN: 978-1-61077-373-1]

GREG LISTON
AUCKLAND

Bidwell's aim in this volume is to summarise, analyse, and evaluate the influential work *After Our Likeness* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) in which Volf provides a theological defence of Free Church ecclesiology through analogy with a social understanding of the Trinity. Bidwell is highly critical of Volf's proposal, and for the most part justifies his negative evaluation. Beyond a direct critique of the explicit text of Volf's volume, he helpfully examines the sources that Volf relies on in constructing his proposal (predominantly Moltmann although others are considered), and also analyses the work of Volf's dialogue partners to see whether or not Volf's understanding and critique of them is accurate and justified (focusing on Ratzinger and Zizioulas' alternative ecclesial proposals, and John Smyth's ecclesiology as the *voice* of the free church tradition).

In terms of sources, Bidwell correctly recognises that Volf unquestioningly adopts Moltmann's non-hierarchical social Trinitarian model. He argues further that this understanding departs significantly from both Western and Eastern understandings of the Trinity, and moreover is out of step with the Biblical text, the historic creeds and the Church Fathers. His analysis of Volf's use of biblical and patristic sources is particularly damning. From a biblical perspective, Bidwell claims that Volf (and Free Church ecclesiologies in general) place more weight on Matt 18:20 than is exegetically warranted, and argues that there are more viable alternatives than interpreting 1 Cor 11–14 in particular and the early Corinthian church in general as evidencing a "congregational model" (pp. 218–28). Even more compellingly, Bidwell notes several places where Volf has utilised patristic sources to argue for positions that are clearly contrary to their authorial intent. In one telling example, Volf quotes Ignatius' *Epistle to the Smyrneans,* "wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic church," to support his contention that the presence of Jesus Christ alone constitutes the church (p. 179). The sentence before and after his chosen quote, however, have Ignatius arguing that the role of the bishop is also constitutionally mandatory (pp.179–80). Overall Bidwell remains concerned that Volf adopts a "pick and choose" approach to Scripture and tradition where he emphasises those portions with which he strongly agrees (e.g. Gal 3:28) and (sometimes explicitly) dismisses and neglects those which don't immediately support his egalitarian understanding (p. 54).