

Reformation
& Revival



A Quarterly Journal for Church Leadership

Volume 5, Number 1 • Winter 1996

Book Reviews

Unbounded Love

Clark H. Pinnock and Robert C. Brow
Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press (1994).
180 pages, paper, \$12.99.

Rush Limbaugh says about political liberals that some of them (Ted Kennedy, et. al.) ought to be kept around just to remind us of how inept their ideas are. If the spiritual stakes weren't so high, I suppose the same might be said about Arminians.

Clark Pinnock (McMaster Divinity School, Hamilton, Ontario) and Robert Brow (a retired Anglican parish priest) have resurrected the Arminian view of God and men from dusty obscurity and are marching it around the academic stage as if a new world order has been found. Based on the teachings of the seventeenth-century patron saint of unlimited human will and limited divine sovereignty, the lengths to which these authors go in their extension of Arminius' thinking prove that the grave danger to the order of biblical Christianity sensed by the church council at Dordt was very real.

Pinnock and Brow authored *Unbounded Love*, which is at once a summary and extension of the theology found in *The Openness of God* by Pinnock and Richard Rice, a philosophy of religion, and an evangelistic apologetic from the perspective of what they call "creative love theism."

Unbounded Love is an invitation to consider God as a dynamic and loving triune being who wants to have meaningful interaction with us.... The image of God as severe Judge and absolute Sovereign has driven and can still drive people to unbelief and despair.... We want to lift up a God who is all-loving and open to the world, and we invite all our readers to embrace the Father's heart.... Understood properly, God is practically irresistible. It is a mystery to us why anyone

would reject Him who loves him so (pp.10-12).

With these kinds of introductory sentiments the biblical and theological naivete ought to appall the truth-conscious mind.

One gets the feeling that Pinnock and Brow are simultaneously engaged in salesmanship toward two very different markets. On the one hand are the evangelicals who down through history keep handing James Arminius and his occasional troubadours their theological walking papers, stubbornly forcing them out of the historical mainstream.

Indeed, it is hard to see how *Unbounded Love* might find a secure niche in evangelical academia, especially given the recent broad acclaim for Augustinian theologians like David Wells, but its potential popular appeal is foreboding. The writing is clear and straightforward, and the book warmly invites anyone interested in exploring God's love into its pages.

The other market to which the authors transparently pander is the pseudospiritual theologians of liberal humanism. Pinnock and Brow's insistence on doing theology by analogy makes one think of magazines like *The Other Side*, or theological features in *The Utne Reader*. The only apparent difference between the elitist liberation theology establishment and Pinnock and Brow is their relationship to evangelicalism, marked mainly by the authors' claim to the over-arching authority of Scripture.

Humanistic theologies often recognize legitimate enemies of their ideas and generally have nothing to do with absolutist-minded evangelical theologies. Pinnock and Brow still seem determined to get these religious secularists to like evangelicals by imitating their language (contextualizing the message?) and implying a pluralistic approach to truth which serves to contradict their insistence on scriptural authority.

The polemic tone set against the Augustinian/Calvinist

tradition in the introduction to this book is maintained throughout. Creative love theism equally misrepresents and attacks three essentials of the Reformation heritage: God's unconditional Election, God's righteous judgment, and God's absolute sovereignty.

First, creative love theism celebrates the grace of God that abounds for all humanity. It embraces a wideness in God's mercy and rejects the idea that God excludes any persons arbitrarily from saving help. Second, it celebrates Jesus' category of Father to express God's openness and relationality with us. God seeks to restore relationships with estranged people and cannot be thought of primarily as a Judge seeking a legal settlement. (The heart of Brow's original model was that we make family rather than courtroom images central.) Third, it envisions God as a mutual and interrelating Trinity, not as an all-determining and manipulative transcendent (male) ego (p. 8).

Regarding their first contention that the doctrine of Election has been mishandled by the Reformers, Pinnock and Brow conclude in their brief discussion of the historical doctrine of Election that particularity in Redemption "imputes to God a character flaw by representing Him as arbitrary in the distribution of grace." They propose that broad application of the historic doctrine of Election will produce the unfortunate result that compassionate Christians "who weep over the lost are actually more merciful than God is in not weeping" (p. 9).

The second contention against the finality and rightness of God's eternal judgment introduces the reader to the authors' method of theology by analogy. "Theologians like Anselm and Calvin," we are instructed, "have led us astray when they have interpreted salvation in heavily formal and legal terms." Also, "God is both parent and judge, but it is important not to equate the two or to reverse their proper order" (p. 9).

At this point it is difficult to determine whether Pinnock and

Brow propose one God or two, one with the nature of a parent and the other inclined as a judge. But it is illustrative of their method that they themselves have ordered the "parent/judge" relationship and have declared it "proper." At no point in the book do they admit the possibility that God is "parent" to those who believe and "judge" to those who do not. (In using neuter terms to refer to God they admittedly avoid unnecessary offense to feminist creative love theologians.) Romans 8:1 and its normative implications apparently never enter their thinking.

Pinnock and Brow's third foundational contention is against what they call "a misrepresentation of divine sovereignty." A major topic of discussion and criticism in this new-model theology is the idea that the future is unknown to God, that He and we are all struggling together to anticipate, make sense of, and ensure a safe and happy future together.

In the Bible the emphasis is on God's vulnerability and openness. Rather than deciding history in advance, God creates human beings with a capacity to surprise and delight Him. Our heavenly Father rejoices with us when we do well and suffers with us when we are in pain. Graciously upholding our significance, God continually works to attain His loving purpose for each one of us without pushing us around. Our emphasis falls on God's generosity and vulnerability, on God's sensitivity and ability to relate to His subjects (p. 10).

Whatever one's conviction regarding the functional aspects of God's sovereignty, statements like this cause major problems for anyone (probably including many Arminians) committed to maintaining a view of God based fundamentally on His transcendence and otherness. But these problems seem to be precisely the point for the authors. They offer no philosophical explanation for the implications against God's character resulting from this rejection of Anselmian, perfect being theology. In fact, they quite ignore the possibility that they have created a God completely unable to deliver man

from his sinful predicament! What need have I for God if all He can or intends to do for me is empathize?

Pinnock and Brow move through an outline derived from a precursory examination of the major questions all religions must answer. Namely, What is the nature of the ultimate? How may the human predicament be best described? What is the character of Salvation? How is Salvation appropriated? Hence we get sections on the doctrines of God, Sin, Salvation, and Faith. This simple approach is both appealing and helpful to the reader, and one wishes more theologians would address these basic issues in such a straightforward style.

All of the chapter headings relate to the central theme of God's loving nature (e.g., Resurrection, Victorious Love; Hell; Rejecting Love; Church; Window Love; Bible; Feeding Love). Though the outline is endearing, the content consistently leads the careful reader into epistemological blind alleys.

Human beings abound with ideas intended to overthrow the old orders and usher in the new world. But Pinnock and Brow's new world emperor, though draped in the lavishly aesthetic garb of indiscriminate affection and everlasting accommodation, is nothing but a reincarnation of other would-be emperors, all of whom have proven to be naked and deserve to be abandoned.

Charles Evans
Roanoke, Virginia

Heaven on Earth? The Social and Political Agenda of Dominion Theology

Bruce Barron
Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan (1992).
\$12.99, paper, 238 pages.

This book is a historical review and evaluation of the social

and political implications and impact of a movement generally known as Dominion Theology. It is a helpful guide for anyone interested in understanding the role dominion theology has played in the development of the Christian Right. The author admitted that he stumbled into this field in doing his research in another area. Understanding and writing about unfamiliar material no doubt contributed to the methodical research and precision that characterizes this book about those who hold to some type of dominion theology. Many of these concepts and movements were new to him. He wanted to make sure he would not lose his readers in the complexity of the issues and the various movements. He has presented his analysis with clarity and brevity. The author's case for Christian scholarship was well stated and his effort to be accurate, gentle and fair was reflected throughout the book. In at least four ways this reviewer found the book to be helpful.

First of all, the book contains an analysis and definition of the terms associated with dominion theology. The book even includes a helpful glossary of terms. The author begins by focusing on what is unique to dominion theology. He asserts the distinguishing mark of a dominionist is a "... commitment to defining and carrying out an approach to building society that is *self-consciously defined as exclusively Christian*." It is this radical commitment that characterizes those who hold to dominion theology and which separates it from other movements within evangelicalism. It is what Barron calls the great divide in Christian involvement in society. On one side are those who contend that it is God's plan for Christians eventually to run things in society. On the other side are Christians who maintain that unbelievers will always have some leadership role in society. He seeks then to make clear the distinctiveness of those who hold to some type of dominion theology. He wishes for the reader to be able to appreciate the nuances of thought held by various significant dominionists. From ideology to practical implementation the author then

seeks to show how dominion theology manifests itself in church and society today.

Second, the author sketches the historical development of dominionist ideas. He traces the roots of dominion theology to the writings of R.J. Rushdoony and other Reconstructionists. His concise overview of the key concepts in Christian Reconstructionism was helpful to this reviewer. It was refreshing to be able to read a book discussing Theonomy without having to wade through invectives and innuendos that often serve as the core of criticisms. Then he shows how dominion ideology has branched off into various movements. He writes about the impact reconstructionist writers had on Herb Titus of Regent University. Reconstructionist concepts are compared to Regent University's "constitutional" concept of Law and Pat Robertson's brand of dominion. When viewed from afar there are many surface similarities between constitutionalists and reconstructionists, but up close significant ideological differences keep the leaders from working closely with each other. Even though the backgrounds are diverse and the issues are complex the author takes great pains to be an accurate reporter. Providing that historical background of understanding law is one factor in making the book interesting reading.

The author proceeds to trace the influence of dominionist writings in the charismatic church, especially in the life and leadership of Earl Paulk in a movement called Kingdom Now. While some might find Paulk's personal background and the development of his theological convictions a distracting excursus, this reader found it to be vital information in understanding the differences among those who hold to dominion theology. Without being pedantic the author includes people and events in the charismatic church that contributed to its own brand of dominion theology in the sociopolitical arena. The diversity of ideas, as well as their unpredictability, in the charismatic church was well substantiated. The diversity of ideas, as well as their unpredictability,

in the charismatic church was well substantiated. The reconstructionists' dance with the charismatics is unfolded in an intriguing fashion. The key role played by Dennis Peacocke and involvement by Bob Tilton contributed to the drama involved in this relationship. But, as Barron shows, while the musical scores have similar themes, they actually keep stepping on each other's theological toes as they discover they are not really dancing to the same tune.

Third, the book documents the formidable challenges that have arisen for dominionists in translating their vision into a unified agenda. That is illustrated in the attempt of the evangelical organization, Coalition on Revival, headed up by Jay Grimstead, to unite dominionists in a program of social involvement. An initial display of unity gradually dissipated. Within the evangelical church dominion theology has not only found skepticism and resistance but also open opposition. The author reviews the tensions and debate between dominionists and evangelical leaders. Theological imprecision or vagueness produced sharp differences between the Christian Research Institute and the leaders in the Kingdom Now movement over their basic theological convictions. Theological differences have produced heated debate between reconstructionists and dispensationalists. Theonomy has also been opposed by articulate evangelical thinkers who advocate a principled pluralism in the political sphere. So, while dominion theology has had a significant influence in the evangelical church many leaders are still resistant to adopting the radical restructuring of society found in dominionist writings.

The author traces evangelical involvement in the political arena in the United States. He notes both the successes and frustrations of their working in the present system. While well-known evangelical writers have sounded the alarm about an encroaching humanism in Western civilization, evangelical political activity suggests they believe participation in the

system is more effective than resistance or confrontation. As Barron states, "Dominionists' ideologies remain radical, not mainstream within the broader evangelical impulse toward social and political involvement."

However, as the author is quick to point out, should there be a growing disenchantment with the political process (especially within the GOP) or some economic or social crisis occur, as reconstructionists believe will happen, it could well create a sympathetic atmosphere and likely popular acceptance of radical change called for in reconstructionist writings.

The conflict created between dominionists and evangelical leaders arises from serious differences in biblical interpretation. The author highlights and discusses three major points of disagreement: Christians' sociopolitical involvement, eschatology, and application of Old Testament civil law. Barron notes that not all evangelicals use the same principles of interpretation in applying biblical texts to questions the biblical writers never had to ask. He then concludes "... crucial conflict between hermeneutical principles lies at the root of the stalemates that plague the evangelical debate over dominion theology."

Finally, I appreciated the author's personal response to dominion theology after his reviewing it from biblical, historical, social and political perspectives. Some of the concluding chapter seemed like a political essay in which the author provides evaluation of dominion ideology. Each reader will have to make his own assessment of the author's assessment of the author's observations, but I found them interesting and insightful. It should be remembered that the author doesn't attempt to provide an in-depth exegetical critique of dominion theology, but his reflections throughout the book are thought-provoking. He suggests that the valuable combination of dominion theology is its cultural distinctiveness and optimism. He expressed genuine appreciation for reconstructionists' contribution in the Christian marketplace of ideas. At

the same time, he urges a "gentler and kinder" approach by Theonomic writers to those who differ with them on the issues.

In a small volume the author has packed a wealth of helpful information in unfolding the historical development of those who hold to a type of dominion theology. The author has provided a constructive analysis that should foster a healthy discussion of dominion theology, its impact in evangelicalism and its role in the Christian right. I heartily recommend this book to those who have an interest in this subject.

Lendall H. Smith
Wheaton, Illinois

***Princeton Seminary, Volume I,
Faith and Learning, 1812-1868***

David B. Calhoun
Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust (1994).
495 pages, hardback, \$37.95.

Lovers of Christian biography and church history will delight themselves in this, the first of two volumes, on the history of Princeton Theological Seminary. The author, David Calhoun, is professor of Church History at Covenant Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri.

Some years in the making, this volume is an excellent addition to the growing corpus of "Princeton" scholarship. Yes—it is a book about the history of a particular Presbyterian seminary—but it is much more than that. This book is a rare combination of factual and interpretive historical analysis and sympathetic, spiritual insight with the work the Lord Jesus Christ commenced in the founding of this institution. The story of this seminary and the men associated with it is part of the larger story of God's work in establishing His

church throughout the centuries.

Volume I, subtitled *Faith and Learning 1812-1868*, is a thoughtful and inspiring retelling of the story of American Presbyterian educational ideals in the training of Gospel ministers. The first several chapters provide us with a brief, but informative, survey of Presbyterian educational efforts in the colonial period and the factors that led to the formation of the first Presbyterian seminary in the United States; the remainder of the book is devoted to careful study of faculty and students, and the theological and cultural issues they faced in their generation.

For those unacquainted with "spiritual biography," this book is a wonderful place to begin. Throughout its pages, the reader is introduced to the men who made Princeton Seminary great. Any institution is only as good as the faculty who teach in it; and the men God brought together in its early days were uniquely suited for its purpose. Wedding scholarship, piety, and outstanding preaching/teaching skills, the faculty who served during these early years set the standard for ministerial training for years to come. Here we meet Archibald Alexander, first professor of the fledgling school, a man whose own life was marked by itinerant evangelistic ministry during seasons of revival. Having served prior as a college president in addition to pastoring several churches, we come to know him as a man who, like Enoch, walked with God and encouraged this experimental piety in his students.

As we walk across the campus we find ourselves in conversation with Samuel Miller, professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government. His life is also marked by this concern for experimental piety in himself and his students, and the preservation of Reformation orthodoxy in the body of Christ. Not long afterwards, Mrs. Hodge is welcoming us into her home that we might meet with her husband in his study. Although ill, Dr. Hodge's very presence is marked by "a joy inexpressible" as he instructs us about the "faith which was

once for all delivered to the saints." Outside the study, in and around the home, we hear the voices of children laughing and playing. One of the little boys is Archibald Alexander Hodge.

Besides the personal strengths of the faculty, we learn of the many students from around the world who came to live and study at Princeton. From Sabbath afternoon conferences to missionary societies, we are inspired and humbled at the commitment of these men as students and later as ministers of the Gospel. Some would rise to high distinction and honor in society and church; others would die quietly in some far-away land; still others would die a martyr's death at the hands of men who hated the message they preached.

Calhoun's book also provides us with a useful overview of the theological issues that confronted the Presbyterian Church during the nineteenth century. Far from being a mere parochial account of the denominational issues unique to Presbyterianism, the story is told against the backdrop of the changing ethos of American Christianity. Shifting cultural values, populism, Enlightenment ideology, and theological modifications (some may even feel they are more mutations!) are highlighted and put in perspective.

Dr. Calhoun has done a great service to the church in our day, even as he has enabled us to enter into the life and memory of men who so faithfully served in the church in another day and time. Unlike other books in church history that are a mere factual report of historical events, Calhoun's book is a powerful, illuminating testimony to the work of Christ in living His life through His servants. It is a rare book indeed, that makes you learn as much about yourself even as you learn about other Christians who have gone before us. Moreover, we learn a great deal about the importance of devoted biblical churchmanship, a virtue not to be forgotten by those who are heirs of Reformation orthodoxy. Equally important is awareness of the issues each generation confronts as it would seek to preserve the treasure in earthen

vessels. Many of the issues these men faced are still before us. We would do well to learn from them how to live and how to think. The psalmist, after all, tells us he is a companion of all those who fear God. The men of "Old Princeton" are such men, now numbered among that great cloud of witnesses!

Were it not for works of charity, necessity, and mercy, it would have been all but impossible to put this book down. This book is a "must read," especially for those who study or teach in a seminary. Buy it, read it, and learn from the nineteenth century that you might be better prepared to live out your discipleship at the end of the twentieth century!

James M. Garretson
Glendale, California

A Pig in a Poke?

*A House United: Evangelicals and Catholics Together:
A Winning Alliance for the 21st Century*
Colorado Springs: NavPress (1994).
368 pages, cloth, \$20.00

Keith A. Fournier passionately claims to be an evangelical who just happens to also be a loyal, theologically dedicated Roman Catholic. He freely admits that he submits without reservation to all the dogmas that this church espouses, and yet claims that he can be both evangelical and Roman Catholic without contradiction in terms, logic, theology, or history (p. 34).

Of course, everything hinges on how he defines the word *evangelical*. The term, until quite recently, was always understood as a synonym for Protestant.¹ Not any more. The times, they are a changing, and nowhere is this more obvious than in the way words change and are changed. Mr. Fournier is aware of this, and even expresses concern with the way verbal engineering is occurring in society at large (p. 126). Nevertheless, he feels free to resort to a little verbal sleight of hand of

his own. According to him an evangelical is one who knows Christ as Savior and Lord and tells others about Him (p. 34). Given this kind of Nutra-Sweet definition of the word (you can put it in or on everything) we should prepare ourselves to be accosted by evangelical Mormons or Moonies, each clamoring to be recognized as such. And why not? They can easily subscribe to Fournier's definition (as they read it) or simply impregnate the word with their own de-theologized understanding. It will not be long, given the way words are divested of their original meaning, before Fournier can claim to be a *Reformed* evangelical Roman Catholic!

Fournier, by the way, is a lawyer who knows how to present his case. The way he plays to the gallery, I am tempted to think that he is also an actor. His book, written with the assistance of William D. Watkins (a Dallas Seminary graduate), is aimed at evangelicals (note that it was published by a respected evangelical publisher). He exhorts his target audience to lay down their weapons and to scale the great wall of division and embrace each other once more as fellow members of the same church family. Evangelicals and Catholics, as seen in the subtitle of the book, need to form an alliance and to stand shoulder to shoulder in the battle for our nation's soul. This appeal will no doubt strike a responsive chord with many evangelicals; indeed, it already has.

It needs to be said that there are issues, highlighted by Fournier, that evangelicals recognize as legitimate concerns, and a shared consensus between evangelicals and Catholics would be entirely appropriate. But Fournier's clarion call to arms to fight against the forces of moral decadence, along with his personal (and no doubt sincere) testimony, is really secondary to Fournier's real objective. The book really has an apologetical thrust. It constitutes a full-fledged and unabashed defense of the dogmas of Rome. It has been carefully packaged, but make no mistake, the design and intent of the author is to convince evangelicals that, doctrinally speaking, the

Reformation was dead wrong and that Rome's gospel is the pure gospel. There is the not-so-subtle hint that the Reformation was abhorrent to God (p. 201)!

We are told throughout this book that Rome has always been faithful to the Gospel and that Protestant concerns are traceable to misunderstanding or distortion (p. 208). Roman Catholic distinctives are defended at every turn—the role of Mary, the papacy, the whole sacerdotal system—all of it is set forth in living color, with no apologies.

Oh, Fournier admits that Rome has made her share of mistakes, and she is partly to be blamed for the rift that took place in the sixteenth century (p. 144). He will even generously concede that the Reformation served a useful purpose in drawing attention to some of the ecclesiastical abuses that were widespread at the time, and he proudly points to the confession of Pope John Paul II in which the pontiff acknowledged the church's culpability for past misguided actions (p. 207).² This is very moving, until we discover that Fournier is only posturing. This tearful confession does *not* touch anything distinctively theological. On the contrary, Rome's claim to doctrinal infallibility is earnestly maintained throughout the book. This is most evident in his treatment of the doctrine of Justification by faith where Fournier simply regurgitates the Council of Trent. Like Trent, he sets this understanding of the doctrine over against that of the Reformers, taking particular care to show how Rome differed sharply with the Reformers on the pivotal understanding of the bondage of the will.³

Fournier, cunning lawyer that he is, realizes that most evangelicals are really heirs of Charles Finney (whom Fournier celebrates, by the way) when it comes to this sticky wicket. He knows he can score points with the jury and takes full advantage of that fact. "Look here," says Fournier in effect, "you have more in common with us than you do with the Reformers. Rome does not believe in total depravity (p. 211). Rome believes that sinners possess the ability to decide to accept

God's love or spurn it. Like you, we also believe that God is conditioned. He only acts in response to our faith (p. 213). Like you, we believe all these things. Look at how much we agree on and how at odds we both are with the Reformers. Why, we're practically kissing cousins!" Shrewd move.

But there remains that whole issue of merit—an exceedingly difficult pill for evangelicals of any stripe to swallow. No problem, declares Fournier. You evangelicals have again completely misunderstood us on this point (it's really not your fault; you were misled by those Reformers). Faith and works, grace and merit, go together! This, we are told, is Paul's point in Galatians 5:6. What counts is "faith working through love"⁴—and remember when Rome talks of merit, she is only referring to the good works we perform by God's grace through the virtues of faith, hope, and love (p. 218). Enter merit into the limelight, exit grace stage right. The two cannot coexist. The doublespeak language that Fournier uses in seeking to justify merit could have been put to good service by the Galatian Judaizers. "Paul, you completely misunderstand us! Why, we believe in grace just like you! Don't you see, it is only through grace that we even desire to be circumcised. It is only by God's grace that we seek justification by bringing in the law—it is all of grace!" (Compare this with the Trent's sixth session, ch. 12.) No matter how loudly and frequently Fournier blows this Roman horn, it is not and will never be anything but a false gospel.

Now by saying this, I have committed, according to Fournier, the ultimate faux pas. He is deeply grieved and angered by accusations like the one I have made. To say such things is most uncharitable.⁵ False accusations, vicious caricatures, innuendos, and the like are really at the root of most Protestant opposition to Roman Catholicism and is reprehensible (p. 206). He even implies that such misguided efforts have a satanic source (p. 199). Fournier maintains that there is simply no place for malicious attacks on other Christian

traditions. I agree. But I don't think Fournier is really sincere in what he says. No, he really is only upset over anti-Catholic rhetoric.

This is a serious charge. On what do I base it? Fournier admits that Catholics have at times (depending, he says, on how they are catechized) become anti-Protestant in an uncharitable way (p. 143). So, if we encounter a Roman Catholic saying harsh and nasty things about the Reformers and their beliefs, we can conclude that (1) they are poorly instructed, and (2) Fournier would totally disapprove. Right? Wrong. Fournier is the director of an organization known as Liberty, Life and Family (LLF) which has, as one of its purposes, the building of a network of an emerging generation of effective apologetics writers (p. 113).

One of these is E. Michael Jones, whom Fournier describes as a prolific author and profound contemporary Christian thinker. (Jones also blurbed Fournier's book.) Fournier especially commends Jones and his book, *Degenerate Moderns: Modernity As Rationalized Sexual Misbehavior* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993).⁶ This is indeed an arresting book, especially the last chapter titled, "Luther's Enduring Legacy." Like Fournier, Jones takes vigorous exception to Luther's position on the bondage of the will. But Jones is not content to discuss the theological issues (he does not discuss theology at all). Like some cheap supermarket tabloid, he traces the theological distinctives key to the Reformation to the moral failures of its leading light. According to Jones the Protestant Reformation was a complete farce. Luther wasn't the least bit interested in reforming the church. His doctrine was a smoke screen behind which he gave vent to his sexual lust (p. 250), and the sixteenth-century equivalent of Hugh Hefner's Playboy philosophy was justification by faith alone (p. 245). In dealing with the account of Jesus and the rich young man in Luke 18:18-29, Mr. Jones sarcastically writes, "According to Luther, what Jesus should have said was, 'Do? What must you

do? Hey, you don't have to do anything to be saved. It's all *sola fide*, baby, Justification by faith alone. Don't do anything, just believe" (p. 238).⁷ Jones gleefully portrays Luther as a notorious whoremonger whose womanizing was a constant source of embarrassment to Melanchthon (p. 247). Where did Jones get this cretinized picture of Luther? His two sources, not surprisingly, come from two fellow Roman Catholics.⁸ This does not necessarily mean that they are unreliable, even though they are both quite dated. Roman Catholics have produced some excellent Reformational historiography. Alexandre Ganoczy's work on Calvin is an outstanding example, as is the effort of John Patrick Donnelly to mention only two.⁹ The works that Jones relies so uncritically on are just the opposite. This is not merely the opinion of Protestant historians. James Atkinson, in his highly recognized work on Luther, refers to these two books as "virulent anti-Protestantism" and "extremely biased against Luther; unreliable."¹⁰ Baron Friedrich von Hügel, the noted Roman Catholic philosopher and essayist, describes the older work (and the only one he had access to at the time) as "unpleasing polemical vehemence" and abounding in "weak imputations of conscious untruthfulness."¹¹ Are we to give Fournier the benefit of the doubt and assume he didn't know about Jones's chapter on Luther? I don't think so.

As a loyal son of the Church of Rome, Fournier has no sympathy for the theology of the Reformation. All the individuals in the Protestant tradition that he lauds are outside the direct stream that flowed out of the Reformation. The great preachers, intellectuals, and literary giants that he lists do not include a single individual from the Reformation tradition. No mention is made of any of the great Puritan theologians (no Bunyan, for instance, when literary writers are mentioned). Jonathan Edwards is ignored when mention is made of the great thinkers (as was Pascal—too Augustinian, I suppose). Wesley is heralded, but George Whitefield is

missing. Fournier does not want evangelicals to continue to cling to their Reformation heritage, and, therefore, he carefully avoids citing anyone who would properly represent Reformational distinctives. His hackneyed evangelicalism is defined by his Roman Catholicism, and he desperately wants Protestant evangelicals to sanction his beliefs and his church as being completely legitimate. This is why he is so enthusiastic over the document, *Evangelicals and Catholics Together* (which is printed in its entirety as an appendix). Regardless of how the various evangelicals who signed the accord interpreted it, Roman Catholics like Fournier saw this as a marvelous coup for Rome. It strengthened their position and weakened the hold of the Reformation on the evangelical mind. Fournier points to the courageous evangelicals who signed the ECT as examples of people who recognize the Roman Catholic church (and her message) as being genuine (p. 331). Individuals like R.C. Sproul, John MacArthur, Harold O.J. Brown, and especially Dave Hunt, are painted in unflattering colors because they aren't falling over one another in the mad rush to promote alliance building with Rome. Over and over again those evangelicals who do not participate in this noble endeavor are labeled as elitists (p. 234) or doomsayers (p. 330) or modern day gnostics (p. 142). Evangelicals concerned with "right doctrine" are lampooned (pp. 146ff.) and are likened to Nehemiah's opposition in rebuilding Jerusalem (p. 99).

Fournier is a pontificator in the literal sense of the word, and he is indeed seeking to build bridges, but only so that Protestant evangelicals can hopefully find their way back home to Rome.¹² A "House United" will not be achieved because Rome has reformed, but because evangelicals have ceased to be. This is what Fournier hopes will happen, and so his book turns out to be, not only apologetic in nature, but also evangelistic.¹³ The cat's out of the bag.

Gary W. Johnson
Mesa, Arizona

Endnotes

- 1 Cf., for example, *Evangelical Alliance Conference 1873. History, Essays, Orations, and Other Documents of the Sixth General Conference of the Evangelical Alliance*; held in New York, October 2-12, 1873, edited by Philip Schaff and S. Irenaeus Prime (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1874). Roman Catholicism is specifically addressed in the section titled "Romanism and Protestantism" (pp. 427-517). It should be noted that Roman Catholics were not, until very recently, in the habit of calling themselves evangelical. Mr. Fournier's attempt to make the two congenial is disingenuous.
- 2 In Calvin's "Antidote to the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent" he observed that Trent began its first session with a similar humble confession of sins. "They mention groans and tears, the signs of repentance. I believe the person employed as their reader on this occasion must have found it difficult to keep from laughing." *Select Works of John Calvin, Tracts and Letters III*, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet. Trans. by Henry Beveridge (reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983), 41.
- 3 The waters that surround the issue of the bondage of the will often get unnecessarily muddy due to a failure to understand Luther's terms. *De Servo Arbitrio* has as its operative the word *arbitrio* which actually refers, not to the will, but to the choices that are made. Luther, along with the rest of the Reformers, understood that the faculty of volition or will is indeed free from external constraint or imposed necessity. What has been lost in the fall, therefore, is not freedom of volition, but freedom of choice—specifically, the ability freely to choose the good and avoid the evil. The Reformers were, therefore, the true heirs to Augustine whose phrase *non posse non peccare* is saying

the exact same thing as Luther's *de servo arbitrio*, and when the Council of Trent condemned the Reformers on this point, they explicitly condemned the Augustine as well. This is seen historically in the way the Roman Catholic Church dealt with other Augustinians like Michel de Bay (Baius) and Cornelius Jansen (Jansenius). Neither of these men were Protestants, but they were committed Augustinians. Baius was briefly in attendance at Trent but was not allowed to have any say and left in disgust. He later was condemned as a heretic. Jansenius was a Bishop who, like Baius, came into sharp conflict with the Jesuits over Augustinianism and met with the same fate. Cf. the discussion in *Justification by Faith: Lutherans and Catholics in Dialogue VII*, ed. H. G. Anderson, T. A. Murphy and J. A. Burgess (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985), p. 39. Leopold von Ranke and his *History of the Popes* in three volumes (New York: The Colonial Press, 1901) is still quite good when he comes to the individuals and issues that were center stage at the Council of Trent (cf. vol. 1, pp. 136-41). For a good explanation of the Latin terms, see Richard A. Muller, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985).

- 4 This verse was appealed to by Trent (chap. VII) and merited this stinging response by Calvin: "It is worthwhile to remark their stupidity. When they quote the passage of Paul, 'Faith which worketh by love,' (Gal. 4:6) they do not see that they are cutting their own throats. For if love is the fruit and effect of faith, who sees not that the informal faith which they have fabricated is a vain figment? It is very odd for the daughter thus to kill the mother! But I must remind my readers that this passage is irrelevantly introduced into a question about Justification, since Paul is not here considering in what respect faith or charity avails to justify a man, but what is Christian perfection; as when he elsewhere

says, 'if a man be in Christ he is a new creature,' (2 Cor. 5:17)." *Calvin*, op. cit., p. 119.

- 5 "I could not," wrote Richard Hooker, "be more sparing in speech than I have been. 'It becometh not man,' said St. Jerome, 'to be patient in the crime of heresy.' Patient, as I take it, we should be always, though the crime of heresy were intended; but silent in a thing of so great consequence I could not, beloved, I durst not be; especially the love which I bear to the truth in Christ Jesus being hereby somewhat called in question." *Faith and Works: Cranmer and Hooker on Justification*, ed. Philip Edgcumbe Hughes (Wilton, Conn.: Morehouse-Barlow Co., 1982), p. 108.
 - 6 This book is being highly touted by Roman Catholics. Ralph McInerney of the University of Notre Dame gave it a glowing endorsement, as did Phyllis Schlafly and Pat Buchanan. Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger said it "deserved the widest possible dissemination."
 - 7 Mr. Jones is woefully ignorant of what the Reformers' doctrine of *sola fide* actually involved. Michael Root, a Roman Catholic, writing in *The Thomist: A Speculative Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1990, Vol. 54, No. 4, (Mr. Jones would do well to read this from time to time) says "for the Reformers there is only a notional distinction between justification and regeneration. There is no justification without accompanying regeneration" (p. 709) and contrary to the type of gross distortion depicted by Mr. Jones, "every Reformation theologian I know, however, coming to faith in the justifying righteousness of Christ constitutes a momentous change in the believer." (p. 705).
 - 8 He cites exclusively from Hartmann Grisar, S. J., *Martin Luther: His Life and Work* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1950).
-