Amos being quite so friendly with such distinctly postmodern thought-categories. Indeed, surely prophetic preaching might critique these prevalent narratives too.

As to the book’s structure, various sets of bullet points and numeral sections are offered with little rationale. One is often lost in a swathe of emphases and intermittent quotations which are never lingered upon long enough to provide sufficient reflective depth or clarity. Along the way, however, Brueggemann offers many insightful pseudo-proverbial reflections upon the significance and theological scope of the preaching task: ‘Prophetic preaching is an effort to imagine the world as though YHWH... is a real character and a defining agent in the world’ (p. 23); ‘The preacher’s words, like the embodied Word, refuse the confines of modern rationality and dare to utter yet another word’ (p. 128); ‘It is the bite of the prophetic tradition that it can out-imagine the dominant imagination, because it is in sync with the truth of YHWH’ (p. 28). Such homiletical gems are extremely valuable.

Brueggemann really does have a lot of perceptive things to say about the theology and practice of preaching. But he does not give a wholly convincing clarion call for the why s and hows which this book appears to offer. Thus, he succeeds in bringing the uniquely prophetic nature of preaching to the forefront of our minds, but fails to bring it home in the way he intends.

Aaron Edwards, University of Aberdeen

On the other hand, North American readers of this journal will find a fair-minded and comprehensive account of the seminar’s two-century existence—an existence which, they have repeatedly been informed, suffered a fatal blow on the occasion of the withdrawal of New Testament scholar, J. Gresham Machen (1881-1937). Rebuffed when nominated to the seminar’s chair in apologetics and apprehensive over the denomination’s determination to broaden the perspective of Princeton, Machen and a circle of supportive faculty members withdrew in 1929 to found Westminster Seminary. Eighty-plus years later, conservative evangelicals on this side of the Atlantic still write and speak as if Princeton Seminary is only of significance until the year of rupture. Moorhead’s massively-researched volume will compel those so-minded to think again, and to acknowledge the complexities at stake in that post-Great War era. The volume is characterized by three great strengths.

Moorhead’s treatment of the two-century existence of the school is what may be called consolidative, for it incorporates the research of many into his own skillful narrative. Indeed, the evangelical constituency (just alluded to) will, to a degree, be disarmed on discovering that their journal articles, doctoral dissertations, and published monographs on Princeton in the pre-1929 era have—with others—been duly noted and digested. Had the same constituency researched the post-1929 era, their researches would also be reflected in this consolidative account.

It ought to have been so. The component of the Princeton faculty remaining in 1929 and dominant until circa 1940 was no less emphatically evangelical in its commitments than the element which departed for Philadelphia in 1929. The last of the Hodges to teach at Princeton, C. W. Hodge Jr. (1870-1937), successor to B. B. Warfield, continued in his post until his death. New Testament scholar, William Park Armstrong and the biblical theologian, Geerhardus Vos finished their careers at the seminary. The popular-level Bible commentaries of Charles R. Erdman (1866-1960), the Bible dictionary compiled by John D. Davis (1854-1926), the missionary writings of Samuel Zwemer (1867-1952), the pastoral writings of Andrew Blackwood (1882-1966)—all these continued to assist the broadly evangelical world for decades to come. When Princeton Seminary inaugurated its academic doctoral programs in 1944, evangelical and Reformed students were among those seeking admission.

Moorhead’s account is, in addition to being consolidative, strongly contextual. He shows that in different epochs, Princeton Seminary mirrored the sentiments and championed the concerns of large swathes of the nation. In the period up to 1812, theological instruction in the College of New Jersey had—as part of the Witherspoon legacy continued under his son-in-law Samuel Stanhope Smith—taught evangelical theology.
from the moderate Enlightenment stance embracing Scottish 'Common Sense' philosophy. This continued well beyond 1812. The early stance of the seminary from its 1812 foundation also mirrored the social outlook of American Whigs; the ante-bellum outlook of the seminary on American slavery mirrored the concern of middle America that slavery be ended (though not abruptly abolished). Until 1900, Princeton's theological outlook was clearly dominant in its denomination and provided the theological 'pulse' of northern Presbyterianism. The difficulty faced by the seminary in the post-1900 period was that it had become self-consciously defensive in the face of a changing theological and social landscape, and stood against a tide of adjustment at work not only in American society but across its sponsoring denomination and her other seminaries.

Moorhead's account further serves as a corrective to an imbalance rooted in the fact that Princeton has been appraised too frequently through the 'lens' provided by the careers and biographies of 'pillar' faculty members such as Archibald Alexander, the Hodges (Charles and son Archibald), and Benjamin Warfield. What colour is added by Moorhead's provision of an extended treatment of Samuel Miller (contemporary to Archibald Alexander), of W.H. Green (1825-1900) 'the Hebrew teacher of his generation', and William Brenton Greene (1854-1928) who from 1892 instructed in what we would today social ethics and apologetics? There is a texture and a variety to the massively-learned conservative Princeton tradition which may have gone underappreciated.

Yet, with all this said, there are certain things one might have liked to see handled, or handled differently. We have begun by noting Princeton's trans-Atlantic significance. But we do not read here of the trans-Atlantic role played by Princeton in effect adjudicated much British Reformed theology by the steady awarding of honorary D.D. degrees to pastors and theological tutors across the water. Especially in English Nonconformity, then-barred from the English (but not Scottish) universities and in Scottish Presbyterian dissent (whose Divinity Halls were not linked to that nation's universities), Princeton's trans-Atlantic role was extensive.

Second, while it is evident that Moorhead deeply admired President John R. Mackay, (president from 1936-59), devoting 50 pages to the impact and direction of his presidency, one comes away with the opinion that the sums have not been reckoned quite adequately. If we grant (and we ought to) that the 'old Princeton' endured beyond 1929, it was clearly on Mackay's watch that this era was laid to rest. Moorhead has not adequately explained how Mackay—who took his former professor, B. B. Warfield as his theological hero—could preside over the school's steady embrace of neo-orthodoxy, with Emil Brunner as visiting pro-

fessor by 1937. In the Mackay era, departing faculty members who were unambiguously evangelical were systematically replaced with those who identified with the evangelical position only in some qualified sense. It was this 'evaporation' at Princeton which opened the way for seminaries such as Fuller and Gordon-Conwell to become the institutions of choice for PCUSA evangelicals.

Third, while any volume surveying two centuries of institutional history in 570 pages will have had to leave many stories untold, some omissions seem rather glaring. Surely, there is an important story to be told relative to the demise of the Princeton Theological Review in 1929 (the year of the seminary's re-organization) and the not-unrelated commencement in that year of the Evangelical Quarterly at Edinburgh? The emergence of Theology Today at Princeton in 1944 was a development consistent with the now more inclusive theological stance of the seminary. Surely the omission of any treatment of its editor, theologian Hugh Thomson Kerr Jr., (a faculty member between 1940 and 1974) represents a missed opportunity to explore this change of theological emphasis. The church historian, Norman Hope, who taught at Princeton 1946-78, is completely passed over as is the practical theologian, Donald Macleod, who taught at Princeton from 1948-88. Finally, we are left to wonder as to what was the line of demarcation determining which current faculty members would be mentioned in this work and which would not. One hopes that the faculty members of today accepted the principle of selection used.

Kenneth J. Stewart, Covenant College, USA


For any who regard Old Princeton with gratitude and respect, Charles Hodge (1797-1878) will be a figure of profound importance. Beyond this constituency, however, it might be wondered why this unoriginal and parochial theologian now deserves a large-scale biography. (In fact, not only one but two biographies of Hodge appeared in 2011, the other written by Paul Gutjahr and published by OUP.) Andrew Hoffercker's authoritative and readable account of Hodge's life and work should satisfy those from either camp. In fact, the scale of his influence and involvement in nineteenth century American life may surprise those for whom he remains primarily the author of a trustworthy work of systematic theology.

Lives can be messy things, and biographers face the challenge of providing structure for a narrative which inevitably has many diverse, diffuse, yet intertwined strands running through it. Here, it must be thought,