There are several important implications of Anti-Arminianism for our understanding of church history. Hampton himself concludes that the strong Anglican Reformed tradition must be seen as background to the eighteenth-century evangelical revival. He also notes that the acknowledgment of a strong Reformed tradition requires abandoning "the idea of a homogenous Anglican theological tradition emerging after the Restoration" (272–73). Even beyond these conclusions drawn by Hampton, Anti-Arminianism also illustrates the strength and coherence of Arminian polemics, which thereby allows scholars to approach the international decline of Reformed orthodoxy with fresh eyes. As Michael Heyd has noted, it was Anglican Arminians such as Tillotson and Burnet who established close relations with Francis Turretin's only son Jean-Alphonse who himself was at the helm of similar polemic against Reformed orthodoxy in Geneva. It is also well known that the subordinationist writings of Clarke were important for theological change in New England. Such international connections to post-Restoration Anglicanism will have to be approached with an awareness of the strong division between Anglican Arminian and Reformed parties that lasted into the early decades of the eighteenth century.

Although the argument of Anti-Arminianism rests on a wealth of primary sources, it would have benefited from the inclusion of further secondary literature. First, in his chapter, "The Reformed Defense of Thomist Theism," Hampton cites Harm Gorti's article on Zanchi in Reformation and Scholasticism (227), but he does not engage the articles of Antonie Vos and Andreas Beck from the same volume. In that volume and elsewhere, Vos and Beck put forward a Scotist reading of the Reformed use of Thomistic distinctions, particularly the distinction between God's scientia simplicis intelligibilis and scientia visionis. Hampton assumes that Pearson and Barlow simply follow Aquinas in the use of this distinction, but Pearson appears to use the more Scotist distinction between God's scientia necessaria and scientia libera, while Barlow equates the Thomist and Scotist distinctions (254–55). At the very least, some acknowledgement of an eclectic use of medieval distinctions would have been warranted here. Second, the friendly relationship between Dutch Remonstrants and the Cambridge Platonists has long been documented, but some of this older literature is missing from Hampton's bibliography. In particular, Rosalie Cole's Light and Enlightenment (1957), which highlights the collegial correspondence of Henry More and Ralph Hudgins with Limborch, would have strengthened Hampton's general case for Remonstrant influence as well as his specific comparison between Hudgins and Episcopius on the Trinity (175–76).

The issue of Cambridge Platonists' relationship with Remonstrants raises another issue not addressed closely in Anti-Arminianism: the relationship of new philosophy to new theology. The primary sources cited by Hampton himself closely associate the "old peripatetic philosophy" with the Reformed tradition but associate the new philosophy with Remonstrant influence (147, 211). Richard Baxter, Joseph Glanvill, and others similarly associated Cartesianism or new philosophy with new trends in theology, and two of the shining stars of the Anglican Reformed tradition—Barlow and South—engaged in polemics against new philosophy. Hampton implies that new philosophy was not significant for the theological divisions in post-Restoration England because some of the greatest scientists (Boyle, Ward, and Wallis) appear to be on the side of the Reformed tradition (16–18, 22–23). Given the integration of Aristotelian notions of substance, causality, and psychology in much of the Anglican Reformed discussion of loci treated by Hampton, as well as the underlying Cartesianism in Sherlock's identification of self-consciousness with individuality, the reader would have benefited from more direct engagement with the extent to which new philosophy, in conjunction with Remonstrant theology, was feeding theological innovation.

These, however, are minor quibbles with an outstanding monograph. Anti-Arminianism makes a powerful case for reading the major Anglican controversies of the late-seventeenth century through the lens of Remonstrant reception and Reformed response. Future studies on theological transition in late-Stuart England cannot afford to ignore the evidence adduced by Hampton.

—David S. Syrman


This fascinating volume by John Hannah, veteran church historian of Dallas Theological Seminary, will automatically invite comparison with two other works. Considered as an institutional history, An Uncommon Union will invite comparisons with George Marsden's history of Fuller Theological Seminary, namely, Reforming Fundamentalism (1995). In this pairing, we can see comparable institutions described in extensively overlapping decades by an insider and participant (Hannah) versus an outsider and empathetic critic (Marsden). Each stance has its advantages and disadvantages. It must be said to Hannah's credit that his insider status has not entailed blind loyalty to the institution that is both his alma mater and his employer. The reader is intrigued to read Hannah's frank appraisal of the hardscrabble foundation and ragged early academic life of this school. It is something of an indicator of the American evangelical post-WWII resurgences, that the school whose history Marsden relates was able to begin, a mere two decades later, with financial and faculty resources almost unthinkable at the time of Dallas' founding (originally as the Evangelical Theological College).

Considered as an account of the distinctive theological trajectory travelled by Dallas, the Hannah volume invites comparison with the recently published Dallas dissertation by Todd Mangum, The Dispensational-Covenanted Rift (2007), which volume, strangely, does not figure in the work under review. Each writer attempts to account for the development of the seminary's distinctive theological position from its foundation in 1924. Both writers are in agreement that Dallas began as a broadly Calvinist institution and developed in other directions as it became progressively clear by the WWII era that its graduates would not be welcomed in Presbyterian and Reformed denominations. As that orientation diminished, an increased focus was given to Baptist evangelical culture. The distinctive of Mangum's approach was that he examined in greater detail a smaller window of time (1936–1944) when
controversy dominated; here was an account of Dallas in its external relationships.

Hannah, by contrast, patiently invested considerable space to investigating the root of
the seminary in the late nineteenth-century Bible Conference movement (itself
broadly Calvinist and premillennial) as well as the theological trajectory associated
with the era of each seminary president. Here, it is internal workings and internal
developments that provide the story line. These two works, substantially in agree-
ment, supplement one another nicely. It must be said at the same time, that Hannah's
approach—which has utilized presidential eras from 1924 to the present as its orga-
nizing principle—has (perhaps unavoidably) told us much more than we wished to
know about presidencies that were not equally eventful. An alumnus would no doubt
view this differently.

The explanatory power of the Hannah volume is very considerable. The late nine-
teenth-century Bible Conference movement was so often alluded to by historians
covering this period. In Hannah's hands it is shown to be a platform from which
many of America's leading evangelical (i.e., Protestant and Reformed) preachers with
moderately Calvinist convictions attempted to caution and reorient evangelicals, in
the face of a coming tsunami of anti-supernaturalist theories, about the origin of
man, the Bible, and Jesus of Nazareth. It was his involvement with these confer-
ences and his ever-growing association with C. I. Scofield (1843–1921) that provided
Lewis Sperry Chafer (1871–1952), the first president of the new seminary, with the
supplementary theological education he lacked, though previously he had been a
Congregational minister, an evangelist, and a musician. Hannah also observes that as
the memory and legacy of the Bible Conference movement faded by the 1930s, this
seminary—so indebted to it for its ethos and emphasis—needed to reorient itself to
a very new situation. Hannah takes a view similar to that of Mangum (above) that the
strident and elaborate defense of dispensational premillennialism (for which Dallas
eventually became so known) was an emphasis more properly characteristic of the
seminary in its second quarter-century of existence than in its first.

For this reviewer, the single most striking disclosure in the Hannah volume was
the elaboration of how the young seminary stood apart from strident and separat-
istic American fundamentalism in the thirty-year period following the seminary's
founding in 1924. It is not that there was necessarily a difference of doctrinal stand
between this seminary and that wider movement, but that under the presidency first
of Chafer and subsequently of John F Wolvoord (1910–2002), the school chewed
saber-rattling controversy and the cult of personality—features evident in abundance
in the decades of controversy.

The Dallas of today, as depicted by Hannah, has travelled a very long way indeed.
It is certainly large, likely no less influential than it ever was, and definitely a more
academically rigorous evangelical institution than it was in its earliest decades. Like
many institutions, it is still remarkably inward-looking (tending to hire almost
exclusively its own graduates), and, like many conservative evangelical institutions,
it is still struggling to come to terms with the preparation of women for minis-
try. The enigma that remains at the end of this history is surely that of what is to
be the ethos and constituency of a seminary birthed on the coat-tails of the Bible
Conference movement that was fading away, even as the seminary was being created.
Hannah hints that Dallas is evolving, often with difficulty, in conversation with
the newer evangelical constituency it helped to create when, the Bible Conferences
having expired, it next found that it was shut out of the broadly Congregational and
Presbyterian bodies, segments of which had been served by the Bible Conferences.
Dallas Seminary had been birthed to serve an already-existing consti-
ituency; it has endured by giving birth to another.

—Kenneth J. Stewart

Ancient Faith for the Church's Future edited by Mark Husbands and Jeffrey P.

This edifying anthology of essays is the fruit of the 2007 theology conference at
Wheaton College. The contributors represent a spectrum of Christian traditions and
include Christopher A. Hall, Brian E. Daley, S.J., D. H. Williams, Peter J. Leithart,
Nicholas Perrin, John D. Witvliet, and D. Stephen Long. The book is appropriately
dedicated to Robert E. Webber (1953–2007), whose life work it was to call evan-
gelical pastors and parishioners alike to seek the theological wisdom and spiritual
guidance of the church fathers. The articles are scholarly, insightful, and touch on
a wide variety of topics: patristic exegesis, social ethics in the early church, worship,
Christology, and emergent Christianity. The anthology succeeds in delivering several
outstanding specimens of evangelical ressourcement theology.

In "Similis et Dissimilis: Gauging Our Expectations of the Early Fathers," D. H.
Williams provides a concise introduction to the study of the church fathers from an
evangelical point of view. Williams is well aware that the primitivist orientation of
the Free Church can breed a superficial fascination for the church fathers, and he
tactfully and respectfully informs his readers of what they should and should not
expect to find when they approach patristic literature for the first time. Williams
warns his readers that they may be offended by the church fathers' anti-Semitism,
acceptance of slavery, and reverence for asceticism. The church fathers, however,
have much to offer the evangelical community. Williams promises, such as a deep-
ened sense of the continuity of the Christian tradition of preaching and a renewed
appreciation for the spiritual disciplines. As Husbands reminds us in the introd-
uction to the anthology: "When the content of the church's confession coheres with
the witness of Scripture, and when Scripture is regarded as the ground of the church's
tradition, respect for the place of tradition is a matter of considerable importance"
(9). Williams' essay would be perfect for an introductory course in patristics at an
evangelical college or seminary.

The articles in this anthology provide us with more than a framework for how to
read the church fathers; several represent stellar applications of patristic theology
in working toward resolving problems in contemporary theology. In "Irenaeus and
Lyotard: Against Heresies, Ancient and Modern," Nicholas Perrin turns to Irenaeus
in an attempt to sketch out an orthodox response to postmodernity. Perrin deter-
mines that Irenaeus' anti-Gnostic arguments stem from a conviction of the centrality